

Why Entrepreneurship Process as a Battle for Business Resources Recognition for Disadvantaged People?

Naheed Nawazesh Roni*
Susan Baines**

***Abstract:** Entrepreneurship with disability is now a significant concern from a number of different policy perspectives in all economies: promoting entrepreneurship among the disabled groups, preventing social exclusion, and narrowing the gap in employment rates between disabled people and the rest of the population of the country. A number of studies of disabled people's employment have highlighted self-employment could be an important source of paid work but very few have focused specifically on entrepreneurial propensity with resources-based view (RBV). Consequently, although it is clear that a significant proportion of disabled people are self-employed in many countries, little is known about who they are, what kind of resources they have, and the earnings they derive from entrepreneurship process. The association between entrepreneurship and disability still is uncertain. Moreover, the disabled entrepreneur's level of ownership of capital resources in the form of human, social and financial capitals in their own business is unclear. With this in view, there is a need to investigate the relationship of capital resources and the self-employed disabled for developing a better entrepreneurship economy. This paper is exploratory in nature, takes a positivist stance, and aims to add explanatory knowledge to the field of disabled entrepreneurship at the UK which could be also supportive for new policy entrepreneurship research in the field Bangladesh in near future.*

***Keywords:** Disabled entrepreneurship, RBV, disability, self-employment.*

1. Introduction

Entrepreneurial career or self-employment¹ options for disadvantaged people (i.e. people with disabilities) are not an unattainable aspiration in practical consideration, due to the

***Naheed Nawazesh Roni**, Assistant Professor, Department of Banking, Faculty of Business Studies, University of Dhaka, Dhaka 1000, Bangladesh.

****Dr. Susan Baines**, Reader, Social Policy & Social Change, Manchester Metropolitan University, United Kingdom.

¹This study uses the terms "self-employed", "entrepreneur" and "business owner" interchangeably.

fact that many disabled people have their own business in the whole world. Previous research has shown that statistical tests have demonstrated a highly significant association between disabled status and career choice (Burchardt, 2002; Noakes, 2006). Empirical research shows that entrepreneurs with disabilities succeed to roughly the same extent as non-disabled entrepreneurs (Larsson, 2006). It is well established that most of the research carried out in the entrepreneurship field is from the perspective of business venture performance. On the other hand, the content or the ownership of capital resources in terms of the human, social and financial capitals of disabled entrepreneurship has not been widely explored in the existing literature. So, an attempt has been made in this study to close the gap between disability and entrepreneurship.

The study of “disabled entrepreneurship” (DE) started in the UK in the 1990s, and is therefore relatively new. Consequently, the viability of disabled entrepreneurship (DE) has not been broadly tested in the field of social science and business (Pavey, 2006). In the beginning, research into disabled entrepreneurship demonstrated that creating entrepreneurs from the disabled population for start-up in business required a high level of investment due to the fact that people with disabilities are highly vulnerable (Gartner, 1988). Other researchers have argued that disabled people have experienced disempowerment and economic exclusion because this section of the population are largely invisible, and are ignored and excluded from mainstream development (Burchardt, 2003). However, despite individual and social impediments, the present decade has seen a rapid rise in the number of businesses owned by disabled people in the UK as a result of encouraging economic inclusion of disabled people in business. Some scholars in entrepreneurship may argue that trying to become self-employed is not the most interesting entrepreneurial behaviour. Rather, they state that the most important entrepreneurial behaviours come from different psychological and self-efficacy factors (Murray et al., 1982). However, starting a business and entering into self-employment is, in most cases, the first step in an entrepreneurial career, and self-employment intentions determine actual entry into entrepreneurship (Parker, 2004).

This study is to relate the resource-based view (RBV) to the disabled entrepreneur’s propensity to start up business in the UK. With this in mind, an investigation is made as to whether or not the resource-based view can explain the difference in the propensity to start up business between the disabled self-employed and other sections of the population. To address this, data from the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) has been tested and analysed. In accordance with the BHPS, distinguishable groups of the population have been selected; the ‘disabled self-employed’, the ‘disabled employed’, and ‘the disabled working-age group’. Another pertinent group has also been selected for the analysis - the ‘self-employed non-disabled group’ - to assess whether there is any significant difference between the disabled and non-disabled population groups. It could

be said that this study is a modest beginning as regards disabled entrepreneurship in the UK.

Insights from resource-based views (RBV) theory are in line with other major findings when it comes to the significant impact from human, social and financial capitals. They point to the indications that entrepreneurial performance is greater from those who begin with more financial, physical, or social resources, than from those who start with a very low resource base. It is therefore important to assess the ownership of real capital resources bases and not only the perceived resource bases. However, the resource demands for disabled entrepreneurs are in general significant, and resources may be harder to obtain for them than for non-disabled entrepreneurs. This may include resources within all the afore-mentioned resource categories; human, capital and financial resources. As we have already seen, research argues that disabled people with a lack of resources have competitive disadvantages due to various reasons (Noakes, 2006). In some cultures, due to prejudice, superstition and so forth, being disabled can result in consumers not wanting to contract products or services from disabled entrepreneurs (Handojo, 2004). Therefore, it is clear that being disabled is a competitive disadvantage when a disabled entrepreneur faces competition from non-disabled entrepreneurs. Nevertheless, the resource deficit as it is perceived by others may not reflect the real resource constraints associated with disabled entrepreneurs. The well-known resource-based theory which has been widely used in business studies, is adopted in this study to explain the relationship between disability and entrepreneurship. Thus, this research is about investigating the relationships between capital resources and disabled self-employed people.

2. Objectives of this Paper

This paper is exploratory in nature. The aim of this research project is to relate the resource-based view (RBV) to propensity to start up business for the disabled entrepreneur in the UK, and to identify the relationship between capital resources with disability and entrepreneurship. This study seeks to address the question as to whether the decision to go self-employed could be a favourable one for disabled people. Specifically, this study seeks to ascertain whether or not RBV can explain the difference in the propensity to start up business between the disabled self-employed and three other groups of the population; the self-employed non-disabled, the disabled employed, and the disabled working-age.

Thus research seeks to assemble the following objectives:

1. To investigate the levels of ownership of capital resources with regard to propensity to start entrepreneurship process for people with disabilities/disadvantaged people.

2. To examine the applicability of resource-based views to explain the disabled population's propensity to business venture.

Research Question

Within most entrepreneurship research, there seems to be no room for disability, as most theories assume that entrepreneurs are able people. No comprehensive study has been carried out as regards data relating to factors such as opportunity and recognition for disabled entrepreneurs. Data has been gathered on self-employment, information search, resource gathering, team starts, and characteristics of the business idea and the business itself has been collected, but has not yet been analysed. Thus, research is needed to increase our understanding of how disabled entrepreneurs can gain competitive advantages by using their experience, knowledge, network contacts, and resource bases in order to enhance their businesses.

A number of studies which have focused on disabled people's employment have highlighted self-employment as an important source of paid work, however very few have focused specifically on the entrepreneurial issue and the resource-based view in particular. Consequently, although it is clear that a significant proportion of disabled people are self-employed, little is known about who they are, what sort of jobs and businesses they have, and the earnings they derive from self-employment. Neither has the process of actually becoming a disabled entrepreneur in the UK been widely explored, along with the problems that are experienced in establishing and sustaining a business, the advice and support that is needed, and the ways in which the needs of the disabled entrepreneur differ from those of the average entrepreneur.

Identifying and explaining the impact of disability on labour market outcomes has become a major focus of labour market research in relation to disability. Studies have consistently identified the negative impact of disability on labour market outcomes, with the impact being greater on employment (or participation) than earnings (Blackaby et al., 1999; Kidd et al., 2000). Evidence has shown that disability is consistently found to have negative effects on labour market outcomes as measured by the employment rate (Jones, 2005). The emphasis of much of this work, and the small number of studies to date, show the influence of employer discrimination on outcomes (Jones et al., 2006), and latterly, the impact of the DDA 1995, aimed at improving the position of the disabled person in the labour market (Bell et al., 2005). Across a range of datasets, research showed that the employment rate of the disabled is estimated to be about half of the non-disabled rate, and less than half of that gap can be explained by differences in observable characteristics such as experience, work history and skills (Blackaby et al., 1999). O'Donnell (1998) however argues that this type of model is inaccurate given that some disabled individuals

are unable to work. Using data from 2001 British Office of Population Censuses and Surveys (OPCS), research shows employment as an outcome of two decisions: capacity to work and desire to work.

My research focuses on a particular group of disadvantaged people, in terms of disability. The disabled group of people traditionally have lower rates of earning growth (Rigg, 2005) and are more likely to exit full-time employment to part-time employment with little evidence of a difference in occupational progression (Jones 2008). Such low rates of participation raise concerns regarding employer discrimination and social exclusion (Burchardt, 2003). Furthermore, the rise of disability benefit claimants represents a concern for public spending (Jones, 2008).

Private and public sector employers claimed they could not meet the criteria necessary for disabled people to work in the health service. When disabled people do find work the majority find themselves in poorly paid, low-skilled, low-status jobs which are both undemanding and unrewarding; the type of work which has been termed as 'underemployment' (Walker 1982; Thomas 1982). Social analysts specialising in racism and sexism in employment have identified two types of jobs in the modern labour market - 'primary' and 'secondary' sector jobs. 'Primary' sector jobs are those with high wages, high skill levels, good working conditions, job security, and ample opportunities for promotion. Examples of such jobs include lawyers, doctors, engineers and so on. 'Secondary' sector jobs have low wages, low skill levels, poor working conditions, little job security, and few, if any, possibilities for advancement. Routine office work, general labouring, catering, and cleaning positions fall into this category (McRudden, 1981). The majority of disabled workers with jobs work in the secondary sector (Schur, 2003). Recent government research shows that considerably more disabled workers have semi-skilled jobs than is the case for the working population as a whole, and fewer are in professional or managerial posts (DWP 2006). In comparison with non-disabled male workers, only half as many disabled men are in professional or managerial jobs; while disabled women are heavily concentrated in routine clerical work and service sector jobs - notably cleaning and catering work. Therefore, with regards to the impact of unemployment, discrimination and underemployment, the conclusion is that this general atmosphere of disadvantage is the motivating force for disabled people's propensity to start self-employment.

The background of the study has given some views of the subject on disabled entrepreneurship examination field. It has been observed that there are relationships between capital resources and entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial performance, however: (i) we know very little about disabled entrepreneurs' relationships with such resources; (ii) entrepreneurship may still be a desirable route for disabled people in the

absence of these resources, making it the responsibility of support service organisations to assist them in gaining the correct resources. From the review, it has been indicated that no comprehensive study on disabled entrepreneurs' performance and the support services they require exists. A few researchers have addressed environmental barriers, but gap has been found which most effective environment such political, financial, social etc. are crucial for the disabled entrepreneurs. Research is absent as regards the salient features of the disabled entrepreneur and his/her entrepreneurial performance in the UK. Questions to be answered are: What types and sizes of enterprises do the disabled manage? What are the success factors with which to evaluate entrepreneurial success for people living with disability? What kinds of challenges are faced by disabled entrepreneurs? Are there any areas of struggle, such as finance or marketing? What is the effect of support services on the growth of disabled-owned business units? Are there any relationships between capital resources and the disadvantaged entrepreneur's business? Moreover, is there any relationship between capital resources and self-employment status for the disabled?

In summary, the association between self-employment, entrepreneurship and disability is uncertain. In the lens of the resource-based view in various empirical studies, the performance of disabled entrepreneurs in the UK is unclear.

Finally, the point of this review is to confine the research hypothesis. In viewing entrepreneurship and self-employment according to resource-based views, the research question has been developed as follows - *“How does the resource-based view explain entry to entrepreneurship for the disabled?”* The following sections would attempt to answer this question.

Background Study of Entrepreneurship and Disability

It is clear that the field of “disabled entrepreneurship” is underdeveloped in academic practice, owing to the fact that there is very little literature surrounding the subject. Presently, in the UK, there is a growing social awareness that policies directed at initiating and developing disabled people's entrepreneurial activity has the potential to improve the social and economic positioning of its participants (Pavey, 2006). One focus group study found that a disabled person can achieve improved standards of living through enterprise and self-employment (DRC, 2005). It is evident that the number of British people with disabilities is on the increase (DOH, 2007; LFS, 2006; ONS, 2001). The Employers Forum of Disability (EFD Research, 2007) states that just over 15% of the UK population have some form of disability. The Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) has published statistics from the Labour Force Survey (LFS) showing that although there are 6.8 million disabled people of working age in the UK, only half of them (50.1%) are in work; compared with 80.5 percent of the non-disabled population in

active employment (DWP, 2007). Reasons for this huge disparity are directly related to health issues, or not having relevant capital resources skills, such as education, training, experience, or social networks.

The definition of entrepreneurship has two precepts: the discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities, and acting on these opportunities (Shane and Venkataraman, 2000). It is argued that many aspects of entrepreneurial activities have been explored over the last four decades, however "*our empirically based knowledge about entrepreneurship is still very limited*" (Davidson and Honig, 2003: 304). This is mainly because research regarding entrepreneurship is still in the early stages, although it has been expanded and connected with a number of other disciplines. As a result, it is fragmented and there is a low level of convergences (Gregoire et al., 2006). Nevertheless, a direction for future research has been suggested to address this limitation - "*this interrelatedness [of entrepreneurship research] highlights the growing recognition of entrepreneurship scholars to borrow from others and develop influential research agendas*" (Schildt et al.: 402). The well-known theory of human capital which has been widely used in social studies can be adopted to explain the relationship between resources and propensity, from the perspective of entrepreneurs.

Self-employment for disabled people is a significant issue from a number of different policy perspectives, namely: promoting entrepreneurship among disadvantaged groups, preventing social exclusion, and narrowing the gap in employment rates between disabled people and the rest of the population. The flexibility afforded by self-employment – given sufficient and appropriate support - is particularly important for disabled people, since the impact of their impairments on their ability to work may be variable. Moreover, self-employment may be able to provide an alternative to a competitive and discriminatory labour market (Griffin and Hammis, 2004). Several studies have examined the relationship between self-employment and economic hardship, but not specifically with reference to disabled people. Brown (1992) identified inadequacies in the social security system with respect to the self-employed, while Meager et al. (1994) and Eardley and Corden (1996) investigated low-income self-employment. Bryson and White (1996) analysed movements into and out of self-employment. None of these studies analysed the relationship between self-employment and disability.

It has been argued in literature that people with disabilities generally lack capital resources in terms of financial capabilities (Noakes, 2006). Accordingly, disabled entrepreneurs are often regarded as having competitive disadvantages due to increased labour costs, for example the need to hire an able-bodied person to carry goods for the disabled person, additional transportation costs, slower production and so on. In some cultures, due to prejudice or superstition, being disabled can also result in a marketing

disadvantage since consumers might not want to contract products or services from disabled business people (Handojo, 2004). Hence, being disabled may well be a competitive disadvantage when a disabled entrepreneur faces competition from their non-disabled counterpart. Nevertheless, the resource deficit as it is perceived by others may not reflect the real resource constraints associated with disabled entrepreneurs. It is therefore important to assess the real capital resource base and not only the perceived resource base. But it can be said that the resource demands for disabled entrepreneurs are in general significant.

There is evidence to suggest that a large proportion of entrepreneurs start their new business as a part-time operation while continuing in organisational employment (Carter et al. 1996; Delmer & Devidsson, 2000). Another piece of research has defined self-employment as a continuous construct, measured by the number of average weekly hours spent working for the business (Kolvereid et al., 2005). There are several reasons for embarking on a career in self-employment as opposed to a career in organisational employment; in his study, Kolvereid (2005) identified these as opportunity, relationship with investor, risk-taking and economic management. The findings of the study reported that there is a clear relationship between the intention to become self-employed, and entry into self-employment; in other words, entry into self-employment is an intentional behaviour. But, this intentional behaviour may be altered in education and training programs (as part of human capital), thus capital resources may influence the individual's decision to become self-employed.

There exists a range of factors motivating people to enter self-employment. A study (Taylor, 1996) regarding the different factors to be considered prior to self-employment, found that the self-employed attach more importance to using their initiative and to the nature of the work in which they are involved. Furthermore, they are attracted by the expectation of higher earnings compared to organisational employment (in comparison, those who rated job security highly prefer organisational employment). Those entering self-employment from long-term unemployment are more particular about the sort of work they want and have a higher reservation wage than those entering employment (Bryson and White, 1994; Kellard and Middleton, 1997).

A recent qualitative study of more than 100 people entering self-employment from unemployment (DWP, 2006) found that some positive or 'pull' factors, such as independence, self-fulfilment and realising a particular goal were important. For others, however, it was a combination of 'push' factors, due to age discrimination, disability, ill-health, childcare responsibilities, or being unable to get a position as an employee due to high unemployment levels. Some had both positive and negative reasons for entering self-employment.

There were more positive than negative reasons for self-employment, and the key motivating factor given was the opportunity to become one's own boss (Crowley and Bainton, 2000). Interestingly, financial factors including job security, as well as job stability and making more money than in employment were also seen as important for self-employment (Crowley and Bainton, 2000). It was revealed that men were more likely to become self-employed due to difficulties in the labour market, while for women flexible hours and easier childcare were important. Interestingly, only half of lone parents mentioned childcare issues as a reason for entering self-employment, and younger people were more likely to become self-employed. Those who were most positive about self-employment had more opportunities in the wider labour market. Although motivating factors differed, it is interesting that few people enter self-employment as a last resort.

Self-employment therefore has different objectives according to different policy interests. This may include self-employment as a local regeneration strategy for deprived areas, self-employment as an economic development strategy (for example, through encouraging overseas trading), self-employment as a welfare-to-work strategy for unemployed people, or self-employment as an active labour market measure to assist particularly disadvantaged groups, such as disabled people, older people or ex-offenders, to re-enter the labour market. Each policy objective requires different policy interventions and different measures of success in terms of outcomes (Joans et al., 2006).

It could be said that a number of individual characteristics appear to influence propensity towards self-employment. These include; gender, age, ethnicity, disability and health status, marital status and household circumstances. Educational attainment, employment history, knowledge and experience of self-employment, and attitudes and motivation towards employment and self-employment. But, it is relatively unknown whether disability influences entry into self-employment.

The Term “Disability” in this Research

Underpinning the academic and practical demands of researching disabled people and their organisations is a socio/political re-interpretation of disability widely referred to as ‘the social model of disability’. The social model of disability is established as nothing more complicated than an emphasis upon the economic, environmental and cultural barriers encountered by people viewed by others as having some form of impairment. These barriers include inaccessible education, lacking information and communication systems, issues with working environments, inadequate disability benefits, discriminatory health and social support services, inaccessible transport, housing, public buildings and amenities, and the devaluation of people labelled as ‘disabled’ by negative imagery and representation in the media – films, television and newspapers. From this perspective,

people designated as 'disabled' are in fact disabled by society's failure to accommodate their individual and collective needs within the mainstream of economic and cultural life (Barnes 1991).

The 'social model of disability' (SMD) aims for society to consider the concept of disability in a different manner. The basis for this model is that "*it is not about the disabled person's impairment, but how society reacts to it*" (Kaplon, 2007:3). The social model perspective does not deny the importance or value of appropriate individually-based interventions in the lives of disabled people, whether they be medical, rehabilitative, educational or employment-based, but draws attention to their limitations in terms of furthering their empowerment and inclusion in a society constructed by 'non-disabled people' for 'disabled people' (Foley et al., 2007). Recently, the social model perspective has been heeded by the UK government, which has started to turn its attention to the barriers to disabled people created through social systems and practices (DRC 2006, 2007; Prime Minister's strategy Unit, 2006).

It can therefore be said that the social model is based on the principle that disability is a social construct, not the inevitable consequence of impairment. In addition, disability is best characterised as the complex interrelationship between impairment, and the individual's response to impairment and the social environment. Furthermore, it states that the social disadvantage experienced by disabled people is caused by the physical, institutional and attitudinal environment (that is, the 'social' environment) which fails to meet the needs of people who do not match the social expectation of 'normalcy'. In the early days of the social model, disabled activists often made the extreme claim that no impairment was disabling; only the failure of society to accommodate difference limited an individual's life options. This conception of the social model met the needs of the times - a mighty shove was needed to overcome inertia and without this extreme proposition the medical model may never have been budged. However, the social model is now widely accepted, and while recognizing the need to avoid reverting to an essentialist conception of disability, a complete account of disability must incorporate the personal experience of impairment and illness (Thomas et al., 2002). This research defines 'disability' according to the social model, because the social model of disability is a tool with which to gain an insight into the disabling tendencies of modern society in order to generate policies and practices to facilitate their suppression (Oliver, 2004). Furthermore, considering the concept of 'independent living' as it is understood in the development activities (Barnes, 2003). Thus the social and individual models' interpretations are used as definitions in this study.

Considering the demography of the disabled population, disabled people constitute a more heterogeneous group than women and ethnic minorities in the world. To put it

another way, establishing the proportion of population based on gender or cultural identity is less problematic than establishing the proportion of population made up of 'disabled entrepreneurs'. The manifestation of disability can take many forms identified in terms of psychobiological and functional distinctiveness. So, disability can vary in terms of type, severity, and stability (be it temporary or permanent). Environmental characteristics like social, political and cultural can also play an enabling or an obstructive role; the same individual who is severely disabled in one environment can be much less so in another. Attempts to accurately measure the size of the disabled population is therefore difficult to measure in the face of so many variables. However, this study does not engage the ownership of different types of disabilities (e.g. level of impairment of disabled entrepreneur) but considering the model of disability - how people perceive about it.

Disabled Entrepreneur

Little previous research has been published regarding disabled people and self-employment. The 2001 Small Business Service Household Survey of Entrepreneurship indicated that 12 per cent of respondents were self-employed, and reported that they had a health problem or disability which limited their ability to carry out their work (Shurry, Lomax and Vyakarnam, 2002). These percentages were higher than amongst the non-disabled respondents. Further analysis by the SBS survey indicated that the apparent difference in the probability of a disabled or a non-disabled person considering self-employment was in fact due to other characteristics such as age and educational qualifications. A study of gender differences in self-employment, using the British Household Panel Study, found that self-employed respondents were more likely than employees to report that their health limited the type or amount of work they could do, and that this difference was particularly marked for women (Cowling and Taylor, 2001). This suggests that females represent a higher proportion of the entrepreneur population than they do the employed population.

A small number of studies have concentrated on the support available to disabled self-employed people and would-be entrepreneurs, including training, advice and financial assistance. In a study of the provision made for disabled people by the London Training and Enterprise Council, staff reported that they received very few enquiries from disabled people regarding self-employment (Floyd, 1995). Advertisements for training courses did not mention any arrangements that could be made to accommodate the needs of disabled people, and there was no active strategy for attracting disabled clients. Disabled people themselves reported confusion about benefit entitlement and taxation, fears about their ability to cope with form-filling and book-keeping, worries about inaccessibility of training courses, and lack of awareness of the kinds of financial support and advice

available (Logan et al., 2008). It reports that establishing disabled people in self-employment could be a lengthy process, and that providing a route to secure business loans is important.

In defining disabled entrepreneurs, there have been some interesting debates. Scase & Goffy (1980) suggest that the “*entrepreneur may be more likely to emerge from those groups in society which are deprived or marginal, i.e. groups which are discriminated against, persecuted, looked down upon or exceptionally exploited*”. Some research looks at entrepreneurs in the context of being ‘deviant’ or ‘marginalized’ characters. Shapero (1975) addressed the issue of the entrepreneur as being a displaced person. This corresponds with what is called the social marginality theory put forward by Stanworth and Curren (1976), who suggest that the perceived incongruity between an individual’s prodigious personal attributes and the position he or she holds in society might force them to become entrepreneurial. Hagen (1962) suggests that there where the behaviour of a group is not accepted or where a group is discriminated against, then a psychological disequilibrium would occur. This might drive a person of an enterprising disposition to compensate for these shortcomings. Thus, it is important to note that disabled people may indeed be more likely to start a new venture than their non-disabled counterparts.

A relatively small sample study (Handojo, 2004) suggested that the characteristics of sincerity and determination are higher amongst entrepreneurial disabled people when they are compared to non-entrepreneurial disabled people. It was not empirically compared but was nevertheless subjectively found that disabled entrepreneurs have exceptional stocks of human capital characteristics such as imagination, optimism, self-confidence, perseverance, honesty, and determination, all of which are vital on the route to becoming self-employed or entrepreneurial (Wheeler, 2006). Other research in rural areas found that UK disabled entrepreneurs are older, have lower educational qualifications, have been self-employed for longer periods of time, are less likely to be in professional occupations, work fewer hours, have lower levels of start-up capital, have lower incomes, are regionally similar, and no significant differences in ethnicity were observed (Wheeler, 2006).

Resource-Based View

It is relevant to briefly review the key discourses of the resource-based view (RBV). The resource-based view helps to explain the conditions under which a business’s resources will provide it with a competitive advantage (Barney, 1991), and are valuable in helping to improve a firm’s efficiency and effectiveness. Resources are generally defined as “*all assets, capabilities, organisational processes, firm attributes, information, knowledge, etc. controlled by a firm*” (Barney 1991).

In contrast with the emphasis on external emphasis and analysis in traditional-organization economics (Bain, 1959), the RBV lays emphasis on the internal analysis of the differences in resource endowments across firms (even within the same industry), and explains how these differences can be a source of sustainable competitive advantage (Barney, 1986, 1991; Wernerfelt, 1984). Resources contribute to such performance advantages owing to the fact that they are valuable, rare, costly to imitate, and non-substitutable. The extent of their value is context-dependent (Barney, 2001; Conner, 1991; Priem & Butler, 2001), and determined in relation to such conditions as business strategy and external environments (Priem & Butler, 2001). In presenting the resource-based view (RBV), Barney (1991) classifies a firm's resources into three categories: (i) Human capital resources, including experience, training, skills and relationships amongst managers and workers; (ii) Physical capital resources, including physical technology and geographical location; (iii) Organizational capital resources, including the formal and informal planning of the firm and its environment. However, in relation to entrepreneurship, there is a tradition of focusing on three forms of capital resources: human, social and financial (Rouse and Jayawarna, 2007). Since this study links capital resources to the disabled, it is pertinent to explain their content, which will be done in the following section.

Human Capital

Human capital can be defined as "*individual capabilities, knowledge, skills, and experience*" (Dess et al. 2007: 118). There are also other aspects of human capital (HC), such as, age, ethnicity and gender (Becker, 1964). A number of studies have investigated the relationship between human capital and business performance. The influence of human capital on the survival chances of newly-founded businesses has been identified in the research of by Bruderl et al. (1992), in which 1,849 founders of business in Germany were surveyed. The conclusion was that those who possess a high stock of human capital are "*in a better position to identify promising business opportunities and to set up firms with high survival prospects*" (Bruderl et al., 1992:238).

However, Rikowski (2001) takes a different view, seeing human capital as the contemporary capitalist formulation of the capacity to individual. This view maintains that those who have more business education and management experience, are opportunistic and utilise external advisors, are more likely to be successful. Furthermore, evidence from a study in Sweden shows that general human capital influences new firms' chances of survival and growth (Cooper et al., 2000). Hancock (2001) placed human capital at the centre of the overlapping domains of social, ecological and economic capital, viewing it as an embodiment of the characteristics of healthy, well-educated, skilled, innovative and creative individuals who are engaged in their communities and

participate in governance. The results also showed that human capital has a positive effect on entrepreneurial activity. In addition, human capital such as education and business management experience are the most influential determinants when it comes to the survival and growth of new business (Pena, 2004 : 234).

The relationship between educational attainment and self-employment is complex, with polarisation existing between highly qualified individuals, and those with low educational attainment and/or relatively few qualifications (Bryson & White, 1996). The research also suggests that the likelihood of success amongst movers into self-employment from reliance on benefits is significantly lower than for those with higher qualifications. Furthermore, the effect of having a degree is statistically significant, literally doubling chances of survival (Meager et al., 2001). It can therefore clearly be seen that there is a distinct correlation between academic qualifications and self-employment.

In previous research regarding the self-employed population as a whole, age at the start of self-employment is a strong predictor of survival (Knight and McKay, 2000; Bryson and White, 1996). Specifically, younger people are less likely to achieve sustained self-employment than older people. For males entering self-employment from long-term unemployment, the self-employment exit rate rises with age, although it appears to have no significant effect on non-survival rates (Bryson and White, 1996), which is not necessarily the same as self-employment non-survival. This study links human capital theory with the disabled population's propensity to start up business.

Social Capital

Social Capital can be defined as "*the network of relationships that individuals have with the stakeholders*" (Dess et al., 2007). According to McElory et al. (2006) there are five major forms of social capital: "*trust, beliefs, norms, rules and network*".

Historically, most studies using the social capital concept as part of a general theoretical strategy argue that unlike physical and human capital "*social capital inheres in the structure of relations between actors and actors*" (Coleman, 1998). Network structures, size and relationships, in essence, are important when it comes to the construction of social capital. Such relationships could be family, friends, casual relationships and even contact with strangers, all providing rich resources in terms of knowledge, information and support" (Taylor et al., 2004). It can be expressed differently according to the economic view of capital, in which emphasis is laid upon the importance of physical and financial capital being inputted directly into the production process, the possession of useful contacts such as potential and existing suppliers, buyers and business advisors, and having the ability to utilise and expand these contacts, all of which can be extremely

valuable capital to businesses. Moreover, Coleman (1988) stresses the social structure of such capital; compared to human capital, which consists of individual's knowledge, skills, and experience, social capital is less tangible "*for it exists in the relations among persons*" (Coleman, 1988: 100). Recalling the influential work on social capital theory (Coleman, 1988), social networks are where social capital is embedded and where interactions occur through relationships. The close connection between human and financial capital, and business performance is implied in Putnam's (2000) work.

" the core idea of social capital theory is that social networks have value. Just as a screwdriver (physical capital) or a college education (human capital) can increase productivity, so too social contacts affect the productivity of individuals and groups...social capital refers to connections among individuals, social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them." (Putnam, 2000 : 18-19)

There exists two streams of social capital networks; one is 'internal' and the other is 'external'. The internal network explores the bonding perspectives - "*the impact of a collective's internal ties and the substance of the network relationships within the collective*" (De Carolis and Saporito, 2006). The external network concept of bridging social capital focuses on individuals and their network relationships. In other words, the individual within the social network uses the resources they can access via their social ties to benefit in their businesses. Thus, the entrepreneur cannot be seen as separate from his or her social life, indeed the social relations of the entrepreneur are necessary for the effective economic functioning of his or her work (Dubini and Aldrich, 1991). The author of this research aims to apply this perspective to the disabled. Due to the limited resources of this project, it focuses on the network and social life (parents, social class and so forth) aspects of social capital in order that the disabled entrepreneur is viewed as an economic resource that also possesses social functions.

Financial Capital

A recent study has shown that financial capital "*has a direct and significant effect on the chances of start-up and success*" (Jayawarna et al., 2007). Start-up and entry to self-employment are synonymous and related to business finance; moreover, the success or failure of a business or a self-employed entity is dependent on finance. There are four perspectives of business growth critical to entrepreneurial success (Mintzberz, 1979); financial growth, strategic growth, structural growth and organizational growth. The potential for these growths are the fundamental criteria to justify entrepreneurial ventures. However, these growths can only be enabled if a certain amount of resources are invested in the business. Cash, overdraft facilities, loans, or investment capital are possible financial capital resources (Wickham, 2001). It is argued by Honig (1999) from a purely

economic perspective that successful firms should realize an evident return on capital invested as operating profits including income, savings and investment. Therefore, unlike human capital, which is measured according to the entrepreneur's tangible and intangible resources, from an economic point of view, a propensity to self-employment can also be measured in terms of tangible figures, such as savings or investment.

The SBS 2001 survey found disabled people were similar to the population as a whole in terms of the business skills and knowledge they demonstrated, but were less likely to know where to find start-up funding. Lacking in sufficient funds is one the fundamental barriers for disabled entrepreneurs to business growth (Bichard and Thomas, 2008). Moreover, they have less access to personal investment or bank loans and have more barriers to overcome in establishing their own business and sustaining business growth. A previous study by Astebro and Burchardt (2005) pointed out that a high level of human capital relaxes financial constraints. Questions then arise regarding the opportunities for disabled individuals who may have limited access to finance. According to a report from the DTI (2005) regarding the improvement of access to funding for small businesses, one of the major barriers to entrepreneurial activities is difficulty in obtaining finance. Furthermore, the report suggests that entrepreneurs in disadvantaged groups have less financial capital than others. Which begs the questions - what other capital resources do these disabled entrepreneurs have that can help to nurture their business? And are these resources effective in their propensity to start up business?

Method of Analysis

The objective of this study was to relate the resource-based view (RBV) to propensity to start business for the disabled entrepreneur in the UK. In order to address this objective the ANOVA results specify whether or not significant statistical differences exist between two groups of the population (e.g. disabled entrepreneur vs. non-disabled entrepreneur, disabled employed vs. disabled entrepreneur, and disabled entrepreneur vs. disabled working-age population). The mean values were taken to evaluate the differences between groups in order to check the stock of capital resource ownership under RBV.

The second part of analysis has been executed by Bivariate analysis, which is concerned with the analysis of two variables at a time in order to uncover whether or not the two variables are related. This analysis explores relationships between variables, which means it searches for evidence that the variation in one variable coincides with variations in another variable. A variety of techniques are available for this analysis depending on the nature of the variables where this study has taken 'Spearman Correlation Test' from the SPSS. This study follows ethical considerations in using the UK data archive.

The formation of the following representative sample of population is followed by searching the value labels of variables from BHPS 16 waves. Population representation has been identified by the dichotomous answer on the specific variables and then re-grouped in order to make the appropriate representation of the required population. One way ANOVA Analysis has been carried out to identify the level of distinction among three different BHPS population mainly the disabled entrepreneur representative (group-1), the non-disabled entrepreneur representative (group-2) and the disabled employed (working age) representative (group-3). The other pertinent population group has also been taken into consideration for the analysis and the comparison that is working age disabled with employment and unemployment (group-4, group-5).

All of these groups have been in a sampling frame from BHPS survey (wave-16) to investigate whether or not the resource based view (RBV) can explain the difference between the propensities to start entrepreneurial activities. Among all of the variables, experience variable from human capital, group membership from social capital variables and income variable from financial capital have got the significant difference between the first three groups. Surprisingly, no other statistical significant mean difference among these three groups in terms of age, education, group activities, parents' occupation, social class, savings and investment. But, the high statistical significant difference showed in disabled self-employed group and disabled working age group in terms of human, social and financial capital.

In the *Bivariate analysis* (Spearman $\rho = \rho$ correlation test) some variables showed significant associations between the variables within the specific group. This test has been conducted for identifying the future entrepreneurial behaviour from the disabled employed or unemployed group. For the comparison and discussion the pattern and prediction the propensity to start business the relationship between the variables, the non-disabled employed group has been taken in Bivariate analysis. From the disabled employed group, the 'intention' and 'expectation' of start to own business showed strong correlation with all job satisfaction variables, but no significant association showed to 'chance of start of own business' variable with all job satisfaction variables. It was expected that, the chance of propensity to start self-employment showed negative value but was not statistically significant.

Table 1: “Disabled Entrepreneur vs. Non-Disabled Entrepreneur”

Capital Resources	Variables	Disabled Entrepreneur N=121 (Group-1)	Non-Disabled Entrepreneur N=1040 (Group-2)	ANOVA F	Sig.
Human Capital	Age	37.34 (21.948)	37.78 (22.694)	.042	.837
	Education	3.74 (1.109)	3.687 (1.192)	.194	.660
	Experience	1.50 (0.512)	1.295 (0.457)	3.840	.051*
Social Capital	Group Membership	4.02 (1.472)	4.28 (1.262)	4.117	.043**
	Group Activities	3.73 (1.438)	3.69 (1.383)	.105	.746
	Parents in Self-employed/Business	0.1638 (0.436)	0.155 (0.408)	.051	.822
	Average Social Class	28.82 (20.796)	26.985 (18.427)	.587	.444
Financial Capital	Income	21969.54 (20849.419)	21163.11 (21765.16)	.127	.722
	Savings	1.47 (0.818)	1.53 (0.654)	.831	.362
	Investment	.54 (0.501)	.52 (.500)	.097	.755

Group 1 = Disabled Entrepreneur

Group 2 = Non-Disabled Entrepreneur

*Values given are mean value. The values within parenthesis are standard deviation and ANOVA statistics were considered significant at * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$ and *** $p < 0.01$ levels.*

Table 2: “Disabled Entrepreneur vs. Disabled employed”

	Variables	Disabled Entrepreneur (N=121) (Group-1)	Employed Disabled (N=627) (Group-3)	ANOVA F	Sig.
Human Capital	Age	37.34 (21.948)	38.97 (23.015)	.518	.472
	Education	3.74 (1.109)	3.61 (1.20)	1.123	.290
	Experience	1.50 (0.512)	1.21 (0.631)	9.157	.003***
Social Capital	Group Membership	4.02 (1.472)	4.33 (1.231)	5.276	.022**
	Group Activities	3.73 (1.438)	3.84 (1.307)	.543	.461
	Parents in Self-employed/Business	0.1638 (0.436)	0.12 (0.350)	1.384	.240
	Average Social Class	28.82 (20.796)	27.21 (18.939)	.401	.527
Financial Capital	Income	21969.54 (20849.419)	17198.93 (10957.610)	11.859	.001***
	Savings	1.47 (0.818)	1.52 (0.573)	.507	.477
	Investment	.54 (0.501)	.51 (.499)	.001	.980

Group 1 = Disabled Entrepreneur

Group 3 = Employed Disabled

*Values given are mean value. The values within parenthesis are standard deviation and ANOVA statistics were considered significant at * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$ and *** $p < 0.01$ levels.*

Table 3 : “Working age Disabled Entrepreneur vs. Not Self-Employed Working age Disabled”

Capital Resources	Variables	Working age Disabled Entrepreneur N=101 (Group-4)	Working Age⁴ Disabled N= 758 (Group-5)	ANOVA F	Sig.
Human Capital	Age	36.34 (19.948)	40.74 (13.799)	12.312	.001**
	Education	4.74 (1.129)	2.681 (1.347)	2.317	.026**
	Experience	1.75 (0.522)	1.389 (.502)	3.776	.043**
Social Capital	Group Membership	4.12 (1.462)	4.21 (1.289)	4.904	.048**
	Group Activities	3.83 (1.418)	2.88 (1.385)	11.763	.002**
	Parents in Self-Employed/Business	2.89 (0.416)	1.084 (.327)	7.660	.006**
	Average Social Class	27.82 (20.596)	26.442 (18.198)	.712	.383
Financial Capital	Income	22969.54 (17849.419)	14781.71 (8944.677)	165.813	.000***
	Savings	1.43 (0.718)	1.39 (.548)	1.571	.260
	Investment	.53 (0.501)	.51 (.499)	.428	.579

Group 4 = Working age disabled Entrepreneur

Group 5 = Employed and unemployed working age² disabled

*Values given are mean value. The values within parenthesis are standard deviation and ANOVA statistics were considered significant at *p<0.10, **p<0.05 and ***p<0.01levels.*

² Official working age definition in the UK: 16-64 (for all people)

Among three human capital variables (age, level of education, experience) only the “experience” variable has the significant difference between these two different groups : (Group-1) and (Group-2) see table: 1. No significant difference between the groups was observed in other human capital variables (i.e. age and education) at $p < 0.10$ level of significance. However mean comparisons revealed that self-employed with disabilities are relatively younger and educated than self-employed non-disabled.

Disabled entrepreneur are less likely to gain social group membership than non disable counterparts and therefore has less social capital. Although statistically not significant (mean value of social group activities $3.73 > 3.69$), self-employed disable seems to be involved in more group activities, receiving the advantages of having a family business background and seems to be coming from higher social class than non disabled self-employed population.

With reference to the table: 1, surprisingly, no significance difference was observed in the mean income, savings and investment between the people in group-1 (self-employed disabled) and group-2 (self-employed non-disabled). Therefore, statistically it could not be possible to claim any difference between the two observed groups in relation to their financial capital. However, the results suggests that self-employed disable population are making relatively higher income and posses higher investment than the non disable self-employed population when mean comparisons were taken to compare the groups. However, disabled self-employed population is making comparatively less savings when compared to non-disable self-employed population though difference was statistically not significant.

The highly significant mean difference have found in ‘group membership works’ between self-employed disabled and employed disabled group ($F=5.276$ at $p < 0.05$, see table 2). This expresses that employed disabled people involved more membership works compare to self-employed disabled people. Other social activities, parents in business and social class did not indicate any significant difference between the group-1 and group-3. The statistical not significant result could explain the pattern of mean comparison (mean value of social group activities $3.76 < 3.84$), employed disabled were more engaged in social activities and self-employed disabled seems to be coming from higher social class (mean value of average Social class $28.82 > 27.21$).

The result indicates highly significant difference between the mean income of the two compared groups at $p < 0.01$ with $F=11.859$ (see table 4.2). The mean income of the compared group disabled self-employed (group-1) and disabled –employed (group-3) were £21969.54 and £17198.93 respectively. This difference was straightforwardly indicated that self-employed disabled people have got more earnings or income that

disabled employed people and statistically significant. But, in terms of other variables, savings or investment did not have any statistical significant difference between these two groups of population. Although not statistically significant the pattern of mean comparison of disabled all age population, savings was low (mean value $1.47 < 1.52$) and investment was higher ($.54 > .51$) for the disabled self-employed than employed disabled population.

Table 4: Future Entrepreneurial Behaviour for the Disabled People.

Group 3: Disabled Employed People

Spearman's rho (ρ) Correlation Test

No.	Variables Name	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Would like: Start own business	1.00							
2	Expect: Start own business	.528**	1.00						
3	Chance of: start own business	-.0190	.040	1.00					
4	Job satisfaction: total pay	.082*	.034	.045	1.00				
5	Job satisfaction: security	.047	.041	.011	.342**	1.00			
6	Job satisfaction: work itself	.099*	.076	.038	.368**	.372**	1.00		
7	Job satisfaction: hours worked	.110**	.040	-.055	.406**	.347**	.469**	1.00	
8	Job satisfaction: overall	.086*	.046	.027	.493**	.467**	.693**	.581**	1.00

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

In the first Bivariate analysis, strong significant correlations at $p < 0.01$ level were observed between intention to start own business and expectation to start business ($\rho = 0.528$) and job satisfaction measured in terms of hours of work ($\rho = 0.110$). The association between the *intention* to start own business and the entrepreneurs perception of the *chances* to start the business is negative and statistically not significant (at $p < 0.05$ level) The negative chances to start own business can be explained in terms of the

intention (would like to start business) of disabled employed person has strong significant correlation with the expectation and current job satisfaction of hours of working (at the significant level of 0.05). The future entrepreneurial behaviour could not predict since there were no significant correlation between the intention and chances of start business.

Discussion and Recommendation

There have been a number of examples of very young individuals successfully setting up their businesses (Oldfield, 1999). It has also been suggested that younger entrepreneurs are possibly more likely to take more risks in an attempt to grow their business (Henry *et al.*, 2003). This study showed that the self-employed disabled (i.e. disabled entrepreneur) people are in younger age than the other compared group of people. Therefore they can take more risk for their business which is important of entrepreneurial orientation. However, if age is measure of experience and possible wealth accumulation it could also be seen as a form of milestone which can trigger an individual towards self-employment (Gorman & Cunningham 1997:14).

The test did not show any significant difference (at any level of p value) of age and education in terms of human capital variables. Lee and Tsang (2001) state that most studies reported in the literature suggest a positive relationship between entrepreneur's prior experience and venture starting. This relationship has a direct influence in propensity to start business for all entrepreneurs. However, the pattern of mean result reveals that disabled self-employed are more educated and young than the employed disabled group of people though it was not statistical significant result.

This study set out to link and compare the resource-based views of disabled self-employed people in the UK, and focus on the resource-based ownership of different groups of disabled people in the identification of their propensity to start up their own business. It relates the resource-based view (RBV) to the UK disabled entrepreneur's propensity to start a business. In order to answer the research question, data from the last available wave of the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) was examined. The sample of the study was a representative sample of UK households from the BHPS population. Human, social and financial resources have been selected and analyzed for this study. It was assumed that the higher the resources, the higher the resources they would subsequently be able to propensity to start self-employment. It was surprising that the typical disabled entrepreneur's propensity to self-employment correspond not to same level of human, social and financial capital when compared with the employed disabled, working-age disabled and self-employed non-disabled people.

Researchers investigating entrepreneurship from a social or demographic approach tend to focus on the effects of an individual's background, and include some analysis of the entrepreneur's family history, the education and occupation of the parents, their childhood experience, religion and culture, age at start-up (if business is already set-up), and his/her education and work experience. Historically, this approach is represented in the literature by Keats de Vries (1977), Collins and Moore (1970), Davids (1963), Gould (1969), Howell (1972), and Gaeavan and O Cinneide (1994), among others. The outcome of these studies do not dominate the entrepreneurship field, however they do not take onto account the individual and social model of disabilities in the performance of entrepreneurial orientation. In this study the difference in the ownership of different resource capital was evaluated in the lens of resource based view. The result of this study present there only in employment or self-employment experience, and social group membership activities, were shown to be a statistical significant difference. There was no statistically significant difference observed (except above two variables) between the self-employed disabled and non-disabled self-employed people in the UK. Since, this study uses the term self-employed and entrepreneur interchangeably, it can be said that, the ownership of different levels of human, social and financial capital can explain their propensity to start self-employment. It was surprising that, disabled entrepreneurs have more experience in employment or self-employment than non-disabled entrepreneurs. The propensity of self-employment of disabled people can be explained under the following headings.

The capital Resources of Disabled Entrepreneurs

In this study, in order to check the ownership level of capital resources, disabled entrepreneurs (self-employed disabled) were compared to non disabled entrepreneur (non disabled self-employed) and non entrepreneur disabled (not self-employed disabled). The result shows the significant difference in experience and group membership variable among disabled entrepreneur and others groups. But in other capital resources, no statistically significant difference was observed. It explains that disabled entrepreneurs' holds the capital resource ownership as good as non disabled entrepreneur.

Though it was not statistically significant, this study found that disabled entrepreneurs are younger in age compared to other groups of people, including non-disabled self-employed or entrepreneurs. This could be linked to the fact that an important entrepreneurial trait is a willingness to take risks, which is a quality usually belonging to younger disabled. There have been a number of attempts in previous literature to establish a link between the entrepreneur's age and the performance of the particular venture in which s/he is involved (Floyd 1995; Bryson and White, 1996; Knight and McKay, 2000; Walker et al. 2007). While one might justifiably hypothesise that a more

mature entrepreneur will have significantly more experience and thus be more likely to succeed, this study showed that the propensity to start business is more likely at a young age, and also relates to other research which suggest that the younger entrepreneur is more likely to take risks in order to grow their business (Henry et al., 2003). However, if age is a measure of experience and possible wealth accumulation, it may also be seen as a form of milestone which can trigger an individual towards self-employment (Gorman and Cunningham, 2007). There have been a number of examples of very 'young individuals' successfully setting up own their businesses (Oldfield, 1999). So, aspiring entrepreneurs could take use early 'age' (young age) as a form of capital, when making decision about becoming entrepreneurs. Additionally, it is suggested by some industrial psychologists that full-time paid work leads to a stressful lifestyle, whereas the ability to work from home in a more relaxed, family environment has the added appeal of a better quality of life with unlimited future earning potential, despite lower financial rewards initially. The younger entrepreneurship revolution has been started in Britain since long. Despite the fact that a disability could be considered an issue, disabled entrepreneurs are represented in this group of young entrepreneurs.

Most studies have shown that in the past, entrepreneurs received very little formal education (Collins et al., 1964; Stanworth and Curren, 1971). However, more recent studies have indicated that entrepreneurs now tend to be better educated. As Caired (1989) and others, including Murray and O' Donnell (1982), have pointed out, uneducated entrepreneurs may well be a dying breed. This assertion is qualified, however; when looking at the effect of propensity to start venture has been very important for determining the size of the business - small, medium or big. Education undoubtedly has a high positive effect on venture growth, and this study showed that education has an important effect on one's propensity to start up a business. A different perspective argued by Bolton & Thompson (2000) is that the positive effect of education on a potential entrepreneur is undermined by the influence of a risk-averse culture. While education may enhance the capacity for analysis and sound judgement, it has been claimed that it can also devalue flair and instinct, resulting in a diminution of entrepreneurial spirit. This appears to be consistent with the experience of disabled population. This study has found that the disabled working age group has less educational qualification and would therefore be deemed less likely to venture into self-employment.

The study found that the in terms of mean average the self-employed disabled are more educated compare to rest of the groups: non-disabled self-employed, disabled employed. But, statistical significant result found only in disabled working age group. However, the likely motivation for propensity to self-employment may be explained due to a high level of ownership in education. Hence, more educational qualified disabled people who suffer from the labour market discrimination are more likely embark upon self-employment.

The discussion has focused on the suggestion that, due to unemployment, discrimination and underemployment, disabled people have a tendency to start up their own business.

Work experience is seen in this study as an important determining factor with regard to propensity to start up a business. It is assumed by many researchers that experience is also an important factor contributing towards entrepreneurial success. Propensity and success are two different areas of discussion. Entrepreneurial work experience in the same sector is an important factor for success. But this study showed that work experience in the form of employment and self-employment influence the propensity of disabled people to start up a business or self-employment. Disabled entrepreneurs have more likely to have more work experience than the non-disabled self-employed and disabled employed groups since this study found the statistical significant result.

The social approach is supported in this study, particularly where the entrepreneur is a person whose family background and other deprivations have been formative in shaping their desire to start their own business. From a sociological perspective, societal upheaval is considered to have considerable impact on the formation of new entrepreneurs. Indeed, societal disruptions which affect family life may influence the choice of non-traditional career paths (Hagen, 1982). If the entrepreneur's family does not seem to 'fit in' to society or is seen to be different, then their children may feel the need to create a new niche for themselves (Ket de Vries, 1996). But the result of this study shows inconsistent since average of working age disabled entrepreneurs come from relatively higher social class though the findings was statistically not significant. Some studies indicate that entrepreneurs are more likely to come from ethnic, religious or minority groups, whereas this study indicates that self-employed disabled people come from a very specific sector of society – a minority advantaged group of fortune members of the society or socially advantaged.

The importance of resource-based theory to business outcomes is well-established in the relevant literature (Barney 1991; Priem & Butler 2001; Rouse & Jayawarna, 2007). Access to and engaging with a resource accumulation process of well-connected others can have an impact on a disabled entrepreneur and his or her business, access to finance and other resources, and can even play a role in the growth of the firm. This study found that disabled entrepreneurs are not a significantly different group when compared to the non-disabled entrepreneur group, and the disabled working-age population in the UK. Therefore, the propensity to starting and operating their business with the same capabilities of ownership in human, social and financial resources. It is not only favourable for them, but also relevant for policy makers to improve the outcome or performance of disabled-owned business firms. It must be remembered that the vast majority of disabled-owned firms are in small sector industries (in terms of savings and

income level), so the opportunities arising from the effective use of different resource capital should be available for disabled entrepreneurs. Despite this, firms owned by disabled entrepreneurs still under-perform when compared to those of non-disabled (Burchardt, 2003; Noakes, 2006). The most important finding come out in this study is the higher income of the disabled working age population. This research is established that the working age disabled entrepreneurs' increased levels of resources are being translated into significant economic gain.

The Resource-Based Environment for the Disabled Entrepreneur

The study found that the significant difference between disabled entrepreneur in working age and non-disabled in working age. The majority of research acknowledges that resource capital is important in terms of entrepreneurial growth; in other words, resource capital acts as a stimulus to development amongst entrepreneurs. But none of these researches acknowledges that resource capitals can explain the propensity to start self-employment. In terms of social capital, concurrence in recognition and a clear understanding regarding the entrepreneurial environment has created the social phenomena of disabled entrepreneurs participating in business. A few studies demonstrate that social recognition in the form of social group membership and activities will not only develop entrepreneurial spirit, but also encourage disabled people to engage in entrepreneurial activities (Scheufele *et al* 2000; Van *et al* 2003). Social capital acts as a boost to motivation, and thus increases the self confidence of the self-employed disabled. This will eventually increase their economic activities, and help disabled people to achieve a better socio-economic life.

Disabled entrepreneurship has the potential to succeed, provided that a supportive atmosphere exists. Key factors for entrepreneurial success are - social, economic, business, legal and political. This study has not identified the entrepreneurial environmental concept of self-employed disabled people. The study has not identified the business, legal and political environment necessary for disabled entrepreneurship. With regards to the current political environment, disability benefits in the UK are extensive. The socio-economic environment also influences the availability of employment for the disabled. Government policies aimed at achieving a certain level of social inclusion exist, however disabled entrepreneurs lack adequate information, communication and sponsorship. From a legal perspective, there are no comprehensive business laws regarding the disabled and entrepreneurship. Therefore, there is a need to build the confidence of disabled people wanting to start a new business with entrepreneurial career. In general, people's confidence can be developed by recognizing personal qualities, such as motivation, optimism, diligence, hard work, honesty and imagination; disabled people are no exception. By mentoring these personality resources in the form of human capital, individuals can be encouraged to grow in an entrepreneurial way.

Future Entrepreneurial Behaviour of the Disabled

This research shows that the chances of starting self-employment are less for disabled people who are in employment and unemployment. This study found that the intention and expectations of starting a new business are positively correlated, but surprisingly, their chances are negative. This study showed that the intention to start a business is significantly correlated with the salaries and hours of work. If disabled employed people are satisfied with their salary and hours of working, they are more likely to start self-employment, considering the income and more flexible or less working hours. The findings shows that the disabled employed people's total pay, job security, work at itself, working hours and overall satisfaction are significantly correlated in the job satisfaction. The initial findings indicate the different level of ownerships of capital resources in the disabled self-employed and disabled employed populations are less significant rather significant in the self-employed disabled in working age. The reason behind differing chances of starting a business for employed disabled people can be explained by the different level of human and social capital. It is surprising that, chances of entrepreneurial or self-employment careers are negative or apparently much lower for the unemployed disabled and non-disabled working age group. The problem could be the process or availability of financial capital for employed and unemployed disabled people could be the explanation for this difference. Thus, this study recommends that the financial capital is a strong indicator to encourage disable entrepreneurship

Conclusion

The existent literature regarding disability and entrepreneurship is fragmented due to the incomparability of findings from different studies in different countries. This study enhances comparability by adopting a resource-based view that has been tested, and will contribute to the research in the field of disabled entrepreneurship. This helps to bridge the knowledge gap that is identified in this study, namely, that the distinguishable factors of capital resource variables determine the pattern of entrepreneurial career choice for the disabled. Presently new forms of support are emerging in developed countries; voluntary and public sector organizations should be able to develop an entrepreneurial role for disabled people but the development of disabled-owned businesses is a topic needing further analysis and research. Furthermore, this study can be utilized to assist the Bangladesh Government policies, guidelines and procedures for making social development decisions in the disabled sector and social exclusion for economic participations. The disable population specification may be clearly included in the population census report of the Bangladesh. This inclusion will help in development of policy on disability enterprise research in Bangladesh. Many foreign donor agencies are helpful to cultivate and promote the disability research and they are seeking research

proposal to develop in this field. So it is a good opportunity for the Bangladeshi researchers for the contribution of disability empowerment strategy in the country, since disability research is much untried and infant in Bangladesh. From these perspectives, there are vast and sufficient scopes of research in the disabled entrepreneurship field in Bangladesh.

References

- Arnold N.L., & Ipsen C., (2005) "Self-employment for People with Disabilities - Enhancing Services Through Interagency Linkages" *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, Vol-15 (4), pp-231-239.
- Alvord, S.H., Brown, L.D., & Letts, C.W. (2004), "Social Entrepreneurship and societal transformation" *Journal of applied Behavioural Science*, 40(3), pp- 260-282.
- Anderson, A. & Jack, S. (2002) "The articulation of social capital in entrepreneurial networks : a glue or a lubricant?" *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 14, pp- 193-210.
- Andolfatto, D., Ferrall, C. & Gomme, P. (2000) Human capital theory and the life-cycle pattern of learning and earning, income and wealth. Available online at <http://www.clevelandfed.com/gomme/lifecycle.pdf>
- Bardasi, E., Jenkins, S. and Rigg, J. (2000) Disability, work and income: a British perspective. Institute for Social and Economic Research Working Paper 2000-36. Colchester: University of Essex.
- Barnes, C (1999) A working social model? Disability and work in the 21st century, paper presented at the Disability Studies Conference and Seminar, Edinburgh. Available online at <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/disability-studies/archive/archframe.htm>
- Baum J. Robert, Frese M, Baron R. (2004) "The Psychology of Entrepreneurship ", Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, Mahwah, New Jersey.
- Bates, T., (1990) "Entrepreneurial Human Capital Inputs and Small Business Longevity", *Review of Economic and Statistics* Vol. 72(4), pp- 551-559
- Bates, T (1995) " Self-employment entry across industry groups" , *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol.10(3) pp-143-56
- Baumol, William J (1993) "Entrepreneurship, Management and the structure of payoffs". The MIT press, Cambridge, London.

- Begley, T. W., Tan W. and Schoch, H (2005) "Politico-economic factors associated with Interest in starting a business : a multi-country study", *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp-35-55.
- Berthoud, R. (2003) 'Disabled people and jobs', *Benefits*, 11, 163-168.
- Benton, T and Craib, I (2001) *Philosophy of Social Science*. Basingstoke, Palgrave.
- Barney. J (1991) Firm resource and sustained competitive advantage, *Journal of Managment* 17(1) p-99-120.
- Blanchflower, David G., Oswald A. J. (1998) "What makes an Entrepreneur?" *Journal of Labor Economics*, 1998, 16(1), pp. 26-60
- Blackaby D., Clark K., Drinkwater S., Leslie D., Murphy P. and O'Leary N. (1999) *Earnings and Employment Opportunities of Disabled People*, Department for Education and Employment, Research Report No.133, Nottingham.
- Bryman, A. (1998) "Quality in Social research", Unwin Hyman, London.
- Bouchikhi, H (1993) "A constructivist framework for understanding entrepreneurship performance" *Organization studies*, Vol. 14 (4) pp-549-570.
- Burchardt, T. (2002) *Enduring Economic Exclusion: disabled people, income and work*. York: York Publishing Services
- Cannon, T. (1991), "Enterprise Creation, Development and Growth" Butterworth Heinemann, Oxford.p-149
- Casson, M., (1995) "Entrepreneurship and Business Culture", *Studies in the Economics of the Trust*, Vol. 1, Edward Elgar, Aldershot. p-83.
- Chell E, Howarth J. H., & Brearley S., (1991), "The Entrepreneurial personality: Concepts cases & Categories," Routledge, London.
- Cooper, A. C., & Dunkelburg, W. C., (1986), "Entrepreneurship and the Paths to Business Ownership", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 7, pp-53-68
- Cunningham, J. Barton, and J. Lischeron, 1993 "Entrepreneurship: some popular impression and New information", *Journal of small Business and Entrepreneurship*, Vol 10, no. 2, Jan- March, pp- 46-50.
- Clark, P., & Kays, A. J (2003) "Micro enterprise and the Poor, Findings from the self-employment learning project five year study of micro entrepreneurs." Washinton DC: Aspen Institute.
- Dunkelberg, W. C, Cooper, A. C. & Woo, C., (1988) Entrepreneurs' perceived chances of success, *Journal of Business Venturing*, Vol-3, pp-97-108.
- Dees, G.1998, The meaning of Social Entrepreneurship, http://www.fuqua.duke.edu/centers/case/documents/dees_SE.pdf.

- Deeks, J., (1976) "The Small Firm Owner Manager", New York, Praeger Publisher.
- Delmar, F. & Davidsson, P (2003) Where do they come from? Prevalence and characteristics of nascent entrepreneurs, *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 12, pp-1-23
- Department for Work and Pensions, DWP (2006) "Working together- the UK national action plan on social inclusion 2006-2008." Available at <http://www.dwp.gov.uk/publications/dwp/2006/nap/WorkingTogether.pdf>
- DOH (2006) ,Department of Health, Valuing people : A new strategy for learning Disability for the 21st Century (London, HMSO)
- Dolan, G. Edwin (1990) Basic Macroeconomics, 2nd edition, The Dryden Press, Hinsdale, Illinois. pp-4-11, , 122-123.
- Douglas W. Naffziger, Jefferey S.Homsby, Donald F. Kuratko (2004), "A Proposed Research model of Entrepreneurial Motivation", *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, Spring 1994. Vol18 (3) .p-33-37.
- EFD (2006) Employers Forum of Disability Report "Realising potential – Disability Confidence builds better business"<http://www.efd.org.uk/www/press-and-media/2006/05/realising-potential-disability-confidence.html>
- Evans, D. S., & Leighton, L. S., (1990) "Small Business Formation by Unemployed and Employed Workers", *Small Business Economics*, Vol 2(4), pp-319-330.
- Eisenhardt, K. M., & martin, J. A. (2000) Dynamic capabilities: What are they? *Strategic Management Journal*. 21.p-1105-1121
- Fleming, P. (1994), "The role of structured interventions in shaping graduate entrepreneurship", *Irish Business and Administrative Research*, Vol. 15 pp.146-64
- Freeman, J. H (1999).Venture capital as an economy of time. Corporate social capital and liability. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic. pp-460-482
- Floyd, M. (1995) "Self-employment and disabled people in the United Kingdom". *International Journal of Practical Approaches to Disability*, 19 (2): 9-14
- Gibb, A., (2001) "Corporate Restructuring and Entrepreneurship: What can large organizations Learn from Small", *Enterprise & Innovation Management Studies*, Vol.1, No.1, pp-19-35.
- Griffin C., Hammis D., (2004) Making Self-employment Work for People with Disabilities, Paul H. brooks publishing Co.,Maryland.
- Gartner, W. B (1987) "Who is an entrepreneur? Is the wrong question", *American Journal of Small Business*, Vol-12, No. 4, pp. 11-32.

- Gartner, W. B., Shaver, K. G., Gatewood, E., & Katz J. A (1994) Finding the Entrepreneur in Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol 18(3), pp-5-10.
- Gerschenkron, A (2002) "The modernization of Entrepreneurship" *Entrepreneurship: The Social Science View*, The Oxford Management Readers Series, Oxford University Press, UK. p.129
- Galloway, L., Kelly, S. Keogh, W.(2005) "Identifying Entrepreneurial potential in Students" Paper presented at the ISBE 28th National Conference for Small Business and Education, Blackpool, November, 2005.
- Gorman, G., hanlon, D.& King, W (1997) "Some research perspective on entrepreneurship education, enterprise education and education for small business management : a ten-year literature review " *International small business journal*, Vol. 15 No. 3, pp. 56-76.
- Handojo, T (2004) "Entrepreneurship : An alternative concept for economic empowerment of people with disability" paper presented on field study and Regional workshop on Poverty Alleviation among Persons with Disabilities, Lanzhou, Gansu Province, China, 2004.
- Hotchkiss, J. L (2004) "Growing part-time employment among workers with disabilities : marginalization or opportunity? *Economic review*, Bank of Atlanta, 3rd Quarter.
- International Labor Organization (ILO) (2005). *World Employment Report*, 2004/05.
- Jack S. L. & Anderson A. R., (1999), "Entrepreneurship education within the enterprise culture: Producing reflective practitioners", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, Vol. 5, No. 3 pp. 110-125.
- Jennings, P. L., (2005) "Alternative Perspectives on Entrepreneurial research", *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, Vol 29, no.2 pp-145-152.
- John A. Hornaday (1998), "Research about Living Entrepreneurs" in *Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship*, in Kent-Sexton-Vesper (ed) p.26-27.
- Jones, M.K (2005a) "Is there employment discrimination against the disabled?" WELMERC Discussion paper, Deptt. Of Economics, Univ of Wales Swansea.
- Jones M. K. (2005b) "Disability and the labour market: a review of the empirical evidence" WELMERC Discussion paper, Deptt. Of Economics, Univ of Wales Swansea.
- Khan, A. R., (2005) "Entrepreneurship: Small Business and Lives of Successful Entrepreneurs "Rubi Publication, Dhaka.

- Kloftsen, M., (1998) "The Business Platform- Entrepreneurship & management in the early stages of a firm's Development", Paper presented on TII- European Association for the transfer of technologies, innovation and industrial information, Luxemburg, 1998.
- Kollman T., Cristofor J., Kuckertz., A (2007) "Explaining individual entrepreneurial orientation: conceptualization of a cross-cultural research framework "Entrepreneurship and small business, Vol. 4, No. 3 pp-325-340.
- Larsson, Stig (2006) "Disability Management and Entrepreneurship "Results from nationwide study in Sweden" International Journal of Disability Management Research, Vol-1, Number-1, pp-159-168.
- LFS 2004 "Labour market Trends" Labour Force Survey available at online http://www.statistics.gov.uk/downloads/theme_labour/LMT_Feb04.pdf
- Majid, A.K.M.S., (2003) "Empowerment through Entrepreneurship: Some Aspects", Dhaka University Journal of Business Administration, Vol 19, No. 3, pp-139-150.
- Markman, G.D., Balkin, D.B., & Baron, R.A. (2001) Inventors' cognitive mechanism as predictors of new ventures formation. Paper presented at the meetings of the Academy of Management, Washington D.C.
- Matlay, H. (2001a), "Strategic issues in vocational education in vocational education and training in central and eastern Europe" Journal of Education + Training, Vol.43(8/9), pp-395-404.
- Matlay, H. (2005b), "Entrepreneurship education in UK business Schools : Conceptual, Contextual and policy considerations", Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development, Vol.12(4), pp-627-643.
- McClelland, David (1965) "Achievement Motivation can be developed", Harvard Business Review 41 (November-December) : Vol 6(24), p-78-87.
- Miner, J.B., Smith, N.R., & Bracker, J.S (1989) " Role of Entrepreneurial task motivation in the growth of innovative firms " Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol 79, pp-629-635.
- Murray, J., and O'Donnell, N. (1982) 'Explorations in the entrepreneurial process', The enterprise centre, University college Dublin, Ireland.
- Naffziger, D. W., Hornsby, J. S., & Kuratko, D.F (1994) A proposed research model for entrepreneurial motivation, Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 18(3) pp- 29-42

- Noakes, P. 2006. "Disability in Great Britain: Results of the 1996/7 Disability Follow-Up to the Family Resources Survey", Research Paper, Social Research Division, Department for Work and Pensions, 4th Floor, Adelphi, 1-11 John Adam Street, London WC2N 6HT.
- O'Farrell, P. (1986) "Entrepreneurs and industrial change", Irish Management Insititue, Dublin.
- Oldfield, C. (1999) "Age improves Entreprenurs" Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship, Vol.6(1) p-126-138.
- Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (1998). Entrepreneurship Policy Brief 1244. Paris, France. OECD. www.oecd.org
- Osborne, R. L. (1995). "The Essence of Entrepreneurial Success", Management Decision, 33(7), pp-3-9
- Reynolds P. D (2002) Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Executive Report, 2002, www.gemconsortium.com.
- Parker, S (2004) "The Economics of Self-employment and Entrepreneurship" Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. pp-141-143
- Pavey, B (2006) "Human Capital, social capital, entrepreneurship and disability: an examination of some current education trends in UK" Disability & Society, Vol 21, No.3, May 2006.
- Rahman, A. H. M. Habibur, 2001, "Entrepreneurship Development in Developing Country : Problems and Prospects" The Dhaka University Studies Part C, Vol-3. December 2001.
- Rao, T. V. and Mehta, P., (1991) "Psychological factors in Entrepreneurship", Udai Pareek and T. V. Rao (Ed) Developing Entrepreneurship- A handbook, Learning System Publication, New Delhi. pp- 6-34
- Reuvid, J (2006) "Working for Yourself: An Entrepreneur's guide to the Basics" 23rd edition, Kogan Page Limited, London.
- Rikowski, G. (2001) "Six Points on education for human capital, employer's need and business". Available online at <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/document/00001708.doc>
- Riddell, S., Baron S., Stalker, K. & Wilkinson, A, (2001) The concept of learning society : Human and Social capital Perspectives, Journal of Education Policy, Vol. 12(6), pp-473-483.
- Rotefoss, B., Kolvereid, L (2005) "Aspiring, nascent and fledgling entrepreneurs: an investigation of the business start-up process" Entrepreneurship & Regional Development, 17, march 2005. pp- 109-127

- Rossa, P., & Bowes, A., (1993), "Entrepreneurship : Some Lessons of Social Anthropology", in Klandt, H. (ed) *Entrepreneurship and Business Development*, Avebury Publishing, Aldershot. pp-87-99
- Sahar, H. & Bobby, H., (2004) "Anyone can Do it "3rd edition, Capstone Publishing limited, West Sussex.
- Shapiro, A. (1975)," The Displaced, Uncomfortable Entrepreneur". *Psychology Today*, November, pp-83-88 & 133.
- Shane, S. and Venkataraman, S. (2000), "The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 25 (1), pp. 217-226.
- Shane, S., Locke A. Edwin, Collins J. C., (2003) "Entrepreneurial Motivation", *Human Resource Management Review*, 13(2003), pp-257-279.
- Shurry, J. Lomax, S. and Vyakarnam, S. (2002) *Household Survey of Entrepreneurship 2001*. London: Small Business Service.
- Schur, L. (2003) "Barriers or Opportunities? The causes of contingent and part-time work among people with disabilities" *Industrial Relations* ,vol-42. pp-589-622.
- Spencer, J., Pruss, A (2000) "Self-Employment – Making it Work For You" 1st edition, Guildford and King's Lynn, Saffron Warden, Essex.
- Stanworth, M. J. K., and J.Curren, (1989) "Who becomes an Entrepreneur", *International Small Business Journal*, Vol 8(1), pp-11-22.
- Stauss, J. H., (1944) "The Entrepreneur: The Firm", *Journal of Political Economy*, 52(2), pp-112-127.
- Storey, D.J & Matlay,H.,(2003) " Should you become an entrepreneur? Positive and negative factors affecting individual career choices", Paper presented at the Mercial Fest, Warwick University, Coventry, June 2003.
- Swedberg. R. (2000). *Entrepreneurship: The social Science View*. Oxford University Press. Oxford. pp.25-37
- Thompson, J. L., (1999), "A Strategic perspective of Entrepreneurship", *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, Vol-5(6). pp-279-296.
- Thornton, P., & Lumt, N. (2003) "Employment Policies for disabled people in eighteen countries : A review" *Social policy Research Unit*, University of York.
- Thurik, R., 1999 "Entrepreneurship, industrial transformation and growth," In: *The Sources of Entrepreneurial Activity*, Libecap, G. D., JAI Press, Stamford, CT. p-78.
- Townroe, P., & Mallalieu, K., (1993) "Founding a New Business in the Countryside", in J Curran and DJ storey (eds), *Small Firms in Urban and rural Locations*, Routledge, London.

- Ventakataraman, S. (1997) The distinctive domain of Entrepreneurship research : An editor's perspective . In J. Katz & R. Brockhaus (Eds), *Advances in entrepreneurship, firm emergence and growth* pp.119-138. Greenwich, CT : JAI press.
- Watkins, D., (1996) "Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation" *American Psychologist*, 57, pp-705-717
- Webb, E. J., Campbel, D. T., Schwartz, R.D. and Secherest, I,(1996) "Unobtrusive measures : Non-Reactive Research in the Social Science", Rand Mc Nally, Chicago. pp-123-124.
- Westhead, P. (2005) "Experience and Cognition : do novice, serial and portfolio entrepreneurs differ?" *International small business Journal*, Vol 23(1). pp- 72-98
- Wheeler P., Danieli A (2006) " Employment policy and disabled people : old wine in new glasses ?" *Disability & Society*, Vol 21, No.5 August 2006, pp-485-498
- Wickham A. Philip (2001) "Strategic Entrepreneurship" 2nd edition, Pearson Education Ltd. UK. pp-123-137
- Woodhams C, Danieli A (2000), *Diasbility and Diversity – a difference too far?* *Personal Review*, Vol.29 No. 3, pp-402-416.
- World Bank Report 2004, "Poverty reduction Strategies: Their importance for Disability" Available at [http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DISABILITY/Resources/280658-1172608138489/](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DISABILITY/Resources/280658-1172608138489/PovertyReductionBonnell.pdf)
- PovertyReductionBonnell.pdf
- Zahra, S & Dess, G (2001) "Entrepreneurship as a field of research: encouraging dialogue and debate." *Academy of Management Review*, Vol 26(1), pp-8-11.