

THE IMPACT OF (OPPORTUNITY AND NECESSITY) ENTREPRENEURSHIP ON ECONOMIC GROWTH: DOES HUMAN CAPITAL MATTER?

Daniela Ribeiro Rodrigues

Dissertation Master in Management

Supervised by: Aurora Amélia Castro Teixeira

June 2018

Biographic note

Daniela Ribeiro Rodrigues was born in Vila Nova de Famalicão and raised in Santo Tirso. She obtained her BA in Economics from the School of Economics and Management of the University of Porto (FEP) in 2015. In the same year, she worked in a hotel in Bournemouth, United Kingdom, while she was taking an intensive English course.

After she get graduated, she started working in a multinational company called SONAE where she stayed 9 months learning how to be a stocks manager for the retail industry. In 2016, Daniela decided to start a Double Degree in Master in Management in FEP and Kedge Business School in Marseille. Additionally, in 2017 she started working in a multinational company called Deloitte as Analyst in the Global investment and Innovation Incentives team.

She is a proactive, versatile and self-motivated youth with a strong orientation towards teamwork and results. From an early age, she was passionate about the business world, enterprising and creative. Besides academic and professional world, she spends her time to charitable causes.

Acknowledgments

First of all, I would like to sincerely express my gratitude towards my supervisor, Aurora Teixeira, for all her commitment and support given throughout this incredible journey. She is, undoubtedly, very talented and skilled and one of the brightest minds I had the honor to work with. Thank you very much for your patience and helpfull insights.

I would also like to thank my family, for providing me with continuous support and encouragement throughout these intense academic years of study. You are the reason why I incessantly search for new enrich opportunities.

To my dear friends, specially those from MiM and Double Degree in Management from FEP and Kedge, an huge thank you for all the good times which gave me pleasent memories and for all the hours spent working and studying together. Specially, to my friends José Diogo and Tiago, for all this year and the final support in revising my thesis. Above all, to my love, Luís, who encouraged me everyday and made me believe in my skills. This is also yours.

Finally, to my colleagues at Deloitte who shared this past year with me and gave me all the support needed throughout the difficult times, as well as, encouragement to the final steps.

Abstract

Entrepreneurship is generally defined as the creation of new firms and according to literature, it is the process by which new enterprises are founded and become viable. Although considerable research has been devoted to the study of the impact of entrepreneurship on economic growth, fewer studies have analyzed the impact of the types (opportunity vs necessity) of entrepreneurship on economic growth. Moreover, the latter set of studies overlooked the relevance of human capital as mediating factor in the relation between (types of) entrepreneurship and economic growth.

The aim of the present study was to fill in the above mentioned gap, by assessing the extent to which the direct and indirect impact of (the types of) entrepreneurship, via human capital, matters for countries' economic growth.

In methodological terms, we resort to fixed effects panel data estimations, involving a large set of (OECD and non-OECD) countries, over a relatively long time span (1990-2016).

The results suggest that total entrepreneurship have a positive impact on economic growth. Distinguishing between types of entrepreneurship, there is clear evidence that opportunity entrepreneurship fosters economic growth, whereas necessity entrepreneurship inhibits it. Interestingtly, human capital tends to mitigate the negative impact of necessity entrepreneurship on economic growth. In the case of opportunity entrepreneurship, the direct positive impact observed is reduced in contexts characterized by high levels of human capital, which might reflect increased opportunity costs.

Keywords: Human Capital; Economic Growth; Panel Data; Entrepreneurship; Impact.

JEL Codes: C23 J24 L26 O4

Resumo

O empreendedorismo é geralmente definido como a criação de novas empresas e, de acordo com a literatura, é o processo pelo qual novas empresas são criadas e se tornam sustentáveis. Um considerável número de pesquisas estudou o impacto do empreendedorismo no crescimento económico. Contudo, poucos desses estudos analisaram o impacto dos tipos (oportunidade versus necessidade) de empreendedorismo no crescimento económico. Além disso, o último conjunto de estudos ignorou a relevância do capital humano como fator intermediário na relação entre o (tipo de) empreendedorismo e crescimento económico.

O presente estudo tem como objetivo ultrapassar a lacuna acima mencionada, avaliando até que ponto o impacto direto e indireto do (tipo de) empreendedorismo, via capital humano, é importante para o crescimento económico dos países.

Em termos metodológicos, recorremos a estimações de dados em painel envolvendo um conjunto alargado de (OCDE e não-OCDE) países num extenso período de tempo (1990-2016).

Os resultados sugerem que o empreendedorismo global apresenta um impacto positivo no crescimento económico. Distinguindo os tipos de empreendedorismo, há claras evidências de que o empreendedorismo de oportunidade apresenta um impacto positivo no crescimento económico enquanto que o empreendedorismo de necessidade inibe o crescimento económico.

De forma interessante, o capital humano tende a mitigar o impacto negativo do empreendedorismo de necessidade sobre o crescimento económico. No caso do empreendedorismo de oportunidade, o impacto direto positivo fica reduzido em contextos caracterizados por elevados níveis de capital humano, o que pode ser influenciado pelo aumento dos custos de oportunidade.

Palavras-chave: Capital Humano; Crescimento Económico; Dados em Painel; Empreendedorismo; Impacto.

Códigos JEL: C23 J24 L26 O4

Index of contents

Biographic note ii
Acknowledgments iii
Abstractiv
Resumov
Index of contentsvi
List of tables
List of figures viii
1. Introduction1
2. The relation between (types of) entrepreneurship, human capital and economic growth: a literature review
2.1. Defining the key concepts
2.1.1 Entrepreneurship and types of entrepreneurship
2.1.2. Human capital4
2.2. Entrepreneurship, human capital and economic growth: main theoretical mechanisms and hypotheses to be tested
2.2.1. The direct impact of entrepreneurship and types of entrepreneurship on economic growth
4
2.2.2. The direct and indirect impact of human capital on economic growth
2.2.3. Other determinants of economic growth
3. Methodological aspects
3.1. Main hypotheses and method of analysis12
3.2. Econometric specification and selection of the estimation technique13
3.3. Variable proxies, data collection and sources15
4. Empirical results
4.1. Brief descriptive analysis of the relevant variables20
4.2. Estimation results
Conclusions
References
Annexes

List of tables

Table 1: Selected studies on the impact of (the types of) entrepreneurship on economic growth	9
Table 2: Description of the variables and data sources	18
Table 3: Models' specifications	19
Table 4: Descriptive analysis, Correlation Matrix and VIF test	26
Table 5: Panel data fixed effects estimations (robust errors): dependent variable - GDP per capit	ita 30

Table A 1: List of Countries	45
Table A 2: Number of observations per country	47
Table A 3: Human Capital values for the period between 1990 and 2016	49
Table A 4: TE values for the period between 2001 and 2016	52
Table A 5: OE values for the period between 2005 and 2015	54
Table A 6: NE values for the period between 2001 and 2015	56

List of figures

Figure 1: Evolution of Gross Domestic Product per capita, 1990-2016	20
Figure 2: Evolution of Total Entrepreneurship, by continents	21
Figure 3: Evolution of Opportunity Entrepreneurship, by continents	22
Figure 4: Evolution of the share of employers, by continents	22
Figure 5: Evolution of necessity entrepreneurship, by continents Source: Stata v14 program	ı (data from
GEM)	23
Figure 6: Evolution of self-employment, by continents Source: Stata v14 program (data f	from World
Bank Indicators)	24
Figure 7: Human Capital evolution by continents	25

1. Introduction

Entrepreneurship plays an increasingly important role throughout the world and it has been considered an important mechanism to achieve economic growth (Stam & van Stel, 2009; Urbano & Aparício, 2016). It promotes economic growth and development by enabling the introduction of innovations, by fostering competition and change, and by increasing rivalry (Wong, Ho & Autio, 2005; Vivarelli 2013). The impact of entrepreneurship on economic development has received considerable attention over the years by recognized and distinguished authors (e.g., Carree & Thurik, 2003; Valliere & Peterson, 2009; Ferreira, Fayolle, Fernandes & Raposo, 2017).

Taking into account the importance of entrepreneurship and despite the well-known challenges and risk involved in the entrepreneurial process, governments increasingly deploy incentives and support programs to encourage and stimulate individuals to become entrepreneurs (McConnell, McFarland, & Common, 2011; Stephan, Uhlaner, & Stride, 2015).

There is no generally accepted definition of entrepreneurship (Van Praag, 1999; Mahoney & Michael, 2004; Thurik & Wennekers, 2004; Reynolds, Camp, Bygrave, Autio & Hay 2005). It can be defined, in a stricter sense, as the creation of new enterprises (Reynolds, 1999; Wong et al., 2005), more rigorously, the process by which new enterprises are founded and become feasible (Szirmai, Naudé, & Goedhuys 2011; Acs, Audretsch, Braunerhjelm, & Carlsson, 2012; Vivarelli, 2013) or, in a broader understanding, as the process by which individuals take advantage and pursue opportunities (Szirmai et al., 2011).

Currently, some dispute exists on whether and which types of entrepreneurship (necessity vs opportunity) matters most for economic growth and development (Reynolds, Camp, Bygrave, Autio & Hay, 2002; Urbano & Aparicio, 2016). 'Opportunity entrepreneurship' occurs when individuals want to take advantage of a unique market opportunity and it is related to innovative entrepreneurship; in contrast, 'necessity entrepreneurship' results from market friction and it is generally related to non-innovative firms (Reynolds et al., 2005; Urbano & Aparicio, 2016). Analyzing a panel with 43 (25 OECD and 18 non-OECD) countries over the period from 2002 to 2012, Urbano & Aparicio (2016) evidenced that both opportunity and necessity entrepreneurship are significantly related to high levels of economic growth; notwithstanding, the effect of necessity entrepreneurship is smaller than that of opportunity entrepreneurship. In contrast, other studies (e.g., Wong et al., 2005; Zali,

Faghih, Ghotbi, & Rajaie, 2013) indicate that relationships between necessity-driven entrepreneurship and economic growth are insignificant or negative, while the relationship between opportunity-driven entrepreneurship and growth is positive.

Although many specific studies related to entrepreneurship and economic growth have been made (see Carree & Thurik, 2003; Wong et al., 2005; Valliere & Peterson, 2009; Acs et al., 2012), no evidence seems to exist on how, over time, the type of entrepreneurship, intermediated by human capital, impacts on a given country's economic growth. We content that the creation of new enterprises might not be in itself sufficient for fostering economic growth; rather, investment in human capital might be necessary to reap or is likely to enhance the benefits of entrepreneurship and, ultimately, create, maintain and ensure sustainable economic growth (Enayati, 2007; Acs et al., 2012; Čadil, Petkovová, & Blatná, 2014).

Using panel data econometric estimation techniques, the present study aims to assess the direct and indirect (through human capital) impacts of (the types of) entrepreneurship on economic growth.

This dissertation is organized as follows. In a first section, a comprehensive literature review is presented, including the definition of the concepts of entrepreneurship, types of entrepreneurship, and human capital. Then, we detail the mechanisms by which these determinants impact on economic growth and put forward the study's main hypotheses. Section 3 presents the methodology pursued, while in Section 4 it is discussed the empirical results. Finally, Section 5 presents the main conclusions and limitations of the study as well as some paths for future research.

2. The relation between (types of) entrepreneurship, human capital and economic growth: a literature review

2.1. Defining the key concepts

2.1.1 Entrepreneurship and types of entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship is generally defined as the creation of new firms and according to literature, it is the process by which new enterprises are founded and become feasible (Reynolds, 1999; Wong et al., 2005; Valliere & Peterson, 2009; Braunerhjelm, Acs, Audretsch & Carlsson, 2010; Acs et al., 2012; Vivarelli, 2013). As result of new firms' formation, Urbano & Aparício (2016) state that entrepreneurship is the process of new jobs creation.

A broader definition of the term lead us to consider entrepreneurship as the discovery and exploitation of innovation and opportunities through the development of new products, new processes, new sources of supply, as well as the exploitation of new markets and economic activities (Davidsson et al. 2006; Santarelli & Vivarelli 2007; Audretsch & Keilbach, 2008, Bosma & Levie 2010; Braunerhjelm et al., 2010; Ferreira et al., 2017).

Distinguished authors presented in their studies two different types of entrepreneurship: the opportunity and necessity entrepreneurship (Carree & Thurik, 2003; Reynolds et al., 2005; Zali et al., 2013; Urbano & Aparicio, 2016; Ferreira et al., 2017).

Necessity entrepreneurship occurs when individuals set up a business because they have no better option for work. This type of entrepreneurship results from market friction and it is related to non-innovative firms (Urbano & Aparicio, 2016). In contrast, opportunity entrepreneurship occurs when adults set up a business or owning-managing a young firm that is motivated to pursue perceived business opportunities (Reynolds et al., 2005; Urbano & Aparicio, 2016; Ferreira et al., 2017).

Differently to necessity entrepreneurship, opportunity entrepreneurship is usually related to innovative firms (Urbano & Aparicio, 2016) being driven by pull motivations (Zali et al., 2013). According to Carree & Thurik (2003), the opportunity entrepreneur is an innovator that create entrepreneurial initiatives and, based on their knowledge, perceive a profit opportunity taking the risk that the product or venture may turn out to be a failure (Ferreira et al., 2017). On the other hand, necessity entrepreneurs tend to be more motivated by monetary rewards and driven by push motivations (Zali et al., 2013).

2.1.2. Human capital

"The most valuable of all capital is that invested in human beings." (Alfred Marshall (1920), Principles of Economics)

Human capital reveals itself as a vague and somewhat complex concept that is referred for a long period of time, and has been one of the most addressed issues in the current societies (Teixeira, 1999; Folloni & Vittadini, 2010).

The concept of human capital emerged in the 1960s, created by Theodore W. Schultz and it was developed and popularized by Gary Becker. For Schultz (1961), human capital is an indispensable factor for economic growth in organizations. It is composed by characteristics of the human being namely, their productive capacities that can result from the education/training they have acquired. Human capital is the set of knowledge, skills, attitudes and experiences, present in people that make up the organization and that in association, allows to provide a competitive differential, through creativity, innovation, motivation and resolution of possible conflicts (Bontis, 1998; Schultz, 1961). Also, according to Becker (1962), human capital should be understood as the skills that an individual acquires throughout his/her life, whose acquisition comes from experience, professional training, health and, above all, formal education.

Reinforcing the previous idea, Becker (1993) says that knowledge is implied in the characteristics and values of individuals. Therefore, education and training, in agreement with Schultz (1981), are the main sources of investment in human capital. Later, following Schultz's (1961) contributions, several authors showed that human capital is a critical driver of productivity and its accumulation is a requisite for economic growth (Benhabib & Spiegel, 1994; Enayati, 2007).

2.2. Entrepreneurship, human capital and economic growth: main theoretical mechanisms and hypotheses to be tested

2.2.1. The direct impact of entrepreneurship and types of entrepreneurship on economic growth

Entrepreneurship is important, especially in contemporary economies because it has high impact on their growth through innovation (Carree & Thurik, 2003; Mrożewski & Kratzer, 2017).

The neoclassical theory started to identify the investment in physical capital and labor as driving factors of economic growth, however it does not explicitly address the issue of entrepreneurship as a cause for technological innovation in a Schumpeterian context (Solow, 1956; Wong et al., 2005, Urbano & Aparicio, 2016). Besides, the endogenous growth theory, initially proposed by Romer (1990), underlined some aspects of entrepreneurship by highlighting that the process of invention and accumulation of knowledge is an additional critical driver to economic growth (Wong et al., 2005).

Schumpeter contributed for the study of entrepreneurship, when recovering the image of the entrepreneur in the economy as the main promoter of economic development, thanks to his/her innovation and ability to make new combinations of productive resources (Lambing & Kuehl, 2007; Fontenele, 2010). He put forward the idea that entrepreneur is at the center of the process of economic growth. According to Schumpeter (1934) the idea of social capacity, i.e. an entrepreneurial behavior, should be used as a key factor to drive economic development since an entrepreneurial activity leads to the process of creative destruction when being the cause of agitations that create opportunities for economic rent (Wong et al., 2005; Urbano & Aparício, 2016). Schumpeter's theory predicts that an increase in the number of entrepreneurs fosters economic growth (Schumpeter, 1942; Wong et al. 2005). Schumpeterian type of models attributes special attention and recognition to innovation as a source of economic development (Wong et al., 2005). Recent studies in this line draw attention to entrepreneurship as a driver of economic growth and a set of them include it as a fourth production factor in the production function (Audretsch & Keilbach, 2004; Stam & van Stel, 2009).

From the viewpoint of evolutionary economics, entrepreneurs bring new ideas to markets and stimulate growth through a process of competitive firm selection (Wong et al., 2005). Indeed, they facilitate the reallocation of resources from less to more productive uses by performing "cost-discovery", "gap-filling", and "input-completing" functions in the economy and by supporting structural changes (Wong et al., 2005).

Despite the above referred theoretical importance, entrepreneurship is a missing link in most empirical studies that aim to explain the drivers to economic growth. Taking into account Schumpeter's work and theory, subsequent empirical literature arose and included the idea of innovation as a source of economic development (Wong et al., 2005; Urbano & Aparício, 2016; Ferreira et al., 2017). Entrepreneurs are the ones who respond to opportunities, threats, uncertainties, constraints, and incentives emanating from the economic environment in which they operate (Szirmai et al., 2011). This puts entrepreneurship at the heart of economic growth, development, and catching-up (Szirmai et al., 2011). Entrepreneurship also contributes to economic development by introducing innovations, creating change, creating competition and enhancing rivalry, which involves the development of new products, new processes, new sources of supply and also the exploitation of new markets and the development of new ways to organize businesses (Wong et al., 2005).

Several authors (e.g., Acs et al., 2012; Urbano & Aparício, 2016; Ferreira et al., 2017) demonstrate that overall entrepreneurship is positively related to economic growth (see Table 1). According to Acs et al. (2012), when using ideas that in other ways might not use and introducing them into the market through the creation of a new firm, entrepreneurship is shown to positively influence economic growth. Urbano & Aparício (2016) found that the overall total entrepreneurial activity (TEA) is higher in OECD countries than in non-OECD countries and it is higher in a post-crisis period than in a crisis period (Urbano & Aparício, 2016). Ferreira et al. (2017), considering Schumpeterian and Kirzenian approaches to entrepreneurship, reported that the overall entrepreneurship holds a statistically significant influence on the global competitiveness index (the proxy for economic growth). Valliere & Peterson (2009) evidence that high-expectation entrepreneurs are positively associated with growth in developed countries. In contrast, Wong et al. (2005) did not find support that higher levels of overall entrepreneurship are associated with higher GDP growth rates. However, they found that high growth potential entrepreneurship have a significant impact on economic growth (Wong et al., 2005).

Taking the above into account, we conjecture that:

Hypothesis 1: Entrepreneurship affects positively countries' economic growth.

Entrepreneurship can be divided into two main sub-categories (Zali et al., 2013; Urbano & Aparicio, 2016; Ferreira et al., 2017): opportunity and necessity entrepreneurship. Wong et al. (2005) state that opportunity entrepreneurship is related to higher rates of growth because its rates reflect the existence of an economic rent that ideally arises from implementing or creating knowledge and technology. Additionally, and according to Audretsch et al. (2008)

cited by Urbano & Aparicio (2016), entrepreneurs take knowledge-based opportunities and develop them into new products, which affect positively on countries' economic performance. In this same line of reasoning, Reynolds et al. (2005) state that opportunity entrepreneurship is the net result of individual decisions to pursue entrepreneurial activities based on knowledge, and in this way is associated with innovation. Such innovation led perspective of opportunity entrepreneurship reflect the creation of knowledge and technology influencing positively economic growth (Valliere & Peterson, 2009; Urbano & Aparício, 2016). To Ferreira et al. (2017) opportunity-based or Kirzerian entrepreneurship positively influences labor productivity growth, suggesting a positive relation between opportunity entrepreneurship and economic growth.

In the study of Mrożewski & Kratzer (2017), it was found that a high share of opportunity entrepreneurship has a positive influence on technological progress. In this case, we should give special attention to opportunity entrepreneurship as an important driver of innovation that leads to an increase on economic growth (Mrożewski & Kratzer, 2017).

Contrasting with the above evidence, Wong et al. (2005), when studying lower-income nations, failed to encounter a significant relation between opportunity entrepreneurship and economic growth. Such absence can be explained, according to Wong et al. (2005), by the presence of economic rents derived from market imperfections.

Taking into account the theoretical and empirical contributions summarized above, we conjecture that:

Hypothesis 2a: Opportunity entrepreneurship affects positively countries' economic growth.

Regarding necessity entrepreneurship, Urbano & Aparicio (2016) reported that individuals who are motivated by the necessity due to bad work conditions, such as unemployment, tend to possess fewer endowments, most notably human capital and entrepreneurial capability. These authors found, nevertheless, that necessity entrepreneurship is positively related to economic growth, given its impact on employment. In contrast, Wong et al. (2005) did not found significant statistical relation between necessity entrepreneurship and economic growth. According to Mrożewski & Kratzer (2017), a high share of necessity entrepreneurship is negatively related to innovation. In this case, the authors found that necessity entrepreneurship has a negative impact on economic development (Mrożewski & Kratzer, 2017).

Albeit affecting positively economic growth, Urbano & Aparicio (2016) found that necessity entrepreneurship tends to reflect a lower value creation and, thus, produces smaller impact on economic growth when compared to opportunity entrepreneurship.

In this context, we conjecture that:

Hypothesis 2b: Necessity entrepreneurship affects positively countries' economic growth.

and

Hypothesis 2c: The impact of opportunity entrepreneurship on countries' economic growth is higher than that of necessity entrepreneurship.

2.2.2. The direct and indirect impact of human capital on economic growth

Several authors (e.g., Barro, 1991; Mankiw et al., 1992; Hanushek & Woessmann, 2008; Hanushek 2013) have studied the impact of human capital on economic growth. The general conclusion is that this factor is a critical driver of countries' economic growth.

Human capital encompasses the set of intangible resources inherent to the labor factor that improves its productivity, being associated with the knowledge and skills acquired by individuals through education, experience and health care (Schultz, 1961; Becker 1962). The increase in schooling allows individuals to become more productive and innovative, leading to improvements in the factor productivity (Romer, 1990; Benhabib & Spiegel, 1994, Bodman & Le, 2013).

At the aggregate, country, level, the improvements achieved in labor productivity through human capital result in enhanced economic growth (Barro, 1991; Benhabib & Spiegel, 1994; Sianesi e Reenen, 2003; Hanushek & Woessmann, 2008).

Considering the above, we conjecture that:

Hypothesis 3: Human capital positively impacts on countries' economic growth.

Author	Countries	Time Frame	Mathadalaary	Dependent	Data Source	Independent variable		Data Source Independent variable		Data Source	Results	regarding entrep	reneurship		
Autior	Countries	Time-Frame	Methodology	variable	Data Source		Independent variable	Data Source	Overall	Opportunity	Necessity				
								Core variable	Entrepreneurship	OECD, Statistical Compendium via Internet (Labor Market Statistics)					
							Gross domestic expenditure on Research & Development (R&D) as percentage of gross domestic product (GDP)	OECD, Statistical Compendium via Internet (Industry Science and Technology)							
							Education	Penn World tables							
			Davidson and	5 year moving	OECD, Statistical Compendium via	1	cal ria	DECD, Statistical Compendium via	stical	Government expenditures as % of GDP	OECD, Statistical Compendium via Internet (Historical Statistics)				
Acs, Audretsch, Braunerhjelm & Carlsson (2012)	18 countries	1981 to 1998, 1990 to 1998	Mackinnon (1993) test of exogeneity and standard fixed effects model	average of gross domestic product growth per capita	Internet, (National Accounts vol. 1, and own	Other variables	Capital stock/employment	OECD, Statistical Compendium via Internet (OECD Economic Outlook Stat & Proj)	+++	N/A	N/A				
					calculations)		Total population living in urban areas	World Bank (2002), World Development Indicators CDROM							
									Age	Values only available for 1978, 1985, 1990, 1994 and 1998. Values in between are approximated by assuming constant change between the years					
									Unemployment	OECD, Statistical Compendium via Internet (National Accounts and Historical Statistics)					
					World	Core variables		Overall entrepreneurial activity							
							Opportunity TEA	Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM)	۶Ľ						
	43 countries:						variables	Necessity TEA	(OLM)						
Lubana 8-	25 OECD		Data Estimation	Cross domostia		World	World			Gross capital formation (in ln)					
Aparicio (2016)	18 non-	2002 to 2012	in Panel with	product (GDP)	Indicators (WDI)	Development Indicators (WDI) by World Bank <i>Other</i> <i>variables</i>	Government consumption (in ln)		+++	+++	++				
	OECD		Tixed Effects		by World Bank		Savings (in ln)	World Development Indicators							
							Population ages 15-64	(WDI) by world bank							
							Age								
						Core variables	New Firm Creation – measured by High Potential TEA, Necessity TEA, Opportunity TEA and overall TEA rates	Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM)							
Wore Ho 8-		1007/1008 ***	Lingarloot	Crowth in CDD	P World Economic Outlook by the International Monetary Fund (MAD)	orld Economic utlook by the nternational onetary Fund (MF)	World Economic Outlook by the	orld Economic outlook by the	'orld Economic Dutlook by the	World Economic Outlook by the	Base year GDP per Worker	Euromonitor Global. Market			
Autio (2005)	37 countries	2001/2002	squares regression	per worker			Growth in Capital per worker	Information Database (GMID)	N/A	0	0				
					(1111)	variavies	Technological Innovation intensity	US Patents and Trademark Office (USPTO)							

Table 1: Selected studies on the impact of (the types of) entrepreneurship on economic growth

Author	Countries	Time Frame	Mathadalagy	Dependent	Data Source	Independent variable		Data Source	Results	regarding entrep	reneurship								
Author	Countries	1 іте-гтате	Methodology	variable	Data Source		Independent variable	Data Source	Overall	Opportunity	Necessity								
					Organization for Economic Co-	Core	Schumpeterian entrepreneurship (INNOV)												
				GDP growth (GDP_GR)	operation and	variable	Kirzenian entrepreneurship (OPP)	Global Entrepreneurship Monitor											
				(001_00)	Development and World Bank		Total Early-Stage Entrepreneurial Activity (TEA)	(OLM)											
Forming				Global	World Economic		Foreign direct investment (FDI)												
Fayolle,	49-56	2009 to 2011;	Data Estimation	Index (GCI)	Forum		Net goods exports (NET_EXP)	International Monetary Fund	+++		NI/A								
Fernandes & Raposo (2017)	countries	2012; 2013	Fixed Effects		International Labor Organization,	Other variables	Gross capital formation (GCF)	Organization for Economic Co- operation and Development and World Bank			11/11								
				Labor productivity (LP)	Organization for Economic Co- operation and	Organization for Economic Co-		Life expectancy at birth (L_EXP)	United Nations										
							Total population (POP)	United Ivations											
					and World Bank		Rural population (RURAL _POP)	United Nations and World Bank											
				GDP growth rate (GDPG)	Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM)		Overall entrepreneurial activity												
							ł	l		Core variahles	Opportunity TEA	Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM)							
								Necessity TEA				ł							
							Annual GDP growth rate			ļ									
	44 countries (20 emerging and 24	2004 to 2005				Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM)	Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM)		One-year lagged value of GDPG]									
Valliere & Peterson (2009)			Hierarchical regression					Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM)	Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM)	Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM)	Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM)	Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM)	Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM)	Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM)		Per-capita GDP, purchasing power parity		+	+
	developed)								Other variables	Per-capita foreign direct investment company spending on R&D	Global Competitiveness Reports								
													Intellectual property protection						
							Firm-level technology absorption												
							Several others												
							Necessity entrepreneurship												
						Core	Opportunity entrepreneurship	Global Entrepreneurship Monitor											
						variables	Entrepreneurial opportunity availability (EOA)	(GEM)											
Mrożewski &	06 countries	2001 – 2012,	Linear regression	Country	World Economic		Country-level innovation (GCI innovation)		NI / A										
Kratzer (2017)	90 countries	2006 - 2013	(OLS)	innovativeness	Forum		Country size (POP)		11/11	++									
							Other	Quality of human capital (EDUC)	C) World Bank										
								variables	variables	variables	variables	variables	variables	variables	variables	Openness to international capital flows (FDI)			
								Quality of institutional environment	1										

Legend: +++ (++) (+) [(---) (-) (-)] statistically and positively [negatively] significant at 1% (5%) (10%); 0: not significant; N/A: not applicable. Source: Own elaboration.

Given that entrepreneurship is highly dependent on human capital attributes of entrepreneurs (Marvel, Davis & Sproul, 2016), the impact of the former on economic growth is likely to be intermediated by countries' endowments in terms of education, experience and skills.

Such contribution tends to be even greater when the absorption and innovation capacity of a country is more intense (Nelson & Phelps, 1966), usually translated into higher levels of opportunity entrepreneurship. The more educated individuals are the greater is their ability to overcome social obstacles and take advantages of business opportunities that emerge and to deal with the risks and uncertainty inherent to self-employment (Lackéus, 2015).

Therefore, we conjecture that:

Hypothesis 4: Human capital positively intermediates the impact of (the types of) entrepreneurship on countries' economic growth.

2.2.3. Other determinants of economic growth

A myriad of factors (beside entrepreneurship, the types of entrepreneurship, and human capital) are likely to affect countries' economic growth: physical investment (through public infrastructure capital or private sector) (Barro, 1991, 1996; Nourzad & Powell, 2003), population growth (Nourzad & Powell, 2003), trade openness (Barro, 1996; Nourzad & Powell, 2003) and corruption (Barro, 1991; Neeman & Paserman, 2008).

Several other factors were added by Barro (1996): life expectancy and fertility rates, the quantity (male secondary and higher schooling) and quality of education, expenditures in Research and Development (R&D), openness to trade, distribution of income and wealth, public policies (regarding taxes, pension and other transfer programs, and labor, financial and other markets regulations), and infrastructure investments.

3. Methodological aspects

3.1. Main hypotheses and method of analysis

The main goal of this study is to assess the impact of (the types of) entrepreneurship on economic growth, directly and indirectly through human capital. According to the literature review (Section 2), four main hypotheses are to be tested:

Hypothesis 1: Entrepreneurship affects positively countries' economic growth.

Hypothesis 2: The types of entrepreneurship affect positively countries' economic growth.

- Hypothesis 2a: Opportunity entrepreneurship affects positively countries' economic growth.
- Hypothesis 2b: Necessity entrepreneurship affects positively countries' economic growth.
- Hypothesis 2c: The impact of opportunity entrepreneurship on countries' economic growth is higher than that of necessity entrepreneurship.

Hypothesis 3: Human capital positively impacts on countries' economic growth.

Hypothesis 4: Human capital positively intermediates the impact of (the types of) entrepreneurship on countries' economic growth.

The development of rich generalizable theories might involve both quantitative and qualitative methods (Wilson, Whitmoyer, Pieper, Astrachan, Hair Jr. & Sarstedt, 2014). The present study, similar to other studies in the area (see Table 1), resorts to quantitative methods of analysis. According to Ferreira & Serra (2009), a quantitative research occurs when researchers use quantitative data about the object to be studied, and statistical tests are performed. These data can be collected directly or indirectly, through specific sources for the study to be performed (Fortin 1999; Ferreira & Serra, 2009). Using the quantitative research method, it is possible for the researcher to compare, reproduce and generalize similar situations, obtaining a greater degree of precision and objectivity given the systematization in the process of gathering data objectives and events which is independent from the researcher (Freixo, 2011).

Taking into account the studies described in Table 1, some authors chose different types of quantitative methods in order to achieve their goals. Specifically, they involve estimations using a panel fixed effects (Urbano & Aparício, 2016; Ferreira et al., 2017), hierarchical

regression (Valliere & Peterson, 2009), linear regression (OLS) (Mrożewski & Kratzer (2017), and linear least squares regression (Wong et al., 2005).

3.2. Econometric specification and selection of the estimation technique

In light of the literature reviewed (see Section 2), the baseline econometric specification regresses the level of the *per capita* Gross Domestic Product (GDPpc) against total entrepreneurship (TE), human capital (HC), the interaction between TE and HC and a set of control variables, \mathbf{X} (trade openness, physical investment, government consumption, population growth, and institutional quality). The econometric specification of the model to estimate is:

$$y_{i,t} = \beta_1 + \beta_2 T E_{i,t} + \beta_3 T E_{i,t} \cdot H C_{-} d_{i,t} + \beta_4 H C_{i,t} + \beta_5 X_{i,t} + \mu_{i,t},$$
(1)

where:

i represents the country and *t* represents time;

y represents the *per capita* Gross Domestic Product (GDPpc);

HC_d represents a dummy which assumes value 1 when HC is high (above the average) and 0 otherwise;

HC represents a measure for the stock of human capital;

TE represents a measure for the total entrepreneurship;

TE * **HC** interaction between the measures of human capital and the total entrepreneurship;

X encompasses the measures of the trade openness, physical investment, government consumption, population growth, and institutional quality;

 $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is the error term.

Along with this basic equation, an analysis is made of the impact of the types of entrepreneurship on economic growth. The extended econometric specification is similar to the baseline, but instead of considering TE, it included the opportunity entrepreneurship (OE) and necessity entrepreneurship (NE):

$$y_{i,t} = \beta'_{1} + \beta'_{2}OE_{i,t} + \beta'_{3}NE_{i,t} + \beta'_{4}OE_{i,t} \times HC_{-}d_{i,t} + \beta'_{5}NE_{i,t} \times HC_{-}d_{i,t} + \beta'_{6}HC_{i,t} + \beta'_{7}X_{i,t} + \mu'_{i,t}.$$
(2)

In the above equation, the dependent variable (y) represents the *per capita* Gross Domestic Product (GDPpc); OE represents the Opportunity Entrepreneurship and NE represents the Necessity Entrepreneurship; OE×HC_d is the interaction between human capital and the Opportunity Entrepreneurship, while NE×HC_d means the interaction between Human Capital and Necessity Entrepreneurship; μ' is the error term.

In order to estimate the effects of the relevant variables on economic growth, namely human capital and its interaction with different types of entrepreneurship, and in line with previous studies made by Urbano & Aparício (2016) and Ferreira et al. (2017), we selected panel data techniques for estimating the econometric specification described above.

It is important to bear in mind that when the described data is characterized by a combination of time series and cross-sectional dimensions, the study should employ panel data techniques. These panel techniques are typically assorted by three approaches: (1) Random effects model (the independent variables are uncorrelated with time constant individual effects); (2) Fixed-effects model (it exists a correlation between the explanatory variables and time invariant individual effects); and (3) pooled OLS estimator (it is a simple linear regression using a panel data arrangement) (Johnston & DiNardo, 1997; Gil-García & Puron-Cid, 2013).

Johnston & DiNardo (1997) and Greene (2001) argue that the OLS estimation may not be a proper technique for a panel data due to the nature of the pooling method to contempt the distinct attributes of individuals. In this context the authors recommended the use of random or fixed-effects models.

The method of analysis through panel data models allows the researcher to study the adjustment dynamics when carrying out an analysis in dynamic terms, estimating effects over a long period of time (Greene, 2011). Additionally, it enables the analysis of a set of variables for a large number of countries, providing more information (Greene, 2011). The estimation of panel data also allows us to assume that countries are heterogeneous with specific and unobservable characteristics. On the other hand, cross-section and times series estimates do not allow to control this heterogeneity, and because of that, the results may be skewed (Greene, 2011).

In the context of panel models, it is important to consider the existence of two types: 'random effects model' (REM) and 'fixed effects model' (FEM). The latter "computes estimates from differences in variables within country across time, on the assumption that individual effects are correlated over time, but are unrelated to other regressors" (Batten & Vo, 2009: pp. 1626). In contrast, the REM assumes that the observations (the countries) have unobservable and constant effects over time that are not correlated with the explanatory variables (Dreher, 2006; Batten & Vo, 2009). One advantage of FEM is that it does not attend to the problem of omitted variables (Batten & Vo, 2009). If the researcher selects the wrong econometric model it can be a huge problem because it can lead to wrong inferences (Onali, Ginesti & Vasilakis, 2017).

These methods must be preceded by specification tests, namely the Hausman test, in order to determine which of the two models are the most suitable (Johnston & DiNardo, 1997). When the Hausman test is insignificant, the REM model should be chosen because if the FEM model is used instead it "may result in statistically insignificant coefficients even when they would be statistically significant for the REM model" (Onali et al., 2017: pp. 463). The null hypothesis (H0) of the Hausman test establishes that the random effects model is more efficient than the fixed effects model.

3.3. Variable proxies, data collection and sources

Our dependent variable is the per capita gross domestic product (GDPpc), in purchasing power parities (PPP), at constant prices (base year 2010) thousands of dollars, which is one of the best-known indicators of material economic performance (Urbano & Aparício, 2016) and it is also used by authors such as Wong et al. (2005), Dreher (2006) and Batten & Vo (2009). The data source for this measure is the World Development Indicator (WDI) by the World Bank.

The core independent variables are the total entrepreneurship (TE), opportunity entrepreneurship (OE), and the necessity entrepreneurship (NE). Two alternative set of proxies are used for these variables, one from the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) and the other from the World Bank Indicators.

Regarding GEM's proxies, TE is measured by Total early-stage Entrepreneurial Activity (TEA), that is, the percentage of adults aged between 18-64 who are either a nascent

entrepreneur or owner-manager of a new business (up to 3.5 years old).¹ The OE is measured by the percentage of adults aged between 18–64 who are either a nascent entrepreneur or owner-manager of a new business (up to 3.5 years old), who are motivated to pursue perceived business opportunities.² On the other hand, NE is measured by the percentage of adults aged between 18–64 who are either a nascent entrepreneur or owner-manager of a new business (up to 3.5 years old), who are involved in entrepreneurship because they have no better option for work.³ The GEM proxies are consistent and internationally comparable measures of entrepreneurship and its subtypes being frequently applied in empirical countrylevel investigations (e.g. Van Stel et al., 2005; Wennekers et al., 2005; Wong et al., 2005).

In what concerns the proxies drawn from the World Development Indicator (WDI) by World Bank, OE is measured by the percentage of employers in terms of total employment and NE as the percentage of self-employment in terms of total employment.

In order to collect data for Human Capital (HC), which in this case is measured by the average number of years of formal education of the working age population (\geq 25 years), we use information extracted from a database constructed by Barro & Lee (2010) which covers the period from 1950 to 2010, referring to 146 countries. The data comes from Eurostat, UNESCO, national agencies, among others, and it is disaggregated for periods of 5 years. The recent unavailability of provided data only allows us to study this variable until the year 2010. Taking into account the fact that there has been an unavailability of data in the human capital variable since 2010, in this study, we fill in the missing values of the variables between the two quinquennia, considering that the compound annual growth rate is constant in that period (Table A 3 presents data of Human Capital from 1990 to 2016).

The other independent, control, variables, include Trade Openness (O), measured by the percentage of imports and exports of goods in terms of GDP; Physical Investment (I), measured by the Investment in physical capital (in percentage of the GDP) (Barro, 1991; Moral-Benito, 2012); Government Consumption (G), measured by the weight of public consumption in GDP and Population Growth (POP), measured by the population annual growth rate. All these indicators come from the World Development Indicators (WDI) by

¹ Table A4, in Annexes, presents data of TE from 2001 to 2016.

² Table A5, in Annexes, presents data of OE from 2005 to 2015.

³ Table A6, in Annexes, presents data of NE from 2001 to 2015.

World Bank. Finally, the variable Institutional Quality (INST) is measured by the corruption index and it was obtained from the Transparency International.

The description of the variables, period of data availability and their source are presented in Table 2.

	Variables	Description	Proxies	Period	Source
Dependent	Gross Domestic Product per capita (GDPpc)	Measure of the total output of a country that takes gross domestic product (GDP) divided by the number of people in the country	Gross Domestic Product per capita (GDPpc)	1990 to 2016	World Development Indicator (WDI) by World Bank
Independent	Total entrepreneurship (TE)	Percentage of individuals who set up a business or owning- managing a young firm.	2001 to 2016		
	Opportunity	Percentage of individuals who set up a business or owning- managing a young firm who are motivated to pursue perceived business opportunities	Percentage of adults aged 18–64 setting up a business or owning– managing a young firm (up to 3.5 years old), including self-employment who are motivated to pursue perceived business opportunities.	2005 to 2015	Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM)
	entrepreneurship (OE)	Employers in % of total employment	Percentage of workers who, working on their own account or with one or a few partners, hold jobs where the remuneration is directly dependent upon the profits derived from the goods and services produced), and that have one or more persons to work for them as employee(s).	1990 to 2016	World Development Indicator (WDI) by World Bank
	Necessity entrepreneurship (NE)	Percentage of individuals who set up a business or owning- managing a young firm because they have no better option for work	Percentage of adults aged 18–64 setting up a business or owning– managing a young firm (up to 3.5 years old), including self-employment who are involved in entrepreneurship because they have no better option for work	2001 to 2015	Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM)
		Self-employment in % of total employment	Percentage of workers that have their own business or work with one or a few partners and that hold jobs where the remuneration is directly dependent upon the profits derived from the goods and services produced.	1990 to 2016	World Development Indicator (WDI) by World Bank
	Human Capital (HC)	Human capital	Average number of years of formal education of the working age population (≥25 years)	1950 to 2010	Barro & Lee (2010)
	Trade openness (O)	Represent the value of all goods and other market services received/provided from/to the rest of the world.	Sum of exports and imports of goods and services measured as a share of GDP.	1960 to 2016	
	Physical investment (I)	It consists in the acquisition/investment in a tangible, hard or real asset	Gross capital formation as percentage of the GDPpc	1960 to 2016	World
Control	Government consumption (G)	All government current expenditures for purchases of goods and services, in percentage of the GDP	Government consumption as percentage GDP	1960 to 2016	Indicators (WDI) by World Bank
	Population growth (POP)	It can be measured by the difference between birth rates and death rates	Annual population growth rate for year t is the exponential rate of growth of midyear population from year t-1 to t, expressed as a percentage	1960 to 2016	
	Institutional quality (INST)	It corresponds to the measure of the quality of governance and institutions in a country ⁴	Corruption index ⁵	1995 to 2016	Transparency International

Table 2: Description of the variables and data sources

Source: Own elaboration.

⁴ Information available on: <u>https://www.igi-global.com/dictionary/institutional-quality/44120</u> and accessed on January 2018.

⁵ Scale of 0 - 10, where 0 means that a country is perceived as highly corrupt and 10 means that a country is perceived as very clean.

In terms of data, the present study considers a sample of 79 countries - 34 OECD and 45 non-OECD countries⁶ (see Table A1, in Annexes, for the list of countries) – for which we found data for all the (dependent and independent) variables. It is important to note that in the particular case of the GEM's entrepreneurship variables, we cannot consider the whole sample of countries because of the unavailability of data - Table A2, in Annexes, presents the effective number of observation by country and variable for the chosen period.

We estimate two models for the specification (2), which reflect the usage of two distinct data sources for the main independent variables respecting the entrepreneurship types. Model B1 considers Employers (E) and Self-Employment (SE) as proxies for the variables 'opportunity entrepreneurship' and 'necessity entrepreneurship', comprising the period 1990-2016 (26 years). Models B2 uses GEM's related proxies 'Opportunity entrepreneurship' and 'Necessity entrepreneurship', comprising a shorter period of time, 2001-2015 (14 years).

Table 3 presents a summary of the data information regarding the models' variables.

		Variables	Model A 2001-2016	Model B1 1990-2016	Model B2 2001-2015
Dep.	Gross Dor	nestic Product per capita (GDPpc)			
	Т	'otal entrepreneurial (TE)			
	Opportunity	Employers (E), WBI			
t	entrepreneurship	Opportunity entrepreneurship, GEM			
den	Necessity	Self-Employment (SE), WBI			
pen	entrepreneurship	Necessity entrepreneurship, GEM			
nde		Human Capital (HC)			
I		HC*TE			
		HC*OE			
		HC*NE			
		Trade Openness (O)			
I		Physical investment (I)			
ontro	Go	vernment consumption (G)			
C	I	Population growth (POP)			
	Ir	nstitutional quality (INST)			

Table	3:	Models'	specifications
-------	----	---------	----------------

Source: Own elaboration.

Note: Blank cells means that the variables are not included; *models with interaction variables.

⁶ We used the classification of the OECD: <u>http://www.oecd.org/about/membersandpartners/list-oecd-member-countries.htm</u>, accessed on January, 2018.

4. Empirical results

4.1. Brief descriptive analysis of the relevant variables

The primary objective of this study is to assess the impact of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship types on economic growth, including the interaction effects of these variables with human capital. Thus, we proceed with an exploratory analysis of the relevant variables taking into account their time evolution by continent, detailing within each continent how countries position themselves against each other. Additionally, we analyse the correlation matrix for all variables.

The GDPpc variable presents 2091 observations which ranges between 711.2 (Malawi in 1994) and 129349.9 dollars (Qatar in 2011) within the observed period, with an average of 21087.6 dollars. Over the past 28 years, the selected countries have experienced an evolution of their GDP per capita. As we can observe in Figure 1, there is a positive growth tendency of the real GDPpc over the period in analysis.



Figure 1: Evolution of Gross Domestic Product per capita, 1990-2016 Source: Stata v14 program (data from World Bank Indicators)

Note: Europe: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom. Asia: Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Namibia, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Thailand, Turkey, Vietnam. Africa: Botswana, Cameroon, Ghana, Malawi, Morocco, Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia. America: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Panama, Mexico, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay, Barbados, Belize, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Canada, United States. Oceania: Australia, New Zealand

Regarding the entrepreneurship variables, we observe that, for the whole sample, the average global entrepreneurship rate is 11.5%. For this indicator, we can state that in Japan (2004) only 1.48% of the individuals set up a business, while in Zambia (2016) the percentage of individuals who set up a business or own/manage a young firm achieved 48.8%. Additionally, there is a growth tendency of the total entrepreneurship variable in almost every continents with exception to Oceania, which presents stationary values between 2001 and 2016 (see Figure 2).





Note: Europe: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway,
 Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom; Asia: Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia,
 Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Namibia, Qatar, Turkey, Vietnam; Africa: Botswana, Cameroon, Senegal, Zambia; America:
 Guatemala, Panama, Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Uruguay, Barbados, Belize, Jamaica, Canada. Oceania: Australia, New

Zealand.

When considering the type of entrepreneurship, we observe that, on average, 50.1% of the individuals set up a business or own a young firm motivated by the pursue of business opportunities. This indicator reaches the highest value for Norway (81.5%), in 2006, and the lowest, 8.2%, for Uruguay, in 2011. There is a negative growth tendency over time of the opportunity entrepreneurship variable in Europe (see Figure 3). In contrast, there is a slight positive growth tendency in Africa and America and a stability of values in Asia and Oceania.



Figure 3: Evolution of Opportunity Entrepreneurship, by continents Source: Stata v14 program (data from GEM)

Note: Europe: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom; Asia: Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Namibia, Qatar, Turkey, Vietnam; Africa: Botswana, Cameroon, Senegal, Zambia; America: Guatemala, Panama, Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Uruguay, Barbados, Belize, Jamaica, Canada. Oceania: Australia, New Zealand.

The other proxy for opportunity entrepreneurship, the percentage of individuals who are 'employers', presents a global average of 3.9%. Its highest (25.9%) and lowest (0.1%) values were registered in Belize (1997), and Uganda (1991)/Vietnam (1998), respectively. According to Figure 4, the variable depicts a stationary trend in almost every continents over time, excluding America and Oceania, which present a slight negative trend.



Figure 4: Evolution of the share of employers, by continents Source: Stata v14 program (data from World Bank Indicators)

Note: Europe: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom. Asia: Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Namibia, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Thailand, Turkey, Vietnam. Africa: Botswana, Cameroon, Ghana, Malawi, Morocco, Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia. America: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Panama, Mexico, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay, Barbados, Belize, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Canada, United States. Oceania: Australia, New Zealand.

Finally, in what respects to necessity entrepreneurship, on average, 22.7% of the individuals located in the selected countries set up a business or own a young firm (up to 3.5 years old) because they have no better option for work. The highest value for this variable (67.8%) occurs in India, in 2001, whereas the lowest (1.8%) happens in Norway, also in 2001.

There is a negative growth tendency over time of the necessity entrepreneurship variable in Africa, Asia and America. In contrast, there is a positive growth tendency in Europe and Oceania (see Figure 5).



Figure 5: Evolution of necessity entrepreneurship, by continents Source: Stata v14 program (data from GEM)

Note: Europe: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom; Asia: Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Namibia, Qatar, Turkey, Vietnam; Africa: Botswana, Cameroon, Senegal, Zambia; America: Guatemala, Panama, Mexico, Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Uruguay, Barbados, Belize, Jamaica, Canada. Oceania: Australia, New Zealand.

The other proxy for 'necessity entrepreneurship', 'self-employment', reaches a global average of 32.4% with a maximum, in 1991, for Vietnam (88.0%), and a minimum of 0.5%, in 2009, for Qatar.

All continents depict a negative trend during the period (see Figure 6). In every continent, except for Europe, the value of self-employment increases until 2000, registering a fall afterwards. Oceania, America and Europe record low values of self-employment, whereas Asia and Africa record the highest values.



Figure 6: Evolution of self-employment, by continents

Regarding the human capital variable, Senegal recorded, in 2005, only 1.5 years of formal education of the working age population (with \geq 25 years old) while in 2010, in Switzerland and United States, the number of years of formal education achieved 13.4. For the whole sample, the average human capital is 8.5.

Human capital grows over the period in analysis in almost every continent, with exception of Oceania, which presents a slight negative trend between 1990 and 2016 (see Figure 7). Africa recorded lowest levels of human capital during this period.

Source: Stata v14 program (data from World Bank Indicators) (Note: **Europe**: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom. Asia: Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Namibia, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Thailand, Turkey, Vietnam. Africa: Botswana, Cameroon, Ghana, Malawi, Morocco, Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia. America: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Panama, Mexico, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay, Barbados, Belize, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Canada, United States. Oceania: Australia, New Zealand)



Figure 7: Human Capital evolution by continents Source: Stata v14 program (data from Barro & Lee 2010)

(Note: Europe: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom. Asia: Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Namibia, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Thailand, Turkey, Vietnam. Africa: Botswana, Cameroon, Ghana, Malawi, Morocco, Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia, Uganda, Zambia. America: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Panama, Mexico, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay, Barbados, Belize, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Canada, United States. Oceania: Australia, New Zealand)

The average value of government consumption, in percentage of the GDP, is 16.4%, ranging between 2.98% (Argentina, 1992) and 34.4% (Qatar, 1994). Population growth values range between -5.8% (Croatia, 1991) and 16.3% (Qatar, 2007), with an average value of 1.2%.

The average value (5.3) for the institutional quality indicator – corruption perception index (0: highly corrupt... 10: highly transparent) – reflects that, for the sample as whole, countries are not perceived as highly corrupt or are relatively clean. Brazil emerges as one of the most corrupt countries with a corruption perception index of 0.35 (the lowest transparency level), in 2005. In contrast, Denmark (1998 and 1999) and Finland (2000) are perceived as a very clean/transparent countries, with a score of 10 (highest transparency) in the corruption index.

Regarding the trade openness variable, Argentina recorded, in 1991, only 13.8% of goods and other market services received/provided from/to the rest of the world, while, in 2008, for Singapore the number exports and imports of goods and services measured as a share of GDP achieved 441.6%. For the whole sample, the average trade openness rate is 81.8%.

Finally, in what respects to the gross capital formation, Bulgaria recorded, in 1996, only 0.3% on acquisitions/investments in a tangible, hard or real asset, while in 2011, China presented a value of 47.7% of gross capital formation. For the whole sample, the average gross capital formation rate is 23.5%.

		Variables		Des	criptive stat	tistics						(Correlati	on Ma	trix			VII		
	(unusios		Obs	Mean	St.dev	Min	Max	GDPpc	TE	OE	NE	SE	EMP	HC	G	POP	INST	0	Ι	
Dep.	Gross Domestic Product per capita (GDPpc)*		2091	21087.56	18877.08	711.19	129349.90	1.00												
	Total entrepreneurship (TE)		793	11.51	7.96	1.48	48.81	-0.53	1.00											1.73
at	GEM	Opportunity entrepreneurship (OE)	575	50.13	12.74	9.82	81.50	0.54	-0.23	1.00										
ender	GEM	Necessity entrepreneurship (NE)	740	22.67	11.26	1.84	67.77	-0.63	0.38	-0.66	1.00									
Indep	WBI	Self-Employment (SELF)	2054	32.40	22.20	0.50	88.00	-0.71	0.68	-0.39	0.48	1.00								2.60
	WDI	Employers (EMP)	2054	3.91	2.24	0.10	25.90	0.17	-0.29	0.04	-0.14	-0.30	1.00							2.42
	Human Capital (HC)		2133	8.55	2.73	1.52	17.19	0.14	-0.18	-0.01	-0.05	-0.16	0.02	1.00						1.12
	Government consumption (G)		2075	16.37	5.20	2.98	34.46	0.44	-0.47	0.39	-0.35	-0.63	0.22	0.08	1.00					1.70
ol	Population growth (POP)		2131	1.18	1.38	-5.81	16.33	-0.06	0.46	0.01	0.04	0.39	-0.12	-0.17	-0.34	1.00				1.39
Contr	Institutional quality (INST)		1479	5.28	2.28	0.37	10.00	0.82	-0.47	0.60	-0.65	-0.70	0.16	0.12	0.54	-0.15	1.00			1.78
	Т	rade openness (O)	2.092	81.88	53.81	13.75	441.60	0.45	-0.16	0.19	-0.27	-0.26	0.02	0.07	-0.01	0.01	0.27	1.00		1.21
	Ph	ysical investment (I)	2.076	23.48	6.11	0.30	47.69	-0.14	0.19	-0.01	0.10	0.30	-0.20	0.11	-0.29	0.17	-0.18	0.01	1.00	1.09

Table 4: Descriptive analysis, Correlation Matrix and VIF test

Source: Own elaboration (extracted data from Stata v14 program); * values in dollars *Note*: Annexes A3, A4, A5 and A6 present the values of Human Capital, TE, OE and NE respectively

Table 4 reports the number of observations, means, standard deviations, maximum, minimum value and correlation coefficients of the variables used in this study. The correlation matrix evidences that richer countries (with a relatively high GDP per capita) tend to present lower global and necessity entrepreneurship rates and higher opportunity entrepreneurship rate and human capital. Additionally, more prosperous countries tend to present lower population growth and (physical) investment rates, spending more in terms of public consumption, being more open to trade, and characterized by higher levels of transparency (institutional quality).

4.2. Estimation results

We estimate 3 models (Model A, Model B1 and Model B2) that correspond to the different combinations of the entrepreneurship variables. The models are estimated using fixed effects panel techniques.

Model A includes 'Total Entrepreneurship' (TE) as core independent variable as well as the interaction between 'Total Entrepreneurship' and 'Human capital'.

Models B1 and B2 include, respectively the types of entrepreneurship as core independent variables, Opportunity Entrepreneurship (OE) and Necessity Entrepreneurship (NE) and their interaction with human capital, considering the measures drawn from the World Bank indicators - Employers (E) is the proxy used for 'Opportunity Entrepreneurship' (OE) and Self-Employment (SE) for 'Necessity Entrepreneurship', the Global Entrepreneurship (GEM) database.

Before the estimations of the panel we perform several diagnosis tests, most notably testing for multicollinearity of the explanatory variables and the heteroscedasticity of the random errors. The Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) coefficients evidence that no signs of serious multicollinearity among the explanatory variables (Mean VIF < 10).⁷ Regarding heteroscedasticity, we carry out the Breusch-Pagan test to check whether the errors terms

⁷ It is important to note that Variance inflation factors range from 1 upwards. VIF shows which percentage of the variance is inflated for each coefficient. For example, a VIF of 1.78 informs that the variance of a particular coefficient is 78% bigger than what we would expect if there was no multicollinearity — that is, if there was no correlation with other predictors. Thus, as a 'rule of thumb', VIF=1: not correlated; 1 < VIF <=5: moderately correlated. (see <u>http://www.statisticshowto.com/variance-inflation-factor/</u>, accessed on 5th April 2018).

were homoscedastic. The null hypothesis (H0) underlying this test states that there are constant variances. After the Breusch-Pagan test, we reject the null hypothesis for the commonly used levels of significance (i.e. 1%, 5% and 10%) for the 3 estimated models (see Table 5). Since our models show the presence of heteroscedasticity it was necessary to estimate the models with robust standard errors.

According to the literature and since we have a diverse set of countries with the limited set of explanatory variables being unable to address all the countries' idiosyncrasies, we content that the fixed effects panel model would be more adequate. The Hausman test, whose null hypothesis (H0) is that the differences between the coefficients of the random effect and fixed effect models are not systematic, yields that in Model B1 the null hypothesis is rejected; for the remaining models, the null hypothesis was accepted. Despite the latter, and given the theoretical argumentation mentioned above, we opted to estimate all models using the fixed effects panel technique.

In general, the estimated models have a good quality of adjustment as reflected by the Fstatistics and the R-squared measure (see Table 5). Looking at the F-statistics and their respective p-values, we can conclude that models are globally significant.

Analyzing the estimates, we found a positive and statistically significant direct impact of total entrepreneurship on the economic growth (see Model A: $\hat{\beta} = 0.0627$, p <0.01). This corroborates H1("Entrepreneurship affects positively countries' economic growth") and suggests, as postulated in the literature, that, on average, all the remaining factors being held constant, countries that present high percentages of entrepreneurs (that is, working age individuals who set up a business or owning–managing a young firm) tend to present high growth performances.

Such results support Schumpeter's theory which predicts that an increase in the number of entrepreneurs fosters economic growth thanks to his/her innovation traits and ability to make new combinations of productive resources (Schumpeter, 1942; Wong et al. 2005; Fontenele, 2010) and that an entrepreneurial behavior should be used as a key factor to drive economic development, since an entrepreneurial activity leads to the process of creative destruction (Shumpeter, 1934).

Considering several studies made on this subject, we can confirm that our results are in line with the literature. Thus, similarly to the study of Stam & van Stel (2009), which tests the impact of entrepreneurial activity on GDP growth over a four year period for a sample of 36 countries participating in the GEM in 2002, we corrobore the fact that entrepreneurship is a

driver of economic growth and it could be the fourth production factor in the production function.

Our results are also in agreement with the viewpoint of evolutionary economics. As Wong et al. (2005: pp. 337) suggest in their study, which uses an augmented Cobb–Douglas production to explore firm formation and technological innovation in a cross-sectional data on the 37 countries participating in GEM 2002, entrepreneurship contributes to economic development "by introducing innovations, creating change, creating competition and enhancing rivalry, which involves the development of new products, new processes, new sources of supply and also the exploitation of new markets and the development of new ways to organize business". Additionally, it states that entrepreneurs bring new ideas to markets and stimulate growth through a process of competitive firm selection by reallocating resources from less to more productive uses (Wong et al., 2005).

According to the work of Acs et al. (2012), which considers a panel data of 18 OECD countries over the period between 1981 and 1998, when using ideas that in other ways might not be used and introducing them into the market through the creation of a new firm, entrepreneurship is shown to positively influence economic growth.

More recent studies also corroborate our results. Considering the study of Urbano & Aparício (2016) through a panel-data analysis with 43 countries in the period from 2002 to 2012, we found that regardless the type of countries (OECD or non-OECD) and the type of period considered (crisis or post-crisis) the impact of the overall total entrepreneurial activity (TEA) on economic growth is positive. Also, Ferreira et al. (2017), considering Schumpeterian and Kirzenian approaches to entrepreneurship, reported that the overall entrepreneurship holds a statistically significant influence on the global competitiveness index (their proxy for economic growth) using an unbalanced panel data for 43 countries in the period from 2009 to 2013. The study of Mrożewski & Kratzer (2017) uses a moderated OLS regression analysis, corrected for heteroscedasticity, and considers a cross-section design during the period 2011-2012 (55 countries) to conduct the empirical analysis which suggest that entrepreneurship contributes to innovation.

Suming up, our results, using a larger and more diversified sample of 79 countries corroborate and reinforce most of the extant studies made by several authors who demonstrate that overall entrepreneurship is positively related to economic growth.

		Variables	Hypoth	Hypothesis			Model B2 2001-2015
		Total entrepreneurial (TE)	H1 : Entrepreneurship affects posit	ively countries' economic growth.	0.0627*** 0.0230		
	Opportunity	Employers (EMP), WBI	H2a: Opportunity entrepreneurship affects			0.0985** 0.0474	
Effect	entrepreneurship	Opportunity entrepreneurship (OE), GEM	positively countries' economic growth.	H2c: The impact of opportunity entrepreneurship on countries' economic			0.0625** 0.0252
Direct]	Necessity entrepreneurship	Self-Employment (SELF), WBI	H2b: Necessity entrepreneurship affects	growth is higher than that of necessity entrepreneurship.		-0.6061*** 0.1217	
П		Necessity entrepreneurship (NE), GEM	positively countries' economic growth.				-0.0871*** 0.0271
		Human Capital (HC)	H3 : Human capital positively impa	cts on countries' economic growth.	0.1436** 0.0610	0.0654* 0.0393	0.0951* 0.0571
es		TExHC_d			-0.0016 0.0121		
ariabl	Opportunity	EMPxHC_d				-0.0386 0.0296	
ion v:	entrepreneurship	OExHC_d	H4: Human capital positively interm entrepreneurship on count	nediates the impact of (the types of) ries' economic growth.			-0.0746*** 0.0247
teract	Necessity	SELFxHC_d					
Ini	entrepreneurship	NExHC_d				0.0978*** 0.0324	
ø		Trade O	0.1101 0.0903	0.2682*** 0.0717	-0.0837 0.0913		
iable		Physical in	nvestment (I)		0.1976*** 0.0679	0.1824*** 0.0502	0.1137** 0.0553
ol var		Government	consumption (G)		0.1499 0.1105	0.1274 0.0814	0.0985 0.0988
Contro		Population	growth (POP)		-0.1200 0.0839	-0.0031 0.1129	-0.1513 0.1143
0		Institutional	quality (INST)		0.1352** 0.0606	0.1189*** 0.0375	0.0916*** 0.0295
		Years × Countries	N		766	1466	550
			R-square	ed .	0.3645	0.7453	0.3305
		Goodness of In	F-statistics (p	-value)	6.460 (0.000)	17.460 (0.000)	5.900 (0.000)
		Diagnosis tests	Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg	Breusch-Pagan / Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity			396.85 (0.000)
			Mean VI	1.74	2.71	6.46	
	Fixe	ed vs Random Effects	test	Chi2<0	108.40	Chi2<0	

Table 5: Panel data fixed effects estimations	(robust errors): d	dependent variable -	GDP per capita
---	--------------------	----------------------	----------------

Source: Own elaboration (using Stata v14). Notes: **** (**) [*] Statically significant at 1% (5%) [10%]; Highlighted cells show the statistically significant estimates; Excluding the dummy variable for human capital (HC_d, which assumes the value 1 when HC is above the average and 0 otherwise), all the variables are in logarithms; Heteroscedasticity corrected - robust standard errors are shown in parentheses.

Despite the fact that Marvel, Davis & Sproul (2016) state that entrepreneurship is highly dependent on human capital attributes of entrepreneurs and the impact of the former on economic growth is likely to be intermediated by countries' endowments in terms of education, experience and skills, there is insufficient evidence in our results to assess the impact of total entrepreneurship through human capital on economic growth. Indeed, there is not enough evidence (the estimates are not statistically significant) regarding the potential increase or decrease that human capital could bring to total entrepreneurship. Thus, we are not able to validate or invalidate the hypothesis H4 ("Human capital positively intermediates the impact of entrepreneurship on countries' economic growth").

Regarding the types of entrepreneurship, when we use the WBI proxies for opportunity (Employers) and necessity (Self-employment) entrepreneurship, which encompass a longer time period (1990-2016), results are in line with the extant literature. Specifically, we verify (see Model B1) a positive and statistically significant estimate associated with the variable opportunity entrepreneurship ($\hat{\beta} = 0.0985$, p < 0.05). With GEM proxies, involving a shorter time period (2001-2015), we also verify (see Model B2) a positive and statistically significant estimate associated with the variable opportunity entrepreneurship ($\hat{\beta} = 0.0625$, p < 0.05). Thus, the hypothesis H2a ("Opportunity entrepreneurship affects positively countries' economic growth") is confirmed. This suggests that, controlling for a set of factors that are likely to influence countries' economic growth, opportunity entrepreneurship significantly fosters growth, which can be explained, at least in part, by the existence of economic rents derived from the implementation or creation of (new) knowledge and technology (Wong et al., 2005; Audretsch et al., 2008; Urbano & Aparicio, 2016).

Concerning necessity entrepreneurship (both GEM and WBI proxies), we found a negative and statistically significant estimates, indicating that countries which present higher levels of necessity entrepreneurship tend, on average, to growth less (see Model B1: $\hat{\beta}$ = -0.6061, p <0.01 and Model B2: $\hat{\beta}$ = -0.0871, p <0.01). Thus, the hypothesis H2b ("Necessity entrepreneurship affects positively countries" economic growth") is not validated. This result, nevertheless, goes in line with recent findings of Mrożewski & Kratzer (2017), who conclude, when analyzing the effects of entrepreneurship on a country-level innovation, that a high share of necessity entrepreneurship is negatively related to innovation and because of that, necessity entrepreneurship has a negative impact on economic development.

Taking into consideration the direct effect of the types of entrepreneurship on economic growth, there is clear evidence that either using the GEM or WBI data, the different types

of entrepreneurship have a very distinct impact on economic growth. Thus, our results corroborate H2c ("The impact of opportunity entrepreneurship on countries' economic growth is higher than that of necessity entrepreneurship") once, contrary to necessity entrepreneurship, opportunity entrepreneurship presents a positive and statistically significant impact on economic growth. This suggests, as postulated in the literature, that necessity entrepreneurship tends to reflect a lower value creation and thus produces smaller impact on economic growth when compared to opportunity entrepreneurship (Urbano & Aparicio, 2016).

Regarding the impact of opportunity entrepreneurship on economic growth, mediated by human capital, we found that opportunity entrepreneurship is not enhanced by higher levels of human capital (see Model B2: $\hat{\beta} = -0.0746$, p <0.01). Thus, although Lackéus (2015) arguments that the more educated individuals are the greater is their ability to overcome social obstacles and take advantages of business opportunities, our results suggest that in contexts/countries characterized by higher levels of human capital, the impact of opportunity entrepreneurship on economic growth is not leveraged up. This might reflect the fact that the opportunity cost of entrepreneurship for highly skilled/educated individuals might be higher in contexts characterized by higher levels of human capital. As Mickiewicz, Nyakudya, Theodorakopoulos & Hart (2017: pp. 957) contend, "individuals who are highly educated may not choose to become entrepreneurs if entrepreneurship may lead to reduced income as compared to the perceived higher incomes from employment".

Contrary to the direct effect of necessity entrepreneurship in economic growth, we find that human capital is likely to enhance the impact of this variable on economic growth. Indeed, as shown by the positive and statistically significant coefficient of the interaction term between 'Necessity entrepreneurship' and 'Human capital', the impact of this type of entrepreneurship on economic growth tends to be higher for higher levels of human capital (see Model B1: $\hat{\beta} = 0.0321$, p <0.05 and Model B2: $\hat{\beta} = 0.0978$, p <0.01). Our results suggest that in countries that present high levels of human capital, higher shares of necessity entrepreneurship increase economic growth, evidencing some kind of match between human capital and necessity entrepreneurship. Concluding, the hypothesis H4 (*"Human capital positively intermediates the impact of (the types of) entrepreneurship on countries' economic growth"*) is only validated when applied to necessity entrepreneurship.

Concerning the hypothesis H3 ("Human capital positively impacts on countries' economic growth"), we found a positive and statistically significant impact of human capital on the economic growth (see Model A: p < 0.05 and Models B1 and B2: p < 0.10). This corroborates H3 and

suggests, as postulated in the literature, that, on average, all the remaining factors being held constant, countries that present high levels of formal education (that is, working age population who set up a business or owning–managing a young firm) tend to grow more rapidly over the periods considered (1990-2016 / 2001-2016). In other words, an increase in schooling years allows individuals to become more productive and innovative, leading to improvements in the factor productivity (Romer, 1990; Benhabib & Spiegel, 1994, Bodman & Le, 2013). Our results therefore advocate that the improvements achieved in labor productivity through human capital result in enhanced economic growth (e.g., Barro, 1991; Benhabib & Spiegel, 1994; Hanushek & Woessmann, 2008).

Concerning the control variables, when statistically significant, as the case of physical investment and institutional quality, we verify a positive impact on economic growth. Thus, the results obtained for the physical investment suggests that economies with higher levels of investment tend to grow faster than others. Considering the literature, we can affirm that higher investment rates are associated with higher economic growth since the high physical capital formation contributes positively to productivity (Barro, 1991; Romero-Ávila, 2011; Makuyana, 2016). Moreover, the positive relationship between the institutional quality and the economic growth reflects that countries with higher levels of transparency tend to grow faster than others. Regarding the trade openness, it only has a positive and significant impact on economic growth through the different types of entrepreneurship (WBI proxies). There is insufficient statistically evidence to discuss the impact of the remaining control variables.

Conclusions

The main objective of the present study was to assess the impact of (the types of) entrepreneurship on economic growth, including the interaction effects of these variables with human capital.

Based on a large sample of 79 countries over the last two decades (1990 to 2016) and resorting to a fixed effect panel data techniques, we uncover several main results. First, our research suggest that, as postulated in the literature, entrepreneurship is an important mechanism to achieve economic growth. Second, when analysing the different types of entrepreneurship, we found that opportunity entrepreneurship positively influences economic growth. On the other hand, necessity entrepreneurship shows a negative effect on economic growth. Third, the interactions between the different types of entrepreneurship and human capital are positive and relevant only in the case of opportunity entrepreneurship. Finally, the direct impact of human capital on economic growth is statistically significant and positive .

Three main scientific contributions are drawn from the present study.

First, it provides a recent empirical analysis of a broader (79) and more diverse (including OECD and non OCDE countries; developed, developing and less developed countries) sample of countries. Extant literature has analysed a rather reduced number of countries – 18: Acs et al. (2012); 36: Stam & van Stel (2009); 37: Wong et al. (2005); 45: Urbano & Aparício (2016) and Ferreira et al. (2017) - and mainly from the OECD (e.g., Acs et al., 2012) or restricted to countries that were included in Global Entrepremeurship Monitor inquires (Stam & van Stel, 2009; Wong et al., 2005; Urbano & Aparício, 2016; Ferreira et al., 2017). Moreover, these latter analysis refer not very recent periods - 1981 and 1998: Acs et al. (2012); 2002: Stam & van Stel (2009); Wong et al. (2005); 2002 to 2012: Urbano & Aparício (2016); 2009 to 2013: Ferreira et al. (2017). Reinforcing the extant evidence, we demonstrate that even when using a broader and more diverse set of countries, over a longer time span, total entrepreurship is a critical engine and a booster of economic growth.

Second, we demonstrate that regardless the proxy used for the types of entrepreneurship (Employers vs Self-employed/WBI or Opportunity vs Necessity entrepreneurs/ GEM), opportunity (necessity) entrepreneurship affects positively (negatively) economic growth. Although some evidence exists that necessity entrepreneurship has a positive impact on economic growth but it reflect a lower value creation and thus produces smaller impact on economic growth when compared to opportunity entrepreneurship (Urbano & Aparicio,

2016), our results sustain that necessity entrepreneurship is detrimental to economic growth. Such result corroborates to some extent the findings by Mrożewski & Kratzer (2017), who conclude that a high share of necessity entrepreneurship is negatively related to innovation and, ultimately on economic growth.

Third, studies that have focused on total entrepreneurship (e.g., Acs et al., 2012; Wong et al., 2005; Urbano & Aparício, 2016; Ferreira et al., 2017) and the types of entrepreneurship (e.g, Carree & Thurik, 2003; Reynolds et al., 2005; Zali et al., 2013; Urbano & Aparicio, 2016; Ferreira et al., 2017) did not take into consideration the potential mediating effect of human capital. We demonstrate that human capital plays an important direct and indirect role on economic growth. Specifically, it mitigates the negative direct impact that necessity entrepreneurship has on economic growth. Thus, although necessity entrepreneurship emerged as harmful for a country economic growth, in countries characterized by a relatively high level of human capital, that negative effect comes reduced.

Our study entails important policy implications.

First, results imply that entrepreneurship, as a whole, has a positive impact on economic growth. Thus, it would be important for countries all over the world to implement active policies to promote businesses creation. Among those policies we could refer the subsidization of the emergence of new start ups, venture capital and the granting of tax benefits and/or the reduction of taxes payable by newly created companies. In addition, it may be beneficial to implement transversal policies, including policies that encourage R&D and most notably the investment in science and technology infrastructures that provide an adequate ecosystem for newly created firms, and /or reduce of bureaucracies associated to the creation of a new business as well as the regulation of labor markets and entry

A second policy implication derives from the finding that opportunity, but not necessity, entrepreneurship promotes growth. Thus, public authorities/ governments should adopt, regardless the country's carachteristics (measured by productive specialization), employment promotion, policies that mitigate the existence of necessity entrepreneurship, by granting reduced costs of context and the encouragement of the emergence of proper employment alternatives for the age-active population.

Third, from the clear evidence of a strong and positive link between human capital and economic growth, we content that transversal education policies would be an important engine to boost economic growth, as well as a facilitator to relieve the negative impacts of the possible occurrence of necessity entrepreneurship. Considering this, it should be reinforced some economic policies such as education incentives and training for the unemployed.

Despite the novelty of the scientific contributions presented in this dissertation, there are some limitations that need to be highlighted.

First, due to its aggregated character, our study presents an overall analysis of a set of 79 countries but overlooks potential differences between groups of countries (e.g., high, medium, low income countries). Such limitation, nevertheless, would constitute a challenging and interesting path for future research.

Second, this study assumes human capital as the unique mediating of entrepreneurship on economic growth. Nevertheless, other variables could be taken into consideration when analysing the direct and indirect impacts of entrepreneurship on economic growth, most notably countries' productive structure and industrial specialization and institutional related factors. Considering the productive specialization and taking into consideration the importance of technology (Lucio, Herce & Goicolea, 2002; Steenhuis & De Brujin 2012; Hoon Yi & Choi 2017), it is likely that countries with more advanced levels of specialization, namely those specialized in high-tech industries, could obtain greater productivity gains compared to those specialized in low tech industries, meaning that they would tend to grow faster. Moreover, it is also likely that industrial specialization and structural change processes mediate the impact that entrepreneurship (and its types) have on economic growth (Sautet & Desrochers, 2008; Silva & Teixeira, 2012; Noseleit, 2013). Therefore, this would be a promising area for further inquiry.

Also, future researches could consider some variables in order to control the environmental characteristics that affect entrepreneurial activity in the light of institutional economics. For instance, authors such as Urbano & Alvarez (2014) signalized the importance of institutional dimensions (regulative, normative and cultural-cognitive) to understand the configuration of entrepreneurial activity among countries that have different economic growth rates. Under this approach, it would be interesting to perform a comparative analysis between countries with distinct institutional frameworks.

Third, our study do not focus the individuals' decision processes that sometimes requires the evaluation of multiple opportunities (which includes an opportunity-cost). Thus, it could be an interesting area for future research if we take into account individual factors, such as, social network, self-confidence and education background, which play an important role in

the entrepreneurs decisions to explore innovative opportunities. This would, nevertheless, require a distinct (micro based) data set.

Finally, despite the fact that we find a negative link between necessity entrepreneurship and economic growth, it is likely that specific situations in which businesses created out of necessity have the potential to become high-growth companies (Shane, 2009). Due to the general character of our analysis, further research with different methodological approaches should be made in order to deepen this issue.

References

- Acs, Z.J., Audretsch, D. B., Braunerhjelm, P., & Carlsson, B. (2012). "Growth and entrepreneurship", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 39 (2), pp. 289–300.
- Audretsch, D.B., & Keilbach, M. (2004). "Entrepreneurship capital and economic performance", Regional Studies, Vol. 38, pp. 949–59.
- Audretsch, D.B., & Keilbach, M. (2008). "Resolving the knowledge paradox: knowledgespillover entrepreneurship and economic growth", *Research Policy*, Vol. 37(10), pp. 1697–1705.
- Barro, R. (1991). "Economic growth in a cross section of countries", The Quarterly Journal of Economics, Vol. 106 (2), pp. 407-443.
- Barro, R. (1996). Determinants of economic growth: a cross-country empirical study, National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 5698. Cambridge.
- Barro, R.J.; Lee, J. W. (2010), A new data set of education attainment in the world, 1950-2010, in www.barrolee.com/data/dataexp.htm, last accessed on December 2017.
- Batten, J.; Vo, X. V. (2009), "An analysis of the relationship between foreign direct investment and economic growth", *Applied Economics*, Vol. 41 (13), pp. 1621-1641.
- Becker, G. (1962), "Investment in human capital: A theoretical analysis", *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 70 (5), part 2, pp. 9-49.
- Becker, G.S. (1993). Human Capital: a Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education. The University of Chicago Press, 3rd Chicago.
- Benhabib, J., & Spiegel, M.M. (1994). "The role of human capital in economic development evidence from aggregate cross-country data", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, Vol 34 (2), pp. 143–173.
- Bodman, P., & Le, T. (2013). "Assessing the roles that absorptive capacity and economic distance play in the foreign direct investment-productivity growth nexus", *Applied Economics*, Vol. 45 (8), pp. 1027-1039.
- Bontis, N. (1998). "Intellectual capital: an exploratory study that develops measures and models", *Journal of Management History into Management Decision*, Vol. 36, pp. 65-67.
- Braunerhjelm, P., Acs, Z.J., Audretsch, D.B., & Carlsson, B. (2010), "The missing link: Knowledge diffusion and entrepreneurship in endogenous growth", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 34 (2), pp. 105-125.

- Čadil, J., Petkovová, L., & Blatná, D. (2014). "Human capital, economic structure and growth", *Procedia Economics and Finance*, Vol. 12 (2014), pp. 85–92.
- Carree, M.A., & Thurik, A.R. (2003). "The impact of entrepreneurship on economic growth", International Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research, pp. 437–71.
- Davidsson, P., Delmar, F., & Wiklund, J. (2006). "Entrepreneurship as growth; growth as entrepreneurship", *Entrepreneurship and the Growth of Firms*, edited by P. Davidsson, F. Delmar and J. Wiklund, pp. 21–38. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Dreher, A. (2006), "Does globalization affect growth? Evidence from a new index of globalization", *Applied Economics*, Vol. 38 (10), pp. 1091-1110
- Enayati, F. (2007). "Human capital as a factor of economic growth", Review of Economic Sciences, Vol. 19 (2), pp. 101–114.
- Ferreira, M., & Serra, F. (2009). *Casos de Estudo: Usar, Escrever e Estudar*. Lisboa: Lidel Edições Técnicas, Lda.
- Ferreira, J.J., Fayolle, A., Fernandes, C., & Raposo, M. (2017). "Effects of Schumpeterian and Kirznerian entrepreneurship on economic growth: panel data evidence", *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, Vol. 29 (1–2,) pp. 27–50.
- Folloni, G., & Vittadini, G. (2010). "Human capital measurement: A survey", Journal of Economic Surveys, Vol. 24 (2), pp. 248–279.
- Fontenele, R.E.S. (2010). "Empreendedorismo, competitividade e crescimento econômico: evidências empíricas". Revista de Administração Contemporânea, Vol. 14 (6), pp. 1094– 1112.
- Fortin, M. F. (1999). O Processo de Investigação: Da Concepção à Realização. Camarate: Lusociência, Edições técnicas e Científicas, Lda.
- Freixo, M. (2011). Metodologia Científica Fundamentos, Métodos e Técnicas. Lisboa: Instituto Piaget.
- Gil-García, J.M. & Puron-Cid, G. (2013). "Using panel data techniques for social science research: an illustrative case and some guidelines", *Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas, México,* Vol. 21 (3), pp. 203-216
- Greene, W. (2001). "Fixed and random effects in nonlinear models.", *Working Paper EC-01-*01, Department of Economics, Stern School of Business, New York University.

- Greene, W. H. (2011), *Econometric Analysis*, (7th Edition), Pearson Education, New York University.
- Hanushek, E.A., & Woessmann, L. (2008), "The role of cognitive skills in economic development", *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. 46 (3), pp. 607-668.
- Hanushek, E.A. (2013), "Economic growth in developing countries: The role of human capital", *Economics of Education Review*, Vol. 37, pp. 204-212.
- Hoon Yi, M., & Choi, C., (2017). "The Internet, R&D expenditure and economic growth", Applied Economics Letters, Vol. 25 (4), pp. 264-267.
- Johnston, J., & J. DiNardo (1997). Econometric Methods, 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lackéus, M. (2015). Entrepreneurship in Education. What, Why, When, How. Entrepreneurship 360 Background Paper. Paris: OECD. In <u>https://www.oecd.org/cfe/leed/BGP_Entrepreneurship-in-Education.pdf</u>, last accessed on December 2017.
- Lucio, J.J., Herce, J.A., & Goicolea, A., (2002). "The effects of externalities on productivity growth in Spanish industry", *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, Vol. 32 (2), pp. 241-258.
- Mahoney, J., & Michael, S. (2004), "A subjective theory of entrepreneurship", in S. Alvarez (Ed.), *Handbook of Entrepreneurship*. Boston, MA: Kluwer.
- Makuyana, G. (2016). "Public and private investment and economic growth: a review", Journal of Accounting and Management, Vol. 6 (2), pp. 25-42.
- Mankiw, N.G., Romer, D., & Weil, D.N. (1992), "A contribution to the empirics of economic growth", *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 107 (2), pp. 407-437.
- Marvel, M.R., Davis, J.L., & Sproul, C.R. (2016). "Human capital and entrepreneurship research: A critical review and future directions", *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, Vol. 40 (3), pp. 599–626.
- McConnell, J.K., McFarland, C., & Common, B. (2011). "Supporting entrepreneurs and small business: A tool kit for local leaders", Vol. 41. http://umdilabs.com/sites/default/files/RI_SmallBizToolkit-2012-Web.pdf last accessed on December 2017.

- Mickiewicz, T., Nyakudya, F. W., Theodorakopoulos, N., & Hart, M. (2016). "Resource endowment and opportunity cost effects along the stages of entrepreneurship", *Small Business Economics*. Vol. 48, pp. 953-976.
- Moral-Benito, E. (2012), "Determinants of economic growth: a bayesian panel data approach", *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 94 (2), pp. 566-579.
- Mrożewski, M., & Kratzer, J. (2017). "Entrepreneurship and country-level innovation: investigating the role of entrepreneurial opportunities", *Journal of Technology Transfer*, Vol. 42 (5), pp. 1125–1142.
- Neeman, Z., & Paserman, M. D. (2008). "Corruption and openness", The B.E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy, Vol. 8 (1), pp. 1–38.
- Nelson, R.R., & Phelps, E.S. (1966), "Investment in humans, technological diffusion and economic growth", *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 56 (1/2), pp. 69-75.
- Nourzad, F., & Powell, J. J. (2003). "Openness, growth, and development: Evidence from a panel of developing countries", *Scientific Journal of Administrative Development*, Vol. 1 (1), pp. 72–94.
- Noseleit, F., (2013). "Entrepreneurship, structural change, and economic growth", *Journal of Evolutionary Economics,* Vol. 23 (4), pp. 735-766.
- Onali, E., Ginesti, G., & Vasilakis, C. (2017). "How should we estimate value-relevance models? Insights from European data", *The British Accounting Review*, Vol. 49, pp. 460-473.
- Reynolds, P.D. (1999), "Creative destruction: Source or symptom of economic growth?", in Zoltan J. Acs, Bo Carlsson and Charlie Karlsson (eds.), *Entrepreneurship, Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises and the Macroeconomy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reynolds, P., Bosma, N., Autio, E., Hunt, S., De Bono, N., Servais, I., & Chin, N. (2005).
 "Global entrepreneurship monitor: Data collection design and implementation 1998-2003", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 24 (3), pp. 205–231.
- Reynolds, P. D., Camp, S. M., Bygrave, W. D., Autio, E., & Hay, M. (2002). "Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2001 Executive Report", *Executive Report*, Vol. 147 (1), pp. 1–16.

- Romero-Ávila, D. (2009). "Productive physical investment and growth: testing the validity of the AK model from a panel perspective", *Applied Economics*, Vol. 41 (23), pp. 3027-3043.
- Santarelli, E., & Vivarelli, M. (2007). "Entrepreneurship and the process of firms' entry, survival and growth", *Industrial and Corporate Change*, Vol. 16, N° 3, pp. 455–488.
- Sautet, F., & Desrochers, P., (2008). "Entrepreneurial Policy: The Case of Regional Specialization vs.Spontaneous Industrial Diversity", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 42 (4), pp. 703-716.
- Schultz, T. (1961). "Investment in human capital", The American Economic Review, Vol. 51, pp. 1-17.
- Schultz, T. (1981). Investing in People: The Economics of Population Quality. University of California, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Schumpeter, J.A. (1934). The Theory of Economic Development: An Inquiry into Profits, Capital, Credit, Interest, and the Business Cycle. Transaction Books.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1942). Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy. New York: Harper and Row.
- Shane, S. (2009). "Why encouraging more people to become entrepreneurs is bad public policy", Small Business Economics, Vol. 33(2), pp. 141–149.
- Sianesi, B., & Reenen, J.V. (2003), "The returns to education: Macroeconomics", Jornal of Economics Surveys, Vol. 17 (2), pp. 157-200.
- Silva, E.G., & Teixeira, A.A.C. (2012), "Does structure influence growth? A panel data econometric assessment of "relatively less developed" countries, 1979–2003", *Industrial and Corporate Change*, Vol.20 (2), pp. 457-510.
- Solow, R.M. (1956). "A contribution to the theory of economic growth". Quarterly Journal of Economics, Vol. 70 (1), pp. 65–94.
- Steenhuis, H.J., & De Brujin, E.J., (2012). "Technology and economic development: A literature review", International Journal of Innovation and Technology Management, Vol. 9 (5), pp. 1-11.
- Stephan, U., Uhlaner, L.M., & Stride, C. (2015). "Institutions and social entrepreneurship: The role of institutional voids, institutional support, and institutional configurations", *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 46 (3), pp. 308–331.

- Stam E., & Stel A. (2009). "Types of entrepreneurship and economic growth", United Nations University, Research Paper N° 2009, Vol 47, pp. 1-16.
- Szirmai A., Naudé W., & Goedhuys M. (2011), "Entrepreneurship, innovation, and economic development: An overview", *Entrepreneurship, Innovation, and Economic Development*, Edited by Adam Szirmai, Wim Naudé, and Micheline Goedhuys, pp. 3-32. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Teixeira, A.A.C. (1999) Capital Humano e Capacidade de Inovação. Contributos para o Estudo do Crescimento Económico Português, 1960-1991, Lisboa: Conselho Económico Social.
- Thurik, A.R., & Wennekers, A.R.M. (2004), "Entrepreneurship, small business and economic growth," *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, Vol. 11, 140–149.
- Urbano, D., & Alvarez, C. (2014). "Institutional dimensions and entrepreneurial activity: an international study", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 42 (4), pp. 703–716.
- Urbano, D., & Aparicio, S. (2016). "Entrepreneurship capital types and economic growth: International evidence", *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, Vol. 102, pp. 34– 44.
- Van Praag, C.M., (1999), "Some classic views on entrepreneurship", *De Economist*, Vol. 147, pp. 311–335.
- Van Stel, A., Carree, M., & Thurik, R. (2005), "The effect of entrepreneurial activity on national economic growth", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 24 (3), pp. 311–321.
- Valliere, D., & Peterson, R. (2009). "Entrepreneurship and economic growth: Evidence from emerging and developed countries", *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, Vol. 21 (5–6), pp. 459–480.
- Vivarelli, M. (2013). "Is entrepreneurship necessarily good? Microeconomic evidence from developed and developing countries", *Industrial and Corporate Change*, Vol. 22 (6), pp. 1453–1495.
- Wennekers, S., van Stel, A., Thurik, R., & Reynolds, P. (2005). "Nascent entrepreneurship and the level of economic development", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 24, pp. 293–309.
- Wilson, W. R., Whitmoyer, J. G., Pieper, T. M., Astrachan, J. H., Hair Jr., J. F., & Sarstedt,
 M. (2014). "Method trends and method needs: Examining methods needed for accelerating the field", *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, Vol. 5, pp- 4-14.

- Wong, P.K., Ho, Y.P., & Autio, E. (2005). "Entrepreneurship, innovation and economic growth: Evidence from GEM data", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 24 (3), pp. 335– 350.
- Zali, M.R., Faghih, N., Ghotbi, S., & Rajaie, S. (2013). "The effect of necessity and opportunity driven entrepreneurship on business growth", *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, Vol. 7 (2), pp. 100–108.

Annexes

Continents		Countries	OECD countries	Non-OECD countries
	1	Botswana		×
	2	Cameroon		×
	3	Ghana		×
	4	Malawi		×
AFRICA	5	Morocco		×
	6	Senegal		×
	7	South Africa		×
	8	Tunisia		×
	9	Uganda		×
	10	Zambia		×
	11	Bangladesh		×
	12	China		×
	13	India		×
	14	Indonesia		×
	15	Israel	×	
	16	Japan	×	
	17	Jordan		×
	18	Kazakhstan		×
	19	Malaysia		×
ASIA	20	Namibia		×
	21	Pakistan		×
	22	Philippines		×
	23	Qatar		×
	24	Saudi Arabia		×
	25	Singapore		×
	26	Thailand		×
	27	Turkey	×	
	28	Vietnam		•
	29	Austria	×	
	30	Belgium	×	
	31	Bulgaria		×
	32	Croatia		×
	33	Czech Republic	×	
EUROPE	34	Denmark	×	
	35	Estonia		×
	36	Finland	×	
	37	France	×	
	38	Germany	×	
	39	Greece	×	
	40	Hungary	×	

Table A 1: List of Countries

Continents		Countries	OECD countries	Non-OECD countries
	41	Iceland	×	
	42	Ireland	×	
	43	Italy	×	
	44	Latvia	×	
	45	Lithuania		×
	46	Luxembourg	×	
	47	Netherlands	×	
	48	Norway	×	
EUROPE	49	Poland	×	
	50	Portugal	×	
	51	Romania		×
	52	Serbia		×
	53	Slovak Republic	×	
	54	Slovenia	×	
	55	Spain	×	
	56	Sweden	×	
	57	Switzerland	×	
	58	United Kingdom	×	
	59	Argentina		×
	60	Barbados		×
	61	Belize		×
	62	Bolivia		×
	63	Brazil		×
	64	Chile	×	
	65	Colombia		×
	66	Costa Rica		×
	67	Dominican Republic		×
AMERICA	68	Ecuador	×	
	69	El Salvador		Х
	70	Guatemala		×
	71	Jamaica		×
	72	Mexico	×	
	73	Panama		×
	74	Peru		×
	75	Uruguay		×
	76	Canada	×	
	77	United States	×	
OCEANIA	78	Australia	×	
OCEANIA	79	New Zealand	×	

Source: Own elaboration

Continents	OECD/ Non-OECD	Countries	TE	OE	NE
	Non-OECD	Botswana	16	11	15
	Non-OECD	Cameroon	11	6	9
	Non-OECD	Ghana	5	4	4
	Non-OECD	Malawi	1	1	1
A FRICA	Non-OECD	Morocco	5	5	5
macn	Non-OECD	Senegal	15	11	15
	Non-OECD	South Africa	2	1	1
	Non-OECD	Tunisia	3	3	3
	Non-OECD	Uganda	4	4	4
	Non-OECD	Zambia	16	11	15
	Non-OECD	Bangladesh	7	6	6
	Non-OECD	China	15	11	14
	Non-OECD	India	9	6	9
	Non-OECD	Indonesia	9	6	8
	OECD	Israel	5	4	4
	OECD	Japan	15	10	14
	Non-OECD	Jordan	11	7	10
	Non-OECD	Kazakhstan	15	10	14
ASIA	Non-OECD	Malaysia	9	8	8
10111	Non-OECD	Namibia	14	10	14
	Non-OECD	Pakistan	3	1	2
	Non-OECD	Philippines	4	3	3
	Non-OECD	Qatar	11	10	10
	Non-OECD	Saudi Arabia	4	4	4
	Non-OECD	Singapore	4	3	3
	Non-OECD	Thailand	2	2	2
	OECD	Turkey	9	8	8
	Non-OECD	Vietnam	12	9	11
	OECD	Austria	3	2	2
	OECD	Belgium	2	2	2
	Non-OECD	Bulgaria	16	11	15
	Non-OECD	Croatia	5	1	5
	OECD	Czech Republic	15	11	15
	OECD	Denmark	3	3	3
	Non-OECD	Estonia	7	6	6
	OECD	Finland	12	10	11
	OECD	France	4	4	4
EUROPE	OECD	Germany	9	5	8
	OECD	Greece	10	7	9
	OECD	Hungary	2	1	1
	OECD	Iceland	9	9	9
	OECD	Ireland	3	2	2
	OECD	Italy	1	1	1
	OECD	Latvia	3	3	3
	Non-OECD	Lithuania	10	6	10
	OECD	Luxembourg	6	5	5
	OECD	Netherlands	15	11	14

 Table A 2: Number of observations per country

Continents	OECD/ Non-OECD	Countries	TE	OE	NE
	OECD	Norway	15	10	14
	OECD	Poland	16	11	15
	OECD	Portugal	14	9	13
	Non-OECD	Romania	12	9	11
	Non-OECD	Serbia	10	8	9
EUROPE	OECD	Slovak Republic	4	4	4
	OECD	Slovenia	8	7	7
	OECD	Spain	7	5	7
	OECD	Sweden	16	11	15
	OECD	Switzerland	16	11	15
	OECD	United Kingdom	11	10	10
	Non-OECD	Costa Rica	2	1	1
	Non-OECD	El Salvador	3	2	2
	Non-OECD	Guatemala	10	5	9
	Non-OECD	Panama	14	11	13
	OECD	Mexico	11	10	10
	Non-OECD	Argentina	15	11	14
	Non-OECD	Bolivia	3	3	3
	Non-OECD	Brazil	13	9	13
	OECD	Chile	3	3	3
AMERICA	Non-OECD	Colombia	9	7	8
	OECD	Ecuador	3	2	2
	Non-OECD	Peru	5	4	4
	Non-OECD	Uruguay	16	11	15
	Non-OECD	Barbados	15	10	14
	Non-OECD	Belize	15	10	14
	Non-OECD	Dominican Republic	3	3	3
	Non-OECD	Jamaica	14	11	13
	OECD	Canada	13	10	12
	OECD	United States	3	3	3
	OECD	Australia	3	3	3
OCEANIA	OECD	New Zealand	3	3	3

Source: Own elaboration Note: Highlighted cells means that the countries are not included

Continent	Countries	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
	Botswana	5,52	5,74	5,97	6,21	6,45	6,71	6,88	7,06	7,24	7,42	7,61	7,74	7,87	8,01	8,14	8,28	8,39	8,51	8,63	8,75	8,87	8,99	9,12	9,24	9,37	9,50	9,61
	Cameroon	3,47	3,60	3,73	3,86	4,00	4,15	4,28	4,41	4,55	4,69	4,84	4,96	5,08	5,21	5,34	5,47	5,56	5,66	5,76	5,86	5,96	6,06	6,17	6,27	6,38	6,49	6,58
	Ghana	4,91	5,05	5,20	5,35	5,50	5,66	5,75	5,84	5,94	6,03	6,13	6,19	6,24	6,30	6,35	6,41	6,48	6,55	6,62	6,69	6,76	6,83	6,91	6,98	7,05	7,13	7,19
	Malawi	2,45	2,50	2,55	2,60	2,66	2,71	2,77	2,84	2,91	2,98	3,05	3,12	3,18	3,25	3,32	3,39	3,55	3,72	3,90	4,09	4,29	4,50	4,71	4,94	5,18	5,43	5,64
AFRICA	Morocco	2,11	2,21	2,31	2,42	2,54	2,66	2,77	2,89	3,01	3,13	3,26	3,36	3,46	3,57	3,68	3,79	3,88	3,96	4,05	4,15	4,24	4,34	4,43	4,54	4,64	4,74	4,83
	Senegal	2,20	2,17	2,14	2,11	2,09	2,06	2,02	1,99	1,96	1,92	1,89	1,81	1,73	1,66	1,59	1,52	1,67	1,82	2,00	2,19	2,40	2,63	2,88	3,16	3,46	3,79	4,08
	South Africa	6,49	6,80	7,13	7,48	7,84	8,22	8,01	7,81	7,61	7,42	7,23	7,42	7,61	7,81	8,02	8,23	8,46	8,69	8,93	9,18	9,43	9,69	9,96	10,2 3	10,51	10,8 0	11,04
	Tunisia	3,43	3,56	3,69	3,83	3,98	4,13	4,27	4,42	4,58	4,74	4,90	5,06	5,22	5,39	5,57	5,75	5,91	6,07	6,23	6,40	6,58	6,76	6,94	7,13	7,33	7,53	7,69
	Uganda	2,77	2,88	3,00	3,12	3,25	3,38	3,47	3,56	3,66	3,76	3,86	3,97	4,08	4,19	4,31	4,43	4,61	4,80	5,00	5,21	5,42	5,64	5,88	6,12	6,37	6,63	6,85
	Zambia	4,68	4,92	5,18	5,45	5,74	6,04	6,01	5,98	5,94	5,91	5,88	5,97	6,05	6,14	6,23	6,32	6,38	6,43	6,49	6,54	6,60	6,66	6,72	6,77	6,83	6,89	6,94
	Bangladesh	2,84	2,92	3,01	3,10	3,19	3,29	3,37	3,44	3,52	3,61	3,69	3,78	3,88	3,98	4,08	4,19	4,33	4,46	4,61	4,76	4,91	5,07	5,23	5,40	5,57	5,75	5,90
	China	5,34	5,51	5,68	5,85	6,03	6,22	6,37	6,52	6,68	6,84	7,00	7,07	7,13	7,20	7,27	7,34	7,38	7,42	7,45	7,49	7,53	7,57	7,61	7,65	7,69	7,72	7,76
	India	2,96	3,06	3,17	3,28	3,39	3,51	3,67	3,85	4,03	4,21	4,41	4,49	4,57	4,65	4,74	4,82	4,93	5,04	5,15	5,27	5,39	5,51	5,64	5,76	5,89	6,03	6,14
	Indonesia	3,28	3,45	3,62	3,81	4,00	4,21	4,31	4,42	4,53	4,64	4,75	4,96	5,17	5,40	5,63	5,88	6,13	6,40	6,67	6,96	7,26	7,57	7,90	8,24	8,59	8,96	9,27
	Israel	11,03	11,1	11,1 8	11,2	11,3	11,4	11,4 8	11,5	11,6 4	11,7	11,8	11,8	11,9	11,9 5	12,0	12,0	12,1	12,3	12,4 7	12,6	12,7	12,91	13,0	13,21	13,3	13,51	13,64
	Japan	9,61	9,72	9,83	9,95	10,0	10,1	10,2	10,4	10,5	10,6	10,7	10,8	10,9	10,9	11,0	11,1	11,2	11,3	11,3	11,4	11,52	11,59	11,66	11,74	11,81	11,88	11,94
	Jordan	5,25	5,51	5,79	6,08	6,39	6,71	6,90	7,10	7,30	7,51	3 7,72	2 7,87	8,02	8,17	8 8,33	8,49	4 8,63	8,77	8 8,91	5 9,06	9,21	9,36	9,51	9,67	9,83	9,99	10,12
	Kazakhstan	8.05	8.28	8.52	8.76	9.01	9.27	9.50	9.74	9.98	10,2	10,4	10,7	10,9	11,2	11,4	11,7	11,6	11,6	11,5	11,4	11.42	11.36	11.29	11.23	11.17	11.11	11.06
	Malamia	6.52	6.72	6.02	7 1 2	7.24	7.56	7.69	7 70	7.01	3	8	2	7 8 46	2	8	4	8	1	5	8	0.75	0.02	10,0	10,2	10,4	10,6	10.78
ASIA	Malaysia	0,55	0,72	0,92	7,15	7,34	7,50	7,00	7,79	7,91	5,04	6,10	6,51	0,40	6,02	0,70	6,94	9,10	9,20	9,42	9,56	9,75	9,92	9	7	5	3	10,78
	Namibia Daliatan	5,59	5,61	5,62	5,64	5,65	3,67	5,65	5,65	5,60	2,58	2,20	5,64	5,71	5,79	5,87	5,95	6,00	6,06	6,11	0,17	6,22	6,28	6,55	6,39	6,44	6,50	0,55
	Pakistan	2,28	2,37	2,40	2,50	2,00	2,77	2,80	2,90	5,00 7 27	3,10 7.45	3,27 7 5 4	5,49	3,72	3,97 7,72	4,23	7.05	4,50	7.09	4,47	4,40 9.11	4,45	4,44	4,45	4,41 0 20	4,40 9.45	4,39	4,38
	Finippines	0,39	0,09	0,00	0,90	7,01	7,12	7,20	1,29	1,37	7,45	7,54	7,00	7,00	1,12	1,19	7,05	7,91	7,90	8,05	0,11	0,10	0,25	0,52	0,50	0,45	10,0	0,50
	Qatar	5,38	5,49	5,60	5,/1	5,82	5,94	6,03	6,13	6,22	6,32	6,42	6,55	6,68	6,82	6,96	7,10	/,35	/,61	7,88	8,16	8,45	8,75	9,06	9,38	9,71	6	10,34
	Arabia	5,55	5,65	5,74	5,84	5,95	6,05	6,16	6,28	6,40	6,52	6,64	6,76	6,88	7,00	7,12	7,25	7,35	7,46	7,57	7,68	7,79	7,90	8,02	8,13	8,25	8,37	8,47
	Singapore	5,79	6,07	6,36	6,66	6,98	7,32	7,61	7,92	8,23	8,56	8,90	8,82	8,75	8,67	8,59	8,52	8,91	9,31	9,73	10,1 7	10,6 3	11,11	11,61	12,14	12,6 9	13,2 6	13,74
	Thailand	3,83	3,93	4,02	4,12	4,23	4,33	4,42	4,52	4,61	4,71	4,81	5,10	5,41	5,73	6,07	6,44	6,60	6,77	6,94	7,12	7,30	7,49	7,68	7,87	8,07	8,27	8,44
	Turkey	4,53	4,58	4,64	4,70	4,75	4,81	4,95	5,09	5,24	5,39	5,54	5,64	5,74	5,85	5,95	6,06	6,16	6,26	6,36	6,46	6,56	6,66	6,77	6,88	6,99	7,10	7,19
	Vietnam	3,94	4,06	4,19	4,32	4,46	4,60	4,75	4,91	5,08	5,25	5,42	5,61	5,81	6,01	6,22	6,44	6,63	6,83	7,03	7,24	7,45	7,67	7,90	8,13	8,37	8,62	8,82
	Austria	8,64	8,69	8,73	8,78	8,82	8,87	8,90	8,94	8,97	9,01	9,04	9,13	9,21	9,30	9,39	9,48	9,56	9,64	9,72	9,81	9,89	9,97	10,0 6	10,14	10,2 3	10,3 2	10,39
EUROPE	Belgium	9,10	9,23	9,37	9,50	9,64	9,78	9,86	9,95	10,0 3	10,1 1	10,2 0	10,2 9	10,3 9	10,4 8	10,5 7	10,6 7	10,6 9	10,7 1	10,7 4	10,7 6	10,7 8	10,8 0	10,8 2	10,8 5	10,8 7	10,8 9	10,91

 Table A 3: Human Capital values for the period between 1990 and 2016

Bulgaria	8,44	8,56	8,68	8,80	8,92	9,05	9,11	9,17	9,23	9,29	9,35	9,56	9,78	10,0 0	10,2 2	10,4 5	10,6 4	10,8 4	11,0 4	11,2 4	11,45	11,66	11,88	12,10	12,3 2	12,5 5	12,73
Croatia	8,68	8,80	8,93	9,05	9,18	9,31	9,42	9,53	9,65	9,76	9,88	10,0 2	10,1 5	10,2 9	10,4 4	10,5 8	10,7 4	10,9 1	11,0 8	11,2 5	11,42	11,60	11,77	11,96	12,14	12,3 3	12,48
Czech Republic	10,88	11,1 1	11,3 4	11,5 8	11,8 2	12,0 7	12,2	12,4	12,5 7	12,7 4	12,9 1	12,9 4	12,9 8	13,0	13,0	13,0 8	13,1	13,1 1	13,1	13,1 4	13,16	13,18	13,19	13,21	13,2 2	13,2 4	13,25
Denmark	8,96	9,14	9,33	9,52	9,71	9,91	10,0	10,2	10,3	10,5	10,7	10,8	10,9	11,0	11,1	11,1	11,2	11,3	11,3	11,4	11,53	11,60	11,67	11,74	11,81	11,88	11,94
Estonia	9,31	9,53	9,77	10,0	10,2	10,4	10,7	10,9	11,2	11,4	11,7	11,8	11,8	11,9	12,0	12,0	12,1	12,2	12,3	12,4	12,4	12,5	12,6	12,7	12,81	12,8	12,96
Finland	7,46	7,68	7,91	8,14	+ 8,38	8,63	8,76	8,90	2 9,04	9,18	9,32	9,41	9,51	+ 9,61	9,70	9,80	9,88	+ 9,96	10,0	10,1	10,21	10,2	10,3	10,4	10,5	10,6	10,71
France	7,33	7,56	7,79	8,03	8,28	8,54	8,73	8,92	9,12	9,32	9,53	9,63	9,73	9,84	9,94	10,0	10,1	10,2	10,4	10,5	10,6	10,7	10,8	11,01	5 11,14	4	11,37
Germany	8.77	8.94	9.12	9.29	9.48	9.66	9.82	9,99	10,1	10,3	10,5	10,7	11,0	11,3	11,6	5 11,9	12,1	8 12,2	12,4	12,5	4	12,8	9 12,9	13.14	13,3	13,4	13.58
Greece	7.89	7.95	8.00	8.06	8.12	8.18	8.26	8.33	6 8.41	3 8.49	1 8.57	9 8.80	9.03	6 9.27	6 9.52	9.77	1 9.87	5 9.96	0 10,0	4	9 10,2	4 10,3	9 10,4	10,5	0 10,6	5 10,7	10.86
Hungary	8.68	8.99	9.32	9.66	10,0	10,3	10,5	10,7	10,8	11,0	11,2	11,3	11,4	11,5	11,6	11,7	11,7	11,8	6 11,9	6 12,0	6 12 14	6 12,2	6 12,3	7	7 12,5	7 12,5	12.66
Iceland	8.46	8 55	8.64	8 74	1	7	4	1	8 9.24	6 9.34	4 9.45	3	3	2	1	1 10,0	9 10,1	8 10 , 2	7 10 , 3	5 10,4	10,5	3 10,7	2 10,8	10,9	0	9	11 27
Incland	0,72	0,55	0,04	10,1	10,2	10,4	10,4	10,5	10,6	10,7	10,8	11,0	11,1	11,3	11,5	4 11,7	5 11,8	6 11,9	7 12,0	8 12,1	9 12,2	0 12,3	2 12,3	3 12,4	12,5	12,6	10.77
Ireland	9,75	9,80	9,99	3	6	0	9	7	6	5	4	1	9	7	5	3	2	2	1	0	0	0	9	9	9 10,0	9	12,77
Italy	7,29	/,41	/,54	/,6/	7,80	7,93	8,06	8,18	8,31	8,45	8,58	8,66	8,/5	8,83	8,91	9,00	9,11	9,21	9,32	9,43	9,54 10,4	9,65	9,76	9,88 10.6	0	10,11	10,21
Latvia	7,56	7,81	8,07	8,33	8,61	8,89	9,00	9,12	9,23	9,35	9,47	9,60 10.0	9,74 10.1	9,87 10.3	1	5	2	8	5	1	8	5	10,61	8	5	2	10,88
Lithuania	8,25	8,40	8,55	8,71	8,87	9,03	9,19	9,35	9,52	9,69	9,86	2	8	5	2	9	6	3	0	8	11,05	11,12	11,20	11,27	11,35	11,42	11,48
fg Natharland	8,92	9,00	9,08	9,16	9,24	9,32	9,39	9,46	9,53	9,61	9,68	9,80	9,92	5	7	0	8	6	4	3	11,22	11,41	11,61	11,81	12,01	2	12,39
s	10,34	0	6	10,5	7	3	0	7	4	10,9	8	8	8	8	8	8	0	2	5	7	11,60	11,73	11,86	11,99	12,12	6	12,36
Norway	10,47	10,5 4	10,6 0	10,6 7	10,7 3	10,8 0	10,8 8	10,9 6	11,0 4	11,1 3	11,2 1	11,3 8	11,5 5	11,7 2	11,8 9	12,0 7	12,0 2	11,9 6	11,9 1	11,8 5	11,80	11,75	11,69	11,64	11,59	11,54	11,49
Poland	8,96	9,13	9,30	9,47	9,65	9,83	9,95	10,0 6	10,1 8	10,3 0	10,4 2	10,5 1	10,6 1	10,7 1	10,8 0	10,9 0	11,0 0	11,1 1	11,2 1	11,3 1	11,42	11,53	11,63	11,74	11,85	11,96	12,05
Portugal	5,25	5,38	5,51	5,64	5,78	5,92	6,07	6,22	6,38	6,54	6,70	6,69	6,68	6,66	6,65	6,64	6,75	6,86	6,97	7,08	7,20	7,32	7,44	7,56	7,68	7,81	7,91
Romania	9,05	9,16	9,27	9,39	9,50	9,62	9,70	9,78	9,86	9,94	10,0 2	10,0 9	10,1 5	10,2 2	10,2 8	10,3 5	10,4 4	10,5 3	10,6 2	10,7	10,81	10,9 0	11,00	11,10	11,19	11,29	11,37
Serbia	7,95	8,12	8,28	8,46	8,63	8,81	8,92	9,04	9,15	9,27	9,39	9,55	9,71	9,87	10,0 4	10,2 1	10,3 6	10,5 1	10,6 6	10,8 1	10,9 7	11,13	11,29	11,45	11,62	11,79	11,92
Slovak Republic	10,75	10,8 8	11,0 0	11,1 3	11,2 6	11,3 9	11,4 2	11,4 4	11,4 7	11,4 9	11,5 2	11,7 2	11,9 3	12,1 4	12,3 6	12,5 8	12,6 8	12,7 7	12,8 7	12,9 7	13,0 7	13,17	13,2 7	13,3 7	13,4 8	13,5 8	13,66
Slovenia	10,91	10,9 7	11,0 4	11,1 0	11,1 7	11,2 3	11,3 0	11,3 6	11,4 3	11,5 0	11,5 7	11,6 0	11,6 3	11,6 6	11,6 9	11,7 2	11,8 0	11,8 8	11,9 6	12,0 5	12,13	12,21	12,3 0	12,3 8	12,4 7	12,5 5	12,62
Spain	6,52	6,74	6,96	7,20	7,44	7,69	7,92	8,15	8,39	8,64	8,89	9,13	9,38	9,63	9,89	10,1 6	10,1 9	10,2 2	10,2 4	10,2 7	10,3 0	10,3 3	10,3 6	10,3 8	10,41	10,4 4	10,46
Sweden	10,54	10,6	10,7	10,7	10,8 7	10,9	11,0 4	11,1 4	11,2	11,3 2	11,4 2	11,5	11,6 8	11,8 2	11,9	12,0	12,0	12,0	11,9 7	11,9	11,89	11,85	11,81	11,77	11,73	11,69	11,66
Switzerland	10,19	10,1	10,1	10,1	10,1	10,1	10,1	10,2	10,2	10,2	10,2	10,4	10,5	10,6	10,7	10,8	11,3	11,8 1	12,3	12,8	13,4	14,01	14,6 2	15,2	15,9 2	16,61	17,19
United	8,88	8,96	9,04	9,12	9,21	9,29	9,40	9,51	9,63	9,74	9,86	10,0	10,3	10,5	10,7	11,0	11,2	11,5	11,7	12,0	12,3	12,6	12,8	13,17	13,4	13,7	14,01
ranguom												0	1	5	2	5	0	5	2	5	4	0	0		U	0	

	Argentina	7,88	7,97	8,06	8,15	8,25	8,34	8,38	8,42	8,47	8,51	8,55	8,69	8,83	8,97	9,11	9,26	9,30	9,35	9,39	9,44	9,48	9,52	9,57	9,61	9,66	9,71	9,74
	Barbados	8,08	8,20	8,33	8,45	8,58	8,71	8,70	8,70	8,69	8,69	8,68	8,78	8,88	8,98	9,09	9,19	9,22	9,24	9,27	9,29	9,32	9,35	9,37	9,40	9,43	9,45	9,47
	Belize	8,22	8,39	8,57	8,75	8,94	9,13	9,32	9,51	9,70	9,90	10,1 0	10,2 4	10 ,3 9	10,5 4	10,6 9	10,8 4	10,9 9	11,1 3	11,2 8	11,4 4	11,59	11,75	11,90	12,0 6	12,2 3	12,3 9	12,53
	Bolivia	6,41	6,54	6,68	6,82	6,96	7,11	7,17	7,24	7,31	7,37	7,44	7,49	7,54	7,59	7,64	7,69	7,71	7,72	7,74	7,75	7,77	7,79	7,80	7,82	7,83	7,85	7,86
	Brazil	4,04	4,19	4,34	4,50	4,67	4,84	5,01	5,20	5,38	5,58	5,78	5,96	6,15	6,34	6,54	6,75	6,92	7,10	7,28	7,47	7,66	7,86	8,06	8,26	8,48	8,69	8,87
	Chile	8,02	8,09	8,17	8,25	8,32	8,40	8,47	8,54	8,61	8,68	8,75	8,88	9,01	9,14	9,27	9,41	9,47	9,53	9,59	9,65	9,71	9,77	9,83	9,89	9,96	10,0 2	10,07
	Colombia	5,46	5,58	5,70	5,83	5,96	6,09	6,17	6,25	6,33	6,42	6,50	6,54	6,58	6,61	6,65	6,69	7,01	7,35	7,70	8,06	8,45	8,85	9,28	9,72	10,19	10,6 7	11,08
	Costa Rica	6,72	6,81	6,90	6,99	7,08	7,17	7,23	7,28	7,34	7,40	7,46	7,56	7,65	7,75	7,85	7,95	7,93	7,91	7,88	7,86	7,84	7,82	7,80	7,77	7,75	7,73	7,71
AMEDICA	Dominican Republic	5,34	5,45	5,56	5,68	5,80	5,92	5,99	6,05	6,12	6,19	6,26	6,39	6,52	6,66	6,80	6,94	7,06	7,18	7,31	7,43	7,56	7,69	7,82	7,96	8,10	8,24	8,35
AMERICA	Ecuador	6,44	6,49	6,55	6,60	6,66	6,71	6,72	6,73	6,74	6,75	6,76	6,81	6,86	6,91	6,97	7,02	7,10	7,19	7,27	7,35	7,44	7,53	7,61	7,70	7,79	7,89	7,96
	El Salvador	3,72	3,88	4,04	4,21	4,39	4,58	4,79	5,01	5,24	5,48	5,73	5,91	6,09	6,28	6,47	6,67	6,86	7,05	7,25	7,45	7,66	7,87	8,10	8,32	8,56	8,80	8,99
	Guatemala	3,05	3,12	3,19	3,26	3,33	3,41	3,47	3,54	3,60	3,67	3,74	3,71	3,68	3,64	3,61	3,58	3,71	3,85	4,00	4,15	4,30	4,46	4,63	4,80	4,98	5,16	5,32
	Jamaica	6,47	6,66	6,86	7,06	7,27	7,48	7,70	7,92	8,14	8,38	8,62	8,71	8,81	8,90	9,00	9,10	9,21	9,32	9,44	9,55	9,67	9,79	9,91	10,0 3	10,15	10,2 8	10,38
	Mexico	5,56	5,73	5,91	6,10	6,28	6,48	6,60	6,73	6,85	6,98	7,11	7,26	7,41	7,57	7,73	7,89	7,98	8,06	8,15	8,24	8,33	8,42	8,51	8,61	8,70	8,79	8,87
	Panama	7,26	7,41	7,56	7,72	7,88	8,04	8,14	8,23	8,33	8,43	8,53	8,61	8,70	8,79	8,87	8,96	9,00	9,04	9,07	9,11	9,15	9,19	9,23	9,27	9,30	9,34	9,38
	Peru	6,52	6,66	6,80	6,95	7,10	7,25	7,44	7,64	7,85	8,06	8,27	8,45	8,63	8,81	9,00	9,19	9,09	8,98	8,88	8,78	8,68	8,58	8,48	8,39	8,29	8,20	8,12
	Uruguay	7,13	7,17	7,21	7,24	7,28	7,32	7,44	7,56	7,69	7,81	7,94	7,93	7,92	7,90	7,89	7,88	7,93	7,97	8,02	8,06	8,11	8,16	8,20	8,25	8,30	8,35	8,39
	Canada	10,28	10,3 5	10,4 2	10,4 9	10,5 6	10,6 3	10,7 0	10,7 7	10,8 4	10,9 1	10,9 8	11,2 2	11,4 6	11,7 1	11,9 6	12,2 2	12,2 9	12,3 5	12,4 2	12,4 9	12,5 6	12,6 3	12,7 0	12,7 7	12,8 4	12,91	12,97
	United States	12,32	12,3 9	12,4 7	12,5 4	12,6 2	12,6 9	12,7 4	12,7 9	12,8 3	12,8 8	12,9 3	12,9 7	13,0 1	13,0 5	13,0 9	13,1 3	13,1 9	13,2 5	13,3 0	13,3 6	13,4 2	13,4 8	13,5 4	13,6 0	13,6 6	13,7 2	13,76
OCEANI	Australia	11,20	11,2 2	11,2 4	11,2 7	11,2 9	11,3 1	11,3 0	11,2 9	11,2 8	11,2 7	11,2 6	11,3 2	11,3 7	11,4 3	11,4 8	11,5 4	11,5 9	11,6 3	11,6 8	11,7 2	11,77	11,82	11,86	11,91	11,96	12,0 0	12,04
Λ	New Zealand	11,54	11,5 5	11,5 6	11,5 7	11,5 8	11,5 9	11,5 9	11,5 9	11,6 0	11,6 0	11,6 0	11,6 1	11,6 2	11,6 3	11,6 4	11,6 5	11,5 8	11,5 1	11,4 4	11,3 7	11,30	11,23	11,16	11,10	11,03	10,9 6	10,91

Source: Barro & Lee (2010) Note: Highlighted values means that values were obtained through the calculation of the Compound Annual Growth Rate (C.A.G.R)

Table A 4.	TF values	for the ne	eriod between	2001 and 2016
Table II 4.	IL values	for the po		2001 and 2010

Continents Countries 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2011 2012	2013	2014 2015	2016
Botswana 27,66	20,85 3	32,79 33,23	35,33
Cameroon	3	37,37 25,37	27,56
Ghana 33,95 35,21 36,52	25,82 2	23,57 21,52	19,64
Malawi 35,56	28,11		
AFRICA Morocco 15,74		4,44	5,56
Senegal		38,55	
South África 6,49 6,3 4,21 5,27 5,11 5,14 6,32 7,76 5,92 8,86 9,14 7,32	10,59	6,97 9,19	6,91
Tunisia 9,43 6,12 5,41 4,78	6,14	7,89 10,13	13,01
Uganda 28,85 31,6 33,67 31,29 33,45 35,76	25,21 3	35,53 36,25	36,99
Zambia 32,63 36,78 41,46	39,91 4	42,68 46,64	48,81
Bangladesh 12,77			
China 12,11 12,92 13,31 13,71 15,97 16,43 17,59 18,84 14,37 24,01 12,83	14,02 1	15,53 12,84	10,29
India 10,81 16,04 17,32 18,70 20,20 10,09 8,53 11,49 11,15 10,82 10,49 10,18	9,88	6,6 10,83	10,59
Indonesia 19,28	25,52	14,2 17,67	14,08
Israel 5,29 6,99 6,80 6,62 7,09 7,59 5,44 6,36 6,07 5,02 5,73 6,53	10,04 1	10,89 11,82	11,31
Japan 3,1 1,69 2,76 1,48 2,2 2,9 4,34 5,42 3,26 3,3 5,22 3,99	3,72	3.83 3,45	3,12
Jordan 18,18 10,24	,	,	8,20
Kazakhstan 9,36	1	13.72 11	10,15
Malaysia 11,09 8,15 6,00 4,41 4,96 4,92 6,99	6,6	5,91 2,93	4,70
ASIA Namibia 18,15	33,34	- , ,	,
Pakistan 9,08 9,07 11,57			
Philippines 20,39	18,52 1	18,38 17,16	16,52
Qatar	1	16,38 11,34	7,85
Saudi Arabia 4,66 9,4		, .	11,44
Singapore 6,05 5,91 4,95 5,66 7,24 4,8 5,12 5,45 5,81 6,19 6,6 11,56	10,68 1	10,96 12,98	15,37
Thailand 18,9 20,74 15,2 26,87 24,80 22,90 21,14 19,51 18,94	17,66	23.3 13,74	17,24
Turkey 6,07 5,58 5,96 7,16 8,59 11,87 12,22	9,95 1	11,69 13,74	16,14
Vietnam	15,35	15.3 13,65	12,87
Austria 5,28 2,44 9,58	,	8,71	9,63
Belgium 4,19 2,99 3,88 3,42 3,93 2,73 3,15 2,85 3,51 3,67 5,69 5,2	4,92	5,4 6,24	7,03
Bulgaria	,	3,46	4,84
Croatia 3,62 2,56 3,73 6,11 8,47 7,27 7,59 5,58 5,52 7,32 8,27	8,27	7,97 7,69	8,41
Czech Republic 7,85 7,64	7,33		
Denmark 7,23 6,53 5,88 5,31 4,71 5,31 5,39 4,04 3,64 3,77 4,63 5,36	5,41	5,47 5,78	6,11
Estonia 14,26	13,11	9,43 13,14	16,16
Finland 8,16 4,56 3,14 4,35 4,92 4,99 6,91 7,34 5,17 5,72 6,25 5,98	5,29	5.63 6,59	6,71
EUROPE France 5.72 3.13 1.63 6.03 5.35 4.39 3.17 5.64 4.35 5.83 5.73 5.17	4,57	5.34 5,33	5,32
Germany 6,28 5,16 5,22 4,4 5,09 4,21 3,98 3,77 4,1 4,17 5,62 5,34	4,98	5.27 4,7	4,56
Greece 6.77 5.77 6.5 7.9 5.71 9.86 8.79 5.51 7.95 6.51	5,51	7.85 6,75	5,70
Hungary 10.86 6.53 5.29 4.29 1.88 6.04 6.86 6.61 9.13 7.13 6.29 9.22	9,68	9.33 7,92	7,94
Iceland 11.32 11.18 13.57 10.59 10.21 12.48 10.05 11.45 10.58 10.15 9.74	9,34	8.96 8,60	8,25
Ireland 11,37 9,14 8,1 7,7 9,83 7,35 8,22 7,59 7,16 6,76 7,25 6,15	9,25	6.53 9,33	10,88
Italy 9,11 5,74 3,11 4,32 4,94 3,47 5,01 4,62 3,72 2,35 3,19 4,32	3,43	4.42 4,87	4,42
Latvia 6,65 6,53 4,46 6,53 10,51 9,68 11,85 13,39	12.05	12 67 14 11	14.10
	13,43	13,0/ 14,11	14,19

	Luxembourg													8,69	7,14	10,18	9,19
	Netherlands	5,87	4,59	3,6	5,11	4,34	5,4	5,18	5,2	7,19	7,22	8,21	10,31	9,27	9,46	7,21	11,00
	Norway	7,4	8,64	7,35	6,86	9,11	8,9	6,18	8,7	8,53	7,72	6,94	6,75	6,25	5,65	5,66	5,38
	Poland	8,04	3,96	5,90	8,78							9,03	9,36	9,28	9,21	9,21	10,66
	Portugal	6,61	5,52	4,61	3,85	5,07	6,67	8,78	6,97	5,54	4,4	7,54	7,67	8,25	9,97	9,49	8,15
	Romania							4,02	3,98	5,02	4,29	9,89	9,22	10,13	11,35	10,83	11,20
	Serbia							8,56	7,59	4,9							
	Slovak Republic											14,2	10,22	9,52	10,9	9,64	9,45
	Slovenia		4,63	4,05	2,6	4,36	4,63	4,78	6,4	5,36	4,65	3,65	5,42	6,45	6,33	5,91	8,02
	Spain	6,32	4,59	6,65	5,15	5,65	7,27	7,62	7,03	5,1	4,31	5,81	5,7	5,21	5,47	5,7	5,23
	Sweden	5,65	3,9	4,12	3,71	4,04	3,45	4,15	4,38	4,62	4,88	5,8	6,44	8,25	6,71	7,16	7,58
	Switzerland		7,13	7,29	6,64	6,05	6,16	6,27	6,96	7,72	5,04	6,58	5,93	8,18	7,12	7,31	8,21
	United Kingdom	6,49	5,36	6,35	6,25	6,19	5,76	5,53	5,91	5,74	6,42	7,29	8,98	7,14	10,66	6,93	8,80
	Argentina	9,92	14,15	19,73	12,84	9,49	10,24	14,43	16,54	14,68	14,2	20,78	18,88	15,93	14,41	17,74	14,51
	Barbados											8	17,12	21,67	12,71	21,05	20,75
	Belize														7,14	14,35	28,83
	Bolivia								29,82		38,6				27,4		
	Brazil	13,8	13,53	12,9	13,48	11,32	11,65	12,72	12,02	15,32	17,5	14,89	15,44	17,31	17,23	20,98	19,56
	Chile		15,68	16,87		11,15	9,19	13,43	13,08	14,79	16,77	23,69	22,58	24,33	26,83	25,93	24,18
	Colombia						22,37	22,72	24,52	22,57	20,61	21,44	20,11	23,71	18,55	22,67	27,35
	Costa Rica										13,44		15,04		11,33		
	Dominican Republic							16,75	20,35	17,53							
AMERICA	Ecuador				27,24	24,28	21,63	19,28	17,18	15,82	21,25	23,78	26,61	35,97	32,61	33,56	31,83
	El Salvador												15,26	17,24	19,48	16,67	14,26
	Guatemala									19,2	16,3	19,31	15,40	12,28	20,39	17,71	20,07
	Jamaica					17	20,32	17,82	15,63	22,73	10,48	13,71	13,73	13,75	19,27	13,78	9,85
	Mexico	17,91	12,4			5,91	5,26	8,30	13,09	11,70	10,45	9,62	12,11	14,83	18,99	21,01	9,63
	Panama									9,59	14,12	20,78	9,46	20,64	17,06	12,8	13,20
	Peru				40,27	40,17	40,08	25,89	25,57	20,93	27,24	22,89	20,21	23,38	28,81	22,22	25,14
	Uruguay						12,51	12,21	11,9	12,16	11,68	16,72	14,63	14,08	16,08	14,28	14,11
	Canada	10,27	9,51	8,28	8,85	9,28	7,12	7,69	8,30	8,97	9,68	10,45	11,29	12,19	13,04	14,72	16,72
	United States	11,07	10,62	11,85	11,27	12,44	10,03	9,61	10,76	7,96	7,59	12,34	12,84	12,73	13,81	11,88	12,63
	Australia	14,68	8,66	11,62	13,38	10,47	11,89	11,21	10,57	9,97	7,8	10,5	11,32	12,19	13,14	12,79	14,56
OCEAINIA	New Zealand	15,45	14,01	13,6	14,67	17,57											

Source: Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) Note: Highlighted values means that values were obtained through the calculation of the Compound Annual Growth Rate (C.A.G.R)

Continents	Countries	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
	Botswana								47,97	52,01	54,71	50,06
	Cameroon										40,51	37,50
	Ghana						34,67	42,04	50,97	44,07		
	Malawi								42,87	29,42		
AFRICA	Morocco					56,54						43,17
	Senegal											51,89
	South Africa	34,10	44,96	50,24	56,14	38,02	31,11	39,29	39,74	31,52	35,49	37,49
	Tunisia					56,64	47,96	45,04	42,29	48,58	55,80	64,10
	Uganda					45,13	33,49	37,55	42,11	47,53	54,25	56,28
	Zambia						41,15	43,62	46,24	37,25	36,03	34,86
	Bangladesh							50,05				
	China	42,65	28,43	43,11	35,62	29,43	34,18	28,96	39,37	35,90	45,41	38,87
	India		42,51	27,42	42,89	41,40	39,96	38,57	37,23	35,94	36,54	34,26
	Indonesia		61,33							43,68	37,95	36,48
	Israel			47,24	53,44	48,40	54,56	50,17	46,13	49,25	44,90	40,93
	Japan	65,66	73,76	52,72	68,19	62,36	46,87	63,53	66,41	59,63	68,24	69,48
	Jordan					35,31						
	Kazakhstan			45,53							33,68	24,04
ASIA	Malaysia		49,13	47,44	45,81	44,24	41,20	71,81	60,70	64,87	63,99	67,01
	Namibia								36,79	32,91		
	Pakistan						38,95	24,74	23,56	18,32	14,25	11,08
	Philippines		42,11							38,03	33,49	41,55
	Qatar										54,37	
	Saudi Arabia					63,02	74,56					
	Singapore	66,51	61,35					52,61	54,45	68,77	70,81	78,18
	Thailand	57,27	56,93	46,59	50,98	55,77	61,03	66,77	67,40	67,80	71,23	75,86
	Turkey		22,76	34,97	41,23	43,86	46,66	44,83	54,57	53,62	56,16	58,83
	Vietnam									62,21	53,27	57,88
	Austria	58,44	57,19	55,96	51,85	48,03	44,50	41,23	38,20	37,78	37,37	
	Belgium	44,77	51,90	50,20	46,37	54,76	51,81	72,38	61,56	43,89	43,12	44,3
	Bulgaria											29,00
	Croatia	34,74	37,75	39,89	56,93	38,94	48,78	30,73	35,68	29,84	28,67	40,85
	Czech Republic		60,90					56,53		60,26		
FUROPE	Denmark	65,45	80,47	72,04	60,17	55,64	53,80	64,02	70,65	65,19	60,15	55,50
EUROPE	Estonia								49,10	50,07	41,15	57,03
	Finland	62,99	61,75	64,80	62,96	61,95	54,33	59,40	59,88	65,99	63,12	63,02
	France	39,51	45,68	51,29	62,33	67,25	55,99	70,69	58,94	60,87	69,15	
	Germany	45,37	37,96	43,30	49,40	42,59	48,47	54,92	50,74	55,70	53,74	64,19
	Greece	62,14	48,30	56,53	39,26	47,22	38,63	36,83	32,11	35,83	30,53	34,43
	Hungary	42,77	50,94	46,06	48,57	44,84	42,86	29,16	35,27	38,67	36,27	50,52
	Iceland	71,42	71,78	70,32	71,42	57,50	68,61	68,06	67,52	66,98	66,44	65,91

Table A 5: OE values for the period between 2005 and 2015

	Ireland	67,73	61,65	47,41	45,41	38,80	33,15	36,92	40,52	43,85	48,56	38,53
	Italy	63,24	58,56	62,23	60,38	56,63	54,58	34,89	22,30	18,38	38,58	30,04
	Latvia	47,13	58,27	40,71	54,00	53,67	50,84	46,17	46,02	52,69	52,05	51,41
	Lithuania							47,19	51,49	55,17	43,78	42,70
	Luxembourg									56,59	59,81	52,16
	Netherlands	58,26	74,36	56,70	70,63	57,38	63,90	62,32	66,35	67,12	62,77	65,28
	Norway	72,04	81,50	58,51	72,36	74,29	73,54	70,50	69,63	60,80	69,03	66,36
	Poland							31,54	30,13	32,70	47,11	46,42
	Portugal			53,18	52,74	52,30	51,86	58,06	53,08	50,65	49,31	35,87
	Romania			38,33	34,13	31,37	47,16	34,45	37,7	31,59	49,75	33,24
	Serbia			27,02	44,43	46,05						
	Slovak Republic							33,86	42,88	40,17	51,83	51,30
	Slovenia	63,88	65,60	76,07	68,19	69,14	53,84	51,25	64,02	53,42	44,78	44,94
	Spain	54,63	56,33	49,65	48,47	41,16	42,04	39,32	32,51	33,18	33,48	44,52
	Sweden	61,49	74,16	76,38	74,76	73,17	71,61	67,62	48,59	58,43	56,16	52,62
	Switzerland	54,6	58,43	62,52	64,93	67,44	60,09	61,38	57,46	67,19	58,14	65,8
	United Kingdom	52,27	61,00	52,40	48,54	43,25	43,10	46,29	42,61	45,18	52,71	51,19
	Argentina	33,64	53,36	41,10	47,28	37,42	43,28	44,67	46,61	47,43	43,51	50,68
	Barbados							60,19	62,68	47,79	53,13	56,45
	Belize										47,61	
	Bolivia				45,52		56,52				51,70	
	Brazil	37,86	40,00	38,07	45,56	47,66	45,91	45,16	58,83	57,36	57,81	47,79
	Chile	57,72	54,80	59,57	45,34	42,15	52,44	54,27	68,87	57,65	62,18	61,18
	Colombia		43,70	42,45	41,91	44,52	40,83	30,10	47,83	26,65	51,55	56,47
	Costa Rica						37,84		47,88		63,52	
	Dominican Republic			39,84	28,74	26,41						
AMERICA	Ecuador				47,31	42,59	44,54	36,68	30,21	32,11	34,95	34,57
	El Salvador								39,22		54,48	
	Guatemala					31,73	27,47	33,47	38,46	44,19	38,93	40,79
	Jamaica	38,61	39,41	31,24	24,77	45,34	38,60	39,76	36,87	34,19	33,51	31,65
	Mexico	42,06	38,80	45,92	53,18	47,03	41,60	54,51	51,82	26,27	50,04	55,53
	Panama					58,64	48,73	40,49	56,76	39,79	60,23	39,06
	Peru		53,68	45,24	44,73	42,44	47,53	51,98	53,13	54,21	58,90	53,60
	Uruguay		38,16	51,14	51,76	56,79	53,51	9,82	39,85	36,80	27,28	53,65
	Canada	66,53	69,19	68,86	68,52	68,19	67,87	67,54	67,21	66,89	63,34	55,92
	United States	67,12	62,96	58,92	62,72	55,16	51,45	58,94	59,45	57,43	66,93	69,02
OCEANIA	Australia	63,00	62,26	61,36	60,47	59,60	58,74	73,10	69,85	66,75	63,78	66,01
OCEMINIA	New Zealand	78,94										

Source: Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) Note: Highlighted values means that values were obtained through the calculation of the Compound Annual Growth Rate (C.A.G.R)

Continents	Countries	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
AFRICA	Botswana												33,41	26,27	30,25	35,56
	Cameroon														33,46	29,77
	Ghana										36,86	31,87	27,56	33,31		
	Malawi											,	41,92	43,69		
	Morocco									25,30	25,79	26,28	26,79	27,30	27,83	28,36
	Senegal									,	,	,	,	,	,	27.06
	South Africa	18.15	36.33	32.38	46.27	39.46	29.30	24,79	20.97	32.66	35.96	34.83	31.67	30.34	28.19	33.23
	Tunisia	- , -	,	- ,	,	,	, <u>,</u>	-,)	20.01	23.73	29.01	35.47	28.31	22.59	18.03
	Uganda			41.38	45.00	44.96	44.92	44.87	44.83	44.79	49.81	47.87	46.00	25.08	18.88	14,81
	Zambia			,	,	,	,. =	,	,	,	32.15	32.07	32.00	38.80	41.31	43.98
	Bangladesh										52,10	27.33	52,00	50,00	11,01	10,20
	Chipa		51 75	51.69	18 12	45.36	51 35	37.8	42.58	47.96	41.75	40.56	36.88	33.88	33.22	34.70
	India	67 77	20.47	28.08	78,40	28.02	27.55	10.57	21.54	24.23	27.25	30.64	34.46	38.76	31 71	18.02
	Indanasia	07,77	29,47	20,90	20,49	20,02	12.57	19,57	21,54	24,23	27,23	50,04	54,40	25.45	20.52	18,92
	Indonesia		20.02	21 51	22.12	22.06	22.00	22.02	20.17	24.92	24.26	21 61	10.17	17.41	20,32	12,42
	Istael	25.77	20,02	10.32	23,12	10.37	15.42	22,93	20,17	24,02	24,30	21,01	19,17	25.00	10.02	12,42
	Japan	23,77	30,30	19,55	11,04	19,37	13,42	33,34	23,00	29,50	30,40	24,00	20,72	25,00	10,02	
	Jordan				14,00			27.01		28,22					26.20	27.55
ASIA	Kazakhstan						4 75	27,81	1 4 4 1	25.10	10.27	10.17	12.22	10.40	20,39	27,55
	Malaysia						4,/5	8,27	14,41	25,10	12,37	10,17	15,52	18,40	17,54	15,68
	Namibia										10.44	14.04	37,25	33,62		
	Pakistan						15.50				40,64	46,94	52,95	12.50	20.24	25.44
	Philippines						45,72							43,59	29,36	25,64
	Qatar														21,53	
	Saudi Arabia			10.11						11,76	9,58			o 11		
	Singapore	13,13	14,55	19,11	11,15	15,87	13,03	13,62	14,23	14,88	15,55	16,25	14,77	8,41	11,40	
	Thailand		17,05	19,12	21,43	24,03	31,28	29,01	26,06	23,42	21,04	18,90	16,69	18,67	17,81	17,18
	Turkey						29,49	35,53	38,51	37,92	37,33	31,58	30,88	30,24		
	Vietnam													25,08	29,74	37,36
EUROPE	Austria					14,30	9,59	6,43	7,13	7,92	8,78	9,74	10,81	10,88	10,95	11,02
	Belgium	10,69	10,34	8,26	4,98	9,91	6,81	5,51	8,98	9,08	9,90	10,44	17,91	28,98	30,67	27,46
	Bulgaria															33,42
	Croatia		21,61	22,90	42,00	50,17	43,64	39,87	28,40	37,31	32,30	35,32	34,23	37,40	46,57	40,06
	Czech Republic						30,58	29,90	29,24	28,59	27,96	27,34	24,92	22,72		
	Denmark	3,02	6,52	6,26	6,87	3,22	3,55	4,76	5,17	7,10	8,00	7,08	8,24	6,69	5,43	
	Estonia												18,22	14,82	15,10	13,69
	Finland	5,11	7,21	9,00	7,48	12,43	14,15	13,24	12,81	19,25	18,07	18,26	17,10	17,93	15,62	15,02
	France	17,02	3,00	22,05	22,60	39,34	38,67	24,25	10,19	13,57	25,23	14,83	18,14	15,66	16,06	16,61
	Germany	16,99	21,81	23,32	27,65	30,58	36,19	30,93	26,44	31,4	25,66	18,59	21,68	18,71	23,18	17,13
	Greece			37,86	28,55	14,19	20,66	9,63	30,87	26,24	27,76	25,39	29,94	23,46	34,77	22,30
	Hungary	26,50	30,34	29,56	28,80	39,34	22,08	23,31	28,27	24,49	19,64	30,98	31,13	28,00	33,19	23,21
	Iceland		8,12	7,22	5,32	4,94	8,88	6,40	5,41	10,18	6,83	7,29	7,77	8,30	8,85	9,44
	Ireland	13.95	14.51	16.11	12.81	19.06	10.39	5,43	18.06	23,60	30.83	29.48	28.14	18.02	29.65	19.33
	Italy	20.01	9.19	6.92	7.68	15.95	22.34	14.79	14.32	14.42	13.38	14,51	15.74	18.70	13.59	18.69
	Latvia	,	-,	~, <i>,</i> =	.,	16.49	15.99	15.05	20.72	31.77	26.82	25.94	25.26	21.21	19.04	17.10
	Lithuania								,	,.	,	28.37	24.63	23 30	19.61	17.34
	Luxembourg												_ ,,	5.63	11.81	9.31

Table A 6: NE values for the period between 2001 and 2015

	Netherlands		10,95	9,88	13,6	7,76	6,14	10,86	8,93	10,38	8,41	9,10	8,44	7,98	15,67	14,66
	Norway	1,84	3,38	9,12	12,36	8,77	3,56	4,98	6,75	9,09	15,44	4,32	7,41	4,00	3,54	10,6
	Poland	47,11	31,98	33,43	34,94					, i		47,62	40,71	47,40	36,75	28,06
	Portugal	18,91	20,97	23,25	25,78	18,55	13,34	9,60	12,62	16,60	21,83	17,80	17,86	21,45	27,37	24,49
	Romania							13,83	34,35	34,06	31,10	41,32	24,19	31,64	28,94	27,54
	Serbia							46,02	33,29	41,41						
	Slovak Republic											27,56	35,57	40,17	32,57	31,09
	Slovenia		29,57	20,09	16,50	11,17	10,18	9,56	12,07	9,60	16,24	12,05	7,36	24,06	25,46	23,67
	Spain	22,15	22,17	5,13	12,10	14,07	15,19	14,89	14,80	15,75	25,38	25,85	25,59	29,24	29,79	24,80
	Sweden	11,05	17,07	9,03	9,00	14,43	7,11	9,52	10,66	11,93	13,36	6,09	6,84	9,69	7,91	9,22
	Switzerland		11,23	12,40	13,13	13,91	14,02	14,14	9,65	6,59	14,09	11,39	18,08	7,49	14,35	10,08
	United Kingdom	14,46	13,01	14,59	10,14	11,26	15,36	11,23	14,00	16,99	10,60	17,20	18,30	16,13	12,90	23,92
	Argentina	39,41	50,14	37,64	28,96	30,05	25,84	32,25	38,38	46,69	36,25	33,11	34,54	29,82	28,03	29,76
AMERICA	Barbados	-										6,77	12,42	12,92	14,56	15,23
	Belize														13,07	
	Bolivia								28,66	21,96	16,83	18,17	19,61	21,26	22,84	
	Brazil	37,43	55,02	42,66	46,12	47,11	47,66	41,60	32,87	38,70	31,06	30,66	30,13	28,60	28,95	42,87
	Chile		42,97	34,56		25,99	28,20	23,82	27,43	25,20	29,32	27,41	17,40	20,11	17,63	25,29
	Colombia						38,85	40,86	41,40	34,31	39,58	25,11	12,42	18,05	33,33	33,26
	Costa Rica										31,74	25,32	20,20	19,75	19,31	17,05
	Dominican Republic							29,52	30,62	34,02						
	Ecuador				30,98	30,31	29,66	20,02	28,40	32,37	27,63	31,46	35,83	33,64	29,43	30,56
	El Salvador												35,24	33,55	31,95	31,18
	Guatemala									25,02	15,01	33,49		31,43	40,62	45,78
	Jamaica					33,40	32,49	38,89	46,56	33,24	42,20	33,05		40,60	32,09	30,38
	Mexico	27,78	21,75	19,46	17,41	15,58	22,29	17,31	13,44	15,98	18,99	19,42	13,44	6,75	22,46	18,91
	Panama									23,63	25,22	26,92	19,49	18,57	26,32	45,31
	Peru				32,51	29,29	26,38	31,69	31,37	27,89	21,26	22,39	23,42	22,48	16,39	25,25
	Uruguay						36,09	31,45	23,64	21,81	26,01	11,07	18,38	11,98	15,96	18,18
	Canada	25,95	11,70	14,18	15,38	12,96	14,35	14,47	14,59	14,72	14,84	14,96	15,09	15,09	15,67	13,51
	United States	7,16	10,56	13,48	13,41	11,66	13,14	15,66	11,98	23,26	36,58	21,21	21,35	21,24	13,50	14,32
OCEANIA	Australia		17,37	12,97	18,50	13,16	10,74	12,31	14,11	16,17	18,54	15,04			17,60	12,73
	New Zealand	16,46	15,75	11,62	14,41	7,23										

Source: Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) Note: Highlighted values means that values where obtained through the calculation of the Compound Annual Growth Rate (C.A.G.R)