CHAPTER III
CONCEPTUAL AND THEORETICAL REVIEW

In the last chapter the literature related to Islam and entrepreneurship, both textually and historically, was reviewed. However, stating the nature of the problem would not be complete unless the relevant theories and empirical studies are reviewed. This review would help in fixing the definition and characteristics of entrepreneurs and delineating the relationship between religious values/institutions, economic, and political structure, on the one hand and entrepreneurship on the other and, finally stating precisely the relevant hypotheses. These issues are taken up in this chapter, beginning with the origin of the term 'entrepreneur'.

The word entrepreneur appeared in the French language and was applied to leaders of military expeditions, beginning with the early sixteenth century. After 1700 it was applied to other types of adventures like the construction of roads, bridges, harbours and buildings and much later even to architectures. Bernard F. de Belidor applied it to the function of buying labour and material at uncertain prices and selling the resultant product at a

contracted price. Richard Cantillon, in early eighteenth century drew attention to the technicality of the term. The essence of the function of the entrepreneur was to bear uncertainty. Cantillon considered every one entrepreneur, barring princes, landowners, and salaried workers. But the physiocrats of the later eighteenth century, like Francois Quesnay and Nicolas Baudeau, considered even agricultural cultivators as entrepreneurs and considered essential characteristics of an entrepreneur to be of taking risk and creative innovations. Even A.R.J. Turgot at the same time spoke of the entrepreneur in manufacturing who risked his capital.

J.B. Say provided the definition that survived until the twentieth century who wrote of entrepreneur as the agent who "unites all means of production and who finds in value of the products------ the re-establishment of the entire capital he employs, and the value of the wages, the interest, and the rent which he pays, as well as the profits belonging to himself". His entrepreneur may or may not
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supply capital, but to succeed must have, "judgement, perseverance, and a knowledge of the world as well as of business. He must possess the art of superintendence and administration".

In the writings of English classical economists one finds words like adventurer, undertaker or projector but not entrepreneur, and never provided its precise definition. The term did not find place in the economic theories of Smith to Marshall, as all these theories were based on the theory of stationary equilibrium, established by the multiple reactions of businessmen, consumers, investors, and workers to the prices of goods and services.

Beside the theory, because of the inseparable entities of capitalist and entrepreneur, in the classical age, confounded the function of entrepreneur mainly because of small sized and closely held firms. As businesses grew, Alfred Marshall saw the difference between the functions of the capitalist and management, but did not elaborate upon.

Because of the rapid rise in corporate sector in America, Francis A. Walker, in 1870's saw the distinction between capitalists and entrepreneurs, to the latter he called as engineers of progress and the chief agents of production. F.B. Hawley in 1882 saw risk-taking as distinguishing attribute of the entrepreneur and ranked this on par with the other factors of production; land, labour and capital. J.R. Commons gave an explanation of risk taking entrepreneurship which Joseph A. Schumpeter had to elaborate upon.

Schumpeter gave credit to John Bates Clark for being the first to connect profit to entrepreneurship, thus, "entrepreneurial profits considered as a surplus over interest (and rent), with successful introduction into the economic process of technological, commercial, or organisational improvements". He ascribed progressive change through economic development to the work of innovative businessmen or entrepreneurs. To Schumpeter, a manager was an entrepreneur only while he was making a creative or innovative response, to which Arthur Cole differed significantly where he stressed continuing general
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actions of a manager\textsuperscript{12}, rather than only innovation, thereby differing in scope within which the term could be applied.

Although all economists recognised the importance of entrepreneurial function but found difficult to place this unquantifiable agent into the quantified theories, except recommending its study in empirical studies. As a result, "entrepreneurial study continues, however, in the unoccupied territory bordered by economics, history, and sociology".\textsuperscript{13}

Therefore, economists recognised, in general, that risk taking, innovation, and supervision and administration are the important ingredients of entrepreneurship. However, it is also recognised that the entrepreneurial characteristics would differ according to cultural setting of the enterprise.\textsuperscript{14}

Therefore, different scholars define the function of entrepreneur differently and some like Frank Knight ascribed the supply of entrepreneurship to multiplicity of

\begin{flushright}

13. Cochran, op.cit., p. 90

\end{flushright}
Psychological, social and economic factors. Schumpeter defines it as a function of innovation, Frank W. Young as a function of group level patterns, Bert F. Hoselitz as a function of managerial skills and leadership, Fredrick Harbinson as a function of organisation building capacity, McClelland as a function of high n. Achievement (n.Ach.), Harvey Leibenstein as 'input completing' and 'gap filling', Everett Hagen as a function of 'status withdrawal', John Kunkel as a function of social, political


and economic structure, and Max Weber\textsuperscript{24} as a function of religious beliefs. A brief description of the views and theories are in order.

According to Schumpeter economic development can take place only due to innovation, in an otherwise system in equilibrium. The innovations may relate to new product, technology, new sources of raw material, new market, or new organisation. An entrepreneur is the agent who works as a catalyst to activate these events: he is considered an innovator. He creates surpluses and could invade various fields with spectacular success. But its applicability is doubted in underdeveloped economies because the basic infrastructure and capital may block the innovativeness of entrepreneurs to unfold\textsuperscript{25}.

Frank W. Young accepts group or cluster of persons rather than individuals to qualify as entrepreneurs. Such a group combines the factors of production in new ways and are called entrepreneurs. He accepts Schumpeterian definition,


but includes the family background, experience, and membership of certain reactive groups and as reflection of general cultural values, as necessary ingredients.

Bert F. Hoselitz considers managerial skills and leadership as the primary factors, and financial skills as of secondary importance for entrepreneurship. However, subsequently he added risk-bearing quality to entrepreneurship.26

Fredrick Harbinson considers the skill of organisation building critical to entrepreneurship, where the entrepreneur multiplies himself by effectively delegating the authority, who in the absence of able deputees may not fructify.

McCleland, like Hoselitz, ascribes the innovative characteristics to entrepreneurial role. If there is no uncertainty in a venture, no risks and therefore no entrepreneurship is involved. Thus innovativeness and risk taking are critical27 and found them to be related to the need for Achievement, which depends on child-rearing practices. The concept of n. Ach. squares well with the Weberian concept that performing a role in relation to some


standard of excellence and that profit is only an objective measure of entrepreneurial performance. Harvey Leibenstein distinguishes between 'routine' entrepreneurship and 'new type' of entrepreneurship and finds the 'gap filling' and 'input completing' as the most important functions of entrepreneurship, and states that training may help improve entrepreneurial performances.

Everett Hagen, in explaining social change, recognises entrepreneurship as an important agent who originate from distinctive groups in societies. He states that 'creative innovation' and 'change' are the fundamental characteristics of economic growth. Such groups emerge when they experience 'withdrawal of status respect' for socio-political reasons, which squares well with the n. Ach. of McClelland. But Hagen considers social change as a slow process extending over a few generations, which therefore does not provide policy measures for backward countries.

John Kunkel has elaborated the theory of supply of entrepreneurship expressed by behaviouristic model, and considers that minority groups, but not all of them, supply larger proportions of entrepreneurs in a given society. He argues that industrial entrepreneurship depends on
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'limitation structures', 'demand structures', 'opportunity structures' and 'labour structures'.

Max Weber considers religious beliefs as the important causative factors for the development of capitalism and considers that Indian religion and Islam lack such a system. His theory on Hindu religious beliefs is criticised by a number of scholars.29

Peter Kilby, after reviewing the major theories of entrepreneurship suggests that technology and managerial competence are essential for entrepreneurship and he organised entrepreneurial functions into four groups, namely: exchange relationship, political administration, management control, and technology and that these functions would vary according to the size, type and setting of an enterprise30, and that these functions could be augmented through training and education - a position which John Harris takes after studying Nigerian entrepreneurship.31


These are the major theories put forward by scholars, most other studies are done in either of the frameworks of these theories. In subsequent studies, some scholars tried to club these theories into sociological, psychological and economic theories. But it is neither necessary nor possible to classify these theories into such categories. To take an instance, the theory of Max Weber may well be classified as sociological or psychological. What is important, however, is to classify them into areas which these theories address to. For the sake of convinience they may be categorised into the theories related to

1. Supply of entrepreneurs
2. Characteristics and Typologies of Entrepreneurs
3. Functions of the Entrepreneurs
4. The role in Economic Development.

In general, it may be stated that the supply of entrepreneurship depends on the socialisation process, education, training and experience which subsequently orient the individuals towards specific careers depending on the environmental factors, like the opportunities and

limitations. Certain groups are more entrepreneurial than others. These groups provide values and training to the younger generation, who in turn take to entrepreneurial career. But not all individuals of these groups become entrepreneurs, which is due to the fact that each individual has one's own individual experiences and may lack resources or motivation to move into these lines.

A large number of studies are conducted in India and elsewhere which try to delineate entrepreneurial characteristics, and as a result a baffling list of adjectives is available to describe entrepreneurial personalities, and often conflicting results are obtained. However, four characteristics are fairly commonly repeated; namely, risk taking ability, innovativeness, managerial skills and n. Ach. It may be stressed that these characteristics may not apply to all the entrepreneurs, the degree and presence or absence would depend on the size of

the enterprise and the level of development of the locale of the enterprise. In case of small enterprises most of these characteristics need to be present in some degree because of the multifarious role of such an entrepreneur, as he cannot afford specialists who may be delegated some of the functions.

In small enterprises an individual performs roles varying from bringing together all the necessary inputs, including finance, labour, licenses, machinery and equipment, land and building etc, to the production, management and marketing of the products. However, in medium and large companies, many of these functions can conveniently be delegated, where an entrepreneur can confine oneself mainly to opportunity scanning, resource mobilisation including professionals and overall supervision and direction of the company. In such cases, however, the entrepreneurial roles get compounded with the organisation.

In most theories of economic development, the entrepreneur, although very well recognised, could not find any particular place, especially in the production function. The difficulty is that the concept of entrepreneurship is multi-disciplinary and is a qualitative phenomenon which does not display very clear quantifiable pattern. Therefore, there is a need to construct socio-psychological
measures, that could be incorporated into the production function to arrive at entrepreneurial performance, either in overall economy, different sectors of industries, varying sizes of the enterprises, or according to the regional context. Such an attempt is made in this study on an experimental basis.

Before attempting to a brief description of emperical studies it may, in summary be stated that the emergence and growth of entrepreneurship depends on the entrepreneurship qualities like innovativeness, risk taking ability, managerial skills and high n. & among the groups or individuals at a given point of time when favourable economic, social, cultural and religious values and environments exist for the development of such qualities.

A large number of emperical studies are conducted in India and elsewhere, which are reviewed here to encase the problem under study.

D.R. Gadgil\textsuperscript{34} in his historical study states that the economic development was impeded by the colonial rule; otherwise the craft-based industries were flourishing well at the beginning of the eighteenth century. He also analysed the communities involved in trade, finance and
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handicraft industries in different geographical regions during seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. 35

Helen Lamb 36 analysed the origin of business communities like Parsis, Gujaratis and Marwaris from middle of the nineteenth century and she did not find any evidences to show that the heirarchical view of society was ever an impediment to vigorous commercial and industrial entrepreneurship.

Andrew Brimmer 37 intensively studied the impact of managing agency system on the setting of entrepreneurship in India. This system provided much scarce factors of finance and management but created problems of concentration of wealth and wide ranging malpractices.

James Berna 38, studied fifty two medium sized manufacturing firms in Madras and Coimbatore and found that
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caste and tradition played little role in the emergence and expansion of entrepreneurship and also suggested that favourable government policies will further help diversify the entrepreneurial base.

Leighton W. Hazlehurst\textsuperscript{39} studied Ramnagar (a pseudonym on India-Pakistan border) entrepreneurs and tried to analyse the impact of migration on the entrepreneurial structure and found that entrepreneurial continuity was further augmented by the migrant entrepreneurs and also noted that refugee entrepreneurs tended to be more innovative than local entrepreneurs.

Robert Kennedy\textsuperscript{40} found that Parsi entrepreneurship could be explained by their Zoroastrian teachings. However, Amalendu Guha\textsuperscript{41} in his historical study of Parsis from 1750-1850 found that their success was attributable to their interest in European forms of business organisation, development of ship building, exploration of new markets.


69
acquisition of working knowledge of English language and adaptation to political milieu.

Thomas A. Timberg\textsuperscript{42} analysed the Marwari entrepreneurial community and seems to conclude that as entrepreneurs the Marwaris performed crucial roles in the development of the industrial and commercial economy of India. This role was facilitated by the strong community support to migrant Marwaris by providing accommodation, finance and supportive values. Their austerity and hard work helped them to build strong capitalist base.

D.K. Taknet\textsuperscript{43} in his recent study on Marwaris tried to show that the phenomenal growth of entrepreneurship of Marwari community is the product of geography and history. The hard living conditions forced migration and provided them innovativeness, frugality, thrift, diligence, racial cooperation and intimacy, charity, devotion to religion and morality, endurance and simplicity.

Raymond Lee Owens and Ashis Naudy\textsuperscript{44} found that


\textsuperscript{43} Taknet, D.K., Industrial Entrepreneurship of Shekawati Marwaris, Jaipur, 1968.

n. Ach. was not higher in the successful entrepreneurs belonging to Mahisyas in Howrah as compared to those from higher casts. This could be explained by the supportive community and positive self image in case of Mahisyas as compared to those from higher castes, in which case the entrepreneurs were deviants.

Richard Fox 45 studied the bazaar economy of a north Indian town and found that scale of business enterprise among traditional merchants was not correlated with a difference in religious ethics, psychology, caste or family loyalty. Instead the status of bazaar merchant was reduced due to colonial rule in India.

McKim Marriot 46 revisited Ramgarhi in 1969 after 18 years and found that the traditional peasants had taken to modern methods of cultivation and that the social structure responded to the opportunities and process of modernisation.

Milton Singer 47 in his Madras city study of 19


industrial leaders found that the industrialists have adopted adaptive strategies to 'compartmentalise' their actions in industry from their traditional rituals and caste obligations.

Michael M. Ames\(^4^8\) also stressed this compartmentalisation of the obligations of extended joint family and workplace, implying that the joint family was a alive concept despite the requirements of modern living conditioned by the industrial life of Jamshedpur workers.

E. Wayne Nafziger,\(^4^9\) in his study of Vishakhapatnam entrepreneurs concluded that there was a disproportionate representation of high castes and, families with higher socio-economic status, which these castes did to maintain or to defend the privileged status, and to enhance or consolidate the high economic position of the family, implying that pre-industrial caste and class groups survived the process of capitalist industrialisation and substantiated his point in relation to the dominant groups in other countries as well.


V.R. Gaikwar and R.N. Tripathi studied small entrepreneurs in Andhra Pradesh and found that non-business communities do better because trading communities found industrial production carrying more risk and long gestation period as compared to trade.

SIET Hyderabad studied small units in Hyderabad and Secunderabad and found that younger age, formal education, urban background, experience in industry, high scores in levels of aspirations, risk taking and adoption intensity were some of the characteristics that were positively associated with the quality of entrepreneurship. But factors like technical education, high monthly income, contacts with influential people, membership of organisations and n. Ach. were not associated with entrepreneurship.

Gloria V. Javillonar and George R. Peters in their study considered family rather than individuals as

50. Gaikwar, V.R. and Tripathi, R.N., Socio-Psychological Factors Influencing Industrial Entrepreneurship in Rural Areas, National Institute of Community Development, Hyderabad, 1970

51. SIET, Socio-Psychological Factors Influencing the Adoption and the Innovation of Starting a small industry Unit, small Industry Extension Training Institute, Hyderabad, 1974.

qualified for entrepreneurship, found n. Ach. motive as inconsistent, and that extended family helped entry into entrepreneurship.

Ashish Nandy\textsuperscript{53} studied entrepreneurs and a matching non-entrepreneur group from Howrah in West Bengal and found that entrepreneurial exposure is an important factor for entry into production. He also found that n.Ach. is the best predictor, followed by n.Power and the sense of efficacy to entrepreneurship.

K.L.Sharma\textsuperscript{54} studied the entrepreneurs in Uttar Pradesh and Punjab and found that socio-economic milieu, non-business background were the most important determinants of entrepreneurship. However, in a later study\textsuperscript{55}, he suggested a multivariate model of entrepreneurship with four stages, namely; entry, expansion, perception of stability and commitment to sustained growth. He concludes that the role of government policies and their implementation is essential to sustain entrepreneurial interest.
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M.U. Desphande\textsuperscript{56} studied the small industries of Marathwada region and found that government policies, the upper strata of society, social and political leadership, occupational background, family aspirations, and general infrastructure as the important factors for the development of entrepreneurship.

There are some studies which are conducted in other cultural contexts that emphasise different characteristics of entrepreneurship and also stress the sociological and economic factors as important\textsuperscript{57}. Most of them emphasise that certain groups take to entrepreneurship in large numbers and that the social structure is not an impediment to the origin and growth of entrepreneurship.


instead it is the economic milieu that influences and regulates the supply of entrepreneurship. The primordial relationships survive in the process of industrialisation and often some traditional institutions even help in the supply and growth of entrepreneurship.

There are but only a few empirical studies available on the Muslim entrepreneurship and even less so, in case of Muslim entrepreneurship in India. These studies may be reviewed in brief here.

A.J. Meyer 58 in his study of Middle East noted that minority status is not an important factor in mobilising entrepreneurship. He states that in Lebanon the Muslim and Christian populations is almost 50 percent each, but there were Christian Industrialists in majority, in Syria there were only 10 percent Christian but most entrepreneurs were Muslims. In Turkey, Iraq and Saudi Arabia the entrepreneurs were Muslims, mainly Sunni Muslims. But in Bahrain and Iran Shia Muslims and in Africa Ismaili Muslims were entrepreneurs. He noted further that in Islamic societies the capitalism is expanding fast with indigenous entrepreneurs and Muslims are found even more enterprising in countries other than the ones to which they belong. He

concluded that management, risk taking and innovations are highly important factors in the growth of entrepreneurship. However, in the contemporary Middle East entrepreneurship was all risk and management and no innovation. Despite the Koranic injunctions against riba, the capitalist class is expanding, often inheritance laws are flouted and extended family loyalty is strong.\(^{59}\)

Yusif A. Sayigh,\(^{60}\) in his study of 207 innovative entrepreneurs found that in Lebanon, religious and social structure is not found any factor of significance in inhibiting the supply of entrepreneurs. In a subsequent analysis,\(^{61}\) he stressed that though cultural values do pose some resistance to development but the "stickiness" of cultural pattern is not high as the sociologists emphasised conventionally. The traditional society is undergoing rapid change with the pace of industrialisation and that there is no reason to believe that cultures or religion of the Arabs are any impediments to economic development.


Van Leur, J.C., 62 in his study of Indonesia noted that Islam and Muslim mercenaries that came to Indonesia brought with them the expansion of trade but in no way the religion contributed or inhibited the economic development of that country.

J.M.Van der Kroef 63, similarly in his study of Indonesian entrepreneurs divided the middle class into five categories and stated that the development of the country was impeded by the political factors but he did not consider the religious or cultural factors as impediments to the entrepreneurial development in Indonesia.

Hafeez Malik 64 in his comparative analysis of East and West Pakistan for the post-independence period tried to search the spirit of capitalism in Islam and concludes that Islamic ideology reinforced the economic development. However, he emphasised political and economic factors as very important.


The theme of Zafar Altaf's study relates to the relationship of the size of the enterprise and access to government benefits, capital and technology. He found that the industrial entrepreneurs mainly originated from trading communities. The laws of inheritance induced horizontal multiplication of units rather than vertical growth. Amongst the most important motives, he discovered 'desire for independence' and 'financial gains'. He also found education as a modernising factor of Pakistani entrepreneurs. He noted that the occupational representation in entrepreneurship is growing.

Gustav F. Papanek studied Pakistani industrialists and concluded that a responsive bureaucracy, favourable government policies, a value system and institutions not hostile to entrepreneurship, a group of responsive traders and stable political system favoured the growth and development of entrepreneurship.

Perhaps, the problem related to Islamic ideology and Muslim entrepreneurship is most vigorously attented to


in an empirical way by Hanna Papanek. She studied Memons work ethic, attitudes and values and arrives at her theory of 'partial' modernisation. She found that the Memons are extremely devout, pilgrimage to Makkah (Hajj) stands as a cherished value, large numbers observe daily prayers, pay regular Zakah (poor tax), but get around customary laws of inheritance of 1937 Shariat Act and also get around the religious sanctions against usury (riba), yet display that vigorous entrepreneurship which is comparable with calvinist austerity. The entrepreneurs under study seem to have compartmentalised the work and religious observance. However, she reported number of mosques in factory compounds, that usury is not a tormenting issue, Jamat protects marriages through mediations and teaches frugality, and community fines on members on conspicuous consumption. In her own words,"Islamic religious prescriptions were assimilated into the general system of

values of community and generally seen as positive forces in
supporting self-confidence and pride in the occupational
roles". 68

On Indian Muslim entrepreneurs there are no
specific studies except the one by Mattison Mines on
Pallavaram Tamil speaking Muslim Merchants 69 in Madras state
and S.M.A. Rizvi on Muslim Karkhanedars 70 of walled city of
Delhi.

Mines argues that urbanisation of Muslims
increased in India during 1901-1961, and analysed the
religious percepts like loan on interest with their economic
behaviour and found that both co-existed and also discovered
that many Pathan Muslims practiced money lending. Nor did
he find the community values, including negative attitude
towards education, as any obstacles to economic pursuit.
All the economic values and attitudes were conditioned by
the bazaar economy rather than religious beliefs. In fact a
large number of his respondents showed pride in business
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occupation as it was in tradition of the Prophet. But in general, their economic behaviour was rational.

Similarly respondents in Rizvi's Delhi study described work as ibadat (worship) if it was done honestly. But concludes that growing industrialisation brought more individualism and that families were getting partitioned into smaller units.

Some studies, while conducting research on entrepreneurship try to find out the community and caste composition, where occasionally some Muslim entrepreneurs also appear. But the tendency is to club all the Muslims in one category instead of classifying them by caste. For instance, Sheobahal Singh in his study found 39 percent Muslim entrepreneurs. Nothing is analysed in relation to their caste composition and its relationship with entrepreneurship.

The theories and empirical studies on entrepreneurial communities, regional studies in India and abroad in relation to religious factors, and studies related to entrepreneurial characteristics throw some questions and trends into relief. The theories and empirical studies

related to entrepreneurial characteristics reveal that risk taking, innovativeness, n.Ach. and managerial competence and status withdrawal or marginal group status are, by and large, are accepted attributes, albeit with different degrees of emphasis. Therefore, these areas become critical to be examined in relation to entrepreneurship.

Secondly, most empirical studies on the relationship between religion and entrepreneurship seem to differ on direction and emphasis showing that religious values may be important for development or inhibition of the origin and growth of entrepreneurship. This relationship needs to be examined in the light of Islamic percepts.

Thirdly, some empirical studies agree that social structure of Asian societies inhibit or retard the growth of entrepreneurship but most disagree with this proposition. Therefore, this aspect also needs to be studied empirically.

Fourthly, most agree that stable political environment, favourable government policies, sympathetic bureaucracy and favourable institutional or infrastructural development facilitate entrepreneurship.

Finally, and perhaps a less important issue is related to the fact that entrepreneurship is an individual or group phenomenon (organisation or family).
Therefore, the hypotheses of the study may be stated, thus:

1) Muslim religious values are not relevant to entrepreneurship.
2) Indian Muslim social structure and entrepreneurial origin and growth are independent.
3) Muslim entrepreneurs are no better or worse off than the non-Muslim entrepreneurs.
4) The entrepreneurial development is not dependent on political milieu, or government administration and institutional development.
5) The entrepreneurial qualities like risk taking, innovativeness, n. Ach., and managerial competence are not discriminatory characteristics between higher and lower levels of entrepreneurship, and
6) Entrepreneurship is not a group phenomenon. Alternatively, it is an individual phenomenon and groups are only supportive entities.