

VATT WORKING PAPERS 168

Stairway to Heaven? Selection into Entrepreneurship, Income Mobility and Firm Performance

Jarkko Harju
Toni Juuti
Tuomas Matikka

VATT WORKING PAPERS 168

Stairway to Heaven? Selection into Entrepreneurship, Income Mobility and Firm Performance

Jarkko Harju

Toni Juuti

Tuomas Matikka

VATT WORKING PAPERS 168

Jarkko Harju:

Tampere University & Finnish Centre of Tax Systems Research (FIT)

Toni Juuti:

The Labour Institute for Economic Research LABORE & Tampere University & FIT

Tuomas Matikka:

VATT Institute for Economic Research & FIT

Suggested citation:

Harju Jarkko, Juuti Toni and Matikka Tuomas (2024). Stairway to Heaven? Selection into Entrepreneurship, Income Mobility and Firm Performance. VATT Working Papers 168.

The same study has been published:

Harju Jarkko, Juuti Toni and Matikka Tuomas (2024). Stairway to Heaven? Selection into Entrepreneurship, Income Mobility and Firm Performance. The Labour Institute for Economic Research LABORE, Working Papers 346. LABORE: ISBN 978-952-209-215-1, ISSN 2984-2158 (pdf)

An earlier version of this study has been published as:

Harju Jarkko, Juuti Toni and Matikka Tuomas (2023). Stairway to Heaven? Selection into Entrepreneurship, Income Mobility and Firm Performance. FIT Working Papers 17.

VATT Working Papers:

<https://doria.fi/handle/10024/147862>

Valtion taloudellinen tutkimuskeskus
VATT Institute for Economic Research
Arkadiankatu 7, 00100 Helsinki, Finland

Helsinki, August 2024

Stairway to Heaven? Selection into Entrepreneurship, Income Mobility and Firm Performance*

Jarkko Harju[†] Toni Juuti[‡] Tuomas Matikka[§]

August 1, 2024

Abstract

Using full-population data from Finland, we show that individuals at the top of the income distribution are significantly more likely to start new incorporated businesses compared to others. There is no similar selection based on parental income, but more than half of new entrepreneurs have entrepreneurial parents. Individual income gains from entrepreneurship are similar across different background characteristics, but parental entrepreneurship and personal income are positively linked to key firm-level outcomes such as productivity and job creation. This highlights the importance of the intergenerational transmission of entrepreneurial skills and suggests that businesses established by high-income individuals generate largest positive spillovers.

Keywords: entrepreneurship; income mobility; inequality; productivity.

JEL Codes: L26; J24; J3

*We thank Adrian Adermon, Jonas Hjort, Niels Johannesen, Markus Jääntti, Martti Kaila, Ross Levine, Matthew Lindquist, Oskar Nordström Skans, Martin Nybom, Tuuli Paukkeri, Tuomas Pekkari-nen, Jukka Pirttilä, Emmanuel Saez, Matteo Tranchero, Joacim Tåg, Danny Yagan, Eric Zwick and several conference participants and discussants for their comments and suggestions. All remaining errors are our own. We are grateful to the Research Council of Finland (grant no. 346252 and 340198) and Palkansaaaja Foundation (Innovation, Productivity and Economic Growth) for the funding for this project.

[†]Tampere University & Finnish Centre of Tax Systems Research (FIT)

[‡]Labour Institute for Economic Research & Tampere University & FIT.

[§]VATT Institute for Economic Research & FIT

1 Introduction

Entrepreneurs are pivotal for generating growth, innovation and employment opportunities in modern economies (see e.g. Aghion et al. 2018a; Decker et al. 2014). Entrepreneurs are often rewarded for their risk-taking, as business owners tend to occupy the top of the income distribution in many developed countries (see e.g. Smith et al. 2023, 2019; Halvarsson et al. 2018). However, despite a large literature on selection into entrepreneurship and differences in incomes between entrepreneurs and salaried workers (see e.g. Hamilton 2000; Moskowitz and Vissing-Jørgensen 2002; Hurst and Lusardi 2004; Levine and Rubinstein 2017; Kerr et al. 2017), we do not exactly know who benefits from entrepreneurship and who creates the largest spillovers to the economy. Therefore, we ask does becoming an entrepreneur increase the incomes of those who are already well-off, or does it provide a "Stairway to Heaven" for those who come from less privileged backgrounds? Also, we ask which characteristics of entrepreneurs are associated with job creation and productivity?

This article provides comprehensive empirical evidence on selection into entrepreneurship and the dynamic implications of new business creation using population-wide administrative data linking together wage earners, business owners and their firms. Our study integrates various separate strands of literature on selection and income development among entrepreneurs (Kerr et al. 2017; Levine and Rubinstein 2017; Garnadt et al. 2023, among many others), the intergenerational mobility of business owners (Lindquist and Vladasel 2022), and the role of individual (Hvide and Møen 2010; Queiro 2022) and parental (Hurst and Lusardi 2004; Hurst and Pugsley 2011; Lindquist et al. 2015) characteristics in entrepreneurial activity.

A key novel feature of our paper is that we link new entrepreneurs to their newly established firms. On top of individual-level outcomes often covered in the literature, we study the productivity and job creation of new firms and reveal how individual and parental characteristics are associated with firm performance over time. As our main results, we show that individuals with high income and entrepreneurial parents are much more likely to become entrepreneurs, and they establish more successful businesses than others. In contrast, we find that parental income is not associated with selection into entrepreneurship or the economic performance of new firms. We also document that the individual income development of entrepreneurs after establishing the new business is similar across both individual and parental income distributions and by parental entrepreneurship.

A necessary requirement for our study is the opportunity to combine high-quality panel data sets from many sources. We link together population-wide administrative registers of wage earners, business owners, and their firms using data from Finland. These data contain information on key individual and firm-level outcomes, such as detailed income information on individuals and their parents, and the financial statements of the

firms. We use these data to define the exact establishment dates of the businesses and the full ownership structures of firms, and to distinguish newly established businesses from existing ones. We construct a tractable and visually clear timeline around the event of founding a new business, enabling us to follow individuals over a long time period before and after the new firm was established.

Following recent literature, Levine and Rubinstein (2017) most notably, we split business owners into owners of incorporated and unincorporated firms, and primarily focus on incorporated entrepreneurs. Earlier studies document that incorporated entrepreneurs more often engage in risky business ventures and conduct non-routine cognitive tasks than unincorporated business owners, and that the owners of incorporated businesses typically end up earning much more than other business owners and wage earners (see e.g. Hurst and Pugsley 2011; Levine and Rubinstein 2017, 2020; Lindquist and Vladasel 2022). We depart from the earlier literature in one key aspect. Instead of asking how being an entrepreneur is associated with various characteristics, we ask how the decision to become an entrepreneur and establish a new business with no previous experience in running one shapes the income dynamics of new entrepreneurs coming from different backgrounds. Thus, we focus on new business creation instead of, for example, individuals joining existing companies as new owners. This feature is novel in the literature, as earlier studies typically rely on either cross-sectional data or survey-based panels with relatively few individuals followed over time, which tends to over-represent business owners who manage mature firms (see e.g. Hamilton 2000, Moskowitz and Vissing-Jørgensen 2002, Levine and Rubinstein 2017, Halvarsson et al. 2018).¹

We find some similar patterns in selection into entrepreneurship and the income development of business owners as in previous studies. We find that parental background in entrepreneurship is heavily associated with starting a new business (see e.g. Dunn and Holtz-Eakin 2000; Uusitalo 2001; Lindquist et al. 2015). Over 50% of new incorporated entrepreneurs have an entrepreneurial parent, while this share is 10% among wage earners. We observe that individual income is positively linked to selection into entrepreneurship (Hurst and Lusardi 2004; Levine and Rubinstein 2017), meaning that a large share of incorporated entrepreneurs were top earners already before they became entrepreneurs. This suggests that the skills and characteristics that are positively associated with labor market success are strong predictors of starting a new business. Our granular analysis highlights that this selection occurs mostly at the very top of the distribution: more than 5% of new entrepreneurs came from the top percentile of the income distribution, while the top 5% included 17% of them. Furthermore, we find that entrepreneurship is associated with positive income gains (Levine and Rubinstein 2017; Halvarsson et al. 2018), as incorporated entrepreneurs earned on average 20% more than similar wage earners ten

¹One notable exception in this literature is a study by Berglann et al. (2011), who follow one cohort of new entrepreneurs over time using Norwegian panel data.

years after the new business was started.

The most striking new finding of our analysis is that parental background in entrepreneurship strongly predicts the development of key firm-level outcomes such as survival rate, sales, value added and the number of employees. In addition to the fact that entrepreneurship often runs in the family, second-generation entrepreneurs who make the transition into entrepreneurship through new businesses appear to establish more successful firms than those whose parents were not business owners. As an illustration of the magnitudes, annual sales of the firms founded by those with entrepreneurial parents are on average more than twice as large over the first ten years of the business than that of the firms founded by those without entrepreneurial parents. These differences are robust to controlling for industry and initial equity of the new firm. Relatedly, we find that the initial equity invested in the firm when it was established is similar for firms founded by both those with and without entrepreneurial parents.

Furthermore, we find that firm performance measures and the initial equity of the firm clearly increase with initial personal income. For example, the average sales of new businesses founded by top decile earners are roughly twice as large than that of the firms founded by bottom decile individuals. In addition, new firms founded by high-income earners are much more likely to survive compared to others. In contrast, we find that none of the firm-level outcomes increase with parental income, including the initial assets invested in the firm. This means that parental income does not predict the success of the new business. Also, we observe that the likelihood of starting a new business slightly decreases by parental income ranks, in contrast to the clear positive selection at the top by individual income and by parental background in entrepreneurship. The difference of these results and the previously documented positive association between entrepreneurship and parental income (Dunn and Holtz-Eakin 2000; Levine and Rubinstein 2017; Lindquist and Vladasel 2022) stems from our specific focus on new business creation. We find that children from high-income families are much more likely to join an existing matured business as a new owner, and these cases are excluded from our main sample of those who established new businesses.

From the income mobility perspective, our findings suggest that entrepreneurship is linked with upward income mobility in the society. This notion stems from the fact that the positive personal income gains associated with entrepreneurship (on average 20%) occur rather evenly across both individual and parental income distributions and for those with and without entrepreneurial parents. This means that those who come from a less well-off background also gain significantly from entrepreneurship. Large income mobility of entrepreneurs is highlighted by our observations that compared to regular wage earners, new entrepreneurs are significantly more likely to reach the top 1% and 10% of the income distribution among those who originally come from the middle and bottom parts of the distribution. In addition, we find that intergenerational income mobility

is distinctively large among those who establish a new business, further indicating that parental income does not predict the individual income development and success of new business owners.

Earlier literature argues for the importance of the role of parental background in entrepreneurship and the associated human capital channel in explaining entrepreneurial traits and activity (see e.g. Dunn and Holtz-Eakin 2000; Hurst and Lusardi 2004; Hurst and Pugsley 2011; Lindquist et al. 2015). Our population-wide analysis confirms these assertions and further highlights the key role of intergenerational transmission of entrepreneurial skills. Parental entrepreneurship drives the development of firm-level outcomes but it is not linked with initial capital assets of the firm. Also, parental financial resources by itself does not predict entrepreneurial success. These novel firm-level observations indicate that the human capital channel instead of liquidity constraints or other financial factors are likely to explain the strong connection between parental entrepreneurship and firm performance.

Our findings emphasize that the positive externalities of entrepreneurship are concentrated among those entrepreneurs who come from the top of the individual income distribution and those with entrepreneurial parents. In contrast, the individual-level income gains associated with entrepreneurship are rather evenly distributed among entrepreneurs coming from different backgrounds. These key findings underline that individual benefits from entrepreneurship do not necessarily go hand in hand with the broader benefits of entrepreneurship in the society. Also, our findings on labor costs and employment suggest that the benefits from entrepreneurship among firms founded by top income earners and those with entrepreneurial parents are to a large extent shared with employees.

Finally, we find that many key observations, such as the key role of parental entrepreneurship in selection into entrepreneurship (Fairlie and Robb 2007; Lindquist et al. 2015), incorporated entrepreneurs' higher incomes (Levine and Rubinstein 2017; Halvarsson et al. 2018) and the high share of business income at the very top of the distribution (Smith et al. 2019; Bruil et al. 2022), are strikingly similar in Finland compared to other countries, strengthening the external validity of our findings. However, similarly as in previous related studies, we underline that our findings are descriptive in nature and do not reflect the causal effects of entrepreneurs' background on personal income development and firm success. This is highlighted, for example, by the clear selection into new entrepreneurship at the the top of the personal income distribution.

The paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 describes the data and explains the detailed definitions and the empirical approach we use in our analysis. Section 3 presents the results on selection into entrepreneurship, and Section 4 the results on income dynamics and mobility. In Section 5, we analyze firm performance. Section 6 concludes.

2 Data and Definitions

2.1 Data

Our analysis builds on detailed population-wide administrative data from Statistics Finland and the Finnish Tax Administration. These data enable us to link together individual-level income information and background characteristics, firm ownership information and date of establishment, and firm-level tax returns and financial statements. The data are unique in the entrepreneurship literature both in terms of details and coverage.²

Individual-level Data. The individual-level data from Statistics Finland include detailed information on annual income (wages, dividends, capital gains and other sources of earned and capital income), education (level and field of highest degree), age, place of residence, marital status, and the number of children. The data contain the universe of individuals living in Finland from 1987 to 2019 with unique individual-year identifiers. We can also link children to their parents (biological and adoptive) for all individuals born after 1952 and living in Finland on the last day of each year.

Firms. Our firm-level data set includes annual financial statements (profit and loss accounts, balance sheet information) from Statistics Finland, firm-level tax return information from the Finnish Tax Administration, and the establishment dates of firms from the Finnish Patent and Registration Office from 1997 to 2019. The data include firm-year identifiers and additional background characteristics for firms such as industry classification codes and the organizational form.

Ownership Information. For the owners of privately held corporations, we use two separate data sets to identify the ownership structures: 1) the main owner information from the Tax Administration for those owners who received dividend income from their firm, available for 1997–2016, and 2) the full ownership database from Statistics Finland, available for 2006–2019. Combining these data enables us to track down the main owners with dividend income from their firm from 1997–2005 and the full ownership structure

²We provide a brief comparison with data used in previous related studies in Online Appendix E. Previous studies on business owners using Finnish data have documented that entrepreneurship appears to be a character trait that runs in the family (Uusitalo 2001), that entrepreneurs' education is positively associated with entrepreneurial success and that smaller firms spawn new entrepreneurs more frequently than larger firms (Hyytinen and Maliranta 2008). Within-twin analysis (Hyytinen et al. 2013; Maczulskij and Viinikainen 2023) suggests that entrepreneurs earn a negative earnings premium, work more, have greater responsibilities, but also have greater control over their work, and that self-confidence predicts entry into entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial success. Previous experience in a high-productivity firm strongly predicts high productivity and probability of survival for the entrepreneur's new firm (Maliranta and Nurmi 2019). Paukkeri et al. (2023) show that entrepreneurs dominate the top of the distribution in Finland, which is similar to our findings. Finally, recent studies on Finnish inventors (Aghion et al. 2018b, 2022, 2023) also use similar data sources as we do.

from 2006–2019.³ Second, we use a data set including all self-employed and partnership firm owners from the Tax Administration available for 1997–2016. Both of these data sets include unique firm-owner-year identifiers, and thus we can merge these data with all the individual-level data sets.

Sample Restrictions. Similarly as in the recent literature on the income development and personality traits of entrepreneurs (Levine and Rubinstein 2017; Halvarsson et al. 2018), we restrict our baseline sample to individuals who are 25–64 years old when establishing their business and to individuals with positive wage income and/or entrepreneurial income in a given year. We also restrict our main sample to individuals for whom we observe child-parent links. This last restriction drops all immigrants and individuals born before 1953 from the sample.

2.2 Definitions

In this section, we discuss our definition of entrepreneurship and details on firm entry, firm ownership, income measurement and the timeline we use in this study. We provide a comprehensive list of key variables and their definitions in Online Appendix D.

Incorporated and Unincorporated Entrepreneurs. A key question in our study and related earlier work is how to define self-employment and entrepreneurship. The literature has long acknowledged that various types of businesses and their owners can differ significantly from each other in terms of the type of business activity (see e.g. Lazear 2004). For example, Evans and Leighton (1989) and Hurst and Pugsley (2011) illustrate that only a small share of self-employed businesses seek to engage in growth-targeted activities. Levine and Rubinstein (2017) show that incorporated entrepreneurs are more likely to engage in activities that are closely related to tasks that increase productivity and demand stronger cognitive skills, compared to unincorporated business owners, who are less likely to conduct non-routine cognitive tasks. The key legal differences that separate the incorporated from unincorporated firms, namely a separate legal entity and the owners' limited liability, also make an incorporated business preferable for entrepreneurs who seek to engage in more risky business ventures.

Recent findings by Levine and Rubinstein (2017) and Halvarsson et al. (2018) highlight that the incomes of the owners of incorporated and unincorporated businesses differ significantly from each other, such that the owners of incorporated businesses earn much

³Figure A1 in Online Appendix A shows the shares of new incorporated and unincorporated entrepreneurs by year. As is visible from the figure, for incorporated entrepreneurs there is a data break in 2006, as we only observe the main owners receiving dividends from their firm before 2006, and from then onwards we observe all main owners of incorporated firms. We use all the firm starts in our baseline analysis. Our main findings are not sensitive to using data before or after 2006, as shown in Table B1 in Online Appendix B.

more than other business owners and wage earners in both the US and Sweden. Therefore, pooling all business owners together tends to mask important heterogeneity in income development and income mobility across different types of business owners.

In the Finnish context, there are several key features that differ between unincorporated firms, consisting of sole proprietors (single owner) and partnership firms, and incorporated firms labeled as privately held corporations. First, the owners of unincorporated firms are personally liable for all the financial commitments such as debts and other obligations of the firm, but the financial liability of incorporated firms is limited to the capital invested in the firm. Second, unincorporated firms are in general subject to more lenient administrative and accounting requirements compared to incorporated firms, including e.g. single-entry bookkeeping, and no requirements for capital installments or assigning a board of directors. Third, in the Finnish tax system, unincorporated firms are pass-through entities, meaning that their profits are allocated to their owners as personal taxable income. Incorporated firms constitute separate tax entities, and their profits are taxed at the corporate tax rate. Owners of privately held corporations pay a wage or dividend tax on income withdrawn from the firm.⁴ Therefore, as in many other countries and institutional contexts, an unincorporated business tends to be a more suitable choice for those who seek to run a simple business with no immediate intention for growth. In contrast, an incorporated firm is more suitable for entrepreneurs who are oriented towards risk-taking and growth-seeking business activities.

Following these lines of reasoning, in our analysis we divide business owners into incorporated (IE) and unincorporated (UIE) entrepreneurs based on the organizational form of the firm, allowing us to track down potential differences in income trajectories and mobility outcomes between different types of business owners. We define the organizational form of the business based on its organizational form in the year when it was established, and include the owners using this definition even if the firm later changes its organizational form.⁵ Our primary focus is on the IE, who we show to be distinctively different from both UIE and wage earners (WE).

Firm Entry. We define the first year of an incorporated business such that it is the first full year after the establishment date when the firm first reports positive sales. We use a similar sales condition for unincorporated businesses but also require the owners to receive at least 50% of their gross market income from the firm in the first year after the establishment date in order to focus on entrepreneurs who are actively engaged in their business operations. This last restriction is important as some wage earners receive additional earnings from an unincorporated business that they run alongside their main

⁴Online Appendix C presents a more detailed description of the differences in the tax schedules between the organizational forms.

⁵In our data, changing the organizational form is rare, as less than 3% of firms change their organizational form from unincorporated to incorporated within their first 10 years.

occupation, and we do not want to label them as being firm owners in our analysis.

Firm Ownership. Our analysis focuses on the main owners of firms, defined as individuals who own the largest share of the firm when it is established. These individuals typically bear the largest entrepreneurial risk but are also those who are likely to gain most in terms of income if the business ends up being successful. For incorporated business owners, we directly observe the ownership share of the business for each owner in the data, and for the owners of unincorporated businesses, we define the main owner status for the owner whose income from the firm is the largest. If two or more individuals own equal shares of a firm using the above definitions, they are all considered as main owners. Importantly, we do not condition on the success of the business in our analysis. After the first year, we allow the firm to go bankrupt or the owner to lose the status as the main owner, but we still label these individuals as entrepreneurs throughout our sample period.

We narrow our focus to individuals who are *new* business owners, defined as individuals who have no current or prior ownership of another incorporated or unincorporated firm in our data. We allow for transitions between the two types of entrepreneurship. This means that individuals can be labeled as new incorporated entrepreneurs if they had no prior ownership of an incorporated business but were sole proprietors or involved in a partnership, and vice versa. We label as wage earners those individuals with positive wage income who have no ownership of *any* firm over the whole period we observe in the data. This allows us to focus on the implications of new business creation on individual income development, excluding those who, for example, join an existing firm as a new partner or inherit an operating business from their parents.⁶

We define parental background in entrepreneurship using administrative data starting from 1987. We define the parent(s) of an individual as entrepreneur(s) if he or she is labeled as a business owner for at least 5 years in our data according to the socioeconomic status defined by Statistics Finland. This approach enables us to use a similar definition for parental entrepreneurship using our full data for 1987–2019, as the more detailed ownership data starts only from 1997.

Income Measurement. Our baseline individual income measure is disposable income, which denotes the net-of-tax-and-benefits annual incomes of individuals from all income sources observed in our data. We observe disposable incomes for all wage earners and

⁶Previous literature argues that inherited firms constitute only a small share of entrepreneurs. For example, they comprise 5.6% of firms in the US (Parker 2009) and 2.2% in Sweden (Lindquist et al. 2015). Furthermore, our ownership definition excludes those wage earners who, for example, join a firm as a minority partner with a very small ownership share but continue to work in the same firm. These types of ownership arrangements often tend to serve as a commitment tool for high-profile workers and do not represent the type of risky entrepreneurship we aim to focus on in this study.

business owners in each year from 1995 onward, which allows us to follow individual incomes over a long time period and enables a careful comparison of income development and mobility between the groups. Furthermore, disposable income is a relevant income measure when considering income mobility outcomes in the distribution, as it also captures differences in taxation and benefits both between wage earners and business owners and between the owners of different types of organizational forms. However, we use market income before taxes and transfers as an alternative income measure, and these results are qualitatively similar to those using disposable income (see Online Appendix B). All income variables are presented in 2005 prices using the Consumer Price Index of Statistics Finland.

In addition to income levels, we analyze the relative income development and income mobility of individuals by using individual and parental income ranks. These denote the individual’s relative position in the income distribution by percentile or decile points. We define the rank of each individual in the *full* population consisting of both wage earners and business owners before the firm was established (as explained in more detail below). We define parental income ranks using a distribution of the average annual household-level market income (labor and capital income) of the parents when they were 45–50 years old. We use market income for the parents to be able to define the ranks of those individuals whose parents were of that age after 1987, as the disposable income measure is not available in our data before 1995. Our results are robust to defining parental ranks using disposable incomes after 1995.⁷

Timeline. To our knowledge, our study is the first to follow new business owners long before and after they established their first business using population-wide panel data that cover transitions into entrepreneurship over multiple years.⁸ This enables us to provide visually clear and tractable evidence on selection into entrepreneurship and the income development and mobility of business owners.

For business owners we define the year $t = 0$ as the year they start their new business, and then follow their income development from before and after they started their business. To obtain a similar timeline for wage earners, we randomly allocate a ”pseudo-start

⁷Defining an exact boundary between the firm and the owner’s incomes can be challenging (see e.g. Kopczuk and Zwick 2020). In addition to income withdrawn from the firm as wages, dividends and capital gains, the owners of privately held corporations can retain earnings in their firm, which do not show up in the administrative data in the year that they are accrued. As an additional analysis to study the relevance of this income source and as a robustness check to our baseline analysis, we follow a similar type of approach as in Alstadsæter et al. (2023) and allocate earnings retained in the firms to each owner of an incorporated firm based on their ownership share of the firm, and include this income on top of the market income observed in the administrative data. The results in Online Appendix B show that the income dynamics follow a similar pattern when retained earnings are included, but including them naturally increases the income gains of entrepreneurship compared to wage earners.

⁸Our data include transitions into entrepreneurship that took place between 1998 and 2014. Berglann et al. (2011), the only other study that we know of that follow new entrepreneurs over time in a similar way, focus on transitions that take place between October 2000 and October 2001 in Norway.

year” ($t = 0$) for individuals who over our sample period never engage in any business activities. Therefore, in year $t = 0$ the wage earners do not actually start a business, but this timeline allows us to describe the overall income trajectories of wage earners using a similar timeline as for business owners. This approach provides us with an intuitive benchmark for the general earnings growth in the economy. In our baseline analysis, we follow the income development from 5 years before to 10 years after $t = 0$, i.e., from $t - 5$ to $t + 10$.

In addition to individual income, we use a similar approach to study firm outcomes and how their development differs by income ranks and other characteristics. We focus on survival rates and key balance sheet measures: sales, number of employees and staff costs, value added and value added per employee, and the likelihood of R&D investments. As there is no pre-period for new firms, we analyze the development of firm outcomes for their first 11 years, i.e. from t to $t + 10$. We analyze firm-level outcomes cumulatively up to the year $t + 10$ and illustrate our findings as binned scatter plots over individual and parental income decile ranks. This approach provides a comprehensive view of the longer-run success of the business while taking into account potential differences in firm survival across the individual and parental income distributions. We account firm survival by including the non-surviving firms in the data but replacing their reported values for the outcome by zero after the firm has exit the data. To estimate the conditional means by ranks reliably, we follow the recent approach of Cattaneo et al. (2024).

Finally, we acknowledge that starting a business and becoming an entrepreneur are not exogenous events. We further underline this by providing detailed evidence on selection into entrepreneurship below. Therefore, our goal is *not* to provide evidence of the causal effects of starting a business on income development. Instead, we provide visually clear and transparent stylized findings on selection into entrepreneurship, and income development, mobility and firm outcomes for those who self-selected to become entrepreneurs.

2.3 Descriptive statistics

Panel A of Table 1 presents the cross-sectional descriptive statistics for the full sample in 1997–2019. Similarly to the well-established existing evidence (see e.g. Halvarsson et al. 2018; Levine and Rubinstein 2017), the table illustrates that incorporated entrepreneurs (IE) earn on average much more (mean disposable income 31,097 and market income 40,348 euros) than wage earners (22,353 and 26,995 euros) and unincorporated entrepreneurs (21,565 and 24,679 euros). In addition, IEs are less likely to be women (24%). They are only slightly more likely to be highly educated, married, have more children and live in the capital city region compared to wage earners (WE) and unincorporated

entrepreneurs (UIE).⁹ Also, the groups do not differ by average age.

Similarly as in many previous studies (Lindquist et al. 2015; Fairlie and Robb 2007; Sorensen 2007; Uusitalo 2001; Dunn and Holtz-Eakin 2000), our data show that both IEs and UIEs are much more likely to have at least one parent who was also an entrepreneur compared to WEs (55%, 61% and 10%, respectively). This means that the children of entrepreneurs are very likely to establish a new business themselves. However, the parental income ranks are rather similar between the groups on average – a key feature that we provide more details on in Section 3.

Panel B of Table 1 presents the same statistics for IEs and UIEs one year before they started their business ($t - 1$) and for WEs one year before the randomly allocated pseudo-start years. The table shows that those who select to become an IE earn significantly more than WEs and UIEs already *before* they started their business (mean disposable incomes of 28,049, 20,596 and 17,371 euros, respectively). The distinct differences in gender and parental entrepreneurship remain similar as in the full cross-sectional data. However, the other observed characteristics such as age and the share living in the capital region are rather similar between the groups in this sample too.

Additionally, Figure A5 in Online Appendix A focuses on the age of start-up entrepreneurs in more detail and shows that the owners of new incorporated businesses are seemingly older than one might perhaps first expect. New IEs are typically between 30–40 years old (average 35) at the time they start their first business. In contrast, the largest share of new unincorporated firms are founded by individuals below 30 years of age.¹⁰ Additionally, our evidence in Online Appendix A Figure A6 suggests that incorporated entrepreneurs are more likely to have a degree in a technical field such as engineering compared to the other groups, but overall the differences between wage earners and different types of business owners in their level or field of education are small. Furthermore, the majority of the new incorporated business are founded in traditional industries, as shown in Online Appendix A Figure A2. Construction, wholesale, retail trade and restaurants comprise almost 41% of all new firms. Some other notable industries with shares of 4-6% are computer programming, consultancy, and architectural and engineering activities.

3 Selection into Entrepreneurship

In this section, we study selection into entrepreneurship based on both individual and parental characteristics. We focus on illustrating how the likelihood of starting a new

⁹For more details on the differences in education between entrepreneurs and wage earners, see Figures A6 and A7 in Online Appendix A.

¹⁰Note that as we restrict our sample to those individuals for which we observe child-parent links, we drop some of those who start their first business at a relatively old age from our analysis. The average age of starting a new IE would be 39 years in our data without the restriction, compared to 35 years with this restriction.

business correlates with individual and parental incomes. Also, we analyze how individual and parental income ranks are correlated with the initial equity of the new business. We evaluate the importance of having entrepreneurial parents throughout the analysis. In addition, we study the role of other potentially relevant characteristics, such as previous work experience, age, gender and education.

Selection by individual income. Selection into entrepreneurship by individual income can be conceptualized through three main channels, as formalized by e.g. Levine and Rubinstein (2020): human capital, liquidity constraints and preferences. The human capital or ability channel is often expressed in terms of the jacks-of-all-trades idea popularized by Lazear (2004), which states that entrepreneurs need not be experts in any single skill but rather they need to be multi-skilled generalists. Many of these required skills also have a high value in the labor market, but a decision to start a business requires some premium from entrepreneurship. A large literature has documented that salaried wages and personal wealth have general positive associations with selection into incorporated entrepreneurship (Evans and Jovanovic 1989; Evans and Leighton 1989; Fairlie 1999; Levine and Rubinstein 2017, 2020).

However, correlation between income or wealth and becoming an entrepreneur may also reflect the existence of liquidity constraints. Starting a business typically requires capital, and acquiring these resources externally might be challenging due to, for example, various frictions in the financial market. Therefore, the positive link between income and entrepreneurship can reflect both the human capital channel and the availability of financial resources for starting a business, and it is often difficult to separate between the two in empirical analysis without an experimental setting.

Additionally, preferences for "being your own boss", perceived work flexibility, attitudes toward risk and other similar personality traits are also likely to be correlated with the decision to become an entrepreneur. These types of connections are observed in many studies (see e.g. survey by Kerr et al. 2017). As an example, Hurst and Pugsley (2011) argue that various non-pecuniary benefits related to entrepreneurship play a key role in starting a business for many individuals.

We begin by zooming into the individual income distribution to analyze self-selection to starting a new business. The upper panel of Figure 1 presents the average likelihood of starting a new incorporated (IE) or unincorporated (UIE) business by individual income rank percentiles, measured one year before individuals started their business ($t - 1$). The figure shows the shares of new entrepreneurs (vertical axis) coming from each percentile-point in the overall income distribution (horizontal axis), which is measured including both entrepreneurs and wage earners.

From the figure we can observe that there is a non-monotonic association between becoming an IE and the individual income rank percentile. Individuals located in the

top 20% of the overall income distribution are much more likely to start an incorporated business compared to the rest of the distribution, where the likelihood of starting an incorporated business only weakly increases with income. The share of top income earners is even more striking the closer we zoom into the right tail: more than half of the starters are in the top earnings quartile a year before setting up their first firm, 17% come from the top 5%, and the top 1% spawns more than 5% of new business owners. However, within the top 1%, the very top 0.1% of earners are as likely as others at the top to become entrepreneurs. In contrast, low income individuals are more likely to start an unincorporated business compared to the rest of the distribution, and there is only a weak increase in this likelihood at the very top of the distribution. This means that selection into unincorporated self-employment differs visibly from selection into incorporated entrepreneurship.

The observed positive connection between income and entrepreneurship and the stark difference in selection between the firm types is well in line with the earlier literature (see e.g. Lazear 2004; Evans and Leighton 1989; Levine and Rubinstein 2017). However, our more granular analysis underlines that the positive selection into incorporated entrepreneurship appears to hold non-monotonically only at the top of the distribution, instead of continuously increasing by income throughout the distribution. This finding is similar to the non-linear association between individual wealth and starting a business documented previously by Hurst and Lusardi (2004) in the US.

Selection by parental characteristics. The channels regarding selection by parental income are conceptually similar as with individual income. Parental income can be correlated with the human capital and ability of the child, indicating positive selection by parental income into entrepreneurship if these skills can be translated into a positive premium or gain from being a business owner instead of a wage earner. Second, parental income or wealth could be linked to entrepreneurship through the liquidity channel if high-income parents are more able and willing to invest capital in the new business founded by their children. Consistent with these hypotheses, a few papers report a positive relationship between parental income and business ownership (see e.g. Dunn and Holtz-Eakin 2000; Levine and Rubinstein 2017; Lindquist and Vladasel 2022). Relatedly, parental entrepreneurship can be correlated with human capital or skills related to entrepreneurship and preferences for starting a business, indicating positive selection to entrepreneurship. Also, parental entrepreneurship could be linked with liquidity if entrepreneurial parents are more able and willing to invest or acquire capital to the newly established firms of their children.

The lower panel of Figure 1 illustrates the correlation between parental income rank and the likelihood of becoming a new IE or UIE. In contrast to individual incomes, this likelihood decreases almost linearly with parental income for both types of entrepreneurs,

except for the very bottom of the distribution. This means that we do not observe positive selection into any type of entrepreneurship by parental income, and that the association between individual and parental incomes and selection into entrepreneurship differ significantly from each other, particularly among incorporated entrepreneurs.¹¹

Our observation of the negative selection into entrepreneurship by parental income differs from previous evidence from the US regarding inventors, who are documented to overwhelmingly come from high-income families (Bell et al. 2019). Also, this pattern differs from incorporated business owners in the US and Sweden, where it is observed that family income positively predicts the probability of owning an incorporated business (Dunn and Holtz-Eakin 2000; Levine and Rubinstein 2017; Lindquist and Vladasel 2022).

We find that these differences between our findings and the previous literature can be explained by our explicit focus on entrepreneurs who start *new* businesses, which departs from previous studies that have focused on entrepreneurship in general – effectively emphasizing entrepreneurs who join an existing firm or whose firms eventually succeeded. First, when using cross-sectional data (years 2006 and 2014 as two examples) that include all current business owners in Figure A4 in Online Appendix A, we indeed observe that *all* incorporated entrepreneurs more often come from high-income families. Second, from the figure we can see a similar pattern when we look at new entrepreneurs who join *existing* businesses, as those with higher-income parents are more likely to join an existing firm as a new owner compared to others. These findings mean that when we focus on mature surviving firms instead of new business creation, we find a positive link between being an incorporated business owner and having high-income parents. In contrast, using the different samples has practically no effect on the association between parental rank and unincorporated entrepreneurship. Therefore, the associations between parental income and selection into new entrepreneurship can be different compared to what we can learn from the findings in the previous literature that do not particularly focus on new business creation (Dunn and Holtz-Eakin 2000; Levine and Rubinstein 2017; Lindquist and Vladasel 2022).

Above in Table 1 we show that parental entrepreneurship is closely connected to new business creation among both IE and UIE, as more than 50% of the new entrepreneurs had at least one parent with entrepreneurial background. However, parental entrepreneurship *does not* explain the selection based on individual or parental incomes presented above. Figure 2 presents the shares of new incorporated entrepreneurs by individual (upper graph) and parental (lower graph) income ranks for those with and without entrepreneurial parent(s). The individual and parental income rank results are strikingly

¹¹Figure A3 in Online Appendix A shows that this observation holds when we use disposable income or capital income instead of market income to define parental income ranks. For capital income, roughly a third of new incorporated business owners come from families with zero capital income while the pattern is flat at roughly one percentage per percentile rank from the 40th percentile all the way to the top of the parental capital income distribution.

similar for both of these groups, illustrating that the selection pattern by income does not depend on parental entrepreneurship at all.

Initial equity of the new firm. In order to assess the relevance of the ability and liquidity channels in explaining selection, we evaluate the association between the initial equity invested in the new firms and income ranks and parental entrepreneurship. We use the equity observed in the firm in its first year to proxy how individual and parental background is linked with firms' available capital when they are established.

Figure 3 presents the initial equity of the incorporated firms in logarithmic scale (vertical axis) by individual and parental income rank deciles (horizontal axis) and by parental background in entrepreneurship. The figure includes unconditional equity and equity conditional on the industry of the firm, which takes into account the potential differences in the industry composition between the firms in each rank.

The upper graph in Figure 3 shows that there is a positive and almost monotonic association between individual incomes at $t - 1$ and the equity of the new firm in year $t = 0$ when the firm is established. This means that individual income is tightly linked with the initial equity invested in the firm almost throughout the distribution. In contrast, the lower graph shows that initial equity is not positively associated with parental income. This suggests that higher parental income is not reflected in higher capital installments in the firm. One reasonable explanation for this finding is that those who start a new incorporated business are typically older than one might first expect, as the average age of new owners is 35 (see Table 1, Panel B). This suggests that parental income or wealth might not be tightly linked with the financial decisions or actions of their children once they are well into their adulthood. Also, the figure clearly shows that these results are robust for conditioning on the industry of the firm.

Figure 3 shows that parental entrepreneurship is not associated with initial equity of the newly established firms, as the equity estimates do not differ by parental background in entrepreneurship across both the individual and parental income distributions. This suggests that having an entrepreneurial parent is not linked with the equity channel that could potentially explain the high selection into incorporated entrepreneurship among the children of entrepreneurs. In contrast, this indicates that other factors, such as human capital, transmission of entrepreneurial skills or preferences for entrepreneurship, are the main factors behind selection into new entrepreneurship for those who come from entrepreneurial families.

Above we show that the positive selection by individual income is concentrated only at the very top of the individual distribution with a steep increase in the likelihood to become an entrepreneur among the top 10% of income earners (upper panel of Figure 1). However, a closer examination of the link between initial equity and individual income reveals that initial equity is not sharply increasing among the top 10% of income earners, in contrast

to the sharp increase in the likelihood of starting a business at the very top. This evidence suggests that the large share of top income earners choosing to start a business is likely to be associated with the perceived human capital as an entrepreneur or preferences for entrepreneurship, in contrast to only reflecting the presence of liquidity constraints. This finding echoes the results of Hurst and Lusardi (2004) on individual wealth and starting a business. On the other hand, either ability or liquidity channels do not appear to be directly linked with parental income, as the share of new entrepreneurs (lower panel of Figure 1) and the initial equity of the new firms are not positively correlated with the parental income rank.

Selection by other observable factors. Although our emphasis is on individual and parental income and parental background in entrepreneurship, we acknowledge that they are not the only factors that contribute to selection into starting a new business. Next, in Table 2, we evaluate the relative importance of various observable characteristics (predictors) by analyzing their role in explaining selection into entrepreneurship. Our procedure builds on the examination of the R^2 values for a wide range of possible models predicting selection into entrepreneurship, following the approach by Azen and Budescu (2003). In the analysis, we evaluate each predictor individually, all of them together and every combination between them. We report the partial R^2 and the share of total R^2 estimates for each predictor or a set of predictors.

Table 2 show that previous experience in running an unincorporated business and the interactions of the Mincerian factors (age, gender and education) are the most relevant determinants explaining the observed selection into incorporated entrepreneurship. They capture 36% and 28% of the total R^2 , respectively. Parental entrepreneurship (14%) and previous industry as a worker (12%) also captures a large share of the total R^2 , and in this model including a wide range of potential predictors and their interactions, personal income ranks explain in total 4% of the overall R^2 . Perhaps surprisingly, the level and field of education have practically no predictive power on selection into incorporated entrepreneurship. This is further illustrated in Online Appendix A Figure A7, which shows that the share of highly educated individuals increases linearly with the initial income rank for both types of business owners and wage earners, in contrast to the clear selection into incorporated entrepreneurship by individual income taking place mainly at the top of the distribution discussed above.

4 Income Mobility

Next, we focus on the differences in income development and mobility between entrepreneurs and wage earners. We first show the average income trajectories and then investigate whether entrepreneurship shapes personal incomes differently for individuals

coming from different backgrounds. From this Section onward, our analysis focuses on the new owners of incorporated businesses.

4.1 Average Income Trajectories

Numerous previous studies suggest that the median business owner does not earn more than their salaried counterpart (see e.g. Evans and Jovanovic 1989, Hamilton 2000, Moskowitz and Vissing-Jørgensen 2002). However, pooling all business owners (self-employed, partnerships, incorporated) together may not be a good proxy for risk-taking entrepreneurship (Glaeser 2009, La Porta and Shleifer 2014). In parallel with this notion, Levine and Rubinstein (2017) disaggregate business owners into entrepreneurs and other business owners based on whether they are incorporated or not. Their results clearly show that the incorporated tend to earn much more than the unincorporated or wage earners. Halvarsson et al. (2018) document a qualitatively similar pattern in Sweden. To our knowledge, the only previous study that explicitly follows new entrepreneurs over time is by Berglann et al. (2011). They focus on transitions into entrepreneurship that took place in Norway during a 12-month spell in 2000–2001. Their findings suggest that incorporated entrepreneurs, in terms of income development, outperform both unincorporated self-employed and the matched control group of wage earners over the first five years of entrepreneurship. Table 1 covering the descriptive statistics on our data shows that these broad findings hold also in our sample. However, it is not evident how much incorporated entrepreneurs benefit from entrepreneurship per se, and how much of the income differences between the groups can be allotted to self-selection into incorporated entrepreneurship from the top incomes. Our evidence in Section 3 suggests that a large share of the observed differences in income can in fact be driven by selection into incorporated entrepreneurship by top income earners.

We study entry into entrepreneurship in 1998–2014 and analyze income trajectories from five years before to 10 years after the new firm was established. To portray the differences in income dynamics between incorporated entrepreneurs and wage earners, we estimate the following regression separately for the two groups:

$$y_{ist} = \sum_{j \neq -1} \psi_j \times \mathbb{1}[j = t] + \sum_k \beta_k \times \mathbb{1}[k = s] + X_{is} + \epsilon_{ist}, \quad (1)$$

where y is log income for individual i in year s at event time t , which is the start year of entrepreneurship. We omit the event time dummy $t - 1$ so that the estimated event time coefficients ψ_j represent income development relative to the year just before the start of entrepreneurship and the randomly allocated pseudo-start years for wage earners. β_k represent year dummies flexibly controlling for the overall time trend. In addition to

unconditional trajectories, we add various individual-level characteristics (X) to study how they affect the income development patterns of business owners and wage earners. The controls include typical Mincer-type controls (age, gender and level of education, and all their interactions and quadratic and cubic terms for age), and individual and parental percentile income ranks. Individual rank is defined as an average rank before starting a business between the years $t - 5$ and $t - 1$, and parental income is observed when the parents are 45–50 years old.¹²

The upper panel of Figure 4 shows the unconditional income trajectories and trajectories conditional on two set of control variables for IE and WE. The first general finding from the graph is that there is a clear difference between the income development of IEs compared to WEs. The unconditional average income trajectory of IEs (squares) is more steeply increasing in comparison to WEs (circles) already before the start of the business. This shows that there is selection into entrepreneurship based on not only individual income as discussed above, but also by the growth rate of individual income. Another interesting finding is the clear dip in the incomes of IE, approximately 8%, in the year the business is established ($t = 0$). This is feasible because it can take some time for a new corporation to be able to operate at full capacity and for the owner to withdraw income from the newly founded firm. The individual incomes of IEs then quickly catch up after this drop and increase more rapidly in the years following the establishment of the business compared to wage earners. After 10 years, entrepreneurs earn on average about 20% more than wage earners, relative to the year before the firm was established.¹³ Including controls flattens the income trajectories of both groups. The difference at $t + 10$ is reduced from 0.21 log points to 0.16. However, it is still clear that the incomes of IEs increase more rapidly than WEs after the firm is established even when including the controls.

The lower panel of Figure 4 shows the regression results using a coarsened exact matching (CEM) approach. We use CEM as an alternative approach to more carefully balance the observed differences between WE and IE before the firm is established.¹⁴ The

¹²Our empirical approach in studying the income mobility of entrepreneurs has clear similarities with a staggered difference-in-differences setup. As is well known, this approach suffers from challenges related to differences in treatment timing and treatment effect heterogeneity, see Roth et al. (2023) for a review. Although our aim is to provide descriptive evidence without causal claims, we want to make sure that the magnitudes of our estimates are not driven by these potential issues. Our setup differs from the examples often discussed in the recent literature, as our benchmark group (wage earners) only consists of "never-treated" individuals. Also, in our setting, the post-entrepreneurship years are always relative to the randomly defined year for the benchmark group, which allows us to estimate the dynamics related to the treatment timing. In Figure 5, we will compare the OLS coefficients to the heterogeneity-adjusted coefficients using two estimators designed to address issues related to staggered treatment and treatment effect heterogeneity, namely, Borusyak et al. (2021) and Callaway and Sant'Anna (2021). Our results using these estimators are very similar to our baseline model.

¹³In euros, IEs saw their disposable income increase from 22,000 to 28,000 during the five years before the start of the business, and eventually to 41,000 10 years after becoming entrepreneurs, on average. For WEs, the corresponding numbers are 17,000, 20,000 and 25,000 euros.

¹⁴We use the average income rank deciles between $t - 3$ and $t - 1$, the growth in rank between $t - 3$

overall implications remain mostly similar as in the upper panel. Significant income gains from incorporated entrepreneurship are evident also when we use matching, as there is a clear 0.18 log point difference in income between IEs and WEs 10 years after the new firm was established. With the CEM approach, we are able to further narrow down the differences in the income trends between WEs and IEs before the firm was established. However, matching comes with a cost of losing many observation from the analysis: only 18% of wage earners and 62% of new incorporated entrepreneurs receive positive CEM weights in the analysis. If we were to relax the matching criteria to increase the number of observations included in the analysis, the differences in pre-entrepreneurship income trajectories quickly re-emerge. This finding further underlines the distinctive self-selection into entrepreneurship based on observed income development before the firm was established when comparing incorporated entrepreneurs to wage earners.

In Figure 5, we plot the differences in income trajectories between IE and WE. We estimate equation (1) using a sample that includes both IE and WE, and interact ψ_j with IE status. We use OLS with and without controls, and estimators designed to address potential issues related to treatment timing and treatment effect heterogeneity (Callaway and Sant’Anna 2021, Borusyak et al. 2021) as robustness checks. With some differences in magnitudes, all these specifications show the apparent positive trend in income before the start of the business among IEs compared to WEs, the dip in income in the first years of entrepreneurship, and the steep increase in income associated with entrepreneurship after the start of the new business.

We test the sensitivity of our findings in various dimensions. These results are presented and discussed in more detail in Online Appendix B. First, focusing on market income instead of disposable income (our baseline measure) does not significantly affect the qualitative aspects of our analysis. Figure B1 for market income paints a very similar picture as Figure 4 did for disposable income. Second, including earnings retained in the firm and not distributed as wages and dividends for the owners of incorporated firms does not change the overall pattern of income trajectories, but it increases the income levels of IEs by an almost constant annual share of 15% starting right from the first year after the business was established. Table B1 in Online Appendix B shows the heterogeneity of the average income trajectories across different subsamples, illustrating that our findings do not crucially change when looking at various subsamples of entrepreneurs. Most importantly, our findings are not sensitive to defining the main owners of incorporated firms using either data from the Finnish Tax Administration or Statistics Finland (discussed in more detail in Section 2). Also, we do not observe significant differences in income gains between entrepreneurs operating in more traditional industries such as manufacturing or

and $t - 1$, parental income rank, a dummy for a parent being an entrepreneur, average share of labor earnings relative to total income in $t - 3$ and $t - 1$, and age, gender, place of residence and the number of children at $t - 1$ in the CEM weighting procedure to match the groups. For more details on the CEM method, see e.g. Iacus et al. (2012).

transportation, and industries characterized by highly specialized human capital skills, such as consultancy or health services, as illustrated in Figure B5 in Online Appendix B.

4.2 Income Gains by Individual and Parental Background

The average income trajectories presented above leave open the question of whether income developments differ by the backgrounds of individuals. Does entrepreneurship open a way for the individuals at the top of the distribution to become even richer, or does it provide a "Stairway to Heaven" for less well-off individuals to reach the top of the income distribution? Entrepreneurship is often viewed as a key channel for income mobility in society (see e.g. Fairlie 2004), but there is only scarce empirical evidence on this available. Furthermore, parental entrepreneurship is clearly associated with selection into entrepreneurship in many countries (see e.g. Lindquist et al. 2015; Sorensen 2007; Uusitalo 2001; Dunn and Holtz-Eakin 2000), but there is limited evidence on whether those who come from entrepreneurial families earn more as entrepreneurs compared to others.

As discussed above in Section 3, personal and parental income and parental entrepreneurship may capture differences in abilities or skills that can reflect differences in earnings potential and development between entrepreneurs coming from different backgrounds. Also, even though we argue above that selection into entrepreneurship by income appears not to be fully driven by liquidity, financial constraints may matter for entrepreneurial success as the initial scale of the business can positively impact the success of the business and personal income trajectories (see e.g. Boháček 2006; Quadrini 2009). These channels, therefore, suggest that income development and entrepreneurial success depend positively on personal and parental incomes and parental entrepreneurship. However, if the prevalence of these channels is only modest and entrepreneurial success does not crucially hinge on initial monetary resources, the largest gains from entrepreneurship may accrue to those who start with lower income or come from low-income families. This would suggest that entrepreneurship opens up a way to increase individual income particularly for those coming from less well-off backgrounds.

We begin by studying income gains by individual and parental income. Analyzing the association between individual and parental incomes jointly within the same data and context allows us to evaluate their relative significance for the individual income development of entrepreneurs. Previous literature has studied these associations separately, but it remains an open question whether individual or parental incomes are the key drivers behind the individual incomes of entrepreneurs. To study the income distributions jointly, we group IEs and WEs into five individual and parental income quintiles, thus dividing the data into 25 individual-parental income bins. We then interact these bins with the event timeline in equation (1), and present the differences in income trajectories between

IEs and WEs in these groups in Figure 6, in a similar fashion as in Figure 5 above.

Each panel of Figure 6 illustrates the differences in raw income trajectories from $t - 5$ to $t + 10$ between IEs and WEs by parental income quintiles for a given individual income quintile before $t = 0$. For example, the top-left graph of the figure shows the trajectories for those coming from the bottom quintile of the individual income distribution (Individual P1–P20) and from each of the parental income quintile (Parent P1-P20...P81–P100).

As our main finding, the figure suggests that the relative income gains are rather evenly distributed in all of these groups. This implies that income development as a new entrepreneur is not closely linked with either individual income from before the firm was established or parental income. One exception to this pattern is that parental income is slightly positively associated with income development among those who were already at the top of the individual distribution before the firm was established (the lower-right panel of Figure 6). For these individuals, given their high initial incomes, the gains from entrepreneurship over comparable wage earners translate into over 34,000 euros at $t + 10$. In other bins, the monetary increases are 10,000–22,000 euros, with an average of 15,000 euros at $t + 10$. Figure 6 also reveals that dividing the sample by individual and parent income narrows the differences in income trajectories between entrepreneurs and wage earners prior to the start of the business, and that the largest income losses in the year of starting a business are among individuals with the highest original income levels.¹⁵

Figure 7 shows the income trajectories separately for IEs with and without entrepreneurial parents. The figure shows that individual incomes for both of these groups of entrepreneurs develop very similarly both before and after the new business is established. Therefore, despite its importance in explaining selection into entrepreneurship discussed above, having entrepreneurial parents is not associated with individual-level income gains.

In Table 3 we evaluate the importance of various other factors (predictors) as potential sources of heterogeneity behind the income gains among IEs and WEs, in a similar fashion as above in Section 3. We find that individual income ranks are the most important predictor of income gains for both IEs and WEs, capturing about half of the total R^2 in both groups. This reflects mean reversion as those with the lowest income at $t - 1$ typically see the largest relative income gains in the future. By adding Mincerian controls and their interactions, we capture as much as 76% and 66% of the total R^2 among IEs and WEs, respectively. These results indicate that there are no stand-out differences in the predictors of income gains between IEs and WEs. Relatedly, as shown in Figure 5, the difference in income gains between IEs and WEs by $t + 10$ is only slightly affected by

¹⁵Figure A9 in Online Appendix A summarizes these results when including Mincerian controls. These results are very similar to the unconditional trajectories in Figure 6. Also, the results on income mobility are similar when using market income instead of disposable income and when adding earnings retained in the firm on top of market income, as illustrated and discussed in Figures B2 and B3 in Online Appendix B.

the inclusion of control variables.¹⁶

Overall, our findings above demonstrate that entrepreneurship is associated with significant personal income gains across both individual and parental income distributions. This suggests that entrepreneurship does not only benefit those already at the top, but also provides a "Stairway to Heaven" for those coming from less well-off backgrounds. Also, the positive gains at the top suggest that entrepreneurship further increases incomes at the top of the distribution, but it is more difficult to pin down whether it is the selection or the gains from entrepreneurship that primarily account for the over-representation of entrepreneurs in the top income brackets. Next, we analyze and discuss these issues in more detail.

Figure 8 further illustrates the changes in the distribution over time. Panel A of the figure depicts how the share of entrepreneurs (vertical axis) in each income rank percentile (horizontal axis) developed from one year before starting a business (rank at $t - 1$) to 10 years after that (rank at $t + 10$). The figure shows that roughly 5% of incorporated entrepreneurs were among the top 1% of income earners already in the year before they established their first business. Ten years later their share increases to almost 11%. Therefore, consistent with our findings on selection and income development, new entrepreneurs appear to occupy the top of the distribution even before starting a business, and their prevalence at the top is clearly increased by the positive income gains associated with incorporated entrepreneurship.¹⁷ Additionally, Panel A highlights that the prevalence of *new* incorporated business owners at the top of the distribution 10 years after they established their first firms closely resembles the share of *all* incorporated entrepreneurs at the top, measured using the cross-sectional data in 2006–2016. This gives further evidence that the length of our event study window is sufficiently long to capture the over-representation of entrepreneurs at the top of the distribution in the entire population.

Panels B and C of Figure 8 describe the positive income mobility patterns in the distribution in more detail. The graphs plot the likelihoods of reaching the top 1% (Panel B) and top 10% (Panel C) of the income distribution ten years after starting the new business for incorporated business owners and wage earners coming from different income percentiles of the distribution before the year $t = 0$. In both panels, incorporated business owners dominate regular wage earners in the likelihood of reaching the top, except for those at the very top before the firm was established. This further demonstrates that

¹⁶Conditioning on success of the business, i.e. when splitting the sample by those who still have an actively operating business after five years or not, clearly affects the income trajectories for IEs. Figure A8 in Online Appendix A shows that successful entrepreneurs have much larger personal gains in comparison to those whose firms did not succeed, as can be expected.

¹⁷This line of reasoning is of course more or less incomplete, as we do not account for a counterfactual where the entrepreneurs never established their businesses. Nevertheless, based on these findings it seems that entrepreneurship amplifies pre-existing differences in incomes at the top, while the role of selection in explaining the high share of business owners at the top is also notable.

entrepreneurship is associated with upward mobility in the distribution for a large number of income groups, not only among those who were already at the top before establishing their first business.

Our results and earlier literature consistently show that parental background in entrepreneurship strongly predicts selection into entrepreneurship, and that incorporated entrepreneurship is associated with significant income gains compared to wage earners. Nevertheless, our findings indicate that parental income is not positively correlated with the likelihood of starting a business or the individual income development of entrepreneurs. Taken together with the earlier evidence, this might at first seem controversial. However, these results can be rationalized by the distinctively large intergenerational income mobility among entrepreneurs.

To shed more light on this, we study intergenerational mobility separately for entrepreneurs and wage earners. Using Swedish data, Lindquist and Vladasel (2022) show that business owners are intergenerationally much more mobile compared to wage earners, meaning that the entrepreneurial children of low-income parents are more likely to have high earnings as an adult (and vice versa). We find similar results using our data. Figure 9 shows the rank-rank correlations between parents and their children for IEs and WEs. We measure children’s income at two fixed points in time, similarly as in our analysis above: one year before (Panel A of Figure 9) and ten years after (Panel B) the entrepreneurs started their first business, and for wage earners relative to the randomly assigned random pseudo-start year.¹⁸

First, we find that the rank-rank correlation of wage earners and their parents is between 0.14 and 0.21, depending on when the children’s income is observed. These numbers align with the earlier intergenerational mobility studies conducted using Finnish data (0.14 in Kaila et al. 2024) and those obtained for Denmark (0.18 in Chetty et al. 2014). This supports the general validity of our rank-rank measures. However, we find that among incorporated entrepreneurs the rank-rank correlation is between 0.06 and 0.09, less than half of that for regular wage earners. Also, the results show that entrepreneurs were more intergenerationally mobile already before establishing their first business. This implies that the large intergenerational mobility among entrepreneurs is driven by self-selection to starting a business.¹⁹ Therefore, these findings can rationalize the observed patterns. Even though we observe that the children of entrepreneurs are more likely to become entrepreneurs themselves, the income levels of their parents do not predict their success as a business owner due to the large intergenerational income

¹⁸The intergenerational mobility literature often measures the rank-rank correlations using proxies for life-time earnings, which measure, for example, average annual incomes from a longer time period for both parents and their children (see e.g. Chetty et al. 2014; Lindquist and Vladasel 2022; Kaila et al. 2024). We depart from this approach and define the earnings of children in two points in time. This enables us to separate the potential impact of self-selection into entrepreneurship from the income mobility while the business is in operation, as discussed in more detail below.

¹⁹Lindquist and Vladasel (2022) document a similar result using Swedish data.

mobility. Second, the higher mobility even before the firm is established indicates that the income of parents is not predicting selection into entrepreneurship either, which is consistent with our key observations above.

Finally, previous evidence from other countries show that business owners significantly contribute to observed top-end inequality, as their share at the top of the income distribution is often striking (Smith et al. 2023, 2019; Halvarsson et al. 2018). Figure A10 in Online Appendix A illustrates how entrepreneurship contributes to the income shares at the top by showing that business income clearly dominates at the top of the distribution also in Finland. The figure shows that wage income is the main income source from the 90th to the 99th percentile of the overall income distribution of all income earners. For example, at the 90th percentile approximately 90% of aggregate income consists of wage income. The share of non-wage income (business income + other capital income) gradually increases the closer we approach the very top of the income distribution, and this share increases very sharply when we move to the richest 0.1%, where the share of wage income falls below 40% of aggregate income, and non-wage income represents more than 60% of total income. This evidence is very similar as is presented for the US by Smith et al. (2019). Despite the clear differences in the level of overall income inequality, the institutional settings and the tax systems for business owners, business income and other capital income clearly dominate the very top of the distribution in both of these countries. Perhaps surprisingly, the share of non-wage income is even larger for the top 0.1% in Finland compared to the US. Additionally, the inclusion of firm-level retained earnings has a notable impact on the income composition at the top in Finland. In this analysis we divide earnings retained in the firm and not distributed as wages or dividends to the main owner based on the ownership shares of the firm. Figure A10 in Online Appendix A shows that including retained earnings in the market income measure further increases the share of non-wage income at the very top from 60% to almost 80%. This further highlights the role of retained earnings at the very top, similarly as has been recently illustrated using data from the US (Piketty et al. 2017; Kopczuk and Zwick 2020), Norway (Alstadsæter et al. 2023) and the Netherlands (Bruil et al. 2022).

5 Firm Performance

Our findings above suggest that individual-level gains from entrepreneurship are rather evenly distributed across the individual and parental income distributions and by parental entrepreneurship. However, individual benefits from entrepreneurship do not necessarily go hand in hand with productivity and job creation of the new firms. Therefore, it is relevant to study whether key firm outcomes such as productivity and employment are linked with individual and parental background of the owners. Our analysis aims to reveal whether the broader benefits of new business creation are linked with these key

owner-level characteristics. Also, it could be that high-income individuals are more likely to establish businesses that require only few workers but high levels of cognitive skills, such as consultancies, indicating that the firm mainly generates return on the human capital of its main owner. In turn, middle- and low-income individuals may be more likely to set up businesses that operate in more labor-intensive sectors, implying that the returns on entrepreneurship are shared more broadly in the society among these groups.

There is only limited earlier evidence on linking owner characteristics to firm performance measures. Existing evidence suggests that the founders of successful businesses are older than commonly thought (Azoulay et al. 2020), innovators often come from the top of the income distribution (Bell et al. 2019) and are responsive to tax incentives (Akcigit et al. 2022), and that education and human capital are important for explaining firm dynamics (Queiro 2022; Cooper et al. 1994; Kangasharju and Pekkala 2002). Also, Holtz-Eakin et al. (1994) show that receiving an inheritance increases firm survival in the US. Hvide and Møen (2010) find that start-up size increases linearly with the owner's prior wealth from the middle wealth brackets to the top in Norway. Andersen and Nielsen (2012) document that entrepreneurs embarking on a business venture after acquiring windfall wealth in Denmark have significantly lower survival rates and profits, in contrast to a matched sample of entrepreneurs who did not experience an influx of unexpected financial resources.

Our contribution is to provide novel evidence on how individual and parental background is connected to key firm outcomes such as employment and productivity. Our unique data enabling us to precisely define the start dates and ownership structures of the businesses combined with the detailed individual-level data allow us to carefully examine the associations between owner characteristics and the economic performance of the new businesses over a long time after the business was established. In particular, our analysis allows us to narrow the focus to the connections between individual and parental characteristics and successful new business creation, instead of characterizing these types of links for all types of existing business owners as is typically done in the previous literature.

Table 4 describes the new firms in their first year (Panel A) and ten years after their establishment (Panel B). The average 10-year survival rate is around 60%. We examine five firm-level business activity measures covering the scale and productivity of the firms. The variables we study include annual sales, number of employees and staff costs, value added and value added per employee (productivity). The table presents the mean, median and 10th, 90th and 99th percentile-point values for these variables. Table shows that, on average, the new firms report sales of approximately 470,000 euros, employ three workers and pay 110,000 in wages at the end of their first year. After ten years, the average sales has increased to nearly one million euros, the number of employees to roughly 7 workers and wage costs to 300,000 euros on average. The average values for

value added (revenue-variable costs) are 130,000 euros and 325,000, and for productivity (value added per worker) 40,000 and 33,000 euros in the first and tenth year, respectively.

Table 4 highlights that there is considerable variation between firm outcomes across the distribution. For example, at the 10th percentile of the distributions the firms do not have any employees and report annual sales below 22,000 euros even after ten years since the firm is established (on average). In contrast, at the 90th percentile the number of employees and annual sales has reached nearly 15 persons and almost two million euros after ten years, respectively. The values at the top 1% of firms are even more striking, as these firms report sales of over 13 million euros and have over 80 employees on average in the tenth year after establishment.

Additionally, we observe that construction, retail trade and computer programming are among the most frequent industries across both the individual and parental income distributions (see Online Appendix A Table A2). Management consultancy, however, is among the most prominent industries only among those who were top earners before becoming entrepreneurs. At its extreme, among those who were in the top individual quintile and who come from top quintile families, management consultancy comprises 13.6% of new businesses. Yet, construction, wholesale, retail trade and restaurants cover roughly a quarter of the new firms among these entrepreneurs too.

A first key measure for the success of a new business is its survival rate. Studying firm survival reveals how successful entrepreneurs coming from different backgrounds are in their business ventures in terms of the general viability of the business. In Figure 10, we present how firm survival rates (vertical axis) developed over the first 10 years after the firm was established (horizontal axis) for owners coming from different individual and parental income rank deciles and by parental entrepreneurship. We define a surviving firm as a firm which we observe in our administrative data, and define a firm exit year as the first year we no longer observe the firm in the tax record data. Therefore, non-survival includes firm exits for all potential reasons, including, for example, bankruptcies, voluntary firm closures and acquisitions by other firms.

Panels A and C of Figure 10 show that the average firm survival rate is clearly higher for those with the highest individual incomes before the firm was established compared to those with lower initial income. This means that those with higher incomes are more likely to establish more viable firms, even though the relative individual-level income trajectories differ only little across the income distribution, as shown in Section 4. Panels B and D show a similar association with parental income, but the link between firm survival and parental income is not as strong as with individual income.

Panels A and B of Figure 10 show the associations for those with entrepreneurial parents, and panels C and D for those without entrepreneurial parents. The graphs underline a clear difference between firm survival and parental entrepreneurship: the new firms established by those who come from entrepreneurial families are much more likely

to survive over their first ten years across both the individual and parental income distributions than those without entrepreneurial parents. Strikingly, the difference between firm survival rate by parental entrepreneurship is almost 30 percentage points, on average. This difference is even larger for those coming from the lowest individual (48 pp.) and parental income rank deciles (42 pp.) compared to those from the top individual and parental income deciles (25 and 17 pp., respectively).²⁰

Next, we focus on the key economic outcomes of new firms over the first ten years after their establishment. Similarly as above, we conduct the analysis by individual and parental income decile ranks and for those with and without entrepreneurial parents. We measure the firm-level outcomes cumulatively over the first ten years of the business. We add up the annual measures for each firm and compare the average outcomes of these accumulated variables between the groups. This approach provides a comprehensive view of the longer-run success of the business while taking into account the differences in firm survival across the individual and parental income distributions described in Figure 10. We account for firm survival by including the non-surviving firms in the data but replacing their reported values for the outcomes with zero after the firm has exited the data. This means that those firms who do not survive over their entire first ten years contribute to the accumulated figures only during those years they were actively operating their business. As described in Section 2.2, we follow the approach in Cattaneo et al. (2024) to plot the binned scatter plots for the firm-level outcomes.

Figure 11 presents the results by individual income decile ranks and parental entrepreneurship. The figure includes the estimates both with and without controls for the industry and initial equity of the firm in its first year of business. Two key findings emerge from the figure: first, firm-level outcomes are generally increasing by individual income. This association is particularly strong at the lower part of the initial distribution, but the differences in firm outcomes are less apparent between those coming from the upper end of the income distribution. As an illustration of the magnitudes, the annual sales and value added of the firms are 100 and 180% higher when comparing the bottom and top 10% of the individual income distributions. The same numbers for the number of employees, staff costs, productivity (value added per worker) and the likelihood of R&D investments are 90, 90, 110 and 30%. Furthermore, the figure highlights that these differences persist when controlling for the industry and initial equity of the firm.

²⁰Figure A11 in Online Appendix A shows the survival rates by the same groups using only bankruptcy declarations as a measure of firm survival. Bankruptcies can be considered as an extreme measure for firm exits. A firm cannot simply decide to go bankrupt, as a bankruptcy petition needs to be filed to a court either by the firm owner herself or its creditors, and the court then decides on the outcome of the petition instead of the firm owners. Also, bankruptcy is expensive and undesirable for the owner. When bankruptcy is declared, the owner can no longer decide on how to use the firm's assets, as they are then liquidated and paid to the creditors. Also, bankruptcy is likely to harm the reputation of the owner. The findings in Figure A11 are qualitatively very similar to those in Figure 10 that includes all types of firm exits, but the survival rates using only bankruptcies are in general higher throughout the distributions compared to all firm exits, as can be expected.

Second, family background in entrepreneurship appears to be a key factor for predicting the economic success of new firms. All key firm outcomes are significantly larger among those coming from entrepreneurial families throughout the individual income distribution compared to those without entrepreneurial parents. On average, sales, value added, the number of employees, staff costs, and productivity are 115, 190, 105, 175 and 150% higher for those with entrepreneurial parents compared to those without them. The differences in the likelihood of any R&D investments is, nevertheless, smaller (25%). In addition, the figure shows that controlling for industry and the initial equity of the firm affect the estimates very little, indicating that the differences between industry compositions and initial capital assets across the distribution do not change these conclusions.

Figure 12 presents similar graphs by parental income and parental entrepreneurship. First, the findings regarding parental entrepreneurship are very similar as above. The firm outcomes are, on average, much larger for those with entrepreneurial parents compared to those without them throughout the parental income distribution. In contrast, the figure shows that there appears to be no significant association between parental income and firm performance. There are no statistically significant differences in the accumulated firm outcomes over the first ten years between entrepreneurs with different parental income, and this holds for both those with and without entrepreneurial parents. Similarly as above, controlling for industry and the initial equity of the firms do not affect these conclusions. Therefore, these findings illustrate that there is a clear difference in the association between individual and parental incomes and firm performance measures.

Earlier literature underlines the role of parental background and the associated human capital channel and intergenerational transmission of entrepreneurial skills in explaining entrepreneurial traits and activity (see e.g. Dunn and Holtz-Eakin 2000; Hurst and Lusardi 2004; Hurst and Pugsley 2011; Lindquist et al. 2015). Our findings above support these observations by showing that key-firm-level outcomes, even conditional on the industry of the firm and its initial equity position, are clearly higher among those new entrepreneurs who come from entrepreneurial families compared to those without entrepreneurial parents. In Figure 3 in Section 3, we provided evidence that neither parental income or parental entrepreneurship are linked with the initial equity of the new firms in their first year, suggesting that the liquidity channel or other financial factors are not associated with parental background characteristics. Taken together, these findings suggest that the transmission of knowledge and skills related to running a successful business are important in explaining key firm outcomes.²¹ Instead, Figures 3 and 10 together indicate that both the initial assets of the firm and firm survival increase by individual income ranks, suggesting that both the human capital and liquidity channels may play a

²¹A more detailed dynamic analysis of this connection, presented in Figure A12 in Online Appendix A, shows that the firms founded by individuals with entrepreneurial parents succeed better than the others particularly in the first years after the business was established.

role behind firm survival among those with high initial income levels.

In contrast, we find that parental income of the owner does not predict the success of a newly established firm. This suggests that even though parental earnings and wealth are often observed to be tightly correlated with individual income and various other child outcomes (see e.g. Ermisch et al. 2012; Chetty et al. 2014; Björklund and Jäntti 2020), they do not appear to correlate with successful entrepreneurship. However, we find that the firms founded by those with high-income parents are more likely to survive over their first years, but this connection is not reflected in higher productivity or employment of the firms founded by those with high income parents in the longer run.

Our findings illustrate that the positive externalities of new business creation in terms of employment and productivity are clearly positively linked with both individual income and parental entrepreneurship. However, these findings differ from our observations above that personal income gains from entrepreneurship are not tightly linked with either individual income or parental entrepreneurship. First, these two findings highlight that the associations of new business creation may differ from individual-level observations often studied in the earlier literature. Therefore, extending the analysis on firm-level outcomes deliver a different and more comprehensive view on the implications of new entrepreneurship in the society for entrepreneurs coming from different backgrounds. Second, our findings on the increased number of employees and staff costs by individual income and parental entrepreneurship indicate that the benefits from new business creation are shared more broadly within the economy. This implies that the increased firm-level outcomes by these characteristics do not only reflect the benefits of individual entrepreneurs, such as in the case if the firm-level outcomes would only correspond to higher returns to the human capital of the owner. Instead, together with the results on similar individual income gains by income ranks and parental entrepreneurship, a distinguishable share of the benefits of successful entrepreneurship by these characteristics are shared with workers.

Finally, we evaluate the importance of various factors (predictors) on firm-level success in a unified regression framework by examining the R^2 values for all possible subsets of models of the predictors, in a similar manner as in Sections 3 and 4 above. In this analysis, we focus on two key firm-level outcomes: the number of employees (total R^2 of the model is 0.3201) and value added (0.2570). Table 5 shows that parental entrepreneurship captures 15.5% and 12.4% of the total R^2 for number of employees and value added, respectively. Individual rank captures 5.9% and 7.7%. With entrepreneurs' industry before entrepreneurship, Mincerian characteristics and all their interactions, and firms' industry interacted with initial equity we capture approximately 70% of the total R^2 for both outcomes.

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we provide evidence on selection into entrepreneurship and the income mobility of entrepreneurs. We observe distinctive selection into incorporated entrepreneurship by parental entrepreneurship and at the very top of the individual income distribution, but no similar selection by parental income. We find that incorporated entrepreneurship is associated with clear positive income gains compared to both unincorporated business owners and wage earners, and that these gains are rather evenly distributed across both the individual and parental income distributions and by parental background in entrepreneurship. Furthermore, we find that new incorporated business owners who come from the bottom and middle parts of the income distribution are much more likely to reach the top income brackets than wage earners. Therefore, our findings demonstrate that entrepreneurship does not only benefit those already at the top, but also provides a "Stairway to Heaven" for those coming from less well-off backgrounds.

The main novelty of our paper is that we study how individual and parental characteristics are associated with new business creation and firm performance over time. Our most striking result from this analysis is that individuals with entrepreneurial parents and those coming from the top of the individual income distribution establish much more successful businesses than others in terms of firm survival, scale (sales, employment) and productivity (value added per worker). These findings emphasize that the positive spillovers of entrepreneurship are concentrated among those entrepreneurs who come from entrepreneurial families and who were top-earners already before becoming entrepreneurs. Together with the fact that the individual-level income gains associated with entrepreneurship are rather evenly distributed among entrepreneurs coming from different backgrounds, our firm-level analysis underlines that individual gains from entrepreneurship do not necessarily go hand in hand with the broader benefits of entrepreneurship in the society.

References

- Aghion, P., Akcigit, U., Bergeaud, A., Blundell, R., and Hemous, D. (2018a). Innovation and Top Income Inequality. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 86(1):1–45.
- Aghion, P., Akcigit, U., Hyytinen, A., and Toivanen, O. (2018b). On the Returns to Invention within Firms: Evidence from Finland. *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, 108:208–212.
- Aghion, P., Akcigit, U., Hyytinen, A., and Toivanen, O. (2022). A Year Older, A Year Wiser (and Farther from Frontier): Invention Rents and Human Capital Depreciation. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 104(6):1–31.
- Aghion, P., Akcigit, U., Hyytinen, A., and Toivanen, O. (2023). Parental Education and Invention: The Finnish Enigma. *International Economic Review*, 64(2):453–490.

- Akcigit, U., Grigsby, J., Nicholas, T., and Stantcheva, S. (2022). Taxation and Innovation in the Twentieth Century. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 137(1):329–385.
- Alstadsæter, A., Jacob, M., Kopczuk, W., and Telle, K. (2023). Accounting for Business Income in Measuring Top Income Shares: Integrated Accrual Approach Using Individual and Firm Data from Norway. Working paper.
- Andersen, S. and Nielsen, K. M. (2012). Ability or Finances as Constraints on Entrepreneurship? Evidence from Survival Rates in a Natural Experiment. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 25(12):3684–3710.
- Azen, R. and Budescu, D. V. (2003). The Dominance Analysis Approach for Comparing Predictors in Multiple Regression. *Psychological Methods*, 8(2):129.
- Azoulay, P., Jones, B. F., Kim, J. D., and Miranda, J. (2020). Age and High-Growth Entrepreneurship. *American Economic Review: Insights*, 2(1):65–82.
- Bell, A., Chetty, R., Jaravel, X., Petkova, N., and Van Reenen, J. (2019). Who Becomes an Inventor in America? The Importance of Exposure to Innovation. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 134(2):647–713.
- Berglann, H., Moen, E. R., Røed, K., and Skogstrøm, J. F. (2011). Entrepreneurship: Origins and Returns. *Labour economics*, 18(2):180–193.
- Björklund, A. and Jäntti, M. (2020). Intergenerational Mobility, Intergenerational Effects, Sibling Correlations, and Equality of Opportunity: A Comparison of Four Approaches. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 70(100455).
- Boháček, R. (2006). Financial Constraints and Entrepreneurial Investment. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 53(8):2195–2212.
- Borusyak, K., Jaravel, X., and Spiess, J. (2021). Revisiting Event Study Designs: Robust and Efficient Estimation. *Working Paper*.
- Bruil, A., van Essen, C., Lejour, A., Möhlmann, J., Rabaté, S., and Leenders, W. (2022). Inequality and Redistribution in the Netherlands. Working paper, CPB Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis.
- Callaway, B. and Sant’Anna, P. H. (2021). Difference-in-Differences with Multiple Time Periods. *Journal of Econometrics*, 225(2):200–230.
- Cattaneo, M. D., Crump, R. K., Farrell, M. H., and Feng, Y. (2024). On Binscatter. *American Economic Review*, 114(5):1488–1514.
- Chetty, R., Hendren, N., Kline, P., Saez, E., and Turner, N. (2014). Is the United States Still a Land of Opportunity? Recent Trends in Intergenerational Mobility. *American Economic Review*, 104(5):141–47.
- Cooper, A. C., Gimeno-Gascon, F. J., and Woo, C. Y. (1994). Initial Human and Financial Capital as Predictors of New Venture Performance. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 9(5):371–395.


- Decker, R., Haltiwanger, J., Jarmin, R., and Miranda, J. (2014). The Role of Entrepreneurship in US Job Creation and Economic Dynamism. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 28(3):3–24.
- Dunn, T. and Holtz-Eakin, D. (2000). Financial Capital, Human Capital, and the Transition to Self-Employment: Evidence from Intergenerational Links. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 18:282–305.
- Ermisch, J., Jäntti, M., and Smeeding, T. E., editors (2012). *From Parents to Children - The Intergenerational Transmission of Advantage*. Russel Sage Foundation.
- Evans, D. S. and Jovanovic, B. (1989). An Estimated Model of Entrepreneurial Choice under Liquidity Constraints. *Journal of Political Economy*, 97(4):808–827.
- Evans, D. S. and Leighton, L. S. (1989). Some Empirical Aspects of Entrepreneurship. *American Economic Review*, 79(3):519–535.
- Fairlie, R. W. (1999). The Absence of African-American Owned Businesses: An Analysis of the Dynamics of Self-Employment. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 17(5):80–108.
- Fairlie, R. W. (2004). Does Business Ownership Provide a Source of Upward Mobility for Blacks and Hispanics. In *Public Policy and the Economics of Entrepreneurship*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Fairlie, R. W. and Robb, A. (2007). Families, Human Capital, and Small Businesses: Evidence from the Characteristics of Business Owners Survey. *ILR Review*, 60(2):225–245.
- Garnadt, N., Funer, L., Stahl, K., and Tåg, J. (2023). Paychecks and Progress: How Labor Market Success Relates to Entrepreneurship Success. Working paper.
- Glaeser, E. L. (2009). Entrepreneurship and the City. In *Entrepreneurship and Openness*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Halvarsson, D., Korpi, M., and Wennberg, K. (2018). Entrepreneurship and Income Inequality. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 145:275–293.
- Hamilton, B. H. (2000). Does Entrepreneurship Pay? An Empirical Analysis of the Returns to Self-Employment. *Journal of Political Economy*, 108(3):604–631.
- Harju, J., Koivisto, A., and Matikka, T. (2022). The Effects of Corporate Taxes on Small Firms. *Journal of Public Economics*, 212:104704.
- Harju, J. and Matikka, T. (2016). The Elasticity of Taxable Income and Income-Shifting: What is “Real” and What is Not? *International Tax and Public Finance*, 23:640–669.
- Holtz-Eakin, D., Joulfaian, D., and Rosen, H. S. (1994). Sticking it Out: Entrepreneurial Survival and Liquidity Constraints. *Journal of Political Economy*, 102(1):53–75.
- Hurst, E. and Lusardi, A. (2004). Liquidity Constraints, Household Wealth, and Entrepreneurship. *Journal of Political Economy*, 112(2):319–347.
- Hurst, E. and Pugsley, B. W. (2011). What Do Small Businesses Do? *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, (43):73–142.

- Hvide, H. K. and Møen, J. (2010). Lean and Hungry or Fat and Content? Entrepreneurs' Wealth and Start-Up Performance. *Management Science*, 56(8):1242–1258.
- Hyytinen, A., Ilmakunnas, P., and Toivanen, O. (2013). The Return-to-entrepreneurship Puzzle. *Labour Economics*, 20:57–67.
- Hyytinen, A. and Maliranta, M. (2008). When Do Employees Leave Their Job for Entrepreneurship? *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 110(1):1–21.
- Iacus, S. M., King, G., and Porro, G. (2012). Causal Inference without Balance Checking: Coarsened Exact Matching. *Political Analysis*, 20(1):1–24.
- Kaila, M., Nix, E., and Riukula, K. (2024). The Impact of an Early Career Shock on Intergenerational Mobility. *Journal of Labor Economics*, 43(4).
- Kangasharju, A. and Pekkala, S. (2002). The Role of Education in Self-Employment Success in Finland. *Growth and change*, 33(2):216–237.
- Kerr, S. P., Kerr, W. R., and Xu, T. (2017). Personality Traits of Entrepreneurs: A Review of Recent Literature. Working Paper 24097, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Kopczuk, W. and Zwick, E. (2020). Business Incomes at the Top. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 34(4):27–51.
- La Porta, R. and Shleifer, A. (2014). Informality and Development. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 28(3):109–126.
- Lazear, E. P. (2004). Balanced Skills and Entrepreneurship. *American Economic Review*, 94(2):208–211.
- Levine, R. and Rubinstein, Y. (2017). Smart and Illicit: Who Becomes an Entrepreneur and Do They Earn More? *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 132(2):963–1018.
- Levine, R. and Rubinstein, Y. (2020). Selection Into Entrepreneurship and Self-Employment. CEP Discussion Paper 1722.
- Lindquist, M., Sol, J., and Van Praag, M. (2015). Why Do Entrepreneurial Parents Have Entrepreneurial Children? *Journal of Labor Economics*, 33(2):269–296.
- Lindquist, M. and Vladasel, T. (2022). Are Entrepreneurs More Upwardly Mobile? BSE Working Paper 1351.
- Maczulskij, T. and Viinikainen, J. (2023). Self-Confidence Predicts Entrepreneurship and Entrepreneurial Success. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 19.
- Maliranta, M. and Nurmi, S. (2019). Business Owners, Employees, and Firm Performance. *Small Business Economics*, 52(1):111–129.
- Moskowitz, T. J. and Vissing-Jørgensen, A. (2002). The Returns to Entrepreneurial Investment: A Private Equity Premium Puzzle? *American Economic Review*, 92(4):745–778.

- Parker, S. (2009). *The Economics of Entrepreneurship*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Paukkeri, T., Ravaska, T., and Riihelä, M. (2023). The Role of Privately Held Firms in Income Inequality. IFS Working Paper 23/36.
- Piketty, T., Saez, E., and Zucman, G. (2017). Distributional National Accounts: Methods and Estimates for the United States. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 133(2):553–609.
- Quadrini, V. (2009). Entrepreneurship in Macroeconomics. *Annals of Finance*, 5(3):295.
- Queiro, F. (2022). Entrepreneurial Human Capital and Firm Dynamics. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 89(4):2061–2100.
- Roth, J., Sant’Anna, P. H., Bilinski, A., and Poe, J. (2023). What’s Trending in Difference-in-Differences? A Synthesis of the Recent Econometrics Literature. *Journal of Econometrics*, 235(2):2218–2244.
- Smith, M., Yagan, D., Zidar, O., and Zwick, E. (2019). Capitalists in the Twenty-First Century. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 134(4):1675–1745.
- Smith, M., Zidar, O., and Zwick, E. (2023). Top Wealth in America: New Estimates Under Heterogeneous Returns. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 138(1):515–573.
- Sorensen, J. (2007). Closure and Exposure: Mechanisms in the Intergenerational Transmission of Self-Employment. *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 25:83–124.
- Uusitalo, R. (2001). Homo Entrepreneurus? *Applied economics*, 33(13):1631–1638.


Figures and Tables

Figure 1: Share of new entrepreneurs by individual and parental income




Notes: Figure presents the percentage shares of new incorporated (red squares) and unincorporated (blue diamonds) business owners in each individual income rank percentile (upper graph) measured one year before establishing the business ($t - 1$), and by their parental income rank percentile (bottom graph). Individual income ranks are calculated from the distribution of disposable income in $t - 1$ including all individuals (entrepreneurs and wage earners) in our baseline sample. Parental income is calculated as average annual household market income when the parents were 45–50 years old. The figure shows that individuals at the top of the individual income distribution are much more likely to start a new incorporated business, but there is no similar selection to starting an unincorporated firm. Also, there is a negative association between starting a new firm and parental income.

Figure 2: Share of new incorporated entrepreneurs by individual and parental income and by parental entrepreneurship




Notes: Figure presents the percentage shares of new incorporated business owners in each individual income rank percentile (upper graph) measured one year before establishing the new business ($t - 1$) and by their parental income rank percentiles (bottom graph). The sample of entrepreneurs is divided in two depending whether at least one of their parents was an entrepreneur. Individual income ranks are calculated from the distribution of disposable income in $t - 1$ including all individuals in our baseline sample. Parental income is calculated as average annual household market income when the parents were 45–50 years old. Parents are classified as entrepreneurs if they are labeled as a business owner for at least 5 years according to the socio-economic status defined by Statistics Finland. The figure shows that the shares of entrepreneurs in each income rank do not significantly differ between those with and without entrepreneurial parents.

Figure 3: Initial equity of new incorporated businesses by individual and parental income and parental entrepreneurship




Notes: The figure shows the average initial equity invested in the new incorporated business in logs in the year of establishment by the owners' individual (upper panel) and parental income ranks (lower panel) and among those with (red symbols) and without (hollow symbols) entrepreneurial parents with 95% confidence intervals. Individual income ranks are calculated as an average over the years $t - 5$ and $t - 1$ including all individuals in our baseline sample. Parental income is calculated as average annual household market income when the parents were 45–50 years old. Parents are classified as entrepreneurs if they are labeled as a business owner for at least 5 years according to the socio-economic status defined by Statistics Finland. The figure includes unconditional equity (squares) and equity conditional on the industry of the firm (diamonds). The figure shows that initial equity increases linearly with individual income, but there is no association between firms' initial equity and parental income. Controlling for the industry (NACE, 2-digit) of the new firm does not affect the estimates, and there are in general no significant differences in initial equity by parental entrepreneurship.

Figure 4: Average income trajectories of incorporated entrepreneurs and wage earners




Notes: The upper panel presents the log disposable income trajectories of new incorporated business owners (red symbols) and wage earners (gray symbols) with 95% confidence intervals before and after the business was established ($t = 0$), relative to one year before the firm was started ($t - 1$), denoted by zero in the figure. For wage earners, pseudo-start years at $t = 0$ are randomly drawn from a uniform distribution. Estimates with controls (triangles) include as controls all interactions of age, sex and education (primary education, secondary degree or tertiary degree) and the interactions using age squared and age cubed, and individual and parental income ranks. Individual income ranks are measured as an average over the years $t - 5$ and $t - 1$ from the full distribution including both wage earners and business owners in our baseline sample. Parental income ranks are calculated using the average of annual household income when the parents were 45–50 years old. In the lower panel, the two groups are matched using coarsened exact matching (CEM). See details of the matching method in Section 4.1.

Figure 5: Difference in income trajectories between entrepreneurs and wage earners




Notes: The figure presents the difference in log disposable income trajectories between incorporated entrepreneurs (IE) and wage earners (WE) before and after the business was established ($t = 0$), relative to the year $t - 1$ (denoted by zero in the figure) with 95% confidence intervals using different estimation specifications. For wage earners, pseudo-start years are drawn from a uniform distribution. The figure includes OLS estimates without controls (hollow squares). OLS estimates with controls (black diamonds) include as controls all interactions of age, sex and education (primary education, secondary degree or tertiary degree) and the interactions using age squared and age cubed, and individual and parental income ranks. Parental income ranks are calculated using the average of annual household income when the parents were 45–50 years old. CS (hollow gray triangles) refers to the estimator proposed by Callaway and Sant’Anna (2021), BJS (gray triangles) to Borusyak et al. (2021), which are both estimated with controls. The figure shows that the trajectories are rather similar regardless of controls or estimators used.

Figure 6: Differences in income trajectories between entrepreneurs and wage earners by individual and parental income




Notes: The figure presents the difference in log disposable income trajectories between incorporated entrepreneurs (IE) and wage earners (WE) before and after the business was established ($t = 0$), relative to one year before starting the first business $t - 1$ (denoted by zero in the figure) with 95% confidence intervals. The figure presents the graphs for individual income trajectories in each quintile of the individual income rank (Individual P1-P20...P81-100). In each graph, the income development is further split into five parental income rank quintiles (Parent P1-P20...P81-100), including top parental quintile (black diamonds), bottom quintile (hollow squares) and the middle three quintiles (gray crosses). For wage earners, pseudo-start years are randomly drawn from a uniform distribution. Individual rank is defined as an average over the years $t - 5$ and $t - 1$ and parental income is observed when the parents are 45-50 years old. The figure shows that IE earn much more compared to WE after $t = 0$ in all income groups, but there are only small differences in relative income trajectories by income ranks. However, among the group with both high individual and parental incomes the income growth among IE is slightly larger than in other groups.

Figure 7: Income trajectories by parental entrepreneurship




Notes: The figure presents the unconditional log disposable income trajectories with 95% confidence intervals for incorporated business owners with (filled red squares) and without (hollow red squares) entrepreneurial parents. Parents are classified as entrepreneurs if they are labeled as a business owner for at least 5 years according to the socio-economic status defined by Statistics Finland. The trajectories are presented before and after the business was established ($t = 0$), relative to the year $t - 1$ (denoted by zero in the figure). The figure shows that individual income trajectories of new incorporated business owners do not differ by parental entrepreneurship.

Figure 8: Entrepreneurship and top income dynamics




Notes: Panel A of the figure presents the percentage shares of new incorporated business owners by their individual income ranks one year before (hollow diamonds) and 10 years after (hollow circles) establishing the business. The shares are plotted for those entrepreneurs that we observe in the data in both of these years. Individual income ranks are calculated from the distribution of disposable income in $t - 1$ including all individuals in our baseline event study sample. The ranks of all incorporated entrepreneurs (red squares) refer to the entire pool of them in 2006–2016 (not just new entrepreneurs), and ranks are calculated among the full population of Finnish individuals over 16 years of age. Panels B and C plot the probabilities of locating in the top 1% and top 10% of the income distribution 10 years after the business was established ($t + 10$) for individuals coming from different percentiles of the distribution one year before the new firm was established ($t - 1$) for incorporated entrepreneurs (squares) and wage earners (circles) with 95% confidence intervals. For wage earners, pseudo-start years are drawn from a uniform distribution. The estimates at rank 50 represent the averages among the bottom 50% of the distribution in all panels.

Figure 9: Rank-rank correlations




Notes: The figure presents the correlations between individual and parental income ranks for incorporated business owners (upper panels) and wage earners (lower panels) one year before ($t-1$) and ten years after ($t+10$) the business was established. For wage earners, pseudo-start years are drawn from a uniform distribution. Parental income rank is calculated using the average annual household income when the parents were 45–50 year old. The rank-rank correlations are estimated conditional on the age of the child. The figure shows that the rank-rank correlations are notably smaller for entrepreneurs than for wages earners both before and after the new business established, indicating that entrepreneurs are much more intergenerationally mobile than wage earners.

Figure 10: Survival rates of new incorporated businesses by individual and parental income ranks and parental entrepreneurship




Notes: The figure presents the survival rates of new incorporated business by firm age (1–10 years) and by individual and parental income decile ranks and by parental entrepreneurship. Firm survival is measured by whether the firm is observed in our administrative tax record data. Panels A and B present the survival rates by individual and parental income and among those with entrepreneurial parents. Panels C and D show similar graphs among those without entrepreneurial parents. Individual income ranks are calculated as an average over the years $t - 5$ and $t - 1$ including all individuals in our baseline sample. Parental income is calculated as average annual household market income when the parents were 45–50 years old. Parents are classified as entrepreneurs if they are labeled as a business owner for at least 5 years according to the socio-economic status defined by Statistics Finland. The top income rank deciles are marked with a solid black line, and the bottom decile with a solid grey line. Deciles 2–9 are marked with dashed lines. The figure shows that the survival rates are higher among those new business owners with entrepreneurial parents, and that the firms of the owners who come from the top of the individual and parental income distribution are more likely to survive over their first ten years.

Figure 11: Firm-level outcomes by individual income ranks and parental entrepreneurship



Notes: The figure presents mean firm-level outcomes measured cumulatively over the first ten years of business operations with 95% confidence intervals by individual income ranks and by those with (filled symbols) and without entrepreneurial parents (hollow symbols). We restrict this analysis to firms that could have been followed for the full ten years, but do not condition on firm survival. Estimates with controls (diamonds) include as controls the initial equity of the new firm and industry fixed effects (NACE, 2-digit level). The income ranks are measured as an average over the years $t - 5$ and $t - 1$ from the full distribution of new business owners and wage earners. Parents are classified as entrepreneurs if they are labeled as a business owner for at least 5 years according to the socio-economic status defined by Statistics Finland. In Panels A-E, the outcomes are in log scale, and Panel F presents the probability for positive R&D investments during the first ten years. In years t and $t + 10$, we observe 20,748 and 12,449 firms, respectively. The detailed description of the variables is presented in Online Appendix D.

Figure 12: Firm-level outcomes by parental income ranks and parental entrepreneurship



Notes: The figure presents mean firm-level outcomes measured cumulatively over the first ten years of business operations with 95% confidence intervals by individual income ranks and by those with (filled symbols) and without entrepreneurial parents (hollow symbols). We restrict this analysis to firms that could have been followed for the full ten years, but do not condition on firm survival. Estimates with controls (diamonds) include as controls the initial equity of the new firm and industry fixed effects (NACE, 2-digit level). The parental income ranks are calculated using the average of annual household income when the parents were 45–50 years old. Parents are classified as entrepreneurs if they are labeled as a business owner for at least 5 years according to the socio-economic status defined by Statistics Finland. In Panels A-E, the outcomes are in log scale, and Panel F presents the probability for positive R&D investments during the first ten years. In years t and $t + 10$, we observe 20,748 and 12,449 firms, respectively. The detailed description of the variables is presented in Online Appendix D.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics, individuals

	All	Wage earners	Entrepreneurs		
			All	Unincorporated	Incorporated
Panel A: Full sample, 1997-2019					
Observations	9,214,232	7,994,448	1,219,784	866,905	403,565
Share of observations	100%	86.5%	13.5%	9.6%	4.5%
Disposable income	22,637	22,353	24,455	21,565	31,097
Disposable income rank	51	52	50	45	61
Market income	27,313	26,995	29,393	24,679	40,348
Market income rank	51	51	49	44	61
Parental income rank	35	34	37	36	40
Parent entrepreneur	0.16	0.10	0.58	0.61	0.55
Age	37	37	36	36	37
Female	0.48	0.51	0.33	0.37	0.24
Secondary education or higher	0.42	0.44	0.34	0.30	0.42
Tertiary education or higher	0.28	0.28	0.23	0.20	0.30
Capital city region	0.22	0.22	0.23	0.22	0.25
Married	0.47	0.47	0.48	0.46	0.54
Number of children	1.13	1.11	1.21	1.18	1.29
Panel B: Sample at $t-1$, 1997-2013					
Observations	659,446	569,044	90,402	61,876	28,707
Share of observations	100%	86.0%	14.0%	9.5%	4.5%
Disposable income	20,619	20,596	20,765	17,371	28,049
Disposable income rank	49	50	43	36	59
Market income	24,424	24,499	23,954	18,081	36,623
Market income rank	49	50	43	35	59
Parental income rank	35	34	37	36	40
Parent entrepreneur	0.16	0.10	0.58	0.61	0.55
Age	34	34	34	33	35
Female	0.49	0.51	0.33	0.38	0.25
Secondary education or higher	0.41	0.43	0.34	0.30	0.43
Tertiary education or higher	0.27	0.27	0.23	0.20	0.30
Capital city region	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.25
Married	0.43	0.42	0.45	0.42	0.51
Number of children	1.06	1.04	1.16	1.12	1.25

Notes: Table presents the mean value of each variable for all individuals, wage earners and the owners of unincorporated and incorporated businesses. Panel A presents the statistics for the full sample in 1997–2018, including all wage earners and business owners. Panel B describes the sample in year $t - 1$, one year before the business was established and one year before the randomly allocated pseudo-start years at $t = 0$ for wage earners for the years 1998–2013. This sample includes the main owners of businesses, and is limited to the year 2013 as we follow each individual for a minimum of five years. Secondary education includes high school and vocational education. Tertiary education includes a bachelor’s or a higher degree. Capital city region includes Helsinki, Espoo, Vantaa and Kauniainen. The detailed definitions of the variables are presented in Online Appendix D.

Table 2: Probability of starting an incorporated business:
Comparing the relative importance of various predictors using dominance analysis

Total R^2 of the model = 0.2688			
Predictor	Dominance statistic (partial R^2)	Standardized dominance statistic (share of total R^2)	Ranking
Individual rank at $t - 1$	0.0107	0.0400	5
Parental rank	0.0027	0.0102	8
Parental entrepreneurship	0.0364	0.1353	3
Unincorporated at $t - 1$	0.0980	0.3644	1
Industry at $t - 1$	0.0321	0.1194	4
Level of highest degree	0.0019	0.0072	9
Field of highest degree	0.0007	0.0026	12
Age and age ² at $t - 1$	0.0005	0.0018	13
Gender	0.0032	0.0120	7
Capital region at $t - 1$	0.0002	0.0008	15
Married at $t - 1$	0.0008	0.0030	11
Unemployed at $t - 1$	0.0017	0.0062	10
Student at $t - 1$	0.0003	0.0012	14
<i>Interactions</i>			
Mincerian (M)	0.0757	0.2816	2
Individual rank (IR) \times M & Parental rank (PR) \times M & Parental entrep. (PE) \times M & IR \times PR \times PE	0.0038	0.0142	6

Notes: Table presents the estimates of the proportion of the variance of the probability of starting an incorporated business that is explained by each predictor, estimated following the methods by Azen and Budescu (2003). The estimates are based on a sample of those individuals who establish an incorporated business and those who never engage in any business activities (wage earners). Dependent variable receives a value of 1 if an individual becomes an incorporated entrepreneur and 0 if they never engage in any business activities during our observation period. For entrepreneurs, $t - 1$ refers to the year preceding the transition into incorporated entrepreneurship, and for wage earners it refers to the year preceding the randomly allocated pseudo-start year. Individual and parental ranks enter the model as rank fixed effects. Parental entrepreneurship, status as unincorporated entrepreneur (self-employed), gender, whether lived in the capital city region and marital, unemployment and student status are dummy variables. Industry at $t - 1$ corresponds to individuals industry as a salaried worker and enters the model as industry fixed effects (NACE, two-digit). The level and field of the highest degree enter the model as fixed effects (ISCED). Mincerian interactions include all interactions between age, age squared, gender and the level of highest degree. The results are based on 32,767 regressions including each predictor individually, all of them together, and every combination between them, which are used to compare the contribution of each predictor to the total R^2 of the full model. The ranking variable ranks the relevance of each predictor by their share of the total R^2 .

Table 3: Income development from $t - 1$ to $t + 10$ among incorporated entrepreneurs and wage earners:
Comparing the relative importance of various predictors using dominance analysis

Predictor	Incorporated entrepreneurs Total R^2 of the model = 0.2731			Wage earners Total R^2 of the model = 0.3292		
	Dominance statistic (partial R^2)	Standardized dominance statistic (share of total R^2)	Ranking	Dominance statistic (partial R^2)	Standardized dominance statistic (share of total R^2)	Ranking
	Individual rank at $t - 1$	0.1441	0.5276	1	0.1515	0.4603
Parental rank	0.0100	0.0368	4	0.0037	0.0113	9
Parental entrepreneurship	0.0004	0.0014	14	<0.0001	0.0001	14
Unincorporated at $t - 1$	0.0032	0.0116	9	<0.0001	<0.0001	15
Industry at $t - 1$	0.0132	0.0482	3	0.0255	0.0775	4
Level of highest degree	0.0028	0.0103	10	0.0049	0.0149	8
Field of highest degree	0.0044	0.0160	8	0.0050	0.0151	7
Age and age ² at $t - 1$	0.0096	0.0353	6	0.0227	0.0691	5
Gender	0.0004	0.0016	13	0.0005	0.0016	13
Capital region at $t - 1$	0.0001	0.0005	15	0.0008	0.0023	12
Married at $t - 1$	0.0017	0.0062	11	0.0022	0.0068	10
Unemployed at $t - 1$	0.0009	0.0033	12	0.0012	0.0036	11
Student at $t - 1$	0.0086	0.0314	7	0.0286	0.0867	3
<i>Interactions</i>						
Mincerian (M)	0.0641	0.2346	2	0.0648	0.1970	2
Individual rank (IR) \times M & Parental rank (PR) \times M & Parental entrep. (PE) \times M & IR \times PR \times PE	0.0096	0.0353	5	0.0177	0.0538	6

Notes: Table presents the estimates of the proportion of the variance of the increase in disposable income from $t - 1$ to $t + 10$ that is explained by each predictor, estimated following the methods by Azen and Budescu (2003). The estimates are based on a sample of those individuals who establish an incorporated business and those who never engage in any business activities (wage earners). Dependent variable receives a value of 1 if an individual becomes an incorporated entrepreneur and 0 if they never engage in any business activities during our observation period. For entrepreneurs, $t - 1$ refers to the year preceding the transition into incorporated entrepreneurship, and for wage earners it refers to the year preceding the randomly allocated pseudo-start year. Individual and parental ranks enter the model as rank fixed effects. Parental entrepreneurship, status as unincorporated entrepreneur (self-employed), gender, whether lived in the capital city region and marital, unemployment and student status are dummy variables. Industry at $t - 1$ corresponds to individuals industry as a salaried worker and enters the model as industry fixed effects (NACE, two-digit). The level and field of the highest degree enter the model as fixed effects (ISCED). Mincerian interactions include all interactions between age, age squared, gender and the level of highest degree. The results are based on 32,767 regressions including each predictor individually, all of them together, and every combination between them, which are used to compare the contribution of each predictor to the total R^2 of the full model. The ranking variable ranks the relevance of each predictor by their share of the total R^2 .

Table 4: Descriptive statistics, new incorporated businesses

	Sales (1000 EUR)	Number of employees	Staff costs (1000 EUR)	Value added (1000 EUR)	Productivity (1000 EUR)
Panel A: First year of business operations					
Mean	470	3.1	110	130	40
Median	131	1.6	44	54	35
Percentile 10	21	0.2	0	1	5
Percentile 90	651	6.0	222	259	78
Percentile 99	4,210	25.0	1,012	1,170	192
Panel B: Ten years after being established					
Mean	916	6.8	298	325	33
Median	225	2.1	80	92	42
Percentile 10	22	0.2	0	1	11
Percentile 90	1,865	13.5	598	686	87
Percentile 99	13,218	84.8	3,990	3,844	239

Notes: Table presents descriptive statistics for firm-level outcomes. Panel A presents the mean, median, and 10th, 90th and 99th percentile outcomes for the first full year of business operations and Panel B ten years after the business was established. Panel A includes 25,364 firms and Panel B 12,449 firms. The difference in the numbers of observations between the two panels is partly explained by firm survival and partly by us not observing all surviving firms for ten years in the full data. Sales refer to annual sales from products and services after taxes, number of employees to full-time equivalent employees, and staff costs to annual wages, salaries and other personnel expenses such as pension and social security contributions but excluding income taxes. Value added refers to sales minus variable costs, and productivity is defined as value added divided by the number of employees. The detailed definitions of the variables are presented in Online Appendix D.

Table 5: Firm-level outcomes: Comparing the relative importance of various predictors using dominance analysis

Predictor	Number of employees Total R^2 of the model = 0.3201			Value added Total R^2 of the model = 0.2570		
	Dominance statistic (partial R^2)	Standardized dominance statistic (share of total R^2)	Ranking	Dominance statistic (partial R^2)	Standardized dominance statistic (share of total R^2)	Ranking
Individual rank at $t - 1$	0.0188	0.0586	5	0.0197	0.0768	5
Parental rank	0.0091	0.0285	6	0.0097	0.0376	6
Parental entrepreneurship	0.0496	0.1551	4	0.0317	0.1235	4
Unincorporated at $t - 1$	0.0040	0.0124	7	0.0062	0.0240	7
Industry at $t - 1$	0.1029	0.3214	1	0.0814	0.3166	1
Level of highest degree	0.0033	0.0104	9	0.0014	0.0054	11
Field of highest degree	0.0034	0.0105	8	0.0024	0.0095	9
Age and age ² at $t - 1$	0.0014	0.0044	11	0.0009	0.0036	12
Gender	0.0007	0.0023	15	0.0021	0.0082	10
Capital region at $t - 1$	0.0010	0.0030	13	0.0003	0.0011	15
Married at $t - 1$	0.0011	0.0035	12	0.0002	0.0008	16
Unemployed at $t - 1$	0.0003	0.0011	16	0.0003	0.0013	14
Student at $t - 1$	0.0008	0.0026	14	0.0006	0.0024	13
<i>Interactions</i>						
Mincerian (M)	0.0628	0.1961	2	0.0422	0.1644	3
Individual rank (IR) \times M & Parental rank (PR) \times M & Parental entrep. (PE) \times M & IR \times PR \times PE	0.0031	0.0097	10	0.0034	0.0133	8
<i>Firm-specific information</i>						
Industry, initial equity & industry \times equity	0.0578	0.1805	3	0.0544	0.2115	2

Notes: Table presents the estimates of the proportion of the variance of the number of employees and value added that is explained by each predictor, estimated following the methods by Azen and Budescu (2003). Firm-level outcomes are measured cumulatively over the first ten years of the business. There are 25,364 unique firms in total, and we can follow 12,449 of them until ten years after establishment. Number of employees refers to full-time equivalent employees and value added to sales minus variable costs. Firm-specific predictors include industry fixed effects (NACE, two-digit level), initial equity invested in the firm, and their interactions. For further details on other predictors, see the notes of Table 2. The results are based on 65,535 regressions, including each predictor individually, all of them together, and every combination between them, which are used to compare the contribution each predictor makes to the total R^2 of the full model. The ranking variable ranks the relevance of each predictor by their share of the total R^2 .

Online Appendix

A Additional Tables and Figures

Table A1: Number of new businesses and business owners in our sample, 1998–2014

	Number of firms or owners
Panel A: New incorporated firms	
All new firms	142,213
New firms with positive sales	129,703
New firms with positive sales and information about ownership structure	74,558
Panel B: Owners of new incorporated firms with positive sales in the first year of operation	
All owners	139,685
Main owners	95,109
Main owners with parental link in data	58,897
Main owners with parental link in data and no prior entrepreneurial experience (our baseline sample)	28,707
Panel C: New unincorporated firms	
All new firms	344,100
New firms with positive sales	316,063
New firms with positive sales and information about ownership structure	316,063
Panel D: Owners of new unincorporated firms with a positive sales in the first year of operation	
All owners	317,686
Main owners	316,950
Main owners who derive the majority of their annual earnings as business income	152,700
Main owners who derive the majority of their annual earnings as business income with parental link in data	102,140
Main owners who derive the majority of their annual earnings as business income with a parental link in data and no prior entrepreneurial experience (our baseline sample)	61,876


Notes: Table presents how the number of new businesses and their owners is shaped by our definitions and data availability. The bottom rows in Panels B and D correspond to our baseline samples of incorporated and unincorporated entrepreneurs.

Table A2: Two most frequent industries of new incorporated businesses by individual and parental income

Income rank		Most frequent	Second most frequent
Individual	Parental		
P1-P20	P1-P20	Constr. of buildings (NACE 41), 13.6%	Retail trade (NACE 47), 11.0%
P1-P20	P21-P40	Retail trade (NACE 47), 14.5%	Constr. of buildings (NACE 41), 10.6%
P1-P20	P41-P60	Constr. of buildings (NACE 41), 12.6%	Retail trade (NACE 47), 9.1%
P1-P20	P61-P80	Retail trade (NACE 47), 9.9%	Computer progr. (NACE 62), 9.1%
P1-P20	P81-P100	Retail trade (NACE 47), 10.1%	Computer progr. (NACE 62), 7.5%
P21-P40	P1-P20	Constr. of buildings (NACE 41), 13.1%	Retail trade (NACE 47), 11.6%
P21-P40	P21-P40	Constr. of buildings (NACE 41), 13.1%	Retail trade (NACE 47), 11.4%
P21-P40	P41-P60	Constr. of buildings (NACE 41), 13.3%	Retail trade (NACE 47), 9.5%
P21-P40	P61-P80	Constr. of buildings (NACE 41), 10.1%	Specialized constr. (NACE 43), 9.4%
P21-P40	P81-P100	Retail trade (NACE 47), 14.9%	Computer progr. (NACE 62), 8.1%
P41-P60	P1-P20	Constr. of buildings (NACE 41), 13.9%	Specialized constr. (NACE 43), 12.0%
P41-P60	P21-P40	Constr. of buildings (NACE 41), 13.8%	Specialized constr. (NACE 43), 13.1%
P41-P60	P41-P60	Specialized constr. (NACE 43), 13.4%	Constr. of buildings (NACE 41), 10.3%
P41-P60	P61-P80	Constr. of buildings (NACE 41), 11.0%	Specialized constr. (NACE 43), 9.6%
P41-P60	P81-P100	Specialized constr. (NACE 43), 9.5%	Retail trade (NACE 47), 9.3%
P61-P80	P1-P20	Specialized constr. (NACE 43), 14.1%	Constr. of buildings (NACE 41), 9.1%
P61-P80	P21-P40	Specialized constr. (NACE 43), 14.3%	Constr. of buildings (NACE 41), 9.3%
P61-P80	P41-P60	Specialized constr. (NACE 43), 13.4%	Constr. of buildings (NACE 41), 7.7%
P61-P80	P61-P80	Specialized constr. (NACE 43), 10.2%	Retail trade (NACE 47), 7.1%
P61-P80	P81-P100	Management consult. (NACE 70), 11.6%	Computer progr. (NACE 62), 9.6%
P81-P100	P1-P20	Specialized constr. (NACE 43), 8.5%	Management consult. (NACE 70), 7.2%
P81-P100	P21-P40	Management consult. (NACE 70), 8.8%	Computer progr. (NACE 62), 8.5%
P81-P100	P41-P60	Management consult. (NACE 70), 10.8%	Computer progr. (NACE 62), 10.3%
P81-P100	P61-P80	Computer progr. (NACE 62), 13.0%	Management consult. (NACE 70), 12.2%
P81-P100	P81-P100	Management consult. (NACE 70), 13.6%	Computer progr. (NACE 62), 11.9%


Notes: Table presents two most frequent industries (NACE) of the newly established incorporated business by individual and parental income rank quintiles. Individual rank is defined as an average over the years $t - 5$ and $t - 1$, before the transition into entrepreneurship, and parental income is observed when the parents are 45–50 years old. Individuals are grouped into five individual and five parental income quintiles, dividing the data into 25 bins altogether.

Figure A1: New entrepreneurs over the sample years




Notes: Figure presents the shares of new owners of incorporated (red squares) and unincorporated firms (blue diamonds) and the shares of wage earners (gray circles) included in our baseline sample by year. The discontinuous jump in the number of new incorporated entrepreneurs stems from the change in the data source for defining new business owners in 2006 (see Section 2.2 for more details). The jump in the number of new entrepreneurs does not significantly affect our results, as discussed in more detail in Online Appendix B.

Figure A2: Industry composition of newly established incorporated businesses




Notes: The figure shows the industry shares among the newly established incorporated businesses in our baseline sample using the TOL 2008 classification by Statistics Finland, which is based on the EU's classification of economic activities (NACE).

Figure A3: Share of new entrepreneurs by parental income ranks using different income concepts




Notes: Figure presents the percentage shares of new incorporated business owners by their parental income ranks using three different income concepts. As our baseline measure, parental income is calculated as average annual household market income when the parents were 45–50 years old (squares). For a subset of parents who are 45–50 years old after 1995, we can define parental ranks using disposable income (diamonds) and capital income (circles). The figures are similar for market income and disposable income, except that for disposable income there is a small increase in the share of new entrepreneurs at the very top. For capital income, the share of new entrepreneurs remains flat from the 40th rank percentile onward. Approximately 25% of the parents do not have positive capital income in the data.

Figure A4: Share of new entrepreneurs by parental income: New firms vs. existing firms




Notes: Figure presents the percentage shares of incorporated (upper graph) and unincorporated (bottom graph) business owners by their parental income ranks using four different definitions of entrepreneurship. The hollow square markers correspond to the lower panel of Figure 1 in the main text and show the shares of new business owners using data for 1998–2014. The circle and diamond markers present the shares for all existing entrepreneurs using two cross-sections of data (2006 and 2014). The red square markers show the figures for new entrepreneurs who join existing firms using data for 1998–2014. Parental income is calculated as average annual household market income when the parents were 45–50 years old. The figure shows that for existing firms there is a positive link for parental income and entrepreneurship at the top of the distribution as in the previous literature, but this association does not hold for new incorporated firms and new business creation presented and discussed in more detail in the main text.

Figure A5: Share of new entrepreneurs by age




Notes: Figure presents the percentage shares of new incorporated (red squares) and unincorporated (blue diamonds) business owners by their age one year before establishing the business ($t - 1$). The average age of new incorporated and unincorporated business owners in our baseline sample is 35 and 33 years, respectively.

Figure A6: Share of new entrepreneurs by education




Notes: Figure presents the percentage shares of new incorporated (red squares) and unincorporated (blue diamonds) business owners by their education one year before establishing the business ($t-1$). The share of wage earners (grey dots) indicates the share of pseudo-starters. Education level and field correspond to ISCED 2011 classification (number in parenthesis). Secondary stands for lower secondary education (2), Secondary+ for upper secondary education (3) or post-secondary non-tertiary education (4), Bachelor- for short-cycle tertiary education (5), Bachelor for bachelor's degree or equivalent level (6), Master for master's degree or equivalent level (7), Doctor for doctoral degree or equivalent level (8), and Unknown for those that are not elsewhere classified (9). For the education fields, General stands for generic programmes and qualifications (00), Educ. for education (01), Hum. & arts for humanities and arts (02), Social for social sciences, journalism and information (03), Bus. & law for business, administration and law (04), Natural for natural sciences, mathematics and statistics (05), ICT for information and communication technologies (06), Tech. for engineering, manufacturing and construction (07), Agr. & for. for agriculture, forestry, fisheries and veterinary (08), Health for health and welfare (09), Service for services (10), and Unknown for unknown categories (99). The figure shows that there are no notable differences in education levels between the groups. The shares in different fields are also similar, but new incorporated entrepreneurs are more likely to have engineering, manufacturing or construction (Tech.) as their field of education compared to the other groups.

Figure A7: Share of highly-educated individuals by individual income ranks




Notes: Figure presents the percentage shares of incorporated (red squares) and unincorporated (blue diamonds) entrepreneurs who have at least a bachelor's degree by their individual income ranks one year before establishing the business ($t - 1$), and for wage earners (gray circles) one year before the randomly allocated pseudo-start years. The figure shows a similarly increasing pattern of education by individual income rank in all of the groups.

Figure A8: Income trajectories by firm survival five years after establishment




Notes: The figure presents the unconditional log disposable income trajectories for incorporated business owners separately for entrepreneurs who are still the main owners of their newly established business five years after the business was established (hollow red squares), and those who are not (filled red squares). The trajectories are portrayed before and after the business was established ($t = 0$), relative to the year $t - 1$ (denoted by zero in the figure). For wage earners (gray circles), pseudo-start years are randomly drawn from a uniform distribution. The figure suggests that the incomes of those entrepreneurs whose firms survive past the first five years increase rapidly over the ten years since the business was established, whereas the incomes of those whose firms did not survive are on a similar trajectory with wage earners after ten years the new firm was established.

Figure A9: Difference in disposable income trajectories between entrepreneurs and wage earners by individual and parental income with Mincerian controls




Notes: The figure presents the difference in log disposable income trajectories between incorporated entrepreneurs (IE) and wage earners (WE) before and after the business was established ($t = 0$), relative to one year before starting the first business $t - 1$ (denoted by zero in the figure) with 95% confidence intervals. The figure presents the graphs for individual income trajectories in each quintile of the individual income rank (Individual P1-P20...P81-100). In each graph, the income development is further split into five parental income rank quintiles (Parent P1-P20...P81-100), including top parental quintile (black diamonds), bottom quintile (hollow squares) and the middle three quintiles (gray crosses). For wage earners, pseudo-start years are randomly drawn from a uniform distribution. Individual rank is defined as an average over the years $t - 5$ and $t - 1$ and parental income is observed when the parents are 45-50 years old. The Mincer-style controls include all interactions of age, sex and education (primary education, secondary degree or tertiary degree) and the interactions using age squared and age cubed.

Figure A10: Composition of market income sources by income percentiles




Notes: The figure plots the income composition between wages and business income + other capital income in the top 10% of the market income distribution for the full population of Finnish individuals over 16 years of age in 2006-2016. In addition, the figure includes the income shares when including in business income the annual retained earnings of the firms divided among each firm owner based on their ownership share of the firm (see Online Appendix B for more details). The detailed description of the variables is presented in Online Appendix D. The figure shows that the share of business income and other capital income increases sharply at the very top of the distribution in Finland, very similarly as in the US, as presented by Smith et al. (2019). Moreover, the inclusion of retained earnings further increases the relevance of business incomes at the very top of the distribution.

Figure A11: Survival rates measured by bankruptcies of new incorporated businesses by individual and parental income ranks and parental entrepreneurship



Notes: The figure presents the survival rates of new incorporated business by firm age (1–10 years) and by individual and parental income decile ranks and by parental entrepreneurship. Firm survival is measured by whether the firm is not declared bankrupt by the court, instead of all types of firm exits that are included in Figure 10 in the main text. Panels A and B present the survival rates by individual and parental income and among those with entrepreneurial parents. Panels C and D show similar graphs among those without entrepreneurial parents. Individual income ranks are calculated as an average over the years $t - 5$ and $t - 1$ including all individuals in our baseline sample. Parental income is calculated as average annual household market income when the parents were 45–50 years old. Parents are classified as entrepreneurs if they are labeled as a business owner for at least 5 years according to the socio-economic status defined by Statistics Finland. The top income rank deciles are marked with a solid black line, and the bottom decile with a solid grey line. Deciles 2–9 are marked with dashed lines. The figure shows that the survival rates are higher among those new business owners with entrepreneurial parents, and that the firms of the owners who come from the top of the individual and parental income distribution are more likely to survive over their first ten years. These findings are similar as in the main text, but the survival rates measured using only bankruptcies are overall larger, as can be expected.

Figure A12: Firm-level outcomes by firm age and parental entrepreneurship



Notes: The figure presents mean firm-level outcomes measured by the age of the firm with 95% confidence intervals, divided to firms with main owners with (red squares) and without entrepreneurial parents (hollow squares). Parents are classified as entrepreneurs if they are labeled as a business owner for at least 5 years according to the socio-economic status defined by Statistics Finland. In Panels A-E, the outcomes are in log scale, and Panel F presents the probability for positive R&D investments during the first ten years. The detailed description of the variables is presented in Online Appendix D. The figure shows that the firms with owners from entrepreneurial families grow faster particularly during the first five years of business.

B Robustness Checks and Sensitivity Analysis for Estimated Income Trajectories

B.1 Market Income and Retained Earnings

Focusing on market income instead of disposable income (our baseline measure) does not significantly affect the qualitative aspects of our analysis. Figure B1 below paints a very similar picture as Figure 4 did for disposable income in the main text. Market income includes the following income sources: wages, entrepreneurial income and capital income, which is the sum of dividends, interest income, private pensions, rental income on properties, taxable capital gains and other capital income.

In addition to market income, Figure B1 includes trajectories for market income plus the earnings retained in the firm. Defining an exact boundary between the firm and the owner's incomes can be very challenging (see e.g. Kopczuk and Zwick 2020). In addition to income withdrawn from the firm as wages, dividends and capital gains, the owners of privately held corporations can retain earnings in their firm. These earnings do not show up as income for the owners in the administrative data in the year that they are accrued.²²

To study retained earnings, we follow a similar type of approach as in Alstadsæter et al. (2023) and allocate them to each owner of an incorporated firm based on their ownership share of the firm, and include this income on top of the market income observed in the administrative data.²³

Figure B1 shows the income development for IEs and WEs when accounting for earnings retained in the firm. Including retained earnings appears to increase the income levels of IEs by an almost constant annual share of 15%, starting right from the first year after the business was established.


Furthermore, Figures B2 and B3 presents the differences in income trajectories between incorporated entrepreneurs (IE) and wage earners (WE) using market income and market income plus retained earnings as the income measures. Overall, the findings in these figures is similar to those in Figure 6 in the main text. The differences in income trajectories develop rather similarly across the individual and parental income distributions.

²²For example, income retained in the firm might show up in the reported individual income of the owner only after a long time period in a very lumpy fashion, making it difficult to derive a consistent income trajectory for entrepreneurs. Second, some of the income retained in the firm can be used for the owners' private consumption without ever showing up in the individual-level administrative data.

²³Similarly as in the Norwegian institutional setting studied by Alstadsæter et al. (2023), the Finnish dividend tax system incentivizes owners to accumulate earnings in their firms. This is due to the fact that firm-level net assets (assets - debts) affect the owner-level dividend income tax rates such that a larger net assets position reduces the dividend tax rate of the owner, as described in more detail in Online Appendix C. Therefore, it is particularly important to take retained earnings into account as a potential income source for incorporated business owners in the Finnish context.

Also, adding retained earnings on top of market income observed in the administrative data increase the difference between the income trajectories of IE and WE quite evenly across both the individual and parental income distributions. One notable difference when using market income instead of disposable income is that the incomes of those with high parental income seem to grow faster among those who originally come from the bottom individual market income quintile.


Figure B1: Average market income trajectories when accounting for retained earnings



69


Notes: Figure presents the log market income trajectories (red squares) and market income + retained earnings trajectories (red triangles) for incorporated entrepreneurs, and market income trajectories for wage earners (gray circles) before and after the business was established ($t = 0$), relative to the year $t - 1$ (denoted by zero in the figure) with 95% standard errors. The figure shows the unconditional trajectories (Panel A), trajectories with Mincer-controls (Panel B), Mincer and individual income rank controls (Panel C), and trajectories with Mincer and individual and parental income rank controls (Panel D). Retained earnings include the share of annual retained earnings of the firm allocated for each owner using their ownership share of the firm. For wage earners, pseudo-starts are randomly drawn from a uniform distribution. The Mincer-style controls include all interactions of age, sex and education (primary education, secondary degree or tertiary degree) and the interactions using age squared and age cubed. Individual income ranks are measured as an average over the years $t - 5$ and $t - 1$ from the full distribution including both wage earners and business owners in our baseline sample. Parental income ranks are calculated using the average of annual household income when the parents were 45–50 years old.

Figure B2: Differences in income trajectories between entrepreneurs and wage earners by individual and parental income: Market income



Notes: The figure presents the difference in log market income trajectories between incorporated entrepreneurs (IE) and wage earners (WE) before and after the business was established ($t = 0$), relative to one year before starting the first business $t - 1$ (denoted by zero in the figure) with 95% confidence intervals. The figure presents the graphs for individual income trajectories in each quintile of the individual income rank (Individual P1-P20...P81-100). In each graph, the income development is further split into five parental income rank quintiles (Parent P1-P20...P81-100), including top parental quintile (black diamonds), bottom quintile (hollow squares) and the middle three quintiles (gray crosses). For wage earners, pseudo-start years are randomly drawn from a uniform distribution. Individual rank is defined as an average over the years $t - 5$ and $t - 1$ and parental income is observed when the parents are 45-50 years old.

Figure B3: Differences in income trajectories between entrepreneurs and wage earners by individual and parental income: Market income with retained earnings



Notes: The figure presents the difference in log market income + retained earnings trajectories between incorporated entrepreneurs (IE) and wage earners (WE) before and after the business was established ($t = 0$), relative to one year before starting the first business $t - 1$ (denoted by zero in the figure) with 95% confidence intervals. The figure presents the graphs for individual income trajectories in each quintile of the individual income rank (Individual P1-P20...P81-100). In each graph, the income development is further split into five parental income rank quintiles (Parent P1-P20...P81-100), including top parental quintile (black diamonds), bottom quintile (hollow squares) and the middle three quintiles (gray crosses). For wage earners, pseudo-start years are randomly drawn from a uniform distribution. Individual rank is defined as an average over the years $t - 5$ and $t - 1$ and parental income is observed when the parents are 45-50 years old.

B.2 Other Robustness Checks and Heterogeneity

Table B1 below summarizes the average increase in disposable income among incorporated entrepreneurs from one year before becoming an entrepreneur to 10 years after using different subsamples of entrepreneurs and different estimation samples.

First, we find that the gains from entrepreneurship are somewhat larger among those who were wage earners right before establishing their first incorporated business than among those who were unincorporated entrepreneurs. Second, the table further confirms the result that parental entrepreneurship is not driving the differences in gains between entrepreneurs and wage earners. Third, the table shows that those who remained entrepreneurs for at least five years gained on average roughly 10% more than those who did not.

The bottom three elements in Table B1 illustrate the robustness of the results in terms of the estimation sample. As discussed in Section 2, we rely on data from the Finnish Tax Administration to define the owners of incorporated firms using information on dividend income received from their firm for the years 1998–2005 (Tax Administration data). For the years 2006–2014 we use data from Statistics Finland including all owners of incorporated firms (Statistics Finland data).

First, Table B1 shows that the observed gains are larger for the firms that started in 1998–2005 compared to 2006–2014. This could imply that the differences in the estimation sample of business owners over time is driving this difference. However, the first time period also coincides with rapid aggregate economic growth in the Finnish economy. In 1998–2005, the annual average GDP growth was 3.6%, while in 2006–2014 it was only 0.6%. To distinguish between the differences in the overall economic development and the estimation sample, we estimate the income gains using the definition based on the Tax Administration data for the years 2006–2014 in the bottom row of Table B1. Reassuringly, these results are nearly identical to those derived using the full owner sample from the Statistics Finland data within the same time period, illustrating that the differences in income gains over time are not driven by differences in the estimation samples.

Figure B4 shows the disposable income trajectories separately for our baseline sample (Panel A) and for the sample including individuals who we observe each year from $t - 1$ to $t + 10$ (Panel B), and from $t - 5$ to $t + 10$ (Panel C). The figure shows that the gains from entrepreneurship are higher in the balanced panels compared to our baseline non-balanced sample. First, keeping only individuals who are in our sample throughout the 10 first years overweights younger individuals, who tend to have steeper income trajectories than older individuals. Second, the balanced panel has a higher share of individuals starting their businesses during the economic upswing of the early and mid-2000s, which is associated with larger increases in income.

Finally, we illustrate how the gains from entrepreneurship differ between the industries


of newly established firms in Figure B5. There is significant overall variation in average gains over different industries, but we do not observe any consistent differences between the more traditional industries such as manufacturing or transportation, and industries characterized by highly specialized human capital skills, such as consultancy or health services.

Table B1: Sensitivity of the gains from entrepreneurship to the estimation sample

Sample	Observations	Mean disposable income (standard error)		Change
		t-1	t+10	
Baseline sample	13,467	28,390 (293)	42,461 (674)	14,071
Switchers (UIE-IE) dropped	11,538	27,933 (339)	43,384 (789)	15,451
Parent entrepreneur: yes	7,697	28,000 (335)	42,453 (670)	14,453
Parent entrepreneur: no	5,770	28,925 (520)	42,473 (1,310)	13,548
Main owner after 5 years: yes	8,873	28,248 (334)	44,585 (915)	16,337
Main owner after 5 years: no	4,594	28,667 (567)	38,279 (871)	9,612
Firm starts 1998-2005 (Tax Admin. data)	4,932	29,204 (592)	47,591 (969)	18,387
Firm starts 2006-2014 (Statistics Finland data)	8,535	27,911 (307)	39,444 (905)	11,533
Firm starts 2006-2014 (Tax Admin. data)	1,654	32,875 (632)	45,517 (1,131)	12,642


Notes: Table presents the average increase in disposable income among new incorporated entrepreneurs from one year before to 10 years after they established their first business using different subsamples of our data. First, we exclude those who had an unincorporated business before becoming incorporated. Second, we show the gains separately for those with and without entrepreneurial parents. Third, we separate entrepreneurs by whether they still are or are not the main owners of the business five years after the business was established. Finally, we show how the gains differ by years and by how we identify incorporated entrepreneurs from the data. Importantly, the last two rows in the table highlight that when using the same time period (2006–2014), our findings on the gains from entrepreneurship do not differ depending on whether we define the ownership status based on Tax Administration data or the Statistics Finland firm ownership database.

Figure B4: Disposable income trajectories using a balanced panel of individuals



Notes: The figure presents the unconditional log disposable income trajectories of incorporated business owners (squares) and wage earners (circles) relative to the year $t - 1$ (denoted by zero in the figure) using three samples. Panel A shows our baseline unbalanced panel results. Panel B includes the panel data results for individuals we observed from $t - 1$ to $t + 10$. Panel C shows the panel data results for individuals observe from $t - 5$ to $t + 10$. Overall, the figure shows that the gains from entrepreneurship are larger when using a balanced panel data instead of an unbalanced panel as in our baseline analysis.

Figure B5: Gains in disposable income by industry of the newly established firm



Notes: The figure shows the individual-level gains in log disposable income by the industries of newly established incorporated firms. The gains are measured as the difference in annual income 10 years after and one year before the firms are established. The gains are presented relative to the industry with the lowest gains (manufacturing of chemicals and chemical products) with 95% confidence intervals. Raw data (squares) corresponds to a model without controls. In the model with controls (diamonds), we account for all interactions of age, sex and education (primary education, secondary degree or tertiary degree), these interactions using age squared and age cubed, and individual ($t - 1$) and parental income ranks. We use the TOL 2008 classification of Statistics Finland, which is based on the EU's classification of economic activities (NACE), to classify the industries.

C Taxation of incorporated and unincorporated firms

Sole proprietors and partnerships are pass-through entities, meaning that their profits are taxed only at the owner level as personal income. In contrast, privately held corporations are separately tax-liable, meaning that their profits are taxed at the firm level at the corporate tax rate. Owners of privately held corporations pay an additional tax on income withdrawn from the firm.

Finland applies a dual income tax system where earned income (wages, pension income etc.) and capital income (interest income, rental income, dividends, capital gains etc.) are taxed with separate tax schedules. The earned income tax rate schedule is more progressive, with a higher top tax rate of approximately 55%, whereas the tax rate for capital income is 30% for income below 30,000 euros and 34% for income above that threshold (in 2023).

Within the dual income tax system, the declared profits of unincorporated firms are divided into earned income and capital income components based on the net assets of the firm (assets minus liabilities), such that the amount corresponding to 20% of the net assets is taxed as capital income and any remaining profit as owners' earned income.²⁴

The tax schedule for incorporated firms is more complex. Privately held corporations pay a 20% tax on profits, and the owners pay earned income tax on any wage income withdrawn from the firm (wages are deductible from firm profits). In addition, corporations can distribute dividends to their owners, which are in general taxed as the owners' personal capital income. However, the dividend income tax schedule for privately held corporations is more complicated, including one further tax rate kink determined by firm-level net assets (8% of net assets) and another kink based on the euro amount of the dividends withdrawn from the firm (150,000 euros). The tax rate increases for dividend income above these thresholds, so as to suppress the incentives to minimize personal income taxes by shifting income from the earned income tax base to the more leniently taxed capital income tax base.

In more detail, the tax rate for dividend income that falls below the amount corresponding to 8% of a firm's net assets is taxed at a flat effective tax rate of 26%, including both owner-level dividend taxes and corporate taxes. This dividend income is 75% tax-free, and 25% is taxed as personal capital income. Combined with the corporate tax of 20%, this yields an effective tax rate of 26% ($0.20 + (0.80 * 0.25 * 0.30) = 0.26$). The rate increases to 26.8% if the annual personal capital income of the owner exceeds 30,000 euros. The tax rate increases to 40.4% (43.1% if capital income above 30,000 euros) for dividends below the net assets threshold that exceed 150,000 euros. Dividend income that exceeds the 8% net assets threshold is partly tax-free (15%) and partly taxed as

²⁴The owners can also choose a smaller capital income component of either 10% or 0%. These choices can be preferable for unincorporated firms with small profits in which case the earned income tax rate of the owner(s) can be below the personal capital income tax rate (30% or 34%).

earned income (85%) according to the progressive wage tax schedule excluding social security contributions. The exact tax rates and thresholds have varied over time in the time period we study, but the baseline system has remained the same.²⁵

D Definitions

In this section, we present the definitions of the samples and the key variables we use in our baseline analysis.

Estimation Sample: We restrict our baseline sample to individuals who are 25–64 years old when establishing their business and to individuals with positive annual wage income and/or entrepreneurial income. We also restrict our main sample to those individuals for whom we observe child-parent links. This last restriction eliminates all individuals born before 1953. We analyze firm starts and pseudo-starts (see wage earners below) that take place in 1998–2014.

Incorporated entrepreneurs, IE: Main owners of newly established privately held corporations. An individual is classified as a new incorporated entrepreneur in the year when his/her firm shows positive sales if the individual had no prior ownership in other privately held corporations. Data on full ownership information from Statistics Finland starts from 2006 (Finnish Longitudinal Owner-Employer-Employee Data FLOWN). For the period 1997–2005, we rely on data from the Finnish Tax Administration that cover owners who received dividend income from their firm.

Unincorporated entrepreneurs, UIE: Sole proprietors or main owners of newly established partnerships. An individual is classified as a new unincorporated entrepreneur in the year when the firm shows positive sales and the owner obtains more than 50% of his/her market income as business income, if the individual had not been a sole proprietor before and had no prior ownership in other partnerships. The ownership data start from the year 1997 and are from the Finnish Tax Administration.

Wage earners, WE: We label as wage earners individuals who are 25–64 years old and have positive annual wage income and who have no ownership of any firm (incorporated or unincorporated) over the whole time period we observe in the data. To these individuals we assign a pseudo-start year ($t = 0$) that is drawn randomly from a uniform distribution. These wage earners do not actually start a business that year, but this approach enables us to benchmark the income development of new business owners against the income growth of wage earners over time.

²⁵See Harju et al. (2022) for details on the recent reforms and Harju and Matikka (2016) for more details on the dividend taxation of privately held corporations.

Disposable income: Sum of earned income, entrepreneurial income, capital income and transfers and benefits received after taxes and other levies.

Market income: Sum of earned income, entrepreneurial income and capital income before taxes and other levies.

Retained earnings: We follow a similar approach as in Alstadsæter et al. (2023) and allocate earnings retained in the firm instead of distributed as dividends to the owners to each owner of an incorporated firm based on their ownership share of the firm. We include this income on top of the market income observed in the administrative data to study the significance of retained earnings in income development over time.

Income rank: Individual's position in the income distribution in a given year for a given income concept. Depending on the scope of the analysis, we use either percentile (1–100), decile (1–10) or quintile (1–5) ranks.

Parental income: Average annual household market income of parents when they were 45–50 years old. Parental income rank refers to household's position in the parental household distribution. We cover parents who are 45–50 years old after 1987. As a sensitivity check, for a subset of parents who are 45–50 years old after 1995, we can define parental ranks using disposable income and capital income.

Parental entrepreneurship status: Parents are classified as entrepreneurs if at least one of the parents is labeled as a business owner for at least 5 years according to the socioeconomic status defined by Statistics Finland. This approach enables us to use a similar definition for parental entrepreneurship over time using our full data starting from 1987.

Education: The educational level and field of the highest qualification/degree. Education classifications correspond to the ISCED 2011 classification.

Rank-rank correlation: A measure of intergenerational mobility; the correlation between parents' and children's income rank. We calculate the correlations one year before and 10 years after the start as an entrepreneur or pseudo-start. We control for the age of the child to account for the positive correlation between individual income and age.

Firm entry: First year of a business is defined as the first year the firm is both registered at the Finnish Patent and Registration Office and presents positive sales in the tax return data.

Firm ownership: For the owners of privately held corporations, we use two separate

data sets to define firm ownership: 1) the main owner information from the Tax Administration for those owners who received dividend income from their firm, available for 1997–2016, and 2) the full ownership database from Statistics Finland, which is based on information from the Finnish Patent and Registration Office, available for 2006–2019. We use a data set including all sole proprietors and partnership owners from the Tax Administration available for 1997–2016.

Main Ownership Status: We define the main owner of an incorporated business as the owner who owns the largest share of the firm.

Bankruptcy: A firm is defined as bankrupt if bankruptcy is declared by the district court, following the bankruptcy regulations in Finland.

Initial equity: Invested equity of the firm in the first year after it was registered at the Finnish Patent and Registration Office.

Sales: Annual sales income from products and services after taxes.

Number of employees: Full-time equivalent employees in the firm during a year.

Staff costs: The annual sum of wages, salaries and personnel expenses determined on the basis of wages or salaries, such as pension contributions and social security contributions, but excluding income taxes.

Value added: Annual value of sales minus variable costs. Variable costs include intermediate inputs used in production, such as materials and services.

Productivity: Value added divided by the number of employees.

R&D investments: Annual investments in research and development. In our analysis, we use an indicator variable of whether or not a firm has positive R&D investments.

E Overview of data used in previous related studies

Previous studies on the link between entrepreneurship and personal income have relied on surveys using either cross-sectional data or panels with relatively few individuals followed over time. Hamilton (2000), who documents that self-employment is associated with lower initial earnings and lower earnings growth compared to paid employment, relies on a sample from the Survey of Income and Program Participation that covers 8,771 males observed in 1983–1986 in the US. Both incorporated and unincorporated business owners are labeled as self-employed if they report self-employment as the main “non-casual” labor market activity for at least three months in a given 12-month spell. Moskowitz and Vissing-Jørgensen (2002) show that, in the US, ownership in privately held businesses is highly concentrated, yet the returns to this poorly diversified investment are at par with stock market returns. Their main source of data is the 1989, 1992, 1995 and 1998 Survey of Consumer Finances, which covers roughly 4,000 households per survey year.

Levine and Rubinstein (2017) make a seminal contribution by disaggregating the self-employed into incorporated and unincorporated. Their first data source is the Current Population Survey, which they use as cross-sections and as a two-year panel. In the pooled cross-sections, there are approximately 40,000 incorporated and 75,000 unincorporated business owners. Their second source is the National Longitudinal Survey NLSY79, which enables the authors to follow roughly 2,000 incorporated and 9,000 unincorporated business owners over 1982–2012.

We depart from these previous studies by having highly detailed administrative population-wide panel data on individuals and firms, including the exact establishment dates and ownership structures of new businesses. These data allow us to follow the same individuals over time before and after they become business owners for the first time in this literature. Moreover, we have access to detailed information about entrepreneurs, their parents and their newly established businesses. The study closest to ours is that by Berglann et al. (2011), who follow a sample of 12,000 new entrepreneurs – both incorporated and unincorporated, who start their business between October 2000 and October 2001 in Norway – five years before and five years after they become entrepreneurs.

Halvarsson et al. (2018) and Lindquist and Vladasel (2022) have similar Swedish administrative data but a different scope. Halvarsson et al. (2018) examine how self-employment shapes the income distribution using two cross-sections of data (2005 and 2013). Lindquist and Vladasel (2022) construct lifetime earnings for entrepreneurial sons and their fathers to document that, driven by selection into entrepreneurship, incorporated entrepreneurs are more upwardly mobile than wage earners.