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REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Review of literature is very important for any type of research work. A brief review of available literature is presented in this chapter, which provides a basis for the theoretical framework and interpretation of findings.

An attempt has been made here to present a brief resume of the available literature on the issues relevant to the study under the following sub-sections.

Kluckhohn (1951) concluded “a value is a conception explicit or implicit. The action is motivated by the “needs orientations” which are the objective conditions and by the “values orientations” which correspond to the choices made by the person on the basis of internalized values. Rokeach (1973); defined value as an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end state of existence.

Schumpeter (1961) defined entrepreneur as a dynamic agent of change, as the catalyst who transforms increasingly physical, natural and human resources in a corresponding production possibility. He viewed entrepreneurship as a means by which economy and society are transformed. McGraw (1991), Santarelli and Pesciarelli (1990), Bygrave and Hofer (1991) and Faris (1999) have advocated Schumpetrian concepts.

The study of motives and goals not only indicated the reasons behind their choice of career but also helped to identify the force which propels women towards achievement and entrepreneurial performance later. While McClelland (1961, 1969,
asserted subconscious internal motives to direct behaviour, Ryan (1970) argued that “human behaviour is affected by conscious purposes, plans, intentions, tasks and the like. He held that conscious goals affect action. Locke and Latham (2002) theorized that goal affects performance through four mechanisms, (a) as a directive function, (b) having an energizing function, (c) affect persistence, and (d) affect action indirectly by leading to discovery and use of task relevant knowledge and strategies. Hence, besides projective techniques to attempt an insight into motives, verbalization of plans and goals might elicit the reason for a certain kind of behaviour, in this case, entrepreneurial endeavours of women.

As early as in 1969, McClelland and Winter attempted to measure success of an entrepreneur in terms of working long hours, making successful attempts to start new business, starting new business, capital investment, amount of specific fixed capital and being in charge of firms. They measured all the indices for the above separately.

Ryan (1970) argued that “human behaviour is affected by conscious purposes, plans, intentions, tasks and the like.” He held that conscious goals affect action.

Cocharan (1971) viewed entrepreneurs as society’s model personality moulded by child rearing practice and schooling. Kunkel (1971) viewed personality not as a determinant of behaviour but as “the behaviour” and emphasised changes in socio-economic structures to bring about economic development. Cooper (1973) defined entrepreneurship as a function of conducive environment.

It was Schultz (1972) who popularized entrepreneurship as a process. Akhouri and Sharma (1978) stated that entrepreneurship was a function of four systems: (a) socio-sphere system, (b) support system, (c) resource system and (d)
self-sphere system. These four systems were interlinked, interacting and constantly adjusting with each other. Anuradha (1988) described an entrepreneur as one who created something new, organized production, undertook risk and handled economic uncertainty. It was the combination of market sense, production sense and creative sense that shaped an entrepreneur.

Cooper (1973) also listed availability of role models, facilitating tax structure, availability of venture capital, manpower, research and consultancy organizations as other promotional factors.

Schrieir (1975) showed that a female entrepreneur had much in common with her male counterpart except that of the sectors in which women tended to operate. Goffee and Scase (1985) developed a typology of female entrepreneurs based on two factors, firstly, the relative attachment to conventional entrepreneurial ideals in the form of individualism and self reliance and secondly, their willingness to accept conventional gender roles, often subordinate to men. Four types of female entrepreneurs emerged in this taxonomy, (a) conventional entrepreneurs gender roles; (b) innovative entrepreneurs who held a strong belief in entrepreneurial ideals but had a relatively low attachment to conventional gender roles; (c) domestic entrepreneurs who organized their business life around the family situation and believed very strongly in conventional female roles and held low attachment to entrepreneurial ideals and (d) radicals who held low attachment to both, often organizing their business on a political and collectivist basis.

Different researchers have emphasized role of conducive environment in promoting entrepreneurship rather than the strategic choices of the individual (Hannan and Freeman, 1977; Peterson, 1981; Vande, 1984, Ven et al., 1993).
Several authors like Finney (1977), Tandon (1975), Drucker (1985) emphasised the 'newness' which was always associated with entrepreneurial behaviour. Entrepreneurship has been defined as a creative and innovative response to the environment. Gaikwad (1978) considered that the emergence of entrepreneurs in a society depended upon closely interlinked economic, social, religious, cultural and psychological variables. Also in a stratified society like the one in India, the indicators, which denote entrepreneurship, may not be uniform for its different strata. What could be an entrepreneurial activity in a particular stratum of population may not be considered so in other strata. It was confirmed by Clarke and Aram (1997) who held that behavioural ethics differ from country to country, even though there is agreement on fundamental values.

Training, technical guidance and grass root training with information support have been found as major facilitators of the entrepreneurship process (Akhouri et al., 1978 and Shah et al., 1994).

Schwartz (1979) concluded that female motivations for starting businesses were similar to those of men. The major motivations for females were need to achieve desire for job satisfaction and economic necessity while for males in addition to the need to achieve, there was a desire to make things happen and to control resources.

Akhouri (1979) developed a common measure, Entrepreneurial Economic Success Index (EESI), taking four aspects of entrepreneurship: (a) an entrepreneur takes moderate risks (b) he has the insight to sense and capacity to mobilize the resources of the environment (c) he has the managerial efficiency to generate profit and (d) he constantly strives for progress/growth. Natrajan (1991) tried to develop an index to measure performance over a period of time and also to identify the
factors which contributed to the success or otherwise of the women entrepreneurs. Rani (1996) measured entrepreneurial performance of Vishakhapatnam women entrepreneurs and found that the women entrepreneurs though exhibited their managerial efficiency and constantly strived for progress were not able to take adequate risk in mobilizing their own or borrowed capital and therefore were losing the opportunity of making much more money. She also studied job satisfaction and work-home role conflict. Downing (1991) studied strategies used by male and female entrepreneurs in many developing countries and asserted that males and females employ different strategies. While male owned enterprises grow vertically, women's enterprises tend to grow by diversifying into other activities.

Failure to find well paid wage employment with flexible hours and no further career prospects were also found to be the motive to start business (Taylor, 1980; Sexton, 1987; Goffee et al., 1985). Finally women who find “trapped” at home once their children had grown up and who wished to reenter the work force in some capacity, but finding reentry difficult, end up choosing “domestic entrepreneurship” (Hertz, 1986). Patel (1989) drew attention to “chance entrepreneurs” who enter into business without preparation, clear goals or plans. Similar to these, Finney (1977) found “accidental entrepreneurs” in USA.

Family and occupational background have importance as it is easier to perform or select a familiar task. “Familiarity reduces the risk involved in performing the task and also dwarfs the fear of failure” (Sarupriya, 1981), Singh et al. (1986) found that around 44 per cent women entrepreneurs’ husbands were also businessmen. Size and type of family affect the entrepreneur. In a small family, woman entrepreneur may have more authority and freedom to do what she wishes to do but simultaneously, she might lack the support which a joint family provides
leading her to shoulder dual responsibilities. Similarly, in a nuclear family set up, she might have full command over the resources than in joint family set up where she might have partial command or none at all.

Welsch and Young (1982) studied personality characteristics like risk taking, locus of control, Machiavellianism, self esteem, receptiveness to innovation, rigidity, attitudes toward government regulation and economic optimism. No overall differences were found. Men scored higher than women on the measure of economic optimism and acted more impulsively with respect to future events. Equal levels of self-esteem were found in both men and women entrepreneurs. The assumption that women were risk adverse while men were risk takers was not substantiated. Nevertheless, men and women differed with respect to their perception and approach to risk taking. Men viewed it as something over which they had some control while women related it more to the possibility of losing.

Hisrich and O’Brien (1982) found that men are motivated by the desire to control their own destiny and to make things happen while women are inclined to be motivated by independence and achievement arising out of job frustration where they have not been able to perform to their full capacity.

Shapero and Sokol (1982) developed a model distinguishing three sets of interlinked variables that intervene in the process of entrepreneurial event formation or creation of new enterprise: (a) negative displacements such as being a refugee, fired, insulted, angered, bored, divorced or widowed, (b) being in between things such as recently out of school or entering labour force and (c) positive pull factors such as influence of a partner, mentor, investor or customer. These were listed as factors motivating women to take up entrepreneurial career.
Incubator organizations were found to play a critical role in development of entrepreneurs by many researchers (Vesper, 1983; Cooper, 1986; Smilor and Gill, 1986). Institutional adequacy and infrastructure facilities availability was another promoter of entrepreneurship process (Pathak, 1975; Akhouri et al. (1978 and Seibel and Dave, 1992).

Surti and Sarupria (1983) found that in India, few women select entrepreneurship as their profession as they shoulder more responsibilities at household front, thus going for select jobs like that of a sales girl or telephone operator. Better educated women go for professions like medicine, academics, law or executives.

Hisrich and Brush (1983) noted that in addition to supportive husbands, strong support came from friends, business associates or professional women's groups. Many had mentors to guide and assist them. Hence women entrepreneurs frequently felt that the presence of a supportive groups of individuals had been the key to their success. Mentors frequently provided women entrepreneurs with knowledge and guidance in areas where they lacked confidence or were deficient, such as law, finance, or organizational planning. Mentors were able to lend credibility to the ventures often by being on the board of directors of the women entrepreneur’s companies. Finney (1977) mentioned the “little man behind every successful woman”, especially regarding the start-up of “nontraditional” female business in the United States.

International Center for Entrepreneurship and Career Development (ICECD), Ahmedabad is an autonomous organization established by a group of professionals to promote women entrepreneurs through training, educational and research initiatives at both the national and international level. Some of the areas that ICECD
works include gender issues, women's economic empowerment, management capability building in government and non-government organizations, awareness generation for enterprise establishment, credit delivery and support, and technology identification and transfer. ICECD has had experience in developing a large number of women for economic self-sufficiency in rural and urban areas of many developing countries.

Martin (1984) identified four main decision-influencing areas: (i) the readiness to act, (ii) the participating event during a free choice period, (iii) a supportive environment – family, financial and others and (iv) the identification of a venture opportunity. If a significant number of these factors were present in an individual’s personal situation, it was reasonable to conjecture that he or she would launch a new venture.

Gartner (1985) found that entrepreneurial performance depends on the interaction among individual traits, entrepreneurial process, environmental factors and features of the organization created.

Hisrich and Brush (1985) found that women usually rely solely on personal assets and savings for start up finance, while males enlist investors, bank loans etc. Singh and Sengupta (1985) found that the proposed investment by potential women entrepreneurs was quite high compared to their economic background. They found most of the enterprises to be joint enterprises or on partnership basis. Iyer (1995) found women invested less and earned less than male entrepreneurs. Mali and Baruah (1992) confirmed that women start with smaller investments than men. Rani (1996) found that there was heavy investment in manufacturing industry; trading and service industries require lesser capital in that order. Sole proprietorship was
the mostly followed way with few partnership (23 \%) concerns while joint family, cooperative and private limited companies were very few.

Singh and Sengupta (1985) found majority of the women interviewed were involved in manufacturing kind of enterprise. Service and trading were the other kinds of enterprises pursued in that order of preference. Iyer (1995) found that most men (75 \%) selected manufacturing and trading enterprises while most women (75\%) chose service and job-work related enterprises. Easwaran (1992) reported that 60 per cent of the sampled women entrepreneurs chose service/trading and 70 per cent of the remaining 40 per cent in the manufacturing sector were in garment, tailoring or design business.

Age of women entrepreneurs has been found to vary in different studies being between 21 – 30 years (Singh and Sengupta, 1985; and Rani 1986), 26 – 40 years (Anna, 1990), 25 – 35 years (Shah, 1990), 31 – 45 years (Singh, 1992), 25 – 35 years (Easwaran, 1992) and 26 – 45 years (Padaki, 1994), Iyer (1995) found that women entrepreneurs were comparatively late starters, mostly in the age-group of 35 – 44 (37 \%) and 45 – 54 years (28 \%).

Educational qualifications of Indian women entrepreneurs were found up to graduate or post graduate levels in various studies. Singh and Sengupta (1985) found 44.5 per cent graduates. Rani (1986) reported 66.7 per cent graduates, Singh (1992) found 50 per cent graduates and 23.5 per cent post graduates, Mali and Baruah (1992) reported 50 per cent graduates while Iyer (1995) found 68 per cent post graduates, 23 per cent graduates and 43 per cent having technical qualifications in her sample. Women preferred to start enterprises based on their educational background, service sector enterprises had entrepreneurs with higher level of education and trading with comparatively less education levels (Rani, 1996).
Monthly family income of women entrepreneurs was found to be between Rs. 1500 – 3000 for 49.2 per cent of respondents by Singh and Sengupta (1985) while Rani (1986) found 46.6 per cent belonging to Rs. 1000 – 2500 category, Iyer (1995) found that 84 per cent of women entrepreneurs belonged to lower middle income category (Rs. 2000 – Rs. 6000 per month) and 11 per cent female entrepreneurs in Rs. 6001 – Rs. 10000 monthly household income category.

Various studies conducted in India revealed that most of the women entrepreneurs were found to be married [Singh et al. (1986) 85 %; Singh and Sengupta (1985) 75.5 %; Rani (1986) 53.3 %; Shah (1990) 71 %; Anna (1990) 54.9 %; Iyer (1995) 76 %; and Easwaran (1992) 80 %]. Mishra (1996) found that majority of the women entrepreneurs were married, often to a businessman, and most of them have children in the age-group of 10 – 12 years. Studies in developed nations indicated family breakup for economically independent women but it was not found true in Indian context as majority of business women were married. Padaki (1994) found that business women involved male members of family, specially their husbands, in several enterprise functions.

Sexton and Bowman (1986) held that conformity, energy level, interpersonal effect, risk taking, social adroitness, autonomy, change, harm-avoidance and security are personality characteristics of entrepreneurs. Studies using McClelland’s (1969) personality characteristics have usually been carried out in many countries. In order to consistently identify personal entrepreneurial characteristics (PECs) in culturally different countries, a competency assessment method was developed to increase cross-cultural validity, reduce racial and gender biases, and ensure predictiveness. An initial list of twenty-one possible personal characteristics was reduced, to one having following nine; opportunity-seeking
information-seeking, persistence, risk-taking, demand for efficiency and quality, goal-setting, systematic planning and monitoring, persuasion and networking and self-confidence (McClelland, 1987). Later on, these were expanded to thirteen personal competencies to include initiative, commitment, problem solving and assertiveness also by International Centre for Entrepreneurship and Career Development (ICECD), Ahmedabad (1988).

The definition of entrepreneurship is not differentiated on the basis of sex and hence could be extended to women entrepreneurs. It has already been studied with this view by many researchers (Cromie, 1987; Downing, 1991; Singh et al. 1986; Anuradha, 1983; Singh and Sengupta, 1985 and Singh, 1992). Zimny (2004) stated that “the concept is a broad term that incorporates a wide range of activities, from engaging in small scale micro-entrepreneurship, often in the informal economy, to family businesses, to managing large companies in high tech sectors and in manufacturing, each with its own set of challenges and constraints. A substantial number of women entrepreneurs are also own account workers, especially in agriculture.”

Hisrich and Brush (1987) stated that woman entrepreneur was individualist, creative, enthusiastic, instinctive and adaptable. She had to deal with very real and immediate problems like meeting payrolls, hiring and firing employees, pacifying creditors, often in face of little cash.

Cromie (1987) compared the motivations of aspiring male and of tiring cost of living, the middle class family finds it difficult today to manage with only one income thus pushing women to find ways to supplement family income. Epstein and Vyakarnam (1990) found that poverty accompanied by lack of income earning
opportunities rather than profit incentives motivated an increasing number of rural women to become petty entrepreneurs.

Vinze (1987) found that women entrepreneurs possessed inclination towards risk taking, initiative, drive tenacity and perseverance, which propelled them towards success in their enterprise. Singh (1992) found women entrepreneurs possessing high entrepreneurial motivation, high value orientation, high levels of self confidence, decision making abilities, managerial abilities and independence. Most of the women entrepreneurs had low degree of credit orientation, risk preference and emotional maturity. Singh and Sengupta (1985) found that medium achievement motivation, medium affiliation motivation and medium power motivation characterized women entrepreneurs. Shah (1990) found that low risk taking, especially at initial stage, was beneficial since it prevented, disappointments arising from over estimation. Problem solving and initiative played important part in sustaining achievement motives.

The definition of entrepreneurship is not differentiated on the basis of sex and hence could be extended to women entrepreneurs. It has already been studied with this view by many researchers (Cromie, 1987; Downing, 1991; Singh et al., 1986; Anuradha, 1983; Singh and Sengupta, 1985 and Singh, 1992). Zimny (2004) stated that “the concept is a broad term that incorporates a wide range of activities, from engaging in small scale micro-entrepreneurship, often in the informal economy, to family business, to managing large companies in high tech sectors and in manufacturing, each with its own set of challenges and constraints. A substantial number of women entrepreneurs are also own account workers, especially in agriculture”.
In a Delphi study, Gartner (1990) found eight themes that constituted the nature of entrepreneurship; entrepreneur, innovation, organization creation, creating value, profit/non profit, growth, uniqueness and the owner — manager. Carton et al. (2000) defined an entrepreneur as an individual or team that identified the opportunity, gathered necessary resources, created and was ultimately responsible for the consequences of the organization. Entrepreneurship was the means by which new organizations are formed whereby wealth and job creation mechanisms are initiated. Hisrich et al. (2002) defined entrepreneurship as the process of creating something new with value by devoting necessary time and effort, assuming the accompanying financial psychic and social risks, and receiving the resulting rewards of monetary, personal satisfaction and independence.

Shah (1990) found that when women entrepreneurs applied for training under entrepreneurship Development Programme (EDP), they listed “helping people” and “to supplement family income” as the reasons for starting out. But after establishing the business, they listed economic needs; desire to become independent, personal ego, personal satisfaction, family’s interest, time availability, utilization of one’s own experience, technical knowledge, and creativity as major motives.

Anna and Pillai (1990) opined that the quest for economic independence, better social status and sometimes sheer need for family’s survival, force women in to self employment and entrepreneurship. Easwaran (1992) observed that the primary motive for engaging in entrepreneurship by women was a desire for gainful time structuring and making more money to support the family. She found that women preferred entrepreneurship to job so as to adjust working hours in such a way to share family commitments also and more independence compared to a job.
Also she found that poor women were forced by economic necessity to feed the family while in higher income groups a business might originate from a desire to structure time gainfully or from genuine achievement motivation. Mali and Baruah (1992) found that a need for independence (wanting to be on ones own) and entrepreneurship development programmes were ranked most frequently as motivating factors. Padaki (1994) listed economic need and self motivation as reasons for starting enterprise. Iyer (1995) found that a high need for achievement motivated 53 per cent of male entrepreneurs and only 28 per cent of female entrepreneurs. Mishra (1996) listed family, personal and economic needs and experience as factors which influence the decision for enterprise launching. He stated that increasing number of women was establishing businesses in the formal sector as a way of generating income. From the poor women running such business (micro enterprises) who simply have to be enterprising in order to service, to the successful women entrepreneurs running small scale industries, one found an endorsement of women's tenacity, drive and capability – bringing them on par with their male counterparts.

Shah (1990) carried out in-depth study of economic performance of women entrepreneurs. They divided them into three distinct groups: High success rate (Group A), Average success rate (Group B) and Low success rate (Group C), Group A women were doing extremely well and were already in the process of diversification and expansion. Group B entrepreneurs were doing substantial business but had no immediate plans for expansion or diversification. Group C women entrepreneurs were just surviving.

Studies on women entrepreneurs vary in their approach, ranging from governmental rhetoric in most developing countries that treats women as one of the
deprived class (Kalleberg and Leicht, 1991) to theories at the other extreme (that claim that there are no major gender related differences in the approach of entrepreneurs to setting up and developing their businesses Easwaran (1992). Brush (1992) noted that "somehow women entrepreneurship has been neglected both by mass media as well as academic community. This is because of the assumption that entrepreneurship is a male activity". Centre for Women's Business Research, USA, brought out a series of researches during 1994.

Marketing intelligence or marketing orientation possessed by an individual was another promoter for entrepreneurship process to develop (Miles and Arnold, 1991). Entrepreneurship education was viewed as a major tool for social change and entrepreneurial success by Akhouri (1988) and Mishra (1991).

Marketing intelligence or marketing orientation possessed by an individual was another promoter for entrepreneurship process to develop (Miles and Arnold, 1991). Entrepreneurship education was viewed as a major tool for social change and entrepreneurial success by Akhouri (1988) and Mishra (1991). Sexton et al. (1997) identified the learning needs of growth entrepreneurs and provided curriculum and training approaches for bridging the gaps between academics and entrepreneurs. Hisrich and O'Brien (1982) emphasized that training programmes must be specifically tailored to the type of business to be pursued.

Iyer (1991) wrote that "Traditional role perceptions of males and females has undergone very little change over the years. The rigid hierarchical structure within the family and the community, re-emphasised the role stereotypes. The appropriate traits of conformity, obedience, modesty, dependence, submissiveness, self denial and adaptability are ingrained in the girl child within rigid hierarchical structure of the family and get reaffirmed by various other institutions like school, marriage etc."
in her later life. This results in the girl developing a low self image and sacrificing her self esteem to conform to the prescribed role of dutiful daughter and good mother.

Mishra (1991) identified lack of business confidence and fear to enter into a business venture as intrinsic problems and gender discrimination, faulty procedural formalities, handling finance, labour dealings etc. as extrinsic problems which women faced. Singh (1992) listed non-consistent traditional norms conflicts due to dual responsibilities, lack of recognition in the family, low economic credibility and lack of motivation from family and society as major constraints from the socio-sphere. Iyer (1995) found that 92 per cent of the women entrepreneurs faced “professional disrespect” by virtue of their gender. Shah (1992) started that almost every woman in the sample found it difficult to cope with attitudes and behaviour of lower level of staff who simply refused to accept women in the role of entrepreneurs. In contrast to this, Singh et al. (1986) wrote that “the successful women entrepreneurs do not face problems by virtue to their gender”.

Studies on women entrepreneurs vary in their approach, ranging from governmental rhetoric in most developing countries that treats women as one of the deprived class (Kalleberg and Leicht, 1991) to theories at the other extreme (that claim that there are no major gender related differences in the approach of entrepreneurs to setting up and developing their business (Easwaran, 1992). Brush (1992) noted that “somehow women entrepreneurship has been neglected both by mass media as well as academic community. This is because of the assumption that entrepreneurship is a male activity” Centre for Women's Business Research, USA, brought out a series of researches during 1994 whereby
Loscocco et al. (1991) found that female owned businesses had lower sales volumes and produced lower incomes than male owned businesses. Samuel (1991) found no significant difference in the managerial performance of male and female entrepreneurship in terms of profit.

Personal value systems of women entrepreneurs have also been studied by Olson and Currie (1992) and Fagenson (1993). In Indian studies, this variable has not been studied separately, though it has found mention among problems women face (Akhouri, 1988; Iyer, 1991 and 1995; Singh K, 1992; Mishra, 1996).

Singh (1992) in a study of U.P. women entrepreneurs found them to possess high value orientation. She argued that a woman's response to entrepreneurship and her decision to opt it as a career would be influenced, conditioned and directed by her value orientation.

Hartshorn (1992) stated that previous experience in the proposed business motivated individuals to become independent entrepreneurs. Hisrich and Brush (1986) found that women usually started with less experience than men. Cooper and Dunkelberg (1987) found good education, business family background, related previous experience and local origin as attributes of entrepreneurs. Watkins and Watkins (1983) in a U.K. study, found that backgrounds and experiences of women differed substantially from those of men. While men had prior work experience, women lacked prior experience, especially in non-traditional business sectors. The women were found to be unprepared for business start up and as consequence took greater risks.

Mali and Baruah (1992) confirmed that women start with smaller investments than men. Rani (1996) found that there was heavy investment in manufacturing industry; trading and service industries require lesser capital in that
order. Sole proprietorship was the mostly followed way with few partnership (23 %) concerns while joint family, cooperative and private limited companies were very few.

Fay and Williams (1993) found that women encounter credit discrimination in seeking start up funding, although the study concluded that this was not necessarily the fault of the banks. Shah (1992) reported that for most women in the sample, it took six to eight months to get their finance sanctioned and that too with high margin and heavier security conditions. Iyer (1995) found obtaining finance, collateral security and lack of experience in financial planning as the problems the women faced. Lack of collateral security has also been reported by Singh (1992). Vinze (1987) also listed lack of support form banks. Studies have also advocated need for bank officer training in reducing women's perceptions of discrimination (Buttner and Rosen, 1988).

In U.K. Johnson and Storey (1993) found that women proprietors had created more stable enterprises than males, although on average the sales turnover for women was lower than for males.

Job satisfaction is a general attitude of contentment towards the job as a whole. Cooper (1993) defined entrepreneurial satisfaction as a fundamental measure of success of an entrepreneur. Satisfaction was determined by the gap between achievement and goal expectations. He found that higher levels of performance had positive impact on the entrepreneurs satisfaction. In Indian context, Singh (1992) studied job satisfaction of women entrepreneurs and found majority of them with medium satisfaction scores.

Padaki (1994) found nine per cent women surveyed acquired technical know-how from hired consultants. Lack of such knowledge was listed as problem
faced by women entrepreneurs by earlier researchers. Mishra (1996) documented that “some women entrepreneurs have started acting as mentors and role models to other potential women entrepreneurs. They have started giving them technical knowledge by permitting them to work in their units as interns. Also, more exposure to business opportunities through mass media, marketing and educational curricula has benefited potential women entrepreneurs.”

Weeks et al. (1994) found that men and women entrepreneurs, thought differently, managed differently and defined success differently. Women emphasized intuitive decision making and caring while men emphasized logic. Women desired satisfaction and success from building relationships with customers and employees, having control over their destiny and doing something they considered worthwhile. Men entrepreneurs described success in terms of gaining self satisfaction for a job well done and achieved desired goals.

Van-dar Wees and Romijn (1995) stated that for men, self employment is legitimate and acceptable occupational status. Though, for women, stereotyping is often implicit. Indeed, two roles of women have undisputed acceptance, those of wife and mother. A third role, the economic one has been undervalued, if not rejected or criticized in many societies. Economic activities that are extensions of the roles of mother and wife are generally more accepted by men and women alike than are other activities that are labeled “non-traditional”. The range of economic activities women engage is not universal, what is unacceptable in one social context may be more easily accepted or be common practice in another. Also, the life cycle of women is seen as having a critical bearing on the kinds of business they operate”.

When it comes to expand their enterprise, women showed more keenness to improve their operations rather than expand (Mishra, 1996). Shah (1990) remarked,
“some women let their husbands or family men take over the leadership role once the business is well established and expansion is inevitable”.

Mishra (1996) considered rural women running micro-enterprises of few thousand rupees turnover and urban women running enterprises of a turnover of crores of rupees, both as “an entrepreneur”. He also conceded that “while women have to go through the same stages of setting up an enterprise as do men, and have similar challenges, irrespective of gender, women do have a distinct set of factors that first impede their entry as entrepreneurs, and later their survival as successful business women”.

Caste is one of the background variables which has been ascribed to have bearing on entrepreneurship process, as it was thought that certain castes being traditional business communities (Baniyas, Jains, Marwaris etc.) were entrepreneurial in nature than others. Beteille (1996) found that in metropolitan India, caste is no longer an important agent of social placement or control. How far this factor is having any effect on the process of entrepreneurship needs to be studied.

Socio-economic status is an indication of the social and economic background which may affect her decision to launch enterprise, affect start up process and also her risk bearing capacity. Meaningful conclusions drawn from such studies can help in identification of potential women entrepreneurs for development. Rani (1996) found that “women entrepreneurs were either from families which are already in business or having highly educated husbands or fathers.

Mishra (1996) emphasized that increased educational opportunities for women have provided them with skills, which has resulted in more opportunities for
them to pursue economic independence. He also attributed this to new constitutional rights, technological breakthroughs for reducing time and effort required for housework, economic growth increasing demand for more workers and above all to change in values towards equality and social justice. Singh and Sengupta (1985) documented shift of value system from feudal to entrepreneurial and growth of women entrepreneurship.

Buttner and Moore (1997) identified three important factors, namely desire for challenge, desire for self determination and desire to balance family and work responsibilities as motivational factors. Kuratko et al. (1997) based on a study of 234 entrepreneurs, identified a four factor structure of goal statements/motivators for entrepreneurs, which were (a) extrinsic rewards, (b) independence/autonomy, (c) intrinsic rewards and (d) family security.

Kuratko et al. (1997) based on a study of 234 entrepreneurs, identified a four factor structure of goal statements/motivators for entrepreneurs, which were (a) extrinsic rewards, (b) independence/autonomy, (c) intrinsic rewards and (d) family security.

Few studies suggested that women perform less well on quantitative measures such as job creation, sales turnover and profitability (Cliff, 1998; Fasci and Valdex, 1998). It was usually because women did not enter business for financial gain but to pursue intrinsic goals (for example, independence, flexibility to run business and domestic lives). Implicitly, women were deemed to assess success in relation to their achievement in attaining personal goals (i.e. self fulfillment, goal attainment etc.), while men were assumed to measure success using quantitative criteria e.g. profits, growth etc. (Buttner and Moore, 1997; Lerner et al. 1997; Still and Timms, 2000). Johnson and Storey (1993) found that women proprietors had
created more stable enterprises than had their male sample, although on average, the sales turnover for women was lower than for males. Kalleberg and Leicht (1991) found only slight differences in key performance measures.

Ganesan and Duraipandian (1999) stated that “an entrepreneur is a person who is willing to take risks because of the adventurous spirit within, same holds good for women also. Family opposition and social constraints had to be overcome by women before establishing themselves as individual entrepreneurs.

Sense of personal efficacy is another attribute, which has a bearing on optimism vs powerlessness of women entrepreneurs and thereby impacting performance as a consequence. Kabeer (1999) considered empowerment as the ability to define one’s goals and act upon them. It encompasses the meaning, motivation and purpose individuals bring to their activity, their sense of urgency, or the power within. Zimmermann (1990) found that as members gain success experience, enhance personal and social efficacy and acquire new skills, they also learn a new sense of hopefulness. Mehta (1998) developed E (Empowerment) scale which measures sense of personal efficacy or perceived psychological empowerment through assessment of one’s dominant thoughts and tendencies. It had three major dimensions of empowerment : (a) Autonomy vs Dependence (b) Self Esteem vs Self Depreciation and (c) Reflective vs Repetitive behaviour. He found that more efficacious one is, more is one’s motivation to perform. Choudhary (1995) observed that empowerment facilities developing entrepreneurial qualities. On the other hand, entrepreneurial pursuits lead to economic empowerment of women. Empowerment refers to a change from a state of powerlessness to one that recognizes and empowers women to take greater control over their lives and resources.”
In presence of such social values all around, the orientation of women entrepreneurs towards these normative beliefs may impact their performance. Thus it was logical to include it as one variable which was considered an important entrepreneurial trait of women entrepreneurs in our conservative nation. Thumton (1999) emphasized the inclusion of social context in entrepreneurship research. Hence, the entrepreneurial traits selected for the present study were achievement-motivation-influence needs, sense of efficacy, aspirations, orientation towards social values and entrepreneurial competencies. The last one included: initiative, opportunity seeking persistence, persuasion ability, self confidence, information seeking, concern for high quality, commitment, planning, problem solving, assertiveness and influence ability.

Rajeshwari and Samaangla (1999) inferred that a self employed women gained better status and it enabled her to take part in decision making in their family affairs. Entrepreneurship could help women's economic independence and their improved social status.

Shah (2000) analyzed behavioural, managerial and entrepreneurial performance of Indian women in enterprise. The study offset the common belief that women were involved only in part time/traditional/small business and established the emergence of a new class of women entrepreneurs in non traditional industries. Enterprise creation was seen as moving towards economic empowerment of women.

Das (2001) asserted that Indian woman entrepreneurs faced lower levels of work-family conflicts as compared to women from western countries.

Locke and Latham (2002) theorized that goal affects performance through four mechanisms: (a) as a directive function, (b) having an energizing function, (c)
affect persistence, and (d) affect action indirectly by leading to discovery and use of
task relevant knowledge and strategies. Hence besides projective techniques to
attempt an insight into motives, verbalization of plans and goals might elicit the
reason for a certain kind of behaviour, in this case, entrepreneurial endeavours of
women.

Collins et al. (2004) studied the relationship of achievement motivation to
entrepreneurial behaviour using meta analysis. It was found that achievement
motivation was significantly correlated with both choice of an entrepreneurial
career and entrepreneurial performance. Both projective and self-report measures of
achievement motivation were found valid.