

IS THE TENDENCY TO ENGAGE IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP GENETIC?

Nicos Nicolaou

Tanaka Business School, Imperial College London,
South Kensington Campus,
London, SW7 2AZ,
United Kingdom.
Tel: 44-20-75949499
Email: nicos.nicolaou@imperial.ac.uk

Scott Shane

Weatherhead School of Management,
Case Western Reserve University,
11119 Bellflower Rd.,
Cleveland, OH 44106.
Tel: 216-368-5538
Email: sas46@cwru.edu

Lynn Cherkas, Janice Hunkin & Tim D. Spector

Twin Research & Genetic Epidemiology Unit
St Thomas' Hospital
Lambeth Palace Road
London,
SE1 7EH,
United Kingdom.

Acknowledgements: We are grateful to Wallace Hopp, the anonymous Associate Editor, and the anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments and encouragement. We would also like to thank Howard Aldrich, Jaideep Prabhu and seminar participants at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Pennsylvania, Case Western Reserve University, Cranfield University, Northwestern University, Imperial College London, Warwick University, the Inaugural Entrepreneurship Conference at London Business School, and a keynote session of the European Doctoral Research Conference for helpful comments on earlier drafts of this paper. We are also grateful to the twins who participated in the study.

IS THE TENDENCY TO ENGAGE IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP GENETIC?

ABSTRACT

We used quantitative genetics techniques to compare the entrepreneurial activity of 870 pairs of monozygotic (MZ) and 857 pairs of same-sex dizygotic (DZ) twins from the United Kingdom. We ran model fitting analyses to estimate the genetic, shared environmental, and non-shared environmental effects on the propensity of people to become entrepreneurs. We found relatively high heritabilities for entrepreneurship across different operationalizations of the phenomenon, with little effect of family environment and upbringing. Our findings suggest the importance of considering genetic factors in explanations for why people engage in entrepreneurial activity.

INTRODUCTION

Why do people engage in entrepreneurial activity? Despite the centrality of this question to the field of entrepreneurship, and over 40 years of research that has sought to answer it, researchers have offered incomplete and uncertain answers (Gartner, 1988; Shane & Venkataraman, 2000). In this paper, we argue that the failure to develop a comprehensive understanding of why people engage in entrepreneurial activity has occurred, in part, because researchers have failed to examine an important category of explanatory factor, genetics.

Despite a body of empirical evidence that has shown that genetic factors influence a variety of business-related outcomes, from job satisfaction (Arvey et al, 1989) to vocational interests (Betsworth et al, 1994), to work values (Keller et al, 1992), entrepreneurship researchers have not, to date, examined empirically the role of genetic factors in explaining the tendency of people to engage in entrepreneurial activity. Rather, the entrepreneurship literature has assumed that the tendency to engage in entrepreneurial activity is explained by learned individual differences or situational factors.

In this paper, we provide the first empirical test of the effects of genetic factors on the tendency of people to engage in entrepreneurial activity.¹ We employ the methodology of behavioral genetics, which holds that researchers can compare monozygotic (MZ) and dizygotic (DZ) twins to determine if genetic factors influence the propensity of people to engage in an outcome of interest. Because MZ twins share all of their genetic composition and DZ twins share half of their genetic material on average, differences in the concordance between entrepreneurial activity of MZ and DZ twins can be attributed to genetic factors, if one assumes that environmental factors are not systematically different for MZ and DZ twin pairs.

Investigating the influence of genetic factors on the propensity of people to engage in entrepreneurial activity is important for several reasons. First, an understanding of the role of genetic factors will help to improve entrepreneurship research. Genetics offers an explanation for why people engage in entrepreneurial activity that is complementary to the standard ones in the literature of having a certain psychological composition or being present in opportunity rich situations (White et al, 2006; White et al, 2007; Shane and Venkataraman, 2000). Because the scholarly field of entrepreneurship has explained only some of the variance in the tendency of people to engage in entrepreneurial activity, examination of additional factors that account for this variance will help scholars to develop a more comprehensive model of why some people and not others become entrepreneurs.

Moreover, empirical investigation of genetic factors will provide richer, more precise explanations for the tendency of people to engage in several important aspects of entrepreneurial activity. For example, genetic research could help to explain to what extent the influence of parental entrepreneurship on children's propensity to become entrepreneurs is influenced by genetic factors transmitted biologically from parent to child, and to what extent it is influenced by environmental factors, such as the role modeling that the parents provide (Sorenson, forthcoming), the transmission of information from parents to children about how to run a business (Aldrich and Kim, forthcoming), and

¹ By genetic factors we mean those factors that are encoded in DNA and transmitted biologically.

the transfer of resources useful for entrepreneurship (e.g., information, social and financial capital) from parents to children (Sorenson, forthcoming).

THEORY DEVELOPMENT

The extant literature shows that people who engage in entrepreneurial activity are not randomly determined. A variety of factors are associated with the tendency of people to engage in entrepreneurial activities, including psychological attributes, such as need for achievement (McClelland, 1961), overconfidence (Busenitz, 1999), locus of control (Evans and Leighton, 1989), optimism (Cooper et al., 1988), and risk taking propensity (Stewart and Roth, 2001), and demographic factors, such as education (Bates, 1995), employment status (Ritsila and Tervo, 2002), age (Bates, 1995), marital status (Evans and Leighton, 1989), income (Amit et al, 1995), career experience (Evans and Leighton, 1989), social ties (Aldrich et al, 1987), and social skills (Baron, 2004).

However, no empirical research has examined the effect of genetic factors on the tendency of people to engage in entrepreneurship. This is surprising given the evidence that many aspects of human behavior are influenced by genes (Benjamin et al., 2003; Plomin and Walker., 2003), including personality (Ebstein et al., 1996; Benjamin et al., 1996), attitudes (Bouchard et al. 2004) and intelligence (Plomin, 2003), job satisfaction (Arvey et al, 1989), work-related values (Keller et al, 1992), and interests (Lykken et al, 1993). If genetic factors influence other aspects of human behavior, they are likely to influence the tendency of people to engage in entrepreneurial activity as well.²

Genetic factors might influence the tendency of people to engage in entrepreneurship through a variety of complementary mechanisms. First, genes might have direct effects on chemical mechanisms in the brain that predispose people with that genetic composition to engage in entrepreneurial activity. Genes provide instructions for the creation of proteins out of amino acids. If a gene that codes for the

² We do not reject the possibility that other factors, such as the exogenously determined external environment, also influence the development of the characteristics that lead some people to engage in entrepreneurial activity. Moreover, we do not argue that genes *determine* who engages in entrepreneurial activity in the way that specific genes *determine* whether or not people will develop diseases, such as Huntington's disease. Rather, we argue genes increase the probability that people will engage in entrepreneurial activity (Plomin et al, 1990). As Plomin et al

creation of a particular protein is missing, then the chemical reaction that it is designed to facilitate will not occur as efficiently. If that chemical reaction controls brain activity, it can influence behavior. For example, the Taq A1 allele³ of the DRD2 gene has been shown to be more prevalent among excessive gamblers than the general population because the gene affects sensations of pleasure in response to risk taking (Comings et al., 1996). Because entrepreneurship involves risk taking, it is possible that people with this variant of the DRD2 gene are more likely to engage in entrepreneurial activity than other people because the gene increases the pleasure that they obtain from taking risks.

Second, genes might predispose people to develop individual attributes that affect the tendency of people to engage in entrepreneurship (White et al, 2006; 2007). For example, extraversion is a personality trait that incorporates several attributes, including sociability, gregariousness, talkativeness and exhibitionism (Barrick & Mount, 1991). Extraversion increases the likelihood that people will engage in entrepreneurship because it facilitates many skills, such as selling, that are important to it (Baron and Markman, 2003). Moreover, extraversion is heritable (Bouchard & Loehlin, 2001; Eaves et al., 1989; Jang et al., 1996; Riemann et al., 1997) and is related to the long alleles of the DRD4 exon III repeat gene (Benjamin et al., 1996). Thus, genes might affect the tendency of people to engage in entrepreneurial activity by influencing their level of extraversion.

Third, genes might affect the tendency of people to select into environments more favorable to entrepreneurial activity, a phenomenon called *gene-environment correlation* (Plomin, DeFries & Loehlin, 1977; Kendler and Eaves, 1986). Because genes lead people to select their environments (Scarr, 1992), environmental factors are non-randomly distributed among people of different genetic make-up (Neale & Maes, 2002). For example, gene-environment correlations might influence the tendency of people to engage in entrepreneurial activity by affecting their educational choices (Taubman, 1976; Lichtenstein & Pedersen, 1992; Tambs et al, 1989; Behrman & Taubman, 1989). People are more likely to engage in

(1990: 376) explained, “Genetic effects on behavior are not deterministic in the sense of a puppeteer pulling our strings. Genetic influences imply probabilistic propensities rather than hard-wired patterns of behavior.”

³ An allele is any one of a number of possible DNA codings of the same gene.

entrepreneurial activity if they are more highly educated because education provides the background knowledge necessary to notice new business opportunities (Shane 2000), and information and skills that increase the expected returns to entrepreneurial activity (Clouse, 1990). Genes affect the level of education that people obtain (Behrman and Taubman, 1989; Tambs et al., 1989). Thus, genes might affect the tendency of people to engage in entrepreneurship by influencing their level of education.

Fourth, genes might make some people more sensitive than others to environmental stimuli that increase the likelihood of engaging in entrepreneurial activity. This tendency, called, *gene-environment interaction*, means that a person with the relevant gene displays a greater reaction to the environmental stimulus than a person without that gene (Plomin, DeFries and Loehlin, 1977; Rowe, 2003; Moffitt et al., 2005). For example, the dopamine D4 receptor gene, which regulates the level of dopamine in the brain (Ebstein et al., 1996; Benjamin et al., 1996), has been shown to increase the salience of information (Berridge and Robinson, 1998, Volkow, 2004). The identification of new business ideas is affected by the salience of information to the person receiving it (Gaglio and Katz, 2001; Shane 2000). People with the DRD4 gene might be more sensitive than others to the stimulus of information about potential business opportunities. That is, the DRD4 gene might interact with information about opportunities to increase the likelihood that a person will identify a new business idea, and so increase the probability that the person will engage in entrepreneurship.

These four mechanisms, through which genes influence social outcomes, suggest that the tendency of people to engage in entrepreneurship might be at least partially heritable. Therefore, we hypothesize: *Genetic factors have a statistically significant and substantive effect on the propensity of people to engage in entrepreneurship.*

METHODOLOGY

Twin Studies

The natural experiment of twins allows us to measure whether the tendency of people to engage in entrepreneurship has a genetic component. The experiments are based on comparison of monozygotic (MZ) twins, which are created when a single sperm fertilizes a separate egg, and so share 100 percent of

their genetic make-up, and dizygotic (DZ) twins, which are created when two separate eggs are fertilized by two separate sperm, and share, on average, 50 percent of their genetic make-up.

Comparing the similarity and difference in entrepreneurship between the two types of twins provides insight into the proportion of variance in entrepreneurship that is explained by genetic factors. Because MZ twins share all of their genetic make-up and DZ twins share, on average, 50 percent of their genetic make-up, greater MZ than DZ twin concordances in entrepreneurship would indicate that genetic factors are important. However, if the tendency to engage in entrepreneurship is explained solely by environmental factors, then no difference between MZ and DZ twin concordances in entrepreneurship should be observed.

Twin studies depend on the assumption that MZ and DZ twins experience equivalent environments. For violation of this assumption to occur, environmental factors must treat MZ twins more similarly than DZ twins and the similarity in treatment must make a difference in the phenotype under study. The equal environments assumption has been tested extensively and many sources now confirm the robustness of this assumption (Scarr and Carter-Saltzman, 1979; Bouchard and Propping, 1993; Kendler et al, 1993; Hettema et al, 1995; Carey, 2003). Studies of MZ and DZ twins raised together and apart have shown that the MZ twins raised apart are consistently more similar than DZ twins raised together (Bouchard, 1998; Bouchard et al, 1990). In addition, studies of twins reared apart and together and studies of biologically unrelated people reared in the same household have shown that the rearing environment explains very little variance in most social outcomes (Bouchard et al, 1990; Plomin and Daniels, 1987). Furthermore, many parents tend to randomize the environmental treatment of their children. Many are misinformed or make erroneous evaluations about the zygosity of their twins, leading some parents to raise their DZ twins as MZ twins and other parents to treat their MZ twins as DZ twins. Some parents accentuate the similarity of their DZ offspring by making certain that they wear the same clothes and have the same hairstyles, while others deliberately try to individualize their MZ twins. As a result, researchers observe little systematic difference in the treatment of MZ and DZ twins by their parents. In fact, studies have shown that in cases where parents made erroneous conclusions about the

zygosity of their twins, it was actual, rather than perceived zygosity that predicted similarity between twins (Scarr and Carter-Saltzman, 1979). Given this evidence, Lykken et al (1993) explain that researchers can safely assume that pairs of MZ and DZ twins, on average, face the same environments, and heritability can be estimated conservatively from samples of twins reared together.

Sample

Our sample is drawn from the TwinsUK registry – the national volunteer twin register in the UK – initially recruited through a national media campaign (www.twinsuk.ac.uk, Spector et al, 1996). All were healthy volunteers, comparable to age-matched singletons (Andrew et al, 2001). The majority was born in the British Isles (96% and 98% of MZ and DZ twins respectively) and was Caucasian (97% and 96% of MZ and DZ twins respectively). Over 90% of the sample were female (this is because the twins were initially recruited to examine bone density and osteoporosis, a disease which occurs primarily in females). All the twins were twins reared together and there were no opposite-sex DZ twins in the sample. Zygosity of each twin pair was determined by using a standard validated questionnaire, which has an accuracy of over 95 percent (Martin and Martin, 1975; Peeters et al, 1998), and, where necessary, through multiplex DNA fingerprinting using variable tandem repeats, which has a 99.7 percent accuracy (Singer et al., 2005).

In 1999, each subject was sent a postal questionnaire (response rate 68 percent) that focused mainly on health related issues and medical history. For example, it included questions on osteoarthritis and osteoporosis, asthma, skin conditions, and general medical history. It also included some ‘lifestyle’ questions related to alcohol consumption, smoking and physical activity. Given this focus, respondents were unaware of the hypothesis of this study when deciding whether or not to respond to the survey. The sample consisted of 2532 twins comprising of 607 pairs of MZ and 657 pairs of same-sex DZ twins.

Of particular interest to this study, the questionnaire elicited information on demographic characteristics, including marital status, ethnicity, whether they were born in the British Isles, household income, educational level and self-employment status. In 2006, we sent an additional postal questionnaire

to the twins, which elicited information using additional operationalizations of entrepreneurship. The 2006 sample consisted of 3454 twins comprising of 870 pairs of MZ and 857 pairs of same-sex DZ twins.

Table 1 shows the questionnaire items used in this study.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Measures of Entrepreneurship

The research literature does not agree on the definition of entrepreneurship. Given these differences, we seek convergent validity for our argument by examining several different operationalizations common in the literature. These include (1) self-employment, (Amit et al., 1995; Evans and Leighton, 1989; Taylor, 1996; Burke et al, 2000; Van Praag and Cramer, 2001; Parker, 2004), which we operationalize with the questions: “are you self-employed?” and “in your working life, how long have you been self employed?”; (2) starting a new business (Gartner, 1989; Mesch and Czamanzki, 1997; Delmar and Davidsson, 2000), which we operationalize with the questions: “have you ever started a new business?” and “in your working life, how many new businesses have you started?” (This latter question is measured on the following scale: ‘one’; ‘two’; ‘three’; ‘four or more’); (3) being an owner-operator of a company (Hull et al., 1980; Ahmed, 1985; Bitler et al., 2005), which we operationalize with the questions: “have you ever been an owner-operator of a company?” and “in your working life, how many companies have you been an owner–operator of?” (this latter question is measured on the following scale: ‘one’; ‘two’; ‘three’; ‘four or more’); and (4) engaging in the firm start-up process (Reynolds et al, 2004; Ruef et al, 2003; Delmar and Shane, 2003), which we operationalize with the questions: “have you taken any actions toward the creation of a new business?” and “in your working life, for how many new business ideas have you taken any actions toward the creation of a new business?” (this latter question is measured on the following scale: ‘one’; ‘two’; ‘three’; ‘four or more’).

Attitudes Toward Entrepreneurship

To identify the mechanism through which genetic factors operate, we also examined the respondents attitude toward entrepreneurship through a Likert scale item that asked them to indicate, on a scale from one (a very good career) to five (a very bad career), their view of entrepreneurship as a career.

Structural Equation Modeling

Quantitative genetic theory holds that three unobservable components can be combined additively to explain the variance in a phenotype (in our case, entrepreneurship): genetic effects (A), shared environmental effects (or the environmental factors that people in the same family have in common) (C), and non-shared environmental effects (the environmental effects that are unique to an individual) (E).⁴ These three components generate the basic ACE model of behavioral genetics.

Following the standard approach in behavioral genetics, we use quantitative genetic modeling techniques (which are based on structural equation models fit to a dataset) to estimate the genetic and environmental contributions to twin resemblance in entrepreneurship (Neale and Cardon, 1992; Falconer, 1989; Sham et al, 1994)⁵. These techniques allow us to estimate the magnitude of the genetic and environmental influences and the size of the errors of these estimates, and test the fit of the model (Plomin et al, 1990).⁶

Figure 1 shows the path models we test graphically. Observed entrepreneurship status is represented by the rectangles (Twin 1, Twin 2). Latent factors, which the study estimates, are represented by the circles. A, C and E are the additive genetic, common environmental, and unique environmental influences, respectively. (Because monozygotic twins share the same genes, and dizygotic twins share

⁴ By environment, we mean all non-genetic effects (including the biological effects of the uterus, the home in which people are raised, and the social environment in which people live and work) on entrepreneurship.

⁵ Maximum likelihood estimation of covariance structure provides the best statistical method for disentangling genetic from environmental variance in behavior (Cherny et al., 1992; Sham, 1998). Although regression methodology for the analysis of twins has been proposed (Sham et al., 1994), there are distinct advantages in using the more general framework of structural equation modeling (Martin and Eaves, 1977, Sham et al., 1994; Sham, 1998). First, the hypothetical causal relationships which are made explicit in a structural equation model are only implicit in the regression models (Sham, 1998). Consequently, if we simply regressed the behaviors of twin one on the behaviors of twin two to see if there was a differential risk for MZ and DZ twins, this would only provide a test of genetic aetiology, not latent heritability. To estimate latent heritability, we need structural equation modeling which assumes that all polygenes act in an independent additive manner to provide a hypothetical normal distribution of risk underlying a binary trait. Second, structural equations permit nested submodel comparisons, which make possible identification of the most parsimonious model (Bulik et al., 2000). Third, the regression approach requires the double entry of twins, which creates problems with interpretation of the coefficients because the co-twins are not independent of each other (Turkheimer et al., 1985). Fourth, the regression approach requires constrained estimation to avoid nonsensical estimates (e.g. negative proportions of variance or estimates exceeding unity) (Cyphers et al., 1990). Fifth the regression approach faces problems with heteroskedasticity, arising from the fact that DZ twins are expected to have a greater residual variance than MZ twins, in the presence of a genetic component (Sham, 1998).

half their additive genes, the correlation between the latent additive genetic factors is 1.0 for MZ's and 0.5 for DZ's. Because monozygotic and dizygotic twins share the same common environment, the correlation between the latent common environmental factors is 1.0 for MZ's and DZ's.)⁷ The regression coefficients of the observed variables on the different latent factors are shown in lowercase letters: "a" denotes the additive genetic effect, "c" the common environmental effect, and "e" the unique environmental effect.

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

The models that we use are represented by the following structural equations:

$$P_{ij} = aA_{ij} + cC_{ij} + eE_{ij}$$

$$V_p = a^2 + c^2 + e^2 = 1$$

where P is the phenotype of the i th individual in the j th pair ($i=1,2; j=1\dots n$; all variables scaled as deviations from zero), and V_p is the total phenotypic variance of the population representing the sum of additive genetic (a^2), common environmental (c^2) and unique environmental variance (e^2).

These models generate the following predicted variance-covariance matrices for the ACE models:

$$\text{Cov MZ} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{Twin 1} \\ \text{Twin 2} \end{array} = \left(\begin{array}{cc} \text{Twin 1} & \text{Twin 2} \\ a^2 + c^2 + e^2 & a^2 + c^2 \\ a^2 + c^2 & a^2 + c^2 + e^2 \end{array} \right)$$

$$\text{Cov DZ} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{Twin 1} \\ \text{Twin 2} \end{array} = \left(\begin{array}{cc} \text{Twin 1} & \text{Twin 2} \\ a^2 + c^2 + e^2 & \frac{1}{2} a^2 + c^2 \\ \frac{1}{2} a^2 + c^2 & a^2 + c^2 + e^2 \end{array} \right)$$

⁶ McGue et al (1987) showed that model fitting techniques provide parameter estimates that are robust to violations of normality assumptions.

⁷ The shared and non-shared environments represent the environmental subcomponents of variance in a phenotype; the non-shared (or unique) environment refers to environmental influences that contribute to differences between family members, while the shared (or common) environment refers to environmental factors that make family members similar (Plomin et al., 2001; Carey, 2003). In other words, the non-shared environmental influences which are uncorrelated across siblings (Rowe, 1994), capture "the extent to which idiosyncratic experiences make relatives different", while the shared environment - things like parenting style and family socio-economic status if these increase twin similarity - captures "the extent to which being raised together makes relatives similar" (Carey, 2003: 305).

We use maximum likelihood methods to generate parameter estimates, which are similar to regression coefficients, and can be interpreted as estimates of the variance in the genetic (A), shared environmental (C) and non-shared environmental effects (E) (although the coefficient for non-shared environmental effects includes measurement error).

The genetic effect measured in the model serves as our key coefficient of interest. If entrepreneurship is completely genetically determined, then the estimate of the effect of the variance in the genetic effect would be 1.00. In contrast, if a phenotype is completely environmentally determined, then the estimate of the effect of the variance in the genetic effect would be zero.

The fit of the overall model is estimated using a chi-square goodness of fit test (a perfect fit is 1.00), with a non-significant chi-square test showing that the model fits the data well (Betsworth et al, 1994). The contribution of A, C, and E to the total variance is evaluated by removing each of them in a nested submodel and testing the level of fit of that model relative to the overall model.

Choice of Models

To ascribe sources of variation to the ordinal measures of entrepreneurship (the number of businesses started, number of businesses that are owner-operated, number of years self-employed, and number of new business start-up efforts), we used polychoric models based on asymptotically distribution free weighted least squares (Browne, 1982; Browne, 1984; Joreskog, 1990; Neale, 2004). To ascribe sources of variation to the dichotomous measures of entrepreneurship (ever started a business, was ever a business owner-operator, was ever self-employed, and ever engaged in the business start-up process), we used liability threshold models in which the presence or absence of entrepreneurship is based on the assumption of an underlying continuous liability and that the ‘trait’ is expressed when the liability exceeds a threshold value (Sham, 1998).

The ability to make strong causal statements about genetic factors requires a correction for potential factors that can lead to a correlation of twin scores (Cropanzano and James, 1990). Therefore, we adjust the model for potential confounders associated with self-employment: age, education, marital status, income, race, and immigrant status. If genetic factors also predict factors that exert an

environmental influence on entrepreneurship then the effect of these factors on self-employment could be the result of either genetic or environmental factors, and the genetic factors cannot be accurately estimated. We follow previous research (e.g., Mohammed et al., 2003, Hakim et al., 2004) in adjusting the model for potential confounders to see how estimates of variance components varied once confounders were included in the model.

RESULTS

Basic demographic data for the MZ and DZ twins are shown in Table 2. The two groups were well matched for factors associated with entrepreneurship, with only statistically significant difference between MZ and DZ twins (at the $p < 0.10$ level) being income over 25,000 Pounds. There were no statistically significant differences between the two groups of twins on measures of self-employment, owner-operator, company founding, or engaging in the business formation process (Levene's test, which was used for the non-dichotomous measures, also indicated equality of variances between the groups). A correlation table between the various measures of entrepreneurship is provided in Table 3.

INSERT TABLES 2 & 3 ABOUT HERE

Table 4 predicts whether the respondent was currently self-employed. The chi-square test for goodness of fit for the model, the Akaike Information Criterion (Akaike, 1987) and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) showed that the best fitting model to explain the variance in self-employment included additive genetic and environmental factors. Estimates of the genetic and environmental variance components revealed that 48 percent of the variance in the propensity to become self employed is explained by genetic factors. None of the variance in self-employment can be attributed to shared environmental factors, while 52 percent can be attributed to non-shared environmental factors plus measurement error.

INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE

If measures of entrepreneurship are correlated with gender, then estimates of genetic effects will be upwardly biased because all MZ twins share the same gender (McGue and Bouchard, 1984).

Therefore, we re-ran our analysis on just the female respondents. As Table 5 shows, our results for whether or not the respondent is self-employed remain qualitatively the same.

INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE

We also re-ran the analysis adjusting the model for potential confounders - income, education, marriage, age, race, and immigrant status - that have been shown to be associated with entrepreneurship (Aldrich and Kim, forthcoming; Shane, 2003). Consequently, differences in these dimensions across MZ and DZ twins might explain some of the differences in the concordance of self-employment between the two types of twins. Table 6 shows that adjusting for these potential confounders does little to reduce the heritability estimates for self-employment, which drop only to 0.41 when these variables are included.

INSERT TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE

We also examined the convergent validity across different measures of entrepreneurship. Table 7 shows the results of our analysis. Across the seven additional operationalizations of entrepreneurship, we found that the best model to explain the variance in entrepreneurship included additive genetic and unshared environmental factors, and heritabilities that ranged between 0.37 and 0.42.⁸ Combining these results with the heritability that we found for our measure of self-employment, we conclude that there is convergent validity for the heritability of entrepreneurship. Moreover, under the assumption that genetic factors are exogenous (genetic factors can affect entrepreneurship, but entrepreneurship cannot affect genetic factors), we can attribute causality to the relationship. That is, genetic factors make some people more likely than others to become entrepreneurs.

INSERT TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE

⁸ Following the suggestion of a reviewer, we derived heritability estimates on a scale based on the ordinal measures of entrepreneurship used in this study. First, we conducted a factor analysis on the measures, which yielded a single factor. All loadings on the factor were greater than 0.80, the eigenvalue was 2.70, and the factor captured 68 percent of the variance. The KMO measure of sampling adequacy was 0.77 and Bartlett's test of sphericity was 5668.94 ($p < 0.001$). The scale composed of the items had a Cronbach's alpha of 0.80. Second, we generated heritability estimates for this composite scale and used the AIC, RMSEA and chi-square statistic to identify the best fitting model. We found that the best fit was with an AE model which had a heritability of 0.33 (AIC= -3.17; RMSEA= 0.02; $p=0.31$), further corroborating the findings of the study.

We also examined the respondents' attitude toward entrepreneurship as a career. This analysis showed that the best fitting model to explain the variance in attitudes included shared and unshared environmental factors. None of the variance in attitudes toward entrepreneurship as a career was explained by genetic factors, indicating that the mechanism through which these factors affect the tendency to become an entrepreneur is not through attitudes toward the vocation.

DISCUSSION

We used quantitative genetics techniques to compare the entrepreneurial activity of a sample of MZ and same-sex DZ twins from the United Kingdom. We ran model fitting analyses to estimate the genetic, shared environmental, and non-shared environmental effects on the propensity of people to become entrepreneurs. We found qualitatively similar heritability estimates across different operationalizations of entrepreneurship, which were of similar magnitude to that obtained in many studies of other social outcomes (MacGregor, 2000). Moreover, our estimates of heritability remained high even after we adjusted the model for potential confounders such as gender, age, income, education, marital status, race, and immigrant status.

In short, our results indicate that genetic factors influence the tendency to become an entrepreneur. However, they do not indicate that entrepreneurship is genetically determined. Although our measures of environmental factors include measurement error (given our study design), their size suggests that they explain much of the variance in entrepreneurial activity, providing strong evidence of the effect of environmental factors on the propensity to become an entrepreneur.

Limitations

This study does not identify the genes that influence the tendency to engage in entrepreneurship. Therefore, we cannot know which genes matter, how many genes matter, or the relative importance of different genes to entrepreneurship. In fact such information cannot be ascertained through twin studies, such as this one, but require molecular genetics research that examines specific genes. Nevertheless, our results indicate the value of conducting molecular genetics studies of entrepreneurship.

Second, this study does little to specify the mechanism through which genetic factors influence the tendency to become an entrepreneur. Our evidence could be explained by direct genetic effects on brain physiology, leading to chemical rewards in response to actions that fit a genetic predisposition. They could also be explained by genetic influences on the predisposition to have other attributes, such as intelligence or social skills, which increase the propensity to become an entrepreneur. It is also possible that environmental factors mediate the effects of genetic factors on the tendency become an entrepreneur. Alternatively, people with certain genes might be more likely than others to become entrepreneurs when confronted with a favorable environmental stimulus.

Data availability limited the variables that could be included in our structural equation models. As a result, we could only examine income, education, marriage, age, gender, race, and immigrant status. The inclusion of these mediating variables changed our estimates of the heritability of entrepreneurship very little, suggesting that these variables are not the mediators through which genetic factors operate, and that future research will be necessary to identify those mechanisms.

Third, our study cannot be directly generalized to males because the twin population we studied is overwhelmingly female. This gender imbalance exists for historical reasons (many of the initial medical conditions that the study was designed to address, such as osteoporosis, are more common among women than among men, leading to a focus on collecting data from women). While we have no reason to believe that the results are gender specific, (our analyses using females only and males and females yielded identical estimates of heritability), we cannot conclude from our evidence that genetic factors influence the likelihood that men become entrepreneurs.

Fourth, like almost all twin studies in behavioral genetics, this study assumes that there is no assortative mating. If this assumption were shown to be untrue, then the estimates of the heritability shown in this study would be overstated. Assortative mating occurs when people with similar phenotypes tend to have children, leading the genetic characteristics of the parents to be positively correlated (Carey, 2003). While we have no empirical evidence to suggest that entrepreneurs are more likely to have children with other entrepreneurs than they are to have children with non-entrepreneurs, such evidence

would violate the no-assortative-mating assumption, and lead our estimates of the heritability of entrepreneurship to be too high.

Finally, this study assumes that MZ twins are no more likely to imitate the behaviors of their co-twins than DZ twins. If this assumption were untrue, then MZ twins could be more likely than DZ twins to be entrepreneurs if their co-twins were entrepreneurs for both genetic and non-genetic reasons. If the MZ twins were more likely to imitate the behavior of their co-twins for genetic reasons, our results would be unaffected, but, if the MZ twins were more likely to imitate the behavior of their co-twins for non-genetic reasons, then our estimates of the heritability of entrepreneurship would be overstated. To rule out the effect of non-genetic mimicry conclusively, we would need data on MZ and DZ twins reared together and apart, thereby ensuring that some portion of the twins were unaware of the entrepreneurial decisions of their co-twins. Unfortunately, we do not have these data.

However, we believe that imitation for non-genetic reasons is an unlikely explanation for the higher concordance for entrepreneurship between pairs of MZ twins than between pairs of DZ twins. Previous research on MZ and DZ twins indicates that MZ twins reared together are no more likely than MZ twins reared apart to make the same choices as their co-twins. For example, MZ twins reared together and MZ twins reared apart are equally likely to smoke if their co-twin smokes (Kendler et al, 2000), indicating that knowledge of the co-twin's smoking decision does little to affect the likelihood that an MZ twin will smoke, and showing that non-genetically driven imitation cannot be the source of the concordance. If there is little evidence that MZ twins imitate the easy-to-undertake activities of their co-twins, like smoking, then it is unlikely that MZ twins will be more likely than DZ twins to imitate the difficult-to-undertake entrepreneurial decisions of their co-twins for non-genetic reasons.

Furthermore, for the alternative explanation of the greater likelihood that MZ twins imitate the entrepreneurial choice of DZ twins for non-genetic reasons to explain the higher level of concordance for entrepreneurship between MZ twins, imitating the behavior of a co-twin would have to be something that MZ twins consider to be more desirable than DZ twins. However, previous research indicates the opposite (Pearlman and Ganon, 2000). MZ twins are more likely than DZ twins to choose behaviors to

differentiate themselves from their co-twin. If that were the case for entrepreneurship as well, our heritability estimates would actually be understated, not overstated.

Research Implications

Our findings suggest the value of broadening the theoretical frameworks to explain entrepreneurship to consider the effects of genetic factors. Extant research does not explain all of the variance in the tendency of people to become entrepreneurs, and examination of genetic factors offers the potential to account for some of this unexplained variance (Aldrich and Kim, forthcoming).

Second, our results offer the potential to reinvigorate a longstanding, but not universally agreed upon, aspect of entrepreneurship research: the role of individual differences in the tendency of people to become entrepreneurs. Although some entrepreneurship researchers consider individual differences to be an important explanatory factor in who becomes an entrepreneur (Shane and Venkataraman, 2000), many researchers believe that individual differences are unimportant (Gartner and Carter, 2003) or even a dead end (Aldrich and Wiedenmeyer, 1993). As a result, in recent years, the field of entrepreneurship has tended to focus less on the role of individuals and more on the role of environmental conditions to explain the tendency of people to become entrepreneurs (Thornton and Flynn, 2003). Our results indicate that individual differences matter considerably, and offer an avenue for invigorating research on the role of individual differences in entrepreneurship. For example, our results suggest that genetic factors may account for the differences in testosterone levels between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs, and thus might affect the tendency to become an entrepreneur through physiological mechanisms (White et al, 2006).

Third, our results inform an important research issue, which is concerned with the mechanism through which parental entrepreneurship influences children's propensity to become entrepreneurs (Aldrich and Kim, forthcoming). There is strong evidence across a wide range of studies that the likelihood of becoming an entrepreneur increases with parental entrepreneurship (Fairlie, 1999; De Wit & Van Winden, 1989; Taylor, 1996; Burke et al, 2000; Uusitalo, 2001). The prevailing explanations for this empirical pattern are (1) that the children of the entrepreneurs learn more about entrepreneurship than the

children of non-entrepreneurs from the information gathered either actively or passively during their childhood, (2) have greater exposure to entrepreneurial role models, or (3) receive more resources useful to entrepreneurship from their parents, such as information, social and financial capital (Aldrich and Kim, forthcoming; Krueger, 1993; Sorenson, 2006). While our study does not negate these mechanisms, it suggests that the intergenerational transmission of entrepreneurship is also influenced by genetic factors passed from parents to children.

Fourth, our findings contribute to a literature on the effect of genetic factors on career choice, vocational interests, and work-related behavior. Segal's (1999a, 1999b, 2005) case studies provide fascinating examples of identical twins choosing similar occupations. In addition, behavioral genetics studies have consistently pointed to a substantial genetic influence on vocational interests (McGue and Bouchard, 1998, Gottfredsson, 1999; Maloney, Bouchard and Segal, 1991; Betsworth et al., 1994), job satisfaction (Arvey et al, 1989) and work-related values (Keller et al, 1992). Our study complements this literature by showing that genetic factors affect an important aspect of work-related behavior: the choice to become an entrepreneur.

Finally, our findings contribute to an emerging literature that adopts a 'biosocial model' of behavior (White, Thornhill and Hampson, 2007), which brings together both biological and sociological explanations for entrepreneurial activity. In an insightful study, White et al. (2007) found that testosterone was positively associated with entrepreneurship *only* in the presence of a family business background. Our paper supports White et al.'s findings, but suggests that social and learning processes are not the only mechanism through which the family business background might influence children's tendency to become entrepreneurs; the transmission of genes passed from entrepreneurial parents to their children also affects that tendency. Our finding of a genetic effect, but no shared environmental influences on the tendency to engage in entrepreneurial activity means that the net effect of being raised in the same family does not, on average, increase the similarity of siblings in their tendency to engage in entrepreneurial activity, but that parents who own a family business are more likely to pass on the genes that increase the predisposition to entrepreneurship than parents who do not own a family business.

Managerial Implications

Our finding that the entire *environmental influence* on entrepreneurship (regardless of operationalization of the phenomenon) was accounted for by *non-shared* environmental factors has important implications for corporate venturing and the creation of spin-off companies. Under the assumption (supported by the literature) that a significant component of the non-shared environment comes from a person's work environment, this result suggests that companies can influence the likelihood that their employees will become entrepreneurs by the type of work environment that they provide. Thus, companies can influence the tendency of their employees to engage in two activities of strategic importance: the tendency of employees to engage in corporate venturing (the creation of new companies by established companies) and the level of spin-off activity (people quitting companies to pursue business opportunities rather than pursuing them on behalf of their employers).

Second, our finding that *attitudes toward entrepreneurship as a career* are not heritable has implications for entrepreneurship education. Attitudes toward entrepreneurship influence the likelihood that a person becomes an entrepreneur (Kolvereid, 1996; Luhtje and Franke, 2003; Souitaris et al., 2007). Because these attitudes are not influenced by genetic factors, but other factors that influence the tendency to become an entrepreneur are influenced by genetics, if all other things are equal, then changes in environmental factors that affect attitudes toward entrepreneurship should have a greater effect on the tendency of people to become entrepreneurs than changes in environmental factors that affect other things. Therefore, our results suggest that the use of entrepreneurship courses to change students' attitudes toward entrepreneurship as a career (Souitaris et al., 2007) is a good focus for entrepreneurship education.

Third, our results bring to the fore the ethical issue of using genetic tests for business purposes. Our results show that science may identify multiple gene systems that allow for more precise predictions about the relationship between genetic factors and the tendency of people to become entrepreneurs. The potential for genetic tests that identify people on the basis of their tendency to become entrepreneurs shows that the ethical problems, which occur when companies collect genetic information on employees, is not limited to current concerns about the potential misuse of data for medical insurance purposes, but

can be much broader. Therefore, corporate human resource managers and venture capitalists need to be aware of the new ethical issues that genetics brings to the human resource management process.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S. 1985. nAch, risk taking, locus of control and entrepreneurship. *Personality and Individual Differences* **6**(6) 781-782.
- Akaike, H. 1987. Factor Analysis and AIC. *Psychometrika* **52** 317-332.
- Aldrich, H., Kim, P. Forthcoming. A life course perspective on occupational inheritance: Self-employed parents and their children. In M. Ruef, M. Lounsbury (Eds) *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*. JAI Press: Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Aldrich, H., Wiedenmayer, G. 1993. From Traits to Rates: An Ecological Perspective on Organizational Foundings. In Jerome Katz and Robert Brockhaus (eds.), *Advances in Entrepreneurship, Firm Emergence, and Growth*, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Aldrich, H., Rosen, B., and Woodward, W. 1987. The impact of social networks on business foundings and profit: A longitudinal study. In N. Churchill, J. Hornaday, B. Kirchoff, O. Krasner, and K. Vesper (eds.), *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, Babson Park, MA: Babson College: 154-168.
- Amit, R., Muller, E., Cockburn, I. 1995. Opportunity costs and entrepreneurial activity. *Journal of Business Venturing* **10**(2) 95-106.
- Andrew, T., Hart, DJ., Sneider, H., de Lange, M., Spector, TD., MacGregor, AJ. 2001. Are twins and singletons comparable? A study of disease-related and lifestyle and lifestyle characteristics in adult women. *Twin Research* **4** 464-77.
- Arvey, R., Bouchard, T., Segal, N., and Abraham, L. 1989. Job satisfaction: Environmental and genetic components. *Journal of Applied Psychology* **74**(2) 187-192.
- Baron, R. A. 2004. The cognitive perspective: A valuable tool for answering entrepreneurship's basic "why" questions. *Journal of Business Venturing* **19**(2) 221-239.

- Baron, R., Markman, G. 2003. Beyond Social Capital: The Role of Entrepreneurs' Social Competence in their Financial Success. *Journal of Business Venturing* **18**(1) 41–60.
- Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K. 1991. The Big Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology* **44** 1-26.
- Bates, T. 1995. Self employment entry across industry groups. *Journal of Business Venturing* **12** 109-124.
- Behrman, J. R., Taubman, P. 1989. Is schooling 'mostly in the genes'? *Journal of Political Economy* **97** 1425-1446.
- Benjamin, J. Ebstein, R. P., Belmaker, R. H. 2003. Genes for human personality traits: endophenotypes of psychiatric disorders? In Benjamin, J. Ebstein, R. P., Belmaker, R. H. *Molecular genetics and the human personality*. Washington, DC: APA.
- Benjamin, J., Li, L., Patterson, C., Greenburg, B. D., Murphy, D. L., Hamer, D. H. 1996. Population and familial association between the D4 dopamine receptor gene and measures of novelty seeking. *Nature Genetics* **12** 81-84.
- Berridge, K. C., Robinson, T. E. 1998. What is the role of dopamine in reward: hedonic impact, reward learning, or incentive salience? *Brain Research Reviews* **28**(3) 309-369.
- Betsworth, D, Bouchard, T., Cooper, C., Grotevant, H., Hansen, J., Scarr, S., and Weinberg, R. 1994. Genetic and environmental influences on vocational interests assessed using adoptive and biological families and twins reared together and apart. *Journal of Vocational Behavior* **44** 263-278.
- Bitler, M. P., Moskowitz, T., Vissing-Jørgensen, A. 2005. Testing agency theory with entrepreneur effort and wealth. *Journal of Finance* **60**(2) 539–576.
- Bouchard, T. 1998. Genetic and environmental influences on intelligence and special mental abilities. *Human Biology* **70** (2) 257-259.
- Bouchard, T. J. Jr., Loehlin, J. C. 2001. Genes, evolution and Personality. *Behavior Genetics* **31** 243-273.
- Bouchard, T. J. Jr., Segal, N. L., Tellegen, A., McGue, M. Keyes, M., Krueger, R. 2004. Genetic influence on social attitudes: Another challenge to psychology from behavioural genetics. In

- DiLalla, L. F. *Behavior Genetics Principles: Perspectives in Development, Personality, and Psychopathology*. Washington, DC: APA.
- Bouchard, T. J. Propping, 1993. *Twins as a tool of behavioral genetics*. Chichester, UK: Wiley.
- Bouchard, T., Lykken, D., McGue, N., Segal, N., Tellegen, A. 1990. Sources of human psychological difference: The Minnesota study of twins reared apart. *Science* **12** (October) 223-228.
- Browne, M. W. 1982. Covariance structures. In Hawkins, D. M. (ed.) *Topics in Applied Multivariate Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 72-141.
- Browne, M. W. 1984. Asymptotically distribution-free methods for the analysis of covariance structures. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology* **37** 62-83.
- Bulik, C. M., Sullivan, P. F., Wade, T. D., Kendler, K. S. 2000. Twin studies of eating disorders. *International Journal of Eating Disorders* **27**(1) 1-20.
- Burke, A.E., FitzRoy, F. R., Nolan, M.A. 2000. When less is more: distinguishing between entrepreneurial choice and performance. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* **62** 567-587.
- Busenitz, L. 1999. Entrepreneurial risk and strategic decision making. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* **35**(3) 325-340.
- Carey, G. 2003. *Human genetics for the social sciences*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Cherny, S. S., DeFries, J. C., Fulker, D. W. 1992. Multiple regression of twin data: A model-fitting approach. *Behavior Genetics* **22** 489-497.
- Clouse, V. 1990. A controlled experiment relating entrepreneurial education to students' start-up decisions. *Journal of Small Business Management* **28** 45-53.
- Comings, D., Rosenthal, R. J. Lesieur, H. R., Rugle, L. J. Muhleman, D. Chiu, C., Dietz, G., Gade, R. 1996. A study of the dopamine receptor gene in pathological gambling. *Pharmacogenetics* **6**(3) 223-234.
- Cooper, A., Woo, C., Dunkelberg, W. 1988. Entrepreneurs' perceived chances for success, *Journal of Business Venturing* **3**(2) 97-108.

- Cropanzano, R., James, K. 1990. Some methodological considerations for the behavioral genetic analysis of work attitudes, *Journal of Applied Psychology* **75**(4) 433-429.
- De Wit G. and van Widen, F.A.A.M. 1989. An Empirical Analysis of Self employment in the Netherlands, *Small Business Economics* **1** 263-272.
- Delmar, F., and Shane, S. 2003. Does business planning facilitate the development of new ventures? *Strategic Management Journal*, **24**(12): 1165-1185.
- Delmar, F., Davidsson, P. 2000. Where do they come from? Prevalence and characteristics of nascent entrepreneurs. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* **12** 1-23.
- Ebstein, R. P., Novick, O., Umansky, R., Priel, B., Osher, Y., Blaine, D. 1996. Dopamine D₄ receptor (D₄DR) exon III polymorphism associated with the human personality trait novelty-seeking. *Nature Genetics* **12** 78-80.
- Evans, D., Leighton, L. 1989. Some empirical aspects of entrepreneurship. *American Economic Review* **79** 519-535.
- Fairlie, R. 1999. The absence of African-American owned businesses: An analysis of the dynamics of self-employment. *Journal of Labor Economics* **17**(1) 80-108.
- Falconer, D. 1989. *Introduction to Quantitative Genetics*, Harlow: Longman.
- Fiet, J. 2002. *The Systematic Search for Entrepreneurial Discoveries*. New York: Praeger.
- Gaglio, C. M., Katz, J. A. 2001. The psychological basis of opportunity identification: Entrepreneurial alertness. *Small Business Economics* **16** (2) 95-111.
- Gartner, W. 1988. Who is an entrepreneur? Is the wrong question. *American Journal of Small Business* **12**(4) 11-32.
- Gartner, W., Carter, N. 2003. Entrepreneurial behaviour and firm organizing proceses. In Z. Acs and D. Audretsch (Eds), *Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research*, Boston: Kluwer, 195-222.
- Gottfredson, L. S. 1999. The nature and nurture of vocational interests. In M. L.Savickas, A. R. Spokane (Eds.) *Vocational interests: Their meaning, measurement, and use in counseling*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black.

- Hakim A. J., Cherkas L. F., Grahame, R., Spector, T. D., MacGregor, A. J. 2004. The genetic epidemiology of joint hypermobility: a population study of female twins. *Arthritis & Rheumatism*. **50** (8) 2640-4.
- Hettema, J. M., Neale, M .C., Kendler, K. S. 1995. Physical similarity and the equal environment assumption in twin studies of psychiatric disorders. *Behavior Genetics* **25** 327-335.
- Hull, D., Bosley, J. Udell, G. 1980. Renewing the Hunt for the Heffalump: Identifying Potential Entrepreneurs by Personality Characteristics. *Journal of Small Business Management* **18** 11–18.
- Jang, K. L., Livesley, W. J., Vernon, P. A. 1996. Heritability of the big five personality dimensions and their facets: A twin study. *Journal of Personality* **64** 577–591.
- Joreskog, K. 1990. New developments in Lisrel: analysis of ordinal variables using polychoric correlations and weighted least squares. *Quality and Quantity* **24** 387–404.
- Keller, L., Bouchard, T., Arvey, R., Segal, N., and Dawes, R. 1992. Work values: genetic and environmental influences. *Journal of Applied Psychology* **77**(1) 79-88.
- Kendler, K. S., Eaves, L. J. 1986. Models for the joint effects of genotype and environment on liability to psychiatric illness. *American Journal of Psychiatry* **143** 279-289.
- Kendler, K. S., Neale, M. C., Kessler, R. C., Heath, A. C., Eaves, L. J. 1993. A test of the equal environment assumption in twin studies of psychiatric illness. *Behavior Genetics* **23** 21-27.
- Kendler, K. S., Thornton, L. M., Pedersen, N.L. 2000. Tobacco consumption in Swedish twins reared together and reared apart. *Archives of General Psychiatry* **57** 886-892.
- Kolvereid, L., 1996. Organisational employment versus self employment: reasons for career choice intentions. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* **20** (3) 23–31.
- Krueger, N. 1993. Growing up entrepreneurial” *Academy of Management Proceedings*, Atlanta.
- Lichtenstein, P., Pedersen, N. L., McClearn, G. E. 1992. Genetic and environmental predictors of socioeconomic status. *Behavior Genetics* **22** 731-732.

- Luthje, C., Franke, N., 2003. The 'making' of an entrepreneur: testing a model of entrepreneurial intent among engineering students at MIT. *R&D Management* **33** (2) 135–147.
- Lykken, D, Bouchard, T, McGue, M, and Tellegen, A. 1993. Heritability of interests: A twin study. *Journal of Applied Psychology* **78**(4) 649-661.
- MacGregor, A. 2000. Practical approaches to account for bias and confounding in twin data. In Spector, T., Sneider, H., MacGregor, A. (eds.), *Advances in Twin and Sib-pair Analysis*, London: Greenwich Medical Media, 35-52.
- Martin, N. G., Eaves, L. J. 1977. The genetic analysis of covariance structure. *Heredity* **38**(1) 79-95.
- Martin, N. G., Martin, P. G. 1975. The inheritance of scholastic abilities in a sample of twins: Ascertainment of the sample and diagnosis of zygosity. *Annals of Human Genetics* **39** 213–218.
- McClelland, D. 1961. *The Achieving Society*, Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- McGue, M., Bouchard, T. 1984. Adjustment of twin data for the effects of age and sex, *Behavioral Genetics* **14** 325-343.
- McGue, M., Bouchard, T. J. Jr. 1998. Genetic and environmental influences on human behavioral differences. *Annual Review of Neuroscience* **21** 1–24.
- McGue, M., Wette, R., and Rao, D. 1987. A Monte Carlo evaluation of three statistical methods used in path analysis, *Genetic Epidemiology* **429** 129-155.
- Mesch, G. S., Czamanski, D. 1997. Occupational closure and immigrant entrepreneurship: Russian Jews in Israel. *Journal of Socio-Economics* **26**(6) 597–610.
- Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Rutter, M. 2005. Strategy for investigating interactions between measured genes and measured environments. *Archives of General Psychiatry* **62** 473-481.
- Mohammed, I., Cherkas, L. F., Riley, S. A., Spector, T. D., Trudgill, N. J. 2003 Genetic influences in gastro-oesophageal reflux disease: A twin study. *Gut* **52** 1085-1089.
- Moloney, D. P., Bouchard, T. J., and Segal, N. L. 1991. A genetic and environmental analysis of the vocational interests of monozygotic and dizygotic twins reared apart. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, **39**(1): 76-109.

- Neale, M. C. 2004. *Mx Software*. Richmond, VA: Department of Psychiatry, Virginia Commonwealth University.
- Neale, M. C., Maes, H. H. M. 2002. *Methodology for genetic studies of twins and families*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Neale, M., Cardon, L. 1992. *Methodology for Genetic Studies of Twins and Families*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Parker, S. C. 2004. *The economics of self-employment and entrepreneurship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pearlman, E. M., Ganon, J. A. 2000. *Raising twins: What parents want to know, and what twins want to tell them*. New York: Harper Resource.
- Peeters, H., Gestel, S., Vlietinck, R., Derom, C., Derom, R. 1998. Validation of a telephone zygosity questionnaire in twins of known zygosity. *Behavior Genetics* **28** (3) 159-163.
- Plomin, R., Daniels, D. 1987. Why are children in the same family so different from one another. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* **10**(1) 1-16.
- Plomin, R., DeFries, J. C., Loehlin, J. C. 1977. Genotype-environment interaction and correlation in the analysis of human behavior. *Psychological Bulletin* **84** 309-322.
- Plomin, R., DeFries, J., McClearn, G. 1990. *Behavioral Genetics: A Primer* (2nd Edition). New York: Freeman.
- Plomin, R., Lichtenstein, P., Pedersen, N. L., McClearn, G. E., Nesselroade, J. R. 1990. Genetic influence on life events during the last half of the life span. *Psychology and Aging*. **5** 25-30.
- Plomin, R., Walker, S. O. 2003. Genetics and educational psychology. *British Journal of Educational Psychology* **73** 3-14.
- Reynolds, P., Carter, N., Gartner, W., and Greene, P. 2004. The prevalence of nascent entrepreneurs in the United States: Evidence from the panel study of entrepreneurial dynamics. *Small Business Economics*, **23**: 263-284


- Riemann, R., Angleitner, A., Strelau, J. 1997. Genetic and environmental influences on personality: A study of twins reared together using the self- and peer report NEO-FFI scales. *Journal of Personality* **65** 449– 475.
- Ritsila, J., Tervo, H. 2002. Effects of unemployment on new firm formation: Micro-level panel data evidence from Finland, *Small Business Economics* **19** 31-40.
- Rowe, D. C. 1994 *The Limits of Family Influence*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Rowe, D. C. 2003. Assessing Genotype X Environment Interactions and Correlations in a Postgenomic World. In Plomin, R., DeFries, J. C., Craig, I. W., McGuffin, P. *Behavioral Genetics in the Postgenomic Era*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Ruef, M., Aldrich, H., and Carter, N. 2003. The structure of founding teams: Homophily, strong ties, and isolation among U.S. entrepreneurs. *American Sociological Review* **68** 195-222
- Scarr, S. 1992. Developmental theories for 1990s: Development and individual differences. *Child Development* **63** 1-19.
- Scarr, S., Carter-Saltzman, L. 1979. Twin method: Defense of a critical assumption. *Behavior Genetics* **9** 527-542.
- Segal, N. 1999a. *Entwined Lives: Twins and what they tell us about human behavior*. New York: Dutton.
- Segal, N. 1999b. New twin studies show.... the career of your dreams may be the career of your genes. *Psychology Today*. Sept – Oct 54-70.
- Segal, N. 2005. *Indivisible by Two: Lives of Extraordinary Twins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Sham, P. 1998. *Statistics in Human Genetics*. London, UK: Arnold.
- Sham, P. C., Walters, E. E., Neale, M. C., Heath, A. C., MacLean, C. J., and Kendler, K. S. 1994. Logistic regression analysis of twin data: estimation of parameters of the multifactorial liability-threshold model. *Behavior Genetics* **24** 229-238.
- Shane, S. 2000. Prior knowledge and the discovery of entrepreneurial opportunities. *Organization Science* **11** 448-469.

- Shane, S. 2003. *A General Theory of Entrepreneurship: The Individual-Opportunity Nexus*, Aldershot, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Shane, S., Venkataraman, S. 2000. The promise of entrepreneurship as a field of research. *Academy of Management Review* **25** 217-226.
- Singer J.J., MacGregor A.J., Cherkas L.F., Spector T.D. Where did I leave my keys? 2005. A twin study of self-reported memory ratings using the multifactorial memory questionnaire. *Twin Research Human Genetics* **8**(2) 108-12.
- Sorenson, J. Forthcoming. Closure versus exposure: Mechanisms in the intergenerational transition of self-employment. In M. Ruef and M. Lounsbury (Eds). *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, Amsterdam: JAI Press.
- Souitaris, V., Zerbinati, S., Al-Laham, A. 2007. Do entrepreneurship programmes raise entrepreneurial intention of science and engineering students? The effect of learning, inspiration and resources. *Journal of Business Venturing* **22**(4) 566-591.
- Spector, T., Cicuttini, F., Baker, J., Loughlin, J., Hart D. 1996. Genetic influences on osteoarthritis in women: a twin study. *BMJ* **312** 940-4.
- Stewart, W., Roth, P. 2001. Risk taking propensity differences between entrepreneurs and managers: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology* **86**(1) 145-153.
- Tambs, K., Sundet, J. M., Magnus, P., Berg, K. 1989. Genetic and environmental contributions to the covariance between occupational status, educational attainment and IQ: a study of twins. *Behavior Genetics* **19** 209-222.
- Taubman, P. 1976. The Determinants of Earnings: Genetics, Family, and Other Environments; A Study of White Male Twins. *American Economic Review* **66** 858-70.
- Taylor, M. 1996. Earnings, Independence or Unemployment: Why Become Self-Employed? *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* **58**(2) 253-266.
- Thornton, P., and Flynn, K. 2003. Entrepreneurship, networks and geographies. In Z. Acs and D. Audretsch (Eds), *Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research*, Boston: Kluwer, 401-436.

- Turkheimer, E., D'Onofrio, B. M., Maes, H. H., Eaves, L. J. 2005. Analysis and interpretation of twin studies with measured environments. *Child Development* **76**(6) 1217-1233.
- Uusitalo, R. 2001. 'Homo entrepreneurs?' *Applied economics* **33** 1631-8.
- Van Praag, C., Cramer, J. 2001. The roots of entrepreneurship and labour demand: individual ability and low aversion. *Economica* **68**(269) 45-62.
- Volkow, N. D. 2004. Mediation of saliency in health and addiction. 157th Annual Meeting of the American Psychiatric Association.
- White, R., Thornhill, S., Hampson, E. 2006. Entrepreneurs and evolutionary biology: The relationship between testosterone and new venture creation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* **100** 21-34.
- White, R., Thornhill, S., Hampson, E. 2007. A biosocial model of entrepreneurship: the combined effects of nurture and nature. *Journal of Organizational Behavior* **28** 451-466.

Table 1 Questionnaire Items

Variable	Item
<i>Self-employment</i>	<i>Working as self-employed (yes=1)</i>
<i>Years self-employed</i>	<i>How long have you been self-employed?</i>
<i>Owner-operator</i>	<i>Have you been an owner- operator of a company?</i>
<i>Businesses owned and operated</i>	<i>How many companies have you been an owner-operator of?</i>
<i>Business founder</i>	<i>Have you started a new business?</i>
<i>Businesses founded</i>	<i>How many new businesses have you started?</i>
<i>Engaged in start-up effort</i>	<i>Have you taken any actions toward the creation of a new business?</i>
<i>Start-up efforts undertaken</i>	<i>For how many new business ideas have you taken any actions toward the creation of a new business?</i>
<i>Attitudes toward entrepreneurship</i>	<i>Please identify your attitudes toward entrepreneurship as a career (an entrepreneur is a person who starts a new business venture)</i>
<i>Race</i>	<i>Which of the following best describes your ethnic origin? Caucasian Asian, Oriental, Black, or other.</i>
<i>Immigrant status</i>	<i>Were you born in the British Isles? (yes=1)</i>
<i>Marital status</i>	<i>What is your marital status? (married=1)</i>
<i>Qualification</i>	<i>Twelve point scale ranging from 'no qualification' to 'university degree'.</i>
<i>Income</i>	<i>What is your total yearly income before taxes (7 scales ranging from 'less than £5000' to 'over £50000') – subsumed into 3 scales to conserve degrees of freedom in the analysis.</i>
<i>Gender</i>	<i>(1=female; 0=male)</i>
<i>Age</i>	<i>Age of the respondents</i>

Figure 1 Path Model For Self-Employment Status For Twin 1 And Twin 2**Table 2** Summary Statistics

	Monozygotic Twins	Dizygotic Twins	P value
Age (yrs)	43	44	0.112
Female	92%	94%	0.134
Currently Self-employed	10%	9%	0.565
Years Self-employed	0.67	0.69	0.656
Owner-operator	0.16	0.16	0.600
Companies owned and operated	0.25	0.25	0.990
Business Founder	0.22	0.23	0.673
Businesses Founded	0.36	0.35	0.601
Engaged in Start-up Effort	0.25	0.26	0.554
Start-up Efforts Undertaken	0.48	0.48	0.984
Attitudes Toward Entrepreneurship	2.52	2.51	0.926
Caucasian	97%	96%	0.394
Born in British Isles	96%	98%	0.100
Married	61%	63%	0.351
Qualification 5	5%	5%	0.403
Income <15K	13%	16%	0.164
Income 15-25K	23%	26%	0.124
Income >25K	64%	58%	0.025

Table 3 Correlations between the various measures of entrepreneurship

<i>Variable</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>1. Businesses founded</i>							
<i>2. Businesses owned and operated</i>	.64						
<i>3. Years self-employed</i>	.60	.51					
<i>4. Start-up efforts undertaken</i>	.69	.48	.45				
<i>5. Business founder</i>	.85	.51	.62	.61			
<i>6. Owner-operator</i>	.53	.85	.51	.41	.83		
<i>7. Self-employment</i>	.58	.48	.88	.43	.87	.81	
<i>8. Engaged in start-up effort</i>	.61	.41	.47	.85	.89	.72	.73

Table 4 Genetic modeling analysis to predict currently self-employed

Model	A (95% CI)	C (95% CI)	E (95% CI)	χ^2	df	p Value	AIC	RMS EA
ACE	0.48 (0.17 to 0.63)	0 (0 to 0.23)	0.52 (0.37 to 0.69)	4.53	3	0.21	-1.47	0.01
CE	–	0.34 (0.20 to 0.47)	0.66 (0.53 to 0.80)	11.74	4	0.02	3.74	0.05
AE	0.48 (0.31 to 0.63)	–	0.52 (0.37 to 0.69)	4.53	4	0.34	-3.47	0.01

A, additive genetic; C, common environment; E, unique environment

Table 5 Genetic modeling analysis to predict current self-employment for females only

Model	A (95% CI)	C (95% CI)	E (95% CI)	χ^2	df	p Value	AIC	RMSEA
ACE	0.48 (0.14 to 0.63)	0 (0 to 0.27)	0.52 (0.37 to 0.69)	5.48	3	0.14	-0.52	0.02
CE	–	0.35 (0.20 to 0.49)	0.65 (0.51 to 0.80)	11.79	4	0.02	3.79	0.05
AE	0.48 (0.31 to 0.63)	–	0.52 (0.37 to 0.69)	5.48	4	0.24	-2.52	0.01

A, additive genetic; C, common environment; E, unique environment

Table 6 Genetic modeling analysis for self-employment, adjusting for income, qualification level, marital status, age, born in the British Isles and Caucasian

Model	A (95% CI)	C (95% CI)	Difference in χ^2	Difference in df
ACE	0.67 (-0.03 to 1.37)	-0.23 (-0.82 to 0.36)	–	–
CE	–	0.29 (0.12 to 0.46)	7.36	1
AE	0.41 (0.20 to 0.62)	–	1.21	1

A, additive genetic; C, common environment; E, unique environment

Table 7 Summary of the results of the genetic modeling using different measures of entrepreneurship

Dependent Variable	A (95% CI)	C (95% CI)	E (95% CI)
Years self-employed	0.39 (0.24 to 0.44)	-	0.61 (0.56 to 0.66)
Owner operator	0.37 (0.25 to 0.49)	-	0.63 (0.51 to 0.75)
Number of companies owned and operated	0.37 (0.32 to 0.42)	-	0.63 (0.58 to 0.68)
Having started a business	0.41 (0.31 to 0.51)	-	0.59 (0.49 to 0.69)
Number of businesses started	0.42 (0.37 to 0.47)	-	0.58 (0.53 to 0.63)
Engaged in start-up effort	0.41 (0.31 to 0.50)	-	0.59 (0.50 to 0.69)
Number of start-up efforts	0.42 (0.37 to 0.47)	-	0.58 (0.53 to 0.63)
Attitudes toward entrepreneurship as a career	-	0.18 (0.13 to 0.23)	0.82 (0.77 to 0.87)

A, additive genetic; C, common environment; E, unique environment. The table shows the results for the best fitting model for each variable.