

**Paper no. 2013/30**

**Local Clusters of Entrepreneurs  
-neighborhood peer effects in entrepreneurship?**

Martin Andersson ([martin.andersson@circle.lu.se](mailto:martin.andersson@circle.lu.se))  
CIRCLE, Lund University, Sweden and  
Blekinge Institute of Technology

Johan P Larsson ([johan.p.larsson@jibs.hj.se](mailto:johan.p.larsson@jibs.hj.se))  
Centre for Entrepreneurship and Spatial Economics (CEnSE), Department  
of Economics, Finance and Statistics, Jönköping International Business  
School (JIBS), Jönköping

This is a pre-print version of a paper that has been submitted for  
publication to a journal.

This version: November 2013

**WP 2013/30**

**Local Clusters of Entrepreneurs -neighborhood peer effects in entrepreneurship?**

Martin Andersson and Johan P. Larsson

**ABSTRACT**

ABSTRACT

Entrepreneurial activity is significantly predicted by the presence of other entrepreneurs in the residential neighborhood. One plausible source of such spatial clustering is local peer effects, where individuals' decisions to become entrepreneurs are influenced by entrepreneurial neighbors. Using geo-coded matched employer-employee data for Sweden, we find that sharing residential neighborhood with established entrepreneurs has a statistically significant and robust influence on the probability than an individual leaves employment for entrepreneurship. An otherwise average neighborhood with a 5 percentage point higher entrepreneurial intensity all else equal produces between 7 and 8 more entrepreneurs per square kilometer, each year. Local peer effects appear as important in explaining local clusters of entrepreneurs, and imply a local feedback-effect in which the presence of established entrepreneurs in a neighborhood breeds new local entrepreneurs.

**JEL Code:** R12, R23, L26, J24

**Keywords:** entrepreneurship, clusters, peer effects, local social interactions, role models, neighborhood, social network externalities, path dependence

Disclaimer: All the opinions expressed in this paper are the responsibility of the individual author or authors and do not necessarily represent the views of other CIRCLE researchers.

# LOCAL CLUSTERS OF ENTREPRENEURS

- neighborhood peer effects in entrepreneurship?

Martin Andersson<sup>∅</sup> and Johan P Larsson<sup>⊗</sup>

## ABSTRACT

Entrepreneurial activity is significantly predicted by the presence of other entrepreneurs in the residential neighborhood. One plausible source of such spatial clustering is local peer effects, where individuals' decisions to become entrepreneurs are influenced by entrepreneurial neighbors. Using geo-coded matched employer-employee data for Sweden, we find that sharing residential neighborhood with established entrepreneurs has a statistically significant and robust influence on the probability than an individual leaves employment for entrepreneurship. An otherwise average neighborhood with a 5 percentage point higher entrepreneurial intensity all else equal produces between 7 and 8 more entrepreneurs per square kilometer, each year. Local peer effects appear as important in explaining local clusters of entrepreneurs, and imply a local feedback-effect in which the presence of established entrepreneurs in a neighborhood breeds new local entrepreneurs.

**JEL:** R12, R23, L26, J24

**Keywords:** entrepreneurship, clusters, peer effects, local social interactions, role models, neighborhood, social network externalities, path dependence

---

<sup>∅</sup>Centre for Innovation, Research and Competence in the Learning Economy (CIRCLE), Lund University and the School of Management, Blekinge Institute of Technology (BTH); e-mail: [martin.andersson@circle.lu.se](mailto:martin.andersson@circle.lu.se)

<sup>⊗</sup>Centre for Entrepreneurship and Spatial Economics (CEnSE), Department of Economics, Finance and Statistics, Jönköping International Business School (JIBS), Jönköping; e-mail: [johan.p.larsson@jibs.hj.se](mailto:johan.p.larsson@jibs.hj.se)

**Acknowledgements:** An earlier draft of this paper was presented at the workshop on “Institutions and the Allocation of Entrepreneurship” at Utrecht University, April 18-20, 2013 as well as the special session on “The effect of regional social capital and entrepreneurship culture on new business formation” at the ERSA congress in Palermo, Sicily in August 2013. We are grateful for constructive comments from in particular Erik Stam, Mirjam van Praag, Magnus Henrekson, Michael Wyrwich and Michael Fritsch on an earlier version of this paper. This work has benefitted from financial support from FORMAS (Dnr 2011-80), as well as the Swedish Research Council (Linnaeus Grant No. 349200680) and the Swedish Governmental Agency for Innovation Systems, VINNOVA, (Grant agreement 2010-07370).

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Spatial variations in entrepreneurship are large and highly persistent over time. Fritsch and Wyrwich (2013) show for example that differences in self-employment and new firm formation across regions in Germany are substantial and have endured over periods as long as eighty years. In particular, they find that the self-employment rate in 1925 in German regions is a highly robust determinant of their entrepreneurial activity in 2005.<sup>1</sup>

The persistence of spatial entrepreneurship clusters is often taken as evidence of historically embedded regional ‘entrepreneurship cultures’.<sup>2</sup> The main intuition for this inference is simple: culture changes slowly, and so should phenomena dependent on it (cf. Williamson 2000). But while the role of local entrepreneurship cultures is generally acknowledged, less is known about what makes such a culture and how it forms and persists over time. This paper aims to contribute to the understanding of these issues with a micro-econometric analysis of local social interactions in entrepreneurship.

Local social interactions in the form of peer effects constitute a mechanism by which a local culture favoring entrepreneurial behavior may develop and persist. The entrepreneurship literature often claims that entrepreneurs are role models for others, and that observations of and social interactions with entrepreneurial peers in a local milieu induce entrepreneurial behavior (Nanda and Sorensen 2010, Gianetti and Simonov 2004, 2009). There are two main channels for such effects: information, and norms. The first channel implies that an individual’s knowledge of entrepreneurship depends on the entrepreneurial behavior of local peers. For example, Minniti (2005) maintains that social interactions with established entrepreneurs may reduce ambiguities and uncertainties about the practice of entrepreneurship and the start-up process. The second channel implies that local entrepreneurial peers may influence individuals’ preferences for becoming an entrepreneur, for example by influencing perceptions and attitudes towards entrepreneurship (Falck et al 2012, Fornhal 2003). Persistent local clusters of entrepreneurship may thus be explained by the emergence of a local culture in which entrepreneurial behavior reinforces itself through local social interactions. As Minniti

---

<sup>1</sup>While most analyses do not cover such a long period of time, the general phenomenon of persistent variations in entrepreneurship across regions and a strong influence of historical rates of start-ups on current ones has been documented for several different countries and time periods (see e.g. Andersson and Koster 2011, Fotopoulos 2013 and the special issue in *Small Business Economics* (2008, issue 1) on the relationship between new firm formation and employment generation.

<sup>2</sup>As a case in point, Fritsch and Wyrwich (2013, p.14) conclude their findings as follows: “This empirical investigation has revealed pronounced persistence of self-employment and start-up rates in German regions over long periods of time, which is a strong indication for the presence of a regional entrepreneurship culture that has long-lasting effects.”

(2005, p.3) puts it: "... entrepreneurship creates a 'culture' of itself that influences individual behavior in its favor".<sup>3</sup>

Available empirical evidence of the economic significance of local peer effects in individuals' start-up decisions as well as their role in explaining spatial clusters of entrepreneurship still remains scant (cf. Falck et al 2012).<sup>4</sup> Analyses of peer effects are also bedeviled by identification problems, in particular Manski's (1993, 2000) 'reflection problem'. Inferring local peer effects from geographic clustering of outcomes hinges crucially on the issue of separating the effects of the behavior of peers on individual behavior from the effects of spatial sorting. Correlations between individual decisions to become entrepreneurs and the aggregate level of entrepreneurship in a region may for example be driven by spatial selection, where underlying local attributes attract individuals with certain entrepreneurial abilities. Spatial clusters of entrepreneurship may thus reflect that entrepreneurs share preferences for a particular neighborhood (or region), rather than an effect of peer behavior.

We exploit a detailed matched employer-employee database for Sweden, and employ a micro-econometric framework in which individuals' decision to transcend from employment to entrepreneurship is modeled directly as a function of the entrepreneurial behavior of their peers in their residential neighborhood. We tackle the identification problems involved in analyses of local peer effects in two main ways. First, we focus on the transition from employment to entrepreneurship and exploit the richness of our dataset to control for a large set of confounding factors at the level of individuals, prior employer and at the level of the neighborhood and region in which the individuals operate.<sup>5</sup> This addresses issues of selection on individual traits and underlying local characteristics. Second, we employ a novel and detailed empirical approximation of within-city neighborhoods, i.e. the area defining the local peer group.

---

<sup>3</sup>The general literature on social interactions indeed emphasizes that they generate feedback effects, which yield a social multiplier and multiple equilibria, such as geographic clusters of similar aggregate outcomes (Glaeser and Scheinkman 2003, Scheinkman 2008).

<sup>4</sup>There are still many studies based on questionnaires and survey data where entrepreneurs are asked about the importance of role models (see e.g. Bosma et al. 2012). While these studies confirm that entrepreneurs often state that personal networks and peer influence is important, they are rather uninformative as regards the magnitude of the peer effects in quantitative terms (relative to other explanations) and few explicitly link peer effects in entrepreneurship to geographic outcomes, in particular clusters of entrepreneurs.

<sup>5</sup>For example, we account for size of individuals' employer, their type of job, years of schooling and type of education.

## 1.1 Identification of local peer effects in entrepreneurship using within-city neighborhood data

The data are geo-coded at a fine spatial resolution, which allows us to define residential neighborhoods as within-city squares of one square kilometer (1 km<sup>2</sup>).<sup>6</sup> There are two main advantages of this in our empirical context. The first is that it alleviates identification of local peer effects. The within-city neighborhood data implies that we have within-city variance in entrepreneurship outcomes. We are thus able to control for city-level factors and identify the influence of the behaviors of neighborhood peers by exploiting variance across neighborhoods within cities. This improves identification because intra-city variance in entrepreneurship cannot be explained by city-wide fundamentals, since those are shared by all neighborhoods in the city. The idea of exploiting within-area variance to identify social interactions is not new (Bertrand et al 2000, Giannetti and Simonov 2009), and builds on the premise that the different neighborhoods of a city or region should be homogeneous with regard to important fundamentals. The main advantage of the small-scale neighborhoods in our analysis is that they are homogeneous with regard to any determinant operating at the city (or municipality) level.

Many traditional demand- and supply-side factors explaining entrepreneurship, such as market-size, population growth and availability of skilled workers, are indeed likely to operate at the city-level.<sup>7</sup> For example, it is difficult to conceive of an entrepreneur starting a business in a city based on the availability of skilled workers, input suppliers or market-size in his residential neighborhood of one square kilometer.<sup>8</sup> For such factors, the wider city (or even the larger labor market region) is more likely to be the relevant scale. After all, cities constitute integrated economic areas, within which customers and workers are highly mobile. Variations in start-up propensities across neighborhoods in cities are thus not likely to depend on differences in such standard supply- and demand-side determinants since they are expected to mainly operate at a scale larger than the immediate neighborhood.

The second advantage of our approximation of neighborhoods is that it comes much closer to the conceptual notion of a neighborhood as an arena for social interactions and peer effects. The spatial scale of our definition of neighborhoods (1 km<sup>2</sup>) corresponds to established findings with regard to the

---

<sup>6</sup>This is a substantially finer spatial resolution than in any other studies of local peer effects in entrepreneurship that we know of.

<sup>7</sup>Swedish municipalities have a local government whose regulations may have a major influence on start-up decisions. As an example, according to the yearly business climate index by the Confederation of Swedish Enterprise, the variation in attitudes of local authorities and the bureaucracy associated with establishment of new plants across municipalities is quite substantial (cf. Westlund et al 2014).

<sup>8</sup>An exemption to this is of course sectors for which the main market is the immediate local neighborhood, such as local cafés and hairdressers. This is an issue we deal with in our robustness analyses.

geography and distance-decay of inter-personal contacts and local communities. For example, urban sociologist Barry Wellman has in a series of studies shown that contacts tend to be localized. One of his findings is that 42% of frequent contacts occur between individuals who live less than 1 mile apart (Wellman 1996).<sup>9</sup> Glaeser and Sacerdote (2000) use data from the General Social Survey (GSS) in the US and report that a similar pattern. They find a correlation between how often one sees a friend and how far it is to that friend of -67%, and a corresponding association between distance to a relative and the frequency of visiting that relative of -73%. Social interactions and peer effects are thus likely to exhibit sharp distance decay, rendering the proximate residential neighborhood a relevant arena for such effects (Glaeser 2000, Durlauf 2004).<sup>10</sup> This provides further support for our strategy of approximating the local arena for social interactions with an area much smaller than a region or municipality.

In terms of the empirical approach and overall design, our paper is akin to recent analyses by Giannetti and Simonov (2004, 2009). They also focus on peer effects in entrepreneurship and employ sample household data for Sweden covering about 4% of the country's population. To proxy neighborhoods they use municipalities, which is a crude proxy given that the median areal size of Swedish municipalities is about 900 square kilometers.<sup>11</sup> The use of municipalities also entail the identification problems described above, which the authors address using instrumental variables and municipality-level controls. They find evidence that peer-effects generate non-pecuniary benefits that stimulate individuals to transcend to entrepreneurship.

The current paper differs in several respects. Most importantly, our neighborhood proxy and definition of the local peer group is completely different. We also employ full population, matched employer-employee data allowing us to include controls for a larger set of confounding factors. We also follow the identification strategy of Lindbeck et al (2007) in isolating sub-groups, such as age cohorts,

---

<sup>9</sup>An objection may be raised in view of the cited result of Wellman (1996) being based on data pre-dating the internet and web-based social media. If such media substitutes contacts face-to-face it may mean that in modern times, frequent contacts are less localized. Available evidence yet points to that web-based interactions do not substitutes face-to-face contacts, and that frequent internet contacts also are localized (see e.g. Gaspar and Glaeser 1998, Wellman et al 2001, Boase et al 2006).

<sup>10</sup>In view of survey-based analysis of entrepreneurs in three Dutch cities, Bosma et al (2012) conclude: "... entrepreneurial role models tend to be next-door examples rather than more remote icons". Given that contacts and inter-personal ties tend to have a local component, one may expect that next-door examples are often found in close proximity. Also, Davidsson and Honig (2003) study determinants of being a so-called nascent entrepreneur using survey data and find that having close friends or neighbors in business is a strong and significant determinant, doubling the odds of someone being a nascent entrepreneur.

<sup>11</sup>The areal size of Swedish municipalities ranges from about 8.5 to over 19,000 km<sup>2</sup>, which is clearly larger than neighborhood conceptualized as an arena for social interactions and peer effects. This definition of neighborhoods is not only conceptually problematic. It also aggravates identification because large administrative areas are often far from homogeneous, which complicates identifying social interactions as a cause of inter-municipal variation in start-up decisions.

immigrants and movers, providing tests of robustness of the results with regard to the underlying identifying assumption.

## 1.2 Summary of main results

Our main results support the hypothesis of local peer effects in entrepreneurship. We first document a, to our knowledge, previously unremarked clustering of entrepreneurs at the level of neighborhoods. We show that the intensity of entrepreneurs varies substantially across neighborhoods within one and the same city. In the city of Stockholm, for instance, there is a small core of neighborhoods where the fraction of residents that are entrepreneurs is in excess of 25%, or about four times the fraction of entrepreneurs in the city as a whole. Within-city neighborhood clusters of entrepreneurs are a generic phenomenon across cities, and reflect an empirical regularity consistent with local peer effects.

We then show that the fraction of established entrepreneurs in a neighborhood has a positive and statistically significant effect on the probability that an individual leaves employment for entrepreneurship. The estimated effect is remarkably robust. Even after controlling for a number of individual, employer, neighborhood and region characteristics that could influence the probability that an individual transcend to entrepreneurship, the estimated influence of the intensity of entrepreneurs in the neighborhood is statistically and economically significant. Furthermore, this effect is robust across age cohorts, remains when we consider immigrants and movers, and is also robust to our definition of entrepreneurship. These results are consistent with neighborhood peer effects being important in stimulating individuals' to become entrepreneurs. Our estimates imply a feedback-effect where the local presence of established entrepreneurs in a neighborhood influences the emergence of new local entrepreneurs. We interpret our findings as providing robust empirical support for that persistent local clusters of entrepreneurship may indeed be explained by that a local culture has developed in which entrepreneurial behavior reinforces itself through local social interactions.

## 1.3 Outline

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides a brief background. Section 3 presents the data and documents local clusters of entrepreneurs at the neighborhood level. It illustrates the skewness of the fraction of entrepreneurs across neighborhoods within regions using the two city-regions as cases in point. Section 4 presents the identification strategy, defines variables and presents main results. In Section 5 we undertake various robustness tests of the results of the baseline model specification and Section 6 concludes.



## 2. LOCAL PEER EFFECTS, CULTURE AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The notion of a local entrepreneurship culture figures prominently in the literature on geographic clusters of entrepreneurship (Beugelsdijk 2007, Davidsson and Wiklund 1997, Andersson and Koster 2009, Fritsch and Wyrwhich 2013, Westlund et al. 2014). It is for example a central argument in Saxenian's (1994) highly influential analysis of the roots of the divergent development paths of the Silicon Valley region in California and the Route 128 corridor outside Boston. One of her main conjectures is indeed that Silicon Valley's success vis-à-vis Route 128 is to be found in the stronger entrepreneurial culture (or climate) prevailing in the former region.<sup>12</sup>

In general terms, a local entrepreneurship culture refers to the social acceptance and encouragement of entrepreneurs and their activities that permeate a locality (cf. Etzioni 1987, Fritsch and Wyrwhich 2013). From this perspective one may think of a local entrepreneurship culture as a form of local informal institution.<sup>13</sup> This type of institutions is typically described as being historically rooted, and evolves and changes in slow processes over time. Williamson (2000) considers informal institutions to be a top-level institution "where the norms, customs, mores, traditions, etc., are located" (ibid. p.596), and whose time scale of change is slow. This provides the main intuition why persistence in regional start-up rates is often interpreted as a reflection of regional entrepreneurship cultures: if regional entrepreneurship cultures are historically rooted and change slowly, so should the regions' frequency of entrepreneurial activity, such as start-up rates (Andersson 2012).

The literature yet remains rather vague about the mechanisms by which a local entrepreneurship culture emerges and is sustained over time. Any discussion of these issues should naturally depart from micro-founded arguments of how individuals' attitudes towards entrepreneurship and their inclination to become entrepreneurs are developed in interaction with the local environment. The literature on peer effects through social interactions offers such a framework.

### *Peer effects and persistent spatial heterogeneity in outcomes*

Peer effects refer to social (non-market) interaction mechanisms, and occur whenever individuals' behavior depends on the behavior of others in their local environment (Glaeser and Scheinkman 2003).

---

<sup>12</sup>An often cited quote from an entrepreneur in Silicon Valley which previously operated in the Boston region serves as an illustrative case in point (Saxenian 1994, p 63): "In Boston, if I said I was starting a company, people would look at me and say: 'Are you sure you want to take the risk? You are so well established. Why would you give up a good job as vice president at a big company?' In California, I became a folk hero when I decided to start a company. It wasn't just my colleagues. My insurance man, my water deliverer – everyone was excited. It's a different culture out here."

<sup>13</sup>There are many different concepts in the literature that generally refer to an entrepreneurship culture (Beugelsdijk 2007). For example, Audretsch and Keilbach (2005) introduce the concept of entrepreneurship capital as a subset of a region's social capital. Westlund and Bolton (2003) discuss local social capital as a fundamental driver of local entrepreneurship.

Theoretically they are often described as pure externalities in that they pertain to more or less effortless transmission of ideas, information or norms between individuals (Glaeser 2000).

Social interactions are interesting in the context of geographic clustering as they have been shown to constitute an important explanation of persistent spatial clusters of various economic and socio-economic outcomes across areas with apparently similar outsets, such as neighborhoods within a city.<sup>14</sup> Scheinkman (2008) indeed argues that social interactions are able to explain "... a pervasive problem in the social sciences, namely the observation of large differences in outcomes in the absence of commensurate differences in fundamentals" (ibid, p.2). The rationale is that local peer effects imply a local feedback process, where peers influence individuals, whom in turn influence others. Put differently, peer effects exemplify how the "environment" influences individual behavior, which in turn feeds back on the same "environment". This feedback process is essentially a network effect, which generate persistence in the form of sensitivity to initial conditions and shocks, and consequent (spatial) multiple equilibria. The feedback process also has policy ramifications as it implies a *social multiplier* (Glaeser et al 2003). An exogenous shock induces not only a direct effect on individual behavior, but also an indirect effect mediated by people adopting the behavior of their peers. As a result, social interactions may amplify the direct effects of a policy, both in terms of scope and durability.

As stated in the introduction, there are two general channels of peer effects: (i) information and (ii) norms (Bertrand et al 2000). These broadly bear on culture and are non-mutually exclusive. The first emphasizes that social interactions with others may influence a person's knowledge and information. The general idea is that interactions with peers who are knowledgeable may reduce costs and/or increase the odds that a person acquires relevant information or knowledge. For example, living in a residential neighborhood where a large fraction of the local peers are employed may increase the odds of acquiring information about job opportunities or the understanding and knowledge of the process of applying for jobs (Granovetter 1995). The second channel holds that preferences may depend on the behavior of peers. This effect may be either direct in the sense that a person's actual attitudes and values are influenced by peers, or indirect in the sense that a person does not want to deviate from the main social norm prevailing in a locality (Akerlof 1997). As an example, being resident of a neighborhood where many others are unemployed may imply exposure to 'negative' peer pressures instead of 'positive' role models, and could increase an individual's acceptance and attitudes towards unemployment.

---

<sup>14</sup>Examples include welfare participation (Bertrand et al 2000), physical fitness (Carell et al 2011), smoking (Fletcher 2010), crime (Glaeser et al 1996), unemployment (Topa 2001) and sick-leave (Lindbeck et al 2007). In all these studies, a central argument is that observed outcomes are driven by individuals replicating the behavior of others in their environment.

### *Peer effects in entrepreneurship and clusters of entrepreneurs*

These characteristics of peer effects and their main channels provide arguments for that a local cluster of entrepreneurs may form and reinforce itself as a consequence of local peer effects in entrepreneurship. In particular, they exemplify how an initial stock of entrepreneurs in a region may reinforce local entrepreneurship by stimulating the emergence of a favorable local entrepreneurship culture characterized by density of information for prospective local entrepreneurs and social norms which encourages and legitimize entrepreneurial activity.

Minniti (2005) presents a stochastic type of agent-based model of entrepreneurship clusters with exactly these features. She shows that a relatively simple assumption of peer effects (which she calls non-pecuniary network externalities), whereby agents follow social cues and are influenced by local entrepreneurial peers in their decision to start a firm, suffices to generate persistent differences in entrepreneurship across communities that have similar initial characteristics. This is a prediction shared with the more general literature on social interactions (cf. Scheinkman 2008).

Although the literature on entrepreneurship has for a long time recognized the role of the social environment and peer effects in explaining the decision to become an entrepreneur (Licht and Siegel 2006), empirical evidence on local peer effects as a phenomenon is rather limited. Bosma et al (2012) maintain that existing evidence of peer and role model effects comes from three main sets of findings: (i) the decision to become an entrepreneur is positively associated with having entrepreneurs in one's social network (Kim and Aldrich 2005, Klyver et al 2007), (ii) there is a positive influence of having parents who are (or have been) entrepreneurs (Chlosta et al 2012, Dunn and Holtz-Eakin 2000), and (iii) entrepreneurial behaviors of school and workplace peers influence entrepreneurial behavior (Falck et al 2012, Nanda and Sorensen 2010). While affirmative of the role of social networks and peer effects on entrepreneurship, few of the existing studies focuses explicitly on the role of neighborhood peer effects as a source of spatial clusters of entrepreneurs.

The analyses in this paper fill a gap in the literature by focusing on peer effects in entrepreneurship operating at the level of residential neighborhoods within cities. In particular, we add to the still limited set of analyses that study clusters of entrepreneurs in neighborhoods and test for peer effects using a micro-econometric framework in which individuals' decision to transcend to entrepreneurship is modeled directly as a function of the behavior of the local peers. We also employ a precise definition of the local peer group which a) is consistent with the large and established literature emphasizing the residential neighborhood as an important arena for social interactions (Glaeser 2000, Durlauf 2004) and b) facilitates identification of local peer effects.

### 3. CLUSTERS OF ENTREPRENEURS WITHIN CITIES

#### 3.1 Data and definition of neighborhoods

The basic data source is a matched employer-employee audited register dataset for Sweden, maintained by Statistics Sweden (SCB). These data track all Swedish individuals aged 25-64 in 2007, and inform on an extensive set of basic observables, such as age, sex, wage, immigration status, and education. The dataset also allows us to identify entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurs are defined as individuals who are self-employed whether through a sole proprietorship or an incorporated business. Their firms may or may not have any employees. We also know who had this status in 2008, allowing us to assess the startup decision between these two years.

Detailed geo-coding of individuals' places of residence allows us to pinpoint each person to a single square in a larger square grid, covering all city-areas, where each square is exactly one square kilometer. City-areas are defined by SCB as places with at least 200 inhabitants and a maximum distance of 200 meters between houses.<sup>15</sup> We use these squares to empirically approximate neighborhoods. The set-up makes it possible to aggregate any individual or work place characteristic to the level of spatial squares, including the number of entrepreneurs. The total number of residential squares with at least 50 inhabitants in 2007 amounts to 8,588 and these comprise about 3.8 million people in the age interval 25-64.

#### 3.2 Neighborhood clusters of entrepreneurs

How are entrepreneurs distributed across neighborhoods in a city? A key feature of models of local peer effects is that they predict persistent heterogeneity in outcomes even in the absence of corresponding differences in fundamentals (Scheinkman 2008). Under the assumption that at least part of the relevant fundamentals for entrepreneurs operate at the city-level and are thus shared by all neighborhoods in the city, then clusters of entrepreneurs at the neighborhood level within a given city is an outcome consistent with local peer effects in entrepreneurship (cf Minniti 2005). In this section we show that there are significant within-city clusters of entrepreneurs.


Figure 1 illustrates the variation in the fraction of entrepreneurs across all neighborhoods with at least 50 inhabitants<sup>2</sup> (squares of 1km), in city-areas. All neighborhoods ( $N=8,588$ ) are ranked in descending order with respect to their fraction of entrepreneurs (vertical axis), and the solid blue line represents the average for Sweden. In Sweden as a whole, about 7% of the labor force is full-time entrepreneurs in the sense that their employment status is either a sole proprietorship or owner of an incorporated business. The variance across neighborhoods is yet substantial. There is a substantial degree of

---

<sup>15</sup> Neighborhoods with fewer than 50 residents are excluded from the analysis.

heterogeneity across neighborhoods and the red line shows a typical S-shape. The observed differences are not scale-driven: there is no clear tendency for highly entrepreneurial neighborhoods to be more sparsely (or densely) populated than less entrepreneurial neighborhoods.

The differences in the fraction of entrepreneurs across neighborhoods in Sweden may be expected in view of the large literature on the geography of entrepreneurship, documenting sharp differences in start-up rates across cities (Armington and Acs 2002, Glaeser 2007). Cities differ in terms of supply- and demand-side determinants of entrepreneurship, and variations in the fraction of entrepreneurs across cities may be appreciated as an outcome of this, i.e. neighborhoods in cities with better conditions for entrepreneurship have high fractions of entrepreneurs.




**Figure 1.** The fraction of entrepreneurs across neighborhoods in Sweden.

*Note:* the vertical axis displays the fraction of entrepreneurs (in percent) on the neighborhood (1 km<sup>2</sup> square) level. The neighborhoods are then plotted in descending order from left to right.

The variation in the fraction of entrepreneurs across neighborhoods *within* one and the same city is still substantial. Figure 2 displays within-city clustering of entrepreneurs in the Stockholm metropolitan area, as well as in the Jönköping urban region. Stockholm is the main metropolitan area in Sweden (population about 2.13 million), while Jönköping is a mid-sized city region (population about 130,000). These are two rather different types of cities and they serve as an illustration of the case in point. The dots on each map show the level of the fraction of entrepreneurs of each neighborhood in the respective cities.

The maps illustrate that the Stockholm and Jönköping city-regions show a similar pattern: the intensity of entrepreneurs varies substantially across neighborhoods within the cities. While Stockholm is displaying clusters to the north-east, Jönköping exhibits occasional hotspots in the city center near the

southern shores of lake Vättern and also a cluster of highly entrepreneurial neighborhoods in the city of Gränna in the north-east. In both cities, the variation in the fraction of entrepreneurs across neighborhoods is substantial, and in an order of magnitude similar to that prevailing across neighborhoods in Sweden as a whole.




**Figure 2.** Distribution of entrepreneurs within the Stockholm metropolitan area (left), and the Jönköping urban region (right).

*Note:* The neighborhood squares are shaded according to the number of entrepreneurs, relative to the total number of residents per neighborhood, as represented by 1 km<sup>2</sup> squares. The color indicates the quintile to which the neighborhood belongs in terms of entrepreneurial intensity. Neighborhoods with fewer than 50 residents are excluded.

This picture is reinforced by reproducing Figure 1 for the two cities which is done in Figure 3. The left panel shows the variation in the fraction of entrepreneurs across neighborhoods within the city of Stockholm, and the right panel shows a corresponding graph for Jönköping. The upper tail values differ slightly between the two cities, but the overall picture is palpably similar; both with respect to each other and with respect to the nation as a whole (Figure 1).

The curves start out steep around 30 percent, then levels off, and becomes steeper again around the 3-4 percent mark. Within each city, there are significant local clusters of entrepreneurs in the form of

neighborhoods where the fraction of residents that are entrepreneurs is significantly larger than elsewhere in the city. Again, these patterns are not driven by scale where some neighborhoods have high fraction of entrepreneurs just because they are small and thereby a small denominator.<sup>16</sup>



**Figure 3.** The fraction of entrepreneurs across neighborhoods in Stockholm (left) and Jönköping (right).

**Note:** The vertical axis displays the fraction of entrepreneurs (in percent) on the neighborhood (1 km<sup>2</sup> square) level. The neighborhoods are then plotted in descending order from left to right.

To further verify the prevalence of within-city clusters of entrepreneurs, we estimate a Probit model with the entrepreneurial status of each individual on the left hand side and the fraction of entrepreneurs the residential neighborhood on the right hand side. This estimation informs whether the probability that an individual is an entrepreneur is associated with the fraction of entrepreneurs residing in the same neighborhood. A statistically significant coefficient for the neighborhood entrepreneur variable indicates general co-location of entrepreneurs across neighborhoods. Since our aim is simply to illustrate a co-location phenomenon and not inference, we do not include any control variables.<sup>17</sup> Table 1 reports the results.

**Table 1.** Co-location of entrepreneurs within neighborhoods. The parameters are estimated using a Probit model. Dependent variable: dummy (1 if entrepreneur in 2007 and 0 otherwise).

Fraction entrepreneurs in neighborhood	.0672*** (.000465)
Observations	3,089,743
Pseudo R-squared	.036

**Note:** Standard errors in parentheses. \*\*\* p < .01, \*\* p < .05

<sup>16</sup>In the city of Stockholm, for instance, the mean population size of the five neighborhoods with the highest fraction of entrepreneurs is 94.2 whereas the same figure for the five neighborhoods with the lowest fraction entrepreneurs is 96.4.

<sup>17</sup>Moreover, regressions on the stock of entrepreneurs suffers severely by Manski's (2000) reflection problem.

It is clear that entrepreneurs tend to live in the same neighborhoods as other entrepreneurs. The probability that an individual is an entrepreneur is positively and statistically significantly associated with the fraction of entrepreneurs in her residential neighborhood.

#### 4. NEIGHBORHOOD PEER EFFECTS IN ENTREPRENEURSHIP

##### *Baseline model*

Are neighborhood peer effects in entrepreneurship an empirically relevant source of the regularity of within-city clusters of entrepreneurs? To test this, we model individuals' decisions to switch from employment to entrepreneurship by becoming a full-time entrepreneur. We restrict the sample to individuals that are full-time employees in 2007 ( $N=2,719,697$ ), and set up a Probit model with which we estimate the influence the fraction of entrepreneurs in an individual's residential neighborhood has on the probability that she switches from employment to entrepreneurship between years 2007 ( $t-1$ ) and 2008 ( $t$ ). Formally, the baseline empirical model is given by:

$$(1) \quad \Pr(E_{i,t} = 1 | \mathbf{x}_{i,t-1}) = \Phi(\mathbf{x}'_{i,t-1} \Gamma)$$

$$\mathbf{x}'_{i,t-1} \Gamma = \alpha + \underbrace{\mathbf{I}'_{i,t-1} \boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{Individual}} + \underbrace{\mathbf{Z}'_{i,t-1} \boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{\text{Employer}} + \underbrace{\boldsymbol{\Omega}'_{i,t-1} \boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\text{Neighborhood}} + \underbrace{\mathbf{R}'_{i,t-1} \boldsymbol{\sigma}}_{\text{Region}} + \varepsilon_{i,t}$$

where  $E_{i,t}$  is a dummy variable which is 1 if individual  $i$  switched from employment to entrepreneurship between years  $t-1$  and  $t$ . Entrepreneurs are identified based on information of sole proprietorship or ownership of an incorporated business.  $\mathbf{I}$  is a vector of individual characteristics,  $\mathbf{Z}$  a vector of characteristics of the individual's employer and work in  $t-1$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$  a vector of neighborhood characteristics and  $\mathbf{R}$  a vector of regional characteristics. Our main focus is on the influence of a specific variable in  $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ , namely the fraction of entrepreneurs. The general idea is straightforward: individuals residing in neighborhoods where a high fraction of the residents are entrepreneurs dwell in a more entrepreneurial local social environment with higher odds for peer effects in entrepreneurship. This should manifest itself in that the density of entrepreneurs in the neighborhood matters over and above individual characteristics in the decision to become an entrepreneur, i.e. individuals with otherwise similar traits should show different propensities to engage in entrepreneurship depending on the type of neighborhood they live in.

##### *Identification strategy*

A key issue in inferring peer effects from this empirical set-up is whether we are able to deal with the possibility non-random spatial sorting of individuals on entrepreneurial skills or ambitions across



neighborhoods. A positive effect of the fraction entrepreneurs in the residential neighborhood on the probability of starting a business may be an artifact of selection. Individuals with entrepreneurial skills may have preferences for certain underlying neighborhood amenities or characteristics, which could mean that they cluster at the neighborhood level. Entrepreneurs are for example often described as “footloose” (Pflueger and Südekum 2008), who can choose locations more freely than employees as they take their business with them. This raises the possibility of stronger amenity-oriented motives in the residential location decision (Johnson and Rasker 1995, Wenting et al 2011). A further issue is that individuals may be stimulated to become entrepreneurs by other neighborhood characteristics than the intensity of established entrepreneurs. Economic characteristics of the region to which a neighborhood belongs as well as the fraction of highly educated neighbors, not necessarily entrepreneurs, could for instance have a significant influence on entrepreneurial decisions.

We deal with these issues in four main ways. The first is through the empirical design itself. By focusing on individuals that leave employment for entrepreneurship we estimate parameters based on an observed active choice to engage in entrepreneurship, which reduces issues of sorting. An alternative could for example be to estimate a fully specified model of the probability that an individual is an entrepreneur (cf. Table 1). Such an approach is nevertheless more indirect and plagued by stronger issues of sorting because established entrepreneurs could move across neighborhoods while maintaining their business. The second way in which we deal with identification is by controlling for an extensive set of theoretically motivated controls at the individual, employer/work, neighborhood and regional level. We include such controls in order to account for spatial sorting on individual characteristics as well as confounding factors at the neighborhood and regional level.

Third, the fact that we observe differences in entrepreneurship between neighborhoods within one and the same city cannot be explained by either differences in formal and informal policy institutions or by city-wide economic fundamentals. Neighborhoods in the same city are exposed to the same city policies and economic characteristics. It follows that some other factor than policy institutions and basic demand- and supply-side characteristics should drive variations in the intensity of entrepreneurs across residential neighborhoods.

Fourth, we undertake a number of robustness tests of our baseline estimations. In particular, we follow the strategy of Lindbeck et al (2007) and test whether our results are robust to estimations with sample of sub-groups of individuals, where each partition is based on different identifying assumptions. A positive and significant influence of the fraction of entrepreneurs in the neighborhood on the probability to transcend to entrepreneurship that is robust to our set of controls and robustness tests provide support for the hypothesis of non-market interactions in explaining local clusters of entrepreneurs.

## 4.1 Variables and descriptives

The variables and their definitions are reported in Table 2 whereas summary statistics are presented in Table 3.

### *Individual characteristics*

We include five standard worker characteristics that may influence entrepreneurship: age, gender, immigration status, years of schooling and education specialization. Previous findings for Sweden suggest that the propensity to become full-time self-employed rises with age though at a diminishing rate (Andersson et al 2012). Gender is an important innate characteristic with a strong influence on entrepreneurial behavior, where males are consistently found to be more prone to switch to full-time self-employment (Blanchflower and Oswald 1998). Better educated individuals are typically more mobile in the labor market (Anderson and Thulin 2013), and the general finding in the literature is that the likelihood of switching to entrepreneurship rises with education (Rees and Shah 1986). One explanation for this is that education proxy human capital and absorptive capacity, and better educated individuals may be in a better position to identify and act on entrepreneurial opportunities. We further control for immigrant status with a dummy for non-native individuals as well as dummies for the education specialization of each individual.

### *Work characteristics*

Six variables are included to capture the influence of individuals' employer and job characteristics on their decision to transcend to entrepreneurship. The first two are the employment size of the establishment at which the individual was employed in 2007 and a dummy denoting whether the establishment closes down between  $t-1$  and  $t$ . Establishment size is an important control as several studies show that firm size is negatively associated with employees leaving for entrepreneurship (Hyytinen and Maliranta 2008, Elfenbein et al. 2010). The argument is that employees of smaller firms are exposed to the whole business process including customers, making them better equipped to start a firm. The dummy for establishment closure is intended to capture whether individuals are pushed into entrepreneurship.

**Table 2.** Variables in the empirical analysis.

		<i>Description</i>
	<i>Startup</i> ( $E_{i,t}$ )	<i>Dummy, denoting whether the worker decided to become an entrepreneur (1) in 2008, or not (0).</i>
<b>Individual characteristics</b>	Years of schooling	Number of (theoretical) years to complete the worker's highest achieved level of education.
	Immigrant (dummy)	Dummy, denoting whether the worker has emigrated from another country (1), or is a native-born Swede (0).
	Age (ln)	The worker's age in 2007.
	Age squared (ln)	The squared value of the age variable.
	Male (dummy)	Dummy indicating whether the worker is male (1) or female (0).
	Education specialization	A set of 10 dummies, indicating the type of education associated with each worker's highest achieved level of education.
<b>Job and workplace variables</b>	Establishment size (ln)	Number of employees in the same work establishment.
	Establishment exit	Dummy, denoting whether the work establishment in 2007 has discontinued its operations before the next reporting period (2008).
	Wage (ln)	The workers yearly wage, in Swedish Kronor, in 2007.
	Tenure	Number of consecutive years that the worker has spent with the same employer. Measured since 1991.
	Occupation	1 digit ICSO-88 standard, denoting the worker's occupation.
	Industry	2 digit industry dummies of the employer
<b>Neighborhood variables</b>	Fraction entrepreneurs	The number of established entrepreneurs relative to working-age individuals, excluding the individual in question.
	Fraction entrepreneurs squared	The square of fraction of entrepreneurs
	Density (ln)	Number of working-age individuals in the same neighborhood.
	Human capital	The number of individuals with the equivalent of a bachelor's diploma, relative to the number of working-age individuals, excluding the individual in question.
	Neighborhood income	Mean income of residents in the neighborhood, excluding the individual in question.
<b>City-wide controls</b>	Municipality entrepreneurship	The fraction of entrepreneurs in the municipality to which the neighborhood, excluding the population in the neighborhood.
	Region heterogeneity	Dummies for each local labor market region

We further control for wage income, tenure, industry and occupation. The wage income at the current employer may be appreciated as an opportunity cost for self-employment, which means individuals with better pay in their current job should be less likely to leave for entrepreneurship. Tenure is defined as the length the employee has remained with the same employer. The longer tenure, the

greater the likelihood that it is a good match and we thus expect tenure to have a negative influence on the decision to leave the job for entrepreneurship (cf. Farber 1994). To account for that the propensity to transcend to self-employment may also be related to the prior job and industry, we further include occupational and industry dummies defined in  $t-1$ .

### *Neighborhood variables*

Our main variable of interest is the fraction of entrepreneurs in the neighborhood in which an individual lives. This variable is defined as the number of entrepreneurs in the neighborhood normalized by the total neighborhood residents of working age.<sup>18</sup> The intuition is that the higher the intensity of entrepreneurs in a residential neighborhood, the higher the likelihood that a resident of that neighborhood interact with and is influenced by an entrepreneurial peer. We also include the squared term of the fraction of entrepreneurs. The marginal effect of the density of entrepreneurs is likely to be non-linear and fall off when the density rises. It is conceivable that there is a ‘threshold density’ at which the density of entrepreneurs is large enough to maintain a local culture through peer effects. Above such a threshold, additional entrepreneurs in the neighborhood adds little.

We control for three other neighborhood characteristics in the baseline model. The first is neighborhood density, which is simply the total number of residents in the neighborhood of working age.<sup>19</sup> We also include the fraction of residents with a long university education ( $\geq 3$  years) and the average income level in the neighborhood. Both measures are based on residents other than the individual it is measured for. These variables are intended to reflect neighborhood characteristics that could disproportionately attract people with entrepreneurial skills (the sorting argument) as well as could generate local knowledge spillover phenomena that influence start-up decisions. A large literature indeed shows that there is typically local clustering within cities based on both income and education (Jargowsky 1996). Many entrepreneurs and business owners have indeed a long university education and are found in the higher income brackets. Furthermore, environments with density of human capital (proxied by people with a university degree) may also boost human capital externalities that could stimulate new firm formation (Acs and Armington 2004, Genniaoli et al 2013).

### *Region- and city-wide controls*

We further include the fraction of entrepreneurs in the city, i.e. municipality, as a whole, subtracting the residents in the neighborhood in which the individual lives. There are two motivations for this variable. First, it capture peer effects at a level wider than the neighborhood. Second, it may be seen as a ‘catch-all’ variable reflecting the general conditions for entrepreneurship in the municipality to

---

<sup>18</sup>As this variable is defined for each individual, we subtract the individual in question from the calculation.

<sup>19</sup>Neighborhoods are spatial squares of one square kilometer. The number of residents in a neighborhood is therefore an ‘exact’ measure of resident per square kilometer, i.e. a standard measure of density.

which the neighborhood belongs. The inclusion of the municipality-specific level of entrepreneurship implies that the marginal effects of the neighborhood variables above are identified from variance across neighborhoods, holding the city-level of entrepreneurship constant. We further include dummy variables for each local labor market region.<sup>20</sup> These are intended to capture differences in region-wide characteristics that may influence entrepreneurial decisions of their inhabitants.

**Table 3.** Summary statistics. N=2,719,697.

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
Entrepreneur (dummy)	.05	.22
Startup (dummy)	.01	.08
Entrepreneurship share (neighborhood)	0.05	0.02
Neighborhood density (ln)	7.14	1.21
Human capital (neighborhood)	.20	.10
Stockholm (dummy)	0.26	0.44
Years of schooling	12.49	2.63
Tenure	7.30	5.68
Wage (ln)	7.82	0.67
Defunct work establishment	0.02	0.15
Establishment size (ln)	4.62	2.82
Age	43.82	10.99
Age squared	2041	981
Male (dummy)	0.50	0.50
Immigrant (dummy)	0.16	0.37
Education: general	0.08	0.28
Education: pedagogy	0.04	0.19
Education: humanities and arts	0.19	0.40
Education: Social sciences and law	0.03	0.18
Education: Natural sciences and computer science	0.22	0.42
Education: Engineering and manufacturing	0.01	0.09
Education: health and social care	0.16	0.37
Education: agriculture and animal care	0.06	0.23
Education: services	0.02	0.15

### 4.3 Results

Table 4 presents the results from a Probit estimation of a baseline version of the model in (1). The baseline model includes the variables listed in the results table, as well as dummies for education specialization, occupation (1-digit ISCO-88) and industry of work (2-digit NACE). Robustness tests of the results obtained with the baseline model are presented in Tables 5-8.

The estimates provide support for the hypothesis that there are significant peer effects in entrepreneurial behavior. The estimated influence of the fraction of entrepreneurs in the neighborhood

<sup>20</sup>Local labor market regions consist of a number of municipalities with spatially integrated labor markets, as evidenced by the intensity of commuting flows and are defined by Statistics Sweden.

in which an individual resides on the probability that the individual become an entrepreneur is positive statistically significant. Individuals residing in neighborhoods with a higher intensity of role models and a presumably favorable ‘entrepreneurial climate’ indeed show a greater likelihood of transcending from employment to entrepreneurship.

**Table 4.** Determinants of leaving employment for entrepreneurship.

Variable	Coefficient estimate
Entrepreneurship share (neighborhood)	0.0681*** (0.00385)
Entrepreneurship share (neighborhood, squared)	-0.00224*** (0.000250)
Neighborhood density (ln)	-0.00923*** (0.00318)
Human capital (neighborhood)	0.425*** (0.0384)
Entrepreneurship share (city-wide)	0.00441* (0.00236)
Years of schooling	0.0136*** (0.00171)
Tenure	-0.00946*** (0.000670)
Wage (ln)	-0.234*** (0.00374)
Age	0.0354*** (0.00243)
Age squared	-0.000342*** (2.72e-05)
Male (dummy)	0.336*** (0.00750)
Immigrant (dummy)	0.0139* (0.00818)
Establishment exit	0.116*** (0.0139)
Establishment employment size (ln)	-0.120*** (0.00321)
Pseudo R-squared	.14
Observations	2,719,697

**Note:** The table report coefficient of the model in (1) using a Probit estimator. The underlying data is a matched employer-employee dataset for Sweden for the years 2007, covering all employees in the age interval 25-64 that live in city areas. The dependent variable is a dummy which is 1 if the individual leave employment to become self-employed in 2008, either through a sole proprietorship or ownership of an incorporated business. The model include a full set of dummies for the educational specialization of individuals, dummies for occupation at the 1-digit ISCO-88 standard, dummies for the industry in which the individual works in 2007 at the 2-digit NACE industry level and dummies for each local labor market region. Robust standard errors are presented in parentheses. \*\*\* p < .01, \*\*p < .05, \* p < .10.

The estimated effect of the fraction of entrepreneurs in the neighborhood on individuals’ decisions to switch to entrepreneurship is nevertheless small. The coefficient estimate in Table 4 implies a statistically significant average marginal effect of 0.12, when evaluated at the mean value of all variables. At the aggregate level, this small average effect on each individual in a neighborhood may still add up to a non-negligible effect on entrepreneurship across neighborhoods with initial

differences in the fraction of entrepreneurs. A small effect that is repeated over extended periods of time may generate substantial heterogeneity in outcomes.

Consider for instance what the estimate implies for the comparison of two otherwise average neighborhoods, where the difference in entrepreneurial intensity is 5 percentage points of the working-age population. A literate interpretation of the estimates implies that the neighborhood with the higher fraction of entrepreneurs would produce between 7 and 8 additional entrepreneurs per square kilometer, each year.<sup>21</sup> Further, the initial differences will be amplified over time through the feedback effect. The estimated influence of the fraction of entrepreneurs on start-up probabilities in fact implies localized increasing returns, driven by feedback effects in the form of a response-mechanism from the stock of entrepreneurs to future start-ups which amplify heterogeneity across neighborhoods.

The other neighborhood characteristics as well as the regional-wide factors have the expected effects. One particular finding is that neighborhood density, i.e. the sheer number working-age inhabitants in a neighborhood, is negative and statistically significant. This may be appreciated as a reflection of that sparser neighborhoods, all else equal, are more conducive for the formation of social ties and that such ties are more important in smaller neighborhoods that may lack market-oriented institutions (Bauernschuster et al 2010, Westlund et al 2014).<sup>22</sup> A further result is that having highly educated individuals as residential neighbors also stimulate entrepreneurship. There are two ways to interpret this result. It could reflect that people with entrepreneurial skills, that often have longer schooling, sort themselves to neighborhoods with many educated residents. It could also reflect an influence of human capital externalities in entrepreneurship (cf. Acs and Armington 2004).

We also find that the fraction of entrepreneurs in the municipality to which the neighborhood belongs has a positive influence on the probability of transcending to entrepreneurship. The statistical and economic significance is yet substantially lower than that of the neighborhood variable. The positive influence of the presence of entrepreneurs in the municipality at large may be understood as an outcome of that effects of social interactions are not bound to the neighborhood. Yet, it could also reflect an influence of the institutional policy environment. Municipalities in Sweden have own local governments and associated regulations, and a high fraction entrepreneurs in a municipality could indicate a favorable local policy environment. This argument, however, does not apply to the estimated influence of characteristics of neighborhoods that belong to the same municipality. The result for the municipality level variable should also be seen in light of regional characteristics being held constant.

---

<sup>21</sup>Both neighborhoods are assumed to have the average size of about 1,250 residents. The calculation is then  $0.12 * 0.05 * 1250 = 7.5$ .

<sup>22</sup>Indeed, Bauernschuster et al (2010) find that social capital (measured as club membership) matters more for the decision to become entrepreneur for residents in smaller communities.

In line with previous studies, we further find that tenure, wage income and employer size have a negative influence on the probability to becoming an entrepreneur. Individuals with longer schooling and whose establishment exit are also more likely to become entrepreneurs. These are standard results in the literature. The dummy for males and the age variable are also positive and significant, though the positive effect of age falls off as individual become older. Being an immigrant is not associated with the probability to leave employment for entrepreneurship.


#### 4.4 Robustness and alternative interpretations

Some reasonable arguments may be raised against the results in Table 4 with regard to confounding factors. In this section we address some main causes for concern with respect to sorting of individuals, conceptual issues with collapsing sole proprietorships and incorporated businesses to one single indicator of entrepreneurship as well as sensitivity of the estimates with regard to additional control variables.

A general problem concerns non-random spatial sorting of entrepreneurs across neighborhoods within cities. It could be argued that individuals who decide to start a firm in a near future move to certain entrepreneurial neighborhoods before they actually start their firm. While this type of *ex ante* spatial sorting in response to entrepreneurial intentions is not directly observable in the data, such behavior should be manifested in the mobility patterns of entrepreneurs vis-à-vis ordinary employees. In particular, it should imply that residents of a neighborhood that leaves employment for entrepreneurship are more likely to recently have moved into the neighborhood.

We do not find any support for this in the data. Figure 2 displays neighborhood tenure for those becoming entrepreneurs in 2008 and those who do not. The bars express the percentages of the total population in each sub-group that moved to a new neighborhood within the most recent 1-5 years. As can be seen, the descriptive data do not support the notion that entrepreneurs are more ‘foot-loose’ in their residential neighborhood decisions than ordinary employees. If anything, they appear to be somewhat less mobile than employees. This pattern is in fact broadly consistent with recent analyses of the ‘home bias’ of entrepreneurs. One explanation of this home bias is in fact that entrepreneurs exploit the richer endowments of local social capital in the home environments (Dahl and Sorenson 2012).





**Figure 4.** *Neighborhood tenure (years) for entrepreneurs, and non-entrepreneurs, respectively.*

The rest of this section deals with issues of robustness in three main ways. First, we discriminate between limited corporations and sole proprietorships. Second, we add further controls to account for that the baseline estimates may be biased due to the occurrence of other factors that may reasonably affect startup behavior while being correlated with the share of entrepreneurs in a neighborhood. Third, we further assess the issue of sorting by looking at some key sub-groups in the population, and at various age intervals.

The reason for discriminating between different types of start-ups is the tendency for entrepreneurs to start limited liability firms if they expect their entrepreneurial venture to grow (Tåg et al., 2013). Incorporated business start-ups should therefore more closely resemble what is referred to as ‘high-impact’ entrepreneurship in the Schumpeterian tradition (cf Gartner 1990, Henrekson and Sanandaji 2013). The baseline results could be driven by home-based and low-impact entrepreneurship. Our data yet discriminates between these types of firms, which allows us to estimate the effects of local entrepreneurial peers on the start-up propensity separately. The estimates from the split-up regressions and their marginal effects are presented in Table 5. We conclude that there is a positive effect on startups for both firm types. While the results are consistent with local social interactions playing a role in both types of start-up decisions, the marginal effect is actually larger for startups of incorporated businesses.

**Table 5.** Estimated effects of neighborhood’s fraction of entrepreneurs on the decision to enter entrepreneurship, by start-up type.

	(1)	(2)
Start-up type	Startup of incorporated business	Startup of sole proprietorship
Fraction entrepreneurs in the neighborhood	.0656*** (.0047)	.0514 *** (.0061)
Average marginal effect	.08	.03

**Note:** The model is identical to (1) which is reported in Table 1. Robust standard errors are presented in parentheses. \*\*\*  $p < .01$ . Out of all startups, 61 percent are sole proprietorships, and 39 percent are incorporated businesses.

Further, we conduct sensitivity analyses with respect to various confounding factors, by adding additional control variables. The added controls are the neighborhood mean wage (step 1) and the neighborhood’s fraction of entrepreneurs in 1991. Step 1 is intended to control for local demand at the neighborhood level, while also acting as a proxy for the general level of wealth in a neighborhood. Step 2 controls for another dimension of spatial sorting. If individuals move to certain ‘entrepreneurial neighborhoods’ in order to become entrepreneurs, then past measures of entrepreneurial frequencies at the neighborhood level should exhibit a downward effect on the coefficient of the present-day variable. The same argument holds true if ‘foot-loose’ entrepreneurs are attracted to natural amenities. Step 3 includes both added variables in one regression. Table 6 presents the coefficients of the main variable of interest from these regressions.

**Table 6.** Sensitivity analysis of the main specification in Table 4.

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Added control(s)	Neighborhood mean wage (ln)	Neighborhood fraction entrepreneurs 1991	(1)-(2)
Fraction entrepreneurs in the neighborhood	.0673*** (.0043)	.0670*** (.0039)	.0591*** (.0043)
Average marginal effect	.10	.12	.10

**Note:** Aside from the added control variables the model is identical to (1), the coefficients of which are presented in Table 4. Robust standard errors are presented in parentheses. \*\*\*  $p < .01$ .

The estimated marginal effect remains robust to the inclusion of both additional controls. When the neighborhood mean wage variable is added, the marginal effects drops from .12 in the main specification to .10. Adding the historical fraction of entrepreneurs does not influence the magnitude

of the estimated marginal effects. We conclude that the results in Table 4 are robust to the inclusion of theoretically motivated additional variables.

In Tables 7-8 we deal more explicitly with the spatial sorting. In steps 1 and 2 of Table 7, we follow Lindbeck et al (2007) and test whether immigrants to Sweden are more likely to leave employment for entrepreneurship if they locate in a residential neighborhood with a high intensity of entrepreneurs. In our empirical context, the rationale for analyzing immigrants as a sub-group is two-fold. First, immigrants often have less local information and fewer local social ties, especially upon arrival. Recent immigrants, including those with certain entrepreneurial intentions or abilities, are therefore less likely to have sufficient knowledge of the Swedish economic geography and neighborhood characteristics within cities to be able to sort themselves to entrepreneurial neighborhoods. Second, in Sweden some streams of immigrants (e.g. refugees) are often assigned to specific neighborhoods by local authorities, giving this distinction some characteristics of a natural experiment.<sup>23</sup> This provides arguments why a focus on immigrants provides a test of the robustness of the estimated influence of local entrepreneurial peers on start-up decision.

We further test whether the marginal effect of the neighborhood fraction of entrepreneurs on start-up propensities is higher for individuals who recently moved in to a neighborhood, i.e. whose neighborhood tenure is low. The idea behind this is as follows: if people with entrepreneurial intentions or abilities intentionally sort themselves to neighborhoods with high fractions of entrepreneurs, then the estimated marginal effect of the fraction of entrepreneurs should be higher for the in-migrants than for the neighborhood population at large. If the marginal effect is instead similar in size for recent in-migrants as for the general population of the neighborhood residents, then this weakens the argument that our baseline results may be driven by sorting. The results of this undertaking are presented in steps 3 and 4 of Table 7, where we perform separate estimations for individuals with a neighborhood tenure of 2 years or less and 5 years or less, respectively.

Steps 5 and 6 further test the issue of local demand driven entrepreneurship, by using a conservative (5) and a liberal (6) criterion for exclusion of industries that may have a very local market. We argued that one benefit of using neighborhood squares is that many traditional determinants of entrepreneurship operate at the city- rather than at the neighborhood level. One such traditional determinant is the market-size. However, the market for industries such as cafés, restaurants and hairdressers is typically local, which means that start-up decisions in such industries may be driven by the market-size of the neighborhood. To make sure that our estimated marginal effects of the fraction

---

<sup>23</sup>Our data, unfortunately, does not allow us to discriminate between different types of immigration. We also emphasize that our data only include individuals who held a job in 2007, and a quite low fraction of recent refugees are likely to be full-time employees. The fraction of the immigrants in our data that are assigned to certain neighborhoods by Swedish authorities is therefore expected to be low.

of entrepreneurs in the neighborhood simply not reflect that certain neighborhoods happen to have a good local market conditions for simple services with a local market, we run separate estimations when such industries are excluded.

**Table 7.** Estimated effects of neighborhood's fraction of entrepreneurs on the decision to enter entrepreneurship, by different sub-groups.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Selection	Immigrants only	Immigrants arrived after 2002	Neighborhood tenure $\leq 5$ years	Neighborhood tenure $\leq 2$ years	Excluding local demand driven sectors	Excluding local demand driven sectors and retail
Neighborhood	.0829*** (0.0111)	.0808** (.0285)	.0678*** (.0060)	.0716*** (.0088)	.0680*** (.0040)	.0655*** (.0041)
Average marginal effect	.15	.15	.12	.13	.11	.10
N	437,844	40,458	1,114,774	575,588	2,718,206	2,716,150

**Note:** The model is identical to (1), the coefficients of which are presented in Table 4. Robust standard errors are presented in parentheses. \*\*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*  $p < .05$ . Local demand driven sectors are defined as NACE 93, including restaurants, and NACE 82, including hair dressers and beauty salons.

The results in Table 7 show that there is a statistically and economically significant impact of the fraction of entrepreneurs in the neighborhood even among the subset of immigrants (for newly arrived as well as the full population). The marginal effects is .15. Steps 3 and 4 also show that the marginal effect is not higher for individuals with low neighborhood tenure. People who recently moved to a neighborhood are affected by the local presence of entrepreneurs (on a yearly basis) in very much the same way as for the population in general. Steps 5 and 6 further test the previous proposition whether these patterns may be driven by local demand, and we conclude that the effect is remarkably robust.

As a final robustness test, we perform separate estimations for age groups. It can certainly be expected that individuals sort themselves across neighborhood based on their respective life cycle phases, and that this pattern is non-random with respect to start-up decisions. One could for example imagine that older people in the later stages of working-life sort themselves to certain neighborhoods and find the time for entrepreneurial behavior as their children have grown up. Estimates for three broad age intervals are presented in Table 8. Step 1 looks at younger individuals, and individuals in the early stages of parenthood. Step 2 looks at prime-aged individuals, while step 3 looks at individuals in the decade before the typical retirement age. Again, we find no significant differences in the influence of neighborhood intensity of entrepreneurs on start-up propensities. We conclude that the estimated influence of the fraction of established entrepreneurs in a neighborhood on the probability that a neighborhood resident leaves employment for entrepreneurship appears to be robust to alternative model specifications and sub-samples.

**Table 8.** Estimated effects of neighborhood’s fraction of entrepreneurs on the decision to enter entrepreneurship, by age interval.

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Age interval	Age 25-35	Age 36-55	Age 56-64
Fraction entrepreneurs in the neighborhood	.0608*** (0.0079)	.0698 *** (.0053)	.0716*** (.0089)
Average marginal effect	.10	.13	.11
N	744,143	1,446,622	525,481

**Note:** The model is identical to (1), the coefficients of which are presented in Table 4. Robust standard errors are presented in parentheses. \*\*\* p < .01.

## 5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

What explains persistent clusters of entrepreneurs across localities? This is an issue of importance, not least since because several studies show that regional entrepreneurship has a significant influence on regional growth and development, i.e. the geography of entrepreneurship is often a driver of the geography of long-term growth and development.

In this paper, we tested local peer effects as a source of the phenomenon of clusters of entrepreneurs at the neighborhood level within regions. Our main conclusion is that local peer effects are relevant in explaining the emergence and persistence of local clusters of entrepreneurs. We employed geo-coded matched employer-employee data and modeled individuals’ decision to leave employment for full-time entrepreneurship as a function of the fraction of established entrepreneurs in their residential neighborhood. The analyses provide empirical evidence of a significant feedback effect in which existing entrepreneurs in a neighborhood breeds new local entrepreneurs. Our estimates imply that an otherwise average neighborhood with a 5 percentage point higher entrepreneurial intensity all else equal produce between 7 and 8 more entrepreneurs per square kilometer, each year. It is clear that such an effect may over extended periods of time reinforce local rates of entrepreneurship and stimulate the development of a ‘local entrepreneurship culture’. In fact, peer effects may be appreciated as a mechanism by which a local culture favoring entrepreneurship develops. The main channels for peer effects are indeed information and norms.

Our findings suggest an explanation for why a locality’s history of entrepreneurship may matter even in the present day. Recent analyses have shown that regional disparities in entrepreneurship are highly persistent over time and also that the historical levels of entrepreneurship typically have a strong influence on current levels of start-ups (Fritsch and Wyrwich 2013, Fotopoulos 2013, Andersson and Koster 2011). The feedback effect implied by peer effects clarifies one mechanism by which an historical difference in entrepreneurship is maintained (or even reinforced) over time. Theoretical

work on the emergence and evolution of entrepreneurship clusters, such as Minniti (2005), has indeed emphasized this property of peer effects in entrepreneurship; i.e. that they imply path-dependence where small differences in initial conditions may have long-lasting consequences through feedback processes. Still, micro-level evidence of these effects, such as presented in this paper, where individuals' behaviors are modeled directly as a function of the behavior of others in their local environment has been limited.

It should finally be recognized that explanations of the role of entrepreneurship history involving peer effects are 'partial' (or proximate) in the sense that they can explain why initial conditions matter, but not what caused the initial conditions themselves. The causes of regional differences in historical rate of entrepreneurship could be rooted in a random historical event or a particular historical natural asset favoring small-scale industries. Whatever reason for the initial condition, accepting that the channels for peer effects are information and/or norms, our results fits nicely with the argument that a locality's entrepreneurship culture has evolutionary origins and evolves over time as the local 'collective outcome' of individual decisions. As Minniti (2005, p.5) writes: "The social environment is not the planned outcome of the decisions of purposeful actors; rather it emerges as the unintended consequence of a sequence of decisions taken by individuals and serves as a conduit for information".

## REFERENCES

- Acs Z and C Armington (2004), "The Impact of Geographic Differences in Human Capital on Service Firm Formation Rates", *Journal of Urban Economics*, 56, 244-278
- Akerlof, G (1997), "Social Distance and Social Decisions", *Econometrica*, 65(5), 1005-1028
- Andersson, M (2012), "Start-Up Rates, Entrepreneurship Culture and the Business Cycle – Swedish patterns from national and regional data", in Braunerhjelm P. (Ed.) *Entrepreneurship, Norms and the Business Cycle – Swedish Economic Forum Report 2012*, Swedish Entrepreneurship Forum, Stockholm, pp. 91–110
- Andersson, M and P. Thulin (2013), "Does Spatial Employment Density Spur Inter-Firm Job Switching?", *Annals of Regional Science*, 51(1), 245-272
- Andersson, M and S Koster (2011), "Sources of Persistence in Regional Start-Up Rates –evidence from Sweden", *Journal of Economic Geography*, 11, 179-201
- Andersson, M, A. Baltzopoulos and H. Lööf (2012), "R&D Strategies and Entrepreneurial Spawning", *Research Policy*, 41, 54-68
- Audretsch, D and M Keilbach (2005), "Entrepreneurship Capital and Regional Growth", *Annals of Regional Science*, 39(3), 457-469
- Armington, C and Z Acs (2002), "The Determinants of Regional Variation in New Firm Formation", *Regional Studies*, 36, 33–45

- Bauernschuster, S., O Falck and S Heblich (2010), “Social Capital Access and Entrepreneurship”, *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 76(3), 821-833
- Bertrand, M., E Luttmer and S Mullainathan (2000), “Network Effects and Welfare Cultures”, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115(3), 1019-1055
- Beugelsdijk S (2007), “Entrepreneurial Culture, Regional Innovativeness and Economic Growth”, *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 17, 187–210
- Blanchflower, D and A Oswald (1998), “What makes an Entrepreneur?”, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 16, 26-60
- Boase, J., J.B Horrigan, B Wellman and L Rainie (2006), “The Strength of Internet Ties”, *PEW Internet and American Life Project* (available at <http://www.pewinternet.org>)
- Bosma, N., J Hessels, V Schutjens, M van Praag and Iverheul (2012), “Entrepreneurship and Role Models”, *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 33, 410-424
- Carrell, S., M Hoekstra and J West (2010), “Is Poor Fitness Contagious? – evidence from randomly assigned friends”, *Journal of Public Economics*, 95, 657-663
- Chlosta, S., H Patzelt, S.B Klein and C. Dormann (2012), “Parental Role Models and the Decision to become Self-Employed - the moderating effect of personality”, *Small Business Economics*, 38, 121-138
- Dahl, M and O Sorenson (2012), “Home Sweet Home: Entrepreneurs' Location Choices and the Performance of Their Ventures”, *Management Science*, 58(6), 1059-1071
- Davidsson, P and B Honig (2003), “The Role of Social and Human Capital among Nascent Entrepreneurs”, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(3), 301-331
- Davidsson, P and J Wiklund (1997), “Values, Beliefs and Regional Variation in New Firm Formation Rates”, *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 18, 179-199
- Dunn, T and D Holtz-Eakin (2000), “Financial Capital, Human capital and the Transition to Self-Employment - evidence from intergenerational links”, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 18, 282-305
- Durlauf, S.N (2004), “Neighborhood Effects”, in J. V. Henderson and J. F. Thisse (ed.), *Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics*, edition 1, volume 4, Elsevier, chapter 50, pp 2173-2242
- Elfenbein, D.W, B.H Hamilton and T.R Zenger (2010), “The Small Firm Effect and the Entrepreneurial Spawning of Scientists and Engineers”, *Management Science*, 56, 659-681
- Etzioni A (1987), “Entrepreneurship, Adaptation and Legitimation”, *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 8, 175–199
- Falck, O., S Heblich and E Luedemann (2012), “Identity and Entrepreneurship: do school peers shape entrepreneurial intentions?”, *Small Business Economics*, 39, 39-59
- Farber, H.S. (1994), “The Analysis of Inter-Firm Worker Mobility”, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 12, 554–593

- Fletcher, J (2011), “Social Interactions and Smoking - evidence using multiple student cohorts, instrumental variables and school fixed effects”, *Health Economics*, 19, 466-284
- Fornahl D (2003), “Entrepreneurial Activities in a Regional Context”, in Fornahl D and T Brenner (Eds), *Cooperation, Networks and Institutions in Regional Innovation Systems*, Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, pp. 38–57
- Fotopoulos, G (2013), “On the Spatial Stickiness of UK New Firm Formation Rates”, *Journal of Economic Geography*, (doi: 10.1093/jeg/lbt011)
- Fritsch, M and M Wyrwich (2013), “The Long Persistence of Regional Levels of Entrepreneurship – Germany, 1925-2005”, *Regional Studies* (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2013.816414>)
- Gartner, W.B (1990), “What Are We Talking about When We Talk about Entrepreneurship?”, *Journal of Business Venturing*, 5(1), 15–28
- Gaspar, J and E Glaeser (1998), “Information Technology and the Future of Cities”, *Journal of Urban Economics*, 43(1), 136-156
- Gennaioli, N., R La Porta, F Lopez-de-Silanes and A Shleifer (2013), “Human Capital and Regional Development”, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 128(1), 105-164
- Giannetti, M and A Simonov (2004), “On the Determinants of Entrepreneurial Activity – social norms, economic environment and individual characteristics”, *Swedish Economic Policy Review*, 11, 269-313
- Giannetti, M and A Simonov (2009), “Social Interactions and Entrepreneurial Activity”, *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy*, 18(3), 665-709
- Glaeser, E (2000), “The Future of Urban Research – nonmarket interactions”, in W.G. Gale and J.R. Pack (eds), *Brookings–Wharton Papers on Urban Affairs 2000*, The Brookings Institution, Washington, DC, 2000
- Glaeser, E (2007), “Entrepreneurship and the City”, NBER Working Paper 13551
- Glaeser, E and B Sacerdote (2000), “The Social Consequences of Housing”, *Journal of Housing Economics*, 9(1-2), 1-23
- Glaeser, E and J Scheinkman (2003), “Non-Market Interactions”, in M Dewatripont et al (eds) (2003), *Advances in Economics and Econometrics – theory and applications*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 339-370
- Glaeser, E., B Sacerdote and J Scheinkman (1996), “Crime and Social Interactions”, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 111, 507-548
- Glaeser, E., B Sacerdote and J Scheinkman (2003), “The Social Multiplier”, *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 1, 345-353
- Granovetter, M.S. (1995), *Getting a Job: a study of contacts and careers*, 2nd ed. University of Chicago Press, Chicago
- Henrekson, M and T. Sanandaji (2013), “Billionaire Entrepreneurs: A Systematic Analysis”, Working Paper Series 959, Research Institute of Industrial Economics



- Hyttinen, A and M Maliranta (2008), "When Do Employees Leave their Job for Entrepreneurship?" *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 110 (1), 1-21
- Jargowsky, P.A (1996), "Take the Money and Run – economic segregation in the US metropolitan areas", *American Sociological Review*, 61, 984-998
- Johnson, J.D and R Rasker, (1995), "The Role of Economic and Quality of Life Values in Rural Business Location", *Journal of Rural Studies*, 11, 405–416
- Kim, PH and H Aldrich (2005), "Social Capital and Entrepreneurship", *Foundations and Trends in Entrepreneurship*, 1(2), 55-104
- Klyver, K., K. Hindle and T Schøtt (2007), "Who will be an Entrepreneur? - how cultural mechanisms and social network structure together influence entrepreneurial participation", *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research* 27(7), 305-320.
- Licht, A.N and J Siegel (2006), "The Social Dimension of Entrepreneurship", in M Casson and B Yeung (eds), *Oxford Handbook of Entrepreneurship*, Oxford University Press, Oxford
- Lindbeck, A., M Palme and M Persson (2007), "Social Interaction and Sickness Absence", IFN working paper No. 725 2007
- Manski, C (1993), "Identification of Endogenous Social Effects: The Reflection Problem", *Review of Economic Studies*, 60(3), 531-542
- Manski, C (2000), "Economic Analysis of Social Interactions", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 14(3), 115-136.
- Minniti, M (2005), "Entrepreneurship and Network Externalities", *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 57, 1-27
- Nanda, R and J.B Sorensen (2010), "Workplace Peers and Entrepreneurship", *Management Science*, 56, 1116–1126
- Pflueger, M and J Suedekum (2008), "A Synthesis of Footloose-Entrepreneur New economic Geography Models - when is agglomeration smooth and easily reversible?", *Journal of Economic Geography*, 8, 39-54
- Rees, H. and A Shaw (1986), "An Empirical Analysis of Self-Employment in UK", *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 1, 95–10
- Saxenian, A (1994), *Regional Advantage: Culture and Competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA
- Scheinkman, J (2008), "Social Interactions (theory)", *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*, 2nd Edition
- Tåg, J., T Åstebro and P Thompson (2013), "Hierarchies, the Small Firm Effect, and Entrepreneurship: Evidence from Swedish Microdata", Working Paper Series 954, Research Institute of Industrial Economics
- Topa, G (2001), "Social Interactions, Local Spillovers and Unemployment", *Review of Economic Studies*, 68, 261-295

- Wellman, B (1996), "Are Personal Communities Local? A Dumptarian Reconsideration", *Social Networks*, 18, 347–354
- Wellman, B., A.Q Haase, J Witte and K Hampton (2001), "Does the Internet Increase, Decrease or Supplement Social Capital? – social networks, participation and community commitment", *American Behavioral Scientist*, 45(3), 436-455
- Wenting, R., O Atzema and K Frenken (2011), "Urban Amenities or Agglomeration Economies? - the locational behavior and economic success of Dutch fashion design entrepreneurs", *Urban Studies*, 48, 1333-1352
- Westlund, H and R Bolton (2003), "Local Social Capital and Entrepreneurship", *Small Business Economics*, 21, 77-113
- Westlund, H., J P Larsson and A. Rader Olsson (2014), "Startups and Local Social Capital in the Municipalities of Sweden", *Regional Studies*, forthcoming.
- Williamson O (2000), "The New Institutional Economics – taking stock and looking ahead", *Journal of Economic Literature*, XXXVIII, 595-61