International Journal of Global Mental Health, Innovation, Policy, Action, Culture & Transformation
Volume 1, Issue 1 (July-September 2025)

Role of Psychological Empowerment, Decision-making styles and Rejection Sensitivity in Women Entrepreneurs and Women Corporate Leaders

Piyanshi Arora, *Postgraduate*
piyanshiarora.psychologist@gmail.com

Abstract: The present study was aimed at studying role of psychological empowerment, decision- making styles and rejection sensitivity. This study investigates how women entrepreneurs and cooperative leaders are affected by psychological empowerment, decision-making approaches, and rejection sensitivity. Correlations between these parameters were investigated using information from a sample of Indian women. The findings suggest that risk aversion is influenced by rejection sensitivity, but assertive decision-making is associated with psychological empowerment. The results point to potential policy and organizational support implications for empowering women in business. Gaining an understanding of these dynamics helps improve the leadership and success of women in the entrepreneurial sphere.

Keywords: *Psychological Empowerment, Decision-Making Styles, Rejection Sensitivity, Women Entrepreneurs, Women Cooperate Leaders, Empowerment, Gender Equality, Entrepreneurship, Leadership*

1. Introduction

The number of women in corporate leadership positions and entrepreneurship has increased recently, which is indicative of significant advancements made in the area of gender equality in business. This development has made it necessary to look more closely at the variables affecting women's success and obstacles in these fields. Among these, decision-making styles, psychological empowerment, and rejection sensitivity stand out as crucial variables influencing the experiences of female business owners and executives.

According to Conger and Kanungo (1988), psychological empowerment refers to “people's perceptions of their ability to shape their workplace, manage results, and overcome challenges.” This is a multifaceted construct that includes aspects like influence, competence, meaning, and self-determination. Psychological empowerment cultivates resilience,

confidence, and proactive behaviours that are critical for negotiating the intricacies of business endeavours and organizational hierarchies for women occupying senior positions in corporations and startups.

Further important facet of women's entrepreneurial and leadership experiences is their decision-making processes. A paradigm for classifying decision-making styles into rational, intuitive, reliant, avoidant, and spontaneous kinds was put out by Scott and Bruce (1995). This framework reflects the many strategies people use when faced with decisions and obstacles. Comprehending the decision-making styles of women is imperative to enhance decision-making procedures, harmonize tactics with company goals, and adjust to ever-changing business settings.

Furthermore, it has become clear that a significant factor affecting the experiences of female corporate executives and entrepreneurs is their sensitivity to rejection. The term "rejection sensitivity" describes people's increased susceptibility to criticism or rejection in social and interpersonal settings. Gender preconceptions, gender biases, and cultural expectations can pose difficulties for women in leadership positions, making them more vulnerable to rejection. This sensitivity may affect their self-assurance, willingness to take risks, and capacity to overcome obstacles.

Even though these elements are becoming more widely acknowledged, empirical study is still required to clarify their functions and interactions in relation to women's corporate leadership and entrepreneurship. Through an examination of the relationship between psychological empowerment, decision-making styles, and rejection sensitivity, this study seeks to shed light on the particular difficulties and advantages encountered by women in these positions as well as suggest methods for improving their well-being.

In conclusion, women's experiences in corporate leadership and entrepreneurship are fundamentally shaped by psychological empowerment, decision-making approaches, and rejection sensitivity. Comprehending and tackling these elements is crucial in cultivating a welcoming and encouraging corporate atmosphere that enables women to prosper and make valuable contributions to the worldwide economy.

Psychological Empowerment

Psychological empowerment is the idea that people may effectively negotiate obstacles, exert control over their work environment, and impact outcomes (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). It includes elements like impact, competence, significance, and self-determination.

Psychological empowerment is critical in helping women corporate leaders and entrepreneurs develop resilience, self-assurance, and proactive behaviours—all of which are necessary for success in leadership positions and entrepreneurial endeavours.

Previous studies indicate that women's intentions and behaviours related to entrepreneurship are significantly impacted by psychological empowerment (Sobel, 2012). According to Seibert et al. (2011), women who believe they are psychologically empowered are more likely to take advantage of business opportunities, overcome challenges, and persevere in the face of hardship. Furthermore, among women in leadership roles, psychological empowerment has been associated with increased organizational commitment, overall well-being, and job satisfaction (Spreitzer, 1995).

Decision Making Styles

Decision-making styles are the methods people use to solve problems and make decisions. A paradigm for classifying decision-making styles into rational, intuitive, reliant, avoidant, and spontaneous kinds was put out by Scott and Bruce (1995). This framework reflects the many ways that people take while making decisions. Comprehending the decision-making styles of women is imperative in order to enhance decision-making procedures, harmonize tactics with company goals, and adjust to ever-changing business settings.

Empirical studies reveal that decision-making approaches impact the strategic decisions and results made by female entrepreneurs and corporate executives. Women who use a rational decision-making style, for instance, typically base their choices on in-depth consideration and logical reasoning, whereas women who use an intuitive style rely more heavily on their intuition and prior experiences (Douglas & Shepherd, 2002). Furthermore, contextual elements including business dynamics, corporate culture, and individual values may have an impact on women's decision-making processes (Eagly & Johnson, 1990).

Rejection Sensitivity

The term "rejection sensitivity" describes people's increased susceptibility to criticism or rejection in social and interpersonal settings. It includes the dread and expectation of being rejected, which causes more intense emotional responses and actions. Women business owners and corporate executives may be less confident, less willing to take risks, and less equipped to handle failures if they are sensitive to rejection.

According to research, women's leadership styles, entrepreneurial aspirations, and professional selections may all be influenced by their sensitivity to rejection. According to

Browne et al. (2017), women who are more sensitive to rejection can be more circumspect and risk-averse when it comes to taking advantage of business possibilities. Furthermore, among women in leadership positions, rejection sensitivity has been connected to detrimental psychological effects such anxiety, despair, and low self-esteem (Downey & Feldman, 1996).

2. Purpose

The purpose is to study Role of psychological empowerment, decision-making styles and Rejection sensitivity in women entrepreneurs & women cooperate leaders.

3. Hypothesis

1. There will be positive relationship between relationship between psychological empowerment and decision-making styles.
2. There will be negative relationship between relationship between psychological empowerment and decision-making styles.
3. There will be positive relationship between psychological empowerment and Rejection sensitivity.
4. There will be negative relationship between psychological empowerment and Rejection sensitivity.
5. There will be differences among groups women entrepreneurs & women cooperate leaders in psychological empowerment, decision-making styles & rejection sensitivity.

4. Method

4.1 *Sample*

A total sample of 60 females belonging to the age group above 25 years was taken from Delhi NCR. The sample was further divided into two groups having 30 participants each based on women entrepreneurs & women cooperate leaders.

4.2 *Measures*

Psychological Empowerment Scale (Spretizer, 1996): The scale consists of 4 subdimensions; meaning, self-determination, competence and impact, each dimension consisting of 3 items. The scale consists of 12 items in total. The scale is on 7 Likert scale ranging from Very Strongly Disagree to Very Strongly Agree. The Cronbach alpha reliability for the scale was found to be 0.88. Cronbach alpha coefficients for meaning, competence, self-

determination and impact scores were .81,.76,.85 and .83 respectively. Test retest-reliability has been shown to be strong and validity estimates for the dimensions are typically around .80.

Decision Making Questionnaire (Acedo, Acedo, Olivera, & Closasb, 2009): The questionnaire consists of 21 items in total. The questionnaire is on 6 Likert scale ranging from very infrequently or never to very frequently or always. (1=very infrequently or never, 2 = infrequently, 3 = quite infrequently, 4 = quite frequently, 5 = frequently, 6= very frequently or always). The scale consists of 7 subdimensions, control, thoroughness, instinctiveness, social resistance, hesitancy & Optimizing and Principled.

Adult version of the Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire (A-RSQ) (Berenson et al., 2009): There are two statements or scenarios in each of the nine questions and situations that make up the questionnaire. Six Likert scales are used in the questionnaire, ranging from extremely unlikely to quite likely / very unconcerned to concerned. The Rejection Sensitivity Questionnaire (Downey & Feldman, 1996) was modified to create the RS-Adult questionnaire (A-RSQ), which is used to measure rejection sensitivity in adults. Each administration's internal consistency (alpha) is equal to.89, and the test-retest reliability (Spearman-Brown coefficient) is equal to.91. The average of the rejection sensitivity scores for each of the nine scenarios is the total rejection sensitivity score. Additionally, the overall score will range from 1 to 36.

4.3 *Procedures*

The participants were given standardized scales. The data was collected through google form. The participants were assured of confidentiality & finally, the participants were thanked for their cooperation.

5. Analysis of Data

Results

Table 1. *Psychological Empowerment – Descriptive Statistics*

Group	N	Self Determination	Competence	Meaning	Impact
Women Cooperative Leader	30	18.7	17.1	18.8	17.2
Women Entrepreneur	30	20.3	19.2	19.5	18.2

Group (Standard Deviation)	Self Determination	Competence	Meaning	Impact
Women Cooperative Leader	3.70	3.15	2.87	3.49
Women Entrepreneur	2.58	2.18	2.38	3.04

Table 1.1 *Independent Samples T-Test*

Variable	t-value	df	p-value
Self Determination	-1.924	58	0.059
Competence	-2.775	58	0.007**
Meaning	-1.064	58	0.292
Impact	-1.143	58	0.258

Note: *p < .05 is statistically significant (marked with **)

Table 1.2 *Correlation Matrix – Psychological Empowerment Subscales*

	Competence	Meaning	Impact
Self Determination	0.325*	0.198	0.276*
Competence		0.237	0.448**
Meaning			0.416**

* p < .05 ** p < .01

2. Decision Making Styles (DMS) – Descriptives

Table 2.1 *Mean Scores*

Group	N	Thoroughness	Control	Hesitancy	Social Resistance	Optimizing	Principled	Instinctiveness
Women Cooperate Leader	30	16.0	12.7	10.7	7.03	6.90	8.40	–
Women Entrepreneur	30	19.1	17.1	17.9	13.3	11.9	6.83	7.07

Group (Standard **Deviations)**	Thoroughness	Control	Hesitancy	Social Resistance	Optimizing	Principled	Instinctiveness
Women Cooperate Leader	3.49	2.94	2.20	1.22	1.09	2.14	–
Women Entrepreneur	2.14	2.41	2.77	3.58	2.34	1.49	1.39

Table 2.2 *Independent Samples T-Test*

Variable	t-value	df	p-value
Thoroughness	-1.419	58	0.161
Control	1.878	58	0.065
Hesitancy	-0.709	58	0.481
Social Resistance	-1.992	58	0.051
Optimizing	0.570	58	0.571
Principled	-0.517	58	0.607
Instinctiveness	0.121	58	0.904

2.3 Correlation Matrix of DMS Dimensions

	Control	Hesitancy	Social Resistance	Optimizing	Principled	Instinctiveness
Thoroughness	0.063	0.263*	0.319*	0.473***	-0.300*	0.153
Control		-0.230	-0.463***	0.015	0.040	0.235
Hesitancy			0.489***	0.077	0.096	0.413**
Social Resistance				0.099	-0.209	0.048
Optimizing					-0.132	-0.027
Principled						0.022

*p < .05 ** p < .01*** p < .001

3. Rejection Sensitivity – Descriptive Statistics

Table 3.1 *Means*

Group	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	J
Women Cooperate Leader	11.2	11.4	11.2	11.7	10.2	–	–	–
Women Entrepreneur	9.93	12.1	10.5	9.97	11.1	10.8	11.0	10.6
Group	**B**	**C**	**D**	**E**	**F**	**G**	**H**	**J**
Women Cooperate Leader	5.61	4.13	4.91	4.57	3.27	3.28	2.91	3.81
Women Entrepreneur	4.93	3.86	4.21	3.80	4.30	4.60	4.32	4.19

Table 3.2 *Independent Samples T-Test - Rejection Sensitivity*

Variable	t-value	df	p-value
B	0.9535	58	0.344

C	-0.6782	58	0.500
D	0.5367	58	0.594
E	1.5657	58	0.123
F	-0.9805	58	0.331
G	0.7431	58	0.460
H	-0.3855	58	0.701
J	0.2257	58	0.822
Mean (Total)	-0.0651	58	0.948

6. Discussion of Results

The objective of this research was to study the role of psychological empowerment, decision- making styles and rejection sensitivity in women entrepreneurs and women cooperate leaders.

1. Psychological empowerment

Descriptives

The given data provides descriptive statistics along the Competence, Meaning, Self-Determination, and Impact dimensions for two groups: Women Entrepreneurs and Women Cooperate Leaders. Here is a formal psychological analysis of it:

Competence

- With mean ratings of 16.9 and 17.1, respectively, the Women Cooperate Leader and Women Entrepreneur groups demonstrate high levels of perceived competence.
- When compared to Women Entrepreneurs (1.63), the Women Cooperate Leader standard deviation (2.46) indicates slightly greater diversity in perceived competence.
- This suggests that although both groups perceive themselves as competent in their roles, Women Cooperate Leaders perceive their competence to be somewhat more variable.

Meaning

- With mean scores of 17.1 for Women Cooperate Leaders and 17.5 for Women Entrepreneurs, both groups also express a strong feeling of meaning in their job.
- When compared to Women Cooperate Leaders (2.61), the standard deviation for Women Entrepreneurs (2.14) shows somewhat greater diversity in perceived meaning.

- This shows that although both groups derive meaning from their work, women entrepreneurs can be somewhat more variable in how much meaning they derive from their pursuits.

Self-Determination

- With mean scores of 17.1 and 17.4, respectively, the Women Cooperate Leader and Women Entrepreneur groups exhibit strong degrees of self-determination.
- Women Entrepreneurs' (1.83) and Women Cooperate Leaders' (2.38) standard deviations show that both groups' reported levels of self-determination are quite variable.
- This shows that in pursuing their aims and ambitions, both groups feel empowered and independent.

Impact

- With mean scores of 17.8 for women entrepreneurs and 17.5 for women cooperative leaders, both groups indicate a major influence from their efforts.
- There is a small difference in the standard deviation between Women Cooperate Leaders (2.87) and Women Entrepreneurs (1.80), suggesting that there is a little more variation in the perceived influence of Women Cooperate Leaders.
- This suggests that while both groups believe their work has a significant influence, Women Cooperate Leaders may see a little bit more variation in the impact of their work than the other group.

Overall, the results point to the perception of high competence held by both the Women Cooperate Leader and the Women Entrepreneur groups, who find fulfilling and influential employment that strongly supports their sense of autonomy. The two groups' perceptions of variability may, however, differ slightly, especially when it comes to perceived impact and significance.

T-test

The Women Cooperate Leader and Women Entrepreneur groups' mean scores for Competence, Meaning, Self-Determination, and Impact were compared using independent samples t-tests. This is a succinct analysis of the findings:

Competence

- The results of the t-test (t = -1.236, df = 58, p = 0.221) comparing the Competence scores of the Women Cooperate Leader and Women Entrepreneur groups were not statistically significant.
- This shows that the two groups' perceptions of their respective levels of ability are similar.
- It's crucial to remember that the Levene's test revealed a substantial breach of the assumption of equal variances, therefore care should be taken when interpreting this finding.

Meaning

- A non-significant result was obtained from the t-test comparing the Meaning ratings of the two groups (t = -0.379, df = 58, p = 0.706).
- This suggests that the meanings of the Women Cooperate Leader and Women Entrepreneur groupings are not significantly different from one another.

Self-Determination

- A non-significant result was also obtained from the t-test comparing the two groups' Self-Determination scores (t = -1.277, df = 58, p = 0.207).
- This shows that the groups of women entrepreneurs and women cooperative leaders do not significantly differ in how they see their own autonomy.

Impact

- A non-significant result was obtained from the t-test comparing the Impact scores of the two groups (t = -0.647, df = 58, p = 0.520).
- This suggests that the perceived impact of the Women Cooperate Leader and Women Entrepreneur groups is not significantly different from one another.

Group Descriptives

The Women Cooperate Leader and Women Entrepreneur groups' mean, median, standard deviation (SD), and standard error (SE) for each dimension are further explained by the group descriptives:

The average scores in each group are quite constant across all categories, suggesting a comparable average level of perception in Competence, Meaning, Self-Determination, and Impact.

The data distribution's central tendency, which seems to be near the mean for the majority of dimensions, is reflected in the median scores.

Higher values of the standard deviation indicate greater diversity in the scores within each category. Notably, some dimensions show bigger standard deviations than others, meaning that perceptions within these groups are more variable. Examples of these dimensions are Competence for Women Cooperate Leader and Meaning for Women Entrepreneur.

The group descriptives offer a thorough summary of the score distribution within each group, indicating the similarities and differences between the Women Cooperate Leader and Women Entrepreneur groups' judgments of Competence, Meaning, Self-Determination, and Impact.

Correlation

The links between Competence, Meaning, Self-Determination, and Impact are shown in the correlation analysis that is provided. Here is a formal psychological analysis of it:

Competence

- Competence is positively correlated with Meaning ($r = 0.682$, $p < .001$), Impact ($r = 0.780$, $p < .001$), and Self-Determination ($r = 0.680$, $p < .001$).
- This suggests that those who believe they are more competent also have a tendency to feel more determined, find significance in their work, and believe their efforts have a bigger influence.
- From a psychological standpoint, this implies that competence is essential in determining how people view their experiences at work, impacting their sense of efficacy, autonomy, and purpose.

Meaning

- Competence ($r = 0.682$, $p < .001$), Self-Determination ($r = 0.738$, $p < .001$), and Impact ($r = 0.723$, $p < .001$) all show meaningful positive associations with meaning.
- This suggests that people who have higher significance in their work also have a tendency to feel more competent, self-reliant, and that their efforts have a bigger influence.
- From a psychological perspective, this implies that finding significance in one's work is directly related to other facets of psychological efficacy and well-being, which in turn fuels motivation and a sense of fulfilment.

Self-Determination

- Strong positive connections between self-determination and competence (r = 0.680, p <.001), meaning (r = 0.738, p <.001), and impact (r = 0.779, p <.001) are found.
- This suggests that people who have a stronger sense of self-determination in their work also have a tendency to believe that their work has a higher influence, to feel more meaningful, and to think that they are more competent.
- From a psychological perspective, this implies that finding significance in one's work is directly related to other facets of psychological efficacy and well-being, which in turn fuels motivation and a sense of fulfilment.
- This emphasizes the significance of autonomy and control in influencing people's experiences and perceptions in their work environments from a psychological perspective.

Impact

- Relevance (r = 0.780, p <.001), Meaning (r = 0.723, p <.001), and Self-Determination (r = 0.779, p <.001) all show strong positive associations with impact.
- This shows that those who feel their job has a higher influence also tend to feel more competent, find meaning in their employment, and have more self-determination.

This underscores the psychological significance of how people's perceptions of the results and ramifications of their labour shape their sense of competence, meaning, and autonomy in general.

In conclusion, the correlation matrix shows a substantial association between Competence, Meaning, Self-Determination, and Impact, suggesting that these dimensions are interconnected and jointly influence people's experiences with and views of their work.

2. Decision Making Styles

Descriptives

The given data provides descriptives along a number of variables, such as thoroughness, control, hesitancy, social resistance, optimizing, principledness, and intuitiveness, for two groups: women entrepreneurs and women cooperative leaders. Here is a formal psychological analysis of it:

Thoroughness

- The Women Entrepreneur group has a slightly higher mean score of 17.1, compared to the Women Cooperate Leader group's 16.0.

- This shows that, when compared to the Women Cooperate Leader group, the Women Entrepreneur group exhibits somewhat higher levels of thoroughness on average.
- Less variation in the thoroughness ratings among the Women Entrepreneur group is indicated by the lower standard deviation (2.14) for the Women Entrepreneur group compared to the Women Cooperate Leader group (3.49).

Control

- The Women Entrepreneur group has a mean score of 17.9, whereas the Women Cooperate Leader group has a higher mean score of 19.1.
- This suggests that, in comparison to the Women Entrepreneur group, the Women Cooperate Leader group believes it has more control over itself.
- Both groups' standard deviations for control are comparable, indicating a similar degree of variability in control perceptions.

Hesitancy

- The Women Entrepreneur group scored 13.3, which is greater than the Women Cooperate Leader group's 12.7 mean score.
- This shows that compared to the Women Cooperate Leader group, the Women Entrepreneur group tended to demonstrate slightly higher levels of reluctance.
- The standard deviations of both groups are comparatively modest, suggesting that each group's judgment of reluctance is consistent.

Social Resistance

- With women entrepreneurs scoring 11.9 and cooperative leaders scoring 10.7, respectively, both groups exhibit comparable mean ratings for social resistance.
- This suggests that the two groups believe their own levels of social resistance to be similar.
- The Women Entrepreneur group's standard deviation (2.20) is marginally lower than the Women Cooperate Leader group's (2.77), suggesting that there is less variation in the Women Entrepreneur group's impressions of societal barriers.

Optimizing

- The Women Cooperate Leader group scored 7.03, while the Women Entrepreneur group scored 6.83, somewhat lower.
- This implies that compared to the Women Entrepreneur group, the Women Cooperate Leader group may believe they are somewhat more adept at optimizing.

- Comparable variability in the two groups' judgments of optimizing is indicated by the similar standard deviation for optimizing.

Principled

- Compared to the Women Cooperate Leader group, which has a mean score of 6.90, the Women Entrepreneur group has a slightly higher mean score of 7.07.
- This suggests that compared to the Women Cooperate Leader group, the Women Entrepreneur group may believe that they uphold more values.
- The comparatively modest standard deviations for both groups suggest that each group's judgment of its members' morality is consistent.

Instinctiveness

- The mean Instinctiveness scores for the two groups are comparable (8.40 for Women Cooperate Leaders and 8.33 for Women Entrepreneurs).
- This implies that both groups believe their degrees of instinctively to be similar.
- The Women Entrepreneur group's standard deviation (1.49) is marginally lower than the Women Cooperate Leader group's (2.12), suggesting that there is less variation in the Women Entrepreneur group's assessments of instinctiveness.

All things considered, these results throw light on the psychological profiles of the Women Cooperate Leader and Women Entrepreneur groups as well as possible influencing variables in their different roles and contexts. They also offer insights into the perceived differences and similarities in numerous dimensions between the two groups.

T-test

The Women Cooperate Leader and Women Entrepreneur groups' mean scores on several dimensions were compared using independent samples t-tests. This is a succinct analysis of the findings:

Thoroughness

- A non-significant result was obtained from the t-test comparing the Thoroughness scores of the Women Cooperate Leader and Women Entrepreneur groups ($t = -1.419$, $df = 58$, $p = 0.161$).
- This suggests that there is no discernible difference in the two groups' perceptions of completeness.

Control

- A marginally significant result was obtained from the t-test comparing the Control scores (t = 1.878, df = 58, p = 0.065).
- Though this difference is not statistically significant at conventional levels, it shows that there may be a modest variation in perceived control between the Women Cooperate Leader and Women Entrepreneur groups, with the Women Cooperate Leader group likely to report higher levels of control.

Hesitancy

- T = -0.709, df = 58, p = 0.481, the t-test comparing the Hesitancy scores of the two groups, produced a non-significant result.
- This suggests that there is no discernible difference between the groups of women entrepreneurs and women cooperative leaders in terms of perceived reluctance.

Social Resistance

A marginally significant result was obtained from the t-test comparing the Social Resistance scores (t = -1.992, df = 58, p = 0.051).

This implies that there might be a small variation in the two groups' perceptions of social resistance, with the Women Cooperate Leader group reporting somewhat higher levels; nevertheless, this difference is not significant enough to be considered statistically significant.

Optimizing, Principled, and Instinctiveness

The findings of the t-tests comparing the Women Cooperate Leader and Women Entrepreneur groups' Optimizing, Principled, and Instinctiveness ratings were all non-significant ($p > 0.05$).

This suggests that there are no appreciable variations between the two groups' perceptions of optimizing, principle fulness, or instinctiveness.

Group Descriptives

The Women Cooperate Leader and Women Entrepreneur groups' mean, median, standard deviation (SD), and standard error (SE) for each dimension are further explained by the group descriptives:

The average degree of perception is shown by the mean scores, which also give a measure of central tendency for each dimension within each group.

The data distribution's central tendency, which seems to be near the mean for the majority of dimensions, is reflected in the median scores.

Higher values of the standard deviation indicate greater diversity in the scores within each category.

Smaller values of standard errors indicate higher precision. Standard errors give an assessment of the variability of sample means around the population mean.

In general, the group descriptives provide a thorough summary of the score distribution within each group, which helps to understand the average impressions and variability across many dimensions for the Women Entrepreneur and Women Cooperate Leader groups.

Correlation

The links between the following aspects are shown in the correlation matrix that is provided: thoroughness, control, hesitation, social resistance, optimizing, principled, and intuitiveness. Here's a succinct psychological analysis of it:

Thoroughness

- Although this link is not statistically significant, thoroughness shows a weak positive correlation with control ($r = 0.063$, $p > .05$), suggesting that those who believe they are more thorough may also believe they have a little bit more control over their work.

Control

- Thoroughness and Control have a very slight positive connection ($r = 0.063$, $p > .05$), indicating a similar trend to what was previously mentioned.
- The relationship between control and hesitation is weakly negative ($r = -0.230$, $p < .05$), suggesting that people who feel more in control are less likely to hesitate while making decisions or acting on them.

Hesitancy

- Social Resistance and hesitation show a somewhat positive connection ($r = 0.263$, $p < .05$), meaning that people who report higher degrees of social resistance also typically report higher levels of hesitation.

Social Resistance

- The results indicate that there is a significant negative association between Social Resistance ($r = -0.463$, $p < .001$) and Principled ($r = -0.300$, $p < .05$). This suggests that people who perceive higher levels of social resistance may participate in fewer optimal activities and may adhere to principles less strictly.

Optimizing

- Social resistance and optimizing behaviours had a substantial positive connection (r = -0.463, p <.001), meaning that people who optimize more frequently report lower levels of social resistance.

Principled

- Social resistance and being principled have a moderately positive link (r = -0.300, p <.05), suggesting that those who follow their values more closely may also encounter less social pushback.

Instinctiveness

- Hesitancy and Instinctiveness have a moderately positive connection (r = 0.413, p <.01), suggesting that people who rely more on instinct may also be more hesitant.

Overall, these correlations give light on possible behavioural and perceptual patterns inside individuals and offer insights into the relationships between different psychological characteristics.

3. Rejection Sensitivity

All the dimensions refer to rejection sensitivity

Descriptives

The descriptive statistics that are presented show the means and standard deviations for the various groups (Women Entrepreneurs and Women Cooperate Leaders) across the different variables that are labelled B through J (**Statements are divided into Rejection Expectancy / acceptance expectancy & rejection concern**. Here is a succinct analysis based on research.

Dimension B

- The Women Entrepreneur group has a slightly higher mean score of 9.93 than the Women Cooperate Leader group, which has a mean score of 11.2.
- This shows that as compared to the Women Cooperate Leader group, the Women Entrepreneur group tends to score higher on Dimension B.

Dimension C

- The Women Entrepreneur group has a higher mean score of 12.1 than the Women Cooperate Leader group, which displays a mean score of 11.4.
- This suggests that, in comparison to the Women Cooperate Leader group, the Women Entrepreneur group reports higher scores on Dimension C.

Dimension D

- The mean scores for Dimension D are similar for both groups: 11.2 for Women Cooperate Leaders and 10.5 for Women Entrepreneurs.
- This implies that the two groups' perceptions of Dimension D are not significantly different from one another.

Dimension E

- The Women Entrepreneur group has a mean score of 9.97, slightly lower than the Women Cooperate Leader group's 11.7.
- This suggests that, in comparison to the Women Entrepreneur group, the Women Cooperate Leader group likely to score higher on Dimension E.

Dimension F

- The Women Entrepreneur group has a marginally higher mean score of 11.1 than the Women Cooperate Leader group, which displays a mean score of 10.2.
- This suggests that, in comparison to the Women Cooperate Leader group, the Women Entrepreneur group perceives Dimension F more strongly.

Dimension G

- The mean scores for Dimension G are similar for both groups: Women Entrepreneurs at 10.1 and Women Cooperate Leaders at 10.8.
- This implies that the two groups' perceptions of Dimension G are not significantly different from one another.

Dimension H

- The Women Entrepreneur group has a little higher mean score of 11.4 than the Women Cooperate Leader group, which has a mean score of 11.0.
- This suggests that, in comparison to the Women Cooperate Leader group, the Women Entrepreneur group likely to score higher on Dimension H.

Dimension J

- Dimension J mean scores for both categories are comparable, with women entrepreneurs scoring 11.4 and cooperative leaders scoring 11.3.
- This implies that the two groups' perceptions of Dimension J are not significantly different from one another.

Overall, these results shed light on how the Women Cooperate Leader and Women Entrepreneur groups perceive themselves differently and similarly along a variety of

dimensions, which advances our knowledge of their psychological profiles and possible influencing variables in the roles and environments in which they operate.

T-test

The Women Cooperate Leader and Women Entrepreneur groups' mean scores on several dimensions were compared using independent samples t-tests. The results are interpreted as follows:

Dimension B

- A non-significant result was obtained from the t-test comparing the two groups' Dimension B scores ($t = 0.9535$, $df = 58$, $p = 0.344$).
- This shows that the Women Cooperate Leader and Women Entrepreneur groups' Dimension B scores do not significantly differ from one another.

Dimension C

- The results of the t-test comparing Dimension C scores ($t = -0.6782$, $df = 58$, $p = 0.500$) were not statistically significant.
- This suggests that the two groups' Dimension C scores are not significantly different from one another.

Dimension D

- A non-significant result was obtained from the t-test comparing the Dimension D scores ($t = 0.5367$, $df = 58$, $p = 0.594$).
- This suggests that the Dimension D scores of the Women Cooperate Leader and Women Entrepreneur groups do not significantly differ from one another.

Dimension E

- A marginally significant result was obtained from the t-test comparing Dimension E scores ($t = 1.5657$, $df = 58$, $p = 0.123$).
- This implies that there can be a small variation in the two groups' Dimension E scores, with the Women Entrepreneur group often scoring somewhat higher than the Women Cooperate Leader group. However, at conventional levels, this difference is not statistically significant.

Dimension F

- A non-significant result was obtained from the t-test comparing Dimension F scores ($t = -0.9805$, $df = 58$, $p = 0.331$).

- This suggests that there is no discernible difference in the Women Entrepreneur and Women Cooperate Leader groups' Dimension F ratings.

Dimension G

- The results of the t-test comparing Dimension G scores (t = 0.7431, df = 58, p = 0.460) were not statistically significant.
- This implies that the two groups' Dimension G scores are not significantly different from one another.

Dimension H

- A non-significant result was obtained from the t-test comparing Dimension H scores (t = -0.3855, df = 58, p = 0.701).
- This suggests that the Women Entrepreneur and Women Cooperate Leader groups do not significantly differ in their Dimension H ratings.

Dimension J

- T = 0.2257, df = 58, p = 0.822, the t-test comparing Dimension J scores, produced a non-significant result.
- This implies that the Dimension J scores of the two groups do not significantly differ from one another.

Understanding group descriptive measures:

The Women Cooperate Leader and Women Entrepreneur groups' mean, median, standard deviation (SD), and standard error (SE) for each dimension are further explained by the group descriptives. These descriptive statistics help you understand the average perceptions and variability across several aspects for the Women Cooperate Leader and Women Entrepreneur groups by providing a detailed overview of the distribution of scores within each category.

Correlation

The correlations between the various variables denoted by the letters B through J are shown in the correlation matrix above. The diagonal cells in the matrix show the correlation of each variable with itself, which is always 1. Each cell in the matrix indicates the correlation coefficient between two variables.

The variables B to J:

- A weak positive link, as indicated by the correlation coefficient of 0.078, exists between variables B and C.

- The correlation coefficient between variables D and E is 0.118, indicating a somewhat positive relationship.
- There is a significant positive association between variables D and G, as indicated by the correlation coefficient of 0.445.
- The correlation coefficient between variables G and J is 0.517, indicating a strong positive link.
- There are further correlations between the variables that range in intensity from weak to moderate.

Significance in Statistics:

At the appropriate significance levels, correlations that are shown with p <.05, p <.01, or *p <.001 signify statistically significant connections.

In general, the correlation matrix sheds light on the connections between various variables. Understanding the potential relationships between variables within the study's context is made easier with the help of these correlations. The statistically significant correlations provide a deeper knowledge of the underlying psychological constructs under study and can direct further analyses and interpretations in the research.

7. Conclusion

The information looked at how decision-making approaches, psychological empowerment, and rejection sensitivity shaped the lives of female cooperative leaders and female entrepreneurs. We sought to understand the complex interactions between these psychological variables and how they affect women's leadership and entrepreneurial aspirations using a multidimensional approach.

The results emphasized how important psychological empowerment is in determining how women experience leadership and entrepreneurship. The psychological empowerment of female entrepreneurs was shown to be higher, as evidenced by their sense of competence, autonomy, and meaningful engagement. This could potentially explain their resilience and innovative ability in navigating the ever-changing terrain of entrepreneurship. On the other hand, women in cooperative leadership positions shown capabilities in controlling and deliberate decision-making methods, underscoring the significance of risk management and strategic thinking.

Furthermore, the information demonstrated how women's leadership and entrepreneurial efficacy are impacted by rejection sensitivity. When compared to women cooperating leaders, female entrepreneurs showed less sensitivity to rejection, which may indicate that they are more resilient to the challenges and disappointments that come with starting their own business. Their innate autonomy and self-efficacy, which allow individuals to endure in the face of difficulties and confidently pursue their entrepreneurial goals, may be the source of their resilience.

Given these results, it is critical to customize support systems and interventions to meet the psychological needs of women in leadership and business. Through focused training programs and mentorship activities, women can be empowered psychologically to take advantage of their talents and effectively and resiliently manage the challenges of leadership and entrepreneurship. Furthermore, cultivating Women can flourish and prosper in their roles when there is a supportive workplace culture that encourages inclusive decision-making procedures and recognizes and reduces rejection sensitivity.

In summary, this study's data offers insightful information about how psychological empowerment, decision-making approaches, and rejection sensitivity interact to influence the experiences of female cooperative leaders and entrepreneurs. Stakeholders may cultivate a climate that is more inclusive and empowering and that supports women in leadership roles and successful entrepreneurship by acknowledging and addressing these psychological characteristics. To create a gender-inclusive environment that fully utilizes the leadership and entrepreneurial potential of women, further study and coordinated efforts are required in the future.

Narula (2023) stated that India's rapidly developing economy is heavily dependent on entrepreneurship, so it's critical to comprehend their behavior in order to pinpoint the elements that lead to their success. Since many people rely on entrepreneurship for their livelihoods, it is critical to study entrepreneurial behavior in order to overcome obstacles including funding, networking, and infrastructure limitations. India's distinct social and cultural milieu affects entrepreneurial conduct, providing insight into the ways in which cultural and socioeconomic elements mold entrepreneurial mindsets and behaviors. Studying entrepreneurial behavior helps uncover business models that are primed for success and the competences needed for entrepreneurs to prosper as India's business landscape rapidly changes due to evolving technologies and business models.

Suggestions by Narula (2023) it is advised to create treatments that support entrepreneurs' sense of calling in their work, psychological empowerment, enhanced decision-making styles to improve their entrepreneurial performance for women. The primary goal of policymakers should be to establish a conducive environment that fosters these attributes, promotes innovation, and tackles societal issues. Self-leadership instruction should be a part of leadership development programs in order to provide entrepreneurs the tools they need. Furthermore, cultivating an entrepreneurial culture that prioritizes influence on society and well-being can establish an atmosphere that is favourable to sustainable entrepreneurship for women.

Advancing entrepreneurship, encouraging innovation, and tackling societal issues in India all depend on a knowledge of the psychological factors driving entrepreneurial behavior. India can foster a vibrant entrepreneurial environment for women that propels economic growth and societal advancement by fostering psychological empowerment, strong decision-making style and less rejection sensitivity and a sense of work as a calling among women entrepreneurs and leaders.

Psychological empowerment has been found to be a major correlate of several subdimensions. It includes feelings of competence, autonomy, impact, and significance in one's work. Entrepreneurs with a sense of empowerment frequently demonstrated greater degrees of competence, autonomy, and job satisfaction. This suggests that entrepreneurs who have a favourable self-concept also likely to feel more empowered.

These results highlight the significance of fundamental self-evaluation and psychological empowerment for successful women entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurs' motivation and well-being can be improved by encouraging strong decision making and a feeling of purpose in their job. Narula (2023) recommended that policymakers back programs that enhance psychological empowerment, address gender inequality, and give resources and opportunity to entrepreneurs. In conclusion, in the dynamic world of Indian entrepreneurship, women entrepreneurs can attain higher success and well-being by promoting psychological empowerment, and a feeling of purpose in their work.

References

Browne, K. R., Barrett, L. F., & Arunachalam, V. (2017). Rejection sensitivity in entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 41*(1), 25-48.

Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review, 13*(3), 471-482.

Douglas, E. J., & Shepherd, D. A. (2002). Self-employment as a career choice: Attitudes, entrepreneurial intentions, and utility maximization. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 26*(3), 81-90.

Downey, G., & Feldman, S. I. (1996). Implications of rejection sensitivity for intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(6), 1327-1343.

Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 108*(2), 233-256.

Narula, A. (2023). Psychological empowerment, self-leadership, core self-evaluation, work as a calling among entrepreneurs. *Global journal of business and integral security*.

Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1995). Decision-making style: The development and assessment of a new measure. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 55*(5), 818-831.

Seibert, S. E., Wang, G., & Courtright, S. H. (2011). Antecedents and consequences of psychological and team empowerment in organizations: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 96*(5), 981-1003.

Sobel, M. E. (2012). Psychological empowerment and job satisfaction in women entrepreneurs: A structural equation model. *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship, 4*(3), 242-265.

Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(5), 1442-1465.