

H200710

**Drivers of entrepreneurial
aspirations at the country level:
the role of start-up motivations and
social security**

Jolanda Hessels
Marco van Gelderen
Roy Thurik

Zoetermeer, October 2007



This report is published under the SCALES-initiative (SCientific AnaLysis of Entrepreneurship and SMEs), as part of the 'SMEs and Entrepreneurship programme' financed by the Netherlands Ministry of Economic Affairs.

Most recent EIM reports and much more on SMEs and Entrepreneurship can be found at:
www.eim.nl/smes-and-entrepreneurship.

The responsibility for the contents of this report lies with EIM bv. Quoting numbers or text in papers, essays and books is permitted only when the source is clearly mentioned. No part of this publication may be copied and/or published in any form or by any means, or stored in a retrieval system, without the prior written permission of EIM bv. EIM bv does not accept responsibility for printing errors and/or other imperfections.

Drivers of entrepreneurial aspirations at the country level: the role of start-up motivations and social security

Jolanda Hessels^A

Marco van Gelderen^B

Roy Thurik^{C, A}

^A EIM Business and Policy Research, Zoetermeer, the Netherlands

^B Massey University, College of Business, Auckland, New Zealand

^C Centre for Advanced Small Business Economics (CASBEC), Erasmus University Rotterdam, the Netherlands and Max Planck Institute of Economics, Jena, Germany

Abstract: This paper investigates whether various start-up motivations and a country's level of social security can explain the prevalence of entrepreneurial aspirations. For entrepreneurial aspirations and motivations we use country-level data from the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) for the year 2005. We distinguish between the *necessity motive*, *independence motive* and *increase wealth motive* and between aspirations in terms of innovativeness, job growth and export orientation. Our findings indicate that social security negatively affects a country's supply of ambitious entrepreneurship. Our results also suggest that entrepreneurial aspirations in terms of job growth and export relate positively to the increase wealth motive.

Version: December 2007, accepted for publication in *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*

Keywords: entrepreneurial motivation, social security, entrepreneurial aspirations, Global Entrepreneurship Monitor

JEL-classification: H50, L21, L26, M13

Document: Drivers of entrepreneurial aspirations_v24_website

Save date: 12/1/2007 5:35 PM

Correspondence: Jolanda Hessels, jolandahessels@yahoo.com

Acknowledgement: An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 2006 Babson College Entrepreneurship Research Conference. The paper has been written in the framework of the research program SCALES carried out by EIM Business and Policy Research and financed by the Dutch Ministry of Economic Affairs. We would like to thank Professor Veciana for his useful suggestions. Ralph Bathurst assisted correcting the Dutch dialect.

1. Introduction

This paper investigates drivers of entrepreneurial aspirations, and in particular the role of start-up motivations and social security. There is a plethora of policy measures with an entrepreneurship flavor that aim to stimulate innovation and growth (Stevenson and Landstrom, 2001; Landstrom and Stevenson, 2005; Audretsch, Grilo and Thurik, 2007) and high growth firms are prominent on the agenda of policy makers (Fischer and Reuber, 2003; Smallbone, Baldock and Burgess, 2002; European Commission, 2003). Aspirations have been shown to be a strong predictor of outcomes (Wiklund and Shepherd, 2003; Cassar, 2007). Therefore it is important to understand the factors that explain the diversity of entrepreneurs in terms of their aspirations.

Previous research explaining entrepreneurial aspirations and ambitions found many determinants on different levels of analyses. Studies looked at individual level factors such as expectancies (Davidsson, 1989; Cliff, 1998; Wiklund, Davidsson and Delmar, 2003), opportunity costs (Cassar, 2006), obstacles (Morris, Miyasaki, Watters and Coombes, 2006), social capital (Liao and Welsh, 2003), ability (Davidsson, 1991; Cassar, 2006), education and household income (Autio and Acs, 2007) and motives (Kolvereid, 1992; Amit, MacCrimmon, Zietsma and Oesch, 2001; Morris et al., 2006; Cassar, 2007). Firm level characteristics explaining growth motivations were studied by Kolvereid (1992), and Gundry and Welsh (2001). On the industry level, Davidsson (1991) looked at opportunities and Kolvereid (1992) at the sector as a determinant of aspirations. In this paper, we employ the national level of analysis. We focus on two determinants: national aggregates of individual motives, and social security arrangements.

Policy goals usually do not correspond with the motives of enterprising individuals. Hardly anybody starts a business in order to achieve innovation, job creation, or economic growth at the national level. Instead, people desire personal profits, or autonomy, amongst others, or are forced into entrepreneurship because they have no other options (Shane, Locke, and Collins, 2003). Still, the type of individual entrepreneurial motivation may determine the goals and aspirations for the firm, which in turn may determine macro-economic outcomes. Policy makers can try to influence the type of entrepreneurial motivation in their jurisdiction, or they can accept the prevalent motives and take these as a basis for their policies. It is vital for policy makers to know how entrepreneurial motivations relate to aspirations. This is precisely the first research question of this paper.

Furthermore, previous research suggests that a country's welfare institutions are likely to affect both the rate of entrepreneurship and its allocation across productive and unproductive activities (Henrekson, 2005). However, empirical efforts that explore such links are limited. We try to contribute to the empirical literature by examining whether social security arrangements, a factor that has been found to affect the supply of entrepreneurship at the country level in recent empirical contributions (Hessels et al., 2007; Wennekers et al., 2002; Parker and Robson, 2004), also affects the level of aspirations that entrepreneurs have with their firm. More specifically, we propose a model where we explain aspirations using motives and social security. The country level is our unit of analysis while 2005 GEM (Global Entrepreneurship Monitor) data are used for 29 countries.

The paper is organized as follows. We first discuss literature regarding entrepreneurial motivations and aspirations. In the subsequent sections we elaborate on the main data used, outline our research methodology and present the empirical results. Finally, we discuss and interpret our findings and identify policy implications.

2. Background and hypotheses

2.1. Entrepreneurial aspirations and motivations

Within-country studies of entrepreneurial motivation, defined as the motivation to start a business, come in three types. First, there are studies of reasons, motives, or goals to start a business. This type of study, being mostly conducted in Western countries where push motives are less prevalent, reports mostly pull motives such as autonomy (also referred to as independence and freedom), income and wealth, challenge, and recognition and status (Kolvereid, 1996; Kuratko, Hornsby, and Naffziger, 1997; Feldman and Bolino, 2000; Robichaud, McGraw, and Roger, 2001; Carter, Gartner, Shaver and Gatewood, 2003; Wilson, Marlina and Kickul, 2004; van Gelderen and Jansen, 2006; Cassar, 2007). However, individuals may also be pushed into entrepreneurship (Thurik, Carree, van Stel and Audretsch, 2008). Push motives (also referred to as necessity motives) are present for example when (a threat of) unemployment forces people into self-employment. They play a major role in developing countries, and also in developed countries, albeit to a lesser extent (Grilo and Thurik, 2006; Bhola, Verheul, Grilo and Thurik, 2006).

Second, there are cost-benefit types of studies that try to explain the decision to start a business (Campbell, 1992; Douglas and Shepherd, 2002). In this type of study, material and immaterial risks and gains are brought into some decision function. Third, there are studies of entrepreneurial motivation investigating depth-psychological motives. Examples are studies on the need for achievement (nAch) (McClelland, 1961; Collins, Hanges and Locke, 2004) and the need for power (nPower) (McClelland, 1975). nAch and nPower usually do not figure heavily in the first two types of studies, as actual business starters usually do not list these motives as conscious reasons to start a business.

Between-country studies look at motives on an aggregate level. Shane, Kolvereid and Westhead (1991), comparing the U.K., Norway, and New Zealand, and Baum et al. (1993), comparing Israel and the U.S., find that prevalence rates of different motives and needs indeed vary between countries (Scheinberg and MacMillan, 1989). Freytag and Thurik (2007) report on the influence of variables like economic freedom, life expectancy, and intensity of health care on the preference for entrepreneurship.

A number of studies relate motives to aspirations (also referred to as ambitions, goals, growth intentions, or growth attitudes). Kolvereid (1992) finds that the achievement motive is related to growth outcomes, but no financial motives are studied. Strong evidence for the relationship between financial motives and growth ambitions is presented by Cassar (2007). Using the U.S. PSED data to track people from nascent entrepreneurship to eventual firm performance, he shows that motivations change over time, with financial motives gaining less importance. In addition, he finds that there is a significant recall bias when nascent entrepreneurs are asked to remember their initial motives for starting the business. The results show that initial financial motives strongly impact on sales and employment intentions, growth preference, and risk-return preference. Morris et al. (2006) also find financial motives to be related to growth ambitions. On the other hand, Amit et al. (2001) find that a group of growth-oriented high-tech entrepreneurs is mostly motivated by non-financial concerns.

Circumstantial evidence for relationships between motives and aspirations can be found in the studies of Davidsson and colleagues using an expectancy approach. Here, respondents are asked how growth would affect a range of domains such as financial rewards, autonomy, control, and employee well-being. Growth willingness is then explained from these perceived expected outcomes of growth. Davidsson (1989) showed that expectations of financial reward and of increased independence are positively related to ambitions to grow. Fear of loss of control and

reduced employee well-being on the other hand are negatively related to ambitions to grow. Wiklund, Davidsson, and Delmar (2003) also explain growth ambitions from its expected consequences and find, in a Swedish sample, that concern for employee well-being is the strongest predictor.

In this study we take the country-level as the unit of analysis. A comprehensive between-country study providing entrepreneurial motives and aspirations became available in 2005 when the GEM (Global Entrepreneurship Monitor) for the first time distinguished between independence and wealth attainment on the one hand, (within the category of opportunity entrepreneurship), and necessity entrepreneurship on the other hand. GEM also measures a range of variables with regard to ambitions of innovativeness, growth and export. Therefore, for the present study we have three dimensions of motivation and three of aspiration. The motivation data are somewhat limited since there are more motivations to start a business than income or wealth creation, independence, and necessity. However, for the purpose of cross-national comparison of the relation between entrepreneurial motivations and aspirations, these are the best data available. Ideally, we would include individual level data in our research (Autio and Acs, 2007). However, since it takes a lag of several years for GEM micro-data to become publicly available for individual countries we focus on country-level aggregate data.

We expect the necessity, independence, and income/wealth attainment motives to be related to innovation, job growth and export ambitions in the following ways.

First, when autonomy or independence is a dominant motive for becoming self-employed, entrepreneurship is likely to be a vehicle to serve the freedom-related needs of the individual. It will enable a lifestyle in which one can decide oneself on goals, methods, and time scheduling (Breugh, 1999; van Gelderen and Jansen, 2006). A larger firm can be seen as reducing external dependencies and therefore increasing autonomy (Davidsson, 1989). However, it is more likely that the majority of autonomy driven entrepreneurs will see a small firm as a vehicle to achieve freedom. Research by Kolvereid (1992) and by Morris et al. (2006) indeed found no relationship between autonomy and growth ambitions, and Cassar (2007) even found a negative relationship. Whereas we do not expect the autonomy motive to be related to growth aspirations, we do expect it to be related to aspirations of innovation. Autonomy is valued for its own sake (van Gelderen and Jansen, 2006), and thus an intrinsic motive. Experimental research shows that intrinsic motivation is related to creativity (Amabile, 1996). Previous research at the micro level found autonomy to be related to innovation. Corman, Perles and Vancini (1988) report that independence is a prime entrepreneurial motive for creating innovative ventures. Amit et al. (2001) showed a group of high-tech high-growth entrepreneurs to be motivated by a range of non-financial drivers including autonomy. Sayers, van Gelderen and Keen (2007) found that a group of home-based internet businesses perceived themselves as inventors and contributed to variety in the economy. Therefore we formulate the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1A: Entrepreneurial aspirations in terms of innovation are positively related to the prevalence of independence as a prime motive for becoming self-employed.

Hypothesis 1B: Entrepreneurial aspirations in terms of growth are not related to the prevalence of independence as a prime motive for becoming self-employed.

When someone starts a firm with the prime motive to increase wealth this will probably positively affect the ambitions in terms of growth and innovation that this entrepreneur has with the firm. Cassar (2007), investigating the relationships between financial motives and a range of ambition and outcome variables, indeed found this to be the case. Regression analyses showed growth preference, risk-return preference, intended sales and intended employment all to be explained by motivations of financial success at the $p < .001$ level. In a sample of females, Morris

et al. (2006) present qualitative as well as quantitative data relating financial motives to growth ambitions. Amit et al. (2001) report a group of high-tech high-growth entrepreneurs to be primarily driven by non-financial motives. However, their research did not study entrepreneurs motivated by financial rewards. This leads to the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2A: Entrepreneurial aspirations in terms of innovation are positively related to the prevalence of increase wealth as a prime motive for becoming self-employed.

Hypothesis 2B: Entrepreneurial aspirations in terms of growth are positively related to the prevalence of increase wealth as a prime motive for becoming self-employed.

For necessity motivated entrepreneurs their daily economic survival will depend strongly on the survival of their business, which may positively affect the aspirations they have with their firm. However, necessity motivated entrepreneurs are more likely to be found in less wealthy regions and are therefore likely to be constrained in their access to human capital, financial capital, technology and other resources, which is expected to inhibit their potential for generating innovations and job growth and for building competitive advantages needed for export. Thus, even though these types of entrepreneurs are often highly dependent on their firm, they lower their expectations for innovation and growth in terms of jobs and export as they expect this may be difficult for them to realize. They may also be forced, because of their situation, to act on less promising opportunities (Morris et al., 2006). Therefore, on average we expect a neutral relationship between the necessity motive and entrepreneurial aspirations for innovation and growth (in terms of employment and export).

Hypothesis 3A: Entrepreneurial aspirations in terms of innovation are not related to the prevalence of necessity as a prime motive for becoming self-employed.

Hypothesis 3B: Entrepreneurial aspirations in terms of growth are not related to the prevalence of necessity as a prime motive for becoming self-employed.

2.2. Entrepreneurial aspirations and social security

Next to exploring the role of start-up motivations in explaining entrepreneurial aspirations we also investigate the potential role of social security arrangements in influencing the type of ambitions that entrepreneurs have with their firm. We rely on institutional theories (new institutional economics (Williamson, 1998) and new institutional sociology (DiMaggio and Powell, 1983)) emphasizing that institutions may both constrain and enable the action choices of agents. In particular, we build on previous literature that suggests that the supply of entrepreneurship as well as its allocation across productive and unproductive activities is likely to be affected by the institutional set-up of societies, and that welfare institutions may be of specific relevance in this respect (Henrekson, 2007). Henrekson (2005) describes in detail how various welfare arrangements may create disincentives for entrepreneurship and in particular for innovative and growth-oriented entrepreneurship. However, thus far empirical efforts on the effects of welfare on the supply and types of entrepreneurship are still limited.

One aspect of welfare state institutions that has received some attention in recent empirical research with respect to the supply of entrepreneurship is social security arrangements. From a theoretical perspective social security arrangements, for example in the case of illness or unemployment, may in various ways influence decisions of individuals when choosing between wage employment and self-employment. A generous social security system may either lead to fewer or to more self-employed. There may be a negative impact on self-employment in so far as

generous social security benefits for employees increase the opportunity costs of entrepreneurship. Social security in general may have a positive effect on entrepreneurial activity by creating a safety net in case of business failure. Empirical results suggest that social security negatively affects the level entrepreneurship, providing support for the argument that social security increases the opportunity costs of entrepreneurship (Hessels et al., 2007; Wennekers et al., 2002; Parker and Robson, 2004). However, it has remained unclear how social security relates to the supply of ambitious entrepreneurship. Autio and Acs (2007) however do investigate the moderating effects of taxation and IPR regimes on education and household income while explaining job growth aspirations using GEM micro data for about 50 countries (Autio and Acs, 2007).

In this paper we extend this empirical literature by investigating whether social security affects the quality of entrepreneurship at the country level. Countries with generous social security and welfare schemes do not emphasize the responsibility of the individual for its own survival, which may hamper ambitions to strive for innovation and growth. Also, higher levels of social security often imply higher wage costs, since employers normally through taxation have to pay at least part of the social security contribution for their employees (Hessels et al., 2007). This may further limit an entrepreneur's aspirations for growth with their firm, since it may be costly for them to hire employees. Overall, it can be observed that entrepreneurs in countries with a relative lack of social security nets, such as is the case in the U.K. and the U.S.A., tend to be more growth- and innovation-oriented than in regions where social security systems are more generous such as Sweden or the Netherlands.

Hypothesis 4: Entrepreneurial aspirations in terms of growth and innovation are negatively related to the social security arrangements at the country level.

3. Methodology and data

In order to examine how entrepreneurial aspirations relate to entrepreneurial motivations and social security we carry out regression analysis, taking into account controls. This leads to the following equation:

$$A = f(M, S, X),$$

where

A = Entrepreneurial aspirations;

M = Entrepreneurial motivations;

S = Social security;

X = Control variables.

3.1. Dependent variables: entrepreneurial aspirations

For measures of entrepreneurial aspirations we use data from the GEM Adult Population Survey 2005 on innovativeness, job growth expectations and export orientations. For innovativeness we use the following indicators:

New technology rate. The rate of early-stage entrepreneurs in the adult population that indicates to make use of technologies that have been available for less than one year.

New product rate. The rate of people involved in total early-stage entrepreneurial activity as a percentage of the adult population that have indicated a desire to offer a product or service that is new to the market.

Furthermore, as indicators for job growth expectations we use:

Medium job growth rate. The rate of early-stage entrepreneurs in the adult population that expect to create six or more jobs in the next five years.

High job growth rate. The rate of early-stage entrepreneurs that expect to create 20 or more jobs in five years time.

As indicators for export involvement we use:

Export rate. The rate of early-stage entrepreneurs for which at least 1% of their customers live outside the country's borders.

Substantial export rate. The rate of early-stage entrepreneurs for which 26% or more of their customers live abroad.

3.2. Independent variables: entrepreneurial motivations and social security

Several measures of entrepreneurial motivation are used in this paper. These measures are taken from the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) Adult Population Survey 2005. They relate to the Total early-stage Entrepreneurial Activity (TEA) rate, which is defined as the percentage of the adult population (18 - 64 years old) that is either actively involved in starting a new firm (nascent entrepreneur) or that is the owner/manager of a business that is less than 42 months old (young business owner). Respondents in the GEM Adult Population Survey are first asked to indicate whether they are involved in a start-up to take advantage of a business opportunity or because they have no better choices for work. When they indicate to take advantage of a business opportunity this is considered as opportunity motive and when they indicate that they have no better choices for work they are classified as necessity motivated entrepreneurs. Next, opportunity motivated entrepreneurs are asked to indicate *the most important* motive for pursuing this opportunity, which includes the independence and the increase wealth motives (they could only select one motive). Based on these questions, we use the following indicators for entrepreneurial motivation expressed as percentage of TEA:

- *Necessity motive.* The share of early-stage entrepreneurs that indicate to participate primarily in entrepreneurial activity because they have no other options for work.

- *Independence motive.* The share of early-stage entrepreneurs for which independence is the main motive for becoming an entrepreneur.

- *Increase wealth motive.* The share of early-stage entrepreneurs that indicate that their prime motive for being or becoming an entrepreneur is to increase wealth.

The three motives that we distinguish are mutually exclusive. However, they do not add up to 100% since people may also have other motives for becoming self-employed such as challenge or recognition (see also section 2).

For social security we take the following indicator:

- *Social security contribution rate.* This is the total (employer's and employees') compulsory social security contribution rate for the year 2004 taken from the World Competitiveness Yearbook 2005 (WCY).

3.3. Control variables

We include a number of controls in the analysis. This number of control variables is limited because of the small number of countries included in our sample. In particular, we control for a country's level of economic development, economic growth, and its age and industry structure. Economic growth is included because higher levels of economic growth are expected to provide entrepreneurial opportunities and therefore entrepreneurial aspirations are assumed to be related to economic growth (Thurik, Carree, van Stel and Audretsch, 2008). Previous studies at the micro-level have identified age and industry as important determinants for aspirations in terms of innovation and growth (Lafuente and Salas, 1989; Simpson and Kujawa, 1974; Westhead, 1995; Madsen and Servais, 1997).

- *GDP per Capita*. We measure level of economic development by means of GDP per capita. Gross national income per capita is expressed in purchasing power parities per US\$ for 2005. These data are taken from the World Development Indicators database of the World Bank.

- *% Population 25-44 yrs*. This variable refers to the percentage of people aged 25 to 44 years in the total population for the year 2005. Data is taken from the US Bureau of the Census.

- *Value added in services (% of GDP)*. We use data on value added in services from the World Development Indicators database of the World Bank. Value added is the net output of the sector after adding up all outputs and subtracting intermediate inputs.

- *GDP Growth*. Data on GDP Growth for 2005 are taken from the World Economic Outlook Database from the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

To illustrate our data Table 1 shows the values for the dependent variables for the 29 countries in our sample. In order to measure aspirations for innovation and growth, GEM asks entrepreneurs and business owners to evaluate the novelty of the technology they use, the newness of their product or service, and their expectations for growth. One should keep in mind that such an assessment of innovativeness and growth expectations is context-specific and that what is innovative in one country is not necessarily regarded as innovative in another (Minniti, Bygrave and Autio, 2006).

--- Insert Table 1 here ---

Table 2 shows the prevalence of various entrepreneurial motives for the countries in our sample and confirms that prevalence rates of different motives vary between countries (Shane, Kolvereid and Westhead, 1991; Baum et al., 1993). It can be noted that the prevalence of the necessity motive is comparatively high in some of the lesser-developed countries in our sample such as in Argentina, Brazil, South Africa and Venezuela. For European countries the share of early-stage entrepreneurs that indicate to start their firm out of necessity motives is relatively high in France and Hungary.

Australia and Japan score highest on the prevalence of the independence motive. In both countries 57% of the early-stage entrepreneurs report that they start their own business out of autonomy related motives. Some European countries also score above average on the independence motive, such as Austria, Denmark, Iceland and the Netherlands. The independence motive has a low prevalence in the Latin American countries in our sample, as well as in Thailand and Hungary.

Countries that score high on the incidence of the increase wealth motive are Chile, Greece, Italy and the United States. Incidence of this motive is low in Australia and South Africa and in a number of European countries such as Belgium, France, Germany and The Netherlands.

--- Insert Table 2 here ---

4. Empirical analysis

We estimate the equation as presented above using data for 29 countries that participated in the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2005. The countries that are included in the analysis are Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Mexico, The Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Thailand, United Kingdom, United States and Venezuela. The unit of analysis is the country level.

Table 3 displays the correlations among the variables that we include in our analysis and also some descriptives (mean and standard deviation). Some of the correlation coefficients among the independent variables are above 0.5, which indicates that problems of multicollinearity may exist when carrying out regression analysis. For this reason, we tested for multicollinearity in all our regression models using the variance inflation factor (VIF) method and tolerance indices. We do not observe VIF above 10 (the highest VIF that we find is 4.4) and tolerance values are above 0.1 (the lowest tolerance value that we find is 0.227) indicating that multicollinearity is not a concern.

--- Insert Table 3 here ---

We investigate the influence of entrepreneurial motivations and socio-economic variables on entrepreneurial aspirations by carrying out regression analyses. Regression results are presented in Table 4. For the increase wealth motive we find a significant positive impact on the medium job growth rate ($p < 0.1$) and on the export rate ($p < 0.1$). We do not find a significant impact for the necessity motive and the independence motive on the ambition variables. Thus, hypotheses 1B, 2B, 3A and 3B receive some support, while the results do not hold up hypotheses 1A and 2A.

For the social security contribution rate we find a significant negative impact on all aspiration variables, with the exception of the new technology rate. This means that Hypothesis 4 is broadly supported.

Looking at the control variables we find that GDP per capita has a significant positive impact on the export rate as well as on the substantial export rate. As expected, we find a positive sign between GDP growth and our aspiration variables. The impact of GDP growth is significant positive on the new product rate, on the high job growth rate and on the substantial export rate. Furthermore, the results indicate that the share of the population that is aged between 25-44 years has a positive impact on the high job growth rate and on the substantial export rate. We do not find a significant impact for our control variable for a country's sector structure (value added in services).

--- Insert Table 4 here ---

5. Discussion and Conclusion

This paper investigates whether entrepreneurial motivations and social security can explain entrepreneurial aspirations. Although several studies focus on aspects of entrepreneurial motivation in relation to firm emergence and success (Cooper and Dunkelberg, 1986; Baum and Locke, 2004; Collins, Hanges and Locke, 2004; Locke and Baum, 2007), little is known about how the incidence of various entrepreneurial motives - such as the necessity motive, the independence motive and the increase wealth motive - affect the aspects of entrepreneurial aspirations such as innovativeness, job growth and export orientation at the country level.

Furthermore, empirical contributions investigating the influence of welfare institutions on the type of entrepreneurial activity are still limited (Henrekson, 2005).

The results of our empirical exercise indicate that various entrepreneurial motives are differently related to various entrepreneurial aspirations. The results support the view that for entrepreneurs primarily motivated to increase wealth, job growth and export orientation are needed to achieve the financial gains that they desire. Our results confirm that entrepreneurs mainly motivated by independence do not have a strong focus on growth. However, contrary to our expectations, we find no evidence that independence contributes to variety. Van Gelderen and Jansen (2006) found that whereas all independence driven entrepreneurs value their decisional freedoms, there is an underlying typology on how autonomy is valued for instrumental reasons. Some simply do not like to work for a boss, others want to do their own thing, and a third type wants control. Possibly not all subtypes feel attracted to innovation. Furthermore, as hypothesized, we find that entrepreneurs with a necessity motive are not so much oriented towards innovation and growth.

Policy-makers should be aware that entrepreneurs motivated to start a firm to strive for independence are not likely to have high ambitions with their business and therefore are probably not the ones making a significant contribution to their country's innovation, employment creation and economic growth. It should be noted, however, that research on nascent entrepreneurship indicates that some start-ups have high aspirations because of over-optimism or incompetence, while others have modest aspirations which however often are based on more realistic perceptions (Davidsson, 2006).

Given that autonomy is usually the most cited motive for people to start a business, generic policies to stimulate entrepreneurship may have little impact on macro-economic ambitions. At the same time, policy-makers should consider why entrepreneurs perceive growth and innovation ambitions to impact negatively on autonomy. After all, both can be seen as enhancing autonomy by reducing outside dependency and vulnerability. Promoting a higher prevalence of the increase wealth motive in the population of entrepreneurs seems to be a somewhat advantageous avenue when aiming to support a higher rate of ambitious entrepreneurship. Future research should seek to explore the various ways in which policy makers can stimulate entrepreneurship with the aim to pursue material gains. Tax laws and a reduction of compliance costs and red tape may be integral elements of material gain policies.

In addition to previous empirical studies that have explored the relationship between social security arrangements and the supply of entrepreneurship at the country level (Hessels et al., 2007; Wennekers et al., 2002; Parker and Robson, 2004) this paper investigates whether social security arrangements also hamper entrepreneurial aspirations. We find a negative relation between social security contribution rate and all ambition variables (with the exception of the rate of early-stages entrepreneurs that uses the very latest technology) indicating that when social security systems are more generous start-ups tend to be less oriented towards innovation in the sense of introducing new products or services, and especially towards growth in terms of jobs and exports. Thus, as we suspected, social security arrangements not only negatively affect the supply of entrepreneurship as illustrated by previous studies, but also seem to hinder the supply of ambitious entrepreneurs. The challenge for policy makers is then to design social security systems in such a way that they do provide sufficient income security combined with incentives for innovative and growth-oriented behavior in order to better exploit entrepreneurship as a potential source for innovation, employment creation and growth. For instance, entrepreneurs of aspiring firms may receive a discount on the employer contributions if they meet certain targets related to innovation and growth. It is left for future research to explore in more detail this type of policy options.

Overall, our results seem to indicate that a country's institutional set-up in terms of social security arrangements may be far more important for encouraging or discouraging ambitious entrepreneurial activity than aggregate measures of the type of motive for self-employment. Future empirical research should seek to include other elements of a country's institutional set-up, such as taxation and labor market regulatory systems (Henrekson, 2007).

The empirical part of this study has a number of limitations, such as the small sample size and the cross-sectional nature of the analysis. Furthermore, we were only able to take into account a limited number of motives currently measured as part of the GEM project. Also, whereas we distinguish between various prime motives for becoming self-employed, in reality individuals may be motivated by a combination of both intrinsic as well as extrinsic factors (Kuratko, Hornsby and Naffziger, 1997). Also, entrepreneurial motives may change over time (Littunen, 2000; Cassar 2007). For example, individuals who started their firm out of independence motives, may over time, as their firm gets successful, become motivated by achieving financial gains. Future research should seek to take into account such dynamic aspects. Lastly, the use of individual micro data may prove superior in unraveling the mechanics of entrepreneurial aspirations (Autio and Acs, 2007).

6. References

- Acs, Z. and Audretsch, D. (1990). *Innovation and Small Firms*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Amabile, T. (1996). *Creativity in Context*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Amit, R., MacCrimmon, K.R., Zietsma, C., and Oesch, J.M. (2001). Does money matter: wealth attainment as the motive for initiating growth-oriented technology ventures. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(2), 119-143.
- Audretsch, D.B., Grilo, I. and Thurik, A.R. (2007). Explaining entrepreneurship and the role of policy: a framework, In: D.B. Audretsch, I. Grilo and A.R. Thurik (Eds), *The Handbook of Research on Entrepreneurship Policy*, Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, US: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited, 1-17.
- Autio, E. and Acs, Z.J. (2007). Individual and country level determinants of growth aspirations in new ventures. Paper presented at the Third Global Entrepreneurship Research Conference, October 2007, Washington.
- Baum, J.R., Olian, J.D., Erez, M., Schnell, E.R., Smith, K.G., Sims, H.P., Scully, J.S. and Smith, K.A. (1993). Nationality and work role interactions: a cultural contrast of Israeli and U.S. entrepreneurs' versus managers' needs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8(6), 499-512.
- Baum, J.R., and Locke, E.A. (2004). The relationship of enterprising traits, skill, and motivation to subsequent venture growth. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(4), 587-598.
- Bhola, R., Verheul, I., Grilo, I. and A.R. Thurik (2006). Explaining engagement levels of opportunity and necessity entrepreneurs. Zoetermeer: Research report H200610, EIM Business and Policy Research.
- Breaugh, J.A. (1999). Further investigation of the work autonomy scales: two studies. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 13(3), 357-373.
- Campbell, C.A. (1992). A decision theory model for entrepreneurial acts. *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, 17(1), 21-27.
- Carter, N.M., Gartner, W.B., Shaver, K.G. and Gatewood, E.J. (2003). The career reasons of nascent entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(1), 13-39.
- Cassar, G. (2006). Entrepreneur opportunity costs and intended venture growth. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 21(5), 610-632.
- Cassar, G. (2007). Money, money, money? A longitudinal investigation of entrepreneur career reasons, growth preferences and achieved growth. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 19(1), 89-107.
- Cliff, J.E. (1998). Does one size fit all? Exploring the relationship between attitudes towards growth, gender and business size. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 13(6), 523-542.
- Collins, C.J., Hanges, P.J., and Locke, E.A. (2004). The relationship of achievement motivation to entrepreneurial behavior: a meta-analysis. *Human Relations*, 17(1), 95-117.
- Cooper, A.C. and Dunkelberg, W.C. (1986). Entrepreneurship and paths to business ownership. *Strategic Management Journal*, 7(1), 53-68.
- Corman, J., Perles, B. and Vancini, P. (1988). Motivational factors influencing high-technology entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 26(1), 36-42.
- Davidsson, P. (1989). Entrepreneurship – and after? A study of growth willingness in small firms. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 4(3), 211-226.
- Davidsson, P. (1991). Continued entrepreneurship: ability, need and opportunity as determinants of small firm growth. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 6(6), 405-429.
- Davidsson, P. (2006). Nascent entrepreneurship: empirical studies and developments. *Foundations and trends in entrepreneurship*, 2(1), 1-76.
- DiMaggio, P. and Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields, *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147-160.
- Douglas, E.J. and Shepherd, D.A. (2002). Self-employment as a career choice: attitudes, entrepreneurial intentions, and utility maximization. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 26(3), 81-90.
- European Commission. (2003). *Green Paper Entrepreneurship in Europe*. http://europa.eu.int/comm/enterprise/entrepreneurship/green_paper/
- Fischer, E.A. and Reuber, R. (2003). Support for rapid-growth firms: a comparison of the views of founders, government policymakers, and private sector resource providers. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 41(4), 346-65.
- Feldman, D.C. and Bolino, M.C. (2000). Career patterns of the self-employed: career motivations and career outcomes. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 38(1), 53-67.

- Freytag, A. and Thurik, A.R. (2007). Entrepreneurship and its determinants in a cross-country setting. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 17(2), 117-131.
- Grilo, I. and Thurik, A.R. (2006). Entrepreneurship in the old and new Europe. In: E. Santarelli (Ed.), *Entrepreneurship, Growth, and Innovation: the Dynamics of Firms and Industries: International Studies in Entrepreneurship*. Berlin: Springer Science, 75-103.
- Grilo, I. and Thurik, A.R. (2007). Determinants of entrepreneurial engagement levels in Europe and the US. Papers on entrepreneurship, growth and public policy #02-2007. Jena: Max Planck Institute of Economics.
- Gundry, L.K., and Welsch, H.P. (2001). The ambitious entrepreneur: high growth strategies of women-owned enterprises. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 16(5), 453-470.
- Henrekson, M. (2005). Entrepreneurship: a weak link in the welfare state? *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 14(3), 437-467.
- Henrekson, M. (2007), Entrepreneurship and Institutions. *Comparative Labor Law and Policy Journal*, 28(4), 717-742.
- Hessels, J., Stel, A. van, Brouwer, P. and Wennekers, S. (2007). Social Security Arrangements and Early-Stage Entrepreneurial Activity. *Comparative Labor Law and Policy Journal*, 28(4), 743-774.
- Kolvereid, L. (1992). Growth aspirations among Norwegian entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 7(3), 209-222.
- Kolvereid, L. (1996). Organizational employment versus self-employment: reasons for career choice intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 20(3), 23-31.
- Kuratko, D.F., Hornsby, J.S. and Naffziger, D.W. (1997). An examination of owner's goals in sustaining entrepreneurship. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 35(1), 24-33.
- Landstrom, A., and Stevenson, L.A. (2005). *Entrepreneurship Policy*. New York: Springer.
- Lafuente, A. and Salas, V. (1989). Types of entrepreneurs and firms: the case of new Spanish firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10(1), 17-30.
- Liao, J., and Welsh, H. (2003). Social capital and entrepreneurial growth aspiration: a comparison of technology- and non-technology based nascent entrepreneurs. *Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 14(1), 149-170.
- Littunen, H. (2000). Entrepreneurship and the characteristic of the entrepreneurial personality. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*, 6(6), 295-309.
- Locke, E.A. and Baum, J.R. (2007). Entrepreneurial motivation. In: J. R. Baum, M. Frese and R.A. Baron (Eds). *The Psychology of Entrepreneurship*. SIOP Organizational Frontiers Series. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 93-112.
- Madsen, T.K. and Servais, P. (1997). The internationalization of born globals: an evolutionary process. *International Business Review*, 6(6), 561-583.
- McClelland, D.C. (1961). *The Achieving Society*. Princeton: Van Nostrand.
- McClelland, D.C. (1975). *Power. The Inner Experience*. New York: Irvington.
- Minniti, M., Bygrave, W. and Autio, E. (2006). Global Entrepreneurship Monitor – 2005 Executive Report, Wellesley, MA / London: Babson College and London Business School.
- Morris, M.H., Miyasaki, N.N., Watters, C.E. and Coombes, S.M. (2006). The dilemma of growth: understanding venture size choices of women entrepreneurs. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 44(2), 221-244.
- Parker, S.C. and Robson, M.T. (2004). Explaining international variations in entrepreneurship: evidence from a panel of OECD countries. *Southern Economic Journal*, 71 (2): 287-301.
- Robichaud, Y., McGraw, E. and Roger, A. (2001). Toward the Development of a Measuring Instrument for Entrepreneurial Motivation. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 6(2), 189-201.
- Sayers, J., Gelderen, M.W. van and Keen, C. (2007). Home-based Internet businesses as drivers of variety. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Scheinberg, S. and MacMillan, I.C. (1988). An 11 country study of motivation to start a business. *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*. Wellesley, MA: Babson College, 669-687.
- Shane, S., Kolvereid, L. and Westhead, P. (1991). An exploratory examination of the reasons leading to new firm formation across country and gender. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 6(6), 431-446.
- Shane, S., Locke, E. and Collins, C.J. (2003). Entrepreneurial motivation. *Human Resource Management Review*, 13(2), 257-280.
- Simpson, C.L. and Kujawa, D. (1974). The export decision process: an empirical inquiry. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 5(1), 107-117.

- Smallbone D., Baldock R. and Burgess S. (2002). Targeted support for high-growth start-ups: some policy issues. *Environment and Planning C – Government and Policy*, 20(2), 195-209.
- Stevenson, L.A. and Landstrom, A. (2001). Entrepreneurship policy for the future: best practice components. Keynote speech for the ICSB Conference, Taipei, 18 June 2007.
- Thurik, A.R. Carree, M.A., Stel A.J. van and Audretsch, D.B. (2008). Does self-employment reduce unemployment? *Journal of Business Venturing*, forthcoming
- van Gelderen, M.W. and Jansen, P.G.W. (2006). Autonomy as a startup motive. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 13(1), 23-32.
- Wennekers, A.R.M., Uhlaner, L. and Thurik, A.R. (2002). Entrepreneurship and its conditions: a macro-perspective. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship Education*, 1(1), 25-64.
- Westhead, P. (1995). Exporting and non-exporting small firms in Great Britain. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior and Research*, 1(2), 6-36.
- Wiklund, J., Davidsson, P. and Delmar, F. (2003). What do they think and feel about growth? An expectancy-value approach to small business managers' attitudes toward growth. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 27(3), 247-270.
- Wiklund, J. and Shepherd, D. (2003). Aspiring for, and achieving growth: the moderating role of resources and opportunities. *Journal of Management Studies*, 40(8), 1919-1941.
- Williamson, O.E. (1998). The Institutions of Governance, *The American Economic Review*, 88 (2), 75-79.
- Wilson, F., Marlino, D. and J. Kickul. (2004). Our entrepreneurial future: examining the diverse attitudes and motivations of teens across gender and ethnic identity. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 9(3), 177-197.

Table 1 Entrepreneurial aspiration rates (2005) for 29 countries

	Innovation		Job growth		Export orientation	
	New technology rate	New product rate	Medium job growth rate	High job growth rate	Export rate	Substantial export rate
Argentina	1.56	2.22	3.57	1.33	2.20	0.83
Australia	1.15	1.27	2.65	1.04	3.35	1.38
Austria	0.32	0.51	1.58	0.63	3.22	1.14
Belgium	2.33	0.43	0.81	0.19	2.27	0.90
Brazil	1.54	0.53	2.24	0.43	2.09	0.26
Canada	0.99	1.34	3.87	1.65	6.96	2.36
Chile	9.62	3.29	5.03	1.78	-	-
Denmark	0.31	1.00	1.28	0.72	2.52	0.74
Finland	0.82	0.67	0.82	0.10	1.66	0.4
France	1.22	0.17	0.90	0.38	3.96	1.54
Germany	0.57	0.53	1.31	0.79	4.29	0.71
Greece	3.05	0.38	1.54	0.84	3.30	1.41
Hungary	0.62	0.12	0.33	0.25	0.76	0.29
Iceland	1.45	1.36	3.90	1.22	7.15	2.45
Ireland	1.23	1.33	2.81	0.98	5.41	1.58
Italy	0.37	0.33	1.13	0.39	2.44	0.8
Japan	0.26	0.00	0.89	0.17	0.96	0.06
Mexico	1.92	0.69	0.95	0.11	1.24	0.21
Netherlands	0.47	0.79	1.04	0.26	2.09	0.88
New Zealand	1.73	3.17	4.67	1.66	10.89	1.84
Norway	2.54	1.75	2.29	0.74	5.31	1.89
Slovenia	0.53	0.65	1.60	0.80	2.80	1.31
South Africa	1.98	0.82	0.76	0.17	2.56	1.38
Spain	0.11	0.86	1.24	0.18	1.92	1.00
Sweden	0.36	0.31	1.10	0.49	1.36	0.42
Thailand	5.05	4.33	4.87	2.02	4.35	1.61
United Kingdom	1.14	0.78	2.13	0.87	2.96	1.11
United States	1.80	1.75	4.86	1.47	9.28	2.59
Venezuela	7.55	2.80	8.29	2.01	5.61	1.80
<i>Mean</i>	<i>1.81</i>	<i>1.18</i>	<i>2.36</i>	<i>0.82</i>	<i>3.68</i>	<i>1.17</i>

Source: GEM.

Table 2 Prevalence of various entrepreneurial motives (2005) in 29 countries, percentage within TEA

	Necessity motive	Independence motive	Increase wealth motive
Argentina	30 %	25 %	19 %
Australia	12 %	57 %	11 %
Austria	14 %	49 %	23 %
Belgium	10 %	35 %	13 %
Brazil	47 %	18 %	24 %
Canada	13 %	34 %	27 %
Chile	26 %	28 %	42 %
Denmark	3 %	49 %	16 %
Finland	12 %	42 %	15 %
France	39 %	24 %	10 %
Germany	29 %	38 %	13 %
Greece	14 %	32 %	42 %
Hungary	39 %	28 %	23 %
Iceland	5 %	49 %	20 %
Ireland	19 %	43 %	22 %
Italy	16 %	31 %	35 %
Japan	19 %	57 %	21 %
Mexico	16 %	19 %	30 %
Netherlands	8 %	46 %	12 %
New Zealand	7 %	52 %	26 %
Norway	9 %	43 %	20 %
Slovenia	11 %	45 %	30 %
South Africa	39 %	33 %	11 %
Spain	14 %	44 %	27 %
Sweden	14 %	40 %	23 %
Thailand	24 %	29 %	26 %
United Kingdom	11 %	39 %	15 %
United States	12 %	35 %	35 %
Venezuela	38 %	25 %	31 %
<i>Mean</i>	<i>19 %</i>	<i>38 %</i>	<i>23 %</i>

Source: GEM.

Table 3 Correlation matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. New technology rate													
2. New product rate	0.701***												
2. Medium job growth rate	0.697***	0.826***											
4. High job growth rate	0.621***	0.851***	0.920***										
5. Export rate	0.295	0.594***	0.696***	0.730***									
6. Substantial export rate	0.369*	0.529***	0.650***	0.699***	0.848***								
7. Necessity motive	0.287	0.007	0.088	-0.012	-0.234	-0.237							
8. Independence motive	-0.412**	-0.108	-0.152	-0.076	0.175	0.131	-0.677***						
9. Increase wealth motive	0.476***	0.297	0.403**	0.391**	0.222	0.190	-0.037	-0.303					
10. GDP Capita	-0.520***	-0.323*	-0.243	-0.157	0.307	0.314	-0.647***	0.650***	-0.281				
11. Social security contribution rate	-0.236	-0.482***	-0.416**	-0.422**	-0.414**	-0.376**	0.219	-0.315*	0.123	-0.007			
12. % Population aged 25-44 yrs	-0.184	-0.023	-0.060	0.096	0.147	0.183	-0.391**	0.289	0.138	0.348*	0.310		
13. Value added in services (% of GDP)	-0.521***	-0.568***	-0.435**	-0.421**	-0.136	-0.196	-0.180	0.098	-0.262	0.278	0.276	-0.042	
14. GDP Growth	0.595***	0.645***	0.572***	0.548***	0.214	0.357	0.230	-0.367*	0.325*	-0.454**	-0.408**	-0.385**	-0.57
Mean	1.813	1.178	2.361	0.816	3.675	1.174	0.190	0.376	0.228	0.258	0.317	28.859	64.94
Standard Deviation	2.160	1.062	1.839	0.601	2.479	0.689	0.119	0.107	0.089	0.107	0.234	1.969	6.124
Observations	29	29	29	29	28	28	29	29	29	29	29	29	29

***: p<0.01; **: p<0.05; *: p<0.10

Table 4 Investigating the impact of entrepreneurial motivations and social security on entrepreneurial aspirations (including controls)

	DEPENDENT VARIABLES: ENTREPRENEURIAL ASPIRATIONS					
	Innovation		Job growth		Export orientation	
	New technology rate	New product rate	Medium job growth rate	High job growth rate	Export rate ¹	Substantial export rate ¹
Constant	7.492 (0.677)	-1.026 (-0.198)	-8.149 (-0.816)	-5.091 (-1.655)	-20.089 (-1.462)	-7.138* (-2.024)
Necessity motive	0.856 (0.181)	-0.827 (-0.373)	4.481 (1.051)	1.438 (1.095)	8.174 (1.393)	1.983 (1.317)
Independence motive	-3.994 (-0.757)	-0.528 (-0.214)	-0.273 (-0.057)	-0.051 (-0.035)	-2.125 (-0.324)	-0.690 (-0.410)
Increase wealth motive	7.306 (1.615)	0.623 (0.294)	7.345* (1.801)	2.090 (1.664)	11.680* (1.981)	2.125 (1.404)
Soc. security contribution rate	-2.239 (-1.138)	-1.655* (-1.797)	-3.657** (-2.062)	-1.285** (-2.352)	-6.672** (-2.755)	-1.395** (-2.245)
GDP Capita	-3.404 (-0.728)	-2.055 (-0.938)	2.083 (0.494)	0.812 (0.625)	14.552** (2.526)	4.341*** (2.935)
% Population 25-44 yrs	0.017 (0.077)	0.151 (1.451)	0.234 (1.164)	0.140** (2.268)	0.445 (1.574)	0.157** (2.228)
Value added in services	-0.084 (-1.133)	-0.029 (-0.826)	0.007 (0.107)	0.010 (0.504)	0.075 (0.820)	0.025 (1.050)
GDP Growth	0.161 (0.430)	0.295* (1.681)	0.458 (1.354)	0.199* (1.911)	0.445 (0.941)	0.285** (2.348)
<i>R² (Adjusted)</i>	<i>0.395</i>	<i>0.452</i>	<i>0.322</i>	<i>0.396</i>	<i>0.304</i>	<i>0.407</i>
<i>Observations</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>28</i>	<i>28</i>

***: p<0.01; **: p<0.05; *: p<0.10. t-values between brackets.

¹For export orientation no data are available for Chile, therefore 28 instead of 29 countries are included in the analysis.

The results of EIM's Research Programme on SMEs and Entrepreneurship are published in the following series: Research Reports and Publicatiesrapportages. The most recent publications of both series may be downloaded at: www.eim.net.

Recent Research Reports and Scales Papers

H200709	12-10-2007	Does Self-Employment Reduce Unemployment?
H200708	10-9-2007	Social security arrangements and early-stage entrepreneurial activity
H200707	11-5-2007	Competition and innovative intentions: A study of Dutch SMEs
H200706	eind maart	High-Growth Support Initiatives
H200705	14-2-2007	The relationship between economic development and business ownership revisited
H200704	2-2-2007	The relationship between knowledge management, innovation and firm performance: evidence from Dutch SMEs
H200703	26-1-2007	Family orientation, strategy and organizational learning as predictors of knowledge management in Dutch SMEs
H200702	3-1-2007	Ambitious Nascent Entrepreneurs and National Innovativeness
H200701	3-1-2007	Entrepreneurial diversity and economic growth
H200627	21-12-2006	Motivation Based Policies for an Entrepreneurial EU Economy
H200626	19-12-2006	Export Orientation among New Ventures and Economic Growth
H200625	18-12-2006	Institutionele voorwaarden voor zelfstandig ondernemerschap
H200624	13-12-2006	Creative Destruction and Regional Competitiveness
H200623	6-12-2006	Entrepreneurship, Dynamic Capabilities and New Firm Growth
H200622	1-12-2006	Determinants of self-employment preference and realization of women and men in Europe and the United States
H200621	1-12-2006	Is human resource management profitable for small firms?
H200620	23-11-2006	The entrepreneurial ladder and its determinants
H200619	20-11-2006	Knowledge Spillovers and Entrepreneurs' Export Orientation
H200618	20-11-2006	The effects of new firm formation on regional development over time: The case of Great Britain
H200617	11-10-2006	On the relationship between firm age and productivity growth
H200616	11-10-2006	Entrepreneurship and its determinants in a cross-country setting
H200615	2-10-2006	The Geography of New Firm Formation: Evidence from Independent Start-ups and New Subsidiaries in the Netherlands
H200614	25-9-2006	PRISMA-K: een bedrijfstakkenmodel voor de korte termijn
H200613	25-9-2006	PRISMA-M: een bedrijfstakkenmodel voor de middellange termijn
H200612	25-9-2006	PRISMA-MKB: modelmatige desaggregatie van bedrijfstakprognose naar grootteklasse
H200611	25-9-2006	PRISMA-R: modelmatige desaggregatie van bedrijfstakprognoses naar provincie
H200610	25-9-2006	Explaining engagement levels of opportunity and necessity entrepreneurs
H200609	25-9-2006	The effect of business regulations on nascent and Young business entrepreneurship
H200608	24-8-2006	High growth entrepreneurs, public policies and economic growth
H200607	18-8-2006	The decision to innovate
H200606	6-7-2006	Innovation and international involvement of Dutch SMEs
H200605	27-6-2006	Uncertainty avoidance and the rate of business ownership across 21 OECD countries, 1976-2004
H200604	22-6-2006	The Impact of New Firm Formation on Regional Development in the Netherlands
H200603	21-6-2006	An Ambition to Grow
H200602	21-6-2006	Exploring the informal capital market in the Netherlands: characteristics, mismatches and causes
H200601	22-5-2006	SMEs as job engine of the Dutch private economy
N200520	7-3-2006	High Performance Work Systems, Performance and Innovativeness in Small Firms
N200519	1-2-2006	Entrepreneurial Culture as Determinant of Nascent Entrepreneurship

N200518	26-1-2006	Social security arrangements and early-stage entrepreneurial activity; an empirical analysis
N200517	23-1-2006	Determinants of Growth of Start-ups in the Netherlands
N200516	23-1-2006	Entrepreneurship in the old en new Europe
N200515	23-1-2006	Entrepreneurial engagement levels in the European Union
N200514	23-1-2006	Latent and actual entrepreneurship in Europe and the US: some recent developments
N200513	20-1-2006	Determinants of self-employment preference and realisation of women and men in Europe and the United States
N200512	20-1-2006	PRISMA-K: een bedrijfstakkenmodel voor de korte termijn
N200511	19-1-2006	Strategic Decision-Making in Small Firms: Towards a Taxonomy of Entrepreneurial Decision-Makers
N200510	11-1-2006	Explaining female and male entrepreneurship at the country level
N200509	11-1-2006	The link between family orientation, strategy and innovation in Dutch SMEs: a longitudinal study
N200508	11-1-2006	From nascent to actual entrepreneurship: the effect of entry barriers
N200507	11-1-2006	Do entry barriers, perceived by SMEs, affect real entry? Some evidence from the Netherlands
H200503	6-12-2005	The Impact of New Firm Formation on Regional Development in the Netherlands
N200506	5-9-2005	Entrepreneurial intentions subsequent to firm exit
N200505	5-9-2005	The relationship between successor and planning characteristics and the success of business transfer in Dutch SMEs
H200502	31-8-2005	Product introduction by SMEs
H200501	12-5-2005	Kosten van inhoudelijke verplichtingen voor het bedrijfsleven
N200504	21-4-2005	Does Self-Employment Reduce Unemployment?