

# On the Economic Performance of Nascent Entrepreneurs

Dora Gicheva  
and  
Albert N. Link

# Outline of the Presentation

- Genesis of the topic
- Purpose of our paper
- Framework for analysis
- Data and key variables
- Empirical model and findings
- Punchline
- Possible next steps

# Genesis of the Topic

- Literature on Nascency
  - individual considering starting a new firm
  - decision to become a nascent entrepreneur
- Literature on Entrepreneurship
  - behavior/performance and firm size

# Purpose of Our Paper

- We compare technology-based performance among nascent and established firms
  - policy continues to focus on technology/innovation-based economic growth while also emphasizing the importance of entrepreneurship as a key driver
    - “Entrepreneurship plays an essential role in generating innovation and stimulating U.S. economic growth. New firms account for most net job growth, and small businesses employ 30% of high-tech workers.” (National Economic Council, 2011)

# Framework for Analysis

- Uncertainty in the *ex-post* value of R&D ( $Y_i$ ).
- *Ex-ante* firm  $i$  knows that the value  $Y_i$  of a new R&D project with distribution  $F_i(Y)$ , with known mean ( $m_i$ ), and with dispersion ( $s_i$ )
- Firms: nascent ( $i=0$ ) or established ( $i=1$ )
- Projects by nascent firms are inherently riskier,  $s_0 > s_1$
- Unconditional expected value  $m_0 > m_1$
- Failure occurs when the value of the R&D project  $Y_i$  falls below a certain threshold level  $\bar{Y}$

# Data and Key Variables

- 2005 NRC database of Phase II SBIR projects funded b/w 1992 - 2001
  - 6408 projects from DoD, NIH, DOE, NASA, and NSF
    - 1878 random projects
- Key Variables
  - Phase II project technology commercialized by 2005
  - Nascent firm founded because of the SBIR Phase II award and the number of previous Phase II awards was zero
  - Failure if Phase II project discontinued by 2005

# Data Set

## National Research Council Survey of Phase II Awards

Agency	Phase II Sample Size	Respondents	Response Rate	Random Sample
DoD	3,055	920	30%	891
NIH	1,678	496	30%	495
NASA	779	181	23%	177
NSF	457	162	35%	154
DOE	<u>439</u>	<u>157</u>	36%	<u>161</u>
	6,408	1,916		1,878

# Data and Key Variables

- 2005 NRC database of Phase II SBIR projects funded b/w 1992 - 2001
  - 6408 projects from DoD, NIH, DOE, NASA, and NSF
    - 1878 random projects
- Key Variables
  - Phase II project technology commercialized by 2005
  - Nascent firm founded because of the SBIR Phase II award and the number of previous Phase II awards was zero
  - Failure if Phase II project discontinued by 2005



# Empirical Model and Findings

We estimated a probit model with sample selection, in which commercialization is only observed for the projects that did not fail:

$$\text{notfail}_i = (z_i\gamma + u_{2i} > 0)$$

and

$$\text{commer}_i = (x_i\beta + u_{1i} > 0 | u_{2i} > -z_i\gamma).$$

The error terms  $u_{1i}$  and  $u_{2i}$  are assumed to be jointly normally distributed

# Project Failure

## Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Project That Did Not Fail (n=988)			Project That Failed (n=541)		
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Range	Mean	Std. Dev.	Range
<i>commer</i>	0.64	0.48	0/1	.	.	.
<i>nascent</i>	0.12	0.32	0/1	0.16	0.37	0/1
<i>breadthexp</i>	1.23	0.45	1-3	1.19	0.44	1-3
<i>privexp</i>	0.70	0.46	0/1	0.71	0.46	0/1
<i>univexp</i>	0.37	0.48	0/1	0.34	0.47	0/1
<i>govtexp</i>	0.08	0.26	0/1	0.09	0.28	0/1
<i>prevphll</i>	6.26	21.47	0-175	8.67	26.98	0-222
<i>prevrelphll</i>	1.14	2.44	0-28	0.54	1.64	0-28
<i>emp</i>	25.76	50.74	0-375	39.58	67.63	0-450
<i>age</i>	17.38	11.18	5-105	20.57	10.86	5-105
<i>\$award</i>	8.23	3.28	1.1-54.3	7.73	4.31	0.9-84.0
<i>addlfund</i>	0.73	0.45	0/1	0.24	0.43	0/1
<i>\$addlfund</i>	1.61	6.96	0-106	0.38	3.57	0-65

Note: Of the 1,878 projects in the NRC database, information on all of the variables in this table was available for only 1,529 projects.

# Conditional Commercialization

- While nascent firms have a greater likelihood of project failure, those that do not fail have a greater probability of commercialization – 11 percentage points higher
- Given that a project did not fail, larger firms have a greater probability of commercialization
- Additional funding (0/1) rather than the amount of additional funding (\$) to support the technology developed during the Phase II project increases the probability of commercialization

# Punchline

- We have shown that nascent technology-based firms that receive a Phase II SBIR R&D award are more likely to fail, but those that do not fail have a higher probability of commercialization

# Possible Next Steps

- Might it be in society's best interest to place an emphasis on supporting technology-based nascent entrepreneurs rather than legacy entrepreneurs?

**THANK YOU**  
**[anlink@uncg.edu](mailto:anlink@uncg.edu)**