

Gender Differences in Small Business Strategic Planning: Do Women Plan More Than Men?

Authors: Elizabeth Walker, Calvin Wang & Janice Redmond

Dr Elizabeth A. Walker
Small and Medium Enterprise Research Centre
School of Management
Edith Cowan University
Western Australia 6027
Tel: +61 8 6304 5282
Fax: +61 8 6304 5988
Email: elizabeth.walker@ecu.edu.au

Dr Calvin Wang
Small and Medium Enterprise Research Centre
School of Management
Edith Cowan University
Western Australia 6027
Tel: +61 8 6304 2201
Fax: +61 8 6304 5840
Email: c.wang@ecu.edu.au

Dr Janice Redmond
Small and Medium Enterprise Research Centre
School of Management
Edith Cowan University
Western Australia 6027
Tel: +61 8 6304 2153
Fax: +61 8 6304 5840
Email: j.redmond@ecu.edu.au

Abstract

As the world of work changes and uncertainty continues in regard to employment conditions, more women are motivated to start their own businesses. However, many women-owned businesses are very small and appear to have limited growth capacity. There are few business role models for women in corporate Australia. So how do women break in? The evidence suggests that not only do many women have the capacity to grow their businesses, they also have the desire. Given the positive relationship between strategic planning and business success, this paper considers whether women are more likely than men to strategically plan their business growth. A new generation of women business leaders who are strategic thinkers is something that Australia desperately needs.

KEY WORDS

Strategic planning, SME, small business, women in business

Introduction

Much of the management literature argues that business competitiveness and survival are placed at risk when planning – especially long term strategic planning – is neglected. However, it is reported that the majority of small businesses do not plan to any great extent, least of all strategically (Berman, Gordon, & Sussman 1997; Orser, Hogarth-Scott & Riding 2000; Robinson & Pearce 1984; Sandberg, Robinson & Pearce 2001; Sexton & van Auken 1985). While this is concerning in relation to the small business sector generally, the lack of strategic planning is especially concerning in relation to women-run businesses. This is because women's businesses often grow at a slower rate than comparable male-owned businesses (Clayton 1998; Lee-Gosselin & Grise 1990).

Accordingly, considerable effort has been expended into understanding the barriers (e.g., socialisation, education, family roles, access to capital/finance, lack of business networks, etc.) faced by women in business (Kalleberg & Leicht 1991). However, there has been a surprising lack of consideration of strategic planning as a possible

barrier. In fact, very little is known about women's business planning activities generally. In response, this paper presents descriptive findings from a Western Australia study into small business planning. In particular, this paper reports the propensity of women small business owner-managers to engage in various types of business planning, their planning sophistication, planning horizon and planning review frequency.

Background – Australian Women in Small Business

Women and small business ownership have been the subject of numerous studies over the past 30 years with the opinion changing from women being pushed into self-employment (Breen, Calvert & Oliver 1995; Brush & Hisrich 1991; Carter & Allen 1997; Moore & Buttner 1997; Roffey et al. 1996; Still & Chia 1995) to women now more actively choosing self employment (Still & Timms 2000; Still & Walker 2006; Walker & Webster 2006). In Australia, over 30% of businesses are owned by women (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2005) and the current 'archetypical' profile of an Australian woman business owner according to Still & Walker (2006, p. 296) is:

- Primarily aged between 30 and 50
- Is an only child or eldest child
- Is tertiary educated
- Had a rural background
- Is Australian-born or has Australian nationality
- Is married with children
- Was educated in single-sex schools
- Had a working mother and a father in business
- Had secretarial training
- Is in the business full-time
- Is operating a business that is predominantly service-oriented
- Is operating in rented premises
- Primarily started the business with less than \$10,000
- Primarily been in operation for more than 12 months
- Had difficulty in obtaining start-up finance

Strategic Planning, Small Business and Women

The small business sector is generally “plagued by high failure rates and poor performance levels” (Jocumsen 2004, p.659) and comprehensive reviews of the small business literature (e.g., Hormozi, Sutton, McMinn & Lucio 2002; Lurie 1987; Miller & Cardinal 1994; Schwenk & Shrader 1993) suggest that, *ceteris paribus*, much of the problem can be attributed to a lack of strategic planning by small business owner-managers. Strategic planning refers to the setting of long-term business goals, and the development and implementation of plans to achieve these goals (O'Regan & Ghobadian 2004; Stonehouse & Pemberton 2002). With respect to performance, strategic planning is most commonly associated with better performing enterprises and is recognised as a vehicle to drive business competitiveness and hence, business success (Vicere 1995).

Small businesses that engage in strategic planning (compared to those that do not) are more likely to be those that achieve higher sales growth, higher returns on assets, higher margins on profit and higher employee growth (Berman, Gordon & Sussman 1997; Bracker, Keats & Pearson 1988; Carland & Carland 2003; Gibson & Casser 2005). Moreover, small businesses that engage in strategic planning are also more likely to be those enterprises that are more innovative, that have more newly patented products, that employ new process and management technologies, and that achieve international growth (Beaver & Prince 2002; Gibbons & O'Connor 2005; Stewart, 2002; Upton, Teal & Felan 2001). Perhaps most importantly, small businesses that engage in strategic planning are less likely to be those that fail (i.e., involuntarily wound up) (Gaskill, van Auken & Manning 1993; Perry 2001). Overall, the relationship between strategic planning and business performance is best summarised by the following statement:

“Of all the contrasts between the successful and the unsuccessful business, or between the leader and follower, the single most important differentiating factor is strategy” (J. Thomas Canon in Olson and Currie 1992, p.50).

While considerable research has been conducted into small business strategic planning and its importance to business continuance, very little attention has been

paid to gender differences in this area. Given that women are generally acknowledged to behave and manage their enterprises differently from men, and their approaches to strategic management are also recognised as being distinct, (Chaganti 1986; Olson & Currie 1992; Rosa, Carter & Hamilton 1996), gender and strategic planning is an under researched area. Gender differences in business operation reflect, in part, the dispositional (interpersonal orientation) and situational (power and opportunity) characteristics peculiar to men and women (Carter, Williams & Reynolds 1997).

Much of the extant knowledge about small business strategy and planning comes from studies which typically ignore gender influences and little is known about whether or how women differ from men in this area. Only three recent studies (viz. Perry 2002; Sonfield, Lussier, Corman & McKinney 2001; Yusuf & Saffu 2005) have provided comparative findings in relation to men and women's strategic planning practices. Results from the studies have been contradictory and the focus on different aspects of planning in each of the studies has made specific comparisons difficult.

For example, Yusuf and Saffu (2005) investigated planning sophistication in small business and found that men were significantly more sophisticated in their strategic planning (e.g., used more formalised and systematic planning methods, procedures, tools and techniques) than were women. Perry (2002) studied the use and extent of planning in small business and found that men were more likely than women to plan and to engage in more substantive planning. However, these differences were not statistically significant and Perry (2002) concluded that gender was "largely unrelated to the extent and use of planning" (p.422) in small enterprises. Finally, Sonfield, Lussier, Corman and McKinney (2001), when examining the comparative preference of men and women small business owner-managers for different business strategies, found no gender effects in the choice of business strategies used by men and women (e.g., high innovation/low risk, high innovation/high risk, low innovation/high risk, low innovation/low risk).

Overall, there exists a substantive deficit in understanding the characteristics of women's strategic planning. If it is accepted that strategic planning underpins much of a business's success, then understanding if there are gender differences could be critical. Given that Australian businesses owned by women is consistently around 1/3 of all businesses (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2005), they represent a significant business cohort. However women owned and operated businesses may be held back from achieving their full growth and performance potentials, and their survival will be placed at risk if women owner-managers do not strategically plan. The aim of this study was to identify whether women owners of small businesses did strategically plan, and to what extent.

Methodology

Design and Sample

The study featured a cross-sectional survey of small businesses operating in the state of Western Australia. A purposive list of 1600 small businesses – defined in the study as businesses with less than 20 employees (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2005) – was compiled from the White Pages telephone directory, WA Department of Industry and Resources business directory and various local proprietary directories. Letters of introduction and self-administered questionnaires were posted to all businesses on the list. Participation was voluntary and anonymous.

Questionnaires were designed to collect general information on the characteristics of owner-managers and their businesses, and the types of planning activities undertaken in those businesses (e.g., business, marketing, cash flow plans) and extent (e.g., level of formality, planning horizon, regularity of review). A simple multiple-choice answer format was used for the majority of questions.

Data Analysis

Multiple response procedures were used for the descriptive analyses reported in this paper while chi-square tests of independence were used for primary analyses. Both were selected based on the categorical level data collected through the predominant use of a multi-choice answer format (Argyrous 2000; Field 2000). Gender differences (male versus female) were of primary interest in all analyses of planning activities. However, respondents' age (categorised into: those 50 years and younger; those

over 50 years) and education level (categorised into: those with secondary school qualifications or less; those with trade certifications; those with tertiary qualifications) were also included as covariates in analyses of gender effects.

Results

A total of 486 usable questionnaires were returned, representing a response rate of 30%. Of this, 58% were from male and 42% were from female owner-managers. Non-response bias was investigated by comparing 'early' and 'late' return respondents on relevant demographic variables. This approach assumes that 'late' return respondents are characteristically similar to non-respondents (French, Kelly & Harrison 2004). No significant differences were found between the two groups in the present study.

Planning Activity

Planning activity was investigated by asking respondents whether they engaged in one or more of the following: business planning, marketing planning and/or cash flow planning. Table I presents multiple response results by gender. From Table I, men and women showed similar propensities towards planning – approximately 60% of both men and women owner-managers reported that they had one or more types of plans for their businesses while about 40% did not have any.

*Table 1
Planning Activities by Gender*

Planning		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
- Yes	Count	495	346	841
	% within Gender	60	59	
	% of Total	35	25	60
- No	Count	329	243	572
	% within Gender	40	41	
	% of Total	23	17	40
Total	Count	824	589	1413
	% of Total	58	42	100

Percentages (rounded to whole numbers) and totals based on multiple responses

Chi-square tests were performed to explore gender differences in relation to each type of planning use. Results for men and women were similar with approximately

two-thirds (66%) of both engaging in business planning, 53% of both engaging in marketing planning and 59% of both engaging in cash flow planning. Overall, no statistically significant differences were found in men and women’s likelihood to engage in each of business planning ($\chi^2 = .03$, $df = 1$, $p > .05$), marketing planning ($\chi^2 = .08$, $df = 1$, $p > .05$) and cash flow planning ($\chi^2 = .56$, $df = 1$, $p > .05$). The inclusion of age and education levels with gender was similarly non-significant.

Planning Formality

Planning formality was investigated by asking respondents whether those plans identified in the previous section were formally written out or whether they were not written out (‘in my head’) . Table 2 presents multiple response results by gender. The table shows a small difference between men (45% written vs. 55% not written) and women (50% written vs. 50% not written).

Chi-square tests were performed to explore gender differences in relation to the formality of each type of plan. In general, women were more likely than men to have written business plans (53% vs. 48%), marketing plans (42% vs. 37%) and cash flow plans (54% vs. 51%). However, these differences were not statistically significant (business plans: $\chi^2 = .98$, $df = 1$, $p > .05$); marketing plans: $\chi^2 = .99$, $df = 1$, $p > .05$; cash flow plans: $\chi^2 = .28$, $df = 1$, $p > .05$). The inclusion of age and education levels with gender was non-significant.

Table 2
Planning Formality by Gender

Formality		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
- Written Out	Count	316	235	551
	% within Gender	45	50	
	% of Total	27	20	
- Not Written Out	Count	382	239	621
	% within Gender	55	50	
	% of Total	33	20	
Total	Count	698	474	1172
	% of Total	58	42	100

Percentages (rounded to whole numbers) and totals based on multiple responses

Planning Horizon

The length of time that business owners thought ahead was referred to as their planning horizon, and was investigated by asking respondents whether their plans were typically short-time only (covers period \leq 12 months), long-term only (covers period $>$ 12 months) or both short- and long- term. Table 3 presents multiple response results by gender.

Generally, the table shows that men and women owner-managers had similar planning horizons – approximately 40% of both had plans that were short-term only, 13% of men and 8% of women had plans that were long-term only, and just under 50% of both had short and long term planning.

Table 3
Planning Horizon by Gender

Planning Horizon		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
- Short-term Only	Count	282	206	488
	% within Gender	39	42	
	% of Total	23	17	40
- Long-term Only	Count	98	40	138
	% within Gender	13	8	
	% of Total	8	3	11
- Short & Long Term	Count	344	240	584
	% within Gender	48	49	
	% of Total	28	20	48
Total	Count	724	486	1210
	% of Total	60	40	100

Percentages (rounded to whole numbers) and totals based on multiple responses

Again, chi-square tests were performed to explore gender differences in relation to the planning horizon for each type of plan. Generally, there were little differences in planning horizons attributable to gender. Almost half of all men and women produced both short and long term business (52% vs. 56% respectively), marketing (45% vs. 46%) and cash flow (44% and 46%) plans. Of those that produced only short or long term plans, women were more likely to be in the former while men were more likely to be in the latter group for each type of planning investigated. Even so, no statistically significant differences were found overall for planning horizons by gender (business plans: $\chi^2 = 4.16$, $df = 2$, $p > .05$); marketing plans: $\chi^2 = 1.13$, $df = 2$,

$p > .05$; cash flow plans: $\chi^2 = 3.61$, $df = 2$, $p > .05$). The inclusion of age and education levels with gender was similarly non-significant.

Planning Review

This item referred to the extent that plans were revised and was investigated by asking respondents whether their plans were revised frequently (at least every 6-12 months), regularly (at least every 1-2 years) or seldom (longer than 2 years). Table 4 presents multiple response results by gender. The table shows that responses were similar for men and women – approximately 60% of both revised their plans frequently, about a quarter of both revised their plans regularly while less than 10% seldom did so.

*Table 4
Planning Review by Gender*

Planning Review		Gender		Total
		Male	Female	
- Frequently	Count	419	299	718
	% within Gender	58	61	
	% of Total	35	25	59
- Regularly	Count	186	122	308
	% within Gender	26	25	
	% of Total	15	10	25
- Seldom	Count	117	70	187
	% within Gender	16	14	
	% of Total	10	6	15
Total	Count	722	491	1213
	% of Total	60	40	100

Percentages (rounded to whole numbers) and totals based on multiple responses

Chi-square tests were performed to explore gender differences in relation to the frequency of review for each type of planning. Overall, men and women were similar in their frequency of planning reviews with more than 80% of both either frequently or regularly revising their business (82% vs. 84%), marketing (84% vs. 86%) and cash flow (86% vs. 88%) plans. Expectedly, no statistically significant differences were found for the frequency of planning reviews by gender (business plans: $\chi^2 = .68$, $df = 2$, $p > .05$); marketing plans: $\chi^2 = .72$, $df = 2$, $p > .05$; cash flow plans: $\chi^2 = .124$, $df = 2$, $p > .05$). Including age and education levels in the analyses had no effect on significance.

Discussion

Male and female owner-managers did not differ significantly in their propensity to engage in business, marketing and cash flow planning. Neither did they differ significantly with respect to the formality, time horizon and frequency of review of their planning. Although research into gender differences in strategic planning has been limited, extant results broadly support our findings that gender is largely unrelated to small business planning.

Even so, this outcome is surprising given that the gender literature in the small business area often report significant differences between men and women in terms of entrepreneurial ability (Cowling & Taylor 2001), leadership or management style (Carter, Williams, & Reynolds, 1997), decision-making (Chaganti 1986), risk preference (Powell & Ansic 1997) and motivation for being in business (Buttner & Moore 1997). These personal trait differences translate into observable operational differences in businesses run by men and women. For example, operational differences have been noted in relation to human resource management (Verheul, Risseeuw, & Bartelse 2002), competitive strategy (Carter, Williams & Reynolds 1997), export orientation (Du Rietz & Henrekson 2000) and the pursuit of growth (Zinger, LeBrasseur, Riverin & Robichaud 2005). Intuitively, it is logical to also expect significant differences in the planning activities of men and women, for example, in the use of different types of planning and the extent of involvement in the overall planning process since these form part of a business's operational task.

Given that gender appears to be unrelated to business planning activities, the pertinent question to ask is 'why are there no differences?'. A possible explanation may be the changing dynamic of small business ownership for women. For women, 'going into business' as a serious employment option has been a fairly recent phenomenon. Traditionally, this pathway was reserved for men in trade and professional services who typically served an apprenticeship and then started a business based on the skills learnt. While women often participated in business, for example with their partners or family, they were often the 'invisible' or 'silent' partner (Mulholland 1997; Rowe & Hong 2000). In the last decade or so however, there has been a surge in the growth of women in small business as owner-managers

in their own right. This has been seen in Australia where women make up 32% of small business operators (Australian Bureau of Statistics 2005). While many women still start their own businesses due to the need to balance work and family, they are nevertheless interested in the financial rewards that business ownership can bring. Given that strategic planning is a vital part of business success, it is therefore reasonable that women, like men, would engage in planning for their business.

Accepting that women are going into business ownership in a serious and systematic way, and are demonstrating their propensity to strategically plan (a skill that is consistent with business success), the real question then is why are there so few 'successful' women business owners compared to their male counterparts? Is it perhaps that women have less desire to achieve the traditional business success, as defined by financial reward, which is the traditional avenue and demonstrable badge of business success? If so, then success is not simply gained by the ability to strategically plan, something that has just been demonstrated that women can and do actively engage in. Rather the successful business person today is defined as being an extremely determined, business focused individual, to the exclusion of other periphery issues such as family and the wider community.

Given that women still have the primary responsibility of family rearing, perhaps focusing primarily on business to attain significant financial rewards is neither an option nor a desire for most business women. Therefore it is not that women cannot gain financial success, rather they may not have the same desire as men to do so.

Summary

This paper presented findings in relation to gender differences in small business strategic planning. While there exists a paucity of research in this area, extant literature on trait differences typically suggest that men and women have operationally different styles of managing their businesses. Results of this study showed that in relation to business planning activities, gender was an unrelated factor in the extent and use of planning in small business. In particular, no differences were found in relation to the types of planning engaged in by both men and women

owner-managers. Similarly, there were no differences in relation to the formality of their respective planning processes, in the timeframes that both genders planned ahead, nor in the frequency in which plans were reviewed or revised.

References

- Argyrous, G 2000, *Statistics for social and health research: With a guide to SPSS*. London: Sage Publications.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics 2005, *Characteristics of small business*. Canberra: Commonwealth Government of Australia.
- Beaver, G & Prince, C 2002, Innovation, entrepreneurship and competitive advantage in the entrepreneurial venture, *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 9(1), pp.28-37.
- Berman, JA, Gordon, DD & Sussman G 1997, A study to determine the benefits small business firms derive from sophisticated planning versus less sophisticated types of planning, *The Journal of Business and Economic Studies*, 3(3), pp.1-11.
- Bracker, JS, Keats, BW & Pearson, JN 1988, Planning and financial performance among small firms in a growth industry, *Strategic Management Journal*, 9(6), pp.591-603.
- Breen, J, Calvert, C & Oliver, J 1995, Female entrepreneurs in Australia: An investigation of financial and family issues, *Journal of Enterprising Culture*, 3(4), pp.445-461.
- Brush, CG & Hisrich, RD 1991, Antecedent influences on women-owned businesses, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 6(2), pp.9-16.
- Buttner, EH & Moore, DP 1997, Women's organisational exodus to entrepreneurship: Self-reported motivations and correlates with success, *Journal of Small Business Management*, 35(1), pp.34-46.
- Carland, JC & Carland, JW 2003, *A model of entrepreneurial planning and its effect on performance*, Paper presented at the ASBE Annual Conference - Building Bridges to the Future, Houston, Texas, 5-8 Mar.
- Carter, NM & Allen, KR 1997, Size determinants of women-owned businesses: Choice or barriers to resources?, *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 9, pp.211-220.
- Carter, NM, Williams, M & Reynolds, PD 1997, Discontinuance among new firms in retail: The influence of initial resources, strategy and gender, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 12, pp.125-145.
- Chaganti, R 1986, Management in women-owned enterprises, *Journal of Small Business Management*, 24(4), pp.18-29.
- Clayton, K 1998, Women's work: Success in small business, *Australian CPA*, 68(10), pp.36-39.
- Cowling, M & Taylor, M 2001, Entrepreneurial women and men: Two different species?, *Small Business Economics*, 16, pp.167-175.
- Du Rietz, A & Henrekson, M 2000, Testing the female underperformance hypothesis, *Small Business Economics*, 14, pp.1-10.
- Field, A 2000, *Discovering statistics using SPSS for windows: Advanced techniques for the beginner*, London: Sage Publications.
- French, SJ, Kelly, SJ & Harrison, JL 2004, The role of strategic planning in the performance of small, professional service firms, *The Journal of Management Development*, 23(8), pp.765-776.
- Gaskill, LR., van Auken, HE & Manning, RA 1993, A factor analytic study of the perceived causes of small business failure, *Journal of Small Business Management*, 31(4), pp.18-31.
- Gibbons, PT & O'Connor, T 2005, Influences on strategic planning processes among Irish SMEs, *Journal of Small Business Management*, 43(2), pp.170-186.

- Gibson, B & Casser, G 2005, Longitudinal analysis of relationships between planning and performance in small firms, *Small Business Economics*, 25(3), pp.207-222.
- Hormozi, AM., Sutton, GS, McMinn, RD & Lucio, W 2002, Business plans for new or small businesses: Paving the path to success, *Management Decision*, 40(8), pp.755-763.
- Jocumsen, G 2004, How do small business managers make strategic marketing decisions? A model of process, *European Journal of Marketing*, 38(5/6), pp.659-674.
- Kalleberg, AL & Leicht, KT 1991, Gender and organisational performance: Determinants of small business survival and success, *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(1), pp.136-161.
- Lee-Gosselin, H & Grise, J 1990, Are women owner-managers challenging our definitions of entrepreneurship? An in-depth survey, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9, pp.423-433.
- Lurie, SM 1987, Strategic business planning for the small- to medium-sized company, *The CPA Journal*, 57(6), pp.90-92.
- Miller, CC & Cardinal, LB 1994, Strategic planning and firm performance: A synthesis of more than two decades of research, *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(6), pp.1649-1665.
- Moore, DP & Buttner, EH 1997, *Women entrepreneurs: Moving beyond the glass ceiling*, California: Sage Publications.
- Mulholland, K 1997, The family enterprise and business strategy, *Work, Employment & Society*, 11(4), pp.685-711.
- O'Regan, N & Ghobadian, A 2004, Re-visiting the strategy-performance question: An empirical analysis, *International Journal of Management and Decision Making*, 5(2/3), pp.144-170.
- Olson, SF & Currie, HM 1992, Female entrepreneurs: Personal value systems and business strategies in a male-dominated industry, *Journal of Small Business Management*, 30(1), pp.49-57.
- Orser, BJ, Hogarth-Scott, S & Riding, AL 2000, Performance, firm size and management problem solving, *Journal of Small Business Management*, 38(4), pp.42-58.
- Perry, SC 2001, The relationship between written business plans and the failure of small businesses in the US, *Journal of Small Business Management*, 39(3), pp.201-208.
- Perry, SC 2002, A comparison of failed and non-failed small businesses in the United States: Do men and women use different planning and decision making strategies?, *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 7(4), pp.415-428.
- Powell, M & Ansic, D 1997, Gender differences in risk behaviour in financial decision-making: An experimental analysis, *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 18, pp.605-628.
- Robinson, RB & Pearce, JA 1984, Research thrusts in small firm strategic planning, *Academy of Management*, 9(1), pp.128-137.
- Roffey, B, Stanger, A, Forsaith, D, McInnes, E, Petrone, F, Symes, C et al 1996, *Women in small business: A review of research*, Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Rosa, P, Carter, S & Hamilton, D 1996, Gender as a determinant of small business performance: Insights from a British study, *Small Business Economics*, 8(6), pp.463-478.
- Rowe, BR & Hong, GS 2000, The role of wives in family businesses: The paid and unpaid work of women, *Family Business Review*, 13(1), pp.1-13.

- Sandberg, WR, Robinson, RB & Pearce, JA 2001, Why small businesses need a strategic plan, *Business and Economic Review*, 48(1), pp.12-15.
- Schwenk, CB & Shrader, CB 1993, Effects of formal strategic planning on financial performance in small firms: A meta-analysis, *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 17(3), pp.53-64.
- Sexton, DL & van Auken, P 1985, A longitudinal study of small business strategic planning, *Journal of Small Business Management*, 23, pp.7-15.
- Sonfield, M, Lussier, R, Corman, J & McKinney, M 2001, Gender comparisons in strategic decision-making: An empirical analysis of the entrepreneurial strategy matrix, *Journal of Small Business Management*, 39(2), pp.165-173.
- Stewart, KS 2002, Formal business planning and small business success: A survey of small businesses with an international focus, *Journal of American Academy of Business*, 2(1), pp.42-46.
- Still, LV & Chia, B 1995, *Self-employed women: Four years on (Women in Leadership Series. Paper No.1)*, Perth: Edith Cowan University.
- Still, LV & Timms, W 2000, *Making a difference: The values, motivations and satisfactions, measures of success, operating principles and contributions of women small business owners*, Perth: The Graduate School of Management, University of Western Australia.
- Still, LV & Walker, EA 2006, The self-employed woman owner and her business: An Australian Profile, *Women in Management Review*, 21(4), pp.294-310.
- Stonehouse, G & Pemberton, J 2002, Strategic planning in SMEs - some empirical findings, *Management Decision*, 40(9), pp.853-861.
- Upton, N, Teal, EJ & Felan, JT 2001, Strategic and business planning practices of fast growth family firms, *Journal of Small Business Management*, 39(1), pp.60-72.
- Verheul, I, Risseuw, P & Bartelse, G 2002, Gender differences in strategy and human resource management: The case of Dutch real estate brokerage, *International Small Business Journal*, 20(4), pp.443-475.
- Vicere, AA 1995, Executive education and strategic imperatives: A formula for crafting competitiveness, *American Journal of Management Development*, 1(2), pp.31-36.
- Walker, EA & Webster, B 2006, Gender, age and self-employment: Some things change, some stay the same, *Women in Management Review*, (in press).
- Yusuf, A & Saffu, K 2005, Planning and performance of small and medium enterprise operators in a country in transition, *Journal of Small Business Management*, 43(4), pp.480-497.
- Zinger, JT, LeBrasseur, R, Riverin, N & Robichaud, Y 2005, *Stages of small enterprise development: A comparison of female and male entrepreneurs*. Paper presented at the 21st Annual Canadian Council for Small Business and Entrepreneurship Conference, Waterloo, Ontario, 26-28 Oct.

Notes

ⁱ This is an updated and summarised version of a longer article appearing in *Gender, Work and Organization*, 2006, March (13) 3: 129-151.

ii. This figure was derived from the employer's copy of forms submitted for government compensation for time work time lost due to injuries sustained at the workplace. The number of injuries is actually much higher as the majority of injuries do not qualify for compensation and forms are not completed.

iii. Seventy nine per cent of perpetrators were male and twenty one per cent were female compared to a client population that is sixty per cent male and forty per cent female.

¹ Indira J Parikh, 1992, 'Women in Management in India', reading in the first workshop on *Role Effectiveness for Women Executives*, Hyderabad, Centre for Organization Development, October 12 –17.

² N. Ramu, 1989, *Women Work and Marriage in Urban India*, Sage Publications, New Delhi.

³ Stanley Jaya Kumar, 1994, 'Changing Directions in the Status and Role of Women In India', in C .Chakrapani and S. Vijaya Kumar's (eds) *Changing Status and Role of Women in Indian Society*, M D Publications Pvt. LTD, New Delhi,, p. 59.

⁴ Aruna Asaf Ali, 1991, *The Resurgence of Indian Women*, Radianat Publishers, New Delhi.

⁵ **Educational Statistics from the 2001** Census of Dept. of Education, Ministry of Home Affairs, GOI.

⁶ UNESCO (1997) *Statistical Yearbook 1997*.

⁷ PP Parikh and SP Sukhatme (2004), "Women Engineers in India", **Economic and Political Weekly**, January 10 2004. p 195.

⁸ Kiran Karnik (edited) (2002) **The Indian IT Software and Business Directory**, New Delhi, NASSCOM, p 14.

⁹ Nayare Ali, 2006, 'Hi Tech Women', *The Asian Age*, as retrieved from <http://www.nasscom.in/Nasscom/templates/NormalPage>

¹⁰ C V Madhavi (1994) "Women Entrepreneurs in India", in (ed) Khair Jahan Sogra, **Women in Management: Champions of Change**, Bangladesh, The University Press Limited.

¹¹ ChenMay Yee, “High tech Lift for India’s Women”, **The Wall Street Journal**, November 1, 2000

¹² Dr M Suriya (2003), **Gender Based Digital Divide in the IT Sector in India**, Annamalai University, p 7.

¹³ **Ibid** pp58-68

¹⁴ Pradip N Khandwalla (2004), **Lifelong Creativity: an unending quest**, Tata McGraw-Hill , New Delhi, p 47.

¹⁵ Preeti Singh (2002), Women in the Corporte world in India - Balancing Work and Family Life, presented at a conferencec in Sweden:**Alva Myrdal's Qustions to our time**, March.