INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurial orientation has taken hold across the globe and has undeniably impacted the world of business forever. Over the last two decades entrepreneurship has emerged as arguably the most patent force the world has ever experienced. Entrepreneurship is at the heart of economic growth and socio economic development (Aardit & Aardit, 1977). The contribution of entrepreneurship to national growth has been documented in the literature (Reynolds et. al 1999). The global entrepreneurship monitor (GEM) provides empirical data regarding the impact of different entrepreneurial forms on the level of economic growth in 37 countries (Reynolds et al. 1999). Entrepreneurs have the potential convert and synthesize ideas into something tangible in the process of proactive reification. Entrepreneurship requires an application of energy and passion towards generation and implementation of valuable ideas and creative solution.

In the present times entrepreneurship is required for grave practical reasons in the sense that it can revolutionize the way business activity is conducted at every level. Though entrepreneurship is desired by all the countries but it is certainly a boon for developing countries like India. Where enhancing growth rate is a major challenge entrepreneurial firms enable million of people, across all sections of society, age and gender to pursue the pursuit of economic success.

ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION

Entrepreneurial orientation refers to the processes, practices, and decision making activities that lead to new entry (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996). An entrepreneur is the person who bear the risk of operating a business in the phase of uncertainty about future conditions and in turn is rewarded
accordingly by the outcome in terms of profits and losses. Some other characteristics of entrepreneurs are, self confidence, risk-taking, competitive behavior commitment, persuasion, innovation and leadership etc (Drucker, 1985). Here it is important to note that entrepreneurship is related to new business entry and is concerned primarily with questions as “what business do we enter and how do we make the new business succeed” (Richard, et al, 2004) where as it is the entrepreneurial orientation of the person that would determine his/her terms of zeal to accept new challenges, take risks and endure the adversities. Entrepreneurial orientation is the combination of abilities, traits and extra personal influences that world enables a person to mobilize his/her psychological resources to enter into a challenging a venture. The **seven distinct characteristic features of entrepreneurial orientation** are risk taking, achievement motivation, organizational abilities, self concept, persuasion, attitude towards entrepreneur and problem solving ability. **Risk taking** depicts the attitude to take prudent risk. Entrepreneurs must not only be the risk taker but also risk handlers who rationally gauge and deal with risk, effectively (Sorenson, 2007). **Achievement motivation** theory states that people who have a strong need for achievement often exhibit certain characteristics. Which include needing opportunities for promotion, requiring feedback so that success can be recognized, placing more importance on tasks than on relationships, having a preference for tasks that allow them to have power and control, recognition for successful outcomes due to their actions, to participate in tasks that exhibit their expertise, seeking tasks that are challenging so that expertise can be recognized. **Organizational ability** involves entrepreneur’s have the capacity and ability to start new organization or revitalizing mature organizations, particularly new business generally in response to identified opportunities, **Self-Concept** is an internal agency which is comprise of self-
assessments. The term self-concept is a general term used to refer to how someone thinks about or perceives him/herself. Total commitment, hard work, energy and single-mindedness are essential components of the entrepreneur’s self profile. *Persuasion quality* is entrepreneur imply that entrepreneurs at times play the leadership role in the sense that along with their personal contribution they persuade, motivate and encourage others to participate in the process of innovative contributions to the success of business. *Problem solving* is a higher-order cognitive process that requires the modulation and control of more routine and fundamental skills. Problem-solving is a mental process that involves discovering, analyzing and solving problems. The ultimate goal of problem-solving is to overcome obstacles and find a solution that best resolves the issue (Reed, 2000). *Attitude toward entrepreneur* is a person's perspective toward a specified target and way of saying and doing things. Attitudes are expected to change as a function of experience. It is widely recognised that enterprise attitude is a strong driving force for entrepreneurial orientation.

Various authors attempted to classify entrepreneurs into some sub categories with divergent viewpoints and implications. However, classification of entrepreneurs suggested by Johnson (2001) seems to cover a wider range of the construct. These *four categories of entrepreneurs* are as follows:

1. **Innovating Entrepreneurs** are frequently aggressive in experimentation and exhibit clarity in putting attractive possibilities into practice. An innovating entrepreneurs is, thus, one who introduce new goods, inaugurates new methods of production, discovers new markets and recognize the enterprise. It is important to note that such entrepreneurs can work only when certain level of development is already achieved, and they look forward the process of change and improvement.
2. *Imitative Entrepreneurs* are characterized by readiness to adopt successful innovations. These entrepreneurs do not innovates the changes themselves they only imitate the techniques and technology innovated by others and apply these to their venture in hand.

3. *Fabian entrepreneurs* are characterized by great caution and skepticism in experimenting any new change in their enterprise. They imitate only when it becomes perfectly clear that failure to do so result in a loss of the relative position in enterprise.

4. *Drone entrepreneurs* are characterized by a refusal to adopt opportunities to make changes in production formulae even at the cost of severely reduced returns. Such entrepreneurs may even suffer losses but they are not ready to make change in their existing strategies.

**An Overview of Theoretical Models of Entrepreneurship**

*Innovation theory (Joseph A. Schumpeter, 1934, 1982)* According to this model, development is not an automatic of spontaneous process rather it must be deliberately and actively prompted by some agency within the system. It is an ‘entrepreneur who provides economic leadership that changes the initial conditions of the economy and causes discontinuous dynamics changes. By nature he is neither technician nor a financier but an “innovator” who cause change and reshape the scenario.

*Group level pattern theory (Young, 1971)* This theory postulated that instead of individuals, groups with higher differentiation have the capacity to react. He designed ‘reactivesness’ or ‘solidarity’ as the degree to which members of the group create, maintain and project. Differentiation is defined as the diversity. Some members of the solidarity group excel at combining resources like labour, capital etc. in new ways and they become entrepreneurs.
This theory of change is based on society’s incorporation of reactive sub group. A group will become reactive as per young’s theory, when the three conditions coincide. That is, firstly, when a group experience low status recognition; secondly, when the denial of access to important social networks and thirdly, when the group has better institutional resources than other groups in society at the same level.

**Managerial Skills and Leadership Theory (Hoselitz, B.F. 1952)**

According to this theory if a person is to become an industrial entrepreneurs he/she must have additional personality traits. According to him, managerial skill and leadership are the important facets of entrepreneurship. Hoselitz's (1963) analysis of entrepreneurship naturally suggests a method for the development of entrepreneurship which depends upon allowing the development of personalities whose predominant orientation is in the direction of productivity, working, creation, and creative integration along with establishment of social institutions which create a favorable environment for the establishment and existence of independent individual entrepreneur. He/she creates their own commodity despite uncertainty about its acceptability. Therefore, entrepreneurs tend to assumes more risks.

**Achievement motivation theory: (McClelland 1961)** like Hoselitz (1963), McCelland (2006, 2009) describes the innovative characteristics of entrepreneurial role. McClelland, like others, identified two characteristics of entrepreneurship. First is doing things in a new and better way. This is synonymous with the innovative characteristics given by Schumpeter (1934). Second is decision making under uncertainly, i.e. risk as identified by Cantillon (1755) and thoroughly studied by various researchers (Naldi, Nordqvist, Hellerstedt & Wiklund (2007). Mc Clelland’s major contribution lies in extending our understanding of casual sequence of entrepreneurial behaviour.
McClelland has explained the entrepreneurs interest in profitability in terms of a need for achievement. For people with high need for achievement, profit is a measure of success and competence.

McClelland, attributes the inculcation of the achievement orientation of child rearing practices which stress standards of excellence, maternal warmth, self-reliance, training and low father dominance. The casual sequence of entrepreneurial behavior as extended by various researchers (McClelland, 1965; Lee & Lim, 2008).

In Input Completing and Gap Filling Theory (Liebenstin, 1968) distinguishes two broad types of entrepreneurial activity namely the ‘routine’ entrepreneurship which is associated with managerial function of the business and the entrepreneurship which is basically of Schumpeterian (1934) type. He identified “gap filling as an important attribute of entrepreneurship. In economic theory, the production function is considered to be well defined and completely known. But theory is silent about the keeper of the knowledge of production function, where and to whom in the firm this knowledge is supposed to be available is never stated. In reality there exist larger gaps in knowledge about the production function. It is the entrepreneurial function to make up the deficiencies or to fill the gaps.

An Upsurge of Interest (Baptista & thurik, 2004; Arend, 1999 and Henderson, 2002). Most of the researches on entrepreneurship gained momentum in the last two decades due to its implications for issues such as unemployment, and impeded economic growth and development. Most of the research on entrepreneurship concentrates on analyzing the firm creation process that too when the decision to create the firm has already been taken. It has been observed that in all studies no attention has been paid to those internal processes and external factors which give a push to people in that direction.
This aspect is referred to entrepreneurial orientation. From this point of view the important thing is not an individual’s will to create a new firm, but what is that particular thing which made the person to have that kind of orientation and zeal to opt for that kind of activity which has been covered under the title of entrepreneurship.

Entrepreneurial orientation construct is often described in entrepreneurship literature as the mind set of firms engaged in the pursuit of new opportunities (Lumpkin & Dass 1996; Wiklund, 1999; Wiklund & Shepherd, 2003). The impact of entrepreneurial orientation on performance in different contexts, for different types of firms, was analyzed by Wiklund & Shepherd (2005); Hughes and Morgan, (2007), but without serious attention paid to the factors and conditions which produce this specific mindset.

Entrepreneurial mindset can be described as multidimensional concept which is affected by two institutions, namely formal institutions (training institutes/school etc.) which would contribute to creating opportunities and informal institutions (family, parents, friends etc.) would contribute to shape society for exposure and individual’s perception for these opportunities (Welter 2007). Personality, exposure factors and family therefore have collective contribution to admiration of entrepreneurial activities in adolescents (Busenitz et. al. 2000)

The rapid changes occurring in society as a result of globalization and due to various problems (unemployment, financial crisis, Job adjustment), which society is facing are not just effecting life style but also the ways through which people earn their livelihood. Although everyone is making constant efforts to combat with the problems arising in their feilds but the most suitable way to get rid of these kind of problems is the development of entrepreneurial orientation, which is more than the mere creation of business and is the
dynamic process of vision and change which requires an application of energy and passion toward the creation and implementation of new ideas and creative solutions. Entrepreneurial orientation appears to be as an important facet which has the potential to revolutionize the way business is conducted at every level and in every country. In present scenario entrepreneurship appears to be a major attraction for young generation especially, for those who are highly motivated in converting their creative talent into production resources. It is in this context that there is a serious need to tap its main reservoir which is entrepreneurial orientation.

**PARENTING AND DEVELOPMENT OF ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION**

A growing body of literature show that entrepreneurs act on what they perceive as valuable opportunity driven by his/her special motivation. Motivation, cognition and action with possible mediators i.e intentions and optimistic ideas are some of the key features of entrepreneurs (Kruger, Reily & Carsrud 2000). Achievement orientation (Leung & Kwan, 1998; Anoula, Stattin & Nurmi, 2000), self confidence (Chen et al., 1998; Scott & Twomey, 1988; Krueger, Reilly, & Carsrud, 2000; Markman et al. 2002; Wang, Wong, & Lu, 2002; Segal, Borgia, & Schoenfeld, 2005), achievement need, energetic participation in an endeavour and desire for independence are other psychological factors judged by entrepreneurs as related to their success. (Kuratko and Hodgetts, 1998; Gross, 2005)

Psychological literature is replete with findings and indications regarding primary influences of parenting in determining children’s achievement related outcomes (Hess & Holloway, 1985; Belz Geary 1984, Jencks, 1972; Majoribanks, 1980). Studies about the role of parents' input in
development of attitudes, motivation and self evaluative outcomes of children indicate that development and use of inner resources of children are amenable to modification in significant manner. In this context the parental control’ dimension has been studied at length in various domains especially school performance outcome as well as self regulation of emotions in children (Hess & Holloway 1985). One pole of control dimension was termed as restrictive (Becker, 1964), controlling (Scheffer, 1989) and autocratic (Baldwin, 1949; Wolfradt et al 2003; Zhou et al 2004; Martinez et al 2007 and Rothrauff et al 2009) which was characterized by parent’s use of power in achieving compliance and inculcating obedience in their children. The opposite end of parenting style was termed as restrictive dimension which implied lack of control and a passive approach to child rearing (Dwairy 2004 & Williams et al 2009). Baldwin (1949); Glasgow et al. (1997) and Berger (2001) identified another style that was democratic which implied active approach in which child’s views are taken into account. Baumrind et. al. (1967, 1971) proposed two dimensions namely, firm vs lax control and psychological antonomy vs psychological control for classification of parenting styles. She classified parents who were high in psychological antonomy and firm control as authoritative whereas parents high in psychological control and firm control were labeled authoritarian. Children of authoritative parents were found to be more self reliant and independent whereas those of authoritarian parents were more withdrawn and discontent Darling & Steinberg (1993). Ketz (1988) & Colman et.al. (2006) in the context of development of self regulation described the process of gradual shift from primarily external to primarily internal sources of controls infancy onwards. In this transition role of caregiving interaction with parents tend to play a major role. Caregiving interactions expose children to new regulatory skills and strategies and provide valuable
opportunities for practicing and strengthening regulatory abilities (Coleman, Hordy, Albert, Raffacti & Crochelt, 2006). Researches also showed that effective management of future emotional experiences of children depends on secure parent child relationship (Londeriville & Martin, 1981; Tronich, 1989; Thompson, 1994; Vondra, Shan, Swearingen, Cohens & Owens, 2001).

Following this body of research regarding main effects of parenting in various domains of children’s behaviours and skills, it appeared that parenting styles might be playing crucial role in shaping children’s entrepreneurial orientation. Hence to analyse the effect of three styles of parenting on entrepreneurial orientation namely, Authoritative, Authoritarian and Permissive which were based on Baumrind’s rich qualitative studies (1991) and Buri’s (1992) were taken for operationalization of the construct accout.

**Authoritative parenting**: Authoritative parents are highly demanding and highly responsive. These parents, though assertive, use disciplinary methods that possess a rational and supportive quality, thus are not punitive or one sided. The goal of these parents is to facilitate cooperative orientation and self regulated children, opposed to submissive and direction taking oriented children. Finally, authoritative parents give clear cut rules that are enforced, but rules are neighter absolute; and nor overly restrictive or intrusive. So authoritative parenting have been found to have a significant positive impact on the personal network. The strongest personal networks are based on the trust between parent and child relationship, while less effective personal networks are framed around very strict, submissive and demanding relationship. Favourable first impressions and being able to adapt effectively and quickly to a wide range of social situations are important source of strong and successful personal and social networks (Ireland et al. 2001) and the value of networks as
an integral part of entrepreneurial success is widely acknowledged (Elfring & Hulrink 2003).

Authoritative parents use interpersonal strategies with the help of positive reinforcement and personalized modes of interaction to produce higher levels of social competence (Baumrind, 1978), a greater ability to regulate emotions, high social skills (Isley, O’Nell and Parke, 1996), and self regulation (Black & Bawrins, 1967). Personalised modes of interaction are the perquisite for effective technology transfer in entrepreneurial process. Feedback and positive reinforcement could therefore be of value in starting and improving entrepreneurial skill (Andrezejewski et al 2001). Interpersonal strategies are dramatically more effective in achieving the individual and organizational behavior changes needed for entrepreneurial orientation processes (Brown & Flynn 2002). Baumrind (1993) found that during the years of middle childhood, children reared by authoritative parents excelled in areas of independence, creativity, persistence, social skills, academic competence, leadership skills, social perspective taking, and self control. All these are the basic personality components seems to be required for entrepreneurial oriented processes.

Authoritarian Parenting: It is characteristed as highly demanding and low responsive. Such parents have highly inflexible structured environment consisting of detailed rules which are expected to be followed without question. In this of form of one-way communication, the child is not permitted to express views or opinions (Baumrind, 1977). Authoritarian parents show little warmth, involvement, support and emotional commitment to their children (Baumrind & Black 1967). An extreme version of authoritarian parenting style will be considered as hostile parenting which include a high frequency of parental
annoyance, disapproval, anger while punishing, mood dependent punishment, behavior management problems, repeated discipline for the same thing, and decreased frequency of praise. Parents determine the direction of behavior of their children. Studies have found that accepted and protected children are likely to be better able to face the demands of life outside the home then the children who has been neglected, rejected and punished. In many studies (Sandhu & Bhargava, 1988 and Bhargava & Bansal, 1996) it was noticed that in the ambit of a neglected parenting rejected children had a disorganized personality, low self esteem and pessimistic view of life.

Beside this, Authoritarian parents tend to raise obedient youth who do not question authority (Baumrind, 1991; Lamborn et. al 1991; Steinberg et al. 1994; Jackson et al., 1998). These youth also tend to have both low self esteem and less social competence in school (Jackson et al 1998). They are more likely to report positive academic performance as compared to neglectful parenting but not compared to authoritative parenting (Aunola & Nurmi, 2004; Wearden, Peters, Berry, Barrowclough, & Liversidge, 2008 and Prinzie, Stams, Dekovic, Reijntjes, & Belsky, 2009). Lamborn et. al (1991) in an investigation regarding price potential of academic activities noted that although they perform well at academic front, they pay the price where self confidence is required.

Elder (1965) reported that parental dominance and submissiveness both adversely affect the development of autonomy, academic motivation and adolescents’ perception of parent’s support for learning has a strong impact on their achievement motivation (Mau & Bikos,2000). All these studies provide sufficient evidence that children reared by authoritarian parent have less chances to develop an entrepreneurial attitude as career perspects.
**Permissive parenting style:** Permissive parents are characterized by low demandingness and high responsiveness. Permissive parents, also termed indulgent parents, are committed parents who are accepting their children. Their household is likely have few rules, and rules are not consistently enforced. These children learn self regulations largely on their own. Such parents avoid confrontation and their expectations of adolescent’s mature behaviour are low. According to (Peterson & Hann 1999) permissive parenting allows extensive autonomy to the child, corroborated by high parental support, with the hope of engendering close relationship with their children. According to Baumrind (1968) children of permissive parents are often left to regulate their own activities, behavior, and emotions at an early age.

Researches have suggested that low parental supervision is positively related with child disruptive behavior (Dornbusch et al. 1985; Griffen et al. 1999; Kim, Brody & Murry, 2003; Pashall, Ringwalt & Flewelling, 2003). Disruptive or an abrasive communication styles have a potential negative effect on the child’s behavior, as observed by Mc Cord (1991). Emphasizing the importance of quality parent-child relationship and parents quality supervision, Amato and Gilbreth (1999) suggested that parents’ extrinsic support (e.g. going out to eat, going to movies, shopping) was not related to child’s positive behavior orientation. On the other hand intrinsic support associated with authoritative parenting (e.g. trust, encouragement, discussing problems) rather than permissive parenting was positively related to entrepreneurship. Studies have also shown that under achievers tend to experience less responsiveness and fewer demands from parents (Shek & Chan 1998).

Highly energetic parents, who were found to be especially effective in achieving a balance between restriction and control, and have rational assessment about children’s need were effective role players in developing
entrepreneurial orientation rather then the parents providing a complete freedom without any restriction or question (Shek & Chan 1998). Neglected parents on the other hand are low in both responsiveness and demandingness. These parents are basically emotionally uninvolved with their children. Uninvolved parents have a household that consists of no rules, no monitoring or supervision, and regulation of behavior is self taught by children. Finally, these parents may also be rejected by adolescents and discourage parent-child contact. The role of parents is largely associated with congenial development of personality because the child first comes in contact with parents and depends on them to satisfy his/her needs. Neglected parenting which is also called the inadequate parenting usually understood to be a prime source of maladjustment (Erickson, 1963), truancy, guilt, self-devaluation and show dependency on others (Coleman, 1970).

Following implications of parenting styles for childrens behavior, it is contended that parenting is a significant external factor in determining the kind of person he will become. Hence, an attempt to understand the effect of parental encouragement upon the entrepreneurial orientation of the individual would be highly relevent. Nuttal & Nuttal (1976) found that parents perceived as more accepting and using less permissive, restrictive and hostile psychological control tend to have children with high achievement motivation. Chaudhary & Slahudin (2006) found a positive relationship between family members’ role and entrepreneurial spirit. As families prepare for succession, they (children) learn how to interact in constructive way in order to tow responsibility for the business and the family. According to social learning theory the essential characteristics of individuals are belief in their own capabilities and motivation to do an entrepreneurial work (White 1982). Bandura (2008) suggested that the type of personal agency described above can
be developed through observing others. It is suggested that a key element in building such personal agency is the role that parents play in shaping early individual leadership development (Bandura 1986). Furstenburg, Eccles, Elder, Cook and Someroff (1999) suggested that the higher degree of personal agency results from parenting provides social enabling environments for positive development of children and their future success. For example, researchs have shown that children who experience authoritative parenting have higher achievement orientation, self confidence, internal locus of control, level of moral reasoning, industriousness, independence, self efficacy and generatively (Baumrind, 1991; Hunsberger & Pancer, 2009).

The accepted and protected children are likely to be better able to face the demands of life outside the home than the children who have been neglected, rejected and punished. The accepted children are generally socialized, co-operative, friendly, loyal and emotionally stable whereas rejected children are likely to be shy, docile, self-conscious, submissive and sensitive. They feel inadequate, inferior, confused, bewildered and inhibited (Symonds, 1938) resulting in lowered autonomy and task independence. Children experiencing parenting with supportive behaviour develop a capacity to learn and transfer knowledge quickly and use of this skill will further become a source of competitive advantage in human capital (Ireland et al 2001).

A strong relationship between children and their parents greatly depends upon the children’s perception of their parents’ manners of handling them. If they perceived parental disciplinary method in a positive way their relationship will be healthier and strain free (Schmitt-Rodermund &Vondracek (2002). Hence it is concluded that the whole structure of entrepreneurial orientation of adolescents is standing upon the contribution of parents. Where the contribution is missing the process of developing entrepreneurial
orientation has gone erratic. The kind of parents a child have and a kind of relationship he/she has with them remain the most significant for the child.

PERSONALITY AND ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION

Knight as early as in 1921 described entrepreneur as being inherently confident and venturesome in the face of uncertain future. He also stated that entrepreneurs assume the risk of creating a new venture and ensure others by guaranteeing a specified return (Ripsar, 1998). Gartner (1988) also pointed out that focus on distinctive psychological characteristics has a long tradition in entrepreneurial research. Personality according to Mischal (1976) consists of distinctive patterns of behaviours characterized by each individual's adoption to the situations of his/her life. Within the context of different personality frameworks, individual differences have been the main focus of attentions of researchers i.e Gramzow, Sedikides, Panter, Sathy, Harries & Insko (2004) include control (Gough, 1987) impulsivity (Buss & Plomin, 1984), ego strenghts (Barron, 1972) superego strength (Cattell, 1980), Prudence (Hogan, 1986) and constraint greater ability to delay gratification (Funder & Black, 1989). Stolze (1999) looked into personality aspect of entrepreneurs interms of their motivation to achieve, habit of hard work, non conformity, strong leadership and street smartness. Zimmerer & Scarborough (2002) overemphasized the factor of capacity to take risk and face uncertainty. It appears that a number of concepts used in the personality research in the control of entrepreneurship have been quite slippery, sometimes difficult to operationalize also.

It is broadly accepted that personality variable have important role to play in developing theories of the entrepreneurial process including such areas as entrepreneurial career intention (Crant, 1996; Zhao, Seibert & Hill, 2005),
and entrepreneurial cognition of opportunity recognition (Ardichvili, Cardzo and Ray, 2003). Entrepreneurial behaviours involve a capacity for risk taking, creativity, and a certain level of ambition, the attributes which are in one way or the other linked with personality. It appears as if certain kind of persons would be attracted to these behaviour, whereas other people would choose safer and more conformist avenues of employment (Llewellyn and Wilson, 2003). Identifying the relationship between personality characteristics and entrepreneurial orientation is important for theoretical and practical reasons, because entrepreneurs with a certain personality trait may have a tendency to identify with sub-optimal entrepreneurial orientation. Hence to identify this tendency may provide benefits to the organization.

In contrast to theory based speculations the emergence of five factor model of personality in which hierarchical taxonomy represents personality traits as characterized by five overarching dimensions tend to account for the largest percentage of variance in personality ratings. The emergence of five factors model of personality (Digman, 1990; Costa and McCrae, 1992) allow us to organize a vast variety of personality variable into small but meaningful sets of personality constructs to search for consistent and meaningful relationship. The five broad dimensions of personality according to Costa and McCrae (1992) are neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness.

**Neuroticism:** Neuroticism represents individual differences in adjustment and emotional stability. Individuals high on neuroticism tend to experience a number of negative emotions including anxiety, hostility, depression, self-consciousness, impulsiveness and vulnerability (Costa and McCrae, 1992). People who scores low on neuroticism can be characterized as self confident, calm, even tempered and relaxed.
Entrepreneurs work within a relatively constructed environment where they have primary responsibility for all aspects of venture. They work for more hours, therefore lack the level of separation between work and life spheres. They also typically have a substantial, financial and personal stake in a venture and lack the security of benefits. Thus work environment, work load, work family conflicts, and financial risk of starting and running a new business venture can produce physical & psychological stress. At the same time, entrepreneurs have been described as highly self confident with a strong belief in their ability to control outcomes in the environment (Crant, 1996; Chen, Greene & Cricke, 1998). Remarkable self confidence and resilience in face of stress therefore appeared to be much more important for entrepreneurs. As a result of processes of attraction, selection, attribution as described above, we expect entrepreneurs to have a lower level of neuroticism.

**Extraversion:** Extraversion describes the extent to which people are assertive, dominant, energetic, active, talkative, and enthusiastic (Costa and McCrae, 1992). People who scores high on extraversion tend to be cheerful, like people in large group and seek excitement stimulation. People who score low on extraversion prefers to spend more time alone and characterised as quiet, reserved, and independent. Costa and McCrae (1992) described sales persons as prototypical extraverts.

Extraversion is positively related with interest in enterprising occupations (Costa, McCrae and Holland, 1984). It appears that extraversion is important for entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurs must interact with the diverse range of constituents including venture capitalists, partners, employees and customers. They are often in the role of sales persons, whether they are persuading an investment banker or venture capitalist to back their ideas or
client to buy their product or services. In addition to the capacity for external relations, even if minimum of the prerequisite structure for a new venture or shortage of developed human resource is there, the entrepreneur can spend considerable time in direct social interaction with external and internal constituent for the success of venture. Hence it is contended that extraversion would play a positive role in the development of entrepreneurial orientation.

Openness to experience: Openness to experience is a personality dimension that characterises someone who is intellectually curious and tends to seek new experiences and explore novel ideas. Someone high on openness can be described as creative, innovative, imaginative, reflective, and untraditional. Someone low on openness can be characterised as conventional, narrow in interest, and unanalytical. Openness is positively correlated with intelligence, especially the aspects of intelligence related to creativity, such as divergent thinking (McCrae, 1987). Schumpeter (1942; 1976) argued that the defining characteristics of the entrepreneurs are his or her emphasis on innovation. Researchers have also noted the strong desire of entrepreneurs to be creative and to create something longer than themselves (Engle, Mah and Sadri, 1997). It require the entrepreneurs to explore novel ideals, use their creativity to solve novel problems, and take an innovative approach of products, business methods or strategies. Management, on the other hand, has a greater emphases on established rules and procedures to coordinate activity and maintain current productivity (Weber, 1947; Denis, 1994; Phan & Hill, 1995; Zahra,1995; Shane & Venkataraman,2000; Wright, Hoskisson, Busenitz & Dial, 2000). Even in the most rapidly changing organizational environments, the managerial role is likely to place more emphasis on established policies and implementing strategies developed at a higher level. It is therefore expected that entrepreneurs will score higher on openness to experience, then managers.
**Agreeableness**: Agreeableness assesses one's interpersonal orientation. Individual high on agreeableness can be characterized as trusting, forgiving, caring, altruistic and gullible. The high end of agreeableness represents someone who has cooperative values and a preference for positive interpersonal relationship. Someone at the low end of this dimension can be characterized as manipulative, self centered, suspicious, and ruthless (Digman, 1990; Costa and McCrae, 1992). All these characteristics of the agreeableness may lead one to be seen as trustworthy and may help one form positive, cooperative working relationship. High level of agreeableness may inhibit the willingness to drive hard bargains, lookout for their own interest and influence or manipulate others for their own advantage. McClelland and Boyatzis's (1982) research has also shown that a high need for affiliation, component of agreeableness, can be detrimental to the career of managers, apparently because it interferes with the manager's ability to make difficult decision affecting subordinates and co-workers. Seibert and Kramer (2001) also found agreeableness to be negatively related to salary level and career satisfaction in a managerial sample.

Although the negative effect of agreeableness appears to predominate for those performing managerial work in established organizations, it is expected that the negative effect to be even more detrimantal for those in an entrepreneurial role. Because the entrepreneurs have to operate with less access to legal protections and with the thin financial margins of error due to limited resources, they are even more likely to suffer serious consequences from even small bargaining advantages. Entrepreneurs working in smaller organizations are less likely to be constrained by dense and interlocking social relationship (Burt 1992). This suggests that there may be fewer negative repercussion
associated with the opportunistic behaviour of entrepreneurs. Therefore, we expect lower level of agreeableness among entrepreneurs.

**Conscientiousness:** Conscientiousness indicates an individual's degree of organization, persistence, hard work and motivation in the pursuit of goal accomplishment. Some researches have viewed this construct as an indicator of volition or the ability to work hard (Barrick and Mount, 1991). It has been most consistent personality predictor of job performance across all types of work and occupations (Barrick, Mount and Judge, 2001). Many scholars regard conscientiousness as a broad personality dimensions that is composed of two primary facets, i.e achievement motivation and dependability (Mount & Barrick, 1995).

McClelland, (1961) was the first to propose that a high need for achievement would drive individuals to become entrepreneurs primarily because of their own efforts rather than other factors. McClelland (1961) also proposed that effective managers would not be characterized by a high need for achievement because managers in organizational environments must work with and through other narratives. Reviews of achievement motivation and entrepreneurship suggest that support for the relatedness has been mixed or inconsistent (Johnson 2001). Collins, Hanges and Lacke (2004) reported that the entrepreneurs have higher achievement motivation. The dependability facet of conscientiousness reflect the extent to which one is organised, deliberate and methodical and can be relied on to fulfill one's duties and responsibilities like the overarching conscientiousness construct. This particular constellation of attributes would appear to be valuable in managers or entrepreneurs. However, managers working with in an established organization are likely to have their responsibilities, goals and work performances more closely structured and
monitored by enlisting organization at systems and day to day interactions, mitigating somewhat the necessity of possessing dependability as an individual trait. Entrepreneurs, by contrast, operate in a more discretionary and self directed environment, that is, a weak situation in which individual traits are likely to have a more important role (Snyder & Lckes, 1985). In addition, it seems that potential partners, venture capitalists, and others agents will be more likely to select entrepreneurs whom they judge to be dependable, for example, those who could develop detailed plans and strategies and demonstrate the tendency to fulfill their commitments. So, it is expected that entrepreneurs score high on conscientiousness.

Staw, Bell and Clausen (1986) performed several landmark longitudinal experiments and found that stable individual personality disposition is formed by the age of adolescence and, thereby, makes it possible to predict future behaviour and attitudes in spite of key situational changes. There is some evidence to suggest a link between entrepreneurship and low neuroticism, conscientiousness and agreeableness, and high openness to experience and extraversion (Brandstatter, 1997). In addition, there is a small amount of research that suggests that successful entrepreneurs may be higher in conscientiousness than unsuccessful ones (Schmitt-Rodermund, 2001).

It has been observed that in of the studies available in the context of personality and entrepreneurship generally the descriptions of behaviours sounded like personality traits (Llewellyn & Wilson, 2003), despite the fact that in most of cases the operationalization of the concepts was unclear and findings equivocal. That is why the conclusions regarding personality studies in entrepreneurship need to be treated with caution. Though, Baron (1998) pointed out that researchers could not clearly differentiate between entrepreneurs and other people with respect to what seemed to be most relevant
dimension of personality and that there are no personality characteristics that predict who will be a successful entrepreneur. Prinzie et.al. (2009), These comments seem relevant in the sense that in most cases researchers have relied on ambiguous and broad band concepts of personality rather than focusing on empirically based and well operationsalized concepts. In this sense it is contended that importance of personality factor cannot be undermined for understanding the development of entrepreneurial orientation, but the conclusion must be based on some primary dimensions of individual differences. Hence following the implication of findings of use of Big five model in various contexts, it is expected that it might give some important leads to the understanding of Entrepreneurial orientation.

ENTREPRENEURIAL EXPOSURE ON ENTREPRENEURIAL ORIENTATION

Till the turn of this century the main focus of researchers remained on personality traits as an explanation of entrepreneurship. But finding it hard to draw flawless and stable inferences from the findings of these studies, attention shifted toward consideration of some extrinsic variables. However number of such factors touched upon by researchers is numerous, which included business environment (Bettis & Hitt, 1995), culture (Lee, Lim & Pathak, 2009), market factors (Shermen & Black, 2006), socio economic background (Mathivannan & Selvakuman 2008), occupation effects (Shane,2000;Sorenson,& Audia,2000; Klepper.2001), socio-political environment (Douglas & Sheperd,2000) and governmental policies (Minniti, Bygrave & Autio,2006) etc. Some researches have also addressed the issues like education and training (Florin Karri & Rossiter,2007), co-workers effects (Gompers,Lerner & Scharfstein,2005) and exposure to stimulating environment (Thomas & Mueller, 2000) for
entrepreneurship. However the scrutiny of all these studies revealed that almost all these studies have taken up these variables singularly that too on samples of restricted scope for drawing valid inferences.

Hence to unravel the significant influences on entrepreneurial orientation some of the variables belonging to socio-environmental domain which seem to have potential were taken up for investigation in the present study. These variables are the effects of media, family, school, peer effect, friends and relatives. It is proposed that adequate exposure of adolescents to the positive facet of the above mentioned factors will make a difference in the development of entrepreneurial orientation.

Following the observation that the attitude, mind set, dedication and skill of an entrepreneur largely depends upon the entrepreneurial exposure and that this exposure exposure shape people's perception of entrepreneurship, it is contended that the more congenial the environment the more person is likely to exhibit entrepreneurial orientation which in turn will foster entrepreneurial spirit in society.

**Media:** The word *Media* has been defined in many ways so as to accommodate different criteria or setting. For instance, media is defined as organized means of dissemination of fact, opinion and entertainment in the form of newspapers, magazines, cinema films, radio, television, and the world wide web. According to Krippendorff (1980) mass media is the generic term for newspapers, book publishing, radio and television. Medium of the media industry includes internet, mobile phone, cable T.V. etc. The essential role of the media is that it can be used to deliver information for the mass usage which can promote entrepreneurial values. In this sense media can be an important tool for entrepreneurial exposure. Hence, media can plays an important role in influencing the entrepreneurship phenomenon. Adolescent might have a strong
inclination towards entrepreneurship due to the exposure they are getting directly or indirectly from media.

**Family members and relatives:** At societal level of analysis of entrepreneurs it has been observed that some societal environments especially family and environments may be more conducive for development of new venture. Consequently, these societies will come to be populated by a distribution of number of enterprises. Adolescents having entrepreneurial exposure in terms of their family members, relatives and community members will have strong inclination towards entrepreneurship. In fact family members and relatives constitute a social network which serve as information dissemination mechanism which facilitate entrepreneurship (Djankov et.al. 2004 and Gompers et.al. 2005).

**Peer Factor:** Some researches tried to relate the characteristics prevalent in the firms in which individuals enter to their entrepreneurship before and after the entry. Results of these studies suggested that there was a change in entrepreneurship scores (Saxeinian, 2000 and Gompers et.al. 2005). Researches also suggest the central role of peers in the diffusion of ideas, attitudes and behaviours. Friends and acquaintances influence the adoption of new technologies and the spread of managerial fads and fashions (Burt, 1992). Social models have been shown to be a consistent and strong predictor of entrepreneurial intentions (Hisrich 1990). Individuals who have family members and/or close friends who are entrepreneurs tend to, are more likely to start their own business than those who have not benefited from same level of exposure to entrepreneurship. Following these observations it is felt that peer effect is likely to exert significant influences in development of entrepreneurial orientation.
School/Institution factor: Education and training act as motivational engine of entrepreneurial capabilities. Purposeful education enhances students entrepreneurial efficacy through providing a set of attitudes, knowledge and skills which equip the individual to cope with complexities embedded in entrepreneurial task such as opportunity seeking, resource assembling, and leading the business to success (Wilson, Kickul & Marlino, 2007). In fact, education enhances entrepreneurial efficacy of students through providing experience of mastery, role models, social persuasion and support by involving them in hand on learning activities, business plan development, and running, simulated small business (Fiet, 2001; Segal, Borgia and Schoenfeld, 2005). There have been indications in literature that education can plays a crucial role in developing students entrepreneurial efficacy through involving them in various entrepreneurial activities and increasing their desirability to step into venture creation by highlighting the merits, values and advantages of entrepreneurship (Segal, Borgia & Schoenfold, 2005); as well as encouraging and supporting them to start-up their own business. Luthje and Franke's (2003) reported, successful research universities seem to promote entrepreneurial activities among students.

Family Environment: It has been observed that individuals are more likely to become entrepreneurs if their family is engaged in some business or had prior entrepreneurial experiences. Krueger (1994) found prior entrepreneurial exposure influenced intentions through perceived feasibility and positiveness of past experiences which in turn influenced perceived desirability to start a new venture. The family background of the individuals influences their occupational choice. Business families are more likely to supply entrepreneurs than any other type because the person from business families are directly or indirectly
exposed to family business situations which makes them familiar with the business practices. Entrepreneurial activity might legitimize the choice of business as a viable career by family and close associates (Stuart & Ding, 2006; Sorensen 2007b). Sorensen (2007b) finds that self-employed parents have lasting effects on their children's propensity to enter self-employment, even if the parents stint in self-employment is short-lived. Children of the self-employed parents by virtue of their exposure to entrepreneurial role models in the family would attach greater value to entrepreneurial job characteristics (Halaby 2003).

With regard to the external variables which have been studied in relation to entrepreneurship, it appears that each study has kept limited focus in mind. All these related investigations can be taken as an important contributions but with specific and limited implications. Hence it is contended that taking the above discussed variables collectively into consideration might help to find out the significance and importance wise hierarchy among them for nurturing entrepreneurial orientation.

In sum, empirical evidence available so for with regard to the development and nurturing of entrepreneurial orientation has not lead to the final answer as to what is there to be directly taken care of if we wish to promote entrepreneurship in our culture. Whatever has been said is neither complete, nor profound. The appropriate answer appears to be an aggregation of multidimensional effects of the potentially relevant variables. If some specific personality traits are prerequisite than the seed has to be flourish under proper care in an appropriate environment. Hence variables from these three active domains viz. personality of adolescents, (neuroticism, openness, extraversion agreeableness, conscientiousness), their parenting (authoritative, authoritarian, permissive), and their exposure to significant psychosocial
environment factors (Family, friends, school, neighbourhood, relatives, media) were taken up for investigation.

**NEED OF THE STUDY**

The rapid changes occurring in society as a result of globalization and due to various problems (unemployment, financial crisis, job adjustment), which society is facing is not just affecting lifestyle but also the ways with which people earn their livelihood. Policy makers are making constant efforts to combat with the such problem arising in the society but the most suitable way to get rid of these kind of problems is to promote entrepreneurship in its citizens. Here it is important to recognize that entrepreneurship is not the outcome of some accidental phenomenon or just a sudden emergence of an entity rather a byproduct of a long process that was set in at very early stage of development. This process implies the development of entrepreneurial orientation which is more than the mere creation of business. It is the dynamic process of development of vision and change which requires an application of energy and passion toward the creation and implementation of new ideas and creative solutions. Entrepreneurship has been proved as an important facet that has revolutionized the ways in which business is conducted at every level and in every country. No doubt it has been proved beneficial for all the countries but it can be a boon for developing countries, like India. As entrepreneurial firms enable million of people, including women, minorities and immigrants to access the pursuit of economic success. Entrepreneurship plays a crucial and indispensable role of providing the social glue that binds together both ‘high tech’ and ‘main street’ activities. Therefore, in present scenario entrepreneurship is working as a major attraction for young generation especially, for those who are highly motivated in converting their creative
talents into productive resources. So, the younger generation of 21st century wish to become more entrepreneurial generation. However the outcome i.e. entrepreneurship is rooted in a disposition, the process called entrepreneurial orientation. Here it is contended that the entrepreneurial orientation its disposition, initiation & development is influenced by a number of factors which include personality, parents and a number of external factors like media, family environment & education etc. Some empirical research is available in this context but with equivocal results and limited in scope. Keeping in view the social needs and global trends in economic activity the present investigation has been planned to unravel the factor which can be taken as foundation of entrepreneurial orientation which further would ensures the expansion of entrepreneurship phenomenon.

On basis of an analyses of researches available in the area of entrepreneurship and gaps in knowledge about answers provided by them, the following objectives were identified to be focused upon in the present investigation.

**OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

1. To study the relationship of authoritative, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles with entrepreneurial orientation of adolescents.
2. To study the association between personality and entrepreneurial orientation in adolescents.
3. To study the relationship between entrepreneurial exposure and entrepreneurial orientation in adolescents.
4. To analyse the relative contribution of parenting styles, personality and entrepreneurial exposure to entrepreneurial orientation of adolescent.