

Research Report 9811/E

Self-employment in 23 OECD countries

The role of cultural and economic factors

Ralph E. Wildeman

Geert Hofstede

Niels G. Noorderhaven

Institute for Research on Intercultural Cooperation (IRIC)

Tilburg University, the Netherlands

A. Roy Thurik

Wim H.J. Verhoeven

Alexander R.M. Wennekers

EIM Small Business Research and Consultancy

Zoetermeer, the Netherlands



Zoetermeer, April 1999

ISBN: 90-371-0727-3
Price: NLG 35.-
Order number: H9811

EIM / Small Business Research and Consultancy employs 170 professionals. EIM provides policy- and practice-oriented socio-economic information on and for all sectors in private enterprise and for policy-makers. EIM is established in Zoetermeer. Besides on the Netherlands, EIM also focuses on the European economy and on other continents. You may contact us for more information about EIM and its services.

Address:	Italiëlaan 33
Mailing address:	P.O. Box 7001 2701 AA Zoetermeer
Telephone:	+ 31 79 341 36 34
Fax:	+ 31 79 341 50 24
Website:	www.eim.nl

This study is funded by the Ministry of Economic Affairs.

*The responsibility for the contents of this report lies with EIM.
Quoting of numbers and/or texts as an explanation or support 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.

EIM does not accept responsibility for printing errors and/or other imperfections.

Contents

	Abstract	5
1	Introduction	7
1.1	Importance of Entrepreneurship	7
1.2	Determinants of Self-employment	8
2	Literature Review and Hypotheses	11
2.1	Definitions	11
2.2	Framework of Explanations	11
2.3	Demographic and Economic Determinants	12
2.4	Cultural Factors	14
3	Data and Data Analysis	19
3.1	EIM's Self-employment and Economic Data	19
3.2	IRIC's Cultural Data	20
3.3	Analysis of the Self-employment Data	21
3.4	Correlations between Culture and Self-employment	23
3.5	Dissatisfaction and Culture	25
4	Regressions on Self-employment	29
4.1	Clustering of Countries	29
4.2	Regressions Across All Countries (No Clustering)	30
4.3	Regressions in Country Clusters, without Dissatisfaction Variables	32
4.4	Regressions in Country Clusters, Including Dissatisfaction Variables	35
4.5	Summary of the Regressions	38
5	Discussion	41
5.1	Cultural Variables and Dissatisfaction	41
5.2	Economic and Demographic Variables	41
6	Conclusions	45
	References	47
	Appendix	
	Economic data: definitions and sources	51

Abstract

This paper studies the influence of cultural and economic variables on differences in the level of self-employment in more than twenty Western nations and Japan, for the period 1974-1994.

We combine data on entrepreneurial and economic variables with data on cultural variables. First, we consider cross-sectional relationships between the cultural variables and self-employment. The results yield evidence that, across nations, dissatisfaction with society and with life in general are the main determinants of the rate of self-employment. Countries where people are less satisfied have more self-employed. These are often societies with larger power distance, stronger uncertainty avoidance, more bureaucracy and corruption, and which are relatively poor.

Subsequently, we carry out regressions including economic and dissatisfaction variables for which time series are available. There are indications for a U-shaped relationship between prosperity and self-employment. Furthermore, unemployment is consistently found to be a significant push factor for self-employment. However, dissatisfaction with life and with society come out again as main determinants of self-employment across nations, even stronger than the economic variables.

Finally, by repeating the regressions for several cultural country clusterings, we show that neglecting the role of the cultural context may create an incorrect picture of the influence of the economic determinants on self-employment.

1 Introduction

1.1 Importance of Entrepreneurship

Economic growth is a key issue both in economic policy making and in economic research. In Europe in particular, the interest in economic growth is widespread because of the persistently high levels of unemployment. Europe is bogged down in stagnant growth and high unemployment. About eleven percent of the work force in the European Union was unemployed in 1997, ranging from 3 percent in Luxembourg and 6 percent in the Netherlands, to 12.5 percent in France and even more than 20 percent in Spain. This high unemployment coupled with stagnant growth in Europe has triggered a plea by policy makers for rethinking the policy approach that ushered in European prosperity during the post-war era.

There is a general feeling in Europe that stimulating entrepreneurship and/or self-employment¹ helps fighting unemployment (see, for instance, the Joint Employment Report 1997 of the European Commission). This feeling provides the justification for researching three questions: What is entrepreneurship?, Where does entrepreneurship come from?, and What does it lead to? The present paper deals with the second question by analysing the influence of cultural, social, and economic variables on differences in the level of self-employment between more than twenty Western nations and Japan for the period 1974 through 1994. For this analysis a new and unique database has been set up.

In most OECD countries the first decades after World War II showed historically high rates of economic growth. Following the first oil crisis in 1973 a period of stagflation set in, characterised by a combination of inflation and slow growth. Since the mid eighties economic growth in most countries has picked up again, but on the whole at a rate too slow to guarantee an acceptable level of unemployment. In the sixties and seventies, academic and political interest in many Western countries gradually turned to matters of demand management and income equality, whereas the interest in the causes of economic growth waned. Neo-classical theory explained economic growth by accumulation of production factors and by exogenous technological change. Mainstream economics, however, did not

¹ In section 2.1 we will go more deeply into the definitions of entrepreneurship and self-employment.

show great interest in the ultimate causes underlying long-term factor accumulation and technological development.

In the eighties, stagflation and high unemployment caused a renewed interest in supply side economics and, simultaneously, in underlying factors. As clearly exposed by North and Thomas (1973), Olson (1982), and more recently by Van de Klundert (1997), the institutional foundations and cultural factors of an economy are among the most prominent of these ultimate causes. These authors focus attention on factors such as incentives, regulation of markets, and social rigidities. Somewhat unclear in their analysis, however, is the primal role of the economic agents (entrepreneurs) who link the institutions at the micro level to the economic outcome at the macro level (see for instance Wennekers and Thurik, 1999). In spite of a growing attention in research, presently still little is known about entrepreneurship. How and why for instance do individuals decide to start an enterprise themselves? Which role do institutional and cultural factors play in this decision process? And how exactly do these factors frame the decisions of the millions of business owners and of entrepreneurial managers working within large companies?

1.2 Determinants of Self-employment

One can investigate the determinants stimulating or hampering self-employment at many levels. At an individual level, one can examine the motives of people for turning into self-employment. Furthermore, one can investigate how the market, regulatory and organisational environment fosters entrepreneurial activity. One can also consider differences between countries and examine whether cultural factors are involved. The latter is the main subject of this paper.

Why do some countries have more self-employed than others? Many researchers have addressed this question and most of them have focused on economic explanations, thereby underexposing the role of culture. Some references in the literature have made attempts to study culture's influence, but mostly without much empirical foundation.

In the present paper we aim at supplementing the research of the determinants of self-employment at the country level by linking three bodies of literature and by subsequently combining different international databases into a new and unique dataset. Firstly, we consider the traditional economic explanation of levels of self-employment. Factors like per capita income, unemployment and profit

opportunities then play a role. Secondly, we embed our study in the literature on the role of cultural traits such as individualism, power distance and uncertainty avoidance in explaining people's motives and actions within the economic arena (see Hofstede, 1980). Finally, from the literature on the examination of motives for self-employment, we derive dissatisfaction as a major driving force.

The following model is set up to test our hypotheses. First, we carry out a simple analysis by considering correlations across countries between self-employment, economic factors, cultural traits and issues of dissatisfaction. From this, we obtain a first inkling of the role of these variables on levels of self-employment. Subsequently, we carry out regressions on time-series data of self-employment, including relevant economic and dissatisfaction variables¹. Thus we can distinguish the role of each explaining variable, and see which variable explains national differences in entrepreneurial activity best. Finally, we repeat the regressions for several country clusterings, based on cultural traits, to examine whether in different cultural clusters the economic and dissatisfaction variables influence self-employment in different ways.

The paper is structured as follows. In the next section we derive hypotheses about the influence of several economic and cultural phenomena on national differences in self-employment, based on the literature. Subsequently, in Section 3 we describe the data of the two databases used in this study. Furthermore, we consider correlations between cultural and dissatisfaction variables, and self-employment. In Section 4 we carry out the regressions. The results of the correlation analysis and the regressions are discussed in Section 5. Finally, in Section 6, we draw conclusions.

¹ Cultural traits are not directly included in the regressions, since they are not available in time series.

2 Literature Review and Hypotheses

2.1 Definitions

In colloquial speech the terms entrepreneurs, self-employed, and businessmen are often used as synonyms. In the management and economic literature, however, entrepreneurship is a behavioural characteristic related to perceiving and creating new economic opportunities (see also Wennekers and Thurik, 1999).

Within the population of self-employed, some are economically marginal, others run their business in a managerial manner, and only a subset are intrinsically entrepreneurial. For practical reasons of measurement, we will equate entrepreneurs and self-employed in our empirical research. However, in formulating our hypotheses and in interpreting our results we will occasionally distinguish the marginal, managerial, and entrepreneurial dimensions.

2.2 Framework of Explanations

The literature provides many explanations of which factors play a role in the number of business start-ups or in the level of entrepreneurship. When explaining business start-ups, it is customary to use factors dealing with the perceived discrepancy between the role someone plays in society and the role one wants to play. Moreover, pull as well as push factors are discerned (see Stanworth and Curran, 1973). Pull factors are concerned with the expectation to be better off as an entrepreneur. Push factors take into account the conflict between one's current and one's desired role in society (see Shapero and Sokol, 1982). In this respect, Van Praag (1996) develops a model separating the unobserved factors of 'opportunity' and 'willingness'. She applies a positive interpretation of the push effect. A similar approach is taken by Shapero and Sokol (1982), who also stress positive desirability aspects in the intentional phase preceding a start-up (see also Krueger, 1993).

This positive approach has roots in the work of Schumpeter (1934), where willingness and ability are emphasised as determinants. A more 'negative' approach is proposed by Weber (1930), stressing responsibility. Achievement motivation is the main driving force observed by McClelland (1976), whereas Etzioni (1987) struggles with the concept of legitimation, i.e., the way society judges entrepreneurial activities.

Early surveys on what makes people decide to start a business are provided by Brockhaus (1982) and Shapero and Sokol (1982), stressing psychological and sociological issues, respectively. A survey of determinants proposed in studies with an economic flavour is supplied by De Wit (1993) (see also Blanchflower and Oswald, 1996). Other (and more recent) surveys can be found in Capon, Farley and Hoenig (1990), Birley and Westhead (1994), Van Praag (1996), Roquebert, Philips and Westfall (1996), and Lumpkin and Dess (1996).

From all these investigations and surveys we conclude that, next to demographic and economic determinants of self-employment, we need to use a push factor indicating some level of 'dissatisfaction', and that we have to test for the stability of our results across different cultural environments.

2.3 Demographic and Economic Determinants

Prosperity (level of per capita income)

There probably is a U-shaped relationship between the level of self-employment and the stage of economic development. A low level of prosperity usually coincides with a low wage level, implying little pressure to increase efficiency or the average scale of enterprise. Small firms in crafts and retail trade are therefore dominant in such an economy. A major route for ambitious wage-earners to increase their income then, is to set up shop and become an entrepreneur. Economic development subsequently leads to a rise in wages, which stimulates enterprises to work more efficiently. Lucas (1978) shows that firm size is positively related to the development of national income when labour and capital are substitutes. Economies of scale set in, especially in manufacturing, and the number of small firms (including many marginal entrepreneurs) decreases.

In a later stage of economic development, services become more important and a new rise in entrepreneurship will occur. The advent of information technology, the availability of capital and the differentiation of markets (niches) lead to the occurrence of dis-economies of scale. An increased emphasis on subcontracting may strengthen this process (Acs, Audretsch and Evans, 1994; Bais, Van der Hoeven and Verhoeven, 1995). This may partly explain the present resurgence of self-employment in some of the most highly developed economies. We assume that relatively many of these self-employed are highly educated and entrepreneurial.

Female labour share

In most Western countries, working women show substantially lower self-employment rates than working men. Under the assumption of constant female self-employment rates over time, a growing participation of women in the labour market automatically implies a decreasing share of self-employed in the labour force (Acs et al., 1994).

Additionally, there might be other factors. Evans and Leighton (1989) point out that people who become entrepreneur have a long employment history. In many Western countries, married women have a shorter employment history than men, due to a break for getting children and raising a family, and so there is a smaller chance that they will choose for self-employment. Besides, self-employed often make long working days, which women cannot easily combine with their family obligations. Finally, the direction of causality may also be reversed, in that a high percentage of (male) self-employment ties down many women in a supportive role of unpaid family worker. Anyway, we expect female labour share to be negatively related to the self-employment rate.

Earning differentials

Individuals may be hypothesised to compare expected profits and wages when weighing the possibilities of future self-employment or wage-employment. They probably also consider the risks they will run either way, but these are extremely hard to measure. For the time being, we simply assume that a relatively high level of business profitability will *ceteris paribus* stimulate the self-employment rate. High profits are thus seen as a pull factor for self-employment (Foti and Vivarelli, 1994; Santarelli and Sterlachini, 1994).

A pragmatic proxy for the earning differential on the country level is the so-called labour income quota, which measures the share of labour income (including the compensation of the self-employed for their labour contribution) in the net national income. The labour income quota is expected to correlate negatively with the self-employment rate.

Unemployment

The relationship between self-employment and unemployment is probably complex. On the individual level, unemployment (or the threat of it) primarily acts as a push factor for self-employment (Evans and Leighton, 1990; Acs et al., 1994; Foti and Vivarelli, 1994).

Since the opportunity costs for unemployed persons to become self-employed are relatively low, they will make their choice for self-employment sooner.

On the other hand, (high) unemployment may be connected with an economic decline, which makes prospects for self-employment less profitable. In the literature (Hamilton, 1989; Meager, 1992) it is stated that in principle there is a positive relation, but it changes into a negative relation beyond a critical level when people get disillusioned (inverse U-shape relation).

Population density

Every region needs a minimum supply of facilities regarding trade and craft for their population to survive in these areas. Therefore, thinly populated areas with many dispersed small villages will often have many small retail outlets and workshops. Conversely, urban areas will give rise to economies of scale, through which small-sized entrepreneurship in trade and craft comes under pressure (Bais, Van der Hoeven and Verhoeven, 1995).

On the other hand, Reynolds and Storey (1993) state that a high population density in urban areas explains the birth of new firms in the services sector. Especially the presence of networks attracts other new firms in an urban area. Consequently, population density may have the same U-shaped relationship with self-employment as prosperity.

2.4 Cultural Factors

Competitiveness and corruption

Few references in the literature deal with entrepreneurship or self-employment directly; most deal with other phenomena, which may indirectly be related to entrepreneurship. For example, Lynn (1991) compares four psychological theories of economic growth (Weber's work ethic, Schumpeter's competitiveness, McClelland's achievement motivation, and Wiener's status of the land-owner) and finds empirical evidence that Schumpeter's theory explains economic growth best (for the contemporary period). This might suggest that competitiveness is also positively related to entrepreneurship.

Mauro (1995) analyses subjective indices of corruption, bureaucracy, and the efficiency of the judicial system (combined in his so-called bureaucratic efficiency index), and finds that corruption lowers pri-

vate investment and thereby reduces economic growth. This might imply that corruption also hampers entrepreneurship (self-employment).

Hofstede's cultural indices

Many articles and books discussing the relationship between culture and economy refer to the four cultural indices of Hofstede (1980), viz. power distance (PDI), uncertainty avoidance (UAI), masculinity (MAS), and individualism (IDV). However, the existing hypotheses with respect to the influence of the indices on entrepreneurship, or the hypotheses that can be inferred from indirectly related phenomena, are often contradicting.

For example, Shane (1992) investigates the relation between culture and *inventions*, and finds that countries with small power distance (PDI-) and high individualism (IDV+) are more inventive than others. Shane (1993) examines the influence of culture on rates of *innovation* (per capita number of trademarks), and finds that weak uncertainty avoidance (UAI-) has the strongest influence, even stronger than per capita income. PDI- and IDV+ are related to innovation as well, though to a lesser extent. Since innovation is more directly related to entrepreneurship than inventiveness, the latter article shows more evidence for the influence of culture on entrepreneurship than Shane (1992). Although the relationships with culture are indirect, the results of the two references suggest that countries with PDI-, UAI-, and IDV+ are more entrepreneurial and hence may have more entrepreneurs than others.

McGrath, MacMillan, and Scheinberg (1992) also refer to Hofstede. The authors compare entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs across countries and identify certain entrepreneurial values, independent of culture. These values are subsequently associated with PDI+ (this is contradicting with Shane, 1992, 1993), UAI-, high masculinity (MAS+), and IDV+. If entrepreneurs indeed hold values corresponding with larger power distance, uncertainty acceptance, masculinity, and individualism, the hypothesis then is that countries with this cultural pattern have more entrepreneurs. However, the arguments that the authors use to associate their findings with the indices of Hofstede are disputable.

Baum et al. (1993) hypothesise a reverse role of individualism (at the level of countries). The authors argue that not high but low individualism may stimulate entrepreneurship (self-employment): an indi-

vidualistic society is more adapted to deal with people who want to do it their own way; both entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs might be able to satisfy their motivational needs in a common organisational environment. In a less individualistic society, organisations and institutions do not yield these opportunities and, as a result, people with entrepreneurial needs are more inclined to start for themselves as they cannot satisfy their needs within the existing structures.

The only reference we found in which the direct relationship between culture and self-employment at the level of nations is (empirically) examined, is the paper of Acs et al. (1994). However, the authors mainly focus on economic explanations and consider culture just marginally. Only the residual influence, which cannot be explained by other variables, is left to examine the effect of culture. Yet, the authors find that UAI+ and IDV- are related to self-employment.

Altogether, there are several contradicting hypotheses with respect to the influence of culture on entrepreneurship and/or self-employment. One hypothesis is that PDI-, UAI-, MAS+ , and IDV+ stimulate entrepreneurship (combining Shane, 1992; Shane, 1993; and McGrath et al., 1992). This is based on the assumption that countries with this cultural profile have relatively more individuals with entrepreneurial values. However, regarding the rate of self-employment the opposite could also be true. Applying the reasoning of Baum et al. (1993) to all four indices, one could argue that 'entrepreneurial' individuals in countries with PDI+ , UAI+ , MAS-, and IDV- have more difficulties in 'doing things their own way', since organisations and existing structures are less suited for them. Dissatisfied as they are in their situation, they may choose for self-employment to be as independent as possible. (The findings of Acs et al., 1994, empirically confirm this reverse role, at least for the indices UAI+ and IDV-).

Dissatisfaction

The latter hypothesis coincides with the aforementioned reasoning why a push factor indicating some level of dissatisfaction is needed to explain the level of self-employment. Direct evidence of dissatisfaction as a motive on the micro level has time and again been found in survey studies concerning real-life entrepreneurs. See, for instance, Huisman and de Ridder (1984), who report that frustrations with previous wage-employment, unemployment, and personal crises are among the most-cited motives of a large sample of entrepreneurs in

eleven different countries. More recently, Van Uxem and Bais (1996) found that about 50% of almost 2000 new Dutch business-owners mentioned dissatisfaction with their previous job among their motives to start for themselves, although some pull factors were mentioned even more frequently.

What exists at a micro level may also exist at a macro level: do countries where people are in general less satisfied with life and with society have more self-employed than other countries? In this paper we will examine this by translating the individual push factor dissatisfaction into a cultural counterpart.

If dissatisfaction is indeed a determinant of self-employment across countries, then it may also be true that the four indices of Hofstede are related according to a dissatisfaction motive: in countries with PDI+, UAI+, MAS-, and IDV- there may be more self-employed, since 'entrepreneurial' individuals are more inclined to start for themselves as they cannot satisfy their needs within the existing structures. We will investigate this in this paper.

Indirect influences of culture

The above hypotheses refer to the direct influence of culture on self-employment. However, culture may also have an indirect role.

For example, one might hypothesise that in cultures characterised by UAI- the average unemployed will be less fearful of becoming an entrepreneur, making an (assumed) positive relationship with self-employment stronger than in UAI+ countries. However, hypotheses like this are rather speculative. Therefore, we have adopted an explorative approach concerning this relationship.

3 Data and Data Analysis

The data used in this study come from two databases: a database with variables of self-employment and several economic variables, collected by EIM Small Business Research and Consultancy, and a database with mainly cultural variables, collected by the Institute for Research on Intercultural Cooperation (IRIC).

3.1 EIM's Self-employment and Economic Data

There are several measures of self-employment for a country at a certain time. For example: the total number of self-employed, the number of self-employed per labour force, and the number of self-employed per population between 15 and 65 years. In this paper we will consider the second measure, that is, the number of self-employed per labour force. EIM has these data available for 23 countries and for the period 1974-1994. The 23 countries are 18 European countries plus USA, Japan, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand (see Table 1 for a list, with the corresponding abbreviations that we will use in this paper). The period 1974-1994 is covered by eleven moments in time, viz. the even years (1974, 1976, ... , 1994).

Table 1 The 23 countries studied in this paper, with their abbreviations

Country	Abbreviations	Country	Abbreviations	Country	Abbreviations	Country	Abbreviations
Australia	AUL	France	FRA	Italy	ITA	Portugal	POR
Austria	AUT	Germany (W)	GER	Japan	JPN	Spain	SPA
Belgium	BEL	Great Britain	GBR	Luxembourg	LUX	Sweden	SWE
Canada	CAN	Greece	GRE	Netherlands	NET	Switzerland	SWI
Denmark	DEN	Iceland	ICE	New Zealand	NZL	USA	USA
Finland	FIN	Ireland	IRE	Norway	NOR		

EIM's databanks furthermore provide five economic variables corresponding with the (economic) issues discussed in Section 2, viz.:

- Labour income quota;
- Population density per square kilometre;
- Female labour force as a percentage of the total labour force;
- Per capita income (GDP per capita);
- Unemployment as a percentage of the total labour force.

These variables are available for the 23 countries listed in Table 1, and for the even years of the period 1974-1994.

The self-employment and economic data were collected by combining several sources. The main sources are: OECD, Main Economic Indicators; OECD, Labour force statistics 1974-1994; and OECD, National Accounts 1960-1994, Detailed Tables. However, many data such as self-employment, unemployment, and labour force were incomplete. EIM completed these data by using ratios derived from data of the Eurostat Labour Force Survey.

Furthermore, EIM made a unified dataset of self-employment, which was necessary as in the OECD statistics the definitions of self-employed were not fully compatible between countries. In some countries, self-employed are defined as individuals owning a business that is not legally incorporated. In other countries, owner/managers of an incorporated business who gain profits as well as a salary, are also included. For the countries not following the broader definition, EIM made an estimation of the number of owner/managers by using information derived from statistical bureaus in these countries. For more details see Appendix I.

3.2 IRIC's Cultural Data

IRIC's database DECOR (Database for European Culture cOmparison Research) contains many cultural and some economic and demographic variables. The most important sources of cultural variables are Hofstede (1980) and the European Values Studies project (Stoetzel, 1983; Harding and Phillips, 1986; Halman, 1990; and Ester, Halman, and De Moor, 1993). For this study some irrelevant variables were eliminated, leaving a total number of almost 300 variables. These variables cover many social issues, such as satisfaction with the current situation (life, society, financially, etc.), important values, opinion of social phenomena, confidence in institutions, perception of the economic situation, interest in politics, and many more.

A problem with many variables is that they are collected in only few (mostly European) countries. Each variable covers minimally 9 and maximally 21 of the 23 countries studied in this paper. For example, Iceland is not covered at all with regard to cultural variables, and Luxemburg very scarcely. Besides, most variables correspond with cultural phenomena measured at only one moment in time, so that time-series analysis of these phenomena is not possible.

Yet, the database is unique for the multitude of issues covered. We will use it to carry out a first simple analysis by considering the cor-

relation between each of these issues and self-employment. This yields an idea of what role cultural and social variables play in differences in the level of self-employment across countries.

Furthermore, IRIC provides two variables (in time series) corresponding with the dissatisfaction issue discussed in Section 2, viz.:

- Dissatisfaction with life (the percentage 'not at all satisfied with life');
- Dissatisfaction with democracy (the percentage 'not at all satisfied with the way democracy works').

These variables are collected from the Eurobarometer Trends (1994), and are available for twelve European countries. However, for one country (Greece) data are available since 1980, and for two countries (Portugal and Spain) only since 1984.

For some years data were missing. For example, dissatisfaction is not given for 1974. Instead, we took the average of 1973 and 1975. Furthermore, in many years dissatisfaction was measured twice, in which case we took the average of the two measurements. Data for 1994 were missing as well, and instead we took the last measurement of 1993. A similar action was done for the year 1980 for Greece, and the year 1984 for Spain and Portugal: as these were missing, we took the first measurement of the next year. Thus, we collected time series for the even years between 1974 and 1994.

3.3 Analysis of the Self-employment Data

To get some idea of the differences between countries with respect to their entrepreneurial activity, we calculated for each country the average level of self-employment in the period 1974-1994. Table 2 lists the countries in descending order of their number of self-employed per labour force.

Table 2 Average level (and dispersion) of self-employment rates between 1974-1994, per country

Country	Average	(disp.)	Country	Average	(disp.)	Country	Average	(disp.)
Greece	18.6	(2.8)	Ireland	10.2	(3.4)	Iceland	8.4	(5.7)
Italy	16.1	(4.0)	USA	9.9	(1.5)	Luxembourg	7.8	(4.3)
Spain	15.5	(2.9)	Switzerland	9.8	(0.9)	Denmark	7.6	(2.8)
Australia	13.8	(3.5)	France	9.5	(2.6)	Germany (W)	6.8	(1.5)
New Zealand	13.3	(6.7)	Norway	8.8	(1.6)	Sweden	6.7	(1.7)
Portugal	11.9	(9.5)	Netherlands	8.7	(2.0)	Austria	5.9	(1.3)
Japan	11.2	(2.8)	Canada	8.6	(3.7)	Finland	5.7	(3.7)
Belgium	10.5	(1.7)	United Kingdom	8.6	(5.3)			

As can be seen from this list, the Southern European countries score high on self-employment. The Anglo-Saxon countries are relatively wide apart, with Australia and New Zealand scoring comparatively high, Canada and the United Kingdom relatively low, and Ireland and the USA in between. Japan, Belgium and France score medium. The Scandinavian and Germanic countries, plus the Netherlands, Iceland, and Luxembourg, score medium to low.

The dispersion shown in Table 2 indicates for each country the absolute difference between the minimum and the maximum level of self-employment in the period 1974-1994. For many countries the number of self-employed (per labour force) has increased. For example, Portugal's self-employment increased monotonously from 7.9% in 1974 to 17.4% in 1994, i.e., 9.5 percentage points. This implies an increment from the 16th place (out of 23) to the third (!). However, there are also countries for which the number of self-employed has decreased. For example, Luxembourg's number of self-employed per labour force decreased monotonously from 9.8% (10th place) to 5.6% (23rd place). Several countries have U-shaped functions (e.g., AUT, NET, and NZL).

To get an inkling of how much a country's level of self-employment is fluctuating compared to other countries, we calculated the correlations between the self-employment rates in the various years. These are given in Table 3.

Table 3 Correlations between self-employment rates per labour force in the period 1974-1994*

	1974	1976	1978	1980	1982	1984	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994
1974	1										
1976	.99	1									
1978	.98	.99	1								
1980	.95	.97	.99	1							
1982	.95	.97	.98	.99	1						
1984	.90	.92	.93	.95	.98	1					
1986	.88	.90	.91	.92	.96	.99	1				
1988	.82	.83	.84	.86	.90	.96	.98	1			
1990	.76	.78	.80	.83	.88	.94	.96	.99	1		
1992	.73	.75	.77	.80	.85	.92	.95	.97	.99	1	
1994	.67	.69	.72	.75	.80	.88	.91	.95	.97	.99	1

* All correlations are significant at the 0.001 level.

The results indicate that the correlations between self-employment rates in the various years are highly significant, but slightly decreasing for years wider apart. This implies that a country's entrepreneurial activity compared to other countries is changing, however slowly.

3.4 Correlations between Culture and Self-employment

We first considered a simple measure of the relationship between culture and entrepreneurial activity: the correlation between cultural variables and the percentage of self-employed per labour force. In Section 2 we mentioned some cultural determinants which might play a role in self-employment. These were (among others) Schumpeter's competitiveness (see Lynn 1991), the bureaucratic efficiency index of Mauro (1995), and the indices of Hofstede (1980).

We have furthermore included the indices of Hoppe (1990), which are comparable with Hofstede's indices (though they were collected at another time, for a smaller set of countries, and for another group of respondents). Although the variables are measured at one point in time only, we correlated them with the number of self-employed for each year (the even years between 1974-1994). Table 4 tabulates the results.

Table 4 Correlations between self-employment and Lynn's, Mauro's, Hofstede's, and Hoppe's Indices

variable	self-employment (the number of self-employed per labour force) in the year										
	1974	1976	1978	1980	1982	1984	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994
Competitiveness (Lynn)	.34	.38	.44	.43	.43	.46	<u>.50*</u>	<u>.55*</u>	<u>.54*</u>	.54*	.55*
Bureaucratic efficiency (Mauro)	-.48*	-.47*	-.49*	<u>-.55**</u>	<u>-.54*</u>	<u>-.58**</u>	-.56**	-.59**	-.63**	-.66***	-.64**
Power distance index (Hofstede)	.47*	.47*	.49*	.55**	.54*	.55*	.52*	.52*	.49*	.49*	.46*
Uncertainty avoidance index	.52*	.52*	.54*	.57**	.56**	.56**	.55**	.54*	.51*	.52*	.49*
Individualism index	-.09	-.11	-.13	-.16	-.15	-.13	-.12	-.13	-.15	-.18	-.17
Masculinity index	.23	.24	.26	.24	.26	.28	.30	.32	.29	.23	.20
Power distance index (Hoppe)	.67**	.68**	.70**	.71**	.71**	<u>.71**</u>	.73***	.73***	.72**	.70**	.67**
Uncertainty avoidance index	.30	.31	.32	.30	.33	<u>.35</u>	.39	.42	.38	.35	.32
Individualism index	-.44	-.49	-.51*	-.53	-.50*	<u>-.48</u>	-.49	-.47	-.49	-.52*	-.52*
Masculinity index	.07	.09	.13	.16	.21	<u>.24</u>	.24	.26	.28	.26	.27

Significance levels: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$.

Year of variable's measurement is underlined (Lynn's competitiveness was measured between 1986 and 1989, Mauro's bureaucratic efficiency index between 1980 and 1983, and Hofstede's indices between 1967 and 1973).

One of the first observations is that the correlations with self-employment vary in time. While in some years correlations are significant, this is not the case in other years. However, as can be expected from the high intercorrelations in Table 3, the differences for years not wide apart are small. Furthermore, assuming that the variables in Table 4 influence self-employment, specifically the correlations in the period *including and after* the years of the variables' measurement are important.

As hypothesised, competitiveness is positively (and significantly) correlated with self-employment (in the period of measurement and later). Corruption is also significantly correlated, but positively, contrary to the hypothesis in Section 2 (corruption is reversely represented by the bureaucratic efficiency index, and since the correlation between self-employment and bureaucratic efficiency is negative, the correlation with corruption is positive). This implies that the more corruption in a country, the more self-employed there are! (This may be a further confirmation of the dissatisfaction hypothesis, see later.)

With respect to the indices of Hofstede, we first notice that they were measured before 1974. Yet, as far as the correlations with self-employment are significant, this significance holds for the whole

period 1974-1994. The Hofstede indices were based on aspects of culture that turned out to be stable over a period of time, and hence it is reasonable to assume that the indices (or at least the countries' rank on these indices) still hold for some time after 1974. The stability of the indices is confirmed by the magnitude of the correlations in the several years, which is almost constant. Hence, it is also reasonable to assume that even though the indices were measured before 1974, they correspond to cultural values that are still relevant.

Hofstede's indices power distance and uncertainty avoidance are (significantly) correlated with self-employment, according to the dissatisfaction hypothesis. That is, countries with large power distance and strong uncertainty avoidance have more self-employed. The same holds for individualism, which is indeed negatively correlated (however, not significantly). The correlations with masculinity are positive (contrary to the dissatisfaction hypothesis), but they are not significant.

The correlations between self-employment and Hoppe's indices have the same sign as the correlations with Hofstede's indices, but the significance differs. Power distance is now the only significant variable (in the year of measurement and later). However, the results are not exactly comparable, since the Hoppe indices are available for fewer countries (17, whereas the Hofstede indices are given for 21 of the 23 countries).

3.5 Dissatisfaction and Culture

From the IRIC database, we considered the variables with a prima facie relationship to (dis)satisfaction, and we correlated them with self-employment. We furthermore included the five economic variables, for the year 1984 (the median of 1974 and 1994). Table 5 lists the most significant correlations ($p < 0.01$).

Table 5 Most significant correlations between self-employment and dissatisfaction and several economic variables

Variable	self-employment (the number of self-employed per labour force) in the year										
	1974	1976	1978	1980	1982	1984	1986	1988	1990	1992	1994
Prosperity (per capita GDP)	-.37	-.38	-.39	-.45*	-.45*	<u>-.50*</u>	-.51*	-.57**	-.63***	-.67***	-.66***
Female labour share	-.62**	-.59**	-.56**	-.54**	-.54**	<u>-.55**</u>	-.55**	-.55**	-.53**	-.52*	-.50*
Satisfied with democracy (1977)	-.66	<u>-.67*</u>	<u>-.68*</u>	-.73*	-.81**	-.87**	-.87**	-.87**	-.86**	-.83**	-.80**
Satisfied with democracy (1993)	-.56	-.56	-.57	-.60*	-.68*	-.76**	-.78**	-.79**	-.77**	<u>-.76**</u>	<u>-.77**</u>
Satisfied with society (1977)	-.68*	<u>-.68*</u>	<u>-.68*</u>	-.72*	-.78*	-.80**	-.80**	-.76*	-.73*	-.71*	-.69*
confidence in legal system	-.65*	-.65*	-.69*	-.72**	-.74**	-.76**	-.77**	-.78**	-.75**	-.76**	-.76**
Interest in politics	-.54	-.55	-.55	-.57	-.59*	-.63*	-.65*	-.69*	-.74**	-.75**	-.75**
Dislike people with different ideas	.63*	.63*	.67*	.71**	.73**	.78**	.79**	<u>.82***</u>	<u>.81**</u>	.85***	.85***
Overall life satisfaction (1985)	-.64*	-.65*	-.66*	-.68*	-.73*	<u>-.75**</u>	<u>-.77**</u>	-.78**	-.74**	-.75**	-.73**
Overall life satisfaction (1993)	-.71*	-.72*	-.73*	-.73*	-.77**	-.79**	-.81**	-.82**	-.78**	<u>-.78**</u>	<u>-.74**</u>
Satisfied with life (1990, male)	-.58*	-.60*	-.63*	-.71**	-.74**	-.81***	-.82***	-.83***	-.81***	-.82***	-.79***
Satisfied with life (1990, female)	-.61*	-.63*	-.66**	-.74**	-.77***	-.85***	-.86***	-.86***	-.85***	-.86***	-.83***
Dispersion of happiness	.74***	.74***	.74***	.73***	.75***	.71***	.71***	.70***	<u>.69***</u>	<u>.70***</u>	.67**

Significance levels: *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001.

Year of measuring variable is underlined (two underlined years: measurement was in the odd year in between).

For all variables in the table, the correlations with self-employment are significant for the years of measurement and later. The only significant economic variables are GDP per capita and female labour share. The other three variables (labour income quota, population density, and unemployment) were not significant. This does not only hold for the year 1984, but for the other years as well.

Summarising the correlations in Table 4 and Table 5, and adding other significant correlations ($p < 0.05$, which are not listed) yields the following connotations.

Connotations

Across countries, the following cultural and non-cultural phenomena are related to self-employment.

- *Less wealth.* There is more self-employment in the countries that are relatively poor.
- *Kind of society.* In countries with higher self-employment rates, the power distance is larger, there is stronger uncertainty avoidance, more bureaucracy and more corruption. There is also a lower female labour participation.
- *Dissatisfaction with society.* In countries with more self-employment, people are less satisfied with the kind of society they live in. They like less the way democracy is functioning and they have less confidence in the legal system. They think that the society must be changed radically. They are less interested in politics, probably because they feel they cannot reach power holders.
- *Dislike of 'deviant' behaviour.* People accept less other people who are different. There is a rejection of homosexuality, prostitution, euthanasia, unmarried mothers, and of other 'deviant' ideas, values and beliefs.
- *Lower life satisfaction.* In countries with more self-employment, the overall life satisfaction is lower. Besides, there are larger differences in happiness between the happy and less happy people than in other countries.

4 Regressions on Self-employment

In this section we will test the hypotheses of Section 2 with respect to the economic and the dissatisfaction issues discussed there. In Section 3 we described five economic and two dissatisfaction variables, given in time series. These variables will be used in the regressions on self-employment.

Rather had we also included the indices of Hofstede, but these are, unfortunately, not given in time series. However, there is another way of studying their influence. We will carry out regressions for distinct cultural country clusterings, based on the Hofstede indices. This enables us to examine whether in different clusters the five economic and the two dissatisfaction variables influence self-employment in different ways. Thus we can indirectly study the role of culture.

4.1 Clustering of Countries

Each Hofstede index is used to divide the countries into two clusters (for example: high PDI and low PDI). Thus we can investigate if, for example, in high-PDI countries the explaining variables influence self-employment in another way than in low-PDI countries.

The advantage of using the Hofstede indices to determine country clusters, is that the indices are available for most of the countries studied in this paper. Unfortunately, for Iceland and Luxemburg the four indices are not available, but for the latter country estimates are known, which will be used¹. Accordingly, for the regressions in country clusters only Iceland is excluded.

We will also use the combination of the four indices to make again two clusters. Altogether, with the four indices and the combination, we have ten different country clusters.

Given a Hofstede index, the two corresponding clusters are determined using the K-means algorithm. In this algorithm the countries are assigned in turn to the nearest of the two cluster centers (which are initialised as the lowest and the highest score among the 22 countries). When all cases have been added, each cluster center is updated as the average score of the countries it contains. This process iterates until the solution converges.

¹ These estimates were provided by the Institute for Training in Intercultural Management (ITIM) and are based on extensive data from training sessions.

4.2 Regressions Across All Countries (No Clustering)

The dependent variable in the regressions is the number of self-employed per labour force, the independent (explaining) variables are the five economic and the two dissatisfaction variables described previously. The time series of all variables are ‘pooled’ over time, so that we obtain variables with maximally $23 \times 11 = 253$ cases (23 countries, 11 years).

We will first consider a regression without clustering of countries and without the two dissatisfaction variables. The reason for leaving out the dissatisfaction variables is that they are available for only twelve of the 23 countries studied in this paper, whereas the other five independent variables are given for all countries. Table 6 summarises the results of the regression.

Table 6 Regression on self-employment across 23 countries

Cluster	Countries	<i>N</i>	Diss. incl.	R^2	Lab. inc. quota	Populat. density	Fem. lab. share	GDP per capita	Unempl.
All	23 (see Table 1)	253	no	.24	-0.025 (-0.424)	-0.069 (-1.210)	-0.265 (-4.148)	-0.228 (-3.487)	0.226 (3.919)

Tabulated are the standardised regression coefficients (T-values between brackets); coefficients with $|T| > 2$ are written in bold.

The first column of Table 6 shows the clustering of countries we are using. In this case we consider all 23 countries (indicated in column 2). The *N* in column 3 denotes the number of cases in the regression. Its maximum is 253 and since there are no missing data here, all cases remain. The fourth column indicates that the dissatisfaction variables are excluded from the regression. The fifth column denotes the amount of explained variance (R^2 , also called the coefficient of determination). The last five columns correspond with the five economic variables.

The second row of Table 6 gives the standardised regression coefficients of the five economic variables in the regression equation, when they are all entered (these coefficients are usually denoted by beta). In the third row, the corresponding T-values (between brackets) indicate the significance of the variables entered.

The significant coefficients in Table 6 (the coefficients with a corresponding absolute T-value of 2 or higher) are written in bold. Three of the five economic variables turn out to be significant: negative are female labour share and GDP per capita; positive is unemployment.

Subsequently, we consider the regression for the twelve countries for which we have the dissatisfaction variables. We will first include only the five economic variables, and subsequently add the dissatisfaction variables. The reason for this is that we can thus distinguish the additional explaining power. Table 7 summarises the results.

Table 7 Regressions on self-employment across twelve countries, including dissatisfaction

Cluster	Countries	N	Diss. incl.	R ²	Dissat. life	Dissat. democr.	Lab. inc. quota	Populat. density	Fem. lab. share	GDP per capita	Unempl.
All	12: BEL, DEN, FRA, GBR, GER, GRE, IRE, ITA, LUX, NET, POR, SPA	119	no	.32			-0.035 (-0.388)	-0.157 (-1.779)	-0.028 (-0.328)	-0.438 (-4.724)	0.126 (1.455)
			yes	.64	0.483 (5.228)	0.265 (3.384)	-0.055 (-0.832)	-0.034 (-0.498)	-0.029 (-0.455)	-0.139 (-1.740)	0.121 (1.776)

Tabulated are the standardised regression coefficients (T-values between brackets); coefficients with $|T| \geq 2$ are written in bold.

In the regressions of Table 7 we apply again no clustering (column 1), i.e., we consider all countries (for which we have dissatisfaction variables). These countries are listed in column 2 (see Table 1 for the abbreviations used). Column 3 shows that there are N= 119 cases in the regression, which – because of some missing data (for Greece, Portugal and Spain the time series start later than 1974) – is fewer than the maximum of $12 \times 11 = 132$ (12 countries, 11 years). The fourth column indicates whether the dissatisfaction variables are included in the regression or not. The last seven columns correspond with the seven independent variables (now including the dissatisfaction variables).

In case the dissatisfaction variables are not included and only the five economic variables are considered (second row of Table 7), we see a slightly different picture than for the regression across all 23 countries (Table 6): only GDP per capita is significant (negatively again). The variables female labour share and unemployment are apparently not significant for this smaller set of countries.

If the dissatisfaction variables are included in the regression as well, the explained variance (R²; fifth column) increases significantly: from .32 to .64. Both dissatisfaction variables are positively influenc-

ing self-employment (the relation is strongly significant). They are the only significant variables.

To conclude this section: across the twelve European countries GDP per capita influences self-employment (negatively). However, dissatisfaction with life and with democracy are even stronger determinants.

4.3 Regressions in Country Clusters, without Dissatisfaction Variables

We will now consider regressions for the various country clusterings based on the indices of Hofstede. Since the dissatisfaction variables are available for only twelve of the 23 countries studied in this paper, we first exclude these variables from the regressions. In the next subsection we will discuss the regressions including the dissatisfaction variables.

Table 8 summarises the results. For example, the clustering based on the four indices PDI, UAI, MAS, and IDV (called 'All_4', see first column) divides the 22 countries (excluding Iceland) into two groups: 'All_4= 1' and 'All_4= 2'. The first group consists of the Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian countries, and the Netherlands (see 2nd column). For these eleven countries there are no missing data, so that the number of cases (3rd column) is maximal: $11 \times 11 = 121$ (11 countries, 11 years). For this country cluster all variables come out significantly in the regression with self-employment: labour income quota, population density, and female labour share negatively; GDP per capita and unemployment positively.

Table 8 Regressions on self-employment in country clusters, excluding dissatisfaction

Cluster	Countries	N	Diss. incl.	R ²	Lab. inc. quota	Populat. density	Fem. lab. share	GDP per capita	Unempl.
All_4=1	11: Anglosax, Scan, NET	121	no	.36	-0.288 (-3.452)	-0.334 (-4.205)	-0.527 (-4.923)	0.265 (2.429)	0.180 (2.354)
All_4=2	11: Germanic, South, BEL, LUX, FRA, JPN	121	no	.48	0.191 (2.572)	0.013 (0.178)	-0.220 (-2.932)	0.398 (-5.217)	0.332 (4.604)
PDI-	14: Anglosax, Germanic, Scan, NET	154	no	.34	-0.210 (-2.952)	-0.400 (-5.569)	-0.529 (-6.184)	0.322 (3.695)	0.240 (3.519)
PDI+	8: South, BEL, LUX, FRA, JPN	88	no	.45	0.177 (1.943)	-0.040 (-0.432)	-0.133 (-0.460)	-0.467 (-5.143)	0.308 (3.468)
UAI-	13: Anglosax, Scan, GER, SWI, NET	143	no	.38	-0.265 (-3.664)	-0.421 (-5.801)	-0.541 (-6.239)	0.300 (3.351)	0.198 (2.849)
UAI+	9: South, AUT, BEL, LUX, FRA, JPN	99	no	.50	0.199 (2.437)	0.104 (1.309)	-0.212 (-2.617)	-0.459 (-5.655)	0.366 (4.718)
MAS-	8: Scan, NET, FRA, POR, SPA	88	no	.68	-0.386 (-5.927)	-0.316 (-4.059)	-0.551 (-6.209)	-0.167 (-2.189)	0.297 (4.513)
MAS+	14: Anglosax, Germanic, BEL, LUX, GRE, ITA, JPN	154	no	.24	0.193 (2.346)	-0.161 (-2.188)	0.098 (1.068)	-0.369 (-3.740)	0.087 (1.105)
IDV-	4: AUT, GRE, POR, JPN	44	no	.57	0.308 (2.052)	0.247 (1.638)	-0.074 (-0.350)	-0.634 (-3.889)	0.089 (0.519)
IDV+	18: Anglosax, Scan, GER, SWI, NET, BEL, LUX, FRA, ITA, SPA	198	no	.39	-0.284 (-4.835)	-0.203 (-3.425)	-0.457 (-6.745)	0.060 (0.833)	0.345 (5.781)

Tabulated are the standardised regression coefficients (T-values between brackets); coefficients with $|T| \geq 2$ are written in bold.

Anglosax = {AUL, CAN, GBR, IRE, NZL, USA}

Germanic = {AUT, GER, SWI}

Scan = {DEN, FIN, NOR, SWE}

South = {GRE, ITA, POR, SPA}

In the other cluster based on the four indices ('All_4= 2'), labour income quota is again significant, but positive now! Female labour share and GDP per capita are both negative, and unemployment is positive. Population density is not significant for this cluster.

Considering Table 8, we make the following observations:

- Female labour share always has the (expected) negative influence (except in MAS+ , but there it is not significant); apparently, this is independent of culture. However, the influence in the cluster 'All_4= 1' is stronger than in the cluster 'All_4= 2'; in 'All_4= 1' it is the most significant variable. The same holds for the clusters PDI- and UAI-, compared to PDI+ and UAI+ . Notice that the clustering according to the indices PDI or UAI corresponds very much with the clustering according to 'All_4'. Also for MAS- (!) and IDV+ , female labour share is the most significant variable.

- GDP per capita is the most significant variable (negatively) for the clusters 'All_4= 2', PDI+ , UAI+ , MAS+ , and IDV-. It has a positive influence for most of the other clusters (mainly 'All_4= 1', PDI-, and UAI-). We will discuss these interesting results in Section 5.
- Population density always appears with negative sign when it is significant in the regression equation. It is only significant in 'All_4= 1', PDI-, UAI-, MAS- and MAS+ , and IDV+ , and not in the other clusters. In 'All_4= 1', PDI-, and UAI- it is the second-most significant variable (after female labour share).
- Unemployment always has a positive influence, irrespective of culture. However, the influence is stronger in 'All_4= 2', PDI+ , UAI+ , MAS-, and IDV+ . In 'All_4= 2', PDI+ , and UAI+ it is the second-most influential variable (after GDP per capita).
- The variable labour income quota has a negative influence in the clusters 'All_4= 1', PDI-, UAI-, MAS-, and IDV+ . For the other clusters the influence is positive (though less significant). This is puzzling, and we will further discuss it in Section 5.

To draw a conclusion from these results, we first notice that the most meaningful clustering (both with respect to the results of the regressions and considering the cultural similarity of the countries) is the clustering according to PDI or UAI, which is almost equivalent to the clustering according to 'All_4'. The differences between these clusterings correspond to the exact position of the Germanic countries, but the results of the regressions are almost the same.

A general conclusion is that for the countries with PDI- and/or UAI- female labour share (-) is the most significant determinant of self-employment, followed by population density (-). These are the Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian countries including the Netherlands, but it also holds for the Germanic countries. For these countries, GDP per capita (+ !!), labour income quota (-), and unemployment (+) are important as well.

For the other countries, the Southern European countries including Belgium, Luxemburg, France, and Japan, and also for the Germanic countries, GDP per capita (-) is the most significant determinant of self-employment, followed by unemployment (+).

4.4 Regressions in Country Clusters, Including Dissatisfaction Variables

Now we will consider the twelve countries for which the dissatisfaction variables are given. For each clustering we have first carried out a regression without the dissatisfaction variables, to see whether for the twelve countries the influence of the five economic variables is different than for the 22 countries studied in the previous subsection. Subsequently, we added the two dissatisfaction variables to discern their extra explaining power. Table 9 summarises the results. (The clusterings according to PDI and UAI turned out to be equivalent. The clustering according to IDV is omitted, since IDV- contained only two countries.)

Table 9 Regressions on self-employment in country clusters, including dissatisfaction

Cluster	Countries	N	Diss. incl.	R ²	Dissat. life	Dissat. democr.	Lab.inc. quota	Populat. density	Fem. lab. share	GDP per capita	Unempl.
AII_4=1	4: DEN, GBR, IRE, NET	44	no	.30			-0.087 (-0.356)	-0.398 (-1.414)	-0.745 (-2.254)	0.575 (1.461)	0.235 (1.172)
			yes	.47	0.073 (0.380)	0.526 (2.742)	-0.061 (-0.276)	-0.551 (-2.169)	-1.049 (-3.424)	1.266 (3.133)	0.195 (1.042)
AII_4=2	8: BEL, FRA, GER, GRE, ITA, LUX, POR, SPA	75	no	.61			0.095 (1.085)	-0.198 (-2.456)	-0.109 (-1.333)	-0.521 (-6.215)	0.307 (3.730)
			yes	.76	-0.035 (-0.265)	0.439 (4.848)	0.040 (0.560)	-0.231 (-2.938)	-0.040 (-0.571)	-0.474 (-4.979)	0.155 (2.143)
PDI- or UAI-	5: DEN, GBR, GER, IRE, NET	55	no	.35			-0.005 (-0.022)	-0.106 (-0.498)	-0.411 (-1.678)	0.190 (0.614)	0.451 (2.706)
			yes	.50	-0.048 (-0.322)	0.552 (3.555)	-0.044 (-0.228)	-0.216 (-1.118)	-0.574 (-2.577)	0.654 (2.145)	0.382 (2.514)
PDI+ or UAI+	7: BEL, FRA, GRE, ITA, LUX, POR, SPA	64	no	.58			0.144 (1.165)	-0.188 (-1.330)	-0.082 (-0.893)	-0.586 (-6.315)	0.283 (3.037)
			yes	.72	-0.131 (-0.892)	0.455 (4.474)	0.069 (0.820)	-0.224 (-2.519)	-0.023 (-0.283)	-0.601 (-5.352)	0.138 (1.617)
MAS-	5: DEN, FRA, NET, POR, SPA	45	no	.84			-0.485 (-5.847)	-0.527 (-4.862)	-0.340 (-3.334)	-0.312 (-3.243)	0.120 (1.497)
			yes	.87	-0.399 (-3.252)	0.173 (1.906)	-0.692 (-6.972)	-0.786 (-5.578)	-0.377 (-3.650)	-0.340 (-3.796)	0.044 (0.560)
MAS+	7: BEL, GBR, GER, GRE, IRE, ITA, LUX	74	no	.29			0.196 (1.124)	-0.219 (1.124)	0.192 (1.122)	-0.288 (-1.684)	0.130 (0.913)
			yes	.78	0.543 (5.199)	0.387 (4.356)	0.107 (1.081)	-0.168 (-1.530)	0.171 (1.647)	0.070 (0.632)	0.051 (0.550)

Tabulated are the standardised regression coefficients (T-value between brackets); coefficients with |T| ≥ 2 are written in bold.

Considering the five economic variables only (excluding the dissatisfaction variables), a first observation is that for this smaller set of countries fewer variables are significant. For example: in 'All_4= 1' and PDI-/UAI- there is only one significant variable (not the same one), whereas for the 22 countries all variables were significant in these clusters. Other observations are (in the order of the previous subsection):

- Female labour share is only significant in 'All_4= 1' and MAS- (negatively).
- GDP per capita is (again) the most significant variable (negatively) for the clusters 'All_4= 2', and PDI+ /UAI+ .
- Population density is always negative, but only significant for 'All_4= 2' and MAS-.
- Unemployment is always positive, but only significant in 'All_4= 2', PDI-/UAI-, and PDI+ /UAI+ . In PDI-/UAI- it is the only significant variable. In 'All_4= 2' and PDI+ /UAI+ it is the second-most important variable (after GDP per capita).
- Labour income quota is only significant in MAS- (negatively).

Adding now the two dissatisfaction variables, we first observe that some economic variables that were not significant, now are. For example: in 'All_4= 1' three of the five economic variables are now significant, whereas only one of them was significant with the dissatisfaction variables excluded. Furthermore, we observe the following:

- The explained variance (R^2) increases significantly when the dissatisfaction variables are included in the regression.
- Dissatisfaction with life does not seem to be very important within country clusters (as it was across all countries, see Table 7). For MAS+ , it still plays the main role. In MAS- it even appears with a negative sign (but only after four economic variables).
- Dissatisfaction with democracy now plays a very important role (positively). Only in MAS- it is not significant. It is the most significant variable in PDI-/UAI-, and the second-most significant variable in PDI+ /UAI+ (after GDP per capita).

To conclude this subsection (again focussing on the indices PDI/UAI): For PDI-/UAI-, dissatisfaction with democracy (+) is the most important variable, followed by female labour share (-), unemployment (+) and GDP per capita (+). For PDI+ /UAI+ , GDP per capita (-) is the most important variable, followed by dissatisfaction with democracy (+) and population density (-).

4.5 Summary of the Regressions

We will now summarise the results of the regressions on self-employment discussed in this section. Considering first the economic variables, we see that across all countries the significant variables are (in order of significance) female labour share (-), unemployment (+), and GDP per capita (-) (see Table 6). Within the country clusters PDI- and UAI- (see Table 8), female labour share (-) is still most important, followed by population density (-). The other three economic variables are also significant, but the order of significance differs slightly for the two country clusters. In the clusters PDI+ and UAI+ the most important variables are GDP per capita (-) and unemployment (+). Female labour share (-) and labour income quota (+) are also significant, but only for UAI+.

When all seven independent variables are included, we see that across all countries dissatisfaction with life (+) and with democracy (+) are the most (and the only) significant variables (see Table 7). In the country cluster PDI-/UAI-, dissatisfaction with democracy (+) is most important, followed by female labour share (-), unemployment (+), and GDP per capita (+) (see Table 9). For PDI+ /UAI+ the significant variables are GDP per capita (-), dissatisfaction with democracy (+), and population density (-). Table 10 summarises the results.

Table 10 Significant variables in the regressions on self-employment

Only Economic Variables:*Across all (23) countries:*

1. Female labour share (-)
2. Unemployment (+)
3. GDP per capita (-)

In countries with PDI- or UAI-:

1. Female labour share (-)
2. Population density (-)
3. GDP per capita (+), Unemployment (+),
Labour income quota (-)

In countries with PDI+ or UAI+:

1. GDP per capita (-)
2. Unemployment (+)
3. Female labour share (-)
4. Labour income quota (+)
(3 and 4 only for UAI+)

Economic and Dissatisfaction Variables:*Across all (12) countries:*

1. Dissatisfaction with life (+)
2. Dissatisfaction with democracy (+)

In countries with PDI- or UAI-:

1. Dissatisfaction with democracy (+)
2. Female labour share (-)
3. Unemployment (+)
4. GDP per capita (+)

In countries with PDI+ or UAI+:

1. GDP per capita (-)
2. Dissatisfaction with democracy (+)
3. Population density (-)

Considering this summary, we conclude that the influence of PDI and UAI on the role of the economic variables in explaining self-employment rates is especially clear for GDP per capita and labour income quota. For PDI-/UAI- GDP has a positive influence, and for PDI+ /UAI+ it is negative. Labour income quota also has a reverse role: across the 23 countries it is negative for PDI-/UAI- and positive for PDI+ /UAI+ (but for PDI+ not significantly). Across the twelve countries, the positive influence of labour income quota in PDI+ /UAI+ is not significant. For the other variables, the signs do not change. The only difference is that some variables lose their significance in the other cluster, or change their order.

5 Discussion

5.1 Cultural Variables and Dissatisfaction

The correlations between self-employment and the cultural variables listed in Tables 4 and 5 imply some interesting relationships. As was hypothesised in Section 2, self-employment is positively related to Schumpeter's competitiveness (see Lynn 1991). But contrary to what was suggested, self-employment is also positively related to corruption (i.e., negatively to the bureaucratic efficiency index of Mauro 1995). However, this positive relationship might very well have to do with the dissatisfaction issue raised in Section 2.

This hypothesis is supported by the correlations between self-employment and cultural values, and the correlations between self-employment and variables related to (dis)satisfaction with life and with society. The connotations listed in Section 3 leave quite a coherent picture. Countries in which people are less satisfied with life as a whole have more self-employed. These are societies with larger power distance, stronger uncertainty avoidance, more bureaucracy, more corruption, and which are relatively poor. People in these countries are less satisfied with the way their democracy is functioning and with their society in general. Perhaps people in such countries are more easily forced into self-employment, as they cannot optimally develop themselves within existing structures and organisations. In other countries, people possibly have more opportunities to find an appropriate job within existing structures, and, as a result, are less inclined towards starting for themselves.

The dissatisfaction hypothesis is further confirmed by the results of the regressions in Section 4. Dissatisfaction with life and with democracy are even stronger determinants than the economic variables.

5.2 Economic and Demographic Variables

The distinction between countries based on cultural clusters turns out to be highly relevant for our analysis. Some economic variables have a negative influence on self-employment in certain clusters, and a positive influence in other clusters. Besides, several variables which were not (or not always) significant in the regressions across all countries, more often appear significantly in the regressions across the cultural clusters. This would not have been visible if we had neglected the cultural context, and in that case we would have obtained incorrect results.

Overall, we find a positive relationship between unemployment and self-employment. Unemployment can thus be seen as a push factor in all countries. Since a negative relation was never found, we conclude that in the countries considered the unemployment rate generally remained below the level where it discourages people to start a business.

With respect to prosperity, a negative correlation with self-employment dominates. However, when cultural clusters are distinguished, sometimes (for example in PDI- or UAI-) a positive relation is found. Since the countries in for instance the PDI- cluster are relatively affluent and those in PDI+ are less prosperous, these findings are in conformity with the U-shaped relationship between self-employment and prosperity, as hypothesised in Section 2. In countries that have a relatively low level of GDP per capita, there is a negative relation due to the yet unexploited possibilities for economies of scale. In countries with a high level of GDP per capita, there is a positive relationship because a stage of tertiatisation, differentiation of markets, and dis-economies of scale has set in.

Since prosperity is negatively correlated with power distance, as well as with uncertainty avoidance (be it weakly), and positively with individualism (see Hofstede, 1991), it is likely that it is the level of prosperity which provides an indirect link between these cultural dimensions and self-employment. The triangular relationship between cultural dimensions, prosperity and self-employment obviously deserves further research.

Concerning labour income quota, only in some cases did we find significant evidence for the expected negative relation with self-employment (implying that a higher level of profitability is a stimulus towards self-employment). When (cultural) clusters are distinguished, a positive relationship is sometimes found (for instance in UAI+ and IDV-), which is not confirmed by theory. This may, however, be due to a reversed causality when a high level of self-employment causes a low level of profitability. In a country with little social security and a low supply of jobs, this situation may perpetuate itself. At the same time, the compensation of entrepreneurial labour is also counted within the labour income quota, which may cause a statistical artefact.

With respect to population density, there appears to be a negative relation with self-employment, which implies that the minimum level of provisions (shops, crafts) needed in thinly populated areas

and the effect of economies of scales in densely populated areas overrule the effect of the attractiveness of networks.

Finally, as predicted in Section 2, the participation of women in the labour force has a negative impact on self-employment.

6 Conclusions

The determinants of self-employment constitute a complex whole. But as far as national differences are concerned, one clear determinant appears: dissatisfaction. Across nations, dissatisfaction with society and with life in general seems to be a distinguishing factor: countries with people who are less satisfied with the society they live in and who have a lower overall life satisfaction, have more self-employed.

Two warnings are appropriate here. First, the relationship between dissatisfaction and self-employment holds across nations, and may not be true for individuals within countries. It might be that dissatisfaction also plays a role within countries (as is often stated in the literature), but this cannot be concluded from this cross-national study. Secondly, one must be very prudent in extrapolating the conclusions found in this study to world-wide relationships. The results hold for Western countries (including Japan). It remains to be investigated whether the relationship still exists when other (e.g. developing) countries are included.

Finally, it is tempting to extract some 'stylised facts' from our research, regarding self-employment and stages of economic development. In the early stages, when countries are relatively poor, their culture can often be characterised by large power distance and low individualism, and often also by strong uncertainty avoidance (at least in the Western countries). At the same time, their population is often relatively dissatisfied with society and life in general. All these circumstances give rise to a high incidence of (small-scale) self-employment. In the next stage, countries start reaping hitherto unexploited economies of scale, prosperity rises, and dissatisfaction seems to diminish. The result is a definite decline of self-employment. Finally, when countries are fully industrialised and a service economy sets in, several countervailing forces seem to dominate the scene. First of all, information technology and differentiation of markets create dis-economies of scale and invite new, innovative entrepreneurship. Simultaneously, a high level of satisfaction with life in these societies may, however, slow down the drive towards self-employment. But when unemployment increases for a longer period, due to the transition to the knowledge-based economy, this may again elicit new (and perhaps marginal) business start-ups.

Conclusions

It is not straightforward, however, how governments in the most highly developed economies may stimulate this resurgence of entrepreneurship (self-employment) by, for instance, safeguarding a reasonable profitability of private enterprise.

References

- Acs, Z.J., D.B. Audretsch and D.S. Evans, 1994. The determinants of variations in self-employment rates across countries and over time (Mimeo).
- Bais, J., W.H.M. van der Hoeven and W.H.J. Verhoeven, 1995. *Determinanten van zelfstandig ondernemerschap*, Den Haag: OSA (in Dutch).
- Baum, J.R., J.D. Olian, M. Erez, E.R. Schnell, K. G. Smith, H.P. Sims, J.S. Scully and K.A. Smith, 1993. Nationality and work role interactions: A cultural contrast of Israeli and U.S. entrepreneurs' versus managers' needs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 8, 499-512.
- Birley, S. and P. Westhead, 1994. A taxonomy of business start-up reasons and their impact on firm growth and size. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 9, 7-31.
- Blanchflower, D.G., and A. J. Oswald, 1996, What makes an entrepreneur? *Journal of Labour Economics*.
- Brockhaus, R., 1982. The psychology of the entrepreneur. In C. Kent, D. Sexton and K. Vesper (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship*. Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Capon, N., J.U. Farley and S. Hoenig, 1990. Determinants of financial performance: A meta-analysis. *Management Science*, 36, 1143-1158.
- Ester, P., L. Halman and R. de Moor, eds. 1993. *The Individualizing Society: Value Change in Europe and North America*, Tilburg University Press.
- Etzioni, A., 1987. Entrepreneurship, adaptation and legitimation: A macro-behavioural perspective. *Journal of Economic Behaviour and Organization*, 8, 175-189.
- Eurobarometer Trends 1974-1993, 1994. Brussels: European Commission.
- Evans, D.S., and L.S. Leighton, 1989. The determinants of changes in US self-employment, 1968-1987. *Small Business Economics*, 1, 111-119.
- Evans, D.S., and L.S. Leighton, 1990. Small business formation by unemployed workers. *Small Business Economics*, 2, 319-330.
- Foti, A., and M. Vivarelli, 1994. An econometric test of the self-employment model: The case of Italy. *Small Business Economics*, 6, 81-93.
- Halman, L., 1990. *Waarden in de Westerse Wereld: Een Internationale Exploratie van de Waarden in de Westerse Samenleving*. Tilburg University Press (in Dutch).
- Hamilton, R.T., 1989. Unemployment and business formation rates: Reconciling time series and cross-sections. *Environment and Planning A*, 11, 249-255.
- Harding, S., and D. Phillips, with M. Fogarty, 1986. *Contrasting Values in Western Europe*. London: Macmillan.

- Hofstede, G., 1980. *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, G., 1991. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. McGraw-Hill, London.
- Hoppe, M.H., 1990. *A comparative Study of Country Elites: International Differences in Work-Related Values and Learning and their Implications for International Management Training and Development*. Ph.D. thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Huisman, D., and W.J. de Ridder, 1984. *Vernieuwend Ondernemen*. SMO, Utrecht (in Dutch).
- Klundert, Th. van de, 1997. *Groei en instituties; Over de oorzaken van economische ontwikkeling*. Tilburg University Press (in Dutch).
- Krueger, N., 1993. The impact of prior entrepreneurial exposure on perceptions of new venture feasibility and desirability. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*, 18, 5-21.
- Lucas, R. E., Jr., 1978. On the size distribution of business firms. *Bell Journal of Economics*, 9, 508-523.
- Lumpkin, G.T., and G.G. Dess, 1996. Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 135-172.
- Lynn, R., 1991. *The Secret of the Miracle Economy; Different National Attitudes to Competitiveness and Money*. Crowley Esmonde Ltd.
- Mauro, P., 1995. Corruption and growth. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 681-712.
- McClelland, D.C., 1976. *The Achieving Society*. Van Nostrand, Princeton.
- McGrath, R.G., I.C. MacMillan and S. Scheinberg, 1992. Elitists, risk-takers, and rugged individualists? An exploratory analysis of cultural differences between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 7, 115-135.
- Meager, N., 1992. Does unemployment lead to self-employment? *Small Business Economics*, 4, 87-103.
- North, D.C., and R.P. Thomas, 1973. *The Rise of the Western world; A New Economic History*. Cambridge, UK: University Press.
- Olson, M., 1982. *The Rise and Decline of Nations; Economic Growth, Stagflation and Social Rigidities*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
- Praag, C.M. van, 1996. *Determinants of Successful Entrepreneurship*. Amsterdam, Thesis Publishers.
- Reynolds, P.D., and D.J. Storey, 1993. *Local and regional characteristics affecting small business formation: A cross national comparison*.
- Roquebert, J., R. L. Philips and P.R. Westfall, 1996. Markets vs management: What 'drives' profitability? *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, 653-664.

- Santarelli, E., and A. Sterlacchini, 1994. New firm formation in Italian industry. *Small Business Economics*, 6, 95-106.
- Schumpeter, J.A., 1934. *The Theory of Economic Development*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Shane, S.A., 1992. Why do some societies invent more than others? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 7, 29-46.
- Shane, S.A., 1993. Cultural influences on national rates of innovation, *Journal of Business Venturing* 8, 59-73.
- Shapiro, A., and L. Sokol, 1982. The social dimensions of entrepreneurship. In C. Kent, D. Sexton and K. Vesper (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Entrepreneurship*. Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Stanworth, M.J.K., and J. Curran, 1973, *Management Motivation in the Smaller Business*. London: Gower Press.
- Stoetzel, J., 1983. *Les Valeurs du Temps Present*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France (in French).
- Uxem. F.W. van, and J. Bais, 1996. *Het starten van een bedrijf; Ervaringen van 2000 starters*, Zoetermeer: EIM (in Dutch).
- Weber, M., 1930. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. New York: Scribner's.
- Wennekers, A.R.M., and A.R. Thurik, 1999. Linking Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth, *Small Business Economics*, forthcoming.
- Wit, G. de, 1993. Models of self-employment in a competitive market. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 7, 367-397.

Appendix: Economic data: definitions and sources

The following countries are in the estimation sample (1974-1994):

Austria	Greece	Spain	U.S.A.
Belgium	Ireland	Sweden	Japan
Denmark	Italy	U.K.	Canada
Finland	Luxembourg	Iceland	Australia
France	Netherlands	Norway	New Zealand
Germany (West)	Portugal	Switzerland	

The main definitions and sources are listed below.

1. Self-employment

There are several definitional aspects to the concept of self-employment or business ownership, which have to be taken into account when measuring the number of self-employed. First one must distinguish between four different categories of self-employment. These are the owners of enterprises that are not legally incorporated, the owner/managers of incorporated businesses, so-called unpaid family workers and wage-and-salary workers operating a side-business as a secondary work activity.¹

Self-employment as defined in the present report includes the owners of both incorporated and unincorporated businesses, but excludes the other categories. Data on the number of self-employed used in this report are taken from the OECD Labour Force Statistics 1974-1994. However, in the OECD statistics the definitions of self-employed were not fully compatible between countries. In some countries self-employed are strictly defined as individuals owning a business that is not legally incorporated. In other countries, owner/managers of an incorporated business who gain profits as well as a salary, are also considered self-employed. Australia, Canada, Denmark, France, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Spain and U.S. use the narrow definition, while the other countries apply the broader characterization. For the countries not following the broader definition, EIM made an estimation of the number of owner/managers by using information derived from statistical bureaus in these countries. Another difference in definition is that in some countries unpaid family workers are included in the data of self-employed as well. The unpaid family workers were eliminated from the data by using ratios derived from other variables, recent years or other domestic sources. This work has resulted in a unified dataset² of self-employed persons, which includes the owners of both the incorporated and unincorporated businesses but excludes the unpaid family workers. As far as we know the dataset also exclude side-businesses. In this dataset possible discontinuities in time series have not been corrected for.

1 For more information on the various measures of self-employment, see *The state of small business; a report of the president 1986*, Washington: US Government Printing Office, chapter 4.

2 This EIM-dataset is called COMPENDIA98 (COMPARative ENTREpreneurship Data for International Analysis).

Finally the number of self-employed, as defined above, was expressed as a percentage of the labour force. Data on the labour force were also taken from the OECD Labour Force Statistics 1974-1994. Again, some missing data have been filled up from other sources.

2. Gross domestic product per capita.

The underlying variables gross domestic product and total population are from OECD, National Accounts 1960-1994, Detailed Tables, and from the OECD Labour Force Statistics 1974-1994, respectively. GDP is measured in constant prices of 1990. Furthermore, purchasing power parities per US \$ in 1990 are used to make the monetary units comparable between countries.

3. Unemployment rate.

This variable measures the number of unemployed as a fraction of the total labour force. The labour force is formed by employees, self-employed persons, unpaid family workers, people who work in the army and unemployed persons. The main source for this variable is OECD Main Economic Indicators. Some missing data on the number of unemployed have been filled up with help of data from the OECD Labour Force Statistics and the Yearbook of Labour Statistics from the International Labour Office.

4. Labour income quota.

The following definition is used. Total compensation of employees is multiplied by the proportion total employment/number of employees to correct for the imputed wage income for the self-employed persons. Next, the number obtained is divided by total income (compensation of employees plus other income). The data on the separate variables are from the OECD, National Accounts 1960-1994, Detailed Tables. Some missing data have been filled up with help of data from the OECD Labour Force Statistics.

List of Research Reports

The research report series is the successor of both the research paper and the 'research-publikatie' series. There is a consecutive report numbering followed by /x. For /x there are five options:

- /E: a report of the department of Strategic Research, written in English;
- /N: like /E, but written in Dutch;
- /F: like /E, but written in French;
- /A: a report of one of the other departments of the Research Institute for Small and Medium-sized Business;
- /I: a report of the department of Strategic Research for internal purposes; external availability on request.

- 9301/E The intertemporal stability of the concentration-margins relationship in Dutch and U.S. manufacturing; Yvonne Prince and Roy Thurik
- 9302/E Persistence of profits and competitiveness in Dutch manufacturing; Aad Kleijweg
- 9303/E Small store presence in Japan; Martin A. Carree, Jeroen C.A. Potjes and A. Roy Thurik
- 9304/I Multi-factorial risk analysis and the sensitivity concept; Erik M. Vermeulen, Jaap Spronk and Nico van der Wijst
- 9305/E Do small firms' price-cost margins follow those of large firms? First empirical results; Yvonne Prince and Roy Thurik
- 9306/A Export success of SMEs: an empirical study; Cinzia Mancini and Yvonne Prince
- 9307/N Het aandeel van het midden- en kleinbedrijf in de Nederlandse industrie; Kees Bakker en Roy Thurik
- 9308/E Multi-factorial risk analysis applied to firm evaluation; Erik M. Vermeulen, Jaap Spronk and Nico van der Wijst
- 9309/E Visualizing interfirm comparison; Erik M. Vermeulen, Jaap Spronk and Nico van der Wijst
- 9310/E Industry dynamics and small firm development in the European printing industry (Case Studies of Britain, The Netherlands and Denmark); Michael Kitson, Yvonne Prince and Mette Mönsted
- 9401/E Employment during the business cycle: evidence from Dutch manufacturing; Marcel H.C. Lever en Wilbert H.M. van der Hoeven
- 9402/N De Nederlandse industrie in internationaal perspectief: arbeidsproductiviteit, lonen en concurrentiepositie; Aad Kleijweg en Sjaak Vollebregt
- 9403/E A micro-econometric analysis of interrelated factor demand; René Huigen, Aad Kleijweg, George van Leeuwen and Kees Zeelenberg

- 9404/E Between economies of scale and entrepreneurship; Roy Thurik
- 9405/F L'évolution structurelle du commerce de gros français; Luuk Klomp et Eugène Rebers
- 9406/I Basisinkomen: een inventarisatie van argumenten; Bob van Dijk
- 9407/E Interfirm performance evaluation under uncertainty, a multi-dimensional frame-work; Jaap Spronk and Erik M. Vermeulen
- 9408/N Indicatoren voor de dynamiek van de Nederlandse economie: een sectorale analyse; Garmt Dijksterhuis, Hendrik-Jan Heeres en Aad Kleijweg
- 9409/E Entry and exit in Dutch manufacturing industries; Aad Kleijweg en Marcel Lever
- 9410/I Labour productivity in Europe: differences in firm-size, countries and industries; Garmt Dijksterhuis
- 9411/N Verslag van de derde mondiale workshop Small Business Economics; Tinbergen Instituut, Rotterdam, 26-27 augustus 1994; M.A. Carree en M.H.C. Lever
- 9412/E Internal and external forces in sectoral wage formation: evidence from the Netherlands; Johan J. Graafland and Marcel H.C. Lever
- 9413/A Selectie van leveranciers: een kwestie van produkt, profijt en partnerschap?; F. Pleijster
- 9414/I Grafische weergave van tabellen; Garmt Dijksterhuis
- 9501/N Over de toepassing van de financieringstheorie in het midden- en kleinbedrijf; Erik M. Vermeulen
- 9502/E Insider power, market power, firm size and wages: evidence from Dutch manufacturing industries; Marcel H.C. Lever and Jolanda M. van Werkhoven
- 9503/E Export performance of SMEs; Yvonne M. Prince
- 9504/E Strategic Niches and Profitability: A First Report; David B. Audretsch, Yvonne M. Prince and A. Roy Thurik
- 9505/A Meer over winkelenstellingstijden; H.J. Gianotten en H.J. Heeres
- 9506/I Interstratos; een onderzoek naar de mogelijkheden van de Interstratos-dataset; Jan de Kok
- 9507/E Union coverage and sectoral wages: evidence from the Netherlands; Marcel H.C. Lever and Wessel A. Marquering
- 9508/N Ontwikkeling van de grootteklassenverdeling in de Nederlandse Industrie; Sjaak Vollebregt
- 9509/E Firm size and employment determination in Dutch manufacturing industries; Marcel H.C. Lever
- 9510/N Entrepreneurship: visies en benaderingen; Bob van Dijk en Roy Thurik
- 9511/A De toegevoegde waarde van de detailhandel; enkele verklarende theorieën tegen de achtergrond van ontwikkelingen in distributiekolom, technologie en externe omgeving; J.T. Nienhuis en H.J. Gianotten
- 9512/N Haalbaarheidsonderzoek MANAGEMENT-model; onderzoek naar de mogelijkheden voor een simulatiemodel van het bedrijfsleven, gebaseerd op gedetailleerde branche- en bedrijfsgegevens; Aad Kleijweg, Sander Wennekers, Ton Kwaak en Nico van der Wijst

- 9513/A Chippen in binnen- en buitenland; De elektronische portemonnee in kaart gebracht; een verkenning van toepassingen, mogelijkheden en consequenties van de chipcard als elektronische portemonnee in binnen- en buitenland; drs. J. Roorda en drs. W.J.P. Voegesang
- 9601/N Omzetprognoses voor de detailhandel; Pieter Fris, Aad Kleijweg en Jan de Kok
- 9602/N Flexibiliteit in de Nederlandse Industrie; N.J. Reincke
- 9603/E The Decision between Internal and External R&D; David B. Audretsch, Albert J. Menkveld and A. Roy Thurik
- 9604/E Job creation by size class: measurement and empirical investigation; Aad Kleijweg and Henry Nieuwenhuijsen
- 9605/N Het effect van een beursnotering; drs. K.R. Jonkheer
- 9606/N Een Micro-werkgelegenheidsmodel voor de Detailhandel; drs. P. Fris
- 9607/E Demand for and wages of high- and low-skilled labour in the Netherlands; M.H.C. Lever and A.S.R. van der Linden
- 9701/N Arbeidsomstandigheden en bedrijfsgrootte. Een verkenning met de LISREL-methode; drs. L.H.M. Bosch en drs. J.M.P. de Kok
- 9702/E The impact of competition on prices and wages in Dutch manufacturing industries; Marcel H.C. Lever
- 9703/A FAMOS, een financieringsmodel naar grootteklassen; drs. W.H.J. Verhoeven
- 9704/N Banencreatie door MKB en GB; Pieter Fris, Henry Nieuwenhuijsen en Sjaak Vollebregt
- 9705/N Naar een bedrijfstypenmodel van het Nederlandse bedrijfsleven, drs. W.H.M. van der Hoeven, drs. J.M.P. de Kok en drs. A. Kwaak
- 9801/E The Knowledge Society, Entrepreneurship and Unemployment, David B. Audretsch and A. Roy Thurik
- 9802/A Firm Failure and Industrial Dynamics in the Netherlands, David B. Audretsch, Patrick Houweling and A. Roy Thurik
- 9803/E The determinants of employment in Europe, the USA and Japan, André van Stel
- 9804/E PRISMA'98: Policy Research Instrument for Size-aspects in Macro-economic Analysis, Ton Kwaak
- 9805/N Banencreatie bij het Klein-, Midden- en Grootbedrijf, Henry Nieuwenhuijsen, Ben van der Eijken en Ron van Dijk
- 9806/A Milieumodel, drs. K.L. Bangma
- 9807/A Barriers for hiring personnel; Jacques Niehof
- 9808/A Methodiek kosten en baten Arboretgeving; drs. K.M.P. Brouwers, dr. B.I. van der Burg, drs. A.F.M. Nijsen en ir. H.C. Visee
- 9809/E Business Ownership and Economic Growth; An Empirical Investigation; Martin Carree, André van Stel, Roy Thurik and Sander Wennekers
- 9810/E The Degree of Collusion in Construction; M.H.C. Lever, H.R. Nieuwenhuijsen and A.J. van Stel