



## PUSH AND PULL FACTORS OF MOTIVATION

**K. SHOBHA**

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR IN ECONOMICS, GOVERNMENT  
ARTS COLLEGE, COIMBATORE

### **Abstract:**

*A woman for the sake of economic independence and better social status enters the labour force. When she becomes a part of the labour force, she is conditioned with dual and multiple responsibilities. The home and work role are mutually influencing and interacting. Paid work in the society is not organized in such a way that it takes the family responsibilities of women into consideration. In such a condition, self-employment is identified as an apt profession. It enables flexibilities and helps in balancing the dual role. But this is not the sole reason for women turning self-employed. Indian women are plunged in to business because of factors such as pull and push factors. They choose the profession as a challenge and adventure with an urge to do something new, interest in business and to have an independent occupation (pull factors).*

### **INTRODUCTION:**

They also take up business enterprises to get over financial difficulties and responsibility thrust on them due to family circumstances (push factors) (Saravanel, 1997). Women are taking up entrepreneurship because of low barriers of entry and flexibility (Sujata Mukherji, 2006). They start new ventures because of frustration and boredom in their previous jobs. Besides, Indian women have less access to formal education, consequently they have less participation in the formal sector and hence many of them take up self-employment (Piyali Ghosh, 2006). Rural women entrepreneurs enter the field of entrepreneurship to supplement family income, non-availability of regular government jobs and to utilize their free time (Krishnaveni Motha, 2004). Nayan Barua and Aparajeeta Borkakoty (2005) observed that the internal environment played a dominating role in shaping the upcoming first generation women entrepreneurs.

According to Vaijayanti Pandit (2005), the pull factors are located in the genetic make-up and the push factors are in the entrepreneurial environment that fosters and nurtures business growth. Entrepreneurial success is a combination of inborn factors and congenial entrepreneurial environment, the mix and proportion can vary. The above views clearly distinguish three categories of women entrepreneurs, namely, chance, forced and created entrepreneurs. Keeping in view with the above facts, the present study aims at assessing the motivational factors of women and men beneficiaries of PMEGP. The sample unit consists of 277 beneficiaries of the Prime Minister's Employment Generation Programme in Coimbatore district. Out of which 122 were females and 155 were male beneficiaries. The tools used to analyze the data was Garrett ranking.

An analysis of the influencing factors which were instrumental in guiding, encouraging and convincing the women/men respondents to venture into business is being carried out. The motivational factors for starting the enterprise by the sample respondents were classified as push and pull factors. Push factors included 'poverty', 'earning extra income', 'sole bread winner', 'lack of employment opportunities in organized sector' and 'supplementing the family income'. The pull factors were 'independence', 'utilization

of free time', 'family member's compulsion', 'advice by friends and relatives', 'government incentives' and 'interest in the particular work'. To find out the extent of influence of these factors, Garrett's ranking technique was adopted. The sample respondents were asked to rank the given motivational factors, giving 1 to the highest motivating factor.

**TABLE 1**  
**REASONS FOR BEING SELF-EMPLOYED – SCORES AND RANKS ASSIGNED**

| S.No                | Motivational Factors                                 | Women beneficiaries |      | Men beneficiaries |      |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|------|-------------------|------|
|                     |                                                      | Mean score          | Rank | Mean score        | Rank |
| <b>Push factors</b> |                                                      |                     |      |                   |      |
| 1                   | To supplement family's income                        | 75.88               | 2    | 84.04             | 2    |
| 2                   | To earn extra income                                 | 80.46               | 1    | 26.15             | 4    |
| 3                   | Financial constraint                                 | 2.92                | 5    | 4.17              | 5    |
| 4                   | Sole bread winner                                    | 24.79               | 4    | 84.89             | 1    |
| 5                   | Lack of employment opportunities in organized sector | 65.95               | 3    | 50.75             | 3    |
| <b>Pull factors</b> |                                                      |                     |      |                   |      |
| 6                   | To be independent                                    | 67.10               | 3    | 68.58             | 2    |
| 7                   | Government incentives                                | 79.10               | 1    | 89.49             | 1    |
| 8                   | To utilize free time                                 | 53.12               | 4    | 29.50             | 4    |
| 9                   | Interest in the particular work                      | 70.76               | 2    | 59.13             | 3    |
| 10                  | Advice by friends and relatives                      | 16.05               | 5    | 29.29             | 5    |
| 11                  | Family member's compulsion                           | 15.94               | 6    | 26.08             | 6    |

Source: Calculation based on field survey.

The order of merit as given by the sample respondents were changed into percent position. The percent position of each rank thus obtained was converted into scores by referring to the table given by Garrett (1983). For each factor the scores of individual sample respondent were added together and divided by the total number of sample respondents. Based on these mean scores the ranks were assigned. The mean scores of all the factors for the entire study group were arranged in the descending order and the ranks were assigned.

From the table it could be seen that 'to earn extra income' was the most compelling push factor for the women beneficiaries to undertake jobs. The mean score for this factor was 80.46. The desire 'to supplement family's income' emerged as the second important motivational factor for resorting to self-employment, with the mean score of 75.88 followed by 'lack of employment opportunities in organized sector, with the mean score of 65.95. 'Financial constraint' to work was the least motivating factor with the mean score of 2.92. The range between the highest and the lowest score was 41.69. In the case of men beneficiaries the dominant motivating factor was 'sole bread winner' with the mean score of 84.89 followed by 'to supplement family's income', with the mean score of 84.04. The third motivational factor was 'lack of employment opportunities in organized sector' with the mean score of 50.75. 'Financial constraint' was the least motivating factor with the mean score of 4.17. The range between the highest and lowest score was 44.53.

The findings revealed that the push factor 'to earn extra income' and 'sole bread winner' were the first most compelling factor for the women beneficiaries and men beneficiaries respectively to undertake

jobs. But the women beneficiaries did not differ from the men beneficiaries in assigning the second rank to the important motivating factor. For the women and men beneficiaries it was the push factor viz, 'to supplement family's income' which compelled them to work. For pull factors all the beneficiaries in different occupations, had stated that it was the 'government incentives' which had motivated them to be self-employed. The scores assigned by the women and men beneficiaries were 79.10 and 89.49 respectively. The women beneficiaries differed from the men beneficiaries in assigning the second rank to the important motivating factor. For the women beneficiaries it was 'interest in the particular work' (70.76) but for men beneficiaries it was 'to be independent', (68.58) which made them to work. Family members' compulsion was the least compelling factor for the women and men beneficiaries. The findings revealed that among the pull motivational factors in the study, it was 'government incentive' which motivated the beneficiaries to raise PMEGP loan. The two groups assigned different ranks for other factors. External motivations like friends and relatives and family member's compulsion hardly had any influence on the women and men beneficiaries to start their business.

To find out whether the ranks assigned by the women beneficiaries and men beneficiaries on the push and pull motivational factors were dependent on each other; Kruskal Wallis 2 test was applied. The null hypothesis tested was,

Ho: The ranks assigned by the women beneficiaries were independent of the ranks assigned by the men beneficiaries, and

Ha: The ranks assigned were dependent.

The calculated Kruskal Wallis 2 value was 0.273 for push factors and 0.026 for pull factors which was much less than the theoretical table value. Hence it could be inferred that in assigning ranks, women beneficiaries and men beneficiaries did not differ.

Sector wise analysis of the motivational factors using Garrett's ranking technique was also carried out for manufacturing and service sectors. The ranks and scores assigned for the selected factors in the two sectors are given in the table. The table clearly depicts that in the women beneficiary group in the manufacturing and service sectors, 'to earn extra income' was identified as the most important motivating factor, which compelled women to be self-employed. But for men beneficiaries in manufacturing sector 'sole bread winner' and in service sector 'to supplement family income' was the most important motivating factors.

The last two important push motivating factors in the women beneficiary group of the self-employed in the manufacturing and service sectors were the same, the order of compelling and facilitating factors was 'sole bread winner' and 'financial constraint'. But the order of importance differed for men beneficiaries in both the manufacturing and service sectors. The second highest mean score of 84.53 in the manufacturing sector was assigned for 'to supplement family income' and for service sector it was 'sole bread winner' (80.73) followed by 'lack of employment opportunities in organized sector', with the mean score of 48.29 and 61.42 in the manufacturing and service sectors respectively. In the case of beneficiary group the least motivating factor for being self-employed for the women and men in the study group in both manufacturing and service sectors was 'financial constraint'. From the analysis, it is obvious that among the women beneficiaries, 'to earn extra income' was the most dominant motivating factor which directed women to be self-employed in the manufacturing and service sectors. Sector wise analysis also brings out a similar conclusion.

Sector wise analysis reveals that among pull motivational factors 'government incentive' was assigned the first rank by the women and men beneficiaries of both the sectors. The women beneficiaries assigned the second rank to pull factor viz 'interest in the particular work' but men beneficiaries in service sector assigned second rank to another pull factor viz 'to be independent'. The least motivating factors assigned by the women and men beneficiaries were 'family member's compulsion'.

TABLE 2  
SCORES AND RANKS FOR SELECTED MOTIVATING FACTORS –  
SECTOR WISE ANALYSIS

| S.No                | Motivational Factors                                 | Women beneficiaries |      |            |      | Men beneficiaries |      |            |      |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|------|------------|------|-------------------|------|------------|------|
|                     |                                                      | Manufacturing       |      | Service    |      | Manufacturing     |      | Service    |      |
|                     |                                                      | Mean score          | Rank | Mean score | Rank | Mean Score        | Rank | Mean score | Rank |
| <b>Push factors</b> |                                                      |                     |      |            |      |                   |      |            |      |
| 1                   | To supplement family's income                        | 77.19               | 2    | 71.68      | 3    | 84.53             | 2    | 81.91      | 1    |
| 2                   | To earn extra income                                 | 81.71               | 1    | 76.44      | 1    | 26.80             | 4    | 23.31      | 4    |
| 3                   | Financial Constraint                                 | 3.01                | 5    | 2.63       | 5    | 4.52              | 5    | 2.63       | 5    |
| 4                   | Sole bread winner                                    | 24.36               | 4    | 26.17      | 4    | 85.85             | 1    | 80.73      | 2    |
| 5                   | Lack of employment opportunities in organized sector | 63.73               | 3    | 73.08      | 2    | 48.29             | 3    | 61.42      | 3    |
| <b>Pull factors</b> |                                                      |                     |      |            |      |                   |      |            |      |
| 6                   | To be independent                                    | 67.40               | 3    | 66.14      | 3    | 66.80             | 2    | 76.33      | 2    |
| 7                   | Government incentives                                | 79.56               | 1    | 77.64      | 1    | 91.05             | 1    | 82.68      | 1    |
| 8                   | To utilize free time                                 | 52.36               | 4    | 55.55      | 4    | 29.06             | 5    | 31.38      | 4    |
| 9                   | Interest in the particular work                      | 69.56               | 2    | 74.60      | 2    | 58.48             | 3    | 61.95      | 3    |
| 10                  | Advice by friends and relatives                      | 16.72               | 5    | 14.24      | 5    | 29.07             | 4    | 30.26      | 5    |
| 11                  | Family member's compulsion                           | 16.48               | 6    | 13.89      | 6    | 27.61             | 6    | 19.47      | 6    |

Source: Calculations based on field survey

To find out whether the ranks assigned by the women beneficiaries differed from the ranks assigned by the men beneficiaries in both sectors Kruskal Wallis 2 test was applied. For the beneficiaries in the manufacturing sector, the calculated 2value was 0.273 and 0.000 for push and pull factors respectively and for services sector it was 0.044 and 0.103 respectively. These calculated values were less than the theoretical values of 2. Hence it was inferred that among the beneficiaries the rank assigned by the women beneficiaries did not differ from the ranks assigned by the men beneficiaries in both the sectors.

#### CONCLUSION

The empirical study revealed that the push factors like to earn extra income and sole bread winner were the important motivating factors for the women and men beneficiaries respectively. Financial constraint was the least motivating factor for both the men and women beneficiaries. In the case of pull

factors, government incentives was the main motivating factor for both women and men beneficiaries. External motivations like advice by friends, relatives and family members' compulsion hardly had any influence on the beneficiaries to start their business. Both the push and pull factors were responsible for motivating the beneficiaries to start their business ventures.

**REFERENCE**

- Krishnaveni Motha (2004), "Women Entrepreneurs in Rural Areas of India", SEDME, Vol. 31, No. 3, September, pp. 21-30.
- Nayan Barua and Aparajeeta Borkakoty (2005), "Women Entrepreneurship", APH Publishing Corporation, New Delhi.
- Piyali Ghosh and Reena Cheuruvalath (2006), "Progress of Female Entrepreneurs in Low Income Countries: A Theoretical Enquiry in India, ICFAI Journal of Entrepreneurship, Vol. III, No. 3, September, pp. 9-17.
- Saravanavel S. (1997), "Entrepreneurial Development- Principles, Policies and Programmes", Ess Pee Kay Publishing House, Madras, Pp, 60-77.
- Sujatha Mukherjee (2006), "What Motivates Women Entrepreneurs? Factors Influencing their Motivation", The ICFAI Journal of Entrepreneurship, Vol. III, No. 4, pp. 7-19.
- Vaijayanti Pandit (2005), "Women@Work", [www.financialexpress.com](http://www.financialexpress.com)
- The Author wishes to acknowledge UGC for funding the project.