Success of Entrepreneurial Teams

Author: Karlijn van der Hoeff
Student number: 6157939
Specialization: Finance and Organization
Field of the thesis: Organization Economics

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. C.M. van Praag
Faculty of Economics and Business (FEB), University of Amsterdam (UvA)

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to investigate if forming an entrepreneurial team to start a new venture could contribute to the success of a venture by conducting an empirical research. Due to the fact that a large percentage, 50-71%, of new ventures go out of business within a relative short time, it is important to find a way how entrepreneurs can start a new firm with a longer viability. By using a questionnaire, information was collected on entrepreneurs. The main focus was on the way they work, "solo" or in a team, and the success of the firm measured in revenue and number of employees. Together with the Amsterdam Center for Entrepreneurship and the bureau of Research and Statistics of Amsterdam an online survey was sent to 1000 entrepreneurs in the region of Amsterdam. The response rate was 45,4%. It turns out that entrepreneurial teams are more successful compared to entrepreneurs who work solo. Furthermore, female entrepreneurs are less successful compared to male entrepreneurs and men tend to start working in a team more often. Additionally, evidence is found that entrepreneurial teams hire more employees at the beginning of the venture compared to "solo" entrepreneurs.

Table of contents

1. Introduction

The number of entrepreneurs in the Dutch market is increasing. The growth percentage of new ventures in 2011 was 7%. Two thirds of this percentage are solo businesses. This is a growing amount compared to 55% in 2007. However, it turns out that 20% of the new ventures started in 2007 are already bankrupt after one year. In April 2012 only 55% of the new ventures started in 2007 were still in business (CBS, 2012). To better understand why this large percentage of new ventures goes out of business within a relative short time, it is important to find a way how entrepreneurs can start a new firm with a longer viability. There is enough research on entrepreneurs who start a new venture "solo". However, there is almost no research on entrepreneurs who start in a team.

The article of Chowdhury (2005) investigates if demographic factors have influence on the success of the entrepreneurial team. However, it does not investigate if entrepreneurial teams in general perform better than "solo" entrepreneurs. Therefore we should explore if there is a relation between an entrepreneur starting in a team compared to the "solo" entrepreneur and the success of their ventures. Lechler (2001) investigates if social interaction is a determinant of entrepreneurial team venture success. In this article he also mentions some other articles on team success. It shows that there has been research on the success of entrepreneurial teams within the high-technology sector (Cooper and Bruno, 1977). Their research shows that teams are more successful in the high tech industry compared to single founders. This is measured in terms of yearly turnover. However, this does not say anything about the success of entrepreneurial teams in all industries together.

For these reasons the main question of this research is the following: *Is there a positive relationship between entrepreneurs who start an entrepreneurial firm in a team and their success compared to entrepreneurs who start on their own?*

It is relevant to understand this possible relationship, so entrepreneurs can take into consideration if they should start a venture "solo" or in a team. This may contribute to the expected viability of the venture.

This research is unique because it takes all industries in consideration. Furthermore this study concentrates on entrepreneurial firms in the region of Amsterdam. In this research a close look will be taken at the success of team-ventures relative to solo-ventures in terms of revenue and number of employees within a new business.

In addition, this research will evaluate the relationship between the gender of the entrepreneur and the form in which they start their business as well as the relationship between team or solo entrepreneurs and the number of employees at the start of a venture.

The paper is structured as follows. Firstly, a discussion of the existing literature on entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial teams will be presented. Chapter 3 will describe the questionnaire, the data and methods used to answer the main question of this research. In Chapter 4 the results will be presented and in chapter 5 the discussion and limitations are formulated. In the last chapter, the conclusions of this research are stated.

2. Literature review

Previous research describes mostly the differences in character between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs. Furthermore, there has also been research on the differences in psychology between these groups. Besides research on single entrepreneurs, there are also some researches on the characteristics of entrepreneurial teams and when they could be successful (Lechler, 2001; Chowdhury, 2005). However, the combination between entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial teams has not been investigated to any great extend. One of the few articles which connect these two is the one of Cooper and Bruno (1977). In order to make a comparison between entrepreneurs and entrepreneurial teams and their success, it should first be explained what the definitions of these two are.

Hereafter the differences between men and women and working in a team will be discussed. This will be discussed because more women become entrepreneur and it should therefore be explored if gender influences the choice for team or solo entrepreneurship.

2.1 The entrepreneur

Economists, behavioural scientists and politicians acknowledge the importance of entrepreneurs in our society. Entrepreneurs are known for their innovative ideas which consist of ideas on product, process, market and organizational innovations. These ideas lead to an economic development which is important for society (van Praag, 2005). With this knowledge it can be stated that new successful entrepreneurial firms cannot be missed in our economy.

The definition that we use of an entrepreneur is as follows: An entrepreneur is someone who indicates either that (s)he has started a business venture alone or with a group or that (s)he has acquired a (family) business, alone or with a group (van Praag, 2005). Entrepreneurs differ from non-entrepreneurs and therefore the characteristics of entrepreneurs will be reviewed briefly. These characteristics may also explain why some entrepreneurs start solo and others in a team.

The average age of an entrepreneur is between 30 and 40 years (Colombo and Delmastro, 2001; KvK, 2012). Furthermore, Lazear (2004) states in his research that entrepreneurs should be generalists compared to those who work for others, which are specialists. Generalists are people with a larger variety of skills. This “variety of skills”

quality combined with this quality of others could therefore be the reason that team-starters are more successful compared to solo-starters.

Kisfalvi (2002) did research on the character of the entrepreneur, life issues and strategy making. It turns out that entrepreneurs, in most cases, do not follow a formal planning. Furthermore, they do not structure their ideas by formalized plans, but they rather shape their strategies through their actions. Entrepreneurs are more individually oriented compared to the rest of the population. Additionally, individual responsibility and effort are distinguishing characteristics (Beugelsdijk and Noorderhaven, 2005). Brandstätter (1997) also distinguishes a couple of characteristics which entrepreneurs have compared to the general Austrian population: risk taking, extraversion, social recognition and readiness for change.

There are a lot of reasons why entrepreneurs start a new venture. The main reasons are independence, to boost income, personal fulfillment, disappointment with previous job, unemployment, customer needs and social status (Smallbone and Welter, 2001). After taking the decision to become an entrepreneur it is important for that individual to determine how this can be achieved. In the next part the entrepreneurial team will be discussed, because one of the decisions the new entrepreneur has to make is starting solo or in a team.

2.2 The entrepreneurial team

Evidence suggests that regardless of the geographic location, type of industry or the gender of founders, a larger number of new ventures are started by teams (Kamm et al., 1990). This is one of the reasons why there is more research needed in the field of entrepreneurial teams. There is not much research done in this field, although the literature has started focusing on team-level issues (Francis and Sandberg, 2000; Lechler, 2001).

Kamm et al. (1990) have formulated a definition of an entrepreneurial team. It focuses on the founding and ownership as essential characteristics. Their definition of an entrepreneurial team is: An entrepreneurial team is two or more individuals who jointly establish a business in which they have an equity (financial) interest. This definition will be used in this research.

The composition of the entrepreneurial team is an important aspect of the success. According to Kamm and Nurick (1993) there are two ways to form a team. The first one is called the lead entrepreneur. The lead entrepreneur has a business idea, or just wants to start a new venture, and he or she seeks others to help him or her with executing the plan. The

second one is called the group approach. In this situation there is already a team, but not yet a business plan. Together they will search for business opportunities to start a new venture.

Lechler (2001) mentioned that the greater part of new high-technology ventures are started by entrepreneurial teams instead of single entrepreneurs. The reason for this phenomenon could be that high-tech industries require more skills of an individual than other industries do. Due to this, it could be more successful to start in a team, as two or more individuals you have greater collaborative knowledge (Gartner, 1985). In 1977 Cooper and Bruno already had done research on the success of high-technology firms. One of the factors they investigated was whether there was a single founder or a team of two or more full-time founders. They found a significant result for the differences between high-growth and discontinued firms. It turned out that high-growth firms more often were started by two or more individuals, in other words, in an entrepreneurial team. However, there is almost no research on the success of entrepreneurial teams in all industries.

Besides the composition and size of a team it is also important to understand what is necessary to make the team work effectively. Each kind of entrepreneurial team has its own way of working effectively. However, research has shown that there are several factors which will increase the possibility of team effectiveness and therefore it will increase the possibility of success of the new venture. Reagans et al. (2005) say that effective teamwork is defined by 'a function of identifying the most appropriate roles for completing a task, assigning the right people to those roles, and enabling people who occupy distinct roles to coordinate their activity'. This definition has been formulated for teams that work together in an organization. It has not been specifically formulated for entrepreneurial teams. However, this definition is also applicable to entrepreneurial teams.

As mentioned, research is done concerning the factors which influences entrepreneurial team effectiveness. Watson et al. (1995) found that leadership, interpersonal flexibility, team commitment and helpfulness have a significant effect on the venture's performance. Furthermore, the cohesion in top management teams in new ventures is a key characteristic of success of the management teams (Ensley et al., 2002). They also state that more cohesion within such a team will lead to working more effectively and it also leads to better performing ventures.

Another factor which influences the new venture success is the quality of social interaction. The higher the quality, the higher the chance for the new venture to be successful (Lechler, 2001).

Reagens et al. (2005) did research on personal experience and how this affects the team performance of a working team in a large organization, but not on entrepreneurial teams. They found that each kind of experience makes a distinct contribution to team performance. This result is in line with Van Praag and Hoogendoorn (2012) who found that ethnic diversity could have a positive effect on the performance teams, due to more relevant knowledge. These are reasons why teams in an organization could be more successful compared to employees that have individual tasks. Dealing with the questions that are raised in the previous part, the main hypothesis is: *A new venture started in an entrepreneurial team will be more successful compared to entrepreneurs who start on their own.*

By starting a firm in a team, more issues will be reviewed. Each person has his or her own competences and therefore they are able to point out each other's shortcomings. The entrepreneur could overlook information which could be crucial for success. In other words, the entrepreneur loses himself in his enthusiasm and possible over-optimism. By starting in a team, many more issues are reviewed, allowing the other team members to point out important issues which are overlooked by the initiator of the idea. Because a team combines more competences, it should lead to a more successful entrepreneurial firm.

As entrepreneurial teams combine skills and experience of the individual members, they are less depending upon others in contradiction to solo entrepreneurs that may require skills from others that they lack themselves. Therefore the second hypothesis is as follows: *An entrepreneurial team will hire fewer employees at the beginning of the venture compared to single entrepreneurs.*

2.3 Gender differences

From the data of the Chamber of Commerce and the Central Bureau for Statistics of the Netherlands (Rijksoverheid, 2011) it can be concluded that in the period of 2000 until 2009 the number of female entrepreneurs increased from 25% to 35% of the total group of new ventures. Several researchers (Sexton and Bownan-Upton, 1990; Hisrich and Brush, 1984; Cromie, 1987; Dawson et al., 2009) stated that there are differences between male and female entrepreneurs. Therefore it is important to realize that gender difference may influence the choice for team or solo entrepreneurship.

Women have different motives to become entrepreneur. Men focus on the financial advantages of an own venture, whereas women's main motive is previous career

dissatisfaction. Furthermore, they see entrepreneurship as a way to combine their own career needs with raising children (Cromie, 1987). These motives did not change much over the past years. Dawson et al. (2009) found that the main motive of becoming self-employed is the same for men and women: to become independent. However, for women the family commitment is another main motive. Men on the contrary mention that financial gain is another important motive to become self-employed. Hisrich and Brush (1984) describe the typical female entrepreneur as follows: married with children, first-born child of middle class parents, age of 40. Their business is often in the service-oriented industry. In their research they also examined the problems which female entrepreneurs face. One of these problems is the lack of training in business and financial planning. A more psychological characteristic of female entrepreneurs is the unwillingness of taking risk and therefore avoiding situations with uncertain outcomes. Moreover their motivation and/or energy level is lower than that of male entrepreneurs, women therefore experience more stressful situations in maintaining a growth-oriented business (Sexton and Bownan-Upton, 1990). It also turns out that the motivation of women to become an entrepreneur has influence on the success of the venture (Hughes, 2006). Buttner and Rosen (1988) also investigated if gender has influence on the success of the entrepreneur, considering nine characteristics which are crucial factors. They concluded that men have more of these nine characteristics. Therefore the third hypothesis of this research is: *Female entrepreneurs are less successful compared to male entrepreneurs.*

Entrepreneurs tend to be overconfident regarding their competences compared to non-entrepreneurs (Lowe and Ziedonis, 2006). Bengtsson et al. (2005) examined the difference between male and female students and their expectation of their grade for an exam. Their results show a significant difference between the expectations. Men seem to be more overconfident concerning their grade than women. Another research investigated the difference between gender and the investment in common stock (Barber and Odean, 2001). This research shows that men are also often more overconfident than women in the finance area. Due to this reason, women will probably deliberate their plans in more detail as well as the feasibility of these plans. They will more likely admit to their lack of competences and therefore will more likely start a new venture in an entrepreneurial team.

In teams the risks are shared between the members of that team. As women are more risk averse, they could overcome this by sharing the risks with others in a team. The fourth hypothesis in this research is therefore as follows: *Female entrepreneurs will start a new venture more often in a team compared to male entrepreneurs.*

3. Research Methodology

As discussed, the main research of this paper is focused on the decision of entrepreneurs to work in teams. In order to test the hypotheses and answer the research question, it is necessary to collect data. Together with the Amsterdam Center for Entrepreneurship (ACE) and the bureau of Research and Statistics of Amsterdam (O&S), an online survey is designed which is sent to 1000 entrepreneurs in the region of Amsterdam. All these entrepreneurs have indicated to the bureau of Research and Statistics that they are available for surveys on entrepreneurship in order to contribute to research. These panel data are collected by multiple surveys with different subjects. The subject of the survey which is used for this research is "the start of a new venture".

After the data are collected, several regressions are used to test the hypotheses. In this chapter the specific data and methods will be explained in order to understand the results from the regressions.

3.1 Data

As said, this empirical study uses an online survey to collect the data that are needed to test the hypotheses. Because the survey (see appendix IV) is designed together with the ACE and O&S not all questions that are put forward to the entrepreneurs are useful for this research. The questionnaire is divided into different sections. The first questions deal with the issue on when and how the venture was started: in a team or solo. The following section asks the entrepreneurs reasons for starting solo or in a team and if the present situation is different from the start. The third part is on the success of the venture. The last couple of questions are some general questions on the background of the entrepreneur.

The survey was sent to 1000 entrepreneurs in the region of Amsterdam. 454 entrepreneurs have completed the survey, an overall response rate of 45,4%. This overall response rate is a good response compared to other response rates of questionnaires of the O&S. However, in this research it is important that only the results of entrepreneurs who started the venture themselves, are taken into account. This means that 12,3% (n=56) of the entrepreneurs are not taken into account, because they did not start the venture themselves. Therefore, the overall response rate is adjusted to 39,8% (n=398). These 398 entrepreneurs are used to test the hypotheses in order to answer the research question. Though, because the

four hypotheses use different variables to test them, the sample number could differ from the 398 stated above. Also, the missing answers of each question are not included as well as the answers “do not know” and “do not want to tell”.

3.2 Dependent variables

By using the survey, data are collected on dependent, independent and control variables.
To test the hypotheses it is important to understand which dependent, independent and control variables should be used. In order to have a clear look at these variables, the hypotheses stated in part 2 of this paper are listed below:

I. Female entrepreneurs are less successful compared to male entrepreneurs.
II. Female entrepreneurs will start a new venture more often in a team compared to male entrepreneurs.
III. An entrepreneurial team will hire fewer employees at the beginning of the venture compared to single entrepreneurs.
IV. A new venture started in an entrepreneurial team will be more successful compared to entrepreneurs who start on their own.

The success of a venture or entrepreneur can be measured in different ways. One of the most common ways is the revenue growth of the new venture (Brush and Vanderwerf, 1992; Watson, et al., 1995). However, also the growth of the number of employees is often used as a measure for success (Ensley et al., 2006). The survey used in this research consists of questions on the number of employees at the beginning of the venture, current number of employees, revenue in 2011, change in revenue compared to 2010 and the growth of the revenue in the first three years of the new venture. These five factors will be used to measure the success. However, it is not possible to combine these factors into one regression for measuring success, therefore, five success regressions are conducted with the following dependent variables: current number of employees, change in number of employees, revenue in 2011, change in revenue comparing 2011 to 2010 and change in revenue over the first three years. The comparison between 2011 and 2010 is used for companies that exist for a longer period, as reliable data over the first years may be missing. The comparison of the first three

years is used for new ventures. The first three years are more representative for measuring success compared to, for example, the second year only.

The first dependent variable, current number of employees, is categorized in 5 groups. A venture without employees is coded 0. A venture with 1-2 employees is coded 1, 3-4 employees is coded 2, 5-6 employees is coded 3 and if a venture has 7 or more employees it is coded 4. Because of the categorized values, this will be tested by using an ordered probit regression. The second dependent variable, change in number of employees, is measured by subtracting the current number of employees of the number of employees at the beginning of the venture. These two items were asked in the survey. This variable is re-coded as a dummy, with 1 if the change in employees is positive, in other words, the number of employees increased and the variable gets a 0 if there is no growth or if the change in number of employees is negative. In order to test this dependent variable, a normal probit regression will be used because it is a dummy. The revenue in 2011, the third dependent variable, is asked to the entrepreneurs in nine different categories with the lowest one being 10.000 or less which is coded 1, and the highest one being over 10.000.000 which is coded 9.

The respondents were also asked how the revenue of 2011 changed compared to the revenue in 2010. The three options were “the revenue increased”, “the revenue stayed the same” and “the revenue decreased”. These options are respectively coded with 1, 0 and -1. The last dependent variable is the change in revenue over the first three years of the venture. The respondent had seven options to answer this question: “the revenue decreased”; “the revenue stayed the same”; “the revenue increased by 0-25% each year”; “the revenue increased by 25-50% each year”; “the revenue increased by 50-75% each year”; “the revenue increased by 75-100% each year”; “the revenue increased by more than 100% each year”. If the revenue decreased it is coded 1 and if the revenue stayed the same it gets a 2. If the revenue increased by 0-25% or 25-50% it is coded respectively 3 and 4. If the revenue increased by more than 50% it is coded 5. These last three dependent variables, revenue in 2011, change in revenue compared to 2010 and change in revenue over the first three years, are tested by using an ordered probit regression.

These five dependent variables are used to test the hypothesis on women vs. men and their success (hypothesis I), as well as the hypothesis on team vs. single entrepreneurs and their success (hypothesis IV).

For the hypothesis on women vs. men and starting in a team (hypothesis II) the dependent variable is “team”. In the survey the respondents was asked if (s)he started the

venture alone or with one or more others. This dummy variable gets a value of 1 if the entrepreneur started the venture with one or more other entrepreneurs and it gets a value of 0 if the entrepreneur started alone. Because, again, it is a dummy variable the hypothesis will be tested by using a normal probit regression.

The dependent variable for the hypothesis on team vs. single entrepreneurs and the employees at the beginning of the venture (hypothesis III) is "number of employees at the start of the venture". This is a continuous variable and therefore the hypothesis will be tested by using a normal regression.

3.3 Independent variables

Similar to the dependent variables, the independent variables also differ between the hypotheses. For the five success regressions used for hypothesis I and the probit regression for hypothesis II the independent variable is "gender". This dummy variable gets a value of 1 if the entrepreneur is a woman and it gets a value of 0 if the entrepreneur is a man. For the five success regressions used for hypothesis IV the independent variable is "team". This is a dummy variable and it is build up the same way as explained in section 3.2 (team = 1 and no team = 0). For hypothesis III the independent variable is also "team".

3.4 Control variables

Control variables are variables which can also influence the dependent variable, alongside the independent variable. Therefore, by adding control variables to the regression formula the results are more powerful.

The dataset collected through the survey has gathered information on the gender, age and education of the entrepreneur and the age of the venture. Gender is already explained in the previous part. The age of the entrepreneur is measured in number of years. The education of the entrepreneur is divided into six categories. The lowest one, primary school, is coded 1, and the highest form of education, a degree at a university, is coded 6. To gather information on the age of the venture, the respondents were asked in what year the venture started. By calculating 2012 minus the year in which the venture started, the age of the venture is determined. This variable is used as a control variable because ventures are started in different periods of time and in those periods of time the circumstances can differ.

For all hypotheses the age and education of the entrepreneur and the age of the venture will be used as control variables. Gender will be used as a control variable if it is not already used as an independent variable. These four variables could have influence on the dependent variables (success, measured with 5 different variables, team and number of employees currently working for the venture).

4. Empirical results

In this chapter the results of the empirical study are presented. First, the descriptive statistics will be discussed. Thereafter, the results on the dependent variables will be reported.

4.1 Descriptive statistics

Of the 1000 survey sent to entrepreneurs, 454 were completed. 398 were useful for this research, as only the entrepreneurs who have started the venture themselves are taken into account.
Of these 398 entrepreneurs, 260 (65,3%) are men and 126 (31,7%) are women. The other 3,0% is unknown. The age of the entrepreneurs differ quite a bit. The youngest entrepreneur is 24 and the oldest entrepreneur is 79 years old. However, the average age of the entrepreneur is 50 years. Most of the respondents (43%) have a university degree. Furthermore, entrepreneurs start more often on their own: 293 (73,6%) started solo and only 96 (24,1%) entrepreneurs started in a team. 8 (2,0%) entrepreneurs started in some other way. One entrepreneur did not answer this question. The average age of the ventures is 10 years. The oldest venture started in 1970 and the newest venture started in 2012. The average revenue of the ventures is 50.000 euro's per year.

Each hypothesis uses different variables. Therefore the observations concerning the hypotheses can differ. In tables 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 the descriptive tables for each hypothesis can be found. These tables describe the number of observations, the range, means and standard deviations.

4.2 Success of female entrepreneurs

To measure the success of female entrepreneurs compared to the success of male entrepreneurs the five success regression are executed.

	Respondents (N=235)					
	DV = Number of employees current		*DV = Change in employees*		*DV = revenue in 2011*	
	Coefficient	*(SE)*	*dF/dx (marginal effect)*	*(SE)*	*Coefficient*	*(SE)*
Independent variable						
Gender	-.63620***	(.19232)	-.26353***	(.05774)	-.54895***	(.15011)
Control variables						
Age entrepreneur	-.02150 **	(.00922)	-.00838 **	(.00357)	-.01430 *	(.00763)
Age venture	.01976	(.01227)	.00879 *	(.00479)	-.00888	(.01037)
Education	.02565	(.06530)	.01678	(.02534)	.06841	(.05548)

*p<.10. **p<.05. ***p<.01.

Table 2.1*. Results of 3 success regression by using respectively ordered probit, normal probit and ordered probit regressions for measuring the success of female entrepreneurs.*

Table 2.1 describes the results of three of the five regressions that are done. The number of observations that is used for testing this hypothesis is 235. It shows that if the current number of employees (divided into 5 categories), change in employees (measured as growth or no growth) and revenue in 2011 are used as dependent variables, gender has a significant influence on these success measures. If an entrepreneur is a female, the number of employees will decrease by 0.636 and the revenue will decrease by 0.549 considering that all other variables are held constant. Furthermore, if the entrepreneur is a woman, the change in employees is -26,4%. These results support the hypothesis that women are less successful. In all three regressions it also turns out that the control variable "age of the entrepreneur" is significant. With the second dependent variable it turns out that the control variable "age of the venture" is significant.

If the change in revenue compared to 2010 and the change in revenue over the first three years are used as dependent variables for measuring success, the coefficient is not significant. The results of these ordered probit regressions can be found in table 2.2 (appendix II).

4.3 Women and entrepreneurial teams

Table 3 shows the result of the normal probit regression done in order to test if women start more often in a team compared to men. The number of observations used to test this hypothesis is 364.

	Respondents (N=364)	
	dF/dx (marginal effect)	*(SE)*
Independent variable		
Gender	-.11063 **	(.04524)
Control variables		
Age entrepreneur	-.00684***	(.00252)
Age venture	.00354	(.00310)
Education	-.01834	(.01910)

*p<.10. **p<.05. ***p<.01.

Table 3. *Result of the probit regression for measuring the influence of gender on team formation.*

This table shows that the coefficient of gender is significant so if the entrepreneur is a woman, the probability of starting in a team decreases by 11,1%. This does not support the hypothesis that women will start in a team more often compared to men. Furthermore, again the control variable "age of the entrepreneur" turns out to be significant: older entrepreneurs are less likely to start in a team.

4.4 Number of employees and entrepreneurial teams

In chapter 2 the hypothesis is formed that entrepreneurial teams will hire fewer employees at the beginning of the venture. In order to test this hypothesis a normal regression was executed and the results are shown in table 4. The number of observations used is 364.

The results show that the coefficient of team is significant. If the entrepreneur works in a team the number of employees will increase with 0.852 considering that all other variables are held constant. This does not support the hypothesis. Furthermore, none of the control variables are significant.

	Respondents (N=364)	
	Coefficient	*(SE)*
Independent variable		
Team	.85213 ***	(.17143)
Control variables		
Gender	-.02802	(.15800)
Age entrepreneur	.00978	(.00799)
Age venture	-.00028	(.00988)
Education	-.01568	(.06365)
Constant	-.26436	(.51017)
Adj. R^2	.0559	

*p<.10. **p<.05. ***p<.01.

Table 4. *Results of the regression for measuring the effect of a team on the number of employees at start.*

4.5 Entrepreneurial team success

The last hypothesis is on the success of entrepreneurial teams. In chapter 2 the hypothesis is formed that entrepreneurial teams are more successful compared to "solo" entrepreneurs. Table 5.1 shows the results of the ordered probit regressions and the normal probit regression. The number of observations used to test this hypothesis is 232.

	Respondents (N=232)					
	DV = Number of employees current		*DV = Change in employees*		*DV = revenue in 2011*	
	Coefficient	*(SE)*	*dF/dx (marginal effect)*	*(SE)*	*Coefficient*	*(SE)*
Independent variable						
Team	.87978***	(.17732)	.28603***	(.07377)	.84919***	(.16093)
Control variables						
Gender	-.59872***	(.20193)	-.25197***	(.05992)	-.50874***	(.15309)
Age entrepreneur	-.01541	(.00958)	-.00634 *	(.00369)	-.00808	(.00778)
Age venture	.02248 *	(.01249)	.00913 *	(.00483)	-.00862	(.01044)
Education	.02474	(.06779)	.01488	(.02618)	.07372	(.05662)

*p<.10. **p<.05. ***p<.01.

Table 5.1*. Results of 3 success regression by using respectively ordered probit, normal probit and ordered probit regressions for measuring the success of entrepreneurial teams.*

The results show that all three coefficients, number of employees current, change in employees and revenue in 2011, are significant. If the entrepreneur works in a team, the number of employees and the revenue in 2011 respectively increases with 0.880 and 0.849 considering that all other variables are held constant. The change in employees increases with 28,6% for entrepreneurial teams. These results support the hypothesis. The results also show that the control variable "gender" has a significant influence in all three cases. The age of the entrepreneur is significant when the dependent variable is "change in employees". Control variable "age of the venture" is significant when the dependent variable is "current number of employees" as well as "change in employees".

If the change in revenue compared to 2010 and the change in revenue over the first three years are used as dependent variables for measuring success, the coefficient is not significant. The results of these ordered probit regressions can be found in table 5.2 (appendix II).

4.6 Robustness checks

Robustness checks in this subsection are conducted by testing other measurements for success, such as "relative success" and using a different definition for the "team" variable. Furthermore, robustness checks are conducted under the assumption that only women are included or that only soloists or teams are included in the regression.
Tables 6.1, 6.2, 6.3 and 6.4 in appendix III report the results of the regressions of the influence of gender on success. Tables 6.1 and 6.2 are under the assumption that everyone works solo and tables 6.3 and 6.4 are under the assumption that all entrepreneurs work in a team. It shows there is no difference in outcome when these assumptions are taken into account. This means that the difference in success between men and women is not affected by the fact that men choose to work in team ventures more often. Therefore, it can be stated that the conclusion concerning the difference is robust in the sense that it cannot be explained by other influences.

The second robustness check that is conducted, is related to the success of entrepreneurial teams and soloists. The regressions are executed under the assumption that the entrepreneur is a woman. The results in tables 6.5 and 6.6 in the appendix show that the significance changes when this assumption is used. Now only "revenue in 2011" is still significant: this is due to the fact that there are fewer female entrepreneurs. It can be concluded that the effect for men and women is not the same.

As a third robustness check the success measures are defined differently. This robustness check is also related to the success of teams and soloists. The relative success is measured, meaning that in case the entrepreneur works in a team, the success measure is divided by two. The results from these regressions are stated in tables 6.7 and 6.8 in appendix III: 4 of the 5 success regressions are significant. However, the coefficient of "revenue in 2011" is now negative. These results show that the success is affected by the size of a team.

The fourth robustness check which is conducted is also related to the success of teams and soloists. The variable "team" is now defined as the final composition instead of the initial composition. So, if the entrepreneur changed his or her way of working, solo or in a team, the change is taken into account. Tables 6.9 and 6.10 in the appendix show the results of these regressions. The first three variables, number of employees current, change in employees and revenue in 2011, are still significant and the coefficients are also still positive. Furthermore,

change in revenue over the first three years is now also significant. So, the final composition influences the success.

5. Discussion and limitations

This paper stated four hypotheses of which two proved to be wrong. The expectation was that female entrepreneurs would more often start a new venture in a team but the opposite turned out to be the case. A reason for this phenomenon, men starting more often in a team, could be that women are less confident and therefore start a new venture really small, for example on their attic. They keep their old jobs because they seem to be less confident in the success of their new venture. Men are more confident and therefore probably want to start on a larger scale and seek other entrepreneurs to execute their plans.

It also turned out that entrepreneurial teams hire more employees at the beginning of their new venture compared to "solo" entrepreneurs. This contradicts the third hypothesis. A possible reason could be that if entrepreneurs start in a team there are more financial means and an entrepreneurial team could therefore hire employees at the start. Another reason could be that if you start in a team, the team as a whole has more and far reaching plans which can only be executed if the team hires employees. The "team" entrepreneurs are most likely more involved in only managing the venture compared to "solo" entrepreneurs that have the desire to execute the various tasks themselves.

One of the limitations of this research is the sample which is used to test the hypotheses. The sample is not a random sample. The online survey is only sent to entrepreneurs in the region of Amsterdam. Furthermore, these entrepreneurs have indicated that they are available for surveys on entrepreneurship in order to contribute to research. This could mean that these entrepreneurs are really motivated to succeed as an entrepreneur or already achieved success and therefore do not represent the general group of entrepreneurs.

Another limitation has to do with the measures for success. In this research only ventures which are still in business are included. However, to create a good measure also discontinued firms should be taken into account, because these firms turn out to be unsuccessful.

This research has shown that working in an entrepreneurial team influences the success of the firm. However, it is unclear if this is causality or only a correlation. There could be other factors which have a greater influence on the success of the venture. More research is required on other factors in order to determine if working in an entrepreneurial team has a causal relationship with success. Furthermore, it should be mentioned that

entrepreneurs may have multiple motives to start in a team. This could influence the success and can lead to endogeneity.

Future research should be focused on examining additional random samples to test the generalization of this research. Furthermore, future research should also take discontinued firms into account to create a good measure for success. At last, more research needs to be done on other factors which could contribute to a longer viability of an entrepreneurial firm. In this way entrepreneurs are offered the best advice how to start a new venture with the highest chance for achieving success.

6. Conclusions

Due to the fact that a large percentage, 50-71%, of new ventures go out of business within a relative short time, it is important to find a way how entrepreneurs can start a new firm with a longer viability. The aim of this paper was to investigate if forming an entrepreneurial team to start a new venture could contribute to the success of a venture by conducting an empirical research.

There is made a comparison between success and the gender of the entrepreneur as well as starting in a team and gender. It turns out that female entrepreneurs are less successful compared to male entrepreneurs if the success is measured in terms of number of employees, the change in number of employees and the revenue of the venture in 2011. This result has the same outcome compared to the research of Buttner and Rosen (1988). Furthermore, evidence is found on the fact that men start more often in an entrepreneurial team compared to women.

Entrepreneurial teams are tested on their success as well as on the number of employees hired at the start of a venture. Evidence is found that entrepreneurial teams hire more employees at the beginning of the venture compared to “solo” entrepreneurs. Evidence is also found for the fact that entrepreneurial teams are more successful compared to “solo” entrepreneurs if the measures for success as stated above are used.

References

Barber, B.M. and T. Odean, 2001. Boys Will be Boys: Gender, Overconfidence, and Common Stock Investment, The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 116 (1), 261-292.

Bengtsson, C., M. Persson and P. Willenhag, 2005. Gender and Overconfidence, Economics Letters, 86 (2), 199-203.

Beugelsdijk, S. and N. Noorderhaven, 2005. Personality Characteristics of Self-Employed; An Empirical Study, Small Business Economics, 24 (2), 159-167.

Brandstätter, H., 1997. Becoming an Entrepreneur – A Question of Personality Structure?, Journal of Economic Psychology, 18 (2-3), 157-177.

Brush, C.G. and P.A. Vanderwerf, 1992. A Comparison of Methods and Sources for Obtaining Estimates of New Venture Performance, Journal of Business Venturing, 7 (2), 157-170.

Buttner, E.H. and B. Rosen, 1988. Bank Loan Officers' Perceptions of the Characteristics of Men, Women, and Successful Entrepreneurs, Journal of Business Venturing, 3 (3), 249-258.

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2012. Nederland steeds ondernemender.

Chowdhury, S., 2005. Demographic Diversity for Building an Effective Entrepreneurial Team: is it important?, Journal of Business Venturing, 20 (6), 727-746.

Colombo, MG. and M. Delmastro, 2001. Technology Based Entrepreneurs: Does Internet Make a Difference?, Small Business Economics, 16 (3), 177-190.

Cooper, A.C. and A.V. Bruno, 1977. Success Among High-Technology Firms, Business Horizons, 20 (2), 16-22.

Cromie, S., 1987. Motivations of Aspiring Male and Female Entrepreneurs, Journal of Occupational Behaviour, 8 (3), 251-261.

Dawson, C., A. Henley and P. Latreille, 2009. Why do Individuals Choose Self-Employment?, IZA Discussion Paper No. 3974.

Ensley, M.D., A.W. Pearson and A.C. Amason, 2002. Understanding the Dynamics of New Venture Top Management Teams: Cohesion, Conflict, and New Venture Performance, Journal of Business Venturing, 17 (4), 365-386.

Ensley, M.D., K.M. Hmieleski and C.L. Pearce, 2006. The Importance of Vertical and Shared Leadership within New Venture Top Management Teams: Implications for the Performance of Startups, The Leadership Quarterly, 17 (3), 217-231.

Francis, D.H. and W.R. Sandberg, 2000. Friendship Within Entrepreneurial Teams and its Association with Team and Venture Performance, Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practice, 25 (2), 5-25.

Gartner, W.B., 1985. A Conceptual Framework for Describing the Phenomenon of New Venture Creation, The Academy of Management Review, 10 (4), 696-706.

Hisrich, R.D. and C. Brush, 1984. The Woman Entrepreneur: Management Skills and Business Problems, Journal of Small Business Management, 22 (1), 30-37.

Hughes, K.D., 2006. Exploring Motivation and Success Among Canadian Women Entrepreneurs, Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship, 19, (2).

Kamm, J.B., J.C. Shuman, J.A. Seeger and A.J. Nurick, 1990. Entrepreneurial Teams in New Venture Creation: A Research Agenda, Entrepreneurship: Theory & Practive, 14 (4), 7-17.

Kamm, J.B. and A.J. Nurick, 1993. The Stages of Team Venture Formation: A Decision-making Model, Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice, 17 (2), 17-27.

Kisfalvi, V., 2002. The Entrepreneur's Character, Life Issues, and Strategy Making: A Field Study, Journal of Business Venturing, 17 (5), 489-518.

Kamer van Koophandel, 2012. Rapport Startersprofiel 2012.

Lazear, E., 2004. Balanced Skills and Entrepreneurship, American Economic Review, 94 (2), 208-211.

Lechler, T., 2001. Social Interaction: a Determinant of Entrepreneurial Team Venture Success, Small Business Economics, 16 (4), 263-278.

Lowe, R.A. and A.A. Ziedonis, 2006. Overoptimism and Performance of Entrepreneurial Firms. Management Science, 52 (2), 173-186.

Reagans, R., L. Argote and D. Brooks, 2005. Individual Experience and Experience Working Together: Predicting Learning Rates from Knowing Who Knows What and Knowing How to Work Together, Management Science, 51 (6), 869-881.

Rijksoverheid, 2011. Monitor vrouwelijk en etnisch Ondernemerschap 2010.

Sexton, D.L. and N. Bowman-Upton, 1990. Female and Male Entrepreneurs: Psychological Characteristics and Their Role in Gender-related Discrimination, Journal of Business Venturing, 5 (1), 29-36.

Smallbone, D. and F. Welter, 2001. The Distinctiveness of Entrepreneurship in Transition Economics, Small Business Economics, 16 (4), 249-262.

Van Praag, C.M., 2005. Successful Entrepreneurship: Confronting Economic Theory with Empirical Practice, Cheltenham Glos: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Van Praag, C.M. and S.M. Hoogendoorn, 2012. Ethnic Diversity and Team Performance: A Field Experiment, Tinbergen Institute.

Watson, W.E., L.D. Ponthieu and J.W. Critelli, 1995. Team Interpersonal Process Effectiveness in Venture Partnerships and its Connection to Perceived Success, Journal of Business Venturing, 10 (5), 393-411.

Appendix I Descriptive tables

Table 1.1. *Descriptive table success of women compared to men.*

	Respondents (N=235)			
	Mean	*(SD)*	*Min*	*Max*
Dependent variables				
Number of employees current	.78	(1.29)	0	4
Change in employees	.33	(.47)	0	1
Revenue in 2011	4.21	(2.05)	1	9
Change revenue compared to 2010	.06	(.86)	-1	1
Change revenue first 3 years	2.93	(1.11)	1	5
Independent variable				
Gender	0.30	(.46)	0	1
Control variables				
Age entrepreneur	50.67	(10.02)	24	79
Age venture	12.23	(7.46)	4	35
Education	4.97	(1.23)	1	6

Table 1.2. *Descriptive table influence of gender on starting in a team.*

	Respondents (N=364)			
	Mean	*(SD)*	*Min*	*Max*
Dependent variable				
Team	.24	(.43)	0	1
Independent variable				
Gender	.32	(.47)	0	1
Control variables				
Age entrepreneur	49.55	(10.34)	24	79
Age venture	10.01	(8.43)	0	42
Education	5.03	(1.16)	1	6

Table 1.3. *Descriptive table number of employees at start if there is an entrepreneurial team.*

	Respondents (N=364)			
	Mean	*(SD)*	*Min*	*Max*
Dependent variable				
Employee at start	.34	(1.42)	0	18
Independent variable				
Team	.24	(.43)	0	1
Control variables				
Gender	.32	(.47)	0	1
Age entrepreneur	49.55	(10.34)	24	79
Age venture	10.01	(8.43)	0	42
Education	5.03	(1.16)	1	6

Table 1.4. *Descriptive table success of an entrepreneurial team.*

	Respondents (N=232)			
	Mean	*(SD)*	*Min*	*Max*
Dependent variables				
Number of employees current	.77	(1.27)	0	4
Change in employees	.33	(.47)	0	1
Revenue in 2011	4.20	(2.03)	1	8
Change revenue compared to 2010	.07	(.85)	-1	1
Change revenue first 3 years	2.94	(1.11)	1	5
Independent variable				
Team	.28	(.45)	0	1
Control variables				
Gender	.30	(.46)	0	1
Age entrepreneur	50.66	(10.05)	24	79
Age venture	12.21	(7.48)	4	35
Education	4.98	(1.23)	1	6

Appendix II Tables of the analyses

Table 2.2. *Results of 2 success regression by using ordered probit regressions for measuring the success of female entrepreneurs.*

	Respondents (N=235)			
	DV = Change revenue compared to 2010		*DV = Change revenue first 3 years*	
	Coefficient	*(SE)*	*Coefficient*	*(SE)*
Independent variable				
Gender	-.17496	(.16632)	-.15257	(.15231)
Control variables				
Age entrepreneur	-.02248***	(.00860)	-.02648***	(.00795)
Age venture	-.01783	(.01144)	.03220***	(.01084)
Education	.06155	(.06179)	.10577 *	(.05746)

*p<.10. **p<.05. ***p<.01.

Table 5.2. *Results of 2 success regression by using ordered probit regressions for measuring the success of entrepreneurial teams.*

	Respondents (N=232)			
	DV = Change revenue compared to 2010		*DV = Change revenue first 3 years*	
	Coefficient	*(SE)*	*Coefficient*	*(SE)*
Independent variable				
Team	.19680	(.17348)	.21935	(.15967)
Control variables				
Gender	-.11599	(.16991)	-.10258	(.15543)
Age entrepreneur	-.02137***	(.00870)	-.02482***	(.00806)
Age venture	-.01774	(.01148)	.03281***	(.01088)
Education	.05180	(.06272)	.09355	(.05920)

*p<.10. **p<.05. ***p<.01.

Appendix III Robustness checks

Table 6.1. *Results of 3 success regression by using respectively ordered probit, normal probit and ordered probit regressions for measuring the success of female entrepreneurs considering they are soloists.*

	Respondents (N=235)					
	DV = Number of employees current		*DV = Change in employees*		*DV = revenue in 2011*	
	Coefficient	*(SE)*	*dF/dx (marginal effect)*	*(SE)*	*Coefficient*	*(SE)*
Independent variable						
Gender	-.57179 **	(.24163)	-.20574***	(.05994)	-.49577***	(.17285)
Control variables						
Age entrepreneur	-.00810	(.01161)	-.00394	(.00368)	.00013	(.00886)
Age venture	.03410 **	(.01531)	.01285 **	(.00497)	.00382	(.01214)
Education	.09062	(.08635)	.04103	(.02756)	.13917 **	(.06666)

*p<.10. **p<.05. ***p<.01.

Table 6.2. *Results of 2 success regression by using ordered probit regressions for measuring the success of female entrepreneurs considering they are soloists.*

	Respondents (N=235)			
	DV = Change revenue compared to 2010		*DV = Change revenue first 3 years*	
	Coefficient	*(SE)*	*Coefficient*	*(SE)*
Independent variable				
Gender	-.00158	(.19007)	-.04632	(.17461)
Control variables				
Age entrepreneur	-.01688 *	(.00998)	-.02165 **	(.00918)
Age venture	-.02316 *	(.01358)	.04103***	(.01275)
Education	.06932	(.07350)	.13932 **	(.06842)

*p<.10. **p<.05. ***p<.01.

***Table 6.3**. Results of 3 success regression by using respectively ordered probit, normal probit and ordered probit regressions for measuring the success of female entrepreneurs considering they work in a team.*

	Respondents (N=235)					
	DV = Number of employees current		*DV = Change in employees*		*DV = revenue in 2011*	
	Coefficient	*(SE)*	*dF/dx (marginal effect)*	*(SE)*	*Coefficient*	*(SE)*
Independent variable						
Gender	-.74658 **	(.37881)	-.36176 **	(.14885)	-.71747 **	(.33747)
Control variables						
Age entrepreneur	-.03570 **	(.01813)	-.01468 *	(.00843)	-.04033 **	(.01748)
Age venture	.00786	(.02362)	.00094	(.01071)	-.02710	(.02228)
Education	-.09433	(.12357)	-.06112	(.05948)	-.08300	(.11717)

*p<.10. **p<.05. ***p<.01.

***Table 6.4**. Results of 2 success regression by using ordered probit regressions for measuring the success of female entrepreneurs considering they work in a team.*

	Respondents (N=235)			
	DV = Change revenue compared to 2010		*DV = Change revenue first 3 years*	
	Coefficient	*(SE)*	*Coefficient*	*(SE)*
Independent variable				
Gender	-.59338	(.38190)	-.31578	(.34483)
Control variables				
Age entrepreneur	-.04698 **	(.01915)	-.03967 **	(.01796)
Age venture	.00857	(.02356)	.01730	(.02277)
Education	-.06251	(.13347)	-.04177	(.12163)

*p<.10. **p<.05. ***p<.01.

***Table 6.5**. Results of 3 success regression by using respectively ordered probit, normal probit and ordered probit regressions for measuring the success of entrepreneurial teams if the entrepreneur is a woman.*

	Respondents (N=232)					
	DV = Number of employees current		*DV = Change in employees*		*DV = revenue in 2011*	
	Coefficient	*(SE)*	*dF/dx (marginal effect)*	*(SE)*	*Coefficient*	*(SE)*
Independent variable						
Team	.69455	(.43581)	.11647	(.12085)	.82212 **	(.34122)
Control variables						
Age entrepreneur	-.02993	(.02358)	-.00964 *	(.00501)	-.00977	(.01676)
Age venture	.03654	(.03384)	.00796	(.00651)	-.02221	(.02213)
Education	.62569 **	(.31335)	.08348	(.05069)	.32462 **	(.14604)

*p<.10. **p<.05. ***p<.01.

***Table 6.6**. Results of 2 success regression by using ordered probit regressions for measuring the success of entrepreneurial teams if the entrepreneur is a woman.*

	Respondents (N=232)			
	DV = Change revenue compared to 2010		*DV = Change revenue first 3 years*	
	Coefficient	*(SE)*	*Coefficient*	*(SE)*
Independent variable				
Team	-.32803	(.39270)	.04867	(.34186)
Control variables				
Age entrepreneur	-.00501	(.01973)	-.03880 **	(.01745)
Age venture	-.06836***	(.02493)	.05716 **	(.02288)
Education	.23314	(.16347)	.02393	(.14678)

*p<.10. **p<.05. ***p<.01.

Table 6.7*. Results of 3 success regression by using respectively ordered probit, normal probit and ordered probit regressions for measuring the relative success of entrepreneurial teams (if in a team, the dependent variable is divided by 2).*

	Respondents (N=232)					
	DV = Number of employees current		*DV = Change in employees*		*DV = revenue in 2011*	
	Coefficient	*(SE)*	*dF/dx (marginal effect)*	*(SE)*	*Coefficient*	*(SE)*
Independent variable						
Team	.51278 ***	(.17398)	.28603***	(.07377)	-.72439 ***	(.15872)
Control variables						
Gender	-.58306 ***	(.19829)	-.25197 ***	(.05992)	-.53709 ***	(.15232)
Age entrepreneur	-.01276	(.00939)	-.00634 *	(.00369)	-.00462	(.00771)
Age venture	.02327 *	(.01230)	.00913 *	(.00483)	-.00844	(.01035)
Education	.02873	(.06665)	.01488	(.02718)	.09317 *	(.05609)

*p<.10. **p<.05. ***p<.01.

Table 6.8*. Results of 2 success regression by using ordered probit regressions for measuring the relative success of entrepreneurial teams (if in a team, the dependent variable is divided by 2).*

	Respondents (N=232)			
	DV = Change revenue compared to 2010		*DV = Change revenue first 3 years*	
	Coefficient	*(SE)*	*Coefficient*	*(SE)*
Independent variable				
Team	-.02744	(.15841)	-1.36514***	(.17114)
Control variables				
Gender	-.06179	(.16076)	-.07879	(.15265)
Age entrepreneur	-.01600 *	(.00829)	-.02156***	(.00791)
Age venture	-.01983 *	(.01107)	.03072***	(.01063)
Education	.05968	(.05967)	.09582 *	(.05713)

*p<.10. **p<.05. ***p<.01.

Table 6.9. *Results of 3 success regressions by using respectively ordered probit, normal probit and ordered probit regressions for measuring the success of entrepreneurial teams by taking into account the final working situation of the entrepreneur.*

	Respondents (N=217)					
	DV = Number of employees current		*DV = Change in employees*		*DV = revenue in 2011*	
	Coefficient	*(SE)*	*dF/dx (marginal effect)*	*(SE)*	*Coefficient*	*(SE)*
Independent variable						
Team	.94643***	(.19198)	.33830***	(.07918)	1.03906***	(.17351)
Control variables						
Gender	-.66632***	(.21016)	-.25431***	(.05965)	-.54744***	(.15658)
Age entrepreneur	-.01810 *	(.00998)	-.00808 **	(.00376)	-.01208	(.00800)
Age venture	.02882 **	(.01344)	.01259 **	(.00509)	-.00255	(.01097)
Education	-.02402	(.07217)	.00386	(.02741)	.02233	(.06004)

*p<.10. **p<.05. ***p<.01.

Table 6.10. *Results of 2 success regression by using ordered probit regressions for measuring the success of entrepreneurial teams by taking into account the final working situation of the entrepreneur.*

	Respondents (N=217)			
	DV = Change revenue compared to 2010		*DV = Change revenue first 3 years*	
	Coefficient	*(SE)*	*Coefficient*	*(SE)*
Independent variable				
Team	.13803	(.18625)	.40475 **	(.17055)
Control variables				
Gender	-.08822	(.17269)	-.11338	(.15869)
Age entrepreneur	-.02059 **	(.00894)	-.02336***	(.00828)
Age venture	-.01507	(.01201)	.03376***	(.01143)
Education	.03361	(.06642)	.07583	(.06178)

*p<.10. **p<.05. ***p<.01.

Appendix IV Online survey

Het Amsterdam Center for Entrepreneurship (ACE) en O+S gaan samen onderzoek doen naar ondernemerschap. Dit is de eerste vragenlijst die gezamenlijk is opgesteld. Het thema is de start van de onderneming.

Het invullen duurt ongeveer 5 minuten. De resultaten van het onderzoek zijn begin 2013 beschikbaar**.**

Welkom bij deze vragenlijst. Het invullen duurt ongeveer 5 minuten.

Quest 2 **In welk jaar is {Ondernemingsnaam} gestart?**

⌊___⌋___⌋___⌋___⌋

Quest 3 **Had uw onderneming bij de start al personeel in dienst? Exclusief de oprichter(s).**

☐ 1 ja
☐ 2 nee → ga naar vraag Quest5
☐ 3 weet ik niet/ geen antwoord → ga naar vraag Quest5

Quest 4 **Hoeveel personeel had uw onderneming bij de start al in dienst? Exclusief de oprichter(s).**

⌊___⌋___⌋___⌋___⌋

Quest 5 **Bent u degene die de onderneming is gestart?**

☐ 1 ja
☐ 2 nee → ga naar vraag Quest11
☐ 3 geen antwoord → ga naar vraag Quest11

Quest 6 **Hoe bent u gestart?**

☐ 1 als enige ondernemer
☐ 2 samen met een andere ondernemer
☐ 3 samen met een aantal andere ondernemers
☐ 4 anders, namelijk _____
☐ 5 geen antwoord → ga naar vraag Quest10

Quest 7 **Wat was uw motief om dit zo te doen?**

X

Quest 8 **Werkt u nog op dezelfde manier als bij de start van uw onderneming, namelijk {#Quest6}?**

☐ 1 ja
☐ 2 nee
☐ 3 weet ik niet/ geen antwoord

Quest 9 **Wat is er dan veranderd? (meerdere antwoorden mogelijk):**

☐ 1 ik werk nu als enige ondernemer
☐ 2 ik werk nu samen met een andere ondernemer
☐ 3 ik werk nu samen met een aantal andere ondernemers
☐ 4 anders, namelijk _____

Quest 10 **Als u nu zou starten, zou u het dan op dezelfde manier doen als u het gedaan heeft?**

☐ 1 ja
☐ 2 nee, omdat _____
☐ 3 weet ik niet
☐ 4 geen antwoord

Quest 11 **Hoeveel personeel heeft de onderneming nu in dienst? Exclusief u en eventuele compagnon(s).**

|___|___|___|___|___|___|___|___|

Quest 12 **Welke omzet heeft de onderneming in 2011 ongeveer gerealiseerd?**

☐ 1 tot 10.000 euro
☐ 2 10.000 tot 25.000 euro
☐ 3 25.000 tot 50.000 euro
☐ 4 50.000 tot 100.000 euro
☐ 5 100.000 tot 200.000 euro
☐ 6 200.000 tot 500.000 euro
☐ 7 500.000 tot 1.000.000 euro
☐ 8 1.000.000 tot 10.000.000 euro
☐ 9 meer dan 10.000.000 euro
☐ 10 wil ik niet zeggen
☐ 11 weet ik niet

Quest 13 **Hoe verhoudt de omzet in 2011 zich tot die van 2010?**

☐ 1 de omzet is hoger dan in 2010
☐ 2 de omzet is gelijk aan die in 2010
☐ 3 de omzet is lager dan die in 2010
☐ 4 weet ik niet
☐ 5 wil ik niet zeggen

Quest 14 **Hoe is de omzet van de onderneming in de eerste drie jaar na de start van de onderneming globaal veranderd?**

☐ 1 de omzet is afgenomen
☐ 2 de omzet is gelijk gebleven
☐ 3 de omzet is gestegen met gemiddeld 0 tot 25% per jaar
☐ 4 de omzet is gestegen met gemiddeld 25 tot 50% per jaar
☐ 5 de omzet is gestegen met gemiddeld 50 tot 75% per jaar
☐ 6 de omzet is gestegen met gemiddeld 75 tot 100% per jaar
☐ 7 de omzet is gestegen met gemiddeld meer dan 100% per jaar
☐ 8 weet ik niet
☐ 9 wil ik niet zeggen

Quest 14 **Hoe is de omzet van de onderneming in de eerste drie jaar na de start van de onderneming globaal veranderd?**

☐ 1 de omzet is afgenomen
☐ 2 de omzet is gelijk gebleven
☐ 3 de omzet is gestegen met gemiddeld 0 tot 25% per jaar
☐ 4 de omzet is gestegen met gemiddeld 25 tot 50% per jaar
☐ 5 de omzet is gestegen met gemiddeld 50 tot 75% per jaar
☐ 6 de omzet is gestegen met gemiddeld 75 tot 100% per jaar
☐ 7 de omzet is gestegen met gemiddeld meer dan 100% per jaar
☐ 8 weet ik niet
☐ 9 wil ik niet zeggen

Quest 14_toe **Indien u dit wenst, kunt u hier uw antwoord toelichten:**

X

Quest 15 **Tot slot volgen er nog wat algemene vragen over u als ondernemer.**

Wat is uw hoogst voltooide opleiding?
(Als u uw opleiding in het buitenland hebt gevolgd, zou u dan de Nederlandse equivalent hiervan willen aangeven?)

☐ 1 lager onderwijs → ga naar vraag Quest17
☐ 2 voorbereidend middelbaar beroepsonderwijs (vmbo, voorheen mavo/vbo) → ga naar vraag Quest17
hoger algemeen en voorbereidend wetenschappelijk onderwijs (havo/vwo) → ga naar vraag
☐ 3 Quest17
☐ 4 middelbaar beroepsonderwijs (mbo)
☐ 5 hoger beroepsonderwijs (hbo)
☐ 6 wetenschappelijk onderwijs (drs, master, bachelor)
☐ 7 wetenschappelijk onderwijs (dr)
☐ 8 weet niet → ga naar vraag Quest17
☐ 9 wil niet zeggen → ga naar vraag Quest17

Quest 16 **Welke richting hebt u gedaan?**

☐ 1 onderwijs
☐ 2 taalwetenschappen, geschiedenis, kunst
☐ 3 sociale wetenschappen, economie, bedrijfskunde
☐ 4 recht
☐ 5 natuurwetenschappen, wiskunde, informatica
☐ 6 techniek, industrie, bouwkunde
☐ 7 landbouw, diergeneeskunde
☐ 8 gezondheidszorg, welzijn
☐ 9 persoonlijke dienstverlening, vervoer
☐ 10 anders, namelijk _____

Quest 17 **Bent u een**

☐ 1 man
☐ 2 vrouw
☐ 3 wil ik niet zeggen

Quest 18 **Wat is uw leeftijd?**

|__|__|

Opmerkingen **In deze vragenlijst zijn verschillende onderwerpen aan bod gekomen. Wellicht zijn er onderwerpen die niet in deze vragenlijst aan de orde zijn geweest, maar waarover u wel graag iets kwijt zou willen.**
Ook suggesties voor verbetering zijn welkom. Deze kunt u hieronder beschrijven.

X

Dit waren alle vragen. Hartelijk dank voor uw medewerking.

Door op 'Vorige' te klikken kunt u uw antwoorden bekijken. Door op 'Verzend' te klikken verzendt u uw antwoorden en sluit u de vragenlijst af. De vragenlijst kan hierna niet meer worden geopend.