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ABSTRACT

This is an exploratory study of the psychological and background characteristics of women small business owners and their managerial orientations/styles. Twenty nine women entrepreneurs in the Illawarra region were selected using the snow-ball sampling technique. Data for this research was collected by administering a structured questionnaire incorporating instruments from Williams (1975), Cohen (1974), Bem (1974) and Levenson (1973) to provide a basis for comparison.

Significant findings were that internal and powerful others locus of control are associated with perceived success, and that highly educated women entrepreneurs have a desire for growth. Previous research linking achievement motivation and success was not confirmed. This suggests potential for further research linking the management styles of women small business owners and appropriate psychological characteristics.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

1.1. INTRODUCTION
This chapter is designed to give an over view of the research by stating the aims of the research, briefly introducing the research methodology adopted, the limitations of the study, and defining the key terms used in the research.

Studies and theories concerning socio-economic factors affecting small enterprises arose during the industrial revolution, with notions of entrepreneurial importance gaining favour early in the twentieth century (Schumpeter, 1949). During the 1960s the behaviour of the individual first emerged as a possible major factor contributing to entrepreneurship or small enterprise development (McClelland, 1961).

1.2. AIM OF THE STUDY:
A significant aim of the study is to contribute to a better understanding of the characteristics of women small business owners with major emphasis on various behavioural variables and their relation to female entrepreneurship. The study also aims at establishing the relationship between different personality characteristics and the style of management which the businesswomen adopt.
This research has been designed to analyse various factors (identified during the literature review) as relevant to the understanding of entrepreneurial behaviour. Empirical research has been carried out to study the behavioural variables.

1.3. THE NEED FOR THIS RESEARCH:

While research on women small business owners has gained momentum worldwide in the past two decades, it is still in its infancy as far as Australia is concerned. Recent well known Australian studies on women business owners include:

1. The Boddington study in Western Australia, 'Women Mean Business' (1987);
2. The Hub Report on Women in Self-employment in Western Australia (1988);
3. The Queensland Small Business Development Corporation study, 'Queensland Women in Business' (1988);
4. Sydney Survey based on a modified Hub instrument on self-employed women (1990) carried out by Dr. Leonie Still; and

The above studies done on women entrepreneurs in Australia mainly concentrated on the problems faced by the businesswomen (such as mobilising funds while starting the business) and their demographic
characteristics. To broaden the knowledge base, this study has been designed to include the important factors which contribute to the initiation and pursuit of entrepreneurship. These factors include achievement motivation, locus of control, management style of the women entrepreneurs, and their masculine/feminine characteristics. The possibility that women entrepreneurs may have to overcome a fear of success (Horner, 1968) is also investigated. It was possible that the fear of success characteristic would influence women's attitude to growth in their own businesses.

Traditional management has sometimes been viewed as requiring "male characteristics" such as rationality, decisiveness, ambition, directive behaviour, and aggression (Schein, 1973; 1975). On the other hand it has also been suggested that the behavioural school of management (e.g. Davidson & Cooper, 1987) is consistent with the nurturing, supportive, sensitive, intuitive characteristics associated with the stereotype of "feminine characteristics". This study has analysed the characteristics of women entrepreneurs and an effort was made to identify the role model (male or female), the female entrepreneurs were adopting.

1.4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:
Twenty nine women entrepreneurs in the Illawarra region were interviewed with the use of a structured questionnaire. Considering the fact that there is no list of women small business owners which was readily
available, the use of "snow-ball sampling" method was justified. The sample size of twenty nine women business owners is also reasonable taking into consideration the time constraint. However, the findings of the research will be sample specific. All the collected data were coded and analysed using the MICROSTAT statistical package and the interpretations are given in Chapter SIX.

1.5. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY:

1. Due to the limited availability of time, the number of women entrepreneurs contacted was not very large. However, given the time constraint, the researcher has contacted a reasonable sample of women entrepreneurs.

2. The responses to the questions might have been biased as the researcher personally administered the questionnaire to the respondents. This was minimized by including a minimum number of open ended questions.

3. Due to funds constraint, the researcher could not travel widely and cover different areas to collect data. This may hamper the generalization of the findings to a certain extent.

4. The questions on fear of success could not be used in full from Cohen's scale due to the number of issues that had to be canvassed in this exploratory study.

1.6. MAJOR RESEARCH ISSUES:

The major research questions addressed are given below:
1. What were the general demographic characteristics of women entrepreneurs?

2. Were there any differences between these findings and what has already been said by other researchers in this field?

3. Is there any relationship between woman entrepreneur's achievement motivation and the perceived success of their business?

4. What were the factors that contribute to the perceived success of the business?

5. Is there any relationship between the personal and personality characteristics and their desire to grow in their business?


7. Are women entrepreneurs androgynous as proposed by Powell & Butterfield (1988)?

Two major propositions evolved with the characteristics of the women entrepreneurs and the perceived success of the business; and the entrepreneur's desire to grow in business

**Proposition 1:**

The perceived success of the small business will be affected by the personal and the personality characteristics of the woman entrepreneur/owner-manager.
Proposition 2

The personal and personality characteristics of the women entrepreneurs contribute significantly to their desire to grow in business.

The findings of the research may be an addition to the knowledge base of women entrepreneurs in Australia.

1.7. DEFINITIONS OF THE KEY TERMS

1.7.1. SMALL BUSINESS:

Most definitions of small business are concerned with defining what is "small". This concept appears to be evasive and necessitates employment of qualitative and quantitative criteria. These definitions seem to be governed by the purpose of the definition and the interests of those who defined them. The stage of the development of the particular environment in which the definition is to be employed also has to be considered. For instance, one international compilation of small-scale industry definitions identified more than 50 different definitions in 75 countries (Neck, 1977). Some of the definitions of small business as used in U.S., U.K., and Australia are reviewed below and the criteria for defining a 'small business' for the purpose of this research is derived from these.

1.7.1.1. QUALITATIVE CRITERIA:

In an effort to try to explain what constitutes a small business, the Committee for Economic
Development (1947, p.14) in United States of America suggested that such a business has at least two of the following characteristics:

* Management is independent - usually managers are also the owners.
* Capital is supplied and ownership is held by an individual or a small group of people.
* The operations of the business are localised, with workers and owners living in one home community; however, markets need not be local.
* The relative size of the business within its industry is small in comparison with the largest units; a measure of size could be sales volume, number of employees or size of assets employed.

The Bolton Committee (1971, pp.1-2), in the U.K. on recognizing the fact that the quantitative criteria of small business definitions ignored the social and personal aspects of the small firms, identified three main characteristics of the small firm:

* It controlled a relatively small share of its market.
* It was managed by its owners or part-owners in a personalised way and not through a formalised management structure.
* It was independent in the sense that it did not form part of a larger enterprise, and owner-managers were free from outside control in making key decisions.
Hollander et al (1967, pp. 4-5) have emphasized a minimum size requirement, as well as a recognition of the value of qualitative criteria. In offering a "functional, analytical definition", they stated that small business refers mainly to enterprises that:

1. are businesses, in the sense that they involve all or most of the business functions and decisions concerning production, marketing, financing and management; and

2. do not exceed a size which, considering the nature of the business, permits personalized management in the hands of one or a few executives, as opposed to the institutionalized management characteristic of larger enterprises.

This definition of Hollander et al (1967) recognizes that neither the number of employees, nor the value of assets, nor the volume of sales nor income earned, alone, can satisfactorily delineate 'small business'.

When the business grows big, the decision-making or managing is no longer as personalized as was possible before the business grew. The line has to be drawn somewhere to differentiate a small business from other businesses. The definitions of small business can be a qualitative measure or a quantitative one. An attempt to qualitatively define a small enterprise was made by the Wiltshire Committee (a Committee established by the
Federal Government of Australia in 1968) to examine small enterprises with particular reference to the manufacturing sector (Parliamentary Paper No.82, June 1971, P.7).

**1.7.1.1.2. THE WILTSHIRE COMMITTEE'S DEFINITION:**

The Wiltshire Committee (1971, p.16) defined small enterprise as

A business in which one or two persons are required to make all critical management decisions—on financing, accounting, personnel, purchasing, processing, or servicing, marketing, selling—without the aid of internal specialists and with owners who have specific knowledge in only one or two functional areas.

The Wiltshire Committee assumed that this definition would apply to the majority of enterprises in Australia with fewer than 100 employees. This definition concentrates on only one aspect i.e., management control and hence the other factors have been excluded. It could be argued that some of the largest businesses in Australia can fit this limited definition.

To this aspect of management control which was highlighted by the Wiltshire Committee, Williams (1975, pp. 31-35) added that a small firm

1. should be managed by risk-taking owner(s) and not by salaried executives (self-managed and limited role of paid employment);
2. should be independent of external control both managerial and financial (i.e., it should be
largely self-financed with direct participation by the owner(s) in the work);
3. should have a relatively small share of the particular market.

Meredith (1977, pp. 10-12) in offering an alternative definition, says that

The overriding characteristics of small businesses are the independence of the owner-managers, the small share of the total market covered by the small enterprise and the decision-making process relies heavily on the skill, competence and experience of one or two owner-managers without specialist support staff advice.

All the above mentioned qualitative definitions can be grouped under four-fold categories, namely the lack of spread in managerial control, the smallness of the total market share, the independence of control and the management of the business by the owners. These qualitative criteria provide very little in the way of guidance in determining whether a business can be classified as a small business, though they provide a framework for the operation of other criteria namely the quantitative criteria (Campbell, 1976, p.3). However, this may be questionable as perceptions may vary.

1.7.1.2. QUANTITATIVE CRITERIA

The Wiltshire Committee adopted the guideline of businesses with fewer than one hundred employees, stating that the majority of such enterprises would have the qualitative criteria which the committee
adopted. Different nations have different definitions based on different quantitative criteria such as the number of employees, amount of investment, annual sales, etc. In this study the quantitative definition of Australian Bureau of Statistics alone is taken for discussion.

1.7.1.2.1. STATISTICAL DEFINITION:

The Australian Bureau of Statistics has defined a `small business' in accordance with the Report of the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Industry, Science, and Technology called Small Business in Australia—Challenges, Problems and Opportunities (1990) as having

* fewer than 20 employees for non-manufacturing industries, and
* fewer than 100 employees for manufacturing industries.

Though this definition has taken the number of employees alone into consideration, it is preferred for this research because of the following reasons.
* It restricts the firms to those which would probably have personalized management; and
* It has advantages over others because of its operational simplicity.

1.7.2. WHAT IS ENTREPRENEURSHIP?

The terms 'entrepreneurship' and 'small business' mean different things to different people. This section will examine a number of definitions of entrepreneurship to
highlight the differences of usage and to explain how the term will be used in this thesis. As Hisrich & Brush (1986) point out, the predominant use of the term has changed over time. Further, within the current time period different authors use the term to signify different properties. According to Kao (1991, pp.14-15), the definition of entrepreneurship is important because of its complexity.

The challenge of defining entrepreneurship is compounded by several factors. First, our understanding of entrepreneurship is often personal; like creativity or love, we all have an opinion about it. Second, "entrepreneurship" is increasingly synonymous with "good". To the extent that entrepreneurs are viewed as the new cultural heroes, critical examination of their characteristics can be obscured by media type or collective beliefs. Third, while "entrepreneur" has some tangibility because it refers to a person, "entrepreneurship" is more difficult to define because it is an abstraction. Fourth, our definitional challenge is also intensified by the current paucity of well-designed and controlled research studies to date on the entrepreneur. Finally, definition is difficult when it is assumed that entrepreneurship is something opposed to or divorced from management - that the entrepreneur and the manager are two different species of business person.

Whilst this argument restricts the definition of entrepreneurship only to business, Kaplan's argument (1987, pp.43-57) relates the definition to the environment. Following is an attempt to review the evolution of the definition of 'entrepreneurship' over a period of time (See Appendix A).

According to Cantillon (1755, p.55), entrepreneurship was self-employment with an uncertain return. Say (1847, pp.330-331) described the entrepreneur as an
extraordinarily talented manager. Entrepreneurship was innovative management for Baudeau (1910, p.51) and this was reiterated by Schumpeter (1952, p.23). Knight's (1921, p.268) entrepreneur is a managerial risk taker. Hoselitz (1951, pp. 209-210) went further by including organizing, supervising, introducing new markets. Marshall (1964) and Leibenstein (1979) have hinted at the differences between a manager and an entrepreneur. For Penrose (1980, p.33), the entrepreneur needed distinctive managerial capacities.

Hisrich and Brush (1986, p.2) indicate that by the nineteenth century, entrepreneurs were differentiated from the capital providing role. Entrepreneurs were seldom distinguished from managers and were mainly viewed from an economic perspective as creators of something new. Some of the definitions of 'entrepreneurship' which have included the above perspectives are discussed below.

1.7.2.1. Schumpeter's Concept of Entrepreneurship:

Schumpeter's (1952, p.23) definition reads that

The function of entrepreneurs is to reform or revolutionize the pattern of production by exploiting an invention or, more generally, an untried technological possibility for producing a new commodity or producing an old one in a new way, opening a new source of supply of materials or a new outlet for products, by reorganizing an industry.

In this definition, both newness and innovation are the integral parts of entrepreneurship. Joseph Schumpeter's
concept of the 'entrepreneur' introduced a new dimension into the thinking of economists about entrepreneurship and its functions. He was the prime mover in changing the dominant view of entrepreneurship from that of a passive agent, guiding the firm's adaptation to changes in the external environment, to a view that defined the entrepreneur solely in terms of non-routine, creative activities (Cauthorn, 1989).

1.7.2.2. Vesper's Perspective on Entrepreneurship:

Vesper (1980, p.22) has defined the entrepreneur from different perspectives such as managerial, business and personal perspectives.

To an economist, an entrepreneur is one who brings resources, labour, materials, and other assets into combinations that make their value greater than before, and also one who introduces changes, innovations, and a new order. To a psychologist, such a person is typically driven by certain forces—need to obtain or attain something, to experiment, to accomplish, or perhaps to escape authority of others... To one businessman, an entrepreneur appears as a threat, an aggressive competitor, whereas to another businessman the same entrepreneur may be an ally, a source of supply, a customer, or someone good to invest in... The same person is seen by a capitalist philosopher as one who creates wealth for others as well, who finds better ways to utilize resources, and reduce waste, and who produces jobs others are glad to get.

This definition by Vesper (1980) has taken into consideration all the characteristics such as newness, organization, creation of wealth, and risk-taking (Hisrich & Brush, 1986). The above discussion is consistent with Say's (1847, p.331) much earlier
In the course of such complex operations there are an abundance of obstacles to be surmounted, of anxieties to be repressed, of misfortunes to be repaired, and of expedients to be devised. Those who are not possessed of a combination of these necessary qualities are unsuccessful in their undertakings; their concerns soon fall to the ground.

1.7.2.3. HISRICH'S DEFINITION:

To account for all types of entrepreneurial behaviour, Hisrich and Brush (1986) have defined 'entrepreneurship' as a process of creating something different and of high value by devoting the necessary time and effort, by assuming the accompanying financial, psychological, and social risks, and by receiving the resulting rewards of monetary and personal satisfaction.

Consistent with but not identical to Hisrich's approach, this research shall use the terms entrepreneur and small business owner interchangeably. Thus an entrepreneur is viewed as a person who owns all or part of a small business and in which he or she has a significant role in decision making.

1.8. OVERVIEW:

Chapter Two deals with the role of women entrepreneurs in small business. In that chapter, the importance and role of the small business sector is examined. The existing and potential contribution of women to the
small business sector are discussed as are the benefits to women in participating in small business management.

Chapter Three presents a literature review on the characteristics of Women Entrepreneurs. A comparison is made between men and women entrepreneurs in the areas of achievement motivation, androgyny and management style. It is suggested that the level of success may be affected by achievement motivation, locus of control, management style including dominant role models (masculine or feminine or androgynous), fear of success, risk-taking, and family background.

Chapter Four contains a literature review supporting the development of the research instrument. Chapter Five explains the research methodology whilst chapter Six deals with data analysis and interpretation.

Chapter Seven is the final phase of this report. It contains general conclusions and discusses the scope for further research in this field.
CHAPTER 2

ROLE OF WOMEN ENTREPRENEURS IN SMALL BUSINESS
2.1 INTRODUCTION:
The objective of this chapter is to highlight the potential for female small business ownership. This is achieved by initially establishing the importance of the small business sector, and its inherent strengths and weaknesses. Secondly, the traditional, emerging and further potential for the female contribution to small business is examined.

2.2. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SMALL BUSINESS SECTOR:
To deny the economic and social importance of the small enterprise sector is to ignore the facts, lose excellent development opportunities and create frustration, despair and hardship in many quarters. Many arguments can be presented to support assistance for the small business sector (Neck, 1977, P.7).

In most economies, the numerical majority of a country's manufacturing enterprises (usually from 60 to 80% in industrialised countries, and up to more than 90% in developing countries) are classified as small. They may account for more than one half of total employment, with the added possibility of being able to employ even more (Neck, 1977, p.10).

It is a well known fact that small businesses contribute a lot to employment and output of any
nation. However, this sector has got its own disadvantages as well. While discussing the advantages of the small businesses, Dunkelberg (1982, p.21) claims that

Small businesses play a very important role in every economy, regardless of its political structure. In all economies, small firms provide a huge share of the jobs available and produce a substantial proportion of G.N.P..... However small businesses have a far more important role than just production and the provision of jobs. Small business is and should be the engine of economic growth and change in an economy. Its success creates new jobs and the capital growth. Through small businesses, new innovations, technologies and management strategies are introduced and tested.

The existence of a very strong, healthy small business community has always been recognised as the very best way to preserve competition in any society, prevent monopolistic control of any industries, and thus assure the population of the benefits of competition through better prices (Steinhoff, 1986). This was earlier mentioned by Falk (1982, p. 29) when he stated that

...small businesses provides opportunities for entrepreneurial drive, use of special talents and skills, urbanization of communities, expression of independence, checks on monopoly and more, particularly, in areas such as specialty manufacturing and service, it provides a more economic form of organisation than larger businesses.

It is also contended that small firms are the seed-bed from which new organisations will grow to challenge existing firms, are an important source of innovation in products, techniques, design and services and act as specialist suppliers to large concerns (Falk, 1982).
2.2.1. **Small Business Scenario in Australia:**

Geographical features of the Australian continent have a significant impact on commerce and/or industry. Traditionally Australia has relied on natural resources for its growth, development and its relatively high standard of living. Australia is often seen as a "primary producer" with an infant manufacturing sector. As a consequence it relies heavily on imports of consumer products (Meredith, 1977, p. 97).

An overall view of the position of small businesses in Australia is shown in Figure 2.1. The total number of small enterprises up to 1989-90 was 692,700 which form 96.3% of the total number of business of 719,000 (Table 2.1). These small businesses also provide employment to 2,547,000 persons (ABS, 1990). Though small business forms a significant proportion of total businesses, the rate of change was the same as the other businesses which was around 3.8% per annum.
Fig. 2.1. An Overview of Small Business in Australia

All Business (843,700 enterprises)

Non-agricultural Private Sector (719,000 enterprises)

Small Business (692,700 enterprises)

Non-employed Businesses (374,700 enterprises)

Other Business (26,300 enterprises)

Employing Businesses (318,000 enterprises)

Source: Small Business in Australia 1990. ABS catalogue No. 1321.0 (p.5).
Table 2.1

Number of Small Enterprises (Statewise Figures)

1989-1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States</th>
<th>Small Business</th>
<th>Percent of all business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>233,700</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>180,600</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>124,200</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>55,800</td>
<td>96.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>67,300</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>16,300</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>4,100</td>
<td>92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.C.T</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUSTRALIA</td>
<td>692,700</td>
<td>96.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Small Business in Australia. ABS Catalogue No.1321.0, 1990 (p.7)

2.2.2. Women in Business in Australia:

The number of women in small business in Australia is increasing at three times the rate of men. The fastest growth is in areas previously dominated by men (construction, transport and manufacturing)- in which until recently there have been very few women proprietors (DITAC Report, 1991, p.17).

In 1989 in Australia, 79,800 women were self-employed and worked from home as against 43,400 males who worked from home. The number of women working from home worked out to be 34% of the total self-employed in the female labour force during April 1989 (ABS 1990, pp. 17-25). Of the 2.5 million people working in small businesses in 1989-90, more than one million or 40% were women.
Most of the industries were clearly dominated by a particular sex. The Community Services industry is the only one where self-employed women outnumbered men (ABS, 1990, pp. 17-25).

Goffee et al (1982, P.112) have reported in a study of 50 women entrepreneurs in the U.K, that

"during the present economic recession..... more women may well opt for self-employment and small- scale proprietorship".

Could this be the way ahead for many women in Australia too?

2.2.3. ADVANTAGES OF SMALL BUSINESS:

The case for assistance to small enterprises include such benefits as:
* the development of a pool of skilled and semi-skilled manpower for future industrial expansion
* improvement of forward and backward linkages between economically, socially and geographically diverse sectors of the economy
* non-requirement of some of the sophisticated managerial and technological techniques normally required by larger enterprises
* opportunities for developing and adapting appropriate technological and managerial approaches
* increases in savings and investment by local personnel and more effective use of capital
* the promotion of special subcontracting arrangements (Neck, 1977, p.15).
Storey (1982), in his review of studies on small businesses, has listed the following advantages over large businesses:

(a) Small firms provide a source of competition to larger firms in their industry;
(b) Small firms are major creators of new jobs;
(c) They are the seed corns from which the giant corporations of future years will grow;
(d) As small firms can provide a harmonious working environment where owner and employee work shoulder to shoulder, it is likely to result in fewer industrial disputes;
(e) As most of the industrialised nations have population concentrations in cities resulting in social problems like unemployment and poor housing, Storey (1982, p.117) argued that small business can make a vital contribution to the regeneration of such areas.
(f) Small firms tend to be innovative especially in industries where technical development is essential for survival.

2.2.4. DISADVANTAGES OF SMALL BUSINESS:

Small businesses suffer greatly from managerial imperialism, the fallacy that ownership is a sufficient guarantee that a business will be properly run.... as a small company grows and begins requiring different managerial skills does this relationship (between successful running and ownership of business) become suspect. (Cohn & Lindberg, 1974, p.12).

With a small firm's limited resources of time, money, and management, it follows that facilities are probably being used to the straining point. Under these
circumstances, the manager may consider it academic to discuss finding the means to exploit opportunities. Small firm managers cannot rely as much on outside financial sources as can large firms, so they must be especially vigilant against build ups of inventory or finished products that are not easily converted into cash (Cohn & Lindberg, 1974, p.8).

Small firms, in contrast to large firms, engage in a narrower range of activities, use a narrow range of materials, employ fewer skills, and tend to serve single markets or fragments of markets (Cohn & Lindberg, 1974, p.14).

2.3. THE ENTREPRENEUR AS OWNER-MANAGER:
Curran and Burrows (1984, p.165) have also stated that the term entrepreneurship is used to denote the innovatory process involved in the creation of a new economic enterprise or a new product or service which differs from products offered by others in content, or in the way its production is organised, or in its marketing. This conceptualisation excludes small business-owners whose enterprise is a replica of an existing business or who inherit or purchase an existing business adding little or nothing novel to its operation. Most small business-owners are not entrepreneurs in the above strict sense but inherit an existing enterprise or purchase an established business
or simply replicate an existing, proven form of business.

Curran and Stanworth (1983) have suggested that people who become small business-owners by purchasing a ready-made business in the form of a franchise share many of the key characteristics and motivations of conventional entrepreneurs as classified by Goffee and Scase (1985).

Chell's (1985) model on entrepreneurship assumes that entrepreneurs are constantly on a learning curve, so that the identification of a single entrepreneurial personality is firmly rejected. In terms of the individual, the approach stresses 'appropriate person variables' that is, a set of attributes which the individual develops over his/her life that regulate or structure how experiences are managed. Entrepreneurs are assumed to develop a set of 'appropriate person variables' specific to running their own enterprises (Curran & Burrows, 1987, p.167).

2.4. ROLE OF THE OWNER-MANAGER IN SMALL BUSINESS:
A small firm is one in which ownership and management are vitally intertwined, one in which there is an active involvement of ownership in management. The small firm responds to the owner's values and views; indeed, the small firm may best be viewed as an owner-managed firm (Rimler & Humphreys, 1980, p. 130).
Unlike the larger firms, such businesses are extensions of the personality of their proprietors.... they are not institutions as much as they are aspects of individuals (Chamberlain, 1962, P.49).

Thus, according to Chamberlain(1962), the entrepreneur warrants an intensive study as an individual rather than as a mere dehumanized agent or mediator between organisational inputs and outputs. In a small business, the entrepreneur's personal characteristics, their fundamental motivation, work habits, role perception, attitudes about business management and many other related factors permeate the total enterprise to such an extent that its eventual success or failure is a direct consequence of personality.

The centralisation of decision making powers at the owner-manager level due to the size of the firm gives the small firm its "personalized" structure and makes it distinctively different from that of a major or multinational company. In the small enterprise, the business person's personality, skills, responsibilities, attitudes and behaviour have a decisive influence on business strategy. This "psychological" aspect or personality type is of critical importance in developing policies and programs for the small business sector(DITC Report, 1992, p.5).
2.5. GENDER IN SMALL BUSINESS:
Equating the small scale enterprise with 'economic man' was unchallenged until comparatively recently. In one way or another women have always been associated with small scale enterprises; small businesses are often family businesses with women typically providing all kinds of essential support from labour to administration (Goffee and Scase, 1985) and moral support is essential to the success of females in small business (Williams, 1975; Hisrich & Brush, 1985; Cromie, 1986; Sexton and Kent, 1981). As research on women entrepreneurs is very limited, systematic comparisons between women and men are difficult.

2.5.1. THE TRADITIONAL ROLE OF MEN:
It has been generally assumed that the entrepreneur is male (McClelland, 1961; Collins & Moore, 1964). Collins and Moore(1970) have stated that entrepreneurship is a way of demonstrating "maleness". Historically and traditionally, women in the main have been confined to the private sphere of domesticity (Smith, 1980, p.85) and hence have been denied access to the requisite resources for entrepreneurial entry. That is, they have not had access to capital, business and technical education, and prior management experience (Stevenson, 1986, p.23).
2.6. WOMEN IN FAMILY BUSINESSES:

Family businesses are a recent area of study. Emotionally, professionally, and financially, family businesses provide a positive working environment for women; many factors in women's psychology and socialization enable them to provide sorely needed humanization of the work environment. The family business system comprises at least two basic subsystems: the family and the business. It contains the otherwise divorced areas of love and work, the "feminine" and "masculine". To understand women's specific contributions to their family businesses, it is first necessary to understand how women interpret their world and the roles they believe they will have to perform as adults. Recent research in psychology reports that women are socialized to nurture, having modelled themselves after their mothers' caring role (Salgonicoff, 1990).

While commenting on family business from the point of view of a woman, Danco (1981, p.5) has remarked:

*We are not the women behind the men. We are the women with the men. In most cases, this means we're the women behind the business, and I've learned that the woman behind a family business is the major strength or weakness of that business.*

The advantages of family businesses for women include the flexibility in work schedules. This flexibility meets the needs of women, who still assume the major responsibility for rearing children. Family businesses also offer women, access to traditionally male-
dominated industries that would otherwise be closed to
them, such as construction and manufacturing
(Salgonicoff, 1990, p.14)

Women who have owned businesses throughout the
centuries have usually inherited those businesses from
fathers or husbands. Very occasionally, a woman has
started a business as a single person or, if married,
with her husband's consent. In these cases the
businesses are normally in "women's" occupational
areas. Until relatively recently, because there has
been a scarcity of women entrepreneurs, information and
knowledge about women as business owners or
entrepreneurs has been limited (Stevenson, 1986).

2.7. Feminist Movement and Move to Greater Independence
of Women:

The Feminist movement has shown limited interest in
small business if only because of a belief that
business ownership sustains rather than challenges the
economic system which leads to the subordination of
women by men (Goffee and Scase, 1987).

Lavoie(1984, 1985, p.35) defines the female
entrepreneur

as the female head of the business who has taken the
initiative of launching a new venture, who is accepting
the associating risks and the financial, administrative
and social responsibilities, and who is effectively in
charge of its day-to-day management.
Hertz (1986, p.2) has remarked that

One successful woman proves only one thing, that she is exceptional. One hundred successful businesswomen can no longer be explained away as exceptions, but must be accepted as evidence of women's abilities and competence. When a hundred women of different backgrounds, age groups and marital status achieve distinction in business it suggests that thousands could do the same.

Hisrich and Brush (1984, p.25) have reported that the women entrepreneur is not an "average" woman. This may be due to the fact that women small business owners are able to manage the business as well as the family successfully. She also overcomes the barriers that are put up by the society in the form of stereotypes. She has problems (e.g., role conflicts at home and at work), not encountered by her male peers. New challenges and a new way of dealing (e.g., skilful handling of people, transferring the skills developed in running a household) with financial and family responsibilities have been discovered by the women entrepreneurs in Georgia (Scott, 1986). 'New challenges' here refer to the starting of their own business. Family business could probably be a way of solving this problem of sharing family responsibilities (both social and financial).

The American literature remained small in spite of the suggestion by Schreier and Komives (1973, p36) that

.... particular attention should be brought to the female entrepreneurs, the emerging role of women in business, the need for research on the subject of women entrepreneurs and most important, the need for more women to become entrepreneurs.
Research in this area is especially important in view of the increase in the number of women entrepreneurs in new business ventures. The virtual absence, until recently, of research on female entrepreneurs is probably due to their lack of visibility as entrepreneurs.

With the onset of the feminist movement, more women realised their self-worth and began to react. Though they met a lot of resistance from society in the initial stages, women slowly started venturing into going out to work. There has been a substantial contribution by women in various ways (Friedan, 1981). Once women became careerwomen, they realised a level of economic independence previously not considered possible (Lunneborg, 1989). Since then, women have increasingly striven for all possible ways of progressing whether it is in the area of business or flying in the sky.

2.8. WOMEN'S CONTRIBUTION TO BUSINESS:
A number of factors are contributing to females taking up business proprietorships. Three factors are of particular importance: those of high unemployment, job dissatisfaction, and the development of new technology (Goffee & Scase, 1987). For the women employed in the corporate sector, gender discrimination could have
caused the job dissatisfaction and driven them to start their own businesses.

Firstly, according to Goffee and Scase, married women often provide a variety of hidden and unpaid services to their husbands' businesses during the crucial start-up period and without this largely unrecognised contribution, many male owned enterprises would not get off the ground (Scase and Goffee, 1980, 1982, 1987). Secondly, a more direct way in which women contribute to the formation of small business growth, is by starting their own enterprises (Scase & Goffee, 1987, p.61).

The National Labour Consultative Council (1986, p.57) in its report on "Women in Management" has quoted a woman entrepreneur as saying

Women entering the building field will enrich it by bringing to it a management style that encompasses both the qualities of leadership and personal warmth. These qualities are "an unbeatable combination" in management because leadership entices people to follow and personal warmth encourages people to tolerate one another.

She may be right. Her thoughts support the perspective of the human resource school.

There has been little discussion of proprietorship as a possible avenue whereby women can overcome their subordinate role within the family, the workplace and in society as a whole. This discussion may understate the radical potential of female proprietorship. To
summarize Goffee & Scase (1981), first, setting up a small business does not necessarily constitute a personal reaffirmation of the principles of capital accumulation; on the contrary, it can represent an explicit rejection of the exploitative nature of the capitalist work process and labour market (Scase and Goffee, 1981).

In this sense, then, proprietorship may be seen as a radical—albeit short term and individualistic—response to subordination. Secondly, even though some women business-owners are committed to the virtues of private ownership and profit, their roles as proprietors and as entrepreneurs can query the traditionally-defined, gender-based division of labour. Thus, women who both own and manage the business enterprises—especially those in exclusively male dominated sectors of the economy—serve to undermine conventional and stereotyped notions of a woman's place. Female proprietors such as these, therefore, have a symbolic importance which explicitly challenges the popular conceptions of the position of women in society. Finally, proprietorship can enable some women to enjoy a degree of material independence and, in many circumstances, the opportunity to control the products of their own labour. Thus, they may obtain financial autonomy from men which, in some instances, can provide material support for female solidarity" (Goffee & Scase, 1987, p.61-62).

2.9. ADVANTAGES OF BUSINESS OWNERSHIP TO WOMEN:

The advantages of small business entrepreneurship over being a woman manager in a large organisation is primarily that it increases the element of choice in women's lives. Instead of struggling with the problem of being accepted by men managers as competent, capable and promotable, she can carry out self-assessment and personal development within her own terms without having other people's norms and stereotypes thrust upon her (Clyne, 1984, pp. 83-84).
According to her, there is also a possibility of greater flexibility in terms of job time-tabling enabling her also to avoid the conflicts of marry/not marry, children/no children. It is acknowledged that to become a successful entrepreneur requires a devotion and single-mindedness which may appear to contradict the idea of flexibility, but she has the choice of how much effort she wishes to put into the business, compared with other areas of her life (Hertz, 1986; Clyne, 1984; Collins et al, 1988).

The choice of business, the management style she adopts and size of the organization are also within the realm of personal choice and temperament. She can exercise and develop her ability as a manager with its attendant satisfactions without sacrificing other, equally important aspects of her life.

2.10. CONCLUSION:

In this chapter the importance of small business in society was discussed. The contribution which women have made to this sector both directly and indirectly through small businesses or family businesses was considered. Finally the potential of small business to provide an avenue for some women to further their own development was identified.
CHAPTER 3

LITERATURE REVIEW - PART 1

BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY
3.1 INTRODUCTION
In Chapter 2, the importance of small business in a nation's economy and the importance of entrepreneurs in small business, and the role of women in small business were discussed. This chapter discusses the background for the study through various previous studies done on women entrepreneurship, characteristics of women entrepreneurs (demographic, personality and entrepreneurial characteristics), types of female entrepreneurs, and differences between women and men entrepreneurs.

3.2. STUDIES ON WOMEN ENTREPRENEURSHIP:
Although there have been numerous studies focusing on the characteristics such as achievement motivation, locus of control, and risk-taking of male entrepreneurs (Williams, 1975; Brockhaus, 1982; Glueck and Mescon, 1980; Hornaday & Knutzen, 1986; Varela, 1986), less attention has been given to the characteristics of women entrepreneurs.

DeCarlo & Lyons(1979) in their study on 122 black, white, Hispanic, and American Indian women entrepreneurs found that the responses of both minority and non-minority women entrepreneurs differed significantly from those of women (non-entrepreneurs) in the general population on tests measuring
achievement, autonomy, aggression, conformity, independence, benevolence, and leadership. Differences were also found between minority and nonminority women entrepreneurs, with minority entrepreneurs reporting that they started their businesses at a later age than the nonminority women.

Schwartz (1979), in his study of twenty female entrepreneurs found that their prime motivations for starting business were: the need to achieve, the desire to be independent, the need for job satisfaction, and economic necessity. These female entrepreneurs tended to have an autocratic style of management, and their major problem during start-up was credit discrimination. Underestimating the operating and/or marketing costs was a subsequent problem.

Twenty-one women who participated in a study of demographic characteristics, motivations, and business problems of female entrepreneurs indicated that they had particular problems with collateral, obtaining credit, and overcoming society's belief that women are not as serious as men about business (Hisrich & O'Brien, 1981).

Another study focussed on how the characteristics of women entrepreneurs varied according to the type of the business. Female entrepreneurs in nontraditional business areas (finance, insurance, manufacturing, and
construction) differed from their counterparts in more traditionally "female" business areas (retail and wholesale trade). The traditional "female" group had particular difficulty in gaining access to external financial sources, from banks, informal investors, and the non-traditional venture capitalists (Hisrich & O'Brien, 1982).

Hisrich & Brush (1985, p.57) in their study on 468 women entrepreneurs who were running businesses profiled the typical U.S. female entrepreneur as

the first-born; from a middle or upper class family; has a self-employed father; has a college degree; is married with children; starts their significant entrepreneurial career between the ages of 40 and 45; has previous experience in the venture; and independence, achievement and job satisfaction are the strongest motivations to starting their own enterprises.

Neider (1987), in her study examined the demographic and personality characteristics of 52 Florida women entrepreneurs. The women entrepreneurs surveyed had a high energy level and strong skills in influencing others. The respondents were rated high on achievement motivation, owning service businesses and being predominantly college educated.

In a study of 154 women entrepreneurs in Atlanta, in Georgia, it was indicated that they are essentially the same as women business owners in other parts of the country in terms of motivation, business
characteristics, and background (Scott, 1986). Time usage of women entrepreneurs was investigated in a study which found that women with families have problems in allocating time between family for attending to household chores, spending time with the children and business, with demands challenging the stability of marriage (Longstreth, et al, 1987).

Brown and Segal (1989) have developed a profile of women entrepreneurs after conducting telephonic interviews with 1000 small business owners across Ontario. Almost 30% of them were women and he has stated that the female entrepreneur is typically 39 years of age; has completed 15 years of schooling; had prior experience before starting the business and the most often cited reason for taking up a business was to be their own boss; they had the idea of a product which was in demand, and to make money.

Egge (1987) in a study of male and female founders of new firms in Minnesota also found women entrepreneurs to be well educated and about 30 years of age at the time of venture start-up. The small business founders (both males and females) who had a mentor had 16 years of education, and had prepared a business plan were more likely to be successful.

Goffee and Scase (1985) had studied 54 female proprietors in the U.K. between 1981 and 1983 and
described the various types of female entrepreneurs as Conventional, Domestic, Innovative and Radical business owners (explained later in this chapter).

3.2.1. Australian Studies on Women in Business:

3.2.1.1. Williams Study:
Findings of a major study done on the characteristics of small business owners by Williams (1975) and as identified for women entrepreneurs have been paraphrased as:
'the survival rate of men in the short term is greater than women. However, women with the businesses over fifteen years old have a better survival rate; firms owned by women generated fewer jobs than those owned by men; women make less use of external debt; women proprietors have a greater risk aversion than men'.

3.2.1.2. The Hub Committee Report in Western Australia:
The Western Australia survey (1988) using the HUB model for the first time in Australia studied about 383 self-employed women in Western Australia and the following findings from the survey indicate a lack of:
1. Resources and information currently available for women in business
2. Visible female role models and
3. Available data on female entrepreneurs.
3.2.1.3. Queensland Study:
Queensland Small Business Development Corporation surveyed the demographic characteristics of women who attended the 'Intenders programme' in 1987-88.

3.2.1.4. Sydney Survey:
Still & Guerin (1990, p.5) has studied 357 Australian self-employed women (in this case, the small business owners) in Sydney using a modified version of Hub Business Owners Survey (1988) and found out that these women exhibited the following profile:

- They were in the age group of 30 and 45; they were married;
- had a degree or professional training;
- Australian born of Australian parents;
- sole owner of the business;
- operated with less than four employees;
- conducted a service business;
- had difficulty in obtaining start-up finance;
- and they commenced business because they wanted 'greater autonomy, independence, and flexibility.'

3.2.1.5. Victorian Women's Consultative Council:
The Victorian Women's Consultative Council conducted a survey based on the HUB survey done in U.S.A. in 1983 on women contemplating commencing a business, and those already operating successful businesses to find out the needs of female entrepreneurs. This HUB report (1991) studied the profiles of 500 self-employed women in Victoria, their business characteristics, their demographic characteristics, the difficulties faced in their businesses, the sources of finance and any problem in obtaining the necessary finance, and the training needs of these women.
3.2.1.6. Study on Immigrant Women Entrepreneurs:

Between 1973 and 1985, 246 immigrant women entrepreneurs were studied and the findings of the study were about the demographic characteristics of the immigrant women entrepreneurs in comparison with the population of non-immigrant women entrepreneurs. The reasons for going into small business, success motivation, locus of control, support for small business, business problems, if any, were also studied by Kermond, Luscombe, Strahan, and Williams (1991).

3.2.2. Australian Findings:

The significant findings of the above mentioned studies on women small business owners can be grouped under the following categories.

* Women small business owners were aged between 30-50 years (Williams, 1985; Still & Guerin, 1990).
* Women have a propensity to use teachers, academics, and family members as role models and mentors rather than business networks (Williams, 1985).
* Women proprietors have a greater aversion to risk than men (Williams, 1985).
* Self-employed women were less likely to have undertaken post secondary education than men (Williams, 1985) whereas, Still & Guerin (1990) have found that majority of women entrepreneurs had completed a tertiary degree and/or professional training.
There is an increased need for creating awareness amongst the women public about small business ownership (VWCC, 1988; WA HUB Project, 1988; SBDC, Qld., 1988).

A need for increased access to resources and information for all women is identified (VWCC, 1988; WA HUB Project, 1988; SBDC, Qld, 1988).

Training courses need to be tailored to suit the particular needs of women (SBDC, Qld, 1988; WA HUB Project, 1988).

A strong data base on female entrepreneurs need to be created to increase provision of female role models and thereby increase the viability of women in business (WA HUB Project, 1988; SBDC, Qld, 1988).

Small Business agencies need to have female advisers and trainers on staff (SBDC, Qld, 1988).

All these studies have concentrated on the demographic characteristics and the support services needed by women small business owners and thus have helped policy formulations of the government.

3.3. TYPES OF FEMALE ENTREPRENEURS:

Hertz (1986) has distinguished two types of female entrepreneurs: heirs and founders/owners. Heirs have usually inherited their businesses through the death of a husband or father. Founders/owners are entrepreneurially inclined women who have either founded or bought and managed their own company.
According to Goffee and Scase (1987, p.65), the age, education, family background and occupational experience of proprietors are important and, for women in particular, marital status and domestic commitments seem to be significant.

It may be that factors like early socialisation and parents' occupation etc. suggest the entrepreneurial role to some women. On the basis of their interviews with the women entrepreneurs, Goffee and Scase (1985, 1987) suggest that the experience of business proprietorship among women is highly influenced by two sets of factors: first, their attachment to entrepreneurial ideas, and second, the extent to which they are prepared to accept or reject conventionally-defined male-female relationships. Goffee and Scase (1987) also present a four category typology of women proprietors. This classification was done taking into consideration the values the women entrepreneurs attach to the entrepreneurial ideals and conventional gender roles as given in the figure below:

**Figure 3.1 Types of female entrepreneurs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachment to entrepreneurial ideals</th>
<th>Attachment to conventional gender roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional (1)</td>
<td>Innovative (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic (3)</td>
<td>Radical (4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Conventional business-owners are those who are both highly committed to entrepreneurial ideas and to conventional notions about gender roles. Domestic business-owners are those who have only limited commitment to entrepreneurial ideas but who are strongly attached to the traditional female role. Innovative entrepreneurs explicitly reject conventional gender relationships and are highly committed to entrepreneurial ideals of personal achievement through business success. These women often trade with technical skills acquired within the educational and occupational system rather than by fulfilling traditional female roles. Radical proprietors have a low commitment to both entrepreneurial ideals and to conventional female roles (Goffee & Scase, 1987, pp. 67-75). They describe such proprietors as 'radical' since they usually regard themselves as members of feminist movement and their businesses as a collective means for improving the position of women in society.

The studies conducted by Goffee and Scase (1985) and Cromie (1986)¹ are similar in the sense that both samples had substantial numbers of innovators. However, Cromie's (1986) sample had 200 business intenders. In general, there seem to be a large number of 'conventional' business women in the society who tend to create ventures in those sectors of economy where

¹. Cromie's (1986) study in U.K. was done on 26 female and 35 male aspiring entrepreneurs.
there are high concentrations of women employees and, often, women managers (Goffee and Scase, 1985, p 73).

3.4. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN ENTREPRENEURS:
A few selected psychological characteristics that might show differences between men and women entrepreneurs are risk-taking, locus of control, Machiavellianism, self-esteem, openness to innovation, rigidity, attitudes towards government regulation and economic optimism (Welsch & Young, 1984)\(^2\). Interestingly, research suggests that male and female entrepreneurs are more similar than different in many core attributes. For example, both men and women cite a desire for autonomy and control and a desire to achieve or "make things happen" as important motivations. Both men and women point to frustrations with current employment as another important impetus to take action (Hisrich & Brush, 1986, p 23).

Like men, women entrepreneurs tend to place higher emphasis on their jobs, and have less job stability than their managerial peers (DeCarlo and Lyons, 1979, p.50; Sexton & Kent, 1981, p. 53). Another study suggests that, like men, women entrepreneurs tend to be lower ranked in conformity, interpersonal affectiveness, harm avoidance than women managers.

---

2. Welsch and Young's 1984 study was done in a large mid-Western city in US in which 217 entrepreneurs(with more than 150 female entrepreneurs) were the respondents.
Female entrepreneurs also rank higher in energy levels, their risk taking, social adroitness, need for autonomy, and change (Sexton & Bowman, 1986) than do their managerial counterparts. Both men and women entrepreneurs tend to value self-respect, freedom, a sense of accomplishment, family security, honesty, ambition, and responsibility (Fagenson, 1986). Finally, there are few differences between the sexes in the entrepreneurial role of past experience or the proportion of debt at start-up (Birley et al., 1986).

However, some gender differences do occur. Women entrepreneurs are more concentrated in retail and service sectors. They work fewer hours per week (45-50) than do men entrepreneurs (Ronstadt, 1984). Female entrepreneurs are also more concentrated in small enterprises in terms of both sales and number of employees (Binder, 1978). One study reports that female entrepreneurs tend to be younger than male entrepreneurs at the time the venture was inaugurated. The same study showed that women had more women as customers, employed more labour, used their families less as employees, started up more slowly, and subsequently incorporated more frequently than men (Birley et al, 1986). Although the home-based business is considered to have unique value to women (who want to combine business with child rearing), the Birley et al. (1986) study showed that, in their sample, more men than women had home-based ventures.
Men and women entrepreneurs experience different problems and obstacles in assembling the resources for new ventures, with women usually facing extra barriers. Chief among those barriers is finding financial support and credit in the face of overt and covert sex discrimination (Hisrich & Brush, 1985). This obstacle may limit women to start-ups with low overhead and capitalization requirements, i.e., sales and service instead of production. Although networking for resource access is important to both men and women entrepreneurs, there is some suggestion that women go about this more formally by joining clubs and networking organizations. Men entrepreneurs by contrast tend to rely on specific interpersonal relationships (Black, 1986).

There is some suggestion that women entrepreneurs may take on a particular style of leadership once the venture has been created. Not only do they tend to employ more labour than men relative to the size of the business (Birley et al, 1986), they pay more attention to employee relations and place a higher value on equality and forgiveness. In general, Birley et al. (1986, p.37) conclude that women entrepreneurs tend to have backgrounds, abilities, and motivations very similar to those of men who are entrepreneurs. The differences that do arise have more to do with market entry choices, access to resources, the type of business established (more likely to be income-
substitution, independent start-up, in the service industries), and the type of employee relations that emerge in the new organization. Sexton and Kent (1981) have also mentioned that almost all the studies done on female entrepreneurs describe backgrounds and characteristics, with some comparisons drawn between female entrepreneurs and female executives. However, background data has often ignored the more subtle factors of different cultural conditioning and experiences (Smith et al., 1992).

A series of comparative analyses of male and female entrepreneurs were done by Welsch & Young (1984); Sexton & Bowman-Upton (1986); Cromie (1987); Fagenson & Coleman (1987); Stevenson (1986). Following is the summary of the results of all these studies. Men are motivated by the drive to control their own destinies, to make things happen. In contrast, women tend to be motivated by a need for independence and achievement that results from the frustration they feel at not being allowed to perform on the job at the level they are capable of. Both men and women entrepreneurs feel their best solution to these problems is to venture out alone.

Women and men are both motivated by money, a need for independence, and seizing an opportunity (Hertz, 1986) to venture into their own business. Chaganti (1986) has observed that no significant differences between the
sexes have emerged concerning need for achievement, autonomy, persistency, aggression, independence, nonconformity, goal-orientation, self-confidence, leadership, and locus of control.

Sexton and Bowman-Upton (1990), in their study of 105 female entrepreneurs and 69 male entrepreneurs, have discovered that both male and female entrepreneurs possess similar traits. Two noticeable differences are in risk-taking and energy level with men entrepreneurs higher on both these characteristics than women entrepreneurs.

In terms of personality, there are strong similarities between male and female entrepreneurs: both tend to be energetic, goal-oriented, and independent. Men, however, are often more confident, and less flexible and tolerant than women which can result in different management styles (Hisrich & Brush, 1985). Men and women came to entrepreneuring from different educational and experiential backgrounds. Hisrich & Brush (1985) and Watkins & Watkins (1984) researched these differences and found that men had more experience than women in business. The Watkins & Watkins study (1984) of 58 UK women entrepreneurs owning 49 businesses found that 55% of the women had business education while 80% of the men had business education. For the male sample, the normal route into entrepreneurship was to replicate a business of which
the man had good prior knowledge, in both technical and managerial terms, as an employee of someone else; for the female sample, this was almost unknown (Watkins & Watkins, 1984, p.29). For men, the decision to start a business seems to follow a logical progression, but it does not appear to be the same for women (Stevenson, 1986).

In most comparative studies, male and female entrepreneurs differ significantly on marital status (Stevenson, 1986). In these studies, approximately 90% of the male sample is married, with most of their wives assuming a traditional, supportive role. The female sample tends to be characterized by less stable marriage relationships, with between 50 and 70% still married. A small but significant percentage of divorced and single women adopt the entrepreneurial role. Generally husbands are not very involved in their wives' businesses, but if they are, it is in an 'expert', rather than supportive role (DeCarlo & Lyons, 1979).

The differences in the level of career satisfaction and the desire to raise children is a reflection of the conflict which many women face between careers and motherhood: a conflict that men do not experience. Men and women have remarkably similar scores on the "entrepreneurial traits" of achievement motivation and locus of control and this reinforces the suggestion
that the differences in motivation between men and women are the result of differences in the socialisation of the sexes (Cromie, 1986, p.360).

On the basis of empirical research done in the U.S., Welsch & Young (1984, p.17) found that the profiles of female and male entrepreneurs are relatively similar. However, on the basis of differences found, the typical woman entrepreneur emerges as being younger, better educated, more interested in education and more likely to use written information sources. These differences may be due to women's recent emergence as small business owners and operators.

3.5. CHARACTERISTICS OF WOMEN ENTREPRENEURS:

The characteristics associated with the women who are entrepreneurs may be classified as shown below.

**Figure 3.2**

 Characteristics of Women Entrepreneurs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Demographic</th>
<th>(II) Psychological</th>
<th>(III) Entrepreneurial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Background</td>
<td>1. Motivation</td>
<td>1. Personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Family</td>
<td>2. Locus of Control</td>
<td>2. Achievement Motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Age</td>
<td>4. Self-confidence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Education</td>
<td>5. Determination</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Marital Status</td>
<td>6. Innovation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Parent's Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Work Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Type of Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.5.1. Personality Characteristics

3.5.1.1. Need for Achievement (nACH)

A variety of psychological characteristics have been utilised in describing entrepreneurs (Brockhaus, 1982(a); Hornaday and Aboud, 1971).

A personality motive, most commonly related to entrepreneurship is need for achievement (nACH), McClelland (1961, 1965). His empirical studies indicate that nACH is a key factor in successful entrepreneurship. McClelland (1961, p 238) suggests that a high need for achievement leads people to behave in most of the ways they should behave if they are to fulfil the entrepreneurial role successfully.... The achievement motive should lead individuals to seek out situations which provide moderate challenge to their skills, to perform better in such situations, and to have greater confidence in the likelihood of their success. It should make them conservative where things are completely beyond their control, as in games of chance, and happier where they have some opportunity of influencing the outcome of a series of events by their own actions and of knowing concretely what those actions have accomplished.... And, finally, it should encourage them to value money not for itself but as a measure of success.

3.5.1.2. Locus of Control

Another entrepreneurial personality trait is internal locus of control. According to Welsch and Young (1984, p.13) entrepreneurs have always been associated with locus of control as being in control of their own destiny. This concept is associated with Rotter's (1966) description of continuum of beliefs or expectancies ranging from internal to external. Internal locus of
control is a belief that one is responsible for his/her own behaviour and its outcome. External control is a belief that events are independent of behaviour and are, instead, the results of such forces as fate, luck(chance) and powerful others(Pandey and Tewary, 1979). Entrepreneurs, as individuals with high internality should possess the tactics of manipulating the business situations. Pandey and Tewary(1979) provide empirical evidence that people with high internal scores on Rotter's (1966) I-E scale are more likely to be successful entrepreneurs and Timmons et al (1977) agree with those research findings. Brockhaus(1975) has also reported a positive relationship between internality as measured by Rotter's scale and the decision to become an entrepreneur. For internals, a personal destiny comes from within and therefore they tend to be more self-reliant and independent(Cromie, 1986).

Internality of locus of control is a personality construct long associated with such entrepreneurial activity as small business ownership (Bowen and Hisrich 1986; Brockhaus 1982). A linkage of perceived control with entrepreneurship is rooted in Rotter's (1966) association of internality with need for achievement, a variable which also had been related by McClelland (1961) to the entrepreneurial spirit. Extremely high achievement would be associated with the strongest internality, while more common plateaux of success
would be tied to comparatively moderate levels of internality (Nelson and Sharp 1989, p 65).

According to Dubois (1987) locus of control has been generally linked to occupational success in occupations requiring traits thought to be associated with a given internal/external tendency. Sylvers and Deni (1983) have shown that internal scorers place more emphasis on success at work, problem solving, taking responsibilities, and getting promotions. Waddell (1983, p 297) found self-employed businesswomen to be significantly more internal.

Perry et al (1986, p.55) have reported that the personality trait of locus of control has only recently been identified as a trait that might distinguish small business owner-managers from others in the population.

3.5.1.3. SELF-ESTEEM:

Self-esteem has been defined as a dominance-feeling, a kind of sureness, pride, sense of mastery, or superiority when dealing with other individuals and objects (Dauw et al, 1980). Thus defined, self-esteem is probably a major characteristic in the profile of an

---

3. A study done on prospective small business owner-managers, existing small business owner-managers and highly successful Australian entrepreneurs to study mainly achievement motivation, locus of control and other psychological traits such as risk-taking propensity, and personal demographic characteristics between the three different sample groups. It does not have any figures relating to the number of women in the samples.
entrepreneur as one probably has to become a master in the trade to become a successful businessperson.

The one-time widely held view that women had lower self-esteem than men was not substantiated for women entrepreneurs. The equal levels of self-esteem of female and male entrepreneurs indicates that women's success as entrepreneurs has allowed them to reassess their self-concepts and reach new levels of self-esteem (Welsch & Young, 1984). However, this may or may not lead to a verdict that only women with high self-esteem go into business depending on the situation.

3.5.1.4. Self-confidence

Swayne and Tucker (1973) emphasize the importance of a positive attitude and of self-confidence in the personality of successful entrepreneurs. These authors note that the high expectations of such individuals are based primarily on what they think about themselves. Swayne and Tucker also point out that successful entrepreneurs have a strong ego drive, that is, an inner desire and need that make these individuals feel that they must succeed which leads to success ultimately. Self-esteem differs from self-confidence in the sense that the latter is an inborn trait to a greater extent and the former is a trait developed over a period of time (Welsch & Young, 1984).
3.5.1.5. Determination

Timmons et al (1977) argue that successful entrepreneurs possess an intense level of determination. They are not easily intimidated by difficult situations.

3.5.1.6. Innovation

Schumpeter (1952) believes an entrepreneur is one who does not accept the boundaries of a structured situation but is a "catalyst of change", able to carry out "new combinations", and is instrumental in discovering new opportunities. Swayne and Tucker (1973) suggest that entrepreneurs are oriented toward innovation and are constantly seeking out new and different ways to expand their business faster or to start a new business.

Schien's (1975) research indicates that the "career anchor" of entrepreneurs is creativity and innovation while business managers find their career anchors in competence and efficiency.

Persons playing multiple roles must remain flexible in their thinking and behaviour. This flexibility can be measured by the degree of differentiation of the person, i.e., a person with a small degree of differentiation behaves in a more stereotyped manner because he/she has a smaller behavioural repertory and has few possibilities of action (Welsch and Young, 1984).
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3.5.2. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Though the women entrepreneurs seem to have different backgrounds on the face of it, they share some similarities with male entrepreneurs in personality, education, and family background (Hisrich & Brush, 1985). Hence, it becomes inevitable to examine the characteristics of women entrepreneurs/small business owners in terms of age, education, family, occupation, personality, motivation, and skills, both to understand women entrepreneurs and to investigate further as to what are the factors which facilitate the growth of self-employment of women.

3.5.2.1. BACKGROUND

According to Hisrich and Brush (1985), the family backgrounds of the women entrepreneurs tend to be similar in many aspects. The majority are first-born children from a middle or upper-middle class family in which the father was self-employed. Most of these women see themselves as similar to their fathers in personality, but as having closer relationship with their mothers. These women might have had their fathers as their role models or had their father's positive influence to pursue an entrepreneurial career. Also, over half of the women owning their own businesses are presently married to men employed in professional or technical occupations and have, on an average, two teenage children.
For the women who fit the profile, according to Hisrich and Brush (1985, p 21), there are basically three implications.

First, being married and having a family frequently provides a support base, both emotionally and financially, from which to launch an endeavour. When the husband is professionally employed, the stress of relying on the new business for the family's financial support is also relieved. Cultural norms have encouraged men to divide their time among work, recreation, and family. For woman business owner or the career woman, those time periods are seldom so distinct. Second, having a father who was self-employed provides a strong inspiration for the entrepreneur. The example set by the father of the independent nature and flexibility of self-employment is ingrained at an early age. Third, first-born children often become self-employed as they must learn at an early age to be assertive and independent. These characteristics are typical of both male and female entrepreneurs.

3.5.2.2. FAMILY

In their study on women entrepreneurs in China, Hisrich and Fan (1991) have pointed out that 90% of their subjects felt that the support and understanding of family members, especially their spouses, played an important role in their success.

Cromie (1986) has observed that role models of parents and other close relations are potentially influential in implanting the idea of business ownership in the minds of his respondents. Lemkau (1979) concluded that non-traditional women were competent as well as warm and expressive and that they shared enriched family backgrounds. They tend to share background characteristics which foster achievement, i.e., high
parental education, frequent foreign ancestry and firstborn status, and high family stability (Lemkau, 1979, pp. 221). She also mentioned that this facilitates the valuing of "masculine" traits and activities and the expectancy of being able to succeed in endeavours traditionally defined as within the masculine domain (p.223).

Watkins and Watkins (1984) suggest that parents who run their own businesses can act as powerful role models for their children in their entrepreneurial endeavours. [A] Female entrepreneur is some four times more likely to have been subject to the influences of an entrepreneurial parent (father and/or mother) than a member of the general population. Parental occupation is only one of the familial factors which might influence the choice of an entrepreneurial career; parental expectation is another (Watkins & Watkins, 1984, p 23).

3.5.2.3. SIBLING POSITION

Numerous researchers have noted the preponderance of first borns among high achievers (Sampson, 1963; Schachter, 1963; Sutton-Smith & Rosenberg, 1970). Hennig and Jardim (1977) had indicated a very strong correlation between the likelihood that a woman executive would also be the first and/or only child. Some researchers concluded that majority of the women entrepreneurs in their samples were either first-born or only child (Gosselin & Grise, 1990; Hisrich & Brush, 1985; Gregg, 1985). However, according to Sexton and
Kent (1981) a majority of the women entrepreneurs in their sample were either middle children or born last.

3.5.2.4. Age

The years between 25 and 40 have frequently been mentioned as the age when the entrepreneurial decision is most likely to be made (Shapero, 1971). An individual at that stage has often obtained sufficient experience, competence, and self-confidence but has not normally yet incurred financial and family obligations or attained a position of prestige and responsibility in a large company (Liles, 1974). According to Liles, this is a free choice period.

The age of the high-technology entrepreneurs at the time of company formation closely paralleled the distribution of the general population between the ages of 25 and 60 (Susbauer, 1972). Before 25, education and military service tend to reduce the number of entrepreneurs; after 60, decreased energy and other physical limitations tend to reduce the number of entrepreneurs. Some differences seem to exist, however, among entrepreneurs of different cultures (Brockhaus, 1982). These studies were predominantly on male samples.

The majority of women entrepreneurs (60%) are between 40 and 49 years old and a few (26%) between 50 and 60
years and (14%) between 30 and 39 years (Hisrich & Fan, 1991, p.10). The ages between 25 and 40 are the times when a person has achieved enough experience to be entrepreneurial and is not burdened with great family and financial responsibilities (Liles, 1974, p.57), which was supported by the results of the study of Sexton and Kent (1981, p.46). According to them, the most frequent group of female entrepreneurs was in 31-40 range. Nearly three-fourths of the sample women entrepreneurs were in the category of 30-39 years and 40-49 years (Scott, 1986).

According to Gosselin & Grise (1990), the age of women entrepreneurs vary greatly, but more than half of his sample women entrepreneurs are between 31-45 years old.

The mean age of Cromie's (1986) women entrepreneurs was 33.6 years whereas in the Watkins and Watkins (1984) study, more women entrepreneurs were in the range of 20-29 years.

3.5.2.5. Education

The entrepreneurs averaged 13.57 years of education as against the managers' education of 15.74 years. Entrepreneurs appear to be better educated than the general population but less so than managers

4. Older age here reflects on the older age of the enterprise as 26% have been running businesses for more than six years and less than 12 years and 14% have been running businesses for more than twenty years.
(Brockhaus, 1982). Nearly 70% of all women entrepreneurs have a college education, many with graduate degrees; their parents, particularly their fathers, and their spouses are also well educated (Hisrich & Brush, 1985).

According to Hisrich and Fan (1991), most Chinese women entrepreneurs had secondary, technical or higher education. Sexton and Kent (1981) have discovered a pattern for the younger women entrepreneurs to have obtained above average levels of education than the rest of their sample. Most of the subject women entrepreneurs possessed a degree or equivalent but few only had business education as compared to their men sample (Watkins and Watkins, 1984; Cromie, 1986). The sample women entrepreneurs of Quebec have an average of 12 years' schooling (Gosslin & Grise, 1990).

3.5.2.6. Marital Status
Less than fifty percent of the women entrepreneur sample were married or had the equivalent of a stable marriage relationship (Watkins & Watkins, 1984). Cromie (1986) has found that a high proportion of women entrepreneurs are single including the divorcees and separated women (48%).

3.5.2.7. Parent's Occupation
Many female entrepreneurs have an entrepreneurial parent (Gregg, 1985; Watkins & Watkins, 1984).
Shapero (1971) has cited that often the occupation of the father is the principal determinant of occupational choice of female entrepreneurs and this was confirmed by the results of the Sexton et al. (1981) study. Despite the dominance of entrepreneurial fathers among female entrepreneurs, only a few have indicated that their father had served as the role model for their own entrepreneurial aspirations.

3.5.2.8. Work Experience
The typical woman entrepreneur has had experience in the area of her endeavour, usually in a service-related field, like teaching, middle management, or secretarial. Most women have experience in positions where they could observe general managers or executives and see them at their best and worst (Hisrich & Brush, 1985, p. 20).

Cross (1981) has observed that the most influential factor on the initial ability of an individual and the subsequent success of a new enterprise is the work experience or history of the founder. The pitfalls of the previous workplace would be a good lesson for the business.

Most of the subject women entrepreneurs had more than four previous jobs and almost half of them had related work experience (Sexton & Kent, 1981). Most of the women entrepreneurs had previous managerial experience
before going into their business (Scott, 1986). Most of the women entrepreneurs that Watkins and Watkins (1984) studied were in their first business, meaning that they did not have prior ownership experience. Later, this was supported by Gosselin & Grise (1990).

According to Cromie (1986), about 24% of his subject women entrepreneurs had managerial experience prior to starting a business whereas more than three quarters of the women entrepreneurs of Quebec acquired work experience (probably through training without pay) before they started their business (Gosselin & Grise, 1990). Thus most of the women entrepreneurs have obtained prior work experience either in the related field or in managerial positions.

3.5.2.9. Type of Business

Watkins & Watkins (1984) contend that women entrepreneurs create business enterprises in stereotypical "female" areas and Cromie (1986) has confirmed this observation. However, the type of business also would relate to the type of female entrepreneur.

3.5.3. Entrepreneurial Characteristics

3.5.3.1. Personality

Though personality does not differ from the psychological characteristics, it is included under
entrepreneurial characteristics to emphasize its importance. According to Hisrich & Brush (1985), the woman entrepreneur is individualistic, creative, enthusiastic, instinctive, and adaptable. She is highly energetic, self-confident, competitive and very goal-oriented. She is usually a generalist rather than a specialist and is more flexible than rigid.

3.5.3.2. Motivation

Most women entrepreneurs have had experience in the area of their own businesses which means that they have spent time assessing the need for their product or service in addition to learning the business and gaining knowledge of their market. Either they may like to put the experience gained into their own business or they are motivated to be independent, to have job satisfaction and a sense of achievement, and to be positive in the overall business context (Hisrich & Brush, 1985).

Cooke and Wildeman (1982) have contended that female entrepreneurs are motivated (in order of importance) by the search for job satisfaction, need for achievement, challenge, and independence.

The dominant motivation was job satisfaction and professional recognition. Nearly 50% of the subject women entrepreneurs had stated this as the principal reason (Sexton and Kent, 1981). But the above results
could include or represent need for power, prestige, etc. These results were consistent with the findings of McClelland (1961), when he found a higher need for achievement (nACH) among entrepreneurs than in the general population.

Actual trait analyses find more similarities between the sexes than differences. Women seem to possess similar motivations to men in relation to the need for more money (Hertz, 1986).

3.5.3.3. PRIORITIES

According to Sexton and Kent (1981) & DeCarlo and Lyons (1979), female entrepreneurs tend to be more job oriented and place a higher priority on their occupation than upon their family life. When a family is present, the entrepreneur should assess her family situation before launching a new venture. Organizational skills must be strong to manage both family and business in even the best of circumstances (Hisrich & Brush, 1986). Priorities such as church, community service, sports and health generally were considered almost totally unimportant as personal priorities for women entrepreneurs. Female entrepreneurs of Sexton & Kent's (1981) sample who had a higher priority for business than family, tended to explain it by indicating their occupation was necessary for the financial support of their family and
the family would suffer if they did not place a higher priority on their occupation.

3.5.3.4. Skills

Women tend to be more tolerant and understanding than men in the human relations side of running of a business, which tends to make them more sensitive to problems and willing to work things out than men. Strength in idea generation/product innovation is helpful, because most women entrepreneurs conceive an idea for their product or service that has some unique features (Hisrich & Brush, 1985).

According to Hertz (1986), successful women business owners practice a totally feminine style of management, that of the "matriarchal boss". Hertz' millionaire business owners had soft, interpersonal management styles. They paid employees well and took a very personal interest in their lives and welfare. They took a personal interest because they wanted a harmonious relationship at work, just as a mother wants harmony at home. They did not worry about money; they worried about people. When they expanded their businesses, they said they did it for their workers (p.20).

Burr's (1987) "female tycoons" treated the staff in the same sympathetic way although Burr called it as "paternalistic". They convinced others to follow, rather than pull rank. They placed great stress on a
pleasant working environment. They tried to reconcile and talk things through. They did not have "them versus us" attitude toward employees but promoted a team approach and tried to see problems from the staff's point of view (pp. 104-105).

White & Cox (1991, p.23) have stated that

the majority of the women entrepreneurs were androgynous or sex-role reversed indicating an ability to think beyond the constraints of traditional sex-role stereotypes. These entrepreneurs were found to be extremely innovative in their creative style and that the entrepreneurs had a "visionary" political style which suggest that women operate on a system of unshared meaning, that is they have independence of thought.

3.6. CONCLUSION

This chapter focussed on the previous studies on women entrepreneurs in USA, UK, China and Australia. Few major studies done on women entrepreneurs in Australia were discussed and the findings of these studies were summarised. Based on the earlier studies, types of women entrepreneurs as defined by various researchers/authors were analysed. As the performance of male entrepreneurs is often taken as the benchmark for comparison, the differences and similarities between the male and female entrepreneurs in their achievement motivation level, risk-taking, locus of control etc., were discussed. The characteristics of the women entrepreneurs were grouped into three categories (demographic, psychological and entrepreneurial) for convenience of analysis. Each
characteristic was analysed in detail to enable the identification of the research variables. The selected variables are studied meticulously and presented in Chapter Four. Chapter Four will also discuss the relevant hypotheses and the reasons for developing the same.
CHAPTER 4

LITERATURE REVIEW - PART 2

ANALYSIS OF VARIABLES
4.1. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the variables that are associated with this research will be studied bearing in mind the studies already done in the relevant areas. In the previous chapter, the characteristics of the women entrepreneurs were discussed. In addition to understanding the psychological characteristics of women entrepreneurs, this study aims at focusing on the psychological factors which could inhibit women from career achievement in their small business ventures. In this chapter, an analysis of the management styles of men and women, the potential advantages of the management styles of women, and how they are likely to fare in small business are discussed in detail. This will necessitate consideration of the compatibility of personality characteristics and stereotypes of masculine, feminine and androgynous styles. However, most of the studies on women entrepreneurs were carried out in U.S. and U.K. Detailed research on the psychological and experiential characteristics of female entrepreneurs in countries outside the U.S.A. and U.K. are less plentiful.

4.2. REVIEW OF RESEARCH ON ACHIEVEMENT:

Though a lot of studies have been carried out on achievement motivation in entrepreneurs (Perry et al, 1986; Cromie, 1987; Nelson & Sharp, 1989; Williams,
1975; London, 1983; Bailey, 1982), only a small number of studies have a detailed examination of female entrepreneurs. Even the achievement motivation theorists like McClelland and Atkinson only devoted a few lines to women.

As traditionally defined and measured, achievement motivation is a masculine characteristic. This is perhaps due to the traditional view that men go out to work and women stay at home to mind their children. Also, in males, achievement motivation is rather consistently correlated with traditionally masculine personality characteristics, such as competitiveness and independence (McClelland, et al. 1953, p.27).

One reason for the lack of research into achievement motivation in females has been the perception that females who do achieve do so out of affiliation, i.e. need for social and interpersonal rewards. Males are motivated to achieve and females are motivated to affiliate, so said theorists like Janman, (1989, p.209).

Major explanations for women's possible lower achievement focus is some psychological factors, which differentiate women from men. They are:
1. Underlying motives or values in one's life,
2. Women's definition of success, and
3. Women's beliefs about their abilities and their perceptions of their performance (i.e., success/failure).

4.3. MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS - AN OVERVIEW:
McClelland (1961, p.37) has defined a motive as one "which determine[s] why people behave as they do; they are the genotypes of behaviour". In other words, motives are explained as unconscious forces which excite and direct the actions of the individual (Frieze et al. 1978, p.38). The theory of psychological motivation developed by McClelland, Atkinson and others suggests that people are motivated by three principal needs namely:
(a) a desire to do things well and be successful (Need for achievement)
(b) a desire for close relationships (need for affiliation); and
(c) a desire for recognition and control (need for power).
These three motivations will be discussed below.

4.3.1. ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION:
Need for achievement was described by Murray (1938, p.164) in his taxonomy of human needs as:

The desire or tendency to do things as rapidly and/or as well as possible. It also includes the desire to accomplish something difficult. To master, manipulate and organize physical objects, human beings, or ideas. To do this, as rapidly, and as independently, as possible. To overcome obstacles and attain a high standard. To excel one's self. To rival and surpass
others. To increase self-regard by the successful exercise of talent.

Need for achievement (nAch) is the need to excel, the need to do a job well (McClelland, 1961) and it is the need for measurable personal accomplishment (Timmons et al, 1977, p.94). The primary motivation among the entrepreneurs is the need for achievement (McClelland, 1961; Brockhaus, 1982; Hornaday & Aboud, 1971; Hisrich & Brush, 1985; Williams, 1975) but these studies were on predominantly male subjects. It is an underlying behavioural tendency to choose and persist at activities that involve a standard of excellence, a challenging task (one with a moderate probability of success), and require personal skill and responsibility for success (McClelland, 1961). This is accepted by Timmons et al (1977) when they stated that persons with high achievement seek out challenging or competitive situations and set goals that are both realistic and achievable. This motivation is thought to contribute to vigour, intensity, and persistence of action in achievement oriented situations (McClelland, 1985).

As Murray's (1938) system of needs (from which achievement motivation theory was derived) specified that motives were unconscious, projective tests were thought to be the best means of assessment.
4.3.1.1. Achievement Motivation and Entrepreneurship:

According to McClelland (1958) and Atkinson (1964), the achievement motive is a motive to compete in a situation where a standard of excellence is involved. A highly achievement motivated person is one who has developed an internal standard of excellence, is independent, persistent, chooses to perform tasks of moderate difficulty, and has a clearly understood goal in mind. This implies that an achievement-motivated person does not rely on external support or social approval; he/she strives to achieve because they have an internal standard of excellence.

High level of achievement motivation is the generally accepted concept often used to explain some important aspects of entrepreneurial behaviour, including setting/competing against self-imposed standards, setting moderate risk goals, and seeking feedback and learning from it (Timmons et al, 1977). They also cautioned about the disadvantages of high achievement motivation:

a) extreme independence and self-reliance can be an obstacle in seeking outside assistance, and developing good team reactions.

5. However, extremely achievement motivated individuals would not mind seeking the best advice if that is bringing in the desired success for them in their endeavour.
b) high personal standards can make one quite intolerant of others who can not quite meet the standards set and this can inhibit team building, and, c) extreme self-reliance, self-confidence, and a doer orientation tend to be an obstacle to delegation of authority, thus imposing some upper limits on how much one can manage effectively (Timmons et al, 1977, p. 108).

4.3.1.2. Expectancy Theory:

Under expectancy theory, the strength of the drive to achieve a task is determined by the combination of intrinsic rewards (satisfaction from a job well done) and the extrinsic (external) rewards flowing from successful completion of the task (McClelland, Atkinson, Clark & Lowell, 1953; Atkinson & Feather, 1966).

The intrinsic rewards are determined by

\[ T_s = (M_s - M_f) \times P_s \times I_s \]

where, \( T_s \) is the anticipated intrinsic satisfaction from undertaking a task, \( M_s \) is the inherent fear of failing in tasks involving personal skills, [Both \( M_s \) and \( M_f \) are conceived as latent stable characteristics of the personality, predominantly acquired in early life Murray (1938)], \( P_s \) is the probability of succeeding in the task involved and \( I_s \) is the incentive value of success and is viewed as equal to \( (1 - P_s) \), that is, the more difficult the task is the greater the satisfaction from succeeding.
According to Horner (1968), when a person is motivated to achieve, he or she encounters a motive to avoid success along with a motive to avoid failure. Hence, the above equation may be modified to take into account the countervailing forces.

4.3.2. AFFILIATION MOTIVATION:

As suggested by McClelland, Atkinson and others, need for affiliation is also a principal need and more so in the case of women, whether they are engineers, scientists, managers, or small business owners. Need for affiliation (nAff) exists only when there is some evidence of concern about establishing, maintaining, or restoring a positive emotional relationship with another person. Persons with high affiliation motivation have concern for being liked by others; concern about the disruption of a positive interpersonal relationship; concern for people in the work situation and people in other than the work situation, and attraction for social situations (Timmons et al, 1977, p. 96).

4.3.2.1. AFFILIATION MOTIVATION AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP:

In the early stages of the venture, affiliation motivation will be more crucial than commonly believed (Timmons et al, 1977)\(^6\). If coupled with a high

---

6. This section draws on Timmons et al (1977) as not many studies have been done on affiliation motivation and entrepreneurship. However, as more and more women are becoming entrepreneurs, affiliation motivation may become a more widely researched variable in entrepreneurship.
level of achievement motivation, affiliation motivation can be a valuable lubricant for team and interpersonal relationships.

On the other hand, certain aspects of affiliation motivation, if left unattended, can contribute to avoidance of conflicts and confrontations, and therefore retard goal orientation if these are seen as potentially damaging to the relationships (Boyatzit, 1974, p.125; Crandall, 1963; Veroff, 1969).

4.3.3. **Power Motivation:**

Need for power exists when an individual's goal is to influence others by outperforming someone else or showing strong concern through powerful actions or doing things that arouse strong positive or negative emotions in others or demonstrating concern for reputation/position (Atkinson & Feather, 1966, p. 137).

Need for power has been defined by McClelland (1975, p.77) as

*...the need primarily to feel strong, and secondarily to act powerfully.*

Schrage (1965, p.59) has analysed the entrepreneur's need for power and the destructive forces that are working against forming and building a substantial enterprise. There are perhaps four indicators of concern for power according to Timmons et al (1977, p.96):

[1] Power concern expressed as powerful concerns;
[2] Arousing strong emotions in others;
[3] Concern for reputation, status, or position; and

4.3.3.1. Power Motivation and Entrepreneurship:
Timmons et al (1977, p.109) contend that beyond the single proprietorship, a strong need for power is COUNTER-PRODUCTIVE and contains many seeds of self-destruction that would affect the forming and building of an entrepreneurial team to launch and build a substantial business. Sex role is a key variable in determining how the power drive is expressed (McClelland, 1975, p.81).

4.4. Achievement Motivation and Women:
The first research pertinent to achievement needs of women utilized the chief experimental paradigm of McClelland, Atkinson, and their colleagues, that is, studies of the level of achievement motivation after instructions designed to arouse the motivation. When female subjects did not respond to the instructions designed to arouse their achievement motivation, it was suggested that they were less motivated than men (Veroff, et al, 1953). Interestingly, the researchers did not seem to think it important that under relaxed conditions females actually scored higher than males in the amount of achievement imagery in their TAT responses. The fact that females give ample achievement imagery under relaxed conditions is noteworthy in a
society which attempts to inhibit the achievement-related tendencies of women (Fitzgerald & Crites, 1980).

A reaction to the lack of applicability of achievement motivation measures for females has been to conclude that females perhaps, are not motivated to achieve as men. This alternative further postulates that females who do achieve do so out of need for affiliation, i.e., need for social and interpersonal rewards (Veroff, 1969; Crandall, 1969, Hoffman, 1972). The relationship between affiliation motivation and achievement-oriented behaviour was clarified by Atkinson and O'Connor (1966, p. 147). According to them, when there is social approval for excellence in the implied achievement task, the strong affiliation motivation enhances the level of performance. Instead, Stein and Bailey (1973) proposed that females are motivated to achieve, but the areas of their achievement are sometimes different from males because of cultural definitions of feminine skill, within the traditional bounds of femininity, namely social skills which was earlier mentioned by French and Lesser (1964, p.121) and Field (1951, p.49). A persistent theory in the field has been that females are primarily concerned with affiliation and so construe achievement in terms of its effects on affiliative success (Sutherland & Veroff, 1985, p. 106).
Sutherland and Veroff (1985, p.103) have proposed four major explanations of women's achievement scores:

1. Females are at their peak level of achievement in the neutral condition, so experimental procedures cannot possibly heighten that level.

2. Females have complex, sometimes conflicting, responses to themes of women in achievement situations, which interfere with the straightforward use of pictures of women to elicit achievement imagery.

3. Females are motivated for achievement by social approval and the need for affiliation, so the experimental procedures used failed to engage their achievement motivation.

4. Females, more often than males, fear success which inhibits the expression of achievement in behaviour.

Many females see social situations as achievement situations. This is an expression of their achievement strivings within the feminine role. The social context of female's achievement has been misinterpreted (Crandall, 1963) as evidence for affiliation as opposed to achievement motives. Females express achievement motivation in activities that are culturally defined as feminine. In effect, they resolve the conflict between achievement motivation as usually defined and prescriptions for the feminine role by translating achievement motivation into a feminine context. Females have affiliative needs that influence their achievement motivations and behaviour, sometimes enhancing and
sometimes blocking them (Mednick, et al, 1975, p.129). The theories of achievement could not account for women's lower achievement. Lying behind the motive to achieve success are the needs of individuals to achieve or "do things better" compared to past performance of others, or relative to some goal (Hoffman, 1972, p. 131). Some researchers also consider the dampening effect of fears, such as fear of failure or the fear of success (Horner, 1968; Tangri, 1972). Possible reasons could be that these women had different types of socialization experiences during childhood and adolescence; and that achievement has not been incorporated into women's sex-role related self-concept and is therefore less important for their self-esteem(Frieze et al, 1978). McClelland et al(1953) concluded that women's achievement motivation is related to social acceptability and men's to leadership and intelligence. Both Bardwick(1971) and Hoffman(1972) stressed the role of affiliation in their interpretations of the achievement literature. Bardwick suggested that achievement motivation and affiliation motivation are fused, at least through adolescence, as a function of the internalization of culturally based sex-role prescriptions and sex-typed socialization experiences. The whole essence of femininity lies in repressing aggressiveness. As a result, a woman is threatened by success because unusual excellence in academic intellectual areas is unconsciously equated with loss of femininity, the consequence of which may
be social rejection. In other words, there are two potential sources for negative consequences of success, i.e., loss of one's sense of femininity and self-esteem regardless of whether anyone finds out about the success or not and/or social rejection because of the success (Freud, 1933, p. 165).

Kagan and Moss (1962, p.360) have stated that the typical female has greater anxiety over aggressive and competitive behaviour than the typical male and that she, therefore, experiences greater conflict over intellectual competition which in turn leads to inhibition of intensive strivings for academic excellence. For women, being successful in such competitive activities is often a major source of threat. Success in such situations implies that one has actively competed or been aggressive.

4.5. PSYCHOLOGICAL BARRIERS FOR ACHIEVEMENT IN WOMEN:

4.5.1. ORIGIN OF FEAR OF SUCCESS:

Historically, Sigmund Freud (1915, p.324) was the first to record his observations of those wrecked by surprising, indeed bewildering......discovery, that people occasionally fall ill precisely because a deeply-rooted and cherished wish has come to fulfilment. It seems as though they could not endure this bliss....

In their original statement of achievement motivation theory, McClelland et al (1953, P.79) have stated that The child must begin to perceive performance in terms of standards of excellence..... and to experience pleasant or unpleasant feelings about
meeting or failing to meet these standards.

Horner (1968) proposed the presence of the "motive to avoid success" as a "Psychological barrier to achievement in women", which is considerably more subtle, stubborn and difficult to overcome. Women are anxious about success and the motive to avoid success receives its impetus from the expectancy held by most women that, success, especially in competitive achievement situations, will be followed by negative consequences for them (Horner, 1968, p. 17).

Horner (1968, p. 38) remarked:

A bright woman is caught in a double bind. In testing and other achievement-oriented situations, she worries not only about failure but also about success. If she fails, she is not living up to her own standards of performance, if she succeeds, she is not living up to societal expectations about the female role.

Initially, Horner (1968, pp. 34-35) hypothesized that

(1) The Motive to avoid success is a stable characteristic of the personality, acquired early in life in conjunction with sex role standards, which can be conceived as a disposition;

(2). Fear of success is much more common in women than in men;

(3). Fear of success is strongly aroused in women who are highly motivated to achieve and/or highly able. e.g., who aspire to and/or readily capable of achieving success; and

(4). Fear of success is more strongly aroused in competitive achievement situations where performance
reflecting "intellectual and leadership" ability is to be evaluated against some standard of excellence and against someone else's performance than in non-competitive situations.

Horner (1968) has also reported that "under achievement-oriented conditions, which stress intellectual and leadership ability, the expression of achievement motivation aroused in women may become inhibited by the concurrent arousal of fear of success".

This is an important issue as it is well known that females tend to be more attentive to the interpersonal affiliative concerns within a situation than are males. This, in fact, was the explanation given by Horner (1968, 1970) for the higher incidence of fear of success in women.

4.5.2. Sex Roles and Fear of Success:
According to Horner, fear of success is a result of sex-role training, through which females come to know about the societal restrictions on their achievement, and the negative consequences that may arise, if violated. This means that society has a considerable impact on personality development and it also implies that societal standards are internalized and thus have motivational significance. In competitive situations, especially those in which important men (i.e., prospective dates, boyfriends) are present, success-
seeking women of high ability have not only a motive to approach success and a motive to avoid failure but also a motive to become anxious about being too successful, a motive to avoid success (Horner, 1968, p. 65; Peplau, 1972, p.151). The motive to avoid success is identified as an internal psychological representative of the dominant societal stereotype which views competence, independence, competition, and intellectual achievement as qualities basically inconsistent with femininity even though positively related to masculinity and mental health. The expectancy that success in achievement-related situations will be followed by negative consequences arouses fear of success in otherwise achievement-motivated women which then inhibits their performance and levels of aspiration (Horner, 1968, 1970, 1972).

According to Mead and Kaplan(1965, p. 149), a woman who is successful in a man's career is made to feel unfeminine because she is aggressive, brash and pushy. This was agreed by Maccoby (1963, p.171). The conflict between a woman's personal life and her career, between society's traditional expectations and her own need for personal fulfilment and identity was explained by Hennig and Jardim (1977). This incidence of fear of success is considered as a function of the age, sex, educational, and occupational level of the subjects (Horner, 1970).
This idea is encompassed in the conceptualization of fear of success by Horner (1968), developed in an attempt to understand or explain the major unresolved sex differences detected in the previous research in achievement motivation (Atkinson, 1958; McClelland, et al, 1953). According to the expectancy-value theory, if action is expected to lead to negative consequences such action will be avoided.

However, Tresemer (1977, p.103) has summarized the theoretical connection in the following manner:

Success requires achievement behaviour, achievement requires competition behaviour, competition behaviour is a "sublimated" form of aggressive behaviour, but aggressive behaviour is negatively sanctioned in this society as unfeminine. This conflict leads to anxiety and avoidance and avoidance behaviour in situations involving present or future success.

Tresemer has also observed that the major difference between Horner's theory and other psychoanalytic theories was that Horner believed fear of success was not an exception, but the rule.

4.5.3. Nature of Fear of Success:

Success refers to one's personal standards of excellence. However, one's culture also has defined standards of excellence for its members to follow. Because of this, role conflicts may arise. One such conflict is that between femininity and professional competence as described by Horner (Vanucci & Kleiner, 1990). However, Vanucci & Kleiner (1990) did not clearly
mention whether the competition is against the standards of excellence or significant others as Horner classified.

McClelland (1968, p.91) used the concept of fear of success as a description of the conflicts between power, achievement and femininity, as revealed in Horner's research. The best explanation for fear of success in women could be that women cannot feel successful unless both their affiliative and achievement needs are met (Sutherland & Veroff, 1985). The traditional feminine role precludes competitive success. That being the case, females with high achievement and affiliation needs are indeed in a precarious position which will lead to fear of success, as Horner (1968) suggests.

4.5.4. Criticisms of Horner's Findings:
Since 1968, several researchers have studied fear of success in men and women in many countries, but mostly in the United States (Feather, 1974; Monahan, et al, 1974; Pappo, 1972; Peplau, 1972; Cohen, 1974; Zuckerman & Wheeler, 1975; Wood & Greenfeld, 1976; Tresemer, 1977; Paludi, 1979a). Unfortunately, most of the studies on achievement motivation and fear of success have been carried out amongst college students and hence generalization of the findings is not always possible. Because of the inconsistencies found the researchers questioned the cues used in Horner's (1968)
study. In addition, Hoffman (1972, 1977), Romer (1974), and Sutherland (1980) have also found the content of fear of success to be different for males and females, as has Tresemer (1977) in his review of many studies. From the above mentioned studies on fear of success, it can be learnt that men also may have fear of success (i) when they are in competition with standards of excellence (e.g., when getting promoted to a more responsible job) or (ii) when in competition with the significant others (e.g., while competing with the boss).

Gumpert et al's (1978) description of the success-fearing persons is that they have a trio of achievement-related motives: a motive to achieve success; a motive to avoid failure and a motive to avoid success. The motive to avoid success coexists with the other motives but does not come into play unless success appears to be close at hand. They have also identified the following traits of success-fearing persons:

1. A low and unstable self-esteem;
2. A preoccupation with being evaluated and with competitive implications of performance;
3. A tendency to repudiate their competence, as by citing eternal factors such as luck or help of others to explain their accomplishments (i.e., external locus of control); and
4. A tendency to become anxious in the face of impending or imminent success and to sabotage the success, usually by doing something to prevent its actual occurrence, or by preventing their enjoyment of its fruits.

Subsequent to Horner's research, studies (Breedlove & Cicerelli, 1974) have shown that fear of success becomes greater as women approach graduation and actual participation in a career. Wood (1975) has stated that a "woman has to be both aggressive and feminine... as she is learning from the men while competing with them". The single perceptible fear of social consequences evidenced by an occasional middle-aged women was concerned with her husband's self-esteem and consequent effects on their marriage. Most younger women who are management bound, however, appear to be able to integrate, quite naturally, marriage and career (Wood, 1975, 1976).

Pappo's (1972) work suggests that fear of success is not a rarity, but a relatively commonplace occurrence among college students. No major difference existed between men and women success-fearers in the way they react to success. Cohen (1974) has observed that fear of success is a personality disposition rather than one that is restricted to particular idiosyncratic spheres of activity as was assumed by Pappo.
Cohen's findings will be of some relevance to this research because her point of view implies that fear of success, for any given person, manifests itself in a wide range of settings in which the person could perceive competition with others, including social situations involving popularity, physical attractiveness, and relational successes as well as athletics, arts and crafts, academic and financial pursuits, and all sorts of exhibitions and contests. Thus, Cohen's scale was also constructed to be general in nature rather than specific to a single category of activities (Gumpert, et al, 1978).

In contrast to the theory of Horner (1968), which states that success avoidance is much more common in women than in men, both Stiver (1976) and Tresemer (1977) suggest that avoidance occurs in men and women with similar frequency.

According to O'Leary (1974, p. 810),

women do not fear success per se. The motive to avoid success is assumed only in situations that stress the possibility of conflict between femininity and competitively derived achievement... a woman's definition of her role appears to be an important determinant of her tendency to fear success (p.89).

4.5.5. Questions about origins and nature:

In view of the inconsistencies in the findings of the earlier studies, it may be presumed that fear of
success is probably not deep-seated in women's personality, but situationally determined. Women may not internalize the motive at a very early age. On the contrary, women may evaluate their behaviours in the light of the specific situation, sometimes acting in accord with sex-role norms, sometimes not (Paludi, 1979). In an individual competitive situation, high fear of success and traditionalism are expected to decrease performance (Peplau, 1972).

Women who fear success probably do not fear to compete in general, only in instances where the task is considered "masculine" or where competition is against a man (Makosky, 1976; Horner, 1968, 1970, 1972).

4.5.6. Relevance of Fear of Success in This Research:

In her study of women small business owners, Demarest (1978), has found that the owners attributed their success to the fact that they were "ambitious, aggressive, self-reliant, independent, competitive, made decisions early, exercised authority, etc". On the basis of these self descriptions, Demarest speculated that women small business owners have a strong stereotyped 'masculine' component in their personalities. When this is the case, these women must naturally not be having significant fear of success in relation to their business activities. This view was

7 Those who enter into non-traditional occupations sometimes do not act in accordance with sex-stereotypes.
endorsed by Waddell (1983) in his study of self-employed women. Hence it will be interesting to see whether there is fear of success in women small business owners and the correlates of it.

4.6. MANAGEMENT STYLES

In the previous sections the personality characteristics which previous literature suggests might be relevant to the level of success and the attitudes women small business proprietors hold towards their business were examined. This segment pursues the attitudes to the business in examining aspects relating to how women might manage their small businesses. Unfortunately this is an under researched area and so the literature survey will examine the work done on large business with a view to developing some hypotheses for testing in the small business context. Thus it is not being suggested that small business management is necessarily comparable to the management of large business. In the absence of a better source of ideas or a theory of how the two would differ, the research on large business management serves as a starting point.

Despite the more positive and liberated attitudes toward women and the increasing number of well educated women in business, women still have to face obstacles before them to advance in their career. A question
often asked is what factors contribute to being a successful manager. According to McGregor (1967, p.23),

The model of a successful manager in our culture is a masculine one. The good manager is aggressive, competitive, firm, just. He is not feminine; he is not soft or yielding or dependent or intuitive in the womanly sense. the very expression of emotion is widely viewed as a feminine weakness that would interfere with effective business practices.

The answers may also include talent, skill, the right experience, being energetic, being at the right place at the right time and sometimes just plain serendipity or determination (Rowe & Mason, 1987). While each of these factors can obviously contribute to success, there is a hidden factor that evades even the most perceptive person- the style that is used to accomplish important or demanding goals (Rowe & Mason, 1987, p.1).

According to Rowe and Mason (1987, p. 2),

Decision style reflects the way that one visualizes and thinks about situations. It has to do with mental predisposition concerning personal objectives, what situations one avoids, what kinds of jobs one enjoys, what things one dislikes, how one communicates, and how one approaches problems and makes decisions.

The main aspects that may describe a decision style are perhaps the person's tolerance level for ambiguity and the value orientation (see Place, 1981 who distinguishes concern for the work and concern for the people). Value orientation may be towards either human and social concerns or task and technical concerns. According to Rowe & Mason (1987, p.4), one of these combinations can
lead to categorisation of decision styles as given below.

**Fig. 4.1. Types of Decision Styles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Tolerance to Ambiguity</th>
<th>Value-orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directive</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Task &amp; Technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Task &amp; technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>People &amp; Social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>People &amp; Social</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The psychological aspects of these four decision styles are given in Appendix-C. The dichotomy between the leader who uses ideas to deal proactively with the future and the manager who reacts to situations to improve current performance (Zaleznick, 1977) is explained by Rowe & Mason (1987, p.56) as below (Fig. 4.2):

**Fig. 4.2. Decision Style Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Conceptual</th>
<th>Leader</th>
<th>Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Proactive</td>
<td>Reactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logic</td>
<td>Systems</td>
<td>Adaptive</td>
<td>Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>Creative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Directive | Behavioural ||
|-----------|-------------|
| Power     | Support     ||
| Structure | Persuasion  ||
| Speed     | Empathy     ||

Skill in human relations is a fundamental requisite for all managers. Women are believed more likely to possess perception and empathy, with emotional sensitivity to others, and since labour relations are an integral part of all leadership situations, women are often considered to be best suited for personnel management (Place, 1981, p. 63). In Australia, although there is a significant increase in women managers, the number of women in senior management positions is relatively few (Reports of Bureau of Census and Statistics, 1986). According to this, the number of women under the classification of manager/administrator was 23.9% in 1986 which shows an increase of 15.3% since 1985. The number of women in senior management positions was only 2.4% in 1985 with the majority of female managers being in the service industry (Still, 1986). The immediate and long-term effects of this new situation (i.e., women in senior positions) are difficult to predict, but more than one investigator has argued that the so-called problems of women in management (like sex discrimination) would disappear if they were a significant proportion of female managers in all industries (Epstein, 1975; Kanter, 1975).

Women may not be more innately aware of people than men, but have been socialised to be so. Socialisation may perhaps influence the women to make a head start in implementation of leadership techniques as advocated by the human relations school of thought which contends
that it is more rewarding in terms of personal satisfaction as well as output. Of late the emphasis has been shifted from aggressive leadership to persuasive humanistic style. Place (1981, p. 68) has given an interesting finding that

\textit{it is not the sex of the manager but of the managed which is the deciding factor of identifying the decision style.}

The managerial style may, perhaps, be effective depending on the leadership capabilities of the manager which necessitates a discussion on "leadership", the sex differences in leading, and the position of a woman manager as discussed below.

\textbf{4.6.1. Leadership:}

Leadership means different things to different people. It is described as a process of influencing one's followers toward the attainment of mutual goals of a group, organization, and society (Hollander, 1978). This results in maximising productivity, stimulating creative problem solving, and promoting morale and satisfaction (Blake & Mouton, 1981). Hence, it becomes important to study managerial leadership as it can have a significant effect on the performance of the organization as is explained by the 'Great man’s Theory' of Borgatta, et al (1954). Abraham Zaleznik (1977) points out the differences in the expectations of managers and leaders as: managers are expected to
be rational decision makers and problem solvers and leaders are expected to be charismatic, exciting, and visionary.

4.6.1.1. Leadership and Small Business:
Leadership is very important in any organization because it establishes a managerial control especially in a small business where the size of the organization is very small compared to its counterparts. Leadership really matters in times of extraordinary situations such as organizational birth, crisis, change and growth (Hall, 1977). Extraordinary situations call for an exercise of transformational leadership. For example, entrepreneurial leaders are called upon to promote product ideas and to guide the firm's operations during its infancy (Chung, 1986). This would relate more to small business managers as most start-ups involve small businesses. Some evidence has been reported in McClelland (1975, p.290) that people with the leadership motive pattern have other characteristics and values that should make them effective managers.

The initiators of new business firms face special problems in the development of the managerial skills and capabilities required for survival and success over the life cycle of a firm (Kroeger, 1974, p.45). He also mentioned that each stage of the small business life cycle requires a managerial role that is unique in its skill requirements (p.46). According to Tibbits
(1979, p.121), different phases of the business cycle in a small business would require different skills for the small business owner-manager to respond appropriately. This can be interpreted as different stages of the business may need incompatible styles of management to be adopted. There is no research evidence presented to suggest leadership style varies with stages of the business (although it probably does).

4.6.1.2. STUDIES ON LEADERSHIP:

From a list of leader behaviours (instruction, communication, production emphasis, task assignment, evaluation, fraternization, consultation, and so forth), the Ohio State studies conducted by Fleishman et al (1955) identified two major dimensions of leadership: consideration and initiating structure. Consideration refers to the leader behaviour that mostly concerns the welfare of employees: friendliness, openness, respect, trust, and supportiveness. Initiating Structure refers to leader behaviour that mostly concerns the attainment of organizational goals: task assignment, instruction, supervision, coordination, and evaluation. These two dimensions of leadership (consideration and initiating structure) have been termed differently by different researchers as shown below.
Leadership is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee-centred or Job-centred</th>
<th>Katz et al (1951) (Michigan Studies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task-oriented or People-oriented</td>
<td>Bem (1973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Powell (1988)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nintzberg (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rosener (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic or Democratic</td>
<td>Tannenbaum &amp; Schmidt (1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for people or Concern for work/production</td>
<td>Place (1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stogdill &amp; Coons (1957)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Behaviour or Relationship Behaviour</td>
<td>Hersey &amp; Blanchard (1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional or Transformational</td>
<td>Bass (1990)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Fleishman et al (1955), initiating structure was positively related to employee performance but was negatively associated with high absenteeism and grievances; consideration was positively related to low absenteeism and grievances but was negatively or neutrally related to job performance; and when both initiating structure and consideration are used, performance and satisfaction tended to go up. However, exceptions may be present in each case. Whilst this is a general relationship between the way of leading and performance of the organisation, Chung (1986) and Katz et al (1951) found that job-centred behaviour was effective in less structured job situations where the supervisor could provide technical assistance.
Blake and Mouton (1954, 1985) plotted leadership on a two-dimensional grid, called the *managerial grid*. They identified five styles of leadership: authority-obedience management, country-club management, impoverished management, and team management, and organization-man management. This theory proposes that the best manager is one who is high in both task-oriented and people-oriented behaviour in all situations (Bem, 1973; Mintzberg, 1990; Rosener, 1990) and Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958). They say that managers should decide to be more task-oriented or people-oriented depending on their evaluation of factors such as their own knowledge and values, subordinates' motivational needs and previous experiences with managers, and situational factors such as time pressure and the organization's climate. According to them, leadership effectiveness is the highest when the manager uses team management approach because this approach satisfies both the management and the workers.

Bem's masculinity dimension on the Bem Sex Role inventory (Bem, 1974) suggests masculine aspects of initiation structure; e.g., willing to take a stand. The femininity dimension represents consideration oriented items; e.g., eager to soothe hurt feelings. This was later mentioned by Powell (1988) when he added that task-oriented behaviours such as initiating
structure are mostly associated with masculine stereotype and people-oriented behaviours such as showing consideration toward subordinates are associated with feminine stereotypes. However, this may not always reflect the feminine stereotype.

4.6.1.3. THEORIES ON LEADERSHIP

Trait theory is the oldest approach and is based on the assumption that leaders are born with certain personality traits (Barnard, 1938). Stogdill (1948), in his literature review, concluded that successful leaders have a set of interpersonal, intellectual, and emotional traits to deal with complex organizational relationships and problems. These traits also include desire to succeed, persistence, initiative, assertiveness, sense of responsibility, low level of stress, tolerance for ambiguity, ability to influence, and sociability (Bass, 1990; Ghiselli, 1963). They are highly motivated, decisive, honest, innovative, approachable, empathetic, intelligent, possess a sense of humour, and are imaginative (Hunt, 1972, p.167).

In situational theory, according to Powell (1988), Gibb (1954), Barnard (1961), Likert (1961) and Reddin (1970), there are four variables in understanding leadership:

* the personality and style of the leader;
* the requirements, goals, or objectives of the situation;
* the needs, attitudes and values of those to be led; and
* the organisational setting (the influence of what we have called the organisational variables).

Situational theory argued that without understanding these four factors, leader behaviour cannot be understood (Hunt, 1972, p.175). Different situations require different sorts of leaders as per situational theory. Though situational theory is a comprehensive one, a combination of style and situation theory may yield the best results (Hunt, 1972, p.176). According to Fielder (1967), there are three role performance components relevant to leadership role;
[1] interpersonal role relations;
[2] the formal authority of the leader position; and
[3] the degree of structure in the task which the group has been assigned to perform. Fielder has also cited that autocratic leaders have traditionally begun the organisations when there is no relationship with the group and when the situation is unstructured. Hunt (1972, p.176) has argued that this style of leading is in contrast to the leadership style advocated by the human relations school of thought.

4.6.1.4. TRANSACTIONAL VS TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERS

Transactional leadership is explained by Bass (1990, p. 20) as a effective leadership under which transactions or exchange of reward for good performance and
punishment or discipline for poor performance take place. This was earlier proposed by Burns (1978).

According to Bass (1990, p. 21)

Superior leadership performance—transformational leadership—occurs when leaders broaden and elevate the interests of their employees, when they generate awareness and acceptance of the purpose of the mission of the group, and when they stir their employees to look beyond their own self-interest for the good of the group.

This was stated in a different manner by Burns (1978) that transformational leaders are those who recognize, exploit, and satisfy the needs of the followers while elevating them into high levels of motivation and morality. He distinguishes these leaders from transactional leaders, who rely on formal authority to manage people. Most of the women managers might fall under the category of transformational leaders as they are stereotyped to be more people-oriented than men managers.

If, indeed, the management of people is as important as the management of task, then effective managers need to acquire and value both instrumental ("masculine") and expressive ("feminine") behaviours as mentioned by Hunt (1972) and Fielder (1967). Broadly speaking, these might be characterized as rational problem-solving and analytical skills, and as nurturing, helping, and inter-personal skills.
This leads to the importance of studying the research variables such as androgynous characteristics along with masculine and feminine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs and whether any relationship exists between the success of the business and these characteristics. As much has been said about the people-orientation style of managing by females, the question arises as to whether the women entrepreneurs are more people-oriented or task-oriented in dealing with their day-to-day business activities.

4.6.1.5. ANDROGYNOUS MANAGEMENT:

Blake and Mouton (1954) in their Managerial Grid theory suggests that better managers are androgynous by advocating a combination of task-oriented and people-oriented behaviour. Donnell and Hall (1980, p.64) have stated that high achievers are androgynous, average achievers are masculine, and low achievers are undifferentiated. They have also provided an explanation for why the ranks of management are filled with individuals who exhibit predominantly masculine behaviours, even though such behaviours are seldom exclusively recommended. These individuals, according to Donnell & Hall (1980), may be the organization's average managers, who perform well enough to retain their positions but not well enough to be considered excellent performers.

8. A study of 1916 managers comparing the practices of 950 females with 966 males in USA
Androgynous management is defined by Sargent (1980, p.12) as a style that blends behaviours previously deemed to belong exclusively to men or women.

Bem (1975, p.156) came to measure androgyny as a propensity to describe oneself as high in both feminine and masculine characteristics. A high probability that the person possesses androgynous behavioural style may be inferred from this though not guaranteed.

However, women small business owners may or may not be androgynous as their goals and ways of achieving them may be different from their male counterparts. Women may use a strictly feminine style of management if they wish to achieve their goals.

Bem (1975, p.161) found, however, that androgynous individuals in her scale were actually high in behavioural flexibility and adaptability. They were capable of exhibiting exclusively masculine behaviours, exclusively feminine behaviours, or whatever combination of masculine and feminine behaviours a situation called for. Androgynous individuals were less locked into a rigid set of behaviours dictated by gender stereotypes than masculine men or feminine women.
As more and more women became managers, it was possible that traditional masculine standards for management were being replaced with more androgynous standards. Therefore, Powell and Butterfield (1979, p. 401) speculated that the "good manager" would now be seen as androgynous.

4.6.1.6. Female leadership styles:

It has been generally assumed in the society that most women are considered passive, accommodative, and intuitive while most men are assumed to be aggressive, active, and authoritarian. Therefore, it follows that by their nature women leaders are favourably disposed to a style which is more human-relationship oriented than their male counterparts. On the other hand, women may feel compelled to be also more task-oriented than their male counterparts because of their perceived marginality in leadership and hence their very survival in a leadership position may be dependent on "getting the job done" (Chapman & Luthans, 1975, p.176).

In one comprehensive study of the relationship between sex-role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics, Virginia Schien (1973, p.97) found that successful middle managers were perceived by the organizations to possess characteristics, attitudes, and temperaments more commonly ascribed to men than to women. For example, successful managers were more similar to men than to women in emotional stability,
aggressiveness, leadership ability, self-reliance, certainty, vigour, desiring responsibility, seriousness, objectivity, knowledge, and straightforwardness. On the other hand, characteristics such as understanding, helpfulness, and intuitiveness may be commonly found in women. Schien (1973, p.99) concluded that women have a relationship-oriented leadership style as opposed to a task-oriented (or) autocratic style for men.

As Friedan (1981, p.244) described the two management styles in the 'Second Stage', the feminine Beta style is the opposite of the masculine style. The Alpha style means authoritarian, hierarchical, competitive, and controlling and where there have been clear win-lose solutions. The Beta style is rational, supportive, consensus building, tolerant of diversity and ambiguity, sharing and open to change. On average, men are more authoritarian than women with respect to the manager's exercise of authority and power in the matter of group goals and control of the behaviour of individual members (Bond & Vinacke, 1961, p.64; Denmarke & Diggory, 1966, p.867).

It was implied from the study of Saddler (1970, p. 10) that women tend to be relationship or participative-oriented as opposed to task-oriented. Chapman & Luthans (1975, p. 178) have concluded that (1) there was no significant difference in male and female leadership
styles; (2) There was no significant difference in male and female leadership styles in situations where the degree of task structure, position power, and leader-member relations was comparable; and (3) there were no significant correlations between leadership styles and demographic variables for either males or females.

Besides the styles and behaviours of females in an analysis of their leadership roles, there must be some understanding of what women think of themselves and their need to be part of and accepted by the group. Bennett & Cohen (1959, p. 145) found that women, in evaluating themselves as compared to men, felt a greater social benevolence, social propriety, lack of self protection, personal satisfaction, controlled rage and democratic feeling; and men, on the other hand, normally felt a greater need for attainment and being uncompromising and ruthless.

Exline (1962, 1963), in her two studies on interpersonal or affiliation patterns of women leaders, has found out that women's messages were more person-oriented than men's. The need for affiliation was significantly and inversely related to the degree of control over other's behaviour.

Rosener (1990) characterizes female leadership as "interactive " and male leadership as "command-and-
control". She describes women's management style as "interactive leadership" because:

these women actively work to make their interactions with subordinates positive for everyone involved. More specifically, the women encourage participation, share power and information, enhance other people's self-worth, and get others excited about their work. All these things reflect their belief that allowing employees to contribute and to feel powerful and important is a win-win situation - good for the employees and the organization.

According to Rosener (1990), leaders with this command-and-control approach rely heavily on exchanging rewards for services performed or punishment for poor performance. Rosener goes on to hypothesize that socialization and chosen career paths are the primary reasons why an interactive style comes naturally to women.

4.6.1.7. DILEMMA IN FEMALE LEADERSHIP:

The leadership influence system, made up of the leader, the group, and the situation- does not appear to be very favourable to women. The female leader is caught in a dual conflict situation involving not only the group and the organizational situation but also herself. If she adopts accommodative leadership behaviour patterns, which are congruent with her basic personality, she will be subjected to the common male criticism of being too intuitive, undependable, and passive. However, if she adopts an autocratic or task-oriented behaviour, there is the self-perception of losing her "femininity" and the resultant conflict between fear of success (Horner, 1968) and fear of
failure. Overcompensation in either direction may result in one or both of two consequences: (1) she will feel uncomfortable with her own behaviours or (2) she will be the subject of considerable male suspicion as to her ulterior motives. The end result in each consequence is to reduce her total leadership effectiveness in attaining organizational goals (Chapman & Luthans, 1975, p.178). It might be interesting to see whether this situation prevails when a woman runs her own business. There are two schools of thought in defining the differences between genders in management: one advocating no difference and another pointing out the gender differences, which are discussed below.

4.7. IS THERE A DIFFERENCE BETWEEN GENDERS IN MANAGEMENT STYLES?

Some researchers (Rosener, 1990; Bardwick, 1980; Gilligan, 1982; Sekaran, 1990) say that there are differences between genders in management styles. However, the other researchers contend that there is no difference between genders (e.g., see Cahoon & Rowney, 1991 and section 4.7.1). Brown's (1979) review reported that only three out of thirteen studies found sex differences in managerial behaviour between the sexes.

4.7.1. NO MAJOR SEX DIFFERENCES IN MANAGEMENT:

Schien (1973,1975), using self-report measures of managerial behaviours, found that female managers were
male-oriented in their outlook. These findings were replicated by Massengil and Di Marco (1979). Brenner and Bromer (1981) concluded that male-stereotypic (task-oriented) behaviours are preferred by both groups.

Donnell and Hall (1980) found that female and male managers did not differ in task-oriented or people-oriented behaviour towards subordinates. The results of an Australian study revealed that there is no significant difference in the way that male and female supervisors exert influence on their staff (Vilkinas, 1988, p. 157). In his review article, Bartol (1978) has observed that in most cases there are no differences or relatively minor differences between male and female leaders on leadership style, whether the leaders are being described by themselves or being described by their subordinates.

Though inconsistencies abound, leader gender has generally been shown to be an important explanatory, in laboratory studies but not in studies conducted in field settings (Osborn & Vicars, 1976). According to them, sex differences will disappear when the influence of age, education, and experience of leaders and subordinates is controlled. Tkach (1980, p.23) has remarked that women are no less qualified psychologically for positions in management than men.
Reif et al (1975) concluded that there is considerable research evidence to support the fact that women managers psychologically are not significantly different from their male counterparts (This is contrary to the researchers belonging to the other school of thought supporting the view that there are differences between genders). Women who pursue the non-traditional career perhaps reject their gender stereotype and have needs, motive and values similar to those of men who pursue managerial careers. This may be due to self-selection, with men and women who decide upon managerial careers sharing similar traits and behavioural tendencies. It may also be due to similarity in experiences within the managerial role (Terborg, 1977, p.655).

According to Handley (1991, p. 17), it does not really matter if the characteristics are attributed to women or men, as long as all the managers exhibit the positive ones. As the present day management tends to be human oriented rather than mechanistic, women may have an advantage as discussed earlier in this chapter.

It will be interesting to know whether there is any change in the situation (gender stereotypes at work) as more women are widely accepted in the managerial positions. Kazemek (1991, p.16) has concluded that most research supports the position that gender is not a significant variable in a discussion of leadership.
She has also felt that personality factors and organizational culture play a far more significant role in determining how people lead.

**4.7.2. GENDER DIFFERENCES IN MANAGEMENT STYLES:**

The differences between female and male managers can be classified under four categories:

1. Behavioural responses to others, particularly their subordinates,
2. Internal motivation and commitment to their jobs, organization and careers,
3. Experiences with stress, and
4. Subordinates' responses to female and male managers (Powell, 1988).

The tough-minded versus the tender-minded and dominance versus submissiveness trait obviously constitute major elements in the masculinity-femininity dimensions (that is in the attitudes, feelings, interests and so on that are considered by our society to become typical of either sex). There is evidence that they become entrained at an early age: that boys are socialised into aggressiveness and competitiveness, while girls are expected to be conformist and compliant; comforting and nurturing rather than ambitious and independent, despite evidence that both sexes possess these characteristics (Rothwell, 1985, p. 83).
The influx of women managers has most occurred in the lower age brackets, in which individuals are least likely to hold high managerial levels or receive high salaries (Powell et al, 1984, p. 915). Female managers were found to be less open and candid with all their colleagues than male managers, possibly reflecting feelings of social isolation (Donnell and Hall, 1980, p.74). Female managers were found to be more accommodative (to equals, subordinates, superiors or all) than male managers (Brenner & Vinacke, 1979, p. 123).

Men and women are different in their psychological make-up and thus their personality as per the findings of Bardwick (1980) and Gilligan (1982).

In contrast to the achievement-oriented egocentric self of the male, the female dependent and interdependent sense of 'self' is basically relational, and extends to reach out to others (Sekaran, 1990, p. 249)

According to Loden (1985), the managing styles of males and females can be grouped into the categories as explained below.

Sometimes differences do exist in the ways of handling official works and finding an amicable solution for the problem, but mostly in ways that would serve to increase the probability of women functioning well as managers.
The differences in the managerial behaviour may be traced through the following factors.

4.7.2.1. Socialization:

Female leaders may have preferred an equality orientation because they were socialized to minimize status differences and to strive for group harmony. Male leaders may have preferred an equity orientation because they were socialized to value achievement, performance and contributions to team accomplishment (Loden, 1985).
4.7.2.2. **Strategy:**

According to Instone et al (1983, p. 325), a leader who is high in considerate behaviour would be expected to use positive influence strategies like praise and rewards rather than negative strategies like criticism and threats, which means that female managers use more positive strategies than male managers.

4.7.2.3. **Level of Confidence:**

Females reported levels of self confidence commensurate with their experience whereas males reported that they felt capable of being effective supervisors regardless of their previous experience at it.

...women managers in Taiwan seem to have grown sufficiently in self-confidence to have discarded the traditional stereotypes, and to have managed according to the dictates of their own sensibility (Tang, 1992, p. 104).

Women with high self confidence differed less from men in their use of influence strategies than women with low self confidence. These suggest that sex differences in influence strategies may disappear as women gain experience in managerial positions (Powell, 1988, p.157), which is supported by Tang (1992) in his study on women managers in Taiwan.

4.7.2.4. **Accessibility:**

Female managers are twice as accessible to others as their male counterparts. Women managers experienced greater difficulty in saying "No" to others, possibly
stemming out of fear of being seen as rejecting the person making the request. Managers can contribute to their subordinates' satisfaction and growth by being truly accessible and gaining support from them, but the need to say "No" to subordinates' requests for time when appropriate, and the importance of one's own time, are also important considerations (Josefowitz, 1980, p.59).

4.7.2.5. Managerial Motivation and Commitment:
Women managers exhibit a more mature and higher achieving motivational profile than the male managers (Chusmir, 1985, p.157). This supports the notion that women managers possess traits superior to those of their male counterparts (see Davidson & Cooper, 1987), because they have to overcome stereotypical attitudes about their unsuitability for management. Women who have successfully gained managerial positions may have been motivated and had more self-actualization than male managers. However, this number may only be grouped under the exceptional category in reality.

The power motivation of managers is more beneficial, however, when it consists of the need for socialized power rather than personalized power (McClelland, 1961, 1976). From the psychological point of view, the goal of power motivation is to feel powerful, and that influencing others is only one of ways of feeling powerful (McClelland, 1976, p.17). Women with a high
need for socialized power may have once looked elsewhere such as to teaching careers to fulfil that need, but now look to managerial opportunities which are more open to them (Powell, 1988, p.163).

4.7.2.6. FAMILY AND COMMITMENT:

Family characteristics such as being married and having children could contribute to a sex difference in managerial commitment. Sex role conflict can be caused by pressures from others as well as an overload from family responsibilities. Married working women with non-traditional attitudes toward sex roles, however, are more committed to their jobs than those with traditional attitudes (Powell, 1988).

4.7.2.7. MANAGERIAL STRESS:

Stress is a negative by-product of both commitment and motivation although women and men are affected by common stresses such as work overload, not having the necessary training, having to meet high performance standards and insufficient time to finish their work. Women have to deal with unique set of stresses that men encounter less often. These include discrimination, gender stereotyping, social isolation and the conflicting demands of family and work life. These conflicting demands are probably absent in single women managers with no children (Powell, 1988, p. 161).
Women take fewer decision making risks and they are more participative than males in decision making (Chusmir & Durand, 1988). Women managers face stresses like gender discrimination in promotions, which subject them to higher levels of work-related stress, according to Cooper & Davidson (1982).

According to Powell (1988), female managers appear to be faced with greater stresses, but they cope with stresses better than male managers. Male and female managers in the main provoke similar responses in subordinates (Powell, 1988, p.164). Perhaps male subordinates may resent women managers in the initial stages of working but as time goes by and as more and more women step in, this will probably disappear.

4.7.3. LEADERSHIP IN TRANSITION:

Unlike the traditional masculine style favoured by men, feminine leadership style is a style of managing that utilizes the full range of women's natural talents and abilities as never before. It is an approach to leading that is linked to gender differences, early socialization, and the unique set of life experiences from childhood, which shape women's values, interests, and behaviour as adults (Loden, 1985, p. 64). Feminine leaders see the world and the organization together and as a result, respond to situations on both the thinking and the feeling levels.
By viewing feminine leadership as an effective complement to the traditional style of management favoured more by men, one begins to see also how women's different style and perspectives can enhance managerial effectiveness and help organizations and the nation to grow.

It is also true that there are individual women who are more comfortable with a predominantly masculine style of leadership, just as there are individual men who find a feminine approach more natural. But the key distinction is that as a class, women exhibit these particular leadership attributes to a far greater degree than do men (Loden, 1985, p.62).

The fact that feminine leadership is a generalization, and may not apply to each individual, in no way makes it less valid, relevant, or meaningful. Just as gender differences persist in virtually every other aspect of life, it seems very likely that a distinctive feminine management style will also persist which may include a fair proportion of masculine characteristics.

That some women are successful suggests that a non-traditional leadership style may be well suited to the conditions of some work environments and can increase an organization's chances of surviving in an uncertain world. It supports that there is strength in a diversity of leadership styles (Rosener, 1990, p.56).
However, the other possible explanations could apply. The conventional sex role stereotypes (e.g., Tyler, 1965) have attributed to women qualities that are not generally subsumed with those associated with effective management (Schien, 1975, p.342). There is also evidence that sex role stereotypes influence perceptions of managerial style, so that the same behaviour is perceived differently if it is thought to come from a female instead of a male supervisor (Batrol & Butterfield, 1976; Jago & Vroom, 1982; Garland & Price, 1977). Perhaps, this may not be relevant to current period in which women are coming in large numbers to take up managerial positions as their careers. Women's management style is to act like an umbrella, protecting the staff from above (Jensen, 1987).

Marshall (1984, p.160), while commenting about the female management style, says:

Their approach to management was based on principles of co-operation rather than competition;...... They believed in honesty, authenticity and co-operation, and consistently rejected superficiality, putting on false appearances and aggressiveness.

4.7.4. ATTITUDES OF WOMEN:

A high proportion of women believe that they have certain deficiencies that limit their capabilities as a manager (Crew, 1985, p.57). Many women have internalized negative evaluations and stereotypes to
the point where they limit themselves, and do not seek future opportunities for fear they will not succeed (Ilgen & Youtz, 1986, p. 328)

Younger women managers today are generally much more confident and likely to see themselves as managers, expect to be geographically and occupationally mobile and expect to advance in their career, (Fogarty, Allen and Walter, 1981). If the position of women in management is to change, a lot will depend on women. They must begin to reorient their thinking and career aspirations towards obtaining necessary line management experience, (Still, 1985).

In addition to stress and sex stereotyping, women face the following problems and pressures; they must cope with the problem of being a "token woman", they lack role models; and they encounter prejudice and overt or indirect discrimination from fellow employees, and the organisation structure, (Hennig and Jardim, 1977, Larwood and Wood, 1979). Schein (1978) found that sex role stereotyping caused women to seek careers in female dominated occupations where they were placed in staff positions with limited advancement potential.

The attitudes of women themselves should become more positive as they see more examples of women being successful in management (Vilkinas, 1991). She has also done a force field analysis of the driving forces and
the restraining forces that are affecting women in taking up a managerial career (given in Appendix B).

In the revision of Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership, Bass (1981, p.491) has summarized the views toward leader-sex when he stated that "the issue of women as leaders now looms large in research and policy consideration".

4.8. ENTREPRENEURIAL LEADERSHIP:

The entrepreneur's leadership ability, philosophy, and style are important to the entrepreneurial process, the resulting organization, and the performance of the organization. As chief decision maker and the person with the control, responsibility, and authority, the entrepreneur makes choices about goals, people, and methods and communicates verbally and nonverbally about the firm, its mission, and his or her position in it. He or she is, by definition, a most powerful leader (Bird, 1989, p.156).

4.8.1. MANAGEMENT STYLE OF WOMEN IN SMALL BUSINESS:

Chaganti(1986, p.27) talks about two contrasting models of strategic management in women owned enterprises namely (i) the feminine mode and (ii) entrepreneurial mode. According to her, the feminine mode suggests that women behave differently as entrepreneurs (small business owners) and as managers (managers working in organisations). The entrepreneurial mode is derived by
Chaganti (1986) from the assumption that female and male leaders are similar. It is also suggested that female entrepreneurs tend to manage their ventures in much the same way that successful managers do (Chaganti, 1986). Strategic elements of female owned enterprises are said to reflect the feminine characteristics of the owners. Still they were successful.

According to Cohen (1989), women know how best to manage any kind of change- with their instinct and ability to hold the changing family structure together and their age-old talent for smoothing over, accommodating and adapting. It is women who can best teach how to break bad habits, a prerequisite of managing change without breaking the backs of the people.

If any woman has found the way of achieving success without giving up the rewards of the family, it probably shows that she has got a different management style from that of her male counterparts. Cohen also quoted Ms. Black's (Publisher of USA Today) list of the qualities the best woman boss should possess: self-confidence, ability to share glory, caring personality, decisive nature, commitment to colleagues and projects, and the courage to surround themselves with people more skilled than they are.

From what has been discussed above, most of the researchers have found out that the female management
style is more of relationship-oriented than task-oriented. Goffee and Scase (1989) have observed that productivity is achieved through the motivating of people. That being the case, there is no doubt that women should be good managers in business too.

Most of the business problems mainly deal with people either in production or marketing or consumer service, etc. A successful manager is expected to have a listening capacity to resolve conflict and to get people to work together. To summarize, women should be able to manage successfully provided they are able to balance the multiple roles they might have to play both for society as well as the business. According to Hay (1980, p.31)

*To succeed in management, then........ a woman has to be all things to all people. Assuming........she has the support of her husband and/or another influential person, she is cautioned to be realistic in her expectations ...... to act like a man, but stay feminine. In short, she must temper her aspirations with an understanding of the situation as it is, in order to achieve a successful career in management.*

4.9. DEVELOPMENT OF HYPOTHESES:

In Chapter 3 and in this chapter, an attempt has been made to consider all major items (factual and judgemental) covered by researchers in this field and related fields. Personality characteristics like achievement motivation, locus of control (internal and external), demographic characteristics like age, education, sibling position, etc. were discussed in
Chapter 3. In this chapter, a detailed analysis of achievement motivation and the factors that act against the motive was given. Also, the management styles of women in general and women business owners are dealt with. From what has been said before, the relevant research hypotheses are being developed below.

In this study, success of the business of the women entrepreneurs was not measured in terms of sales turnover, number of years in business, net profit, etc. as many businesses were in their infancy. Further, all these measurements have their own limitations. Hence, it was decided to use 'self-rating' as a measure of success. Therefore, it will be noted as perceived success and not success of the business.

As seen in Chapter 2, the performance of the small business can be found in the factors which have a bearing on the woman entrepreneur's personal capability to function effectively and efficiently under the highly stressful circumstances. This does not rule out the other possible factors which have an impact on the performance of the business. Hence the first primary proposition is:

**Primary Proposition 1**

The perceived success of the performance of the small business will be affected by the personal and the personality characteristics of the woman entrepreneur/owner-manager.
The main personality characteristics covered in this study are achievement motivation, locus of control and its sub-components, masculine, feminine, androgynous characteristics, education of the woman entrepreneur and factors such as managerial behaviour.

The number of possible combinations and the inter-relations is huge in a study with so many plausible variables. However, a selective approach has been adopted thereby minimising the number of inter-relations to be studied, to keep the research within meaningful bounds.

Many studies have established that entrepreneurs (both males and females) are high in achievement motivation (McClelland, 1961; Williams, 1975; London, 1983; Bailey, 1982; Brockhaus, 1972; Hornaday & Aboud, 1971, etc.). Very few studies have been done in relating achievement motivation to success of the business (e.g., Williams, 1975; Perry et al, 1986; Nelson & Sharp, 1989). It may be held that achievement motivation may perhaps be an essential contributor to the choice of the small business as well as the successful running of the business. In this study, it may be hypothesized that achievement motivation and its related factors like risk-taking and fear of success of the woman entrepreneur do affect the level of success of the small business as given below.
Null Hypothesis $H_0$ # 1

There is zero correlation between the perceived success of the business and the level of achievement motivation of the women entrepreneurs.

Alternative Hypothesis $H_1$ # 1

There is a significant positive correlation between the perceived success of the business and the level of achievement motivation of the women entrepreneurs.

Achievement motivation and fear of success is negatively correlated according to Horner (1968; Pappo, 1972; Peplau, 1972; Tresemer, 1977; Paludi, 1979) and according to some of these researchers fear of success is more prevalent in women than in men. Hence a hypothesis relating fear of success to achievement motivation is adopted to see whether there is any correlation between them.

Null Hypothesis $H_0$ # 2

There is zero correlation between the level of achievement of the women entrepreneurs and their fear of success.

Alternative Hypothesis $H_1$ # 2

There is a significant negative correlation between the level of achievement of the women entrepreneurs and their fear of success.

Middle class families tend to stimulate the development of personalities consistent with empowering a high need for achievement. Researchers have found that many of the women entrepreneurs come from middle class families (Hisrich & Brush, 1985). Hypothesis 4 is developed to test the above finding in this sample.
Null Hypothesis $H_0$ # 3

There is zero correlation between the level of achievement motivation of the women entrepreneurs and the socio-economic status of their parents.

Alternative Hypothesis $H_1$ # 3

There is a significant positive correlation between the level of achievement motivation of the women entrepreneurs and the socio-economic status of their parents.

As discussed earlier in this chapter, early socialization aids in forming achievement motivation of the women especially when these women are in a non-traditional occupation and hence hypotheses can be developed linking achievement motivation of the women entrepreneurs and their parents discipline (in bringing up children).

Null Hypothesis $H_0$ # 4

There is zero correlation between the level of achievement motivation of women entrepreneurs and their parents' upbringing of children.

Alternative Hypothesis $H_1$ # 4

There is a significant positive correlation between the level of achievement motivation of women entrepreneurs and their parents' upbringing of children.

Education brings in more awareness and it involves cost as well. The fact that they have done higher studies itself shows that they might be achievement oriented. Hence, it will be of use to link education and achievement motivation in the form of hypothesis and test the same.
Null Hypothesis $H_0 \ # 5$

There is zero correlation between the level of formal education of the women entrepreneurs and their level of achievement motivation.

Alternative Hypothesis $H_1 \ # 5$

There is a significant positive correlation between the level of formal education of the women entrepreneurs and their level of achievement motivation.

As discussed earlier there is a limited amount of research into locus of control and small business proprietorship. The most commonly researched area in business is the concept of internal-external locus of control. However, psychologists also identify powerful others locus of control and chance locus of control. As examined earlier in Chapter three, it is to be expected that persons with a high probability of success are those who believe they can personally affect the performance of their business (internal locus of control), and who believe powerful others can strongly influence their business and cultivate appropriate contacts. In contrast, those who believe that chance strongly influences their success have less incentive to apply a high level of commitment to all matters associated with the running of the business. Waddell (1983) has found that women who take up self employment are highly internal. To find out the relationship between internal, powerful others locus of control and chance locus of control and success of the business, three hypotheses have been developed as below.
Null Hypothesis $H_0 \ # 6$

There is zero correlation between the perceived success of the business and the internal locus of control of the women entrepreneurs.

Alternative Hypothesis $H_1 \ # 6$

There is a significant positive correlation between the perceived success of the business and the internal locus of control of the women entrepreneurs.

Null Hypothesis $H_0 \ # 7$

There is zero correlation between the perceived success of the business and the powerful others locus of control of the women entrepreneurs.

Alternative Hypothesis $H_1 \ # 7$

There is a significant positive correlation between the perceived success of the business and the powerful others locus of control of the women entrepreneurs.

Null Hypothesis $H_0 \ # 8$

There is zero correlation between perceived success of the business and the chance locus of control of the women entrepreneurs.

Alternative Hypothesis $H_1 \ # 8$

There is a significant negative correlation between perceived success of the business and the chance locus of control of the women entrepreneurs.

The level and relevance of the education of the women entrepreneurs may act as an influencing factor in the success of the business and hence a hypothesis to examine the relationship between the education and success is developed.

Null Hypothesis $H_0 \ # 9$

There is zero correlation between the perceived success of the business and the level of the education of the women entrepreneurs.
Alternative Hypothesis H₁ # 9

There is a significant positive correlation between the perceived success of the business and the level of the education of the women entrepreneurs.

Managerial and industry specific work experience of the entrepreneurs should be an aid to success of the business as they would be aware of the techniques of the trade and hence it may be hypothesized as below.

Null Hypothesis H₀ # 10

There is zero correlation between pre-decision work experience* of the women entrepreneurs and the perceived success of their business.

Alternative Hypothesis H₁ # 10

There is a significant positive correlation between pre-decision work experience* of the women entrepreneurs and the perceived success of the business

* Pre-decision work experience here includes any type of work experience the woman entrepreneur had irrespective of the relevancy to the present business.

A lot has been said about the managerial behaviour of the women and the performance of organizations though not about small business specifically. It would be interesting to see whether the managerial style of the women small business owners as exhibited in their day-to-day functioning has an impact on the perceived success of their businesses. Managerial attitude is measured by questions on people-orientation and task-orientation type of behaviour.
Null Hypothesis $H_0$ # 11
There is zero correlation between the managerial attitude of the women entrepreneurs and the perceived success of the business.

Alternative Hypothesis $H_1$ # 11
There is a significant positive correlation between the managerial attitude of the women entrepreneurs and the perceived success of the business.

The recent concept about who is a successful manager emphasizes androgynous qualities as mentioned earlier in this chapter. Hence, it may be postulated that women small business owner-managers are more likely to be successful if they adopt an androgynous management style.

Null Hypothesis $H_0$ # 12
There is zero correlation between the androgynous scores of women entrepreneurs (measured on Bem's Sex Role Inventory) and the perceived success of their business.

Alternative Hypothesis $H_1$ # 12
There is a significant positive correlation between the androgynous scores of women entrepreneurs (measured on Bem's Sex Role Inventory) and the perceived success of their business.

Researchers have done a lot of work on sex role stereotypes and the requisite management characteristics (e.g., Schien, 1973, 1975). Still, it remains a debatable one as to whether women are successful managers. There is also evidence from research that women managers are androgynous (Wood & Greenfield, 1976). In the earlier hypothesis efforts have been taken to test the relationship between androgyny level
of the women entrepreneurs and the perceived success of their business. The following two hypotheses have been developed to find out which of the two masculine or feminine characteristics help women more to succeed in their business.

**Null Hypothesis** $H_0$ # 13(a)

There is zero correlation between the feminine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs and the perceived success of their businesses.

**Alternative Hypothesis** $H_1$ # 13(a)

There is zero correlation between the feminine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs and the perceived success of their businesses.

**Null Hypothesis** $H_0$ # 13(b)

There is zero correlation between the masculine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs and the perceived success of their businesses.

**Alternative Hypothesis** $H_1$ # 13(b)

There is zero correlation between the masculine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs and the perceived success of their businesses.

As the name of the motive goes, fear of success or motive to avoid success may be a hindrance to the success of the business too because of social rejections. Smith (1981) has quoted Rosemarie Patty's theorizing that women who do not fear success "will excel in situations which are difficult, important, and/or reflectiions of their individual abiility, i.e., those which are personally significant". It would be apt to test this relationship in women entrepreneurs.
Null Hypothesis $H_0$ # 14

There is zero correlation between the level of fear of success of women entrepreneurs and the perceived success of their business.

Alternative Hypothesis $H_1$ # 14

There is a significant negative correlation between the level of fear of success of women entrepreneurs and the perceived success of their business.

Inter-relations between the variables

Achievement motivation and locus of control go hand in hand in most of the entrepreneurs and it is appropriate to see whether it holds good in this sample of women entrepreneurs also.

Lot of studies have been done to research on locus of control and achievement motivation especially in the small business sector where the qualities of the owner-manager play a very vital role. Not many studies have taken the components of locus of control as separate variables. However, the past research on entrepreneurs shows that there is a positive correlation between achievement motivation and the locus of control (Waddell, 1983, Nelson & Sharp, 1989 and Perry et al, 1986). It would be an addition to the existing data base if these findings are tested on the sample women entrepreneurs with internal, powerful others and chance locus of control as three separate independent variables. The following hypotheses 15, 16 and 17 are developed for this purpose.
Null Hypothesis $H_0$ # 15

There is zero correlation between the level of achievement motivation and the internal locus of control of the women entrepreneurs.

Alternative Hypothesis $H_1$ # 15

There is a significant positive correlation between the level of achievement motivation and the internal locus of control of the women entrepreneurs.

Null Hypothesis $H_0$ # 16

There is zero correlation between the level of achievement motivation and the powerful others locus of control of the women entrepreneurs.

Alternative Hypothesis $H_1$ # 16

There is a significant positive correlation between the level of achievement motivation and the powerful others locus of control of the women entrepreneurs.

Null Hypothesis $H_0$ # 17

There is zero correlation between the level of achievement motivation and the chance locus of control of the women entrepreneurs.

Alternative Hypothesis $H_1$ # 17

There is zero correlation between the level of achievement motivation and the chance locus of control of the women entrepreneurs.

Though a lot has been said about achievement motivation, mostly it relates to males (i.e., masculine qualities) and hence it will be interesting to find what kind of correlations exist between achievement motivation and the masculine, feminine, and social desirability characteristics.
Null Hypothesis $H_0$ # 18

There is zero correlation between the level of achievement motivation of the women entrepreneurs and their score on masculine characteristics (measured using Bem's Sex Role Inventory).

Alternative Hypothesis $H_1$ # 18

There is a significant positive correlation between the level of achievement motivation of the women entrepreneurs and their score on masculine characteristics (measured using Bem's Sex Role Inventory).

Null Hypothesis $H_0$ # 19

There is zero correlation between the level of achievement motivation of the women entrepreneurs and their score on feminine characteristics (measured using Bem's Sex Role Inventory).

Alternative Hypothesis $H_1$ # 19

There is a significant negative correlation between the level of achievement motivation of the women entrepreneurs and their score on feminine characteristics (measured using Bem's Sex Role Inventory).

Often, highly achievement motivated women enter into non-traditional occupations. This is sometimes considered as unfeminine and socially not acceptable. Hence, it is of interest to find out whether there is any relationship between achievement motivation and the social desirability scores of women entrepreneurs as measured by Bem's Sex Role Inventory.

Null Hypothesis $H_0$ # 20

There is zero correlation between the level of achievement motivation of the women entrepreneurs and their score on social desirability (measured using Bem's Sex Role Inventory).
Alternative Hypothesis $H_1$ # 20

There is a significant negative correlation between the level of achievement motivation of the women entrepreneurs and their score on social desirability (measured using Bem's Sex Role Inventory).

An androgynous manager is one who exhibits both feminine and masculine characteristics and a good manager is an androgynous person (Powell, 1988). The world is becoming more and more competitive in the field of education and more educated people enter into managerial positions (both in small and large businesses). Education is a means in the society for breaking down the stereotypes of behaviour. Hence, it will be interesting to test whether women entrepreneurs with more education would adopt the androgynous style.

Null Hypothesis $H_0$ # 21

There is zero correlation between the level of education of women entrepreneurs and their scores on androgynous characteristics (measured using Bem's Sex Role Inventory).

Alternative Hypothesis $H_1$ # 21

There is a significant positive correlation between the level of education of women entrepreneurs and their scores on androgynous characteristics (measured using Bem's Sex Role Inventory).

No research evidence in research apart from Bem's (1974) research (on a sample of university students) was found testing the relationship between masculine characteristics, feminine characteristics and social desirability of any individual. It is a common belief that women in general are more nurturing, caring, etc., (when compared to men) which is socially acceptable and
desirable. When these women possess masculine characteristics which probably make them to be aggressive, authoritative, etc., they are no longer socially desirable. Hence, the relationship between the masculine characteristics and the social desirability characteristics can be tested by the following hypotheses among the sample of women entrepreneurs.

**Null Hypothesis** $H_0 \ # \ 22$

There is zero correlation between masculine characteristics and the social desirability scores of the women entrepreneurs.

**Alternative Hypothesis** $H_1 \ # \ 22$

There is a significant negative correlation between masculine characteristics and the social desirability of the women entrepreneurs.

**Null Hypothesis** $H_0 \ # \ 23$

There is zero correlation between feminine characteristics and the social desirability of the women entrepreneurs.

**Alternative Hypothesis** $H_1 \ # \ 23$

There is a significant positive correlation between feminine characteristics and the social desirability of the women entrepreneurs.

There is a common belief that men are more highly internal and women are more chance oriented (Rotter, 1966). This research concentrates on women only and hence, it will be interesting to find out whether there is any positive/negative relationship between the masculine/feminine characteristics of the subject women entrepreneurs and the internal locus of control. Hypotheses 24 and 25 are developed to test this.
Rotter (1966) has said that women are more chance oriented than men and this study does not have an opportunity for comparisons with men. Hence, it will be of use for further research to find out whether there is any relationship between chance locus of control and the feminine characteristics of the subjects. Hypothesis 26 has been developed to verify this.

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 24**

There is zero correlation between the internal locus of control and the masculine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs.

**Alternative Hypothesis H₁ # 24**

There is a significant positive correlation between the internal locus of control and the masculine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs.

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 25**

There is zero correlation between feminine characteristics and the internal locus of control of the women entrepreneurs.

**Alternative Hypothesis H₁ # 25**

There is a significant negative correlation between feminine characteristics and the internal locus of control of the women entrepreneurs.

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 26**

There is zero correlation between feminine characteristics and the chance locus of control in women entrepreneurs.

**Alternative Hypothesis H₁ # 26**

There is a significant positive correlation between feminine characteristics and the chance locus of control in women entrepreneurs.

Among the three scales of measures in locus of control, internal locus of control is present in achievers,
chance and powerful others are present in the rest according to theorists like Nelson & Sharp (1989). It is a generalised statement and it could be tested in this sample by the following hypotheses.

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 27**

There is zero correlation between powerful others control and chance locus of control in women entrepreneurs.

**Alternative Hypothesis H₁ # 27**

There is a significant positive correlation between powerful others control and chance locus of control in women entrepreneurs.

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 28**

There is zero correlation between internal locus of control and chance locus of control in women entrepreneurs.

**Alternative Hypothesis H₁ # 28**

There is a significant negative correlation between internal locus of control and chance locus of control in women entrepreneurs.

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 29**

There is zero correlation between powerful others control and internal locus of control in women entrepreneurs.

**Alternative Hypothesis H₁ # 29**

There is a significant negative correlation between powerful others control and internal locus of control in women entrepreneurs.

It is found that internal locus of control is positively related to achievement motivation according to researchers [Nelson & Sharp (1989) and Perry et al. (1986)]. According to Horner (1968, 1970, 1972), fear of success is more prevalent in women who are so
conscious of the society' attitudes towards them. Highly internal persons attribute their success or failure to 'self' and therefore they may have less fear of success (Gumpert et al., 1978) when compared with women who are less internal. Women who fear success may not be willing to take any risk which will affect their image in the society. The following hypotheses is generated to test these.

**Null Hypothesis** $H_0$ # 30

There is zero correlation between the fear of success of the women entrepreneurs and their internal locus of control and

**Alternative Hypothesis** $H_1$ # 30

There is a significant negative correlation between the fear of success of the women entrepreneurs and their internal locus of control.

**Null Hypothesis** $H_0$ # 31

There is zero correlation between the fear of success of the women entrepreneurs and their score on Wiliam's scale on risk-taking.

**Alternative Hypothesis** $H_1$ # 31

There is a significant negative correlation between the fear of success of the women entrepreneurs and their score on Wiliam's scale on risk-taking.

It was also noted in the earlier parts of this chapter that women have high fear of success when they are in competition with men. However, as this study tries to find out the relationship between the personality characteristics (masculine, feminine and androgynous), the following hypotheses 32 and 33 will aim to find the relationship between fear of success and the
masculine/feminine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs.

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 32**

There is zero correlation between the feminine characteristics and the fear of success of the women entrepreneurs.

**Alternative Hypothesis H₁ # 32**

There is a significant positive correlation between the feminine characteristics and the fear of success of the women entrepreneurs.

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 33**

There is zero correlation between fear of success of women entrepreneurs and their masculine characteristics (measured using Bem's Sex Role Inventory).

**Alternative Hypothesis H₁ # 33**

There is significant negative correlation between fear of success of women entrepreneurs and their masculine characteristics (measured using Bem's Sex Role Inventory).

It is a common belief that women i.e. entrepreneurs in particular, have to exhibit both masculine as well as feminine characteristics depending on the managerial position and situation they are in. Horner (1968) has observed that women have more fear of success when compared to men. That being the case, when women adopt an androgynous style (both masculine and feminine characteristics), it will be interesting to find whether there is any relationship between fear of success of the sample women entrepreneurs and their androgyny level.
**Null Hypothesis** $H_0$ # 34

There is zero correlation between fear of success and the androgynous characteristics of the women entrepreneurs.

**Alternative Hypothesis** $H_1$ # 34

There is a significant negative correlation between fear of success and the androgynous characteristics of the women entrepreneurs.

A common belief about women entrepreneurs/owners-managers is that they would start the business small and stay small. Is it because of their personal or personality factors or due to the environmental factors or a combination of both? Hence, another primary proposition was evolved between the women entrepreneurs' desire to grow and their personal and personality factors as mentioned earlier.

**Primary Proposition 2**

The personal and personality characteristics of the women entrepreneurs contribute significantly to the explanation of the desire to grow in business.

This primary proposition can be tested by multiple regression with the desire to grow as the dependent variable and the personal and personality characteristics (Appendix D) as the independent variables.

**4.10. CONCLUSION**

In this chapter, the research variables to be studied in this study were dealt with in detail. The major
variables to be studied are Achievement Motivation, Fear of Success, Locus of Control, Managerial behaviour, Androgyny, Masculine characteristics and Feminine characteristics. The relevant primary propositions and hypotheses were also developed. In the next chapter, the research methodology will be presented.
CHAPTER 5

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
5.1. INTRODUCTION:
This chapter gives a brief description of the questionnaire (survey instrument) used in this research and the methodology adopted for data collection. While elaborating on the research methodology, efforts have also been taken to outline the difficulties in sample selection, collecting the data and the limitations of the research.

5.2. AIMS OF THIS RESEARCH:
This research aims to explore why individuals choose to become small businesswomen, the factors which influence the level of success and the question of attitudes to growth. In attempting to do so, this study investigates the antecedents and the relationship between antecedents and succeeding in the business. Two primary propositions are evolved with perceived success of the business and the desire to grow as the main dependent variables and the independent variables are those factors which are thought to be influential in bringing this act about. Some of the independent variables are achievement motivation, locus of control, managerial behaviour and fear of success. These factors can be grouped as 'pull' and 'push' factors. **Pull** factors are the ones which attract the women towards the entrepreneurship such as the achievement motivation and the **push** factors are the ones which are pushing the
women away from being successful in business such as the fear of success.

Rosenthal and Rosnow (1975, p. 41) suggested that

(a) workable scheme for classifying independent variables is a biological drive, an aspect of the social environment, a hereditary factor, something having to do with previous training or experience or the element of maturity.

In this study the first two factors may not be directly relevant but the last three seem to be more appropriate. The relationship between the independent variables are also examined.

5.3. ABOUT THIS RESEARCH:
The previous studies on female entrepreneurship were conducted on the demographic characteristics, the problems faced by the women entrepreneurs at the start-up, and why the women started the business. This study, however, is different in that it includes various concepts like the management style of the women entrepreneurs, their personality traits as to whether they are feminine, masculine or androgynous, their achievement motivation, locus of control and fear of success, as well as the traditional aspects.

5.3.1. THE SAMPLE:
Respondents for this study were chosen randomly without adhering to any standard sampling techniques. The lists of entrepreneurs were collected from various sources like the Australian Institute of Management (Local
Chapter) and the women entrepreneurs themselves. All other organisations like Department of Consumer and Business affairs and The Chamber of Manufacturers were concerned about confidentiality and their policy is not to release the names of their clients/members to anyone. This proved a great problem for the researcher. As the time available was limited, the researcher could not pursue it further. Though the sample size of twenty nine women entrepreneurs may seem to be small, in view of the face-to-face interviews which consumed a lot of time, it is a reasonable sample size.

5.3.2. ABOUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE:
The questionnaire consists of 48 main questions. Some of these questions have been included based on the literary research done by the researcher and questions used by previous researchers. A complete list of questions is annexed in Appendix E.

The questionnaire was designed to identify the factors which motivate the women entrepreneurs to take up business, to get them to nominate their perception of their level of success, to find out the level of their achievement motivation, their motives to avoid success, their locus of control, their managerial behaviour, and their personality characteristics as to whether they possess more of feminine or masculine or androgynous qualities. Questions on demographic characteristics of the women entrepreneurs were also included.
Question 1 was to find out the age of the business and question 2 to find out the type of the business, whether manufacturing or service oriented. Questions 3 and 4 were included to find out about the type of ownership and the number of employees (both full-time and part-time).

The role success motivation or the factors that motivated the women to take up their own business was found out using Question 5 and 5(a) and question 6 was used to identify the difficulties the respondents had to overcome when they started the business.

The level of educational attainment and the nature of their education was found out using questions 7 to 10 and the school in which they studied was found using question 11.

The age of the women respondents when they first became businesswomen and the age at which they started this business were found out using question 12. Questions 13 and 14 were designed to ascertain their marital status and the occupations of their parents and their spouses (if appropriate). There is a research finding that most of the fathers of women entrepreneurs are either self-employed or professionals. To test this, question 15 was used to identify the involvement of the respondents' fathers and their contribution to small business.
Some of the researchers have found that most of the women entrepreneurs come from middle-class families (see e.g. Hisrich, 1985). It was also believed that parents' discipline does carry importance in shaping one's motivation level. To verify these findings, questions 16 and 17 were included in the questionnaire.

To identify whether the women entrepreneurs had their father or their mother as their role model, Question 18 was included. There is a finding in most of the studies on entrepreneurship that the entrepreneurs are the first born child in the family (Hisrich & Brush, 1986). Question 18(a) was to find out the sibling position of the women entrepreneurs.

Experiences of the women entrepreneurs prior to starting this business is yet another crucial factor in choosing business as a career (Cromie, 1986; Watkins & Watkins, 1984) and in affecting their level of success in the business. Questions 19 to 21 were used to obtain the number of years of work/managerial/ownership experience, whether they were related to the present business and the nature of management experience.

Questions 21 and 22 were designed to find out the significance of the roles played by the women owner-managers in their previous business or businesses, if they had any, before commencing this business. Reasons for withdrawing from the previous business were also
questioned. Questions 23 and 24 were used to elucidate information about the work-home conflicts, if there were any.

The questions on achievement motivation (Questions 26.1 to 26.18) were taken from William's (1975) research done in Western Australia. Though this study resembles his research, the samples were not exactly the same in the sense that this study was done on women entrepreneurs only. These questions were taken mainly to have a means of comparison in Australia.

There is a saying that women start the business small and stay small and questions 41, 42, and 43 were used to understand the reason as to why the women may want or not want to go in for expansion. The managerial behaviour of the women entrepreneurs were found out using questions 27 to 40. Bem's Androgyny Scale (1974) was also used to find out whether the women entrepreneurs are androgynous.

When it was decided to study the level of achievement motivation, the need to concurrently study the effect of fear of success was felt because of its potential to counter the achievement drive. Hence, selected important questions used by Cohen (1976) for finding out the fear of success amongst college students were incorporated in the questionnaire (Question 45). Ideally the whole questionnaire would have been used.
but constraints on the possible length of the overall questionnaire required use of a sub-sample.

Question 47 was applied in finding out how successful the businesses were. It should be noted that the variable is a self-rating of their perception of the level of success. An alternative would have been to focus on verifiable measures of success such as:

* sales levels
* return on investment
* surplus available to the owner after allowing for the cost of capital involved (residual income)
* return per hour to the proprietrix, etc.

However, all these measures have limitations. Sales levels may be more related to growth goals than in achieving the proprietor's objectives. There are measurement issues in relation to the other three measures. Also, there is the possible problem that proprietors would be unwilling or unable to provide the necessary data. Thus in terms of the fact that the achievement of goals is a personal matter both in terms of the objectives and the aspiration levels, and the practical problems associated with the alternatives, a self-rating scale was used. This is not to suggest that the problems of bias that may affect self ratings have not been thought of. When looking at personality characteristics for example, a strong correlation could either indicate a strong relation between personality and success, or a strong link between the personality variable and aspiration levels.
The question on Locus of control (Question 48) was designed by Levenson (1973) for use in a different type of a study and subsequently it was used by Hogan (1984) in a study on locus of control and managerial performance in U.K.

5.3.3. THE INTERVIEW:
The choice of instruments were between a mail questionnaire and a personal interview. The fear of non-response, the length of the questionnaire and the ability to pursue interesting responses in more depth are the reasons for the selection of a personal interview.

The personal interviews helped the researcher in building rapport with the respondents. In spite of the length of the questionnaire, the respondents did not make any fuss about it. However, two women business owners could not give interviews due to their prior commitments.

The interview was also recognised as a form of social interaction between the academics and the practitioners. However, the problem of bias has not been ruled out completely in the sense probing with leading questions and agreeing with the respondents to maintain a rapport. As Oppenheim (1968) reports the
interviewer may unconsciously transmit his/her feelings to the interviewee and may misinterpret the responses.

5.4. CONCLUSION:
In this chapter, the details of the methodology adopted for this research, the research instrument used and the sample were discussed. In the following chapter, collected data will be analysed using a statistical package, interpreted and presented.
CHAPTER 6

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION
6.1. INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, the discussion focusses on describing and analysing the data from the sample of women entrepreneurs. The results obtained are interpreted and used in summarising the findings of the study.

6.2. GENERAL BUSINESS CHARACTERISTICS

6.2.1. AGE OF THE BUSINESS:

Most of the women entrepreneurs (55.2%) from the sample have businesses aged between 1 and 5 years. The remaining 44.8% of the sample women entrepreneurs have businesses aged from 6 to 14 years.

6.2.2. TYPE OF OWNERSHIP:

The legal status of the businesses owned by the women entrepreneurs are shown below in Table 6.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of ownership</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sole Proprietorship</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership [less than 50% stake]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership [50% and above stake]</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Company [less than 50% stake]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Company [50% and above stake]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust [less than 50% stake]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust [50% and above stake]</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.3. **Type of Business:**

About 31% of the respondents were in retail businesses and the other major contributors were from Professional Service, Food Service/Production, and Communication Services each forming 10% of the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF BUSINESS</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>FREQUENCY %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service and Production</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication, Service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; Construction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Household/ Consulting Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Repair Service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.4. **Employment Potential:**

About 90% of the sample women entrepreneurs have employed two or less than two employees either male or female or both. 58.7% of the women had female employees and 31.3% had male employees. The number of part-time employees
were more than the number of full time employees in both males and females. Only 6.9% of the businesses had more than 10 full time employees.

**TABLE 6.3** NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES

**Table 6.3 (a) Total Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of employees</th>
<th>Number of businesses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 To 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 To 10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.3 (b) Full Time Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of employees</th>
<th>Number of businesses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 To 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 To 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6.3 (c) Total Employment of all Businesses**

Number of Female Employees = 93
   (i) Full Time = 54
   (ii) Part Time = 39

Number of Male Employees = 77
   (i) Full Time = 54
   (ii) Part Time = 23

(employees here do not include the owner-managers)
6.2.5. Motivating Factors:

Respondents were asked to select and rank the factors which influenced them to become a small business owner. Respondents were allowed to nominate multiple factors from the list of 11 provided and were encouraged to add other factors which they thought were important. The following is the list of the motivating factors showing frequency with which they were nominated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTIVATORS</th>
<th>Number of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urge to do something different</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for money</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be your own boss</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration in previous Jobs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunity to be creative</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Independence</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To get job satisfaction</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be at home</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Product or idea</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Influence</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were given a chance to give multiple responses and amongst these motivators, the ranking was done by the respondents according to the order of their importance. An overall score was calculated by giving the
first priority items a mark of 12, the second priority a mark of 11, etc. Non responses were given a score of zero. The top seven items are listed in the table below in descending order of their average score of the respondents.

**Table 6.5. Strong Motivators for Starting Business**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>MOTIVATORS</th>
<th>AVERAGE SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To be your own boss</td>
<td>8.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To get job satisfaction</td>
<td>7.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Economic Independence</td>
<td>6.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>More opportunity to be creative</td>
<td>5.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Frustration in previous jobs</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Need for money</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Urge to do something different</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note: Multiple choices included)

**6.2.6. Problems at the Start-up:**

Most of the women entrepreneurs (17) have faced problems in obtaining the necessary finance when starting the business. It is worth quoting a woman entrepreneur who has run a successful manufacturing industry for the past 14 years:

When I first went to the Bank for obtaining a loan for starting this industry, I and my husband had hardly 600 dollars in hand and we were very sure about the success of (the) product to be manufactured by us. The manager hesitated to give the loan since I was very young and rejected our application for the same reason...... After some years, the same manager regretted his decision of not giving the loan to us since we were running the unit very successfully.
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Thirteen (44.8%) of the women entrepreneurs had a problem of not being able to get from one source all the information needed for starting a business. They also felt that there was hardly any place where they can get the professional advice at an appropriate price. The other two problems faced by them were finding a suitable location (7 respondents) and gaining necessary confidence to start the business (5 respondents). One woman entrepreneur mentioned time allocation as one of the problems at the start up and there was no response from one subject.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaining necessary confidence</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locating the information for business</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding a suitable location</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining necessary finance</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining support from family and friends</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Note that multiple choices are included)

6.2.7. EDUCATION:

When questioned as to the level of the highest qualification obtained, 34.6% of the sample women entrepreneurs had a degree and above, 27.6% of them had reached diploma level, 13.8% had a TAFE Certificate and
24.1% had finished high-schooling. These responses are outlined in Table 6.7. These findings closely match those obtained in earlier studies (Brockhaus, 1982; Hisrich & Brush, 1985; Sexton & Kent, 1981; Watkins & Watkins, 1984; Cromie, 1986; Gosslin & Grise, 1990 and Hub Report, 1991). 48.3% of them had studied business subjects and 41.4% of them had done technical subjects related to their present businesses. Since 44.8%(13) of the women were educated overseas there was insufficient data on the type of Australian school attended to give a meaningful picture.

TABLE 6.7. EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF EDUCATION</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE NUMBER OF RESPONSES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY %</th>
<th>CUMULATIVE FREQUENCY %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Post graduate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.69</td>
<td>20.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>34.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>62.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAFE Certificate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>75.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24.12</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 6.8. BUSINESS EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUSINESS SUBJECTS</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE RESPONSES</th>
<th>FREQUENCY %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studied</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not study</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6.9 Relevant Technical Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Subjects</th>
<th>Absolute Responses</th>
<th>Frequency %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studied</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not study</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.2.8. Age of Entry to Ownership:

51.7% of the subjects had entered into ownership of a business when they were between 20-29 years of age and 37.9% of them between 30-39 years of age. On the whole, 89.6% of the women subjects had started a business when they were in the age group of 20-40 years. 82.6% of the subjects had started this business also in the same age group and the difference is due to some of the women entrepreneurs owning businesses prior to starting this business. This confirms the findings of Shapero, 1971; Susbauer, 1969; Sexton & Kent, 1981; Brockhaus, 1982; Scott, 1986; Gosselin & Grise, 1990; Cromie, 1986; and Watkins and Watkins, 1984. However, the findings do not agree with the results of Hisrich & Fan (1991) who found that majority of their sample women entrepreneurs in China were in the age group of 40-49 years. According to the Hub Survey done in Victoria in 1991 also, the age of entry to ownership for 40% of their sample was between 31-40 years. The majority of the women entrepreneurs studied by Still (1987) were in the age group of 35 to 45, but the age of entry into the business was not given.
### Table 6.10. Age of Entry to Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>Age When First Started Business</th>
<th>Age When Started This Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 - 29</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 60</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.2.9. Marital Status:

In this sample, almost 69% of women entrepreneurs are married and have a stable marriage relationship which does not fully agree with Watkins and Watkins' (1984) and the findings of Cromie (1986), both for U.K. women entrepreneurs. However, the findings agree with that of the Hub Survey, 1991 and Still (1987).

### Table 6.11. Marital Status of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Absolute No. of Respondents</th>
<th>Frequency %</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>13.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single (widow)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>17.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>24.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68.96</td>
<td>93.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De Facto</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>96.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.10. Parent's Occupation:

27.6% of the sample women entrepreneurs had self-employed fathers and 58.6% of the fathers were professionals. This may support Sexton et al's (1981) findings that father's occupation is the principal determinant of the female entrepreneurs' occupational choice. The responses obtained are given below in Table 6.12.

**TABLE 6.12. OCCUPATION OF PARENTS AND SPOUSE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>FATHER</th>
<th>MOTHER</th>
<th>SPOUSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Employed</td>
<td>27.69</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>58.62</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td>48.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Making</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>71.41</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>10.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, not many studies on entrepreneurs have included the women entrepreneurs' mothers occupation as suggested by Osipow (1976).

55.2% of them had the positive influence of their fathers and 44.8% of them had their mothers' as their role models as in Table 6.12 below:

**TABLE 6.13 ROLE MODEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE MODEL</th>
<th>ABSOLUTE NO. OF RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>FREQUENCY %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTHER</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.11. Parent's Financial Position:

58.6% of the women entrepreneurs were from moderately well-off families and nobody from their sample belonged to the wealthy to moderately well-off range. Hence it is assumed that these women were mainly from middle-class families which adhered to the findings of Hisrich and Brush (1985).

6.2.12. Parent's Discipline:

44.8% of the women entrepreneurs had very strict disciplinary conditions imposed by the parents in their early lives and 31.03% of them had a democratic atmosphere during that period. This finding confirms the finding of Watkins and Watkins (1984) in their UK sample of women entrepreneurs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6.14. PARENTS DISCIPLINE IN EARLY LIFE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABSOLUTE NO. OF RESPONDENTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very strict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.13. Sibling Position:

61.9% of this research sample came from a family consisting of 4 to 10 children; 55.2% of the women entrepreneurs were first born children and 24.1% were second born ones. This differs from the findings of
Still's (1987) study in Australia, which says that 33.3% were first born and 44.45% were the middle child. However, the findings confirm the findings of Hennig and Jardim, 1977; Gregg, 1985; Sampsons, 1962; Hisrich and Brush, 1985; Gosselin and Grise, 1990; Schachter, 1963 and Sutton-Smith et al, 1970. It does not agree with the findings of Sexton and Kent (1981).

6.2.14. PRE-DECISION EXPERIENCE:

The details of pre-decision experience of the women entrepreneurs and the relevance to the current business are given below in tables 6.15 and 6.16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6.15 PRE-DECISION EXPERIENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6.16 RELEVANCE OF EXPERIENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2.14.1. Work Experience:
24 of the sample women entrepreneurs had previous work experience out of which 13 of them had the same work experience as their present business (see table 6.16) which agrees with the findings of Sexton and Kent (1981); Cromie (1986); Hisrich and Brush (1985) and Cross (1981). The details of pre-decision experience (work, managerial and ownership experience) are as given above in table 6.15.

6.2.14.2. Managerial Experience:
From table 6.15, it can be observed that 16 of the sample women entrepreneurs had managerial experience prior to starting the present business and 31.03% of them had the experience in the same field as the present business (see table 6.16) which is similar to the findings of Scott (1986).

6.2.14.3. Ownership Experience:
Only 31% of the sample women entrepreneurs had previous ownership experiences and 20.68% had the experience in the same line. For most of them, the current business is the first one.

6.2.14.4. Previous Ownership Experience:
24.13% of the women entrepreneurs had one business earlier in which they played a significant managerial role and only one woman had three businesses in the same
The major reasons for withdrawal from the earlier businesses as cited by the entrepreneurs were:

* Incompatibility with the co-owners (4)
* Lack of sufficient profitability (2)
* Personal problems (1)
* Lucrative sale of the business (1)
* Having appointed a suitable managerial person to take care of the business (2)

6.2.15. Family Problems Due to Business:

37.9% of the women had no problems caused by the business and rest of them had some problem(s). The respondents were asked to give more than one reason (if they have any). The main reasons were given as below:

* Time management - in allocating time for the family (husband and children) and the business (12)
* Too stressful (5), and
* Role conflict between businesswoman and mother/wife (5)

48.28% of the women subjects were not willing to give any response for this question -(Multiple choices were included).

6.2.16. Society's Attitude Towards Women Entrepreneurs:

The open ended question provoked the following responses and most of the women entrepreneurs felt positive about the attitude as seen from Table 6.17. This question was originally included to find out whether the women entrepreneurs had any fear of social rejection or unfeminine feeling leading to fear of success.
TABLE 6.17  SOCIETY'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS WOMEN IN BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REACTION FROM SOCIETY</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>RESPONSES %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gain respect from others</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role models</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive reaction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfeminine or social rejection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem in male dominated field</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not make any difference</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.17. RISK TAKING:
The questions relating to risk taking were adapted from Williams (1975) study and the subjects were scored high for their moderate risk preference and scored low for risk aversion and risk proclivity. The distribution of the scores are given below in comparison with Williams findings in Table 6.20.

TABLE 6.18  RISK-TAKING ATTITUDES OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RISK SCORES⁹</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>THIS RESEARCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Williams suggested, entrepreneurs of both samples are moderate risk takers in situations where the outcome is substantially dependent on their own ability.

⁹ A high score signifies situations involving moderate risks are preferred.
6.2.18. Sex Role Inventory:

In general, masculinity has been associated with an instrumental orientation, a cognitive focus on "getting the job done"; and femininity has been associated with an expressive orientation, an affective concern for the welfare of others. The Androgyny score reflects the relative amounts of masculinity and femininity that the person includes in his or her self-description, and, as such, it best characterizes the nature of the person's total sex role. According to Bem (1973), the masculinity and femininity scores of the Bem Sex Role Inventory are logically independent. Also, the near-zero correlations between the androgyny and social desirability measures suggests that the androgyny score was not measuring a general tendency to respond in a socially desirable direction, provided the socially desirable component measures social desirability in a business environment. Correlation figures of masculinity, femininity, and androgyny from Bem's sample are given below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>BEMS RESEARCH (Students)</th>
<th>THIS RESEARCH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Masculinity with Social Desirability</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femininity with Social Desirability</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgyny with Social desirability</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table. 6.20 Mean Scores of The Androgyny Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Bem's sample</th>
<th>This research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Students)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine items</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine items</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral items</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Androgyny score</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Bem (1973), the lower the androgyny score the more the androgynous the samples are. The sample women are lower in androgyny score and hence they are more androgynous and the masculine score is stronger than the findings of Bem (1973).

6.2.19. SUPPORTIVE BEHAVIOUR

For the question on whether the female entrepreneurs will support subordinates when they have personal problems, the responses created were: 1) always supportive, 2) supportive when necessary, and 3) not at all supportive. 62.07% of them have responded that they would support if the problem is genuine and needs attention (i.e., the respondents have said that they would support when that becomes necessary).

6.2.20. DECISION MAKING

27.5% of the subjects expressed that they do not discuss their business problems with anyone regularly and 44.8% of them had stated that they discuss the problems with their spouses.
6.2.21. Desire to Grow

65.5% of them had the desire to grow and the major reasons for their desire is to be more successful and to earn more money. It is to be noted that this was growth from a small base in most cases.

6.3. Personality Characteristics

6.3.1. Achievement Motivation

The possible range of respondents' scores was between 15 and 75 and the higher the score the higher the level of achievement motivation. The actual scores were in the range of 48 to 70. The mean score was 57.65 and the scores were not spread widely. The standard deviation of the sample was 6.246. According to the previous studies on entrepreneurship, the higher the level of achievement, the more entrepreneurial one probably will be (McClelland, 1961; Brockhaus, 1984; Sexton and Kent, 1981). The fact that the mean score was 57.65, and did not occupy the lower range of the scale indicates that the women entrepreneurs were achievement motivated. A comparison with the findings of Williams' (1975) study follows in table 6.20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>This Research</th>
<th>Williams' Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Score</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Score</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>57.65</td>
<td>51.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>6.246</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table. 6.21. Comparison with Williams' (1975) study
6.3.2. Management Style:
The possible range of scores for people-oriented style of behaviour was from 8 to 50 and the actual scores ranged from 8 to 26. The mean of the sample was 17.827 and standard deviation of the sample was 5.07, which only showed that the subject women entrepreneurs are not very high on the people-orientation management style index.

On the task oriented behaviour scale, where the possible scores were between 2 and 14, the actual scores ranged from 2 to 14 and the mean score was 11.52. That shows that they have high task orientation in their managerial attitude. These findings about managerial behaviour indicate that the sample women entrepreneurs have a combination of both a strong task-orientation as well as moderate people-orientation.

6.3.3. Fear of Success:
The possible range of scores on the questions extracted from the Cohen's instrument was 0 to 18 and the actual scores were from 0 to 14. The mean score was 6.586 and the standard deviation was 3.417 which indicates that the women entrepreneurs do have fear of success but not on the higher side (high and low fear of success scores are separated by the mid-point of the scale although there is no standard for comparison). 65.5% of the women entrepreneurs had moderate fear of success followed by 20.7% with low fear of success and 13.8% with high fear of success.
6.3.4. Locus of Control:

The locus of control instrument as developed by Levenson (1973) was used. This instrument consists of three different components interwoven in the questionnaire. The possible range of scores in internal, powerful others and chance scales were from 8 to 56. The actual scores of the respondents in the internal, powerful others, and chance scales were 30 to 56, 15 to 37, and 13 to 38 respectively, which shows that these women entrepreneurs were high on internal locus of control.

6.4. Primary Propositions and Hypotheses:

Primary Proposition A:

The perceived success of the business will be affected by the personal and personality characteristics of the woman entrepreneur/owner-manager.

Success of the business was not quantitatively measured for this research (partly due to the difficulty in measuring the same as many of the businesses were in their infancy) and the women entrepreneurs were asked to self-rate the success of their businesses and this was taken as the primary dependent variable. As discussed earlier, success of the small business was assumed to depend on the characteristics of the owner-manager. The personal and personality characteristics such as achievement motivation, locus of control (internal, powerful others, and chance), educational level of the owner-manager, pre-decision work experience, managerial
behaviour, feminine, masculine, and androgynous characteristics of the women entrepreneurs and the two factors associated with achievement motivation, namely fear of success and risk taking were taken as independent or predictor variables. A Step-wise multiple regression was run using MICROSTAT statistical package. The computer output of the above mentioned regression is reproduced in Appendix F.

The regression output showed that the success of the business as perceived by the women entrepreneurs was related to the personal and personality characteristics of the women entrepreneurs. The personality factors that contribute most to the perceived success were internal locus of control, powerful others locus of control, preference to take moderate risk and chance locus of control in the order in which they entered the equation. The adjusted R Squared was 0.5324. This indicates that 53.24% of the perceived success of the business was explained by these factors. As Perry et al (1986) and Nelson & Sharp (1989) found, it is the internal locus of control which has contributed most to an explanation of the perceived success and not the achievement motivation of the entrepreneur. This also suggests that achievement motivation may be a factor which influences the decision to set up a business (McClelland, 1961), but it does not contribute to the success of the business to a significant extent.
Alternatively, it may be that high internal locus of control and achievement motivation may be correlated so that previous studies related achievement motivation to performance when it was really a surrogate for the internal locus of control. Fear of success or motive to avoid success may be a barrier for achievement motivation but it does not contribute significantly to explaining the perceived success of the businesses in this study. This finding suggests a change in focus in small business research from achievement motivation to locus of control especially internal locus of control. From the results obtained, a model can be developed as follows.

\[
\text{SUCCS} = 0.1170 + 0.1373(\text{INT}) + 0.1687(\text{POW}) - 0.4148(\text{RISK}) - 0.89(\text{CHANCE})
\]

SUCCS = Perceived success of the business; INT = Internal locus of control; POW = Powerful others locus of control; and RISK = Preference for moderate risk-taking; CHANCE = Chance locus of control.

However, the meaning that can be placed on the coefficients is complicated by the possibility of multicollinearity arising from a correlation between the regressors internal locus of control, the chance locus of control and the powerful locus of control. The equation prior to the entry of the chance locus of control was

\[
\text{Perceived success} = -0.8048 + 0.1549 \text{ INT} + 0.0866 \text{ POW} - 0.4064 \text{ RISK}
\]

Adjusted \( r^2 \) = 0.4891.
Primary hypotheses have been developed from the primary propositions and were tested by using regression techniques. Efforts have also been taken to establish the relationships between important variables.

**Unless mentioned, all the hypotheses mentioned below have been tested at 95% confidence level. Wherever the relationship between two variables are tested using regression, it is assumed that other independent variables do not contribute to any significant change in the dependent variable.**

**Null Hypothesis \( H_0 \) # 1**

There is zero correlation between the perceived success of the business and the level of achievement motivation of the women entrepreneurs.

A regression was run between perceived success of the business and the achievement motivation of the women entrepreneurs, with the former as the dependent variable and the latter as the independent variable.

The above regression yielded the following results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient.</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NACH</td>
<td>0.0757</td>
<td>0.0377</td>
<td>2.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>1.8070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std.error of est. = 1.2454

\( r \) Squared = 0.1301

Value of 'r' = 0.3607

From these results, it can be observed that achievement motivation is positively and significantly correlated to perceived success as seen from the value of t-statistic 2.010 against the critical value of 't' = 1.703. Hence, the null hypothesis can not be accepted. This finding is consistent with Waddell (1983)
but success in that study was measured by tenure and not a self-rated one. This implies that though achievement motivation level of the women entrepreneur is positively and significantly related to the perceived success of the business, it is not a significant contributor to the dependent variable (as seen from the results of primary proposition A). All along all the programmes that were aiming to develop women entrepreneurs were focussing on achievement motivation. This finding supports the experiences of the trainers of entrepreneurship development programmes. However, in light of the earlier finding (primary proposition A), there are other factors which contribute more to perceived success than achievement motivation. This will be discussed further under hypotheses 7 and 15.

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 2**

*There is zero correlation between the level of achievement motivation of women entrepreneurs and their fear of success.*

The regression was run with achievement motivation as the dependent variable and fear of success (FOS) as the independent variable. The computer output of the regression is reproduced below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOS</td>
<td>-0.7740</td>
<td>0.3187</td>
<td>-2.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>62.7532</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Std. error of est. = 5.7626  
r Squared = 0.1793  
Value of 'r' = -0.4235.

Above results show that t statistic is significant and the probability of achieving the null hypothesis is low. This reveals a significant negative relationship between the achievement motivation and fear of success which supports the alternative hypothesis. The level of achievement motivation exhibits an inverse relationship with the fear of success and hence, the higher the level of achievement motivation, the less likely the participants were to exhibit high levels of fear of success. This finding does not agree with that of Horner (1968). However, the samples (students versus businesswomen) and the measure of need for achievement motivation used in these two studies are different.

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 3**

*There is zero correlation between the level of achievement motivation of the women entrepreneurs and the socio-economic status of their parents.*

* Socio-economic status was measured by self-rating of the applicants about their parents' financial positions. This might be biased depending on the personality of the subject woman entrepreneur.

The computer regression output between achievement motivation and parents' financial position (PARFN), which was run with the former as the dependent variable is reproduced below.
The value of t-statistic is very low when compared to the critical value. Hence the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. This suggests that there is no significant positive relationship between the variables under consideration. Hence the alternative hypothesis can be rejected. This does not support the findings of Hisrich & Brush (1985) as discussed earlier in Chapter Three. This implies that either the measurement of the financial background was inadequate or that the financial status has not had an impact on the development of the need for achievement in the manner suggested by the literature reviewed.

Null Hypothesis $H_0$ # 4

There is zero correlation between the level of achievement motivation of the women entrepreneurs and their parents' upbringing of children.

The regression was run with achievement motivation as the dependent variable and the parents discipline (PARDN) as the independent variable. The computer output of the regression is reproduced below:
The value of 't' is positive and is significant which suggests that the null hypothesis cannot be accepted. Hence the alternative hypothesis can be accepted. This suggests that women entrepreneurs who come from families which do not impose too many conditions and with a broad outlook tend to be more achievement motivated than others. This finding is partly consistent with Stein & Bailey (1973) in that females are motivated to achieve but the areas of achievement are different because of cultural definitions of feminine skills within the traditional bounds of femininity (i.e., early socialization).

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 5**

*There is zero correlation between the level of achievement motivation of the women entrepreneurs and their level of formal education.*

A regression was run between formal education (EDN) and achievement motivation with the latter as the dependent variable. The computer output is reproduced below.
It can be observed from the above results that there is a positive correlation between achievement motivation and formal education as seen from the value of $t = 1.581$. However, it is not a significant relationship. Hence the null hypothesis can be accepted and alternative hypothesis be rejected. This finding supports the finding of Neider (1987) that there is a positive linear relationship between education and achievement motivation, though not significant.

**Null Hypothesis  $H_0$ # 6**

*There is zero correlation between the perceived success of the business and the internal locus of control of the women entrepreneurs.*

A regression was run between the perceived success of the business and the internal locus of control (INT) with the former as the dependent variable. The computer output is reproduced as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>$t$(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDN</td>
<td>1.2076</td>
<td>0.7640</td>
<td>1.581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>52.9913</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Std. error of est.</th>
<th>= 6.0859</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r$-Squared</td>
<td>= 0.0847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of `$r'$</td>
<td>= 0.2910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>$T$(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>0.1158</td>
<td>0.0281</td>
<td>4.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>1.2204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The computer results show that there is a significant positive relationship between the internal locus of control and the perceived success of the business as previously indicated in the multiple regression. This is confirmed by the value of t-statistic 4.115 which is more than the critical value of t-statistic 1.702. This relationship is significant even at $p<0.001$. Hence the null hypothesis can be rejected and alternative hypothesis can be accepted. This could mean that the sample women entrepreneurs are more likely to achieve success in their own opinion if they have an internal locus of control. This finding confirms the findings of Perry et al's (1986) study in Australia (though the samples are different and not representative). This also supports the findings of Brockhaus, 1975; Timmons et al, 1977; Pandey & Tewary, 1979; Waddell, 1983; Welsch & Young, 1984; Bowen & Hisrich, 1986; and Dubois, 1987. This will encourage the training policy formulators to include internal locus of control as the main variable for attention. There is scope for more comprehensive study of internal locus of control and the propensity to succeed in small business.
Null Hypothesis $H_0$ # 7

There is zero correlation between the perceived success of the business and the powerful others locus of control of the women entrepreneurs.

A regression was run between powerful others locus of control (POW) and the perceived success of the business with the latter as the dependent variable. The computer output is reproduced as below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POW</td>
<td>0.0313</td>
<td>0.0433</td>
<td>0.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>5.3350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. error of est. = 1.3225

$r$ Squared = 0.0190

Value of $r'$ = 0.1378

The equation generates a positive coefficient for the powerful others locus of control which would be consistent with a positive relationship between the two variables. However, the relationship is not significant, revealed by the value of the t-statistic of 0.723 which is much lower than the critical value. Also note the low $r^2$. Thus the null hypothesis must be accepted. Accepting the null hypothesis is not consistent with the findings of the primary proposition A, but the sign of the co-efficient is. This suggests that perhaps the powerful others locus of control is not so much explaining the level of perceived success but only a component unexplained by the internal locus.
of control. It is to be noted that there are not many studies which have considered powerful others locus of control as a separate variable, and there is scope for further exploration of this variable.

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 8**

*There is zero correlation between the perceived success of the business and the chance locus of control of the women entrepreneurs.*

A regression was run between the perceived success of the business and the chance locus of control (CHANCE) of the women entrepreneurs with the former as the dependent variable. The computer output is reproduced below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHANCE</td>
<td>-0.0276</td>
<td>0.0373</td>
<td>-0.0740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>6.8891</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. error of est. = 1.3219  
$r^2$ Squared  = 0.0199  
Value of $r$ = -0.1411

It can be observed from the above results that there is a negative relationship between the two variables under consideration. However, the value of t-statistic - 0.0740 is well below the critical value of t-statistic of 1.702 which shows that there is no significant relationship. Hence the null hypothesis can be accepted. It is inferred that there are inconclusive evidence relating chance locus of control of women
entrepreneurs to the perceived success of their business.

**Null Hypothesis \( H_0 \) # 9**

*There is zero correlation between the perceived success of the business and the level of education of the women entrepreneurs.*

A regression was run between the perceived success of the business and the educational level (EDUTOT) of the women entrepreneurs (inclusive of business as well as technical education) with perceived success of the business as the dependent variable. The computer output is reproduced below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUTOT</td>
<td>-0.0985</td>
<td>0.1406</td>
<td>-0.701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>6.6990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. error of est. = 1.3233  
\( r \) Squared = 0.0179  
Value of \( 'r' \) = -0.1336

From the above results, it may be inferred that there is negative relationship between the two variables under consideration. Hence, the null hypothesis can be accepted. This implies that education level of the women entrepreneurs does not have any positive impact on the perceived success of their businesses. There could be several possible explanations for this. Firstly, the level of education could raise
expectations as to earning ability and hence reduce the satisfaction with any given level of achievement. Secondly, education can reduce the "streetwise" quality of entrepreneurs and hence their ability to make money in difficult situations. Thirdly, it could be influenced by the quality of the measures of the variables.

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 10**

There is zero corelation between the number of years of pre-decision work experience* of the women entrepreneurs and the perceived success of their businesses.

A regression was run between the perceived success of the business and the pre-decision work experience (WORK) of the women entrepreneurs with the former as the dependent variable. The computer output is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WORK</td>
<td>-0.2266</td>
<td>0.1526</td>
<td>-1.485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>6.8991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. error of est. = 1.2839
r Squared = 0.0755
Value of 'r' = -0.2747

From the above results, it can be inferred that there is a negative or zero relationship between the two

*Pre-decision work experience here includes any type of work experience the women entrepreneur had irrespective of the relevancy to the present business.
variables under consideration. Hence, the null hypothesis can be accepted. From the above statistical results, it can be noted that the perceived success of the business does not depend on the pre-decision work experience of the women entrepreneurs. Normally, the financial institutions insist that women entrepreneurs have prior work experience, when they approach for finance. However, this finding questions conventional wisdom. It would be interesting to examine this question further. Does the time spent managing a household help to account for the level of perceived success? or do aspiration levels alter with work experience?

Null Hypothesis \( H_0 \) # 11

There is zero correlation between the managerial attitude of the women entrepreneurs and the perceived success of their business.

A full regression was run between perceived success of the business as the dependent variable and the people-oriented behaviour, task-oriented behaviour and the cross product of these two variables as independent variables using the following regression equation.

\[
Y = \text{Const.} + b_1 \times \text{Var}_1 + b_2 \times \text{Var}_2 + b_3 \times \text{Var}_1 \times \text{Var}_2
\]

where \( Y \) = dependent variable, \( X_1 \) the people-oriented behaviour, \( X_2 \) the task-oriented behaviour and \( b \)'s are co-efficients respectively (Ostle & Malone, 1988, p.484). The computer output is reproduced below.
The results mentioned above indicate that there is no significant relationship between the perceived success of the business and the managerial style of the women entrepreneurs. The value of adjusted $r^2$ squared is very low. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected. Here the variable BEHAR2 is the cross product of the people-oriented style index as well as task-oriented style index. The perceived success of the business does not depend on the style of management adapted by the sample women entrepreneurs. This contradicts the earlier studies stating that women are less suitable for management because they are person-oriented (Schien, 1973, 1975) and that they have to be more task-oriented. The relationships between managerial experience, ownership experience and the perceived success of the business were tested and it showed no significance.
**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 12**

There is zero correlation between the androgynous score* of women entrepreneurs (measured using Bem's Sex Role Inventory) and the perceived success of their business.

* Androgynous people are relatively equal in the degree of masculine(M) and feminine(F) characteristics they endorse, whatever the absolute level of either. Androgynous individuals may have M and F scores at any score level, but the absolute discrepancy between their scores is low (Spence & Heimreich, 1979).

- This means people with high degree of androgynous characteristics score a low positive or zero score on the Bem Sex Role Inventory.

A regression was run between the perceived success of the business and the androgynous characteristics (ANDROGYN) with the former as the dependent variable. The computer output is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANDROGYN</td>
<td>-0.0014</td>
<td>0.0115</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>6.1855</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. error of est. = 1.3349

r Squared = 0.0005

Value of 'r' = -0.0230

The above results show that there is no significant positive relationship between androgynous characteristics and perceived success of the business, as is seen from t-statistic = -0.120 which is not significant. However, there is a high probability of achieving the null hypothesis. Hence the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. Note also the low
explanatory power of the equation as reflected in the value of $r^2$. This will be discussed further in relation to the next hypothesis.

**Null hypothesis Ho # 13(a)**

There is zero correlation between the feminine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs and the perceived success of their businesses.

**Null hypothesis Ho # 13(b)**

There is zero correlation between the masculine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs and the perceived success of their businesses.

A multiple step wise regression was run with perceived success as the dependent variable and the masculine and feminine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs as the independent variables. The regression results are given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fem</td>
<td>0.0346</td>
<td>0.0169</td>
<td>2.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.8112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. error of est. = 1.2421

$r$ Squared = 0.1347

Value of '$r'$ = 0.3670

**Variable not in equation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Partial r2</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>F to enter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mas</td>
<td>0.0743</td>
<td>0.9992</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The above regression results imply that there is a significant positive correlation between the feminine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs and the perceived success of the business. Hence the null hypothesis 13(a) must be accepted. This can be interpreted that women entrepreneurs with high scores on feminine characteristics (measured on Bem's Scale) had relatively high perceived success. This contradicts the traditional management philosophy that an effective manager is a male (McGregor, 1967). Given that masculine characteristics did not enter the equation, it is seen as unnecessary to further explore hypothesis 13(b). The failure of the male characteristic measure to enter may help to explain the unexpected result of the androgynous scale. Whilst not the only possible explanation, it may be that those who act how others expect them to act (i.e., according to sex role stereotypes) may generate more favourable treatment from stakeholders. Another possible explanation is that the more the feminine characteristics the greater the success. A third possibility is that women perceived themselves as successful if they can manage the business incorporating the best of "feminine" qualities. These explanations, however, need to be explored further.

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 14**

There is a zero correlation between the level of fear of success of the women entrepreneurs and the perceived success of their business.
A regression was run between the perceived success of the business and the fear of success (FOS) of the women entrepreneurs with the former as the dependent variable. The computer output is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOS</td>
<td>-0.1527</td>
<td>0.0677</td>
<td>-2.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>7.1780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. error of est. = 1.2250
r Squared = 0.1584
Value of ‘r’ = -0.3980

There is significant negative relationship between the perceived success of the business and fear of success of the women entrepreneurs, which is seen from the value of t-statistic -2.254 which is higher than the critical value. Hence the null hypothesis cannot be accepted and the alternative hypothesis is accepted. This finding reveals that fear of success is present in women entrepreneur and it does affect their perceived success. This finding supports the views of Tresemer(1977) and Feather(1974). There are at least two possible interpretations of this finding. Those with high fear of success could downgrade in their own minds their accomplishments, and hence avoid inner conflict. A second possibility is that those with higher fear of success actually achieve less. This would provide an opportunity for further research to distinguish between the two possibilities. It would
also be worth exploring whether the availability of numerous role models would modify the relationship. This finding is also consistent with the finding of Vanucci and Kleiner (1990).

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 15**

There is zero correlation between the level of achievement motivation of women entrepreneurs and their internal locus of control.

A regression was run between achievement motivation and the internal locus of control scores of women entrepreneurs and the computer output is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error of Est.</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>0.4161</td>
<td>0.1511</td>
<td>2.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONST.</td>
<td>39.8636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Error of Est. = 5.6209

r Squared = .2192

Value of 'r' = .4082

From the above results, it can be observed that the value of t is positive and significant. Hence, the null hypothesis cannot be accepted. This study confirms the findings of Nelson & Sharp (1989) and Perry et al (1987). This implies that highly achievement motivated individuals will probably attribute their success to themselves (e.g., their knowledge, hard work, etc). Another interpretation in light of the above proposition is that the primary driving force of small
business success is a belief that one's personal ability and effort will substantially influence one's level of success (see the primary proposition tested earlier). Since need for achievement is highly correlated to the locus of control, it also gives results which are strongly related to small business success. This finding would suggest that small business development programme formulators consider changing their focus from achievement motivation to internal locus of control.

Null Hypothesis H₀ # 16

There is zero correlation between the level of achievement motivation of the women entrepreneurs and their powerful others locus of control.

A regression was run between achievement motivation and the powerful locus of control scores of the women entrepreneurs. The computer output is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POW</td>
<td>-0.1590</td>
<td>0.2060</td>
<td>-0.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONST.</td>
<td>61.9103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Error of Est. = 6.2921

r Squared = 0.0216

Value of 'r' = -0.1470

The above results show that there is a negative relationship between achievement motivation and the powerful others locus of control of the sample women entrepreneurs, which is not significant as seen from
the value of the t statistic. The probability of achieving the null hypothesis is such that it cannot be rejected. The alternative hypothesis linking achievement motivation and the powerful others locus of control shows appropriate direction but was not at a significant level and hence the relationship is not supported beyond reasonable doubt. Also the explanatory power of the equation is low. This warrants further investigation on a larger sample.

Null Hypothesis H₀ # 17

There is a zero correlation between the level of achievement motivation of the women entrepreneurs and their chance locus of control.

A regression was run between the achievement motivation and the chance locus of control of the women entrepreneurs and the computer output is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHANCE</td>
<td>-0.2956</td>
<td>0.1704</td>
<td>-1.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONST.</td>
<td>65.3214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Error of Est. = 6.0337

r Squared = 0.1003

Value of 'r' = -0.3107

The results shown above reveals that there there is a negative correlation between achievement motivation and the chance locus of control. The value of t-statistic obtained -1.735 is significant. Hence, the null
hypothesis cannot be accepted and the alternative hypothesis has to be accepted.

The findings of hypotheses 15, 16 and 17 show that women entrepreneurs who are highly achievement motivated will also tend to be highly internal and that they will not attribute their success to luck, fate, etc. This also suggests that the relationship between achievement motivation and the powerful others locus of control is not proved beyond reasonable doubt.

**Null Hypothesis \( H_0 \ # 18 \)**

There is zero correlation between the level of achievement motivation of women entrepreneurs and their score on masculine characteristics (measured using Bem's Sex Role Inventory).

A regression was run between achievement motivation and the masculine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs. The computer output is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error of Est.</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>0.0839</td>
<td>0.0670</td>
<td>1.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONST.</td>
<td>48.6905</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Error of Est. = 6.1840

\( r^2 \) Squared = .0549

Value of \( r \) = .2344

The above mentioned results show that there is a positive correlation between achievement motivation and the masculine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs. However, the value of \( t \) is not
significant. Hence alternative hypothesis cannot be accepted. This does not agree with the views of McClelland et al (1953), and Janman (1989).

Null Hypothesis $H_0$ # 19

There is zero correlation between the level of achievement motivation of women entrepreneurs and their score on feminine characteristics (measured using Bem's Sex Role Inventory)

A regression was run between achievement motivation and the feminine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs. The computer output is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>$t(DF=27)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>0.0863</td>
<td>0.0847</td>
<td>1.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONST.</td>
<td>49.2573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Error of Est. = 6.2423

$r^2$ Squared = .0370

Value of $r$ = .1925

Above mentioned results show that there is a positive correlation between the two variables under consideration. The value of $t$-statistic 1.019 is not significant. Hence, the null hypothesis can be accepted. This can be interpreted that there is no proven negative correlation between the feminine characteristics and the achievement motivation level of the women entrepreneurs. This does not endorse the views of Veroff et al (1953) and Fitzgerald & Crites (1980).
**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 20**

There is zero correlation between the level of achievement motivation of women entrepreneurs and their score on social desirability (measured using Bem's Sex Role Inventory).

A regression was run between the achievement motivation and the social desirability attitudes of the women entrepreneurs. The computer output is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOCD</td>
<td>0.0447</td>
<td>0.1608</td>
<td>0.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONST.</td>
<td>53.5359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Error of Est. = 6.3521

r Squared = .0029

Value of ‘r’ = .0534

The above results show that there is a positive correlation between the two variables under consideration with a modest statistic. Hence, the null hypothesis can be accepted. This finding can be interpreted as that women entrepreneurs who have high level of achievement motivation can have high score on social desirability (measured on Bem's Scale) as well.

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 21**

There is zero correlation between the level of education of women entrepreneurs and their scores on androgynous characteristics* (measured using Bem's Sex Role Inventory).
A regression was run between the androgyny level of women entrepreneurs and their formal education with the former as the dependent variable. The computer output is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDN</td>
<td>6.7783</td>
<td>2.4922</td>
<td>2.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>-16.6609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. error of est. = 19.8514
r Squared = 0.2151
Value of 'r' = 0.4637

From the above results, it may be inferred that there is positive correlation between the scores on androgynous characteristics and the educational level of the women entrepreneurs. The value of t-statistic obtained is 2.720 which is more than the critical value. Positive significant correlation between androgynous score and education means a negative relationship between androgynous level and education. This denotes that there is a significant negative relationship between the education level of the women entrepreneurs and their androgyny level.
entrepreneurs and their androgyny level. Hence, this null hypothesis cannot be accepted. According to Powell and Butterfield (1984), good managers are androgynous and nowadays, managers have higher level of qualifications. However, this finding contradicts this logic. It implies that the study should be carried out on a larger sample before any generalization could be done.

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 22**

There is zero correlation between masculine characteristics and the social desirability scores of the women entrepreneurs.

A regression was run between the scores on social desirability and the masculine characteristics of women entrepreneurs. The computer output is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>0.0310</td>
<td>0.0822</td>
<td>0.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONST.</td>
<td>88.8616</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. error of Est. = 7.5815  
\[ r \text{ Squared} = 0.0052 \]  
Value of \( 'r' \) = 0.0724

From the above results, it can be inferred that there is a very low positive correlation between the masculine characteristics and the social desirability scores of the women entrepreneurs. Further, the probability of the null hypothesis being true is 70.85%. Hence, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.
Null Hypothesis $H_0$ # 23

There is zero correlation between feminine characteristics and the social desirability of the women entrepreneurs.

A regression was run between the feminine characteristics and the social desirability attitudes of the women entrepreneurs and the computer output is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error of Est.</th>
<th>$T(DF=27)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>0.3353</td>
<td>0.0805</td>
<td>4.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONST.</td>
<td>59.5556</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Error of Est. = 5.9307
$r$ Squared = 0.3913
Value of $r^2$ = 0.6255

The above results show that there is high positive correlation between the feminine characteristics and the social desirability attitudes of the women entrepreneurs. The value of $t$-statistic is also significant and the probability of achieving the null hypothesis is very low. Hence, the null hypothesis cannot be accepted and alternative hypothesis has to be accepted. This finding has two possible interpretations. The women entrepreneurs with strong/weak feminine characteristics also tend to display strong/weak socially desirable attitudes, or those women entrepreneurs with a strong commitment to responding in socially desirable ways will tend to
respond strongly to "feminine traits" questionnaires because that is socially desirable.

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 24**

There is zero correlation between internal locus of control and the masculine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs.

A regression was run between masculine characteristics and the internal locus of control of the women entrepreneurs and the computer output is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>0.1795</td>
<td>0.0694</td>
<td>2.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONST.</td>
<td>23.5918</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Error of Est. = 6.4088

r Squared = .1983

Value of 'r' = .4453

From the computer results, it can be seen that there is a positive correlation between the two variables under consideration. The value of t-statistic is 2.584 which is significant and the probability of achieving the null hypothesis is very low. Hence the null hypothesis cannot be accepted. This implies that women entrepreneurs with high internal locus of control tend to exhibit more masculine characteristics as measured on the Bem's (1974) scale. The preceding remarks is not a comment on the direction of the relationship. This finding is fully consistent with Waddell (1983) in that
Internality and masculinity (measured using Bem's Sex Role Inventory) of the women entrepreneurs are positively related. The only difference between these two studies is in the research instrument used for measurement of locus of control.

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 25**

There is zero correlation between feminine characteristics and the internal locus of control in women entrepreneurs.

A regression was run between feminine characteristics and the internal locus of control of the women entrepreneurs and the computer output is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>0.1339</td>
<td>0.0937</td>
<td>1.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONST.</td>
<td>29.7355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Error of Est. = 6.9014

r Squared = .0704

Value of 'r' = .2652

The above results show that there is positive correlation between the two variables under consideration. The value of t-statistic is not significant. The null hypothesis, therefore, cannot be rejected. This finding is consistent with Waddell (1983) and partially consistent with Neider (1987, p. 23) that 'female entrepreneurs expressed a strong belief that they were in control'.
Null Hypothesis H₀ # 26

There is zero correlation between feminine characteristics and the chance locus of control of the women entrepreneurs.

A regression was run between chance locus of control and the feminine characteristics using MICROSTAT and the output is as given below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>0.1128</td>
<td>0.0899</td>
<td>1.255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONST.</td>
<td>14.9570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Error of Est. = 6.6242

r Squared = 0.0551

Value of 'r' = 0.2348

From the above results, it can be seen that there is a positive correlation between the two variables under consideration and the value of t-statistic is not significant. Hence the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. This partially supports the findings of Waddell, 1983 and Welsch & Young, 1984 (both the studies have tested only the overall locus of control measure as a single variable and not the components of it).

Null Hypothesis H₀ # 27

There is zero correlation between powerful others control and chance locus of control in women entrepreneurs.
A regression was run between the two variables under consideration and the computer output is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHANCE</td>
<td>0.7182</td>
<td>0.0920</td>
<td>7.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONST.</td>
<td>8.1351</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Error of Est. = .6930

r Squared = .6930

Value of 'r' = .8324

From the above results, it can be observed that there is high positive correlation between powerful others locus of control and the chance locus of control of the sample women entrepreneurs. The value of t-statistic is also very significant. The probability of achieving the null hypothesis is zero. Hence, the null hypothesis cannot be accepted. This finding confirms the findings of Levenson (1973) which marked the high positive correlation between the powerful others locus of control and chance locus of control.

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 28**

*There is zero correlation between internal locus of control and chance locus of control in women entrepreneurs.*

A regression was run between the two variables under consideration and the computer output is reproduced below.
The above results show that there is negative relationship between the chance locus of control and the internal locus of control. The value of t-statistic is significant and the probability of achieving the null hypothesis is very low. Hence, the null hypothesis cannot be accepted. This confirms the findings of Levenson (1973) in that the persons with high internal locus of control do not attribute their success or failure to external factors like powerful others or fate or luck, etc.

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 29**

*There is zero correlation between powerful others locus of control and internal locus of control in women entrepreneurs.*

A regression was run between the two variables under consideration and the computer output is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHANCE</td>
<td>-0.4047</td>
<td>0.1865</td>
<td>-2.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONST.</td>
<td>53.2538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Error of Est. = 6.6050

\[ r^2 = 0.1485 \]

Value of \( r \) = -0.3853

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POW</td>
<td>-0.2675</td>
<td>0.2286</td>
<td>-1.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONST.</td>
<td>49.9174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Error of Est. = 6.9828
Though the sign of the correlation is negative, the value of t-statistic is not significant and the probability of achieving the null hypothesis is too high for rejection. Hence, the null hypothesis may be accepted. (There is no strong evidence to arrive at any findings). However, this is consistent the views of the researchers like Rotter, (1966) in that people with high internality do not attribute their success to external factors. This implies that the study has to done on a larger sample before any conclusions can be arrived at.

**Null Hypothesis $H_0 \ # \ 30$**

*There is zero correlation between fear of success of the women entrepreneurs and their internal locus of control.*

A regression was run between fear of success and the internal locus of control of the women entrepreneurs and the computer output is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOS</td>
<td>-1.2901</td>
<td>0.3083</td>
<td>-4.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTR.</td>
<td>51.2553</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Error of Est. = 5.5745

r Squared = .3935

Value of 'r' = -.6273
The above results show that there is strong negative correlation between the two variables under consideration. The value of t-statistic is significant and the probability of achieving the null hypothesis is extremely low. Hence, the null hypothesis cannot be accepted. This implies that women entrepreneurs who are highly internal in nature will tend to have a low fear of success. This also reiterates the earlier finding of this study that emphasis has to be more on interesting those with a high internal locus of control to become business owners. Alternatively it could be argued that there could be merit in developing the internal locus of control in people if more small business entrepreneurs are to be developed. This supports the findings of Gumpert et al (1978). This is also consistent with the findings of Vanucci and Kleiner (1990, p. 21) in that people high in fear of success tend to have an external locus of control.

Null Hypothesis $H_0$ # 31

There is zero correlation between fear of success of women entrepreneurs and their score on Williams' scale on risk-taking.

(Preference for moderate risk-taking was measured using Williams'(1975) instrument)

A regression was run between fear of success and the preference of the women entrepreneurs to take moderate risks, and the computer output is reproduced below.
Variable  | Regression Co-efficient  | Std. Error  | t(DF=27)
----------|--------------------------|-------------|---------
FOS       | -0.1256                  | 0.0532      | -2.361  
CONST.    | 5.6547                   |             |         

Std. Error of Est. = .9619
r Squared = .1711
Value of 'r' = -.4137

From the computer results given above, it can be observed that there is significant negative correlation between fear of success and the preference for moderate risk-taking measured with the Williams (1975) instrument. The value of t-statistic is significant and the probability of achieving the null hypothesis is low only. Hence, there is no strong statistical evidence to accept the null hypothesis. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis is accepted. People with a high fear of success will either tend to take up tasks with low risk or with high risk. If the task has very low risk, there is no necessity to explain away "success". If the chance of success is being low, then results are explained by chance and not skill and hence there is no reason to fear success.

Null Hypothesis  H₀ # 32

There is zero correlation between fear of success of women entrepreneurs and their feminine characteristics (measured using Bem's Sex Role Inventory).

A regression was run between the two variables under consideration and the output is reproduced below.
Variable | Regression Co-efficient | Std. Error | t(DF=27)
--- | --- | --- | ---
FEM | -0.0012 | 0.0472 | -0.026
CONST. | 6.7061 | |

Std. Error of Est. = 3.4802

r Squared = 0.0000

Value of 'r' = -0.0050

The above results show that there is no correlation between the feminine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs and the fear of success. Hence, the null hypothesis must be accepted. This finding implies that feminine characteristics as measured by Bem's scale have no correlation with fear of success. According to Horner (1968), women exhibit more fear of success than men. These findings whilst not directly comparable with Horner's (1968) Tests do not appear to be supportive of her work. Other researchers (for e.g., Pappo, 1972; Tresemer, 1977) have also contradicted Horner's findings. One possible explanation for the incompatibilities could be the view of O'Leary (1974) that fear of success is situation specific and depends on whether the role she occupies is perceived as a threat to her femininity. These questions deserve further investigation.

**Null Hypothesis Ho # 33**

*There is zero correlation between fear of success of women entrepreneurs and their masculine characteristics (measured using Bem's Sex Role Inventory).*
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A regression was run between fear of success and the masculine characteristics and the output is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error of est.</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>-0.0120</td>
<td>0.0298</td>
<td>-4.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>19.4198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

r Squared = 0.3761
Value of 'r' = -0.6133

The above results show that there is a significant negative correlation between the masculine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs and their fear of success. Hence null hypothesis can not be accepted and alternative hypothesis is accepted. This finding partially supports Horner (1968) and Cabellero et al (1975) in that nontraditionally oriented sex-revered females experience greater fear of success. This also agrees with the findings of Gayton et al (1978), Kearney (1982), and Sadd et al (1979) in that high masculine characteristics in women coincide with less fear of success.

**Null Hypothesis H₀ # 34**

There is zero correlation between fear of success and the scores of androgynous characteristics (measured using Bem's Sex Role Inventory) of the women entrepreneurs.
Androgynous people are relatively equal in the degree of masculine (M) and feminine (F) characteristics they endorse, whatever the absolute level of either. Androgynous individuals may have M and F scores at any score level, but the absolute discrepancy between their scores is low (Spence & Heimreich, 1979).

- This means people with a high degree of androgynous characteristics score a low positive or zero score on the Bem Sex Role Inventory.

A regression was run between fear of success and the androgynous characteristics with the latter as the dependent variable. The computer output is reproduced below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>t(DF=27)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOS</td>
<td>-3.1091</td>
<td>1.0850</td>
<td>-2.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>29.9946</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. error of est. = 19.6204  

r Squared = 0.2332  

Value of 'r' = -0.4829

The regression results show that there is a significant and negative relationship between fear of success and the scores of androgynous characteristics of the women entrepreneurs as is seen from the value of t-statistic equalling 2.866. Hence, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. This finding is inconsistent with the findings of Major (1979) and Vanucci & Kleiner (1990) that women with more androgynous characteristics tend to exhibit less fear of success. This may be tested on
a larger sample of women entrepreneurs before any generalizations could be done.

PRIMAR Y PROPOSITION 2

The personal and personality characteristics of the women entrepreneurs contribute significantly to the explanation of the desire to grow in business.

A multiple regression was run with the desire to grow as the dependent variable and the variables shown in Appendix D as independent variables. The reproduction of computer output of mutiiple regression is given in Appendix G. The regression equation may be formed from these results as below.

\[
GROW = 1.1804 + 0.1359 \times EDN
\]

\(GROW = \) Desire to grow; \(EDN = \) Level of formal education.

The regression results show that the most significant contributor for the desire to grow in business is the level of formal education of the women entrepreneurs. The values obtained are statistically significant at the \(p<0.05\) level. Level of education of the women entrepreneurs is a factor which emerged out to be the significant variable to explain the women entrepreneurs' desire to grow in their businesses. It is of research interest to note that factors which
explained perceived success of the business did not appear in the equation explaining the desire to grow (See results of the primary propositions A & B). Perceived success which was loaded as an independent variable also did not appear in the equation explaining the dependent variable, the desire to grow. Level of education which had a negative relationship with perceived success (see results of hypothesis 11) has appeared as a positive and significant variable explaining the women entrepreneurs' desire to grow. It is possible to interpret that due to the fact that education creates awareness; or that the forces which drive the women to seek higher education also drives them to seek a larger business; or opportunity costs are greater, so they expect greater returns from business.

It is hard to generalize from these findings as the sample is not a representative one. However, it suggests that this finding should be tested on a broader sample to establish whether this important relationship can be generalized. This finding will also be of much use when designing an entrepreneurship development programme (to aim at a particular target group).

6.5 CONCLUSION
This chapter analyzed the data collected and interpreted the findings in light of the previous
studies in relevant areas. This chapter also tested the hypotheses using multiple regression equations and simple regression methods. The results will be summarized and presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 7

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

7.1. INTRODUCTION
This chapter summarizes the major results of the whole research by discussing the findings in comparison with the studies already done in this field. It has two parts. Firstly, it discusses the two primary research propositions, and secondly, it gives the suggestions for further research on women in business.

7.2. RESEARCH FINDINGS:
This research project focussed on a sample of 29 women small business owners in the Illawarra region and studied their demographic, personal and personality factors, which aid or hinder the establishment, running and the growth of small business. The barriers that act on women may be social or psychological. The relationship between important variables were also tested.

7.2.1. DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS
7.2.1.1. PROFILE OF THE BUSINESSES SURVEYED:
55.2% of the businesses have been operating for the past 1 to 5 years and 44.8% for more than five years and less than 14 years. Most of the businesses (44.8%) are partnerships where the women have more than 50% stake in the business. Most of the women surveyed were from service oriented businesses with retail businesses(31.04%), followed by professional service,
food service and production, and communication service (10.34% each). 59.10% of the businesses were employing two or less than two full time or part time employees. Only two businesses had more than 10 employees.

7.2.1.2. Motivating Factors
The most important motivating factors for the women entrepreneurs to become small business proprietors was to be their own boss, to get job satisfaction, and to be economically independent. This is consistent with the findings of other Australian studies (Still, 1986; Hub Report, 1990).

7.2.1.3. Operational Problems at Start-up
The major problem at start-up is obtaining necessary finance for running the business. 59% of the subjects had this problem and 44.8% of them felt that information regarding small business was not available under one roof.

7.2.1.4. Education
34.49% of the subjects had a degree and above. 27.6% had a diploma and 13.8% had a TAFE certificate. Altogether, more than 75% of the subjects have had more than 13 years of formal education. 48.3% of the women entrepreneurs had studied business subjects and 41.8% had studied technical subjects related to their present business.
7.2.1.5. **Age and Marital Status**

51.7% of the women entrepreneurs had started the businesses when they were between 20 and 29 years. 69% of them are married and have a stable marriage relationship.

7.2.1.6. **Parent's/Spouse's Occupation**

Only 27.6% of the women entrepreneurs had self-employed fathers. However, 58.6% of them had professionals as their fathers. Most of them (71.41%) had mothers as housewives.

7.2.1.7. **Sibling Position**

Most of the women entrepreneurs are first born (55.2%), which agrees with most of the studies done already in the field (e.g. Hisrich & Brush, 1985).

7.2.1.8. **Work Experience**

65.5% of the subjects had previous work experience with 51.62% having managerial experience and 27.5% having previous ownership experience.

7.2.1.9. **Family Problems due to Business**

The main problems faced by the subject women entrepreneurs are time management and the role conflict arising out of multiple roles played by the businesswomen.
7.2.1.10. RISK-TAKING

Most of the subject women entrepreneurs are moderate risk-takers which agrees with the study done by Dr. Williams, whose questions were used for this aspect of the research.

7.2.1.11. ANDROGYNY

Bem Sex Role Inventory was used in full to measure the masculine, feminine and androgynous characteristics. Androgynous characteristics were measured by the absolute difference between the masculine and feminine scores of the women entrepreneurs. The subject women entrepreneurs are more androgynous than the subjects of Dr.Bem's study on college students. This is consistent with the findings of Waddell(1983) in that women entrepreneurs score higher on masculine characteristics than feminine.

7.2.1.12. MANAGEMENT STYLE

Women entrepreneurs in this study appeared to have a style which had moderate scores in both task-orientation and relationship-orientation, although there is no basis for comparison. Most of the subjects discuss their day-to-day business problems with their spouses or parents. 27.5% of them do not discuss them with anybody.
7.2.2. MAJOR HYPOTHESES:

Findings of this research support the first primary proposition stating that the personal and personality characteristics of women entrepreneurs contribute to perceived success of their business. The measure of success was a self rating provided by the women entrepreneurs. The research proposition was addressed by using a stepwise multiple regression on the MICROSTAT package. The value of adjusted $r^2 = 0.5324$ is on the higher side for behavioural studies (Devore & Peck, 1986). The factors that contribute significantly to the perceived success of the business are internal locus of control, powerful others locus of control, preference for moderate risk, and chance locus of control in the order of entry into the equation. Internal locus of control was the most significant contributor in explaining the perceived success of the business. This reiterates the findings of Pandey & Tewary, (1979); Timmons et al. (1977); Dubois (1987); Sylvers & Deni (1983); Waddell (1983); and Perry et al (1986) which said that persons with high internality are more likely to be successful. Amongst these, Cromie (1986), Waddell (1983), Timmons et al. (1977); Pandey & Tewary (1979) and Perry et al (1986) have specifically researched entrepreneurs. Perry et al's (1986) study was on Australian entrepreneurs. There is no information available about the proportion of women entrepreneurs who participated in their study. It concentrated on nursery owners only. This is the first
such study done on women entrepreneurs in Australia. It is therefore necessary to replicate the study on a larger and broader sample before any generalizations can be done.

Traditional emphasis in research on entrepreneurs so far has been on achievement motivation of the entrepreneurs themselves. This research findings show that internal locus of control is more dominant than the achievement motivation of the women entrepreneurs (as seen from the findings of the primary proposition A). This need not necessarily be inconsistent with the traditional focus on achievement motivation. The definition of achievement motivation by Murray (1938), as explained earlier, includes internal locus of control in the sense that achievement motivation involves the satisfaction of achieving greater heights by making use of their own talents. Though achievement motivation of the women entrepreneurs is significantly and positively correlated to the perceived success of the business (see the findings of hypothesis 1), it is not as significant as the internal locus of control of the women entrepreneurs.

In the sample of this study, there was a significant positive correlation between achievement motivation and the internal locus of control with $r^2 = 0.2192$ (see results of hypothesis 15). This would be consistent

There is positive correlation between internal locus of control and the masculine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs, which again is consistent with Waddell (1983).

Internal locus of control had a significant and negative correlation with fear of success (see results of hypothesis 3). This is consistent with Vanucci & Kleiner (1990, p. 21) in that 'people with high fear of success tend to have an external locus of control. That is they attribute their success to uncontrollable events in their environment, rather than to their own efforts'. Fear of success had a significant negative correlation with achievement motivation (see results of hypothesis 2) though the explanatory power is not high. This finding agrees with Tresemer (1977) and does not agree with Horner (1968). Fear of success is also significantly and negatively correlated to the perceived success of the business, which agrees with Vanucci & Kleiner (1990). These findings contribute to an understanding of the relationship between the perceived success and the internal locus of control.

The second result shows powerful others locus of control of women entrepreneurs as one of the significant contributor to the perceived success of
their businesses. Comparison is difficult as not many studies have included this variable (powerful others) as a separate variable with the exceptions being Rotter* (1966), and Levenson (1973). Powerful others locus of control is not significantly correlated to the perceived success (see hypothesis 7). Though powerful others locus of control had low correlation with perceived success on its own, in conjunction with other explanatory variables it became a significant factor which can explain the perceived success of the business (see results of primary proposition A).

The third factor which significantly explained perceived success of the business was the moderate risk-taking attitude of the women entrepreneurs. This is negatively correlated with the fear of success (see results of hypothesis 31), which has a moderate explanatory power as seen from $r^2 = 0.1711$.

The fourth factor which was included in the stepwise regression on the perceived success was significantly chance locus of control of the women entrepreneurs. However, chance locus of control on its own did not have a significant effect on the perceived success of the business (see results of hypothesis 8). Chance locus of control had a negative coefficient in the

---

* Rotter (1966) included powerful locus of control as a component of external locus of control and not completely as a separate variable.
equation "explaining" perceived success and therefore it may be considered as an inhibiting factor.

The second primary proposition stated that the personal and personality factors contribute to the desire to grow in business. The only factor that had a significant contribution was the education level of the women entrepreneurs. The findings of this research reveals that the higher the education level of the women entrepreneurs, the more the desire to grow in business. The level of education of the women entrepreneurs is positively but not significantly correlated to the achievement motivation (see results of hypothesis 15). Possible explanations could be that education creates awareness of growth possibilities; or that the forces which drive the women to seek higher education also drives them to seek a larger business; or that opportunity costs are greater, so they expect greater returns from business. The reasons for the correlation need to be investigated.

7.2.3. OTHER FINDINGS:

There are some other findings which are of relevance and interest to the researchers. The concept of fear of success introduced by Horner (1968) was tested in this study using part of Cohen's research instrument. The sample women entrepreneurs had a score less than the mid-point of the scale.
Women entrepreneurs of this study had a high score on internal locus of control as measured on Levenson's (1973) scale. No generalization could be made due to the size of the sample which is not necessarily a representative of the general population of women entrepreneurs.

According to the scores measured by Bem's (1974) Sex Role Inventory, these women entrepreneurs exhibited more masculine characteristics than feminine characteristics. It was also found that feminine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs are significantly and positively related to the perceived success of the business. Feminine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs had a significant and positive correlation with the social desirability characteristics (both measured using Bem's Scale). Further, the study showed that the masculine characteristics of the women entrepreneurs had a high negative correlation with their level of fear of success, being consistent with Vanucci & Kleiner, (1990). This study also shows that the more the androgyny level of the women entrepreneurs, the more the fear of success of the women entrepreneurs. This contradicts the findings of Major (1979) and Vanucci & Kleiner (1990).

The level of education of the women entrepreneurs does not correlate positively to their androgyny level.
This is contradictory to the common belief. For example, according to the sex-role stereotypes, women are not expected to exhibit as many masculine characteristics as these women. It may be that the small business environment necessitates that successful proprietors exhibit masculine characteristics, and may give them the courage to act according to the situation in which they are in. This study has to be done on a larger sample before any general conclusions are arrived at.

7.3. LIMITATIONS:
In view of the size of the sample, the results could not be generalized. Further, the sample was taken only from Illawarra region and it is not representative of the whole of Australia, or of the Illawarra because of the problems of identifying a representative group.

The research instrument used in this study was based on a combination of subsegments of questionnaires used by other researchers (Williams, 1975; Bem, 1974; Cohen, 1974; Levenson, 1973). Because the sample subjects used in this research differed from those of the previous researches, comparison between their results and the current ones would not have always been efficacious. This inability to compare with results from male entrepreneurs, female entrepreneurs in other countries and the lack of business and adult comparison groups
limits the number of insights which could be obtained from the research.

7.4. RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS:

According to the data analysed, it was derived that internal locus of control is the most significant contributor to the perceived success of the business. This suggests a change in the focus of the training programmes offered for development of entrepreneurship. In the past, the focus has been more on achievement motivation rather than any of the three types of locus of control.

The above finding partly agrees with the findings of Perry et al's (1986) study in Australia. In spite of the differences in the nature of the two samples, the findings of these studies give the direction in which the focus needs to change. Hence, it would be interesting to test it on different samples before the results can be generalised. Though internal locus of control is the most significant contributor to the perceived success equation, the powerful others and chance locus of control also emerged as the second and fourth most significant contributors to the equation. This shows the locus of control could be a dominant factor which could affect perceived success.

It is also interesting to further test the findings of the other proposition that highly educated women
entrepreneurs tend to have a higher desire for growth in their businesses. This would enable the developmental organisations to tailor different programmes accordingly, if the results are generalisable.

This study, as an exploratory one, has contributed to the understanding of the position of women small business owners, their personality characteristics, and their management styles.

7.5. FURTHER RESEARCH AVENUES

a) With further resources (both time and money) it would be appropriate to survey a more representative sample of women small business proprietors.

b) A cross-cultural study of women entrepreneurs between several countries can be carried out to generalize the results.

c) Fear of success is a psychological concept and this may or may not be applicable for women in different fields. Hence, a comparative study of women managers in various occupations should be done rather than using student subjects as the base for comparison.

d) "Breaking the glass ceiling" has been a recent terminology in U.S. It will be interesting to study the management styles of women managers / women business owner-managers in Australia and relate them to what is happening in U.S.
e) Case studies involving a significant period of observation of women entrepreneurs to collect more direct evidence on managerial and leadership styles can be carried out.

f) It would be an addition if a study is done to find whether feminine characteristics scores are a good indication of managerial behaviour in practice.

g) As many of the studies done in the past compare male and female entrepreneurs, it would be useful if this study can be done on a larger sample comprising both men and women.
### A Historical Summary of Important Definitional Problems

| **Richard Cantillon** (circa 1730) | * entrepreneurs defined as a self-employed person  
* additional uncertainty accompanies self-employment  
* entrepreneurs should proportion their activity to market demands |
|---|---|
| **Abbe Nicolas Baudeau** (circa 1767) | * the entrepreneur is a leader of men, a manager of resources and an innovator of ideas, including new scientific ideas  
* although not necessarily the owner, the entrepreneur is a risk taker |
| **Jean-Baptiste Say** (circa 1810) | * many managerial talents are required to be a successful entrepreneur  
* many obstacles and uncertainties accompany entrepreneurship |
| **Carl Menger** (circa 1871) | * entrepreneurship involves: obtaining information, calculation, an act of will, and supervision |
| **Alfred Marshall** (circa 1890) | * the abilities of an entrepreneur are different yet complementary to the abilities of a manager |
| **Joseph Schumpeter** (circa 1910) | * entrepreneurship is in its essence the finding and promoting of new combinations of productive factors  
* entrepreneurship is the prime creative socio-economic force in society |
| **Frank Knight** (circa 1921) | * the courage to bear uncertainty is the essential aspect of entrepreneurship  
* entrepreneurs are required to perform such fundamental managerial functions as responsible direction and control |
* managerial capacities should be distinguished from entrepreneurial capacities
* identifying and exploiting opportunistic ideas for expansion of smaller enterprises is the essential aspect of entrepreneurship

* entrepreneurial activity is aimed at the reduction of organizational inefficiency and at the reversal of organizational entropy

* the identification of market arbitrage opportunities is fundamental function of the entrepreneur

# Force Field Analysis For Increasing the Representation of Women in Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Level</th>
<th>Desired Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving Forces</td>
<td>Restraining Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Legislation</td>
<td>* Attitudes of Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Organizational Awareness</td>
<td>* Missed Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Action of Women</td>
<td>* Few Developmental Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Changes in Structure of Work</td>
<td>* Conflict of Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Infrastructure</td>
<td>* Not Enough Child-Care Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Role Models</td>
<td>* Positions Occupied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Educational Streaming</td>
<td>* Different Perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Social and Professional Groups</td>
<td>* Doubts About Long-term Commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Education/Qualifications</td>
<td>* Work Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Commonwealth Government Support</td>
<td>* &quot;Old Boy&quot; Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Acceptance of Women as Bosses</td>
<td>* Discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Superannuation</td>
<td>* Lack of Maternity/Parental Leave</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Descriptions of Key Characteristics of the Basic Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological aspects</th>
<th>Directive</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Conceptual</th>
<th>Behavioural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focusses on</td>
<td>Tasks and Technical Problems</td>
<td>Tasks and Technical Problems, Involving a Logical Approach</td>
<td>People and Broad Aspects of a Problem</td>
<td>People, Social aspects of the Work Situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considers</td>
<td>Facts, Rules, and Procedures</td>
<td>Every Aspect of a Given Problem</td>
<td>By Using Intuition and Discussion with Others</td>
<td>Many Options and Future Possibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquires Information</td>
<td>By sensing and Using Short Reports with Limited Data</td>
<td>By careful Analysis, Using a Large Number of Data</td>
<td>By Integrating Diverse cues to Reach Conclusions, Applying Judgement</td>
<td>By Sensing, Listening, and Interacting with Others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluates Information</td>
<td>Using Intuition, Experience, or Rules</td>
<td>Through Abstract Thinking, Avoiding Incomplete Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>Using Feelings; Instincts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Has a Low Tolerance for Ambiguity and Needs Structure</td>
<td>High Tolerance for Ambiguity, Innovative in Solving Problems</td>
<td>High Tolerance for Ambiguity; Takes Risks and is Very Creative</td>
<td>Has a Low Tolerance for Ambiguity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership style</td>
<td>Practical, Matter of Fact, Authoritarian</td>
<td>Intellectual, Ingenious, Wants Control</td>
<td>Is Insightful and Enthusiastic</td>
<td>Sociable, Friendly, Supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Orientation</td>
<td>Impersonal; Needs Power and Status; Is Forceful; Dislikes Committees and Group Discussions</td>
<td>Impersonal, Skilled in Organizing Facts, establishes Controls, Prefers Limited Control by Others</td>
<td>Very Personal, Shows Concern for Others' Views</td>
<td>Talent for Building Teams, Encourages Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Orientation</td>
<td>Quick; Is Action and Results Oriented</td>
<td>Applies Rigorous Analysis, Prepares Elaborate, Detailed Plans</td>
<td>Is Adaptive and Flexible, Uses Intuition, Seeks New Ideas</td>
<td>Is Action Oriented, Holds Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Situations with Measurable Achievement Potential, Tangible Rewards</td>
<td>Enjoys Complex Situations with Variety and Challenge, Wants to be able to Predict Outcomes</td>
<td>Seeks Recognition from Others, Wants Independence, Enjoys Achieving Personal Goals</td>
<td>Acceptance by Peers, Avoidance of Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Organizational Fit</td>
<td>Structured, Goal—oriented, such as Bureaucracies, or where Power and Authority are important</td>
<td>Impersonal, Planning, Solving Complex Problems, Science, Engineering, and so on</td>
<td>Loose, Decentralized Settings, Open or Organic Organization</td>
<td>Well—designed, People—oriented, Collegial Settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Criticism</td>
<td>Too Rigid, Impersonal, Simplistic, Autocratic</td>
<td>Too dogmatic, Overcontrolling, Impersonal, Careful, Abstract or Mathematical; Sometimes Too Slow</td>
<td>Is a Dilettante; Too idealistic, &quot;Indecisive,&quot; Imaginative, Slow, Difficult to Control</td>
<td>Too Concerned About Others; Too &quot;wishy—washy,&quot; Sensitive, Can't Make Hard Decisions, Can't Say No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Descriptive Statistics of Selected Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGEB</td>
<td>3.4138</td>
<td>1.9368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROLE</td>
<td>1.5517</td>
<td>0.5061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACH</td>
<td>57.6552</td>
<td>6.2466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISK</td>
<td>4.8276</td>
<td>1.0375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHAR</td>
<td>17.8276</td>
<td>5.0714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>11.5172</td>
<td>2.7597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDROGYN</td>
<td>9.5172</td>
<td>22.0026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>106.7931</td>
<td>17.4405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>97.2759</td>
<td>13.9256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCD</td>
<td>92.1724</td>
<td>7.4645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOS</td>
<td>6.5862</td>
<td>3.4176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>42.7586</td>
<td>7.0288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POW</td>
<td>26.7586</td>
<td>5.7734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANCE</td>
<td>25.9310</td>
<td>6.6918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDN</td>
<td>3.8621</td>
<td>1.5053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK</td>
<td>3.2069</td>
<td>1.5897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUTOT</td>
<td>5.3448</td>
<td>1.7784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUCCS</td>
<td>6.1724</td>
<td>1.3112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE:

1. Date of establishment of this business :

2. Which one of the following categories best describes your business? (Please put a 'TICK' in the column).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional service (e.g. Doctor, Accountant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and repair service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Service/Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal services (e.g. Beautician)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Household services (e.g. House cleaning)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Services (e.g. Personnel)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment/Recreation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Type of ownership: Please put a 'tick'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Ownership</th>
<th>Financial Stake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sole Proprietorship</td>
<td>100% financial stake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>&lt;50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private company</td>
<td>&lt;50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>&lt;50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Total Number of Employees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Workers</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Which of the following 12 factors motivated you to become a small business owner? (Please tick them).

1. Urge to do something different
2. Need for more money
3. To be your own boss
4. Background of the family
5. Frustration in the previous job
6. More opportunity to be creative
7. Economic Independence
8. To get job satisfaction
9. To be at home with children
10. New product/service idea
11. Friend's influence
12. Others (Please specify)

5(a) Can you please rank them in the order of importance to you?

1. Urge to do something different
2. Need for more money
3. To be your own boss
4. Background of the family
5. Frustration in the previous job
6. More opportunity to be creative
7. Economic Independence
8. To get job satisfaction
9. To be at home with children
10. New product/service idea
11. Friend's influence
12. Others (Please specify)

6. What were the difficult parts of starting your business?

- Gaining necessary confidence
- Locating information on starting a business
- Finding a suitable location
- Obtaining the necessary money to start
- Gaining support from family and friends
- Others (Please specify)
7. To what level are you educated? (Please tick the highest level).

- Finished Primary
- High School
- TAFE certificate
- Diploma
- Degree
  (Areas of major and sub-majors)
- Post Graduate
  (Areas of specialisation)
- Others

8. Did you study any business subjects or courses (e.g. accounting, management, supervision, etc.) at any level of your education?

YES

No

9. If YES to question 8, please supply details of the business courses undertaken (e.g., subject matter and who ran the course)

10. Have you studied any technical subjects or courses relating to the type of work you are now doing? If YES, please specify the subjects studied.

YES

NO

11. What type of school did you attend during the majority of your formal schooling years (primary and secondary combined)?

GOVERNMENT SCHOOL

NON-GOVERNMENT SCHOOL
12. **Age in Years**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How old were you?</th>
<th>&lt;20</th>
<th>20-29</th>
<th>30-39</th>
<th>40-49</th>
<th>50-59</th>
<th>&gt;60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When you first started a small business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When you started this business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. **What is your marital status?**

- Unmarried
- Single
- Married
- Divorced
- Separated
- De Facto

14. **Please give the occupations of your parents and Spouse (if applicable):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Occupation</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Spouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. **Has your father ever been involved in small business? If so, to what extent?**

16. **How would you describe your parents' financial position?**

- Wealthy
- Moderately well off
- Poor

17. **How would you describe your parents' discipline at home?**

- VERY STRICT
- STRICT
- DEMOCRATIC
- WEAK
18. Which of the parents has got the most positive influence on your attitudes in your life?

MOTHER  FATHER

19. Type of previous Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of years of Experience</th>
<th>Work experience</th>
<th>Managerial experience</th>
<th>Ownership experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 2yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 5 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 to 10 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19(a). This question is to learn from you whether the experience gained before commencing the business is relevant to the business:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Exp.</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Not very same</th>
<th>Different</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managerial experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownership experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. What types of management experience have you had?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Sales</th>
<th>Office/Accounting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>Purchasing/Stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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If there is no previous ownership experience, please go to Question 23 directly.

21. How many previous businesses have you owned or partly owned in which you had **significant role** in management?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONE</th>
<th>ONE</th>
<th>TWO</th>
<th>THREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOUR</td>
<td>FIVE</td>
<td>SIX</td>
<td>&gt; SIX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21(a). How many previous businesses have you owned in which you had **no significant role** in management?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NONE</th>
<th>ONE</th>
<th>TWO</th>
<th>THREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FOUR</td>
<td>FIVE</td>
<td>SIX</td>
<td>&gt; SIX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. For each previous business for which you have been an owner/manager please indicate the reason for your withdrawal from management, if that has occurred:

- Unable to finance further expansion
- Insolvent/Bankrupt
- Lack of sufficient profitability
- Incompatible with co-owners
- Boredom
- Family Problems
- Personal Problems
- Lucrative sale of the business
- Other reasons (Please specify)

23. Do you feel any problem at home because of your business?

Frequent _____ _____ Very rarely _____ _____ No problems
24. If YES to Qn.23, can you elaborate on the problems, please?

25. Do you feel that you will be looked upon differently if you become successful business woman? If so, can you give the reason you perceived?

26. **Note**: The columns of boxes, from the left, are:

- **A** = Always
- **F** = Frequently
- **S** = Sometimes
- **R** = Rarely
- **N** = Never

Place a tick in the choice which indicates most accurately your response to each question.

There are no right or wrong answers!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Do you like being personally responsible for solving difficult problems and completing difficult tasks?

2. Do you think you can succeed at most things you attempt?

3. Do you think and talk about what you hope to achieve?

4. Do you like to know how well or how badly you are doing?
5. Do you prefer to work with friends rather than with experts who may not be close friends?

6. Do you find that associating with very successful people, who show much ambition, increases your desire to succeed?

7. Do you accept challenges when the chances of winning (or succeeding) may not be good?

8. Did your parents set high standards and expect you to measure up to them?

9. Did your parents encourage you to take up worthwhile activities and interests?

10. Do you like to trying out new schemes or ideas, even if the chances of success may not be good?

11. Does a person who believes he can succeed have more chance of being successful?

12. Would you prefer being popular to being successful?

13. Do you prefer to ask others to help you with difficult tasks, rather than tackle them by yourself?

14. Would you work hard on a task that you enjoy doing, when you know it will bring no profit?

15. Do you feel comfortable when you have no work to do and you are forced to be inactive for, say, 2 or 3 days?
26.16 This question is aimed at finding out how you would feel about a financial risk in a business situation.

Suppose you are in business and you are offered in a deal where your own personal skill in business will largely determine whether you lose money or profit. Assume that you have funds to invest.

Indicate (by a tick in the appropriate box) how much you would be willing to invest if the best result the deal can produce (with your skill) is a \textbf{50/50 chance of making $10,000 or losing your investment}.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
NIL & $1000 & $2000 & $3000 & $4000 \\
\hline
$5000 & $6000 & $7000 & $8000 & $9000 \\
\hline
$10,000 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

26.17 Assuming exactly the same details as in the above question, except the deal (taking your own personal skill into account) has a \textbf{4:1 chance of making $10,000 profit or losing your investment}. How much would you be willing to invest?

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
NIL & $1000 & $2000 & $3000 & $4000 \\
\hline
$5000 & $6000 & $7000 & $8000 & $9000 \\
\hline
$10,000 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

26.18 Assume a similar situation, except that the deal (again with your business skill) now has a \textbf{1:4 chance of making $10,000 profit or losing your investment} (i.e., one chance of profiting and four chances of losing). How much are you now prepared to invest?

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
NIL & $1000 & $2000 & $3000 & $4000 & $5000 \\
\hline
$6000 & $7000 & $8000 & $9000 & $10,000 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
27. Would you carefully explain to a subordinate the background to a job as well as encouraging the subordinate to express his ideas on how to do it?

VERY LIKELY UNLIKELY

28. Would you greet colleagues in a friendly manner each morning on entry into the office or factory?

VERY LIKELY UNLIKELY

29. Do you have frank discussions with subordinates concerning their progress in the department?

VERY LIKELY UNLIKELY

30. Are you friendly to customers, job applicants, and other visitors to the department?

VERY LIKELY UNLIKELY

31. Do you praise a subordinate who satisfactorily completes a task ahead of schedule?

VERY LIKELY UNLIKELY

32. Do you set clear goals for individual subordinates?

VERY LIKELY UNLIKELY

33. Are you always accessible to your subordinates?

VERY LIKELY UNLIKELY

34. When you want to get a work done within a short time, do you guide the subordinates about the task or do you direct them?
35. Outline a business situation when you felt under considerable pressure. Explain your personal and business responses.

36. How many changes in your business (i.e., changes in products, services or processes) have you made in the last three months?

37. When a subordinate expresses some personal problem, what will be your reaction?

38. Do you regularly discuss the business problems with other people? If YES with whom?

39. When you take up a task, do you tend be firm and determined to get it completed whatever may be the obstacles that come in the way?

   VERY LIKELY       VERY UNLIKELY

40. In your opinion, are you a task-oriented person?

   ALWAYS       NOT ALWAYS

41. Have you thought about further expansion of your business?

   YES       No
42. If YES to question 41, what are the reasons?

43. If NO to question 41, what are the reasons?

44. On the following page you will be shown a large number of personality characteristics and will be asked to use those characteristics in order to describe yourself. That is you will be asked to indicate, on a scale of 1 to 7, how true of you these various characteristics are. Please do not leave any characteristic unmarked.

Mark 1 - never or almost never true.
Mark 2 - usually not true.
Mark 3 - sometimes or infrequently true.
Mark 4 - occasionally true.
Mark 5 - often true.
Mark 6 - usually true.
Mark 7 - always or almost always true.

*******************************************************************************
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Self-reliant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Yielding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Defends own beliefs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Cheerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Moody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Independent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Shy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Conscientious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Athletic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Affectionate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Theatrical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Assertive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Flatterable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Strong Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Loyal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Unpredictable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Forceful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Analytical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Sympathetic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Jealous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25. Has leadership abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Sensitive to the needs of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Truthful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Willing to take risks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Secretive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Makes decisions easily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Compassionate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Sincere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Self-sufficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Eager to soothe hurt feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Conceited</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Dominant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Soft-spoken</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Likable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Masculine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Solemn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Willing to take a stand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Tender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Friendly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Aggressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Gullible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Inefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Acts as a leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Childlike</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Adaptable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Individualistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Does not use harsh language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Unsystematic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Competitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Loves children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Tactful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Ambitious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Gentle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Conventional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Can you please circle the correct answer whichever suits you?**

45.01. It makes me feel uneasy to have to ask for other people for things.

YES  NO

45.02. I often have trouble saying no to people

YES  NO

45.03. I am pretty competent at most things I try.

YES  NO

45.04. I generally feel uptight about telling a boss or a professor that I think I'm entitled to a better deal.

YES  NO

45.05. Before getting down to working on a project, I suddenly find a whole bunch of other things to take care of first.

YES  NO
45.06. I have often "woken up" during a lecture or a meeting and realized that I haven't heard a word that was said.

YES  
No

45.07. I am reluctant to make a large purchase without consulting someone else first.

YES  
NO

45.08. It pays to check out your ideas with other people before making a final decision.

YES  
NO

45.09. It is important not to get too excited about things one really desires.

YES  
NO

45.10. When I notice things have been going particularly well for me, I get the feeling that it just can't last.

Yes  
NO

45.11. I tend to believe that people who look out for themselves first are selfish.

YES  
No

45.12. I sometimes have trouble acting like myself when I'm with people I don't know.

YES  
NO

45.13. I hate having a fuss made over me.

YES  
NO


YES  
NO
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45.15. When I'm praised for something, I sometimes wonder if I can do as well next time.

YES  NO

45.16. When someone I know well succeeds at something, I usually feel that I've lost in comparison.

YES  NO

45.17. I sometimes "Playdown" my competence in front of others so they won't think I am bragging.

YES  NO

45.18. In the lower grades in school, if I got a good grade on a work assignment I often felt that I had fooled the teacher.

YES  NO

46. Any other factors which you would like to make a mention about your business or relating to this research:

47. Can you rate your business as to how successful it is?

Very successful  Not at all successful

48. For each of the statements below you are asked to judge how true that statement is according to your own experience. Put an X at the point on the scale which most closely represents your judgement of the statement. It is not necessary to spend a long time on any item, your first impression will suffice. Again, there are no right or wrong answers in this questionnaire.

1. Whether or not I get to be a leader depends mostly on my ability.

AGREE  DISAGREE
2. To a great extent my life is controlled by accidental happenings.

AGREE _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DISAGREE

3. I feel that what happens in my life is mostly determined by powerful other people.

AGREE _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DISAGREE

4. Whether or not I got into the car accident would depend mostly on how good a driver I was.

AGREE _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DISAGREE

5. When I make plans I am almost certain to make them work.

AGREE _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DISAGREE

6. Often there is no chance of protecting my personal interests from occurrences of bad luck.

AGREE _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DISAGREE

7. When I get what I want it is usually because I am lucky.

AGREE _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DISAGREE

8. Although I have good ability, I will not be given leadership responsibility without appealing to those in positions of power.

AGREE _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DISAGREE

9. How many friends I have depends on how nice a person I am.

AGREE _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DISAGREE

10. I have often found that what is going to happen will happen.

AGREE _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DISAGREE

11. My life is chiefly controlled by powerful others.

AGREE _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DISAGREE
12. Whether or not I get to be a leader depends on whether I'm lucky enough to be in the right place at the right time.

AGREE _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DISAGREE

13. People like myself have very little chance of protecting our personal interests when they conflict with those of strong pressure groups.

AGREE _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DISAGREE

14. It's not always wise for me to plan too far ahead because many things turn out to be a matter of good or bad fortune.

AGREE _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DISAGREE

15. Getting what I want requires pleasing those people above me.

AGREE _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DISAGREE

16. Whether or not I get into a car accident is mostly a matter of luck.

AGREE _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DISAGREE

17. If important people were to decide they didn't like me, I probably wouldn't make any friends.

AGREE _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DISAGREE

18. I can pretty much determine what will happen in my life.

AGREE _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DISAGREE

19. I am usually able to protect my personal interests

AGREE _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DISAGREE

20. Whether or not I get into the car accident depends mostly on the other driver.

AGREE _____ _____ _____ _____ _____ DISAGREE
21. When I get what I want it is usually because I have worked hard for it.

AGREE ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ DISAGREE

22. In order to have my plans work, I make sure that they fit in with the desires of people who have power over me.

AGREE ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ DISAGREE

23. My life is determined by my own actions.

AGREE ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ DISAGREE

24. It's chiefly a matter of fate whether or not I have a few friends or many other friends.

AGREE ____ ____ ____ ____ ____ DISAGREE

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE
APPENDIX F

Multiple Regression (Step-wise)

STEP 1 VARIABLE: INT ENTERED

Dependent Variable: SUCCS (Perceived Success)

Variable | Regression Coefficient | Std. Error | F(1, 27) | Prob. |
----------|-------------------------|------------|----------|-------|
INT       | .1158                   | .0281      | 16.934   | .00033|
CONSTANT  | 1.2204                  |            |          |       |

Std. Error of Est. = 1.0468

r Squared = .3854

r = .6208

Analysis of Variance Table

Source            | S. S.  | D.F. Mean S. S | F Ratio | Prob  |
------------------|--------|----------------|---------|-------|
Regression        | 18.5542| 18.5542        | 16.934  | 3.262E-04|
Residual          | 29.5837| 1.0957         |         |       |
Total             | 48.1379|               |         |       |

Variables not in equation:

Name | Partial r² | Tolerance | F to enter | Prob |
-----|------------|-----------|------------|------|
NACH | .0102      | .7808     | .269       | .6087|
RISK | .0539      | .8473     | 1.480      | .2347|
BEHAR| .0401      | .9935     | 1.087      | .3066|
MAS  | .0003      | .8017     | .008       | .9284|
FEM  | .0716      | .9296     | 2.006      | .1685|
POW  | .1286      | .9517     | 3.836      | .0610|
TASK | .0029      | .9811     | .075       | .7859|
CHANCE| .0184     | .8515     | .488       | .4911|
STEP 2 Variable: POW entered.

Dependent Variable: SUCCS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var.</th>
<th>Regn. Coefft.</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>F(1, 26)</th>
<th>Prob</th>
<th>Partial $r^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>.1276</td>
<td>.0274</td>
<td>21.627</td>
<td>.00008</td>
<td>.4541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POW</td>
<td>.0654</td>
<td>.0334</td>
<td>3.836</td>
<td>.06097</td>
<td>.1286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>-1.0357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Error of Est. = .9958

Adjusted R Squared = .4233

R Squared = .4645

Multiple R = .6815

**Analysis of Variance table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>S.S</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Mean S.S</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>22.3578</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1789</td>
<td>11.274</td>
<td>2.981E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>25.7802</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>.9915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48.1379</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Variables not in Equation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Partial $r^2$</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>F to enter</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NACH</td>
<td>.0164</td>
<td>.7787</td>
<td>.417</td>
<td>.5242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISK</td>
<td>.1482</td>
<td>.7676</td>
<td>4.351</td>
<td>.0474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHAR</td>
<td>.0295</td>
<td>.9805</td>
<td>.760</td>
<td>.3916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.7996</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.9979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>.0178</td>
<td>.7549</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.5072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>.0003</td>
<td>.9440</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.9309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANCE</td>
<td>.0973</td>
<td>.2640</td>
<td>2.695</td>
<td>.1132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STEP 3 Variable: RISK entered

DEPENDENT VARIABLE : SUCCS ENTERED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RISK</td>
<td>- .4064</td>
<td>.1949</td>
<td>4.351</td>
<td>.04736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>.1549</td>
<td>.0289</td>
<td>28.628</td>
<td>.00002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POW</td>
<td>.0866</td>
<td>.0330</td>
<td>6.867</td>
<td>.01472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>- .8048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Error of Est. = .9372

Adjusted R Squared = .4891

R Squared = .5438

Mutiple R = .7375

Analysis of Variance Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Mean S.S.</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>26.1791</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.7264</td>
<td>9.935</td>
<td>1.711E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>21.9588</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.8784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48.1379</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables not in Equation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Partial r²</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>F to enter</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NACH</td>
<td>.0086</td>
<td>.7691</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.6514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHAR</td>
<td>.0061</td>
<td>.9112</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.7049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>.0598</td>
<td>.5959</td>
<td>1.527</td>
<td>.2286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>.00048</td>
<td>.7296</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.7362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>.0026</td>
<td>.9178</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.8041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANCE</td>
<td>.1213</td>
<td>.2638</td>
<td>3.313</td>
<td>.0812</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STEP 4. Variable: CHANCE Entered

DEPENDENT VARIABLE : SUCCS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RISK</td>
<td>-.4148</td>
<td>.1865</td>
<td>4.947</td>
<td>.03581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>.1373</td>
<td>.0293</td>
<td>21.896</td>
<td>.00009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POW</td>
<td>.1687</td>
<td>.0551</td>
<td>9.377</td>
<td>.00535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANCE</td>
<td>-.0897</td>
<td>.0493</td>
<td>3.313</td>
<td>.08121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONST.</td>
<td>.1170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. Error of Est. = .8966

Adjusted \( r^2 \) Squared = .5324

\( r^2 \) Squared = .5992

Multiple \( r \) = .7741

Analysis of Variance Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>D.F.</th>
<th>Mean S.S.</th>
<th>F Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>28.8430</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.2108</td>
<td>8.969</td>
<td>1.408E-04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>19.2949</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>.8040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48.1379</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Variables not in Equation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Partial $r^2$</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>F to enter</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NACH</td>
<td>.0086</td>
<td>.7691</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.6514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEHAR</td>
<td>.0061</td>
<td>.9112</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.7049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAS</td>
<td>.0598</td>
<td>.5959</td>
<td>1.527</td>
<td>.2286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>.00048</td>
<td>.7296</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.7362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK</td>
<td>.0026</td>
<td>.9178</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.8041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Primary Proposition B - Multiple Regression (Step-wise)

Step 1. Variable: EDN Entered.
Dependent Variable: GROW (Desire to grow in business)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Regression Co-efft.</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>F(1, 27)</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDN</td>
<td>0.1359</td>
<td>0.0560</td>
<td>5.878</td>
<td>0.02230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTANT</td>
<td>1.1304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Std. error of est. = 0.4464

r Squared = 0.1788

Value of 'r' = 0.4228

Analysis of Variance Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>D.F</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1.1713</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1713</td>
<td>5.878</td>
<td>0.0223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>5.3804</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.5517</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All other independent variables did not enter into the equation explaining the women entrepreneurs' desire to grow. Some of the independent variables were internal locus of control, powerful others locus of control, perceived success of the business and achievement motivation.
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