Does managerial personality matter? Evidence from firms in Vietnam

Smriti Sharma [a,*], Finn Tarp [a,b]

[a] *UNU-WIDER, Katajanokanlaituri 6B, 00160 Helsinki, Finland*
[b] *Department of Economics, University of Copenhagen, Øster Farimagsgade 5, DK-1353 Copenhagen K, Denmark*

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Using novel data from micro, small and medium firms in Vietnam, we estimate the relationship between behavioural and personality traits of owners/managers – risk attitudes, locus of control, and innovativeness – and firm-level decisions. We extend the analysis beyond standard metrics of firm performance such as revenue and growth to study intermediate investments, including product innovation, worker training, and adoption of workplace safety measures that are potentially conducive to observed firm performance. Our results show that innovativeness and locus of control are positively correlated with revenue while risk aversion predicts lower revenue. Risk aversion is positively correlated with the adoption of safety measures. Innovativeness, as expected, is associated with an increased probability of product innovations. An internal locus of control predicts higher probability of investments, innovations and worker training. Heterogeneity analyses indicate that innovativeness and risk aversion matter more for firm outcomes in provinces characterized by better business climate. Our results are robust to a variety of checks. We contribute to a nascent and rapidly growing literature on the importance of managerial capital by shedding light on the role of managerial personality characteristics for decision-making in firms in a dynamic transition economy.

1. Introduction

Firms in developing countries are faced with a variety of constraints that may hamper their productivity and threaten their survival, with broader implications for economy-wide growth. These range from external characteristics such as difficulty in access to finance, lack of market outlets, macroeconomic uncertainty, and complicated government policies, to internal features such as shortage of labour and lack of technical knowledge. Another crucial internal constraint is the scarcity of managerial capital, which relates to managerial practices and inherent talent. Better managerial capital can improve the marginal productivity of other inputs, and affect the quantity and quality of other inputs in the production process (Bruhn et al., 2010).

---

* Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: smriti@wider.unu.edu (S. Sharma), finn@wider.unu.edu (F. Tarp).

Managerial heterogeneity has only recently started receiving attention in the empirical literature as an additional quantifiable explanation of between-country and between-firm productivity gaps (e.g., Bloom and Van Reenen, 2007; Bloom et al., 2014; Bruhn et al., 2010).[1] For instance, Bloom and Van Reenen (2007) use data from medium-sized manufacturing plants in the US and Europe to find management practices to be positively associated with total factor productivity and GDP per capita.[2] In a similar vein, McKenzie and Woodruff (2017) uncover that implementation of business practices – related to financial planning, marketing and record-keeping – in small firms in seven developing countries increases labour productivity and total factor productivity. While one part of managerial quality derives from management and business practices, another dimension is related to inherent talent and entrepreneurial traits, with the latter possibly influencing the adoption of the former. In fact, using data from large manufacturing firms in Brazil, France, Germany, India, UK and USA, Bandiera et al. (2017) show that while CEO behaviour and management practice scores are correlated with one another, they exercise independent influences on firm performance.

While management practices have been the subject of substantial academic scrutiny, entrepreneurial personality traits remain relatively under-researched with some exceptions. While traits such as risk preferences, innovativeness and need for autonomy have been analysed from the point of view of business entry and exit, there remains considerable scope to gain a better understanding of whether and how they determine firm performance. In this study, our objective is to understand the relationship between behavioural and personality traits of firm owners and managers and performance of firms in the context of a dynamic transition economy – Vietnam. The traits we specifically consider are risk attitudes, locus of control, and innovativeness. To the best of our knowledge, we are among the first in the economics literature to examine the relevance of managerial locus of control and innovativeness for firm performance. Another key contribution is that we go beyond standard indicators of firm performance such as sales or profits to shed further light on the importance of these traits for intermediate practices and investments such as product innovation, worker training, and installation of safety measures at the workplace against hazards related to fire, heat, and light. The focus on these intermediate practices is justified by existing literature that shows these practices to be relevant for final firm performance. For instance, firm-sponsored worker training is associated with higher firm productivity (e.g., Adhvaryu et al., 2016a; Dearden et al., 2006; Konings and Vanormelingen, 2015) as are firm-level innovations (e.g., de Mel et al., 2009a; Geroski et al., 1993). Given the negative impacts on worker productivity arising from pollution and high indoor/outdoor ambient temperatures especially in developing country settings (see Dell et al., 2014 for an overview), recent studies show that installing workplace health and safety measures enhances firm performance by increasing worker efficiency and reducing absenteeism arising from job-related sickness (e.g., Adhvaryu et al., 2016b; Sudarshan et al., 2015).

Previous literature provides pointers on how and why traits such as locus of control, innovativeness, and risk should matter for these measures of firm outcomes.[3] *Locus of control* is a psychological concept developed by Rotter (1966) that indicates how much individuals believe that outcomes in their life are within their control. Those with an internal locus of control attribute their outcomes to their own efforts while those with an external locus of control believe that their outcomes are determined by luck and other factors outside of their control. Work in organizational psychology (e.g., Boone et al., 1996; Miller et al., 1982) posits that firms led by managers with an internal locus of control (or 'internals') are expected to perform better because they are better equipped to handle stress and uncertainty, able to work towards long-term goals due to their longer planning horizons, able to learn from feedback, and have a task-oriented and motivational leadership style. The literature on locus of control and human capital investment finds that internals perceive the subjective returns to investment to be higher, and that this explains the positive relationship between locus of control and investment in education, worker training, and efforts into job search (e.g., Coleman and DeLeire, 2003; Caliendo et al., 2016; McGee and McGee, 2016). Social psychology literature finds that an internal locus of control lowers the subjective perception of risk because the agent believes that she has control over the risky environment (e.g., Simon et al., 2000) and this can lead to higher investment in more risky assets (Salamanca et al., 2016). Based on this, one may expect firms led by internal managers to be more successful and undertake more investments.

The trait of *innovativeness* derives its importance from early emphasis by Joseph Schumpeter, who described entrepreneurs as innovators (see McGraw, 2009). Innovativeness refers to openness and creativity of individuals, and a willingness to look for new ways and solutions. Innovative managers are more market-oriented and therefore more likely to experiment with new and improved products and processes to cater to customer demands. In small firms that may not have the scale to undertake sophisticated R&D, innovative managers rely on supplier networks to update their market knowledge. Empirically, studies in organizational psychology find that being innovative contributes to business success (see Rauch and Frese, 2007 for a meta-analysis).

---

[1] Note that while early micro theory models alluded to the importance of 'talent for managing' (see Bruhn et al., 2010 for a brief discussion), integration of these concepts into empirical work is rather recent. Syverson (2011) highlights that "perhaps no potential driver of productivity differences has seen a higher ratio of speculation to actual empirical study" (p. 336).

[2] Management practices also affect firms' ability to deal with setbacks and crises. For instance, Aghion et al. (2017) show that firms with a more decentralized management performed better than centralized firms during the 2008-09 crisis. Adhvaryu et al. (2016c) find that managers adept at identifying and solving problems and monitoring their employees endure smaller losses due to workers' exposure to pollution, as they are more likely to reallocate tasks among workers and re-optimize production.

[3] Some other traits have also been examined for entry, exit, and business success. Batsaikhan (2017) studies the correlation between experimentally elicited trust and trustworthiness and sales of Mongolian small entrepreneurs in the mobile phone industry. Caliendo et al. (2014) explore the importance of a host of personality traits such as Big Five, trust, reciprocity, and patience for business entry.

Finally, on *risk attitudes*, early seminal work by Kihlstrom and Laffont (1979) uses a general equilibrium model to show that assuming identical skills across individuals, those with lower risk aversion will become entrepreneurs. Less risk averse entrepreneurs are more likely to be open to new business opportunities. They are also more likely to choose a portfolio of activities or projects that is characterized by high risk and high returns (Pattillo and Söderbom, 2000). Recent empirical work shows that risk preferences affect decisions regarding entry into self-employment (e.g., Caliendo et al., 2009; Skriabikova et al., 2014), business exit (e.g., Caliendo et al., 2010), and firm performance (e.g., Willebrands et al., 2012; Kremer et al., 2013; Opper et al., 2017). Further, in developing countries, institutional barriers and incomplete credit and insurance markets imply that investments are laden with uncertainty. Therefore, only individuals with a higher risk tolerance might show willingness to undertake investments. Courbage et al. (2014) review the literature on risk and preventive behaviour and find that the likelihood of adopting preventions that can either affect the size of the potential loss or the probability of loss increases with risk aversion (or loss aversion). Therefore, we would expect risk averse owners to have lower revenues, be less likely to undertake investments and innovate, and more likely to install workplace safety measures.

Using new original data from micro, small and medium firms in Vietnam, we find that risk aversion, locus of control, and innovativeness of firm owners/managers are correlated to varying degrees with the outcomes under consideration. Our results show that innovativeness and locus of control are positively correlated with revenue while risk aversion predicts lower revenue. Risk aversion is positively correlated with the adoption of safety measures, pointing towards loss-averse behaviour. Innovativeness, as expected, is associated with an increased probability of product innovations. An internal locus of control predicts higher probability of investments, innovations and worker training. A negative relationship between locus of control and installation of safety measures is indicative of an internal locus of control lowering subjective risk perceptions. Further, as preferences and traits can matter differentially for firm performance depending on conditions, we also conduct heterogeneity analyses. These indicate, *inter alia*, that innovativeness and risk aversion yield higher returns for firm outcomes in provinces with a better business climate.

With this study, we contribute to three broad research agendas. First, and most importantly, we add to understanding of the role of managerial personality traits on an unexplored set of outcomes. Specifically, while most literature is concerned with only some measure of revenue or profitability as the firm-level outcome, we examine whether personality traits matter for intermediate practices and investments – such as decisions to innovate or train workers or investing in workplace safety – that matter for final observed firm performance.

Second, while managerial risk preferences have previously been shown to be important for firm performance, to the best of our knowledge, we are among the first in the economics literature to examine the relationship between managerial locus of control and innovativeness and firm performance and decision-making.[4]

Third, existing analyses provide evidence that CEO or manager behavioural traits, as captured by overconfidence, optimism, and risk aversion etc., matter for firm performance and policies of large and often listed companies (e.g., Bandiera et al., 2017; Malmendier and Tate, 2015; Graham et al., 2013; Opper et al., 2017). However, such evidence on smaller firms is mostly lacking. We attempt to fill this gap. Arguably, such preferences and traits are also likely to matter in smaller firms where decision-making is often vested almost completely in the hands of the owner/manager, as compared to larger firms with more complex decision-making structures.

Our study also assumes importance in the context of a dynamic transition economy like Vietnam. By recent estimates, the SME sector contributes 45% of the country's GDP and approximately 60% of jobs. Considering the significance of this sector to the Vietnamese economy and the ongoing focus of the Vietnamese government on improving the competitiveness of this sector, our research is also policy-relevant.

2. Data and methodology

The data analysed here come from the Vietnam Micro, Small and Medium Enterprise Survey that was conducted from June to August 2015 based on face-to-face interviews with owners/managers of private manufacturing enterprises.[5] These data are one wave of a long-running panel survey of firms that has been conducted biennially since 2005. They contain a host of information relating to sales and costs, employment, enterprise history, production and technology, and owner/manager characteristics.

At the time of the first survey in 2005, the following ten provinces were selected from across different regions of the country: North (Ha Noi, Ha Tay, Phu Tho, and Hai Phong), South (Ho Chi Minh City, Long An, and Khanh Hoa), and Central (Nghe An, Quang Nam, and Lam Dong), and the survey was representative at the province level. The population of private manufacturing enterprises in these provinces came from two data sources from the General Statistics Office (GSO) of Vietnam: (i) the 2002 Establishment Census and; (ii) the Industrial Survey of 2002–2005. At the time, these provinces accounted for about one-third of manufacturing enterprises in Vietnam. Stratified sampling was used to ensure adequate numbers of

enterprises in each province with different ownership forms (household enterprises, sole proprietorships, partnerships, limited liability, and joint stock enterprises). The subsequent surveys conducted every two years trace the same firms over time. Exiting firms are randomly replaced such that the replacement firm is similar in terms of ownership status and location to the exiting firm. The new population of firms is obtained from the most recent GSO Establishment Census.

In this paper, we utilize only the 2015 cross-section as this was the first time a personality module was added to the survey instrument. This round consists of approximately 2600 non-state manufacturing enterprises. Our outcomes of interest pertain to the firms' financial performance which we measure using annual sales revenue (in logs),[6] the rate of growth of sales revenue between the last two years (in percent), and whether the firm has undertaken any investment in the preceding two years (coded 1 if yes; 0 if no). As measures of intermediate investments, we consider whether the firm has undertaken product innovation by introducing new products or improving existing ones since the previous survey (coded 1 if yes; 0 if no). In small firms in developing countries, product differentiation through improving product design or quality can also be considered an innovative strategy. As an additional measure of intermediate investments, we study whether firms spend on training of new or existing workers (coded 1 if yes; 0 if no). Finally, we analyse whether the firm has invested in safety measures against hazards related to fire (by installing fire extinguishers, alarm systems, and sprinklers), heat (such as fans, air conditioners, and cooling systems), and light (such as window systems and light bulbs). These are each coded as 1 if the firm responds yes, and 0 if no.

Our main variables of interest come from the personality module of the questionnaire.[7] Risk attitudes were assessed using the willingness to take risk question. Respondents were asked to answer on an 11-point scale ranging from 0–10 where 0 means 'risk averse' and 10 'risk loving' to the question 'Would you describe yourself as someone who tries to avoid risks (risk averse) or as someone who is willing to take risks (risk loving)?'. Dohmen et al. (2011) have experimentally validated this risk scale – using the German Socioeconomic Panel – by showing that this can predict fairly well the choices made in an incentivized lottery game and also other cases of risky behaviour such as smoking, drinking and investments in stocks. Using a sample from rural Thailand, Hardeweg et al. (2013) also validate the willingness to take risk question against the standard incentivized multiple price list risk experiment. Following previous studies, we create a binary variable *risk averse* that takes the value 1 if the response on the risk scale lies between 0 and 5, and 0 if the response is between 6 and 10. Ten statements were used to ascertain the locus of control which measures whether one believes one can control the important outcomes in one's life. Respondents are asked to indicate agreement with each statement on a 1–7 scale where 1 means 'disagree completely' and 7 'agree completely'. Finally, innovativeness was elicited by asking respondents to rate how much they agree with each of three statements on a scale of 1–5 where a 1 denotes 'being very untrue' and a 5 'being very true'. These statements are like the ones used in Fairlie and Holleran (2012).

For locus of control and innovativeness, we calculate the score as the average of scores on all items corresponding to each trait. We standardize these scores using the sample mean and standard deviation and use *z*-scores in regressions. In Section 3.3, we show that our results are robust to using factor analysis to construct indices of locus of control and innovativeness.

We also calculate the Cronbach's alpha, a widely used measure of internal consistency, that indicates the inter-item correlation among items corresponding to the same general construct. The alphas for locus of control and innovativeness are 0.78 and 0.71 respectively, above the range of 0.6–0.7 that is deemed desirable for statistical analyses.

Our estimating equation is of the following type where *i* represents the firm:

$$Y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Risk_i + \beta_2 Locus\ of\ Control_i + \beta_3 Innovativeness_i + \sum_{j=4}^{N} \beta_j\ X_{ij} + \varepsilon_i$$

We estimate OLS/linear probability models for all outcomes *Y*. In addition to risk, locus of control and innovativeness as defined above, in vector *X*, we also control for respondent characteristics such as gender (takes value 1 if female; 0 if male), age (in years), education (takes value 1 if at least college educated; 0 otherwise), and previous experience of self-employment (takes value 1 if yes; 0 otherwise).[8] Among firm characteristics, we account for age of the firm (in years), size of the firm as measured by the number of employees, and whether it is a household enterprise (coded 1 if yes; 0 if no). We include dummies for the province where the firm is located and the sector it operates in to account for common factors within provinces and within sectors that affect all firms. This lends support to our results as we are then studying the relationship between risk and personality measures and firm outcomes within sectors and provinces. As there may be correlation in the error terms between firms in the same sector within a province, we cluster standard errors at the province-sector level.

---

[6] Firms were asked to report their total revenue from sales in 2014. de Mel et al. (2009b) show that there is little difference between annual sales data and quarterly collection of monthly sales, using data from the Sri Lanka Microenterprise Survey.

[7] The questions are available in Appendix A.

[8] 70% of respondents are firm owners and the remaining 30% are managers. However, as one may be concerned that we are pooling data from owners and managers together, we re-estimate the regressions separately for these groups. These results are available from the authors and the coefficients of interest are largely similar across owners and managers.

As the data are cross-sectional with firm outcomes and personality traits being measured contemporaneously, the reported estimates measure robust conditional correlations, and establishing causality is not possible.[9] Nevertheless, significant and sizable observed correlations indicate how changing these skills can contribute to deeper understanding of firm practices and performance, and show that these skills and traits can be important omitted variables in such studies. One may be concerned about reverse causality such that firm outcomes affect skill accumulation. However, as we discuss in Section 3.1, the average respondent in our sample is 46 years old, falling in the working-age range during which personality traits are most stable, and any changes are found to be modest and not economically significant (e.g., Cobb-Clark and Schurer, 2013).

A caveat of this survey, as is the case with most other firm-level surveys, is that the coverage is limited to existing businesses, making it hard to correct for sample selection bias. Existing literature shows that behavioural factors determine entry and exit from self-employment and that behavioural differences exist between entrepreneurs and non-entrepreneurs (e.g., Caliendo et al., 2010; Caliendo et al., 2014; Holm et al., 2013). As we will see in Section 3.2, the traits we consider are significantly correlated with various metrics of firm performance and intermediate investments, indicating that there is sufficient variance in traits, even among those who remain in self-employment. However, as less risk averse, more internal, and more innovative individuals are more likely to become self-employed (e.g., de Mel et al., 2010; Hansemark, 2003; Skriabikova et al., 2014), our estimated coefficients are likely to suffer from attenuation or downward bias. In terms of exit, the bias could operate in both directions. On the one hand, as less productive firms are more likely to exit, and these are firms run by individuals characterized by a more external locus of control, less innovativeness, and more risk aversion (e.g., Rauch and Frese, 2007; Caliendo et al., 2010), because of observing only more successful firms, the estimated coefficients are subject to a downward bias. Conversely, it is also possible that excessively risk-taking and innovative owners make choices that are both high-return and embody greater risk/variance that can increase the chances of firm failure (Patillo and Söderbom, 2000; Hyytinen et al., 2015). In such a case, the coefficients would be upward biased.

We perform a set of suggestive checks to assess the direction of bias for the case of selective exit.[10] First, we compare firm age based on owners' risk aversion, innovativeness and locus of control, and find that firms led by risk averse owners are significantly older while firms led by highly innovative owners are significantly younger. Second, we examine differences in distribution of revenues based on traits. We find that less risk averse owners have significantly higher revenues but *lower* variance than more risk averse owners. Similarly, while innovative owners have higher revenues, its variance is not significantly different from that of firms led by less innovative owners. We do not find significant differences in means and variance of revenues based on locus of control. Combining evidence from these two points, while we do find that less risk averse and innovative owners lead younger firms, we can rule out evidence that this is due to high variance choices that such owners make. Therefore, for the case of exit, the upward bias is less likely to be of concern for our estimates. Overall, this suggests that considering potential bias arising from selective entry and exit, our estimates are likely to be downward biased.

3. Results

3.1. Summary statistics

Table 1 presents the mean and standard deviation for each of our outcome variables (Panel A) and explanatory variables (Panel B) for the analysis sample. The average revenue is 3070 million Vietnamese Dong (VND), which translates to approximately USD 136,440 (USD 1 = VND 22,500 at the time of survey). The average rate of growth in revenue over 2013–2014 is 2.1%. Just under half of the firms undertook some type of investment in land, buildings, machinery or equipment. In terms of engaging in product innovation, a third of firms introduced new products or undertook incremental innovation by improving their existing products. A quarter of firms undertook training of new or existing workers. Investments in workplace safety measures relating to fire, heat, and light were made by 36%, 23% and 21% of firms respectively.

The average respondent is – as already noted – aged 46 years and 41% are female. Over a quarter of respondents have completed college and 23% of them have some previous experience of self-employment. Coming to risk attitudes and personality, 75% are risk averse in that they score 0–5 on the 0–10 scale.[11] The average score on locus of control is 5.05 (out of a maximum score of 7) and the average score on innovativeness is 3.61 (out of a maximum score of 5). In line with the literature on gender differences in risk preferences and personality traits (e.g., Bertrand, 2011), we find females to be significantly more risk averse and displaying significantly lower internal locus of control than males. We do not observe significant gender differences in innovativeness.

On average, a firm has been operating for 16 years and has about 13 employees. Household enterprises make up 63% of the sample. Firms are predominantly located in the provinces of Ha Noi and Ho Chi Minh City (approximately 25% each), and Nghe An (13%). Khanh Hoa and Lam Dong (about 3.5% each) have the lowest shares of firms in the sample. Firms are

---

[9] Observed correlations may be because skills affect outcomes of interest, business outcomes potentially affect skill accumulation, and/or other factors that are jointly driving both skills and outcomes.

[10] We thank a referee for suggesting this. Results are available in Tables B3 and B4 in Appendix B.

[11] The modal response is 5 and it accounts for 20% of all responses. Most of the responses lie in the 2-7 value range with the mean value being 3.82. This is largely in line with the distribution reported in Dohmen et al. (2011).

Table 1
Summary statistics.

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation
Panel A:		
Revenue (in million VND)	3070.76	7434.3
Annual Revenue rate of growth	2.091	17.95
Investment	0.488	0.5
Product innovation	0.331	0.47
Worker training	0.252	0.43
Investment in fire safety	0.364	0.48
Investment in heat safety	0.235	0.42
Investment in light safety	0.209	0.41
Panel B:		
Female	0.41	0.49
Respondent age (in years)	46.46	11.13
College and above education	0.265	0.44
Previously self-employed	0.231	0.42
Risk averse	0.752	0.43
Locus of control	5.05	0.8
Innovativeness	3.612	0.85
Firm age (in years)	16.52	10.15
Number of employees	12.78	27.29
Household enterprise	0.63	0.48
Micro (1–9 employees)	0.73	0.44
Sector: Food and beverages	0.318	0.47
Sector: Fabricated metal products	0.17	0.38
Sector: Wood	0.11	0.31
Sector: Furniture	0.062	0.24
Sector: Rubber	0.06	0.24
Sector: Apparels	0.052	0.22
Number of firms	2632	

Notes: The maximum score for locus of control and innovativeness is 7 and 5 respectively.

spread over 18 manufacturing sectors. The leading sectors in which firms operate are food and beverages (32%), fabricated metal products (17%), wood (11%), furniture (6%), rubber (6%), and apparel (5%). The sectors with very small shares under 2% are chemical products, basic metals, motor vehicles and transport equipment, refined petroleum, and recycling.

In Table B1 in Appendix B, we present averages of outcomes and behavioural preferences and traits of owners for the six leading sectors, i.e., those with shares over 5%. An eyeballing of the data shows some variation across sectors. Food and beverages, the most dominant sector in the sample, has the lowest average revenue compared to other sectors. It generally fares worse than other sectors in terms of other metrics such as product innovations, worker training and investment in workplace safety. Probability of investments in safety measures and training workers is highest in the rubber and apparels sectors. The rubber and apparels sectors also have a lower share of risk averse and more innovative owners as compared to owners in food and beverages and furniture. Locus of control scores are marginally higher in fabricated metal products, food and beverages, rubber and apparels as compared to other sectors. These sectoral variations highlight the importance of controlling for sector fixed effects in the regression framework.

3.2. Regression results

In Table 2, we explore how behaviour and personality correlate with standard measures of firm performance: log (revenue), annual rate of growth of revenue, and whether the firm made investments. We find that all three behavioural traits are correlated with firm revenues. Column 1 shows that firms with risk averse owners/managers have 7% lower revenue than firms with owners/managers who are not risk averse. A one standard deviation change in locus of control and innovativeness is associated with higher firm revenue by 3.3% and 3.4% respectively. Risk aversion is also associated with a 2.4 percentage point lower annual revenue growth. A more internal locus of control predicts a 3 percentage point higher probability of investments.

In terms of other right-hand side controls, firm size, as measured by number of employees, is positively correlated with revenues, rates of growth, and investment. Firm age is negatively associated with revenue growth and investment. Household enterprises, as expected, have lower revenues and are less likely to invest. We find that female-led firms are less likely to invest while there are no significant gender gaps observed for other outcomes.

Table 3 presents results on intermediate investments and practices such as product innovation, worker training and investments in safety measures pertaining to fire, heat and light. We find owners/managers scoring higher on the innovativeness scale to have a greater likelihood of undertaking product innovations, and this channel could possibly explain the positive relationship between innovativeness and revenues observed in Column 1 in Table 2. Risk averse owners are 5 and

Table 2
Firm performance.

	(1) Log(Revenue)	(2) Annual Revenue growth	(3) Investment
Risk averse	−0.070*	−2.416**	−0.003
	(0.035)	(0.984)	(0.024)
Locus of control	0.033**	−0.059	0.029***
	(0.014)	(0.405)	(0.010)
Innovativeness	0.034**	0.371	0.005
	(0.016)	(0.377)	(0.012)
Female	−0.011	−0.125	−0.037*
	(0.042)	(0.807)	(0.019)
Respondent age	−0.002	−0.062	−0.002*
	(0.002)	(0.038)	(0.001)
College and above education	0.105*	0.346	−0.064**
	(0.055)	(1.053)	(0.027)
Previously self-employed	0.021	0.966	−0.006
	(0.035)	(0.750)	(0.023)
Number of employees	0.956***	1.754***	0.129***
	(0.026)	(0.474)	(0.013)
Firm age	−0.002	−0.097***	−0.003***
	(0.002)	(0.031)	(0.001)
Household enterprise	−0.514***	−0.539	−0.080***
	(0.048)	(1.239)	(0.028)
Constant	5.489***	−12.268**	1.041***
	(0.276)	(4.793)	(0.112)
N	2538	2487	2622
Joint significance of traits (*p*-value)	0.006	0.03	0.02
R-squared	0.765	0.052	0.216
R-squared (without controls)	0.13	0.01	0.032

Notes: Columns 1 and 2 report marginal effects from OLS and column 3 reports marginal effects using linear probability model. Robust standard errors clustered at the province-sector level.
R-squared (without controls) is from a regression including only the behavioural traits.
*** $p < 0.01$.
** $p < 0.05$.
* $p < 0.1$.

7 percentage points more likely to invest in heat-related and light-related safety measures respectively. In this case, it is indicative of loss aversion as these preventive investments are made to protect existing assets. A one standard deviation increase in locus of control predicts a 2.8 percentage point and 3.2 percentage point higher chance of innovating and training workers respectively. Locus of control being positively correlated with investment (in Column 3 of Table 2) and with product innovation and worker training (in Columns 1 and 2 of Table 3) can be explained by those with an internal locus of control having higher expectations of success conditional on undertaking these actions. Remarkably, we find that owners with a more internal locus of control are less likely to invest in precautionary fire safety measures. Locus of control is also negatively correlated with the probability of investing in heat-related and light-related safety measures though these coefficients are not significant at conventional levels. This is potentially explained by owners with an internal locus of control believing that they exercise control over their environment, and this subsequently lowering their subjective risk perceptions of the possibility of a fire-related incident.

For all intermediate investments, we find that household enterprises are less likely and larger firms are more likely to undertake them. The positive correlation between firm size and adoption of workplace safety could be due to laws on occupational safety and health that mandate the provision of such measures in larger firms to ensure worker safety. Further, it could also be due to customer demands for maintaining quality control and taking necessary precautions at the workplace.

Overall, our results indicate that risk attitudes, locus of control, and innovativeness have predictive validity of varying degrees with respect to firm performance and adoption of intermediate productive practices. For all these outcomes, behavioural traits are jointly significant as indicated in the bottom panels of Tables 2 and 3.

3.3. Robustness checks

In the event of multiple null hypotheses being tested, as in our study, the probability of a false rejection (i.e., Type I error) could be higher than desired. To minimize this error, it is important to consider the multiplicity of null hypotheses being tested. We use the method of Benjamini et al. (2006) as outlined in Anderson (2008) to correct the standard errors for multiple hypotheses. To apply this method, we form a composite index based on our traits of interest. As in Aghion et al. (2017), we average the three *z*-scores of locus of control, innovativeness and risk attitudes and then normalize

Table 3
Intermediate investments.

	(1) Product innovation	(2) Worker training	(3) Fire-related	(4) Heat-related	(5) Light-related
Risk averse	−0.027	0.014	0.011	0.052**	0.074***
	(0.024)	(0.021)	(0.026)	(0.024)	(0.022)
Locus of control	0.028***	0.032***	−0.031***	−0.016	−0.008
	(0.009)	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.011)
Innovativeness	0.021**	−0.005	0.006	0.009	0.008
	(0.010)	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.007)
Female	−0.018	−0.026	0.026*	0.009	−0.005
	(0.021)	(0.016)	(0.014)	(0.016)	(0.014)
Respondent age	0.001	−0.001	0.001	−0.000	0.000
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
College and above education	−0.003	0.035	0.028	0.009	0.005
	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.023)	(0.021)	(0.025)
Previously self-employed	−0.001	−0.044**	0.011	0.001	−0.020
	(0.022)	(0.018)	(0.016)	(0.015)	(0.018)
Number of employees	0.034***	0.075***	0.079***	0.065***	0.064***
	(0.012)	(0.015)	(0.009)	(0.013)	(0.011)
Firm age	0.002*	−0.001	−0.002**	−0.001	0.000
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Household enterprise	−0.048*	−0.084***	−0.168***	−0.108***	−0.130***
	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.025)	(0.034)	(0.027)
Constant	0.092	0.749***	0.292**	0.190	0.070
	(0.220)	(0.281)	(0.112)	(0.151)	(0.122)
N	2622	2100	2622	2622	2622
Joint significance of traits (p-value)	<0.001	0.014	0.017	0.013	0.01
R-squared	0.081	0.181	0.506	0.196	0.220
R-squared (without controls)	0.02	0.031	0.039	0.016	0.018

Notes: This table reports marginal effects using linear probability models. Robust standard errors clustered at the province-sector level.

R-squared (without controls) is from a regression including only the behavioural traits.

*** $p < 0.01$.
** $p < 0.05$.
* $p < 0.1$.

Table 4
Correction for multiple hypotheses testing.

	(1) Log (revenue)	(2) Annual revenue growth	(3) Investment	(4) Product innovation	(5) Worker training	(6) Fire-related safety	(7) Heat-related safety	(8) Light-related safety
Composite traits index	0.059	0.846	0.019	0.038	0.014	−0.017	−0.0125	−0.012
	(0.001)	(0.104)	(0.065)	(0.00)	(0.287)	(0.068)	(0.037)	(0.023)
	[0.004]	[0.08]	[0.066]	[0.001]	[0.1]	[0.066]	[0.059]	[0.049]
N	2538	2487	2622	2622	2100	2622	2622	2622
R-squared	0.76	0.05	0.21	0.08	0.18	0.50	0.19	0.22
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: Composite traits index is the normalized average of locus of control, innovativeness and risk attitude z-scores. Controls include respondent's gender, age, education, and previous self-employment dummy, number of employees, firm age, household enterprise dummy, and province and sector dummies. Robust standard errors clustered at the province-sector level. Unadjusted p-values are presented in parentheses. Multiple hypothesis corrected sharpened q-values in square brackets.

the average again to have a composite traits index (with mean 0 and standard deviation 1).[12] In results presented in Table 4, we present OLS/linear probability model estimates for the various outcomes regressed on the composite traits index and other controls respectively, along with unadjusted outcome-specific p-values and sharpened q-values derived using the multiple hypotheses correction. Our results are robust to this correction.

There may be concerns that the responses to the personality questions capture the underlying unobserved traits with noise, thereby leading to measurement error. In such cases, forming an index that is a simple average assigning equal weight to all items suffers from measurement error, leading to attenuation bias in coefficient estimates (Piatek and Pinger, 2016). Latent factor models estimate the joint distribution of the latent factors and help remove some of this measurement error.[13] We use exploratory factor analysis to determine the underlying dimensionality for locus of control and innovativeness. For

---

[12] To have all traits in the same direction, we use a dummy for risk-loving that takes a value 1 if risk averse dummy equals 0.

[13] See Laajaj and Macours (2017) for a recent overview of problems with skill measurement in developing countries.

Table 5
Using standardized factor scores.

	(1) Log(Revenue)	(2) Revenue growth	(3) Investment	(4) Product innovation	(5) Worker training	(6) Fire-related safety	(7) Heat-related safety	(8) Light-related safety
Risk averse	−0.073**	−2.466**	0.000	−0.026	0.015	0.011	0.052**	0.075***
	(0.036)	(0.989)	(0.023)	(0.024)	(0.021)	(0.026)	(0.023)	(0.022)
Locus of control	0.039***	0.135	0.033***	0.017*	0.023**	−0.027***	−0.013	−0.012
	(0.015)	(0.460)	(0.011)	(0.009)	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.011)
Innovativeness	0.034**	0.348	0.007	0.023**	−0.001	0.003	0.008	0.007
	(0.017)	(0.393)	(0.012)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.007)
Joint significance of traits (*p*-value)	0.006	0.06	0.01	0.01	0.118	0.03	0.02	0.005
Observations	2538	2487	2622	2622	2100	2622	2622	2622
R-squared	0.765	0.052	0.217	0.079	0.179	0.505	0.195	0.220
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: Controls include respondent's gender, age, education, and previous self-employment dummy, number of employees, firm age, household enterprise dummy, and province and sector dummies. Robust standard errors clustered at the province-sector level in parentheses.

*** $p < 0.01$.
** $p < 0.05$.
* $p < 0.1$.

each, a principal component factor analysis with varimax rotation yields one eigenvalue exceeding 1. To facilitate interpretation, we standardize the factor scores to have a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1. In Table 5, we use these factor scores on the right-hand side. As is evident, our results are quite similar to those in Tables 2 and 3.

Finally, we also report marginal effects from probit models for the six binary outcome variables (investment, innovation, training, and fire-related, heat-related and light-related safety). As the results in Table B2 show, our results are robust to this change.

3.4. Heterogeneity analysis

While Section 3.2 presented findings on the pooled sample of firms, it is a natural corollary to examine whether these traits and preferences matter for outcomes in different ways depending on conditions and samples. Rauch and Frese (2007) pose this as an avenue for research, and there is little research in economics that has examined the moderating effects of varying conditions on translation of preferences and traits into material outcomes. We study two avenues of heterogeneity: (i) the quality of the local business environment; and (ii) gender of owner/manager.

The first avenue relates to the local environment. The decision to start a business in a specific sector and location is associated with considerable uncertainty. First, at the time of entry, there are *fixed* time and pecuniary costs to be borne. Depending on the quality of the business environment and the level of competition among incumbents, entry costs – in the form of structural cost barriers, and strategic barriers imposed by incumbents to deter new competitors – can vary (Porter, 1980). Second, there are marginal operating costs faced by existing firms, conditional on entry, that can also vary based on the quality of business environment. In the presence of these uncertainties, it is plausible that choices made by firm owners are affected by the stock of their traits. In terms of selection, risk averse owners may not be inclined to start a business in an area presenting high entry barriers as that may also increase their assessment of risk inherent in such an environment. On the other hand, owners with an internal locus of control may be more willing to enter somewhat worse business environments as they subjectively perceive the risk to be lower and believe that outcomes can be achieved based on their effort. Similarly, innovative owners may believe that they can devise solutions to deal with entry barriers. In terms of existing businesses, owners who are risk averse may perform better in favourable business climates as operating costs (broadly defined) are lower and this reduces the cost of uncertainty for them. Innovative owners may benefit from being in better governed areas as the returns to their creativity and problem-solving approach are more certain and likely higher due to better business support services and legal institutions. On the other hand, it is possible that owners with a high locus of control and innovativeness, due to their wherewithal, can realize opportunities even in less business-friendly environments. Therefore, the effects may be ambiguous, which is why this is an interesting empirical question.

To examine this, we use a summary indicator of business environment and economic governance in a province called the 'Provincial Competitiveness Index' (PCI) for the year 2014.[14] Based on this index, the nine provinces in our data are split across three ranks, with high-ranking provinces being characterized by better regulatory environment. As this ranking is

---

[14] This index is based on a survey of approximately 10,000 randomly sampled firms across all provinces in Vietnam, and is a weighted mean of the following ten sub-indices: entry costs for business start-up; land access and tenure security; transparency of business environment and equitable provision of business information; time spent on bureaucratic procedures and inspection; informal charges; equal opportunity for all economic sectors; provincial leadership in solving problems for enterprises; business support services; vocational training and skill development; and legal institutions. See Malesky (2015) for more details on the survey methodology.

Table 6
Heterogeneity by provincial governance.

	(1) Log(Revenue)	(2) Revenue growth	(3) Investment	(4) Product innovation	(5) Worker training	(6) Fire-related	(7) Heat-related	(8) Light-related
Risk averse	−0.042	−2.305	−0.084*	0.023	0.009	−0.021	−0.024	−0.065*
	(0.072)	(2.034)	(0.048)	(0.048)	(0.046)	(0.052)	(0.042)	(0.038)
Locus of control	0.028	2.075***	0.042**	0.047***	0.008	−0.034	−0.041**	0.018
	(0.029)	(0.760)	(0.021)	(0.017)	(0.023)	(0.021)	(0.020)	(0.023)
Innovativeness	−0.016	−0.787	−0.034	0.013	−0.018	−0.015	−0.026*	−0.027**
	(0.030)	(0.750)	(0.023)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.015)	(0.015)	(0.013)
Risk aversion × rank	−0.020	−0.023	0.053**	−0.031	0.001	0.019	0.045*	0.086***
	(0.032)	(0.917)	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.023)	(0.030)	(0.026)	(0.023)
Locus of Control × rank	0.003	−1.372***	−0.009	−0.012	0.015	0.002	0.015	−0.018*
	(0.019)	(0.509)	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.010)	(0.008)	(0.011)	(0.010)
Innovativeness × rank	0.032**	0.742*	0.024**	0.006	0.008	0.014**	0.022**	0.021***
	(0.013)	(0.417)	(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.010)	(0.007)	(0.010)	(0.007)
Constant	5.485***	−13.355***	1.065***	0.074	0.758***	0.306***	0.227	0.102
	(0.282)	(4.963)	(0.116)	(0.215)	(0.278)	(0.114)	(0.149)	(0.119)
N	2538	2487	2622	2622	2100	2622	2622	2622
R-squared	0.766	0.057	0.219	0.082	0.182	0.506	0.200	0.228

Notes: In all regressions reported, we control for respondent's age, gender, education, previously self-employment dummy, number of employees, firm age, household enterprise dummy, sector and province dummies. Robust standard errors clustered at the province-sector level.
*** $p < 0.01$.
** $p < 0.05$.
* $p < 0.1$.

Table 7
Heterogeneity by gender.

	(1) Log(Revenue)	(2) Revenue growth	(3) Investment	(4) Product innovation	(5) Training	(6) Fire-related	(7) Heat-related	(8) Light-related
Risk averse	−0.026	−1.484	0.020	−0.015	−0.001	−0.016	0.055**	0.057**
	(0.041)	(1.094)	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.028)	(0.027)	(0.025)	(0.022)
Locus of control	0.035*	−0.298	0.030**	0.027**	0.046***	−0.018	−0.009	−0.004
	(0.019)	(0.446)	(0.014)	(0.014)	(0.013)	(0.011)	(0.013)	(0.013)
Innovativeness	0.049**	0.305	−0.002	0.010	−0.004	0.003	0.016*	0.012
	(0.021)	(0.461)	(0.014)	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.010)	(0.010)	(0.009)
Risk aversion × Female	−0.118*	−2.598	−0.047	−0.033	0.039	0.075**	−0.007	0.047
	(0.062)	(1.711)	(0.043)	(0.044)	(0.043)	(0.034)	(0.039)	(0.035)
Locus of Control × Female	−0.002	0.639	−0.000	0.001	−0.034*	−0.031*	−0.016	−0.011
	(0.028)	(0.783)	(0.019)	(0.022)	(0.020)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.015)
Innovativeness × Female	−0.037	0.116	0.015	0.024	−0.003	0.010	−0.015	−0.009
	(0.028)	(0.709)	(0.020)	(0.019)	(0.018)	(0.012)	(0.014)	(0.014)
Female	0.077	1.864	−0.001	0.007	−0.054	−0.031	0.014	−0.041
	(0.063)	(1.546)	(0.034)	(0.044)	(0.034)	(0.032)	(0.034)	(0.032)
Constant	5.480***	−12.476**	1.037***	0.091	0.749***	0.299***	0.188	0.074
	(0.273)	(4.811)	(0.112)	(0.220)	(0.284)	(0.114)	(0.151)	(0.121)
N	2538	2487	2622	2622	2100	2622	2622	2622
R-squared	0.765	0.053	0.217	0.082	0.183	0.507	0.197	0.221

Notes: In all regressions reported, we control for respondent's age, education, previously self-employment dummy, number of employees, firm age, household enterprise dummy, sector and province dummies.
*** $p < 0.01$.
** $p < 0.05$.
* $p < 0.1$.

collinear with respect to province fixed effects, our coefficients of interest are the interactions of rank with the measures of risk aversion, locus of control, and innovativeness. Note that since this index captures factors that affect both selection into businesses and the cost of operating, the business environment could affect the returns to traits due to differential selection into entrepreneurship in favourable versus unfavourable business environments based on traits, or because the environment affects the returns to a trait, conditional on entry.

Results are in Table 6. Returns to being in a favourable province are greater for firms with innovative owners/managers as assessed by revenues, revenue growth, investment likelihood, and probability of investing in all types of workplace safety measures. Locus of control has a compensating influence such that having an internal locus of control matters more for revenue growth and probability of installing light-related safety measures in a weakly governed environment. Risk averse owners in provinces characterized by a favourable business climate are more likely to undertake investments and are also more likely to install heat and light-related safety measures.

As a second avenue of heterogeneity, in Table 7, we investigate whether the traits in our study determine firm performance differently depending on owner/manager gender. Studies in social psychology and economics refer to gender

stereotypes and socially prescribed gender roles that dictate how men and women should behave, and how deviating from gender roles and expectations, can lead to differential treatment for women. For instance, Eagly and Karau (2002) state that women in leadership roles are perceived to be less qualified than their male counterparts, and women leaders tend to violate gender norms and people's beliefs about what constitutes desirable female behaviour. As leadership in organizations and firms is still considered a masculine activity, female entrepreneurs present a 'role incongruity' wherein their gender identity and leader identity are a mismatch between gender stereotypes and the desirable leader characteristics. Similarly, lab experiments find that women are perceived to have different social preferences than men such that women are expected to be more generous (Aguiar et al., 2009; Brañas-Garza et al., 2016) and more risk averse (Eckel and Grossman, 2002). Weaker perceptions of female firm owners (who are similar in characteristics to male owners) can result in them facing barriers and discrimination at the workplace from employees, from customers and suppliers, in the credit market, as well as in dealing with local authorities for assistance, all of which can affect their firm performance and their ability to undertake investments. In addition, it is also possible that the gender dummy picks up other unobserved differences (for instance, in social preferences and management styles) correlated with gender. We find that risk averse female-led firms have lower revenues than risk averse male-led firms. Risk averse females are more likely to have installed fire safety measures. Locus of control matters less for worker training and fire-related safety measures in female-led firms. Overall, we observe only weak heterogeneity in this case implying that these traits have generally similar relationships with outcomes for both male and female firm owners.

4. Conclusion

Non-cognitive skills have received significant attention as determinants of educational attainment, labour market outcomes, and occupational selection. We contribute to this literature by examining the relationship between behavioural and personality traits of owners/managers – risk attitudes, locus of control, and innovativeness – and firm-level decision-making in micro, small and medium firms in Vietnam. We went beyond previous literature that is limited to studying sales/profits as a metric of firm performance and considered as outcomes intermediate practices such as product innovations, worker training, and adoption of workplace safety that are conducive to firm performance. We found that the traits of interest are correlated to varying degrees with the outcomes. It emerged that risk aversion predicts lower revenue and revenue growth, and is positively correlated with the adoption of safety measures. An internal locus of control predicts higher revenue and investment, and is associated with an increased likelihood of undertaking innovations as well as worker training. Innovativeness is positively correlated with revenue and as expected, also with product innovations. Heterogeneity analyses, *inter alia*, indicate that innovativeness and risk aversion matter more for firm performance in better governed provinces. We also observed some weak heterogeneity based on respondent gender.

Due to the nature of our data, a caveat is that while we can estimate robust correlations, these do not establish causality. Nevertheless, the correlations we find between behavioural traits and intermediate practices merit further research into identification of causal estimates.

Government assistance to SMEs in most countries usually focuses on reducing the burdens of the regulatory environment by simplifying rules for formalization, providing easier credit access on reasonable terms, market support, and reducing administrative processes, and Vietnam is no exception. Our paper shows that managerial capital also has implications for various aspects of investments and decisions made by firms. In fact, acknowledging that the lack of managerial capital may be a relevant constraint for small firms, some recent studies analyse the effectiveness of targeted management training as well as personal initiative training to small firms in developing countries such as Mexico, Ghana, Peru and Togo (e.g., Bruhn et al., forthcoming; Karlan et al., 2015; Valdivia, 2015; Campos et al., 2017). Given that personality traits matter for adoption of business/management practices as shown in Bandiera et al. (2017), and under conditions where these traits may be difficult to change especially among adults after a certain age, offering personal initiative training to existing firm owners appears as a policy-relevant tool to overcome the behavioural barriers firms may face due to owners' inherent mindsets. To improve the stock of skills of potential entrants, Premand et al. (2012) show that offering entrepreneurial education, life skills and soft skills training, especially among adolescents is one avenue forward.

Acknowledgements

Appendix A. Personality questionnaire

A1. Risk attitudes

Would you describe yourself as someone who tries to avoid risks (risk-averse) or as someone who is willing to take risks (risk-loving)? Please answer on a scale of 0–10 where 0 means "risk averse" and 10 means "risk loving".

Code: 0-1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9-10   _____

A2. Locus of control

For each of the following statements, indicate how much you agree with it on a scale of 1 to 7 where 1 means "disagree completely" and 7 means "agree completely". *Code: 1-2-3-4-5-6-7*

a) How my life goes depends on me   _____
b) One has to work hard in order to succeed   _____
c) If a person is socially/politically active, he/she can have an effect on societal living conditions   _____
d) If I run up against difficulties in life, I often doubt my own abilities   _____
e) Compared to other people, I have not achieved what I deserve   _____
f) What a person achieves in life is above all a question of fate or luck   _____
g) I frequently have the experience that other people have a controlling influence over my life   _____
h) The opportunities that I have in life are determined by societal living conditions?   _____
i) Inborn abilities are more important than any efforts one can make   _____
j) I have little control over the things that happen in my life   _____

A3. Innovativeness

For each of the following statements, indicate how true these are for you on a scale of 1–5 where 1 means "being very untrue" and 5 means "being very true". *Code: 1-2-3-4-5*

a) I have innovative ideas   _____
b) If something can't be done, I find a way   _____
c) I often find more than one solution to a problem   _____

Appendix B

Table B1
Key averages for leading sectors.

	Food & beverages	Fabricated metal products	Wood	Furniture	Rubber	Apparels
Risk aversion	0.82	0.71	0.74	0.82	0.70	0.68
Locus of control	5.04	5.09	4.96	4.97	5.04	5.02
Innovativeness	3.4	3.66	3.76	3.54	3.85	3.97
Revenues	1770.55	2406.51	2257.82	2980.35	6421.13	3795.77
Investment	0.41	0.53	0.58	0.69	0.43	0.34
Product innovation	0.27	0.37	0.39	0.31	0.25	0.36
Worker Training	0.19	0.28	0.21	0.24	0.29	0.31
Investment in fire safety	0.22	0.33	0.24	0.32	0.69	0.64
Investment in heat safety	0.16	0.27	0.15	0.2	0.38	0.37
Investment in light safety	0.14	0.21	0.14	0.18	0.34	0.42
N	837	448	291	163	158	137

Notes: This table lists averages for sectors that have over 5% representation in the data. Revenues listed in million Vietnamese Dong (VND). The maximum score for locus of control and innovativeness is 7 and 5 respectively.

Table B2
Probit estimates for binary outcomes.

	(1) Investment	(2) Product innovation	(3) Worker training	(4) Fire-related	(5) Heat-related	(6) Light-related
Risk averse	−0.000	−0.028	0.014	0.032	0.054**	0.062***
	(0.029)	(0.025)	(0.022)	(0.040)	(0.022)	(0.016)
Locus of control	0.036***	0.030***	0.037***	−0.041***	−0.015	−0.007
	(0.013)	(0.010)	(0.012)	(0.015)	(0.011)	(0.010)
Innovativeness	0.006	0.022**	−0.005	0.020	0.012	0.010
	(0.015)	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.013)	(0.012)	(0.007)
N	2615	2622	2100	2622	2530	2622
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: This table reports marginal effects from probit regressions. Controls include respondent's gender, age, education, and previous self-employment dummy, number of employees, firm age, household enterprise dummy, and province and sector dummies. Robust standard errors clustered at the province-sector level in parentheses.
*** $p < 0.01$.
** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table B3
Differences in firm age by traits.

	Firm age (in years)	*p*-values (*t*-test)
Risk averse = 1	16.98	<0.001
Risk averse = 0	15.11	
High locus of control	16.72	0.34
Low locus of control	16.34	
High innovativeness	15.66	<0.001
Low innovativeness	17.67	

Notes: High (low) locus of control if the locus of control score is above (below) the sample median. High (low) innovativeness if the innovation score is above (below) the sample median.

Table B4
Differences in distribution of revenue by traits.

	Mean Log (revenue)	*p*-values	Std Dev Log (revenue)	*p*-values
Risk averse = 1	6.57	<0.001	1.53	0.06
Risk averse = 0	7.12		1.44	
High locus of control	6.66	0.157	1.52	0.92
Low locus of control	6.75		1.53	
High innovativeness	6.93	<0.001	1.52	0.33
Low innovativeness	6.39		1.48	

Notes: High (low) locus of control if the locus of control score is above (below) the sample median. High (low) innovativeness if the innovation score is above (below) the sample median.

References

Adhvaryu, A., Kala, N., Nyshadham, A., 2016a. The Skills to Pay the Bills: Returns to on-the-Job Soft Skills Training Working Paper.
Adhvaryu, A., Kala, N., Nyshadham, A., 2016b. The Light and the Heat: Productivity Co-Benefits of Energy-Saving Technology Working Paper.
Adhvaryu, A., Kala, N., Nyshadham, A., 2016c. Management and Shocks to Worker Productivity Working Paper.
Aghion, P., Bloom, N., Lucking, B., Sadun, R., Van Reenen, J., 2017. Turbulence, Firm Decentralization, and Growth in Bad Times NBER Working paper 23354.
Aguiar, F., Brañas-Garza, P., Cobo-Reyes, R., Jimenez, N., Miller, L.M., 2009. Are women expected to be more generous? Experimental Economics 12, 93–98.
Anderson, M.L., 2008. Multiple Inference and Gender differences in the effects of early intervention: a re-evaluation of the abecedarian, perry preschool, and early training projects. J. Am. Statist. Assoc. 103 (484), 1481–1495.
Bandiera, O., Hansen, S., Prat, S., Sadun, R., 2017. CEO Behaviour and Firm Performance NBER Working Paper 23248.
Batsaikhan, M., 2017. Trust, trustworthiness, and business success: lab and field findings from entrepreneurs. Econ. Inq. 55 (1), 368–382.
Benjamini, Y., Krieger, A.M., Yekutieli, D., 2006. Adaptive linear step-up procedures that control the false discovery rate. Biometrika 93 (3), 491–507.
Bertrand, M., 2011. New perspectives on gender. In: Card, D., Ashenfelter, O. (Eds.). In: Handbook of Labor Economics, 4b. Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 1543–1590.
Bloom, N., Van Reenen, J., 2007. Measuring and explaining management practices across firms and countries. Q. J. Econ. 112 (4), 1351–1408.
Bloom, N., Lemos, R., Sadun, R., Scur, D., Van Reenen, J., 2014. JEEA-FBBVA lecture 2013: the new empirical economics of management. J. Eur. Econ. Assoc. 12 (4), 835–876.
Boone, C., Brabander, B., Witteloostuijn, A., 1996. CEO locus of control and small firm performance: an integrative framework and empirical test. J. Manage. studies 33 (5), 667–700.
Brañas-Garza, P., Capraro, V., and Rascon-Ramirez, E., 2016. Gender differences in altruism: expectations, actual behaviour and accuracy of beliefs. Working Paper.
Brandt, K., Rand, J., Sharma, S., Tarp, F., Trifkovic, N., 2016. Characteristics of the Vietnamese Business Environment: Evidence from a SME Survey in 2015. UNU-WIDER, Helsinki.
Bruhn, M., Karlan, D., Schoar, A., 2010. What capital is missing in developing countrie? Am. Econ. Rev. 100 (2), 629–633.
Bruhn, M., Karlan, D., and Schoar, A. (forthcoming). The impact of consulting services on small and medium enterprises: evidence from a randomized trial in Mexico. *J. Polit. Econ.* DOI: https://doi.org/10.1086/696154.
Caliendo, M., Fossen, F., Kritikos, A., 2009. Risk attitudes of nascent entrepreneurs: new evidence from an experimentally validated survey. Small Bus. Econ. 32, 153–167.
Caliendo, M., Fossen, F., Kritikos, A., 2010. The impact of risk attitudes on entrepreneurial survival. J. Econ. Behav. Org. 76, 45–63.
Caliendo, M., Fossen, F., Kritikos, A., 2014. Personality characteristics and the decisions to become and stay self-employed. Small Bus. Econ. 42, 787–814.
Caliendo, M., Cobb-Clark, D.A., Seitz, H., Uhlendorff, A., 2016. Locus of Control and Investment in Training IZA Discussion Paper 10406.
Campos, F., Frese, M., Goldstein, M., Iacovone, L., Johnson, H., McKenzie, D., Mensmann, M., 2017. Teaching personal initiative beats traditional training in boosting small business in West Africa. Science 357, 1287–1290.
Cobb-Clark, D.A., Schurer, S., 2013. Two economists' musings on the stability of locus of control. Econ. J. 123 (570), F358–F400.
Coleman, M., DeLeire, T., 2003. An economic model of locus of control and the human capial investment decision. J. Hum. Resour. 38 (3), 701–721.
Courbage, C., Rey, B., Treich, N., 2014. Prevention and precaution. In: Dionne, G. (Ed.), Handbook of Insurance. Springer, Cox, NJ, pp. 185–204.
Dell, M., Jones, B.F., Olken, B.A., 2014. What do we learn from the weather? The new climate-economy literature. J. Econ. Lit. 52 (3), 740–798.
de Mel, S., McKenzie, D., Woodruff, C., 2009a. Innovative Firms or Innovative Owners? Determinants of Innovation in Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises IZA Discussion Paper #3962.
de Mel, S., McKenzie, D., Woodruff, C., 2009b. Measuring microenterprise profits: must we ask how the sausage is made. J. Develop. Econ. 88, 19–31.
de Mel, S., Mckenzie, D., Woodruff, C., 2010. Who are the microenterprise owners? evidence from Sri Lanka on Tokman versus De Soto. In: Lerner, J., Schoar, A. (Eds.), International Differences in Entrepreneurship. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, pp. 63–87.
Dearden, L., Reed, H., van Reenen, J., 2006. The impact of training on productivity and wages: evidence from British panel data. Oxford Bull. Econ. Statist. 68, 397–421.
Dohmen, T., Falk, A., Huffman, D., Sunde, U., Schupp, J., Wagner, G., 2011. Individual risk attitudes: measurement, determinants, and behavioral consequences. J. Eur. Econ. Assoc. 9 (3), 522–550.
Eagly, A., Karau, S.J., 2002. Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. Psychol. Rev. 109 (3), 573–598.

Eckel, C.C., Grossman, P.J., 2002. Sex differences and statistical stereotyping in attitudes toward financial risk. Evol. Hum. Behav. 23, 281–295.

Fairlie, R.W., Holleran, W., 2012. Entrepreneurship training, risk aversion and other personality traits: evidence from a random experiment. J. Econ. Psychol. 33, 366–378.

Geroski, P., Machin, S., Van Reenen, J., 1993. The profitability of innovating firms. Rand J. Econ. 24 (2), 198–211.

Graham, J.R., Harvey, C.R., Puri, M., 2013. Managerial attitudes and corporate actions. J. Financ. Econ. 109 (1), 103–121.

Hansemark, O.C., 2003. Need for achievement, locus of control and the prediction of business start-ups: a longitudinal study. J. Econ. Psychol. 24, 301–319.

Hardeweg, B., Menkhoff, L., Waibel, H., 2013. Experimentally validated survey evidence on individual risk attitudes in rural Thailand. Econ. Develop. Cultural Change 61 (4), 859–888.

Holm, H.J., Opper, S., Nee, V., 2013. Entrepreneurs under uncertainty: an economic experiment in China. Manage. Sci. 59, 1671–1687.

Hyytinen, A., Pajarinen, M., Rouvinen, P., 2015. Does innovativeness reduce startup survival rates. J. Bus. Venturing 30, 564–581.

Karlan, D., Knight, R., Udry, C., 2015. Consulting and capital experiments with microenterprise tailors in Ghana. J. Econ. Behav. Org. 118, 281–302.

Kihlstrom, R.E., Laffont, J-J., 1979. A general equilibrium entrepreneurial theory of firm formation based on risk aversion. J. Polit. Econ. 87 (4), 719–748.

Konings, J., Vanormelingen, S., 2015. The impact of training on productivity and wages: firm-level evidence. Rev. Econ. Stat. 97 (2), 485–497.

Kremer, M., Lee, J., Robinson, J., Rostapshova, O., 2013. Behavioral biases and firm behavior: evidence from Kenyan retail shops. Am. Econ. Rev. 103 (3), 362–368.

Laajaj, R., and Macours, K., 2017. Measuring skills in developing countries. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 8000.

Malesky, E., 2015. The Vietnam Provincial Competitiveness Index: Measuring Economic Governance for Private Sector Development, 2014 Final Report. Vietnam Chamber of Commerce and Industry and United States Agency for International Development, Ha Noi, Vietnam.

Malmendier, U., Tate, G., 2015. Behavioral CEOs: the role of managerial overconfidence. J. Econ. Perspect. 29 (4), 37–60.

McGee, A., McGee, P., 2016. Search, effort, and locus of control. J. Econ. Behav. Org. 126 (A), 89–101.

McGraw, T.K., 2009. Prophet of innovation: Joseph Schumpeter and Creative Destruction. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

McKenzie, D., Woodruff, C., 2017. Business practices in small firms in developing countries. Manage. Sci. 63 (9), 2967–2981.

Miller, D., Kets de Vries, M., Toulouse, J.M., 1982. Top executive locus of control and its relationship to strategy-making, structure and environment. Acad. Manage. J. 25 (2), 237–253.

Opper, S., Nee, V., Holm, H.J., 2017. Risk aversion and Guanxi activities: a behavioural analysis of CEOs in China. Acad. Manag. J. 60 (4), 1504–1630.

Pattillo, C., and Söderbom, M., 2000. Managerial risk attitude and firm performance in Ghanaian manufacturing: an empirical analysis based on experimental data.

Piatek, R., Pinger, P., 2016. Maintaining (locus of) control? data combination for the identification and inference of factor structure models. J. Appl. Econ. 31, 734–755.

Porter, M.E., 1980. Competitive Strategy. Free, New York, NY.

Premand, P., Brodmann, S., Almeida, R., Grun, R., Barouni, M., 2012. Entrepreneurship Training and Self-employment among University Graduates: Evidence from a Randomized Trial in Tunisia IZA Discussion Paper 7079.

Rauch, A., Frese, M., 2007. Let's put the person back into entrepreneurship research: a meta-analysis on the relationship between business owners' personality traits, business creation, and success. Eur. J. Work Organ. Psychol. 16, 353–385.

Rotter, J.B., 1966. Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control of reinforcement. Psychol. Monogr. 80 (1), 1–28.

Salamanca, N., de Grip, A., Fouarge, D., and Montizaan, R., 2016. Locus of Control and Investment in Risky Assets. IZA Discussion Paper 10407.

Sudarshan, A., Somanathan, E., Somanathan, R., and Tewari, M., 2015. The Impact of Temperature on Productivity and Labour Supply: Evidence from Indian Manufacturing. CDE-DSE Working Paper 244.

Skriabikova, O.J., Dohmen, T., Kriechel, B., 2014. New evidence on the relationship between risk attitudes and self-employment. Labour Econ. 30, 176–184.

Simon, M., Houghton, S.M., Aquino, K., 2000. Cognitive biases, risk perception, and venture formation: how individuals decide to start companies. J. Bus. Venturing 15, 113–134.

Syverson, C., 2011. What determines productivity. J. Econ. Lit. 49 (2), 326–365.

Valdivia, M., 2015. Business training plus for female entrepreneurship? Short and medium-term experimental evidence from Peru. J. Develop. Econ. 113, 33–51.

Willebrands, D., Lammers, J., Hartog, J., 2012. A successful businessman is not a gambler. Risk attitude and business performance among small enterprises in Nigeria. J. Econ. Psychol. 33, 342–354.