Relationship between social capital, and organizational performance with reference to small and medium-sized Women Entrepreneurs (SME) in Bangalore

[1]M S Kokila, [2]Dr. Shubha Chandra and [3]Dr. Raja Kamal Ch

[1]Research Scholar, School of commerce and Management, Garden City University, Bengaluru, Senior Assistant Professor, New Horizon College, Marathalli, Bengaluru

[2]Associate Professor, school of commerce and Management, Garden City university, Bengaluru

[3]Assistant Professor, Kristu Jayanti College, Bengaluru

Abstract

The goal of this research is to examine the interplay between cultural dominance, competence, and efficiency. In this context, capability is reflected by a company's innovativeness and social capital. However, there are also issues with research into cultural authority and performance. Studies on cultural authority and capacity are almost never conducted in less-developed nations. In this research, we explore the connection between cultural management and output in the Bangalore-centered batik sector. Control, adoption, and cultural issues will vary between the developed world and the rest of the world. The city of Bangalore is home to a burgeoning batik Women Entrepreneurs, which encompasses the arts and technologies that were developed inside the palace and later made public.

Primary data on respondents' perceptions were gathered via in-person interviews with a professional interviewer. There were a total of 287 questionnaires utilized in the studies. The author conducts multivariate analysis using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM). In order to help tackle covariance based SEM difficulties, AMOS software was used in this research.

Organizational creativity and social capital are used as proxies for competence in this research, and they are shown to have a substantial association with cultural control. One such finding is that there is a strong connection between organizational competence and effectiveness. However, the causal link between cultural control and organizational effectiveness cannot be shown here. That is to say, competence acts as a moderator between cultural authority and the efficiency of an organization.

Keywords: social capital and performance, women Entrepreneur, cultural control, organizational creativity,

INTRODUCTION

The notion and function of cultural control are still poorly defined in the literature on control systems. Prior studies on cultural control were still overlapped with other forms of control, such as informal control (Cravens, et al., 2004), clan control (Ouchi, 1980; Govindarajan & Fisher, 1990), group control (Abernethy & Brownell, 1997), professional control (Abernethy & Stoelwinder, 1995; Orlikowsky, 1991), personal control (Wiersma, 2009), ideological control (Collier, 2005; Ditillo, 2004) and social control (Merchant, 1985; Rockness & Shields, 1988).

Cultural dominance, according to Merchant and Van der Stede (2007), is not limited to any one areas of systems (like management tenets) that are formally established and those that are improvised.

In this work, we revisit cultural management in light of current research. Organizational control and employee behavior are shaped by both explicit and implicit systems of cultural control. Formal control is also included in this concept (Malagueo & Bisbe, 2010) in addition to informal control. Management control system (MCS) components include cultural control. This is consistent with the concept of MCS, which states

that MCS is a tool meant to aid the manager in decision making by using both formal and informal control (Chenhall, 2003) in order to achieve the desired organizational objective (Bhimani et al., 2008), which includes improved organizational performance.

There are still issues with how we study cultural dominance and effectiveness. While some studies have found that cultural control directly improves performance (Kallunki et al., 2010; Chapman and Kihn., 2009), others have found that it first improves organizational capability (Malagueo and Bisbe., 2010) before having any effect on performance at all (Henri., 2006). Cultural control, however, was shown by Batac and Carassus (2009) to stifle an organization's efficacy. Despite the fact that the study's control form was culturally grounded in nature, culturally based Women women Entrepreneurs were not included in previous research. Studies on cultural authority and capacity are almost never conducted in less-developed nations.

This research delves at how the cultural norms of Bangalore, where many batik businesses are headquartered, affect their ability to succeed. Testing direct and indirect linkages between cultural control and performance via creativity and social capital is also a goal of this study in an effort to close a knowledge gap in the existing literature. Meutia (2012) revealed that culturally-based batik Women Entrepreneurs in Bangalore relied heavily on their creativity andsocial capital. Recent research has shown that the links between cultural dominance and efficiency are moderated by the qualities of creativity and social capital.

The Controlling Role of Culture in Organizational Success

According to Merchant and Otley (2006), an MCS's primary function is to provide relevant data for use in the preceding three processes: decision making, planning, and assessment. Management control systems (MCS) are used to exert authority over subordinates and direct their actions in accordance with management's goals (Anthony and Herzegovina, 2007; Bhimani et al., 2008).

Employee traits and behaviors may be influenced by MCS's cultural management (Jaworski et al., 1993; Merchant and Van der Stede, 2007). According to the literature (Meyer and Rowan, 1977; Wilkins & Ouchi, 1983), cultural control is the result of the gradual accretion of a company's accumulated rituals, myths, and social mores. (Jaworski et al., 1993) "Cultural control" refers to the practice of using an organization's prevailing values and norms to regulate employee conduct. Written (ethical code and purpose) and verbal (ethical norms and expectations) types of cultural management are also included (Merchant & Van der Stede, 2007). The topic at hand is the use of policy inside an organization as a means of molding the mentality of its members.

Organizational performance may be enhanced by using MCS since its component control systems are interdependent and complement one another (Otley, 1980; Abernethy and Chua, 1996; Malmi & Brown, 2008). According to Chapman & Kohn (2009), formal control may boost performance in organizations that have understood their information systems. According to Widener's (2007) analysis of the LOC framework, which measures how using a control system affects performance, the results are good. According to recent studies (Kallunki et al., 2010), an organization's optimal performance may be achieved by using both formal and informal management control systems. We anticipate that enforcing cultural norms will also aid in boosting business results. The following theories are based on the information presented above:

H1 Organizational effectiveness is boosted when culture is kept under control.

Culture's influence on an organization's ability to innovate

According to Zimmerer and Scrborough (2006), creative thinking is the capacity to generate novel ideas and approaches to identifying and exploiting opportunities. There are a variety of methods for discovering and stimulating people's originality. It becomes a method for breaking rid of preconceived notions that might stifle creative

thinking. The brainstorming method is one way to unlock latent imagination. The goal of a brainstorming session is to generate a large number of fresh, original ideas via a group interaction process with no organization (Zimmerer & Scrborough, 2006). The purpose of a brainstorming session is to encourage free expression between group members. Employees at small startups are more likely to show tolerance if their manager comes from the same cultural background. If bosses can show workers respect for their traditions even if they aren't from the same place, they'll be more likely to engage with one another (Meutia, 2012). Better ideas will result from these collaborations, but they need to be managed well to provide a solid foundation for success (Henri, 2006).

There is a robust correlation between managerial oversight and employee innovation at work (Davila et al., 2009). Organizational creativity will suffer under mechanical management, as shown by Woodman (1993). However, an organic control structure will provide excellent results for the company. There is a positive correlation between MACS adoption and product innovation, according to certain management accounting literature (Simons, 1995; Chenhall & Morris, 1995; Bonner et al., 2002; Henri, 2006; Revelino & Mouritsen, 2009). Levers of control that enhance worker creativity and stimulate innovation have received particular attention from Simons (1995; Bisbe and Otley, 2004). When it comes to managing your staff's personality and actions, cultural management is crucial (Jaworski et al., 1993; Merchant & Van der Stede, 2007; Bisbe & Otley, 2004). Organizational innovation based on women Entrepreneurial spirit is fostered by a culture of control (Miller and Friesen, 1982; Langfield - Smith, 2007).

Organizational values and beliefs may be seen in the way they exercise cultural control. The system's design mirrors the company's overall strategy. The system improves upon the current level of performance by nurturing an innovative atmosphere. Marginson (2002) demonstrates how a company's values may shape its overall approach to business. Therefore, cultural control will aid in qualities (such cooperation and the integration of information) that make it easier to create innovations. Managers in women Entrepreneurial organizations place more emphasis on sales force and customer motivation, information, and education (Hambrick, 1983). Cultural control, as Malagueo and Bisbe (2010) discover, improves an organization's efficacy. We base the following hypothesis on the aforementioned arguments:

H2 Organizational innovation is influenced favorably by cultural control.

Cultural dominance and the value of social networks

The productive aspects of social capital are not the only ones. To put it simply, social capital is the result of human interactions, most notably long-term, close-knit friendships. The social capital of a community is its interconnected web of norms, beliefs, and practices. Relationships based on shared standards and values foster confidence, which in turn generates huge, quantifiable economic values (Fukuyama, 1995).

Cultural control is found to steer widely held values and beliefs as the behavioral standard in an organization, according to studies of control systems and capabilities. Cultural control has been defined in the literature as the accumulation of social interaction rituals inside an organization (Meyer and Rowan, 1977; Wilkins and Ouchi, 1983). Therefore, we shall take into account social capital in terms of the resource-based view (RBV) theory of capacity. If the empowerment process is effective, the resources and abilities will be governed deliberately and systematically. The outcome will determine the company's competitive position and the value, rarity, imitability, and substitution of its resources relative to those of its rivals. Competitive advantage may be enhanced by the use of such resources (Hitt et al., 2001).

Henri (2006) provided an overview of the connection between MCS, resource-based viewpoints, and organizational effectiveness. Henri's research is focused on the ways in which interactive and diagnostic control systems

contribute to an organization's efficacy. The findings demonstrate how a well-implemented control system improves the efficiency of any given business. Capability enhancement is made easier by the use of both fed-forward and feedback control systems, as explained in detail by Grafton et al. (2010). The author makes the following hypothesis based on the information provided above:

H3 Cultural dominance has a constructive effect on social capital.

The Impact of Creative Problem Solving on Batik Business Results

In this sense, opportunity is the chance, and creativity is the doing of making things happen. To be creative is to have the power to create something new (Olsen, 1996). Luthans (2002) defines creativity as the capacity to develop novel methods for addressing challenges and resolving issues. According to Munandar (1988), creative people are able to show their abilities in several ways. Being efficient implies coming up with more concepts in less time. The capacity to be adaptable includes being open to many perspectives and solutions, as well as being able to come up with answers that others didn't anticipate.

According to West (2000), creativity is the integration of disparate forms of information to generate superior original ideas. Finding a novel technique was crucial to creative problem solving. Forget everything you know about how a company has always operated in the past; that's creativity (Olsen, 1996). One may be creative in one of three ways. There are three types of creativity: the capacity to make something from nothing (creation), the ability to bring disparate elements together (synthesis), and the ability to make something better or different (modification) (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2005). An women Entrepreneur is someone who engages in actions that increase the worth of a product. People in the neighborhood will appreciate creative products. According to Barney (1991), the capacity of a corporation to generate goods and services and to offer new products, processes, or ideas varies. Creativity has been shown to affect organizational effectiveness in a research by Dibrell (2008).

Added value for customers and value in usage are the results of innovative thinking inside a company (Souder and Sherman, 1994). Creativity-driven new products may seize and hold onto their own niche markets, increasing sales and revenue as a consequence (Amabile et al., 1996; Souder and Sherman, 1994). Amabile et al. (1996) and Gaynor (1996a) both agree that a company's creative output is crucial to maintaining a competitive edge. This means that creative work has to be done on a regular basis (Amabile et al., 1996).

Organizational performance may be enhanced and competitive advantages maintained via creative problem solving, according to the resource-based approach of management. The ingenuity of the business will provide a practical competence that can be copied only partially. In other words, the ever-changing wants and requirements of today's consumers make innovation crucial to a company's continued success. . As stated by Hitt et al. (2001) and Danneels (2002), creativity is the driving force behind strategy transformation via the enhancement of a resource's value. Capability has been shown to have a beneficial effect on performance in the past (Hult and Ketchen, 2001). The author makes the following hypothesis, which is grounded on the prior research:

H4 The SME's organizational performance in batik benefits from a creative workplace Women Entrepreneurs.

The Implications of Social Capital for Business Success

Both individual and group efforts contribute to a person's social capital (Modityang, 2007). Each perspective in the social capital space is sustained through symbolic and material exchange (Bourdieu, 1986), and this is linked to the individual's ability to activate and mobilize the networks' connection effectively. Each person in this setting amasses and deploys their own unique stockpile of social capital in order to further their own unique set of goals. The communal approach,

on the other hand, views social capital as a network and connection characteristic that fosters cooperative effort and enhanced group performance (Fukuyama, 2000; Putnam, 2000).

Social capital, which demonstrates in-house connections and expertise, is regarded as one of the most valuable organizational resources in Ahuja's (2000) research. The social interactions between companies that result from internal relationships are an invaluable resource for any business (Tsai and Ghosal, 1998). The partnership will strengthen a firm by providing access to resources and increasing its organizational capacity.

There are several definitions of social capital. First, according to Bourdieu (1986), social capital includes all the resources one has access to because of their ownership of a long-lasting, mutually advantageous connection inside an institution. This implies that a company's social capital may serve as an asset in building the kinds of connections and networks that boost productivity. Putnam and Gross (2002) and Sodano et al. (2008) both agree that social capital is an organizational element like a network, norms, and social beliefs that promotes coordination and cooperation. Networks, standards, and attitudes that contribute to economic growth are all examples of social capital (Kassa, 2007). The third kind of capital is social capital, which may be used to boost performance (Lin, 2001). Individuals build social capital via their interactions with others in pursuit of a shared goal or an unstated benefit.

Social capital was validated as a network and belief that significantly contributed to enhanced performance (Ahuja, 2000; Stam and Elfering, 2008). Through the efficient use of in-house resources, social capital may boost a business' competitive edge. Beliefs and interaction, two components of social capital, tend to promote members' desire to pool resources and knowledge. When trust rises and employees work together, a company's internal knowledge grows and improves (Lee et al., 2007). The lowering of transaction costs is another perk of building social capital (Grootaert et al., 2003). Following these justifications, the author offers the following hypothesis:

H5 batik business owners having social capital has a beneficial effect on the efficiency of their operations.

METHOD

Data Collection and Sample Design

Managers and owners of batik businesses in Bangalore with at least two years of experience are the focus of this survey. Direct interview with respondents, conducted by a qualified interviewer, provides the main data for this research. There were a total of 287 questionnaires utilized in the studies.

Multivariate data analysis is performed using structural equation modeling (SEM). Using SEM, the author of this research was able to examine the correlation between the many complicated variables and provide a comprehensive description of the model as a whole. Most scholars in the social sciences see SEM as a valuable statistical resource. In order to help tackle covariance based SEM difficulties (Byrne, 2009), AMOS software is used in this investigation.

Measurement Of Variables

Five questions are used to assess participants' level of cultural control using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). Each inquiry mirrored some facet of the company in issue. Merchant, Van der Stede, 2007, Malagueo, and Bisbe, 2010, are used as the basis for the indicators used in the measurements. These metrics include employees' knowledge of the company's core values (cc1), their knowledge of their coworkers' actions (cc2), the use of a code of conduct to educate workers on inappropriate behavior (cc3), the dissemination of these values throughout the company (cc4), and the degree to which outside interest groups exert pressure on the relevant unit (cc5).

Lee and Choi (2003) and Malagueo and Bisbe (2010) have created tools that may be used to evaluate the creative capacity of an organization. These metrics are used to support the premise

that the company in question generates original concepts. In five questions, respondents describe the conditions under which their products were created. Each question requires respondents to provide a score out of 7. On a five-point Likertscale, we have: (1) how often new and useful ideas are generated; (2) how many new and valuable ideas are created; (3) how much thought goes into creating new and useful ideas; (4) how much time is spent creating new and useful ideas; and (5) how an atmosphere is fostered that encourages the generation of new and useful ideas.

The term "social capital" refers to the value of an organization's shared standards, beliefs, and mutual understanding. Organizational cohesion and collaboration are bolstered by social capital's focus on the long term. Author used indicators adapted from Meutia (2012) to measure this concept, including: social relationship building (sc1), business-based social relationship building (sc2), employee relationship building (sc3), customer relationship building (sc4), and supplier relationship building (sc5). There are five questions used to assess various aspects of social capital. The respondents are to indicate their responses on a 7-point Likert scale, where 1 represents strongly disagreeing and 7 strongly agreeing.

The success of batik company owners and managers is reflected in the success of their small and medium-sized enterprises. SME success is measured by tracking changes in four key areas: employee count growth (p1), sales growth (p2), market expansion (p3), and income growth (p4). Wiklund (1999), Hadjimanolis (2000), Krauss (2006), and Stam and Elfering (2008) are the original authors of the indicators used here. Five questions are used to assess an organization's performance, with respondents' responses shown on a seven-point Likert scale (where 1 indicates strongly disagreeing and 7 strongly agreeing).

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Analyses

The typical owner or manager in the batik industry has 5.5 years of experience. Four Construct variables have descriptive statistics shown in Table 1. Sum score including cultural command, organizational innovation, social capital, and productivity.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistical Values For Each Construct

Construct	Mean Score	SD	Min.	Max.
Job-related experience (years)	5.55	1.9	2	27
Cultural control	3.1	1.91	1	7
Organizational creativity	3.3	1.11	1	7
Social capital	3.3	1.15	1	7
Organizational performance	3.5	1.13	1	7

Source: Computed by Researcher

The following table demonstrates how batik business owners use cultural control, organizational innovation, social capital, and organizational performance.

Structural Equation Modeling

The validity of a model for explaining variance, loading factor values, and overall model fit may be determined with the use of confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Each construct is studied separately as well as together (as a model measurement).

Table II
Summary of measuremnet scale, normality, reliability and validity

Variable	Skewness	Kurtosis	Factor loading	Cronbach'α	AVE	CR
Cultural control				0.75	0.55	0.75
cc1	1.28	1.84	1.54			
cc2	1.71	1.31	1.71			
cc3	1.33	1.73	1.55			
cc4	1.41	1.71	1.55			
cc5	1.72	1.47	1.77			
Organizational Creativity				0.76	0.56	0.76
cr1	1.31	1.94	1.72			
cr2	1.25	1.94	1.81			
cr3	1.18	1.92	1.71			
cr4	1.15	1.74	1.57			
cr5	1.35	1.95	1.72			

Social Capital				0.77	0.61	0.77
sc1	1.35	1.95	1.85			
sc2	1.27	1.94	1.77			
sc3	1.19	1.93	1.55			
sc4	1.15	1.74	1.74			
sc5	1.25	1.95	1.91			
Organization Performance				0.74	0.59	0.74
p1	1.51	1.11	1.53			
p2	1.32	1.28	1.59			
p3	1.39	1.14	1.57			
p4	1.54	1.21	1.55			

Source: Computed by Researcher

These three criteria must be fulfilled. First criteria, all indicator item which shape the constructs must be normally distributed and each variable's value is less than 7 for curtosis and skewness values in +2 till -2 (Byrne, 2009).

Second, loading factor to all indicators must have at least 0.5 (Table II) and third, model must have acceptable fit range (Table III). The result of full model has filled these criteria to remove the outliers. Composite reliability (CR) is employed to investigate the measurement reliability. CR coefficient value is between 0.84 – 0.87, above the accepetable degree 0.70 (Hair, 2010) (Table II). AVE value is between 0.55 – 0.61. These coefficient values must be above the cut off values which are recommended as 0.50. Loading item ranges between 0.63 – 0.9, and it is also above the recommended cut off value 0.50 and the result shows reliable convergent validity (Hair, 2010).

Table III
Parameter of The Model

Fit Item	Measurement Model	Standard for Acceptance
χ^2	113.4	NA
DF	74	NA
p-values	0.04	<0.05
CMIN/DF	1.6	<2
GFI	0.96	>0.9
CFI	0.97	>0.9
TLI	0.97	>0.9
IFI	0.98	>0.9
RMSEA	0.04	<0.08

Source: Computed by Researcher

Hypotheses Testing

Table IV shows that the hypothesized relationship between cultural control and organizational performance is not supported by the data. Both Kallunki et al. (2010) and Chapman & Kihn (2009) disagree with this conclusion. H2 and H3 are accepted because of the consensus that cultural control has a major impact on both organizational and social capital innovation. By fostering an atmosphere that inspires innovation and the growth of social capital inside a company, cultural control enhances current capabilities. This discovery demonstrates how value management will have an effect on business tactics.It agrees with the findings of Malagueo and Bisbe (2010) that demonstrate how cultural management may improve an organization's performance (Henri, 2006; Grafton et al., 2010). In other words, a creative organization and strong social capital will result from employees' understanding of corporate principles, their peers' activities, and the ethical code, the transmission of organizational values to the whole employee body,and the establishment of a favorable atmosphere. The results back up the claim that there is a correlation between cultural control and organizational innovation at 0.23 (p0.001) and a correlation between cultural control and social capital at 0.30 (p0.001).

Another encouraging finding from this research is the evidence of a substantial correlation between the various skills. Organizational innovation, as well as social capital and performance, will serve as proxies for this connection. This conclusion is backed up by the results of the output test, which show a correlation between organizational creativity and performance of 0.34 (p0.001) and a correlation between social capital and performance of 0.32 (p0.001). Since this firm has a competitive advantage and the values will be continuously performed (Amabile et al., 1996;

Gaynor, 1996), our findings are consistent with those of Dibrell et al. (2008), who state that creativity will influence organizational performance, by creating customers' values added and values in use (Souder and Sherman, 1994).

Another finding is that the performance of an organization is not directly affected by cultural control. In other words, the capacity variable will mediate the connection between cultural control and performance.

Table IV
Output Result

Hypotheses	Autonomous variables	External variables	Loading	Test result
H1	Performance	Cultural	0.26	not accepted
H2	Creativity	Cultural	0.24***	Accepted
H3	Capital	Cultural	0.31**	Accepted
H4	Performance	Organizational	0.33***	Accepted
H5	Performance	Social capital	0.31***	Accepted

Source: Computed by Researcher

CONCLUSION

Improved organizational performance among Bangalore's batik business owners is the study's overarching goal, and it does so by examining the connection between cultural control and capacity as it manifests in organizational capability and social capital. In light of these considerations, this research creates a pathway model and puts it to the test empirically via the use of survey data collected from 287 owners and managers of batik businesses in Bangalore.

Organizational creativity and social capital are used as proxies for competence in this research, and they are shown to have a substantial association with cultural control. The research also found that there is a positive and statistically significant link between organizational capabilities and performance. However, the causal link between cultural control and organizational effectiveness cannot be shown here. Capability, therefore, acts as a moderator between cultural command and organizational effectiveness.

There are two new insights gained from this research. As a first step, we demonstrate that there is a mediating component in the link between cultural control and organizational performance. Second, it helps to close a gap in the literature by examining the connection between cultural control and organizational performance in emerging.

REFERENCES

[1] Abernethy MA and Chua WF. (1996). A field study of control system "redesign": the impact of institutional processes on strategic choice. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 13(2):569–606.

[2] Abernethy, M. A. and Brownell, P. (1997). Management Control Systems In Research And Development Organizations: the role of accounting, behavior and personnel controls. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 24,189–204.

[3] Abernethy, M. A. and Stoelwinder, J. IJ. (1995). The role of professional control in the management of complex organizations, *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 20, 1-18.

[4] Ahuja, G.(2000). Collaboration networks, structural holes, and innovation: A longitudinal study. *Administration Science Quarterly*. 45, 425-455.

[5] Amabile, T. M., Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J. and Herron, M. (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(5), 1154–1184.

[6] Anthony RN and Govindarajan V. (2007). *Management Control Systems*. Chicago: McGraw-Hill Irwin. Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120.

[7] Bisbe, J. and Otley, D. (2004). The effects of the interactive use of management control systems on product innovation. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 29, 709–737.

[8] Bonner, J. M., Ruekert, R. W. and Walker, O. C. (2002). Upper management control of new product development projects and project performance. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 19(3), 233-245.

[9] Bourdieu, P. (1986) *The forms of capital*. In J. Richardson (Ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, New York, Greenwood, 241-258.

[10] Byrne, B.M. (2009), S*tructural Equation Modeling with AMOS: Basic Concepts, Applications, and Programming,* Psychology Press, New York, NY.

[11] Chapman, C. S., & Kihn, L.-A. (2009). Information system integration, enabling

control and performance.
Accounting, Organizations and Society, 34(2), 151–169.

[12] Chenhall and Morris, (1995). Organic Decision and Communication Processes and Management Accounting Systems in women Entrepreneurial and Conservative Business Organizations. *Int. J. Mgmt Sci.*, 23(5), 485-497.

[13] Chenhall RH. (2003). Management control systems design within its organizational context: findings from contingency-based research and directions for the future. *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 28, 127– 68.

[14] Collier, P. M. (2005). women Entrepreneurial control and the construction of a relevant accounting. *Management Accounting Research*, 16, 321– 339.

Cravens, D. W., Lassk, F. G., Low, G. S., Marshall, G. W. and Moncrief, W. C. (2004). Formal and informal management control combinations in sales organizations: the impact on salesperson consequences. *Journal of Business Research* 57, 241– 248.

[15] Danneels, E. (2002). The dynamics of product innovation and firm competencies. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23, 1095– 1121.

[16] Davila, A., Foster, G. and Oyon, D., (2009). Accounting and Control, Women women Entrepreneurship and Innovation: Venturing into New Research Opportunities. *European Accounting Review*, 18 (2), 281-311.

[17] Dibrell, C., Davis, P. S & Craig, J. (2008). Fueling Innovation through Information Technology in SMEs. *Journal ofSmall BusinessManagement*, 46 (2).

[18] Ditillo, A. (2004). Dealing with uncertainty in knowledge-intensive firms: the role of management control systems as knowledge integration mechanisms. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 29(3–4), 401– 421.

[19] Fukuyama, F (1995). *Trust: The social Virtues and the creation of prosperity*, New York: the Free Press.

[20] Fukuyama, F (2000). Social capital and civil society. *Paper presented at the conference on second generation reforms IMF Headquarters*,Washington, D. C.

[21] Gaynor G.H. (1996). *Handbook of Technology Management*. McGraw-Hill. New York. USA.

[22] Govindarajan, V. & Fisher, J. (1990).Strategy, control systems and resource sharing: effects on business unit performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33, 259–285.

[23] Grafton, J., Lillis, A. M.& Widener, S. K. (2010). The role of performance and evaluation in building organizational capabilities and performance. *Accounting, Organizations and Society,* 35, 689-706,

[24] Grootaert, C., Narayan, D., Jones, V.N & woolcock, M. (2003). Integrated questionnaire for the measurement of social capital (SC-IQ). Washington, DC: *The World Bank, Retrieved*, January, 2004.

[25] Merchant, K.A. and Otley, D.T. (2006). A review of the literature on control and accountability. In Chapman, C. Hopwood, A. and Shield, M. (Eds.). *The handbook of management accounting research.* Elsevier Press.

[26] Meutia. (2012). *women Entrepreneurial development of social competence to increase competitive advantage and business performance of SMEs',*UNDIP, Semarang.

[27] Meyer, J. and Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized Organizations: formal structure as myth and ceremony. *TheAmerican Journal of Sociology*, 23(2), 340- 363.

[28] Miller, D. and Friesen, P. H. (1982). Innovation in conservative and women Entrepreneurial firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 3 (1), 1–25.

[29] Modityang, D.B.K (2007). *A Bayesian believe network computational model of social capital in virtual communities.* Summary of dissertation, university of Saskatchwan.

[30] Munandar, S.C.U,. (1985). *Developing Talent and Creativity School Children: A Guide For Parents and Teachers*.
Jakarta: Grasindo.

[31] Olsen, R.W. 1996. *Art of Creative Thinking: A Practical Guide.* Jakarta: Erlangga.

[32] Orlikowsky, W. J. (1991). Integrated information environment or matrix of control? The contradictory implications of information technology. *Accounting, Management and Information Technologies*,9-42.

[33] Otley, D. T. (1980). The contingency theory of

management accounting: achievement and prognosis, *Accounting Organizations and Society*, 5(4), 413–428.

[34] Ouchi, W. (1980). Markets, bureaucracies and clans, Administrative Science Quarterly,.

[35] Putnam, R. D. (1993). *Making democracy work: Civic traditions in modern Italy*. Princeton NJ: PrincetonUniversity Press.

[36] Putnam, R. D., (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collpase and Revival of American Community,* New York: Simon andSchuster.

[37] Putnam, Robert D. and Kristin A. Gross. (2002). *Introduction." Democracies in Flux: The Evolution of Social Capital in Contemporary Society* , New York, NY: OxfordUniversity Press.

[38] Revellino, S. and Mouritsen, J. (2009). The Multiplicity of Controls and the Making of Innovation, *European Accounting Review*, 18(2), 341-369.

[39] Rockness, H. and Shields, M. (1988). An empirical analysis of the expenditure budget in research and development, *Contemporary Accounting Research*, 4, 568–581.

[40] Simons, R. (1995) *Levers of control. Boston*:Harvard Business School Press.

[41] Sodano, V., Hingley, M. & Lindgreen, A. (2008). The usefulness of social capital in assessing the welfare effects of private and third party certification fod safety policy standards. *British Food Journal*, 110 (.4/5), 493-513.

[42] Souder, W. E. and Sherman, J. D. (1994). *Managing New Technology Development*, McGraw Hill Inc.

[43] Stam, W. & Elfering, T. (2008). women Entrepreneurial orientation and new venture performance: The moderating role of intra-and extra Women women Entrepreneurs social capital. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51 (1), 97-111.