

Determinants of job satisfaction: A European comparison of self- employed and paid employees

José María Millán
Jolanda Hessels
Roy Thurik
Rafael Aguado

Zoetermeer, May 2011



This research has been partly financed by SCALES, SCientific Analysis of Entrepreneurship and SMEs (www.entrepreneurship-sme.eu)

EIM Research Reports

reference number	H201106
publication	May 2011
number of pages	25
email address corresponding author	joh@eim.nl
address	EIM Bredewater 26 P.O. box 7001 2701 AA Zoetermeer The Netherlands Phone: +31(0)79 343 02 00

All the EIM research reports are available on the website www.entrepreneurship-sme.eu.

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.

Determinants of job satisfaction: A European comparison of self-employed and paid employees

José María Millán^A, Jolanda Hessels^{B, C},
Roy Thurik^{B, C, D}, Rafael Aguado^A

^A Department of Economics, University of Huelva, Spain

^B EIM Business and Policy Research, The Netherlands

^C Erasmus School of Economics, Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands

^D GSCM-Montpellier Business School, France

Abstract:

Job satisfaction of self-employed and paid employed workers is analyzed using the European Community Household Panel for the EU-15 covering the years 1994-2001. We distinguish between two types of job satisfaction: job satisfaction in terms of type of work and job satisfaction in terms of job security. Findings from our generalized ordered logit regressions indicate that self-employed individuals as compared to paid employees are more likely to be satisfied with their present jobs in terms of type of work and less likely to be satisfied in terms of job security. The findings also provide many insights into the determinants of the two types of job satisfaction for both the self-employed and paid employees.

First version: January 2011

This version: May 2011

Keywords: entrepreneurship, self-employment, job satisfaction, Europe

JEL-classification: J24, J28, L26, O52

Document: Millan_Hessels_Thurik_Aguado_INBAM_V21

Save date: 5/31/2011 5:43 PM

Correspondence: Jolanda Hessels, joh@eim.nl

Acknowledgement: 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, Agriculture and Innovation. This work has also benefited from financial support by the Spanish Ministry of Education (Programa Nacional de Movilidad de Recursos Humanos, Plan Nacional de I+D+i 2008-2011). Andrew Burke, Gavin Reid and Concepción Román provided useful comments.

1. INTRODUCTION

Entrepreneurship as an occupational choice has been widely investigated. The choice between entrepreneurship (i.e., self-employment) and wage-employment is found to be influenced by a broad range of factors including demographics, educational typology, labor market issues, (expected) financial and (expected) non-financial benefits (Grilo and Thurik, 2008; Parker, 2009). Recent studies emphasize that job satisfaction may be an important determinant of the choice between self- and wage-employment (Taylor, 1996, 1999; Blanchflower, 2000, 2004; Georgellis, Sessions and Tsitsianis, 2007).

A different body of research has identified various positive effects of job satisfaction on individual and organizational performance. For example, that there are quantifiable positive links between job satisfaction and organizational effectiveness (Ostroff, 1992; Koys, 2001), individual performance (Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza, 2000), employee turnover (Ryan, Schmitt and Johnson, 1996), customer satisfaction (Roger, Clow and Kash, 1994; Ryan, Schmitt and Johnson, 1996; Brown and Lam, 2008), achievement orientation (Lusch and Serpkenci, 1990) and lower absenteeism (Vroom, 1964).

Therefore, job satisfaction is not only a determining factor of occupational choice, but may also contribute to a firm's competitiveness, productivity and growth potential. Hence it is important to investigate its determinants. This is not a new line of research. For many years labor economists have been interested in the determinants of job satisfaction (Clark, 1996; Hamermesh, 1977; Freeman, 1978; Borjas, 1979; Meng, 1990; Clark and Oswald, 1994; Blanchflower and Oswald, 1998) while others have focused on job satisfaction in relation to self-employment (Blanchflower and Oswald, 1998; Blanchflower, 2000; Hundley, 2001; Benz and Frey, 2004, 2008; Noorderhaven, Thurik, Wennekers and Van Stel, 2004). A consistent finding is that the self-employed tend to have higher levels of job satisfaction than employees.

Nevertheless, studies comparing job satisfaction between self-employed and paid employed suffer from two shortcomings. *First*, like most studies explaining job satisfaction, they have failed to take into account that job satisfaction is a heterogeneous phenomenon. Self-reported job satisfaction may reflect satisfaction with both financial and non-financial benefits and different people can mean different things when they evaluate the extent of satisfaction with their job (Muñoz de Bustillo-Llorente and Fernández-Macías, 2005; Bianchi, 2010). For example, if one states to be satisfied with one's job, this may reflect satisfaction with its content or with the number of hours required to do the job or with both aspects. While some individuals may place a high or low value on some specific job-related aspects, which may influence their overall assessment of job satisfaction, for others it will comprise an evaluation of several different aspects. Therefore, it is difficult to assess what is actually measured when asking individuals to evaluate overall satisfaction with their jobs. Consequently, there is a lack of understanding of what job satisfaction refers to and how, ultimately, it can be influenced by employers and policy makers. In the present study we take an initial step in overcoming this problem by making a distinction between two types of job satisfaction, i.e. job satisfaction with the type of work and job satisfaction with job security. *Second*, studies comparing job satisfaction between self-employed and paid employed lack wide empirical coverage.

Simultaneously addressing these aspects of the existing literature is precisely the main aim of this work—that is, comparing self-reported levels of job satisfaction in terms of type of work and job security among self-employed individuals and paid employees by using survey data of 15 European countries for the 1994-2001 period and a large range of explanatory variables.

Since autonomy and independence are common motives for becoming self-employed, one would expect that the self-employed have more freedom in determining their type of work and are therefore more likely than employees to be satisfied with their jobs as far as the type of work is concerned. However, with respect to job security, self-employment can be considered more risky than paid employment, as the risk of business failure can be expected to be higher than the risk of unemployment. Furthermore, self-employment tends to be associated with lower levels of social

security protection. Therefore, self-employed individuals are expected to be less satisfied than paid employees in terms of job security.

Next, by running separate estimations both for the self-employed and employees, we also investigate the many determinants of job satisfaction in terms of the type of work and job security. This allows us to determine whether determinants of the two types of job satisfaction differ between the self-employed and paid employees.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: the literature background is dealt with in section 2. In this section we also develop two propositions. Section 3 provides a description of our unique European dataset, the European Community Household Panel, the variables and the methodology. Results are presented in section 4. Section 5 concludes and provides some further discussions.

2. RELATED LITERATURE

Occupational choice refers to the choice to engage in self-employment or wage-employment (Kihlstrom and Laffont, 1979; Evans and Jovanovic, 1989). Many factors affect an individual's decision to become self-employed (Grilo and Thurik, 2008; Parker, 2009). Next to demographic factors, educational attainment and labor market experience, this decision may be influenced by financial considerations such as expected income and profits, and income variability as well as non-financial considerations such as autonomy, prestige and job satisfaction (Acemoglu, 1995; Van Praag, 1999). Verheul, Wennekers, Audretsch and Thurik (2002) view occupational choice decisions as being made on the basis of an assessment of the potential risks and rewards of both employment options. Individuals compare both the (expected) financial and non-financial risks and rewards of the alternatives. In their assessment, individuals take into account environmental factors (opportunities and opportunity costs) as well as their individual characteristics (means, skills and preferences).

Work may provide both economic and non-economic utility (Benz and Frey, 2008). Self-employment is often associated with lower levels of economic utility than wage employment (Hamilton, 2000; Van Praag and Versloot, 2007). The income of the self-employed also tends to be more variable than the income of paid employees (Van Praag and Versloot, 2007). This leads to the idea that the self-employed are able to obtain greater non-financial benefits as compared to the wage-employed such as greater independence or satisfaction (Van Praag and Versloot, 2007; Bianchi, 2008). One indicator of non-financial utility that has received considerable attention in previous studies is job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction broadly refers to the degree to which people like their work and is usually determined by self-reported information. Economists tend to avoid data based on subjective feelings like job satisfaction. Due to this subjective nature and the problem of making interpersonal comparisons it may be difficult for researchers to interpret responses to questions on job satisfaction. The economic literature that investigates the relationship between satisfaction and self-employment, however, has yielded consistent results across data sets, which provides confidence with respect to the reliability of job satisfaction data (Blanchflower and Oswald, 1998; Blanchflower, 2000). Furthermore, there are several reasons why it is important to analyze a subjective indicator like job satisfaction. It is often argued, people who are satisfied with their work perform better (Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza, 2000). Previous studies suggest both a direct as well as an indirect link between job satisfaction and organizational performance. For example, there is evidence of positive indirect linkages of satisfaction with organizational effectiveness (Ostroff, 1992; Koys, 2001) and employee turnover (Ryan, Schmit and Johnson, 1996). Indirect linkages of satisfaction with performance are suggested through a direct positive relationship between job satisfaction and customer satisfaction (Rogers, Clow and Kash, 1994; Ryan, Schmit and Johnson, 1996; Brown and Lam, 2008); a positive link of satisfaction with achievement orientation (Lusch and Serpkenci, 1990); and the observation that low satisfaction leads to higher absenteeism (Vroom, 1964), job separations and quits (Akerlof, Rose and Yellen, 1988; Clark, Georgellis and Sanfey, 1998; Clark, 2001). Thus job satisfaction can be considered an important factor in improving a firm's competitiveness. Against this background we have witnessed an increased interest of economists in subjective aspects of well-being at work (Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza, 2000).

Previous studies on job satisfaction have focused on analyzing various aspects in relation to employees (Clark, 1996, 1997; Clark and Oswald, 1996; Sousa-Poza and Sousa-Poza, 2000). Furthermore, several studies have included the self-employed in the analysis of job satisfaction. A consistent finding is that the self-employed have higher levels of job satisfaction than employees (Blanchflower and Oswald, 1998; Blanchflower, 2000; Blanchflower, Oswald and Stutzer, 2001; Parasuraman and Simmers, 2001; Benz and Frey, 2004, 2008; Bradley and Roberts, 2004). In other words, individuals who are self-employed tend to be more satisfied with their jobs than individuals who work as employees. This is attributed in large part to the strong perception of independence of the self-employed (Hyytinen and Ruuskanen, 2006). It has been emphasized that job satisfaction is an important determinant of the choice between self- and wage-employment (Taylor, 1996; Blanchflower 2000, 2004) and a strong predictor of self-employment exits (Georgellis, Sessions and Tsitsianis, 2007). Job dissatisfaction has also been found to be a factor that pushes employees into self-employment, because individuals who are dissatisfied with their jobs are more likely to seek alternatives to being paid employees (Brockhaus, 1980).

Job satisfaction may refer to financial and/or non-financial benefits and different people can mean different things when they evaluate it. Previous studies have generally failed to consider this heterogeneity. While previous studies usually do not take the heterogeneity of job satisfaction into account, some studies have considered different job aspects such as (satisfaction with) job security and type of work as determinants of overall job satisfaction in comparing the self-employed with employees (Taylor, 1996; Green and Tsitsianis, 2005; Benz and Frey, 2008). Such work-related aspects are found to contribute to overall job satisfaction of workers (Green and Tsitsianis, 2005; Benz and Frey, 2008). Also, it is observed that people who place high value on job security prefer paid employment over self-employment, while the reverse is true for people who are attracted to a certain occupation by the type of work (Taylor, 1996). However, these studies provide no insight into the determinants of different types of job satisfaction. We are familiar with one study that analyzes some determinants of several types of job satisfaction among employees (Origo and Pagani, 2009), but this study does not include the self-employed. Hence it is not possible to compare the two groups of workers.

Precisely to fill this research gap, the current study distinguishes between two types of job satisfaction with the type of work and with job security and compares self-reported levels of these two types of job satisfaction among the self-employed and paid employees. Since being your own boss provides autonomy and independence, one would expect that the self-employed have more freedom in determining the type of work. This leads to our first proposition:

Proposition 1: The self-employed are more satisfied than paid employees with their present job in terms of type of work.

However, job security can be expected to be lower for the self-employed as compared to employees. The self-employed tend to have lower social security or employment protection (European Commission, 2004). Also, for self-employed individuals the risk of failure is quite high, in particular in the start-up phase. Approximately 50 to 60 percent of new business start-ups survive the first three years of activity (Eurostat, 2004). The risk of business failure is much higher than the risk of becoming unemployed. Therefore, our second proposition is:

Proposition 2: The self-employed are less satisfied than paid employees with their present job in terms of job security

The main objective of this paper is to test the validity of these propositions. In addition, we explore whether the two types of job satisfaction have different determinants comparing the self-employed and employees. We will not make an a priori list of additional propositions given the large number of determinants we investigate.

3. DATA, METHODOLOGY AND VARIABLES

Data source and sample

Data source. We use data from the European Community Household Panel (ECHP) covering the period 1994-2001.¹ The ECHP is a standardized multi-purpose annual longitudinal survey carried out at the level of the EU-15.² It is designed and coordinated by the Statistical Office of the European Communities (Eurostat). The target population of the ECHP consists of people living in private households throughout the national territory of each country. The definition of household is based on the standard criteria of “sharing the same dwelling” and “common living arrangements”. Individuals in the sample who move or join a new household are followed up at their new location. Lastly, the survey also covers all persons cohabiting with any of the original sample persons in the same household. These rules are followed to reflect the demographic changes in the population and to maintain the panels’ cross-sectional representativeness of the population.³

Each year all members of the selected households in the participating countries are interviewed about issues relating to demographics, labor market characteristics, income and living conditions. The same questionnaire is used in all countries, which makes the information directly comparable. The first wave of data collection was held in 1994. We have information on 60,500 nationally representative households, i.e. approximately 130,000 individuals aged 16 years and older, for the entire period 1994-2001.

Our sample. To construct our sample, we first categorize individuals in the ECHP according to their labor market status, that is (I) paid employment, (II) self-employment, (III) education or training, (IV) unemployment, (V) unpaid employment, and (VI) inactivity. In a next step, we limit our sample to include only men and women aged 18 to 65 working either part-time or full-time in any business sector either as paid employees or self-employed.⁴ Workers in the public sector are excluded from our analysis for comparability purposes between paid and self-employed individual.⁵ In a final step, we removed observations with missing data for any of the variables included in our regressions. Our final dataset comprises 225,019 observations (62,652 individuals) with 59,604 (26.5 percent) observations referring to self-employment. Table 1 presents some descriptive information.

--- Insert Table 1 about here ---

Table 1 reveals that participation of females in the labor market is rather low, especially with respect to participation in self-employment. Self-employed individuals are on average 7 years older than their paid counterparts. Furthermore, paid employees have received higher levels of education than self-employed individuals. Concerning business sectors, our descriptive results show how self-employment is the *natural* employment status in the agricultural industries. Finally, on average, self-employed individuals work 10 hours longer, earn €1,900 less and present more unequal incomes (22.01 against 9.46 in terms of standard deviation for annual earnings) as compared to paid employees.

¹ ECHP data are used with the permission of Eurostat (contract ECHP/2006/09 with the Universidad de Huelva).

² Information concerning job satisfaction for Sweden was not collected.

³ See Peracchi (2002) for a review of the organization of the survey, and a useful discussion of the issues a researcher may face when using these data.

⁴ Individuals are forced to choose only one main occupation, either working for an employer in paid employment, or working as a self-employed. Since no information is collected about secondary activities, we cannot identify whether some individuals combine both self- and paid employment. When running our estimations, however, the exclusion of part-time workers (who might combine both activities) does not affect our results in any significant way. Therefore, our results seem to be robust to the presence of these special cases.

⁵ We exclude workers in the public sector from the analysis because determinants of occupational choice and job satisfaction among public sector workers deviate from those of private sector workers. This is related to several factors such as a relatively lower workload for public sector workers and a motivation to serve the community (Francois, 2000; Glazer, 2004; Besley and Ghatak, 2005; Prendergast, 2007; Delfgaauw and Dur, 2008, 2009).

Reported levels of job satisfaction among self-employed and paid employed individuals are presented in table 2.

--- Insert Table 2 about here ---

Table 2 shows that on average self-employed individuals report higher levels of satisfaction with the type of work and lower levels of satisfaction with job security than their paid employee counterparts. These figures, however, do not hold for some countries. In France and Greece, for example, the percentage of respondents that report high job satisfaction with regard to the type of work is lower for the self-employed as compared to the paid employed. Also, self-employed individuals in Denmark, Germany, Italy and Portugal report having a high level of satisfaction with respect to job security more often than paid employees.⁶

Methodology and dependent variables

To investigate whether the self-employed are more satisfied or less satisfied with their job in terms of type of work and job security and to investigate determinants of the two types of job satisfaction among the self-employed and employees, we use ordered logit models. In particular, to avoid violation of the proportional odds assumption (also called parallel regressions assumption, or parallel lines assumption) we apply generalized ordered logit models.⁷

Within this framework, an individual's self-reported job satisfaction (sat_i) is interpreted as an ordinal indicator of a latent wellbeing variable (WB_i), which is unobservable. Our dependent variables are job satisfaction in terms of type of work and job satisfaction in terms of job security. These variables range from 1 to 6 and equal 1 for individuals who are not satisfied with their present job and 6 for those being fully satisfied with their job. The dependent variable has been reclassified into three values for job satisfaction: (1) dissatisfied, (2) neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, (3) satisfied.⁸ The relationship between self-reported job satisfaction (sat_i) and the latent variable (WB_i) is given by

- (1) $sat_i = 1$ if $-\infty < WB_i \leq \mu_1$
- (2) $sat_i = 2$ if $\mu_1 < WB_i \leq \mu_2$
- (3) $sat_i = 3$ if $\mu_2 < WB_i \leq +\infty$

where μ_1 and μ_2 are the thresholds of the variable WB_i that divide its range into separate intervals associated with the different levels of job satisfaction.

The generalized ordered logit model can be written as

$$(4) \quad Pr(sat_i > j) = g(X\beta_j) = \frac{\exp(a_j + X_i\beta_j)}{1 + \exp(a_j + X_i\beta_j)}$$

⁶ The data in table 2 indicate that it is questionable to assume uniform results across the sample of countries. Thus, in order to test if the fit is similar across all countries (or if the results are being skewed by some idiosyncratic specifications for a few countries), we ran separate estimations country by country and reported the results of these robustness tests in section 4.

⁷ The parallel lines model is a special case of the generalized ordered model which assumes that the coefficients are equal across categories (*proportional-odds* assumption -also called *parallel lines* assumption-). Different tests provided evidence that the parallel regression assumption was violated and, as a consequence, demonstrate the need to apply generalized ordered logit models. See Williams (2006) for a complete description of the methodology.

⁸ There are two reasons for doing this: first, in most cases, there are only few observations in the low satisfaction scales. A second reason for recoding is that we assume that there is quite a bit of "noise" in detailed scales. This can be illustrated using the following - much-cited - example: people usually know if they are tall or short; they may, however, have difficulties in classifying themselves as very short or extremely short.

where the vector X_i represents individual and firm-specific characteristics and economic conditions; β_j is the associated vector of coefficients to be estimated⁹; and $g(\cdot)$ is specified as the logistic cumulative distribution function. It can be determined that the probabilities that sat_i will take on each of the values 1, 2 and 3 is equal to

$$(5) \quad Pr(sat_i = 1) = 1 - g(X_i \beta_1)$$

$$(6) \quad Pr(sat_i = 2) = g(X_i \beta_1) - g(X_i \beta_2)$$

$$(7) \quad Pr(sat_i = 3) = g(X_i \beta_2)$$

We will first explore the determinants of job satisfaction on the full sample of workers. This allows us to test whether there are significant differences on reported job satisfaction levels between the self-employed and the paid employed (by including a self-employed dummy). In addition, to explore whether the determinants of job satisfaction differ for the self-employed and employees, separate estimations are conducted for both groups of workers. Since the ECHP tracks the same individuals from 1994 to 2001, standard errors are adjusted for intra-individual correlation to control for possible unobserved heterogeneity.

Independent variables

Propositions-related independent variable. The individuals in our dataset give detailed information about their main activity status. From this self-reported information, we construct our main independent variable *self-employed*: a dummy taking the value 1 for those being self-employed and taking the value 0 for those being wage employed.

Control variables. Despite being relative latecomers to the job satisfaction field (compared to psychologists or sociologists), economists, when explaining job satisfaction, use similar explanatory variables to those included in earning equations. In the analyses we include a large number of individual-specific independent variables such as demographic indicators (gender and age), family aspects and structure (cohabiting status and number of young children), educational attainment, firm-specific indicators (firm size and sector of industry), employment characteristics (job status, type of contract, hours of work, past spells of unemployment, and a control that captures the degree that individuals think they have the skills or qualifications to do a more demanding job than they currently do). Finally, we also explore the impact of several income characteristics on job satisfaction (level of earnings, relative earnings compared to last year's level, easiness to make ends meet). Earnings are corrected by purchasing power parities (comparability across countries) and harmonized consumer price indexes are used (comparability across time). Harmonized national unemployment rates from the OECD are also included to capture the state of the various national economies in the period under study.¹⁰ A detailed definition of our variables is presented in the Appendix.

4. RESULTS

This section presents the main results of the empirical analyses. They are not directly comparable to previous literature for two reasons. First, the existing literature including self-employment is scarce. Second, and more importantly, previous results refer to a global measure of job satisfaction which is

⁹ The formulas for the parallel lines model and generalized ordered logit model are the same, except that in the parallel lines model the Betas (but not the Alphas) are the same for all values of j .

¹⁰ Endogeneity is a potential concern when doing cross-section analysis. The reason why we did not include any time lag between our main independent variable (self-employment dummy) and our dependent variables (job satisfaction) is that it can be expected that the current employment position determine the assessment of job satisfaction. Also, while we cannot rule out the possibility that the observed empirical correlation between job satisfaction and self-employment is due to some other effect, we included a large number of potential explanatory variables to reduce potential omitted variable bias. With respect to multicollinearity, the maximum correlation between variables is 0.39 (between hours of work and self-employed) and variance inflations factors range from 1.07 to 3.03. Therefore, multicollinearity is not a concern.

not directly comparable with our two different measures capturing separate aspects of job satisfaction (type of work and job security). For this reason we will simply describe our results.

First, the results for the estimates of the probability of being satisfied with a present job in terms of the *type of work* for all workers (both self-employed and employees) as well as for self-employed individuals and employees separately will be presented in table 3 and discussed in subsection 4.1. Subsequently, subsection 4.2 discusses the results of predicted probabilities for both groups of workers using satisfaction with a present job in terms of *job security* as the dependent variable. The results for these estimates are presented in table 4. In a three-column format, both table 3 and table 4 present results for all workers (both self-employed and employees) in the first column and for paid employed and self-employed individuals separately (in the second and third columns). At the top of each column, the number of individuals and observations involved in the estimations are reported. Then, for each possible level of job satisfaction (1 = dissatisfied, 2 = neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, 3 = satisfied), predicted probabilities of job satisfaction for the sample means are shown. Below only the effects of the explanatory variables on the probability that individuals are satisfied with their job (job satisfaction equals 3) are presented in terms of marginal effects (and not the coefficients). These marginal effects are expressed in relative terms (with respect to the predicted probabilities for the sample means). Finally, t-statistics associated with marginal effects are reported in each column.

4.1 Satisfaction with present job in terms of type of work

The first column in table 3 presents results for satisfaction with the present job in terms of the type of work as the dependent variable including all workers (both self-employed and employees). In accordance with proposition 1, the self-employment dummy reveals that the self-employed are more satisfied with their jobs in terms of type of work than employees.¹¹ To be precise, we observe a 14% increase of the probability of being satisfied with the type of work in case of being self-employed. The magnitude of this marginal effect justifies a separate analysis for self-employed individuals and employees, which is presented in the second and third columns of table 3. We will now present results that follow from these two columns.

--- Insert Table 3 about here ---

With respect to demographic characteristics, a number of factors such as gender and cohabitation status do not matter for determining job satisfaction for either the paid employed or the self-employed. Furthermore, the findings indicate that for both groups of workers the relationship between age and the probability of being satisfied seems to be non-linear, showing a U-shaped pattern which reaches the lower probability at the age of 40 for employees and at the age of 46 for the self-employed.

Regarding education, the findings indicate that education matters among both groups of workers in the sense that those who received secondary schooling or university education are more likely to be satisfied with the type of work as compared to those who received only primary education or no schooling at all. This effect is especially relevant in the case of self-employed individuals. For self-employed individuals with a university education, the predicted probability of being satisfied with the type of work increases by approximately 33%, while the increase amounts to only 9% for employees.

Several employment characteristics are considered. For both groups of workers, those working in agriculture are less likely to be satisfied with the type of work (in comparison to individuals working in other industries). This effect is stronger for self-employed individuals than for employees. Regarding firm size, we find that those employees working in micro, small and medium-sized firms are more likely to be satisfied with the type of work than those working in large firms (> 99 employees). For self-employed individuals, however, being a self-employed individual without employees marginally reduces the likelihood of being satisfied, compared with those who hire

¹¹ When running these estimations country by country as robustness tests, the same results persist for all countries except for France, Greece and the UK where being self-employed (as opposed to being paid employed) does not seem to alter the likelihood of being satisfied with the type of work. These additional estimations are not reported for brevity, and are available upon request.

employees. Furthermore, employees having a supervisory or an intermediate job status (as compared to having a non-supervisory role) are more likely to be satisfied. Also, employees with indefinite contracts are more likely to be satisfied in terms of type of work. When employees work longer hours, this displays a negative (non-linear) association with satisfaction with the type of work. Conversely, when self-employed individuals work longer hours, this displays a positive (non-linear) association with satisfaction with the type of work. It appears that a recent unemployment (after 1989) experience decreases satisfaction with the type of work for all workers (both employees and the self-employed). Furthermore, those employees who think they have the skills or qualifications to do a more demanding job than they currently do are less likely to be satisfied with the type of work. The same does not hold true, however, for self-employed individuals.

We also explored the impact of several income characteristics on job satisfaction. For both employees and the self-employed, having higher relatively earnings compared to last year, coming from households that more easily make ends meet and having higher work incomes increases the likelihood of being satisfied with the type of work.

Regarding the impact of the state of the various national economies, it can be seen that when countries have higher unemployment rates, both employees and self-employed individuals are more likely to be satisfied with the type of work they do.

Finally, we also included country dummies using Spain as the reference category. There are hardly any differences between the results for employees and the self-employed. In general, it can be observed that workers from Austria, The Netherlands, Ireland Denmark, and Luxembourg are more likely to report high levels of satisfaction with the type of work than workers from other countries within the EU-15. The reverse is true for workers from Greece, Portugal and Italy.

4.2 Satisfaction with present job in terms of job security

As explained above, we focus not only on job satisfaction in terms of type of work but also on satisfaction in terms of job security. Table 4 displays the results for satisfaction with the present job in terms of job security as the dependent variable. In line with our second proposition, we find that the self-employed are less likely to be satisfied with their present job in terms of job security than paid employees.¹² Our results show that for self-employed individuals, the probability of being satisfied with job security decreases by 9%, which supports the need to run separate analyses for the self-employed and employees. The discussion of these independent estimations is reported below.

--- Insert Table 4 about here ---

Regarding demographic characteristics, females (both the self-employed and employees) are significantly more likely to be satisfied in terms of job security than men. Also both middle-aged employees and the self-employed are less likely to be satisfied in terms of job security, reaching the lower probability of being satisfied at the age of 43. Cohabiting is positively related to satisfaction in terms of job security for paid employees, while it does not seem to have an impact on satisfaction with job security for self-employed individuals. The findings also illustrate that for both the self-employed and employees, the number of children under 14 does not seem to be related to satisfaction in terms of job security.

Educational attainment does not matter in determining job satisfaction with the type of work for the self-employed. However, we find that those employees with university studies (as compared to those who received only primary education or no schooling) are less likely to be satisfied in terms of job security.

¹² The same analysis was performed country by country as a robustness test. The only deviation from the norm concerns Italian paid employees, which present lower levels of satisfaction with job security than their self-employed counterparts. In addition, our results do not reveal any effect of being self-employed (as opposed to being paid employed) on the likelihood of being satisfied with job security for Denmark, Germany, Portugal and the UK. These additional estimations are available upon request.

Regarding employment characteristics, workers in the construction sector are less likely to be satisfied with their jobs in terms of job security as compared to workers in any other industry. Furthermore, those employees working in small firms (5-19 employees) are more likely to be satisfied in terms of job security than those in firms of different size. Additionally, self-employed individuals with no employees (own-account workers) and self-employed individuals of firms with less than four employees are less likely to be satisfied in terms of job security than self-employed individuals of larger firms. Also, both having a supervisory and having an intermediate job status (as compared to having a non-supervisory job position) increases the probability of being satisfied in terms of job security for employees. Having an indefinite contract is the strongest predictor of satisfaction with job security for employees. The probability of being satisfied with job security increases by approximately 64% for paid employees with an indefinite contract. When self-employed individuals work longer hours, this increases job satisfaction with job security (at a decreasing rate). The reverse is true for paid employees. Furthermore, those who feel that they have the skills or qualifications to do a more demanding job than they currently do are less likely to be satisfied in terms of job security. The same applies to those who have been recently unemployed.

Regarding income, higher relative earnings, a household of making ends meet as well as individual work income are positively related to job security. This is true for both employees and self-employed individuals.

With regard to the impact of the state of the various national economies, it appears that a country's unemployment rate has a negative association with job satisfaction in terms of job security.

Finally, with respect to the existence of country-specific effects (and using Spain as the reference category), again only minor differences are detected between the paid employed and the self-employed. Overall, we find that workers in Austria, Denmark, Ireland and Finland are more likely to be satisfied with their jobs in terms of job security than workers from other countries within the EU-15. The reverse is true for workers from Portugal, Greece, Italy, France, Germany and the UK.

5. CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

A large European data set is used to analyze determinants of job satisfaction distinguishing self-employed and paid employees. The main finding is that self-employed report significantly higher levels of satisfaction with the type of work they do, while paid employees report significantly higher levels of satisfaction in terms of job security, even when controlling for a large number of individual and job-related characteristics.

That self-employed are more likely than paid employees to be satisfied with the type of work is probably related to the independence and flexibility that self-employed enjoy as they are not working for a boss. Self-employment has advantages in providing autonomy as compared to paid employment. Self-employed are in charge and therefore capable of (re)defining their work. This suggests that introducing entrepreneurial aspects (i.e. autonomy, independence, etc.) to paid employed jobs may help to increase job satisfaction of paid employees with type of work. Indeed, this seems to be in line with our result that employees with supervisory positions are more satisfied. Even though self-employed indeed often have substantial freedom in creating and shaping their type of work, we can not rule out the possibility that people who tend to be enthusiastic about their type of work are those who self-select into self-employment. Other factors may, however, also be at play here. Self-employed who have been pushed into self-employment because they have no alternative employment options, for example, may simply be more satisfied as a result of lower expectations, for instance because they had no jobs or worse jobs in the past.

The finding that self-employed have a lower probability than employees to be satisfied with job security probably follows, as we argued before, from the reality that self-employed, on average, have more limited employment protection than employees and that for self-employed the risk to fail is higher than the risk to become unemployed for employees. Another factor that possibly plays a role in

explaining differences in the assessment of job security between self-employed and employees is that it may be more difficult for self-employed to predict the extent of job security that they will derive from their own business than it is for employees who are working under a written contract. Thus, while job security circumstances are rather well defined for employees meaning that they more or less know what to expect beforehand, it is very well possible that the expectations that self-employed have in advance about the security that they will get from their own business deviate from their actual job security. Self-employed, for example, may obtain security from the belief that they can shape their own future, which could result in positive expectations about their ability to (re)define their business to meet threats and to ensure survival (Hundley, 2001). When such positive prior expectations are not met in practice it could negatively affect self-employed's evaluation of their job security as a result of the substantial gap between positive prior expectations and the actual situation. Thus, possibly employees are more likely to be satisfied in terms of job security than self-employed, because they face a lower gap between expected and actual job security. The ability to predict the extent of job security beforehand is further complicated by the fact that job security is also likely to be more variable for self-employed as it may differ substantially from one year to another depending on the specific circumstances and challenges that they encounter with their business.

Our findings underline the importance of education, especially among self-employed, for increasing one's opportunities for finding an interesting job in terms of type of work. Education, however, appears to be no determining factor for satisfaction with job security among self-employed. This seems to suggest that having a higher level of education does not help to reduce the (perceived) risk of business failure. Furthermore, among employees those having university studies are even less likely to be satisfied in terms of job security than those who have only primary education or no education. Possibly employees with university studies have more demanding jobs and have to meet higher expectations, which makes it more challenging for them to be able to keep their job.

Looking at firm size, it appears that employees who work in micro, small, and medium-sized firms are more likely to be satisfied with the type of work than those working in larger firms. This may imply that employees in smaller firms have more freedom and independence in shaping the type of work they do than those in larger firms. For the self-employed, those who have five or more employees are more likely to be satisfied with job security than those who have no employees or less than five employees. This may indicate that self-employed individuals associate having at least some employees with better survival and growth prospects of the business, which in turn positively affects their perception of job security.

One distinguishing feature between self-employment and paid employment is that self-employment provides for greater skill utilization (Hundley, 2001). Previous results for Portugal provide evidence that job satisfaction with type of work and job security is adversely affected by perceived skill underutilization (Allen and van der Velden, 2001; Vieira, 2005). With respect to satisfaction with type of work, however, our results do not indicate an adverse impact of skill mismatches among the group of self-employed. This indicates that, even when self-employed consider they have the skills to do a more demanding job, which potentially might push down job satisfaction, the advantages of self-employment may compensate for such a negative effect.

A consistent finding is that individuals with better financial positions (both the self-employed and employees) are more likely to be satisfied with their type of work as well as with job security. For employees this might mean that better paying jobs are also the ones that provide nice work content. Furthermore, with respect to job security, it could mean that the better paying jobs are also the more secure jobs and/or that having a better financial position makes you less worried about job security as you are able to take some financial losses in case you lose your jobs. For self-employed, the positive relationship between financial position and the two types of job satisfaction suggests that having a better financial position improves the ability of self-employed to shape the content of the work they do (i.e. they can be a bit more critical in accepting or rejecting assignments) as well as their ability to survive and perform well with their business.

Self-employed are distinguished by the effort they put in their work. We even find that among self-employed working more hours is associated with being more satisfied with type of work and job security. For both types of job satisfaction, however, it is found that when paid employed individuals work longer hours they are less likely to be satisfied. Possibly working longer hours is more of a free choice for the self-employed than for employees and results in positive returns or benefits for the self-employed.

Another consistent finding among both the self-employed and employees is that those who have experienced recent spells of unemployment tend to be less satisfied with their jobs both in terms of type of work and job security.¹³ Probably these individuals have more limited choices for finding satisfying jobs and are also more aware of the risks of losing one's job. Furthermore, this negative effect of previous spells of unemployment is particularly strong in the case of satisfaction with job security for self-employed individuals, which suggests they are particularly insecure about their chances of survival. Governments may want to consider this when designing their policy initiatives to encourage the unemployed to enter into self-employment, which are present in many countries (Shutt and Sutherland, 2003; Kluge and Card, 2007).

One final result that we would like to highlight is that national unemployment rates relate positively to job satisfaction in terms of type of work, while these relate negatively to satisfaction in terms of job security. The first finding may reflect that, in case of high unemployment rates, people are simply happy not to be unemployed and therefore report higher levels of satisfaction with the type of work they do. The latter finding implies that, when unemployment rates are higher, job conditions may worsen and people may also be more aware of the risk of losing their job and hence report lower levels of satisfaction with their job in terms of job security.

Although this work highlights the importance of considering different aspects of job satisfaction (type of work and job security) when comparing self-employed and paid employees, we acknowledge some limitations of our study. For example, we rely on self-reported measures of job satisfaction derived from answers to subjective questions that may be perceived differently by people in different countries (Lévy-Garboua and Montmarquette, 2004; Kristensen and Johansson, 2008). Blanchflower and Freeman (1994) stress that people in one country may "scale" responses differently than those in another. For instance, Americans may be relatively optimistic, with an "everything will work out" mentality that leads people with the same true satisfaction on some objective scale to respond more positively to a "Are you satisfied with your job?" question than the British who tend to be more reserved. Furthermore, the current analysis does not allow us to isolate directions of causality. Lastly, we only focus on entrepreneurship in terms of self-employment and do not consider other approaches that define entrepreneurs as a heterogeneous group such as: (i) innovative against imitative entrepreneurs (Schumpeter, 1912); (ii) opportunity against necessity entrepreneurs (Reynolds, Camp, Bygrave, Autio and Hay, 2002); (iii) the distinction between several engagement levels of the entrepreneurial process (Grilo and Thurik, 2008; Van der Zwan, Thurik and Grilo, 2010); and (iv) the distinction between self-employed with employees and the own-account workers (Earle and Sakova, 2000; Millán, Congregado and Román, 2011b).

Lastly, we would like to highlight a number of avenues for future research, such as whether or not higher levels of job satisfaction are associated with higher levels of economic utility over time. Furthermore, future research could help to establish whether different aspects of job satisfaction affect the occupational choice between self-employment and paid employment. Previous studies have provided evidence of job dissatisfaction as a reason for new venture creation (Hisrich and Brush, 1986; Brockhaus, 1980; Cromie and Hayes, 1991). Finally, it is interesting to consider the influence of various labor market institutional factors such as employment protection legislation, unionism and active labor market policies on several types of job satisfaction.

¹³ Previous research reports that those entrepreneurs with previous unemployment experience are less likely to survive as entrepreneurs (Van Praag, 2003; Millán, Congregado and Román, 2011a). Similarly, other studies indicate that push entrepreneurs are less successful, both in terms of venture success (sales per employee) and personal income than pull entrepreneurs (Amit and Muller, 1995).

REFERENCES

- Akerlof, G.A., Rose, A.K., and Yellen, J.L. (1988) Job switching and job satisfaction in the U.S. labor market, *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 2, 495–582;
- Allen, J. and van der Velden, R. (2001). Educational mismatches versus skill mismatches: effects on wages, job satisfaction and on the job search. *Oxford Economic Papers* 53(3), 434-452;
- Acemoglu, D. (1995) Reward structures and the allocation of talent, *European Economic Review* 39(1), 17-33;
- Amit, R. and Muller, E. (1995) “Push” and “pull” entrepreneurship, *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship* 12 (4), 64-80;
- Benz, M. and Frey, B.S. (2004) Being independent raises happiness at work, *Swedish Economic Policy Review* 11, 95-134;
- Benz, M. and Frey, B.S. (2008) Being independent is a great thing: subjective evaluations of self-employment and hierarchy, *Economica* 75(298), 362-383;
- Besley, T. and Ghatak, M. (2005) Competition and incentives with motivated agents, *American Economic Review* 95(3), 616-636;
- Bianchi, M. (2010) Financial development, entrepreneurship and job satisfaction, *Review of Economics and Statistics* (forthcoming);
- Blanchflower, D.G. (2000) Self-employment in OECD countries, *Labour Economics* 7, 471-505;
- Blanchflower, D.G. (2004) Self-employment: more may not be better, *Swedish Economic Policy Review*, 11(2), 15-74;
- Blanchflower, D.G. and Freeman, R.B. (1994) Did the Thatcher reforms change British labour market performance?, in R. Barrell (Ed.), *The UK Labour Market. Comparative Aspects and Institutional Developments*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, England;
- Blanchflower, D.G. and Oswald, A.J. (1998) What makes an entrepreneur? *Journal of Labor Economics* 16(1), 26-60;
- Blanchflower, D.G. and Oswald, A.J. (1999) Well-being, insecurity and the decline of American job satisfaction, working paper, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH;
- Blanchflower, D.G., Oswald, A.J. and Stutzer, A. (2001) Latent entrepreneurship across nations, *European Economic Review* 45(4-6), 680-691;
- Borjas, G.J. (1979) Job satisfaction, wages and unions, *Journal of Human Resources* 14, 21–40;
- Bradley, D.E. and Roberts, J.A. (2004) Self-employment and job satisfaction: Investigating the role of self-efficacy, depression and seniority, *Journal of Small Business Management* 42(1), 37-58;
- Brockhaus, R.H. (1980) The effect of job dissatisfaction on the decision to start a business, *Journal of Small Business Management* 18, 37-43;
- Brown, S. P. and Lam, S. K. (2008) A meta-analysis of relationships linking employee satisfaction to customer responses, *Journal of Retailing* 84(3), 243–255;
- Clark, A.E. (1996) Job satisfaction in Britain, *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 34(2), 189–217;
- Clark, A.E. (1997). Job satisfaction and gender: Why are women so happy at work? *Labour Economics*, 4(4), 341-372;
- Clark, A.E. (2001) What really matters in a job? Hedonic measurement using quit data, *Labour Economics* 8, 223–242;
- Clark, A.E., Georgellis, Y. and Sanfey, P. (1998) Job satisfaction, wage changes and quits: Evidence from Germany, *Research in Labor Economics* 17, 95–121;
- Clark, A.E. and Oswald, A.J. (1994) Unhappiness and unemployment, *Economic Journal* 104, 648–659;
- Clark, A.E. and Oswald, A.J. (1996) Satisfaction and comparison income, *Journal of Public Economics* 61(3), 359-381;
- Cromie, S. and Hayes, J. (1991) Business ownership as a means of overcoming job dissatisfaction, *Personnel Review* 20, 19-24;
- Delfgaauw, J. and Dur, R. (2008) Incentives and Workers Motivation in the Public Sector, *Economic Journal* 118, 171-191;
- Delfgaauw, J. and Dur, R. (2009) From public monopsony to competitive market: more efficiency but higher prices, *Oxford Economic Papers* 61(3), 586-602;

- Earle, J.S. and Sakova, Z. (2000). Business start-ups or disguised unemployment? Evidence on the character of self-employment from transition economies. *Labour Economics* 7, 575-601;
- Evans, D.S. and Jovanovic, B. (1989). An estimated model of entrepreneurial choice under liquidity constraints. *Journal of Political Economy* 97(4), 808-827;
- European Commission. (2004) *Second Career. Overcoming the Obstacles Faced by Dependent Employees Who Want to Become Self-Employed and/or Start their own Business*, European Commission, Brussels;
- Eurostat. (2004) *Business Demography in Europe. Results for 10 Member States and Norway*, Eurostat, Luxembourg;
- Francois, P. (2000) Public service motivation as an argument for government provision, *Journal of Public Economics* 78(3), 275-299;
- Prendergast, C. (2007) The motivation and bias of bureaucrats, *American Economic Review*, vol. 97(1), pp. 180-196;
- Freeman, R.B. (1978) Job satisfaction as an economic variable, *American Economic Review* 68, 135–141;
- Georgellis, Y., Sessions, J.G. and Tsitsianis, N. (2007) Pecuniary and non-pecuniary aspects of self-employment survival, *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance* 47(1), 94-112;
- Glazer, A. (2004) Motivating devoted workers, *International Journal of Industrial Organization* 22(3), 427-440;
- Green, F. and Tsitsianis, N. (2005) An investigation of national trends in job satisfaction in Britain and Germany, *British Journal of Industrial Relations* 43(3), 401-429;
- Grilo, I. and Thurik, A.R. (2008) Determinants of entrepreneurial engagement levels in Europe and the US, *Industrial and Corporate Change* 17(6), 1113-1145;
- Hamermesh, D.S. (1977) Economic aspects of job satisfaction, in O. Ashenfelter and W. Oates (Eds.), *Essays in Labor Market Analysis*. Wiley, New York;
- Hamilton, B.H. (2000) Does entrepreneurship pay? An empirical analysis of the returns to self-employment, *Journal of Political Economy* 108(3), 604-631;
- Hisrich, R.D. and Brush, C. (1986) Characteristics of the minority entrepreneur, *Journal of Small Business Management* 24, 1-8;
- Hundley, G. (2001) Why and when are the self-employed more satisfied with their work? *Industrial Relations* 40(2), 293-316;
- Hyytinen, A. and Ruuskanen, O-P. (2006) What makes an entrepreneur independent? Evidence from time use survey, discussion papers no. 1029 The research institute of the Finnish Economy;
- Kihlstrom, R.E. and Laffont, J-J. (1979). A general equilibrium entrepreneurial theory of firm formation based on risk aversion. *Journal of Political Economy* 87(4), 719-748;
- Kluve, J. and Card, D. (Eds.), (2007). *Active labor market policies in Europe: performance and perspectives*. Springer Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2007;
- Kristensen, N. and Johansson, E. (2008) New evidence on cross-country differences in job satisfaction using anchoring vignettes, *Labour Economics* 15, 96-117;
- Koys, D.J. (2001) The effects of employee satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, and turnover on organizational effectiveness: a unit-level, longitudinal study, *Personnel Psychology* 54 (1), 101-114;
- Lévy-Garboua, L. and Montmarquette, C. (2004) Reported job satisfaction: what does it mean? *Journal of Socio-Economics* 33, 135-151;
- Lévy-Garboua, L., Montmarquette, C. and Simonnet, V. (2007) Job satisfaction and quits, *Labour Economics* 14, 251-268;
- Lusch, R.F. and Serpkenci, R.R. (1990) Personal differences, job tension, job outcomes, and store, *Journal of Marketing* 54(1), 85-101;
- Meng, R. (1990) The relationship between unions and job satisfaction, *Applied Economics* 22, 1635–1648;
- Millán, J.M., Congregado, E. and Román, C. (2011a) Determinants of self-employment survival in Europe. *Small Business Economics* (forthcoming). doi: 10.1007/s11187-010-9260-0;
- Millán, J.M., Congregado E. and Román, C. (2011b) Entrepreneurship persistence with and without personnel: The role of human capital and previous unemployment. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal* (forthcoming). doi: 10.1007/s11365-011-0184-1;

- Muñoz de Bustillo Llorente, R. and Fernández Macías, E. (2005) Job satisfaction as an indicator of the quality of work, *The Journal of Socio-Economics* 34, 656-673;
- Noorderhaven, N., Thurik, A.R., Wennekers, A.R.M. and Van Stel, A.J. (2004) The role of dissatisfaction and per capita income in explaining self-employment across 15 European countries, *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* 28(5), 447-466;
- Origo, F. and Pagini, L. (2009) Flexicurity and job satisfaction in Europe: The importance of perceived and actual job satisfaction for well being at work, *Labour Economics* 16, 547-555;
- Ostroff, C. (1992) The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: an organizational level analysis, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 77(6), 963-974;
- Parasuraman, S. and Simmers, C.A. (2001) Type of employment, work-family conflict and well-being: A comparative study, *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 22(5), 551-568;
- Parker, S.C. (2009) *The Economics of Entrepreneurship*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK;
- Peracchi, F. (2002). The European Community Household Panel: a review, *Empirical Economics*, **27**, 63-90;
- Reynolds, P., Camp, S.M., Bygrave, W.D., Autio, E. and Hay, M. (2002). *Global Entrepreneurship Monitor 2001 Executive Report*, Babson Park/London: Babson College and London Business School;
- Rogers, J.D., Clow, K.E. and Kash, T.J. (1994) Increasing job satisfaction of service personnel, *Journal of Service Management*, 8(1), 14-26;
- Ryan A.M, Schmit M.J and Johnson R. (1996) Attitudes and effectiveness: examining relations at an organizational level, *Personnel Psychology* 49(4), 853-882;
- Schumpeter, J.A. (1912). *Theorie der Wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung* ("The theory of economic development"). Leipzig: Dunker & Humblot; translated by Dedvers Opie. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1934;
- Shutt, J. and Sutherland, J. (2003) Encouraging the transition into self-employment, *Regional Studies* 37(1), 97-103;
- Sousa-Poza, A. and Sousa-Poza, A. (2000) Well-being at work: a cross-national analysis of the levels and determinants of job satisfaction, *Journal of Socio-Economics* 29(6), 517-538;
- Taylor, M.P. (1996) Earnings, independence or unemployment: Why become self-employed? *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 58(2), 253-266;
- Taylor, M.P. (1999). Survival of the fittest? An analysis of self-employment duration in Britain, *The Economic Journal* 109, 140-155;
- Van der Zwan, P. Thurik, A.R. and Grilo, I. (2010) The entrepreneurial ladder and its determinants, *Applied Economics* 42(17), 2183-2191.
- Van Praag, C.M. (1999) Some classic views on entrepreneurship, *De Economist* 147(3), 311-335;
- Van Praag, C.M. (2003) Business survival and success of young small business owners. *Small Business Economics*, 21, 1-17;
- Van Praag, C.M. and Versloot, P.H. (2007) What is the value of entrepreneurship? A review of recent research, *Small Business Economics* 29, 351-382;
- Verheul, I., Wennekers, A.R.M., Audretsch, D.B. and Thurik, A.R. (2002) An Eclectic Theory of Entrepreneurship, in: D.B. Audretsch, A.R. Thurik, I. Verheul and A.R.M. Wennekers (Eds), *Entrepreneurship: Determinants and Policy in a European-US Comparison*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston/ Dordrecht, 11-81;
- Vieira, J.A.C. (2005). Skill mismatches and job satisfaction. *Economics Letters* 89, 39-47;
- Vroom, V. (1964) *Work and Motivation*. Wiley, New York, US;
- Williams, R. (2006) Generalized ordered logit/partial proportional odds models for ordinal dependent variables, *Stata Journal* 6(1), 58-82.

TABLES

Table 1. Descriptive statistics

Group	All workers	Paid employees	Self-employed
Number of observations	225,059	165,455	59,604
Number of individuals	62,652	48,983	17,363
Job Satisfaction with type of work			
JS with type of work = 1	7.49%	7.14%	8.46%
JS with type of work = 2	40.17%	39.97%	40.75%
JS with type of work = 3	52.34%	52.89%	50.79%
Job Satisfaction with job security			
JS with job security = 1	13.43%	12.67%	15.54%
JS with job security = 2	41.87%	40.73%	45.04%
JS with job security = 3	44.70%	46.61%	39.42%
Demographic characteristics			
Female	34.89%	37.6%	27.39%
Age (18-65)	39.05 (11.25)	37.23 (10.78)	44.09 (10.99)
Cohabiting ⁽²⁾	73.45%	70.54%	81.52%
Children under 14	0.62 (0.9)	0.61 (0.89)	0.63 (0.93)
Education			
No education or primary education	49.25%	46.34%	57.35%
Secondary education	35.07%	37.51%	28.3%
University studies	15.68%	16.16%	14.35%
Employment characteristics			
Agricultural sector	10.17%	3.2%	29.5%
Industrial sector	26.86%	32.64%	10.8%
Construction sector	11.02%	11.12%	10.76%
Services sector	51.95%	53.03%	48.94%
No employees			52.51%
Micro firm (1-4 employees)		17.57%	35.96%
Small firm (5-19 employees)		42.01%	10.2%
Medium-sized firm (20-99 employees)		10.41%	0.59%
Large firm (> 99 employees)		30.01%	0.74%
Hours of work	42.63 (11.88)	39.89 (8.92)	50.26 (15.27)
Indefinite contract		82.8%	
Intermediate		14.45%	
Supervisory		10.76%	
Recent spell(s) as unemployed	35.23%	40.26%	21.28%
Considers herself better skilled	50.69%	53.79%	42.1%
Incomes			
Income situation (1-5)	2.95 (0.86)	3 (0.86)	2.82 (0.84)
Ends meet (1-6)	3.44 (1.21)	3.49 (1.21)	3.29 (1.18)
Annual earnings <i>t-1</i> ('000)	12.2 (13.96)	12.69 (9.46)	10.82 (22.01)
Country			
Austria	6.88%	7.54%	5.02%
Belgium	3.83%	4.34%	2.41%
Denmark	4.61%	5.51%	2.11%
Finland	4.63%	4.38%	5.31%
France	5.94%	7.5%	1.58%
Germany	3.54%	4.27%	1.51%
Greece	10.53%	6.77%	20.98%
Ireland	5.75%	5.52%	6.38%
Italy	14.44%	12.73%	19.19%
Luxembourg	0.86%	1%	0.47%
Netherlands	8.57%	10.88%	2.16%
Portugal	14.17%	13.59%	15.78%
Spain	14.58%	14.52%	14.76%
United Kingdom	1.67%	1.43%	2.33%

Note: standard deviations for continuous explanatory variables in parentheses

**Table 2 Percentage of observations reporting high satisfaction levels
(Job satisfaction is high: JS=3)**

Job satisfaction with Country	Type of work			Job security		
	All workers	Paid employees	Self-employed	All workers	Paid employees	Self-employed
Austria	77.67%	77.08%	80.11%	67.94%	68.05%	67.45%
Belgium	62.03%	59.94%	72.48%	53.12%	54.12%	48.16%
Denmark	71.75%	70.01%	84.39%	65.95%	65.71%	67.68%
Finland	54.5%	52.21%	59.75%	53.11%	56.4%	45.56%
France	62.77%	62.96%	60.28%	40.69%	41.14%	34.75%
Germany	59.74%	57.39%	78.25%	48.06%	47.62%	51.5%
Greece	27.71%	28.59%	26.92%	24.67%	25.16%	24.22%
Ireland	70.14%	65.87%	80.39%	59.6%	60.53%	57.37%
Italy	45.94%	41.96%	53.28%	38.53%	36.6%	42.07%
Luxembourg	70.03%	67.87%	82.86%	63.8%	65.22%	55.36%
Netherlands	71.54%	70.47%	86.51%	64.6%	65.11%	57.52%
Portugal	30.08%	29.56%	31.32%	23.88%	23.09%	25.76%
Spain	50.48%	48.65%	55.46%	45.07%	45.9%	42.81%
United Kingdom	60.21%	56.78%	66.07%	44.97%	46.39%	42.56%
Unweighted average	58.19%	56.38%	65.58%	49.57%	50.08%	47.34%

Table 3 Job satisfaction with type of work
-Generalized Ordered Logit estimations-

Group	All workers		Paid employed		Self-employed	
Total # ind.	62,652		48,983		17,363	
Total # obs.	225,059		165,455		59,604	
Prob (JS = 1)	0.0536		0.0503		0.0549	
Prob (JS = 2)	0.4196		0.4159		0.4318	
Prob (JS = 3)	0.5268		0.5338		0.5132	
Variables	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.
Self-employed ⁽¹⁾	14.15%	16.63***				
Demographic characteristics						
Female	-1.51%	-2.07**	-0.17%	-0.21	-1.8%	-1.19
Age (18-65)	-0.02%	-0.09	-1.05%	-4.32***	-1.19%	-2.74***
Age (squared)	0.0009%	0.39	0.0134%	4.38***	0.0131%	2.68***
Cohabiting ⁽²⁾	-0.66%	-0.84	-0.81%	-0.93	-2.44%	-1.39
Children under 14	0.65%	1.75*	0.7%	1.66*	-0.65%	-0.86
Education						
Secondary education ⁽³⁾	11.09%	15.86***	7.01%	8.93***	15.02%	9.9***
University studies ⁽³⁾	18.74%	19.98***	9.3%	8.62***	32.52%	16.35***
Employment characteristics						
Agricultural sector ⁽⁴⁾	-18.35%	-12.96***	-4.83%	-2.2**	-22.95%	-9.82***
Industrial sector ⁽⁴⁾	1.72%	1.61	1.28%	1.07	14.64%	5.69***
Services sector ⁽⁴⁾	8.09%	7.97***	8.08%	6.94***	5.44%	2.63***
No employees ⁽⁵⁾					-3.38%	-1.63
Micro firm (1-4 emp.) ⁽⁵⁾			8.31%	7.78***	0.07%	0.04
Small firm (5-19 emp.) ⁽⁵⁾			6.35%	7.3***		
Medium-sized firm (20-99 emp.) ⁽⁵⁾			2.92%	2.54**		
Intermediate ⁽⁶⁾			16.93%	19.33***		
Supervisory ⁽⁶⁾			27.11%	24.18***		
Indefinite contract			14.17%	16.35***		
Hours of work	0.2%	1.95*	-0.45%	-3.07***	0.87%	4.89***
Hours of work (squared)	0.0009%	0.88	0.0055%	3.28***	-0.0048%	-2.97***
Recent spell(s) as unemployed	-8.23%	-11.71***	-6.26%	-8.02***	-9.37%	-5.87***
Considers herself better skilled	-9.96%	-17.35***	-13.5%	-20.67***	-1.03%	-0.87
Incomes						
Income situation (1-5)	3.79%	12.52***	3.95%	11.58***	3.55%	5.52***
Ends meet (1-6)	8.11%	28.82***	6.5%	20.33***	10.77%	18.62***
Annual earnings <i>t-1</i> ('000)	0.56%	13.97***	0.53%	8.75***	0.29%	5.52***
Business cycle						
Unemployment rate (%)	0.76%	6.03***	0.66%	4.52***	1.1%	4.24***
Country						
Austria ⁽⁷⁾	55.6%	38.92***	49.4%	29.4***	65.37%	21.92***
Belgium ⁽⁷⁾	12.66%	6.89***	8.77%	4.34***	19.18%	4.26***
Denmark ⁽⁷⁾	36.18%	20.24***	30.38%	15.25***	61.06%	14.75***
Finland ⁽⁷⁾	2.68%	1.75*	-3.21%	-1.82*	11.36%	3.58***
France ⁽⁷⁾	22.68%	15.47***	18.92%	12.01***	3.9%	0.95
Germany ⁽⁷⁾	9.91%	5.68***	5.92%	3.13***	27.23%	5.5***
Greece ⁽⁷⁾	-41.83%	-32.43***	-33.7%	-20.11***	-48.35%	-20.93***
Ireland ⁽⁷⁾	36.48%	25.46***	25.9%	15.01***	59.07%	22.83***
Italy ⁽⁷⁾	-9.39%	-7.48***	-16.43%	-11.29***	-5.37%	-2.15**
Luxembourg ⁽⁷⁾	29.69%	9.55***	22.68%	6.59***	51.1%	6.87***
Netherlands ⁽⁷⁾	36.8%	22.52***	30.1%	16.19***	69.22%	22.83***
Portugal ⁽⁷⁾	-25.17%	-15.02***	-28.25%	-14.9***	-24%	-6.94***
United Kingdom ⁽⁷⁾	13.66%	6.56***	9.01%	3.82***	15.43%	3.52***
Log pseudolikelihood	-181,885.49		-132,918.01		-47,032.132	
Reference categories: (1) Paid employed, (2) Non-cohabiting individuals, (3) No education or primary education, (4) Construction sector, (5) For paid employees the reference category is large firm (> 99 employees). For self-employed the reference category is small, medium-sized and large firm (> 4 employees), (6) Non-supervisory, (7) Spain.						

Note: *** denotes significance at 1% level; ** denotes significance at 5% level; * denotes significance at 10% level.

Table 4 Job satisfaction with job security
-Generalized Ordered Logit estimations-

Group	All workers		Paid employed		Self-employed	
Total # ind.	62,652		48,983		17,363	
Total # obs.	225,059		165,455		59,604	
Prob (JS = 1)	0.1087		0.922		0.1278	
Prob (JS = 2)	0.4516		0.4546		0.4922	
Prob (JS = 3)	0.4397		0.4532		0.38	
Variables	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.	Marg. Eff. (%)	t-stat.
Self-employed ⁽¹⁾	-9.02%	-9.1***				
Demographic characteristics						
Female	6.46%	7.38***	6.39%	6.42***	8.16%	4.5***
Age (18-65)	-2.16%	-9.13***	-4.45%	-15.48***	-3.11%	-5.89***
Age (squared)	0.0263%	9.14***	0.0525%	14.57***	0.0354%	5.99***
Cohabiting ⁽²⁾	2.89%	3.25***	1.95%	1.85*	0.01%	0.01
Children under 14	0.5%	1.19	0.41%	0.85	0.21%	0.24
Education						
Secondary education ⁽³⁾	1.84%	2.28**	-1.41%	-1.57	-2.11%	-1.16
University studies ⁽³⁾	0.45%	0.4	-5.6%	-4.62***	-0.97%	-0.39
Employment characteristics						
Agricultural sector ⁽⁴⁾	15.54%	8.78***	13.7%	5.01***	29.03%	10.34***
Industrial sector ⁽⁴⁾	13.08%	9.76***	5.73%	4.03***	24.16%	7.64***
Services sector ⁽⁴⁾	19.48%	15.48***	15.46%	11.66***	19.64%	7.78***
No employees ⁽⁵⁾					-20.62%	-8.19***
Micro firm (1-4 emp.) ⁽⁵⁾			0.96%	0.77	-7.35%	-2.98***
Small firm (5-19 emp.) ⁽⁵⁾			2.63%	2.7***		
Medium-sized firm (20-99 emp.) ⁽⁵⁾			1.05%	0.78		
Intermediate ⁽⁶⁾			18.58%	17.35***		
Supervisory ⁽⁶⁾			20.87%	14.64***		
Indefinite contract			64.42%	75.18***		
Hours of work	0.4%	3.29***	-1.04%	-5.86***	1.14%	5.2***
Hours of work (squared)	-0.0002%	-0.15	0.0115%	5.71***	-0.0046%	-2.31**
Recent spell(s) as unemployed	-22.71%	-28.2***	-14.23%	-15.69***	-22.79%	-12.79***
Considers herself better skilled	-3.56%	-5.25***	-3.61%	-4.66***	-6.08%	-4.48***
Incomes						
Income situation (1-5)	6.66%	18.6***	6.34%	15.58***	9.98%	12.14***
Ends meet (1-6)	11.72%	35.11***	7.92%	20.78***	19.49%	27.29***
Annual earnings <i>t-1</i> ('000)	0.87%	16.57***	0.71%	10.1***	0.35%	5.65***
Business cycle						
Unemployment rate (%)	-1.8%	-12.13***	-1.9%	-10.97***	-1.02%	-3.19***
Country						
Austria ⁽⁷⁾	25.76%	10.76***	2.06%	0.78	42.91%	7.02***
Belgium ⁽⁷⁾	-10.86%	-5.09***	-26%	-11.83***	-15.47%	-3***
Denmark ⁽⁷⁾	15.2%	6.06***	-4.38%	-1.66*	44.71%	5.71***
Finland ⁽⁷⁾	3.27%	1.89*	-6.53%	-3.32***	-5.66%	-1.57
France ⁽⁷⁾	-25.73%	-15.7***	-43.84%	-28.38***	-30.24%	-6.19***
Germany ⁽⁷⁾	-25.14%	-13.16***	-39.13%	-20.57***	-15.12%	-2.7***
Greece ⁽⁷⁾	-50.3%	-38.71***	-55.07%	-36.31***	-47.73%	-18.5***
Ireland ⁽⁷⁾	11.89%	6.19***	-2.92%	-1.35	17.14%	4.14***
Italy ⁽⁷⁾	-25.83%	-18.95***	-47.2%	-35.73***	-11.94%	-4.09***
Luxembourg ⁽⁷⁾	-9.27%	-2.39**	-23.38%	-5.86***	-25.37%	-2.85***
Netherlands ⁽⁷⁾	1.89%	0.84	-15.4%	-6.49***	9.79%	1.5
Portugal ⁽⁷⁾	-60.56%	-40.16***	-74.22%	-49.79***	-50.39%	-14.93***
United Kingdom ⁽⁷⁾	-22.26%	-9.85***	-37.74%	-15.98***	-15.85%	-3.33***
Log pseudolikelihood	-203,212.58		-142,042.81		-54,810.576	
Reference categories: (1) Paid employed, (2) Non-cohabiting individuals, (3) No education or primary education, (4) Construction sector, (5) For paid employees the reference category is large firm (> 99 employees). For self-employed the reference category is small, medium-sized and large firm (> 4 employees), (6) Non-supervisory, (7) Spain.						

Note: *** denotes significance at 1% level; ** denotes significance at 5% level; * denotes significance at 10% level.

APPENDIX: DESCRIPTION OF VARIABLES

Dependent variables

Job satisfaction with type of work	Dependent variable varies from 1 to 3 showing a scale of job satisfaction with present job in terms of type of work. Thus, this variable equals 1 for individuals who are not satisfied with their present job and 3 for satisfied individuals.
Job satisfaction with job security	Dependent variable varies from 1 to 3 showing a scale of job satisfaction with present job in terms of job security. Thus, this variable equals 1 for individuals who are not satisfied with their present job and 3 for satisfied individuals.

Explanatory variables

Self-employment	
Self-employed	Dummy equals 1 for self-employed individuals.

Demographic characteristics	
Female	Dummy equals 1 for females.
Age	Age reported by the individual, ranging from 18 to 65.
Cohabiting	Dummy equals 1 for cohabiting individuals.

Education	
No education / primary education	Dummy equals 1 for individuals with less than second stage of secondary education (ISCED 0-2).
Secondary education	Dummy equals 1 for individuals with second stage of secondary level education (ISCED 3).
University studies	Dummy equals 1 for individuals with recognized third level education (ISCED 5-7).

Employment characteristics	
Agricultural sector	Dummy equals 1 for individuals whose codes of main activity of the local unit of the business is A (Agriculture, Hunting and Forestry) and B (Fishing), by the "Nomenclature of Economic Activities" (NACE-93).
Construction sector	Dummy equals 1 for individuals whose codes of main activity of the local unit of the business is F (construction), by the "Nomenclature of Economic Activities" (NACE-93).
Industrial sector	Dummy equals 1 for individuals whose codes of main activity of the local unit of the business are C (mining and quarrying), D (manufactures) and E (electricity, gas and water supply), by the "Nomenclature of Economic Activities" (NACE-93).
Services sector	Dummy equals 1 for individuals whose codes of main activity of the local unit of the business are G (wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles, motorcycles and personal/household goods), H (hotels and restaurants) and I (transport, storage and communication), J (Financial intermediation) and K (real estate, renting and business activities), L (public administration and defense; compulsory social security), M (education), N (health and social work) and O-Q (other community, social and personal service activities; private households with employed persons; extra-territorial organizations and bodies), by the "Nomenclature of Economic Activities" (NACE-93).
No employees	Dummy equals 1 for own-account workers individuals (0 employees).
Micro firm (1-4 emp.)	Dummy equals 1 for individuals working in very small firms (1-4 employees).
Small firm (5-19 emp.)	Dummy equals 1 for individuals working in small firms (5-19 employees).
Medium-sized firm (20-99 emp.)	Dummy equals 1 for individuals working in medium-sized firms (20-99 employees).
Large firm (> 99 emp.)	Dummy equals 1 for individuals working in large firms (> 99 employees).
Non-supervisory	Dummy equals 1 for individuals whose job status is non-supervisory.
Intermediate	Dummy equals 1 for individuals whose job status is intermediate.
Supervisory	Dummy equals 1 for individuals whose job status is supervisory.

Hours of work	Hours of work per week.
Indefinite contract	Dummy equals 1 for workers with indefinite contract.
Recent spell(s) as unemployed	Dummy equals 1 for individuals with previous spell(s) as unemployed after 1989.
Considers herself better skilled	Dummy equals 1 for individuals who feel they have the skills or qualifications to do a more demanding job than the one they have.

Incomes	
Income situation	Variable varies from 1 to 5 showing a scale of income situation compared to last year. Thus, this variable equals 1 for households with relative income situation clearly deteriorated and 5 for households with relative income situation clearly improved.
Ends meet	Variable varies from 1 to 6 showing a scale of ability to make ends meet. Thus, this variable equals 1 for households with great difficulty in making ends meet, and 6 for households that very easily make ends meet.
Annual earnings $t-1$ ('000)	Net work incomes, either from paid employment or self-employment, earned during period $t-1$, converted to thousands of average euros of 1996, having been corrected by Harmonized Consumer Price Index. Furthermore, these incomes are corrected by Purchasing Power Parity (across countries).

Business cycle	
Unemployment rate	Harmonized annual unemployment rate (source: OCDE).

Country dummies	
Dummies equal 1 for individuals living in the named country, and 0 otherwise. The following countries are included: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain and United Kingdom.	

The results of EIM's Research Programme on SMEs and Entrepreneurship are published in the following series: Research Reports and Publicatierapportages. The most recent publications of both series may be downloaded at: www.entrepreneurship-sme.eu.

Recent Research Reports and Scales Papers

H201105	13-1-2011	Gender, risk aversion and remuneration policies of entrepreneurs
H201104	11-1-2011	The relationship between start-ups, market mobility and employment growth: An empirical analysis for Dutch regions
H201103	6-1-2011	The value of an educated population for an individual's entrepreneurship success
H201102	6-1-2011	Understanding the Drivers of an 'Entrepreneurial' Economy: Lessons from Japan and the Netherlands
H201101	4-1-2011	Environmental sustainability and financial performance of SMEs
H201022	16-11-2010	Prevalence and Determinants of Social Entrepreneurship at the Macro-level
H201021	20-10-2010	What determines the volume of informal venture finance investment and does it vary by gender?
H201019	9-8-2010	Measuring Business Ownership Across Countries and Over Time: Extending the COMPENDIA Data Base
H201018	6-7-2010	Modelling the Determinants of Job Creation: Microeconomic Models Accounting for Latent Entrepreneurial Ability
H201016	29-4-2010	The Nature and Prevalence of Inter-Organizational Project Ventures: Evidence from a large scale Field Study in the Netherlands 2006-2009
H201015	27-4-2010	New Firm Performance: Does the Age of Founders Affect Employment Creation?
H201014	1-4-2010	Van defensief MKB-beleid naar offensief ondernemersbeleid
H201013	16-3-2010	Human capital and start-up succes of nascent entrepreneurs
H201012	16-3-2010	New business creation in the Netherlands
H201011	16-3-2010	Factors influencing the entrepreneurial engagement of opportunity and necessity entrepreneurs
H201010	16-3-2010	The more business owners the merrier? The role of tertiary education
H201009	2-3-2010	Open, distributed and user-centered: Towards a paradigm shift in innovation policy
H201008	1-2-2010	Geographical distance of innovation collaborations
H201006	21-1-2010	Family ownership, innovation and other context variables as determinants of sustainable entrepreneurship in SMEs: An empirical research study
H201005	12-1-2010	Intrapreneurship – An international study
H201004	12-1-2010	Schumpeter versus Kirzner: An empirical investigation of opportunity types
H201003	7-1-2010	Institutions and entrepreneurship: The role of the rule of law

H201002	5-1-2010	Patterns of innovation networking in Dutch small firms
H201001	4-1-2010	Administratieve lasten en ondernemerschap
H200911	29-1-2010	Ambitious entrepreneurship, high-growth firms and macroeconomic growth
H200910	4-2-2010	Entrepreneurial exit and entrepreneurial engagement
H200909	10-3-2009	Entrepreneurship Education Monitor (EEM)
H200908	3-3-2009	Internationale samenwerking door het Nederlandse MKB
H200907	2-3-2009	The Dynamics of Entry and Exit
H200906	2-3-2009	Bedrijfsgrootteverdelingen in Nederland
H200905	2-3-2009	Start-ups as drivers of incumbent firm mobility: An analysis at the region-sector level for the Netherlands
H200904	16-2-2009	Een reconstructie van het beleidsprogramma Ondernemerschap en Starters 1982-2003: een eclecticische analyse
H200903	16-2-2009	Determinants and dimensions of firm growth
H200902	2-2-2009	The decision to innovate: Antecedents of opportunity exploitation in high tech small firms
H200901	7-1-2009	The Relationship between Successor, Planning Characteristics, and the Transfer Process on Post-Transfer Profitability in SMEs
H200825	19-12-2008	Isomorfie en het beloningspakket van werknemers in het MKB
H200824	16-12-2008	The relation between entrepreneurship and economic development: is it U-shaped?
H200823	11-12-2008	International Entrepreneurship: An Introduction, Framework and Research Agenda
H200822	11-12-2008	The two-way relationship between entrepreneurship and economic performance
H200821	5-12-2008	Spin-outs
H200820	27-11-2008	Innovative Work Behavior: Measurement and Validation
H200819	17-11-2008	Open innovation in SMEs: Trends, motives and management challenges
H200818	10-11-2008	High-Growth SMEs Evidence from the Netherlands
H200817	3-11-2008	Internationalization of European SMEs towards Emerging Markets
H200816	27-10-2008	Measuring business dynamics among incumbent firms in The Netherlands
H200815	20-10-2008	Vergrijzing van het arbeidsaanbod
H200814	16-10-2008	User Innovation in SMEs: Incidence and Transfer to Producers
H200813	30-9-2008	How Does Entrepreneurial Activity Affect the Supply of Business Angels?
H200812	16-9-2008	Science and technology-based regional entrepreneurship in the Netherlands: building support structures for business creation and growth entrepreneurship
H200811	8-9-2008	What Determines the Growth Ambition of Dutch Early-Stage Entrepreneurs?
H200810	6-8-2008	The Entrepreneurial Advantage of World Cities; Evidence from Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Data