



From Ideas To Successful Enterprises- Recognition Of Right Opportunities By Women Entrepreneurs In Lucknow

¹Saira Banoo Warsia, ²Dr. Doa Naqvi

¹Research Scholar, ²Assistant Professor

¹Department of Business Administration

¹Khwaja Moinuddin Chishti Language University , Lucknow, India

Abstract: Contribution of women has always been vital in the growth of economies especially developing nations. And with India aiming to be an “Atm Nirbhar Bharat”, it seems quite imperative now to understand that how do women in business identify opportunities to create successful businesses. Entrepreneurship itself is a key to the development of an economy and this pace of development may be fastened by encouraging more number of women to enter businesses. By understanding the factors behind setting up businesses, more women may be motivated and guided by females who have established themselves.

The objective of this paper is to understand that how these women entrepreneurs take cues from their environment, how they identify a business opportunity and turn them into a successful business venture. The study aims to find out which factors play a role when it comes to them choosing a specific business. Also once the opportunity is identified, how is it converted into a business idea and what do they do to steer their businesses ahead.

This paper examines how women entrepreneurs in Lucknow identify viable business opportunities, the local ecosystem that aids opportunity discovery, sectoral strengths, and barriers that shape opportunity selection. Drawing on recent empirical studies, government program data, and local sectoral analyses, it proposes a practical framework for opportunity identification tailored to women in Lucknow, along with policy and practice recommendations to increase venture success. Key findings indicate that (1) traditional sectors (Chikankari/handicrafts, textiles, food processing, and e-commerce-enabled micro-enterprises) continue to lead opportunity formation; (2) digital adoption and government schemes have materially increased women-led ventures; and (3) incubation, SHG networks, and market linkages substantially improve opportunity realization (Kumar & Singh, 2023).

Key Words: Women, Entrepreneurship, Opportunity identification, Successful business, Lucknow.

INTRODUCTION

A) Rationale and Background behind the study

Opportunity identification may be understood as the process of recognizing and evaluating potential business ideas which is a critical early-stage activity for entrepreneurs (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). For women in Lucknow, it is shaped by cultural capital, institutional support (such as self-help groups and incubators), and state initiatives (Sharma, 2022). This paper synthesizes the evidence base to produce actionable guidance for women entrepreneurs and policymakers.

B) Lucknow's Women Entrepreneurship Landscape

Lucknow's entrepreneurial ecosystem combines a centuries-old artisanal economy with modern start-up incubation and MSME programs. Women increasingly start enterprises in handicrafts, textiles, food processing, education, and e-commerce (Agarwal, 2023). Institutional programs both state (e.g., SAMARTH) and central (PMEGP, Women Entrepreneurship Platform) have expanded access to finance, skills, and markets (Government of India, 2024).

Recent reports highlight that Uttar Pradesh's Mukhyamantri Yuva Swarozgar Yojana (MMYUVA) attracted record applications in 2025, indicating increased entrepreneurial activity (Times of India, 2025).

C) Statement of the Problem

Recognition of opportunities is the first important step in the entrepreneurial ladder (Baron and Shane, 2005). Yet not everybody is able to identify opportunities (Shane and Venkataraman 2000) and if they are, not all opportunities convert to successful business ventures. Studies also point out that men and women have different ways of identifying a business opportunity (DeTienne and Chandler 2007).

This study aims to understand that how women in Lucknow identify an opportunity, create them into a successful business venture.

D) The Objectives of this Study

1. How do women entrepreneurs identify opportunities?
2. Why are some able to discover and exploit these opportunities and others are not?

E) Significance of the study

Women setting up their businesses in Lucknow are on a rise. By understanding the factors behind the recognition of an opportunity, more women will be motivated to start their own ventures. Through this study we wish to understand that is there an ecosystem for specific kind of businesses available in Lucknow. Lucknow's rich cultural history has been a witness to traditional handicrafts businesses along with cuisine that developed here. Apart from these dominant businesses are there other opportunities also available here is a matter to study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A) Explaining entrepreneurship

Schumpeter's influential framing casts the entrepreneur as an innovator who introduces "new combinations" (creative destruction) that drive economic development and structural change; this work grounds entrepreneurship as an economic force rather than merely a managerial role (Schumpeter, 1934).

Kirzner emphasizes discovery: entrepreneurs are alert to previously unnoticed profit opportunities created by market disequilibria; his work foregrounds alertness and market discovery as central entrepreneurial mechanisms (Kirzner, 1973).

Shane and Venkataraman (2000) propose the individual-opportunity nexus: entrepreneurship research should treat entrepreneurship as the intersection of enterprising individuals and valuable opportunities; they called for theory that links opportunity existence and the alertness/ability of individuals to exploit them (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000).

Gartner (1988) argued that asking "who is an entrepreneur?" is the wrong question and instead promoted studying the activities and processes of organization creation shifting analysis from traits to acts and context (Gartner, 1988).

Shane (2003) extended the individual-opportunity nexus into a general theory outlining how prior knowledge, environmental conditions, and individual characteristics jointly explain why some people discover/exploit opportunities and others do not (Shane, 2003).

B) Women's entrepreneurship

Brush's classic review maps early empirical work on women business owners, highlighting different research strands (motivation, performance, resource constraints) and calling for theoretically grounded, gender-aware research (Brush, 1992).

Carter, Brush and colleagues (Diana Project and related reviews) synthesized literature on women entrepreneurs and underlined gaps in financing, high-growth pathway research, and tailored policy recommending more nuanced, gender-sensitive measures and comparative work (Carter et al., 2003).

Ahl (2006) offered a critical, discourse-analytic critique: much entrepreneurship research reproduces male-normative assumptions; she called for feminist and constructivist approaches to reveal how gendered assumptions shape both research and policy (Ahl, 2006).

De Bruin et al. (2007) advanced a more coherent research framework for women's entrepreneurship, suggesting integrative approaches that combine economic, social and feminist perspectives to better explain women's enterprise behaviour.

Yadav's (2016) systematic review traces the evolution of women entrepreneurship research, noting the shift from descriptive comparisons to more structural analyses (finance, networks, institutional support) and recommending context-sensitive, policy-oriented studies (Yadav, 2016).

Policy and development studies (e.g., World Bank syntheses) document how gendered constraints, access to finance, social norms, mobility and time poverty systematically shape the venture types women choose and their growth trajectories, arguing for integrated policy responses.

More recent reviews (post-2010) stress methodological pluralism and intersectionality; that gender interacts with class, caste, and urban and rural contexts to shape entrepreneurial choices, a lesson directly relevant when studying Lucknow (several recent reviews).

C) Entrepreneurial opportunity (concepts, recognition, discovery vs creation)

Ardichvili, Cardozo, and Ray (2003) synthesize opportunity identification research and propose that opportunities emerge through a combination of prior knowledge, social networks, environmental changes, and cognitive processes; they also stress the staged nature of opportunity development (Ardichvili et al., 2003).

Eckhardt and Shane (2003) elaborate a disequilibrium perspective: opportunities arise because of changes (technological, regulatory, and demographic) that create new profit possibilities; the paper classifies opportunity types and links them to entrepreneurial action.

Alvarez and Barney (2007) contrasted discovery and creation views: discovery sees opportunities as objective and discoverable, while creation treats opportunities as enacted by entrepreneurs through action and social construction, an important theoretical distinction for how we study opportunity identification.

Shane's work on prior knowledge (Shane, 2000) shows that entrepreneurs are more likely to discover opportunities in domains where they already hold knowledge; this explains why craft-based skills (e.g., Chikankari in Lucknow) often lead to related enterprise ideas.

Corbett (2007) introduced learning asymmetries, emphasizing that the form and timing of experiential learning influence which opportunities are perceived and pursued; novices and experts learn differently, producing distinct recognition paths.

Ardichvili et al. (2003) and later syntheses emphasize that social networks and information flows (market signals, customer feedback) are central to early opportunity shaping and that institutional supports can change the salience of particular opportunities.

D) Psychological factors in identifying opportunities (cognition, heuristics, personality, learning)

Baron (2006) frames opportunity recognition as pattern recognition: entrepreneurs connect disparate trends, experiences and cues to form a meaningful composite that signals a new venture possibility; expertise, cognitive structures and attentional focus are crucial (Baron, 2006).

Krueger's intentions-based cognitive infrastructure model (2000) argues that perceived desirability and feasibility (attitudinal/intention antecedents) shape whether someone interprets a situation as an opportunity; cognitive templates and prior beliefs guide perception.

Busenitz and Barney (1997) and related work show that entrepreneurs rely on heuristics and are subject to certain biases (overconfidence, representativeness) that, paradoxically, can be functional in uncertain environments by enabling decisive action despite limited information.

McMullen and Shepherd (2006) highlight the role of perceived uncertainty and the willingness to act under judgmental uncertainty as core to entrepreneurial behavior, entrepreneurs make judgmental decisions that convert perceived opportunities into action.

Sarasvathy's effectuation theory (2001) complements pattern-recognition accounts by showing that experienced entrepreneurs often create opportunities through means-driven, iterative, partner-oriented logic (effectuation) rather than purely predictive planning (Sarasvathy, 2001).

Baron's pattern recognition and Krueger's intentions framework intersect: cognition (knowledge structures), attention (what entrepreneurs look for), and motivation/intentions jointly explain why specific individuals identify the same environmental signal as an opportunity (Baron, 2006; Krueger, 2000).

Personality meta-analyses (Zhao & Seibert, 2006; Rauch & Frese, 2007) indicate that traits (Big Five dimensions such as openness and conscientiousness, plus risk propensity and internal locus of control) show modest but meaningful relationships with entrepreneurial entry and performance, personality helps explain who is more likely to notice and act on nascent opportunities.

Studies that compare novice vs expert entrepreneurs find that prior domain knowledge, pattern-recognition skills and network access mediate the relationship between personality/cognition and successful opportunity identification i.e., psychological traits matter more when combined with relevant knowledge and social capital (Corbett, Baron, Shane).

Heuristics, bias research, and effectuation together explain different routes to opportunity identification: in some contexts entrepreneurial success depends on fast, heuristic-based linking of cues (pattern recognition/heuristics); in others it depends on experimental, co-creative processes (effectuation/creation theory). Both routes have empirical support.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study synthesizes secondary data from peer-reviewed articles, government publications, and reports. Findings are interpreted through a socio-economic lens to identify opportunity identification patterns among Lucknow-based women entrepreneurs.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The literature converges on a multi-level explanation of opportunity identification: macro (institutional changes, markets), meso (networks, incubators, policy programs), and micro (knowledge, cognition, personality, learning) all interact (Shane, Eckhardt, Ardichvili; Baron; Krueger). For women in Lucknow, this implies that craft-based prior knowledge (Shane, 2000), SHG networks (Ardichvili; Carter et al.), and locally appropriate incubation & market linkages (policy reviews) will shape which opportunities are recognized and exploited.

The discovery vs creation debate (Alvarez & Barney, 2007) suggests two practical pathways for women entrepreneurs: (1) converting existing skills and observable market gaps (discovery), and (2) co-creating new offerings through effectual experimentation and partner networks (creation/effectuation). Both are empirically valid and should be supported via different interventions.

Empirical studies on Lucknow-based women entrepreneurs reveal several themes:

Sectoral Advantage: Chikankari embroidery remains a dominant entry point due to local skills and heritage (Khan, 2022).

Push and Pull Factors: Women start ventures for both necessity and opportunity reasons; finance and market access are critical for scaling (Singh & Gupta, 2023).

Digital Transformation: Social media and e-commerce platforms have enhanced visibility and access to broader markets (Tide Report, 2024).

Recognition of Opportunities by Women in Lucknow

Skill and Heritage-Based Recognition

Women often build enterprises around inherited skills such as Chikankari and other handicrafts, converting traditional knowledge into marketable products (Khan, 2022).

Household and SHG Networks

Self-help groups act as crucial discovery networks, sharing information on markets and funding. UPSRLM and SAMARTH programs play a key role in this process (UPSRLM, 2024; Government of Uttar Pradesh, 2024).

Market Problems and Local Demand Gaps

Women identify micro-level opportunities by observing community needs in food, clothing, and services (Sharma, 2022).

Digital Signals and Platform Data

Social media and e-commerce provide low-cost validation tools. Increased digital participation among women in Tier-2 cities, including Lucknow, has expanded market access (Tide Report, 2024).

Institutional Exposure and Incubation

Exposure to incubation centres such as IIM Lucknow's Enterprise Incubation Centre broadens women's opportunity recognition and business acumen (IIM Lucknow, 2024).

Barriers Influencing Opportunity Selection

Opportunity selection is limited by access to finance, mobility, and cultural norms. Collateral-based lending continues to restrict women's access to credit (National Sample Survey Office [NSSO], 2023). Moreover, domestic responsibilities limit time for market exploration (Sharma, 2022).

Opportunity Identification Framework for Women in Lucknow

A three-stage framework is proposed:

1. Scanning: Use SHG meetings and digital networks to identify unmet needs.
2. Filtering: Apply skill–market–finance feasibility checks (Shane, 2003).
3. Strengthening: Engage with incubation centres and schemes like PMEGP or WEP for scaling (Government of India, 2024).

High-Potential Sectors in Lucknow

Sector	Description
Chikankari & Handicrafts	Traditional strength with export potential (Khan, 2022).
Food Processing & Home Foods	Growing demand for packaged local foods (UPSRLM, 2024).
Textiles & Apparel	Rise of home-based tailoring and online microbrands (Agarwal, 2023).
Education & Skill Services	Increasing demand for private tutoring and skill training (Singh & Gupta, 2023).
Digital Micro-Trading	Women leveraging WhatsApp and Instagram for business (Tide Report, 2024).

Institutional and Policy Support

The IIM Lucknow Enterprise Incubation Centre provides mentoring and networking (IIM Lucknow, 2024). State initiatives like SAMARTH and MMYUVA have been instrumental in promoting entrepreneurship (Government of Uttar Pradesh, 2024). At the national level, PMEGP and WEP continue to empower women entrepreneurs (Government of India, 2024).

CONCLUSION

Entrepreneurs in Lucknow can begin micro-pilots to test idea. They can utilise digital marketplaces for visibility (Tide Report, 2024). The state and central schemes for finance and training (Government of India, 2024) may be leveraged for their early stages and even for growth.

Incubators when deliver short "Opportunity Scanning" workshops in SHG centres may help the local entrepreneurs. Partnering with craft clusters to modernize traditional industries (Khan, 2022) will be beneficial for the stakeholders.

Policymakers have been making the loan process accessible to many but a simplification of the loan application procedures would be a booster (Times of India, 2025). Digital literacy and e-commerce on boarding programs (Government of Uttar Pradesh, 2024), will help in the growth of the businesses.

Lucknow's entrepreneurial ecosystem provides fertile ground for women-led ventures. Effective opportunity identification depends on aligning traditional skills with market demand, supported by digital

tools and institutional programs. Strengthening incubation and mentorship linkages will significantly enhance women's entrepreneurial success in Lucknow (Sharma, 2022; IIM Lucknow, 2024).

REFERENCES

1. Agarwal, R. (2023). Women entrepreneurs in Tier-2 cities: Case of Lucknow. *Journal of Entrepreneurship and Development Studies*, 18(2), 45–59.
2. Ahl, H. (2006). Why research on women entrepreneurs needs new directions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 30(5), 595–621.
3. Ardichvili, A., Cardozo, R., & Ray, S. (2003). A theory of entrepreneurial opportunity identification and development. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(1), 105–123.
4. Baron, R. A. (2006). Opportunity recognition as pattern recognition: How entrepreneurs “connect the dots” to identify new business opportunities. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 20(1), 104–119.
5. Brush, C. G. (1992). Research on women business owners: Past trends, a new perspective and future directions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 16(4), 5–30.
6. Busenitz, L. W., & Barney, J. B. (1997). Differences between entrepreneurs and managers in large organizations: Biases and heuristics in strategic decision-making. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 12(1), 9–30.
7. Carter, N. M., Brush, C. G., Greene, P. G., Gatewood, E., & Hart, M. M. (2003). Women entrepreneurs who break through to equity financing: The influence of human, social and financial capital. *Venture Capital*, 5(1), 1–28.
8. Corbett, A. C. (2005). Experiential learning within the process of opportunity identification and exploitation. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(4), 473–491.
9. Corbett, A. C. (2007). Learning asymmetries and the discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(1), 97–118.
10. De Bruin, A., Brush, C. G., & Welter, F. (2007). Advancing a framework for coherent research on women's entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31(3), 323–339.
11. Eckhardt, J. T., & Shane, S. A. (2003). Opportunities and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Management*, 29(3), 333–349.
12. Gartner, W. B. (1988). “Who is an entrepreneur?” is the wrong question. *American Journal of Small Business*, 12 (4), 11–32.
13. Government of India. (2024). Women Entrepreneurship Platform (WEP) annual report 2024. NITI Aayog.
14. Government of Uttar Pradesh. (2024). SAMARTH and MSME entrepreneurship initiatives 2024: State report. Lucknow: Department of MSME.
15. IIM Lucknow. (2024). Enterprise Incubation Centre: Annual impact report 2024. Indian Institute of Management Lucknow.
16. Khan, S. (2022). Chikankari entrepreneurship among women in Lucknow: Tradition to transformation. *International Journal of Social Research*, 14(1), 62–78.
17. Kirzner, I. M. (1973). *Competition and entrepreneurship*. University of Chicago Press.
18. Krueger, N. F. (2000). The cognitive infrastructure of opportunity emergence. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 24(3), 5–23.
19. Kumar, P., & Singh, N. (2023). Women entrepreneurship and opportunity recognition in northern India. *Indian Journal of Management Studies*, 21(3), 112–126.
20. McMullen, J. S., & Shepherd, D. A. (2006). Entrepreneurial action and the role of uncertainty in the theory of the entrepreneur. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1), 132–152.
21. National Sample Survey Office. (2023). *Employment-unemployment survey: Women-owned enterprises in India 2023*. Government of India.
22. Sarasvathy, S. D. (2001). Causation and effectuation: Toward a theoretical shift from economic inevitability to entrepreneurial contingency. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(2), 243–263.
23. Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The theory of economic development*. Harvard University Press.
24. Shane, S. (2003). *A general theory of entrepreneurship: The individual–opportunity nexus*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
25. Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217–226.

26. Sharma, A. (2022). Barriers to women entrepreneurship in Uttar Pradesh. *Journal of Rural Development and Policy*, 9(4), 80–93.
27. Singh, R., & Gupta, P. (2023). Push and pull factors among women entrepreneurs in Lucknow. *Journal of Business Perspectives*, 15(2), 91–104.
28. Tide Report. (2024). Digital adoption by women entrepreneurs in India's Tier-2 cities. Tide Global Research Initiative.
29. Times of India. (2025, January 12). Record applications under UP's MMYUVA self-employment scheme. *The Times of India*.
30. Uttar Pradesh State Rural Livelihood Mission (UPSRLM). (2024). Lakhpati Didi and women-led microenterprise progress report 2024. Lucknow: Department of Rural Development.
31. Zhao, H., & Seibert, S. E. (2006). The Big Five personality dimensions and entrepreneurial status: A meta-analytical review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(2), 259–271.

