Behind the scenes: the hidden power of women in family businesses

ABSTRACT

Considering the prevalence of family business around the world, and the amount of research conducted on these business organizations, it is surprising that the contribution of women is still perceived in a traditional light, stereotypically associated to the home and family. This paper proposes that their role needs to be studied within a new framework, which focuses on an ‘integrated perspective’ (family, community and business). The study, based on empirical data gathered from interviews with women involved in successful family businesses in Australia, reveals that the main aspects related to their role are the asymmetrical positions of the female and male figures, women’s contribution to family culture, and the advantages that women have when working in a family business. Keywords: Family business; women and work; work/family balance.

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to examine the roles that women play in family business, and their dynamic contribution to its success. The data supporting our work results from research activities, still work in progress, embedded in a project that analyses successful three-generational family businesses in Australia. A primary analysis of our data has revealed that women (wives, sisters, daughters) involved in family businesses work across two separate, but interdependent, and ultimately converging, spheres that build the very essence of a family business. These two spheres are: the family, with all its personal, intimate, physical and moral values, and the business sphere, primarily determined by profit, investments, organizational functions and structures. Interestingly, women living and acting between these two spheres provide a strong and supportive hand, as well as hold dual responsibilities; they not only offer comfort, security and support to the family but also to the business. They are the wives, mothers, daughters or sisters of the business owner-manager, and in most businesses they remain behind the scenes, almost an invisible presence (Gillis-Donovan & Moynihan-Bradt, 1990). Interviews with a number of women reveal that they actively work in both spheres, usually without due recognition and appropriate financial compensation for the benefits of the abilities and experience that they regularly contribute to the business. Their intelligence, intuition, adaptability, their energy and abilities, act as the ‘invisible hand’ which is more than guiding and contributing to the achievements of both the family and the business. By using the metaphor of the ‘invisible hand’ we would like to highlight how those women act as a regulatory element, in the same way as Adam Smith (1970) described the invisible rules of the market. However, contrary to how the market is treated in theory
and practice, the role of women in family business is largely considered ancillary, absorbed into the
typical roles and rules of the family system.
Since the 1980s when family business was revealed as an important global phenomenon that
tributes to the economic wealth and output of most world countries (Gomez-Mejia, Nunez-Nickel
& Gutierrez, 2001; Astrachan & Shanker, 2003), most of the extant literature on family business has
focused exclusively on the ‘business’ side of the family-business institution, concentrating on
ownership and management issues (Handler, 1989; Sharma, Chrisman & Chua, 1997; Steier,
Chrisman & Chua, 2004). Although the importance of the owning family is recognized and considered
as the “oxygen that feeds the fire of entrepreneurship” (Rogoff & Heck, 2003, p.559), and the
reciprocal role of family and business is acknowledged (Astrachan, 2003, Rogoff & Heck, 2003), few
studies explore the nature and internal dynamics of the owning family (Kepner, 1983; Sundaramurthy
& Kreiner, 2008). Studies conducted on the nature and characteristics of family business are therefore
based predominantly around male family business leaders and owners as well as successors (Handler,
1994; Lansberg, 1999; Sharma & Irving, 2005). In more recent times, an increasing number of
scholars have acknowledged and explored the more dynamic roles that women play in family
businesses (Frishkoff & Brown, 1993; Hollander & Bukowitz, 1996; Danes & Olson, 2003), for
example addressing the gender-based differences in family business activities.
Our research emphasizes the important contribution that women make to family business which has
traditionally been confined to the private sphere and thus devalued in terms of tangible and intangible
resources and capital. This paper highlights the lack of recent studies about the involvement of women
in family business by proposing a deeper understanding of their complex role, a topic that “has
remained shallow, lacking comprehensive theoretically-based frameworks” (Zahra & Sharma, 2004,
p.335). With our paper, we would like to extend the notion of the reciprocal influence of family and
business dimensions in family firms and propose an ‘integrated perspective’ that acknowledges both
the important role that women play within the firm and the emphasis that women place on an
interconnected relationship system between the family, community and business (Brush, 1992) based
on empirical data. To this purpose, we will first review the extant literature and elaborate on the
meaning of this ‘absence’ in the theoretical definition of family business. As a second step, we will
underpin our analysis with empirical data extracted from two interviews conducted with women involved in successful family business in Victoria, Australia.

It is hoped that our qualitative study will add depth of knowledge and understanding of women’s contribution to the success of family businesses and make an important empirical contribution to the field resulting from direct interaction with the family business practitioners, in particular with the women, who have shared their experiences with the researchers. Such close and direct interactions are too often lacking in family business research studies (Zahra & Sharma, 2004, p.338). The exemplary empirical data collected during the past two years offer a sound basis to a deeper understanding of the role of women in family businesses, adding intellectual rigour to the field.

THE LITERATURE ON FAMILY BUSINESS

It is known that over two-thirds of businesses around the world are family businesses (Gersick, Davis, Hampton & Lansberg, 1997) and in Australia, approximately half of the existing businesses are founded on a family (Getz & Carlson, 2000). In Europe, the majority of the top 500 firms are either owned or managed by the family. The low survival rate of these types of businesses is also a well known fact, with only a small percentage (often quoted as 30%) surviving into the second generation, with most transitions into the third generation failing not long after this succession (generally quoted as 10%) (Beckhard & Dyer, 1983; Handler, 1990, 1992; Ward, 1997, 2004). As Lansberg (1999) comments “Every successful business is, in a way, a small miracle. Family companies that are successfully passed down from one generation to another and continue to thrive represent an even greater achievement.” Schumpeter (2004) pointed to succession risks in family businesses already in 1928 when he wrote about the rise and decay of industrial family firms of the third generation which tend to loose market positions no matter how conscientiously they may be managed.

Since the 1980s when family business was revealed as an important global phenomenon that contributes to the economic wealth and output of most world countries (Gomez-Mejia et al, 2001; Astrachan & Shanker, 2003), researchers have concentrated on issues of management such as leadership (Chrisman, Chua & Sharma, 2005), stewardship (Davis, Schoorman & Donaldson, 1997; Zahra, Heyton, Neubaum, Dibrell & Craig, 2008), continuity and succession (Chua, Chrisman &
Sharma, 2003), conflict (Kellermanns & Eddleston, 2004) and ‘complexity’ in the business family
(Gimeno Sandig, Labadie, Saris & Mayordomo, 2006). More recently the literature has examined the
role of family culture in influencing firm performance (Miller & Le Breton-Miller, 2006; Eddleston,
Kellermanns & Sarathy, 2008), and the attitudes and commitment of family members towards the
business as a powerful and important element associated with the success of a family firm (Zahra et al,
2008). Family organizations prevail in the world’s economies, and are one of the major outcomes of
entrepreneurial activity, yet remain an under-researched topic.

Numerous researchers have compared family and non-family firms but there appears to be little
consensus on the definition of what constitutes a ‘family business’. Generally, there is agreement that
a family business can be loosely classified as one in which family members have ownership or
management of the organization (Shanker & Astrachan, 1996), but researchers also agree that family
firms cannot be regarded as an homogeneous entity (Chrisman et al, 2005). Family businesses differ in
structure, attitudes, behaviour and leadership to non–family businesses as the family members work
together across two separate but converging domains, the social domain (the family) and the economic
domain (the business). The two overlapping systems of the family and the business are considered by
Aldrich & Cliff (2003) to be as closely connected as “oxygen and fire”, and their “family
embeddedness perspective” particularly recognizes the importance of the family dimension in family
business. Astrachan (2003) emphasizes the distinctive reciprocal interdependence of the two separate
units that may display a great variety of social and economic factors. Understanding the norms and
principles that steer the activities and dynamics of the family system and how these may impact and
differ from the principles that regulate the business operations is a complex issue which is
fundamental to understanding family businesses (Kepner, 1983; Cole, 1997). However, most studies
undertaken on the two intersecting systems of work and family concentrate on viewing this interface
as a source of contradictions and tensions (Haas, 1999). More recently, researchers have increasingly
begun to observe the positive effects of combining the two roles of family and work through theories
of enrichment and ‘positive spillover’ (Grzywacz, Almeida & McDonald, 2002), in line with recent
emerging trends in psychology and family studies that concentrate on strengths rather than weaknesses
(Patterson, 2002). In family business theory, there is an absence of research on the positive effects of combining work and family roles.

There are a number of definite advantages of family businesses compared to non family firms. The senior managers, usually family members, have a strong commitment to the successful long-term performance of the business (Mattessich & Hill, 1976; Davis, 1983), they remain in the business for periods longer than professional managers (a generation) (Wong, 1988, Song, 1999) and have a long-term visionary outlook aimed at long-term goals, thus exploit commercial opportunities for longer periods. Family businesses have a commitment to providing quality and value to customers (Davis, 1983). They are generally much more ‘human’ places to work, places where care and concern for the family members and other employees prevail, compared to large organisations, thus inspire strong employee allegiance (Ward, 1988) and promote better performance in their employees (Moscetello, 1990). Family businesses have a particular organisational culture based on strong family values and visions, a sense of pride and shared purpose, which take precedence over corporate values (Lyman, 1991). This family culture nurtures and supports the family members and supports the success of the firm by promoting the development of positive relationships equally inside the organisation as well as with outsiders.

Family culture plays an important role in determining the success of a family firm. It is a strong influence on goal-setting (Sharma et al, 1997), strategy (Hall, Melin & Nordqvist, 2001), performance (Ram & Holliday, 1993) and contributes to the complexities of the family dynamics that support the management of the business operations. Family culture comprises the values, beliefs and behaviour that bind each family member together to form the implicit social ties of the family system. Recognition has been given to the way leaders and founders translate their values into the organizational culture (Schein, 1983; Ciulla, 1999) and how these pave the way for successive generations. However, the important role played by the female partners of business founders and their contribution to the culture and operations of the business remains largely ignored.

Women’s contribution to the family business is too often ‘invisible’, hidden within the configuration of the traditional family business which focuses on the male founder and the male successors. As Lyman et al state, the “strength of traditional family roles, both within society and within individual
families, kept women’s business contributions from being acknowledged” (1985, p.47). Historically their role has been viewed as belonging to the “outward division of labor in the family business” (Frishkoff & Brown, 1993, p.66), referring to domestic, emotional and social roles as belonging to the woman (wife) and the business responsibilities as belonging to the man (husband). According to Brush (1992), women’s social orientations generally focus towards relationships, whilst their skills, motivations, goals and organisational characteristics (including business strategies, problems, management style and networking behaviour) differ from the men’s. This integrated perspective approach, originally rooted in psychological and sociological theories, encompasses family, community and business, suggesting that “women view their business as an interconnected system of relationships instead of a separate economic unit in a social world” (Kent, Sexton & Vesper, 1982). Brush expands by arguing that “business relationships are integrated rather than separated from family, societal, and personal relationships…. The business is integrated into the woman [business owner]’s life… Women’s personal reality is “web-like” connecting family, work and community relationships”(1992, p.16-17). Helgesen’s (1990) work found that “women emphasized interpersonal connections, were guided by intuition and opportunity, and dealt with work and family matters simultaneously” (cited in Brush, 1992, p. 17). More recently, Kreiner has further investigated the theory of integration of the work-home domains, “Integration…represents the merging and blending of various aspects of work and home.”(2006, p.485). Our study points to the need to investigate the woman’s contribution to family business in terms of an integrated perspective framework.

METHODOLOGY

A number of women were interviewed as part of a larger, more encompassing project being undertaken on successful family businesses in Victoria, Australia. A qualitative research methodology was used for the study which is related to life history, involving a combination of methodologies which provided different sources of data: ethnography, observation and life history narrative through semi-structured interviews, as well as reference to other secondary source material. Life history focuses on issues of representation, voice and context (Hatch & Wisniewski, 1995), it is a “linguistic form that preserves the complexity of human action with its interrelationship of temporal sequence,
human motivation, chance happenings, and changing interpersonal and environmental contexts” (Polkinghorne, 1995, p.7) From this approach we were able to gain depth, coherence and information on the interviewees’ selves such as personal reflections, feelings and opinions. Thus, the question underpinning our research is the following: Can the work performed by women in family businesses be classified as a substantial “business contribution”? The question of the involvement and contribution of women is not new as it has been researched since the mid-1990s especially by feminist writers (Kritzinger and Voster, 1996; Brandth and Haugen, 1997) focusing on rural contexts. More recent literature has confirmed previous studies by pointing to the auxiliary and invisible role played by women (O’Toole and MacGarvey, 2003) but also their adherence to discourses which exclude them from the core business (Reed 2003; Alston, 2006). And the most recent studies continue to identify persisting difficulties in women’s position in rural communities and business where they still appear to be confined to volunteer and/or social activities (Bryant and Pini, 2009). Our research confirms these studies with regard to rural business women. But in this paper we would like to extend the meaning of such findings to women in family business in general. To this purpose we will propose that what facilitates or impedes an understanding of women’s work as a substantial business contribution very often also depends on the women’s perception of their own role. We will present and analyse two interviews conducted with business women involved in family businesses, one in rural Victoria and one in Melbourne. Although the two contexts in which the two women live and work are very different, their perceptions of their own role as the glue of the family business allows us to establish a common element that justifies our methodological approach and choice of interviewees.

THE ROLE OF WOMEN IN FAMILY BUSINESS

The data analysed as part of our research revealed some main elements related to the women’s role in family business which include the asymmetry in the positions of the female and the male owners of a family business, the women’s contribution to family culture and values, and the advantages that women perceive in working in a family business.

The family firm environment tends to focus on the male founder and his male heirs. The male founder tends to be the main source of income and employment of all or most of the family members. In most
cases, the male partner tends to take on the heaviest responsibility in the work sphere and work the longest hours, and “will be involved in the firm very deeply, financially and emotionally” (Degadt, 2003, p.381). As a result he will have executive functions, and his role is represented as business owner and business manager, with a paid position.

The woman (wife, daughter or sister), most often ‘invisible’ and peripheral, tends to play a pivotal role in the family business by creating the business foundations (including the values, norms and attitudes that bind the family, and thus the business, together) and by providing a supportive environment for the family and the business. She usually works part-time or full-time, taking on the usual domestic responsibilities of wife and mother in addition to supporting the husband in the family business, she may live and work in the business on a daily basis, devoting her mental and physical energies to both areas of responsibility.

Kristen (pseudonym) married and raised four children while working on the family farm in eastern regional Victoria which has grown and developed into a successful three generational family business. She is involved, and most often expected to be involved, in most aspects of the business organisation and contributes to the operational decision-making, yet she has no definite title nor position within the business (Alston, 2006). She married young into a large traditional hard working ethnic family, also a family business.

“…for me to marry into the P. family or to marry ‘John’ (pseudonym), it was not just marrying John, it was marrying into a whole family… which was wonderful on one side, but really quite difficult on the other, because, oh, you all worked together, which was fine, but I had a child only a few months after I was married, so to be expected to work… you know… Now we work seven days a week and then, you know, then we also worked seven days a week… for twelve, sometimes fourteen hours a day […] We’ve just had a month of intense work for our festival and then another two weeks of intense work getting our wine club wine packed and out to all the people, you know, … I am still quite exhausted…”

Kristen works long hours for the success of the family and the business and readily provides whatever support is needed as the partner in a successful wine family business, previously growing tobacco. In her understanding of her own role the pressure from both the work and the home is immense, but not irreconcilable. Such self-perception seems to confirm new findings about the intergenerational and
across social boundaries activities performed by women (Bryant and Pini, 2009). She vividly remembers the struggles in the early years in the family business:

“[By this time] I had four kids, and I was working on tobacco as well, and my own house, and doing the gardening, because I actually did most of the gardening as well because the blokes were just so busy on the tobacco, … and I just found it all a little bit too much.”.

Often the two spheres combine physically, as the family business is run from home and the overlap work-family become more closely interwoven and undistinguishable. In Kristen’s case, the family home is located on the family farm:

“[…] and even now our life is our business, our office is there (note: in the house) and another bedroom is being made into an office […] “

Kristen seems to confirm the finding in the literature (Reed, 2003) related to a certain willingness to unquestioningly accept the two responsibilities as worker and mother: the difficulty is in harmonizing the two, and assuming separate identities across the two domains proves to be difficult. As Kristen discusses the family culture she does so from a feminine and caring perspective, with a measure of emotion, thus transferring the domestic manager role from the family across the family business sphere:

“Yeh, well, basically it has its own entity… It’s like an animal within itself that needs nurturing and needs caring for… I think we really do have to be very careful with the amount of work, and the amount of stress that each individual carries, you know, none of us really talks about how we cope with the amount of work and the amount of stress, which is probably wrong, it’s bad…”

It appears that women’s contribution to the shaping of the family culture inevitably flows into the shaping of the family business, as they two merge and create “a context in which all decisions are made and the glue that holds the family business together” (Hollander & Bukowitz, 1990, p.140). Kristen’s work in the business has always been considered largely ancillary to her main traditional role and duties associated to bearing children, taking the lion’s share in their care and education, looking after the house and the garden. These never ending household, mothering and nurturing duties and obligations are always unpaid, and usually considered to be ‘non-work’. As the family business webpage states, the jobs that Kristen undertakes in the family business are an extension of the caring
role that she provides in the home domain. She is described on the family business website as “the great woman behind the good man! She is no doubt the backbone of the P. family. ‘Kristen's’ main roles within the business are to run the office and oversee marketing activities, though it is her catering abilities that receive the most kudos.” Her role, though apparently largely related to the traditional role of primary carer for the children, and now for ageing parents-in-law and grandchildren, involves also making a substantial contribution to the family business which is not overtly acknowledged. “Visibility and influence are not the same thing” (Gillis-Donovan & Moynihan-Bradt, 1990, p.157), and Kristen’s invisible but active and influential role in the business includes doing bookkeeping, supporting employees: “I care for our staff enough to have them comfortable within their working space…” , adding extra activities to the core business, understanding every aspect of the business, contributing with her ideas, ingenuity and intuition to expand, strengthen and promote the firm.

Over the last few years, as her children have grown up, have partners and children of their own, her own mothering and nurturing responsibilities have been redirected to caring for the aged parents-in-law, and supporting her daughters’ involvement in the business by partly baby-sitting her grandchildren. Her obligation now is to ensure a future for the family business, and she sees her role as passing on “… certainly the love and the passion that I have, wanting all of the kids to actually share in what we are doing and be part of what we are doing…. and teaching and helping, more of the helping I suppose…”

From this data there seems to emerge a picture of a woman who, in spite of being pivotal to the very existence of a family business, remains behind the scenes and acts like a grey eminence. The data also confirms that she actively integrates into the business sphere, largely through the family culture and dynamics. Perhaps this attitude reveals more leadership (O’Toole and MacGarvey, 2003) than the assumptions underpinning some studies on rural businesswomen have predicted.

**Helen** (pseudonym), the only woman of the second generation in a successful business family dealing in coffee in Melbourne, came back into the family firm after spending a lengthy period away from Australia during which she travelled, worked, married, had two children, and divorced. She returned to settle in Melbourne a couple of years ago and now works and participates in the family business. She
enjoys being part of the business, which includes her two brothers and her nephew, all married with children of different ages. Although she previously worked part-time in the firm that her father founded when she was young, her work was “upstairs, answering the phone and taking messages”, not involved in any decision-making.

“[…] Back then it was just the way it was. Now I don’t like it, they don’t do it now because I’d start kicking and screaming, but no, back then that’s just how it was. My father made all the decisions. We didn’t make any decisions… [and mother just] supported them yes, […] she was happy with that …”

Since returning to the family business she has had to confront traditional notions of what women should or should not do:

“It’s very hard especially if it’s all boys. Women are always seen as a ‘woman’, where women should be staying at home and having babies and cleaning the house. I still have to fight that a lot here…mmm.. If women can achieve, get past that, and stamp it out and prove to the boys that we are not just baby carriers and house cleaners, that’s great. You know, there’s times when they’ve said to me ‘You are just a woman, you don’t know…’ and I’m like ‘Well, why? Does my brain not work like yours?’ And they can’t answer me.”

Helen is attempting to fulfil the dual responsibilities of family and work and combine the two sectors (home and work), although not always successfully, and being a single parent she is committed to give priority to her mothering role, so a full-time attendance at her place of work is impossible at this stage of her life. However she appears to be satisfied with her arrangements which seem to give her more conceptual space.

“I like coming to work…. I can’t always come to work at 9 o’clock in the morning, but I like coming to work and getting into things and always discovering new ways of doing things and new products and that kind of thing and I do it at home too… Even though I leave here at 2 o’clock, sometimes at night time I am still looking around for things [for work] and thinking about work.”

Helen does not contribute to the management of the firm nor to the central operations of the business and her role is considered ancillary, or even more related to volunteering than to executing tasks (Bryant and Pini, 2009), yet she feels comfortable in the family business, and understand her contribution as valuable.
“I’m known as the front of the house, somebody walks in and the first person they see is me when I’m here … Lately that hasn’t been too much… But the first person they see is me and they automatically deal with somebody from the family right away which is very important here… People coming here know that they are going to deal with somebody from the family. They are not dealing with a sales rep who may or may not be able to give that better deal, you know what I mean. They are dealing with somebody from the family. …”

The family in her eyes is almost sacrosanct. She states that “the family always comes first. … Never go against the family. … look after the family…[…] I believe family should come even before spouses, because we will always be family. Spouses come and go”. Helen seems to greatly appreciate the advantages associated with working in family business, such as the supportive environment and the flexibility in arranging her work schedules in order to attend to her children’s needs:

“Look, I love working with my family, it’s important to me not only as a family business. It enables me, at this point in my life, to be where I need to be, do things, certain things with my children. My son finishes school today and now I have to leave and go and pick him up. He starts a new one next week. So I have to take a couple of days off. So working for a family business enables me to do that. If I didn’t work for a family business my boss would turn around and say ‘See you later, good bye’. There are days when my children are sick and I need to stay home with them. When my son’s sick I’ve got to stay home. Family businesses enable you to do that and I don’t have to hear it from anybody.”

From this interview, a very different type of businesswoman emerges, perhaps a little spoilt, but very much self-sufficient and aware of her own physical and conceptual abilities. She does not seem to suffer from her “marginality” (Reed, 2003) and confinement into a more representative role, because what counts here is her own evaluation of the “emotive aspects of belonging” (Bryant and Pini, 2009, p. 56) which have included her in the core of the family business. It is this consciousness that allows her to perceive her work as a substantial business contribution to the family business.

**CONCLUSION**

In our study we have reconstructed the life histories of two business women, one in rural Victoria and one in urban Melbourne. We have listed the main roles taken by these two women in a table inserted at the end of the text. As a whole, the data show that their work and participation in the family business advantages the family business organisation. We have explored the manner in which women interact
and negotiate the intergenerational, class and gender boundaries (Bryant and Pini 2009) between home (family) and work (business) not only in rural business contexts but also in urban businesses. The data also nicely disclose the way in which women move between the two domains, within the overlapping two spheres. But most importantly, what our research shows is that the two women interviewed are aware of the fact that their business contribution is downplayed in society, and in the family itself. They seem to be able to live with, and accept such denial because they themselves acknowledge proudly that their roles may be pivotal to the success of the business. It seems to us that their preparedness to accept a secondary role is done for the sake of keeping the family and the business together by acknowledging and accepting that that they live and work in a different reality due to their situation and experience as a mother, wife, sister, or daughter (Gilligan, 1982). To us this appears to be the role played by a ‘horizontal’ and generous leader, aware of their emotional and conceptual strengths, but not consumed by power struggles within the family business. For that very reason, we are inclined to suggest that the role of women in family businesses needs to be viewed from an integrated perspective capable of seeing her successfully involved in more than one area. This could also mean that their chosen ‘invisibility’ is perhaps related to emotional and practical leadership rather than ‘marginality’. This conclusion does not intend to downplay research outcomes that have ‘discovered’ persisting forms of exclusion of the woman from the family business decision-making processes and powers. But it seems to suggest the necessity to further study the role of women in family businesses by revisiting some assumptions related to the female self and to place them into a more integrated perspective. The integrated perspective that we have accentuated in this paper seems to offer a descriptive framework that helps to develop an understanding of women’s presence and contribution to the family business from the point of view of their personal, emotional, and intellectual resources. Further qualitative research in the participative process of women in family firms needs to be undertaken so as to gain a deeper understanding and appreciation of the ways in which women integrate their family and business roles and domains, and act as the guiding ‘invisible hand’ that contributes to the achievements of both the family and the business.
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### TABLE

The following table lists the specific roles played by our two women in their respective family businesses and their perception of their own role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Kristen: rural family business</th>
<th>Helen: urban family business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Mother</td>
<td>4 children</td>
<td>3 children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Wife</td>
<td>Married</td>
<td>Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Decision-making</td>
<td>Involved</td>
<td>Indirectly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clients</td>
<td>Indirectly involved</td>
<td>Directly involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conceptual planning</td>
<td>Limited to certain areas</td>
<td>Across the board (effective?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Marginalisation</td>
<td>Not perceived</td>
<td>Perceived but accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Auxiliary work</td>
<td>Not perceived</td>
<td>Perceived but accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Acting across spheres</td>
<td>Perceived and enjoyed</td>
<td>Perceived and enjoyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Emotional resources</td>
<td>Creator and administrator</td>
<td>Creator and administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Business contribution</td>
<td>Conscious of it</td>
<td>Conscious of it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Female self</td>
<td>Conscious of female self</td>
<td>Conscious of female self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Self-denial</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>Not given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leadership role</td>
<td>Perceived but not admitted</td>
<td>Perceived but not admitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Happiness</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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