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ABSTRACT

Researchers and policymakers are increasingly interested in gender influences, such as doing gender, where entrepreneurs conform to their perceived gender identity and roles, and re-doing gender, where entrepreneurs resist perceived gender differences through their entrepreneurial practices. Many studies have examined gender influences in traditional entrepreneurship, but this study investigates how they affect environmental entrepreneurship. Environmental entrepreneurs contribute to the sustainability of society by reducing negative environmental impacts or finding innovative solutions to climate change and other environmental problems such as water scarcity and biodiversity loss.

It has been argued that women entrepreneurs might be more engaged with environmental issues than men entrepreneurs in their SMEs as a result of gender role socialisation in developed countries. The claim does not apply to emerging economies, especially when gender influences and institutional influences interact to shape entrepreneurial behaviour. Turkish women are perceived as feminine through their caregiving roles at home, creating specific institutional barriers (e.g., access to finance) for them in starting/running their businesses. Turkish men are perceived as masculine, which is attributed to the characteristics of being an entrepreneur; however, this may create tensions between being a male entrepreneur and practising feminist ethics of care in environmental entrepreneurship.

In this thesis, the influence of gender and institutions on entrepreneurs' environmental engagement in Turkey is empirically investigated as a driver, enabler, or/and barrier. Specifically, the thesis argues that compliance with perceived gender identity and roles shape entrepreneurs’ ethical value creation, yet when institutional gaps occur as barriers to the development of their SMEs, women and men strategically do and redo gender and transform their reaction to perceived gender differences by practising feminist ethics of care through being relational, supportive, and collaborative in their SMEs.

This thesis suggests the above argument by developing an integrative theoretical framework drawing on gender role socialisation, feminist ethics of care, gender identity and institutional theory to understand the socially constructed gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship. Empirically, the thesis develops two case studies of gender influences and institutional influences on women and men-owned SMEs. Qualitative research is employed with data collection comprising in-depth interviews and complemented by secondary sources.
Findings reveal the distinctive (gendered) environmental drivers for female and male environmental entrepreneurs as doing and re-doing gender depending on the institutional enablers and gaps. The interaction of gender influences and institutional influences in entrepreneurs’ environmental engagement results in sustainability-driven and/or economically driven environmental entrepreneurship in SMEs.

These findings contribute to gender and environmental entrepreneurship literature by uncovering how gender and institutional factors influence environmental entrepreneurship by interacting with each other as a driver and/or an enabler through an integrative theoretical framework. Moreover, the findings have implications for female and male entrepreneurs who may wish to run environmental businesses but face challenges in environmental legislation, access to finance, and collaboration with public and private sectors in a patriarchal social structure.

The findings also have implications for social and entrepreneurial policymakers to support the role of women as stakeholders in the green economy with their contribution to the circular economy through their sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship. Also, there are policy implications for developing institutional support mechanisms for increasing environmental entrepreneurship in both women and men-owned SMEs from distinctive sectors.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

This thesis explores the gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship through the environmental engagement of women and men entrepreneurs with reference to value creation, ethical decision-making and environmental practices in their SMEs from different sectors in Turkey. Based on the constantly changing interactions between gender influences and institutional influences on women and men-owned SMEs in an emerging economy, environmental entrepreneurs are influenced by their perceived gender identity, roles, and characteristics in their environmental engagement. These gender and institutional influences are visible in their (1) value creation goals, (2) decision-making processes (ethics of care and/or justice) and (3) environmental practices which reflect environmental engagement in this study. Therefore, environmental entrepreneurship in this study is a process of how female and male entrepreneurs engage with the environment under the interaction of institutional and gender influences.

There have been many studies focusing on gender influences in decision-making and behaviour in the realm of traditional entrepreneurship; however, this study explores how these gender influences occur in the realm of environmental entrepreneurship in an emerging economy by answering scholarly inquiries (e.g., Barrachina et al., 2021; Hechavarria, 2016). Environmental entrepreneurship is a term used by Hendriksen and Tuttle (1997) and Schaltegger and Wagner (2011) to represent initiatives to mitigate the environmental impact of business activities. An environmental entrepreneur is an entrepreneur who is not merely driven by financial outcomes but is also concerned about the environmental and social impacts of their business (Walley and Taylor, 2002). This triple bottom line approach (social, environmental, and economic) makes the distinction between traditional and environmental entrepreneurs (Elkington, 1994).

This study examines how environmental entrepreneurs engage with the environment under the influence of gender and institutional factors, resulting in either economically oriented or sustainability-oriented SMEs.
Gender and institutional influences on environmental engagement (value creation, ethical decision-making and environmental behaviour) of female and male entrepreneurs are found under three components of their SMEs:

1. Duality of goals (environmental-economic trade-offs) or triple bottom-line goals (social and ecologic goals that serve the environment)
2. Environmental innovation (product/process/organisational) or system transformation (e.g., societal change with environmental initiatives)
3. Environmental value creation (e.g., repurposing the business such as adding value to waste in the market that contributes to a circular economy)

Gender and institutional influences have a significant impact on how women and men-owned SMEs engage in environmental issues within these three components. This reveals the distinctive types of environmental entrepreneurship which are important for recognising the complex and contentious nature of such entrepreneurship, and that it is essential to view environmental entrepreneurship as a diverse combination of different drivers and enablers rather than the reinvention of business as usual. The portrayal of growth-oriented and male-dominated assumptions of businesses where entrepreneurs always and everywhere pursue their interests creates tensions between being an entrepreneur and female and/or being a male and practising feminist ethics of care in business, especially in emerging patriarchal economies (Anderson and Ojediran, 2022; Hechavarria et al., 2017).

Recent literature on environmental entrepreneurship suggests personal values (environmental and social) and economic goals play a pivotal role as drivers of the environmental engagement of entrepreneurs (Gunawan et al., 2021; Spence et al., 2011). Yet, these environmental values and ethical dimensions are influenced by gender and contextual factors in each country differently (Hechavarria, 2016). Drawing on the definition of West and Zimmerman (1987, 17), I refer to ‘gender’ as a socially constructed term when exploring gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship. In this study, gender is constructed through the system of social practices in the institutional environment that leads to the construction of masculine and feminine identities among entrepreneurs.

The identity construction can be seen in the drivers of environmental entrepreneurs as 'doing gender' when they adhere to their perceived gender identities and roles, and/or 're-doing gender' where they defy perceived gender differences and patriarchy through feminist ethics of care in
environmental entrepreneurship. Doing gender refers to where entrepreneurs comply with socially constructed gender identities, such as defining themselves as feminine or masculine. Doing gender also refers to getting legitimation for women’s entrepreneurship through gender roles such as their perceived carer role in society (Chodorow, 1971; Giddens, 1984). This gender identity and role compliance resulted in practising feminist ethics of care in their SMEs consistent with the notion of Gillian (1982) about women and men practising ethics of care and justice depending on their gender identities and roles.

Re-doing gender refers to where entrepreneurs show defiance against perceived gender differences (patriarchy) in their private and professional life. The institutional environment encountered by female and male environmental entrepreneurs unveils how Turkish female and male owners/managers decide to ‘do and redo’ gender by engaging with the environment in their SMEs.

Therefore, the study is also sensitive to institutional factors such as regulative environment and unwritten but socially embedded rules that shape entrepreneurial behaviour (North, 1990). Hence, in relation to the three research objectives (1.3), this thesis reveals how gender influences interact with institutional influences and shape environmental entrepreneurship types in women and men-owned SMEs. In terms of gender and environmental entrepreneurship, there are four significant studies (Braun, 2010; Hechavarria, 2016; Hechavarria et al., 2017; Outsios and Farooqi, 2017), spanning Australia, GEM countries, and the UK.

Hechavarria et al. (2017) inform the literature that female entrepreneurs from developed and advanced countries such as the UK and other European countries (e.g., Germany, and France) are more likely to engage with environmental issues compared to male entrepreneurs. Male entrepreneurs are found to be more traditional (economically oriented) because gender role socialisation influences the relationship between the drivers and the adoption of environmental practices. Consequently, women are more likely to practice the 'ethics of care' than men (Braun, 2010). The 'ethics of care' represent a feminine-centric view of values, emphasising the connection between the agents involved in entrepreneurial activities and caring (Hechavarria et al., 2017).

Yet, knowledge of factors affecting gender-based environmental behaviour, especially from emerging economies, is scarce and dispersed. Therefore, the lack of literature on environmental
entrepreneurship encourages international scholars to investigate gender influences on the environmental behaviour of entrepreneurs, especially in developing countries and emerging economies (e.g., Outsios and Farooqi, 2017; Vatansever and Arun, 2016). Hechavarria et al. (2017) claim that the gender gap in entrepreneurship can be reduced by environmental entrepreneurship since women are more likely to practise the ethics of care than their male counterparts. Therefore, revealing female entrepreneurs’ managerial capabilities in terms of funding and/or pursuing sustainable environmental practices is crucial in emerging economies.

After conducting a systematic literature review (SLR) on gender and environmental entrepreneurship and obtaining HREC (Research Ethics) permission, I had a chance to do a pilot study at the MPhil stage before the upgrade report submission (to become entitled to be a PhD candidate). The pilot study enabled me to clarify the emerging theoretical perspectives that can be applied to Turkey while studying gender and environmental entrepreneurship and the feasibility of a setting for my research. The following sections explain the background to the study and the theoretical and practical rationale behind this research.

This chapter comprises seven sections.

Section 1.1 introduces the study.

Section 1.2 outlines the research problem.

Section 1.3 identifies the research aim, research questions and objectives drawn from the literature review (Chapter 2).

Section 1.4 presents the research setting of the study.

Section 1.5 elaborates on the research approach.

Section 1.6 discusses the main contributions of the study.

Finally, Section 1.7 outlines the structure of the rest of the thesis.

1.2 Research Problem

The first rationale of this study is to contribute to our understanding of gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship through the environmental engagement of owners/managers of SMEs which is consistently addressed in the literature (Sumathi et al., 2014; Outsios and Farooqi, 2017). Looking at the gender influences in the environmental engagement of owners/managers by considering institutional factors is required to contribute to theoretical...
advancement regarding the prediction of gender-related environmental drivers in SMEs (Gunawan et al., 2021).

Following the systematic literature review on female entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship, it can be seen that there has been scant research into gender influences in the environmental entrepreneurship landscape (Braun, 2010; Hechavarria, 2016). Gender and environmental entrepreneurship literature offer limited knowledge in understanding the gender influences on entrepreneurs and how these gender influences shape environmental behaviour in SMEs. Moreover, the existing literature repeats itself in terms of claiming a female tendency to environmental engagement in their businesses based on quantitative-based descriptive analyses (Braun, 2010; Hechavarria et al., 2017). By developing a new theoretical framework, this study brings new insights into gender influences and their interactions with institutional enablers for the development of environmental entrepreneurship.

Second, based on gender role socialisation (Chodorow, 1971), women practise the ethics of care and related entrepreneurial behaviour such as caring for and supporting others in their SMEs (Braun, 2010). However, gender role socialisation creates tensions in emerging patriarchal economies in the sense of women practising any kind of entrepreneurship as the role of women is associated with caregiving and being mothers, whereas the men’s duty is perceived as making money for the family. Hence, entrepreneurship is thought as an appropriate career choice for men (Anderson and Ojediran, 2022). Women’s perceived role in society as mothers creates tensions in gaining legitimacy for their entrepreneurship in the patriarchal society.

Meanwhile, the study of Vatansever and Arun (2016) on environmental entrepreneurship, which only includes male participants, claims that Turkish environmental entrepreneurs prioritise their economic values, drivers, and financial outcomes in their environmental engagement. In the long run, these growth-oriented assumptions can create paradoxes between being male and practising the feminist ethics of care in environmental entrepreneurship. Therefore, understanding gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship by focusing on institutional factors is important because the patriarchal social structure in emerging economies refers to institutional gaps which are problematic for the development of women’s entrepreneurship as well as environmental entrepreneurship (e.g., Anderson and Ojediran, 2022; Hechavarria et al., 2017).
This study emphasises the importance of the interactions between gender and institutional influences as drivers and enablers to show the role of women in sustainability through environmental entrepreneurship in an emerging economy, and the importance of practising feminist ethics of care for all entrepreneurs for the sustainability of their SMEs. Uncovering perceived feminist values practised by men and women entrepreneurs is important as feminist lenses should be used in general entrepreneurship studies, not only in female entrepreneurship studies (Swail and Marlow, 2018). This study informs entrepreneurs in terms of the importance of practising feminist ethics of care in their SMEs even if there are institutional barriers to doing so.

Third, as a practical rationale, the pilot study based on nine interviews with environmental owners/managers of SMEs and four interviews with stakeholders from private and public institutions that support either women’s entrepreneurship or environmental entrepreneurship has shown that there are iterative institutional barriers for women environmental entrepreneurs because of perceived gender roles (e.g., childcare), together with limited access to sectoral environmental legislation because of gender segregation in specific sectors. Consequently, limited financial opportunities in women-dominated sectors (e.g., home-based environmental manufacturing, environmental consultancy) are considered as well. By taking this as a problem and its relationship to the research objectives (1.3), this study unpacks how women entrepreneurs in Turkey are capable of doing and re-doing gender as a driver in their environmental engagement even if there are institutional barriers that are specific to them.

Moreover, the pilot study shows that institutions are usually the main enablers of Turkish male entrepreneurs in applying environmental practices. Nevertheless, this study helps understand how the feminine-oriented value system is practised by men when they are re-doing gender, and they benefit from it with sustainable outcomes (economic, social, and environmental) in their SMEs. Considering Turkey’s cultural and geographical position that bridges Asia and Europe (Chapter 3), practical and policy-related implications from this study would be beneficial for both developed (advanced economies) and developing countries (emerging economies) in achieving their goals for developing environmental entrepreneurship and women’s entrepreneurship.

In conclusion, the subject of the research is important because of the research gap in both female entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship, with insufficient attention having been paid to the gender dimension in environmental entrepreneurship. Those (Braun,
who have worked on this subject have shown that female entrepreneurs are more likely to engage with social and environmental issues compared to male entrepreneurs. They claim that gender socialisation is expected to influence the relationship between drivers and the adoption of environmental and sustainable practices. Yet, we still do not know how institutional factors reinforce or reduce entrepreneurs’ inclinations toward certain environmental engagement when interacting with gender influences.

Both men and women are potentially able to follow an ethic of care in their decisions; however, male stereotypes reduce this likelihood for men. With the new insights based on an integration of four theoretical approaches, this study contributes to our knowledge in understanding socially constructed gender influences in the environmental engagement of entrepreneurs by understanding their practice of doing and re-doing gender in their entrepreneurial environmental behaviour. Re-doing gender when entrepreneurs face institutional gaps increases their environmental engagement and other sustainable practices. Moreover, it changes the perception of perceived gender differences that are detrimental to the development of both female entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship.

1.3 Research Questions, Aims and Objectives

1.3.1 Research Questions

Throughout the identified research gaps and research problems in the previous section (1.3), this research aims to explore two main questions, as follows:

Q1: How does gender influence entrepreneurs’ environmental engagement in Turkey?

Q2: How can institutions enable environmental entrepreneurship for women and men entrepreneurs in an emerging economy?

1.3.2 Research Aim(s)

Based on the two main questions outlined above, this study aims to explore gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship for SMEs owned by women and men in an emerging economy

1.3.3 Research Objectives

Regarding the research aims, this study has three objectives:

- To explore the gender influences on environmental engagement of entrepreneurs in their value creation, ethical decision-making, and environmental practices
• To analyse gender-related environmental drivers of women and men entrepreneurs for understanding similarities and differences by uncovering what types of environmental entrepreneurs they are (economically driven/sustainability-driven)

• To conceptualise the institutional enablers and barriers for women and men-owned SMEs, uncover specific challenges to female environmental entrepreneurs, and provide practical implications to female and male environmental entrepreneurs and policymakers

1.4 Research Context: Turkey

Turkey is an appropriate research context for at least three reasons.

First, women entrepreneurs play a pivotal role in the growth and development of emerging economies (De Vita et al., 2014). Yet, patriarchal sociocultural values and associated gender ideologies affect their entrepreneurial activity negatively (Anderson and Ojediran, 2022). From childhood, Turkish people learn how to enact and behave according to gender and are thereby expected to comply with gender roles and associated behaviour perceived as female or male. Entrepreneurship is perceived as a man’s job, while the primary role for women is perceived as being a caregiver (Maden, 2015; Sefer, 2020). Turkish society appears to restrict the economic participation and career progression of women in any type of entrepreneurship by defining them as mothers and wives or by prioritising their caregiver role. This gender role socialising leads me to expect Turkish women’s legitimation in entrepreneurship will be through their environmental engagement because environmental entrepreneurship allows them to practise feminist ethics of care (e.g., caring, supporting, being relational) in their SMEs.

Turkey is a suitable research setting for uncovering how women entrepreneurs navigate gendered challenges by strategically doing and re-doing gender in environmental engagement for the benefit of their SMEs, which may be a key differentiator of the role of women in sustainability-related entrepreneurship in emerging economies like Turkey. Such a role makes women key stakeholders in economic growth and sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship.

Second, emerging economies and their entrepreneurship policies force companies to gain a competitive advantage in the industry, which leads to growth in the country’s economy (Potluri and Phani, 2020). Hence, entrepreneurship is a catalyst in Turkey’s economic development. However, focusing only on economic growth is causing significant damage to the natural beauty of Turkey through environmental pollution, the waste of natural resources, and the
reduction of biodiversity (Vatansever and Arun, 2016). In many developed countries (advanced economies) and developing countries (emerging economies), environmental entrepreneurship helps to protect the environment and contributes to both the economy and society in terms of sustainability. However, recent studies claim that there are still no Turkish entrepreneurs who are sustainability-driven acting to transform society with environmental innovation (e.g., Vatansever and Arun, 2016).

This view leads me to question how institutions can enable environmental entrepreneurship for both female and male entrepreneurs in Turkey. Identifying distinctive types of environmental entrepreneurship (economically driven vs sustainability driven) in women and men-owned SMEs operating in different sectors, such as eco-tourism, sustainable fashion or organic textile, would be fruitful to show the distinctive nature of environmental entrepreneurship. This is crucial because the environmental entrepreneurship literature claims that the weight of economic growth interpretations of environmental entrepreneurship limits entrepreneurs’ potential to effectively perform in the economy otherwise (O’Neil and Gibbs, 2016). In this sense, Turkey has been a suitable research context because this thesis shows how female and male entrepreneurs can resolve the tensions and paradoxes in constructing their environmental entrepreneurship identity because of the typical entrepreneur expectations which are associated with masculinities and growth-oriented assumptions in advanced and emerging economies.

Third, the literature on gender and environmental entrepreneurship from the extant literature is mostly from developed countries (Gunawan et al., 2021). A study set in Turkey contributes to the existing literature by filling this empirical gap. Also, theoretically, gender and environmental entrepreneurship studies from developed countries tend to claim that women have greater social and environmental commitment than men in their SMEs due to different gender socialisation circumstances (Braun, 2010; Hechavarria, 2016).

However, when institutional influences do not work in tandem and interact with gender influences, such as perceived gender identity and gender role expectations, even if women have a more social and environmental commitment than men, it might be challenging for women to turn their environmental aspirations into entrepreneurial action. Thereby, this thesis theoretically extends the previous argument by claiming that, in developing countries, when institutions, such as access to finance, environmental legislation, non-governmental organisations, and other unwritten socially embedded rules, support female and male
environmental entrepreneurs equally, then female entrepreneurs are more likely to transform their sustainability-oriented (economic, social, and environmental) values into entrepreneurial behaviour.

The findings from Turkey contribute to the literature in terms of offering an understanding that socially constructed gender is not simply an aspect of what one is (West and Zimmerman, 1987: 17). This study suggests practical implications for both women and men entrepreneurs by practising feminist ethics of care and the benefits arising for sustainable outcomes despite SME gender disparities in Turkey. The findings of this study may also be useful for environmental entrepreneurs from other countries by conveying this message: even if institutions define the rules of the game, it is important to acknowledge that institutions are formed through human agency (Giddens, 1984). Hence, women and men entrepreneurs can change these rules for the greater good (social, environmental, economic) by doing and re-doing gender in their SMEs.

1.5 Research Approach

1.5.1 Theoretical Framing

To develop a theoretical framing for exploring how gender influences environmental entrepreneurship, this thesis adopts a SLR. The SLR will be used to integrate feminist theories and institutional theory to offer an understanding of gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship. With the SLR on female entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship, the study develops the conceptual linkages that inform the empirical analysis. By doing so, this study reveals the gender-related environmental drivers of and women and men entrepreneurs based on their institutional environment in an emerging economy.

Based on the SLR, four existing theoretical perspectives are identified, namely: gender role socialisation theory (Chodorow, 1971; Giddens, 1984), feminist ethics of care (Gillian, 1982; Held, 2006), gender identity (Diaz Garcia and Welter, 2013; Lewis, 2013) and institutional theory (Kolk, 2014; North, 1990). Each of these perspectives contributes to the generation of effective theoretical framing to understand gender dynamics and institutional enablers in women and men-owned SMEs.

Feminist lenses enhance our understanding of the socialisation of one’s gender, as well as one’s relationship to society, which is reflected in the value creation goals/aspirations that entrepreneurs set for their SMEs in this study. Based on gender socialisation, the emerging theoretical framing uncovers socially constructed gender differences in practising ethics of care
through the entrepreneurial decision-making process in women and men-owned SMEs. Women entrepreneurs’ socialisation of ethics of care is strongly reflected in their triple bottom-line goals (i.e., social, environmental, and economic) in their entrepreneurship. Men’s socialisation of ethics of care is strongly reflected in their duality of goals (i.e., environmental, and economic trade-offs).

Reconstructing gender identity by practising feminist ethics of care shows that Turkish environmental entrepreneurs are core to this process of making and remaking environmental entrepreneurship when gender influences and institutional factors intersect with each other in their multiple selves. Their narratives help to expand the concept of environmental entrepreneurship and to uncover ‘present’ alternatives which challenge the prevailing obsession with economic growth and masculine discourse in entrepreneurship. Constructing environmental entrepreneur identities, women and men redo gender and act in ways that go beyond not only the normative concepts of what is male, and female are but also the regulative structures that punish women for their traditional gender roles (e.g., caregiver role). Yet, this identity construction also depends on other factors, such as how entrepreneurs engage with institutions in their society.

Institutional theory enhances our knowledge of gender influences with its interaction with a society based on institutional factors by conceptualising these factors for both women and men entrepreneurs in a specific country context. Institutions outline the available modes of appropriate actions, which are commonly conceived as the rules of the game (North, 1990). The notion of legitimacy is central to institutional theory. Legitimacy refers to whether an agent's actions are deemed desirable, appropriate, or proper. While some regulatory institutions may affect female and male entrepreneurs in similar ways, others have gendered effects, such as labour market laws that give (un)equal access to employment positions and family policies that specify childcare provisions (Welter and Smallbone, 2010).

In this sense, institutional lenses enable us to comprehend institutional gaps that are specific to female environmental entrepreneurs as well as those gaps in the development of environmental entrepreneurship (Kolk, 2014). Consequently, the context influences the nature, the pace of development and the type of environmental entrepreneurship, as well as how female and male entrepreneurs pursue their environmental practices in Turkey.

To sum up, the theoretical framing depends on gender role socialisation theory (Chodorow, 1971; Giddens, 1984), feminist ethics of care (Gillian, 1982; Held, 2006), gender identity (Diaz
Garcia and Welter, 2013; Lewis, 2013) and institutional theory (Kolk, 2014; North, 1990). The gender role socialisation and feminist ethics of care help us to understand gendered environmental drivers based on perceived gender identity and the roles and reactions of perceived gender differences in the environmental engagement of entrepreneurs in Turkey. Gender identity and institutional theory uncover how the institutional environment becomes the enabler for these entrepreneurs, especially when they reconstruct their identity and redo gender with their entrepreneurial activities.

These four theories are relevant to the study and make a significant contribution to the theory for understanding the socially constructed gender influences and institutional influences that shape environmental entrepreneurship in women and men-owned SMEs. The emerging integrative theoretical framing is explained in the literature review chapter (Figure 2.8).

1.5.2 Research Method

The study used a qualitative case study research design to understand the gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship. A qualitative case study design is appropriate for employing 'how?' and 'why?' research questions to focus on the socially constructed nature of reality (Bryman, 2012; Yin 2018). A sample of owners/managers of SMEs was recruited using non-probability techniques of purposive and theoretical sampling during the pilot study in Turkey and, subsequently, during the PhD fieldwork. Primary and secondary data collection methods were employed during six months of the PhD fieldwork, from November 2020 to May 2021. Primary data was collected through face-to-face and online video interviews (due to COVID-19). This was complemented by secondary documents, such as leaflets, social media pages, website information, and government reports.

In total, 36 research participants, comprising 14 women owners/managers, nine men owners/managers, and eight officials of governmental and non-governmental institutions underwent interviews lasting 40-120 minutes. An initial 13 semi-structured interviews had been conducted with Turkish women and men owners/managers as well as officials. The main PhD fieldwork in-depth interviews were based on a semi-structured interview guide (Appendix 3), which drew on a systematic literature review (Chapter 2) applied in the earlier pilot study.

The collected data was first translated from Turkish to English. Then, it was analysed through transcription and coding using the NVIVO programme. The design included individual interviews with environmental owners/managers categorised by gender from both urban and rural areas, presented in Chapter 5. The second stage of the research design comprised both
environmental entrepreneurs (women and men) and related representatives from formal/informal institutions that support either environmental SMEs or women’s entrepreneurship in rural and urban areas (Istanbul-Ankara). The use of video-call interviews during COVID-19 restrictions increased the chances of interviewing participants from both urban and rural areas.

The data analyses were based on the theoretical framework developed, which included the application of a coding scheme during the data collection that was guided by content analysis, narrative analysis, and thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006), and Miles, Huberman, and Saldana’s (2014) analytical approach. Finally, a new theoretical framework was developed (Figure 7.1) from the application of the integrated emerging theoretical framing (Figure 2.8) to the empirical research setting of Turkey (Chapters 5 and 6).

1.6 Findings

By exploring the influences of gender on the environmental engagement of entrepreneurs through their value creation, decision-making, and environmental practices, it has been found that gender influences manifest themselves as a driver of environmental entrepreneurship where entrepreneurs do and/or redo gender. However, these gendered environmental drivers are practised by women and men entrepreneurs differently depending on the institutional enablers and how entrepreneurs experience these enablers for the benefit of their SMEs. These interactions between gender and institutional influences uncover different types of environmental entrepreneurship, namely economically oriented and sustainability-oriented, in Turkey. Moreover, women owners/managers are found to be key stakeholders in the development of a circular economy because of their value creation goals focusing on the triple-bottom-line goals rather than the duality of goals (economic-environmental) in SMEs.

There are limited funding opportunities and deficiencies in the environmental legislation that present significant challenges to all environmental entrepreneurs in Turkey. However, these institutional influences are more effective on women’s environmental entrepreneurship than men’s environmental entrepreneurship in the sense of starting their SMEs, the level of their environmental engagement, and the growth of their businesses with financial returns. This is usually because of the unwritten rules that promote males to be entrepreneurs while females stay at home as caregivers.

While gender role socialisation drives women to practise the feminist ethics of care and start environmental businesses, institutional gaps become a barrier and hinder their environmental
aspirations to turn into practice in a patriarchal society. Similarly, being male and an entrepreneur creates tensions in practising feminist ethics of care for them. However, the findings show that entrepreneurs can redo gender contrary to the perceived gender differences in entrepreneurship (masculine-oriented) by being relational, supportive, and collaborative in their SMEs. Drawing on the empirical findings, the integrative theoretical framework proposes that both women and men entrepreneurs can change the rules of the game for the benefit of their SMEs by doing and re-doing gender within environmental entrepreneurship strategically.

1.7 Contributions of The Study

First, the integrative theoretical framework (Figure 7.1) contributes to gender and environmental entrepreneurship literature (e.g., Braun, 2010; Hechavarria, 2016; Outsios and Farooqi, 2017) by uncovering how gender and institutional factors influence environmental entrepreneurship by interacting with each other as a driver and/or enabler. The framework argues that the constantly changing interactions between gender influences and institutional influences shape the environmental engagement of women and men entrepreneurs differently. The interaction of gender and institutional influences is evident in the emergence of environmental entrepreneurship types in the form of sustainability-driven or economically driven SMEs led by women and men entrepreneurs.

The integrative theoretical framework represents a theoretical contribution because of the systematic review that integrates female entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship literature (Chapter 2) and the subsequent elaboration through qualitative case studies. Though female entrepreneurship (e.g., Diaz Garcia and Welter, 2013; Tlaiss and Kauser, 2019) and environmental entrepreneurship (e.g., Vatanser and Arun, 2016) have received extensive coverage in the literature, a research knowledge gap exists in terms of understanding their interrelated influences. Socially constructed gender influences affect the environmental drivers, the practice of feminine-oriented value systems in ethical decisions, and the various types of environmental entrepreneurship.

Second, feminist ethics of care have emerged as a response to the male bias in traditional ethical theories (Held, 2014). Feminist lenses in this study have helped to capture heterogeneity in environmental entrepreneurship, in conjunction with institutional factors. This theoretical development leads to new ways of grasping the nature of entrepreneurs’ drivers more accurately, be they relational, corporative, or supportive of environmental entrepreneurship. By underpinning the importance of feminine decision-making in environmental
entrepreneurship, especially when facing institutional barriers such as deficiencies in environmental legislation and difficulties in access to finance, this study contributes to feminist theories in entrepreneurship where women and men add value to femininity (caring, being relational, supportive, collaborative) in the business realm.

Third, the study contributes to both female entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship literature, especially in emerging economies, by explaining formal and informal institutional influences as enablers for both female and male entrepreneurs in their venture creation, their development of environmental practices and the growth of their SMEs. Research on environmental entrepreneurship in emerging economies indicates that formal and informal institutions are one of the main barriers for environmental entrepreneurs (Vatansever and Arun, 2016; Wahga, 2017). However, this study shows that when institutions work in tandem and support environmental entrepreneurship equally, the gender influences and institutional influences are most likely to become an enabler for all entrepreneurs and the development of environmental practices in their SMEs.

This thesis also has an empirical contribution. Hechavarria et al. (2017) encourage international scholars to explore gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship in emerging economies since studies reveal different findings based on contextual factors. Previous studies have examined the gender and environmental entrepreneurship relationship based on social role theory and through post-structural feminist lenses (e.g., Braun, 2010; Outsios and Farooqi, 2017) in Australia and the UK, respectively. In this sense, Braun (2010) claims that the findings are culturally and contextually restricted and are less likely to apply to women in developing economies with limited economic resources (Outsios and Farooqi, 2017). Braun (2010) highlights that her findings are based on women raised in “privileged” Western settings.

Therefore, by considering contextual factors in combination with institutional influences that are unique to Turkey, the theory proposed in this study contributes to understanding why gender influences are the main drivers of female entrepreneurs while institutional influences are the main drivers of male entrepreneurs in environmental engagement in an emerging male-dominated country. The portrayal of women as “caring and relational” turns the disadvantages of being a woman into an advantage in a male-dominated country. Environmental entrepreneurship helps women to gain legitimation for fulfilling goals in their personal and professional lives.
Through feminist ethics of care perspectives, it is understood that feminine-oriented values (caring, supporting, being relational) in decision-making help both women and men entrepreneurs to construct their environmental entrepreneurship identity and understand it beyond traditional entrepreneurship, which is mainly growth-oriented, regardless of environmental and social concerns. While gender socialisation theory and institutional theory help define the current perspectives on female entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship, feminist ethics of care and gender identity theories show rejection and defiance (re-doing gender) of these perceived gendered roles thanks to environmental entrepreneurship among entrepreneurs.

Therefore, the rejection and defiance of perceived gender roles are also drivers of Turkish female entrepreneurs, especially when institutional factors act as barriers. Therefore, without understanding the interactions between gender influences and the institutional environment that stimulates the specific drivers for environmental behaviour, applying the previous theoretical framework (ethics of care and social role theory) to explain these drivers would support the male normative model (Ahl, 2006).

**Implications for Policy and Practice**

By exploring how women challenge behavioural norms when they face challenges because of perceived gender differences in access to finance, and limited environmental legislation in women-dominated sectors, this study shows that women can overcome these challenges by doing and re-doing gender. By doing gender, women can practise the feminist ethics of care in their SMEs in pursuit of triple bottom-line outcomes. Re-doing gender means women practising what is perceived as ‘masculine’ according to entrepreneurship norms, ‘supporting other women by specifically hiring women and training women employees’, and ‘adding value to women’s femininity in the business realm’. Women add value to their feminine-oriented value system in the business realm by being relational, supportive, and practising ethics of care. For instance, being relational and collaborating with public and private institutions contribute to women’s financial, environmental, and social sustainability in their SMEs.

Similarly, being part of private organisations for women, such as the women’s entrepreneurship association or local women’s cooperatives, increases their knowledge about environmental innovation, and their access to finance through networking in Turkey. This study shows that specific feminine managerial capabilities (caring, supporting, being relational) accelerate sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship and slow down
certain global problems such as climate change and social inequality. The inclusion of more women in environmental SMEs ensures these company’s sustainability (Fabrega et al., 2017) because the greater social and environmental commitment of women helps SMEs provide more socially and environmentally responsible products and services, as explained in the findings of this study (Chapters 5 and 6).

Therefore, male owners/managers can redo gender (practise feminist ethics of care) by collaborating with women owners/managers from other SMEs and sectors in terms of these women’s environmental engagement. Men entrepreneurs can also consider hiring women. In this study, women co-founders of SMEs are illustrated by specific business practices they have adopted, where the emphasis is on how they differ from their male co-founders in terms of the environmental engagement (Chapter 5) which increases their sustainability through their triple-bottom-line approach. Male owners/managers can learn and benefit from women in terms of following the triple-bottom-line approach rather than the duality of goals in their SMEs.

This study also contributes to policy in both advanced and emerging economies.

First, because of the challenges, women entrepreneurs face, such as their perceived caregiver role at home, which holds them back in terms of starting and running their SMEs in the male-dominated industrial sectors or developing their environmental engagement through technological integration, existing welfare policy on ‘childcare pay’ for women employees must be reviewed and include women who want to start or run their own SMEs.

Second, the social policies for women should be supported by entrepreneurship policies. Turkey’s green SME policies should be more inclusive and gender-aware when considering potential green sectors. There should be investment and support for new entry micro and small businesses in women-dominated sectors, such as fashion, eco-tourism, textile, and design. For instance, women entrepreneurs should be rewarded for their contribution to the circular economy thanks to their environmental and social commitment. Reducing the tax burden on these women-owned SMEs would be effective in encouraging more sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurs. Moreover, the existing supportive institutions for entrepreneurs, such as KOSGEB and BCSD, could collaborate in the sense of including more women entrepreneurs in men-dominated environment-related sectors through environmental training on legislation, finance, and networking opportunities. Women entrepreneurs who participate in the TMM programme of BCSD Turkey because of their energy efficiency and waste management can be role models for future women entrepreneurs.
Third, both social policies and entrepreneurship policies should be warier of the perception of women as ‘caregivers’ in society in their discourse. For instance, instead of separating female entrepreneurship from male entrepreneurship in terms of thematic topics such as young entrepreneurship and social and eco-entrepreneurship in entrepreneurship strategy and policy reports, female entrepreneurship should be taken into consideration as separate from these thematic topics. Even if they overlap in some cases, female entrepreneurship should not be treated as a thematic topic such as social entrepreneurship or ecopreneurship but as a primary factor, as male entrepreneurship is. This suggests the criteria for supporting women owners/managers should no longer focus on perceived feminine sectors (e.g., home-based manufacturing), rather women entrepreneurs should be included in all sectors. The supporting mechanisms of women’s entrepreneurship was focusing on feminine sectors in this study through the discourse of participants from public and private institutions (Chapter 6).

Finally, the discourse on green SME policies should emphasise the importance of feminist ethics of care as much as growth-oriented approaches. The definition of environmental entrepreneurship should be avoided from being constantly associated with traditional economic development objectives (masculine norms), especially in patriarchal societies which have problems in terms of the inclusion of women-owned SMEs in areas of green growth. Moreover, such a discourse creates tensions between being a male and an environmental entrepreneur in Turkey, which usually places male entrepreneurs in the class of economically oriented environmental entrepreneurs (7.2.2). This can be detrimental to the development of distinctive types of environmental entrepreneurship, such as sustainability-driven environmental male entrepreneurship (7.3.3).

1.8 Structure of the Thesis

This thesis comprises seven chapters.

Chapter 1 is the introductory chapter which provides an overview of the study.

Chapter 2 presents the SLR of gender and environmental entrepreneurship as two research streams, female entrepreneurship, and environmental entrepreneurship, which provide the theoretical framing of the research.

Chapter 3 discusses female entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey after explicitly revealing the research problem and the feasibility of using the country for this study.
Chapter 4 explains the qualitative research methodology, including methods for data collection, data analysis and ethical considerations.

Chapter 5 uncovers the empirical findings by analysing the gender influences as drivers of environmental engagement of entrepreneurs in women and men-owned SMEs.

Chapter 6 presents the institutional influences on entrepreneurs’ environmental engagement as enablers and/or constraints in the Turkish context.

Chapter 7 presents the conclusions, policy and practical recommendations, the limitations of the study and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2

SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW: GENDER AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP

2.1 Introduction

This chapter critically reviews the different sets of literature that require attention when studying gender influences on the environmental engagement of entrepreneurs. A systematic literature analysis of female entrepreneurship, environmental entrepreneurship and gender and environmentalism disciplines may highlight the role of gender influences and institutional influences in understanding the level of environmental engagement in women and men-owned SMEs. The SLR method is used for two main reasons.

First, there are various separate studies on environmental entrepreneurship and female entrepreneurship covering different perspectives. However, only a few studies (to my knowledge) discuss the role of gender as a driving factor for female entrepreneurs in environmental entrepreneurship. An SLR is essential to identify research gaps in the existing knowledge of this nascent phenomenon to inform empirical research (Danese and Romano, 2018). Gender and environmental entrepreneurship is a nascent phenomenon, and some scholars have addressed the limited knowledge available for understanding gender influences in environmental entrepreneurship (Gunawan et al., 2021). SLR helps to outline different themes that can be useful for studying gender and environmental entrepreneurship, such as gender influences and their interaction with institutional influences, to understand how women and men entrepreneurs are driven to environmental engagement in their business.

Second, the SLR method contributes to the development of the theoretical framework by providing an opportunity to use a range of citation databases from different disciplines. SLR reduces the chance of partial reviews based on one subject (Snyder, 2019). This chapter uses SLR as an approach to integrating feminist theories and institutional theory for understanding gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship. The chapter clarifies the research gaps in female and environmental entrepreneurship and develops the conceptual linkages that inform the study’s empirical analysis. This chapter lays the foundation for the development of research questions 1 and 2 by contributing to the emerging theoretical framing (Figure 2.8).
By using the SLR approach, it has been found that as gender influences are underpinned in feminist theories (e.g., Diaz Garcia and Welter, 2013; Poggesi et al., 2016), environmental entrepreneurship is underpinned in institutional theories (e.g., Hamann et al., 2015; Meek et al., 2010; Vatansever and Arun, 2016; Wahga, 2017). Thereby, this study links gender influences and institutional influences while studying gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship by drawing on four theories, namely: gender role socialisation, feminist ethics of care, gender identity and institutional theory (Figure 2.8).

The remainder of this chapter is structured in seven sections.

Section 2.2 presents a synthesis of female entrepreneurship literature by identifying feminine entrepreneurial characteristics, feminine entrepreneurial opportunities and specific barriers to female entrepreneurs such as perceived gender identity, sociocultural values, perceived gender roles, finance, and policy-related problems. This analysis reveals the importance of gender and contextual influences on women’s entrepreneurship.

Section 2.3 provides a conceptual clarification of environmental entrepreneurship and identifies the types of such entrepreneurship based on a synthesis of environmental entrepreneurship literature. Informed by these streams of literature, individual motivations (e.g., ethics of care and the environmental responsibility of entrepreneurs) and institutional motivations (e.g., competitive advantage), factors emerge as concepts that support the development of environmental entrepreneurship.

Section 2.4 elaborates on an understanding of the drivers of environmentalism by taking gender influences into account based on environmental entrepreneurship, female entrepreneurship, and gender and environmentalism literature.

Section 2.5 discuss the barriers to starting/pursuing environmental entrepreneurship in SMEs.

Section 2.6 summarises gaps in the extant literature and contextualises the research problem while outlining the research agenda for this study. Consequently, this chapter reviews the suitable theoretical frameworks for the study in Section 2.6.

Finally, the chapter concludes with a summary of Section 2.

2.1.1 Brief Overview of the Systematic Literature Approach

Four steps have been applied to conduct the SLR. First, the need for an SLR in gender and environmental entrepreneurship, as has been discussed in the preceding sub-section, is to act
as an underpinning for the integration of a set of theoretical perspectives. Second, databases such as ProQuest, Science Direct, Scopus, Jstor, Greenfile, and Sage Journals Online have been selected. They mostly carry the studies on female entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship to date (Table 2.1). Moreover, the entrepreneurship journals from the Harzing Journal Quality List (Harzing, 2019) have been reviewed to choose the most appropriate journals. Third, phrase search, Boolean search and ‘truncation search methods have been applied to develop search strings. These search strings are found in the title, abstract and keywords of articles as specified in the table given below (Tale 2.2). The numbers in Table 2.2 represents how many papers found in each database in total based on the search strings and how many of them included.

**Table 2.1: Major Journals from (1) Female Entrepreneurship, (2) Environmental Entrepreneurship, (3) Gender and Environmentalism (1990-2022)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal(s)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Business Venturing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Business Ethics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour &amp; Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Small Business Journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender in Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science Quarterly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Business Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Strategy and The Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Ethics Quarterly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Journal of Entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other:**

Table 2.2: Search Strings and the Number of Articles in the Database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>PROQUEST</th>
<th>SCOPUS</th>
<th>SCIENCE DIRECT</th>
<th>SAGE JOURNALS ONLINE</th>
<th>JSTOR</th>
<th>GREEN FILE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Female Entrepreneurship ‘AND ‘Systematic Literature Review’”</td>
<td>3/12</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Environmental Entrepreneurship ‘AND ‘Systematic Literature Review’”</td>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>1/6</td>
<td>1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gender OR Female OR Women) AND Entrepreneurship AND “Environmental Entrepreneurship”</td>
<td>17/66</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>2/16</td>
<td>1/16</td>
<td>0/7</td>
<td>2/34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Female Entrepreneurship ‘AND ‘Gender Differences’”</td>
<td>12/343</td>
<td>4/26</td>
<td>3/10</td>
<td>1/29</td>
<td>3/54</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Environmentally Friendly’ AND “Women’s Entrepreneurship’”</td>
<td>2/12</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5/14</td>
<td>0/5</td>
<td>0/5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Female Entrepreneurship ‘AND ‘Theory’”</td>
<td>4/458</td>
<td>4/39</td>
<td>0/7</td>
<td>7/97</td>
<td>4/93</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Female Entrepreneurship ‘AND ‘Green Entrepreneurship’ ‘AND ‘Sustainable Entrepreneurship’”</td>
<td>1/16</td>
<td>5/52</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Female Entrepreneurship ‘AND (Determinants OR Motivations)”</td>
<td>2/48</td>
<td>3/22</td>
<td>7/108</td>
<td>2/17</td>
<td>4/77</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Female Entrepreneurship ‘AND Institutions”</td>
<td>2/10</td>
<td>5/5</td>
<td>6/71</td>
<td>2/12</td>
<td>3/24</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fourth, the abstracts of the studies were read to decide which to include and exclude. Only peer-reviewed journal articles were chosen since they are considered to be the most valid (Tranfield et al., 2003; Podsakoff, 2005). Narrative reviews are generally criticised because of insufficient peer-reviewed methodologies and frequently fail to disclose study inclusion criteria (Byrne, 2016). Books, discussion papers, and other non-referenced publications were excluded, as were articles which did not focus on either gender or environmental studies as a key topic. Additionally, only English language articles are included.

Articles which focused on corporate social responsibility (e.g., Rodgers and Ketola, 2010; Tiba et al., 2019) sustainable entrepreneurship (Shick et al., 2010; Muñoz et al., 2018), in addition to gender and environmental entrepreneurship (e.g., Braun, 2010; Hechavarria et al., 2017) were included. This is relevant because these studies began to signal the interconnectedness of some of the key concepts that feature in different parts of the thesis, including some concepts which are used interchangeably. Topic-related articles which were not found using search strings, but which appeared in the references of peer-reviewed articles were also included.

In total, 166 peer-reviewed articles related to gender and environmental entrepreneurship were found. The included papers coded according to most recent themes studied in female entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship literature from 1990 to 2022. Moreover,
the commonly used theories, methodologies and geographical context in these studies are coded in order to relate gender with environmental entrepreneurship in the literature. As a result of the application of inclusion and exclusion criteria by reading all the articles, the final sample consisted of 80 publications, namely from female entrepreneurship, environmental entrepreneurship and gender and environmentalism studies. The remaining 80 articles focused on theoretical perspectives, methodological applications, and empirical studies from advanced and emerging economies (developed and developing countries). This guided me to find patterns in each domain and identify common theories in both female entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship.

This identification involved two steps: (1) searching for theoretical, methodological, and contextual trends in both the female entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship domains and (2) examining what is missing in the current literature to develop a coherent agenda for future research to study. The results of the SLR enabled me to understand how gender and environmental entrepreneurship could be theorised based on different but interrelated theories and which needed to be investigated when studying gender and environmental entrepreneurship.

Gender influences in female entrepreneurship illustrate the role of gender role socialisation, feminist ethics of care and gender identity theories in understanding the socially constructed differences between female and male environmental entrepreneurs. Environmental entrepreneurship studies highlight the role of institutional theory in understanding the drivers and enablers of entrepreneurs based on contextual factors. Therefore, this thesis integrates feminist lenses with institutional perspectives while studying gender in environmental entrepreneurship.

2.2 Female Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship has a significant role as a support structure for economic development in both developed and developing countries. (Poggesi et al., 2016). Recent literature has also discussed how entrepreneurship contributes not only to economic development but also to the social and environmental development of countries in terms of sustainable development by providing solutions to the environmental and social problems of the world (Belz and Binder, 2017; Schaefer et al., 2015) Yet, in some societies, entrepreneurship is still perceived as a male-related activity, even if the number of women-owned businesses increases (Maden, 2015). Contrary to this, female entrepreneurship literature emphasises that women can contribute
significantly to innovation, employment, and wealth creation with their businesses (Brush et al., 2009; OECD Entrepreneurship Policies, 2021).

According to Terrell and Troilo (2012) and Yousafzai et al. (2018), women entrepreneurs create value at multiple levels, including value for their lives (individual value), their businesses (business value), their families and households (family value), and their communities (community value). Consequently, increasing women's participation in entrepreneurship should help the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals\(^1\) to be achieved (Strawser et al., 2021). Yet, the European Commission Report (2019) and OECD (2017) report reveal that men are 1.7 times more likely to be entrepreneurs than women. For instance, in Slovenia, Greece, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and Turkey there are fewer start-ups owned by women than men, according to the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) 2018/2019. The persisting gender gap in entrepreneurship is present in both advanced and emerging economies.

In that vein, female entrepreneurship literature claims that entrepreneurship is usually seen as a male-dominated activity; hence, compared to male entrepreneurs, the participation of women entrepreneurs still lags, especially in patriarchal societies (Kalemci, 2017; Shahriar, 2018). According to Shahriar (2018), while essentialist scholars explain gender differences in entrepreneurship as a cause of biology based on sex and variables, the constructionists claim that the difference between female and male entrepreneurs is merely the outcome of social structure and local environment. Therefore, female entrepreneurship has been subject to much debate to determine the cause of the gender gap in entrepreneurship and to find ways to increase women's participation.

Based on the SLR of female entrepreneurship, the following common themes were revealed: (1) female entrepreneurial characteristics, (2) female entrepreneurial opportunities, and (3) female entrepreneurial barriers, such as gender identity, perceived gender roles, and financing and policy-related problems for female entrepreneurs in contrast to male entrepreneurs. A few articles focused on narratives of female entrepreneurs based on gender identity to understand how they navigate challenges that are specific to their society by re-doing gender (e.g., Tlaiss

---

\(^{1}\) The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, adopted by all United Nations Member States in 2015, provides a shared blueprint for peace and prosperity for people and the planet, now and into the future. At its heart are the 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which are an urgent call for action by all countries - developed and developing - in a global partnership. They recognize that ending poverty and other deprivations must go hand-in-hand with strategies that improve health and education, reduce inequality, and spur economic growth – all while tackling climate change and working to preserve our oceans and forests. (United Nations, 2022).
and Kauser, 2019). The following sections elaborate on each of these themes as sections 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2.4, respectively.

2.2.1 Female Entrepreneurial Characteristics

Several scholars have attempted to explain the low level of women's entrepreneurship by comparing the personality traits of female and male entrepreneurs (Minniti and Nardone, 2007; Terrel and Troilo, 2010; Shinnar et al., 2012). According to Arshad (2016), the reason behind the gender gap in entrepreneurship is the perceived lack of entrepreneurial traits among women, such as a lack of competency and fear of failure. Female entrepreneurs are also examined through their motivational factors (e.g., Kirkwood, 2009). Women engage in entrepreneurship with the desire to balance their work-family responsibilities thanks to the greater flexibility entrepreneurship offers. They also wish to challenge the gender inequalities they experienced in their previous work (i.e., break the glass ceiling) (Maden, 2015).

Women entrepreneurs have been found to have specific characteristics, such as practising ethics of care, being relationship-oriented, being creative, having problem-solving abilities, and being risk-averse (e.g., Yetim, 2008). On the other hand, men start ventures for financial achievements and the desire to create something new in the market (Kirkwood, 2009). Some studies have discussed that while the education levels and human capacity levels are equal between men and women entrepreneurs, women are less likely to choose education in business and management studies because of their personal preferences and, therefore, they lack some entrepreneurial characteristics, such as risk-taking, compared to men. (Yetim, 2008).

Some scholars (Ahl and Marlow, 2012; Marlow, 2014) have criticised previous findings, especially those comparing men and women based on their biological sex without considering the complexities of women’s society and culture. Women are blamed for lacking the so-called “male norm” and, therefore, it has been suggested they might redress their deficiencies by adapting to the male business world by, for example, becoming better educated, possessing greater motivation, and networking differently (Jennings and Brush 2013; Henry et al. 2016). Based on this criticism, scholars have started to see men and women as essentially different as women have unique experiences because they are women (Ahl 2006). This perspective is known in the literature as social feminism or the feminist standpoint theory (Foss et al., 2018). According to social feminism, women have a so-called “standpoint” from which to interpret knowledge regarding women themselves and their subordination.
2.2.2 Female Entrepreneurial Opportunities

According to social feminism, the perception of having female characteristics helps women in terms of exploiting opportunities. For instance, Kabasakal et al. (2016) claim that women define success as reaching targets, innovativeness and being different, while men focus more on making money and achieving status, which is related to masculine characteristics. Women are also more likely to be concerned about social and environmental issues, which leads them to focus more on social and environmental innovation than profit maximization in their managerial practices (Hechavarria, 2016; Hechavarria et al., 2017).

In this context, social and environmental entrepreneurship has less to do with bold and aggressive behaviour and risk-taking but with prosocial behaviour based on values such as empathy, and social and environmental responsibility. Therefore, these studies suggest that women evaluate their firm’s performance through personal fulfilment, serving the community and doing something different for social change (Hechavarria et al., 2012). Similarly, by pointing out Hechavarria’s study, a review of the literature on female entrepreneurship conducted by Jennings and Brush (2013) concluded that previous studies on women’s entrepreneurship had challenged the assumption that economic gain has greater priority compared to other gains, such as product quality, personal enjoyment, helping others, and contributing to society. For instance, Braun (2010) asserts that during the greening process of SMEs, women see themselves as agents of change in causing profound social change, while men see ‘greening’ as an opportunity for leaner business practices such as operational savings.

However, these perspectives have been questioned because they only provide an alternative norm, yet they still polarise men and women (Ahl, 2006; Foss et al., 2018). Furthermore, most social feminists do not consider contextual and cultural factors when differentiating between female and male entrepreneurs (Ahl and Marlow, 2012). In short, social feminism theory avoids women's entrepreneurial barriers but highlights female characteristics as entrepreneurial assets or advantages. Gupta et al. (2014) claim that society’s perception of femininity and masculinity impacts women’s entrepreneurship regarding opportunity evaluation and resource acquisition. Therefore, it is important to uncover the female entrepreneurship barriers as well as the female entrepreneurial opportunities.
2.2.3 Female Entrepreneurship Barriers

By focusing on the early and ongoing socialization processes of women and men, social feminism contributes to the literature regarding our understanding of how women do entrepreneurship and how they implement entrepreneurial behaviour. Nevertheless, it is not enough to disclose gendered discriminatory practices (Foss et al., 2018). For that reason, post-structural feminists have embraced the concept of gender as socially constructed by history, geography, society, language, and culture (West and Zimmerman, 1987). Accordingly, perceived masculine and feminine traits change over time, place, and discourse, and they are continually being reconstructed. Both men and women entrepreneurs may adopt behaviour that is typically associated with the opposite sex.

Due to different socialization processes, women and men entrepreneurs face different barriers. Women are usually disadvantaged by the perception that entrepreneurship is more masculine than feminine. (Marlow, 2014; Yadav and Unni, 2014; Foss et al., 2018). In emerging economies, informal institutions substitute for weak formal institutions (Xiong et al., 2020). Therefore, culturally bound perceptions of socially acceptable practices as feminine or masculine will affect practices. The relatively low participation of women in entrepreneurship in emerging economies can be attributed to patriarchal institutional settings and systemic gender stereotyping (Anderson and Ojediran, 2022).

Few scholars have applied the post-structuralist perspective and its political implications for women entrepreneurs' barriers in their studies (e.g., Shneor et al., 2013; Gupta et al., 2014). Wu et al. (2019) have examined female entrepreneurial barriers and identified four aspects, these being gender identity, perceived gender roles, financing, and policy-related problems.

Gender Identity

Studies suggest that women entrepreneurs have no monolithic archetype; rather, specific contexts shape their emergence and the ways they "do" and "redo" gender in identity management (Diaz Garcia and Welter, 2013; Tlaiss and Kauser, 2019). Women act as entrepreneurs by constructing gender identities as female and by redoing them, which confirms the definition of gender as ‘socially constructed through history, geography, and culture’ and, therefore, suggests ‘masculine and feminine traits vary over time, place and discourse and are ‘constantly renegotiated’ (West and Zimmerman, 1987).
The contextual factors play a key role in terms of women entrepreneurs constructing their identities by defining themselves as women, females, mothers, and female entrepreneurs in this study. For instance, while some women construct their gender identities as mothers or wives, thereby do gender by complying with gendered norms (juggling act\(^2\)), others redo gender by finding valuable things that women bring to the business realm and finding things that empower women as a group. While doing gender, women balance their domestic and business responsibilities (gendered roles) with the influence of their perception of themselves (Dhaliwal, 1998).

When re-doing gender, women can still balance their personal and professional lives by adding value to being feminine in the business realm. Women redo gender to negotiate with the perceived gender differences when challenging to be an entrepreneur in a male-dominated society (Dhaliwal, 2012, pp. 250). Therefore, while gender identity construction can be a barrier for some women entrepreneurs, it can be a driver for others. Thus, in relation to the first research objective of this thesis, the focus is to explore gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship through women and men entrepreneurs’ environmental engagement in their value creation, ethical decision-making and environmental behaviour. By doing so, the thesis reveals how women gain social legitimation by defining themselves as environmental entrepreneurs by establishing their gender identities under institutional influences. The findings of the study uncover how entrepreneurs use compliance (doing gender), neglect (doing and re-doing), and defiance (re-doing) strategies to expand the boundaries of what is socially acceptable in a patriarchal environment within their environmental engagement in their SMEs.

**Perceived Gender Roles**

Women's entrepreneurial experiences have generally been hindered by local sociocultural values and gender ideologies in emerging patriarchal economies and masculine cultures (Anderson and Ojediran, 2022). The stereotypical characteristics attributed to men and women in society influence the classification of various occupations as masculine or feminine, which

---

\(^2\) The practice of doing a ‘juggling act’ occurs when expectations of being an ideal business owner are juggled alongside concealing emotions concerning lack of fit, especially in male-dominated sectors. For example, as business owners, women should make profits, but they also need to conform to female values, such as being the family carer. (Diaz Garcia and Welter, 2013).
tends to affect people's aspirations and inclination toward such jobs (Gupta et al., 2014). Women's careers are often hampered by the centrality of the family and the gendered framing of domestic responsibilities, such as childcare.

In Turkey, technology-related and engineering jobs are associated with men. In contrast, women mostly involve themselves in child care, education, and design-related fields (Maden, 2014; Sefer, 2020). Most women have modest growth expectations and expansion plans for their businesses. They cannot find enough time to focus on growth strategies with their caregiver's role at home (e.g., Orser et al., 2013; Naguib and Jamali, 2015). However, women have the agency to take their carer role as an opportunity by following the environmental entrepreneurship model as it is associated with feminist ethics of care (Hawk, 2011; Hechavarria et al., 2016).

**Finance**

There are different sources of financing for entrepreneurs, such as personal resources, venture capital companies, banks, microfinancing, government financing, and capital markets (Ngoasong and Kimbu, 2019). The supply of finance for women exposes evidence that women experience discrimination when accessing loans, as well as the conditions under which they are offered (Poggesi et al., 2016), even if women entrepreneurs have better repayment records compared to their counterparts (Wang et al., 2020). Only a few scholars explain that the gender gap in entrepreneurial financing is because of socially constructed gender roles, which women are socialised into while seeking to achieve gender role congruity (Ahl 2006; Shneor et al. 2013).

Furthermore, identifying the women entrepreneur as merely ‘female’ reduces their chances of accessing funding; therefore, it can be said that contextual factors influence funding access (Henry et al., 2016). In this thesis, it has been found that, in Turkey, identifying women as mothers and attributing the caregiver role to them limits entrepreneurial financial access. Based on the importance of contextual factors, Anderson and Ojediran (2022) claim that women have more difficulties in entrepreneurship in terms of financing in emerging economies because of the patriarchal background of these societies that favour men in the entrepreneurship sector.

**Policy-Related Problems**
Some women in emerging economies cannot get access to finance because of the political environment that favours men more than women in their country (De Vita et al., 2014). Scholars suggest that training support, tax relief and social security provisions can positively influence entrepreneurial entry through their direct impact on expected returns from entrepreneurial activities and opportunity costs. Yet, Mazzarol (2014) suggests that government policy cannot be effective by acting in isolation. Other components of the entrepreneurial ecosystem, such as funding and finance, culture and local agencies should work in harmony. In some cases, while some of them work very well, others do not. In these circumstances, the literature refers to these components as ‘institutional gaps’ (Kolk, 2014).

The institutional framework may inadvertently discriminate against women's businesses; for example, enterprise policies tend to favour high-tech, growth-oriented manufacturing sectors dominated by men (Anna et al. 2000; OECD Entrepreneurship Policies through a Gender Lens, 2021). A positive change in this aspect of the ecosystem, regarding social and enterprise policies, could help mitigate some of these challenges by increasing the rate of development and growth among women-owned firms.

The SLR of this thesis on female entrepreneurship concludes that even if there are some studies based on an institutional theory with the nature and impact of institutional voids and gaps on specific topics such as social innovation and social entrepreneurship (e.g., Turker and Vural, 2017) and environmental innovation and environmental entrepreneurship (e.g., Wahga, 2017), most of them do not refer to gender. Little research has been done especially on women’s entrepreneurship and institutional voids (e.g., Ngoasong, 2018; Littlewood and Kiyumbu, 2018). The impact of institutional gaps on women entrepreneurs is still underexplored.

2.2.4 Theory, Methodology and Country-level Findings

Most of the studies have reported that quantitative methods are overused in female entrepreneurship literature because scholars treat gender as individual’s sex rather than treating it as a social construct based on sociocultural factors (Brust et al., 2009; Marlow, 2014; Muntean and Ozkazanc, 2015). Yet, my SLR indicates that there is an increasing trend of using qualitative methods, such as interviews from emerging economy (developing country) studies (Figure 2.1).
Figure 2.1: Research Methods Applied in Female Entrepreneurship

Source: Developed by the researcher for this study

Qualitative methods have been found quite useful for understanding entrepreneurial behaviour and the reasons behind the gender gap specifically caused by institutions, such as the culture and social background of the country (Henry et al., 2016). Qualitative methods allow us to comprehend the thoughts and experiences of entrepreneurs through their narratives within a specific context.
As it is discussed in the previous section, different theoretical lenses are applied to female entrepreneurship (Figure 2.2), and the main studies usually use either institutional or feminist perspectives.

Figure 2.2: Theoretical Lenses in Female Entrepreneurship

Source: Developed by the researcher for this study

However, most of the studies from institutional and feminist perspectives are still based on quantitative methodologies (Henry et al., 2016; Cardella et al., 2021). Yet, institutional, and feminist perspectives should be integrated with qualitative methods such as case studies, interviews, and life stories to better comprehend the difficulties women face in their SMEs within a specific context (Foss et al., 2018; Yadav and Unni, 2016). The development of women entrepreneurs depends on their country’s specific institutional and gender interactions.
There is a debate on the influence of contextual dimension on female entrepreneurs, yet the existing research largely focuses on developed countries, meaning what we know about female entrepreneurship is usually based on these countries (Hisrich and Öztürk, 1999; Strawser et al., 2021). Nevertheless, there has been an increasing trend in studying female entrepreneurship in developing countries (Figure 2.3).

**Figure 2.3: Developed vs Developing Country Studies**

Source: Developed by the researcher for this study

Anderson and Ojediran (2021) explain the reason for an increasing trend in studying female entrepreneurship in emerging economies (usually developing countries) is because women and women’s entrepreneurship could play a vital role in developing these economies (Poggesi et al., 2016; Zhu et al., 2019). Yet, emerging economies are characterised by weaker formal institutions being substituted by informal institutions (Xiong et al., 2020). Thus, culturally bound perceptions of socially acceptable practices intrude on practice. This highlights an avenue of research that explores how social legitimacy might be achieved by female entrepreneurs, especially in patriarchal societies. This is important because women
entrepreneurs show different behaviour in each country based on its social, cultural, and economic background (Bianco et al., 2017; Kalemci and Tuzun, 2017).

The institutional environment is usually challenging for women entrepreneurs in emerging economies because “the institutional contexts in developing countries are known to be particularly complex and challenging, typically characterised by rapid transformation, ineffective or weak formal institutions and the reliance on informal institutions, which at times are conflicting” (Peng, 2000). The findings of the SLR lay the groundwork for future studies to examine female entrepreneurship, especially in the context of patriarchal societies, where the gender gap is a persistent issue in entrepreneurship (OECD, 2021). Studying female entrepreneurship in emerging economies (developing countries) contributes to understanding women entrepreneurs’ barriers, which are unique to them in their countries. Consequently, it reveals the best practice and policy implications for women’s development. Moreover, it contributes to uncovering the heterogeneity of women entrepreneurs based on their interactions in society. This is important to comprehend those women who are doing and re-doing gender based on their specific contextual (e.g., institutional) interactions.

2.3 Environmental Entrepreneurship

2.3.1 Definition and Types of Environmental Entrepreneurship

After the Brundtland Commission or Our Common Future report, which stresses that the Earth’s resources are being used at a rate that leaves little for future generations (Frank, 1987), sustainable development has gained wide recognition among scientists, professionals and policymakers (Barrachina et al., 2021). In recent years, environmental problems, such as climate change and water scarcity, have become so serious that they have been named societal grand challenges (Lopez et al., 2019). Some scholars claim that the major reason behind these challenges is the traditional business models (i.e., the linear economy3) and seek to clarify the tension between the economy and the environment (Weale, 1992).

However, academics from a variety of fields (e.g., ethics, sustainability, entrepreneurship) have agreed that businesses are not only the predominant perpetrators of the grand issues but are also at the core of the solutions to them, especially in emerging economies (Wei et al.,

---

3 The traditional model is where raw materials are collected and transformed into products that consumers use until discarding them as waste, with no concern for their ecological footprint and consequences. It prioritizes profit over sustainability, with products made to be thrown away once they’ve been used (Santander, 2021).
Wei et al. (2022) contributes to environmental entrepreneurship literature by revealing how environmental entrepreneurship plays an important role in contributing to the green growth of emerging economies. Yet, according to Potluri and Phani (2020), a policy prescription is needed for environmental entrepreneurship in emerging economies because of the conflict between growth-oriented traditional entrepreneurship policies and environmental concerns.

Table 2.3: Definition and Conceptualising of Environmental Entrepreneurship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Description Level</th>
<th>Attributes of EE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hendrickson and Tuttle</td>
<td>Environmental entrepreneurship is an entrepreneurial activity that benefits the environment.</td>
<td>Individual and Business</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1997)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastakia</td>
<td>Individuals or institutions that attempt to popularise eco-friendly ideas and innovations either through the market or non-market routes may be referred to as ecopreneurs.</td>
<td>Individual and Institution</td>
<td>Motivation and System Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaak (2002)</td>
<td>An ideal ecopreneur creates businesses to radically transform the economic sector in which he or she operates … and it is a form of business behaviour committed to sustainability.</td>
<td>Individual and Business</td>
<td>Motivation-Environmental Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaltegger and Synnestvedt</td>
<td>Ecopreneurship can be described as an innovative, market-oriented and personality-driven form of value creation through environmental innovations and products exceeding the start-up phase of a company.</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Motivation-Environmental Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schick et al. (2002)</td>
<td>Ecologically oriented start-ups are those which look for opportunities in their respective markets to develop goods and services for environmentally aware customers.</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Opportunity Creation-Environmental Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volery (2002)</td>
<td>Green entrepreneurs, as a catalyst of change … are individuals who develop an innovation that either reduces resource</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Environmental Innovation-System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors and Year</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Individual Motivation</td>
<td>Transformation-Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beveridge and Guy (2005)</td>
<td>Ecopreneurs are individuals and organizations that, in various forms, combine the drive, imagination and impact of the conventional entrepreneur with a concern for the environment usually associated with environmental activists.</td>
<td>Individual Activists and Business</td>
<td>Motivation-Social Activism (System Transformation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean and McMullen (2007)</td>
<td>Environmental entrepreneurship is the process of discovering, evaluating and exploiting economic opportunities that are present in environmentally relevant market failures.</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Motivation-Opportunity Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dixon and Clifford (2007)</td>
<td>Environmental entrepreneurship is the process of discovering, evaluating and exploiting economic opportunities that are present in environmentally relevant market failures.</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbs (2009)</td>
<td>Ecopreneurs are those entrepreneurs who combine environmental awareness with their business activities in a drive to shift the basis of economic development toward a more environmentally friendly basis.</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Motivation - System Transformation-Outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meek et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Environmental entrepreneurship can be defined as the ‘process of discovering, evaluating, and exploiting economic opportunities that are present in market failures’ which relate to environmental problems.</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Motivation Opportunity Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkwood and Walton (2010)</td>
<td>Ecopreneurs are those entrepreneurs who enter these eco-friendly markets not only to make profits but also to have strong, underlying green values.</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacheco et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Sustainable/environmental entrepreneurship is the discovery, creation, evaluation, and exploitation of opportunities to create future goods and services that are consistent with sustainable development goals.</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Motivation-Innovation-Opportunity Creation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thompson et al. (2011)</td>
<td>Environmental entrepreneurs build up eco-friendly businesses and, therefore, combine profit orientation with the ambition to create a greener business world.</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Motivation-Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaltegger and Wagner (2011)</td>
<td>Environmental entrepreneurs are actors and companies making environmental progress to their core business. They generate new products, services,</td>
<td>Individual-Business-Institution</td>
<td>Motivation-Environmental Innovation-Outcome</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
techniques, and organizational modes that substantially reduce environmental impacts and increase the quality of life.

| Phillips (2013) | An ecopreneur is an individual who claims to be motivated by the creation of social and environmental value over economic value when founding a business. | Individual | Motivation-Social Goals |
| Vatansever and Arun (2016) | One of the most important aims of green entrepreneurship is to protect the natural environment from all adverse effects. The other main goals of that are to recycle waste products, to increase the use of renewable energy sources and to make organic agriculture. | Individual | Motivation-Outcome |
| O’Neil and Ucbasaran (2016) | Environmental entrepreneurship is an entrepreneurial activity which seeks to promote environmental welfare generally and address various sustainability problems, especially while being financially sustainable. | Business | Motivation and Outcome |
| York et al. (2016) | Environmental entrepreneurship is the use of both commercial and ecological logic to address environmental degradation through the creation of financially profitable organizations, products, services, and markets. | Individual-Business | Motivation-Innovation |
| Gast et al. (2017) | Ecologically sustainable entrepreneurship is beyond traditional economic concerns, where societal and environmental issues should be considered by entrepreneurs. | Individual | Outcomes |
| Lopez et al. (2019) | Environmental entrepreneurship is a multi-component and dynamic construct of environmental and economic goals with the environmental agency, and environmental value creation. | Individual | Motivation-Environmental Agency (Environmental Innovation or Transformation)-Value Creation |

The definition of environmental entrepreneurship is inconsistent because a range of terms, ‘sustainable entrepreneurship’, ‘ecopreneurship’, and ‘green entrepreneurship’, are used in the literature (Gast et al., 2017; Lopez et al., 2019). However, attributes of environmental entrepreneurship, such as motivation (environmental, social and economic), opportunity recognition, environmental innovation, environmental outcomes, and social transformation, change depending on the authors’ focus on different agents, including individuals, businesses,
and institutions. Therefore, for the purpose of this thesis (Section 1.3.2), environmental entrepreneurship is defined as:

“A diverse combination of different (gendered) drivers and enablers that serve the triple bottom line outcomes of society through environmentally innovative products, services or systems in financially profitable businesses”

This definition recognises some of the common features of the existing definitions in Table 2.3, such as environmental value creation, environmental goals, environmental innovation, or system of transformation, at individual and business levels (e.g., Philips, 2013; O’Neil and Ucbasaran, 2016).

Additionally, the environmental entrepreneurship literature reveals different types of environmental entrepreneurship, summarised in Figure 2.4.

Figure 2.4: Types of Environmental Entrepreneurs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Orientation</th>
<th>Formal Institutional Influences (e.g., legislations, financial incentives)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AD ENVIROPRENEUR</strong></td>
<td>(e.g., producer of organic pork)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INNOVATIVE OPPORTUNIST</strong></td>
<td>(e.g., fridge recycler)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHICAL MAVERICK</strong></td>
<td>(e.g., craft exchange founder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VISIONARY CHAMPION</strong></td>
<td>(e.g., producer of natural skin and hair care products)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


According to Walley and Taylor (2002), environmental entrepreneurship can be categorised through two scopes as (1) entrepreneurs’ drivers and (2) institutional influences as an enabler
on them. The authors refer to four ideal types as ad enviropreneur, innovative opportunist, ethical maverick, and visionary champion depending on these two scopes (Figure 2.4). The types of environmental entrepreneurship depend on entrepreneurs’ motivation and the influence of institutional factors drawn from internal (personal identity, beliefs, characteristics) and external structures (society, market, industry, regulations). They suggest that economic orientation refers to profits and some form of green orientation as minimum criteria and sustainability orientations refer to a combination of economic, green, and social/ethical motives in environmental entrepreneurship. This suggests that environmental entrepreneurs are characterised by a combination of internal motivations and external structural influences.

These findings are developed by Bansal (2002) who found that companies go green because of three main motivations which are competitiveness, legitimation and environmental responsibility. While competitiveness and legitimation are caused by the influence of formal institutions, ecological responsibility comes from internal motivations, such as personal identity or personal characteristics (Beveridge and Guy, 2005). Similarly, Dean and McMullen (2007) claim that the incentives of environmental entrepreneurs are understood through economic lenses in terms of market shortcomings, where entrepreneurs can create opportunities for achieving profitability while reducing environmentally degrading behaviour in business under the influence of internal and external factors.

The perspectives from the psychology of an entrepreneur are not enough to understand inherently complex environmental incentives which are structured by external influences since the role of society within the state-sponsored incentives, environmental consumption norms and the norms of the family are found to be the key factors in environmental entrepreneurship (Meek et al., 2010). Kirkwood and Walton (2010) compare the motivations of environmentally friendly and traditional entrepreneurs under push-pull theories to comprehend the drivers, motives and determinants of such entrepreneurs. It is suggested the main difference between environmental and traditional entrepreneurs is that financial achievement is less important than independence in environmental entrepreneurship. This suggests that environmental entrepreneurs are driven by opportunity rather than necessity.

Regarding institutional perspectives, Hörisch et al. (2017) examined the determinants of environmental entrepreneurship by gathering data from the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor. They analyse the institutional impacts and individual characteristics which influence the degree of environmental orientation of entrepreneurial activity. While previous studies mentioned
above have emphasised the impact of formal and informal institutions on a societal level, Hörisch et al. (2017) discuss the implication of institutions on the individual level (age, education, gender) as well. They claim that environmental orientation is frequently used as a source for securing the legitimacy of entrepreneurial ventures at the societal level. They also find a positive relationship between higher education and environmental entrepreneurship. Kruse et al. (2019) also conclude that age, income, and gender influence social entrepreneur activity as well as environmental entrepreneur activity.

In terms of gender and environmental entrepreneurship, some scholars advise studying gender and the types of environmental entrepreneurship using the specific differences among women and environmental entrepreneurs (Outsios and Farooqi, 2017). There has not been enough research to understand the relationship between gender and environmental entrepreneurship (Braun, 2010; Hechavarria et al., 2017). Existing studies on gender and environmental entrepreneurship focus on the differences in internal factors and motives (e.g., profit-making, and ethical values) between women and men entrepreneurs (e.g., Braun, 2010; Hechavarria et al., 2017).

Choi and Gray (2008) assert that some entrepreneurs can balance social and environmental objectives in business if they are value-driven individuals, even if they have limited financial resources. It is, therefore, crucial to examine the socially constructed gender differences between women and men environmental entrepreneurs in Turkey to highlight the importance of personal characteristics and beliefs that are constructed through gender identity to achieve sustainability in business. In the sense of changing the global level of sustainability (ecologically and socially), some scholars focus on the triple bottom-line strategy in environmental entrepreneurship. Dixon and Clifford (2007) question how environmental entrepreneurs can create an economically viable business while maintaining its core environmental and social values. They claim that it is possible by using a triple bottom-line strategy, which refers to the simultaneous pursuit of environmental, social, and economic goals.

Regarding the triple bottom-line perspective, some authors have examined solutions to the environmental degradation required to cover these triple bottom-line goals within sustainable entrepreneurship (e.g., Belz and Binder, 2017; Choi and Gray, 2008; Muñoz et al., 2018; Koe et al., 2015; Rodgers and Ketola, 2010; Schaefer et al., 2015; Tiba et al., 2019; Vuorio et al., 2018). This thesis contributes to this debate by uncovering how environmental entrepreneurs,
especially women, use this triple bottom-line strategy in their businesses with the pursuit of
goals simultaneously (socially, economically, and environmentally) by 're-doing gender'
through feminist ethics of care in their SMEs. This reveals women’s distinctiveness in serving
sustainability with environmental entrepreneurship compared to men’s environmental
entrepreneurship, which mainly focuses on the duality of goals in balancing economic and
environmental outcomes.

I prefer to use environmental entrepreneurship as a more comprehensive concept that includes
ecological and/or environmental practices in line with the social and environmental values of
entrepreneurs as it has been defined previously. To broaden the definition of environmental
entrepreneurship, entrepreneurs require the three components that refer to environmental
engagement:

1. Duality of goals or triple bottom-line goals
2. Environmental innovation or system transformation
3. Environmental value creation

These three components are found in women and men entrepreneurs’ value creation, ethical
decision-making and environmental activities/engagement in their SMEs. The reason for
choosing a broader definition of environmental entrepreneurship is to be consistent with the
theoretical perspectives and the qualitative approach of this study. Instead of categorising
entrepreneurs based on a more specific label, drawing on the three research objectives of this
study, the study reveals the discourses of women and men entrepreneurs while exploring
gender influences on their environmental engagement and the type of environmental
entrepreneurship they pursue. This approach shows how they construct their environmental
entrepreneurship identity under the influence of gender and institutional interactions and,
consequently, the type of environmental entrepreneurship they start or pursue in Turkey.

This enables us to understand how women and men entrepreneurs make sense of themselves
and their environmental entrepreneurship based on their socially constructed gender. This also
shows how women and men negotiate with tensions between their value-oriented mindset and
profit-oriented SMEs in an emerging economy. Their narratives reveal how gender and other
contextual factors play a role in their environmental engagement or development in their SMEs.
The following section examines the main drivers of environmental entrepreneurs from environmental entrepreneurship studies. However, there is no generalisation among them, and the level of these drivers can change depending on other factors, such as gender and context (Braun, 2010; Outsios and Farooqi, 2017).

2.3.2 Drivers of Environmental Entrepreneurship

Many scholars (e.g., Arend, 2014, Hamann et al., 2015; Paulraj, 2009; Williams and Schaefer, 2013;) emphasise the importance of studying drivers of environmental entrepreneurship in SMEs as sustainable and genuine motivations have a positive effect on the implementation of eco-friendly initiatives. The existing literature on environmental entrepreneurship focuses on three main motivational factors: competitive advantage, legitimation, and the personal values of owners/managers in SMEs.

Competitive Advantage

First, drawing on institutional and resource-based views, SMEs increase their profitability by improving their environmentally related resources and capabilities to build long-term financial benefits (Hart and Dowell, 2011; Wahga, 2017). Environmental engagement helps them improve their brand image, and process efficiencies and product value (Bansal and Roth, 2000). The environmental capabilities of firms, such as technology adoption capability and strategic proactivity, play an important role in terms of enabling environmental improvement and increasing profitability (Hofmann et al., 2012; Wahga et al., 2015).

Bansal and Roth (2000) conducted a qualitative study for understanding the drivers of environmental engagement with data collected from 53 firms in the United Kingdom and Japan. They suggested that owners/managers are motivated by competitive advantage and that they did not focus on their environmental impact but on cost savings. Further studies have supported this view by claiming SMEs use environmental engagement as a strategy to gain a competitive advantage (e.g., Banerjee, 2001; Hamann et al., 2015). According to Banerjee (2001), industries with negative environmental impacts tend to conduct more environmental activities to avoid paying penalties. This is related to the financial outcomes of the firm rather than environmental consequences (e.g., Paulraj, 2009; Revell et al., 2010).
Particularly, in developing countries, firms think that it ‘is cheaper to pollute and pay taxes rather than improve environmental performance’ (Ciccozzi et al., 2003, p. 63). This is because the managers of such firms worry about their competitors who do not meet the requirements competing with them not only on a price basis but on a profitability basis as well (Revell and Blackburn, 2007).

**Legitimacy**

Second, legitimacy is required for the survival of businesses (Zimmerman and Zeith, 2002). Businesses operate according to the relevant rules, expectations and norms. Institutions are the rules of the game for businesses; an institutional framework defines the incentives that determine which skills and knowledge will be most successful (North, 1990). Institutions can be broadly characterised as either 1) public, centralised institutions, or 2) private, decentralised institutions (Ingram and Silverman, 2002). Public institutions include laws, regulations, and tax codes, while private institutions include societal norms, cultural norms, expectations, and beliefs. Environmental SMEs are particularly vulnerable to both types of institutions (Meek et al., 2010) since they suffer from the liability of newness and are subject to existing institutional arrangements (Paulraj, 2009).

Environmental SMEs that offer products and services which have not received the endorsement and legitimacy of extant institutions must work to achieve acceptance and adoption through legitimation (O’Neil and Ucbasaran, 2016). Legitimation influences entrepreneurs’ ethical decisions, environmental engagement, and the growth of their businesses (e.g., Dixon and Clifford, 2007; Mair and Marti, 2009; Paulraj, 2009; Hörisch et al., 2017). Environmental engagement is used as a source for securing the legitimacy of entrepreneurial ventures for their stakeholders (e.g., customers, community, government). Compliance with legislation seems to regulate the social and environmental activities of SMEs in developed and developing countries (e.g., Hamann et al., 2015; Meek et al., 2010).

Legitimacy can be the main environmental driver or not in SMEs based on the influence of other contextual factors on entrepreneurs. Some studies, especially from emerging economies such as Turkey, India, and Pakistan (e.g., Potluri and Phani, 2020; Vatansever and Arun, 2016; Wahga et al., 2015), have indicated that legislation is not the leading driver of environmental behaviour in SMEs. The main reason for this is justified by the weaker implementation of
regulations and/or lack of sanction power (Parker et al., 2009; Thaddeus, 2013; Vatansever and Arun, 2016). This refers to institutional gaps where institutions are present in some markets but absent in others. Kolk (2014) suggests that institutional gaps should not be conceived as spaces “empty” of institutions but rather that informal rules or arrangements may exist, yet they may be insufficient to enable the overall proper functioning and development of markets.

In this thesis, gender is perceived as a socially structured term; thereby, the level of legitimation may differ in women’s and men’s environmental engagement depending on different institutional factors that affect their decision-making processes. The emerging theoretical framing (Figure 2.8) includes gender influences experienced by (environmental) entrepreneurs, which signal the different legitimation processes for women and men entrepreneurs. The existing literature on environmental entrepreneurship has not paid enough attention to understanding the identity implications of engaging in different legitimation activities in environmental entrepreneurship (Neil and Ucbasaran, 2014). However, studying different motivation factors held by women and men entrepreneurs helps build a comprehensive understanding of how values and behaviour influence sustainability-related activities (Marcus et al., 2015).

**Ethics of Care**

Third, compared to competitive advantage and legitimation motivations, research on SMEs' value-driven environmental engagement is limited. Some researchers claim that the environmental values of owners are not a reliable predictor of SMEs' environmental behaviour (e.g., Schaper, 2002). In contrast, Battisti and Perry (2011) argue that, in New Zealand, while the competitive advantage is an important environmental driver, owner-managers tend to be motivated by ethical values to adopt environmentally friendly practices. Similarly, the main environmental drivers of owners/managers in the UK have been found to be SME owners/managers’ ethical values (e.g., Rodgers and Ketola, 2010; William and Schaefer, 2013). Therefore, ethical values are shaped by institutional factors such as family, education and past experiences, depending on the country (Marcus et al., 2015; Outsios and Kittler, 2018).

Spence et al. (2011) examined the drivers of applying environmental innovations from the entrepreneurs’ perspectives in 44 SMEs in Canada, Tunisia, and Cameroon. They have asserted that the personal values of entrepreneurs are crucial drivers. It was found that normative values
are considered important by owners/managers as having environmental values. These environmental values refer to ecological responsibility and environmental conservation in their societies. Kirkwood and Walton (2010) have stated that environmental entrepreneurs are motivated by the same factors as entrepreneurs in general, except that they are driven by personal ethical values. Consequently, while studying environmental entrepreneurship, the ethical values of the entrepreneurs should not be neglected (Fors and Lennerfors, 2019; Paulraj et al., 2017).

According to Braun (2010), these value-driven entrepreneurs tend to be women, and these women entrepreneurs tend to engage voluntarily in sustainable and environmentally friendly business practices. Value-driven women entrepreneurs give at least equal importance to social and environmental objectives as to economic objectives (Sumathi et al., 2014). Such value-driven environmental entrepreneurship is likely to be even stronger in regions where the government is unable to implement or enforce environmental policies by law (Montiel and Husted, 2009). By examining both new and established SMEs from different sectors, this argument can be developed by identifying the main drivers of owners/managers based on institutional influences they experience.

Existing institutional perspectives on environmental entrepreneurship are criticised for undervaluing, or even largely ignoring, the importance of agency and individual characteristics in the sense of entrepreneurs’ emotions, and personal values that drive them to be environmental entrepreneurs (e.g., Hörisch et al., 2017; Johnsen et al., 2017). Some scholars acknowledge that environmental entrepreneurship is an emotional behaviour because practising entrepreneurs tend to express high degrees of ‘environmental concern and commitment’ (Fors and Lennerfors, 2019). This criticism has led to the development of a theoretical framework for this study that incorporates not only institutional influences on societal levels but also how individuals perceive institutions through their own identities.

The following section summarises the barriers to environmental entrepreneurship.

2.3.3 Barriers to Environmental Entrepreneurship

Linnanen (2002) highlights that a significant obstacle for environmental firms is the entrepreneur's ethical reasoning. Although ethics of care have positive side effects, such as the
entrepreneurs’ desire to make the world a better place, it complicates management due to the strong focus on value-led entrepreneurship and the fact that SMEs are typically driven by profit-making (O’Neil and Gibbs, 2016). Linnaenen (2002) discusses other challenges, such as financial barriers, the challenges of market creation, and finding investors, which are supported by other findings (e.g., Thaddeus, 2013; Murillo and Lozano, 2006; Schick et al, 2002; Vatanser and Arun, 2016).

Similarly, the study of Thaddeus (2013) focuses on the barriers that prevent SMEs from implementing environmentally sustainable practices. They conclude the main barriers comprise seven aspects: 1) the perception of SMEs having little impact on the environment, 2) a lack of financial sources, 3) a lack of qualified human resources personnel, 4) an SME’s characteristics, 5) competing strategic priorities, 6) a lack of management time, and 7) a lack of information and knowledge. Moreover, Shick et al. (2002) found that many start-up entrepreneurs were not fully aware of the potential market opportunities for environmentally friendly businesses and complained about the lack of information passed by business advisers to new business owners about environmental issues. The role of public funding in promoting new environmental enterprises is often overlooked. It seems reasonable that government funding schemes for new-firm ventures should make extra allowances for social and environmental projects since they help reduce the overall cost of public environmental protection and clean-up.

Finance is an ongoing problem for both environmental start-ups and established SMEs (e.g., Linnaenen, 2002; Outsios and Kittler, 2018; Vatansever and Arun, 2016, Wahga, 2017) in developed and developing countries. Outsios and Farooqi (2018) have claimed that access to finance in the UK is challenging for both women and men environmental entrepreneurs. The scarcity of financial problems (Parker et al., 2009) and the extra costs of environmentally friendly products (Shick et al., 2002) are challenging for owners/managers when engaging with environmental practices. In some cases, the structure of the economy does not allow for the rapid liquidation of outdated and polluting technology, such as industrial machinery, vehicles, fuel and so on (e.g., Vatansever and Arun, 2016, p. 32). Moreover, investors are prone to believe that environmental entrepreneurs “fail to grasp the investor’s interest” (Linnanen, 2002, p. 76).
Accordingly, Hamdouch and Depret (2013) claim that the economic/financial constraints are the most important constraints that environmental entrepreneurs must deal with; yet psychological and legislative obstacles are the primary barriers in the example of Turkey. It would be interesting to investigate this phenomenon in the context of emerging economies, where local and regional differences mean that SMEs might be facing different internal barriers compared to their counterparts in developed countries.

2.3.4 Theory, Methodology and Context-Level Findings

Institutional theory has gained increasing attention in environmental entrepreneurship research in the literature (Figure 2.5). Moreover, there is an increasing trend in applying ethics of care theory in environmental entrepreneurship studies.

Figure 2.5: Theoretical Perspectives on Environmental Entrepreneurship
Environmental entrepreneurship studies are generally discussed through institutional lenses, with few studies emphasising personal identity and ethics of care (e.g., Fors and Lennerfors, 2019; O’Neil and Gibbs, 2016). In this thesis, by drawing on the role of institutional influences and personal ethical values associated with identity construction in environmental entrepreneurship, I combine institutional theory with feminist theories, namely: gender role socialisation, gender identity and feminist ethics of care.

Regarding research methods, most of the studies are based on qualitative methods rather than quantitative approaches and systematic literature reviews (Figure 2.6).

**Figure 2.6: Methods in Environmental Entrepreneurship**
Most of these studies are based on institutional theory and qualitative methods involving interview-based techniques or case studies that serve the purpose of an in-depth analysis of the context have been employed. It is important to choose the most appropriate methodology to test the researcher’s theoretically based expectations (Duane et al., 2005). Since environmental entrepreneurship is still in its infancy, I conclude that current discourses on it are important in contextualising the ways women and men entrepreneurs make sense of themselves and their businesses. It is also important to comprehend the experiences and the thoughts of entrepreneurs to reveal how they negotiate between their ethical values, their business activities, and other institutional challenges.

Therefore, qualitative methods involving interviews, and case studies are found to be more appropriate for future studies in gender and environmental entrepreneurship. The theoretical lenses and methodologies that have been applied in both female and environmental entrepreneurship have shown some similarities in recent years. Furthermore, although I have found that most of the studies on environmental entrepreneurship are still from developed countries (advanced economies) (Figure 2.7), the studies on female entrepreneurship from developing counties (emerging economies) have been rapidly increasing (2.2.4, Figure 2.3).
Accordingly, there is still an urgent need for studying environmental entrepreneurship phenomena in emerging economies. There are few if any comparative studies involving advanced and emerging economies. Studying environmental entrepreneurship in emerging economies lays the foundation for such comparative studies. Therefore, studying gender and environmental entrepreneurship from an emerging economy such as Turkey can contribute to the environmental entrepreneurship literature in terms of filling the empirical gap of research from emerging countries.

Based on the environmental entrepreneurship literature, the introduction of the triple bottom line by Elkington (1994) refers to sustainability in businesses where entrepreneurs balance their financial, environmental, and social goals and outcomes. Gender differences in sustainability attitudes, behaviours and activities has been investigated which is visible in drivers of environmental entrepreneurship and how female and male entrepreneurs perceive sustainability and practice accordingly through ethics of care or justice (Braun, 2010; Hechavarria, 2012). For example, while men entrepreneurs focus on the duality of goals (economic and environmental), women entrepreneurs focus on triple bottom line (social, environmental and economic) to achieve sustainability in their business. This can be explained through doing and re-doing gender where entrepreneurs act according to gender norms or defy the patriarchy through their environmental engagement.
2.4 Gender and Environmental Entrepreneurship

With the increasing focus on environmental entrepreneurship, gender is also receiving increasing attention in the existing literature (Outsios and Farooqi, 2017). Even though studies have examined the influence of gender on traditional entrepreneurship, and environmental entrepreneurship research is increasing, there has been little focus on gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship. Yet, women are found as the key stakeholders in sustainable development (Denton, 2002).

Blocker et al. (1997) have claimed that women are more concerned about the environment due to their attributed roles such as caregiver roles as mothers and housewives. Yet, there are no significant differences between men and women in their environmental actions. On the other hand, Bord and O’Connor (1997) found that women are more active than men in protecting the environment in the USA. Similarly, Zelezny et al. (2000) supported this argument by contending that women typically tend to show higher levels of environmental concern and behavioural engagement compared to men. They concluded that the distinctive behaviour of women and men is shaped by gender expectations within the context.

For instance, women are visible as caregivers, nurturers, and child-bearers (Davidson and Freudenburg, 1996). Therefore, women have more ethics of care, while men are socialised as the breadwinners in the family (Gillian, 1982). In contrast, Tindall et al. (2003) demonstrated similar findings to Blocker et al. (1997) regarding gender by arguing that there is no difference between men and women in environmental activism. Hence, more research is needed to determine whether there are gender differences in environmental behaviour and, if so, how they can be explained.

Hunter et al. (2004) examined gender differences in private (household-oriented) and public (socially oriented) environmental behaviour across 22 nations within gender role socialisation theory. They found that women tended to engage in environmental behaviour more than men in many nations. However, this study was limited to advanced economies. Different factors influence the socialisation of environmental behaviour (Zeleyn et al., 2000). Examples include the political environment, gender, social status, education, and environmental disasters, all of which differ from context to context (Hechavvaria et al., 2017). For instance, women and men who have higher social status and education are more likely to engage in pro-environmental issues and are less likely to see the economy as more significant than the environment (Rodgers and Ketola, 2010).
Gender influences in environmental behaviour have also been researched in the entrepreneurship domain. Some findings regarding gender and environmental entrepreneurship research indicate that women entrepreneurs are more engaged with environmental issues in their businesses (e.g., Braun, 2010; Hechavarria, 2016; Outsios and Farooqi, 2017).

First, Braun (2010) contributes to this new phenomenon with her theoretical and empirical findings by defending those men entrepreneurs who have been socialised to look for bottom-line outcomes to achieve a competitive advantage. Meanwhile, women tend to lean towards broader ethical concerns in terms of benefiting the greater good because of their ethical concerns and their caregiver role in society. This means gender differences in environmental entrepreneurship are shaped through a social orientation that supports the previous findings on gender role socialisation in environmental engagement.

Second, Hechavarria (2016) posits three important hypotheses: 1) women are more likely to engage in ecological venturing, 2) women entrepreneurs in societies with strong stereotypes in terms of gender socialisation will be more likely to engage in environmental entrepreneurship than male entrepreneurs, and 3) societies with high levels of post-materialist national values are significantly more likely to persuade women entrepreneurs to engage in environmental ventures when compared to men entrepreneurs. It is evident from these findings that contextual factors influence environmental entrepreneurs within institutional and gender influences.

Third, Outsious and Farooqi (2017) in the UK explore the different behaviour of women and men environmental entrepreneurs by examining their professional experience, performance, financial resources, and attitude toward risk. Based on interviews with environmental entrepreneurs, post-structural feminist perspectives provide insight into the barriers that women and men face, such as a lack of funding, as a major problem. Nonetheless, women entrepreneurs are more inclined to use their professional and social networks than their men counterparts to achieve environmental sustainability in their SMEs in the UK. Bearing in mind that findings from different sociocultural contexts may document different results.

Moreover, Sumathi et al. (2014) examine opportunities for women entrepreneurs in environmental entrepreneurship in the emerging economy of India. They claim that environmental entrepreneurship creates a win-win situation for women entrepreneurs in their personal and professional lives. As an example, they claim that women can make new consumer goods from landfill material, which reduces waste, preserves landfill space, and
reduces global warming. Repurposing consumer goods (upcycling) has become fashionable as entrepreneurs use recycled clothes and furniture to create sustainable fashion statements. In the environmental entrepreneurship literature, it has also been discussed that protecting the environment creates opportunities for entrepreneurs (Clifford, 2007; Choi and Gray, 2008). Therefore, being environmental in business becomes economically rewarding, socially responsible and environmentally beneficial for women and men.

Additionally, environmental entrepreneurship helps women balance their family and their professional lives, especially in societies where gender role socialisation is high (Hechavarria et al., 2017). However, they still face some difficulties in environmental businesses such as a lack of financial assistance and fewer opportunities to create a market for their products because of institutional and gender influences (Sumathi et al., 2014; Outsios and Farooqi, 2017). Even if the current studies provide an opportunity to understand how to approach gender and environmental entrepreneurship through feminist perspectives and institutional lenses, there is no significant correlation between environmental value creation and practising feminist ethics of care.

Most of these studies claim that women entrepreneurs might be more environmentally friendly, but the relationship between institutions, environmental entrepreneurs and gender is missing in the literature. Therefore, this thesis examines the gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship through the process of environmental engagement of women and men entrepreneurs separately by considering contextual factors. The theoretical underpinnings for understanding gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship can be found embedded in gender role socialisation, feminist ethics of care, gender identity and institutional lenses. Each of these distinctive perspectives has contributed to the theoretical development process adopted to uncover the gender factors that serve as key drivers of environmental entrepreneurship. Integrating theories is very important for organisational scholarship because insights from different disciplines can provide a rigorous development of theory in entrepreneurship research (Duane et al., 2005).

Therefore, the main rationale of multi-theoretical perspectives in this research is based on the objective of the contribution to theoretical development in gender and environmental entrepreneurship research. The distinctive assumptions of each theory help answer the research questions. Environmental entrepreneurs' perceptions of their gender identity and roles in
society are a primary driver for them to practice feminist ethics of care in their businesses. This study does not make any prior assumptions about differences between men and women (social feminists) and does not assume that they are alike (liberal feminists). I adopt a social constructionist (post-structural) feminist approach, thereby using gender as a social construct for exploring similarities and differences in the experiences of men and women environmental entrepreneurs in Turkey.

2.5 Emerging Theoretical Background for Gender and Environmental Entrepreneurship

2.5.1 Gender Role Socialisation Theory

Gender socialisation is a “process by which individuals develop, refine and learn to ‘do’ gender through internalising gender norms and roles as they interact with key agents of socialisation, such as their family, social networks, and other social institutions” (Tlaiss and Kauser, 2019). Gender role socialisation encourages men to be more rational and competitive than women because men are taught to be more individualistic in their behaviour to succeed as breadwinners (Chodorow, 1971). Male socialisation is internalised in a "marketplace mentality," which places a high value on economic growth based on technical mastery of the Earth and the exploitation of natural resources, regardless of the environmental consequences (Braun, 2010).

In response to gender socialisation, women are more likely to have an ethics of care orientation that is nurturing, compassionate, and concerned with others' well-being (Chodorow, 1971). Thereby, gender role socialisation influences occupation choices, family roles, extended social roles, helping behaviour, altruism and, by extension, a special kind of help, such as environmental behaviour (Davidson and Freudenberg, 1996, p. 305). The female entrepreneurship literature argues that women's roles are determined by three bio-social factors to influence behaviour in role-appropriate directions in decision-making processes. These underlying reasons for male and female behaviour include biological processes involving hormonal changes and sociocultural factors of gender identity and others’ stereotypic expectations. These three factors interact to produce both gender differences and similarities (e.g., Brush et al., 2009; Bianco et al., 2017; Orser et al., 2013; Strawser et al., 2021; Yenilmez, 2018;).
For instance, Turkish women believe that it is natural for a woman to be a social or environmental entrepreneur by practising ethics of care based on her perceived caregiver role in society. Consistently, most Turkish men entrepreneurs claim that they care about nature; however, when they need to prioritise between environmental or economic outcomes, they prioritise economic outcomes because what is expected of a family father is to bring home the bread to his wife and children. On the other hand, when women entrepreneurs need to prioritise financial or environmental outcomes, they continue to practise feminist ethics of care for the greater good by being relational, supportive and collaborative in their SMEs (Chapter 5).

Turkish women and men manifest behaviour consistent with their gender roles and identity beliefs to receive approval in society. When women and men comply with their gender roles, it unveils how they do gender in environmental engagement by practising ethics of care to secure legitimation for their entrepreneurship. However, behaviour inconsistent with gender roles is often negatively criticised and tends to disrupt social interactions, especially for women in Turkey. Role-inconsistent behaviour (e.g., being in a male-dominated industry) leads to obvious sanctions (e.g., lack of support from the family, stakeholders, suppliers, etc.) or subtle ones (e.g., being ignored, receiving disapproving looks, especially from family members, etc.) (Chapter 5).

For some scholars, the portrayal of women as caring and relational turns role-inconsistent disadvantage into an advantage, an opportunity to fulfil goals in their personal and professional lives (Braun, 2010; Hechavarria, 2016; Sumathi et al., 2014). This appears in Turkish women entrepreneurs’ narratives when they claim that their businesses are sustainable in every way, where they can run their businesses through environmental and social commitment, but also, they can continue their carer role at home (e.g., having a digital office rather than being somewhere physically). Having a digital office does not harm nature in terms of resource use and it gives other women who are not eligible to work, especially in rural areas, the opportunity to work from home. Moreover, it enables women entrepreneurs in Turkey to carry out their home-related duties while earning money.

**Criticism of Gender Role Socialisation Theory**

While gender role socialisation theory has been much appreciated for extending our understanding of how women do and implement entrepreneurial behaviour differently from
men because of the early and ongoing socialisation process, it has certain limitations (Marlow, 2014).

First, Ahl (2006) has claimed that the female motivation perspective supports the male normative model. Gendered stereotypes decrease the probability of engaging in environmental entrepreneurship. In line with this argument, it has been found that as levels of post-materialism rise among societies, the relationship between value creation goals and gender changes intensify both the negative effect of being female on economic value goals and the positive effect on social value goals (Hechavarria et al., 2017).

Second, many scholars claim that female subordination, resulting from the socialisation process, is still evident (Ahl and Marlow, 2012), especially in emerging patriarchal economies (Anderson and Ojediran, 2022). Therefore, gender role socialisation theory limits our understanding of how women and men entrepreneurs redo gender in a patriarchal environment. Re-doing gender means resisting the patriarchy (perceived gender differences) and the negative effect of being female on economic value goals and the negative effect of being male on social/environmental value goals in Turkey. Considering the male socialisation in entrepreneurial activity and female socialisation in the caregiver role in Turkey (Chapter 3), it is important to understand how women and men entrepreneurs deal with perceived gender roles by practising feminist ethics of care in environmental entrepreneurship.

Gender role socialisation creates paradoxes and tensions between being male and practising ethics of care in entrepreneurship because such behaviour is perceived as being feminine in Turkey. However, environmental entrepreneurship requires, by nature, practising a feminine-oriented value system. Turkish entrepreneurs do not always necessarily comply with perceived gender roles, especially when they face institutional challenges such as access to finance or legislative problems (Chapter 6). Therefore, gender role socialisation is not the only driver for environmental entrepreneurship. Turkish entrepreneurs have the agency to practise feminist ethics of care by being relational, supportive and collaborative with regard to rational decisions, which implies re-doing gender rather than doing gender. Therefore, as Giddens (1984) and Walley and Taylor (2002) have proposed, the structure (personal beliefs and institutional influences) prompts entrepreneurial action and entrepreneurial action, in turn, changes the structure.
In this study, gender refers to what is regarded as masculine or feminine and is independent of a person’s biological sex. Therefore, both male and female entrepreneurs may adopt behaviour that would typically be expected to be adopted by the opposite sex. Thus, compliance with fixed (male) standards could finally be given up in entrepreneurship. This study responds to the suggestion of Ahl and Marlow (2012):

“Post-structural feminist perspectives must be applied not only to women’s business ownership but to the field of entrepreneurship more broadly”

Given the limitations of gender role socialisation theory and building on what Ahl and Marlow (2012) have also suggested, this study has considered using gender role socialisation in conjunction with feminist ethics of care, gender identity and institutional theory to investigate both gender influences and institutional influences that shape the environmental engagement in Turkish women and men-owned SMEs.

The next three subsections (2.5.2, 2.5.3 and 2.5.4) of this chapter delve into other theoretical frameworks considered suitable for examining the gender influences on the environmental engagement of entrepreneurs in Turkish SMEs.

2.5.2 Feminist Ethics of Care

The feminist ethics of care shows how caring webs of relationships work. It is first positioned as an alternative to traditional masculine ethical discourses that place great emphasis on power, influence, and rights (Gilligan, 1982). Traditional ethics frequently operate on the assumption that women’s moral capacities are lower than men’s, which overvalue traits that are culturally perceived as masculine (e.g., independence, rationality, autonomy, intellect, will or hierarchy). Therefore, it undervalues traits that are culturally or socially understood as feminine (e.g., interdependence, sharing, emotions, feelings, connection, community and caring). Moreover, traditional ethics devalue women’s moral experience by favouring masculine ways of thinking that focus on rules, universality and impartiality over feminine ways of thinking that focus on relationships, particularity and partiality (Gillian, 1982; Noddings, 1984).

Held (2014, p. 109) notes that feminist ethics of care challenges “[…] the portrayal of economic man [sic], with its assumptions dominating market-driven society, that we always and everywhere pursue our own interests”. Hammington (2013) argues that care in businesses
is not a utopian ideal; it is in evidence today in the sense of achieving sustainability (social, environmental, economic). Therefore, in this study, the feminist ethics of care analysis helps us understand why and how owners/managers exhibit an ethical sensitivity and how gender dynamics help reshape entrepreneurs’ identities as environmentally responsible. According to feminist ethics of care, we are all interdependent in a web of relationships that define who we are and what identities we choose to define ourselves by (Hawk, 2011; Held, 2006). Hammington argues that “caring involves a commitment toward environment and society, but action on behalf of them as well” (2013, p. 1131).

Feminist ethics of care recognises the value of others by being relational, supportive and collaborative in business when engaging in ethical decision-making, rather than only identifying abstract and universal principles, such as peace, freedom and human dignity (Held, 2006). In this sense, empirical results from both female entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship literature point to the need for more theoretical rigour in explaining the application of feminist ethics of care within the venture creation process (e.g., Fors and Lennerfors, 2019; Orser et al., 2013; Outsios and Farooqi, 2017; Pastakia, 2002).

In response to these studies, this thesis extends the gender and ethical framework to the different contexts in Turkey, exploring how identity perceptions (e.g., femininity and masculinity) influence environmental venture creation and ethical decisions in turning entrepreneurs' environmental aspirations into action. When considering the value of feminist care ethics, it is important not to mistake it for feminine ethics, thus, possibly, committing the mistake of essentialising the nature of women as carers (Borgerson, 2007). The feminist ethic of care offers explanatory value for understanding how certain business owners/managers are contributing to the development of the purpose of the green economy in Turkey (Chapter 3). Sustainability-oriented environmental business models with mainly women re-doing gender are based on them being relational, supportive and collaborative in their SMEs.

Women’s sustainability-oriented environmental entrepreneurship reveals that businesses are part of society and rely on their relationships for their survival. Environmental entrepreneurs, with their innovative mixing of triple bottom-line goals, are important leaders in sustainable development (Elkington, 1994). Building relationships of care and interdependence serves as an essential catalyst to building a more sustainable and fair future. However, even if most men entrepreneurs fit into the economy-oriented environmental entrepreneur category, they also
make ethical decisions in their businesses in terms of protecting nature. This shows that while Turkish women exhibit masculine characteristics, they also take feminine-oriented decisions by choosing to protect nature while running their SMEs.

The SLR of this study has concluded that managers’ decision-making is mainly derived from modern ethical theories focusing on indications of masculinities more than femininities in both female entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship. Therefore, the scale leaves feminine decision-making dimensions invisible. The new theoretical framing suggests that in seeking a deeper understanding of (female) entrepreneurs’ moral decision-making, scholars must find a broader basis for the analysis and develop the scale further so that it allows different voices to be heard and different dimensions to be seen.

Lewis (2013: 4) articulates an “urgent need to direct critical attention away from a dominant focus on masculinity and the exclusion of women from entrepreneurship”, instead of advocating for the examination of how “plural femininities” become “included in the organizational sphere”. Lewis (2013) advocates a need to reflect gender as a “situated social practice” with multiple performative possibilities. Using the concept of the feminist ethic of care, I explain how these processes evolve over several social interactions (e.g., institutional influences) through gender identity construction. Therefore, this study draws on gender identity theory where women and men entrepreneurs reconstruct their identities as environmental entrepreneurs by practising feminine-oriented value systems in their environmental businesses.

2.5.3 Gender Identity

Individuals have interrelated, evolving, multiple selves (Lewis, 2013), and their identities are historically, contextually and discursively constructed at the intersections of various identity categories (Welter, 2011). Therefore, when building identities, they incorporate factors such as gender, language, society and culture.

This thesis suggests that women and men entrepreneurs build their entrepreneurial identities within the dominant gendered discourse of entrepreneurship. By doing environmental entrepreneurship, though, women and men redo gender and act in ways that go beyond not only the normative concepts of what is male and female but also the regulative structures that often punish women for their gender roles (e.g., caregiver) (Chapters 5 and 6). Turkish women face an ongoing struggle to find their voices and space to position themselves and their work within
an unequal masculine domain (e.g., male dominance in entrepreneurship and specific sectors). Only a few studies have focused on how women entrepreneurs construct their identities considering the influences and roles of context and process (Swail and Marlow, 2018).

The intersectional lenses within gender identity construction add to the traditional debate on entrepreneurship, given that identities are inter-sectionally constructed and undifferentiated from other inequalities, such as gender, class and socio-economic institutional factors (Lewis, 2013). For instance, some Turkish women entrepreneurs operate in traditionally masculine areas, such as manufacturing sectors, or they exhibit masculine behaviour, for which they are punished or ignored because of institutional influences in the country (Chapter 6). Nevertheless, they challenge what is acceptable to society’s gender norms by ignoring what others think or say about them in terms of perceived gender differences.

Moreover, most women entrepreneurs even go further and defy perceived gender identity and roles. Ignoring and defying gender biases enables women to focus on the advancement of their businesses and to add value to their feminist ethics of care. Consequently, they experience less oppression in their lives compared to their previous gender role compliance in seeking to please everyone in society.

As much as women interact with others (e.g., stakeholders, other entrepreneurs) as environmental entrepreneurs, they reconstruct their identities and learn to detach themselves from socially perceived identities and roles by taking the best actions for their SMEs. Diaz Garcia and Welter (2013), accordingly, describe gender identity as a dynamic process in which women entrepreneurs apply complex strategies in their working lives, shift between identities, and adopt various entrepreneurial practices depending on the situation. Consequently, women add value to their femininity as environmental entrepreneurs. Therefore, the emerging theoretical framework suggests that women can learn how to construct their identity in a way that supports their businesses in a patriarchal society.

Turkish men entrepreneurs can also learn how to construct their identity in a way that supports their environmental entrepreneurship. For instance, men entrepreneurs perceive themselves as having masculine identities; thereby, their discourse on their entrepreneurial identity is embedded in traditional economic development objectives (e.g., competitive advantage and market-driven and growth objectives). However, engaging with the environment, being relational, supporting others and following collaborative approaches in waste management help them improve their environmental, social and economic sustainability (Chapter 6). Therefore,
they start to add value by incorporating a feminine-oriented value system in their decision-making processes and engaging in more environmental activities. Some men entrepreneurs claim that by being environmental entrepreneurs, they reject what is expected from a man entrepreneur in Turkey (Chapter 5).

These responses answer the question of Vatansever and Arun (2016) about why there are no sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurs in Turkey. As some scholars claim (O’Neil and Gibbs, 2016; O’Neil and Ucbasaran, 2016), the dominant discourse of the green economy and environmental entrepreneurship remains embedded in traditional economic development objectives and, as such, does little to encourage ‘strong’ environmental entrepreneurship. This is evident in most emerging economies (Potluri and Phani, 2020). However, like mainstream entrepreneurship, environmental entrepreneurship is constantly being made and remade; its form and characteristics are fluid and open to transformation (Gast et al., 2017).

Environmental entrepreneurs are core to this process of making and remaking (O’Neil and Gibbs, 2016). Their narratives help to expand the concept of environmental entrepreneurship and to make ‘present’ alternatives which challenge the prevailing obsession with economic growth and increasing consumption in the emerging economy of Turkey. I claim that current definitions of the green economy and favoured sectors (usually male dominated) in transforming the economy with greening policies create tensions for an environmental entrepreneurial identity given its dual focus on both greenness and continued economic growth (Chapter 3/6).

2.5.4 Institutional Theory

According to Foss et al. (2018), post-structural feminism is inherently political. Therefore, they suggest that future studies should draw on post-structural feminist theory by considering contextual factors for uncovering perceived gender differences and their challenges to women entrepreneurs in a specific context. Henry et al. (2016) have asserted that a failure to recognise the “contextually embedded” nature of women’s diverse experiences with entrepreneurship may reinforce a “traditional . . . dated and inaccurate” view of women’s perceived entrepreneurial incompetence.

Institutions outline the available modes of appropriate actions, which are commonly conceived as the rules of the game, as a contextual factor for entrepreneurs (North, 1990). The
The notion of legitimacy is central to institutional theory. It refers to whether an agent's actions are deemed desirable, appropriate or proper in a specific context. While some institutions may affect women and men entrepreneurs in similar ways, others have gendered effects, such as labour market laws that give (un)equal access to employment positions and family policies that specify childcare provisions (Welter and Smallbone, 2010). This uncovers how some norms and values apply to everyone in society, and others apply only to certain groups, given particular “roles” defined as “conceptions of appropriate goals and activities for people of specific social positions” (Scott, 1995, p. 55).

In Turkey, entrepreneurial activity is associated with qualities that are typically considered masculine, such as being bold, aggressive, achievement-oriented, calculating and risk-taking (Maden, 2015). Such stereotyping constrains women from starting and growing any type of business. Additionally, institutions affect whether individuals believe they have the knowledge, skills and competencies needed to start/run a business and how they perceive the risks, fears and rewards associated with entrepreneurship (Baughn et al., 2006). Accordingly, in relation to the third research objective (1.3), this thesis conceptualises the formal and informal institutions for women and men environmental entrepreneurs. As I explain, considering institutional enablers and barriers that interact with gender influences in the emergence of the type of environmental entrepreneurship, I will extend theoretical perspectives on environmental entrepreneurship in emerging patriarchal economies.

Drawing on the institutional factors emerging in this study, such as access to finance and the political environment (2.2.3, 2.2.4), as enablers and/or barriers, depending on how women and men entrepreneurs experience them in their pre-entry and post-entry decision-making process, this study integrates institutional perspectives into feminist ethics of care theory. Many scholars (e.g., Brush et al., 2009; Poggesi et al., 2016; Sefer, 2020) acknowledge the “heterogeneity of what constitutes women’s entrepreneurship” based on contextual factors. Therefore, they stress the importance of the examination of context, including informal institutions (e.g., identity construction and perceived gender roles in society) and formal institutions (e.g., finance, policy), in explorations of entrepreneurial outcomes.

Similarly, many scholars from environmental entrepreneurship literature (e.g., Beveridge and Guy, 2005; Gast et al., 2017; Meek et al., 2010; Kirkwood and Walton, 2010; Nikolaou et al., 2018; Paulraj, 2009) have identified the importance of institutional theory in terms of
understanding the drivers of environmental engagement among SME owners/managers. Therefore, the context influences nature, the pace of development and the type of entrepreneurship, as well as how entrepreneurs behave (Martinelli, 2004; Welter, 2011).

In this thesis, legislation, finance, non-governmental organizations, and unwritten social rules play a role in influencing women and men entrepreneurs’ environmental engagement in their SMEs. Institutional theory helps explain when formal institutions become enablers or barriers to running environmental businesses that are led by women and men entrepreneurs within the gender dynamics of Turkey. Institutional theory works well to explain the context, formal, and informal institutions in detail, yet it fails to present a clear perspective on the gendering of these contexts.

Table 2.4: Institutional Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumptions</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Entrepreneurs create their value based on governmental rules and agreements to gain legitimacy</td>
<td>1. Little attention is given to the role of humanity’s feelings (ethical issues) regarding the entrepreneur’s environmental decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. External institutions (other companies, industry) create pressure and structure for SMEs</td>
<td>2. The institutional framework does not specify the nature of decisions/structures and self-dependence of entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Entrepreneurs make decisions based on beliefs based on cognitive limitations and traditions</td>
<td>3. It cannot explain alone the impact of gender on entrepreneurship without enhancement from ethical lenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Obedience to rules and norms can blind entrepreneurs to focusing on the needs of others (like future generations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed by the Researcher

In that vein, the integration of feminist theories for understanding the gendered institutions and, ultimately, the context is vital. While there is a growing body of literature examining how institutions influence female entrepreneurs (Chapter 2), there is a general lack of knowledge on how women and men experience institutional complexities and actively react to these complexities and contradictions. In this sense, institutional theory, and the feminist lenses support each other in terms of unpacking how women and men overcome institutional challenges by doing and re-doing gender in environmental entrepreneurship. This means
entrepreneurs are not the only ones who are gendered; the socio-economic context in which entrepreneurship is taking place can also be gendered (Giddens, 1984).

For instance, challenges in access to finance in feminine-perceived sectors (e.g., fashion, home-based businesses, decoration) refer to institutional ‘gaps’ in this study as defined by Kolk (2014). This discourages micro and small business owners who are usually led by women entrepreneurs from adopting environmental practices since they think that their sector is isolated from the industry’s environmental development support (Chapter 6). The reason for limited support for these feminine-perceived sectors is found in how women are perceived in society as ‘caregivers’ and, thereby, less likely to contribute to the economy compared to masculine-perceived sectors, such as technology, energy and manufacturing. This shows how these informal institutions are the guidelines and behaviour that shape the implementation of formal institutions (North, 1990).

2.6 Emerging Conceptual Framework

Drawing on the intersectionality of institutional and feminist lenses, the emerging theoretical framing (Figure 2.8) develops logic by combining insights from four perspectives, namely: gender role socialisation, feminist ethics of care, gender identity and institutional theory.
Figure 2.8: Emerging Theoretical Framework for the Study
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Figure 2.8 depicts the emerging theoretical framework based on the integration of concepts from the female entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship literature. In Figure 2.8, blue arrows (1) and 2 represent the relationship between gender influences and their interaction with institutional influences is represented by black arrows 3 and 4 (→). This relationship between gender influences and institutional influences refers to the rules of the game that shape the environmental engagement, which is evidenced in value creation, drivers, and different behaviour among women and men entrepreneurs. The theoretical framework suggests gender is socially constructed through institutional interactions based on the rules of the games. Yet, these rules of the games are also gendered, based on the perceived gender differences in Turkey.

From 1 to 2, it can be seen that perceived masculine and feminine traits change over time and are continually reconstructed within gender identity through the interactions of owners'/managers’ experiences in the institutional environment.

First, women entrepreneurs try to gain legitimation for their environmental entrepreneurship by emphasizing how practising feminist ethics of care is acceptable for a female entrepreneur in her business. Similarly, men environmental entrepreneurs prioritise their rational decisions, which are based on competitive advantage and financial sustainability rather than social transformation within environmental innovation.

This framework supports the argument made in female entrepreneurship studies as gender role socialisation encourages men to be more rational and competitive than women because men are taught to be more individualistic in their behaviour to succeed as breadwinners (Chodorow, 1971; Giddens, 1984). Consequently, while Turkish women are socialised to practise ethics of care in their environmental engagement, men are socialised to practise ethics of justice in their SMEs. However, by engaging with environmental issues in their SMEs, both women and men entrepreneurs add value to the feminine-oriented value system in their decision-making processes, such as caring and being relational and supportive. This supports the view that both men and women entrepreneurs can adopt behaviour that would typically be expected to be adopted by the opposite sex (Diaz Garcia and Welter, 2013; Lewis, 2013).
Second, different socialisation processes between men and women can lead to the barriers faced by women entrepreneurs and men entrepreneurs being different and often unequal, with women generally being more disadvantaged in their entrepreneurial activities in emerging economies (Poggesi et al., 2016). Based on this argument, formal institutions are found in the form of legislation, and access to finance for both women and men entrepreneurs, while informal institutions are the patriarchal social structure and non-governmental institutions for environmental entrepreneurs. As has been discussed by Poggesi et al., (2016), the patriarchal environment that favours men and their entrepreneurial role as being more masculine than feminine generally means being more disadvantaged in women’s environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey.

Nevertheless, by practising environmental entrepreneurship within a feminine-oriented value system in the decision-making process, women and men redo gender and act in ways that go beyond not only the normative concepts of what is male and female but also the regulative structures that often punish women for their gender roles. Women and men redo gender by reconstructing their gender identities and adding value to their femininity in environmental entrepreneurship, which is contrary to the traditional assumptions of the masculinity-oriented decision-making processes of entrepreneurship (Henry, 2013). As a result of the re-doing of gender of owners/managers, environmental engagement increases in SMEs (Chapters 5 and 6). Supporting women and men entrepreneurs in the institutional environment when re-doing gender, where they add value to feminist ethics of care, benefits the greater good in the sense of a triple bottom line in business.

2.7 Chapter Conclusion

This literature review chapter has had two important goals: presenting the current state of knowledge and identifying research gaps within the female entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship literature. Multiple disciplines have been employed to justify the research questions regarding the research gaps identified, and a theoretical framework has been developed through the systematic literature review method. The new integrative theoretical framing (Figure 2.8) aims to critically explain gender influences on environmental entrepreneurs’ value creation, drivers and behaviour through the lenses of gender role socialisation, feminist ethics of care, gender identity, and institutional theory.
The primary aim of the SLR has been achieved by revealing research gaps in gender and environmental entrepreneurship studies. First, a research gap exists in understanding the socially constructed gender influences as gender identity, gender role perceptions and expectations of value creation goals, and the pre-entry and post-entry decisions of women and men entrepreneurs in adapting environmental practices from societies where gender role stereotypes are high (e.g., emerging economies and/or patriarchal societies) (Hechavarria et al., 2017).

The second research gap found was a lack of knowledge in the relationship between institutional factors, environmental entrepreneurship, and their interaction with gender influences. It is important to understand how institutional factors interact with gender influences within environmental entrepreneurship because women face institutional gaps as challenges that men entrepreneurs do not experience in patriarchal societies. This study reveals how environmental entrepreneurship enables women entrepreneurs to navigate gendered challenges within the institutional environment by re-doing gender, adding value to their femininity in society and in the business realm.

The third gap was found in the application of the feminine-oriented value system (ethics of care) in business decisions to show how men and women are both potentially able to follow a feminist ethic of care, especially in environmental entrepreneurship. Although existing studies (e.g., Hechavarria et al., 2017) claim that male stereotypes reduce this likelihood for men in patriarchal societies, this study suggests that men have the agency to practise feminist ethics of care in their SMEs. Using qualitative in-depth interview approaches, the proposed theory aims to investigate real tensions and paradoxes associated with being male and having a feminist ethic of care orientations in business decision-making as well as being female and an entrepreneur in a patriarchal society in terms of gaining legitimation in both women and men-owned SMEs.

By developing the integrated theoretical framework, gender role socialisation theory, feminist ethics of care, gender identity and institutional theory, how behavioural norms (gender role compliance/resistance) shape environmental action or inaction among women and men entrepreneurs (ethical decisions) are reviewed and applied. How women and men challenge such norms by re-doing gender (gender identity construction), especially when they face challenges in terms of perceived gender differences in the institutional environment, such as
access to finance and limited enforcement of environmental legislation in women-dominated sectors, can then be explored.

The second aim of the SLR is achieved by building an integrative theoretical framing (Figure 2.8) for understanding these research gaps in the gender and environmental literature. The systematic literature review method has contributed to understanding why feminist theories should be used in not only female entrepreneurship but also in all entrepreneurship studies. Environmental entrepreneurship is closely related to a feminine-oriented decision-making value system. However, environmental entrepreneurship literature has ignored feminist ethics of care while focusing on the role of institutional theory in terms of understanding the determinants, drivers and institutional barriers of environmental entrepreneurship. Therefore, by conceptualising institutional factors for both women and men entrepreneurs in environmental entrepreneurship, integrated theoretical perspectives from gender role socialisation, gender identity and feminist ethics of care theories reveal how women and men have the agency to do and redo their gender for the development of environmental entrepreneurship.

Theoretical framework implementation requires data collection from women and men owners/managers who start/run environmental SMEs. Primary data collection is significant to gain in-depth knowledge and insights about how gender influences shape the decisions and behaviour in SMEs led by environmental entrepreneurs in the research setting. The categories of SMEs are cross-sectoral where owners/managers have environmental aspirations and practices. These SMEs are usually established small and medium-sized enterprises, yet there are also some micro-SMEs with high growth potential thanks to owners/managers’ sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship. The diversity of SMEs from different sectors led by women and men entrepreneurs helps reveal new potential environmental sectors, which are usually led by women entrepreneurs.

The emerging theoretical framing presented in Figure 2.8 suggests that a theoretical relationship exists between feminist lenses and institutional lenses, which are also gendered based on contextual factors. Therefore, the narratives of representatives from the institutional environment contribute to the development of a new integrative theoretical framework (Figure 7.1) in this study. It is important to understand how gender is constructed and reconstructed with social interactions (the institutional environment) between environmental entrepreneurs.
and, consequently, affects their environmental engagement in their SMEs. This theoretical relationship, which is elaborated on in this thesis to address the two research questions, has been set out in section 1.3 of Chapter 1.

Turkey provides a feasible context for the application of the framework as it has similarities with European and Asian countries in terms of political, geographic and societal structures. Moreover, its patriarchal societal structure inhibits women’s access to the institutional environment, reflecting similarities with other emerging economies (Anderson and Ojediran, 2022). Turkey has been chosen as a research context to reveal how women’s agency navigates institutional challenges within environmental entrepreneurship. Moreover, the Turkish context represents the role of women in the emergence of sustainability-oriented environmental entrepreneurship, especially in emerging economies, where environmental entrepreneurship is mainly associated with the growth objectives of traditional entrepreneurship.

The next section presents the study's research setting based on gender influences and then presents the institutional context as formal and informal institutions that enable/disable environmental engagement for entrepreneurs in Turkey.
CHAPTER 3
THE CONTEXT OF GENDER AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN TURKEY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to present the context of gender and environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey, focusing on perceived gender disparities in the entrepreneurship sector, the emergence of environmental entrepreneurship and the institutional environment required for its development. In doing so, the chapter discusses why Turkey is a suitable research setting for studying gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship for three main reasons.

First, male domination in the entrepreneurship sector and its negative effects on female entrepreneurs are evidenced in many emerging economies (Anderson and Ojediran, 2022). Patriarchal sociocultural values and associated gender ideologies negatively affect women’s entrepreneurial activity in Turkey (OECD Entrepreneurship Policy Report, 2021). In this study, it has been found that the decision-making process of entrepreneurs is usually associated with masculine characteristics, such as profit maximisation and financial sustainability, rather than being relational and supportive or by following collaborative approaches in the industry. Moreover, entrepreneurship in Turkey is also perceived as a man’s role while childcare is perceived as a woman’s primary role (Chapter 5). This hinders the development of both women’s entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship. Thus, understanding how women navigate gendered challenges by strategically doing and re-doing gender may be a key differentiator of the women’s role in sustainability-related entrepreneurship in emerging economies like Turkey.

Second, Turkey is known as a leading emerging economy with its entrepreneurial infrastructure (GEM, 2017), yet the institutional environment for sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship is still underdeveloped (Vatansever and Arun, 2016). The existing SME greening policies mainly focus on growth-oriented sectors, such as energy, industrial manufacturing, or technology-oriented SMEs, where the number of male entrepreneurs is higher than female entrepreneurs (TUIK, 2022). In this study, the discourse of women and men entrepreneurs shows the tensions and paradoxes in constructing their environmental entrepreneurship identity because of the typical entrepreneurial expectations in an emerging economy that are associated with growth-oriented assumptions (Chapter 6). This
study emphasises the importance of sustainability-oriented environmental entrepreneurship, where entrepreneurs practice feminist ethics of care to address how they resolve the conflict between commercialising environmental innovation and addressing environmental concerns in an emerging economy.

Third, the literature on gender and environmental entrepreneurship from the existing literature is mostly from developed countries (Gunawan et al., 2021). Turkey contributes to the existing literature by filling this empirical gap. Gender and environmental entrepreneurship studies from developed countries show that women have greater social and environmental commitment than men due to different gender socialisation circumstances. This is evident in Chapter 5, with women’s triple bottom-line goals compared to men’s duality of goals in Turkey. However, when institutional influences do not work in tandem or interact with gender influences, such as perceived gender identity and gender role expectations, even if women have a more social and environmental commitment than men, it is challenging for them to turn their environmental aspirations into action (Chapter 6). Based on this, this study claims that when institutions such as access to finance, environmental legislation, non-governmental organisations and socially embedded rules support women and men environmental entrepreneurs equally, women entrepreneurs are more likely to transform their sustainability-oriented (economic, social and environmental) values into entrepreneurial behaviour in developing countries.

The structure of the remaining sections is as follows. Section 3.2 elaborates on the nature of the emerging economy that influences women’s entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey. Section 3.3 examines the gender influences on the development of women’s entrepreneurship that reveal the patriarchal societal background in Turkey. Section 3.4 reviews the emergence of environmental entrepreneurship and the current institutional environment for the development of environmental entrepreneurship, with examples from different sectors. Section 3.5 integrates gender and environmental entrepreneurship in the context of Turkey by uncovering how gender influences affect women and men entrepreneurs’ ethical decisions, the types of their environmental enterprises, and the sector they choose for their SMEs. Finally, Section 3.6 provides a chapter summary and conclusions.

3.2 Turkey as an Emerging Economy

This section describes the nature of the emerging economy that affects female entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey. According to the International
Monetary Fund (International Monetary Fund (IMF,2015), emerging economies include Argentina, Bangladesh, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile, China, Colombia, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, Pakistan, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Russia, South Africa, Thailand, Turkey, Ukraine, and Venezuela. The importance of an emerging economy has its emphasis on having a significant growth orientation matched with global aspirations. The main characteristic of emerging economies is lower gross domestic product (GDP) per capita compared to advanced economies. The World Bank defines an emerging economy as a developing country whose average income is less than $4,035 per person (World Bank, 2015). Turkey is also defined as a developing country because its GDP is lower than in developed countries (OECD, 2021). Therefore, the terms emerging economy and developing country are used interchangeably for Turkey.

According to the Table 3.1, OECD member states, including Turkey are closer to achieving social, environmental, and economic (sustainable development goals) targets than other countries. Since this thesis is on gender and environmental entrepreneurship specifically, the table below illustrates a sustainable development dashboard for related goals (SDG5, SDG9, SDG12, SDG13) with gender and environmental entrepreneurship in OECD countries which are emerging economies as Turkey.

Table 3.1: Sustainable Development Goals Index Scores by Emerging Economies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emerging Economy</th>
<th>SDG’s Index Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey (OECD)</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan (East&amp; South Asia)</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh (East&amp; South Asia)</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India (East&amp; South Asia)</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia (East&amp; South Asia)</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation (Eastern Europe and Central Asia)</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine (Eastern Europe and Central Asia)</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria (Eastern Europe and Central Asia)</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary (OECD)</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland (OECD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania (Eastern Europe and Central Asia)</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia (East and South Asia)</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China (East and South Asia)</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand (East and South Asia)</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines (East and South Asia)</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia (Latin America and the Caribbean)</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina (Latin America and the Caribbean)</td>
<td>72.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil (Latin America and the Caribbean)</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico (OECD)</td>
<td>69.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru (Latin America and the Caribbean)</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile (OECD)</td>
<td>77.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared based on data retrieved from Sustainable Development Goals (2021)
Most OECD emerging economy countries in Table 3.2 moderately increase their Gender Equality Goal (SDG5) score compared to the previous year, however, Turkey suffers from major challenges in terms of achieving gender equality. On the other hand, Turkey locates itself in a better position compared to other emerging economies such as Poland and Mexico in Industry, Innovation & Infrastructure. Turkey is the eighth-largest OECD economy and the fastest growing which is evidence of developments through sustainable industry and innovation. According to OECD Environmental Performance Review (2019), Turkey has made progress in relatively decoupling its strong economic growth from a range of environmental pressures (air emissions, energy use, waste generation and water consumption).

Therefore, while all emerging OECD countries have challenges in achieving responsible consumption and production and climate action goals, Turkey’s environmental performance is better than other emerging economy OECD countries. However, all of the emerging economies generate significant negative environmental impacts outside their borders (spillovers) through trade and consumption, hampering other countries’ efforts to achieve the SDGs (Sustainable Development Report, 2021).

Table 3.2: Sustainable Development Dashboard for Emerging Economy & OECD Countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Gender Equality (SDG5)</th>
<th>Industry Innovation &amp; Infrastructure (SDG 9)</th>
<th>Responsible Consumption and Production (SDG 12)</th>
<th>Climate Action (SDG13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkey (OECD)</td>
<td>Major challenges remain</td>
<td>Moderately Increasing</td>
<td>Significant challenges remain</td>
<td>Major challenges remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary (OECD)</td>
<td>Moderately Increasing</td>
<td>Moderately Increasing</td>
<td>Major challenges remain</td>
<td>Major challenges remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland (OECD)</td>
<td>Moderately Increasing</td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td>Significant challenges remain</td>
<td>Major challenges remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico (OECD)</td>
<td>Moderately Increasing</td>
<td>Stagnating</td>
<td>Significant challenges remain</td>
<td>Significant challenges remain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile (OECD)</td>
<td>On Track</td>
<td>Moderately Increasing</td>
<td>Major challenges remain</td>
<td>Major challenges remain</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Prepared based on data retrieved from Sustainable Development Goals (2021)
To achieve the sustainability through these goals, the findings from the Turkey will be useful for other emerging economies and even for developed OECD countries that suffer from gender equality and develop their environmental performance. Studying gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship from an emerging economy Turkey, this thesis suggests that women entrepreneurs have sustainability-driven environmental goals, and their SMEs support economic and environmental sustainability goals. This is important in terms of increasing women’s role in entrepreneurship to achieve gender equality and other environmental and economic goals.

Entrepreneurship is perceived as a factor in GDP growth, and it is encouraged by government policies in emerging economies (Sunje, 2017, p. 204). Turkey creates a stimulating environment for entrepreneurship due to its high return on GDP growth. SMEs are one of the essential elements of Turkey's economy (Mert, 2021). They contribute 62% of the country’s GDP, 55% of its exports, and 73.5% of its workforce (KOSGEB, 2022). Turkey has, by far, the highest number of microenterprises among OECD countries, according to the most recent data available. It is followed by Italy and Japan (OECD, 2021). In Turkey, 93.6% of SMEs are microenterprises, followed by 5.29% of SMEs being described as small and 0.89% being medium (KOSGEB, 2022).

KOSGEB (the Small and Medium Enterprises Development Organisation) is the most important semi-autonomous public institution responsible for implementing SME policies in Turkey (OECD Turkey, 2022). According to KOSGEB’s definitions, there are three significant criteria for SMEs; these are the number of employees, revenue, and net sales (Table 3.3).

**Table 3.3: SMEs Definitions in Turkey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Revenue (Million TL)</th>
<th>Net (Million TL)</th>
<th>Sales</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Micro</td>
<td>&lt;10</td>
<td>≤3</td>
<td>≤3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>&lt;50</td>
<td>≤25</td>
<td>≤25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>&lt;250</td>
<td>≤125</td>
<td>≤125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: KOSGEB, 2022
Turkey’s economy is dominated by industry and services, while the agricultural sector contributes about 6.1% of GDP and accounts for 20.7% of total employment (World Bank, 2018). The manufacturing sector comprises 13.6% of all enterprises and focuses mainly on low- and medium-technology products. Globalisation progress forces SMEs to gain a competitive advantage in Turkey, which leads to growth in the country’s economy. It is problematic for emerging economies to prioritise growth in SMEs rather than focusing on the triple bottom line as they are equally valuable in environmental entrepreneurship (Potluri and Phani, 2020).

As an emerging economy, Turkey prioritises growth-oriented sectors in environmental entrepreneurship with SME greening policies. This creates some challenges for women entrepreneurs as some women in developing countries cannot get access to finance because of the political environment that favours men more than women in their country (De Vita et al., 2014). However, women are considered a lever for economic growth and sustainability, especially in emerging economies (Anderson and Ojediran, 2022).

### 3.3 Women’s Entrepreneurship in Turkey

#### 3.3.1 Gender-related Factors that Influence Entrepreneurship in Turkey

This section outlines the gender influences in the entrepreneurship sector, which is usually challenging for women entrepreneurs.

Turkey is the only secular country where 98% of the population is Muslim, and it serves as a geographic and cultural bridge between Europe and Asia. The era of modernization began with the establishment of the Turkish Republic in 1923, with a focus on women's emancipation and liberalization (Aycan, 2004). The period between 1960-1993 was known as the industrialisation period for Turkey (Tunc and Alkan, 2019). During this period, the number of women entrepreneurs increased fourfold. By providing micro-credits and information centres for women to run their businesses, the government played a major role in encouraging women entrepreneurs (Savrul and Akyüz, 2014). However, despite an equal stance in legislative regulations, the gap between women and men in political, social and labour market arenas is apparent.

Hisrich and Öztürk’s study (1999) focuses on women’s entrepreneurship in Turkey. Occupational segregation because of male domination is cited as a difference in women's entrepreneurship there compared to developed countries. The perceived gender role of motherhood and childcare is seen as one of the obstacles to becoming an entrepreneur for
Turkish women. In Turkish society, women's roles are still heavily influenced by traditional and cultural values. Women and men differ from the moment they are born through the experiences, social conditions, and positions they are subjected to during socialization processes to their sexes as 'women' and 'men'. For instance, while women are perceived as feminine, men are perceived as masculine. In other words, women are subjected to female norms and men are subjected to male norms (Chodorow, 1971).

The Turkish sociocultural structure is characterised by the gender inequality that occurs in almost every area of work, especially in entrepreneurship (Ozar, 2007). Entrepreneurship is perceived as ‘male behaviour’ and/or as a ‘masculinity-related activity’ which makes it a man’s job (2015). Therefore, women entrepreneurs tend to consult their families regarding their entrepreneurial intentions. Married women perceive their husbands as 'the head of the family' whereas single women tend to place their fathers in that role (Tunc and Alkan, 2019). It shows that female entrepreneurs face crucial gender-based barriers in entrepreneurship since it seems to be a field dominated by patriarchy and masculine reality.

Maden (2015) demonstrated that women entrepreneurs face serious criticism and punishment when they present their business ideas to their family and friends, who may suggest that they will fail or neglect their children. These pressures do not apply to men entrepreneurs. Consequently, women entrepreneurs are supposed to also embody the social roles of caregiver and housewife, which creates extra pressure on them. They worry about becoming entrepreneurs as they imagine they will neglect their family responsibilities and that their family lives will be worse. (Ufuk and Özgen, 2001). Previous studies have shown that Turkish women entrepreneurs are generally in their thirties when they start a business. This is because their gender-related responsibility (i.e., motherhood, caregiving) in the home has ended because their children are almost grown up (Ince, 2012).

The socially constructed gender roles push women to balance their life and work roles in their career development. For instance, some Turkish women entrepreneurs feel more comfortable in home-based manufacturing sectors because they do not have to worry about their caregiver role at home as mothers and wives while running their SMEs (Ozar, 2007; Yenilmez, 2018). As a result of the gender role expectations of Turkish women at home, women are also associated with supposedly feminine sectors in their career development. For instance, technology-related, and engineering jobs are associated with men; those are seen as men’s jobs. Conversely and parallel to social structure, women mostly involve themselves in the childcare, healthcare, tourism, food, education, and design-related sectors (Halac and Celik, 2019). The
appearance of women entrepreneurs in certain sectors, especially the growth-oriented sectors, is unusual. Underrepresentation among women-owned SMEs is prevalent in the Turkish economy, international trade, and public procurement (Kagider, 2019).

This male domination in entrepreneurship which causes sectoral segregation represents a gendered barrier that affects women's entrepreneurship in size and scale. For example, the study by Ozar (2007) of nearly 5,000 Turkish micro and small enterprises found that only 6% of these enterprises were led by women. Most women's businesses are small since nearly half are in trade and one-third are in home-based manufacturing. Most of them did not use credit for starting their businesses, and very few had access to business support services. Further studies show that Turkish women tend to run smaller businesses than men, and have 1-4 employees, thereby requiring less capital (e.g., Keskin, 2014). However, many studies in Turkey compare women and men entrepreneurs without explaining such gender differences in entrepreneurship.

For instance, some studies (Cetindamar et al., 2012; Yilmaz et al., 2012) claim that women’s businesses are mostly established through their own efforts or with the support of their families or spouses. Human capital (e.g., education, networking) is found more effective for women rather than men while financial capital is similarly accessible for the entrepreneurial activities of both women and men. Therefore, it is claimed that women’s likelihood of becoming an entrepreneur could increase if Turkey increased access to education, as well as the skills necessary to take advantage of their family capital. Yet, it is not enough to understand the challenges women entrepreneurs face in a male-dominated society where they may wish to rely on human capital rather than financial capital to start or run their SMEs.

In that vein, a few recent qualitative studies (Maden, 2015; Sefer, 2020) have claimed that financial access is not the same for women and men, despite the existence of various support mechanisms such as governmental and non-governmental, banks, business partners and family members. Yenilmez (2018) argues that women entrepreneurs have limited access to banks because of gender biases against women. Moreover, as mentioned earlier, Turkish women often seek permission from their fathers and husbands to start their own SMEs. When the husband or father is reluctant to support women financially, and there is no access to finance from institutions because of their perceived gender differences, women depend on their savings. In most cases, this explains the reason for the smaller size and scale of women-owned SMEs compared to men-owned SMEs, and why less capital is required.
In addition, only 7% of collateral is held by women because of male domination. Therefore, it is more challenging for women to access finance from banks compared to men entrepreneurs (Kagider, 2019). The key components of women's equal rights in the Turkish Republic are widely distributed through education, legislative and administrative reforms, political rights, public visibility, and professionalism. However, women who have applied for the women’s entrepreneurship programme have strongly felt the influence of social gender norms despite their levels of education and professional experience. Even though a relatively lower number of women have experienced the effect of these gender norms in Western Turkey, their SMEs are still affected by these gender role socialisation concerns (Gul and Altindal, 2016).

Similarly, few studies show that even highly educated women entrepreneurs experience structural constraints such as prejudice, discrimination, and the obstruction of women’s access to economic resources (e.g., Maden, 2015; Yenilmez, 2018; Sefer, 2020). Gendered barriers have often been ignored in these implementations, and the success level of policies, programmes and practices supporting women’s entrepreneurship has remained limited (Gul and Altindal, 2016). For instance, regional differences affect the degree to which women feel the visible or invisible pressure of social gender norms (2020). Therefore, social policies and strategies should be developed to be implemented along with educational programmes to eliminate social gender-based barriers and ensure a holistic perspective. This is evidenced by Hanisoglu and Ozgur (2021) through their findings showing that most women entrepreneurs are from big cities, such as Istanbul, Izmir, Bursa and Kocaeli, and have university degrees.

In addition to the male-dominated social structure, gender roles and geographical context (e.g., regional differences) that shape women’s entrepreneurship in Turkey in size, scale and development, there are also personal characteristics, such as gender factors, that women usually use as a weapon to deal with perceived gender differences for gaining legitimization as entrepreneurs or developing their business in size and scale.

Some of the feminine characteristics of women entrepreneurs, like good communication skills, interpersonal problem-solving abilities, tolerance, altruism and caring, contribute significantly to their entrepreneurial qualities (Yetim, 2008). The findings of Kabasakal et al. (2016) also support the idea of women’s tendency to embrace a feminine-oriented value system by discussing different definitions of success held by men and women in Turkey: women define success as reaching targets, innovativeness and being different, while men focus more on making money and achieving status. Exploiting unique opportunities in the business realm by working for the good of society and being independent in one’s decisions and actions have
been identified as major factors behind Turkish women’s decision to become entrepreneurs (Maden, 2015; Tuzun and Araz, 2017).

Based on these studies, it has been concluded that women entrepreneurs are more altruistic than their counterparts and that they use a feminine-oriented value system in the decision-making process in SMEs because they give more priority to society than profit maximising (Yetim, 2008), which might be important for gaining legitimation in environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey. Although Turkish women benefit from practising feminine-oriented values in their entrepreneurship, they continue to face challenges because entrepreneurship is perceived through masculine-oriented values, such as profit maximisation, risk-taking, and being aggressive and individualistic rather than being interpersonal. Only a few studies have uncovered how women entrepreneurs deal with the challenges of these gendered barriers by developing female entrepreneurial strategies.

For example, the study by Kalafatoglu and Mendoza (2017) claims that networking, which is based on the relational resources embedded in personal relationships and ties between people, is an important tool of entrepreneurship, helpful in accessing industrial knowledge, resources, and finance. Contrary to previous studies from Turkey (e.g., Hisrich and Öztürk, 1999; Ufuk and Özgen, 2001) which claim that female entrepreneurs face difficulties in establishing an effective network because of marriage responsibilities and living with partners, Kalafatoglu and Mendoza (2017) show how Turkish women use their female entrepreneurial skills by adding value to being relational and, thereby, their networking skills. Therefore, they suggest that networking is a key factor in women entrepreneurs overcoming the gendered barriers that they face in access to capital, financial information, resources, and new business opportunities.

Finally, Fis et al. (2019) suggest that middle-class families are less likely to fulfil traditional gender roles, particularly when it comes to female family members who wish to become entrepreneurs. This is due to the middle-class status providing income security. "Women use class anxiety to break away from patriarchal family roles, adopting various tactics to realise their strategy" (Fussel, 1983). For instance, education has been used as a key confronting tool in the face of patriarchy in the middle class because Turkish women claim that there is no need to go to university if they are not going to benefit from it by becoming entrepreneurs. This could explain the high level of education among Turkish women entrepreneurs compared to men entrepreneurs. Thus, education is the key weapon in women’s struggle against patriarchy.
In summary, a male-dominated structure, gender roles, geographical context, personal characteristics, such as being relational, and networks and education appear to be gender factors to be considered in the thesis.

3.3.2 Institutional Influences on Women’s Entrepreneurship in Turkey

This section reveals the institutional environment and its influences on female entrepreneurship in the research context. The main institutions that support women’s entrepreneurship in Turkey are given below (Table 3.4).

Table 3.4: Public and Private Institutions Supporting Women Entrepreneurs in Turkey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution Name</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turkish Confederation of Tradesmen and Craftsmen (TESK)</td>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish Industrialists and Businessmen Association (TUSIAD)</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small and Medium Enterprises Development and Support Administration (KOSGEB)</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Directorate of Women's Status (KSGM)</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association of Women Entrepreneurs (KAGIDER)</td>
<td>2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges of Turkey (TOBB) Women Entrepreneurs Board</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed by the researcher

In Turkey, public institutions, and organizations, as well as the private sector and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are increasingly placing importance on developing strategies for women entrepreneurs. The state and many state-affiliated institutions have developed policies for women to be included in the labour market. A summary of the most important and related legislations that refer to formal institutions in this study regarding women’s status and their entrepreneurship is given below.
Table 3.5: Regulative Background for Women’s Empowerment in Turkey
### Legislative Regulations

#### National Legislations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Constitution:</th>
<th>The principle of equality between women and men in Turkey was reinforced with the amendments to Articles 41 and 66 in 2001, Articles 10 and 90 in 2004, and again Article 10 in 2010.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Turkish Civil Code:** | - The provision “The head of the family is the husband” was amended and the provision “The spouses manage the union of marriage together” was adopted.  
- In the new Code, the provision that the spouses would not require the other’s permission in the selection of profession and occupation was adopted. |
| **Family Courts:** | Enforcement of the Law on the Protection of Family and Prevention of Domestic Violence against Women in 2012 |
| **Labour Law:** | - The New Labour Code, entered into force in 2003, stipulates that any form of discrimination in respect to human rights, including sex, is not permissible in employer-employee relations. Some new provisions, such as prohibiting a direct or indirect difference in action due to sex or pregnancy in the preparation, execution and termination of employment contracts; giving less payment for equal work due to sex; gender, civil status, family obligations, pregnancy and birth not being valid causes for the termination of an employment contract, have been incorporated into the law for the first time along with provisions regarding sexual harassment in the work place and part-time work. Moreover, the duration of the paid maternity leave for women workers was increased. |
| **The Revenue and The Corporate Taxes Law:** | The Revenue Law and “the Law No. 7103 on Amending Tax Acts and Some Specific Laws and Decrees” which was published in the Official Gazette on 27th March 2018; it was ensured that if the employer pay 50% of the monthly gross minimum wage for each child of the female employees (currently equivalent to 1.279 TL) directly to the crèches and day-care providing these services, this amount shall be exempted from income tax |
| **Social Insurance of the Persons Working in the Agricultural Sector In Their Own Names and Account:** | Women farmers engaged in agricultural activities in their own name and account are considered to be the head of the family in order to be covered by insurance has been abolished |
| **The Prime Ministry Circular No. 2010/14 on “Increasing Women’s Employment and Promotion of Equality in Opportunities”** | was published in the Official Gazette and entered into force on 25th May 2010 in order to increase women’s employment and to implement the equal pay for equal work principle for strengthening the socio-economic positions of women, implementing the equality of women and men in social life, and achieving sustainable economic growth and social progress |

---
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There have been many developments in terms of women’s entrepreneurship in Turkey, especially since 1990. The primary steps taken for the development of women's entrepreneurship in line with the national legislations given above are summarised in Table 3.6 below:

**Table 3.6: Historical Background of the Steps Taken for the Development of Women’s Entrepreneurship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Initial Steps for the Development of Women's Entrepreneurship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>The 'husband permission' required for a married woman to work and open a business in the Turkish Civil Code has been removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992-1993</td>
<td>Turkish Halk Bank started to give Women Entrepreneur Loans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2004</td>
<td>• The Women Entrepreneurs Association (KAGIDER) was established to strengthen the status of women entrepreneurs in the business world and to increase their contribution to the country's economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Micro-credit project was launched by Bangladesh Micro Finance Corporation and Diyarbakir Governorate to decrease poverty among women and to enable them to become entrepreneurs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Supporting Women Entrepreneurs Project of the Turkish Confederation of Tradesmen and Craftsmen (TESK), with EU funds between 2002 and 2004, was initiated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled by the Researcher from Female Entrepreneurship Studies in Turkey
After the husband’s permission for women’s entrepreneurship was removed from the Civil Code in 1990, Halk Bank became the first public bank to support women entrepreneurs who wanted to start their businesses through loans. The most important non-governmental organisation that supports female entrepreneurs in Turkey is KAGIDER, which groups different activities and projects, such as the training and mentoring group (e.g., environmental entrepreneurship), the private sector working group (e.g., CEO forum, women in women leadership platform), the networking group (networking meetings between old and new members), and the international relations group (e.g., partnership with international organisations).

The primary financial steps (e.g., loans micro-credits, EU funds) involved micro-credit projects in cooperation with Bangladesh and Turkey. The financial support to women was followed by the Supporting Women Entrepreneurs Project of the Turkish Confederation of Tradesmen and Craftsmen (TESK) with EU funds between 2002 and 2004. This financial support for women entrepreneurs was followed by the Turkish Economy Bank (TEB) which established the TEB Women's Academy in 2015. TEB Women's Academy provided financial support and entrepreneurship consultancy services to women entrepreneurs. However, the extent to which the financial support provided by the banks was reached by women entrepreneurs, its costs and how efficiently it was administered is debatable.

KOSGEB is one of the most important Turkish governmental organisations that supports small and medium enterprises by developing SME policies under the Ministry of Science, Industry and Technology. It provides support to SMEs and offers some programmes/services such as financial support or mentoring to entrepreneurs. It is not specifically focused on women’s entrepreneurship, yet there is a special support rate in the implementation of the New Entrepreneur Support Programme, particularly for women (KOSGEB, 2022). Between 2015-2018 with loans supplied by KOSGEB, female entrepreneurs received 41.6 million TL in total, with training programmes, which helped boost the participation of women in the male-dominated workforce of Turkey where women still lagged in entrepreneurship (Guven et al., 2017).

In addition, non-governmental organizations have also provided support for women entrepreneurs in Turkey. Some of these institutions are KAGIDER, the development agencies’ General Directorate on the Status of Women (KSGM), the Women's Labour Evaluation Foundation (KEDV), the Women's Solidarity Foundation (KADAV), and ARYA (the Women’s Investment Platform). Arya Women, the first women’s investment platform, brings
together companies founded by women and male angel investors who believe in women as a driving force of the economy. The platform has a set of criteria that must be met before a start-up can have financial support from investors. According to the criteria, applicant companies should have at least one woman partner in their management, have operated for at least two years, have over $100,000 in annual earnings and show high growth in this amount regularly (ARYA, 2022).

Despite the growth in the number of women entrepreneurs with the support of the institutional environment, total male entrepreneurial activity rates are 2.43 times higher than for women (GEM, 2016). Moreover, Turkey has the greatest gender gap among emerging economies (e.g., Brazil, India, Russia) because of fewer supportive regulation policies for women entrepreneurs (European Commission, 2019). The GEM Global Policy Report (2018) supports these findings by stating that even if there has been development in Turkish government policies with financial support, governmental regulations and programmes, the gender gap between female and male entrepreneurs is still a cause for concern. There is a lack of strong political commitment to gender equality: stereotyped views of gender roles, including in the school textbooks and the media, continue to pervade Turkish society and foster the persistent low social status of women. They are also more tolerant of violence against women (OECD, 2021).

Findings from grey literature acknowledge that gender equality is protected by law in Turkey; however, government representatives have criticised gender equality provisions, making statements such as: “Women cannot be treated as equal to men as it is against nature” (BBC News Europe, 2014); “Motherhood is the best career” (Daily News, 2015). The president has also blamed feminists for rejecting motherhood on several occasions and encouraged his “dear sisters” to have at least three, or preferably five, children. (Spiegel, 2012). The government's policies that have encouraged marriage, childbirth, and part-time work for women are counterproductive to women's empowerment in Turkey. One of the most remarkable pieces of evidence is Turkey’s removal from the Istanbul Convention Agreement, after high level officials, including the president, asserted that the “Istanbul Convention poses a threat to Turkish family values” (Ransom, 2021).

The representation of women in decision-making positions remains very limited. Female representation in parliament is low (17.3%). The percentage of women in senior managerial positions is only 9.05%. The gender pay gap is 12.9% and the motherhood pay gap is 29.6%. The lack of daycare services for preschool children and an adequate institutional framework
for providing care to sick and elderly people restrict women’s participation in the workforce (OECD, 2021). In Turkey, only employed women are eligible for childcare support. Turkish women (employed or self-employed) outsource caring duties to mothers, mothers-in-law, sisters, neighbours or babysitters and kindergartens, depending on their socio-economic status (Ozasir-Kacar and Essers, 2021).

There have been many studies on female entrepreneurship through institutional lenses in Turkey. For instance, Kabasakal et al. (2016) claimed that “although programmes and initiatives have helped to create positive momentum for women entrepreneurs in Turkey, there have not been integrative frameworks, policies and coordination across these programmes to support and empower women entrepreneurs in a sustainable and systematic manner”. Therefore, Yenilmez (2018) claims, legislation and bureaucracy are the primary barriers for female entrepreneurs in Turkey. Similarly, Aslan and Gunes (2017) and Tuzun and Araz (2017) find female entrepreneurs in both urban and rural areas face a lack of financial support and must overcome difficult bureaucracy.

This demonstrates that the role of formal institutions is as significant for women entrepreneurs as gender influences. Social norms in the patriarchal society, such as conservative rhetoric and government policies focusing on motherhood and caregiver roles rather than gender equality, have resulted in a deterioration in women's status and widespread discrimination against them. Formal institutions (legislative, economic) and informal institutions (unwritten rules) affect both female and male entrepreneurs in Turkey. However, their effect on women is more detrimental in terms of legislation, access to finance, and development of their SMEs in size and scale because of previously discussed gender disparities (Tunc and Alkan, 2019). Therefore, this thesis investigates the influences of gender by considering institutional influences on environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey.

3.4 The Emergence of Environmental Entrepreneurship in Turkey

This section explains the increasing environmental entrepreneurship trends in Turkey.

First, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change has been accepted in Turkey, along with the 1997 Kyoto Protocol. Countries that are party to these protocols have made certain commitments in terms of reducing the emissions of carbon dioxide and five other greenhouse gases that harm the atmosphere. Turkey has been included since 2009. Further, after the Kyoto Protocol, it started to integrate the protection of nature into specific manufacturing sectors such as energy and automobiles (Balli, 2019).
Second, after the G-20 meeting, the concept of a green economy has been recognised by Turkey to protect future generations against crucial environmental risks and ecological scarcities. Yet, environmental regulations started much earlier in the country, with the establishment of the State Planning Organisation in 1960, and through the implementation of five-year plans for the development of the economy. There have been 11 development plans until now. The 10th Development Plan emphasises a significant objective which sought to increase awareness of environmental-friendly entrepreneurship activities among SMEs. This was the first time Turkey used the concepts of ‘environmental-friendly’, ‘eco’, and ‘green’ in its development plans. The 11th Development Plan has recently been released and illustrates Turkey’s 2023 ambitions for energy and digital transformation. According to this plan, Turkey generated 32.5% of electricity from renewable sources in 2018 and its share in power production will rise to 38.8% by 2023 (Daily Sabah, 2019).

Third, SMEs are one of the essential elements of Turkey's economy (Zehra, 2008), and globalisation has forced them to gain a competitive advantage in emerging economies, which has led to growth in the country’s economy (Section 3.2). Yet, it has caused significant damage to nature in the form of environmental pollution, a waste of natural resources, and a reduction in biodiversity in the country (Balci, 2019). In this vein, radical changes in working practices and the consumption of goods during industrialisation in the early twentieth century have forced SMEs to focus more on environmental activities.

Many different arguments about sustainable development and the greening of industry have been proposed, but the entrepreneurial perspective has been frequently overlooked in the Turkish context, especially concerning SMEs (Efeoğlu, 2014). Turkish environmental SMEs contribute to the protection of the climate, the environment and to biodiversity through their products, services and organisational practices (OECD Turkey, 2018). According to the OECD (2013, 6), environmental SMEs can contribute to green growth and inclusive growth; however, there is a lack of data on the share of environmental entrepreneurs that fall into different categories and how that varies by country groups (OECD, 2018).

To sum up, (1) the United Nations' actions against climate change and sustainable development goals as well as (2) Turkey’s five-year national development plans (10th and 11th) in line with European Union environmental legislation requirements and (3) a growth-oriented economy perspective that ruins the natural beauty of Turkey are the stimuli for the emergence of environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey. Yet, there remains a lack of data on the different types of environmental entrepreneurs operating in Turkey.
3.4.1 Sectoral Outlook on Environmental Entrepreneurship in SMEs from Turkey

For a better understanding of the different types of environmental entrepreneurship, this section presents the sectoral differences in Turkish SMEs. The selection of environmental entrepreneurship cases is taken from TTGV’s Green Entrepreneurship in Turkey, Regional Activity Centre for Cleaner Production Report (2012). The present and potential environmental sectors are listed as energy, waste management and recovery, agriculture and husbandry, mobility and automobiles, electrical household appliances, eco-tourism, and environmental and energy consultancy. Table 3.5 illustrates the main environmental practices in potential green sectors.

Table 3.7: Environmental Practices from different sectors in Turkish SMEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy and Energy Consultancy</th>
<th>Electrical Households and Appliances</th>
<th>Mobility and Automobile</th>
<th>Agriculture and Husbandry</th>
<th>Waste Management and Recovery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Clean Coal Technologies</td>
<td>-Engine and Battery Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Efficient Techniques</td>
<td>-Recycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Energy Efficiency</td>
<td>-Eco-designed Appliances</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Waste to Energy/Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Regional Activity Centre for Cleaner Production Report (2012)

Besides energy and waste management, Turkey has other environmental sectors, such as food, housing and mobility. It can be concluded that all sectors are directly or indirectly related to waste management and energy efficiency in Turkey. For instance, the automotive sector is linked to energy efficiency and agriculture and husbandry focuses on organic (green) production and waste management. The following table (3.7) provides a clearer picture of what is happening in which industry regarding environmental practices.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry and Husbandry</th>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th>Description of Case</th>
<th>Key features</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>Difficulties</th>
<th>Use of Innovative Technologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                        | BUGDAY ASSOCIATION | Bridging the gap between organic farmers and urban consumers | · Rural development  
· Organic farming  
· Sustainable consumption and production  
· Awareness raising  
· Holistic health benefits | Social: To sustain rural livelihoods through the practice of organic agriculture, thus preventing further immigration to the urban centre. Environmental: To realise environmental gains with the help of a variety of available products grown by using environmentally friendly methods, considering factors such as erosion and water consumption. To increase the demand for agricultural products which do not contain pesticides, insecticides, and other additives. To reduce the overall carbon footprint of both the consumers and the producers by producing and supplying goods to the national market rather than importing them from other countries. Economic: To establish a commercial zone which guarantees the producers a place for their value-added organic products to be sold. | The marketplace was founded parallel to Turkey’s Organic Agriculture Law, which did not have a proper implementation roadmap. Thus, the rules and regulations in establishing the standards for the marketplace were not clearly defined and took many years of practical know-how. In the establishment of new markets, the standards acknowledged by the Buğday Association should be used but the legal infrastructure remains ineffective for this. | None |
| Clean Production (Food) | KARAGONLE R | Productio n of biofuel and olive oil from olive pulp | · Resource efficiency  
· Waste reduction and valorisation  
· Value-added product formation  
· Industrial symbiosis  
· Industry-Industry cooperation  
· Regional competitiveness  
· Social responsibility | Social: To act as an example in the sector, providing better-quality fuel for the people in the region, who tend to use olive pulp directly, which is an unhealthy practice.  
Environmental: To overcome an important environmental problem by the recovery of waste. Furthermore, it contributes to the prevention of air pollution by producing fuel from waste. In addition, it also contributes to the saving of natural resources and forests by preventing wood consumption.  
Economic: To provide local production of fuelwood that is presently imported from Syria, and to act as an example of industrial symbiosis by the collection of olive pulp from other producers in the region. | Difficulties in creating sufficient investment capital | It has an innovative character due to introducing the concept of waste used for the production of new products and fuel in the region. Furthermore, in this case, relatively new environmental technologies such as extraction (including vapour, drying and oil extraction), refining processes and the production of olive pulp are used. |
|------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------------------|--|------------------------|------------------|--|
| Manufacturing (Goods)  | STEPPEN     | Biodegradable pen                               | · Environmentally friendly products  
· Women’s empowerment  
· Women’s employment  
· Biodegradable plastics | Social: To spread the knowledge of environmental protection to the people who are interested in distributing and/or using the products.  
Environmental: To participate in the protection of the environment, and save natural resources and support forestation.  
Economic: To increase sales by innovations targeting an emerging market.  
· The lack of knowledge regarding environmental protection in Turkey  
· The lack of a market for environmental-friendly products in Turkey  
· The lack of a market for environmental-friendly products in Turkey | -The lack of knowledge regarding environmental protection in Turkey  
- The lack of a market for environmental-friendly products in Turkey  
- The lack of a market for environmental-friendly products in Turkey | The innovation in this eco-friendly approach is the seed in the pen. The pen has a section in the cap in which three torch pine seeds are placed to reinforce the environmental benefits. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource Efficiency</th>
<th>Awareness raising</th>
<th>Recycling</th>
<th>Innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market of environmentally friendly products.</td>
<td>High prices of eco-friendly raw materials</td>
<td>No additional incentives for environmentally friendly products</td>
<td>Idea that this product supports natural life. Its body is made of recycled paper and the rest is made of biodegradable plastic. As the company produces pens for promotional purposes also, they expect their products to be attractive and interesting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Regional Activity Centre for Cleaner Production Report (2012)
Three cases have been chosen from TTGV’s report on environmental entrepreneurship to demonstrate that differing cases can have a direct contribution to sustainable lifestyles. This suggests that all SMEs are driven by social, environmental, and economic value creation and the goals of their owners/managers. Yet, their focus is distinctive. For instance, the Buğday Association does not use innovative technologies, but they contribute to organic farming, sustainable consumption, and production, increasing environmental protection awareness with a stewardship approach. Thereby, the business is still innovative because the business model focuses on the production and sale of sustainability-related organic foods that do not harm the environment in the production stage.

Karagonler focuses on eco-efficiency with the use of environmental technologies in the production stage and they collaborate with other sectors for waste management. They are reducing the environmental footprint of their production process. Finally, Steppen contributes to both the environment and the economy by increasing environmental awareness through a stewardship approach and bringing innovative solutions to the economy in green production. They also contribute to women’s employment and empowerment in their SMEs.

The rationale for the inclusion of these cases is to reveal how these SMEs support the ‘green growth’ definition given for Turkey in the OECD green policy report (2013):

“Green growth means the implementation of environmental policies in strategic sectors, aimed at achieving Turkish and EU standards and the UN’s sustainable development goals, with special emphasis given to [...] resource efficiency [...] clean production and consumption [...] together with policies that foster employment and innovation [...] socially inclusive and welfare-improving”.

Although Turkish environmental entrepreneurs have sustainability-related values (environmental, economic and social), Vatansever and Arun (2016) suggest that they typically act based on their financial concerns and under the influence of informal institutions like networking and social norms rather than government policies. Yet, their study excludes women entrepreneurs and focuses only on the agriculture and husbandry sectors. The selected TTGV cases (Table 3.8) indicate that environmental entrepreneurs might be distinctive and that there are potential sectors for developing environmental entrepreneurship apart from growth-oriented sectors like energy, recycling, waste management, automobiles and manufacturing.
The eco-tourism sector offers potential for green growth in Turkey, especially in terms of gender inclusion and environmental protection (Guzeloglu and Gulc, 2021). Interestingly, Tucker (2020) claims that gender roles are fluid and negotiable within sustainability and tourism in the national and global sense. She explores how Turkish women's employment in eco-tourism further entrenches gender roles regarding what women can or cannot do. Turkish women face a double burden of combining home-based organic production in eco-tourism with household-centred reproductive (caregiver) responsibilities. Sustainability and green growth fluxes result in "cultural sustainability" regimes of value that legitimise 'compliance and sameness' gendered practices and ways of life.

Taking the notion of Guzeloglu and Gulc (2021) into consideration, the third research objective (1.3) helps us to understand there are alternative sectors in environmental entrepreneurship, including eco-tourism, textiles, design and consultancy, where Turkish women entrepreneurs are particularly active depending on institutional enablers. Yet even if there are institutional barriers such as finance, legislation and social structure, the first and second research objectives (1.3) help us to understand how Turkish women environmental entrepreneurs do and redo gender, which becomes a driver in their pre-entry and post-entry decision-making. For instance, by adding value to their feminine-oriented values (e.g., caring, being relational and supportive) they reveal their contribution to the green economy in women-dominated sectors.

A cross-sectoral look at both women and men environmental entrepreneurs from Turkish SMEs contributes to theory and practice by identifying distinctive types of SMEs led by environmental women and men owners/managers depending on the interaction of gender influences and institutional environment. For instance, environmental rewards usually go to export-and growth-oriented SMEs in the manufacturing or energy sectors where the number of women entrepreneurs is fewer because of the sectoral segregation in Turkey (3.3.1). Therefore, in relation to the second and third research objective (1.3), the thesis analyses the similarities and differences between women and men entrepreneurs in environmental engagement by taking gender as a social construct and discussing institutional influences depending on how women and men entrepreneurs experience them as an enabler or barrier in their daily interactions.

The following section discusses the institutional environment that shapes environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey.
3.4.2 Institutional Influences on Environmental Entrepreneurship in Turkey

Turkey has ratified many international agreements for the protection of the environment, such as the Kyoto Protocol regarding the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Barcelona Convention for the Protection of Marine Environment and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean, and The Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty (Balli, 2019). The main regulatory authorities for environmental law and practice are the Ministry of Environment, Protection and Climate Change, the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, the General Directorate of Environmental Management, the General Directorate of Environmental Impact Assessment Permit and Audit, the municipalities (who regulate waste management activities), Chambers of Industry, and the Turkish Environmental Agency, established under Law No. 7261 (Mavioglu et al., 2021).

Turkey’s environmental legislation has been harmonised with EU law and international standards thanks to the regulatory authorities in Turkey. In addition, NGOs play a major role in addressing society's needs, raising awareness, providing expert advice, and finding solutions to environmental problems. Many Turkish NGOs are active in environmental issues such as TEMA, Trade Unions, and TUCEM (Environmental Education and Waste Management).

Energy-related legislation in terms of efficiency and renewable energy, especially regarding the concept of SCP (sustainable consumption and production), can be listed as:

- Energy Efficiency Law
- Regulation on the Enhancement of Efficiency in Energy Resources and Energy Use
- Regulation on the Energy Performance in Buildings
- Regulation on the Procedures and Principles for the Enhancement of Energy Efficiency in Transportation
- Law on the Utilization of Renewable Energy Resources for the Purpose of Generating Electrical Energy
- Regulation on the Eco-Design of Energy-Related Products
CommuniQUëS/ Regulations Related to the Energy Labelling of Household Appliances (refrigerators, washing machines, air conditioners, dishwashing machines, dryers, ovens, bulbs, etc.)

Environmental permits and licences for emissions are integrated under the Environmental Permits and Licences Regulation. To operate facilities, manufacturing companies must obtain an integrated environmental permit that covers air, noise, wastewater and deep-water emissions (Mavioglu et al., 2021). An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is required for some sectors such as crude petroleum refineries, and industrial manufacturing requires the permission of the Ministry of the Environment, Urbanisation and Climate Change (2022).

The development of energy efficiency is one of the key goals of SME greening in Turkey. There are some key national strategic documents which address greening SMEs. These national documents include the SME Strategy and Action Plan (2015-2018), the Tenth Development Plan (2014-2018), the National Climate Change Action Plan (2011-2023), the National Energy Efficiency Action Plan (2017-2023), the Turkish Industrial Strategic Document (2015-2018), the Turkish Entrepreneurship Strategy (2018-2023), and the Productivity Strategy (2018-2023). Turkish SME greening strategies focus on supporting eco-efficient products, services and processes, as well as environmental innovation and a sustainable society.

KOSGEB has the Efficiency Increasing Programme for entrepreneurs, which is run in cooperation with the Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources Directorate, General Renewable Energy. According to this programme, SMEs with energy consumption above a certain threshold can apply to be supported by up to 30% in their energy efficiency projects, including their ISO-1400 application and auditing costs. There is also the Voluntary Agreements Programme, where the government covers 20% of SMEs’ energy costs if they reduce them by 10% of their five-year consumption average. This support increases the number of energy efficiency consultancy firms through government subsidies for their services in SME energy efficiency (KOSGEB, 2022). The Turkish Union of Chambers and Commodity Exchanges is one of the most active business associations, providing input to the development of environmental policies for SMEs. Due to the local character of the environmental projects KOSGEB implements, it systematically co-operates with local chambers of commerce and industry.
For instance, the Istanbul Chamber of Industry organises awards to recognise good environmental practices in SMEs (ISO, 2022). Moreover, Energy Management Units (EMUs) have been established in Turkey’s Organised Industrial Zones to provide direct mentoring support to interested companies operating there. In the course of this project, Turkey aims to increase energy efficiency in SMEs in the manufacturing sector by raising awareness, promoting a culture of efficiency among staff, and introducing small-scale changes in the industry (reducing electricity/water consumption and achieving savings through simple modifications of certain parts of the manufacturing process) (Butuner, 2014).

Training and mentoring are also offered by the Global Cleantech Innovation Programme (GCIP) to SMEs working in clean technologies (environment and energy). The GCIP is run by the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, the Global Environment Facility and TUBITAK, to develop an entrepreneurship ecosystem in clean technologies (OECD, 2019). Since its establishment in 2014, the GCIP has offered training and mentoring to around 80 projects, mainly in the areas of waste management, water efficiency and renewable energy (TUBITAK, 2022). Furthermore, TUBITAK funds programmes to increase the number of innovative SMEs in the country (Daily News, 2018).

The TTGV (the Technology Development Foundation of Turkey) was founded through cooperation between public institutions, such as KOSGEB, TUBITAK and the Republic of Turkey Ministry of Trade, as a non-profit intermediary agency to support the private sector with technology and innovation activities in research and development. It implemented an Environmental Support Programme in 2006. This programme provides soft loans for the private sector and covers the investment and application of projects involved in environmental technologies, energy efficiency and renewable energy (TTGV, 2022).

Moreover, international banks and programmes, such as the Clean Technology Fund, the European Investment Bank, and the World Bank, are some banks executing credit lines for renewable energy and energy efficiency investments. Recently cleaner production investments have been included in the credit programmes of a few Turkish banks. Energy efficiency is also supported by donors and banks through the Turkish Small and Mid-Sized Sustainable Energy Financing Facilities (TurSEFF and MidSEFF) launched by the EBRD, with support from the EIB (European Investment Bank) in 2010 and the European Commission in 2011.
In addition to energy efficiency, waste management regulation in Turkey has a long history. The Ministry of Environment, Urbanisation and Climate Change has drafted a Waste Management and Action Plan for 2016-2023 (WMAP). There is a comprehensive list of waste management regulations within the framework of the EU harmonization process. In these regulations, the basic principles and activities related to SCP (sustainable consumption and production) are listed below:

- Development and use of clean and minimum waste-producing technologies
- Waste minimization, recycling, and reuse
- Waste recovery as raw material and energy
- Separate collection of different wastes at the source
- Taking certain end-of-life products to relevant collection points for recovery
- Identification of waste
- Production of long-life products
- Reduction of hazardous chemicals used in products
- Waste collection systems for waste recovery
- Obligations for producers and retailers (for packaging)
- Training on waste valorisation and recovery

Turkey adopted a new regulation on waste management in April 2015, largely modelled on the EU Waste Framework Directive and the European Commission (EC) decisions establishing classification for wastes. However, these regulations related to waste management were complex to understand and implement, which created uncertainty for companies and disincentivised efforts toward the use and trade of secondary raw materials. The Turkish Materials Marketplace (TMM) was launched in 2016 as a solution.

TMM is built on the concept of a circular economy and complements conventional recycling and waste management systems. Using this system, participating companies can exchange wasted materials, repurposing them once. Waste from one company can be used as raw material in another. Additionally, TMM includes knowledge exchange meetings and workshops, as well as a technical component to identify investments in secondary raw materials. Several donors are funding the TMM, including the Austrian government, EBRD,
and EU IPA. This project is being managed by the Business Council for the Sustainable Development of Turkey (BCSD), an association founded in 2004 to accelerate the transition to a more sustainable economy in Turkey.

Turkey introduced the Regulation on Packaging Waste Control in 2017, requiring manufacturers to recycle 54% of their glass, plastic, metal, and paper waste. Authorised private companies or municipalities collect and recycle packaging waste. Companies should be a member of these authorised organisations and pay membership fees to reuse recycled materials. The Turkish Ministry of Environment, Urbanisation and Climate Change (2022) has introduced zero waste campaigns to reduce the volume of non-recyclable waste as well as holding public institutions, organisations, and provincial governorates responsible for waste management by 2020. Turkey has saved tonnes of plastic and made its seas cleaner, with thousands of buildings, residences and companies having implemented recycling into their waste disposal policies.

Aside from the environmental benefits, the zero-waste project looks to save the country around TL 20 billion annually and create jobs for 100,000 people by 2023 (National Action Plan for Waste Management 2016-2023). Turkey has high hopes that by 2023, the whole country will have gone ‘zero waste’. The government will start to charge manufacturers a recycling contribution fee (GEKAP) in a move to further reduce waste (Daily Sabah, 2020).

Although it is providing environmental training to entrepreneurs and supporting them financially, and implementing new environmental regulations based on energy efficiency and waste management which comply with EU regulations, Turkey's ranking in the Cleantech Innovation Index fell from 31st to 33rd between 2014 and 2017. The Cleantech Innovation Index (2017) argues that although Turkey has some government policies that support cleantech sectors (e.g., renewable energy) and environmental entrepreneurship, it still lacks access to private finance. The environmental entrepreneurship literature delineates the role of institutional structures in shaping environmental behaviour (Walley and Taylor, 2022; Paulraj, 2009). Accordingly, the following section examines the challenges of environmental entrepreneurship by taking the institutional environment in Turkey into account.

3.4.3 Challenges for Environmental Entrepreneurs in Turkey

There are governmental institutions that support environmental entrepreneurs by providing support programmes regarding research and development for environmental projects.
(TUBITAK, 2022), providing soft loans for the private sector that cover the investment in and implementation of projects of environmental technologies, energy efficiency and renewable energy (TTGV, 2019), and offering environmental consultancy and training services for SMEs (KOSGEB, 2022).

Vatansever and Arun’s study (2016) on environmental entrepreneurs from SMEs in the agriculture and husbandry sector where companies focus on organic production or, at least, where entrepreneurs have environmental awareness in their businesses shows the institutional challenges for these entrepreneurs. The table below demonstrates the common difficulties that Turkish entrepreneurs face taken from various studies and reports within various environmental sectors (e.g., Global Cleantech Innovation Index, 2019; Uslu et al., 2015; Vatansever and Arun, 2016).

Table 3.9: Main Challenges for Environmental Entrepreneurs in Turkey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Access to Finance</th>
<th>Market Demands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Contradictions or conflicts exist between laws</td>
<td>• The emerging economy structure does not permit the rapid closure of outdated and polluting technologies (e.g., industry, vehicles, fuel)</td>
<td>• The disbelief of private companies that sufficient demand exists for environmentally friendly products or services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The legal infrastructure is insufficient for international commitments</td>
<td>• There is a lack of funding and incentives for advancing environmental sectors, including renewable energy</td>
<td>• Environmental entrepreneurship is still an emerging (new) concept for stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are no programmes specifically designed to support environmental entrepreneurship</td>
<td>• Existing support for access to finance is not enough and fair for all sectors</td>
<td>• Lack of interest from Turkish consumers in environmentally friendly products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Environmental audits are insufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Product-based environmental entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The findings of this thesis on institutional influences on women and men-owned environmental SMEs support the findings of Vatansever and Arun (2016) by underpinning the main reasons behind these challenges (Chapter 6). In that sense, this thesis takes gender influences and social norms into consideration. According to North (1990), informal institutions such as social norms or unwritten socially embedded rules reinforce or hinder the formal institutions to enable entrepreneurs to embrace or reject certain behaviour. The main obstacles for both women and men entrepreneurs are recognised as legislation and finance, followed by societal norms regarding what is perceived by environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey’s transformation to a green economy as an emerging economy.

In addition, although Turkey has an SME greening policy, there has not yet been any impact analysis of the SME greening policies. Therefore, it is not clear what the real impact of these initiatives is or their full effectiveness. Turkey is suggested to start evaluating the effectiveness of environmental policies that target SMEs on the ground (OECD SMEs Policy Report, 2019). Given the abundance of policies and programmes on SME greening in Turkey, it is essential to ensure effective coordination among the different bodies implementing support programmes. This particularly applies to projects for enhancing energy efficiency since several bodies are responsible for them (Section 3.4).

Based on the challenges, Turkey should focus on increasing the number of innovative entrepreneurs with governmental and financial support. Moreover, the role of women entrepreneurs in the green economy should be identified to deal with gender inequalities in the entrepreneurship sector. This is important not only for the development of Turkey’s economy but also for the achievement of the United Nation’s Sustainable Development Goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nongreen entrepreneurship policies applied (e.g., growth-oriented)</td>
<td>Lack of knowledge and capacity in sustainable consumption and production and eco-efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specific strategy or clear action plan for sustainable development plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Vatansever and Arun (2016)
3.5 Chapter Conclusion

The chapter details three main reasons why Turkey is a suitable research context for examining gender influences on the environmental engagement of owners/managers in SMEs.

First, key evidence of the gender influences appears with gender role socialisation, which explains how women do entrepreneurship differently based on perceived gender differences. Like many other emerging economies where the institutions are weaker in terms of providing an equal environment for women and men in entrepreneurship compared to advanced economies, patriarchal sociocultural values affect women’s access to any of the entrepreneurship sectors in Turkey. Moreover, consistent with the perceived gender role of women as ‘caregivers’, which is associated with being female rather than male, is the evidence of gender influences and their interaction with institutional influences for women entrepreneurs because it manifests itself through challenges with starting and running their businesses in Turkey. In summary, a male-dominated structure, gender roles, geographical context, personal characteristics, such as being relational, and networks and education appear as gender factors to be considered in the thesis.

Second, the institutional environment for sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship is underdeveloped in Turkey (Vatansever and Arun, 2016). This chapter signals those deficiencies in the institutional environment through the association of entrepreneurship and its perception as a factor in GDP growth that is encouraged by government policies in Turkey as in many emerging economies. This chapter has identified the main institutional factors that need to be considered when researching environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey as environmental legislation, access to finance and social norms in the market and society. For instance, environmental legislations and existing SME greening policies mainly focus on growth-oriented sectors such as energy, industrial manufacturing, or technology-oriented SMEs in Turkey.

However, the number of men entrepreneurs is higher than women entrepreneurs in these sectors because of sectoral segregation. This might affect access to finance opportunities for women and men environmental entrepreneurs differently. Moreover, it might create conflicts between being a male entrepreneur and practising female entrepreneurial characteristics, such as being relational, supportive, and caring for others (environment and society), which might affect the development of environmental practices in the long run.
Third, findings from Turkey contribute to the environmental entrepreneurship and female entrepreneurship literature theoretically and empirically. Theoretically, even if the masculine norm is built into management and the aspects of organisations, this thesis illustrates that the feminine norm is not a fixed essence that is attached to women’s bodies. Both Turkish women and men entrepreneurs practise what is perceived as feminine or female, such as being relational, collaborative and caring, in environmental entrepreneurship. Thereby, contrary to many female entrepreneurship studies (e.g., Maden, 2015; Yenilmez, 2018), this study shows that women environmental entrepreneurs are not the victim of male domination in Turkey. The thesis reveals how women and men can successfully mobilise femininity with ethics of care when managing and doing business environmentally.

Nevertheless, despite the optimistic impact on women’s organizational experience where women benefit from their strategic performance of perceived femininity in that women are usually associated with their caregiver role in Turkey, the social interactions of women and men entrepreneurs in the institutional environment (e.g., access to finance, socially embedded rules) might affect how women and men define and add value to being feminine and define themselves as environmental entrepreneurs. Thereby, socially constructed gender is a constantly changing process and is perceived as both a gender factor and an institutional factor in environmental entrepreneurship in this study.
CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

4.1 Introduction

This chapter aims to present the methodology that has been used to investigate how gender influences the environmental engagement of women and men entrepreneurs and how/when gender influences interact with institutional factors that enable environmental behaviour in Turkish SMEs.

To address the research aims and research questions (1.3), I have adopted a qualitative case study research approach. The case study is used to understand how organisational dynamics or social processes work and examines an extensive body of knowledge of the problem that was not available at the beginning of the study (Yin, 2018). The study adopts a multiple-embedded case study approach to gender and institutional influences on environmental entrepreneurship with a sub-unit of analysis within the research setting of Turkey.

The data was acquired through semi-structured in-depth interviews with the owners/managers of SMEs from different sectors and various sub-units of analysis who are representatives and stakeholders in greening SMEs, such as KOSGEB. This data is supported by other secondary documents. Non-probability sampling is mainly used in qualitative research (Saunders et al., 2016). Therefore, as a non-probability sampling technique, theoretical purposive sampling and snowball methods were found to be the most appropriate sample strategy for studying gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship. A qualitative case study approach is supported by inductive data analysis (e.g., Braun and Clarke, 2006; Gioia et al., 2013; Miles, Huberman, and Saldana, 2014) drawing on the abductive reasoning (systematic combining) of theory development (Dubois and Gadde, 2002).

Finally, the study was carried out in line with the Open University’s ethics principles for research involving human participants found in the research ethics handbook (2019).

This chapter comprises eight sections.
Section 4.1 introduces the methods and methodology.
Section 4.2 discusses the research philosophies for gender and environmental entrepreneurship. Section 4.3 explains the research design based on the role of case studies in theory development, which is aligned with the theoretical contributions of this study. Section 4.4 elaborates on the sampling used in recruiting the study participants. Section 4.5 presents the methods adopted for data collection. Section 4.6 justifies the qualitative data analysis techniques of the study. Section 4.7 discusses the reliability and validity of the study with the ethical considerations involved. Section 4.8 concludes the appropriate methods and methodology for this study.

4.2 Ontology and Epistemology

The reality of research philosophy represents the goals of research and the application of methods to achieve these goals in a study (Bryman, 2012). The assumptions of knowledge development are explained in three stages: ontological assumptions (nature of reality), epistemological assumptions (knowledge), and axiological assumptions (values and beliefs). These assumptions indicate how the researcher understands the research questions and the usage of methods to interpret the findings (Crotty, 2014).

Within management and business studies, there are two popular but confronting social research philosophies: the positivist (quantitative, objectivist or traditionalist) and the social constructionist (qualitative, subjectivist or interpretive) paradigms (Bryman and Bell, 2018; Saunders et al., 2016). In the next section, I will discuss why I chose to adopt the social constructionist (interpretivism) paradigm over the positivist paradigm.

4.2.1 Beliefs and Assumptions

The positivist paradigm propounds that reality exists independently of the thing being searched and it can be measured through objective methods (Newman and Benz, 2016), while interpretivism claims that reality is identified by people rather than objectives related to external factors (Easterby-Smith et al., 2018). Positivism assumes that real knowledge can be discovered through observations and measurements (Patton, 2015). The positivist paradigm follows deductive processes which test the cause-and-effect relationships between variables through statistical measurements, and usually with large-sized samples that will steer the researcher to generalise findings by testing the theories from the existing literature (Lincoln
and Guba, 1985; Saunders et al., 2016). Since positivism is concerned with ‘scientific’ facts and their relationship to one another, studies following the positivist tradition follow highly structured procedures (Bryman and Bell, 2018; Saunders et al., 2016).

On the other hand, social constructionist philosophy assumes that reality ‘is not objective and exterior but is socially constructed: given meaning by people’ (Mason, 2017; Saunders et al., 2016). According to social constructionism, what is researched is not independent of external factors; therefore, epistemology is constituted by the interpretation of people in society (Saunders et al., 2016). This means interpretive epistemology is interested in understanding the worldviews based on the assumptions that the scientific model of the natural sciences is inappropriate to study human experience and society (Bryman, 2012).

Table 4.1 provides a summary comparing the two research philosophies.

**Table 4.1: Comparison of two research philosophies: Positivism vs Social Constructionism**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigms</th>
<th>Ontology (Nature of reality or being)</th>
<th>Epistemology (What constitutes acceptable knowledge)</th>
<th>Axiology (Role of values)</th>
<th>Typical methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positivism</strong></td>
<td>-Real, external, independent</td>
<td>-Scientific method</td>
<td>-Value-free research</td>
<td>-Typically deductive, highly structured, large samples, measurement, typically quantitative methods of analysis, but a range of data can be analysed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-One true reality (universalism)</td>
<td>-Observable and measurable facts</td>
<td>-The researcher is detached, neutral and independent of what is researched</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Granular (things)</td>
<td>-Law-like generalisations</td>
<td>-Researcher maintains objective stance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Ordered</td>
<td>-Numbers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Causal explanation and prediction as contribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Constructionism (Interpretivism)</strong></td>
<td>-Complex, rich socially constructed through culture and language</td>
<td>-Theories and concepts too simplistic</td>
<td>-Value-bound research</td>
<td>-Typically inductive. But in some cases, can be deductive. -Small samples, in-depth investigations, qualitative methods of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Multiple meanings, interpretations, realities</td>
<td>-Focus on narratives, stories, perceptions and interpretations</td>
<td>-Researchers are part of what is researched, subjective</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-New understandings</td>
<td>-Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2 Research Approach to Theory Development

There are various types of research approaches to theory development, including the deductive approach, inductive approach, and abductive approach (Saunders et al., 2016). A qualitative inductive and abductive approach has been used in this study based on the social constructionist philosophical tradition.

Cho and Lee (2014) suggest that the unique advantage of using the qualitative approach is the flexibility of adopting inductive and deductive methods or a combination of the two (abductive reasoning). An inductive approach is the process of theory building through observations of specific instances, codes and themes which are directly drawn from the data collected (Yin, 2018). A deductive qualitative approach starts with preconceived themes or codes derived from

Source: Saunders et al. (2016)

Based on Table 4.1 comparing two research paradigms, my perceptions of social reality can never be fully detached from the knowledge I am creating, implying the outcome of my research will be value-laden (Bryman, 2012; Crotty, 2014; Saunders et al., 2016). This links in with the realist stance outlined by Sayer (1992), who also claims the notion that social phenomena, although dependent on the social actors creating them, can exist independently of the researcher studying the social actors. Therefore, I have adopted the notion of constructionism, that all knowledge of the world is created and negotiated through human practices (Crotty, 2014), but do not go so far as to claim that reality is reliant upon our knowledge of it. In other words, I see the natural world - with its occurrences such as climate change - as real and existing independently of our knowledge about it.

I see knowledge about the real world as socially constructed and understand the environmental entrepreneurs as a social phenomenon reacting to their knowledge of the real world through their practices based on gender influences and institutional influences. This justifies the adoption of a more subjectivist ontology which holds that reality is subjective, involves multiple realities, and is socially constructed through human experiences and perceptions (Saunders et al., 2016) rather than objectivist, which assumes that reality can be externally explained objectively.
previous investigations (Kondracki et al., 2002). Both the inductive and deductive qualitative approaches have strengths and weaknesses that influence the outcome of any research. A summary of the strengths and weaknesses of both methods is presented in Table 4.2 below.

Table 4.2: Strengths and Weaknesses of Inductive and Deductive Qualitative Approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Research Approaches</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weakness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Inductive                       | • Allows the researcher to look at phenomena with fresh eyes and from new perspectives without restrictions within an already existing theory.  
• Allows the researcher to understand phenomena historically. | • Although the researcher may follow a rigorous coding process, he or she may not find any substantial theory.  
• The researcher must exercise stringent theoretical sensitivity in the process of data analysis to achieve saturation in theoretical sampling. |
| Deductive                       | • Allows different participants to well discuss a construct in different ways.  
• Leads to an understanding of phenomena or social reality through an interpretation of a variety of written, recorded, or verbal communication materials as it allows the researcher to process a large amount of data. | • It can compromise the researcher’s ability to pay more attention to the respondent’s point of view.  
• Labour-intensive and time-consuming procedure. |

Source: Cho and Lee (2014)

Dubois and Gadde (2002) suggest an approach based on ‘systematic combining’ grounded in an ‘abductive’ logic, especially in case studies where the aim is to develop or establish new theories (Yin, 2018). An abductive approach is known as collecting data to explore a phenomenon, identifying themes, and explaining patterns to generate a new or modify an existing theory which the researcher subsequently tests through an additional data collection (Dubois and Gadde, 2002; Saunders et al., 2016). Table 4.3 below shows the reason for employing the abductive approach in this study.
Table 4.3: Abductive Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abductive Reasoning</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Logic</td>
<td>In an abductive inference, known premises are used to generate testable Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalisability</td>
<td>Generalisations are made from the interactions between the specific and the general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Data</td>
<td>Data collection is used to explore a phenomenon, identify themes and patterns, locate these in a conceptual framework and test this through subsequent data collection and so forth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>Theory generation or modification; Incorporating existing theory, where appropriate, to build new theory or modify existing theory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Saunders et al. (2016, p.,146)

In this study, abductive approach of Dubois and Gadde (2002), with the identification of gaps, theoretical knowledge, and empirical findings in the literature review, was used (Stage 1). This was followed by a pilot study involving interviews to compare the literature review findings with a real word setting (Stage 2). Finally, interviews were conducted in the field to match the emerging theory leading to data collection (Stage 3), which helped in the construction of the new integrated theoretical framework (Fig. 7.9) (Stage 4).

To sum up, abductive reasoning is particularly useful in this study for the development of a new theory in understanding the gender influences that affect environmental behaviour in Turkish SMEs. The research approach to theory development informed the choice of research design in this study.

4.3 Research Design

The purpose of this section is to examine which research design is appropriate for investigating gender influences on the environmental engagement of entrepreneurs in Turkey. Denzin and Lincoln (2011) define research designs as frameworks for collecting and analysing data depending on the research philosophy, objectives, and questions. Research design shows how the researcher proposes to analyse collected data drawn on ethical issues, and the constraints the researcher will inevitably encounter. (Saunders et al., 2016).
4.3.1 Types of Research Designs

Yin (2018) and Easterby-Smith et al. (2018) describe the selection criteria for the most appropriate research design (Table 4.4).

Table 4.4: Selection Criteria for Research Strategies and Main Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Strategy</th>
<th>Form of the Research Question</th>
<th>Requires Control of Behavioural Events</th>
<th>Focus on Contemporary Events</th>
<th>Representative Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experimental Design</td>
<td>How</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Laboratory-based research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Studies the probability of a change in an independent variable causing a change in another, dependent variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uses predictions, known as hypotheses, rather than research questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conducted in laboratories rather than in the field; therefore, requires control over behavioural events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Study Design</td>
<td>how, why</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Focuses on an in-depth investigation of a single case or a small number of cases within its real-life setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information can be sought through the use of different types of data, such as observations, interviews and the analysis of documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leading to rich, empirical descriptions and the development of theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey or Cross-case Analysis</td>
<td>who, what, where how many, how much</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Usually associated with a deductive research approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Used for exploratory and descriptive research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Usually uses questionnaires as they allow the collection of standardised data from a sizeable population in a highly economical way allowing easy comparison.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>how, why</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Involves the study and analysis of data about past events rather than contemporary topics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Critical investigation of events, their
development, and experiences of the past
A clearer understanding of the impact of
the past on the present and future events
related to the life process

Sources: Yin (2018), Easterby-Smith et al. (2018)

Based on the table above (Table 4.4) explaining the criteria for and main characteristics of each research design, three significant reasons informed the selection of a case study for this research.

First, the choice of research design should be made based on the philosophical assumptions of the study (Easterby-Smith et al., 2018). This study is rooted in the social constructionist paradigm (4.2), assumptions of which suggest the researcher undertake context-based investigations. Therefore, the case study design was chosen as an appropriate research design for investigating the complex and infinite knowledge of the influences of gender on environmental behaviour in the context of Turkey, where institutional enablers and constraints are important factors for these entrepreneurs, as well as gender.

Second, a case study design is used to understand how organisation dynamics or social processes work or to establish why a phenomenon takes place (Yin, 2018). The case study design was the most appropriate for exploring how gender dynamics within social interactions of environmental entrepreneurs shape pre-entry and post-entry decisions of environmental entrepreneurs in Turkey. The case study design enabled me to focus on an in-depth investigation of multiple cases (gender influences and institutional influences) and multiple units of analysis (owners/managers entrepreneurs and stakeholders) in a real-life setting.

Third, multiple options for conducting this study, such as industries (cross-case industries), SMEs led by entrepreneurs, (women and male entrepreneurs), stakeholders (governmental-non-governmental institutions) and other representatives (banks-intermediaries, cooperatives-not-for-profit organisations), were amenable to case study design. Moreover, the study analysed the policy and SME-related documents and reports using a case study design strategy. Therefore, the case study design enabled the collection of information using different types of data, such as interviews and an analysis of secondary sources from websites.
It has been suggested by Yin (2018) that three types of research design can be used to answer why and how questions: experiments, histories, and case studies. However, experimental design is not suitable for the objective of this study which seeks to understand gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship in a natural setting rather than laboratory-based research. History design is also out of consideration for this study even if it can be conducted in a natural setting because a historical design does not investigate contemporary topics but past events. Environmental entrepreneurship is an emerging concept in Turkey and understanding the role of socially constructed gender on women entrepreneurs, which has emerged within the past decade, represents a contemporary phenomenon (Foss et al., 2018).

In addition, survey designs are usually aimed at collecting quantifiable data relating to two or more variables investigated to determine relationships and which are associated with a deductive research approach (Bryman and Bell, 2018). Therefore, the case study research design is considered a suitable choice for this research.

4.3.3 Case Study Approach

There are different types of case studies, such as single or multiple case studies and holistic case versus embedded case studies. A single case may be selected purposively because it is typical or because it provides researchers with an opportunity to observe and analyse a phenomenon that few have considered before (Saunders et al., 2016). Yin (2018) claims that multiple cases provide a more consistent base for theory building based on the richness of information of each case under analysis. Multi-case studies may provide a resulting theory that is likely to be consistently supported by empirical evidence, which allows pattern recognition of the attributes and themes, linkages, and logic of the phenomenon under investigation (Eisenhardt and Graebner, 2007).

A single environmental entrepreneur type from a single industry SME would not have provided sufficient information needed to probe the research problem of this study effectively. Therefore, in contrast to a single case-based study, investigating multiple cases of different women and men environmental entrepreneurs from different industries and regions was considered suitable for making the findings of this study more robust and trustworthy (Easterby-Smith et al., 2018; Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Stake, 2005; Yin, 2018; Eisenhardt and Graebner, 2007).
Case study design can also be holistic versus embedded, which refers to the unit of analysis. For instance, if the researcher is only concerned with the organisation, s/he would treat the organisation as a holistic case? On the other hand, if a case involves more than one unit of analysis, an embedded case study would be used (Saunders et al., 2016). This study is a multiple-embedded case study because it relies on understanding the socially constructed gender influences (e.g., gender and institutional factors) on environmental entrepreneurs’ decisions/behaviour in Turkish SMEs from different sectors which contain more than one subunit of analysis (e.g., women entrepreneurs, men entrepreneurs, stakeholders from the public and private institutions, secondary resources).

The following section elaborates on the unit of analysis and the research participants of this study.

4.3.4 Unit of Analysis and Research Participants

The study aims to explore the influences of gender as a driver in environmental engagement through entrepreneurs’ values, decisions and behaviour when interacting with the institutional enablers of environmental entrepreneurship (Section 1.3). Entrepreneurs can decide and behave differently even if they are in the same sector because the decisions they take depend on their knowledge and skills, which depend on various institutional structures within a specific context (Vatansever and Arun, 2016). Therefore, the first unit of analysis in this research is women and men environmental entrepreneurs who are the owners/managers of SMEs in Turkey. Table 4.5 and Table 4.6 show the list of entrepreneurs from women-owned and men-owned SMEs respectively.

The notion of Vatansever and Arun (2016) also supports why this study requires a clear understanding of the influence of formal institutions and informal institutions on women and men entrepreneurs. Therefore, questioning related stakeholders from private and public institutions strengthens our understanding of how they enable/hinder environmental practices used by SMEs. This helps theoretical development by uncovering the gendered institutions (socially constructed gender influences) for environmental entrepreneurs in a patriarchal society (Figure 7.1). Consequently, the second
participants are stakeholders of women’s entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship supporters in Turkey from both public and private institutions (Table 4.7).

Table 4.5: List of women-owned SMEs research participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women Owners and Managers</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Family-status</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Position of Participant (s)</th>
<th>Core Products/Services</th>
<th>Employees (excluding owner and managers)</th>
<th>Business Size and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PF1</td>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>Widow/Child(+)</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>Sustainable Fashion</td>
<td>Owner and Manager</td>
<td>100% hand-made organic female accessories</td>
<td>Daughter (International Sales) Female (Local Artisans)</td>
<td>Small-Size -Istanbul (Urban)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF2</td>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>Married/Child (+)</td>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>Eco-Tourism</td>
<td>Owner and Manager</td>
<td>Accommodation in village houses -Organic food production for visitors -Camps, dough workshops, fruit picking, nature tours</td>
<td>Female (Local Farmers)</td>
<td>Small-Size -Bilecik (Rural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF3</td>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>Married/Child (+)</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>Sustainable Fashion</td>
<td>Owner and Manager</td>
<td>Accessories from waste rugs (zero waste approach)</td>
<td>Daughter (Social Media Manager) Female Workers</td>
<td>Small-Size -Istanbul (Urban)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF4</td>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>Married/Child (+)</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>Industrial Waste Management and Recycling</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Waste/garbage/recycling management</td>
<td>Female and Male Workers</td>
<td>Medium-Size-Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Academic Degree</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Employment Size</td>
<td>Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1F</td>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>Single/ Child (-)</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>Sustainable Fashion and Eco-Tourism</td>
<td>Owner and Manager</td>
<td>-Local and traditional products from (trash) recycled materials (e.g., bags, wallets) -Workshops for visitors (handicrafts from waste)</td>
<td>Female (only) Employees</td>
<td>Small-Size - Ayvalik (Rural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2F</td>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>Widow/ Child (+)</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>Organic Agriculture and Eco-Tourism</td>
<td>Owner and Manager</td>
<td>-Organic food sold in the local bazaar for visitors -Camps, workshops, fruit picking, walking tours</td>
<td>Female (Local Farmers)</td>
<td>Small-Size - Silivri (Rural)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3F</td>
<td>25-45</td>
<td>Married/ Child (+)</td>
<td>MSc</td>
<td>Environmental Consultancy and Digital Services</td>
<td>Owner and Manager</td>
<td>-Environmental consultancy -Digital services (Carbon-free green publishing) -Subscription service</td>
<td>Female (Writers) Male (Advisory Board Member)</td>
<td>Micro-size Digital office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4F</td>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>Married/ Child (-)</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>Ecological Architecture and Design</td>
<td>Owner and Manager</td>
<td>-Eco-tourism and agrotourism buildings -Circular design -Permaculture design</td>
<td>Female and Male Workers</td>
<td>Small- Size Head office: Istanbul (Buildings in urban and rural areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Product/Technology</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5F</td>
<td>25-45</td>
<td>Married/ Children (+)</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Organic Food Additives Manufacturing</td>
<td>Co-founder and Manager</td>
<td>-Feng shui interior design -Use of environmentally friendly technologies</td>
<td>Co-Founder (Male)</td>
<td>Female and Male Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6F</td>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>Married/ Children (+)</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>Green Food and Restaurant</td>
<td>Co-founder and Manager</td>
<td>-Manufacturing organic food additives by using environmentally friendly technologies</td>
<td>Co-founder (Male)</td>
<td>Female and Male Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E7F</td>
<td>25-45</td>
<td>Single/ Child (-)</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>Textile</td>
<td>Owner and Manager</td>
<td>-Eco-friendly textile materials (With 100% organic certified fabrics) -Sustainable clothing (e.g., washable masks) recycled fashion</td>
<td>Female Workers (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E8F</td>
<td>25-45</td>
<td>Single/ Child (-)</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>Biotechnology</td>
<td>Co-founder and Manager</td>
<td>Bio-based granules from olive seeds (alternative to petrol-based plastics)</td>
<td>Co-founder (Male)</td>
<td>Female and Male Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Employment Status</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Licenses/Services</td>
<td>Sex of Co-founders</td>
<td>Company Size</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E9F</td>
<td>25-45</td>
<td>Married/Child (+)</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>Sustainable Food and Kitchen Materials</td>
<td>Co-founder and Manager</td>
<td>2 Female Co(founders)</td>
<td>Micro-size Istanbul (Urban)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Home-made clean and healthy food (free of additives, sugar, gluten, and lactose) - Sustainable kitchen materials (e.g., eco-friendly steel straw)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E10F</td>
<td>25-45</td>
<td>Married/Child (+)</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>Environmental Services</td>
<td>Co-founder and Manager</td>
<td>2 Female Co (founders)</td>
<td>Micro-size Istanbul (Urban)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Consulting and training services: sustainability reports, carbon footprint, water footprint, energy management, LCA (life cycle assessment), assets management, and risk management, Eco-labels and environmental product declaration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11F</td>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>Single/Child (-)</td>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>Electromechanical Goods and Services</td>
<td>Founder and Manager</td>
<td>Women-dominated (employers)</td>
<td>Medium-size Istanbul (Urban)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Wind turbine generator systems, Solar panels, Thermal turbine boiler generator, Hydroelectric</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6: List of Men-Owned SMEs Research Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men Owners and Managers</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Family-status</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Position of Participant (s)</th>
<th>Core Products/Services</th>
<th>Employees (excluding owner and managers)</th>
<th>Business Size and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>power plant equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PM1</th>
<th>46-65</th>
<th>Married/Child (+)</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree</th>
<th>Energy- Transport Industry and Trade</th>
<th>Manager</th>
<th>Fuel distribution and logistics</th>
<th>Women and Men Workers</th>
<th>Medium-size Head Office: Istanbul +9 other stations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PM2</td>
<td>25-45</td>
<td>Single/Child (-)</td>
<td>MSc</td>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>Owner/Manager</td>
<td>Glass waste recycling</td>
<td>Men Workers</td>
<td>Small-size Mersin *Organised Industrial Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM3</td>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>Married/Child (+)</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>Automotive Construction and Chemicals Production Marketing Import Export</td>
<td>Owner/Manager</td>
<td>Alternative environmentally friendly car cleaning products</td>
<td>Men Workers</td>
<td>Medium-size Istanbul *Organised Industrial Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4M</td>
<td>25-45</td>
<td>Single/Child (-)</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>Industrial Glassware Manufacturing</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Glassware, tableware, giftware, and ovenware</td>
<td>Women and Men Workers</td>
<td>Medium-size Eskisehir *Organised Industrial Zone +6 branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1M</td>
<td>25-45</td>
<td>Single/Child (-)</td>
<td>MSc</td>
<td>Medical Eco-Tourism</td>
<td>Owner/Manager</td>
<td>-Medical and touristic consultancy - Tailor-made trips -Blue cruises -Eco-tourism routes -Offer environmentally</td>
<td>2 women workers</td>
<td>Micro-size digital office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2M</td>
<td>25-45</td>
<td>Single/Child (-)</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>Renewables and Energy- Solar PV, Wind, and Biogas/Biomass</td>
<td>Owner/Manager</td>
<td>-Utility-scale power plants, solar energy applications (rooftop, ground-mounted, solar car parks), residential applications, irrigation (agricultural irrigation, drinking water), On-grid/ off-grid systems</td>
<td>Men Workers</td>
<td>Small-size Istanbul (Rural and Urban)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3M</td>
<td>25-45</td>
<td>Single/Child (-)</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>Green Restaurant and Organic Agriculture</td>
<td>Co(founder) and Manager</td>
<td>Female Co (founder) and workers (women and men)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Professional Background</td>
<td>Business Description</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Business Size</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4M</td>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>Married/Child (+)</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Digital Publishing and Environmental Consultancy</td>
<td>Owner/Manager - Environmental consultancy - Digital services (Carbon-free green publishing) - Subscription service</td>
<td>Women and men workers</td>
<td>Micro-size digital office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5M</td>
<td>46-65</td>
<td>Divorced/Children (+)</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Social and Environmental Services</td>
<td>Owner/Manager - Online green market services</td>
<td>Women and Men Workers</td>
<td>Small-size Istanbul (Urban)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6M</td>
<td>25-45</td>
<td>Married/Child (-)</td>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>Food and Beverages Technology: Smart Solutions</td>
<td>Co (Founder) - Food &amp; Tech, hardware, beer, mobile development, AI, big data, software, robotics, sustainability, and draft beer</td>
<td>Co-Founder (Male) Female Business Development Manager</td>
<td>Women and Men Workers</td>
<td>Medium-size Istanbul (Urban)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.7: List of Other Participants from Public and Private Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Institution Type</th>
<th>About Institution</th>
<th>Position of Participant</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KOSGEB (Small and Medium Enterprises Development Organisation of Turkey)</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Semi-autonomous public institution and responsible for implementing SME policies in Turkey (OECD Turkey, 2022) Support for Women’s Entrepreneurship Support for Energy and Environment-related Industries (e.g., Manufacturing sectors)</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship Development Manager</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEB BANK (Economy Bank of Turkey)</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Known as the Greenest Bank in Turkey (Green Loans to Energy and Electric Sectors) TEB’s Women Academy (2015)</td>
<td>Branch Manager</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Environment Culture and Business Cooperative</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Regional Women and Environment Support Institution in Gokova (Rural)</td>
<td>Founder</td>
<td>Mugla (Rural Area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARYA (Women’s Investment Platform)</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Support for Women’s Entrepreneurship (Mentor, Training, Network, Access to Market, Investment)</td>
<td>Community Manager</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICI: Istanbul Chamber of Industry</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Offering support to entrepreneurs regarding environment-related issues since 1990. Their activities in the fields of training, consultancy, opinion formation, environment projects, carbon footprint, waste management, mining and non-sanitary enterprise licences, occupational health and safety, and forestation.</td>
<td>Enterprise Project Manager</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWRE:</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Contributing to gender equality in business life and increasing female employment and initiatives in the male-dominated energy sector.</td>
<td>Founder of the Institution</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Coordinator/Manager</td>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish Women in Renewable Energy MMU: Marmara Municipalities Union</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Environmental management efforts focus on the development of local environmental policies and environmental management strategies by acting as a bridge between municipalities and ministries and other organisations operating in the field of environmental management.</td>
<td>Environmental Management Coordinator</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUCEM: Environmental Education and Waste Management Association</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Association’s vision was to bring together women from across the country who are waste and resources specialists and work together to embed best practices from the EU and beyond. These women’s broad network seeks to bring about positive change at all levels of resource and waste policy. They use collaborative and evidence-based approaches to inspire and inform national policymakers, encouraging them to build a policy that follows the waste hierarchy, encourages best practices and supports innovation, uses economic instruments when necessary and delivers behaviour change across the supply chain.</td>
<td>Founder of the Association</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCSD TURKEY: (Business Council for Sustainable Development Turkey)</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Their purpose is to increase the awareness of businesses about sustainable development and to extend their influence. With this purpose in mind, they focus activities on following five areas within the framework of the UN’s sustainable development goals, and work with the leading companies of Turkey on sustainability: (1) Transition to Low Carbon Economy and Efficiency (2) Sustainable Agriculture and Access to Food (3) Sustainable Industry and the Circular Economy (4) Social Inclusion (5) The Sustainable Finance Forum</td>
<td>Sustainability Manager</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ministry of Environment Turkey</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>The main regulatory authorities for environmental law and practice</td>
<td>Zero Waste and Waste Processing Department</td>
<td>Ankara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Istanbul Kadıköy Municipality Environment Protection Headship</td>
<td>Public</td>
<td>Kadıköy Municipality’s Efforts Against Climate Change and Energy Efficiency Initiatives (2010-2020) – (2020-2024) “No Plastic Bag!” Campaign to inhibit the plastic bag usage of the businesses that apply for a licence, : information was given to these businesses for them to use environmentally friendly shopping bags in their workplaces. After companies</td>
<td>Environment Engineer</td>
<td>Istanbul</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
were opened for business, they were inspected by the municipality and made to transfer to environmental-friendly products.
Multiple cases with women and men environmental entrepreneurs from different sectoral SMEs offered an opportunity for cross-case comparison in this study since multiple cases are considered to provide a better understanding of issues and enrich theoretical discussion drawing on diverse perspectives as explored across cases (Stake, 2005; Yin, 2018). Another reason for a cross-sectoral study is that (1) green refers to different sectors in Turkey, and (2) SME greening policies through environmental entrepreneurship focus on specific sectors (e.g., energy, industry) where the number of men-owned SMEs is higher (Chapter 3).

Yet, according to many scholars (e.g., Ulutas and Alkaya, 2012; Walley and Taylor, 2002), looking at environmental entrepreneurs in different sectors provides an opportunity for a deeper understanding of environmental entrepreneurship which is necessary for the continuity of entrepreneurship where the natural resources are limited. (3) Finally, there is no official list of environmental entrepreneurs in Turkey and there is an access problem for environmental entrepreneurs (Vatansever and Arun, 2016).

The following section illustrates which sampling strategy is used to access research participants in this study.

4.4 Sampling Strategy

There are different sampling techniques for researchers to choose from in the form of probability and non-probability sampling techniques. The probability sampling technique is usually used for survey-based studies and large-scale samples in quantitative research (Brymen and Bell, 2018). Non-probability sampling is mainly used in qualitative research (Saunders et al., 2016). Since this study is an in-depth analysis of gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship drawing on qualitative research, non-probability sampling has been chosen to examine the processes underlying a phenomenon by gathering rich information (Easterby-Smith et., 2018; Saunders et al., 2016). The types of non-probability samplings in qualitative research and their criteria for selection are given in the table below (Table 4.8).
Table 4.8: The Non-probability Sampling Techniques

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Types of research in which useful</th>
<th>Control over sample contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quota</td>
<td>Quota</td>
<td>Where costs constraints, data is needed very quickly</td>
<td>Specifies quota selection criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposive (1)</td>
<td>Extreme Case</td>
<td>Unusual or special</td>
<td>Specifies selection criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposive (2)</td>
<td>Heterogenous</td>
<td>Reveal/illuminate key themes</td>
<td>Specifies selection criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposive (3)</td>
<td>Critical Case</td>
<td>In-depth focus</td>
<td>Specifies selection criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposive (4)</td>
<td>Typical Case</td>
<td>Importance</td>
<td>Specifies selection criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposive (5)</td>
<td>Theoretical</td>
<td>Inform emerging theory</td>
<td>Specifies selection criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer (1)</td>
<td>Snowball</td>
<td>Where cases are difficult to identify</td>
<td>Selects initial Participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer (2)</td>
<td>Self- selection</td>
<td>Where access is difficult, research exploratory</td>
<td>Offers general invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haphazard</td>
<td>Convenience</td>
<td>Ease of access</td>
<td>Haphazard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Saunders et al., 2016

Snowball and purposive theoretical sampling were thought to be the most appropriate techniques for this study.

The most appropriate method of sampling is purposeful sampling, which does not make generalisations based on the sample but rather seeks to explore different perspectives from a range of individuals relevant to the research question (Bryman and Bell, 2018). Moreover, the purposive theoretical technique contributes to building a new integrated theory for understanding the relationship between gender and environmental entrepreneurship by informing the background of emerging theory (Figure 2.8). Yet, this study starts with a snowball sampling technique to get access to environmental entrepreneurs and other stakeholders from public and private institutions in the pilot study. Since there is no official list
of environmental entrepreneurs in Turkey, recent studies on environmental entrepreneurship have also used the snowball technique to access each case (e.g., Vatansever and Arun, 2016).

4.4.1 Access to Participants

This section presents how I secured access to research participants through snowball and purposive theoretical sampling techniques with the criteria for participant selection depending on theoretical background. Challenges are also highlighted. Access to research participants started with the pilot study conducted in October 2019.

First, I visited one of the Women Entrepreneurs Associations. Because I had waited a long time for an answer to my email, I decided to ask for an appointment there. I was not allowed in and was told to send my questions to them so they could forward them to the entrepreneurs. My plan, however, was to speak with a member of the institution to learn how they supported women entrepreneurs. Thus, I emailed them again, explaining that my study was not survey-based and that I needed to conduct interviews. It turned out they had an ongoing EU project and were extremely busy, so they could not assist me. No further days were suggested either. My last pilot interview resulted in one of my interviewees referring me to the Association, and they contacted me and suggested setting up an appointment. In this way, I became aware of the importance of the snowball technique in my research. However, it was disappointing that I could not reach them until I was referred to them by a male entrepreneur.

Second, at the 25th International Energy and Environment Fair and Conference 2019, I had some informal discussions with environmental entrepreneurs, academics, and key representatives from the Turkish Ministry of Environment thanks to research grants from the Open University. Three entrepreneurs and one academic from a Turkish university were contacted. As a result, I began to receive referrals to others. The fair gave me a chance to learn about the 'zero waste' project in Turkey since it had not been officially announced yet and was not accessible on the internet. Having this knowledge before conducting fieldwork interviews helped me and the environmental entrepreneurs as research participants to gain a new perspective on zero waste. The Zero Waste Project was announced in the official gazette in July 2019.

Third, I visited the Istanbul Kadıköy Municipality Environment Protection Headship as suggested to me at the Fair. They were able to answer some of my questions, but they did not have an official list of environmental entrepreneurs in Istanbul. They said that I could only
access environmental entrepreneurs from 'environmental sectors' through the Istanbul Chamber of Trade. After contacting the Istanbul Chamber of Trade, I received a list of SMEs in the environment industry (mainly industrial recycling). In addition, I found some potential participants through a review of grey literature on the Turkish context, who I emailed. This is how I compiled a large list of potential participants using snowball sampling.

Finally, drawing on the research aim, research objectives and questions (1.3), I added a purposive theoretical sampling method to reach participants. The outcome of the pilot study informed the theoretical sampling technique adopted during the actual PhD fieldwork and data collection. Participants were chosen as they were needed based on theoretical reasons, such as replication, an extension of theory, contrary replication and the dropping of alternative explanations in this study. Subsequent sample selection was dictated by the needs of the emerging theoretical framing (Figure 2.8) and the evolving storyline in the empirical chapters (Chapters 5 and 6).

The first inclusion criterion was being an environmental entrepreneur in SMEs from different sectors. The SMEs should have either environmental-friendly adaptation in their traditional business practices with the owners/managers’ duality of goals (environmental and financial) or a sustainability-oriented approach with a triple bottom-line strategy (environmental, social and economic goals) in Turkey. This means environmental entrepreneurs could be of any age, sex and in any sector which is directly or indirectly related to environmental entrepreneurship.

Both women and men entrepreneurs can be useful in identifying the socially constructed gender differences between them that shape their environmental engagement in their SMEs, drawing on the post-structuralist feminist notion (Outsios and Farooqi, 2017). My research focuses on the socially constructed gender influences for understanding the environmental engagement of women-owned and men-owned SMEs in the Turkey context. The inclusion of both women and men entrepreneurs has given me a deeper understanding of the relationship between gender influences, the institutional environment, and environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey. Hence, this has contributed to the study in terms of developing an integrative theoretical framework based on gender role socialisation, feminist ethics of care, gender identity, and institutional theory within the Turkish context (Figure 7.1).

The second inclusion criterion was that the samples should be from private and public institutions acting as key stakeholders in the development of women’s entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship. Subsequently, I sent an email invitation to those who had expressed interest in participating in the study. To ensure that the participants met the selection
criteria, I attached an information sheet (Appendix 5) to the invitation letter (Appendix 4) sent out to interested participants. The same process was applied to other stakeholder participants.

4.4.2 Research Setting

Women and men entrepreneurs were chosen from SMEs located in four major cities in Turkey, mostly in Istanbul, Izmir, Ankara, and Eskisehir, where SMEs contribute to the Turkish economy most (Gergin et al., 2019). However, there was no urban or rural area exclusion for two reasons. First, including both urban and rural areas provide insights into gender dynamics based on the social interactions in the context of environmental entrepreneurship through single and cross-case analyses. Second, the COVID-19 outbreak led me to interview participants from different regions in Turkish cities, following snowball and purposive sampling techniques.

Table 4.9: Research Setting Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Participants: Environmental Entrepreneurs in Turkey</th>
<th>Secondary Participants: Representative Stakeholders from Formal Institutions in Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divided by: Gender Dimension</td>
<td>Categorised by: the type of institution where the interviewees worked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Women Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>1. Public Institutions (Contributors to Environmental, Social and Entrepreneurship Policy and Legislation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Men Entrepreneurs</td>
<td>2. Private Institutions (Banks, Non-governmental institutions that support entrepreneurs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Region:</strong> Urban/Rural Areas in Turkish Cities (Istanbul, Izmir, Ankara, Eskisehir)</td>
<td><strong>Region:</strong> Urban Areas in Turkey (mainly Istanbul/Ankara)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed by the Researcher

Sample Size

Some scholars claim that 4 to 20 interviews are enough to reach a saturation point in homogenous interview participants (Crouch and Mckenzie, 2006; Saunders et al., 2016). Yet, the heterogenous participant groups based on in-depth interview research require a 12-30 sample size. According to Patton (2015), there is no right number of samples to be considered
for qualitative research analysis, especially for interviews, because each participant contributes value to the study until the saturation point (Yin, 2018; Saunders et al., 2016).

Drawing on the lack of uniformity in the sample size suggestions, I followed the general principle of achieving a saturation point; in other words, until the additional data collected provided little, if any, new information or suggested new themes. Moreover, theoretical sampling continues until theoretical saturation is reached (Saunders et al., 2016). I reached the saturation point after interviewing respondents from women-owned and men-owned SMEs resulting in 25 interviews (Table 4.5 and 4.6) in addition to interviewing 11 other stakeholders (Table 4.7) for the development of women’s entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey. With at least another 10 informal interviews with entrepreneurs and stakeholders, the total sample size was 46. All the participants provided sufficient and useful information to investigate gender influences as a driver of environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey.
4.5 Data Collection

This section presents the data collection techniques in this qualitative case study. In case studies, data is collected from a wide range of qualitative data sources, such as interviews, observation, documentation, and historical records (Yin, 2018). Every choice has its benefits and limitations (Duane et al., 2005). Therefore, I gave thought to all of them before choosing the most appropriate one. In this study, the different data sources chosen were interviews and secondary sources (reports, leaflets, websites, and social media).

4.5.1 Primary Sources: Semi-structured Interviews

Interviews are often the primary data source in case studies (Eisenhardt and Graebner, 2007). Interviews are also a resourceful source of empirical evidence as researchers can find deep information about the cases investigated (Patton, 2015). Interviews can be structured, semi-structured, or unstructured interviews. Each of them are used for specific purposes according to the research aim and objectives. Table 4.10 shows the usage of interview types for different research purposes.

Table 4.10: Interview Types based on Research Purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exploratory</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Explanatory</th>
<th>Evaluative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structured</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-structured</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstructured</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
<td>✓ ✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Saunders et al. (2016)

Considering the research philosophy (Section 4.2), an in-depth semi-structured interview was conducted in this study. Through semi-structured interviews, I was able to 'probe' answers to open-ended questions where I wanted participants to elaborate on their responses. This is important, especially when adopting an interpretive philosophy where the researcher wishes to understand the meanings that participants ascribe to phenomena. Participants may use words or ideas in a particular way, and the opportunity to probe these meanings adds significance and depth to the data the researcher can obtain (Easterby-Smith et al., 2018; Saunders et al., 2016). The gender influences that shape the institutional environment and, consequently, the environmental behaviour of entrepreneurs cannot be explained through quantitative methods with numbers and mathematical calculations (Saunders et al., 2016). Qualitative research is based on words or images rather than numbers (Silverman, 2017).
To design and conduct interviews effectively, researchers need to follow specific guidelines (Creswell, 2012). In general, the guidelines instruct the researcher to prepare thoroughly before initiating the interview process. Accordingly, I created a semi-structured interview script which listed the essential questions and/or themes that helped the respondents to answer the research questions. The questions drawn up were based on the emerging theoretical framing of this study (Chapter 2). A full list of interview questions can be found in Appendix 1. Appendix 1a shows the introductory questions for all entrepreneurs. Appendix 1b presents the main questions for women and men owners/managers of SMEs. The interview questions for stakeholders are given in Appendix 2. The interview guide (Appendix 3) served as a benchmark to assure consistency in the phrasing of questions and the consequent credibility of the interview.

The types of interviews for this study were face-to-face and online interviews through different platforms in the pilot and fieldwork study. While face-to-face interviews are more advantageous in terms of reliability and natural setting (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011), online interviews were quite suitable in this study when entrepreneurs did not have time to meet or were in a different city from me. Also, video conferencing was safer in terms of the COVID-19 pandemic. For this study, online interviews were an environmental way to conduct the research without increasing the carbon footprint. With video conferencing, it was possible to observe the respondents' body language, which would not be possible with a telephone interview (Saunders et al., 2016).

I conducted 23 face-to-face (formal and informal) interviews and 23 formal online interviews with entrepreneurs and representative stakeholders. Ten informal interviews were used for additional sense-making (Hustinx and De Waele, 2015). During the interviewing process, theoretical and academic terms were avoided to ensure that the participants fully understood all the questions asked (Bryman and Bell, 2018). The interviews were audio-recorded. Only one of these interviews with stakeholders was recorded as a video because the participant had to report every action to the affiliated public institution. The length of the interviews was between 40 to 120 minutes, depending on the participants’ responsiveness.

Some amendments were applied to the interview questions after my written ‘fieldwork experiences’ and ‘participant tables’ on the first five interviews, based on discussions with my supervisors and their tracked comments on my notes. During the fieldwork, I also shared
emerging themes such as gender roles and gender identity with my supervisors. Given their expertise in the subject area, their comments were used to clarify gaps in the interviews that needed to be addressed in the prospective interviews. By following up on those gaps in later interviews as well as analysing data through primary and secondary codes, theoretical saturation was achieved.

One of the advantages of interviews in qualitative studies is that they allow participants to speak openly about the topic. However, one limitation is bias due to poorly articulated questions and responses or personal interpretation bias (Saunders et al., 2016). One way to mitigate bias in interviews is to increase validity. The interview language in this study was Turkish. To be sure that nothing was missing in the meanings, the translations from Turkish to English were checked by an expert who had studied the English language and had nine years of experience as an English teacher. Another way to mitigate bias in interviews is to combine them with other data collection sources, such as other documents, which I did in this study. The use of different sources of evidence increases the chances of obtaining a richness of information and increasing the chances of the reliability of data in the data collection (Bryman and Bell, 2018).

4.5.2 Secondary Sources: Documentation from Websites

The reason for gathering secondary data was to contribute to the richness of information gathered through the semi-structured interviews and add further depth to the analysis (Saunders et al., 2016). Documentation is useful for increasing evidence from other additional sources as part of the data collection. Beyond the interviews, the data collection included document reviews such as (1) national strategic reports (e.g., the Development Plan (2019-2023), the National Climate Change Action Plan (2011-2023), the National Energy Efficiency Action Plan (2017-2023), the Turkish Entrepreneurship Strategy (2018-2023), (2) corporate reports (sustainability reports, when available), (3) national websites (e.g., Clean Production Information, KOSGEB Entrepreneur’s Handbook, the list of Environment and Energy Rewards for Turkish Businesses), (4) international reports on Turkey (e.g., the OECD Turkey Reports, United Nation’s Environment Programme (data by country), the European Commission Turkey Progress Report, and GEM Reports. Moreover, websites of SMEs led by women and men entrepreneurs and other institutional institutions were included in the study, and news in the media about the topic was also explored.
4.6 Method of Data Analysis

Scholars have discussed the appropriateness of different types of qualitative analysis techniques, such as thematic analysis, explanation-building analysis, grounded theory analysis, narrative analysis, and discourse analysis in business studies (e.g., Braun and Clarke, 2006; Corbin and Strauss, 2008; Easterby-Smith et al., 2018; Miles, Huberman, and Saldana, 2014; Patton, 2015; Saunders et al., 2016). As part of applying the integrative theoretical framing (Figure 2.8), I applied different data analysis techniques at different stages in this study.

This study mainly draws on thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006; Miles, Huberman, and Saldana, 2014), which was strengthened by the Gioia methodology (Gioia et al., 2013) and coupled with using cross-case narrative analysis (Yin, 2018). Thematic analysis is appropriate for achieving the aim of identifying, analysing, and reporting patterns (themes) within data and interpreting various aspects of the topic (Braun and Clarke, 2006, p.79). Thematic analysis was useful for unpacking the socially constructed differences between women entrepreneurs and men entrepreneurs as well as the similarities between them, such as practising feminist ethics of care in their environmental engagement.

I applied both deductive and inductive analysis, representing "theoretical or deductive/top-down" and "inductive or bottom-up" approaches, to inform the theoretical framework in the coding scheme. Table 4.11 details Braun and Clarke’s (2006) six-phase thematic analysis approach I applied in this study.

Table 4.11: The Six Stages of the Thematic Analytic Framework Phases of Thematic Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description of the process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.  Familiarising yourself with your data</td>
<td>Transcribing data (if necessary), reading and re-reading the data, noting down your initial ideas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.  Generating initial codes</td>
<td>Coding interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.  Searching for themes</td>
<td>Collating codes into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) **Familiarising with Data:** NVivo 12 was used to organise the corpus of data gathered from the research participants. Two sources, namely interview transcripts, and website evidence (media, website information of SMEs and other website information on SME policies) were imported into NVivo 12. By reading and re-reading data, I was prompted to generate summaries in my fieldwork journal (Appendix 10) to effectively reflect upon my field-based observations while analysing the data (Miles, Huberman, and Saldana, 2014; Easterby-Smith et al., 2018). This process aided me in the sense of giving me an initial idea of the emerging story.

(2) **Generating Initial Codes (first-order):** I started the systematic data analysis with first-order coding in NVivo 12. The first level codes were usually sentences or a line of a transcript, such as ‘as a female environmental entrepreneur’ or ‘I am a father and money-maker for my family’. The sources of the codes (nodes) were data-driven and derived from participants’ discourse at this stage. Based on the social constructionist paradigm philosophy of this research, all my data was interesting, yet the research questions (1.3) helped me focus on which data to code. Without coding the data, researchers may struggle to comprehend all the meanings in the data in which they are interested (Braun and Clarke, 2006).

(3) **Searching for Themes (second-order):** The previous initial coding led to the development of second-order codes, as Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) call them.
In this phase, I used academic terminologies over the terms used by the participants to give a theoretical structure to the data. Two concepts of the theoretical framework (Figure 2.8) included gender influences and institutional influences at this stage. I revisited the second-order codes to assure they captured distinct features of the data and combined codes where no recognisable difference was found through within-case analysis.

To reduce the number of codes and lay the foundation for the cross-case analysis, the first level of coding was followed by identifying second-order codes based on the existing literature (Chapter 2), which enabled me to further code and re-classify the second-order codes under specific aggregated terms (Miles, Huberman, and Saldana, 2014).

(4) Reviewing Themes (Aggregated): In this phase, recurring themes in the data were summarised into labels (Miles, Huberman and Saldana, 2014). First-order and second-order codes were reviewed. This iterative process of data analysis not only resulted in finding recurring themes but also in rearranging some of them across categories to ensure consistency between the views of participants and the nodes as labelled. In this stage, I moved from the second order to the aggregate dimension.

For example, the nodes representing gender influences were coded under gender influences labelled in pink for women entrepreneurs and men entrepreneurs. Gender influences were aggregated under (1) Compliance (doing gender), (2) Neglect (doing and re-doing), or (3) Defiance (re-doing gender). Gender identity perception, gender role expectations, and gender role socialisation were labelled in green, and were grouped under compliance. Acknowledging the lack of support for female entrepreneurs and no longer paying attention to gender role socialisation were labelled in orange and were grouped under neglect. Practising masculinity, adding value to being different (feminine) and women’s empowerment were labelled in yellow and grouped under defiance. The same strategy was followed when coding both gender and institutional influences. For an illustration, see Appendix 8.

(5) Defining and Naming Themes: Data were not only analysed within cases but also across cases to achieve the objectives of this study (Appendix 9). Cross-case analysis was adopted, which consists of comparing the case studies in the empirical Chapters 5 and 6 by following Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) and Yin (2018), who have suggested that cross-case
analysis has specific purposes in theory building. The aim of this study as theory building is detailed in the literature review (Chapter 2) and Section 4.2.2.

To reveal the heterogeneity of women entrepreneurs and environmental entrepreneurs in a specific context, the need for cross-case analysis in understanding gender influences and institutional influences has been evidenced in the literary context. The theory building aim of this study for understanding the socially constructed gender influences that shape the environmental behaviour of women and men entrepreneurs justifies the application of cross-case analysis in undertaking the study.

Defining and naming themes through data structure displays the validity and rigour of the research design adopted and establishes the credibility and trustworthiness of the research findings (Braun and Clarke, 2006; Gioia et al., 2013). I tabulated and matched the emerging themes for the specific dimensions of the theoretical framework that represented the gender influences and institutional influences on the environmental engagement of women and men-owned SMEs in Turkey. In doing so, I was moving away from the inductive data analysis approach to ‘abductive reasoning’ (Dubois and Gadde, 2002; Gioia et al., 2013) as it is explained in Section 4.2.2.

Therefore, the theory development approach was based on the sources of the data structure as data-driven and theory-driven at this stage (Figure 4.1). Here, I was viewing the data through the integrated theoretical perspectives of this study, namely gender role socialisation, the feminist ethics of care, gender identity and institutional theory.
**Figure 4.1: Sources and Types of Codes in The Study**

**Sources of Data Structure**

**Data-Driven**
- Actual terms used by participants
  - “In Vivo Codes”

**Theory-Driven**
- Derived from existing theories and literature
  - (Priori codes)
  - “Systematic Literature Review” (Chapters 2)
  - “Turkish Context” (Chapter 3)
- Derived from data by me as a “Researcher”

Source: Developed by the Researcher

The data structure of codes through different levels of analysis is depicted in the empirical chapters (Chapters 5 and 6).

As an example, the ‘data structure’ presented in Figure 4.1 informs the first research question drawing on understanding how socially constructed gender influences the environmental engagement of entrepreneurs in their doing and re-doing gender, which is evident in Chapter 5.
The same approach is applied in Chapter 6 with responses to understanding institutional influence factors that enable environmental engagement within gender dynamics for women and men entrepreneurs in Turkey.

(6) Producing a Report: To achieve cross-case analysis in the sense of unpacking socially constructed similarities and differences between women and men entrepreneurs, gender influences and institutional influences on women-owned SMEs and men-owned SMEs were written separately in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6.

Chapters 5 and 6 enabled me to analyse my data according to homogenous groups (i.e., women entrepreneurs and men entrepreneurs separately) by revealing the different types of women entrepreneurs operating in an emerging economy. Chapter 7 reveals the key findings through a cross-case comparison of socially constructed similarities and differences between women and men environmental entrepreneurs. This enabled me to present distinctive types of environmental entrepreneurs from different sectors.

Source: Developed by the researcher.
4.7 Ethical Considerations

Ethical issues play a significant role in conducting business research (Saunders et al., 2016; Bryman and Bell, 2018). There are ten ethical principles that many social science scholars believe should be taken into consideration (Bryman and Bell, 2018; Easterby-Smith et al., 2018, p. 134; Saunders et al., 2016, p.244), namely the privacy of those taking part, the integrity and objectivity of the researcher, voluntary participation, the informed consent of those participating, avoidance of the risk of harm as a result of participation, ensuring the confidentiality and anonymity of those taking part, responsibility in the analysis of the data and reporting of the findings, compliance in the management of data, and ensuring the safety of the researcher. Each of these ethical principles has been achieved at specific stages of this study.

First, the study was carried out in line with the Open University’s Ethics Principles for Research Involving Human Participants in the research ethics handbook (2019). Considering the requirements of the Open University’s Human Research Ethics Committee to conduct qualitative research, I secured ethical approval for the fieldwork. An ethics clearance from the Open University Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) dated 04/10/2019 referenced RE: HREC/3329/Kutlu was granted for this study (Appendix 7). Therefore, after the mini viva (14.01.2020), I was ready to start the fieldwork.

I abided by the compliance in the management of the data principle. Many governments have passed legislation to regulate the processing of personal data, such as the UK. Other laws may exist in particular countries relating to the processing, security and possible sharing of data. The need for gaining ethical approval from any authorities in Turkey did not arise.

How the remaining nine requirements of ethical clearance in social sciences and how they are achieved in this study are explained below

- **Privacy of Participants:** A person's privacy relates to their control over others' access to their information and themselves or their preservation of the boundaries that prevent them from giving out that information (Bryman and Bell, 2018). In terms of privacy, after I obtained data from participants which was deemed confidential, such as the biographical data of all the participants (owners/managers of SMEs and key representatives from institutions) or the role of participants in public or private organisations, such data was anonymised after the transcription of the interview. For
instance, owners/managers from women-owned and men-owned SMEs in the pilot study are anonymised as PF1, PF2 or PM1, PM2 and in the fieldwork are anonymised as F1, F2, F3 or M1, M2, M3.

- **Integrity and objectivity of the researcher:** The quality of the research depends on the researcher’s integrity and objectivity. This means no deception or misinterpretation of the data collected is permitted. In Chapters 5, 6 and 7, where the empirical chapters and conclusion of this study are discussed, I followed the ‘systematic combining’ approach (Dubois and Gadde, 2002). This enabled me to review my data recurrently before finalising the findings of the study based on my interpretations. Also, during my data structuring, I received feedback from my supervisors and other senior academics. By doing so, I avoided any misinterpretation and deception in this study.

- **Voluntary participation:** The researcher should not force any human being to participate in the research (Saunders et al., 2016). Participation was unpaid. All the participants, including women entrepreneurs, men entrepreneurs and key representatives from private and public institutions, were issued an information sheet (Appendix 5), which had been confirmed by the Open University’s Human Research Ethics Committee.

  The information sheet was sent to the participants before the scheduled meeting date via e-mail. It informed the participants about their rights, such as the right to withdraw from the study. Participants were also informed before the signing of the consent form (Appendix 6) and the commencement of the interviews that they would be recorded.

- **Informed consent of participants:** The principle of informed consent involves researchers providing adequate information and assurances about taking part to allow human beings to understand the implications of participation and to reach a fully informed, considered and freely given decision about whether to do so, without the exercise of any pressure or coercion (Bryman and Bell, 2018; Easterby-Smith et al., 2018).

  Participants were fully informed about the procedures of the research regarding giving their consent for participation in this study. The information sheet and consent forms were signed by the participants before the interviews were conducted. Moreover, their
verbal consent (recorded during the interview) was consistently requested throughout the interview process.

- **Avoid the risk of harm as a result of participation**: The risk assessment form was concerning the potential harm to participants in the research context, Turkey. All kinds of potential risks were evaluated before securing ethical approval. I made every attempt to avoid any potential harm that could occur to the participants resulting from research participation. For example, with the e-mail of the HRMC at the coronavirus outbreak, the interviews were conducted via online platforms. There was no physical or psychological harm to participants during this study.

- **Confidentiality and Anonymity**: According to Bryman and Bell (2018), confidentiality refers to agreements with individuals or organizations about what will happen to their data, including legal constraints, while anonymity refers to ways of concealing research participants to prevent their identification (Miles, Huberman, and Saldana, 2014, p. 63). In terms of data confidentiality, prior information was provided to participants through the information sheet referred to above. They were informed about how their data would be used within an academic context and that the findings would be published in academic journals, conferences and, ultimately, in a doctoral thesis.

  In terms of anonymity, I created a coding identifier for each participant. The prefix indicates the sex of the entrepreneur, whether he is a woman or a man. This was followed by the two letters of the specific person's name, such as EF or EM, and the code ended with a digit (e.g., EF1, EF2, or EM3). In this way, anonymity was maintained, and the case could be reviewed more easily during coding and analysis. Participants' identities will remain anonymous and hidden from third parties to protect their privacy.

- **Responsibility in the analysis of the data and reporting of the findings**: Data protection and security measures were implemented throughout the pilot study, fieldwork, analysis and writing-up. The data has only been used for research purposes, such as in journal articles, conference presentations and in this thesis. No personal information was shared with anyone outside the research team (supervisors). The
participants’ identities were always omitted from the interview transcripts, presentations, and publications. To ensure full anonymity, the participants were provided with a draft of their transcription for their confirmation that they had not been identified in the transcript. Interview recordings were always destroyed after being anonymised in the transcription process and then stored on a password-protected OU laptop.

- **Ensuring the safety of the researcher:** The Social Research Association’s Code of Practice for the Safety of Social Researchers identifies possible risks from social interactions, including ‘risk of physical threat or abuse; risk of psychological trauma . . .; risk of being in a compromising situation . . .; increased exposure to risks of everyday life’ (Social Research Association, 2001: 1). Therefore, the research design of this study considered risks to the researchers as well as the participants. All kinds of potential risks were evaluated before securing ethical approval. I made every attempt to avoid any potential harm that could occur to me resulting from social interactions during the fieldwork.

As a result of an ethics approval for the study, I was able to ensure that participants provided the appropriate information needed for theory development.

4. 7. 1. Fieldwork challenges and Reflexivity

In this section, I reflect on the PhD fieldwork through the lens of one woman academic conducting her research in a male-dominated country. There were challenges worth documenting for other research students to know.

Female researchers in highly patriarchal settings are more likely to have difficulties and dilemmas than men because they are more pressured to conform to local gender norms (Wolf, 1996: 8). As a Turkish citizen, I was already expecting the possible challenges based on perceived gender differences in Turkey.

The first issue I encountered was difficulty in accessing one of the women's entrepreneurship associations until one of the men managers referred me to their board member. As part of my interview with him, he suggested I contact them for the benefit of my research, and I briefly explained the challenges I faced. It did not surprise him, and he asked if he could introduce me
to them. After this, I was contacted and asked for possible interview dates that were convenient for me. Why do women need to be supported by men in every aspect of life? Accepting the support felt like conforming to gender norms in Turkey, which went against my personal beliefs. Nevertheless, I had to accept it for my research. However, this situation enabled me to better understand those women entrepreneurs who conform to perceived gender roles to get legitimacy in society. Further, it was evidence that access to institutions was difficult for women researchers as well as for women entrepreneurs.

Second, as explained in my thesis, especially in Chapter 3, women are regarded as primary caregivers in Turkey. Due to the COVID-19 period, women were not able to send their children to creches or schools, so children sometimes sat on their laps during our online meetings. At times, I wondered whether the husband was home and why he was not caring for the baby for an hour during the interview. It upset me. As a woman, I was also expected to interact with their children by asking questions about them. It was natural for me to like and speak to a child, but I realised that some of these expectations were gendered. The interactions I had with their children confirmed my gender identity and my career position in their eyes. Then, women asked about my children, expecting that I would be married and have a child by now. It seemed necessary to reassure them that despite not being married and having a child, I was fine. This gave some women confidence in terms of talking about challenges they face because of perceived gender differences and how they reacted to them by re-doing gender.

Third, when I asked about gender differences and women’s entrepreneurship in Turkey, some men owners/managers hesitated to talk about it. They usually claimed that there was positive discrimination against women by noting the increasing support for women’s entrepreneurship. One of them was offended and claimed that men were usually socialised for making money for the family, and he never understood what was so difficult for women. It disturbed me but I had to continue my interview. However, some men owners/managers were against the patriarchy and the oppression of women. They were aware of the challenges women face but they gave me great examples of successful environmental women entrepreneurs who had overcome those challenges. Then, I had the opportunity to include some of them as participants in my study.
Finally, email communication, which is useful in developed countries such as the UK, does not work effectively in Turkey. Many participants did not respond to my e-mails but when I tried to contact them through other platforms, such as LinkedIn, I found that owners/managers of SMEs responded quickly. Therefore, I had to start with an informal chat through social media platforms such as LinkedIn and then continue with an email to send them the documents they needed, such as the information sheet. This worked well. Moreover, it was environmentally friendly. Van Eperen and Marincola (2011) suggest that researchers should recognise the communicative power of social media and that successful communication can only be achieved by employing the channels in which the public is currently engaged.

4.8 Chapter Conclusion

In summary, this chapter has addressed the methodological aspects of the study. Drawing on the social constructionist philosophy, a qualitative research approach was supported by a multiple and embedded case study research design. Considering environmental entrepreneurship as an emerging concept, which makes access challenging for environmental entrepreneurs in Turkey (Vatansever and Arun, 2016), snowball sampling strategies were used at the beginning of participant recruitment. Drawing on the research aim, objectives, and research questions (1.3), a purposive sampling strategy was also adopted to recruit participants. For in-depth explorations, semi-structured interviews were conducted, using a 'probing technique' (Easterby-Smith et al., 2018).

The chapter also explains that the data and thematic analysis was coupled with an abductive reasoning approach (Dubois and Gadde, 2022), which allowed the researcher to achieve trustworthiness, rigour and validity in the findings and analysis (Easterby-Smith et al., 2018). The practical challenges faced, and strategies adopted to address ethical issues were also discussed. Finally, the reflections of the researcher were presented.

The next three chapters report on the findings, discussion, and conclusions of this study.

Chapter 5 presents the gender influences on women-owned SMEs and men-owned SMEs in Turkey and refers to entrepreneurs’ environmental engagement through two concepts: (a) doing gender and (b) re-doing gender. This classification of doing and re-doing gender informs the analysis and discussion in the remainder of this thesis.
Chapter 6 investigates the (gendered) institutional influences on environmental entrepreneurs in the Turkish emerging economy.

Chapter 7 proposes a new integrated framework (gender role socialisation, feminist ethics of care, gender identity, and institutional theory) based on the empirical findings by answering the research questions (1.3).
CHAPTER 5

GENDER INFLUENCES ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL ENGAGEMENT OF WOMEN AND MEN ENTREPRENEURS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter reports on the findings of the gender influences as drivers for women and men entrepreneurs of environmental engagement in Turkey by responding to the first research question (Section 1.3).

Analysing 15 women-owned SMEs from different sectors through the first and second-order codes, three iterative codes emerged, (1) compliance, (2) neglect (3) defiance, as gender motivation in environmental entrepreneurship. After aggregating these three themes as gender influence factors, doing and re-doing gender emerged as women’s gender-aware entrepreneurial responses based on gender role socialisation, feminist ethics of care and gender identity theories.

Doing gender refers to where women comply with socially constructed gender identities, such as defining themselves as feminine or as wives. Doing gender also refers to getting legitimation for women’s entrepreneurship through gender roles such as their perceived carer role in society (Chodorow, 1971; Giddens, 1984). This gender identity and role compliance resulted in practising feminist ethics of care in their SMEs consistent with the notion of Gillian (1982) about women and men practising ethics of care and justice depending on their gender identities and roles.

When women are in between compliance and defiance of perceived gender roles, they are aggregated under both doing and re-doing gender which represents ‘neglect’ as Diaz Garcia and Welter (2013) refer to it in their work on gender identities and practices. Even if Turkish women are neglecting the perceived gender differences in their discourse, especially in the business realm, they are still getting legitimation for their entrepreneurship by gender role compliance through their practices at home (e.g., caregiver role as mother and wife).

Re-doing gender refers to where Turkish women entrepreneurs show defiance against perceived gender differences (patriarchy) in their private and professional life. In other words, re-doing gender is their entrepreneurial behaviour, such as practise what is perceived as masculine but also practising a feminine-oriented value system by adding value to their femininity in the business realm. According to Lewis (2013), women are positioned nearer to
the ‘traditional feminine’ (i.e., women who choose to be ‘stay at home mothers’); therefore, they are often pressured to adopt masculine traits to gain legitimation in the business realm. Therefore, the importance of motherhood, home, and family constrains women’s femininity in the workplace.

However, Turkish women show that as environmental entrepreneurs, they have the agency and power to choose which entrepreneurial trait (feminine and/or masculine) to follow in their SMEs. Moreover, women’s definition of their femininity as being relational with nature and society, supporting others (especially the empowerment of women in business), and following collaborative approaches with stakeholders, in this study referred to as feminist ethics of care, add new meanings and value to ‘being feminine’ at the workplace (Held, 2013).

Doing and re-doing gender has led Turkish women entrepreneurs to practise both ethics of care (feminine) and justice (masculine) in their SMEs. Moreover, their re-doing gender allows them to challenge gender-based difficulties through their triple bottom line approach because with feminist ethics of care they have the power to serve society, the environment and the economy in their SMEs. This results in sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship that contributes to a sustainable society (Figure 5.3).

Analysing 10 men-owned SMEs from various sectors showed that gender identity/role compliance does not influence men entrepreneurs in terms of showing ethics of care but ethics of justice in their SMEs. Yet, their discourse illustrates that gender identity and role compliance influence their career choice as entrepreneurs, which is associated in Turkey with being masculine and making money for the family. This is where men entrepreneurs do gender in Turkey, by practising ethics of justice through a marketplace mentality (e.g., competitive advantage, legitimation). Thereby, they are usually motivated by formal institutions (e.g., SMEs greening policy) through financial incentives in the sectors they are operating in (usually male-dominated). It is in this way that most of the men environmental entrepreneurs are economically driven in this study.

However, Turkish men entrepreneurs also practise ethics of care, which is inevitable in environmental entrepreneurship because even if they follow energy efficiency to avoid penalties, they know that they are protecting nature by reducing their carbon footprint. Their environmental engagement is a process which teaches Turkish men entrepreneurs the value of being feminine since they acknowledge that practising feminist ethics of care is rewarding in
business. For example, with energy maximising to protect nature, they are increasing cost savings, which benefits their SMEs financially as well as the environment and society.

The gender influence factors are discovered for men environmental entrepreneurs in this study as (1) compliance, (2) ethics of justice, (3) gendered institutional motives, and (4) defiance of perceived gender differences where Turkish men entrepreneurs redo their gender through adding value to contemporary feminine characteristics (e.g., caring, being relational, supportive, collaborative), empowering women in their discourse and in the business realm and practising feminist ethics of care in their business activities.

Exploring the influences of gender on environmental entrepreneurship contributes to existing studies because according to recent studies, female entrepreneurs might be more engaged with environmental issues in their businesses compared to their male counterparts, especially where gender socialisation is high in society (Hechavarria et al., 2017). However, this study shows that women entrepreneurs do not only practise feminine ethics of care because of their gender role socialisation (as mothers or wives). Their reaction to perceived gender differences drives them to sustainability-oriented environmental entrepreneurship. Moreover, men entrepreneurs are also engaged with environmental issues in their businesses by practising what is perceived as feminine in Turkey.

Gender influence factors emerge as gender identity and gender roles (GIR) that give rise to practising female and male stereotypes from the perspectives of gender role socialisation theory (Chodorow, 1971; Giddens, 1984). Moreover, ethical perceptions in the decision-making processes of entrepreneurs refers to feminine ethics of care in their environmental practices (Gillian, 1982; Held, 2013). Therefore, drawing on post-structuralist feminist perspectives, gender is not perceived as a variable but a social construct achieved through a series of individual acts and daily interactions with others (Diaz Garcia and Welter 2013; Lewis 2013). This perspective shows that both women and men can practise what is perceived as masculine and feminine in their societies and businesses through doing and re-doing gender.

The remainder of this chapter is structured as follows:

Section 5.2 describes a summary of the theoretical argument that has been revealed after analysing the gender identity, gender roles and ethics of care/justice practised by women and men entrepreneurs who are the owners/managers of SMEs in Turkey.
Section 5.3 details the findings on gender influences in the women-owned SMEs, covering how complying with gender identity/roles, neglecting them, and rejecting them drive women entrepreneurs to decide to engage in environmental practices.

Section 5.4 details the findings on men-owned SMEs by covering gender-related factors.

Section 5.5 concludes the chapter by highlighting the key findings from the previous sections.

5.2 Understanding Gender Influence Factors as Drivers of Environmental Entrepreneurship

The SLR for understanding gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship has shown the embeddedness of gender role compliance (e.g., Chodorow, 1971; Hechavarria, 2016), the feminist ethics of care (e.g., Gillian, 1982; Held, 2014; Outsios and Kittler, 2018), gender identity (e.g., Diaz Garcia and Welter, 2013; Lewis, 2013) and institutional theory (North, 1990; Kolk, 2014). Each of these perspectives has contributed to the theory development process to identify the factors that serve as key gender influences in environmental entrepreneurship.

Gender role socialisation theory (Chodorow, 1971) has helped me to comprehend how gender roles are constructed in Turkey through interaction with the institutional environment (Giddens, 1984). Entrepreneurial legitimation is a multifaceted process requiring the enactment of a convincing identity plus, access to resources, as well as a credible actor who fits field expectations (Marlow and McAdam, 2015). Thereby, I explain the paradoxes of being a female and an entrepreneur which is perceived as a male dominant activity, as well as being a male entrepreneur and practising ethics of care through environmental engagement in an emerging economy since the caring role is attributed to females in Turkey.

Feminist ethics of care lenses (Gillian, 1982; Held, 2009; Held, 2014) contribute to the understanding of the challenges women entrepreneurs face when they acknowledge gendered barriers. Yet, Turkish women overcome these challenges thanks to the nature of environmental entrepreneurship, which enables them to practise feminine-oriented value systems and add value to their feminine identities. Therefore, as Lewis (2013) defines gender, through the daily interactions of individuals, Turkish women and men entrepreneurs re-construct their gender through a series of individual acts and daily interactions with others. This study shows that women and men entrepreneurs can have multiple fluid identities that are socially constructed in a process that is influenced by context and their own experiences.
One of the most interesting findings of this study is that while women entrepreneurs re-do gender by challenging gender differences, some men entrepreneurs also resist perceived gender differences by practising feminine-oriented value systems in their decision-making processes.

Figure 5.1 for women entrepreneurs and Figure 5.2 for men entrepreneurs present the data structure that underpins the findings presented in this chapter.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Evidence</th>
<th>First-Order Codes from Participants’ Account</th>
<th>Second-Order Themes and Aggregated Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As a wife/mother/ woman/female entrepreneur (e.g., PF1, PF3, PF4, EF1, EF2, EF3, EF5, EF8, E9F, E10F)</td>
<td>As a mother; as a female entrepreneur; being a wife; being the mum of; being feminine; I am a woman</td>
<td>Gender Perception (identity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Women are expected to be more sensitive, so women entrepreneurs show care for nature” E3F</td>
<td>Women change society; women are more sensitive to nature and society than men; women are expected to care for their children; women are relational; it is natural for women to be sustainable in business; women should stay</td>
<td>Gender Role Expectations (family &amp; business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“After I had a second child, my responsibilities at home as a mother increased, and then I decided to do this job” E10F</td>
<td>I take care of children; I need to look after them; I need to take care of others; I am the one who cares; I care for society; I care for the environment; We (women) protect</td>
<td>Gender Role Socialisation (ethics of care)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“They did not want to invest, there have been people trying to take away my customers who are trying to prevent women entrepreneurs.” E8F</td>
<td>Nobody (suppliers) cared about my business ideas; nobody helped me; I did not get any support; they (family and friends) made fun of me; they (investors) laughed at what I do because I am a woman; my husband</td>
<td>Acknowledging Lack of Support as a Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“If I had listened to them, I would not be talking about my success now” E4F</td>
<td>You need to fight against the traditional gender stereotypes; I won’t give up, I do not agree women should sit at home, I stopped listening to them about my</td>
<td>Stop Giving Attention to Gender Role Expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The expectation from women entrepreneurs is […] I was always fighting with our green economy-based investment with mainly trash” E1F</td>
<td>I can make money like a man, I chose a male-dominated sector, I learned to be aggressive from male competitors, I took so many risks</td>
<td>Practice ‘Masculinity’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘We’re the first and only green office in Turkey in the industry, it is because we have a female manager’PF4</td>
<td>What I do is different; I do business differently to men; our business is against the traditional business models that are male dominated; we collaborate; our work is relational; female entrepreneurs are more supportive</td>
<td>Adding Value to Being Different (feminist ethics of care)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I support other women” (e.g., PF1, PF3, PF4, EF1, EF2, EF3, EF5, EF8, E9F, E10F, E11F)</td>
<td>I am a member of the women’s entrepreneurship network, we support women, I only have women employees, I collaborated with women; we are a mother and a daughter team, we (women entrepreneurs) support each other</td>
<td>Women’s Empowerment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5. 1: Data Structure of Gender Influences on Women owners/managers**

- **Compliance**
  - Doing Gender
  - Neglect
    - Doing and Re-Doing Gender
  - Defiance
    - Challenge Gender Difference
    - Re-doing Gender
## Figure 5.2: Data structure of Gender Influences on Men Owners/Managers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Evidence</th>
<th>First-Order Codes from Participants’ Account</th>
<th>Second-Order Themes and Aggregated Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“As a man, I have to think about my family financially.” P3M</td>
<td>As a male entrepreneur, I am a man; being the father of the family; as a man</td>
<td>Gender Perception (identity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A man has to earn money at any cost” P4M</td>
<td>Men are given authority; men are expected to work in different sectors than women; men are thought to being aggressive; men do not want to give up power; men are known as powerful; men bring money</td>
<td>Gender Role Expectations (family &amp; business)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“When I need to prioritise between economic or environmental outcomes, I have to prioritise financial sustainability” P1M</td>
<td>I prioritise economic outcomes, regardless of financial sustainability, I do not believe in environmental impact; I always focus on cost savings; I need to take risks as a man</td>
<td>Gender Role Socialisation (ethics of justice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“People prefer environmental companies, so providing eco-touristic destinations makes us different in the medical tourism sector” E1M</td>
<td>Competitors go green; the sector is changing; being environmental is a new trend; customers prefer environmental companies; our product is new to the market; nobody has this service in the market</td>
<td>Competitive Advantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We must prove ISO-14001 Environmental Management System Certificate authorised by the Ministry of Environment. […] (P2M)</td>
<td>We must comply with the regulations, market, industry, sector; we need to follow legislations; our sector is required to get environmental certificate; our sector requires you to protect the environment; no other way in</td>
<td>Legitimation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“[…] Female entrepreneurs are better in sustainability-related issues because of their nature […]” E5M</td>
<td>Female entrepreneurs are more systematic and resilient than men; women are more ambitious and energetic; female entrepreneurs are more sensitive to nature; women are hardworking; women are innovative; women are more relational; women entrepreneurs help each other; women entrepreneurs are supportive</td>
<td>Adding Value to Feminine Characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We provide workforce support to women in disadvantaged committees within the organic food sector” E3M</td>
<td>We recruit half female half male; we give great importance to gender equality; I prefer to see more female entrepreneurs in the male associated sectors</td>
<td>Women’s Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I create the reverse perception for a male entrepreneur by being an environmental entrepreneur (E4M)</td>
<td>Society did not influence my values; create reverse perception; against the current business models; expected gender roles in society should be eliminated</td>
<td>Practicing Feminist Ethics of Care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Compliance (Doing Gender)
- Ethics of Justice
- Male socialisation to a "marketplace mentality"
After data familiarisation was completed with the transcripts, first-order codes helped the development of the second-order codes. For example, narratives with references to ‘being a mother, female, wife’ are the first-order codes that reflect how Turkish women entrepreneurs define themselves with their perceived gender identity. They also claim that there are expectations from women entrepreneurs, such as acting for climate change, because of their caregiver role in society. As a result of this, women practise expected gender roles in their SMEs by showing care for nature and society. This gender identity and role compliance enable them to gain legitimation as women entrepreneurs in society, which is evidenced in their choice of being environmental entrepreneurs rather than traditional entrepreneurs since traditional entrepreneurship is perceived as a male-dominated activity.

On the other hand, most Turkish women neglect the perceived gender differences in their discourse, especially when acknowledging that they face discrimination as female entrepreneurs. But women do not listen to others when it is best for the financial and environmental development of their SMEs. This is where they acknowledge the criticism and challenges female entrepreneurs face in Turkey. However, even if they acknowledge the challenges, Turkish women continue to pursue their gender roles in their family life.

Finally, almost all Turkish women entrepreneurs learn to show resistance to perceived gender differences based on patriarchy thanks to environmental entrepreneurship. These women entrepreneurs either add value to their femininity, practise what is perceived as masculine in entrepreneurship or support other women entrepreneurs, especially by hiring them in their environmental SMEs. Practising feminine ethics of care in business refers to being relational with nature and society, following collaborative approaches rather than individualistic approaches, and supporting others who need care (Gillian, 1982; Held, 2014; O’Neil and Gibbs, 2016; O’Neil and Ucbasaran, 2016), as discussed in Section 2.5.2.

The data structure for men entrepreneurs demonstrates that gender identity construction through their personal beliefs about their roles and responsibilities does not influence them in terms of employing environmental practices. However, their narratives support the women entrepreneurs’ narratives about a male-dominated society where men are socialised as breadwinners, allowing them to become entrepreneurs in Turkey. Their narratives demonstrate the impact of gender in environmental engagement when looking at the type of environmental entrepreneurship they choose to pursue, such as economically oriented or sustainability-oriented in this study. While most men entrepreneurs show compliance with gendered
stereotypes through economic values and goals for choosing to be environmental in SMEs, all Turkish men entrepreneurs practise feminist ethics of care (e.g., caring, being relational, supportive), which helps construct their environmental entrepreneurial identity through conceptualising environmental entrepreneurship as relational.

These findings are consistent with the notion of Lewis (2013) about how femininity can be perceived distinctively depending on individuals’ experiences. Men entrepreneurs negotiate tensions between their growth objectives and their environmental aspirations by practising a feminine-oriented value system in their decision-making processes for the survival of their SMEs. This shows the heterogeneity of what constitutes environmental entrepreneurs. In this study, three men entrepreneurs resisted expected social roles for themselves by prioritising environmental and social values over economic outcomes in their SMEs, which is contrary to the findings of Vatansever and Arun (2016), who claim that there were no environmental men entrepreneurs who were driven by sustainability goals values in Turkey.

5.3 Gender Influences on Women-owned Environmental SMEs

Many gender influence factors (compliance, neglect and defiance) drive Turkish women entrepreneurs to become sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurs or to choose to follow environmentally friendly practices in their SMEs. These are summarised in detail in Figure 5.3.
**Figure 5.3: Gender Influence Factors on Women-Owned Environmental SMEs**
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**Practices of women-owned SMEs**

1. **Organisational:**
   **Triple Bottom Line Approach:** The enterprise offers a sustainable product and/or service, which creates economic, ecological, and social added value

2. **Environmental Practises**
   - Waste management (e.g., water/food/composting/recycling/upcycling/waste to product/zero-waste)
   - Resource efficiency (e.g., use of natural raw-material, organic production, no chemicals)
   - Environmentally friendly delivery (e.g., no use of plastic bags)
   - Eco-designed appliances and technologies (e.g., selling or using eco-designed products)
   - Efficient techniques (e.g., solid structure use in architecture)
   - Energy efficiency
   - Environmental consultancy/mentoring

3. **Social Practises**
   Women’s employment, delivering functionality rather than ownership, adopting a stewardship role, encouraging sufficiency, collaborating with the public and private institutions

---

Feminist Ethics of Care
- ‘Relational’
- ‘Supportive’
- ‘Collaborative’
The gender influences on women in environmental entrepreneurship include compliance with gender identity and gender roles attributed to them by the family and society by defining themselves through being feminine, practising care through gender role socialisation within the family (as wives and mothers) and business realm (as the leaders of social and environmental change). This is based on the gender role socialisation theory (Chodorow, 1971) explained in Chapter 2.

On the other hand, while compliance with gender identity and gender roles drives women entrepreneurs to engage in environmental issues by practising care in their SMEs, neglecting perceived gender differences also motivates women to become environmental entrepreneurs in Turkey. Drawing on their discourse, neglecting means acknowledging the criticism and lack of support for being a female entrepreneur but no longer listening to what is perceived as being feminine (e.g., staying at home instead of being an entrepreneur). The notion of neglect in this study refers to the disregard of women entrepreneurs for patriarchy, where women try to find a balance between compliance and defiance which they achieve through disregard for societal expectations (e.g., Diaz Garcia, Welter, 2013; Tlaiss and Kauser, 2019).

At the end of this process, women show defiance of perceived gender differences through their decision-making which is seen in their business activities. This results in not only them practising feminine ethics of care in their businesses but also practising ethics of justice (e.g., competitive advantage, money, career, compliance with legislation). While this is consistent with claims that women are more focused on social provisioning by maintaining relationships and helping others than men because of perceived gender roles (Hechavarria et al., 2017), Turkish women entrepreneurs are sustainability-driven and have a strategy of doing and re-doing gender where they focus on society and environment as well as financial benefits through their rational decision for the benefit of their SMEs within the reality of the patriarchy.
5.3.1 Compliance (Doing Gender)

Turkish women entrepreneurs express their gender identity by emphasising being women, mothers, wives, and female entrepreneurs and explaining the caregiver role attributed to them in every aspect of life. Therefore, practising ethics of care in their businesses helps them gain legitimation as female entrepreneurs in a patriarchal society. This unveils how and why their gender identity and role compliance influence their choice of being environmental entrepreneurs where they practice traditional femininities.

For instance, PF1 has two children, and she started her business when she was 45 years old after her husband died. Previously, she had to take care of her children and husband at home because of her perceived caregiver role in the family. After her husband died and her children grew up, she claims her caregiver role at home ended. She is now the owner and manager of a small sustainable fashion enterprise where environmental women’s accessories such as bags and shoes are 100% hand-embroidered by women artisans. They use only organic and sustainable materials without chemicals to prevent mass production for the protection of nature. They also use environmentally friendly products such as cloth instead of plastic bags in their delivery service. Her narratives show how her gender identity construction results in her caring for nature in her business, which is referred to as gender role socialisation in the literature (Chodorow, 1971; Giddens, 1984).

“[...] I believed that I could do better for nature by being a female entrepreneur, we (women) are worried about our children's future; therefore, we (women) produce and consume sustainably because men can be careless about the environment compared to female entrepreneurs.” (PF1)

Being a woman, a female entrepreneur and a mother are perceived as her needing to do something good for nature. She thinks that it is her responsibility because male entrepreneurs are not expected to be engaged in environmental issues and somebody needs to care for the children’s future. Therefore, she challenges herself to do something different from what male entrepreneurs do in Turkey. But her narratives show that she is still showing compliance with perceived gender roles by seeking legitimation for her ethical decisions as a female entrepreneur.

Similarly, PF4 is a mother of two and a manager of a medium-sized industrial recycling management company, founded in 1998 by a male entrepreneur. They focus on recycling facilities, treatment facilities, waste management, and other environmental services for
industrial businesses. She constructs her identity through being a woman and mother and her concern for her children’s future, which supports the previous narrative of PF1 as being a mother and being worried for her children’s future as a gender driver for protecting nature in her business.

“[…]
I think women who have a child are more concerned about the environment because you do not want to raise a child in this world where the resources are fading away day by day.” (PF4)

In this sense, when she is asked if she knows other women who are engaged in environmental issues because she believes that women are more concerned with the environment in their business, she mentions that most of their customers are women managers. Then she gives an example of the zero-waste campaign which is governed by the wife of the Turkish president. This supports the influence of perceived gender roles on women entrepreneurs to choose to be environmental entrepreneurs and apply environmental practices. For instance, when she is asked if they have any environment-related certificates, she claims that ‘We’re the first and only green office in Turkey in this male-dominated industry. Then, she explains the reason for being the first green office in the industry: ‘It is because we have a female manager’ (She refers to herself here).

Similar emphasise on women entrepreneurs’ identity construction through being a woman, female, mother, and wife appears in the other women’s narratives when they are asked how social roles and expectations influence their choice of being environmental entrepreneurs. For instance, E3F is the co-founder of an established micro-business in environmental consultancy and digital green publishing with another female co-founder. Their goal is to act against climate change by guiding private sectors and non-governmental organisations. As a mother of two children, and having responsibilities of taking care of them and her husband at home, she asserted that:

“[…] climate change is an environmental crisis […] and even a feminist issue for me because women are at the top of the action on climate change crisis. […] I think this has a lot to do with femininity.” (EF3)

This narrative of EF3 displays similarities with the previous women entrepreneurs’ definition of themselves through their identity and how they are influenced by their gender identity construction, which motivates them to be environmental in their business because it is natural for to them perceive femininity as related to being a mother, being a woman, being a wife in
Turkey. Turkish women socially construct their identities as entrepreneurs through their unique narratives and social interactions within their society's normative concepts, expressing what it means to be a female, woman, wife, or mother, and how their identity prepares them for environmental entrepreneurship. Therefore, women entrepreneurs internalise gender norms as their own gender identity.

The construction of their gender identity as a woman, wife and mother results in practising the perceived gender roles (e.g., the carer role) in the family, society and even in their businesses. Therefore, gender becomes an environmental driver for these Turkish women entrepreneurs to run their businesses by engaging in environmental practices in their SMEs. This is consistent with the previous studies on gender and environmental entrepreneurship (Braun, 2010; Hechavarria et al., 2017) which show that women might be more engaged with environmental entrepreneurship because they are socialised to practice ethics of care rather than ethics of justice in their societies.

However, in the existent literature review, the portrayal of women as a carer and being relational is considered a disadvantage to commercial entrepreneurship in terms of balancing their work and responsibilities at home. For example, difficulties in relationships with spouses, relationships with children and their homemaker roles may prevent them from being entrepreneurs in either developed or developing countries (e.g., Maden, 2015; Yenilmez, 2018). Contrary to these studies, this thesis unpacks how those Turkish women entrepreneurs can turn these disadvantages of perceived gender roles into an opportunity through environmental entrepreneurship.

Gaining legitimation with environmental entrepreneurship enables them to fulfil both their personal and professional life responsibilities in Turkey, which supports the findings of Outsios and Farooqi (2017) regarding positive gender influences on environmental women entrepreneurs in the UK in the sense of balancing their work and social lives.

The following findings from some women entrepreneurs show how Turkish women turn the disadvantages of perceived gender differences into an advantage by doing gender.

“[...] I applied for many jobs but none of them got back to me as a woman in the gas and petroleum sector [...]. I thought it is not for me. [...] then the idea of producing organic food additives came to my mind and I did it.” (EF5)
“[...] I started my second undergraduate degree in Chemistry. [...] but, when I got involved in corporate life as a woman, I didn't feel like I belonged to corporate life very much. My environmental business idea was born at that time because I felt more comfortable with it.” (EF8)

EF5 and EF8 are in the organic food preservatives manufacturing and biotechnology sectors respectively. They had experienced the disadvantages of being a woman in these male-dominated sectors, and they thought that they did not belong in the engineering and technical sectors. Then, they give up their previous jobs and decided to start a venture, one where they felt more comfortable doing environmental business. While EF5 and EF8 chose male-dominated sectors (i.e., manufacturing and technology), which showed their defiance of perceived gender differences, they still wanted to get legitimation for their entrepreneurship by claiming that environmental entrepreneurship fitted them better and how they showed compliance to gender roles by acknowledging their environmental practices in their narratives.

Just like them, PF1, EF6, EF9 and EF10 had experienced the disadvantages of perceived gender roles in Turkey, which led them to decide to start their environmental businesses. So, these narratives demonstrate the evidence of compliance through gender identity and roles as a driver for environmental engagement to gain legitimation as women entrepreneurs in a male-dominated country.

“[...] I had to take care of children and the house, [...] I decided to start a business which would be sustainable by any means where I could arrange my working hours [...] and we got into this business. We produce organic foods, and we do retail sales on our e-commerce site with sustainable lifestyle products, such as eco-friendly steel straws [...].” (EF9, Sustainable Food and Kitchen Materials)

“[..] After I had a second child, my responsibilities at home as a mother increased and I wanted my children to live in a sustainable world in the future. Then, I decided to do consulting and training services in eco-labelling, sustainability reporting or carbon footprint measuring for industrial SMEs [...].” (EF10, Environmental Consulting and Training)

These narratives of women entrepreneurs (EF5, EF8, EF9, EF10) indicate how the difficulties of being women experienced through their previous work and life experiences pushed them to start their environmental businesses within gender role socialisation
based on what is perceived as masculine and feminine. This is consistent with the previous findings of sectoral segregation between women and men entrepreneurs as a result of gender role socialisation in Turkey (Maden, 2015; Yenilmez, 2018; Sefer, 2020).

Similarly, when EF3 is asked about her motivational factors behind her choice of the environmental sector in her business, she explains that she had decided to stay at home and care for the children while running her business. So, her perceived caregiver role as a mother drove her to choose to be an environmental entrepreneur, along with other motives, such as the desire to change the world.

“[…as being a mother and caring for the future of my child and others, my desire to change the world and my certificate in climate change leadership [...] the motivation is not only money but also a different motivation […].” (EF3)

She wants to take care of her children and she thinks she must do so as she believes that if she does not take the responsibility as a mother, and woman, who else will take it? So, she wants to create a business that will benefit the environment and her children as well as herself, where she can comply with her caregiver role at home. This shows the importance of focusing on welfare policies for women entrepreneurs in Turkey, as discussed in the context chapter (Chapter 3).

Having a digital consultancy firm helps her to not only take care of her family but also to run an environmental business with a zero-carbon footprint. These findings show how complying with the caregiver role for others pushes her to become an environmental entrepreneurship type. She does gender strategically through ethics of care in her business, as well as in her family.

According to this thesis’ findings, almost all Turkish women have a “motherhood and womanhood mentality”. Turkish women entrepreneurs care for nature and the environment because they perceive themselves embedded in their caregiver roles. These roles, such as caregiving, nurturing and being protective, are attributed to being feminine (Chodorow, 1971; Gilligan, 1982); therefore, usually women have these feminine characteristics while running their businesses (Hechavarria et al., 2017).

In addition, the narrative of EF3 shows that her training certificate in climate change
leadership has helped her to start her environmental business. This shows that she is eager to learn and get knowledge when there is an opportunity. Her knowledge of climate change has an important role in her ethical decision-making process (Gillian, 1982). Moreover, the narratives of Turkish women show that they have a desire to change the world and transform society into a more sustainable place. One of the reasons behind these motivations is the discovery of their expectations as female entrepreneurs in Turkey. Their expectations in family and business life compel them to transmit their carer role into practice through environmental commitments. For instance:

“[…I wanted to find something that would make a change in society for future generations and make the world a better place to live. Let me put it this way, it is something developed by heart, not something of thinking I will make money if I sell this or that […].” (refers to male-dominated entrepreneurship).” (EF3)

Similar narratives on the desire to change society and the world reoccur as a theme in other interviews (EF4, EP2, EF1, EF2, EF7, EF8) based on gender role socialisation. This uncovers that most Turkish women entrepreneurs have environmental values, such as the desire to change society with environmental commitment, which arises from the influence of their perceptions and expectations as female entrepreneurs. They feel that this is their duty because they perceive that they should be different from male entrepreneurs. They believe that they are different from male entrepreneurs in terms of caring for others, for society, and for the environment. Yet, they see it as an advantage. The narrative of EF8 makes it clearer how women see feminine characteristics as an advantage:

“[…] We might owe our success to our emotional intelligence. That is why as women, we worry about and care for nature, and society because we feel sorry for them. If there is something that harms our nature or society, we become emotional and do something about it as women.” (EF8)

This is one of the examples of how Turkish women entrepreneurs do but also redo gender. Because, while EF8 previously mentions that she felt that she did not belong to the male-dominated sector, now her narrative shows that she adds value to her femininity, which benefits herself, society, the environment, and her business. The evidence from her and other women entrepreneurs’ quotes, based on adding value to their femininity, is elaborated upon in the Defiance section.
This section highlights the process of environmental engagement of Turkish women entrepreneurs where they do not fight against patriarchy but gain agency by negotiating and conforming to perceived gender identity and roles by choosing to be environmental entrepreneurs. They think that establishing a conventional feminine venture (and caring for others, society, and the environment in their business) shows socially appropriate behaviour by focusing on and prioritising their role as mothers and wives, which has resulted in their engagement with environmental issues in Turkey.

These findings of the thesis, therefore, support previous studies (e.g., Diaz Garcia and Welter, 2013; Yenilmez, 2018) highlighting the influence of the societal perceptions and expectations of women entrepreneurs in terms of constructing their identities and, thereby, their actions. This is also consistent with Essers and Tedmanson's (2014) findings that Turkish women in the Netherlands develop their entrepreneurial identities and advance their careers by embracing societal gender roles and expectations and behaving in an appropriate feminine manner.

However, while these societal perceptions and expectations make women entrepreneurs lag behind the male entrepreneurs in traditional entrepreneurship (e.g., Anderson and Ojediran, 2022; Wu et al., 2019), Turkish women entrepreneurs in this study have turned these expectations into an advantage by practising feminist ethics of care within environmental entrepreneurship. Turkish women see themselves as wives and mothers and their role as being caregivers. Therefore, the findings of the thesis support the studies on gender and environmental entrepreneurship (Braun, 2010; Hechavarria, 2016), which claim that women entrepreneurs have more tendency to practise ethics of care than men entrepreneurs drawing on gender role socialisation (Chodorow, 1971).

However, this is not the only gender-related driver for Turkish women entrepreneurs to engage with environmental practices in their SMEs in a patriarchal society. As discussed in the literature review (Chapter 2), the portrayal of women as a carer and being relational as female motivation supports the male normative model (Ahl, 2006), and is destructive of any kind of women’s entrepreneurship, especially in emerging economies. Therefore, this study also uncovers how neglecting and defying perceived gender differences influence women entrepreneurs to engage in environmental practices in their SMEs through the notion of post-structuralist lenses (Lewis, 2013), which is embedded in feminist ethics of care theory (Gillian, 1982; Held, 2013) and gender identity theories (Lewis, 2013; Diaz Garcia and Welter, 2013).
5.3.2 Neglect (Doing and Re-Doing Gender)

Compared to the previous section (5.3.1), which highlights how women entrepreneurs comply with their ascribed gender identity and roles in society through incorporating ethics of care in their decision to become environmental entrepreneurs, this section investigates those women entrepreneurs who neglect perceived gender roles by acknowledging the criticism of female entrepreneurs and the lack of support for women, as well as neglect gender discrimination.

In this section, Turkish women claim that they do not conform to gender role stereotypes when they face gender-related challenges as female entrepreneurs. While these women are disregarding the social perceptions and expectations of women, they also neglect the traditional business models in Turkey, where women are forced to ‘merely practice masculinity’ in their business rather than ‘femininity’, with no choice. This is one of the most interesting findings in this thesis for me because I find that the main reason behind the neglect of traditional business models among women entrepreneurs is the perception of masculinity-related and growth-oriented activity in the Turkish emerging economy (Section 3.2).

First, when PF2, EF1, EF2, EF3, EF4, and EF6 were asked about the challenges they faced throughout their entrepreneurial journey, they asserted that women were being blocked in many areas in Turkey because men were still dominant in both society and the entrepreneurship ecosystem. This male dominant and patriarchal environment was also discussed in Chapter 3. These women entrepreneurs mention how they are criticised and mocked, and they are not able to get support from their families or the public and private institutions because of their socially perceived gender roles. However, they have neglected these gender-related challenges, something which helps them to pursue their sustainability-driven environmental enterprises.

For instance, the founder and the manager of an established micro-business, in the sustainable fashion sector where they produce re-usable materials from trash by aiming for zero waste to protect nature, EF1 explained how she had faced the challenges of being a female entrepreneur and she had acted against the male-dominated manufacturing industry:

“I can’t even remember how many times I said the ways of doing something in an environmentally friendly way [...] and then a male counterpart said no let me tell you how it is [...] the expectation from women entrepreneurs is to make money the same way men do. [...] I was always fighting with our green economy-based investment with trash. It was a new and innovative product for the economy.” (EF1)
From the narratives of EF1, I concluded that she neglected the disadvantages of being a female entrepreneur in the manufacturing industry because a male counterpart had not taken her seriously since she is not only focusing on financial outcomes. She challenged herself to run an environmental business, which is different from the classic business model in Turkey where earning money is the main purpose of entrepreneurship, specifically where male entrepreneurs are dominant in Turkey (Kalafatoglu and Mendoza, 2017; Kalemci and Araz, 2017). So, her business not only benefits the environment with zero waste management but also benefits the green economy since Turkey aims to transform from a linear economy to a circular economy (Chapter 3). In her narratives, she gives the impression of not paying attention to male dominance in the manufacturing industry.

Similarly, EF8 challenges herself against social perception and expectations by being in a male-dominated technology-related sector (she referred to this in the previous section). She has discovered that olive seeds have a similar chemical composition to plastic, so her company turns waste olive seeds into bioplastics. Her initiative won in the advanced materials category for waste beneficiation in the cleantech awards and she was named Turkey’s most promising woman entrepreneur in 2017. She explained she had achieved this recognition by neglecting expectations of her as a female entrepreneur in Turkey.

“[...] They (family, male counterparts and investors) laughed a lot when I explained my innovative idea. [...] But I started to ignore them. [...] Environmental protection and sustainability were the core of my business. They did not understand what I was trying to do because they were used to seeing entrepreneurs as those who are only pursuing economic goals (she refers to male entrepreneurs in Turkey).” (EF8)

EF8 explained the reason she did not get support from her family at the beginning was that she was expected to stay in corporate employment instead of becoming an entrepreneur as a woman. Also, it was difficult to explain the purpose of her business because people were used to seeing male entrepreneurs who were eager to earn money and start their businesses. But, she ignored these socialised gender roles and became a successful environmental entrepreneur with both international and national awards. Moreover, just like EF8 acknowledged not getting support from her family, EF3, EF2, EF4 and EF6 complained that they could not get financial support from public or private institutions because of being a female entrepreneur. Also, they
experienced gender role expectation-related challenges, but they also neglected these issues and challenged themselves to achieve their environmental goals.

For instance, EF4 explained the barriers to taking financial support as a women entrepreneur in Turkey:

“[…] when I say the project is in soil construction, then they usually mock me by saying ... we switched to concrete in today’s world. […] If I had gotten caught up in their thoughts or believed my family sayings like ‘Why are you dealing with these unnecessary things instead of just making money?’, I wouldn't be talking about it now and I would not be happy.” (EF4)

Although the compliance section displays an attitude of conformity that seek approval from society by conforming, the disregard EF4 experiences is an attitude of independent freedom achieved by distancing oneself from social perceptions and expectations. When she applies for funding from a public institution, they make fun of her. Moreover, her family does not believe her, and they want her to stay in corporate life and earn money instead of becoming an environmental entrepreneur. However, her narratives show that the reason why she is included in this study is that she stops paying attention to them. Eventually, this brings her happiness.

According to the narratives and my observations, women entrepreneurs are choosing their careers as environmental entrepreneurs, where they can practise ethics of care with environmental engagement, something which also helps them gain legitimacy for their entrepreneurship in a patriarchal society. In this way, they ‘strategically’ show that they are still caring for their families and society. After gaining legitimation for their entrepreneurship, they learn to neglect gendered social roles and expectations by distancing themselves from what is expected of them in the business realm as female entrepreneurs. This is where Turkish women entrepreneurs start re-doing gender.

Moreover, the experiences of women entrepreneurs regarding lack of support, specifically from their families, in this thesis are contrary to the many findings from emerging countries (e.g., Anderson and Ojediran, 2022; De Vita et al., 2014; Yenilmez, 2018) because most women entrepreneurs usually have strong family support or have cost-effective home help when they are traditional women entrepreneurs. I explain this using the notion of Lewis (2013) because these traditional women entrepreneurs are not allowed to choose to practise their femininity in the business realm, and they secure financial support from their husbands or fathers. This thesis shows that it is more challenging for women entrepreneurs to gain support
from their families and society when they neglect the traditional business models, which are usually associated with men and profit maximising.

On the other hand, the narratives of women in this study suggest the validity of some previous findings. Turkish women entrepreneurs are supposed to embody social roles as wives, mothers and housewives which when not met, causes a lack of support from families in Turkey (Maden, 2015).

There is only one-woman entrepreneur participant who has claimed that she never faced any difficulties because of being such an entrepreneur. She is one of the three women entrepreneurs who were able to get financial support from the public and private institutions in this study. She said that:

“[…] I have never had any difficulties […] there's a lot of stuff for women, but women don't know about it. […] we have more than 50 customers. No disrespect. Maybe even positive discrimination in financial support […].” (EF5)

Although she claims that there are no challenges for a woman entrepreneur in Turkey, she did explain she could not find a job in her previous sector because it was a male-dominated sector and it was then that she decided to become an environmental entrepreneur (5.3.1). Also, contrary to what she says, other women entrepreneurs are aware of the support mechanisms and most of them are attending mentorship and entrepreneurship-related training. However, there is limited support for women entrepreneurs, specifically regarding financial support. I will elaborate on the reasons for this difference between women entrepreneurs in Chapter 6. I conclude that she was able to get financial support because her business operates in a male-dominated sector (industrial manufacturing) and it has another male co-founder. Her sector is directly related to the energy and waste management industries, where the legislation and governmental supports are higher and more structured.

Women entrepreneurs’ contradictory answers in the compliance and neglecting sections support the notion of women doing and re-doing gender depending on their experiences in society during their entrepreneurial journey. This shows that gender dynamics are contradictory, complex, and fluid, and constructed through social interaction.
The following section debates how women entrepreneurs show defiance of perceived gender differences in Turkey by putting sustainability at the core of their business, along with feminist ethics of care.

### 5.3.3 Defiance (Re-doing Gender)

Previous sections have illustrated how Turkish women entrepreneurs are highly motivated to start environmental enterprises by their perceived gender identity and gender roles (5.3.1), but they neglect traditional business models associated with masculinity, which enables them to have sustainability at the core of their businesses rather than ‘prioritising economic goals’ in their environmental engagement (5.3.2). This section lays out the process of environmental engagement where neglect of perceived gender differences is transformed into sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship with feminist ethics of care.

The sustainability-related environmental entrepreneurship emerges as a result of women’s defiance of gender differences. However, they do not resist ‘being masculine’ but ‘patriarchy’. These women entrepreneurs show defiance of patriarchy in their environmental engagement in different ways. First, some Turkish women entrepreneurs expressed how they practised what is ‘perceived as masculine’ in entrepreneurship in such aspects as their financial outcomes, cost savings and competitive advantage by drawing on their femininity-oriented decision-making regarding environmental products or services. Second, some women add value to their femininity (e.g., being relational, caring, supportive and collaborative) since femininity enhances their financial outcomes, as well as serving society and the environment. Third, most Turkish women entrepreneurs show defiance of perceived gender differences by supporting other women (e.g., women in rural areas) in the country.

The narratives of women entrepreneurs show how they re-purpose their organisations with a triple bottom-line approach (sustainability). This approach enables them to develop their SMEs in terms of size and scale, as well as their environmental commitment, through collaborative approaches with the public and private sectors. For instance, when they talk about the environmental goals and practices of their SMEs, they usually define themselves as ‘environmentally sustainable entrepreneurs’ and/or talk about ‘sustainability’ which is at the core of their business.

In that vein, EF1, in the eco-tourism and sustainable fashion sectors, said that:
“We are reducing our carbon footprint through a zero-waste approach in production [...] I call myself an environmentally sustainable entrepreneur [...] we access our usable garbage through collaboration with private firms [...] Producing from their waste has no cost and is sustainable [...] We increased environmental awareness among our visitors through workshops on sustainable fashion.” (EF1)

As can be seen from the narrative of EF1, she has sustainability-driven values whereby she wants to protect nature, but she also wants to make a change in society and the economy. In the previous section, she said that she neglected the male dominance in the industry with her green economy-based products based on trash. Her narratives show that instead of focusing on merely making money, their organisation follows a hybrid business model of eco-tourism and sustainable fashion whereby they can benefit the environment, society, and economy.

Moreover, their collaboration with the private sector saves over six tonnes of waste from going into landfills annually because they use other companies’ waste as raw materials (trash) in their production, which reduces their production costs. This is also evident on their website and on many Turkish news websites. This is a good example of a business that would support Turkey’s zero waste aims and circular economy approaches. (Chapter 3).

Similarly, EF4, in the eco-design sector, explained how she integrates sustainable pieces into their business practices:

“ [...] recycling, upcycling, and including some of the waste in the design project. We consume less energy. [...] but we focus on projects that empower women’s roles in rural areas [...] These women build eco-touristic houses [...].” (EF4)

She aims to construct completely ecological buildings with a very low carbon footprint, where the soil breathes and consumes less energy. They collect rainwater, store it, and save as much water as possible by using it in the toilet bowls. Therefore, they maximise energy efficiency as well as create value from waste. Her upcycling approach of using rainwater is free from the ‘destruction of waste’, which is different from recycling. This is another example of how Turkish women entrepreneurs are contributing to the zero-waste aim of Turkey (Chapter 3). While they have an environmental commitment, they also support women in rural areas to allow them to earn money and construct green buildings, which is an example of women’s contribution to the green economy.
Like EF1 and EF4, the business of EF8 is in a completely different form from traditional business models. They produce bio-based plastics from organic food (e.g., olive seeds) instead of using petroleum, as in traditional plastic production. So, she asserts that:

“[...] we calculate our carbon footprint, water footprint in the production process [...] and share our social and environmental impacts with our customers. We are not just sale-oriented like other firms in the technology industry [referring to male dominance in the industry]. We are combining economic, social, and environmental goals at the core of our business.” (EF8)

EF8 previously mentioned that the technology sector was a male-dominated industry (5.3.2). However, even if her family did not want her to be an entrepreneur because it was not appropriate, she resisted and even chose to be in a male-dominated industry. She claims that her business is different from other firms that are usually growth-oriented and owned by men entrepreneurs. One example of their difference is how they share their environmental and social impact with their customers. Therefore, they adopt an environmental stewardship role in the industry by encouraging environmental production. This shows that they do not only prioritise economic outcomes but also the environmental and social outcomes of their actions.

While some scholars define environmental entrepreneurs as those who prioritise the environmental goals of their businesses (Schaltegger and Synnestvedt, 2002), Turkish women entrepreneurs combine three (environmental, social, economic) goals to move toward a sustainable society (Choi and Gray, 2008; Dixon and Clifford, 2007; Muñoz et al., 2018; Tiba et al., 2018; Walley and Taylor, 2002). Similar narratives based on sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship where women entrepreneurs focus on the environment, society, and the economy (triple bottom line) are evident in the narratives of PF1, EF2, EF3, EF4, EF5, EF6, EF7, EF8, EF11.

The narratives of these environmental Turkish women entrepreneurs illustrate what environmental entrepreneurship means to them and why they follow a triple bottom-line approach rather than balancing their environmental and economic outcomes. This is because they defy male dominant traditional business models in Turkey. Moreover, Turkish women entrepreneurs constantly emphasise how they are capable of practising what is perceived as masculine in entrepreneurship. For instance, as a woman co-founder of a biotechnology firm,
E8F claimed that:

“[…] showing a bossier attitude and being a hard person sometimes helps because then our stakeholders stop waiting for my male counterparts since they could deal with financial crises better at that point.” (EF8)

EF8 practises perceived masculine behaviour (e.g., being bossy, hard, aggressive) if it is needed for the benefit of her business. Similarly, the narratives of EF10 and EF11 show how they practise what is perceived as masculine behaviour in entrepreneurship, such as having economic outcomes and financial sustainability. EF10 is the co-founder of a micro-sized firm that offers sustainable environmental services, such as carbon footprint assessment, energy management, LCA (life cycle assessment), and risk management for large businesses, especially in the cement industry. Moreover, she is the first female carbon emissions trading auditor in Turkey. EF11 is the owner and manager of a renewable energy firm. They claim:

“Sustainable environmental entrepreneurship is not just an environmental and social issue, so we have an economic benefit as well. [...] we are advising our customers that non-financial data should be combined with financial data. [...]” (EF10, Sustainable Environmental Services)

“[…] Renewable energy is a completely male-dominated industry where engineers work. You must stand in front of them, resist and prove yourself as a woman [...] I sold wind tribunes that cost a million dollars [...] I am now accepted because I proved to them our financial sustainability as a female entrepreneur [...]” (EF11, Renewable Energy)

While E8F mentions that she is capable of practising both feminine and masculine behaviour depending on the situation she is in and after considering the best outcome for her business, E10F and E11F emphasise their financial management knowledge and financial sustainability. E10F claims that environmental entrepreneurship is usually perceived as not-for-profit, especially when female entrepreneurs run these SMEs. However, their business model proves the opposite. Similarly, E11F emphasises how she takes a risk by being in a challenging-male-dominated industry yet overcomes these challenges by achieving financial sustainability based on environmental innovation.

The SMEs led by women entrepreneurs usually offer a sustainable product, service, or a combination of the two, which creates economic, ecological, and social value-added SMEs. Yet, most of the narratives of women entrepreneurs in this study show that almost
all of them have women’s empowerment on the social side of their SMEs. There are two main reasons why Turkish women entrepreneurs support other women in their environmental businesses.

First, they believe that women are good at environmental-related fields by adding value to women’s femininity such as being relational, supportive, and caring.

Second, it is a reaction to perceived gender differences in entrepreneurship and traditional business models.

For instance, EF6 in the green restaurant sector collaborates with the municipalities for the collection of their waste from their restaurants and she explained their environmental commitment by adding value to her femininity:

“Men entrepreneurs focus on one thing in the business and succeed, but we (female entrepreneurs) succeed by thinking about different things in business such as our environment, society, in addition to making money. We care for nature, society because we feel sorry for them. If there is something that harms our nature or society, we become emotional as women.” (EF6)

E6F claims that being emotional, detailed, and caring help her achieve waste management. She adds value to her femininity because it helps her to integrate the triple bottom-line approach by being sensitive to her society and nature. Similarly, PF1 in the sustainable fashion sector adds value to being relational as a female entrepreneur and how it helps them to increase their sales.

“My biggest wish is to increase the number of local women artisans who work with us. I believe in genuine connections and long-term relationships which help me to increase sales […] We want to make sure that not just our materials and process, but also our relationships are sustainable.” (PF1)

By hiring women artisans in the rural areas of Turkey, she increases the number of sales to the international market. She aims to work with more women in the future to increase their firm’s sales but also give those women economic freedom. Therefore, while being relational with society (e.g., women) increase her sales, it also helps women and their business’ sustainability in the triple bottom-line (social, economic, environmental) outcomes. Similarly, EF4 in the eco-design sector supports other women entrepreneurs’ narratives by talking about collaborative approaches. She explains how these collaborative approaches make their business visible in the market.
“Female entrepreneurs are always collaborative […] I give training, lectures, seminars, and workshops on ecological design subjects collaborating with public and private sectors. I also collaborate with the women’s entrepreneurship association for environmental entrepreneurship module production. Creating environmental awareness among women entrepreneurs and being a part of the transformation made our business more visible.” (EF4)

Her narratives show how the collaborative approaches, being relational and supporting other women, have helped EF4, who is in the design and ecological architecture sector. The narratives of these women entrepreneurs show that Turkish women are very open to doing business with other women and supporting each other.

Women-focused support is also evident in PF1, PF2, PF3, PF4, EF1, EF2, EF3, EF7, EF11. While some women entrepreneurs merely choose to work with women (e.g., PF1, PF2, PF3, EF1, EF2, EF7, EF9, EF10), by believing women’s tendency to practise environmental protection, some of them add value to their femininity as when female managers decide to collaborate with other women (e.g., PF4, EF3, EF5, EF6, EF8, EF11).

The findings of this section refer to the notion of feminist ethics of care in the sense of Held (2014, p. 109), who claims that feminist ethics of care challenges “[…] the portrayal of economic man [sic], with its assumptions dominating market-driven society, and that we always and everywhere pursue our own interests”. Therefore, while the traditional entrepreneurship studies undervalue traits that are culturally or socially understood as feminine (e.g., interdependence, collaboration, emotions, community, support, caring), the narratives of women environmental entrepreneurs show how they practise what is perceived as feminine and still pursue their sustainability through the triple bottom-line approach that serves society, the environment, and the economy.

The triple bottom-line approach is not market-driven; thus, it is not associated with masculinity (e.g., profit maximising, independence, being aggressive, hard, growth-oriented, market-driven) but with feminist ethics of care in this study.

The next section represents the gender influences on men-owned SMEs.

5.4 Gender Influences on Men-owned Environmental SMEs

Many factors drive men entrepreneurs to become environmental entrepreneurs or choose to follow environmentally friendly practices in their established SMEs in Turkey. The gender influences explored are (1) compliance in terms of perceived gender identity and roles, and (2) ethics of justice, covering male socialisation to marketplace mentality. Finally, another gender
influence factor is found as (3) defiance of perceived gender differences as a driver for constructing their environmental entrepreneur identity in their SMEs. These influences are summarised in detail in Figure 5.4 with the activities of men-owned SMEs.
Gender Factors
Perceived Gender Identity, Gender Roles
Gender Role Expectations (family and business)
Ethics of Justice (e.g., gender role socialisation to marketplace mentality)
Acknowledging Institutional Support for Male-dominated Sectors
Adding Value to Feminine Characteristics
Empowerment of Women
Practising Feminist Ethics of Care

Practises of men-owned- SMEs

1. Organisational Double Line Approach: The enterprise offers an environmental product or service which creates economic, and ecological value-added (Duality of goals)

2. Environmental Practises
- Energy-Efficiency (e.g., Renewable energy, clean technologies, environmental pipelines, local and environmental distribution, low wattage lighting)
- Waste Management (e.g., recycling and reusing products or services)
- Environmentally Friendly Manufacturing (e.g., production of eco-designed goods)
- Innovative Environmental Technologies (e.g., application of environmental technologies in production)
- Environmental Market Services (e.g., creating a digital market for environmental entrepreneurs)
- Fair and Responsible Trade Market

Doing Gender
(Compliance)

Re-Doing Gender
(Defiance)

Feminist Ethics of Care
‘Relational’
‘Supportive’
‘Collaborative’
According to Figure 5.4, Turkish men entrepreneurs are influenced by their gender identity construction in terms of choosing to be entrepreneurs where they show compliance to stereotyped gender roles in terms of practising ethics of justice. Turkish men are socialised as breadwinners; therefore, they prioritise money and their careers, more prominently reflecting ethics of justice than ethics of care in their SMEs, which is consistent with certain previous findings (e.g., Braun, 2010; Hechavarria et al., 2017). Consequently, it has been found that Turkish men entrepreneurs are usually driven by economic values and seek a competitive advantage in their environmental engagement.

Turkish environmental men entrepreneurs also seek legitimation from institutions for not paying penalties for their negative environmental impacts on their industries. Most of the men entrepreneurs in this study have adopted environmental practices because it is required by the regulations, industry, market, customers, stakeholders, or international pressures. Men entrepreneurs are highly motivated by institutional support. Most men entrepreneurs acknowledge in their narratives that their sector is male dominated. Therefore, these acknowledgements about financial support which motivates them to apply environmental practices are aggregated as ‘gendered institutional’ motives. These findings corroborate findings that suggest that men entrepreneurs are socialised to practice ‘ethics of justice’ in their environmental businesses (e.g., Gunawan, 2021; Hechavarria, 2016; Hechavarria et al., 2017; Vatansever and Arun, 2016).

However, by being relational, supportive, and collaborative, men entrepreneurs learn to practice feminist ethics of care, which increases their economic and environmental sustainability. Moreover, three men entrepreneurs (EM3, EM4, and EM5) in this study have been influenced by their sustainability-driven values rather than economic values to start their environmental initiatives Turkish men environmental entrepreneurs show defiance of patriarchy by re-doing gender in three ways. First, they add value to the feminine characteristics of entrepreneurship. Second, they support other women in society through their businesses. Third, they talk about how they practise what is perceived as feminine by emphasising their care for the environment in their businesses. Moreover, they add value to this feminine-oriented value system in their SMEs.

Therefore, while previous studies claim that men entrepreneurs prioritise money and career in emerging economies (e.g., Maden, 2015; Yenilmez, 2018), this study shows that Turkish
men entrepreneurs are also engaged in environmental practices by practising ‘feminist ethics of care’ in their decision-making processes, which is transformed into environmental business activities.

5.4.1 Compliance (Doing Gender)

The interview transcripts of men entrepreneurs show how their perceived gender identity and roles influence their decisions regarding applying environmental practices to their established traditional businesses.

For instance, PM3, the owner and manager of a medium-sized enterprise in the manufacturing industry where they produce environmental-friendly cleaning products for cars, explained how he was driven by economic goals and decided to produce environmental products. His narratives show that there was pressure from his perceived role as a father in the family. His primary focus was financial stability, which seemed possible after applying alternative environmental services to their existing business.

“[…] Men take care of the family financially […] Environmental sustainability is compulsory to make money.” (PM3)

He is quite motivated to earn money through environmental practices, which shows his compliance with stereotyped gender roles in Turkey. He constructs his identity as a man entrepreneur who needs to take care of his family financially. Thereby, he is motivated by competitiveness, believing that their ecological responsiveness can lead to sustained competitive advantage in their sector by improving their long-term profitability.

Similarly, P1M, as the manager of an established medium-sized business in the energy sector, talks about perceived gender roles in Turkey and how they affect men’s ethical decisions in their SMEs.

“[…] Sometimes managers, especially men, tolerate even unethical issues in our sector for profit, but the scenario changed […] We follow three important goals which are social, environmental, and financial.” (PM1)

PM1 adopts environmental technologies for fuel distribution services, especially in their transportation. When he is asked how he decides to apply these environmental practices while there are a lot of negative environmental impacts in the energy sector, he responds by saying that especially men managers tolerate unethical issues in the energy sector. He signals that he
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perceives female entrepreneurs as more ethical in terms of protecting nature while male entrepreneurs are more profit-oriented. His narratives reflect the growth-oriented emerging economy structure of Turkey (Chapter 3). For instance, the ‘tolerating environmental degradation to enable financial sustainability’ argument shows his compliance with the expectations of a male entrepreneur in Turkey. He tries to gain legitimation as a male entrepreneur who practises ‘care’.

The narratives of PM2, the founder and manager of the family-owned medium-sized recycling firm, are coherent with the narratives of P1M and P3M in terms of complying with the ascribed gender roles to a man in Turkish society.

“[...] A man must earn money at any cost. [...]” (PM2)

His narratives illustrate that he perceives men’s identity as associated with being masculine, thereby with a desire to earn money based on his role in the family. The typical response appears in other men entrepreneurs’ narratives (EM1, EM5, PM4, EM2, EM3, EM4, EM6) as ‘society's expectation of men is to earn money’ when they are asked if they see any difference between women and men environmental entrepreneurs in Turkey.

For instance, the narratives of EM1 and EM5 in medical eco-tourism and environmental services show how they perceive gender differences:

“[...] Men are given responsibility, authority, and the chance to test themselves in the business world. Therefore, I was lucky as a male entrepreneur to start my eco-tourism idea based on my previous skills and experiences.” (EM1)

“The expectation from male entrepreneurs is not the same as the expectations from female entrepreneurs. I think in environment-related businesses, women entrepreneurs are luckier because they know how to care.” (EM5)

The narratives of EM1 and EM5 show how they perceive gender differences (being female and male) differently. EM1, the owner and manager of a micro-sized established eco-tourism company, perceives having authority and being responsible for earning money as an advantage for a man entrepreneur to start his business. He thinks that because of gender role socialisation, men entrepreneurs are luckier to start and grow their businesses in Turkey.

However, EM5 thinks that because of the perceived gender roles, men entrepreneurs are not as lucky as women if they wish to show themselves in environment-related business activities. He thinks that men always have the burden of making money for the family. But women are
not socialised for this, and they are not punished for not doing that. This shows that gender role socialisation can be an advantage or disadvantage in environmental entrepreneurship based on the entrepreneurs’ perception of their identity and roles.

This also shows that while practising ethics of justice is usually advantageous for traditional entrepreneurship, environmental entrepreneurship requires practising feminist ethics of care. Nevertheless, Turkish men entrepreneurs are usually socialised to practice ethics of justice in their decision-making processes, and it is challenging for them to turn their environmental aspirations into reality. Therefore, men entrepreneurs usually practise ethics of justice in their businesses. The discourse of Turkish men entrepreneurs shows how male socialisation that is internalised into a “marketplace mentality” influences them to gain legitimation through ethics of care for their environmental practices in their SMEs.

### 5.4.2 Ethics of Justice (Doing Gender)

While ethics of care is a feminine-oriented value system that focuses on being relational with parties involved, and on caring and supporting, ethics of justice is a masculine-oriented value system prioritising fairness, rights, and obligations in decision-making processes (Gillian, 1982). Ethics of justice is associated with autonomy, objectivity, and positivistic rationality (Gillian, 1982).

The narratives of Turkish men entrepreneurs are consistent with the findings in terms of their priority focused on their economic growth in their environmental businesses (Hechavarria et al., 2017). However, Turkish men’s environmental entrepreneurs do not exploit natural resources and cause environmental destruction as has usually been highlighted in previous the literature (e.g., Braun, 2010, Hechavarria et al., 2012).

The discourse of men entrepreneurs reveals that they apply environmental practices through the duality of goals based on economic and environmental outcomes. This shows how they construct their environmental entrepreneurship identity within the gender influences in Turkey. This enables us to understand how men entrepreneurs make sense of themselves and their environmental entrepreneurship based on their socially constructed gender.

“I prioritise economic values compared to environmental values at the core of my business.” (PM2)
PM2, working in the recycling sector, claims that men prioritise their economic goals and outcomes in Turkey, which can be explained through gender role socialisation theory (Chodorow, 1971), as discussed in Chapter 2. Similarly, the following quote from E3M shows men entrepreneurs prioritise economic outcomes. This is evident when he talks about financial sustainability, cost savings, and financial incentives for their environmental practices in their SMEs. The discourse of men entrepreneurs suggests that having ethics of justice drives them to adopt environmental practices regarding the potential economic outcomes:

“[…] there must be a logical structure […] we integrate environmental technologies for agricultural productivity and avoid food waste.” (EM3, Green Restaurant and Organic Agriculture)

Although men entrepreneurs have environmental concerns, economic priorities are always present in Turkish men entrepreneurs. The narrative of EM3 notes that while he has environmental responsibility for food waste, integrating environmental technologies is result-oriented for them in productivity. These findings support the findings of Vatansever and Arun (2016), who claim environmental entrepreneurs usually have financial motivation in Turkey in the agriculture and husbandry sector. However, contrary to Vatansever and Arun’s (2016) findings in terms of labelling all environmental entrepreneurs in this category, where they are influenced by informal institutions such as family, friends and networks, this study has discovered that there is a strong influence of formal institutions, such as market dynamics and environmental legislation, on some men-owned SMEs (PM1, PM2, PM3, EM2).

The institutional influences will be elaborated upon in Chapter 6. These men entrepreneurs who are influenced by formal institutions such as environmental legislation mention that the financial incentives or outcomes motivate them to integrate environmental practices into their established SMEs. For instance, P1M, who is in the energy sector, said:

“[…] international bank (EBRD) forced us to share our sustainability reports, so we measured our waste management, air and soil protection […] to get their financial support.” (PM1)

His narratives reveal that they needed to comply with the European Bank for Reconstruction
and Development’s (EBDR) environmental impositions by preparing environmental reports for wastewater management, air and soil protection, and energy efficiency to get financial support. EBRD has supported them with a financing package of up to €10 million, which is displayed on their company website. With this financial support, they have succeeded in upgrading up to 30 petrol stations across Turkey. This shows his environmental practices, including waste management and sharing sustainability reports, were based on his ethics of justice engendered by the economic rationale to grow his business. In addition to the economic development, the business advanced its environmental health and safety standards and enhanced its energy efficiency thanks to the support of the EBDR.

Similarly, EM4 in the digital publishing and environmental consultancy services told how financial support from international institutions had helped him to turn his aim of increasing environmental sustainability by reducing their carbon footprint into reality.

“The European Climate Foundation has been giving financial support [...] there are some national incentives, but they are not sufficient because set-up costs are quite high [...]” (EM4)

EM4 explained that financial support from the philanthropic initiative which is founded as a means of tackling climate change enables him to start his business and succeed in becoming Turkey's first carbon neutral magazine. This shows how he practises ethics of justice in his decision-making process based on starting an environmental business rather than a traditional business that only focuses on economic outcomes. Moreover, he explained that government incentives were limited, and set-up costs were too high to start a business in Turkey.

Therefore, the financial opportunities given by international institutions to start SMEs with the condition of being carbon-free influenced his decision to pursue his career as an environmental entrepreneur rather than a traditional entrepreneur. Gender socialisation encourages men to be rational and competitive in their sector by embracing environmental practices. Therefore, P1M and E4M have been able to get financial support from international institutions thanks to applying environmental practices in their SMEs.

Their discourse also shows how they perceive these sectors as male-dominated sectors. This is consistent with the many studies in the female entrepreneurship domain (Chapter 3). Therefore, based on previous findings and the narratives of Turkish men entrepreneurs in this
study, it can be concluded that these institutional supports (e.g., financial incentives) are gendered rather than being holistic support in distinctive sectors for the development of environmental entrepreneurship. This explains why gender socialisation encourages Turkish men entrepreneurs to practise ethics of justice rather than ethics of care, even in their environmental practices.

For instance, PM3 who is in the manufacturing sector, applied for credit from the bank to start his business. After starting his it, he took a financial risk by taking more loans to help his business grow. He said:

“Our business is established in an Organisational Industry Zone (OIZs) and there is ongoing financial support for SMEs established in industrial areas [...] our sector is quite male dominated [...].” PM3

His venture is established in the OIZs, and he is aware that there is ongoing financial support for manufacturing SMEs in industrial areas; therefore, he has been confident in terms of getting financial support in the future. The potential in the manufacturing industry for this financial support enabled him to take the risk to start his business.

Similarly, PM1, PM2, PM4, EM2, and EM6 are in the energy, recycling, industrial manufacturing, renewable energy, and smart technology industries and they typically say “our sector is male-dominated” in their narratives. This shows how Turkish men entrepreneurs perceive their wider industrial sector as socialised to men. Consequently, they usually practise ethics of justice, which is a masculine-oriented value system, even if they are environmental entrepreneurs. Their ethical decisions regarding environmental applications in their SMEs are influenced by gender role socialisation in decision-making.

For instance, EM3, who is in the agricultural entrepreneurship consultancy sector, accesses support through an initiative that supports the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda, with funding from the UNDP. They are in partnership with the Business Council for Sustainable Development Turkey (Imecce Impact, 2021). E3M applied for this established programme because he said that they were already using innovative technological solutions for their
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4 It is a program that accelerates the growth phase initiatives that produce social and ecological benefits and aims to make the social impact of these initiatives visible. The main goal of this programme is to direct the enterprises whose development is supported by investment processes with accurate valuations. This established impact-oriented program application has helped SMEs to have (1) a ready product, (2) an established solution-based innovation or technology, (3) SMEs to make their first sale or (4) help start-ups to gather customers and to develop a scalable income model. It also assists initiatives with investment and global goals.
customers, and he was confident that they were meeting the criteria.

“[…] we joined an impact-oriented entrepreneur programme […] we were meeting the criteria […] with the funding, we established our green kitchen.” (EM3)

The above quotation suggests that being motivated to engage in environmental entrepreneurship is not enough. It is also important to take initiatives or actions to realise it (Belz and Binder, 2017). Based on this programme, they were able to get cash funding, mentoring, access to local and global networks, and office opportunities. However, not all entrepreneurs can engage in environmental practices as they are unable to take action to secure the type of financial support that PM1, EM4, PM3 and EM3 have secured. EM3 has not mentioned in his narratives that their sector is male-dominated; however, his confidence in knowing that they are ‘already’ meeting the criteria comes from running a technology-oriented firm which is still perceived as being a male-dominated sector in Turkey (Chapter 3).

This supports the argument that institutions usually focus on environmental development in specific industries which are perceived to be male-dominated sectors, such as manufacturing, energy, and technology (Chapter 3). For instance, there are two environmental men entrepreneurs (EM1 and EM5) in women-dominated sectors, which are health tourism and environmental services, respectively. Both have problems getting access to finance as environmental entrepreneurs, while men entrepreneurs manage in the men-dominated sectors to gain financial support and develop their environmental practices in their SMEs. However, there is one male entrepreneur, who defines his sector as quite male dominated, who cannot access finance. This is EM2, the owner-manager of a renewable energy firm that provides energy solutions through wind, solar and biogas to their customers. I will elaborate on these financial challenges in Chapter 6.

It is worth mentioning that while Vatansever and Arun’s (2016) environmental entrepreneurship study in Turkey focuses on men entrepreneurs working in the agriculture and husbandry sector, this study includes men entrepreneurs from different sectors. It has been shown that Turkey has energy and environment-related policies specifically for SMEs in men-dominated sectors, such as manufacturing, technology, and energy-related sectors. Therefore, PM1, PM2, PM3, PM4 and EM2 are categorised as innovative opportunists who are mainly financially driven and have spotted the green niche or opportunity based on ethics of justice because of male socialisation (Chodorow, 1971; Giddens, 1984). Therefore, they practise ethics of justice in their decision-making processes to apply environmental practices in their SMEs.
These findings support the hypothesis of Hörisch et al. (2017) claiming that the environmental orientation of entrepreneurial ventures is weaker among male entrepreneurs because they take environmental actions when required financially. This also supports the argument that men prioritise economic growth, cost savings and financial sustainability based on ethics of justice (Gillian, 1982). This shows how men entrepreneurs are socialised to a marketplace mentality in Turkey, which supports the previous findings (Braun, 2010; Hechavarria et al., 2017). However, reaction to gender differences based on patriarchy plays its role in men entrepreneurs’ decisions to engage in more environmental practices by practising feminine ethics of care in their SMEs.

The narratives on the expected roles of men entrepreneurs suggest that there is high gender role socialisation in Turkey. Male entrepreneurs usually comply with their ascribed gender roles in terms of pursuing economic goals rather than focusing on the environment or balancing them, even if they are environmental entrepreneurs. However, when Turkish men entrepreneurs are asked how their social perceptions and expectations influence their environmental engagement, they claim that they are acting against these common perceptions and expectations. This is discussed in the next section. Thus, it can be said that environmental entrepreneurship enables men entrepreneurs to see the importance of feminine-oriented value systems in the decision-making process while running a sustainable environmental business.

5.4.3 Defiance (Re-Doing Gender)

In the previous sections, the notion that men entrepreneurs are driven to environmental business practices through ethics of justice in their decision-making process by prioritising possible economic outcomes has been explored. This is because of perceived gender roles and expectations from men entrepreneurs, as discussed in the compliance section. However, when men entrepreneurs are asked if there is a role for social perceptions and expectations on them becoming environmental entrepreneurs, some of them (EM1, EM2, EM3, EM4) emphasised that it was the opposite. For example, EM1, the owner and the manager of a micro-sized medical eco-tourism enterprise, asserted that:

“[…] expectation of men entrepreneurs is to only focus on economic outcomes.”

(EM1)

Then he went on to talk about how he was behaving against the social expectations of men entrepreneurs by focusing on the environmental outcomes of his business as well as the economic outcomes:
“[…] to create the reverse perception […] calculating carbon footprints […] choice of eco-touristic routes […] zero-paper consumption […] digital office […] subscription services […]” (EM1)

His narratives show that his firm has stewardship in terms of environmental protection because he cares for the environmental outcomes as the manager of his business. By integrating medical tourism and eco-tourism, he is following a hybrid business model, which creates environmental market opportunities in the tourism sector. Creating value from their environmental services such as calculating carbon footprints shows that he practices ethics of care by being relational with nature and society. Moreover, their subscription model increases environmental awareness among their clients. This shows that he is not individualistic but rather functional for others across his business. Therefore, he sees himself as reacting against the perceived gender differences between women and men entrepreneurs.

Similarly, EM2, the founder and manager of an established medium-sized company in the renewable energy sector, is asked if there is an influence of social perceptions and expectations in his decision to be an environmental entrepreneur, and he said that:

“[…] I studied finance with the guidance of my family […] but to do something that benefits nature, I entered into renewable energy industry […].” (EM2)

EM2 was directed by his family to study finance for complying with perceived gender roles in Turkey. He showed defiance of male socialisation by choosing an environment-related sector to demonstrate that he wanted to take a role in transforming the traditional energy sector in which the environmental impact is highly negative to nature. This shows how EM2 acted against the social perceptions and expectations of him as a male entrepreneur by his career choice of being an environmental entrepreneur. Also, his narrative unveils his defiance of perceived gender differences when he practices feminist ethics of care in his choice of environmental industry, rather than a mainly finance-oriented industry.

Some men entrepreneurs’ narratives show their resistance to perceived gender differences by adding value to a feminine-oriented value system that women entrepreneurs usually practise by being sensitive, a caregiver, detailed, nurturing, relational, supportive, and collaborative:

“[…] Female entrepreneurs are better in sustainability-related issues because of their care for others […].” EM5 (Social and Environmental Services)

“[…] Female entrepreneurs are ethically more responsible. We should learn from them”. PM1 (Energy)
“[…] I am not saying all women are sensitive to nature but if you give a hundred women and men a business to run, female entrepreneurs will do it more sensitively to the environment. Women are more open to being relational and working together.” EM4 (Digital Publishing and Environmental Consultancy)

The narratives of EM5, PM1 and EM4 show that they are aware of the importance of the feminine-oriented value system in the decision-making processes of owners/managers when they run environmental businesses. Having ethics of care is important for owners/managers to achieve sustainability in the sense of environment, society, and the economy in their SMEs (Fors and Lennerfors, 2019). Turkish men entrepreneurs add value to caring, being sensitive, ethically responsible, and relational in environmental entrepreneurship.

Their narratives help to expand the concept of environmental entrepreneurship and to make present alternatives which challenge the prevailing obsession with economic growth and increasing consumption in Turkey. As a result of adding value to the feminine ethics of care, some men entrepreneurs support other women in their SMEs and benefit from it, both financially and environmentally. This is evident in the narratives of men entrepreneurs:

“We make a lot of difference in the industry with the detailed perspective of our women employees […] our men employees learn from them in terms of environmental commitment […].” EM2 (Renewable Energy)

“We have the ‘empower’ principle in our sustainability strategy […] a human-oriented management approach to the empowerment of all stakeholders, primarily women […].” PM4 (Industrial Glassware Manufacturing)

“More than 40 million pints of beer have been served with our smart tap technologies […] working with a female business development manager has helped us grow our business […] her sustainable strategies, such as introducing an environmental brewery method to the beer industry, which is more efficient […].” EM6 (Food and Beverages Technology: Smart Solutions)

These narratives of men entrepreneurs show how they practise a feminine-oriented value system by showing care for nature, which has resulted in collaborative approaches with stakeholders, especially women. This increases environmental sustainability as much as the financial sustainability in their SMEs. EM2 and PM4 show stewardship in terms of
empowering women where the gender gap is large in relation to labour practices and employment in their sectors. Women workers in the renewable energy sector increase the environmental commitment among men employees.

P4M’s narratives show how his company sees women as their primary stakeholders in terms of achieving sustainability, and they follow a human-oriented management approach where they practice the ethics of care precisely. Releasing their sustainability reports, which include their environmental management systems, encourages sufficiency and productivity in their sector.

Moreover, EM6 claims that having a woman manager and practising a feminine-oriented value system in her decision-making processes has led to scaled-up solutions and increased their sales worldwide. Having a female business development manager has helped the two male co-founders to maximise the company’s materials and energy efficiency as well as being responsible for water consumption. Up to now, 492,873, … litres of water has been saved by their smart beer tap technology, which is available on their company website. The robotic technology integrated into their beer taps enables their customers (e.g., bars, restaurants, clubs) to control the flow rate of the beer, thereby increasing efficiency. This process is supported by the data gathered through the sensors and interpreted via artificial intelligence.

In the same way, EM3 benefits from collaborating with women farmers in rural areas in terms of access to local organic food for their green restaurant, which reduces their costs and carbon footprint. Moreover, they use their green kitchen as a food incubator centre for the local women farmers, which leads to energy savings and profit-making. Low-cost kitchen space has led to the development of shared commercial kitchens that can be rented for hourly or monthly rates by women who want to become organic food entrepreneurs in rural areas. The defiance of EM3 regarding perceived gender differences is transformed into fair and environmentally responsible activities in his business practices where he practices a feminine-oriented value system. He said that:

“The main idea of the incubation project was to provide the workforce for women in rural areas […] has now evolved to more organic food entrepreneurship and zero waste packaged food with green technology-oriented SMEs led by women […] food waste is a threat to nature and future generations […]” (EM3)
They support these women farmers in terms of organic food entrepreneurship and agro tourism, which shows the importance of symbiotic relations between industries in environmental entrepreneurship since it affects environmental, social, and economic outcomes positively. They work with women farmers in the whole process from idea to green implementation by providing support to initiatives in many areas, such as product development, design, and legal processes, for food entrepreneurs. They provide a kitchen area for organic food production, thereby accelerating the market access process for women with environmental equipment, and production permits for entrepreneurs.

They help these women by training them in food safety, water, agriculture and clean technologies, adaptation for climate change, the circular economy, access to finance, environmental logistics, social and environmental impacts, sustainable production and consumption, and energy efficiency. The prevention of industrial environmental problems, such as food waste, with a zero-waste approach and collaborative approaches which provide economic advantages. This shows the benefits of practising ethics of care in environmental entrepreneurship since it increases environmental commitment, and environmental innovation helps to transform society.

Similarly, the narratives of EM4 and EM5 are good examples of where environmental innovation helps to transform society into a more sustainable environment in terms of nature, economy, and society. The discourse of PM2, EM4 and EM5 reveals how men practise ethics of care by creating environmental values and goals to protect nature in their SMEs. Moreover, some men entrepreneurs (EM1, EM4 and EM5) have a desire to transform the existing ‘economic system’ which destroys nature. Held (2014, p. 109) notes that feminist care ethics challenges “[...] the portrayal of economic man [sic], with its assumptions dominating market-driven society, that we always and everywhere pursue our own interests”. The following discourses from men entrepreneurs are evidence of how they are motivated toward a sustainable society rather than to pursue their own interests, as is expected of them. Accordingly, they show defiance of expected masculine-oriented values in the economic system and redefine gender:

“As a man entrepreneur, I do not think that everything should be done just to get profit [...] I care for nature and future generations like many female entrepreneurs.” (PM2)

“As a man [...] I am an environmental entrepreneur; I am not only focused on the environment and cost savings but also social benefits.” (EM4)
“[…] climate crisis is the outcome of the current growth-oriented economic system dominated by men […] with our prosumer economy, businesses produce by minimising their externalisation to nature and human beings.” (EM5)

The narratives of PM2, EM3, EM4 and EM5 show that when Turkish men entrepreneurs practise ethics of care (e.g., caring, being relational, supportive), this helps construct their environmental entrepreneurial identity. While their discourse shows that they mainly practise the ethics of justice, such as prioritising money and economic outcomes to comply with social norms, they have the agency to reconstruct their identity when they practise feminist ethics of care. This helps them understand how masculinity and femininity can be practised by both women and men entrepreneurs in a patriarchal society where entrepreneurship is usually perceived as a masculine-related activity.

Individuals have interrelated, evolving, and multiple selves (Lewis, 2013), and their identities are historically, contextually, and discursively constructed at the intersections of various identity categories (Welter, 2011). As an example, PM2, EM4 and EM5 negotiate tensions between being men entrepreneurs, their market-oriented growth objectives, and their environmental goals for sustainable change by practising a feminine-oriented value system in their decision-making processes.

These findings complete the gaps in our theoretical knowledge understanding of the potential tensions and paradoxes associated with being male and using the ethic of care orientations toward blended value creation goals in business decisions. As the recent systematic literature review on gender and environmental entrepreneurship (Gunawan et al., 2021) suggests, when investigating differences in what drives female and male entrepreneurs to adopt environmental practices, the narratives of Turkish men entrepreneurs help us to understand how entrepreneurial identities influence motivation and behaviour to adopt environmental practices in SMEs.

For instance, the narratives of EM4 in the compliance and ethics of justice sections (5.4.1, 5.4.2) reveal that he is driven by financial incentives for being an environmental entrepreneur and being in an environment-focused sector. However, during the interview, his narratives show contradictory discourse since practising ethics of care has helped him understand the importance of environmental and social sustainability as well as economic sustainability. He negotiates tensions between being a man entrepreneur, his growth objectives, and environmental goals by practising a feminine-oriented value system in his decision-making
processes. He has been able to get financial support on the condition of starting a carbon neutral business. Although they are not financially supported now, he continues carbon neutralization through collaboration with Climate Volunteers Turkey\(^5\). He asserted that:

“Now we have good relationships with our stakeholders, and we even gain new customers thanks to collaborating with Climate Volunteers.” (EM4)

This supports the findings of O’Neil and Gibbs (2016) who have emphasised the fluidity and complexity of making sense of environmental entrepreneurship in the discourse of entrepreneurs in their study. Therefore, as Neil and Ucbasaran (2014) suggest, there is value in exploring how being a ‘stranger in a strange land’ during the legitimation process impacts entrepreneurs’ emergent and changing entrepreneurial identities. Understanding the tensions between being male entrepreneurs and practising the ethics of care through environmental entrepreneurship unveils how men entrepreneurs do and redo gender strategically for the benefit of their SMEs.

Taking the narratives of men entrepreneurs defining their understanding of environmental entrepreneurship, the three entrepreneurs (EM3, EM4, and EM5) are environmental entrepreneurs who embrace a transformative sustainability orientation. Such champions of sustainability set out to change the world, operate at the leading edge and have a vision of a sustainable future that envisages hard structural change (Walley and Taylor, 2002). This type of SME is based on the principle of sustainability. These three entrepreneurs (EM3, EM4, and EM5) are active in the transformation of society and act as the brokers of contact between two cultures: traditional and environmental businesses.

To sum up, the main gendered environmental drivers for men entrepreneurs are compliance with perceived identity and gender roles, practising ethics of justice to gain legitimation in society as men entrepreneurs and defiance of perceived gender differences between women and men entrepreneurs. While there is the influence of perceived gender identity and roles to become entrepreneurs for Turkish men in the sense of making money for the family based on gender role socialisation, their environmental engagement increases when they redo gender by showing defiance of perceived gender differences and practise ethics of care in their SMEs.

\(^5\) Climate Volunteers Turkey aims to attract small and medium sized enterprises and individuals to fight against climate change while continuing to work with government and large corporations. However, they do not provide any financial support for SMEs (Climate Volunteers Turkey, 2021).
5.5 Chapter Conclusion

This chapter shows how gender factors serve as key influences in environmental engagement in Turkey for both women and men owners/managers in SMEs by focusing on the first research question. The gender factors have been discovered as gendered driver influences, but they interact with other institutional influence factors to enable environmental engagement among entrepreneurs, which will be elaborated upon in Chapter 6. The gender influences for both women and men entrepreneurs are evident in their value creation, drivers, ethical decision-making processes, and business practices. These gender influences uncover how doing and re-doing gender strategically benefits their professional and social lives, as well as their SMEs, both financially and environmentally. In some cases, re-doing gender has benefitted the greater good, meaning creating positive social, environmental, and economic outcomes, which serve the triple bottom line through feminist ethics of care in their SMEs.

Several gender influences (compliance, neglect, and defiance) drive women entrepreneurs to become environmental entrepreneurs by starting a new business or choosing to follow environmentally friendly practices in their existing SMEs. Turkish women socially construct their identities, and their multiple identities prepare them to practise ethics of care in environmental entrepreneurship. Turkish women turn feminine and/or perceived female role compliance into an opportunity for fulfilling their personal and professional life responsibilities within environmental entrepreneurship by doing gender. This is evident in their narratives when they gain legitimation through their caregiver role in the business realm, as well as in their family life. Therefore, because of perceived gender identity and gender roles, and the expectations of the family and the entrepreneurship ecosystem, environmental entrepreneurship enables Turkish women to gain legitimation (socially embedded rules) for their entrepreneurship in a male-dominated society by practising feminist ethics of care.

Although gender identity and role compliance display an attitude of conformity that seeks approval from society and provides advantages in environmental entrepreneurship for Turkish women, as has been suggested by many scholars (e.g., Braun, 2010; Sumathi et al., 2014), neglecting the perceived gender differences prepares these women to resist and display an attitude of independent freedom by distancing themselves from social perceptions and expectations, as studied in patriarchy, gender identity and entrepreneurship research (e.g. Diaz and Garcia, 2013; Tlaiss and Seleema, 2019).
This neglect of perceived gender differences is evident in the women’s narratives when they acknowledge the lack of support for female entrepreneurship, that they are not being paid attention to, which helps them reconstruct their identities by adding value to being feminine in their environmental practices and which emphasises their economic outcomes in their SMEs achieved through practising feminine-oriented value systems. Turkish women redo gender by practising perceived masculinity, adding value to femininity in entrepreneurship and supporting others, especially women, in society.

The gender influences for men entrepreneurs have been found to be compliance, ethics of justice, and defiance. Men entrepreneurs show compliance with perceived gender identity and roles, and expectations of them in their family and the entrepreneurship ecosystem, which is evident in their narratives when they define themselves as male entrepreneurs, fathers, or economic providers of the family. Moreover, some men entrepreneurs are driven to environmental entrepreneurship based on financial incentives from public and private institutions.

However, these entrepreneurs are from men-dominated sectors, as they mention in their narratives. Since they perceive these sectors to be male dominated, it forces them to comply with male socialisation with a marketplace mentality. This is evident in their narratives through economic values, goals, or decisions to engage in environmental practices for their economic rationale, which is, therefore, aggregated under the ethics of justice. Since men entrepreneurs acknowledge the financial incentives that increase their environmental engagement in their SMEs, institutional influences require attention for understanding environmental engagement in women and men-owned SMEs.

Even if there are tensions between being male and showing care for nature since it is perceived as a women’s duty, environmental entrepreneurship enables men entrepreneurs to practise a feminine-oriented value system in their decision-making processes by caring, supporting and being relational with others. As a result, this benefits their SMEs both financially and environmentally. Therefore, they learn to resist perceived gender differences between women and men entrepreneurs and follow a double-line approach (environmental and economic).

When men entrepreneurs show defiance of perceived gender differences and expectations from themselves in their business activities, it improves their environmental commitment, cost savings, financial sustainability, and relations with stakeholders. Therefore, men entrepreneurs redo gender by adding value to female entrepreneurship, supporting women in environmental
innovation, and prioritising sustainability values over individualistic economic benefits. These findings are contrary to the findings of Vatansever and Arun (2016) as they claim that there are no environmental men entrepreneurs who are driven by sustainability values in Turkey.

However, the gender influences on men-owned SMEs’ activities are seen in their ethical decision-making processes, especially when they can access financial support, even if it is from international institutions. The narratives of men entrepreneurs show that they are predominantly driven by earning more money, creating a competitive advantage, and getting legitimation from their stakeholders. The contextual setting and being in manufacturing, technology or energy sectors pave the way for the emergence of these findings for men entrepreneurs. Yet, women entrepreneurs are usually driven by environmental/social values, but they still practise ethics of justice through their commercial goals and the growth of their businesses.

Therefore, the entrepreneurial practices used by men entrepreneurs are usually based on their economic values, goals, and decisions rather than a desire to change the world, protect the environment or care for others, as women entrepreneurs do based on gender role socialisation in Turkey. This finding is consistent with some previous findings (e.g., Braun, 2010; Hechavarria, 2016; Hechavarria et al., 2017; Zeley, 2000). Nevertheless, re-doing gender in environmental entrepreneurship enables both women and men entrepreneurs to practise the opposite of what is socialised to women and men through femininity and masculinity.

For instance, three men entrepreneurs (EM 3, EM 4, and EM 5) showed similarities with women entrepreneurs in terms of having a triple bottom-line strategy focusing on environmental, social and economic outcomes as a result of practising feminine ethics of care in their business practices. According to the studies of Walley and Taylor (2002) and Nikolaou et al. (2018) on environmental entrepreneurship, these types of entrepreneurs are known as visionary champions (sustainability-oriented and having a desire to change hard structures). Therefore, these three entrepreneurs (EM 3, EM 4, EM 5) fall into the visionary champions category.

Both women and men entrepreneurs in Turkey are driven by the influences of gender to start or run their environmental businesses. However, while men-led SMEs directly benefit the economy and environment, women-led SMEs directly benefit the economy, environment, and society; this is based on their sustainability-driven values and outcomes. In addition to that, financial incentives have been found to be gendered institutional motives for men
entrepreneurs, while women entrepreneurs find it challenging to access getting funds, which is evident when they acknowledge the lack of support for female entrepreneurship in the country.

Therefore, there are gender-related difficulties for women entrepreneurs and institutional voids based on women-dominated sectors for the development of environmental engagement in these sectors. Yet, limited funding opportunities are also seen in the narratives of men entrepreneurs in men-dominated sectors. Therefore, the following chapter seeks to examine gendered institutional influences to uncover how institutions can enable environmental entrepreneurship for both women and men-owned SMEs. This is also important for men entrepreneurs who are in women-dominated sectors such as environmental services, health, and tourism.
CHAPTER 6

INSTITUTIONAL INFLUENCES ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL ENGAGEMENT OF WOMEN AND MEN ENTREPRENEURS

6.1 Introduction

This chapter reports on the findings regarding the institutional influences on women and men entrepreneurs in terms of their entry and post-entry decisions, value creation goals, underlying environmental activity and the growth of their SMEs. It responds to the second research question of this study by explaining how institutions enable environmental entrepreneurship for both women and men entrepreneurs in an emerging economy. Research on entrepreneurship in emerging economies has increasingly taken into account the nature of both formal and informal institutional frameworks (e.g., Kimbu and Ngoasong, 2016; Yenilmmez, 2018; Wahga, 2017). This is because institutions are defined as the available modes of appropriate actions, which are commonly conceived of as the rules of the game by entrepreneurs (North, 1990).

In this study, formal institutions refer to the rules and regulations written down or formally accepted to guide the economic and legal framework based on the narratives of the research participants in this study. Informal institutions refer to societal norms and unwritten codes of conduct (North, 1990). While some regulatory institutions may affect women and men entrepreneurs in similar ways, others have gendered effects, such as (un)equal access to finance. In Chapter 5, the narratives of women and men entrepreneurs implied that there were some gender-related challenges specific to women entrepreneurs, such as access to finance, lack of financial incentives in women-dominated sectors, or social structures that prioritise the caregiver role of women in the family. These inequalities refer to institutional gaps in the literature (Kolk, 2014).

Analysing 15 women-owned SMEs from different industries through the first and second-order codes, four iterative institutional influences emerged: (1) legislation, (2) finance, (3) societal structure, and (4) non-governmental organisations. These formal and informal institutions are seen as factors that influence women entrepreneurs’ environmental goals, decisions, and behaviour, as well as the development, growth, and outcome of their SMEs.

The analysis of ten men-owned SMEs from various industries illustrates the formal institutional influences of (1) legislation and (2) finance. The informal institutional influences
emerge as (3) non-governmental institutions. These formal and informal institutions are seen to influence men entrepreneurs’ environmental objectives, decisions, and behaviours, as well as the development, growth, and outcome of their SMEs.

Formal institutions emerge as legislation and finance, which is the same for women and men environmental entrepreneurs; however, there is a difference in how these formal institutions influence ethical decision-making and environmental engagement in their SMEs. This difference usually depends on informal institutions such as the perceived gender roles of women in a patriarchal society. Therefore, some institutional influences are gendered even if some institutional influences are the same for women and men environmental entrepreneurs in Turkey.

Moreover, the findings of this chapter are supported by interviews conducted with representatives from public and private institutions, such as KOSGEB and the Istanbul Chamber of Industry, or BCSD Turkey, as well as the website documents such as company websites. The narratives of some stakeholders from the public and private institutions have unveiled the gendered discourse, which is also consistent with the unwritten rules that are specific to women in a patriarchal society. (Chapter 3).

The remainder of this chapter is structured as follows:

Section 6.2 manifests a summary of the theoretical argument that shows, from analysing institutional influence factors on environmental entrepreneur’s decision-making processes, the development of environmental practices and the growth of the SMEs led by women and men entrepreneurs in Turkey.

Section 6.3 details the findings regarding institutional influences on women-owned SMEs.

Section 6.4 details the institutional analyses of men-owned SMEs.

Finally, Section 6.5 concludes the chapter by highlighting the key findings from the previous sections.

6.2 Understanding Institutional Influence Factors as an Enabler for and/or a Barrier to Women and Men Environmental Entrepreneurs

Entrepreneurs and their activities are influenced by the opportunities and incentives provided by a country’s context, which is made up of both formal and informal institutions (Kolk, 2014; North, 1990; Webb et al., 2020). Henry et al. (2016:584) assert that a failure to recognise the “contextually embedded” nature of women’s diverse experiences with entrepreneurship may
reinforce a “traditional . . . dated and inaccurate” view of women’s perceived entrepreneurial incompetence.

The same argument, when applied to both women and men environmental entrepreneurs, unveils distinctive types of environmental entrepreneurs. This is important as Vatansever and Arun (2016) claim that there are no sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurs in Turkey. Yet, understanding distinctive institutional enablers and barriers through feminist lenses (e.g., gender role socialisation, feminist ethics of care and gender identity) helps to contextually embed women’s and men’s environmental entrepreneurship.

In that vein, this chapter integrates institutional theory (North, 1990; Kolk, 2014) according to the post-structural feminist notion (Lewis, 2013), which enables us to comprehend the institutional environment and, thereby, the institutional enablers and gaps that are specific to women and men entrepreneurs in this study. For instance, the presence of institutional gaps, such as deficiencies in environmental legislation, limited financial support, and an unsupportive society, constrain both women’s and men’s environmental engagement processes and the outcomes of their business practice. Nevertheless, the narratives of women entrepreneurs show that these components impact them more than men entrepreneurs in terms of the development of environmental practices, especially in the sense of technological developments or access to environmental certification.

One of the reasons for the differences between women-owned and men-owned SMEs is found in Turkey’s SME policies that favour high-tech, growth-oriented manufacturing sectors in terms of environmental development and green growth that are typically dominated by men. Furthermore, men entrepreneurs in women-dominated sectors have noted how there is limited environmental legislation and limited financial support for these sectors. Understanding the influences of gendered institutions on environmental entrepreneurs enables me to suggest how institutions can enable environmental engagement in SMEs led by women and men entrepreneurs. The influences of institutions on environmental entrepreneurs should be investigated because the discourse of women and men entrepreneurs based on doing and re-doing gender against the perceived gender differences reflects how entrepreneurs can change the rules of the game based on their social interactions in the institutional environment (Chapter 5).
Figure 6.1 presents the data structure of women-owned SMEs reflecting legislation, finance, non-governmental organisations, and social structure dimensions aggregated under formal and informal institutions (North, 1990), as does Figure 6.2 for men-owned SMEs.
**Figure 6.1: Data Structure of Institutional Influences on Women-owned SMEs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected Evidence</th>
<th>First-Order Codes from Participants' Account</th>
<th>Second-Order Themes and Aggregated Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is legislation-related environmental cleaning tax (E10F)</td>
<td>Environmental regulations on waste management and energy efficiency; environmental cleaning tax; ISO-14001 is compulsory; waste information system; waste collection of municipalities; zero-waste campaign; environmental certification</td>
<td>Legislation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No environmental legislation for our business and other small SMEs (E1M)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The environmental legislation information system is very complicated (E5F)</td>
<td>There is no environmental regulation in our sector (P2F, P3F, E3F, E4F, E10F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No governmental agency or institution informed us about environmental legislation (E9F)</td>
<td>Not enough information on how to comply with environmental legislation in each sector; information is not shared; information is confusing; information is not clear on environmental legislation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We give our oil waste to municipalities [...] but the restaurant next to me doesn't do anything related to their waste and nobody checks on them (E6F)</td>
<td>Disconnection and inconsistency in auditing; I don't know if there is auditing; institutions are not reliable in checking; legislation; chemicals allowed because no auditing; no legal sanctions; no proper check on SMEs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial incentives on environmental entrepreneurship are for men-dominated manufacturing or technology-related sectors [...] (E3F)</td>
<td>Financial sponsors needed; need an investor; searching for sponsors, can't find financial support; nobody invests; they do not want to be our sponsors anymore; banks did not give me credit loans; could not get loans; could not get funding; difficult to get funding; no financial support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After receiving the investment [...] established our laboratory [...] received financial support of TUBITAK and KOSGEB (E8F)</td>
<td>Get financial reward as 20,000 Euro; Ministry of Science and Technology supported us financially; we had capital support; international funding from American Bank; my personal savings; my husband supported me financially; my family gave me money to start</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s entrepreneurship association encouraged women entrepreneurs to do a carbon footprint measurement under the green works project (EF4)</td>
<td>Support from NGOs; NGOs deal with environmental issues; being a member of NGOs increases environmental awareness; we collaborate with NGOs; I was a volunteer in NGOs; I took part in many environmental and social impact projects before starting environmental business</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In accessing the market and network, being part of NGOs help, which is the most important need (PF2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had to stop working when I was married because of my responsibilities as a mother and wife [...] Now, I am over 40, but I still have responsibilities at home as a wife. This time it did not stop me to start my business. I produce all sustainable products at home.” (PF3)</td>
<td>No man next to me; women are blocked in many places; loan officer told me I have a child to take care of; I am struggling as a woman in this patriarchal society; the discourse of media favour men; men dominate in the entrepreneurship; no woman working in local authorities; home-based business because of duties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**
- **Formal (Regulative)**
- **Informal (Decentralised, Unwritten Rules)**
- **Non-Government Organisations**
- **Society Structure**
Selected Evidence

- We must get Environmental impact assessment permit (EIA) from Ministry of Environment and Urbanisation (PM1, PM2, PM3, PM4, E2M)
- I am not aware of any environmental legislation that applies to my business (E1M, E4M, E5M)
- […] I could not start my business […] because of the slow and confusing legislative process. (PM3)
- No regular inspection […] for long time now […] we do not know what to do with our waste […] we started to ignore it for now’ (PM3)
- There is not enough environmental engagement in our competitors because of not enough financial support programmes (PM4)
- We are funded by the financial incentives of EBRD on condition of applying environmental management systems based on energy efficiency in our logistic systems’ (PM1)
- There are industry associations for SMEs. For example, there is the Solar Energy Producers Association […] The Recycling of Electronic Waste Association helps companies recycle their electronic waste. (E5M)
- We follow European Union’s Green Deal procedures because we need foreign investors (E2M)
- We follow the global environmental innovations by networking with all international stakeholders.’ (E3M)

First-Order Codes from Participants’ Account

- Waste management and energy efficiency regulation in industrial sectors; environmental cleaning tax; ISO-14001 Certificate; Environmental Management Systems (EMS); Environmental Impact Assessment; documentation of hazardous waste; non-agricultural field permission for solar energy; EU Green Deal
- No environmental legislation applies to our sector; no environmental regulation in this sector; we are not required to follow any environmental rules; not enough environmental legislation; environmental legislation applies to specific sectors
- not enough information on how to comply with environmental legislation; legislative information is confusing; information is not clear on environmental legislation; confusing and unstructured procedures to follow
- Nobody came to check us; they do not check environmental issues; there is no inspection; there is not enough inspection; I do not believe that they inspect
- Financing is challenging; not enough financial support; loans from banks are not enough; need for financial incentives; banks would not give me support without enough capital
- Get financial reward of 20,000 Euro; Ministry of Science and Technology supported us financially; we had capital support; international funding from American Bank; my personal savings; my family gave me money to start
- Habitat Association; Solar Energy Producers Association; Recycling of Electronic Waste Association; Bugday Association; Local Development Agencies; Hoteliers Association and Travel Agencies Union; Municipalities; Chamber of Industry; American Department of Energy; EBRD
- International customers, international investors and/or international networking environment; sustainable development goals of United Nations; We are partners with many NGOs; we collaborate with NGOs; I worked in NGOs

Second-Order Themes and Aggregated Codes

- Legislation
- Non-Government Organisations
- Finance
- Informal (De-centralised)
- Formal (Regulative)
Environmental legislation and access to finance for SMEs led by women and men are the main formal institutional influences that affect entrepreneurs’ ethical decisions in terms of starting an environmental business or applying environmental practices in SMEs. In addition, there are also informal institutions that affect environmental engagement in women-owned and men-owned SMEs. As an example, while non-governmental institutions usually influence men owners/managers’ SMEs in terms of their growth with financial support, the influence of non-governmental institutions is different in women-owned SMEs.

Drawing on institutional theory, the narratives of both women entrepreneurs and men entrepreneurs shows that there are institutional gaps which are perceived as institutional barriers for both women and men entrepreneurs. For instance, legislation-related problems and access to finance are formal institutional challenges for both women and men environmental entrepreneurs in Turkey. However, negative institutional influences on women’s SMEs in terms of growth and environmental commitment have usually been addressed by all the women entrepreneurs in their pre-entry and post-entry stages, depending on their perceived gender roles. This refers to institutional gaps in terms of supporting women environmental entrepreneurs.

Moreover, the growth and market-oriented goals of Turkey as an emerging economy (3.2) affect the development of environmental entrepreneurship and women-owned SMEs negatively. This is because society perceives entrepreneurship as a male-dominated activity that increases economic growth rather than as a facilitator for sustainable life. The poor functioning of such informal institutions would be an institutional gap even if formal institutions functioned well (Kolk, 2014). The narratives of entrepreneurs indicate that institutions are there for both women and men entrepreneurs, but are ‘sometimes not effective’, especially when informal institutions are poorly functioning or sometimes not consistent with formal institutions (North, 1990).

For instance, there is environmental legislation in the manufacturing and technology-related sectors in terms of energy and waste management, as both women and men entrepreneurs have discussed (6.3.1-6.4.1); however, women-dominated sectors, such as consultancy, tourism, health, food, design, and fashion, are not part of these potential green sectors in terms of enforcing environmental legislation in Turkey. This forces the destructive influence of institutions on women-owned SMEs, such as legislative deficiencies or access to finance to
start or run their environmental SMEs, even if they have environmental values and goals. There are also challenges which are not regulative but appear as social norms, where only women entrepreneurs struggle in terms of their perceived caregiver role in society. The findings from this chapter provide insights into institutional environments, environmental entrepreneurship, and the interplay between them in the Turkish context.

6.3 Institutional Influences on Women-owned SMEs

Women entrepreneurs in Turkey encounter several institutional influences (legislation, finance, NGOs, and social structure) which make it easier or more difficult to establish or manage their SMEs as sustainable-driven environmental entrepreneurs. These institutional influences, being ‘institutional enablers’ or ‘institutional gaps’, are identified with their outcomes on women-owned SMEs in Figure 5.3.
Table 6.1: Institutional Influences on Women-owned SMEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Influences</th>
<th>Identification of Institutional Enablers and Gaps</th>
<th>The outcome of institutional Influences on Women-owned SMEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Formal (Regulative) Enablers** | - Environmental legislation and sectoral regulations  
- Financial support and incentives (national and international)  
- Vocational programmes for women entrepreneurs: mentoring, environmental training, access to the market, networking by Ministries |  
Environmental Practices + Cost savings + Access to market + Growth of SMEs |
| **Formal (Regulative) Gaps** | - Limited legislative information dissemination in women-dominated sectors  
- Green Growth SMEs Policy (Favouring industrial growth-oriented manufacturing firms)  
- ‘Gender neutral criteria’ in financial incentive programmes for energy efficiency in SMEs (e.g., export-oriented, technology-oriented, high amount of energy use conditions)  
- Deficiency in environmental auditing  
- Tax burden (e.g., lack of tax incentives for environmental SMEs)  
- ‘Lack of Welfare Policy for Women Entrepreneurs’ (e.g., childcare pay) |  
Feeling ‘out of the game’ rules  
Choosing feminine-perceived sectors (e.g., home-based manufacturing)  
Lack of trust in institutions  
Lack of environmental technologies  
Limited access to finance and market scale and size developments (-)  
Cost-savings (-) |
| Informal Enablers (NGOs) | - Education level  
- Informal education (e.g., climate change leader certificate)  
- Family and friend support  
- Being a member of NGOs (environmental and social)  
- Being a volunteer or previous employee in NGOs  
- Supportive discourse on women’s entrepreneurship in NGOs |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| Informal Gaps (Socially embedded) | - *Male domination in society* (patriarchal society structure)  
- Perception of entrepreneurship as a man-related activity  
- Prioritising the woman’s role as a mother and carer at home in media and entrepreneurial environment  
- Gender biases among investors, bank loan officers, and other representatives from public and private institutions |

| Environmental knowledge and engagement  
Access to finance (human or social capital)  
Starting environmental business  
Collaborating with NGOs (social and environmental impact) |
| Feeling ‘out of the game’ rules  
Choosing feminine-perceived sectors (home-based manufacturing)  
Limited access to finance and market  
Limited environmental engagement  
Scale and size developments (-)  
Cost-savings (-) |
The institutional influences on women-owned SMEs include legislation and finance implemented by formal (regulative) institutions and NGOs, and societal structures under informal institutions. The NGOs refer to previous professional experience in the third sector, therefore accepted as informal as in the study of Outsios and Farooqi (2017) on gender and sustainable entrepreneurship. Table 6.1 identifies the institutional enablers and gaps resulting from these institutional influences on women-owned SMEs. Institutional influences as enablers result in engagement with environmental practices, such as energy efficiency and waste management, creating value from waste, increasing cost savings, gaining access to green industry, or promoting the growth of SMEs. These formal institutional influences as enablers are supported by informal enablers, such as the level of women’s education (see Table 4.5: list of women owners/managers), their managerial capabilities in gaining informal knowledge on environmental protection, family, and the support of friends, when used their social capital. Also, previous experiences with NGOs help women entrepreneurs use their networks to start their SMEs, increase their environmental practices through collaboration, and improve environmental knowledge through environmental training modules in these NGOs.

On the other hand, institutional influences also occur as barriers to women-owned SMEs when formal institutions are not effective and/or they operate in tandem with informal institutions, such as socially embedded rules (e.g., patriarchy). For instance, environmental legislation and sectoral regulations regarding the environment enable women entrepreneurs to engage with environmental protection through energy efficiency and waste management. However, especially women-dominated sectors suffer from limited information dissemination and other deficiencies in environmental legislation. The green growth policy of Turkey as an emerging economy (Section 3.2 and 3.4) that favours industrial and growth-oriented SMEs leave women-owned SMEs out of the game. This is because there is gender role socialisation and, consequently, gender segregation between sectors, which is reflected in Section 5.3.1.

Consistent with the sectoral segregation, financial incentives provided to SMEs for their environmental engagement are usually designed for ‘established SMEs’ that are already in industrial manufacturing sectors and dominated by men entrepreneurs. This triggers women entrepreneurs in terms of feeling out of the game. As a result of this, three women participants started/now run home-based environmental manufacturing which affects their technological development, access to the green market or growth of their SMEs.
This was also the case for some women entrepreneurs because of the lack of welfare policies in childcare. As a result of gender role socialisation, whereby institutions perceive the appropriate behaviour of women to be childcare, these women continue their business from home. This depicts the potential interaction of gender influences and institutional influences and their effect on Turkish environmental entrepreneurs. Moreover, gender biases against women among investors, bank loan officers and representatives from public institutions show the specific barriers that occur as a result of these institutional gaps for women environmental entrepreneurs.

### 6.3.1 Legislation

The data reveals several legislation-related influences in the regulatory environment that affect environmental entrepreneurship for women-owned SMEs. The legislation-related influences that have been identified include environmental legislation, legal infrastructure, environmental certification based on legislation, access to legislative information, energy, and waste management-related auditing for SMEs. The narratives of some women entrepreneurs show that environmental engagement is used as a source for securing the legitimacy of their SMEs, which is consistent with many previous findings (e.g., Dixon and Clifford, 2007; Paulraj, 2019; O’Neil and Ucbasaran, 2016; Hörisch et al., 2017) where scholars suggest legitimacy is a driver to environmental behaviour.

In this sense, environmental legislation influences women’s ethical decisions in terms of applying environmental practices in their SMEs. However, throughout the narratives of women entrepreneurs, it is also discovered that legislation influences women entrepreneurs’ decision processes, environmental goals, and the growth of their businesses as a barrier. This refers to institutional gaps in the regulative environment (Kolk, 2014) in terms of the development of environmental engagement in women-owned SMEs in Turkey.

For instance, EF3, who is the owner of the environmental consultancy and digital services firm, was asked if she was aware of any public institution that dealt with environmental issues of SMEs in Turkey, and she claimed that:

“[…] NGOs working on this, but there is a big disconnection and inconsistency on the governmental side […].” (EF3)

As an environmental consultant for SMEs, EF3 was referring to legislative problems in the regulative environment in Turkey. Subsequently, other women entrepreneurs were asked about environmental legislation/regulations they needed to comply with in their businesses. They all
stated that “there is the legislation-related environmental cleaning tax\textsuperscript{6}, which applies to all business types. According to environmental legislation, all businesses must pay an environmental cleaning tax and the amount of the tax is based on the amount of water used in the business facility (Chapter 3).

However, when the women were asked if this legislation affected their environmental practices, none of them said that they reduced their use of water because of not paying the environmental cleaning tax. On the other hand, some of them (PF4, EF3, EF5, EF6) claimed that imposing taxation on waste management and energy efficiency activities would be more effective in terms of encouraging environmental engagement in their SMEs. For instance, E6F in the organic food and restaurant sector with nine franchises in different cities claimed:

“Reward or tax-free support by the government would be more encouraging.” (EF6)

The environmental cleaning tax seems ineffective in terms of encouraging women entrepreneurs to take environmental actions. This is consistent with the recent study by Sarigul and Topcu (2021) claiming that the environmental cleaning tax has not been successful in reducing environmental pollution, and the amount of waste and eliminating the collected waste in Turkey. However, women’s acknowledgement of the environmental cleaning tax shows that there is legislation on the environment that includes SMEs.

Similarly, some women entrepreneurs (PF4, EF3, EF5, EF6, EF7, EF8, EF9, EF10, and EF11) mentioned that there are environmental regulations on waste management and energy efficiency applied to SMEs such as proving ISO-14001 certification\textsuperscript{7} to The Ministry of the Environment, Urbanisation and Climate Change of Turkey in specific sectors. For instance, PF4, the owner and manager of a medium-sized family-owned company in industrial services, such as waste reception facilities, wastewater treatment plants and recovery systems services said:

“ISO-14001 is compulsory in industrial sectors, otherwise you are subjected to a penalty [...] it helps to minimise our operations that negatively affect the environment and increase efficiency with cost savings.” (PF4)

\textsuperscript{6} The only environmental tax in Turkey is the environmental cleaning tax (\textit{Article 44, Law on Municipal Revenues}). The users of buildings are liable to pay this tax. The amount of the tax is based on the amount of water used. The applicable tax rates for 2021 are TRY0.50-/m\textsuperscript{3} in metropolitan cities and TRY0.38-/m\textsuperscript{3} in other cities.

\textsuperscript{7} The primary objective of the ISO 14000 series of standards is to promote effective environmental management systems in organizations. The standards seek to provide cost-effective tools that make use of best practices for organizing and applying information about environmental management.
The above account by PF4 about minimising the impact of business operations on the environment is an example of how legislation can have a positive influence on women-owned businesses by reducing waste and being cost-effective through efficiency. Reducing waste and being efficient as a result of compliance with environmental rules and regulations are discussed by many scholars (e.g., Banarjee, 2001; Bansal and Roth, 2002; Choi and Gray, 2008).

Similarly, EF5, co-founder of a manufacturing organic food additives firm, noted that although they were not required to have an ISO-14000 certificate, they had to follow environmental legislation in the form of waste management regulations of the Ministry of Environment, Urbanisation and Climate Change. She talked about a waste information system⁸, which refers to how companies that produce a tonne or more of plastic waste per year deal with their plastic waste according to environmental legislation. So, EF5 claimed:

“All the waste you enter into the waste information system is not recognised as a waste and is used as a raw material by another firm based on Turkey’s zero waste aim […] but this is also a problem because the state says throw your waste away if you have less than a tonne of waste.” (EF5)

As it can be understood from the narrative of EF5, there are clear and strict environmental regulations for industry-related firms with a certain amount of waste and energy use, which forces them to recycle their waste through the waste information system of the Ministry of Environment and Urbanisation. In the case of PF4 and EF5, this consists of suggesting that SMEs might succeed in minimising the negative impact on the environment because of environmental legislation in their sectors. This helps them gain legitimacy for their SMEs through environmental practices. Therefore, it is possible to suggest that formal institutions are present, and the government tries to encourage SMEs in terms of environmental management.

On the other hand, EF1 is the owner and manager of an established small business and produces local and traditional products from the trash of private companies (e.g., Unilever Turkey). Her small-sized business provides workshops about creating sustainable handicrafts from waste for visitors who come to their shop, which is in an eco-touristic destination. Although what she is doing is the same as women in the technology and industrial

---

⁸ The Turkish Ministry of Environment and Urbanization has an environmental information system. Companies registered in the system enter their waste online into it. For example, if they have a ton or more of plastic waste per year, they make a deal with other companies for this plastic waste. They either make an agreement with the municipality or with the subcontractors of this work.
manufacturing sectors (e.g., PF4, EF5, EF8, EF11) in terms of efficiency and waste management, she claimed:

“At the end of the day, we are a small business [...] we are not an international firm but local one, so there is no environmental legislation for our business.” (EF1)

E1F thinks that the environmental legislation does not include small businesses that are local because she claims that while international companies can provide employment for more people and help economic growth, those small businesses cannot. However, as also discussed in Chapter 5, like many other women in this study, she reduces poverty by creating job opportunities for women in rural areas. Similar narratives about ‘lack of environmental regulations’ was discussed by other women entrepreneurs, typically as “there is no specific environmental regulation” when referring to their sector (PF2, PF3, EF3, EF4, EF10).

These women participants are the owners/managers of micro and small businesses in the sustainable fashion, eco-tourism, environmental consultancy, food, and design-related sectors, which are defined as women-dominated sectors in Turkey (e.g., Maden, 2015; Sefer, 2020). All of them claimed that environmental regulations were only enforced on specific industries or larger firms that use a specific amount of energy and produce a specific amount of waste. This may be because prioritising specific sectors in energy efficiency and waste management is a part of the National Waste Management Action Plan (2016-2023).

However, if Turkey has a zero-waste approach as stated in Chapter 3, environmental legislation should be inclusive of all sectors to avoid any kind of waste, and to avoid confusing the entrepreneurs. Otherwise, as EF3 claims at the beginning of this section, such legislation will look problematic, inconsistent, and disconnected. As a result of SME greening policies in environmental legislation that favours high-tech, growth-oriented manufacturing sectors, Turkish women managers of micro-businesses and/or who are working in less technology-oriented sectors do not consider themselves required to follow these environmental regulations. They feel out of the game and do not see themselves as responsible for environmental legislation. This can discourage these women owners/managers to develop their businesses’ environmental sustainability in the future.

Even if some women entrepreneurs acknowledge the environmental legislation that applies in their sector, they claim that there is not enough inspection from the government on the energy
efficiency or waste management practices of SMEs. Some of the narratives of these women entrepreneurs are given below:

“We give our oil waste to municipalities [...] but the restaurant next to me doesn’t do anything related to their waste [...] we are losing our competitive advantage.” (EF6)

“The food manufacturers are too afraid to try our environmental food additives. They (manufacturers) do not want to work with us because they believe that their technology already complies with the legislation.” (EF5)

E6F decided to comply with waste management regulations because of their oil waste since it had to be stored and collected separately under the environmental legislation (Chapter 3). To separate their olive oil waste, they used an environmental technology, placing an oil separator under the restaurant taps, which adds value to nature. The tap is a device that removes the oil from the water. By complying with waste management regulations, they increased their environmental commitment in terms of efficiency and waste management since the separated oil was given to the municipality and recycled in specific facilities. However, this technology is expensive, and they needed to reflect their costs in their sales prices. This meant their competitors’ prices became more appealing to customers. This shows the importance of auditing and the penalty that can be imposed by the equal entrepreneurship ecosystem.

Another example, where execution and auditing of legislation are not as effective is found in the account of E5F, who owns a business in the industrial manufacturing sector that produces food additives from natural sources of calcium instead of chemical preservatives. They sell these organic food additives, which can extend the shelf life of food products, to food manufacturers. Dealing with chemical opponents and customers is challenging and hampers their growth and this forces them to weigh their marketing activities.

In other words, it is difficult to break the usual idea that manufacturers are used to, which is caused by deficiencies in the execution and auditing of environmental legislation. As a result, it becomes challenging for women entrepreneurs to pursue their environmental commitments and future growth objectives.

---

9 According to Regulation on Management of Waste Oils (dated 21 December 2019), oil waste must be stored and collected separately under the environmental legislation since storage or collection of different types of waste together is prohibited under regulations on waste management. Civil and criminal penalties are imposed for violations of the relevant environmental laws.
In addition to this, the reason for their opponents or manufacturers not following the environmental legislation could be the lack of information on environmental legislation among owners/managers (Thaddeus, 2013). This could also explain why some women entrepreneurs are influenced by environmental legislation as an enabler and others are influenced negatively. However, it is not the case in this study because most of these women entrepreneurs are well-educated and trained in environmental management. Most of them claim environmental information about legislation is complicated and confusing or that access to information is challenging regarding environmental legislation. This is evident in the following narratives:

“I could not find enough information on environmental legislation.” (EF3, Environmental Consultancy and Digital Services)

“The information system is very complicated.” (EF5, Organic Food Additives Manufacturing)

“The Ministry has not enough information about how to comply with environmental legislation in each sector, it is so confusing.” (EF8, Biotechnology)

Similar to the above narratives, E9F, who is in the organic food and sustainable kitchen materials sector, talked about insufficient information about environmental protection and legislation issued by the government. Moreover, she explained how she felt and had lost her trust in public institutions since the data was not shared with them in terms of what was being achieved by the municipality waste collection systems:

“We have separated our glass, plastic waste [...] People from the municipalities have to come and pick your waste up when you call. They say that such a system exists, but there is no such system. [...] I even saw that the person who came to collect our waste threw our separate batons into the same place as normal waste. This, of course, breaks all our enthusiasm and trust about environmental commitment.” (EF9)

Interviews with some stakeholders from governmental and non-governmental organisations support the findings based on women entrepreneurs’ narratives regarding the lack of execution and auditing and the poor dissemination of information on environmental legislation. For instance, the founder of the Turkish Women’s Network in Renewable Energy (TWRE) asserted that:

“Environmental laws are mature enough. [...] There are problems with the application since the ministries and their bureaucratic branches do not work in harmony [...] some
regulations are not very clear for entrepreneurs those are not in the environment and energy industries.” (Founder of TWRE, NGO)

Similarly, a sustainability manager from the Business Council for Sustainable Development Turkey (BCSD) claimed that environmental rules and laws were only very clear for manufacturing firms:

“Environmental rules are very clear for industrial manufacturing companies. Control may be dubious in Turkey [...] sanctions will be applied very soon.” (Sustainability Manager, NGO)

Based on the narratives of the two representatives claiming the sanction powers are limited and regulations are confusing for entrepreneurs, the environmental management coordinator from the Union of Marmara Municipalities was interviewed about the environmental legislation. His narratives on environmental legislation for SMEs were consistent with the previous narratives on the deficiencies in the execution and auditing of the legislation.

“[...] The Ministry of Environment, Urbanisation and Climate Change has largely delegated sanction powers to provincial directorates and municipalities in Turkey. [...] Unfortunately, the system does not work properly. [...]” (Environmental Management Coordinator, Public)

The narratives of the representatives from institutions and the narratives of women entrepreneurs indicate that the reason for ineffective enforcement is the lack of inspection and the lack of harmony among governmental institutions. In this sense, even if some women entrepreneurs seek legitimation for their SMEs with environmental practices, the findings also show that legislation-related problems serve as a barrier to environmental improvement in their case. Therefore, these findings are consistent with the previous studies on environmental entrepreneurship from Turkey (e.g., Uslu et al., 2015; Vatansever and Arun, 2016) which emphasise the inadequate regulatory framework for innovative and environment-related entrepreneurship.

In conclusion, findings about legislation refer to notable institutional ‘gaps’ (Littlewood and Holt, 2015; Kolk, 2014) rather than ‘voids’ for environmental women entrepreneurs in terms of improving their environmental and financial performance. In the long run, such a situation can discourage SMEs led by women from actively adopting environmental practices because of the difficulties they have faced, such as losing customers, increased prices and difficulties in achieving their environmental and growth objectives.
Taking into consideration women entrepreneurs’ tendency toward environmental engagement noted in Chapter 5, the Turkish government needs to take steps to overcome consistent institutional gaps that become a barrier for women environmental entrepreneurs. They should encourage women entrepreneurs by sharing more information on environmental legislation in women-dominated sectors, specifically for micro and small SMEs. Moreover, enforcing regular auditing mechanisms for environmental legislation is required in all sectors. However, it is still not enough because most women entrepreneurs want to know what will be achieved by their compliance with environmental legislation.

6.3.2 Finance

Increasing access to finance for women entrepreneurs is one of the main strategies for the Turkish government (Women’s Strengthening Strategy and Action Plan (2018-2023) as they aim to increase the number of women-owned SMEs for economic development (Chapter 3). The data reveals several financing influences in the regulatory environment that affect environmental entrepreneurship for women-owned SMEs. Financing has often been found as a barrier for women-owned SMEs in Turkey in this study. However, while access to finance is limited for some women entrepreneurs, it is not for others. Difficulties related to sponsors and investors, getting access to finance from the government and/or banks, and insufficient financial incentives in women-dominated and/or feminine-perceived sectors hamper women entrepreneurs’ environmental objectives and growth.

In that vein, E3F said that:

“[…] investors said to me to come back again […] Banks did not give me credit loans […] there are some financial incentives, but these are for men-dominated manufacturing or technology-related sectors […].” (EF3, Environmental Consultancy and Digital Services)

When EF3 wanted support from investors to start her business in 2011, the reason they did not invest appears to have been that the market for environmental SMEs had not been formed yet in Turkey. Investors and bank officers thought that it was too early to enter green markets considering the environmental legislation, which had not been fully enforced. Moreover, she explained how she struggled to get loans from the bank because of the biases against women-dominated sectors in terms of their growth capabilities. Moreover, the Turkish government
provided limited financial incentives in feminine-perceived sectors. A recent study by Salman et al. (2019) found that 35 percent of loan officers were biased against women applicants. E3F managed to start her business with her husband’s support rather than through loans and investors.

Consequently, while it is challenging for Turkish women entrepreneurs to access finance in traditional entrepreneurship, it seems even more challenging for women who want to start environmental businesses with loans or investor support.

Similarly, statements based on women entrepreneurs’ experiences indicate that many SMEs led by women suffered from limited financial incentives in terms of starting their environmental businesses or achieving their triple bottom-line goals in their SMEs. For instance, the co-founder of the micro-sized sustainable environmental consultancy firm in sustainability reports, carbon footprints, water footprints, energy management, LCA (life cycle assessment), and eco-labels, EF10, said that:

“[…] It is not easy to afford environmental certificates when SMEs want to work with international firms. […]” (E10F)

Even if E10F claims that environmental certification is expensive, it is known that KOSGEB has the Efficiency Increasing Programme for SMEs (KOSGEB, 2022) and that it provides financial support to SMEs to acquire ISO 14001 certification, which covers 50% of the cost of a certificate (application and file examination, inspection, and audit), and the test and analysis documents as explained in Chapter 3. Unfortunately, most women entrepreneurs in this study could not benefit from this programme because they could not meet the criteria for receiving financial support. Moreover, financial incentives aim to transform the established SMEs that have energy consumption above a certain threshold. Therefore, it is challenging for new entry women entrepreneurs or SMEs led by women entrepreneurs in less technology-oriented firms where energy use is limited. This also refers to institutional gaps in the development of environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey.

For instance, E7F in the textile sector with organic production and sustainable clothing products claimed that she had applied for KOSGEB’s Efficiency Programme many times, but she had never been notified she would get financial support from them. She wants to apply again in the future because she wants to work with international firms to grow her business. She emphasised that getting an environmental certificate is financially challenging.
“Costs increase as everything goes through the certification processes because it requires more workforce and certain procedures for inspection and auditing.” (EF7)

E7F has not benefitted from financial incentives because of the SME policies on environmental legislation that prioritise financial incentives for the SMEs with the most negative influences on the environment, such as industrial manufacturing and technology-related businesses. However, E7F has gained an organic fabric certificate from an international non-governmental organisation to export their products to European countries. But she has had to pay for the certification process from her savings. Based on the accounts of these women entrepreneurs, it is possible to claim that gaining credit or accessing the financial incentives in emerging economies can be problematic as institutions favour larger businesses and are more reluctant to finance small enterprises usually led by women. This supports the previous findings of Anderson and Ojediran (2022) in the sense of challenges women entrepreneurs face in emerging economies.

Most women environmental entrepreneurs in this study started their businesses with their savings or family support. As in the case of EF3, EF10, and EF7 above, most of the other women entrepreneurs (PF1, PF2, PF3, EF2, EF6, EF9, EF11) claimed that accessing credit was a constraint on environmental entrepreneurial activity in emerging economies and that micro firms or SMEs led by women often resorted to the informal credit market; for example, borrowing money from family and friends or using their savings to start their environmental businesses.

Nevertheless, access to finance through family or personal savings is not possible for all women entrepreneurs. Even if it is possible for starting a business, it is not possible during the growth of their SMEs. This affects Turkish women entrepreneurs’ environmental initiatives, growth objectives and sustainable outcomes and acts as a barrier to their SMEs, which is consistent with the findings of Outsios and Farooqi (2017) on environmental women entrepreneurs from the UK. For instance, E6F in the organic food and green restaurant sector showed how the lack of financial support had influenced her company’s environmental objectives and growth:

“We applied for a loan to establish our organic production facility, but nobody came back to us. It is said that domestic and organic production will be supported [...] we
came with our own means. We opened our first restaurant in 96, and we could not open the second one until 2011.” (EF6)

These narratives of women entrepreneurs show that financing is challenging for women entrepreneurs, and it influences their pre- and post-entry decisions or growth as an environmental business. The reason for finance-related barriers to women entrepreneurs is because of the insufficient support for women entrepreneurs and the lack of financial incentives in specific sectors, which is different from what Outsios and Farooqi (2017) suggested was the case in the UK. They claim that the lack of support for women environmental entrepreneurs was not gender specific. However, this thesis suggests the opposite applies to an emerging economy.

This is also evident in other women entrepreneurs’ narratives.

PF2, in the eco-tourism sector, has a small established business SME. When she was asked for the reason for the lack of support, she stated that:

“Eco-tourism is supported by governorships and development agencies in Turkey [...] but there is no support for women entrepreneurs, but if you have enough money to make yourself heard, then it is another scenario [...].” (PF2)

Her answer shows that she has the capacity and knowledge to seek financial support from responsible institutions; however, even if she tries, she cannot get financial support. She explains her lack of support by having insufficient capital for institutions to believe in her and to support her small business. Similarly, the claim of PF1 supports the challenging situation for women entrepreneurs in terms of getting financial support from governmental and non-governmental institutions because she needed to get training from one of the women’s associations in Turkey on finance, digital marketing, and tax legislation, if she wanted to speed up starting her business. However, she claimed that she had to pay for this training:

“I had to pay for this training [...], which is quite a high amount for a woman who does not have financial income and has two kids.” (PF1)

She paid for the training with the money left by her husband and the training helped her to develop her knowledge in the required areas to be an entrepreneur and start her business. Yet,
there would be more women entrepreneurs attending these training sessions if they were given for free. Since access to finance is already challenging for women entrepreneurs, training-based programmes should be free for all women who want to be an entrepreneur.

On the other hand, when I interviewed related people from formal institutions, they claimed the opposite by talking about offering free training opportunities for all entrepreneurs. For instance, the participants from KOSGEB and the Women’s Investment Platform emphasised their support for women entrepreneurs:

“We have distance learning online entrepreneurship training for both traditional and advance entrepreneurs, which is completely free.” (EDM)

“We have online support for female entrepreneurs to advance their knowledge in digital marketing, accounting, online selling.” (ECM)

Although most of the support given from governmental and non-governmental institutions for women entrepreneurs, such as mentoring and online education, is technically free, it is challenging for women entrepreneurs to meet the criteria required to get this free training. To access the free training, you should not have had any previous entrepreneurship experience. This disqualifies the women who had to shut down their previous businesses (e.g., PF1, EF7) because of their perceived roles in the family (Chapter 5). In addition to that, some Turkish men entrepreneurs showed their wives as being co-founders of their businesses to take advantage of paying lower commission rates provided to Turkish women entrepreneurs, which is the case for some of the men entrepreneurs in this study (e.g., PM3). In his case, his wife does not physically run the business with her husband. Therefore, the criteria for access to free training for women entrepreneurs should be re-assessed.

While there are some financial opportunities for women entrepreneurs in Turkey, the reason they are suffering from poor financing, especially at the start-up level, is usually because they cannot meet the stringent criteria required to get the support for their SMEs. The narratives of most representatives from institutions supported this situation.

“We support all manufacturing sectors, but some sectors, such as agriculture or health sectors, are not included in our supported sectors because they are supported by specific ministries, such as agriculture ministry.” (EDM, KOSGEB)

Moreover, the representative (EPM) from the Istanbul Chamber of Industry talked about the start-up accelerator programme and she said that:
“[…] since it is industry-oriented, the number of male entrepreneurs is higher.” (EPM)

Their accelerator programme focused on four main areas, these being internet technologies, health technologies, energy and the defence industry, and the application criteria included (1) producing an industry-driven technological product, (2) having at least one viable product, and (3) issuing a minimum of at least two invoices. If the entrepreneurs could meet these criteria, they could get free training and mentorship and investment in their SMEs.

Another example of a women entrepreneur who struggled in terms of access to finance, despite being one of the members of the Turkish women entrepreneur’s association where she had access to training and mentor opportunities, was EF4. She is in the eco-design and architecture sector, and she stated that she was unable to find investors or get financial support from her family or the public institutions for her Houses from Earth project:

“Nobody helped me […] I applied to so many institutions to get funding. […] they told me that they would have supported me if I had done this project in Istanbul (urban area).” (EF4)

She could not get financial support either from her family or from the Turkish government to increase her existing business’ environmental commitment, and it took her a long time to start because of a lack of support. In addition to that, the reason that was given to her for the lack of support was because her business was in a rural area, showing that institutions favour urban areas in terms of entrepreneurial support. This refers to institutional gaps in those areas in terms of the development of innovative-related entrepreneurship, such as in the case of EF4. Therefore, it points to the need for a holistic and integrated understanding of rural female entrepreneurship and the reformulation of policies at the state level. For rural women, it draws attention to the measures required to be taken at the cooperative level to overcome inequalities. This is consistent with the findings from the female entrepreneurship literature in Turkey (Chapter 3).

Limited access to finance influences the process of eco-house projects caused delays. However, the narratives of EF4 also show that when she was awarded grants by the Yves Rocher Foundation because she won at the Terre de Femmes Awards in 2016, the number of her customers increased. The aim of the Foundation, through an international competition
among women entrepreneurs, was to show women can change the world by leaving a positive footprint on our planet. Therefore, it supports local and global nature preservation, solidarity, and environmental education initiatives around the world by collaborating with women entrepreneurs. So, EF4 said:

“[…] Everything was visible after the awards, and we started the ecological design for our customers […] We have local and international customers, we protect biodiversity with energy efficiency, an upcycling […] project includes rural women making earthen houses […].” (EF4)

Even if EF4 could not get financial support from her family or institutions, she decided to participate in the global competition when her entrepreneur friend from the women entrepreneur’s association encouraged her by sending her the link to the international competition. She eventually became the winner of The Terre de Femmes Award\(^\text{10}\) in 2016. She was able to build her ecological houses from the grants she won. The financial support influenced her entrepreneurial process positively and encouraged her to achieve sustainable outcomes that benefit the economy, society, and the environment. This study has uncovered the negative impacts of institutions concerning the entrepreneurial decisions and experiences of women. However, the positive intuitional influences have also been probed in the pre-entry and post-entry decisions of women environmental entrepreneurs, as in the example of EF4.

While most Turkish women entrepreneurs complain about access to finance and difficulties in finding a sponsor for their SMEs, PF2 in the industrial waste management services sector, E5F in the organic food additives manufacturing sector, EF8 in the biotechnology (manufacturing alternatives to plastic) sector did not mention financing as a barrier to starting their SMEs. Three of them had access to financial support from governmental and non-governmental institutions either to start their businesses or to develop their innovative environmental practices in their SMEs. It is also noteworthy to mention that EF5, and E8F are the co-founders of their SMEs joining other men founders, while PF4 is the woman manager of a family-owned medium-sized business that was founded by her father.

The following quotes show how access to finance easily helps their environmental engagement in their SMEs.

---

\(^{10}\) The Terre de Femmes Award was created in 2001 by Jacques Rocher, Honorary President of the Yves Rocher Foundation, who believed that women could change the world and leave a positive footprint on our planet. The foundation supports local and global nature preservation, solidarity, and environmental education initiatives around the world.
"We were established with the support of funds from the governmental bodies. Then we received support from TUBITAK." (EF5)

They managed to benefit from financial incentives in the form of capital contribution support\textsuperscript{11} following the application she made with her supervisor (co-founder) for a project involving a natural antibacterial made from eggshells. Then they applied for an SME R&D Start-Up Programme from TUBITAK\textsuperscript{12} and were entitled to receive 450,000 TL. They continued the organic food preservation project with financial support. Techno-enterprise capital support from KOSGEB under the Ministry of Science and Technology encouraged her to transform her innovative idea into an enterprise with high potential to create added value and qualified employment. The TUBITAK start-up support programme aims to increase the research and technology development capability, innovation, and competitiveness of SMEs in the fields of machinery, materials, chemicals, electronics, information, biotechnology, agriculture and food, transportation, energy, and environmental and textile technologies.

Operating in the food technologies group has been advantageous to them for the commercialisation of her environmentally friendly project. In Turkey, the media talks about her innovative idea being based on her master’s thesis, which has enabled the company to turn innovative environmental ideas into a financially sustainable business. They offer the food manufacturing industry the opportunity to produce environmentally friendly foods by replacing ‘chemical preservatives’ with natural ‘organic food additives’. Moreover, on their company website, they inform their customers that they have saved an average of 36 million kilograms of food from waste in five years.

Similarly, E8F has received cash support from Vestel Ventures since their sector is included in the supported technology-related sectors of Vestel Ventures.

\textsuperscript{11} Techno-Enterprise Capital Support: Support for students/individuals with technology and innovation-oriented business ideas who have received one of their undergraduate, graduate, or doctoral degrees at most five years before the preliminary application date. It is intended to encourage them to transform their businesses into enterprises with high potential to create added value and qualified employment, within the framework of a business plan that is approved to be supported by the public administrations within the scope of the central government.

\textsuperscript{12} TUBITAK SME R&D Start-Up Support Programme (1507) aims at increasing the research-technology development capability, innovation culture and competitiveness of SMEs. The programme was established in 2007. It provides support as grants for SMEs. Project proposals submitted to the 1507 programme are evaluated and monitored under the relevant technology group: (1) Machinery, Manufacturing Technologies Group (2) Materials, Metallurgical and Chemical Technologies Group (3) Electrical, Electronic Technologies Group (4) Information Technologies Group (5) Biotechnology, Agriculture, Environment and Food Technologies Group (5) Transportation, Defence, Energy and Textile Technologies Group.
“[...] after receiving the investment from Vestel Ventures\textsuperscript{13}, we established our laboratory in Yildiz Technical University Technopark\textsuperscript{14}. Then we received the support of TUBITAK and KOSGEB.” (EF8)

Vestel Ventures is a private institution that offers entrepreneurs knowledge and facility opportunities at all stages of production, such as product design, certification and production, along with the necessary cash support. Receiving investment from them as a start-up enables a firm to establish their laboratory to produce ‘bioplastics’ as an alternative raw material to ‘petrol-based plastics’ that harm the environment in many industries. While entrepreneurs are normally required to pay for the project application fees for the R&D/Software/Design projects of Yildiz Technical University, publicly and privately funded projects are exempted from this. Being privately funded by Vestel Ventures provides a great opportunity for them to join the incubation centre and have a laboratory for production in Yildiz Technical University Technopark.

According to a recent review on gender equality and a women’s economic empowerment report (Kagider, 2019), one of the three major problems is still the low number of women entrepreneurs in Turkey, and the underrepresentation of women-owned SMEs in the economy, international trade, and public procurement. The narratives of environmental women entrepreneurs in this study have shown that access to finance is the major reason for this gap. While financial support from governmental and non-governmental institutions has been satisfying for E8F, and E5F and influenced their entry decisions and growth processes positively, the rest of the SMEs led by women have suffered from poor access to finance. This is mainly caused by biases against or a lack of trust in women’s entrepreneurship, with urban

\textsuperscript{13} Vestel Ventures was established by Zorlu Holding to support start-ups and has invested in 20 entrepreneurs to date. They provide necessary cash support to entrepreneurs. They offer entrepreneurial knowledge and facility opportunities at all stages of productization such as product design, industrial design, multi-screen interface design, prototyping, testing, certification, and production. They also support marketing, global sales, law, and accounting issues, and contribute to branding and patent processes. Finally, they support funding and utilization worldwide.

\textsuperscript{14} Technopark is a special investment zone where universities, research institutions and industrial enterprises operate their innovation and R&D activities and where R&D activities are supported. Techno parks and R&D incentives have been regulated by specific laws in Turkey. According to the Technology Development Zones Law, firms using high technology may produce or develop technology or software or transform technological innovation into products by benefiting from the facilities of the universities or research institutions in these techno parks. The main purpose of techno parks is to produce and transfer technological information, and to make innovations to make the country's industries capable of competing with other industries in the world and to provide the conformity of small and medium sized enterprises with new and developed technologies.
entrepreneurship being favoured, and insufficient financial incentives for women-dominated sectors in the sense of environmental entrepreneurship.

These financial challenges affecting entrepreneurial processes as a barrier is referred to as an institutional gap in the literature (e.g., Kolk, 2014; Littlewood and Holt, 2015).

To sum up, considering Turkey already had a National Action Plan on Gender Equality 2015-2020, which included “Women and Environment”, the goals are still yet to be realised. Women’s entrepreneurship needs recognition in policies and special programmes for women, and environmental entrepreneurship and longer-term funding mechanisms should be encouraged to offer incentives for SMEs led by women owners/managers.

6.3.3 Non-Governmental Organisations

The role of non-governmental institutions is the third institutional influence factor on women entrepreneurs’ environmental objectives and environmental knowledge development in terms of the institutional framework dictating the incentives that determine which skills and knowledge will result in the maximum payoff (North, 1990). Institutions can be broadly characterised as either 1) public, centralised, or 2) private, decentralised (Ingram and Silverman, 2002). The influence of non-governmental institutions on women entrepreneurs’ decision-making processes concerning their environmental engagement refers to ‘decentralised formal institutions’ in this section.

Throughout the narratives of women entrepreneurs, it has been found that being a member of environmental and social NGOs, being a volunteer and having a professional background in NGOs and receiving support from these organisations influences Turkish women entrepreneurs’ decision-making processes in terms of environmental objectives in their SMEs. Experiences of Turkish women entrepreneurs related to the third sector reflect how NGOs help them develop environmental business skills, such as measuring carbon footprints, which ultimately influences them in setting up an environmental enterprise or developing their environmental management.

For instance, PF1, EF4, and EF6 are members of the Women Entrepreneurship Association in Turkey, and they benefit from the association financially (post-entry) and in their environmental commitment to SMEs. The following narratives show how they are influenced by these institutions.
“[…] they (women’s entrepreneurship association) encouraged women entrepreneurs to do a carbon footprint measurement under the green works project.” (EF4, Ecological Design and Architecture)

“We measured how many trees equal the carbon footprint that corresponds to our work. For our work, it was 80 trees. It increased our environmental awareness and commitment.” (EF6, Green Food and Restaurant)

With the green work group facilitated by the Women Entrepreneurship Association, Turkish women are confronted with their carbon footprint in their daily lives and businesses. This increases their awareness of their carbon footprint in their SMEs. In return, there has been a valuable off-set in the form of calculating how many trees need to be planted to balance out the carbon emissions they cause. The Women Entrepreneurship Association and ÇEKÜL 15, an NGO that strives to foster and build a nationwide awareness and network for the preservation of the urban and rural natural environment, have created Forest Grove.

Women entrepreneurs in the green work group have started to plant trees in Forest Grove after calculating their SMEs’ carbon footprint. As a result of this, E6F and E4F started to act against climate change in their SMEs. Moreover, while the green work project inspired EF4 and other women entrepreneurs to calculate their carbon footprint, EF4 also proposed an ‘environmental entrepreneurship module’ for women entrepreneurs because of the lack of information on environmental legislation and entrepreneurship (6.3.1).

Moreover, PF1 became a member of a branch of the Women Entrepreneurship Association by paying a joining fee (5.500, - TL), and an annual fee (2.900, -TL) with the money she had received from her husband. Thanks to her membership, she was able to join the training and development programme of Good for Business 16, which has been jointly developed by the Boyner Group and the International Finance Corporation (IFC). She asserted:

15 As one of the leading heritage NGOs in Turkey, the Foundation for the Protection and Promotion of the Environment and Cultural Heritage (ÇEKÜL) strives to foster and build nationwide awareness and a network for the preservation of the urban and rural, built and natural environment.

16 The training and development programme of Good for Business was jointly prepared by the Boyner Group and the International Finance Corporation (IFC). With Good for Business, it was the first time in the world for a company operating in the private sector to establish a capacity development programme that would support the requirements of female entrepreneurs in their own supplier networks. The contents of the programme were designed to improve the social and business skills and financial capabilities of female entrepreneurs in line with women’s requests. It was implemented with a programme taking 12 weeks. The training programme, which was
“ [...] the products of women entrepreneurs who participated in the project went on sale at the Good Jobs Store opened in a well-known e-commerce address of fashion. They have given a special discount to women entrepreneurs on this e-commerce site. With the Good Jobs Shop, they supported us in accessing the market, which is the most important need for our company.” (PF1, Sustainable Fashion)

As PF1 explained, being a member of the Women Entrepreneurship Association provided her with an opportunity to be in a capacity development programme that supports the requirements of women entrepreneurs in their supplier networks. The programme contents are designed in a manner to improve the networks, business skills and financial capabilities of entrepreneurs in line with women’s requests. According to one of the private Turkish company’s Boyner Group website data, the training programme, which was designed to allow female entrepreneurs to grow by increasing their capacities, was completed successfully. Good for Business was introduced to the world as an exemplary programme in the “United Nations Women’s Empowerment Principles Meeting” held in New York in 2016. With this programme, PF1’s business increased its sustainable product sales through an e-commerce website by paying fewer commission rates, which reduced its costs.

Similar to being a member of NGOs, it has been found that being a volunteer or working at non-governmental organisations influences Turkish women entrepreneurs to start environmental types of businesses. In this regard, EF1 in the eco-tourism and sustainable fashion stated that:

“I took a place in the Civil Involvement Project where we were trying to increase the awareness and responsibility on the environment and women [...] however, I do not think that it is enough and that is why I become an environmental entrepreneur.” (EF1)

The Civil Involvement Project\(^{17}\) programme was introduced in one of the best-known universities in Turkey with the partnership of another non-governmental organisation. After becoming a member, EF1 did not believe that it was enough to increase environmental awareness. Such awareness was one of her main motivations to decide to become an

---

\(^{17}\) This program for Participatory Democracy is designed to give students an understanding that every individual has a responsibility to contribute positively to society.
environmentally sustainable woman entrepreneur; she saw from the project that it mattered to the environment, women, and society. In addition to being a volunteer in the Civil Involvement Project, designed to increase environmental awareness among students, she was also the Turkish country representative at Ashoka Turkey\(^\text{18}\) in 2000, where she selected the best Turkish social and environmental entrepreneurs who serve the sustainability of society before, she started her business.

Similarly, EF2 in the organic agriculture and tourism sector has a professional background in non-governmental organisations as a founder of a farmer’s women’s cooperative. Thanks to her network from this cooperative, she started to work with women farmers who were also members. She said:

“We are working on biodiversity projects to bring environmental solutions and to support traditional (local and organic) agriculture with women farmers from the cooperative […] selling in the local bazaar, providing environmental training to farmers […].” (EF2)

She has increased her sales by selling the organic products made by members of the cooperative at the local bazaar. The local bazaar not only contributes to environmental production with organic agriculture but also contributes to women’s employment and the eco-tourism activities in the area, such as camps, workshops, fruit picking, and walking tours for visitors to there.

Another example of the influence of NGOs on Turkish women entrepreneurs regarding their environmental engagement is in the account given by EF3 from the environmental consultancy and digital services firm. She has a professional background as a volunteer in environmental and social non-governmental organisations in terms of giving speeches and leading workshops and taking part in both national and international projects, which has prompted her to start and run an environmental consultancy firm in Turkey.

\(^{18}\) Ashoka identifies and supports the world’s leading social entrepreneurs. She has pioneered the field of social entrepreneurship, identifying, and supporting the world’s leading social entrepreneurs since 1980. Social entrepreneurs are individuals with innovative solutions to society’s most pressing social, cultural, and environmental challenges.
“One of the representatives of the Climate Reality Project\(^{19}\) said to me, ‘Why don't you get training from Al Gore (former US Vice President) and come back to Turkey to do something about climate change and increase climate change awareness in Turkey?’ [...]” (EF3)

Having a Climate Reality Leadership certificate from Al Gore, she gave over 80 presentations on tackling climate change in Turkey. Then, she decided to turn her environmental knowledge into a business opportunity by starting her environmental consultancy and digital services business. Volunteering in many projects related to climate change and becoming a climate change leader have enabled her to see gaps in environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey, which she has turned into a business opportunity. Similar narratives of the positive influence of NGOs in starting or pursuing environmental businesses among Turkish women entrepreneurs can be found in the narratives of PF4, EF5, EF7, EF8 and EF9.

To sum up, the narratives of women entrepreneurs indicate that in the absence of effective public institutional mechanisms, non-governmental institutions operate and act as formal private (decentralised) compensatory institutional structures to enable environmental engagement among them. NGOs influence women entrepreneurs’ environmental goals by contributing their environmental knowledge, environmental awareness, networking, and environmental management skills.

Conversely, PF2, PF3, EF10, and EF11 found NGOs ineffective in terms of driving environmental commitment among women entrepreneurs in Turkey. They explained the reason behind the ineffective support from NGOs was because of gendered institutions. Therefore, the following section focuses on social structures and other Turkish women entrepreneurs who claim that it is male dominance in every part of society that inhibits their entrepreneurship activities as women environmental entrepreneurs.

6.3.4 Societal Structure

The narratives of all environmental women entrepreneurs show that being a woman is a challenging situation because of the patriarchal system in all parts of society in Turkey.

\(^{19}\) In 2006, Nobel Laureate and former US Vice President Al Gore got the world talking about climate change with the Academy Award-winning film An Inconvenient Truth. It was just the beginning of a climate revolution. Later that year, he founded what would become The Climate Reality Project to move the conversation forward and turn awareness into action all across the world.
Almost all the women entrepreneurs referred to male dominance in their narratives. Women entrepreneurs were asked about their thoughts on women’s entrepreneurship based on their experiences.

PF1 and EF4 claim the reason for not getting financial support from the institutions when they wanted to start their businesses was the lack of a man standing next to them.

“I was the co-founder of my husband’s firm, but I was usually taking care of children [...] other men founders did not want me after my husband died [...] It was challenging to get any kind of support because I had previous experience and there was no man next to me this time.” (PF1, Sustainable Fashion)

“ [...] women are being blocked in many places in Turkey [...] when I went to apply for credit loans, they said it is impossible to get loans for me. Moreover, they asked if I have a child to take care of. [...] when I went there again with my husband, the loan officer was so positive to give credit to start my business.” (EF4, Green Restaurant and Organic Agriculture).

The narratives of both women show that being an entrepreneur is not perceived by formal institutions as acceptable behaviour for women because of their attributed roles, such as childcare, in society even if they are very well-educated. Although PF1 had previous experience as an entrepreneur, she started her business with her savings because being a previous business owner stopped her from applying for many NGOs that support women entrepreneurs with the criterion of ‘not having previous business experience as an entrepreneur’. The previous section shows that training in managerial skills, legislation, and access to finance are important for women entrepreneurs in terms of environmental commitment and the growth of their SMEs. Yet the support in training, access to finance and legislation should be supported by the perception of women’s role in society. The following narratives show how women are perceived as ‘second-class’ by institutions because of patriarchy.

“Socially attributed gender roles are very strong for women in Turkey. I am a well-educated American woman entrepreneur who lives and runs her business in Turkey, but still, I am struggling as a woman in this country.” (EF1, Sustainable Fashion and Eco-Tourism)

“ [...] look how the Turkish media refers to the co-founders and developers of BioNTech Vaccine as ‘Ugur Sahin and his wife’ rather than writing her name too. It
makes me feel angry. [...] There is extreme discrimination between women and men in society. No matter what they say about how women and men are equal in law. I don't agree that they are seen as equal in Turkey.” (EF11, Electromechanical Goods and Services)

EF1 and EF11 talked about perceived gender differences between women and men in Turkish society. While E1F emphasised how even if she had been from a developed country, it would still have been challenging for her as a woman. This shows the importance of unwritten but socially embedded roles, where entrepreneurs run their businesses, as North (1990) claims, depending on informal institutions. E11F went on to claim that male dominance was also apparent in the discourse of Turkish media, even if women and men were treated equally based on the law.

Drawing on the narratives of Turkish women entrepreneurs, it can be seen that while the law recognises gender equality in every aspect of life in Turkey (Chapter 3), in practice, the unwritten rules of society remain strong and still apply to most of the population of any patriarchal society. Therefore, I conclude that the rules of the games in a formal environment are not the same as 'the way the game is played’, which is based on the informal environment in an emerging economy.

The narrative of EF3 supports this argument by claiming that women were being blocked in many parts of society, such as filling governmental and other powerful positions. This affected the decision-making mechanism applied in women’s entrepreneurship:

“[...] men still dominate in entrepreneurship. Unfortunately, women are sometimes prevented from being successful [...] As a woman-led company, we have never received any support from the NGOs or local institutions at the beginning [...] there was not any woman working in local authorities who would care for nature and women as much as the economy.” (EF3, Organic Agriculture and Eco-Tourism)

The narrative of EF3 addresses the situation of Turkish women when they are associated with their childcare roles. In this situation, women entrepreneurs cannot access support mechanisms from NGOs and other formal institutions easily. Moreover, it should be noted that EF3 claims that when the local development agency officer changed, they started to be supported by local authorities in their biodiversity project and the environmental technologies that could be used
in their organic farming. This shows the importance of institutional influences on women-owned SMEs in Turkey.

Throughout the narratives, it can be said that the presence of limited policies form societal institutional gaps, such as the favouring of men because of their perceived gender roles requiring them to earn money (Chapter 5). This acts as a constraint on women’s environmental entrepreneurial processes and sustainability-related outcomes. This supports many findings from the female entrepreneurship literature (e.g., Foss et al., 2018; Poggesi et al., 2016; Sefer, 2020), claiming that some women in developing countries or/and emerging economies cannot get access to support from institutions because of the political environment that favours men more than women in their country. One solution suggested by these scholars is the implementation of tax or social security provisions which can positively influence entrepreneurial entry through their direct impact on expected returns from entrepreneurial activities and opportunity costs.

The discourse of NGO and public institution stakeholders represents how the regulatory framework ecosystem discriminates against women's businesses; for example, SME policies favour high-tech, growth-oriented manufacturing sectors that are typically dominated by men. This is because women are perceived as mothers or wives who need to take care of their homes. Moreover, in some cases, the discourse of representatives from institutions shows that they exclude women from the environmental entrepreneurship ecosystem.

“[…] Since environmental entrepreneurship is a very new concept, I can say that we haven't come there for women entrepreneurs yet and there are many non-governmental organisations that support women-dominated sectors in Turkey. […]”

“We did not make a special programme for women entrepreneurs, but in the end, we did not make a distinction either. The number of men entrepreneurs in technology and manufacturing-related sectors are high in Turkey because most of the women run their businesses from home.”

“We have an online training system which is good for women not to leave the house since their duties are at home.”

These narratives of representatives from public and private institutions show that women are often ascribed a primary role as homemakers and child caregivers in the family rather than an entrepreneurial role. This shows that entrepreneurial activity is associated with gender role stereotyping, which constrains Turkish women from starting and growing sustainable
environmental businesses even if they have environmentally innovative aspirations (Chapter 5).

In this case, it is concluded that some norms and values apply only to certain sections of the population, those who are given particular “roles”, understood as “conceptions of appropriate goals and activities for particular individuals or specified social positions”. This also shows the interaction of institutional and gender influences in shaping environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey.

Moreover, claiming women usually run their businesses from home otherwise they would be censured in society for not conforming to perceived gender roles is not gender-sensitive language. These are sentiments expressed by institutional representatives who claim that they are gender neutral. It is clear that a social structure which favours men in every aspect of life must implement gender-aware support for women to develop their businesses in the technology and manufacturing sectors. The narratives of women entrepreneurs (PF3, EF3, EF9, EF10) illustrate how patriarchal society influences them in their decision-making process to start home-based businesses.

“I had to stop working when I was married because of my responsibilities as a mother and wife [...] Now, I am over 40, but I still have responsibilities at home as a wife. This time it did not stop me to start my business. I produce all sustainable products at home.” (PF3, Sustainable Fashion)

“I wanted to do something which would enable me to take care of my baby at home and be sustainable in every aspect where I didn’t need to spend time on transportation because I have so many responsibilities at home. My husband always supports me when he is at home but let me tell you something, he was so worried when I told him I wanted to do a PhD in sustainable business management because he knew that I wouldn’t be spending enough time on the domestic chores. Also, the childcare facilities are too expensive, I have delayed my PhD plans for now.” (EF3, Environmental Entrepreneurship and Digital Services)

“People told me that I might not be able to travel if I worked with international companies. Even my mum’s reaction was like ‘Are the children staying home alone if you start your business?’” (EF9, Sustainable Food and Kitchen Materials)
“No matter how many opportunities are given to women in their businesses, society makes their expectations felt. These expectations and perceptions continue [...] Running my business from home enables me to take care of my children while doing my work.” (EF10, Sustainable Environmental Consultancy)

Some Turkish mothers (PF3, EF3, EF9, EF10) adopt a coping strategy against patriarchy by locating their businesses at home as women environmental entrepreneurs, which supports some previous findings (e.g., Bianco et al., 2017; Webb et al., 2020) in the sense of negative informal influences of women’s reproductive roles, and expensive day-care provisions, especially in developing countries. Yet, working from home is not negative in the sense of environmental sustainability because Turkish women claim that having digital offices is carbon-free and increase their environmental commitment. Nevertheless, even if Turkish women can redo gender by rejecting perceived gender differences (Chapter 5), these narratives prove the existence of a patriarchal social system in Turkey.

Meanwhile, the narratives of some representatives from other institutions show that the perception of women’s roles and female entrepreneurship should change because of their success in technology and manufacturing-related industries with their environmental engagement. Some examples of these narratives are:

“We realised that female entrepreneurs are financially more successful than male entrepreneurs in social and environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey because most of these women are more educated in these topics.” (CM, Women’s Investment Platform)

“Since ancient history, the goddess has been identified with ‘fertility and motherhood’ (Rhea), ‘recuperative, ‘procreator’, ‘medicine producer from natural resources’ (Artemis). So, we should not be surprised that women are more engaged with environmental issues than men, even in business, because they have it in their blood.” (F, Women's Environment Culture and Business Cooperative)

“The number of women among our successful entrepreneurs that we support is quite high. There are companies led by female entrepreneurs in the industrial manufacturing industry [...] one of them owns a biotechnology company that produces alternative sustainable protein from edible insects by converting pre-consumer food waste into
fertilizer [...] Her business contributes to sustainable development goals in the sense of environment, society, and economy.” (EPM- Istanbul Chamber of Industry)

“Even if the number of women entrepreneurs in the green industry is less than men in Turkey, there are some successful women entrepreneurs in renewable energy sectors that our bank supports.” (TBM- TEB BANK)

The discourse of these representatives is supportive of women’s entrepreneurship. This shows that by re-doing gender, women can change the perception of their roles in society. This can change the structure of patriarchal society that prevents the development of women’s entrepreneurship in Turkey. Moreover, if women who are re-doing gender are supported rather than suffer censure because of unwritten rules, it can help women-led SMEs to increase their environmental commitment and their sales in both the domestic and international market. The narratives of women entrepreneurs in men-dominated sectors (PF4, E5F, E8F) also support this argument by showing how access to finance in these men-dominated sectors has helped them to develop their environmental commitment and become export-oriented international firms with the concomitant growth of their sales (6.3.2).

6.4 Institutional Influences on Men-owned SMEs

Men entrepreneurs encounter several institutional influences (legislation, finance, NGOs and societal structure) which make it easier or more difficult to establish or manage their SMEs as economically driven environmental entrepreneurs. These institutional influences, or ‘institutional enablers’ or ‘institutional gaps’, are identified with their outcomes for women-owned SMEs in Figure 5.
Table 6.2: Institutional Influences on Men-owned SMEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutional Influences</th>
<th>Identification of Institutional Enablers and Gaps</th>
<th>The outcome of institutional Influences on men-owned SMEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Formal Institutional (Regulative) Enablers** | Environmental legislation and sectoral regulations  
Financial support and incentives (national and international)  
Sectoral support programmes offered by Ministries (Mentoring, environmental training, access to the market, networking) | Environmental practices + cost savings + access to finance, market, and networks + growth of SMEs                                                                         |
| **Formal Institutional Gaps**                 | Environmental legislative deficiencies (confusing processes, slow processes, deficiency in environmental auditing, etc.).  
Green growth SME policy (favouring industrial manufacturing firms).  
Tax burden (e.g., lack of tax incentives for environmental SMEs) | Feeling 'out of the game'  
Lack of trust  
Ignoring environmental engagement  
Limited access to finance (difficulties in finding international investors)  
Competitive advantage (-)  
Scale and Size developments (-)  
Cost-savings (-) |
| **Informal Institutional Enablers**          | Education level  
Informal education (e.g., LEED certificate)  
Family and friend support (e.g., family-owned business, financial support from father)  
Being a member of an NGO (environmental and social)  
Being a volunteer or previous employee in an NGO (creating social and environmental impact)  
Financial support from NGOs (national and international) | Environmental knowledge and engagement  
Starting environmental business  
Collaboration with NGOs (social and environmental impact)  
Cost savings + access to finance, market, and network + growth of SMEs |
The institutional influences on men-owned SMEs include legislation and finance under formal (regulative) institutions and NGOs and institutions aggregated under informal institutions. The NGOs refer to previous professional experience in the third sector, therefore accepted as informal as in the study of Outsios and Farooqi (2017) on gender and sustainable entrepreneurship. Institutional environments can be characterised as either regulative or formal, which are considered centralised institutions, or private, informal non-governmental decentralised institutions (Ingram and Silverman, 2002; North, 1990) (6.1).

Table 6.2 identifies the institutional enablers and gaps as a result of these institutional influences on men-owned SMEs. These institutional influences are presented in men’s narratives as positive and negative influences affecting themselves and their SMEs. Positive institutional influences have resulted in engagement with environmental practices such as energy efficiency and waste management or creating value from waste, thus increasing cost savings, access to green industry or the growth of men-owned SMEs. These formal institutional influences are supported by informal enablers, such as men’s levels of education (Table 4.6 presents a list of men owners/managers), their managerial capabilities in gaining informal knowledge about environmental protection, and the use of family support as social capital. Moreover, their previous experiences as volunteers in environmental or social NGOs has helped them to use their network to start their SMEs and increase their environmental practices through collaboration.

On the other hand, negative institutional influences occur in men-owned SMEs when formal institutions are not effective and/or they work in tandem with informal institutions. For instance, environmental legislation and sectoral regulations concerning the environment enable men entrepreneurs to engage with environmental protection through energy efficiency and waste management. However, they find this process confusing because formal and informal institutions do not work in harmony in the sense of environmental management.

For instance, there is waste management legislation. According to legislation, SME waste should be collected by the municipalities in each district (Chapter 3). However, each municipality follows their procedure and some of them ignore the process since it is difficult to handle. In this case, they offer SMEs the opportunity to work with private companies; however, this is usually too expensive for the men owners/managers in this study. Moreover, men in feminine-perceived sectors suffer from limited information dissemination and other
deficiencies in environmental legislation. In addition, the green growth policy of Turkey as an emerging economy (Section 3.2 and 3.4) that favours industrial and growth-oriented SMEs leaves some men-owned SMEs out of the game in sectors like environmental consultancy, digital publishing, or medical eco-tourism. With deficiencies in environmental auditing, men entrepreneurs lose their trust in the regulative environment and start to ignore their environmental problems, in some cases. These ‘institutional gaps’ affect the men-owned SMEs negatively when they wish to increase their environmental engagement.
6.4.1 Legislation

The data reveals a number of legislation-related influences in the regulatory environment that affects environmental entrepreneurship for men-owned SMEs. Legislation-related influences are defined as environmental regulations based on sector, legal infrastructure, environmental certification, access to legislative information, energy, and waste management-related auditing. The narratives of some men entrepreneurs show that environmental engagement is used as a source for securing the legitimacy of the survival of SMEs, which is consistent with many previous findings (e.g., Dixon and Clifford, 2007; Paulraj, 2009; Zimmerman and Zeith, 2002).

Men-led SMEs operate according to the relevant rules, expectations and norms of the society, sectors, and markets where they operate in this study. Environmental legislation influences men entrepreneurs’ ethical decision processes, environmental goals, and the growth of their SMEs as an enabler and/or a barrier. Throughout the narratives of men entrepreneurs, Turkish men entrepreneurs are found to be aware of environmental legislation they need to follow in their sector and the penalties applied to their SMEs in the case of non-compliance. However, legislation-related problems also influence men entrepreneurs’ environmental engagement and the growth of their businesses negatively.

For instance, PM1 in the oil products transportation and energy industry is clear about the environmental regulations that apply to his business, such as getting permission to operate after receiving an EIA report from the Ministry of Environment, Urbanisation and Climate Change, and having an ISO-14001 Environmental Management Certificate based on environment and energy-related legislation in Turkey. So, PM1 said:

“We are supposed to have an EIA report to avoid penalties and we took ISO-14001 certification because of our international customer’s demand.” (PM1)

Similarly, E2M in the renewable energy sector asserted that:

“[…]to make a solar energy project, we needed to get a non-agricultural field permission related to the land […]” (EM2)

Their (PM1, EM2) industries are highly regulated regarding the environment and energy. As explained in Chapter 3, environmental permits and licences for emissions are integrated under the Environmental Permits and Licences Regulation for specific sectors and crude petroleum refineries, nuclear fuel, the metal industry and asbestos facilities must obtain a positive EIA decision by the Ministry of Environment and Urbanisation before starting construction. So,
there are environmental regulations, and men entrepreneurs are aware of them and the penalties they will incur if they do not get legitimation by being environmentally responsible. Therefore, they use their environmental engagement as a source of legitimacy for their SMEs in the energy sector, which shows how environmental legislation drives them to apply environmental practices.

EM6 is the co-founder of a medium-sized food and beverages technology firm with alternative solutions, such as a smart beer tap, mobile development software, robotics, and sustainable draft beer, that provides a digital ecosystem where draft beer operations are becoming fully automatised, standardised, trackable and, therefore, more environmentally friendly. As a technology-oriented firm, they are energy efficient, and they calculate their water usage and carbon footprint. He explains how the EU Green Deal with Turkey influences his decisions to act as a sustainability leader:

“We comply with all environmental legislations and regulations for technology-oriented firms […] EU Green Deal between Turkey and Europe is the reason for the climate change action plan of Turkey. What we do is completely sustainable in terms of energy and waste management.” (EM6)

This narrative shows how E6M seeks legitimation from formal institutions based on their environmentally friendly alternative smart solutions in the technology industry. Similar narratives in terms of how the environment and energy-related legislation force men entrepreneurs to adopt environmental practices such as waste management and energy efficiency appear in the accounts of PM2, PM3, PM4, and EM3, who are in the industrial recycling, automotive construction, glass manufacturing and organic agriculture and food entrepreneurship consultancy sectors. Therefore, in the case of PM1, PM2, PM3, PM4, EM2, E3M and E6M, it is possible to say that there is environmental legislation that requires compliance with the adoption of environmental practices in these men-owned SME sectors. Otherwise, their SMEs would not be able to get legitimation for the survival of their SMEs and they would be penalised.

On the other hand, even if these men owners/managers (PM1, EM2, EM6) follow the strict environmental and waste management regulations in their sectors, they still have problems with the environmental legislation because of insufficient execution and auditing. PM1 and EM2 were asked about the challenges they encounter and both claimed:
“Some competitors are illegal in our sector, and they evade tax; this affects our environmental engagement negatively.” (PM1, Fuel Distribution and Logistics)

“The legislation is a bit complicated and constantly being changed. [...] They (government) changed the proficiency criteria for getting a positive EIA report. You can’t do business under these circumstances. Ultimately, investors look at the legal infrastructure and when they see this, they stop investing in your company.” (EM2, Renewable Energy)

While the reason for competitors in PM1’s sector evading tax reveals the weak auditing of SMEs in the sense of environmental issues, the narrative of EM2 shows that the confusing and complicated environmental legislation, which is constantly changing, is also a challenge for these entrepreneurs. Environmental engagement and development are prevented in both cases. Moreover, constantly changing environmental legislation for the benefit of elicits becomes a barrier for environmental entrepreneurs to access finance from international investors. These findings of the thesis support the findings of Hamdouch and Depret (2013) who claim that legislative barriers are the primary restrictions for environmental entrepreneurs in the example of Turkey.

Similarly, other men entrepreneurs claim legislation-related problems as a barrier to starting their environmental projects in research and development or to the growth of their SMEs.

For instance, PM4, the manager of a medium-sized firm which is in the glass manufacturing sector, claims that the environmental legislative and regulative process is confusing and unstructured for all entrepreneurs in Turkey:

“ [...] an entrepreneur who wants to produce or use solar panels is giving up like us because of the confusing and unstructured procedure to follow […].” (PM4)

The narrative of PM4 explains how one company has delayed using the solar panel in their manufacturing facilities because they find the legislative processes so confusing. Similarly, when PM2, in the recycling sector, is asked about the environmental regulations they need to follow in their sector, he complains that even if there are environmental regulations, they have been waiting too long to get an environmental permit and licence (EIA report) before starting the business:
“I have been waiting for my environmental protection certificate and licence for 11 months by the Ministry of Environment [...] I could not start my business for almost 1 year because of the slow and confusing process.” (PM2)

The narratives of PM4 and PM2 show the legislation-related problems in terms of complicated procedures and slow regulative processes that negatively influence the environmental objectives pursued in their SMEs. This indicates that even if there is environmental legislation for SMEs to follow, it can be a burden for some entrepreneurs. It can even discourage entrepreneurs from following their environmental objectives.

For instance, the claim of PM3, working in the automotive construction sector where they produce environmentally friendly cleaning products for automobiles as an alternative to chemicals, supports the argument in terms of discouraging environmental entrepreneurs with deficiencies in environmental legislation:

“[…] they do not come checking for a long time now […] we do not know what to do with our waste […] we started to ignore it for now.” (PM3)

While PM3 claimed that there was not enough inspection by the Ministry of Environment in terms of waste management, he also noted that they did not know what to do with their waste because they did not have enough storage for it. When the researcher asked if they were aware of the municipality waste collection system, he stated that:

“We wanted to give our waste to the municipality, but they advised us to work with private companies, but recycling companies demand a high amount of money that we cannot afford […] nobody is coming to check anyway […].” (PM3)

PM3’s narrative shows that there is no harmony between formal institutions in terms of dealing with environmental issues in Turkey, and the waste management system is still not established enough even if the country has a zero waste aim for 2023 (Chapter 3). Lack of consistency among institutions has been challenging for all men environmental owners/managers in this study. Considering the challenging experiences of PM1, PM2, PM3, PM4, and EM2, whose businesses operate in the Marmara Region, the environmental management coordinator from the Marmara Municipalities Union was interviewed about the working system of municipalities in the region. His narrative supports the inadequate level of waste management systems in terms of pushing SMEs to comply with environmental
legislation:

“[…] Uskudar (district of Istanbul) municipality collects organic waste on certain days and non-organic (chemical) waste on other days from businesses and houses. But each municipality has a different system […] an adequate level of administrative sanction is still not implemented […] SMEs are expected to be included in the system voluntarily.”

(EMC)

As can be seen from his narrative, Turkey needs to develop its environmental practices with clearer and more holistic approaches that are in harmony with the regulative environment. Otherwise, it is challenging for SMEs led by men entrepreneurs who are in manufacturing, energy, and technology-related sectors to increase their environmental commitment (Chapter 3). Although PM1, PM2, PM3, PM4, EM2, and EM6 are aware of existing environmental legislations in their sectors, others talk about limited informative institutions regarding the environmental legislative issues in their sector.

For instance, E1M is the owner and manager of a micro-sized tourism firm that follows a hybrid business model by combining medical tourism with eco-tourism. They provide online medical and eco-touristic consultancy with a zero-carbon footprint, and without the use of plastic or paper, using digital e-receipt and e-signature systems. They also provide tailor-made trips that favour environmental options, such as blue cruises, climbing, nature-walking, or eco-village visit options, employing the most environmentally friendly transportation options, in addition to their free subscription services for their customers. He was asked if there was any institution that dealt with the environmental issues of SMEs in Turkey, and he said that:

“There are very informative organizations related to tourism and sustainability, such as TURSAB, TUROB […]. But they should give more space to environmental issues like environmental legislation. I am not aware of any legislation that applies to my business.” (EM1)

Similarly, EM5 from the social and environmental services sector, where they create online market access for fair and environmentally responsible SMEs to support the prosumer economy, said that:

“There is no institution that will move SMEs from one place to another on environmental sustainability, and we are trying to do that.” (EM5)
Based on the limited information and market opportunities for environmental entrepreneurs, EM5 created an online platform system that has two main components. The first is the producer. Producers are those who adopt a fair and environmentally friendly production method. The second component is the prosumer. Prosumers are those who try to use local products and who consciously seek information about where the product comes from and whether the product is environmentally friendly. To sell their products using EM5’s online market, entrepreneurs needed to sign a declaration of intent to be fair and environmental or they needed to share their existing environmental production processes. This new environmental business model supported the producers through free training as well as environmental consultancy. This shows that although there may be insufficient environmental legislation and auditing, entrepreneurs can change the system and influence institutions through their business activities.

These findings support the recent studies on environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey (Uslu et al., 2015; Vatansever and Arun, 2016; Keskin, 2017) which claim that there are persistent legislative-related problems and a lack of sanctioning power for environmental entrepreneurship. Moreover, this thesis contributes to the understanding of the policy framework for environmental entrepreneurship in emerging economies as a research gap suggested by many scholars (e.g., Potluri and Phani, 2020). By exploring the legislative barriers to environmental entrepreneurship as a lack of waste management (by municipalities, which was the case in Turkey), limited SME greening policies (e.g., providing environmental regulations only for industrial sectors), and insufficient environmental auditing on SMEs, the next section discusses how environmental legislation deficiencies pave the way for financial barriers for men-owned SMEs in an emerging economy.

6.4.2 Finance

Chapter 5 (Section 5.4.1 and 5.4.2) presents the economic rationale underlying the environmental practices of men-owned SMEs in Turkey, based on gender role socialisation and the practice of ethics of care. Economic personal values and business-related financial goals are the main environmental drivers of men-owned SMEs in Turkey. The main reason for these drivers is financial incentives through institutional support mechanisms for environmental entrepreneurs. This shapes the pre-entry and post-entry decisions and behaviour of men owners/managers and the growth of their SMEs.
PM1, EM3 and EM4, from energy, technology-oriented organic agriculture and digital publishing sectors, respectively, claimed that they are supported by financial incentives of the Turkish government or other available financial support which drives them to adopt environmental practices in their SMEs. They stated:

“We are funded by the financial incentives of EBRD with the condition of applying environmental management systems based on energy efficiency in our logistic systems.” (PM1, Fuel Distribution and Logistics)

“With the funding of IMECE Impact and their partner UNDP, we established our first green kitchen.” (EM3, Green Restaurant and Organic Agriculture)

“We had some small sponsorships from international non-governmental organisations to start our business rather than national supports […]” (EM4, Digital Publishing and Environmental Consultancy)

These narratives show that the financial incentives and support have influenced the environmental initiatives taken in the case of these three SMEs led by men entrepreneurs. PM1 decided to apply environmental management systems to his company’s logistics to gain EBRD’s financial support to open more petrol stations. EBRD supported the energy sector in Turkey to expand the number of medium-sized operators in a highly competitive environment (Turkey Energy Sector Strategy, 2019-2023).

Similarly, EM3 had financial access to develop his company’s research and development project with funding from IMECE’s impact-oriented programme that was financed by the UNDP (Imece Impact, 2022). It is a programme that accelerates the growth phase initiatives that produce social and ecological benefits with the aim of making the social and ecological impact of these initiatives visible. This established impact-oriented programme is suitable for SMEs that (1) have a product ready, (2) use established solution-based innovation or technology, (3) have made their first sale, and (4) have customers and/or a scalable income model with investment and global goals. EM3 decided to apply for this impact-oriented growth programme because they offered innovative technological solutions for their customers by meeting the second criterion.
Similarly, EM4 was supported by the European Climate Foundation with a small amount of financial support because access to finance was challenging for Turkish SMEs compared to EU countries. Therefore, he decided to apply for financial support from international organisations. From this, it is understood that even if there are financial incentives offered by the Turkish government in terms of energy efficiency (Chapter 3), these were not sufficient for the men entrepreneurs in this study. This situation has pushed Turkish men entrepreneurs to seek external funds from European countries.

Regarding this, PM4 was asked about his thoughts on environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey and he claimed that:

“[…there are only feed-in tariffs for electricity producers or renewable energy incentives in small amounts […] the greening policy is also economy-oriented rather than environment […] the government does not want us to produce our own solar energy to get tax from us.” (PM4, Glass Manufacturing)

In Turkey, private companies produce electricity and install power plants. The state promises to buy electricity from these private firms for at least 10 years. These fees are referred to as the ‘feed-in tariff’ in the electricity sector. PM4 claimed that even if there were financial incentives and support from the state in the energy sector, this is very limited and not enough to encourage the environmental engagement of all types of SMEs in Turkey. This explains why SMEs led by men entrepreneurs usually seek financial support from international organisations. The narratives of these men entrepreneurs show that there is some level of preparation for increasing environmental awareness in SMEs in terms of progress, mainly by increasing capacity in waste management and energy efficiency legislative alignment, as discussed in Chapter 3.

However, access to financial resources has been found to be a major problem for some men-owned SMEs in this study. Finance-related influences are seen as access to finance, information flows about financial providers, limited financial incentives, and even a lack of financial support in specific sectors, especially for micro and small-sized firms in women-dominated sectors. For instance, the biggest challenge for many men entrepreneurs was claimed to be a lack of financial support. The following quotes show evidence from some entrepreneurs’ narratives.
“The source of financing has been always my personal savings [...] banks would not give me support without enough capital.” (EM1, Medical Eco-tourism)

“The biggest challenge is financing for our biogas project to start [...] International investors do not support us because of the lack of environmental entrepreneurship ecosystem and inadequate regulations.” (EM2, Renewable Energy)

“Even if there are financial supports, these are a small amount of money.” (PM2, Recycling)

“We are a small enterprise willing to become a medium-sized enterprise, yet we cannot get sufficient credit from banks.” (PM3, Automotive Construction and Chemicals Production)

The narratives of EM1, EM2, PM2, PM3 and PM4 show that they were struggling in terms of access to finance from public and private institutions.

EM1 started his micro-sized business with his savings from his previous job, and he explained the reason for not applying for any credit, which was because of his inadequate financial statements and lack of business plans to present, in a realistic and favourable light, to financial institutions.

Similarly, EM2 started his business with the support of his wealthy father. However, EM2 needed financial support to start his technology-oriented biogas projects, yet he could not find financial support from national or international institutions. He explained the reason for not getting access to finance was because of the inadequate regulations that did not satisfy the foreign investors in Turkey. This illustrates the difficulty in obtaining loans due to the financial institutions and investors’ perceptions of the high risk associated with environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey caused by an inadequate regulative framework. This supports many previous studies on environmental entrepreneurship regarding the difficulties of accessing finance from institutions (e.g., Murillo and Lorenzo, 2006).

Concerning PM2, he had not applied for financial support from the bank because he claimed that the support offered was not enough to meet his company’s growth goals. Although his business was a family-owned medium-sized business, which had not required financial
investment at the beginning, he now could not grow his business because of insufficient finances.

Finally, the narratives of PM3 shows that he succeeded in getting financial credit from banks, but the amount given was not enough to afford bigger factories, which he needed to increase his environmental commitment and achieve growth at the same time. His company needed a larger place for their clean production and waste management; however, they could not afford it.

Similarly, PM4 emphasised in his narratives the insufficient financial incentive programmes from the Turkish government for enabling environmental engagement in SMEs. While PM1, EM3, and EM4 had financial support through international institutions (section 6.4.3), none of them talks about financial incentives given to them through national governmental institutions. Moreover, most of the representatives from institutions claim that they did not have any specific support programme for ‘environmental entrepreneurship’. For example, they asserted:

“We don’t have any financial support or project programme focused only on environmental entrepreneurship, but we are working on it [...] We had entrepreneurship acceleration programme focusing on sustainable industry.” (EPM-Istanbul Chamber of Industry)

“We do not consider all aspects of environmentalism in our rewarding criteria; maybe we should take it into consideration.” (KOSGEB, EDM)

“We have financial support provided by international institutions and the main focus is the transition to a low carbon economy and efficiency in the industry.” (SM, BCSD)

“[...] we offer solutions to the sustainable financing needs of private companies especially in renewable energy [...] We will provide green foreign trade opportunity [...]” (TEB)

The representative participant from the Istanbul Chamber of Industry claimed that they had financial support for environmental entrepreneurs in the manufacturing industry. Their focus was not on the entrepreneurs, but on the industry. This indicates Turkey’s growth-oriented focus because the institutions usually focus on specific industries that are economically more viable. For instance, they support a start-up project on recycling which is related to future technologies. The recycling project is consistent with the goals of a sustainable future in being
in the biodiesel industry and an energy-oriented manufacturing firm, as well as being profit-oriented.

Moreover, KOSGEB financially rewards energy and environment-related SMEs in industrial manufacturing sectors; however, they usually focus on the growth of the business with its production and sales rather than due diligence processes based on environmental protection.

Similarly, the narratives of the representative of the BCSD and the branch manager of the Turkish Economy Bank showed how environmental engagement was usually financially supported in industrial manufacturing, energy, and technology-oriented or export-oriented firms.

Therefore, the narratives of Turkish men entrepreneurs and representatives from institutions were consistent with the claim that larger industrial firms had better access to financial support in Turkey (Erdoğan, 2018). In that vein, the Turkish government could develop strategies to support ‘new entry environmental entrepreneurs’ from different sectors or start implementing tax exemptions for environmentally responsible SMEs, where the tax burden is known as the biggest challenge for SMEs in Turkey.

In addition to limited financial support from governmental institutions for environmental SMEs, there is also the burden of the fiscal system for men-owned SMEs, which increases their costs. For example, when men environmental owners/managers are asked about the challenges they faced in their SMEs, most of them emphasised the tax burden. Some of them claimed:

“The government is applying high tax procedures to small and micro-businesses from the moment you set up a company.” (EM4, Environmental and Social Services)

“There is no support for environmental SMEs, such as tax exemption [...].” (PM2, Renewable Energy)

“The taxes are very high [...] There are no tax advantages.” (EM5, Organic Agriculture and Food Entrepreneurship Consultancy)

These narratives of men entrepreneurs show that the tax system is not a driving force for environmental engagement in Turkish SMEs. This claim supports the previous findings claiming that the environmental orientation of entrepreneurs must be stronger in countries with
higher levels of governmental support for environmental entrepreneurship than in countries with low levels of governmental support (Muñoz et al., 2017; Hörisch et al., 2017; Nikalaou et al., 2018). Governmental support, such as tax exemption for environmental firms, contributes to the development of environmental entrepreneurship as this kind of support is an environmental motivation factor for entrepreneurs from developed countries (e.g., Gast et al., 2017; Meek et al, 2010).

6.4.3 The Role of NGOs

While the previous two sections have focused on legislation and financing for SMEs led by men owners/managers, this section examines the role of non-governmental institutions in the owners’ environmental engagement processes. The narratives of the participants from the related institutions encouraged me to ask the entrepreneurs about non-governmental institutions and their support for SMEs when legislative and financial support is limited in the regulative environment.

It can be seen that most SMEs led by men entrepreneurs benefit from non-governmental support in terms of acquiring environmental knowledge. For instance, EM5 in the social and environmental services sector was asked about the non-governmental environmental supports that SMEs can benefit from. He asserted that:

“There are industry-related associations for SMEs. [...] the Solar Energy Producers Association [...] Recycling of Electronic Waste Association [...] for industrial sectors there is the Business Council for Sustainable Development, and they have projects on circular economy and sustainability.” (EM5)

E5M is aware of non-governmental institutions that deal with SMEs’ environmental issues and listed some industry associations. The Turkish Solar Energy Industry Association (GENSED) was founded in 2009. It creates sectoral synergy by gathering national and international companies operating in the field of solar electricity generation and energy storage under one roof. While supporting the development of domestic production in Turkey with its sectoral experiences, it also contributes to the formation of policies and related laws and regulations for the creation of a market with continuity in the sector.

Solar Energy and other energy-related industry associations, where entrepreneurs have the opportunity to network with other stakeholders in their industry and international investors, were also mentioned by PM1 and EM2, who operate in the energy sectors. In addition,
entrepreneurs from other sectors explained how they, were supported by non-governmental organisations in different ways.

For instance, EM3 in the organic agriculture sector said that:

“The Buğday Association supports businesses like us to switch compost system.” (EM3)

The Buğday Association for Supporting Ecological Living is a non-profit, non-governmental organization. The pioneering Buğday (Wheat) ecological movement started in the 1990s with a restaurant/wholesale store offering local and organic food. It served as a space for like-minded, environmentally conscious people to meet, gather and share their ideas and visions about ecological living in Turkey. Their working areas were organic agriculture, ecological living, agro-biodiversity, eco-agro-tourism, and urban agriculture, which are included in EM3’s sector. EM3 attended meetings, seminars, and workshops on composting and organic agriculture through the Buğday Association. These seminars and workshops are designed for small business owners/managers to dealing with the food waste/recycling to achieve zero waste. This reflected the collaborative and relational approaches of E3M in his industry.

Similarly, EM4 in the digital publishing sector benefitted from the non-governmental organisation as he claimed:

“Climate Volunteers help us with our carbon footprint and do the calculations on our behalf to balance the carbon. It helps reduce our environmental footprint in every aspect of our business. […]” (EM4)

EM4 collaborated with Climate Volunteers to become the first carbon-free publishing firm in Turkey, which contributed to its brand image and increased the number of its members and followers around the world (Chapter 5). Although E4M’s firm had a physical office and they previously produced hard copies of their documentation, with the support of Climate Volunteers in their carbon footprint management, they transformed their business into a completely digital publishing firm running out of a digital office. This supports the argument made by women entrepreneurs in Chapter 5 regarding them running their SMEs at home for the sake of carbon footprint management rather than to show compliance to their gender roles as a caregiver at home.

Concerning carbon footprints, PM4, EM1, EM3, and EM6 also calculated their carbon footprint by collaborating with national or international non-governmental institutions. This
non-governmental support compensated for the limited legislative and financial access as a driving force of the SMEs’ environmental engagement for men owners/managers. This is consistent with the previous findings of Ortolano et al., (2014), who claimed that industry associations or other non-governmental organisations enable owners/managers of SMEs where there are institutional voids or gaps in terms of supporting environmental engagement.

For instance, the Business Council for Sustainable Development is an important stakeholder for environmental entrepreneurs in Turkey, as was discussed in Chapter 3 with their TMM management. EM5 suggested in his narratives how BCSD Turkey is the local network and partner of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD). The Council shares knowledge on sustainability with its members and stakeholders through the activities of its working groups. In that vein, the narratives of the representative from BCSD Turkey support BCSD’s role as a non-governmental organisation for Turkish environmental SMEs.

“We have grants and sponsors for industrial businesses under European Bank for Reconstruction and Development’s sponsorship [...] SMEs always have access to our circular economy platform [...]” (Sustainability Manager, BCSD)

BCSD’s focus areas include transitioning to a low carbon economy and greater efficiency, sustainable agriculture and access to food, sustainable industry and the circular economy, social inclusion with women’s employment, and the sustainable finance forum (BCSD, 2022). However, based on their focus on industrial companies, it can be concluded that as an association, they are working with larger businesses rather than micro and small businesses. This has discouraged some micro and small business owners to seek support from industry supporters or other non-governmental organisations. Even if there are environmental SMEs that can contribute to the sustainability and circular economy of Turkey from other sectors, such as design, medical tourism and environmental consultancy services, these SME owners/managers usually feel excluded from the support mechanisms.

For instance, EM1, as an owner of a micro medical eco-tourism business, stated that:

“We do not aim to benefit from any support programme because I see there is no environmental entrepreneurship programme or even if there is, they have a very limited budget to only spend on larger firms.” (EM1)
E1M is aware of very informative organizations related to the tourism industry, such as the Hoteliers Association and the Travel Agencies Union, as he mentions them and their informative seminars on sustainable tourism (6.3.1). However, non-governmental organisations dealing with energy efficiency, sustainability and the circular economy should also encourage SMEs who are not in the industrial sectors, as well as larger businesses, to create an inclusive entrepreneurship ecosystem in the country.

This is important because some industry associations are still not effective in terms of influencing environmental entrepreneurs to take more environmental action or to start environmental businesses, even if entrepreneurs are aware of them. Environmental entrepreneurs from specific sectors, especially in industrial manufacturing SMEs, are more likely to seek financial and other types of support at the national and international levels from institutions. Yet, this argument depends on the industry of the particular SMEs led by owners/managers because there is sectoral segregation in Turkey (Chapter 3 and Chapter 5).

Moreover, SMEs led by men entrepreneurs who have international customers, international investors and/or an international networking environment, thanks to non-governmental organisations, are more aware of the UN’s sustainable development goals. This has increased their environmental awareness and engagement in their SMEs. The quotes of some men entrepreneurs are given below as evidence:

“*If you are environmentally friendly, your foreign customers love and trust you.*” (PM1, Oil Transportation and Logistics)

“The majority of our customers are from abroad and this pushed me to do eco medical tourism in the sense of sustainable development goals of United Nations.” (EM1, Medical Eco-Tourism)

“We follow the European Union’s Green Deal procedures because we need foreign investors.” (EM2, Renewable Energy)

“We follow the global environmental innovations by networking with all international stakeholders.” (EM3, Green Restaurant and Organic Agriculture)

“[… the whole problem of human civilisation on the planet will be solved with the realisation of sustainable development goals, and we wanted to be part of it.” (EM4, Environmental and Social Services)
PM1 and EM1 are influenced by their international customers in terms of their environmental awareness and engagement, while EM2 is influenced by the investor’s expectations of their environmental engagement to provide financial support.

EM3 and EM4 follow international initiatives by taking part in international network platforms that focus on the United Nations’ Sustainable Development Goals. The Non-Governmental environment influences the type of environmental businesses they pursue. For instance, men entrepreneurs (EM1, EM3, EM4, EM5 and EM6) start to engage with the environment in SMEs with the main economy-oriented decision-making process, yet with the influence of NGOs, they start to become sustainability-oriented environmental entrepreneurs.

For instance, earlier, EM3 coordinated an EU project, which supported small food producers that was carried out in Turkey and the Balkans. During his experiences abroad, he saw many organic and technology-oriented environmental initiatives in the food and agriculture sector. Being a part of a non-governmental institution that supported sustainable development goals influenced his sustainability-oriented decision-making processes.

In the case of PM1, EM1 and EM2, it is possible to say that informal institutions such as non-governmental stakeholders, customers, suppliers, investors, or competitors influence their sustainability-oriented goals in their SMEs. In the case of EM3, EM4, EM5 and EM6, environmental engagement is used as a source of legitimacy by national and international non-governmental institutions. These arguments are consistent with the findings of many scholars in the environmental entrepreneurship domain (Hockerts and Wüstenhagen, 2010; Pastakia, 2002; Rao, 2008; York Venkataraman, 2010; O’Neil and Ucbasaran, 2016) in that they suggest environmental engagement is not only a source of legitimation in the regulative environment but in the normative environment as well.

To sum up, non-governmental institutions usually enable SMEs led by men owners/managers to start businesses and/or grow businesses that have social, environmental, and economic benefits (the triple bottom-line approach). However, some of them still find non-governmental support ineffective in specific sectors, such as environmental and social consultancy, tourism and digital publishing and services, in terms of increasing their environmental knowledge as owners/managers.

6.5 Chapter Conclusion

The findings from this chapter contribute to our understanding of the institutional environments as formal and informal institutions that become enablers and/or barriers to
starting and running environmental businesses, as well as growing SMEs led by women and men owners/managers in Turkey. This chapter has aimed at applying the theoretical framework developed in subsections 2.5 to uncover the institutional influences on entrepreneurs and their SMEs through institutional theory (2.5.4) that is integrated with other feminist lenses, these being gender role socialisation, feminist ethics of care and gender identity theory. The notion of legitimacy is central to institutional theory. Legitimacy refers to whether an agent's actions are deemed desirable, appropriate, or proper, the notions of which are outlined in the emergent theoretical framework of this study (Figure 7.1).

However, while some regulatory institutions may affect women and men environmental entrepreneurs in similar ways, others have gendered effects in this study, such as labour market laws that give (un)equal access to employment positions to women and men entrepreneurs and family policies that specify childcare provisions. While the regulative environment is identified as similar for both women and men environmental entrepreneurs, its negative influence on women’s SMEs is more challenging, being referred to as an ‘institutional gap’ and becoming a barrier for the women-owned SMEs.

The legislation-related influences have been identified as environmental legislation, legal infrastructure, environmental certification based on legislation, access to legislative information, energy, and waste management-related auditing. The narratives of both Turkish women and men entrepreneurs reveal that environmental engagement is used as a source for securing the legitimacy of their SMEs in the regulative environment. Moreover, financing is the main institutional influence in women and men-owned SMEs, needed to adopt environmental practices to gain a competitive advantage in the market.

The formal institutional gaps occur for both women and men environmental entrepreneurs in this study. For instance, deficiencies in environmental legislation and limited financial support for environmental entrepreneurship influence both women and men entrepreneurs’ growth negatively, as well as their environmental engagement through feminist ethics of care. Although there are financial incentives in energy-related sectors for environmental engagement, SMEs led by men in manufacturing and technology-related sectors can access financial support from international organisations. It can be concluded that national capital is limited, thereby financial incentives may not be sufficient to start or run such environmental SMEs.
These institutional gaps influence women more than men entrepreneurs because of the burden of women’s perceived caregiver role in a patriarchal society. Looking at institutional influences through gender-sensitive lenses shows unequal access to finance and limited environmental legislation in women-dominated sectors. SME greening policies on sectoral environmental regulations favour high-tech, growth-oriented manufacturing sectors in terms of environmental development; these are typically dominated by men as a result of gender role socialisation in Turkey.

Furthermore, the discourse of representatives from formal institutions supports the ‘gendered institutions’ argument, which has detrimental influences on women’s environmental entrepreneurship in the sense of their entry into the green market and the start or growth of their SMEs, applying environmental engagement. In other words, the highly patriarchal society structure becomes more problematic for women environmental entrepreneurs in that unwritten rules have been revealed. What is more, the growth-oriented mindset in public and private institutions that support entrepreneurs creates tensions between men entrepreneurs’ environmental entrepreneurship identity and growth objectives as well as women entrepreneurs’ female identities and entrepreneurial identity (Chapters 5 and 6).

Nevertheless, it is possible to claim that when Turkish women redo gender through their sustainability-oriented goals, whereby they show defiance of ‘traditional entrepreneurship’ and perceived gender differences, public and private institutions become more supportive of them. For instance, EF8 and EF5 started their businesses in men-dominated sectors. They were unable to access financial and non-financial support, such as mentoring, for the development of environmental practices in their SMEs. Some representative participants from the institutions supported these Turkish women entrepreneurs. The discourse of these representatives was supportive of the women when women entrepreneurs were re-doing gender. Moreover, when men entrepreneurs practised feminist ethics of care by being relational to nature and society, following collaborative approaches, the SMEs and society benefitted from it.

This signals that by re-doing gender, women and men entrepreneurs can change the perception of female/feminine/feminist identity and women’s roles in society. This can change the patriarchal social structures and encourages the development of women’s entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey and other advanced and emerging economies that
are growth-oriented, as stated by many scholars (e.g., O’Neil and Gibbs, 2016; Potluri and Phani, 2020).

Consequently, this chapter claims that the type of environmental entrepreneurship women and men entrepreneurs pursue in their SMEs depends on both gender influences and their interaction with institutional influences in an emerging economy. This chapter contributes to the development of theoretical lenses for understanding the institutional enablers and barriers for women and men entrepreneurs in their environmental engagement, as suggested should be explored by many scholars (e.g., Hechavarria et al., 2017; Horich et al., 2017; Muñoz et al., 2018).

The findings from this study support the previous reports and studies from Turkey (e.g., GEM, 2018; European Commission Report, 2019; Kalemci and Araz, 2017; Kalafatoglu and Mendoza, 2017; Yenilmez, 2018) in terms of persistent policy problems caused by institutions that are created based on regulations or social norms that are subject to objective constraints (Stephan et al. 2015). These are concluded as (1) limited support for women entrepreneurs in terms of uncovering their role in sustainability and (2) deficiencies in environmental legislation and/or limited financial support with a growth-oriented focus which prevents the development of sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship. The practical and policy implications of these objective constraints in environmental entrepreneurship will be elaborated upon in Chapter 7.
CHAPTER 7
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

7.1 Introduction

This thesis explores the gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship through environmental engagement of women and men entrepreneurs in their value creation, ethical decision-making and environmental behaviour. Chapters 5 and 6 have revealed that this environmental engagement process in women and men-owned SMEs is socially constructed through gender influences and their interaction with institutional influences. Thereby, the thesis has analysed the gender-related environmental drivers and their interaction with institutional enablers in women-owned and men-owned SMEs in Turkey. By doing so, the study has drawn on a theoretical perspective that integrates gender role socialisation (Chodorow, 1971), feminist ethics of care (Gillian, 1982, Held, 2014), gender identity (Diaz Garcia and Welter, 2013; Lewis, 2013), and institutional theory (North, 1990; Kolk, 2014).

The study applies an integrated theoretical framework drawing on different academic disciplines to reveal findings on three important aspects: 1) gendered drivers of environmental entrepreneurship (doing and re-doing gender); 2) distinctive environmental entrepreneurship types in women and men-owned SMEs (sustainability-driven and economically driven), and 3) distinctive institutional enablers, such as access to finance, environmental legislation or social norms, depending on socially constructed gender influences for women and men environmental entrepreneurs.

First, environmental engagement is evident in how gender role socialisation is manifested in the practice of ethics of care or justice (doing gender) and the construction of gender identity (re-doing gender), where environmental entrepreneurs add value to feminist ethics of care in SMEs. Doing and re-doing gender depends on different gender influences, such as gender identity and role perception, expected gender roles (e.g., compliance), acknowledgement of limited support for female entrepreneurship and the neglect of gender differences in entrepreneurship through discourse, as well as the adding of value to femininity through caring, being relational and following collaborative approaches in the business realm (defiance). Thereby, gender influences become the primary driver of environmental entrepreneurs in their environmental engagement.
Second, environmental engagement in this study refers to a process of (1) owners’/managers’ goals (duality of goals vs triple bottom-line approach), (2) environmental innovation and/or system transformation that serves society, and (3) value creation (Section 1.1.). By examining doing and re-doing gender as a driver of the environmental engagement process, this thesis suggests that different gender influences on women and men entrepreneurs, depending on their discourse and experiences, pave the way for different types of environmental entrepreneurs, either as economically driven and/or sustainability-driven in Turkey. Therefore, I conclude that there are different environmental entrepreneurship types in women and men-owned SMEs in Turkey.

Third, the experiences and interactions of women and men entrepreneurs in the institutional environment considering environmental legislations, access to finance, the role of non-governmental organisations, and social structure that have distinctive influences on women and men environmental entrepreneurs also shape the process of environmental engagement as an enabler or barrier in SMEs. As Gidden (1984) suggests, institutions prompt entrepreneurial action and entrepreneurial action, in turn, changes the structure. Thereby institutional influences on entrepreneurs affect the type of environmental entrepreneurship driven by gender influences. This explains why this study requires an integrated approach to theory building for understanding gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship.

Based on the findings from the empirical chapters (Chapters 5 and 6), and the emerging theoretical background (Figure 2.8), the integrative theoretical framework (Figure 7.1) has been derived by depicting the interactive influences of gender dynamics (doing-re-doing gender) and institutions (e.g., legislation, finance, society structure and the role of NGOs) on women and men entrepreneurs in the sense of shaping their environmental entrepreneurship as economically driven or sustainability-driven. The new theoretical framework (Figure 7.1) suggests that even the institutional enablers are limited to facilitating the environmental engagement among environmental entrepreneurs as both women and men environmental entrepreneurs have the agency to change the rules of the game through their gender-responsive entrepreneurial behaviour, such as re-doing gender. This is usually enacted by feminist ethics of care in which environmental entrepreneurs care, support, and are relational while making a profit, without harming nature or society in their SMEs.

Re-doing gender facilitates the emergence of sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship where entrepreneurs apply a triple bottom-line approach rather than a duality
of goals (trade-offs between environmental and economic outcomes). While the existing environmental entrepreneurship studies still focus on merely growth-oriented perspectives which dominate the masculine assumptions of environmental entrepreneurship, they portray one type of environmental entrepreneurship, which is economically oriented (O’Neil and Gibbs, 2016).

This thesis portrays the feminist assumptions in environmental entrepreneurship which are beneficial for both economically oriented and sustainability-oriented environmental entrepreneurs. Having reviewed the female entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship literature (Chapter 2) where I have applied the emerging theoretical background (Figure 2.8) to the empirical research setting of an emerging economy (Chapters 5 and 6), the integrative theoretical findings are discussed drawing on the cross-case analyses in this chapter. With the social constructionist philosophy of this study (Section 4.2), where the reality is given meaning by people (Mason, 2017), a cross-case analysis involves comparing the socially constructed similarities and differences in owners/managers of women-owned SMEs and men-owned SMEs. The use of cross-case analysis improves the elaboration, accuracy, and reliability of theories developed from cases (Miles, Huberman, and Saldana, 2014; Yin, 2018).

The remaining sections are structured as follows:
Section 7.2 discusses theoretical findings through a cross-case analysis of owners/managers from women-owned SMEs and men-owned SMEs.
Section 7.3 presents the contributions of the study.
Section 7.4 discusses the implications for policy and practice.
Section 7.5 sets out the limitations of the research and future directions by concluding the chapter.

7.2 Research Findings
It is a qualitative study and the findings are mainly drawn from the inductive analysis of interview data based on an abductive approach to theory development (Section 4.2.2). The analysis has been guided by the following research questions addressing the research aim and objectives (1.3).

Q1: How does gender influence entrepreneurs’ environmental engagement in Turkey?
Q2: How can institutions enable environmental entrepreneurship for women and men entrepreneurs in an emerging economy?

Informed by Chapter 5, and Chapter 6, the key findings respond to these research questions in line with the research aims: to understand how socially constructed gender influences and their interaction with institutional influences shape the environmental engagement of entrepreneurs and, thereby, the type of environmental entrepreneurship.

Based on the three main findings, this study has achieved its three objectives which is presented in the table below (Table 7.1). The remainder of this section elaborates on each finding in turn and its relation to the existing literature.
Table 7.1: Research Objectives: Achieved by the Study Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research objectives</th>
<th>Research findings</th>
<th>Chapter 6 about institutional influences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| (1) To explore gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship through the environmental engagement of women and men entrepreneurs in their value creation, ethical decision-making, and environmental practices | (1) Gender is socially constructed through the social interactions of women and men entrepreneurs in the institutional environment. Socially constructed gender influences both women and men entrepreneurs as a driver in their environmental engagement process based on their doing and re-doing gender.  
   **Doing gender:** Entrepreneurs gain legitimation in their environmental engagement through the ethics of care or justice values, depending on the perceived gender identity, gender role expectations and gender role socialisation in practice (e.g., male, and female stereotypes in behaviour).  
   **Re-doing gender:** Entrepreneurs neglect the patriarchy and even reject perceived gender differences, such as the perception of a typical entrepreneur which is associated with being male and masculine. This drives both women and men entrepreneurs to practise feminist ethics of care (e.g., relational, supportive, collaborative) in SMEs by manifesting them in their environmental engagement. | (1) Environmental engagement also depends on institutional enablers under gender influences because while some institutions have the same influence on women and men environmental entrepreneurs, some do not. For instance, access to finance is a barrier for both women and men to increase their environmental engagement through technological environmental practices. Yet, it affects women more than men in the case of starting their environmental businesses or increasing their environmental practices through financial incentives. This is a result of social norms and SME greening policies and/or NGOs favouring growth-oriented and/or men-dominated sectors. |
the organisational, environmental, and social practices (Fig 5.3-Fig 5.4)
(2) To analyse the gender-related environmental engagement of both women and men entrepreneurs in terms of understanding similarities and differences by revealing what type of environmental entrepreneurs they are (economically driven/sustainability-driven), drawing on institutional enablers

| (2) Doing and re-doing gender is a complex process based on the perception of entrepreneurs of their identities and roles, depending on their experiences. So, while women start their businesses drawing on ethics of care, men entrepreneurs usually start theirs based on ethics of justice. Therefore, while women are usually more sustainability-oriented, men are economy-oriented environmental entrepreneurs |
| (2) To defy institutional barriers, or institutional gaps, to the development of women-owned-SMEs in size and scale through limited environmental legislation, access to finance, and a patriarchy that values men over women, women engage in sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship because there are fewer financial incentives and environmental legislation in their sectors. Yet, institutions influence most men entrepreneurs as an enabler to engage in an environment with environmental legislation in men-dominated sectors or by providing grants in men-owned SMEs, making men entrepreneurs economically oriented environmental entrepreneurs in this study. |
To conceptualise the institutional enablers and barriers for both women and men-owned SMEs and uncover specific challenges to women environmental entrepreneurs and provide practical implications to women and men environmental entrepreneurs, and policymakers.

With the cross-analysing Chapters 5 and 6:

Gender is perceived as ‘socially constructed’, based on social interactions of entrepreneurs in the institutional environment (regulative environment and socially embedded rules), which is apparent through the discourse of the entrepreneurs in Chapters 5 and 6. Therefore conceptualising the institutional environment for both women and men entrepreneurs unveils the institutional enablers and barriers that are specific to women and men environmental entrepreneurs. Revealing the barriers which refer to the ‘institutional gaps’ in the development of women’s entrepreneurship as well as environmental entrepreneurship, in general, has helped me to provide practical implications to women and men owners/managers for doing and re-doing gender strategically in their environmental engagement, especially when they face challenges in their social interactions within the institutional environment.

Understanding specific challenges to women entrepreneurs, such as the perception of women’s roles as caregivers in society, which incite them to do gender (e.g., gender role socialisation through home-based manufacturing for their children or family) in pre-entry and post-entry business decisions help suggest ‘care pay’ policies for women who want to start environmental businesses in industrial sectors. Moreover, social policies should be supported by entrepreneurial policies that should favour women-dominated sectors as well as men-dominated sectors since this study reveals how women contribute to the green economy through their triple bottom-line approach in their environmental engagement and become sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurs.
7.2.1 Gender influences on Environmental Entrepreneurship

The first key finding in this thesis relates to the first objective (1.3) to explore socially constructed gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship. The main finding is that gender influences are viewed through the lens of gender role socialisation (Chodorow, 1971; Giddens, 1984), feminist ethics of care (Gillian, 1982; Held, 2006), gender identity (Díaz García and Welter, 2013; Lewis, 2013), and institutional theory (North, 1990; Kolk, 2014) as drivers of environmental entrepreneurship at different levels for women and men entrepreneurs in Turkey. Gender as a driver affects the entrepreneurs' entry choices and post-entry strategic decisions about how to approach environmental engagement within their SMEs.

At one level, doing gender’ as a driver is understood through the lens of gender role socialisation (Chodorow, 1971), where women and men entrepreneurs perceive their identities as either female or male. While women are socialised to being feminine, which is associated with ethics of care, men are socialised to being masculine, which is associated with ethics of justice, which is evident in their discourse and business practices (Section 5.3.1 and Section 5.4.1). Therefore, women and men entrepreneurs have different approaches to their organisations, such as the duality of goals approach or the triple bottom-line approach. Since men entrepreneurs tend to engage with the environment based on their rational decisions, gaining legitimation for not paying penalties or having a competitive advantage in the market (Section 5.4.2), men entrepreneurs usually have a duality of goals (economic and environment). Yet, by showing compliance to their caregiver role in society, women follow a triple bottom-line approach to benefit society, the environment, and the economy in their business (Section 5.3.1 and Section 5.3.2).

On another level, re-doing gender as a driver is understood through the integration of gender role socialisation with other perspectives (feminist ethics of care, gender identity and institutional theory), which explains how women and men environmental entrepreneurs negotiate the challenges of perceived gender differences, especially in the institutional environment, by employing defiance (Section 5.3.2, Section 5.3.3, and Section 5.4.3). Women entrepreneurs’ defy perceived gender differences in three ways: 1) they practise ‘perceived masculinity’, which can be seen in their cost savings, competitive advantage, or financial sustainability, 2) they add value to their femininity in the business realm by being relational, supportive, and collaborative to increase their environmental and social commitment as well as financial outcomes.
For instance, collaborative approaches with institutions in using their waste as a raw material reflect women’s triple bottom-line approach. By being collaborative, they show their care for nature by reducing waste, they increase their cost savings, and they help their stakeholders’ corporate social responsibility by using their waste as a raw material. Third, women entrepreneurs defy perceived gender differences by supporting other women in their environmental businesses to empower them in society.

Men entrepreneurs’ defiance of gender differences occurs in three ways where they redo gender: 1) they add value to feminine characteristics, such as caring, being relational and sensitive to nature and community in business, 2) they start to empower women by hiring them in their SMEs or being business partners with them, which increases their cost savings, environmental engagement, and social practices (Section 5.4.3) and 3) they redo gender by practising feminist ethics of care (e.g., being relational, supportive, collaborative), which is against the traditional business models (e.g., growth-oriented). Therefore, men entrepreneurs claim that their environmental activities are against the expectations of a male entrepreneur in Turkey. I conclude that this creates tensions between being a male and practising environmental entrepreneurship. However, men entrepreneurs construct their environmental entrepreneur identity when they learn to practise feminist ethics of care.

This shows both women and men entrepreneurs practise ‘feminist ethics of care’ in their environmental engagement, as evidenced by their entrepreneurial behaviour (Fig 5.3 and Fig 5.4). Consequently, gender becomes the main driver of environmental entrepreneurs, which is aggregated under (1) doing gender and (2) re-doing gender for both women and men.

Moreover, challenges as being a woman arise from a patriarchal social structure. Accordingly, women are sometimes in between doing and re-doing gender and not being punished for any inappropriate behaviour is aggregated under neglect (Section 5.3.2). In this sense, while women acknowledge the lack of support for ‘female entrepreneurs’ (being female is associated with being a woman), they claim that they stop giving attention to the challenges of being a female entrepreneur when they cannot get support from their family and society. These women then show the agency to follow their entrepreneurial decisions to start or run their SMEs despite gender biases. For instance, they use their NGO networks to access international funding or choose to operate their SMEs in a male-dominated sector.
Yet, in their discourse, they claim that they still try to show that they are complying with social expectations (the caregiver role) to avoid punishment in society, which is different from men entrepreneurs in this study.

These findings respond to the question Vatansever and Arun (2016) addressed regarding why there are no sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurs in Turkey, which they researched by only considering men entrepreneurs. Gender as a driver in this study shows the different levels of environmental engagement of women and men entrepreneurs’ decision-making based on doing and re-doing gender. By doing gender, most men entrepreneurs follow the traditional perception of being an entrepreneur through masculine characteristics, such as profit maximisation. Thus, the study of Vatansever and Arun (2016) lacks sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship examples by discussing only men owners/managers of SMEs.

The distinctive findings of this study signal that gender plays a role in the relationship between environmental drivers (competitive advantage, legitimacy, and ethical values) and the adoption of environmental practices in SMEs. The interactions between gender and institutional influences shape the distinctive types of environmental entrepreneurship as sustainability-driven or economically driven. Accordingly, some environmental drivers are more prevalent (feminist ethical values, legitimacy) for women entrepreneurs, while other drivers are more dominant (competitive advantage, legitimacy) for men environmental entrepreneurs.

Consequently, drivers of environmental entrepreneurship are gendered because women entrepreneurs are less motivated by market pressures (competitive advantage) and environmental legislation compared to men entrepreneurs. This is consistent with the previous findings (Braun, 2010; Hechavarria et al., 2017) in the sense of women entrepreneurs are more engaged with the environment and society compared to men entrepreneurs, who are socialised to a marketplace mentality. However, this study also shows that gender role socialisation is not the only gender driver because women and men entrepreneurs have the agency to redo gender and act against the perceived gender differences as environmental entrepreneurs for the benefit of their SMEs.
7.2.2 Distinctive Types of Environmental Entrepreneurship in Women-owned vs. Men-owned SMEs

Environmental entrepreneurs are differentiated into different types based on the interaction of gender and institutional influences on them as economically driven and sustainability-driven types while running profit-oriented SMEs in Turkey.

Table 7.2 Environmental Entrepreneurship Types in Women-owned vs. Men-owned SMEs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters for distinction</th>
<th>Women-owned SMEs</th>
<th>Men-owned SMEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sustainability-driven Environmental Entrepreneurship</strong></td>
<td>1. Organisational: - Triple bottom-line approach (environmental, social and economic)</td>
<td>1. Organisational: - Duality of goals approach (environmental-economic payoffs (in some cases, economic goals are prioritised for profit-making)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Environmental Practices: - Transformative change with environmental innovation, such as creating value from waste, upcycling, or zero-carbon footprint, renewable energy (serving a circular economy model)</td>
<td>2. Environmental Practices: Environmental adaptation for economic outcomes (e.g., energy efficiency, use of more environmentally friendly products in established SMEs, industrial waste management for competitive advantage, avoiding penalties, financial incentives, cost savings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Social Practices: - Environmental Stewardship (e.g., relational with nature) - Women’s Empowerment (e.g., supportive) - Collaboration with Public and Private Institutions (e.g., cost-saving) - Functionality rather than ownership (e.g., training for visitors, and customers)</td>
<td>*In some cases, men entrepreneurs acknowledge that they employ social practices, such as empowering women by hiring them and appreciating their environmental and social commitment or following collaborative approaches with women, yet social practices are usually integrated after they add value to feminist ethics of care in their SMEs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Developed by the Researcher

The data suggests that sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship is a result of re-doing gender in the environmental engagement process by women and men entrepreneurs. Sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurs are those who are skilled at transforming society with environmental innovation in their products and/or repurposing their businesses for
the protection of the environment by embracing a triple bottom-line approach. In terms of their environmental practices, most women entrepreneurs aspire to make a difference in their society, or even the world (Chapter 5). Based on Elkington's (1998) triple bottom-line framework, the performance of a business is measured in terms of economic, social, and environmental balances.

The data in this study illustrates that most women entrepreneurs fall into the sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship type, those who combine a strong desire for profit with a strong desire for social change with their triple bottom-line approach. These entrepreneurs are referred to as visionary champions and/or ethical mavericks who are sustainability-oriented in their SMEs, drawing on the notion of Walley and Taylor (2002). The sustainability-driven approach is taken against the perceived gender differences in society and in entrepreneurship, which is seen as male and masculine-related behaviour in Turkey. Woman's environmental entrepreneurship addresses the question of how entrepreneurs can create an economically viable business while maintaining social and environmental values (e.g., Dixon and Clifford, 2007; Belz and Binder, 2017; Choi and Gray, 2008; Muñoz et al., 2018; Koe et al., 2015; Rodgers and Ketola, 2010; Schaefer et al., 2015; Tiba et al., 2019; Vuorio et al., 2018). Therefore, by giving at least equal importance to social and environmental goals regarding economic outcomes (Fig.5.3), women entrepreneurs are usually found to be sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurs.

The data also suggests that economically driven environmental entrepreneurship is a result of doing gender in the environmental engagement process of women and men entrepreneurs. Economically oriented entrepreneurs are those who are skilled at spotting an environmental niche or opportunity in the market to make a profit in their established SMEs. Economically driven entrepreneurs are usually influenced by formal institutions, such as legislation, and finance in the environmental engagement, and so they are driven by a duality of goals (environmental and economic). Most men entrepreneurs integrate environmental practices, such as the use of environmentally friendly technologies, to abide by energy efficiency legislation or increase cost savings through waste management. These economically driven men entrepreneurs are referred to as innovative opportunists and/or ad hoc enviropreneurs by Walley and Taylor (2002), and are entrepreneurs who have been mainly influenced by sectoral regulations to engage in environmental practices.
Women entrepreneurs perceive their entrepreneurial identity by referring to ‘sustainable entrepreneurship or environmentally sustainable entrepreneur’ (5.3.3) and men entrepreneurs define their entrepreneurial self as a ‘green entrepreneur’ or ‘ecopreneur’ (5.4.1). These findings are consistent with the study of Vatansever and Arun (2016) in which men entrepreneurs defined themselves as green or eco-entrepreneurs in Turkey. The cross-case analysis (Chapters 5 and 6) suggests that men entrepreneurs define themselves as green entrepreneurs as they usually operate in perceived potential green sectors, which are associated with a green economy, green growth, and the green policy of Turkey (Chapter 3). The interviews in this study with governmental and non-governmental stakeholders support these findings.

However, it does not necessarily mean that women entrepreneurs cannot fall into the economically driven environmental entrepreneur category and men entrepreneurs cannot fall into the sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship category. For instance, most women entrepreneurs fall into sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship types (e.g., PF1, PF2, PF3, EF1, EF2, EF3, EF4, EF7, EF9) as they have a triple bottom-line approach in their environmental engagement and are influenced by formal and informal institutions, such as non-governmental institutions, socially embedded rules and personal values or regulative rules. Yet PF4 (industrial environmental services), E5F (organic food additives manufacturing), and E8F (biotechnology) are classified as lying between sustainability-driven and economically driven environmental entrepreneurs because of doing and re-doing gender. While they (PF4, E5F, E8F) have a triple bottom-line approach (people, planet, profit) at the core of their businesses resulting in sustainable outcomes, they are influenced by formal institutions, such as financial incentives, market pressures from competitors, international customers, and consistent environmental legislation and practices, in their men-dominated industries (Chapter 6).

Another example is that most of the men entrepreneurs (e.g., PM1, PM2, PM3, PM4, EM1, EM2, EM3, EM4, EM5, EM6) fall into the economically driven environmental entrepreneurship types who have a duality of goals (environmental and economic) but prioritise economic outcomes through profitability, cost savings or financial sustainability with the influence of formal institutions, such as environmental legislation or financial incentives. Nevertheless, EM1, EM3 and EM4, whose SMEs operate in women-dominated sectors (e.g., health tourism, consultancy, food), have more sustainability values which refers to the triple
bottom-line approach compared to other men entrepreneurs in the male-dominated industrial sectors. These constantly changing processes of environmental engagement which can be seen as sustainability-driven and economically driven unpacks how women and men entrepreneurs practise their environmental engagement depending on how they do and redo gender under institutional enablers. This also illustrates that by practising feminist ethics of care (re-doing gender), men entrepreneurs learn to transform their SMEs into sustainability-oriented environmental SMEs.

Therefore, I suggest that the perception of environmental entrepreneurship needs to be diverse to support, encourage, and legitimise the transformative agenda of environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey. The data reveals that entrepreneurs may start environmental engagement in their SMEs for profit-making; however, caring for the environment and benefiting from it in the sense of environmental and economic outcomes leads them to become more sustainability-oriented by practising feminist ethics of care. It is important to understand the perception of environmental entrepreneurs on their activities, which contributes to the presentation of the experiences of the complex and messy reality of being an environmental entrepreneur (O’Neil and Gibbs, 2016). Focusing solely on the cleantech type or energy sectors where, usually, men entrepreneurs operate in this study does little to alter perceived gender differences, which seems problematic to the development of women’s entrepreneurship as well as environmental entrepreneurship.

7.2.3 Distinctive Institutional Enablers for the Development of Environmental Entrepreneurship in Women and Men-owned SMEs

The third finding of this study is the identification of distinct institutional enablers on women and men environmental entrepreneurs during the start-up or growth processes of their SMEs. The institutional influences on women and men-owned SMEs are perceived as formal and informal institutions. Formal institutions refer to legislation and finance and informal institutions refer to the role of non-governmental organisations or socially embedded rules. Each of the institutional influences on environmental entrepreneurs can be an enabler and/or barrier in Turkey, depending on the gender dynamics in play in the choices and decisions of the entrepreneurs.

First, legislation becomes an enabler when women and men entrepreneurs attract new markets, reduce their costs, and/or minimise their environmental impact on their SMEs (Figure 6.1 and Figure 6.2) which is consistent with the previous findings, suggesting that legitimation
influences entrepreneurs’ ethical decisions, environmental engagement, and the growth of their businesses (e.g., Dixon and Clifford, 2007; Mair and Marti, 2009; Paulraj, 2009; Hörisch et al., 2017). However, in this study, the legislation also acts as a barrier for both women and men environmental entrepreneurs, even if environmental legislation is a driving force for securing entrepreneurial legitimacy (e.g., O’Neil and Ucbasaran, 2016). The institutional environment is important to explore in terms of theory development in entrepreneurship because some societies have regulations that promote entrepreneurship while some other societies discourage entrepreneurs by making it a challenge (North, 1990).

Women entrepreneurs usually explain the difficulties they face in terms of accessing environment-related legislative information on their sectors, and deficiencies in auditing environmental activities because SME greening policies target larger firms in men-dominated sectors (Chapter 6). This is problematic for women entrepreneurs because their competitors or suppliers avoid environmental commitment through the deficiencies in the inspection. For instance, although there is waste oil legislation under the waste management law (Chapter 3), EF6 complained that her next-door competitors did not follow this procedure. This puts women’s competitors in an advantageous position in terms of offering lower prices to their customers by not complying with environmental legislation. The data has uncovered that existing environmental legislation discourages women entrepreneurs to be part of the environmental development mechanisms in Turkey.

Nevertheless, the findings of this study show that all women environmental entrepreneurs contribute to the development of industry in the sense of environmental sustainability despite the institutional gaps. For instance, although there is no direct environmental regulation or audit in her sector, E1F is environmentally trained and has worked in a non-governmental institution supporting social enterprises. By using her knowledge gained through informal training and networking skills, she collaborates with private companies (such as Unilever Turkey) to transform their waste into new products. In this way, they save more than six tonnes of waste in Turkey by contributing to the circular economy. Similar examples are found in other women entrepreneurs’ narratives (Chapter 5 and Chapter 6). This shows that although women entrepreneurs feel out of the game because of institutional gaps in legislation, women’s informal education (e.g., a climate change leader certificate), relationship with the public and private sectors through networking, previous experiences in NGOs as volunteers, employees,
or members, enable them to increase their environmental knowledge and environmental practices in SMEs.

The narratives of men entrepreneurs, even in the energy and waste management sectors, show that environmental legislation prevents their environmental activities as well as the development of such activities (Chapter 6). For instance, PM2 from the recycling sector waited for six months for his environmental permit certificate required to start his business. PM3 in the automotive and industrial manufacturing sector did not know what to do with their waste because of the deficiencies in auditing, although Turkey has waste management legislation (Chapter 3). These institutional gaps occur because environmental legislation applies only to industrial SMEs. Moreover, there is no alignment between institutions in the inspection. This data is supported by the key representatives in this study (6.3.1). The data reveals that every municipality has a different approach to waste management. Therefore, this study suggests more integrative environmental regulations and a gender-aware holistic approach that would focus on all sectors equally for the development of environmental entrepreneurship. Because, as Potluri and Phani (2020) suggest, in emerging economies, policies usually promote traditional entrepreneurs, which constrains the space for environmental entrepreneurship and challenges the ethical values of SME owners/managers.

The second institutional enabler is the access of both women and men entrepreneurs to finance from national and international institutions to integrate environmental practices into their SMEs. This is evidenced in many cases (Chapters 5 and 6). For instance, financial incentive programmes for energy efficiency in SMEs supported by KOSGEB increase the environmental practices of women and men-owned SMEs in the industrial sectors. Yet, legislative barriers impose financial barriers on women and men environmental entrepreneurs in Turkey, which suggests that institutional gaps coexist and hinder entrepreneurs from adapting or developing their environmental activities in SMEs. The data shows that access to financial support is more challenging for women entrepreneurs than for men entrepreneurs, usually because of the patriarchal social structure (Chapter 6). The financial support programmes are designed to transform SMEs that are already established that have an energy consumption above a certain threshold.

Therefore, most women entrepreneurs cannot meet the criteria for obtaining financial support from a green economy, green growth, or green transformation programme in an emerging
economy, Turkey. While many scholars (e.g., Yenilmez, 2018) suggest that women entrepreneurs usually have access to finance through social capital (e.g., friends and family), it becomes even more challenging for women in environmental entrepreneurship because they are re-doing gender by showing defiance to traditional entrepreneurship, which is male dominated (Chapters 5 and 6). How could it be possible for women entrepreneurs to access financial support in environmental engagement, which is designed for established firms that use a certain amount of energy and create a certain amount of waste in men-dominated sectors, by considering the reality of occupational segregation depending on female and male stereotypes? (Chapter 5).

For instance, PM1 benefitted from financial incentives when it came to getting an environmental protection certificate, while EF7 did not even apply for the same support, like many women entrepreneurs in this study. Despite this, E7F wanted to work with international companies; this required environmental certification. If her husband had not provided her with the money, she would not have been able to afford the ISO-1400 environmental protection certificate. However, in this study, most women entrepreneurs did not have access to finance and they had to use their savings to start their SMEs. Because of the limited opportunities given to feminine-perceived sectors, all the women environmental entrepreneurs in this study were unable to obtain credit loans, investor support, or government financial incentives, except for three women entrepreneurs with male co-founders in male-dominated sectors.

This study shows that women environmental entrepreneurs face financial challenges at the entry and growth stages due to their perceived roles as caregivers in a patriarchal society, as well as the limited financial support for women-dominated sectors. Men environmental entrepreneurs are usually faced with financial problems at the growth stage due to legislative deficiencies (Chapters 5 and 6). For instance, because of legislative deficiencies, international investors do not want to invest in the environmental projects of the men-owned SMEs studied in this research. Additionally, both women and men are challenged by the tax burden. Their narratives confirm that there are no carbon taxes to reduce CO2 emissions in Turkey, even though the country has very promising legislation in the energy and environmental sectors (Chapter 3). Based on this study, both environmental women-owned and men-owned SMEs should receive a positive tax rate (Chapter 6).
The findings from this study support the previous reports and studies (e.g., GEM, 2018; Kalafatoglu and Mendoza, 2017; Yenilmez, 2018) in terms of persistent policy problems caused by formal institutions that are created by social norms that refer to institutional gaps (e.g., Stephan et al., 2015). This study claims that limited support for women entrepreneurs might give rise to a gender gap in environmental entrepreneurship, while deficiencies in environmental legislation and/or auditing and limited access to finance prevent the development of environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey. This study suggests that to avoid the gender gap problem in environmental entrepreneurship as in traditional entrepreneurship (male dominated) in Turkey, it is important to uncover women entrepreneurs’ roles as stakeholders and feminist ethics of care in the development of sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship.

7.3 Contributions

7.3.1 Theoretical Contributions

First, the study contributes to the theory building of gender and environmental entrepreneurship studies (e.g., Braun, 2010; Hechavarria, 2016; Outsios and Farooqi, 2017) in the sense of understanding gender influences in the entry and post-entry decisions of environmental entrepreneurs. Specifically, this thesis has derived an integrative theoretical framework for understanding the socially constructed gender influences as a driver for women and men entrepreneurs in their environmental entrepreneurship (Figure 7.1). The framework argues that the constantly changing interactions between gender influences and institutional influences shape the environmental engagement of women and men entrepreneurs distinctively.

The interaction of gender and institutional influences is evident in the emergence of environmental entrepreneurship types as sustainability-driven or economically driven SMEs led by women and men entrepreneurs. Therefore, to uncover the gender influence on environmental entrepreneurship, it is appropriate to integrate theoretical perspectives from feminist theories (Chodorow, 1971; Gillian, 1982; Held, 2014; Lewis, 2013; Diaz Garcia and Welter, 2013) and institutional theory (North, 1990; Kolk, 2014) and apply them to empirical case studies that include both women-owned and men-owned SMEs.
Figure 7.1: Emerging Theory of Interactive Gender and Institutional Influences on Environmental Entrepreneurship
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The arrows (●) illustrate the constantly changing interaction between gender influences and institutional influences on women-owned and men-owned SMEs. It suggests that based on gender role socialisation, both women and men do gender to legitimise their ethical behaviour in environmental entrepreneurship. This is natural when women and men perceive being females and being males depends on specific behaviour according to contextual factors within institutional influences. However, by practising feminist ethics of care, both women and men environmental entrepreneurs care and become relational to and supportive of others. Thus, based on the influences of the feminine-oriented value system on their decision-making and behaviour, entrepreneurs construct their identities by re-doing gender in their entrepreneurial practices, such as adding value to femininity and collaborating with the public and private sector in their environmental practices.

The theoretical framework shows the interactions between gendered drivers of women and men environmental entrepreneurs and the institutional environment, which comprises written and unwritten rules, inform environmental entrepreneurs' decisions and behaviour regarding the type of environmental entrepreneurship they pursue (sustainability-driven vs economically driven) in their SMEs. This enables us to understand how gender drives women and men to environmental engagement in a different way, based on contextual factors. This argument contributes to previous studies by claiming that gender role socialisation is the main driver of women and men entrepreneurs in the sense of gaining legitimation for their environmental engagement through ethics of care or justice (e.g., Braun, 2010; Hechavarria, 2016). However, according to the theoretical framework (Fig 7.2), entrepreneurs are also driven by not complying with their perceived gender roles, which are explained through feminist ethics of care, gender identity and institutional theory.

The integrative framework enables us to understand there is no monolithic archetype of the environmental entrepreneur; instead, specific contextual differences shape the formation of the different identities within gender dynamics and the ways that women and men entrepreneurs do gender and redo gender in their environmental engagement. For example, when women face institutional gaps such as access to finance and legislative deficiencies with their socially embedded roles as caregivers, these affect women’s SMEs negatively in competitive advantage, access to the market, and environmental engagement. Then, the women show defiance by re-doing gender: They add value to their femininity in the business realm, especially for the sustainable outcomes in their SMEs, they support other women by believing
they are good at environmental commitment and they follow collaborative approaches with the decentralised private institutions for their environmental engagement and cost savings. As a result of this, their SMEs benefit the economy, society, and the environment.

The framework summarises entrepreneurial identity as constructed through perceived gender roles and social interactions, which individuals encounter during their lifespan. These social interactions (gender influences and institutional influences) form the environmental entrepreneur identity and are a driver of the adoption of environmental practices in women and men-owned SMEs. Gender identities and roles influence the different personal values (ecological, economic and social) in venture creation and the role of specific drivers (personal values, competitive advantage, legitimation) in the environmental engagement process, which reveals different types of women and men environmental entrepreneurs (sustainability-driven and economically driven). In doing so, the theoretical framework illustrates the influence of institutional factors (legislation, finance, societal structure, and the role of NGOs) and their embeddedness within constantly changing gender dynamics in terms of the emergence of different types of environmental entrepreneurship in an emerging economy.

Second, this study also contributes to extending a feminist perspective to the study of entrepreneurship. Understanding how the portrayal of women as carers can be advantageous in environmental entrepreneurship within gender role socialisation, especially in a patriarchal society. However, in this study, gender role socialisation creates tensions between male entrepreneurs and environmental entrepreneurs. Supported by the claim that ‘masculine and feminine traits vary over time, place, and discourse’ and are ‘constantly renegotiated’ (Lewis, 2013; West and Zimmerman, 1987), this thesis contributes to feminist theories in entrepreneurship by suggesting the importance of practising feminine-oriented value systems where women and men add value to femininity in the business realm, especially when there are institutional gaps, such as limited financial support or deficiencies in the legislation.

Moreover, managers’ decision-making is mainly derived from modern ethical theories focusing on indications of masculinities more than femininities in both female entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship. Therefore, the scale leaves feminine decision-making dimensions invisible. In this sense, this study values the feminist ethics of care in the business realm. Thereby it contributes to gender identity and patriarchy in entrepreneurship studies (e.g., Diaz Garcia and Welter, 2013; Tlaiss and Kauser, 2019).
Third, recent studies linking environmental entrepreneurship and female entrepreneurship from developing countries separately indicate that formal and informal institutions are one of the main persistent barriers for entrepreneurs (Maden, 2015; Sefer, 2020; Vatansever and Arun, 2016; Wahga, 2017). To my knowledge, there have been no attempts to study the relationship between gender (doing and re-doing gender) and environmental entrepreneurship in developing countries by taking institutional factors (institutional enablers and barriers) into consideration. In addressing this long-standing knowledge gap, this thesis adds to the theoretical debates in environmental entrepreneurship by uncovering the institutional challenges for both women and men environmental entrepreneurs by offering practical and policy implications for the development of environmental entrepreneurship. Understanding gendered institutional influences and different driving factors of environmental entrepreneurs contributes to the development of the required environmental strategies and practices since it helps predict and encourage environmental action in women-owned and men-owned SMEs.

7.3.2 Empirical contribution

This study also has an empirical contribution. Previous studies have examined the gender and environmental entrepreneurship relationship from the points of view of ethics of care and gender role theory (e.g., Braun, 2010; Hechavarria, 2016) in the Australian and the USA context, respectively. In this sense, Braun (2010) claims that the findings are culturally and contextually relative and less likely to apply to women in developing economies with limited economic resources. She highlights that her findings are based on women raised in privileged Western settings. Moreover, Outsios and Farooqi (2017) encourage international scholars to explore socially constructed gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship in developing countries since studies reveal different findings based on contextual factors. So, research on the gender influences on the environmental engagement of SME owners/managers has been usually undertaken in the context of developed economies, which have distinct institutional structures compared to developing countries (2.2.4-2.3.4).

In that vein, findings from developed countries/advanced economies cannot be generalised globally. The research in contextual settings of developing countries/emerging economies is, thus, vital, mainly because of the heterogeneity in institutional setups and fluidity of gender dynamics. Both gender influences and institutional influences are apparent in entrepreneurs’ career choices and behaviour in Turkey (Chapter 3). Moreover, empirical analysis (Chapters 5
and 6) contributes to understanding the heterogeneity of women and men entrepreneurs in the sense of knowing that they are not always complying with their perceived gender roles by following the rules of the game when these rules are detrimental to their entrepreneurial aspirations and SMEs growth. The proposed theory in this study explains how gender influences become a driving force for women and men environmental entrepreneurs in an emerging economy where there is a patriarchal society structure by taking gender into account, in combination with institutional factors.

Through feminist ethics of care perspectives, the new framework argues that the portrayal of women as "caring and relational" turns the disadvantages of being a woman in a male-dominated country into an advantage with sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship. However, neglect and defiance of the perceived gendered roles are also motivations for Turkish women entrepreneurs when there are formal institutional gaps that involve limited financial support or legislative deficiencies in women-dominated sectors, drawing on informal institutions such as women's socially embedded roles. Therefore, contrary to Outsios and Farooqi's (2017) study on gender influences in environmental entrepreneurship in the UK claiming that gendered traits have not triggered women's reluctance to take on debt by challenging the investment environment for both women and men entrepreneurs, the negative influences of institutions more affect women environmental entrepreneurs in the sense of the growth of SMEs in Turkey.

Yet, integrating feminist ethics of care, gender identity and institutional theory into gender role socialisation theory shows how Turkish men entrepreneurs practise feminine-oriented value systems and then start to construct their identities as relational environmental entrepreneurs. This contributes to gender and environmental entrepreneurship literature in the sense of uncovering how men entrepreneurs deal with the tensions of being male and practising ethics of care in a patriarchal country. Even if recent studies from developed countries propose rigorous practice and policy implications for the development of environmental entrepreneurship, the institutional background in patriarchal countries might not enable the development of women's environmental entrepreneurship (Anderson and Ojediran, 2022).

Even if, in this study, women entrepreneurs have more social and environmental aspirations (value creation goals) than men entrepreneurs it is more challenging for women entrepreneurs to turn their aspirations into practice because the significant limiting factor is financial problems, such as obtaining loans and financial support for women entrepreneurs based on
locally perceived gender roles. Therefore, the new theory lets us understand the role of gender influences in its interaction with the institutional environment, which serves as either an enabler and/or a barrier by referring to institutional gaps for women and men environmental entrepreneurs (Chapter 6). The institutional differences between developed and developing countries make it imperative to explore gender and environmental entrepreneurship in the context of developing economies (Outsios and Farooqi, 2018).

Among the most important reasons why women entrepreneurs from developing countries experience a wider gender gap in entrepreneurship compared to their counterparts in developed countries like the UK and Germany is because we have limited knowledge of the drivers, experiences, challenges, and needs of women entrepreneurs in patriarchal (male-dominated) emerging economies such as Turkey. I present a new integrative theoretical framework for explaining women's potential to foster environmental entrepreneurship, where gender influences result in the acceptance and/or defiance of identity, perceived roles, and institutions (Chapters 5 and 6). This study contributes to the literature by revealing women entrepreneurs' feminine and masculine entrepreneurial characteristics (ethics of care-justice) in pursuing sustainability-driven environmental businesses in an emerging economy. As described in the thesis framework (Fig 7.2), this study suggests that even if doing and re-doing gender depends on the institutional influences on women and men entrepreneurs, women and men have the agency to redo gender for the greater good.

As Giddens (1984) and Taylor and Walley (2002) propose, institutions prompt entrepreneurial action and entrepreneurial action in turn changes the structure. There is a risk of treating institutions as a deterministic homeostatic loop because this study shows that they may form entrepreneurship types; however, they do not always determine practices. In other words, I examine how sustainability-driven women's environmental entrepreneurship, where women are change agents, can affect the institutions as well. In turn, this signals an opportunity to understand how the interactions between gender and institutions change over time and reveal women’s role as stakeholders in environmental entrepreneurship within institutions. It is important to keep in mind institutions (formal and informal) are the “humanly-devised constraints that structure human interaction” (North, 1996, p. 8); they represent the rules of the gam” (North, 1990, p. 27) through a human agency which is diverse in each context.
7.4 Implications for Policy and Practice

7.4.1 Implications for Entrepreneurs

The findings have practical implications for women and men entrepreneurs who wish to start or develop sustainable environmental enterprises, secure resources with financial access and gain entrepreneurial support from providers (e.g., the Business Council for Sustainable Development, KOSGEB, KAGIDER, Climate Volunteers) to operate their business in a triple bottom-line approach (e.g., Dixon and Clifford, 2007).

First, women entrepreneurs in a patriarchal society, where gender role socialisation starts from childhood and continues in career choices can do gender strategically by choosing to be environmental entrepreneurs. When suggesting doing gender, I take the notion of Ahl and Marlow (2012), Lewis (2013) and Marlow and McAdam (2015), who assumed gendered weakness or difference can be a legitimate strategy, rather than one which limits women's entrepreneurship. It is not always necessary for women to conform to gender biases. They can do gender using masculine and feminine traits.

For example, while women entrepreneurs talk about their financial success (e.g., cost savings, financial sustainability), they add value to their femininity because being relational and supportive enhances the size and scale of their SMEs, as well as their environmental commitment (Chapter 5). Moreover, since the traditional entrepreneurship norms are usually perceived through masculinity (e.g., competitive advantage, growth orientation), many women entrepreneurs in this study have gained legitimation for environmental entrepreneurship through their feminine-oriented ethical values, where it is inevitable, they will practise environmental entrepreneurship (Fors and Lennerfors, 2019).

Another example of doing gender is when some women entrepreneurs chose to run their SMEs from home, which can be an expression of gender-related responsibilities at home, such as looking after their babies. However, women do not always consider their perceived gender identities (being female, wife, mother) and roles (e.g., caregiving) to be a limiting factor to their environmental entrepreneurial desire (e.g., the desire to change the world by protecting nature). Therefore, they re-purpose their business as sustainable in many ways by providing the opportunity to stay at home based on their agency and running a digital business, which does not harm the environment because they are carbon neutral. In this way, when women do
gender in their entrepreneurial behaviour through environmental engagement, it increases their chances of starting and running SMEs in a patriarchal environment. As Lewis (2013) claims, how we perceive femininity and masculinity depends on our interpretations and experiences; thereby, by doing gender, these women show staying at home while running a business can be advantageous in environmental entrepreneurship, where you can make a profit as well as run a sustainable business. Considering the COVID-19 pandemic, where digital businesses were less affected in terms of their sales (e.g., Donthu and Gustafsson, 2020), making this argument even more valuable because digital technologies in each sector seem like our new normal.

Second, doing gender can be detrimental, in some cases, to the development of women-owned SMEs in size and scale, environmental development, or access to the green market (Chapter 6). Therefore, women entrepreneurs should know how and when to distance themselves from the perceived caregiver role in society. For example, apart from three women entrepreneurs who are partnered with other men entrepreneurs whose SMEs operate in men-dominated sectors, most women entrepreneurs face challenges in legislation, access to finance and support from institutions because of the patriarchal social structure, which creates gender biases against women entrepreneurs.

At that point, women must consider how re-doing gender (defying the perceived gender differences) can facilitate their creation of sustainability-driven environmental enterprises. For example, one woman entrepreneur claimed that because of the insufficient information on and support for environmental legislation in women-dominated sectors, she struggled to start her business. However, she did not give up and re-did gender by practising feminist ethics of care in the sense of being relational with her networking skills through NGOs. At this point, her business started to educate SMEs, NGOs and different kinds of organisations as a consulting firm, where she found an opportunity in the market with limited information on and support for environmental regulations for entrepreneurs, especially in women-dominated sectors. Moreover, she supported other women by hiring them to write on the company website about the environment, women, renewable energy, and so on. Consequently, by being supportive and relational and showing care she created sustainability-related environmental entrepreneurship, even if the existing institutional environment was not supportive of women-dominated sectors.

Another example of when women can consider re-doing gender is the one woman entrepreneur from the organic textile sector who wanted to export her products. She needed an environmental certificate (ISO-1400) demanded by international firms. Yet, she has struggled
to get loans from the bank because of gender biases against women entrepreneurs. Moreover, her funding application to KOSGEB’s Energy Efficiency Support Programme for the environmental certification and auditing process was declined because her business was not producing at a certain level, unlike energy and technology firms which are male dominated. Yet, by being a member of the Women Entrepreneur’s Association, she learned about other international organisations that provided organic certification which is valid in EU countries. First, she gained that international organic certification to export her products, and then she gained an ISO-1400 certificate, with her husband’s financial support. In the end, she managed to work with international firms by increasing her sales based on the knowledge she had acquired from the Women Entrepreneur’s Association and by using this knowledge as an opportunity to gain an environmental certificate.

The findings show that gender influences are the drivers and enablers of sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship. However, they can be a barrier because of the perceived gender roles of women in the institutional environment (e.g., lack of access to financial support in feminine-perceived sectors). Therefore, changes are needed to ensure starting or pursuing environmental businesses require women entrepreneurs to consider how to do and redo gender to benefit themselves, their businesses and society. External networks and informal training (e.g., organic production courses, the Climate Leader Certificate, green entrepreneurship modules) seem crucial for helping women entrepreneurs to redo gender. This study suggests that being part of networks (KAGIDER’s Green Women’s Group, Green Caller’s Women’s Platform, TMM Digital) including governmental and non-governmental organisations and multinational corporations is essential for women seeking information, resources and advice in environmental entrepreneurship.

For men owners/managers, there are two practical implications based on the findings of this study (Chapters 5 and 6).

First, men owners/managers from the industrial manufacturing, energy, and potential green sectors (e.g., recycling, automobile sectors) can collaborate with the enterprises led by women entrepreneurs in different sectors to increase their environmental commitment. I make this practical suggestion considering women’s commitment to society and the environment in their venture creation goals, even in the absence of sectoral environmental regulations, finance and
support (Chapter 5). Because, although there are waste management regulations for firms in manufacturing sectors and the municipalities responsible for dealing with such waste (Chapter 3), many men entrepreneurs do not know what to do with their waste, claiming that there is no harmony between municipalities.

Moreover, it is expensive to pay private companies to collect the waste (Chapter 6). Yet, most women entrepreneurs follow a triple bottom-line approach, which includes a zero waste approach (Figure 5.2, Figure 5.3). For example, they add value to waste and use it as a raw material without destroying it, which increases their environmental engagement as well as cost savings in production. So, when men owners/managers are lagging in environmental engagement, especially in waste management, they can consider collaborating with women owners/managers from different sectors, which will also increase the industrial symbiosis, which is important in the circular economy approach of Turkey with their TMM initiative (Chapter 3).

Second, men entrepreneurs can learn from women entrepreneurs in the sense of practising feminist ethics of care. For example, women entrepreneurs create value from waste by using other companies’ waste as their raw materials with an upcycling approach. E1F collaborates with Unilever (private sector) to use their non-chemical waste as raw materials and has saved almost 6,000 tonnes of waste in Turkey. This shows that specific managerial capabilities (caring, supporting, being relational) accelerate sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship and, consequently, slow down some global problems, such as climate change, and pollution. This is because sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurs practise feminine ethics of care by being relational, supportive and collaborative, which is different from masculine ethics of care which are market-driven and growth-oriented.

In that vein, men owners/managers can redo gender by practising feminist ethics of care and concluding that it is possible to grow your business, access the market and protect society and the environment. In some cases, it even brings solutions to environmental problems such as increased carbon emissions that cause climate change. For example, one male entrepreneur claims that they practise a feminine-oriented value system by showing care to nature, which has resulted in collaborative approaches with stakeholders, especially with women. This increases the environmental sustainability as much as the financial sustainability in their SMEs.
“More than 40 million pints of beer have been served with our smart tap technologies [...]. working with a female business development manager has helped grow our business [...] her sustainable strategies such as introducing environmental brewery method to the beer industry which is more efficient [...].” EM6 (Food and Beverages Technology: Smart Solutions)

Therefore, I also suggest men owners/managers should include more women in environmental jobs to ensure their company’s sustainability (environmental, social and economic). This practical implication can be supported by the argument made by Buil-Fabregà et al. (2017), who claimed women’s greater social and environmental commitment helps SMEs provide the more socially and environmentally responsible products and services demanded by new customers, create value for society and improve environmental conditions.

For instance, three women entrepreneur participants were co-founders of their SMEs, with men owners/managers, in industrial organic food additives manufacturing, biotechnology, and industrial waste management firms, respectively. Their narratives unveil how these women are different from their men counterparts in terms of practising a feminine-oriented value system and, therefore, becoming sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurs who serve society, the environment, and the economy. Men owners/managers can adopt practices to empower and advance the role of women in environmental companies, as do most women entrepreneurs in this study (e.g., hiring women, gender equality responsibility, increasing awareness on gender equality among workers), which can enhance the sustainability outcomes of their SMEs.

In summary, while I am suggesting women entrepreneurs do and redo gender strategically in their environmental engagement because of the patriarchal social structure, I strongly suggest men entrepreneurs redo gender by adding value to femininity in the business realm, especially in environmental entrepreneurship, since it pays off not only in an economic sense but also in environmental and social outcomes. What I am suggesting is different from perceived traditional entrepreneurship, which is merely associated with economic outcomes and masculine traits (e.g., growth orientation, profit maximising, being individualistic). Our world is changing and the current problems, such as climate change and COVID-19, have shown us our existing assumptions and perspectives on entrepreneurship and the way of running businesses are not working.
The current entrepreneurship norms may be effective, in the short term, for making profits, but when the natural resources (e.g. water, energy, soil) are no longer there to be used as raw materials for businesses because of our individualism rather than interpersonal relationships, our aggressiveness rather than care, our subordination and/or externalisation (e.g. female, nature, society) rather than support, how can we make a profit since there is nothing left to produce and consume?

7.4.2 Implications for Policymakers
This study has three policy implications for supporting women entrepreneurs to overcome existing barriers (gender-based and institutional) to starting and pursuing their sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship. Moreover, drawing on the key findings of the study (7.2.1, 7.2.2 and 7.2.3), there is another crucial policy implication for the development of distinctive types of environmental entrepreneurship for both women and men-owned SMEs in an emerging economy.

First, the thesis has implications for social policies aimed at addressing gender influences (e.g., the perceived caregiver role of women) that are constraining women-owned SMEs’ participation and development in environmental entrepreneurship. Although the findings of this study reveal that gender influences have become women’s main driver to engage in environmental practices by doing and re-doing gender (Section 7.2.1), gender influences, especially the gender role socialisation of women’s caregiver role at the home, stop some women entrepreneurs from operating their SMEs beyond home-based manufacturing (Chapter 5). Even a one-woman entrepreneur (EF3) claimed that although her husband supported her in childcare, he could not stay at home all the time and they had to find private childcare facilities, which are expensive in Turkey. This has pushed her to run her business at home.

There is an existing welfare policy for Turkish women in childcare pay to increase women’s employment (Ozasir-Kacar and Essers, 2017). Yet, this welfare policy only applies to those who want to work as an employee in Turkey. In the women-owned SME cases from this study, it is revealed that by doing and re-doing gender, women owners/managers follow a triple bottom-line approach, which contributes to the economy and society (e.g., hiring women, environmental training of customers and employees), as well as the environment (e.g., zero waste management, being carbon neutral). Thereby women fall into sustainability-driven
environmental entrepreneurship. Regarding women’s roles in sustainability and green growth, it is suggested that welfare policy should be redesigned to apply to all women who want to work as an employee and should include women who want to start their businesses.

Second, the social policies for women should not be applied in isolation, as suggested by Kimbu and Ngoasong (2016). To change the perception of women’s role as caregivers in a patriarchal society, social policies should be supported by market-oriented policies. Turkey has already encouraged environment and energy-related SMEs in the sense of green growth (e.g., the Energy Efficiency Programme of KOSGEB). Similarly, many institutions, such as the Small and Medium Enterprises Support Administration (KOSGEB), distribute billions of Turkish Lira every year to the enterprises that apply to them.

However, is this type of support likely to boost environmental entrepreneurship that is expected to create value within green growth? This study has demonstrated that how entrepreneurial support is designed matters more than how much is provided. The content of the support provided to SMEs, as well as the way the support is distributed equally between men and women owners/managers, helps the emergence of sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship. Many women entrepreneurs find access to environmental support programmes challenging since they do not meet the criteria (7.2.3).

In this sense, KOSGEB, local women’s cooperatives and women’s entrepreneurship associations can collaborate with BCSD Turkey such that women entrepreneurs in the male-dominated industrial sectors can be mentors, and even role models, for other women entrepreneurs. Information sharing and knowledge exchange (e.g., know-how) can serve as an incentive for women entrepreneurs who want to run environmental businesses (Section 7.2.3). Moreover, given that most women-owned SMEs operate in women-dominated sectors (Sefer, 2020), an SME greening policy incorporating men-dominated sectors with women-dominated sectors to promote environmental entrepreneurship could prioritise the needs of women environmental entrepreneurs. This includes training for environmental legislation for women entrepreneurs, market opportunities beyond home-based manufacturing, financial support, and inclusion in networks for industrial symbiotics in the green economy with the support of BCSD’S TMM programme.
The market-oriented policies need to increase awareness and usage of environmental legislation through entrepreneurship policies, networking opportunities, and new financial opportunities for newly established SMEs from women-dominated sectors similarly to what is currently being done in the energy, technology and manufacturing sectors, which are men-dominated in Turkey (Maden, 2015; Sefer, 2020). As suggested by Kimbu et al. (2019), networks that support women entrepreneurs are effective in facilitating the exchange of information among governments and private sector resource providers (e.g., financial providers) and linking women-owned businesses to markets. Moreover, tax incentives for women who want to start environmental businesses in each sector equally would help women in the sense of their environmental engagement and cost savings.

The findings of this thesis support these policy implications by showing when women entrepreneurs have access to resources, such as information on sectoral environmental regulations, finance, and the green market, and network through governmental and non-governmental institutions, they use them to create empowerment for various stakeholders, including themselves, through sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship (7.2.3). For example, women entrepreneurs in men-dominated sectors have demonstrated how they can run profitable but also socially and environmentally engaged SMEs with opportunities given in these sectors: namely biotechnology, industrial waste management, and industrial food additives manufacturing (Chapter 3).

Third, the entrepreneurship policy discourse is often ‘gendered’, which is evident in reports and studies on how women as mothers or housewives are expected to be less engaged in entrepreneurship because of their gender (OECD, 2021; Sefer, 2020). For instance, by examining entrepreneurship policies (e.g., the Entrepreneurship Strategy and Action Plan of Turkey) which have been designed by KOSGEB, I found that “women entrepreneurship” is categorised as a “thematic entrepreneurship” along with social, youth, global and eco-entrepreneurship (p.5), not as a primary entrepreneurship, which is how male entrepreneurship is classified. This reflects the gender inequality in the state-based perception of women’s employment (e.g., Halac and Celik, 2019). The discourse of the participants from both the formal and informal institutions showed that they were more likely to support women in certain sectors, but not in the manufacturing industries.
The gender inequalities practised based on state perceptions is also evidenced in this thesis with limited regulative information dissemination in women-dominated sectors, green growth SME policy and financial incentives that favour established SMEs in men-dominated sectors. These are a barrier for women to develop their SMEs in size and scale as much as increase their environmental engagement, such as using environmental technologies for energy efficiency (Section 7.2.2 and Section 7.2.3). Therefore, it is suggested that the discourse of entrepreneurship policies should be gender-sensitive and supportive for women as well as men entrepreneurs. If social and entrepreneurial policies encouraged women entrepreneurs to access support, they would be able to play an increasingly important role in sustainable development (economics, environment, society) through environmental entrepreneurship (Outsios and Farooqi, 2017).

Finally, the discourse on green SME policies should emphasise the importance of feminist ethics of care as much as growth-oriented approaches. The definition of environmental entrepreneurship should be avoided, being constantly associated with traditional economic development objectives (masculine norms), especially in patriarchal societies, which is problematic in terms of the inclusion of women-owned SMEs in green growth. Moreover, it creates tensions between being a male and an environmental entrepreneur in Turkey, often pushing men entrepreneurs into becoming economically oriented environmental entrepreneurs (7.2.2). This can be detrimental to the development of distinctive types of environmental entrepreneurship, such as sustainability-driven environmental entrepreneurship among men-owned SMEs (7.3.3).

Environmental entrepreneurship studies claim that a green economy is designed to increase (1) social welfare, (2) social equality, and (3) environmental awareness, which can be achieved by reducing ecological shortages (O’Neil and Ucbasaran, 2016). Based on the green entrepreneurship policy of Turkey, KOSGEB and the chambers of industry reward environmental SMEs especially in the potential green sector for their energy efficiency, use of environmental technologies, clean production, and resource efficiency. However, considering Turkey’s zero waste aims, and waste management legislation, such rewards (financial and training-based) must be also given to SMEs led by women and men entrepreneurs who show ‘symbiotic relationships with other sectors (a combination of different production/industrial processes in which the waste is used as an input and raw materials of another industrial process are used).
Moreover, when rewarding the behaviour of environmental entrepreneurs based on green economy policies, social welfare and social equality dimensions should be taken into consideration. Such support would enable environmental entrepreneurship and contribute to the emergence of distinctive types of environmental entrepreneurs that serve the triple bottom line by promoting the UN’s sustainable development goals (i.e., gender equality, responsible consumption and production, decent work).

7.5 Limitations and Future Directions for the Study

This study is not without its limitations, as in all studies. There are three main limitations that future research can consider while studying gender and environmental entrepreneurship.

First, this study has applied the qualitative methodological approach, where the sampling was limited to women and men entrepreneurs from specific regions in Turkey. Therefore, the findings cannot be generalised to all parts of Turkey and other countries. Future studies can consider different sampling approaches, such as surveys where the sample size would be larger, making the findings more generalisable. Nevertheless, this study provides some theoretical generalisations by using a multiple-case study approach (Yin, 2018). For instance, by exploring doing and re-doing gender as a driver of entrepreneurial (ethical) decision-making (Diaz Garcia and Welter, 2013; Tlaiss and Kauser, 2019), the findings of this study can be applied to other country contexts, especially in patriarchal societies where gender influences affect women and men entrepreneurs’ decision-making and entrepreneurial behaviour. Moreover, in countries with similar gender dynamics to Turkey, legislation, finance, society structure, and the role of NGOs could be investigated to see if they enable or hinder environmental engagement of owners/managers and SME growth in a similar way.

Drawing on the new integrative theoretical framework (Fig 7.1), future studies may use quantitative techniques to uncover the relationships I have revealed within gender influences, institutional influences, and environmental entrepreneurship in distinctive contexts. The findings of this study can be used in other studies with different contexts because transferability, dependability, creditability and conformity have been achieved by following an abductive approach (systematic combining) to theory development (Dubais and Gadde, 2002). Moreover, the findings of this study are supported by the embedded case study approach, where there are sub-units of analysis (e.g., stakeholders from the public and private institutions) as well as secondary data analysis (e.g., reports, company websites, news).
Second, most female entrepreneurship studies merely include women entrepreneurs to investigate the challenges they face (e.g., Sefer, 2020). In that sense, I missed the chance to include more women in this study, which could have ensured that it focuses more on women’s voices and their concerns regarding gender equality in entrepreneurship. However, Lewis (2013) claims that how we perceive femininity and feminine practices depends on our own understanding and experiences; thus, access to any entrepreneurial femininity is influenced by the structural position of individual women in terms of class, ethnicity, race, age, sexuality, and other forms of social difference (e.g., institutional influences). Thereby, understanding how men entrepreneurs perceive femininities in a patriarchal society extends our understanding of the challenges to female entrepreneurs as well as revealing the importance of practising feminist ethics in the business realm by both women and men owners/managers of SMEs. Nevertheless, future studies can build on my approach but focus on women entrepreneurs only.

Third, to advance our understanding of the relationship between gender and environmental entrepreneurship, I integrated feminist theories (e.g., gender role socialisation, gender identity, and feminist ethics of care) with institutional theory. By taking the advice of Yadav and Unni (2016), who claim that there is a need to make a shift in one’s epistemological position from how gender is done to how social orders are gendered in entrepreneurship, I used the existing concept of environmental entrepreneurship, which is underpinned by institutional theory and grounded it in feminist theories. Although it helped me to develop a new integrative theoretical framework (Figure 7.1) to understand socially constructed gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship, some scholars may claim that institutional and feminist theories are contradictory, while some others may claim that I missed the opportunity to deeply engage in either of these theories.

Moreover, it is also possible that other theoretical perspectives I examined in my systematic literature review on female entrepreneurship and environmental entrepreneurship, including motivation theory (e.g., Kirkwood, 2009), life value theory (e.g., Maden, 2015), the resource-based view (e.g., Bansal and Roth, 2002), dynamic capabilities view (e.g. Hofmann et al., 2012), theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991) or legitimation theory (e.g., Zimmerman and Zeith, 2002), may help the further understanding of gender influences within environmental entrepreneurship while also integrating the feminist ethics of care. Future studies may consider integrating feminist ethics of care theory with these theories that I highlighted but did not investigate in depth.
Institutions impinge upon entrepreneurial experiences, and a feminist analysis positioning women and men as being socially constructed also illustrates the influences of gender upon entrepreneurial processes. Therefore, in future studies, to make explanations at an institutional level, scholars should continue to probe the positive and negative impacts of institutions related to the entrepreneurial choices and experiences of both women and men entrepreneurs. Moreover, future studies can specifically focus on the influence of decentralised NGOs on the environmental engagement of owners/managers in SMEs since their influences have been found to be effective in this study. For example, based on my observations and the findings of the study, both women and men entrepreneurs who have previous experience in the third sector (e.g., NGOs) show more environmental and social commitment in their SMEs. This is also underlined in the study of Outsios and Farooqi (2018) which explored gender influences on environmental entrepreneurship in the UK.

Finally, comparative studies of SMEs led by co-founders (women and men) and SMEs led by men regarding environmental performance would help to uncover women’s roles in sustainability and the green economy, based on the findings of this study regarding women’s triple bottom-line approach in their environmental businesses.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Interview Questions for Entrepreneurs

Appendix 1a: Introductory Questions

Interview Questions for Entrepreneurs

1.1. Introductory Questions

I would like to start by asking you to provide a bit of background about your business. These will be factual questions and let me know if you are unable to provide any of the information.

1. Age: □ Less than 25 □ 25-45 □ 46-65 □ Above 65

2. Gender: □ Male □ Female

3. How would you identify the industry you are in?

4. How the education and training you have received has prepared them for environmental entrepreneurship
   □ Primary education □ Vocational College (O-Level, A-Level)
   □ University degree □ Other training/certification

5. Sources of finance for your business (Tick more than one if applicable)
   □ Self-financing (personal savings) □ Donations from friends and family
   □ A personal loan from a bank □ Venture capital
   □ Grants & subsidies (e.g. from the government)

6. Type of business?
   □ Environmental Services □ Textile
   □ Organic Agriculture and Husbandry □ Decoration
   □ Tourism □ Fashion
   □ Health services □ Arts and craft/souvenir sellers
   □ Renewable Energy
   Other: Can you please describe your business?

7. Size of the enterprise (number of employees, annual turnover, etc.):
   □ 0-5 □ 6-10 □ 11-50 □ above 50

8. Family status?
   □ Married with child/children □ Divorced/separated
   □ Single/widow □ No child/Children

9. Do you have any documents that have additional background information: Company documents, or case studies about your business?
Appendix 1b: Main Interview Questions for Entrepreneurs

Main Questions for Environmental Entrepreneurs

1. What are your motivations for engaging in the type of business you are doing?
2. How do your motivation factors influence your decisions to choose the sector you operate in your business?
3. Does your organisation have any strategy for balancing economic, social and environmental outcomes? If yes, how? and why?
4. How would you identify yourself as an entrepreneur?
   When do not refer to them: Use Probing technique ‘(green entrepreneur, social entrepreneur, environmental entrepreneur/ sustainable entrepreneur’
   Is there any term you feel more closely related to? Why?
5. What do you think about women entrepreneurs in Turkey? Do you see any difference between men and women entrepreneurs in Turkey?
6. Do you think there are societal perceptions and expectations related to women entrepreneurs? If yes, is there any relation between your being an environmental entrepreneur and these societal perceptions and expectations?
7. Were your friends and family supportive of your decision to become an environmental entrepreneur?
   If the answer is yes:
   a) How did they support you in your decision?
   If the answer is no:
   b) Why do you think they were not supportive?
   c) Do you think your gender had anything to do with your lack of support?
8. How do you think education helped you form your environmental thinking and your entrepreneurship identity and mindset? How do you think education or training could become more effective in supporting environmental entrepreneurs?
9. Are you benefiting from any environmental support programme offered by the government of Turkey or by some other organisations?
   If the answer is yes:
   a) What enabled you to access this support programme?
   If the answer is no:
   b) What do you think constrained you from approaching this support programme?
10. Are you aware of any governmental or non-governmental institution that is concerned with environmental issues that businesses face?
    If yes, can you tell me how do they engage with you or your business and what kind of challenges and opportunities you faced in this process?
11. Is there any legislation related to the environment and society that you need to comply with and if yes, can you tell me about them?
12. What kind of challenges do you face as an entrepreneur in Turkey?

13. How do you consider environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey, in terms of law and legislations, economics and politics?

Appendix 2: Interview Questions for Stakeholders of Women’s and Environmental Entrepreneurship

**Interview Questions for Stakeholders from related Institutions**

1. What is the main duty of your organisation?
2. Which strategies does your organisation use to deal with environmental issues?
3. How often do you audit or check SMEs visiting them at their work environment to see if they are complying with environmental laws and legislation?
4. Do you think that your interventions have been effective in promoting environmental practices in green SMEs? How?
5. How do you support environmental entrepreneurs?
6. Are these supports the same for women and men entrepreneurs?
7. Do you have any specific programmes, mentoring or training for women entrepreneurs and/or environmental entrepreneurs?
Appendix 3: Interview Guide for me as a researcher in The Fieldwork

INTERVIEW GUIDELINE FOR THE FIELDDWORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Interview Questions</th>
<th>Literature References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Q1: How does gender influence entrepreneurs’ environmental engagement in Turkey?** | 1. What are your motivations for engaging in the type of business you are doing? | Q1, Q2: Terrell, R. and Truilo, M. (2010)  
Kumar, A. (2015)  
Ahnad, Mohammad et al. (2016)  
Hedayatnia, D. (2016)  
Hedayatnia, D. et al. (2017)  
Battussa et al. (2015)  
Parrish (2010)  
Enfalt (2009) |
| 2. How do your motivation factors influence your decisions to choose the sector you operate in your business? | 3. Does your organization have any strategy for balancing economic, social and environmental outcomes? If yes, how? and why? |  
| 4. How would you identify yourself as an entrepreneur? Is there any perception you feel more closely related to? Why? | 5. What do you think about female entrepreneurs in Turkey? Do you see any difference between men and female entrepreneurs in Turkey? |  
| 6. Do you think there are societal perceptions and expectations related to women entrepreneurs? If yes, is there any relation to your being a green entrepreneur and this societal perception and expectations? | 7. Were your friends and family supportive in your decision to become a green entrepreneur? |  
| 8. How do you think education helped you form your environmental thinking and your green entrepreneurship mindset? How do you think education or training could become more effective in the making of green entrepreneurs? | |  
| **Q2: How do institutions enable environmental entrepreneurship for women and men entrepreneurs in an emerging economy?** | 9. Are you benefiting from any environmental support programme offered by the government of Turkey or by some other organisations? |  
Q9, Q10, Q11: Manns, A. (2015)  
TTGV Report (2012)  
CGM Policy Report  
OECD Turkey (2019)  
| 10. Are you aware of any governmental or non-governmental institution that is concerned with environmental issues that businesses face? If yes, can you tell me how they engage with your business and what kind of challenges and opportunities you faced in this process? | 11. Is there any legislation related to environment and society that you need to comply with and if yes, can you tell me about them? |  
| 12. What kind of challenges you face as a green entrepreneur in Turkey? | 13. How do you consider green entrepreneurship in Turkey, in terms of law and legislations, economics and politics? | |
Appendix 4: Interview Invitation Letter

Dear Madam/Sir

PhD. Research Project

I am Gizem Kutlu, a doctoral student in the Public Leadership and Social Enterprise Department at Open University Business School. Prior to joining Open University in February 2019, I studied MSc Management and International Relations at the University of Lincoln and graduated with distinction. During my MSc studies, I noticed the importance of environmental entrepreneurship for micro, small and medium enterprises (SMEs) and for policymakers, especially in terms of managing the sustainable development goals in their countries.

Among the grand societal challenges, the major problems are reported as climate change, air-water pollution and insufficient energy all over the world. Regarding these environmental problems, movements toward green entrepreneurship have increased rapidly and studies showed that gender has an important influence on such entrepreneurial movements.

In that vein, I am conducting interviews in Turkey questioning the influence of gender on environmental entrepreneurship. I consider that your enterprise/organisation has potential stakeholders for my study. My research aims to examine the impact of gender and institutional structures on green entrepreneurship through the perspectives and experiences of entrepreneurs/managers from micro, small and medium enterprises and through the perspectives of other key stakeholders from the organisations that support environmental/sustainable entrepreneurship in Turkey.

The research adopts the interpretive paradigm by using qualitative data collection which will be obtained from both female/male entrepreneurs and stakeholders from some organisations in Turkey. This research aims to reconstruct the stories to understand the experiences of female entrepreneurs through individual discussions. The unit of analysis in this study includes the influence of gender and institutions on green entrepreneurs in Turkey from different green sectors.

If your Enterprise/Organization accept to be involved in my research, I am looking forward to collaborating with you as soon as possible. My Human Research Ethics application is accepted by the Open University. The fieldwork is expected to commence in October 2020. I will keep you updated about any changes to the above work plan.

Please send your response to gizem.kutlu@open.ac.uk

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours Sincerely,

PhD Candidate Gizem Kutlu
Appendix 5: Participant Information Sheet

INFORMATION SHEET

This is an invitation to take part in the study of the influence of gender on environmental entrepreneurship in the Turkey context.

Project Title: The influence of gender on environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey

What is the aim of this project?
Environmental entrepreneurship where entrepreneurs advocate for policies that are good for the economy and good for the environment has become a popular topic for researchers and policy managers. Recent studies showed that gender has an important impact on environmental entrepreneurship. However, the relationship between gender and environmental entrepreneurship has not been studied in the Turkey context. Therefore, the main aim of this study is to collect data from male/female entrepreneurs and from key stakeholders of some organisations that support Environmental Entrepreneurship in Turkey. Gaining access to representative stakeholders from enterprises and organisations and getting information from them will be useful for in-depth empirical study for my PhD project on gender and environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey’s context.

Who is conducting the research?
Gizem Kutlu, a PhD student at the Department of Public Leadership and Social Enterprise at the Open University Business School, UK, will be conducting the research.

Why am I being invited to participate in this research?
You have been invited to participate in this research because you are a key authoritative or stakeholder of the organisations which support environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey. Therefore, the researcher would like to invite you to participate in this research.

What will participation involve?
The main primary data collection methods of the study contain individual informal discussions with female/male entrepreneurs from Micro and Small Business Enterprises and other stakeholders from governmental/non-governmental organisations. Individual interviews will take place from November 2020 to January 2021 and will take approximately 50 to 80 minutes. The interviews will be concluded where the participants feel comfortable either in the participant’s workplace or via Skype. Key issues for discussion will be your ideas about the female entrepreneurs in environmental entrepreneurship in Turkey. Participants are free to ask questions whenever they need information. Participation in this study is entirely voluntary, and you can opt out up to 10 days after proving information to the researcher. The reason you should not opt out after 10 days is the information will be used to analyze the findings of the research.

Confidentiality
Your participation will be treated in strict confidence in accordance with the EU General Data Protection Regulation 2016 and The Data Protection Act 2018. No personal information will be shared with anyone outside the research team, and interviewees’ identities will be omitted from the interview transcripts, presentations, and publications. To ensure full anonymity, participants will be provided with a draft of the discussions for their confirmation that they cannot be identified through the transcript. Interview recordings will be destroyed after transcription and anonymised transcripts stored secured in Open Research Data Online (ORDO) an online data repository for a maximum of ten years unless accessed and used by other researchers.

How will the study results be disseminated?
The researcher will share the study results with her supervisors and with all participants of the study if they ask for it. Moreover, the study results will be used in her PhD thesis and will be shared with the Academic Community.

This project has been reviewed by and received a favourable opinion from, The Open University Human Research Ethics Committee, reference HREC/3329.

Contact Details
For questions and concerns about the research, please contact the researcher and her lead supervisor, respectively.

Gizem Kutlu (PhD Student) Open University, UK E-mail: gizem.kutlu@open.ac.uk
Dr Aqueel Wagh (Supervisor) Open University, UK E-mail: Aqueel.Wagh@open.ac.uk

Thank you in advance for your participation!
Appendix 6: Participant Consent Form

INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

Research Project Title: The Influence of Gender on Environmental Entrepreneurship in Turkey

☐ I confirm that I have read and understood the information contained in the information sheet for this study.

☐ I understand that I can ask questions and/or seek for clarifications and have these adequately addressed by the researcher.

☐ I understand that my involvement in this study is at my free will and that I can withdraw my consent at any time without prior notice, providing any reason and with no adverse consequences.

☐ I understand that I can request for the information I have provided to be destroyed up to four weeks after I have provided it without providing an explanation.

☐ I understand that my identity and the information I provided will be kept confidential and will be omitted from interview transcripts, study report presentations, and publications.

☐ I understand that the interview will be digitally recorded and will be transcribed within five weeks and I can request to see a copy of the transcript.

☐ I understand that the anonymised transcripts will be deposited and held in ORDO for a maximum of ten years unless accessed and used by other researchers.

☐ I would like to receive a copy of the interview transcript - if checked, you will need to provide an active email address.

☐ I would like to be contacted about future involvement in the study including follow-up discussions.

☐ I would like to receive a summary of the research findings.

Participant’s Name (Printed): ________________________________

Participant’s email address: ________________________________

Participant’s signature: ___________________________________

Date: __________

Researcher’s signature: ________________________________

Date: __________

Your participation in this study is highly appreciated. Thank you!
Appendix 7: Ethical Approval

HREC/3329/Kutlu: HREC Favourable Opinion

Research-REC-Review
To: Gizem Kutlu Research-REC-Review
Cc: Michael Nguosing

You forwarded this message on 04/10/2019 14:10.

Dear Gizem,

This message confirms that the research protocol for the following research project, as submitted for ethics review, has been given a favourable opinion on behalf of The Open University Human Research Ethics Committee.

Project title: The Influence of Gender on Environmental Entrepreneurship in Turkey

HREC approval date: 03/10/2019

As part of your favourable opinion, it is essential that you are aware of and comply with the following:

1. You are responsible for notifying the HREC immediately of any information received by you, or of which you become aware which would cast doubt on, or alter, information in your original application, in order to ensure your continued safety and the good conduct of the research.

2. It is essential that you contact the HREC with any proposed amendments to your research, for example, a change in location or participants. HREC agreement needs to be in place before any changes are implemented, except only in cases of emergency when the welfare of the participant or researcher is in danger.

3. Your HREC reference number has to be included in any publicity or correspondence related to your research, e.g. when seeking participants or advertising your research, so it is clear that it has been approved by the HREC and adheres to OU ethics review processes.

4. Researchers should discuss any project-related risks with their Line Manager and/or Supervisor, to ensure that all the relevant checks have been made and permissions are in place, prior to a project commencing, for example, compliance with IT security and Data protection regulations.

5. Researchers need to have read and adhered to relevant OU policies and guidance, in particular the Ethics Principles for Research with Human Participants and the Code of Practice for Research - [http://www.open.ac.uk/researchgoodpractice/policies](http://www.open.ac.uk/researchgoodpractice/policies)

6. The Open University’s research ethics review procedures are fully compliant with the majority of research codes, professional organisations, and grant awarding bodies research ethics guidelines. Where required, this message is evidence of OU HREC support and can be included in an external research ethics review application. The HREC should be sent a copy of any external applications, and their outcome, so we have a full ethical review record.

7. At the end of your project you are required to return your research for ethics-related issues and/or any major changes. Where these have occurred you will need to provide the Committee with a HREC final report to reflect how these were dealt with using the template on the research ethics website - [http://www.open.ac.uk/researchgoodpractice/ethics/human/review/ethics-process/initial-report](http://www.open.ac.uk/researchgoodpractice/ethics/human/review/ethics-process/initial-report) (HREC Final Report Form).

Sent on behalf of the Human Research Ethics Committee

Dr Claire Newson
Chair
Professor Louise Westmarland
Deputy Chair
Dr Evonne Banks
Deputy Chair
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Appendix 8: Illustrations of NVivo Project

Appendix 9: Illustration of Within-case and Cross-Case Analysis in Distinct Documents
Appendix 10: Illustration of Fieldwork Notes
Appendix 11: Representative Photographs from Field Visits (When applicable) and Company Website/ participant shared illustrative photos (permission gained through interview)
Who We Are

Our company is founded by a group of entrepreneurs who have experience in the tourism and health sectors and are committed to the satisfaction of their clients. Our goal is to meet all the needs of our guests who come to Turkey to receive medical services and ensure that they receive a comfortable and reliable experience.

Dear [name],

I am writing to extend my congratulations on the fact that your company can now officially be called climate neutral company!

This is an important action and we are truly proud of you. Thank you for your initiative and intention to lead by example. Thank you for your well-calculated work and bringing the process to its conclusion. We still have a long way to go together to fight the climate crisis. But today it is worth noting what you have achieved.

Share the news about your climate neutrality with your employees, customers, and partners and it is an important message nowadays. Responsible people prefer...

(Biotechnology Company Website)

(Medical Eco-Tourism Company Website)

(Organic Agriculture and Eco-Tourism, taken by researcher in pilot study 2019 before Covid)

(Shared by company owner participant:

Collaboration with NGOs in carbon emission)