

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 Nascent
– 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:

$$notfail_i = (z_i\gamma + u_{2i} > 0)$$

and

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

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>prevphill</i>	6.26	21.47	0-175	8.67	26.98	0-222
<i>prevrelphill</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