

**DO MINORITY AND NONMINORITY BUSINESS OWNERS EVALUATE FIRM
PERFORMANCE DIFFERENTLY?**

Eva Dodd-Walker (Student)
Department of Management
The University of Texas at Arlington
Box 19467
Arlington, TX 76019-0467
Phone: 214.630.7470
Fax: 817.272.3122
edwuta@flash.net

Christopher L. Shook
Department of Management
The University of Texas at Arlington
Box 19467
Arlington, TX 76019-0467
Phone: 817.272.3858
Fax: 817.272.3122
cshook@uta.edu

Jeffrey E. McGee
Department of Management
The University of Texas at Arlington
Box 19467
Arlington, TX 76019-0467
Phone: 817.272.3868
Fax: 817.272.3122
jmcgee@uta.edu

DO MINORITY AND NONMINORITY BUSINESS OWNERS EVALUATE FIRM PERFORMANCE DIFFERENTLY?

ABSTRACT

The Small Business Administration (SBA) announced that “small business has re-emerged as the dominant economic force in the United States” (U. S. SBA, 2000). According to the SBA, there has been unprecedented interest in owning or starting a small business in recent years. (U. S. SBA: The Facts, 1999) Minority business ownership, however, has shown the greatest increase. Given the importance of small business to economic growth and the impact of minority business owners (MBOs), a study of whether or not MBOs and nonminority business owners (NMBOs) differ in the evaluation of firm performance would seem both pertinent and timely. The purpose of this paper is to build knowledge about how cultural differences between MBOs and NMBOs affect their evaluation of firm performance.

Key Words: performance referents, minority business owners, individualism-collectivism

INTRODUCTION

The Small Business Administration (SBA) announced that “small business has re-emerged as the dominant economic force in the United States” (U. S. SBA, 2000). Small Businesses (SBs), firms with less than 500 employees, employ more than half (i.e., 53%) of the private nonfarm work force in the United States. They are responsible for nearly half (i.e., 47%) of all American sales as well as more than half (i.e., 51%) of the private gross domestic product. Additionally, more than half (i.e., 55%) of innovations are produced by SBs. According to the SBA, there has been unprecedented interest in owning or starting a SB in recent years. (U. S. SBA: The Facts, 1999) Minority business ownership, however, has shown the greatest increase. The number of minority-owned firms increased 62% between 1987 and 1992 (U. S. Department of Commerce MB92-4, 1996), while women-owned businesses and all businesses increased 43% and 26% respectively during the same time period (U. S. Department of Commerce WB92-1, 1996). Data for ethnic minorities reflect Black, Hispanic, and API/AIAN (i.e., Asian, Pacific Islander, American Indian, and Alaska Native) business owners. In 1997, minority business ownership was as follows: 44% Hispanic-owned, 27% Black-owned, and 33% API/AIAN owned. (U. S. SBA: The Facts, 1999) Summing the percentages will produce totals greater than 100% because Hispanic is considered an ethnic origin and may include people of any race. Thus, a business may be classified as both Hispanic-owned and Black-owned or Hispanic-owned and API/AIAN owned, although it is counted as one minority owned business. (U. S. SBA: Minorities, 1999)

Given the importance of small business to economic growth and the impact of minority business owners (MBOs), a study of whether or not MBOs and nonminority business owners (NMBOs) differ in the evaluation of firm performance would seem both pertinent and timely. The purpose of this paper is to build knowledge about how cultural differences between MBOs and NMBOs affect their evaluation of firm performance. Hofstede (1984) distinguishes between culture, used to describe nations or societies, and subculture, used to describe ethnic or regional groups. We will maintain that distinction here. Hofstede (1984) suggests that cultures differ along four main dimensions: Power Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Individualism, and Masculinity. The Power Distance Index (PDI) measures tolerance for social inequality, while the Uncertainty Avoidance Index (UAI) measures tolerance for uncertainty. The Individualism Index (IDV) reflects the relationship between the individual and the group or collectivity in a culture, and the Masculinity Index (MAS) measures the extent to which a culture endorses masculine vs. feminine goals.

In a cross-cultural study of 40 nations, Hofstede (1984) explored the existence of differences in thinking and social action and was able to categorize countries into culture areas on the basis of their scores on the four dimensions. He asserts that the degree of cultural integration varies among societies; however, subcultures within a society share enough common traits to make them recognizable to foreigners or those not belonging to their society (Hofstede, 1984). Hofstede (1991) further adds, “Regional, ethnic, and religious cultures account for differences within countries” and “ethnic and religious groups often transcend political country borders. Such groups form minorities at the crossroads between the dominant culture of the nation and their own traditional group culture” (pp. 15-16). Hofstede (1984) contends that the UAI is a summary index for wealthier countries because he found the UAI significantly correlated with PDI, IDV, and MAS, despite negligible intercorrelations between the three

indices (i.e., PDI, IDV, and MAS). There were no significant correlations between the indices across the 21 poorer countries in his study (i.e., the indices were mutually independent). He states, “comparative studies which are limited to wealthy countries will easily distinguish only one dimension, Uncertainty Avoidance, which subsumes also Power Distance, Masculinity, and the inverse of Individualism” (Hofstede, 1984: p. 213). Therefore, it is logical to assume that comparative studies within a wealthy country across subcultures will also distinguish along the Uncertainty Avoidance dimension. By definition, Uncertainty Avoidance is equivalent to risk aversion; Hofstede (1984) states that a low UAI means a greater willingness to take risks. Thus, this study explores one research question: (1) Do cultural differences in MBOs and NMBOs, manifested as differences in risk propensity, affect how they evaluate firm performance?

BACKGROUND AND THEORETICAL DEVELOPMENT

Minority Business Owner Entry

There is little consensus regarding the reason minorities decide to enter business. One camp asserts mostly positive reasons for self-employment that do not differ significantly from the general small business population (Curran & Blackburn; Srinivasan in Ram, 1997). Another group argues that the self-employment rate of some minority groups, particularly South Asians, is due to “self-help” ethos as well as a culture that is conducive to entrepreneurial activity (A. Basu; Werbner in Ram, 1997). Another camp, however, maintains that “ethnic minority businesses often arise out of a context of disadvantage, and that the adverse ‘opportunity structure’ carries greater explanatory power than speculations on ‘culture’ and so-called ‘ethnic’ resources” (Jones et al. cited in Ram, 1997). Similarly, the Ethnic Minority Business Initiative, launched in 1985, asserts that discrimination in employment as well as disproportionately high levels of unemployment experienced by ethnic minorities force them to seek autonomous means to economic activity via self-employment (Taner & Tiesdell, 1999). Hagen’s (1962) “principle of relative social blockage” lends further credence to the third view; he states that “the channel in which creative energies will flow depends in part on the degree to which other possible channels are blocked” (p. 241). Additionally, he states

Social groups are often pushed rather than pulled into economic innovation. The ‘minority thesis’...provides an example of this. This thesis is that if a minority group within a society is rejected by the society as a whole, that group will tend to be especially industrious and innovational in an effort to give itself economic security. (Hagen, 1968: p. 223)

He notes that this is not always the case. Sometimes, rejected minorities submit to their fate or console themselves with traditional rituals. Generally, however, subordinated groups in the modern world are innovative, where discrimination is not so oppressive as to make it impossible. (Hagen, 1968)

Social blockage engenders need aggression within the subordinated individual. If the familial environment is nurturant, need achievement and need autonomy may also be acquired. If need aggression dominates the individual’s behavior, s/he will become a common criminal. However, if need achievement is greater than need aggression, s/he will seek creative outlets. If conventional channels are not open to the individual, s/he may become a racketeer. If, however, conventional channels are not closed, s/he is likely to pursue status recognition via entrepreneurship. (Hagen, 1962)

Minority Business Owner Growth

Hofstede (1984) asserted a relationship between economic growth and individualist vs. collectivist values. Per Hofstede (1991), collectivist values exist “in societies in which the interest of the group prevails over the interest of the individual,” and individualist values exist “in societies in which the interests of the individual prevail over the interests of the group” (p. 50). He further states that the vast majority of people in our world live in collectivist vs. individualist societies. Hofstede indicates that individualist countries, such as the United States, tend to be rich and collectivist countries poor (Hofstede, 1991). However, he found Individualism to be negatively related to economic growth for the 19 wealthier countries in his study, which included the United States (Hofstede, 1984). The fact that “wealth is positively associated with individualism, but lower individualism with faster growth of wealth” (Hofstede, 1984: p. 168) is reflected in the growth patterns of MBOs and women. Hispanic and API/AIAN business owners are the fastest growing segment of the small business boom with Blacks and women following close behind. Between 1987 and 1992, Hispanic business owners experienced an 83% increase in number of firms and a 195% increase in sales; API/AIAN business owners experienced a 61% increase in number of firms and a 193% increase in sales, while Black businesses grew 46% with a 63% increase in sales. (U. S. Department of Commerce MB92-4, 1996) During the same time period, women-owned businesses increased 43% in number and 131% in sales compared to a 26% increase in the total number of firms and a 67% increase in total receipts for SBs (U. S. Department of Commerce WB92-1, 1996). Hofstede (1984) indicated that Asiatic societies tend to have collectivist (i.e., lower individualist) values. McWhirter (1997) acknowledges the close-knit, interdependent family structure (i.e., collectivist values) of the Mexican-American culture. Nwankwo and Lindridge (1998) note the collectivist tendency of Black African-Caribbeans. Eagly (1987) asserts the communal or collectivist values of women. Communal values reflect concern for others, selflessness, and a desire to be at one with others (Eagly, 1987). As stated previously, Hofstede (1984) contends that high individualism is associated with low UAI and low individualism or collectivism is associated with high UAI. This would suggest that MBOs and women have a higher uncertainty avoidance or aversion to risk than NMBOs.

Minority Business Owner Performance Evaluation

Per Hofstede, tolerance for uncertainty is determined by both personality and culture. Culture is determined by collective mental programming that is shared within a certain group but differs among groups. Personality is unique to each individual; it explains the variation in behaviors within a collective culture. Three questions (see Appendix 1) in his survey were used to form a country’s UAI. The three questions measured three aspects of a nation’s level of uncertainty avoidance: rule orientation, employment stability, and stress. (Hofstede, 1984) According to Hofstede, “The conceptual link among the stress question and the other two questions is the mean level of anxiety in a country. When this is higher, people feel more stressed; but at the same time they try to cope with the anxiety by a greater need for security, which is visible in both rule orientation and employment stability” (1984: p. 120). Stress is a fundamental human phenomenon. It is a subjective state manifested via objective consequences. (Hofstede, 1984) Wofford and Daly (1997) define the negative consequences of stress as strain and link strain to ill-health. Hofstede also found a correlation between the stress question and

reported medical symptoms (Hofstede, 1984). Kenski's (1995) findings lend support to the links between tolerance for uncertainty, employment stability, and stress as well as the effects of stress. He analyzed the Voter Research and Surveys General Election Exit Polls data set for 1992 and found that non-white (i.e., Blacks, Hispanics and Asians) voters were far more concerned about economy-jobs, health care and education than white voters were (Kenski, 1995).

Hofstede contends that people will rely on rules more when UAI is high. He also asserts that organizations use rules and rituals to cope with uncertainty. These rituals include memos and reports, accounting systems, planning systems, control systems, and the utilization of experts. (Hofstede, 1984) Per Ansoff and Anthony, business planning is a mechanism to implement controls via established goals (cited in Oakes, Townley, & Cooper, 1998). Therefore, rule orientation leads to a focus on goals.

Richard Cyert and James March, in their 1963 work *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*, found that organizations seek to avoid uncertainty via strategies that focus on the short-term.

Organizations avoid uncertainty: (1) They avoid the requirement that they correctly anticipate events in the distant future by using decision rules emphasizing short-run reaction to short-run feedback rather than anticipation of long-run uncertain events. They solve pressing problems rather than develop long-run strategies. (2) They avoid the requirement that they anticipate future reactions of other parts of their environment by arranging a negotiated environment. They impose plans, standard operating procedures, industry tradition, and uncertainty-absorbing contracts on that environment. In short, they achieve a reasonably manageable decision situation by avoiding planning where plans depend on predictions of uncertain future events and by emphasizing planning where the plans can be made self-confirming through some control device. (Cyert & March, 1963: p. 119)

Staw (1991) asserts that firm behavior and individual behavior are identical when there is a single owner. Therefore, a logical extension of Hofstede's and Cyert and March's assertions is that SBOs use rules, manifested via a goal orientation, and short-term strategies to cope with uncertainty. Brimmer's (1987) findings lend additional support to the assertion that MBOs and women appear to be more risk averse than NMBOs. In a study of the banking industry, he noted that black-owned banks, when compared to other banks in the industry, channeled a larger portion of their resources into securities versus loans, invested a larger share of their deposits into money markets as short-term loans, and concentrated their securities holdings more in short-term maturities. Because MBOs and women appear to be more risk averse (i.e., have a higher uncertainty avoidance) than NMBOs, we predict the following:

Hypothesis 1a: MBOs will place greater importance on goals than NMBOs.

Hypothesis 1b: MBOs will place greater importance on short-term goals than NMBOs.

Per Festinger, "There exists, in the human organism, a drive to evaluate...his abilities." (1954: p. 134) He further asserts that abilities are manifested via performance. Therefore, humans have a need to evaluate their performance. If objective means are not available, people

evaluate their performance by comparison with the performance of others. (Festinger, 1954) However, he adds, “A person does not tend to evaluate...his abilities by comparison with others who are too divergent from himself” (Festinger, 1954: p.138).

Scholars from a variety of theoretical perspectives, including reference group theory...relative deprivation theory...social evaluation theory...and social comparison theory...have hypothesized that selectivity occurs in who is chosen as a social comparison target. Several of these theories propose that people are more likely to compare with others who are in-group members or who are similar to the self in some way than to compare with others who are out-group members....(Major, Sciacchitano, & Crocker, 1993: 711).

Clarifying the terminology, McGrath and MacMillan state “the group one perceives oneself as belonging to is termed the ingroup, while members of other groups (particularly groups that are in conflict with one’s own) become the outgroup” (1992: p. 420). According to Crocker and Major (1989), members of stigmatized or oppressed groups are more likely to compare themselves to ingroup members.

Specifically, stigmatizing conditions accompanied by a recognizable group identity may foster more frequent affiliation with similar others. For example, comparisons with ingroup members may be more prevalent among women, Blacks...and other group members who are identified and labeled early in life, than among those who suffer from more rare stigmatizing conditions or who are stigmatized by less visible or clearly labeled stigmas.... (Crocker & Major, 1989: p. 621)

They further state that unavoidable or forced comparisons with out-group members may be dismissed as not self-relevant (Major et al., 1993). Tamotsu (1955) concurs, noting that reference groups determine the perceptual field of the actor. Triandis (1995) lends further credence to the assertion that minorities and women are more likely to use ingroup members as performance referents by stating that “People in collectivistic cultures tend to have clear ingroup-outgroup boundaries, few (even one) ingroups and have trouble interacting outside the ingroup” (cited in Oetzel, 1998: p. 139).

Thus, we predict

Hypothesis 2: MBOs will place greater importance on comparing their firm’s performance with the performance of firms managed by people they know (i.e., ingroup members) than NMBOs.

METHOD

Sample

Our hypotheses were tested with a sample of small business owners from a large, southwestern city in the United States. The data was collected in conjunction with an annual survey administered by the city’s chamber of commerce. The purpose of the chamber’s survey was to obtain the views of local business owners on the city’s economic outlook for the coming

year. One thousand small business owners were randomly selected for the mail survey. To be classified as a small business, the employer had to have less than 500 employees.

Data Collection

Data was collected via a questionnaire that was distributed to the top official (i.e., Owner, CEO, Manager) at each company. Two hundred twenty-two (22.2%) surveys were returned. Respondents were distributed as follows: chief executive officer/president/owner 148 (66.7%), vice president 15 (6.7%), general manager/department manager 34 (15.3%), and other managers 25 (11.3%). Of the 222 surveys returned, 200 were usable with the following composition: 154 were NMBOs and 46 were MBOs.

Measures

Small business owners used a five-point scale (5=referent is very important; 1=referent is not important) to identify the importance of various performance referents when evaluating their firm's performance. See Table 1 for the list of performance referents.

 Insert Table 1 about here

Data Analysis

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was used to determine if MBOs and NMBOs differed with respect to their choice of performance referents. Follow-up ANOVAs were used to identify which variables distinguished the two groups.

RESULTS

MANOVA was used to determine if there were differences between MBOs and NMBOs in the importance of performance referents. MANOVA was selected as the appropriate multivariate technique for two reasons: (1) The dependent variables were correlated (see Table 3). (2) It controls for experiment-wide error. The MANOVA results ($F=3.28$, $p<.001$) indicated that there were differences in the importance of performance referents between the two groups. To determine the exact nature of the differences, individual ANOVAs were performed. Table 4 indicates that MBOs placed greater importance on stated, personal, and short-term goals than NMBOs (4.63/4.20, 4.76/4.18, 4.41/3.88). In addition, MBOs valued superior performing, media, and personal referents more than NMBOs (3.83/3.22, 3.63/3.16, 3.93/3.12). The difference in personal goals is significant at the $p<.0001$ level, whereas the differences in short-term goals and personal referents or acquaintances are significant at the $p<.001$ level. The difference in stated goals is significant at the $p<.01$ level, and the differences in superior performing and media referents are significant at the $p<.05$ level. An important finding is that both MBOs and NMBOs valued internally-generated goals (i.e., goal orientation variables) more than external referents (i.e., social comparison variables).

Because of the unequal group sizes (i.e., 154 NMBOs and 46 MBOs), one third of the NMBOs were randomly selected and used in the analysis. To determine the robustness of the findings, a second random selection of one third of the NMBOs was obtained. The findings for

the second sampling are found in Table 5. Per Table 5, MBOs still placed greater importance on stated, personal, and short-term goals than NMBOs (4.63/4.31, 4.76/4.35, 4.41/3.92). However, with the second sample, the difference in stated goals is significant at the $p < .05$ level vs. the $p < .01$ level previously stated. Also, the differences in personal and short-term goals are significant at the $p < .01$ level vs. the previous levels of $p < .0001$ and $p < .001$ respectively. In addition, Table 5 indicates that MBOs still valued personal referents more than NMBOs (3.93/3.12). The significance level of the difference is unchanged at $p < .001$. It is important to note that MBOs and NMBOs no longer differed with respect to superior performing and media referents at the $p < .05$ level. (Since the variables are unstable across the analyses, they will not be considered in the interpretation.) Still noteworthy is the finding that both MBOs and NMBOs valued internally-generated goals more than external referents. The findings support all three hypotheses: (1a) MBOs will place greater importance on goals than NMBOs. (1b) MBOs will place greater importance on short-term goals than NMBOs. (2) MBOs will place greater importance on comparing performance to firms managed by acquaintances than NMBOs.

Insert Table 3 about here

Insert Table 4 about here

Insert Table 5 about here

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this paper was to determine if MBOs and NMBOs differed with respect to performance referents in the evaluation of firm performance. MANOVA verified that MBOs and NMBOs do indeed differ with respect to their choice of performance referents. MBOs preferred the use of stated goals, personal goals, and short-term goals when evaluating firm performance. They also preferred to use people they know or acquaintances as performance referents. These findings suggest that cultural differences, manifested via collectivist vs. individualist orientation, are important determinants of how business owners evaluate performance. Interpretation of these findings in light of Hofstede's (1984) assertion that subcultures within a society may vary in the degree of cultural integration but share enough common traits to make them distinguishable to foreigners would suggest that MBOs and women in the United States are less individualist than NMBOs.

Limitations

Due to the small group size of MBOs (i.e., 46), the split-sample analysis for MANOVA validation was conducted with the same group of MBOs to avoid insufficient power. Per Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black (1998), "In analyses with group sizes of fewer than 50 members, obtaining desired power levels can be quite problematic" (p. 352). The research instrument did not contain a UAI measure.

Future Research

This study has demonstrated a relationship between the evaluation of firm performance and culture. Future researchers should investigate the relationship between culture and firm performance. Per Dodd-Walker (working paper), the individualist-collectivist orientation moderates the entrepreneurial orientation-performance relationship. She dichotomizes performance into two constructs: corporate social performance (CSP) and financial performance. She posits that an individualist orientation will strengthen the relationship between entrepreneurial orientation (EO) and financial performance, and a collectivist orientation will weaken it. She also asserts that a collectivist orientation will strengthen the relationship between EO and CSP, and an individualist orientation will weaken it. This would suggest that MBOs place greater importance on CSP than NMBOs, and NMBOs place more importance on financial performance than MBOs.

Culture also has implications for firm performance via the company's strategy. Per Faucheux (1977), the formulation of strategy is a cultural process. Future researchers should investigate this relationship as well as other contingency frameworks that evaluate the role of culture.

Finally, future researchers should investigate more fully the relationship between individualist-collectivist orientation and risk propensity as well as the impact of this relationship on entrepreneurial startups. Given Hofstede's (1984) assertion of a relationship between economic growth and individualist vs. collectivist values, more information is also needed on second and third generation ethnic minority entrepreneurs to see how they are doing. According to Metcalfe et al. (cited in Ram, 1997), much of the research to date has focused on first generation ethnic minorities; these authors note a lack of information pertaining to second

generation ethnic minority entrepreneurs and suggest that increases in educational attainment by some minority groups may actually decrease interest in self-employment.

CONCLUSION

Given the importance of small business to America's economic progress and the importance of culture to small business development, this article is both timely and relevant. Our goal has been to shed light on the important role of culture as well as the different risk propensities of MBOs and NMBOs. In an extensive review of the literature, we found no previous works positing a risk differential between minority and nonminority groups. Therefore, we believe that we have added to the cumulation of knowledge.

APPENDIX 1

Hofstede's (1984) UAI Questions:

1) A company or organization's rules should not be broken—even when the employee thinks it is in the organization's best interests.

1. strongly agree
2. agree
3. undecided
4. disagree
5. strongly disagree

2) How long do you think you will continue working for this company or organization?

1. Two years at the most
2. From two to five years
3. More than five years (but I probably will leave before I retire)
4. Until I retire

3) How often do you feel nervous or tense at work?

1. I always feel this way.
2. Usually
3. Sometimes
4. Seldom
5. I never feel this way.

REFERENCES

- Brimmer, A. 1987. Black banks: High risks and slow growth. *Black Enterprise*, 17 (8): 31.
- Crocker, J., & Major, B. 1989. Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. *Psychological Review*, 96 (4): pp. 608-630.
- Cyert, R. M., & March, J. G. 1963. *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Dodd-Walker, E. D. (working paper). The role of ethics in the entrepreneurial orientation-performance relationship.
- Eagly, A. H. 1987. *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Faucheux, C. 1977. Strategy formulation as a cultural process. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 7 (2): pp. 127-138.
- Festinger, L. 1954. A theory of social comparison processes. In S. Schachter & M. Gazzaniga (Eds.), *Extending psychological frontiers: Selected works of Leon Festinger* (pp. 134-160). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hagen, E. E. 1962. *On the theory of social change: How economic growth begins*. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press.
- Hagen, E. E. 1968. *The economics of development*. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin Inc.

- Hair, J. F. Jr., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. 1998. *Multivariate data analysis*. (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hofstede, G. 1984. *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. (abridged edition). London: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. 1991. *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kenski, H. 1995. Catholic and evangelical voting: 1992 and 1994. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 22 (9/10/11): pp. 149-164.
- Major, B., Sciacchitano, A. M., & Crocker, J. 1993. In-group versus out-group comparisons and self-esteem. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19 (6): 711-721.
- McGrath, R. G., & MacMillan, I. C. 1992. More like each other than anyone else? A cross-cultural study of entrepreneurial perceptions. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 7: 419-429.
- McWhirter, E. H. 1997. Perceived barriers to education and career: Ethnic and gender differences. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 50: 124-140.
- Nwankwo, S., & Lindridge, A. 1998. Marketing to ethnic minorities in Britain. *Journal of Marketing Practice: Applied Marketing Science*, 4 (7): pp. 200-216.
- Oakes, L. S., Townley, B., & Cooper, D. J. 1998. Business planning as pedagogy: Language and control in a changing institutional field. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43: 257-292.

- Oetzel, J. G. 1998. Culturally homogeneous and heterogeneous groups: Explaining communication processes through individualism-collectivism and self-construal. *International Journal of Intercultural*, 22 (2): pp. 135-161.
- Ram, M. 1997. Ethnic minority enterprise: An overview and research agenda. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 3 (4): 149-156.
- Staw, B. M. 1991. Dressing up like an organization: When psychological theories can explain organizational action. *Journal of Management*, 17 (4): 805-819.
- Taner, O. C., & Tiesdell, S. 1999. Supporting ethnic minority business: A review of business support for ethnic minorities in city challenge areas. *Urban Studies*,
- Tamotsu, S. 1955. Reference groups as perspectives. *American Journal of Sociology*, 60 (6): 562-569.
- U. S. Department of Commerce. 1996. *1992 Economic census MB92-4: Survey of minority-owned business enterprises*, Washington, DC: Bureau of the Census.
- U. S. Department of Commerce. 1996. *1992 Economic census WB92-1: Women-owned businesses*, Washington, DC: Bureau of the Census.
- U. S. Small Business Administration. 2000. *News release no. 2000-07*, Birmingham, AL: U. S. Small Business Administration.
- U. S. Small Business Administration. 1999. *Minorities in Business*. Washington, DC: Office of Advocacy.

U. S. Small Business Administration. 1999. *The facts about small business*. Washington, DC: Office of Advocacy.

Wofford, J. C., & Daly, P. S. 1997. A cognitive-affective approach to understanding individual differences in stress propensity and resultant strain. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 2 (2): 134-147.

Table 1

Performance Referents*	
X1	Your company's past financial performance.
X2	Your company's stated goals and objectives.
X3	Your personal goals and objectives.
X4	The short-term financial performance goals of your company.
X5	The long-term financial performance goals of your company.
X6	The average financial performance of your industry nationwide.
X7	The financial performance of other companies located in your community.
X8	The financial performance of companies experiencing superior performance to your firm.
X9	The financial performance of companies experiencing similar performance to your firm.
X10	The financial performance of companies experiencing poorer performance than your firm.
X11	The financial performance of highly reputable companies described in the media.
X12	The financial performance of firms managed by people you know socially or professionally.

* Using a five-point scale (5= very important; 1= not important); questionnaire respondents were asked to indicate the importance of the above comparative benchmarks in evaluating their firm's performance.

Table 3
Correlations Among Study Variables

Referents	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	X7	X8	X9	X10	X11	X12
X1	1.00											
X2	.34##	1.00										
X3	.34##	.55##	1.00									
X4	.36##	.34##	.48##	1.00								
X5	.25#	.47##	.38##	.36##	1.00							
X6	.24#	.23#	.43##	.32##	.26##	1.00						
X7	.23#	.19**	.37##	.34##	.30##	.65##	1.00					
X8	.32##	.18**	.28##	.29##	.26##	.50##	.58##	1.00				
X9	.31##	.15*	.33##	.30##	.24#	.58##	.57##	.80##	1.00			
X10	.18*	.03	.23#	.29##	.14*	.41##	.54##	.45##	.58##	1.00		
X11	.17*	.08	.32##	.20**	.18*	.53##	.56##	.58##	.55##	.52##	1.00	
X12	.23#	.15*	.33##	.30##	.24#	.41##	.51##	.54##	.54##	.47##	.66##	1.00

*=p<.05

**=p<.01

#=p<.001

##=p<.0001

Table 4

Anova Results

Referents	MBO Mean	NMBO Mean	F
X1: Past Performance	4.37	4.16	1.42
X2: Stated Goals	4.63	4.20	11.18**
X3: Personal Goals	4.76	4.18	17.92##
X4: Short-Term Goals	4.41	3.88	13.36#
X5: Long-Term Goals	4.50	4.24	3.45
X6: Avg Industry Performance	3.76	3.41	2.18
X7: Community Performance	3.72	3.31	2.71
X8: Superior Performance	3.83	3.22	6.73*
X9: Similar Performance	3.50	3.24	1.27
X10: Poorer Performance	2.93	2.90	.02
X11: Media Referents	3.63	3.16	4.98*
X12: Acquaintances	3.93	3.12	13.45#

*=p<.05

**=p<.01

#=p<.001

##=p<.0001

Table 5

Anova Results

Referents	MBO Mean	NMBO Mean	F
X1: Past Performance	4.37	4.31	0.12
X2: Stated Goals	4.63	4.31	5.57*
X3: Personal Goals	4.76	4.35	11.15**
X4: Short-Term Goals	4.41	3.92	10.64**
X5: Long-Term Goals	4.50	4.42	.28
X6: Avg Industry Performance	3.76	3.46	1.73
X7: Community Performance	3.72	3.42	1.69
X8: Superior Performance	3.83	3.52	1.76
X9: Similar Performance	3.50	3.23	1.53
X10: Poorer Performance	2.93	2.71	.95
X11: Media Referents	3.63	3.19	3.72
X12: Acquaintances	3.93	3.12	13.32#

*=p<.05

**=p<.01

#=p<.001

##=p<.0001