



PERSONAL INFLUENCE AND ENTREPRENEURIAL CAPABILITY: A STUDY OF WOMEN AS CONTRARIAN GROUP IN RUSSIA

Vipin Gupta*, Tatiana Iakovleva**

ABSTRACT

Despite previous research identifying many of the antecedents associated with entrepreneurial behavior, little systematic research examines the role that personal influences beyond socio-cultural factors influence entrepreneurial behavior. In specific, we need a better, richer understanding of how personal influences are related to a nascent entrepreneur's development of his/her own perceptions of capabilities to launch a new venture. Our results revealed that women have a higher mean entrepreneurial capability, and higher mean personal and social influences. We also find that personal and social influences are positively related to entrepreneurial capability; the strength of relationship does not vary significantly by gender. Finally, we find that personal influence has a U-shaped relationship with entrepreneurial capability, especially for women, but not differently for men also. Only at low and high levels, personal influence has an accelerated positive influence on entrepreneurial capability.

Keywords: Personal influence, Entrepreneur, Capability, Behavior.

INTRODUCTION

A long and rich tradition of research has examined the impact of personal psychological factors on entrepreneurial behavior. Conversely, there has been a historical tradition for examining the impact of socio-cultural or sociological factors on entrepreneurial behavior (See Shane, 2004). Impact of personal psychological factors refers to the influence of people's observations of their own self, and may be termed as 'personal influence'. Impact of socio-cultural sociological factors refers to the influence of people's observations of their families and communities, and may be termed as 'social influence'.

Recently, a number of studies across disciplines cited below suggest known group differences mediate the influence of personal and socio-cultural factors. People from contrarian groups – those

who evidence deviant attitudes, norms, and behaviors from the mainstream – are more influenced by observations of the members of their families and communities, whereas people from dominant groups – those who evidence mainstream attitudes, norms and behaviors – are more influenced by observations of their own self.

- Immigrant entrepreneurship: immigrant entrepreneurs have been found to rely on the members of their community generally, and their family more specifically, for human and financial capital, and for sourcing and for marketing; their role models tend to be the members of their own family and community (Zimmer and Aldrich, 1987).
- Ethnic entrepreneurship: ethnic entrepreneurs, such as blacks, Hispanics, and Asians, have also been found to evidence similar behaviors,

* Roslyn Solomon Jaffe Chair in Strategy, Simmons School of Management, Simmons College, Boston, USA

** Senior Research, Nordland Research Institute, Bode, Norway

far more than the majority whites who rely comparatively more on their own self (Masurel, Nijkamp, Tastan, and Vindigni, 2002).

- Women entrepreneurship: women entrepreneurs in studies from a number of nations have been found to evidence similar behaviors, which distinguish them from male entrepreneurs who rely comparatively more on their own self (Greve and Salaff, 2003).
- Social entrepreneurship: entrepreneurs in nonprofit and public sectors have also been found to evidence similar behaviors, as compared to the for-profit entrepreneurs who rely more on their own self (see Seelos and Mair, 2005).
- Micro entrepreneurship: micro entrepreneurs have also been found to be more successful when they rely on members of their family and community, as compared to the macro (i.e. large enterprise) entrepreneurs (Aldrich & Zimmer, 1986; Ramachandran & Ramnarayan, 1993).
- Rural entrepreneurship: entrepreneurs in rural areas have been found to evidence similar behaviors, as compared to the urban entrepreneurs who rely more on their own self (Frazier and Niehm, 2004).
- Asian/LDCs entrepreneurship: In Asian nations, and less developed nations, the entrepreneurs have been found to rely more on their family and community, as compared to the entrepreneurs from the Anglo nations and the more developed nations, which are the economically dominant group at the international level (Menkhoff and Gerke, 2002).

The social influence on the members of the contrarian group has often been interpreted as conformity, and restrictive of personal choice. In this paper, we review the relevant literature, and propose that the members of the contrarian group may have a choice to conform or not to conform. These members may conform when conformity is expected to be more attractive; and may instead play a transformative role if social influence is not positive. To play this transformative role, these members may rely on the strength of their reserved personal influence.

We develop hypotheses based on the review of the literature, and test these hypotheses using a survey of Russia that investigated entrepreneurial intentions of a sample of men and women. Our findings suggest that contrary to the predictions expecting the members of the dominant group to have a greater personal influence to be entrepreneurial and to have a greater entrepreneurial capability, the members of the contrarian group may rely on a combination of both personal and social influences for developing super-normal entrepreneurial capability.

The impact of socio-cultural sociological factors

Research on a diverse set of contrarian groups has increasingly shown that models developed for the dominant group contexts cannot simply be borrowed and applied to explain the behavior of the contrarian groups. For people from contrarian groups - including immigrant, ethnic, women, social and micro entrepreneurs – socio-cultural interdependence and connectedness carries a substantial value. Social resources, such as financial capital in the form of rotating credits, informational capital about unique market and customers, and human capital comprising of the family and the community members, have been found to be important to the entrepreneurs from the contrarian groups. Informal networks of the contrarian groups are generally based on social or kinship ties or geographic proximity (O'Donnell, Gilmore, Cummins & Carson, 2001); a member may have multiple over-lapping networks based on different types of ties and serving diverse over-lapping purposes. Informal social networks act as a source of privileged and flexible information, resources, and support, for the contrarian groups, who lack sufficient assistance from and linkages with the formal institutional systems. For instance, formal business information sources tend to be less accessible to the members of contrarian groups, and do not reflect their unique needs (Frazier & Niehm, 2004). Effective networking can supply competitive information to contrarian groups and create first mover advantages in the identification of market gaps (Aldrich & Zimmer, 1986). Such

networking can create intangible, relational assets, or social capital, which can be leveraged to create opportunities for well-connected members (Burt, 1992). Informal social networks are also filling the need for reconciling work and family life, which tends to be greater among the contrarian groups, who lack appropriate institutional support (National Reference Centre for Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, 2004).

More specifically, social network research has shown that informal networks contain information and knowledge gaps, or structural holes. Well-connected members may bridge these gaps, thereby adding value to the members of their informal groups (Burt, 1992). The ability of a member to bridge the gaps, and to exploit social capital, rests on the confidence of the group about the normative basis of the member's behaviors, intentions, and motivations (Jones & George, 1998). Mutual trust and obligations contribute to the shared confidence within an informal social network.

Social Influence and Entrepreneurial Behavior

An important issue is whether one depends only on own group resources and niches, or whether tries to broaden net to the wider market. Many recent empirical investigations have analyzed this so-called internal and external orientation (e.g. Choenni, 1997). An internal orientation ensures stability, but limits market expansion (i.e. "break out strategy"). This is so because informal social networks tend to lack sophisticated information channels, resources, and skills needed to support broader market expansion and diversification (Levent, Masurel, & Nijkamp, 2003). The entrepreneurial benefits of informal social networks tend to be greatest in niches and sectors where informal production (with low government control and low competition from the formal sector) yields a competitive advantage. These benefits weaken as the contrarian entrepreneurs seek to develop or pursue break out strategies.

An additional issue relates to the enmeshment effects, or psychological enmeshment, of the

informal social networks. Research has identified four variables that moderate the enmeshment effects of informal social networks. First, in absence of institutional protection, contrarian entrepreneurs may be vulnerable to exploitation or undue influence from their informal networks. For instance, street vendors in India often are forced to borrow Rs. 100 from a money-lender in the morning, and return Rs. 120 in the evening (Singh, 2000), and are thereby entrenched in the vicious cycle of money lending at high interest rates, making little profits. Second, informal networks may lay excessive claims on members who are successful, sometimes even forcing them to break their ties (Narayan, 1999). Third, informal networks may also create downward leveling pressure. One study found that the black students in a suburban school in Ohio were ridiculed as trying to be white, if they took their schoolwork seriously (Fletcher, 1998). Fourth, informal networks may undermine a sense of accountability, and engender corruption and cronyism (Evans, 1989). Essentially, exploitative influence, excessive claims, downward leveling, and cronyism variables may make informal social networks a negative liability, rather than a positive resource, for entrepreneurial capability.

Nevertheless, when the informal social networks are supportive of entrepreneurial initiatives, they should have a positive impact on entrepreneurial capability; further the positive effects of social networks, in general, should outweigh their negative effects. Also, while the members of the dominant group have also been found to rely on network relationships, their relationships tend to be more formal, less enduring, and more oriented towards short-term goals.

The Impact of Personal Psychological Factors

For people from dominant groups – including non-immigrants, non-ethnic majority, men, for-profit entrepreneurs, and macro entrepreneurs — an opportunity for personal choice is a powerful motivator. Research involving subjects from dominant groups has identified four variables that moderate the opportunity for personal choice. First,

personal choice is more difficult to exercise in relation to the acts in which people engage publicly rather than privately (Hovland, Campbell, & Brock, 1957). Second, personal choice becomes less likely when people have exerted past efforts on and shown their prior commitment to certain behaviors (Sherif, Sherif, & Nebergall, 1965). Third, personal choice is problematic when people are engaged in irrevocable commitments (Jones & Gerard, 1967). Fourth, personal choice becomes further constrained, when people have previously exercised or believe they have exercised a choice, and then they strive to be consistent by not opting to choose subsequently (Freedman & Steinbruner, 1964).

Essentially, people from dominant groups perceive opportunity for personal choice to be limited when their behaviors are or are believed to be public, effortful, irrevocable, and based on prior volition. Asch (1951) was classic evidence. In the presence of nine other confederates who all provided the wrong answer, Asch (1951) asked Anglo-American male participants to name which of three comparison lines was the same length as a standard. 36% of his subjects conformed to group pressure. Subsequently, over 100 studies have examined the choice limitation. Recent meta-analyses indicate that the greater the size of the majority, the greater the likelihood of choice limitation (Bond & Smith, 1996).

Thus, people from dominant groups may be expected to have a desire to defend their personal choice, by relying on their personal psychological influence for making decisions. Indeed, studies involving members of the dominant groups suggest that when individuals get an opportunity for personal influence at the first time, then they evidence a greater interest and self-responsibility in the subsequent behaviors (Bem, 1972). Iyengar and Brockner (2001) note:

“In a typical study, the intrinsic motivation of participants is compared across two conditions, one in which participants are given a choice (“Which one of the following six puzzles would

you like to do?”) and a second in which participants are told by an experimenter which puzzle to undertake (Zuckerman, Porac, Lathin, Smith, & Deci, 1978). Findings consistently indicate that when given a choice, people tend to do better and persevere more at these activities - both of which may reflect greater commitment.”

As the above suggests, personal influence plays a positive behavioral role, because it generates empowering emotions and positive attitude of being in control and being able to pursue one’s interests and goals. The positive role of personal influence may be weaker for the members of contrarian groups, who tend to rely more on social factors as reviewed later.

Personal Influence and Entrepreneurial Behavior

A long tradition of research has examined the relationship between personal psychological factors and entrepreneurial behavior. Most of the early studies focused on three personal variables – achievement motivation, locus of control (autonomy), and risk-taking propensity. McClelland (1961) identified achievement motivation as a primary stimulus for an individual to become entrepreneurial; he stipulated that a country with higher mean level of achievement motivation would show more entrepreneurial activity and economic growth compared to those countries with a lower level of achievement motivation. Risk taking propensity, defined as the willingness to take moderate risks or chances in a decision-making situation, is often identified as an important trait of entrepreneurs in popular literature (Begley, 1995). Autonomy or internal locus of control refers to a belief in being control of one’s destiny, and is supposed to underlie belief of entrepreneurs in their capacity to influence business outcomes through their own abilities, efforts, and skills (Watson & Newby, 2005).

However, accumulated evidence suggests only weak relationship of personal influence with entrepreneurial success (Aldrich & Wiedenmayer, 1993). Indeed, a recent study using cross-cultural

data from 60 societies reported that autonomy and risk-taking propensity actually had small negative correlation with the construct of entrepreneurial leadership (Gupta, Macmillan & Surie, 2004). Only achievement motivation has been found to be a significant predictor of entrepreneurial behavior as well as entrepreneurial performance. Based on a meta-analysis of 41 studies, Collins, Hanges, and Locke (2004) concluded that achievement motivation is significantly correlated with choice of entrepreneurial careers ($r=.21$, $p<0.001$), as well as with entrepreneurial performance ($r=.46$, $p<0.001$).

More recently, scholars have begun reexamining the personal influence on entrepreneurship by identifying factors that empower individuals who face challenges related with the entrepreneur's situation. The entrepreneurs face (a) extreme uncertainty (newness of products, markets, and organizations; lack of information), (b) resource scarcity (financing, knowledge, operating assets, and legitimacy), (c) hyper volatility, and (d) high complexity and chaos (Gupta, Macmillan & Surie, 2004; Baum & Locke, 2004). Baum and Locke (2004) proposed passion (genuine love and longing for their work to confront opportunity and challenges with enthusiasm) and tenacity (be perseverant about pursuing their goals in the face of obstacles) to be the important sources of personal influence of entrepreneurs as well as successful business leaders. However, they found that passion and tenacity do not contribute to entrepreneurial performance directly; instead their effects on entrepreneurial performance are mediated by self-efficacy. More specifically, passion and tenacious striving encourages individuals to acquire relevant skills and capabilities, which in turn enhance their efficacy beliefs as well as performance (Baum & Locke, 2004).

Prior research suggests that personal influence opportunities make the members of the dominant group more committed to the selected goals. Therefore, we would expect that men are more likely to enjoy greater personal influence than women, as

well as greater entrepreneurial capability than women; and that both these are likely to be related. Thus, we hypothesize that:

H_{1a} Men enjoy a higher entrepreneurial capability than do the women.

H_{1b} Men enjoy a higher personal influence (to be entrepreneurial) than do the women.

H_{1c} Women enjoy a higher social influence (to be entrepreneurial) than do men.

H_{2a} Personal influence has a positive impact on entrepreneurial capability.

H_{2b} Social influence has a positive impact on entrepreneurial capability.

Moderating Effect of Gender

Our review has suggested that as members of the contrarian group, women rely more on social networks, and these social networks may partly limit – or possibly even impede – their entrepreneurial capability. Are any options available to the members of the contrarian group in general, and women specifically, when they are aware that their social networks are limiting or impeding their behaviors? While two of the options may be to seek transformative change in the social influence, and to seek to move into an alternative informal social network, eventually the feasibility of overcoming the limitations of social influence should rest on the personal influence of women. Of course, women may choose not to exercise their personal influence individually, and instead prefer a collective action using some of their more supportive network ties. For instance, in India, there have been instances of rural women getting together to force their husbands to quit alcohol and to quit beating them after drinking.

One might expect that the personal influence of women is more likely to play a transformative role in the face of obstacles and resource scarcity, extreme uncertainty, hyper volatility, and high degree of complexity and chaos – or what characterizes the entrepreneurial situations. It is in these situations that the women are more likely to become aware of the limiting or impeding

potential of their social influence, and are more likely to have a motivation to achieve and to preserve in order to survive and preserve their self-dignity.

Since the personal influence of women is likely to be more directly related to the entrepreneurial situations, it may actually have a higher positive relationship with entrepreneurial capability, than does the personal influence of men. Recent research suggests that the concept of personal influence for women is indeed different from that for men. The men concept of personal influence is the power to dominate and to force others to be in a subservient position. In contrast, the women concept of personal influence is the power to resist and to take control of their life.

For men, personal influence or power often boils down to a system of advantages, based on their need for self-assertion and self-importance, their objective independence, and their greater tendency for control and self-control. From a psychological perspective, men concept of power is ability to dominate others: subject A wields power over subject B to the extent that he can force B to do something that B would otherwise do differently. Similarly, from a sociological perspective, men concept of power is “the ability of one or several persons to do what they want to do, behaving in ways that others do not approve of, that is, against their will” (Weber, 1946: 24). Men’s personal influence is exercised through strength, dominance, and the control of resources, both material and nonmaterial. In either perspective, “power as domination” implies the right (and the opportunity conferred by that right) of certain people to command other people and make them subordinate by limiting and structuring their field of choice, decisions, and practices (or nonequivalent exchange).

However, power relationships may not only be binary interactions - of dominance and subordination, they can also be of the need to dominate versus power to resist accepting -

especially through collective effort and support – a relationship of inequality. Women have been observed to frequently employ power based on “contrarianism” or “opposition to the views of the majority or prevailing opinion.” (Griscom, 1992). Women’s power is based on their lack of power – i.e. on the strength and power of resistance (Janeway, 1981). Another aspect of women’s concept of power is its interpretation as a syndicate function – the function of multiplying the abilities and power of another into a unified whole (Wheeler & Chinn, 1991). Power should first be shared and second be used for the good; and is based not on the psychology of coercion, but on the psychology of persuasion. Rosener (1995) describes women’s personal influence as ‘transformative’, as opposed to the command style more typical of men. Women’s personal influence is based on active interaction with others, who are “invited” to share in decision-making, with whom power and information are shared, and whose personal goals are transformed into joint goals, encouraging them to be committed the opportunity to make an active contribution, and not be opposing. Such a transformative process of personal influence is oriented towards increasing others’ sense of self-esteem and self-worth, as opposed to increasing power distance.

Consequently, because of their personal influence that yields power to resist, to persuade, and to gain positive involvement and dissolve opposition, women may be able to persist better through adversity and other aspects of entrepreneurial situations than do men. In summary, while women – as members of the contrarian group – may face negative social influence on their entrepreneurial capability, they could rely on their transformative personal influence to develop superior entrepreneurial capability. Another possibility is that women’s exercise of personal influence becomes particularly strong when faced with entrepreneurial situations, so that they may transform their social influence and resist any negative social influences. In either case, high levels of personal influence for women may

contribute to entrepreneurial capability. But for men, high levels of personal influence may not be as effective, because the excessive striving to dominate and control uncertain, complex, and volatile entrepreneurial situations may be counter-productive.

Therefore we hypothesize that:

H_{3a} *Personal influence has an inverse-U shaped influence on entrepreneurial capability for men.*

H_{3b} *Personal influence has a U-shaped influence on entrepreneurial capability for women.*

METHODOLOGY

Measuring Entrepreneurial capability

For developing our measure of entrepreneurial capability, we relied on the model of entrepreneurial leadership, proposed by Gupta, Macmillan, and Surie (2004). Gupta et al (2004) identify

entrepreneurial leadership as comprising of two capabilities: entrepreneurial and leadership. The entrepreneurial capability, in turn, comprises of three factors: framing the challenge, absorbing uncertainty, and path clearing. Framing the challenge involves “specifying highly challenging but realistic outcomes for the cast of actors to accomplish.” Absorbing uncertainty involves “taking the burden of responsibility for the future”. Path clearing involves “negotiating opposition and clearing the path for scenario enactment.” (Gupta, Macmillan & Surie, 2004: 250). Table 1 lists our measures, adapted from DeNoble et al (1994), for these three factors. Each of the items was measured on a 11-point scale.

Measuring Personal and Social Influence

For developing our measures of personal influence, we relied on Gundry and Welsh (2001), who identify items to measure attitudes towards choice of entrepreneurial career. For developing our analogous measures of social influence, we relied on Ajzen and Driver (1992), who identify items to measure attitudes of family, friends and significant others towards a subject’s choice of entrepreneurial career. Both these set of items have previously been validated and used in the Russian culture (Kolvereid and Isaksen, forthcoming). Each of the items was measured on a 7-point scale (see Table 2 for variables).

Table 1

First order factors	Variables
Framing the challenge	See new market opportunities for new products/services Discover new ways to improve existing products/services Identify new areas for potential growth Design products or services that solve current problems Create product/services that fulfill customer unmet needs Bring a product concept to a market in a timely manner
Absorbing uncertainty	Work productively under continuous stress, pressure and conflict Tolerate unexpected changes in business Persist in the face of adversity
Path clearing	Be able to obtain sufficient funds for future growth Develop and maintain favorable relationships with potential investors Develop relationships with key people connected to capital sources Identify potential sources of funding

Table 2

Factors	Variables
Personal influence	I would rather own my own business than earn a higher salary employed by someone else I would rather own my own business than pursue another promising career I am willing to make significant personal sacrifices in order to stay in business
Social influence	My closest family members think that I should pursue a career as self My closest friends think that I should pursue a career as self People that are important to me think that I should pursue a career as self

RESULTS

Rejecting H1a, the mean entrepreneurial capability is significantly greater in the women sample (7.35) than in the men sample (6.78). Rejecting H1b, the mean personal influence is significantly greater in the women sample (4.07) than in the men sample (3.36). But in support of H1c, the mean social influence is significantly greater in the women sample (4.19) than in the men sample (3.53); moreover the variances in personal and social influences are significantly greater in men sample than in women sample (refer to Table 3).

We then investigated the impact of personal and social influences on the entrepreneurial capability in the following regression equations. In support of H2a, personal influence has a positive impact on the entrepreneurial capability, though the impact is statistically significant only for women. In support of H2b, social influence has a positive impact on the entrepreneurial capability of both men and women.

We also conducted post-hoc tests of the differences in beta for men and women sample; but found no statistically significant gender-based differences in any of the slope estimates (see Table 4).

In the following analysis, we added the impact of squared personal influence to be entrepreneurial. Low levels of personal influence have a negative impact on entrepreneurial capability, particularly for women. Higher levels of personal influence have an increasingly positive on entrepreneurial capability, particularly for women. H3a predicting an inverse U relationship for men between personal influence and entrepreneurial capability is not supported. For both men and women, personal influence to be entrepreneurial has a U shaped relationship with entrepreneurial capability, though the effects are more pronounced for the women in support of H3b. However, the post-hoc tests again show no significant differences in beta estimates for men and women sample (refer to Table 5).

Table 3

	Men Means (standard deviation)	Women Means (standard deviation)	Variance difference Levene's F-test	Mean difference t-test
Entrepreneurial capability	6.78 (1.57)	7.35 (1.48)	F=.395, p>0.10	.56** (t=3.25)
Personal influence	3.36 (1.53)	4.07 (1.31)	F=2.796, p<0.10	.71** (t=4.43)
Social influence	3.53 (1.67)	4.19 (1.42)	F=9.495, p<0.01	.66** (t=3.80)
N	168	145		

Table 4

	Beta for men sample	Beta for women sample	t-test of beta difference
Constant	5.302		
Personal influence	.128 (1.55)	.306** (3.69)	.178 (1.69)
Social influence	.313** (3.79)	.234** (2.81)	.077 (0.43)
R squared	.154	.211	

Table 5

	Beta for men sample	Beta for women sample	t-test of beta difference
Constant	6.285	7.679	
Personal influence	-.500(-1.62)	-1.032**(-2.68)	-.532(-1.21)
Social influence	.325** (3.97)	.222(2.79)	-.103(-.65)
Personal influence squared	.639*(2.11)	1.367** (3.56)	.728(1.57)
R squared	.176	.276	

DISCUSSION

For men but more explicit for women, we found personal influence to be a strong predictor of entrepreneurial capability. While comparative research across countries that examines this question does not yet exist, research has shown that this form of personal influence to be more related to entrepreneurial motivations, willingness to make sacrifice and incur opportunity costs, and intentions to grow the business (Gundry & Welsch, 2001). In this light, personal influence reflects aspects of nature and nurture, and would seem to have implications on how culture may influence the degree of personal influence. The individual aspect of having this influence may counterbalance factors within one's culture may override cultural aspects that may discourage entrepreneurship. Those with a high personal influence are those that engage in extensive learning behavior, incur broad experiences, acquire high skill, engage in variable activity, develop entrepreneurial competency, engage in personal growth and development, and possess a high entrepreneurial orientation (Pistrui, et al, 2001). Accompanying attitudes include maturity, seriousness, environmental attunement, liability to act, proactivity, and financial success. Additional entrepreneurial outcomes may also include external financing, market share, short-term success factors such as incorporation and growth, as well as long-term factors such as acquiring companies, longevity, and mergers.

This research presents the first attempt to test models of how personal psychological and socio-cultural factors influence entrepreneurial capability within the framework of the new venture creation process. Whereas sociological factors may assist us in understanding how entrepreneurs across different cultures process information to make judgments about themselves and their ventures, personal influence may be a universal motivator that taps into the entrepreneur's willingness to initiate and launch their own organizations in a context where a variety of cultural and environmental barriers and opportunities exist. Our results indicate that contrary to the predictions

expecting the members of the dominant group to have a greater personal influence and to have a greater entrepreneurial capability, the members of the contrarian group may rely on a combination of both personal and social influences for developing super-normal entrepreneurial capability. Incorporating personal motivational perspectives along with socio-cultural approaches into international entrepreneurship research enables educators to foster the development of curricula and practices to assist entrepreneurs, and to provide the field with new conceptual tools and techniques across and within our cultural and international borders.

Study Limitations and Directions for Future Research

One of the limitations of the study is that it is based on the data from only Russia. One needs to be cautious about generalizing the results, as the results may be peculiar to Russian culture. In one Russian study, the responses showed that women draw a clear distinction between "control of (resources and people)" vs. "personal power." Most of the women (81 percent) answered that in their lives power does not mean "control over" or "means."; instead it simply means having an opportunity to have a personal say (Groshev, 2002¹). It is possible that personal influence, defined in terms of having an opportunity to have a personal say, plays more important role in case of women, than personal influence defined in terms of dominance.

Further, entrepreneurial capability is distinct from the actual start-ups. Entrepreneurial capability may not translate into actual entrepreneurial activity. Within the broader set of known group studies, a long tradition of investigations has shown that men tend to dominate entrepreneurial initiatives. While there may be few differences among boys and girls in entrepreneurial career aspirations, women may not be able to start entrepreneurial initiatives, or grow them once started, because social support available to them is rather limited. Therefore, further studies are needed to add actual entrepreneurial activity variable to this study.

REFERENCES

- Aldrich, H. E., & Zimmer, C. 1986. Entrepreneurship through social networks. In D. L. Sexton & R. W. Smilor (Eds.), *The art and science of entrepreneurship*, (pp. 2–23). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Aldrich, H. E., & Zimmer, C. 1986. Entrepreneurship through social networks. In D. L. Sexton & R. W. Smilor (Eds.), *The art and science of entrepreneurship*, (pp. 2–23). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Aldrich, H. E., & Wiedenmayer, G. 1993. From traits to rates: An ecological perspective on organizational foundings. In J. A. Katz & R. H. Brockhaus, Sr. (Eds.), *Advances in entrepreneurship, firm emergence, and growth*, vol. 1: 145-195. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Ajzen, I & Driver B L. (1992). Application of the theory of Planned Behavior to leisure choice. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 24:207-224.
- Asch, S. E. (1951). Effects of group pressure upon the modification and distortion of judgement. In H. Guetzkow (ed.) *Groups, leadership and men*. Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie Press.
- Baum, JR, & Locke, EA (2004). The relationship of entrepreneurial traits, skill, and motivation to new venture growth. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 587-599.
- Begley, T. M. 1995 Using founder status, age of firm and company growth rate as the basis for distinguishing entrepreneurs from managers of small businesses, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 10: 249-263.
- Bond, M.H., & Smith, P.B. (1996). Cross-cultural social and organizational psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47, 205-235.
- Burt, R, S. (1992). *Structural Holes: The Social Structure of Competition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Choenni, A. (1997) *Veelsoortig assortiment. Allochtoon ondernemerschap in Amsterdam als incorporatietraject 1965-1995 (Amsterdam, Het Spinhuis)*.
- Collins, C. J., Hanges, PJ, & Locke, EA (2004): The Relationship of Achievement Motivation to Entrepreneurial Behaviour: A Meta-Analysis, *Human performance*, 17(1): 95-117.
- De Noble, A.F., S.B. Ehrlich, T. Moore, and R.R. Weaver (1994). "After the Cash Arrives: A Comparative Study of Venture Capital and Private Investor Involvement in Entrepreneurial Firms," *Journal of Business Venturing* 9(1), 67-82.
- Evans, P. 1989. "Predatory, Developmental and Other Apparatuses: A Comparative Political Economy Perspective on the Third World State." *Sociological Forum*, 4(4), pp. 561-87
- Fletcher, M. 1998. "A Good-School, Bad-Grade Mystery. Educators Striving to Close Racial Gap in Affluent Ohio Suburb." *The Washington Post*. October 23, 1998.
- Frazier, B J and Niehm L S (2004). Exploring Business Information Networks of Small Retailers in Rural Communities. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 9(1): 23-42.
- Freedman, JL & Steinbruner, JD (1964). Perceived choice and resistance to persuasion, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 68, 678-681
- Masurel E, Nijkamp P, Tastan M, and Vindigni G (2002); Motivations and Performance Conditions for Ethnic Entrepreneurship, *Growth & Change*, 33(2): 238-260.
- Greve, A. and Salaff, J. (2003). Social Networks and Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice*. 28(1): 1-22.
- Griscom, J.L. (1992) "Women and Power: Definition, Dualism, and Indifference." *Psychological Women Quarterly*, 16(4): 389-414.
- Groshev, I V. (2002). *Sociological Research*, 41(3); 5-20.
- Gundry, L.K., Welsch, H.P., 2001. The ambitious entrepreneur: high growth strategies of women-owned enterprises. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16, 453-470.
- Gupta, V., MacMillan, IC, & Surie, G. (2004). Entrepreneurial leadership: Developing and measuring a cross-cultural construct. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 19: 241-260.