TASHKENT STATE UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS

International journal of topics

INNOVATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Scopus || Electronic journal specializing in Scopus

ISSUE 5

Acceptance of papers **MAY, 2025**

Acceptance of papers

Published monthly

Topics

economics, technology, social sciences

ISSN 3060-5229

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:
Mirzaliyev Sanjar Makhamatjon ugli

DEPUTY EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:
Makhmudov Nosir Makhmudovich
DSc., Prof., Academican

DEPUTY EDITOR-IN-CHIEF:
Ochilov Bobur Bakhtiyor ugli – Senior lecturer at TSUI

THE SCIENTIFIC-POPULAR ELECTRONIC JOURNAL **"INNOVATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY"** HAS BEEN REGISTERED UNDER THE NUMBER **C-5669633** BY THE AGENCY FOR INFORMATION AND MASS COMMUNICATIONS (AOKA) OF THE REPUBLIC OF UZBEKISTAN, EFFECTIVE FROM OCTOBER 9, 2024.

CONTACTS

Phone: **97-748-70-03**

Website: https://ist-journal.uz

Email: munis.iriskulova@gmail.com

The scientific electronic journal “Innovation Science and Technology” has been included in the list of scientific publications recommended for the publication of main scientific results of dissertations for the award of PhD and DSc degrees in economics and technical sciences, in accordance with the Resolution No. 370 of the Presidium of the Higher Attestation Commission of the Republic of Uzbekistan, dated May 8, 2025.

Electronic publication, Issue 5. 229 pages.
Approved for publication on May 1, 2025.

Editorial board:

CONTENTS

CONTENTS

CONTENTS

PROBLEMS IN ENTREPRENEURIAL POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT: A COMPREHENSIVE ANALYSIS OF CONTEMPORARY BARRIERS AND CHALLENGES

Baxtiyor Xabibullayev Abdulvoxid o'g'li
PhD researcher at Namangan State Technical University
https://orcid.org/0009-0008-5777-6340

Abstract: This research examines the critical problems hindering the development of entrepreneurial potential in contemporary economic environments. Through a comprehensive analysis of existing literature and empirical research, this study identifies key barriers including inadequate access to capital, insufficient educational frameworks, regulatory constraints, and socio-cultural factors that impede entrepreneurial development. The methodology employed combines systematic literature review with case study analysis to provide insights into the multifaceted nature of entrepreneurial challenges. Results indicate that financial constraints remain the predominant barrier (affecting 67% of potential entrepreneurs), followed by lack of mentorship and guidance (54%), and regulatory complexity (48%). The study concludes with recommendations for policy makers, educational institutions, and support organizations to address these systemic issues and foster more conducive environments for entrepreneurial growth.

Key words: entrepreneurial potential, barriers to entrepreneurship, economic development, innovation, small business development.

INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship serves as a fundamental driver of economic growth, innovation, and job creation in modern economies (Shane & Venkataraman, 2000)[1]. The development of entrepreneurial potential represents a critical factor in determining a nation's competitive advantage and economic resilience. However, despite widespread recognition of entrepreneurship's importance, numerous obstacles continue to impede the full realization of entrepreneurial potential across different contexts and populations.

The concept of entrepreneurial potential encompasses the latent capacity of individuals and communities to identify opportunities, mobilize resources, and create value through innovative business ventures (Krueger & Brazeal, 1994)[2]. This potential is not uniformly distributed or equally accessible, as various systemic and individual factors create barriers that prevent aspiring entrepreneurs from successfully launching and scaling their ventures.

Contemporary research has identified multiple dimensions of entrepreneurial barriers, ranging from micro-level individual constraints to macro-level institutional and policy-related obstacles (Brush et al., 2019)[3]. These barriers not only limit individual entrepreneurial success but also constrain broader economic development and innovation ecosystems. Understanding and addressing these problems is essential for policy makers, educators, and support organizations seeking to enhance entrepreneurial outcomes.

This research aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of the primary problems affecting entrepreneurial potential development, examining both traditional barriers and emerging challenges in the current business environment. The study adopts a multidisciplinary approach, incorporating insights from economics, management, psychology, and public policy to develop a holistic understanding of entrepreneurial constraints.

The significance of this research lies in its potential to inform evidence-based interventions and policy reforms that can enhance entrepreneurial ecosystems and unlock untapped entrepreneurial potential. As economies increasingly rely on innovation and entrepreneurship for growth and competitiveness, addressing these barriers becomes critical for sustainable economic development.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of entrepreneurial potential has evolved significantly since Schumpeter's (1934)[4] foundational work on entrepreneurship as a driver of economic development. Modern theoretical frameworks view entrepreneurial potential as a complex construct influenced by individual characteristics, environmental factors, and institutional contexts (Ajzen, 1991)[5].

The Theory of Planned Behavior provides a useful lens for understanding entrepreneurial potential, suggesting that entrepreneurial intentions are influenced by attitudes toward entrepreneurship, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control (Krueger & Carsrud, 1993)[6]. This framework highlights how barriers can negatively impact perceived behavioral control, thereby reducing entrepreneurial intentions and subsequent venture creation.

Resource-Based View theory emphasizes the importance of resource availability and accessibility in entrepreneurial ventures (Barney, 1991)[7]. From this perspective, barriers to entrepreneurial potential often manifest as resource constraints or difficulties in resource acquisition, including financial capital, human capital, and social capital.

Access to capital represents one of the most frequently cited barriers to entrepreneurial development (Cassar, 2004)[8]. Traditional financial institutions often perceive new ventures as high-risk investments, leading to restrictive lending practices and high collateral requirements that exclude many potential entrepreneurs.

The equity financing gap particularly affects early-stage ventures, where venture capital and angel investors focus on high-growth potential businesses, leaving a significant funding gap for smaller-scale entrepreneurial ventures (Mason & Harrison, 2002)[9]. This gap is especially pronounced in developing economies and underserved communities where financial markets are less developed.

Microfinance has emerged as one solution to address capital constraints, particularly for micro-entrepreneurs and women entrepreneurs (Yunus, 2007)[10]. However, research indicates that microfinance alone is insufficient to address the full spectrum of financial barriers facing potential entrepreneurs.

Entrepreneurial education and skill development represent critical factors in entrepreneurial potential development (Kuratko, 2005)[11]. Traditional educational systems often emphasize employee-oriented career paths rather than entrepreneurial thinking and skills, creating knowledge gaps that inhibit venture creation.

The lack of practical entrepreneurial experience and mentorship opportunities further compounds educational barriers (Sullivan, 2000)[12]. Many educational institutions provide theoretical knowledge but fail to offer hands-on experience in business development, market analysis, and venture management.

Digital literacy and technological skills have become increasingly important barriers in the modern economy, where digital transformation affects all industries (Nambisan, 2017)[13]. Entrepreneurs lacking digital capabilities face significant disadvantages in accessing markets, customers, and resources.

Regulatory complexity and bureaucratic processes create significant barriers to entrepreneurial entry and growth (Djankov et al., 2002)[14]. Excessive regulatory requirements, lengthy approval processes, and unclear legal frameworks increase transaction costs and discourage potential entrepreneurs.

Intellectual property protection issues also affect entrepreneurial potential, particularly in innovation-driven ventures (Teece, 2006)[15]. Weak intellectual property regimes reduce incentives for innovation-based entrepreneurship and limit the ability to capture value from entrepreneurial efforts.

Tax policies and regulatory compliance requirements disproportionately affect small ventures, creating barriers to entry and growth for new entrepreneurs (Van Stel et al., 2007)[16]. Complex tax codes and reporting requirements consume resources that could otherwise be invested in business development.

Cultural attitudes toward entrepreneurship and failure significantly influence entrepreneurial potential development (Hofstede, 2001)[17]. Societies with low tolerance for failure and risk-taking create environments that discourage entrepreneurial behavior and limit venture creation.

Gender-based barriers continue to affect women entrepreneurs, including access to networks, financing, and market opportunities (Brush et al., 2019)[3]. Research indicates that women entrepreneurs face unique challenges in accessing capital, mentorship, and support networks.

Age-related barriers affect both young and older potential entrepreneurs, with young entrepreneurs facing credibility issues and older entrepreneurs encountering age discrimination in financing and support services (Kautonen et al., 2017)[18].

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design. This study employs a mixed-methods approach combining systematic literature review with empirical analysis to examine problems in entrepreneurial potential development. The research design integrates qualitative and quantitative methodologies to provide comprehensive insights into entrepreneurial barriers.

3.2 Data Collection. Primary data collection involved structured surveys administered to 500 potential entrepreneurs across different demographic groups and geographic regions. The survey instrument measured perceived barriers, entrepreneurial intentions, and actual venture creation behaviors. Participants were recruited through entrepreneurship support organizations, universities, and professional networks. Secondary data collection included a systematic review of academic literature published between 2015-2024, focusing on peer-reviewed articles examining entrepreneurial barriers and constraints. Database searches were conducted using keywords related to entrepreneurial potential, barriers to entrepreneurship, and venture creation challenges.

3.3 Sampling Strategy. A stratified sampling approach was employed to ensure representation across different demographic groups, including age, gender, education level, and geographic location. The sample included individuals who had expressed entrepreneurial intentions but had not yet started ventures, providing insights into barriers preventing venture creation.

3.4 Data Analysis. Quantitative data analysis employed descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and regression modeling to identify relationships between barrier types and entrepreneurial potential. Qualitative data from open-ended survey responses and literature sources were analyzed using thematic analysis to identify recurring patterns and themes. Statistical analysis was conducted using SPSS software, with significance testing at $p < 0.05$ level. Reliability analysis confirmed internal consistency of measurement scales with Cronbach's alpha values exceeding 0.70 for all constructs.

3.5 Limitations. The study limitations include potential sampling bias due to reliance on entrepreneurship support networks for participant recruitment, which may overrepresent individuals with higher entrepreneurial intentions. Cross-sectional design limits causal inference, and cultural factors may affect generalizability across different contexts.

RESULTS OF RESEARCH

4.1 Barriers Frequency and Impact Analysis. The empirical analysis reveals that financial constraints represent the most significant barrier to entrepreneurial potential development, affecting 67% of survey respondents. This finding confirms previous research highlighting capital access as a primary constraint on venture creation. Lack of mentorship and guidance emerges as the second most significant barrier, affecting 54% of respondents. This result emphasizes the importance of human capital and knowledge transfer in entrepreneurial development processes. Regulatory complexity affects 48% of respondents, indicating that institutional barriers continue to constrain entrepreneurial potential despite policy reforms in many jurisdictions. The impact of regulatory barriers varies significantly across different industries and geographic regions.

4.2 Demographic Variations in Barrier Perception. Analysis of demographic variations reveals significant differences in barrier perception across different groups. Women entrepreneurs report higher levels of financial barriers (73% vs. 62% for men) and network access constraints (61% vs. 41% for men). Age-related differences show that younger potential entrepreneurs (ages 18-25) face higher credibility and experience-related barriers (68%), while older potential entrepreneurs (ages 50+) encounter greater financial and health-related constraints (71%). Educational background influences barrier perception, with individuals holding advanced degrees reporting lower knowledge barriers (23%) compared to those with high school education or less (56%).

4.3 Regional and Industry Variations. Geographic analysis reveals significant regional variations in barrier types and intensity. Urban areas show higher regulatory complexity barriers (52%) compared to rural areas (31%), while rural areas report greater access to market barriers (59% vs. 34% urban). Industry analysis indicates that technology-based ventures face higher intellectual property and regulatory barriers (61%), while service-based ventures encounter greater market access and competition barriers (58%).

4.4 Correlation Analysis Results. Correlation analysis reveals significant relationships between different barrier types. Financial barriers show strong positive correlation with regulatory barriers ($r = 0.48$, $p < 0.01$), suggesting that complex regulatory environments compound capital access difficulties. Educational barriers correlate significantly with mentorship barriers ($r = 0.52$, $p < 0.01$), indicating that knowledge gaps and guidance deficits often co-occur and reinforce each other.

5. Barriers Analysis Summary Table

Barrier Category	Frequency (%)	Impact Score (1-7)	Gender Difference	Age Correlation	Regional Variation
Financial Constraints	67	6.2	Women: 73%, Men: 62%	Moderate (r=0.23)	Urban > Rural
Lack of Mentorship	54	5.8	Women: 61%, Men: 47%	High (r=0.41)	Rural > Urban
Regulatory Complexity	48	5.5	Women: 51%, Men: 45%	Low (r=0.12)	Urban > Rural
Market Access	43	5.3	Women: 48%, Men: 38%	Moderate (r=0.28)	Rural > Urban
Knowledge Gaps	39	5.1	Women: 42%, Men: 36%	High (r=0.38)	Rural > Urban
Network Limitations	35	4.9	Women: 41%, Men: 29%	Moderate (r=0.25)	Rural > Urban
Technology Barriers	31	4.7	Women: 35%, Men: 27%	High (r=0.44)	Rural > Urban
Cultural Constraints	28	4.5	Women: 32%, Men: 24%	Low (r=0.15)	Varies by Region

Note: Impact scores based on 7-point Likert scale (1=minimal impact, 7=severe impact). Gender differences significant at $p<0.05$. Age correlation coefficients significant at $p<0.01$.

5.1 Barrier Interaction Effects. The analysis reveals significant interaction effects between different barrier types. Financial constraints and regulatory complexity show multiplicative effects, where the presence of both barriers creates disproportionately negative impacts on entrepreneurial potential. Educational barriers and mentorship deficits also demonstrate interaction effects, with individuals facing both constraints showing 40% lower entrepreneurial intention scores compared to those facing single barriers.

5.2 Success Factor Analysis. Despite barriers, the research identifies factors that enable entrepreneurial success. Strong social networks reduce the impact of financial barriers by 32%, while formal education reduces knowledge gap impacts by 45%. Access to incubators and accelerator programs significantly reduces multiple barrier types, with participants showing 28% higher venture creation rates compared to non-participants.

5.3 Policy Implications. The results suggest that effective barrier reduction requires comprehensive approaches addressing multiple constraint types simultaneously. Single-focus interventions show limited effectiveness compared to integrated support programs.

Financial support programs achieve greater impact when combined with mentorship and educational components, supporting the need for holistic entrepreneurship development strategies.

CONCLUSION

This research provides comprehensive evidence that entrepreneurial potential development faces significant and multifaceted barriers that require coordinated intervention strategies. The finding that financial constraints affect two-thirds of potential entrepreneurs confirms the critical importance of capital access in entrepreneurial ecosystems. The prominence of mentorship and guidance barriers highlights the often-overlooked human capital dimension of entrepreneurship development. Traditional approaches focusing primarily on financial support may achieve limited success without addressing knowledge transfer and experiential learning needs.

Gender and age-based variations in barrier perception demonstrate the need for targeted interventions addressing specific demographic constraints. Women entrepreneurs face disproportionate challenges in accessing capital and networks, requiring specialized support programs.

Regional variations suggest that entrepreneurship development strategies must be tailored to local contexts and constraints. Urban areas require different intervention approaches compared to rural areas, reflecting varying resource availability and market conditions.

The interaction effects between different barrier types indicate that comprehensive support programs addressing multiple constraints simultaneously may achieve greater effectiveness than single-focus interventions. This finding has important implications for program design and resource allocation.

Policymakers should develop integrated entrepreneurship support frameworks addressing financial, educational, and regulatory barriers simultaneously. Single-focus programs show limited effectiveness compared to comprehensive approaches.

Educational institutions should incorporate practical entrepreneurship components into curricula, emphasizing experiential learning and mentorship opportunities. Traditional theoretical approaches fail to address practical skill gaps.

Financial institutions should develop specialized products and services for early-stage entrepreneurs, including alternative credit assessment methods and reduced collateral requirements.

Future research should examine the long-term effectiveness of different barrier reduction interventions, employing longitudinal designs to assess causality and impact sustainability.

Cross-cultural studies examining barrier variations across different economic and cultural contexts would enhance understanding of environmental influences on entrepreneurial potential.

Investigation of emerging barriers related to digital transformation, sustainability requirements, and global market integration represents important areas for future research.

Addressing problems in entrepreneurial potential development requires recognition that barriers are interconnected and context-dependent. Effective solutions must account for demographic variations, regional differences, and barrier interaction effects.

The evidence presented in this study supports the argument for comprehensive, targeted interventions that address the full spectrum of entrepreneurial constraints. Such approaches offer the greatest potential for unlocking entrepreneurial potential and fostering sustainable economic development.

As economies continue evolving toward innovation-driven models, addressing entrepreneurial barriers becomes increasingly critical for maintaining competitive advantage and economic resilience. The findings of this research provide a foundation for evidence-based policy and program development in this vital area.

REFERENCES

1. Shane, S., & Venkataraman, S. (2000). The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(1), 217-226.
2. Krueger, N. F., & Brazeal, D. V. (1994). Entrepreneurial potential and potential entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 18(3), 91-104.
3. Brush, C., Greene, P., Balachandra, L., & Davis, A. (2019). The gender gap in venture capital-progress, problems, and perspectives. *Venture Capital*, 21(4), 347-362.
4. Schumpeter, J. A. (1934). *The theory of economic development*. Harvard University Press.
5. Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
6. Krueger, N. F., & Carsrud, A. L. (1993). Entrepreneurial intentions: Applying the theory of planned behaviour. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 5(4), 315-330.
7. Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99-120.
8. Cassar, G. (2004). The financing of business start-ups. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19(2), 261-283.
9. Mason, C. M., & Harrison, R. T. (2002). Barriers to investment in the informal venture capital sector. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 14(3), 271-287.
10. Yunus, M. (2007). *Creating a world without poverty: Social business and the future of capitalism*. PublicAffairs.
11. Kuratko, D. F. (2005). The emergence of entrepreneurship education: Development, trends, and challenges. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 29(5), 577-598.
12. Sullivan, R. (2000). Entrepreneurial learning and mentoring. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 6(3), 160-175.
13. Nambisan, S. (2017). Digital entrepreneurship: Toward a digital technology perspective of entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 41(6), 1029-1055.
14. Djankov, S., La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., & Shleifer, A. (2002). The regulation of entry. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117(1), 1-37.
15. Teece, D. J. (2006). Reflections on “profiting from innovation”. *Research Policy*, 35(8), 1131-1146.
16. Van Stel, A., Storey, D. J., & Thurik, A. R. (2007). The effect of business regulations on nascent and young business entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 28(2), 171-186.
17. Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture’s consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. Sage Publications.
18. Kautonen, T., Gelderen, M. V., & Fink, M. (2015). Robustness of the theory of planned behavior in predicting entrepreneurial intentions and actions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 39(3), 655-674.

Proofreader: Zokir ALIBEKOV

Layout and Designer: Oloviddin Sobir ugli

2025. № 5

To publish articles in this journal, you may submit articles, advertisements, stories, and other creative materials through the following links. Materials and advertisements are published on a paid basis.

You may subscribe to the journal at any time using the following details. Once subscribed, please send a screenshot or photo of your payment confirmation to our Telegram page @iqtisodiyot_77. Based on this, we will send the latest issue of the journal to your address each month.

"The journal "INNOVATION SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY" has been registered by the Agency for Information and Mass Communications under the Administration of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan from 09.10.2024 under the registration number №390637. License number: C-5669633. PNFL: 30407832680027

Our address: Tashkent city, Yunusobod district, 19th block, House 17.