

Does the Status Quo Affect the Private Equity Investment Decisions?

Sana El Harbi

Received: 13 September 2021 Accepted: 5 October 2021 Published: 15 October 2021

Abstract

Despite the huge literature that has been carried to investigate the determinants of the private equity market, studies examining the extent of the SQB in the private equity investments decisions are missing. Our regressions are based on a data set that covers 24 OECD members countries from 2007 to 2015. We discovered the absence of a link between the SQB and the choice of private equity investments. However, the added value by activity, the private equity country attractiveness index, and the research development expenditures have a significant impact on the choice of the investment sector.

Index terms— behavioral finance, decision making, panel data, private equity, status quo bias.

1 Introduction

Private equity (PE) investment had experienced a major boom in the nineties, (Gompers et al, 2016; Hung and Tsai, 2017). For instance, Hung and Tsai (2017) because of the boom of the venture capital in 1990, to the technology bust of 2000 to 2001, and the leveraged buyouts boom and bust in 2000. They also added that the resistance of lending standards in 2008 has caused the fall of the investments of the private equity industry. Nevertheless, it is well documented that private equity activity had a positive influence on economic development and entrepreneurship, (Bernoth and Colavecchio, 2014; Bernstein et al., 2016; Hellmann and Puri, 2000; Lerner, 2000). It positively affected the innovation by the introducing of new products, processes, or services on the market, the productivity and economic growth (i. e. to ensure the improvement of the production system, growth of high-tech start-up, development of skills that induce an effective use of existing knowledge), business dynamics and employment growth, (see, for instance, Belke et al., 2003; Engel and Keilbach, 2007; Gompers, 1994; Khan et al., 2018; Levine, 1997; Li et al., 2014; Milosevic, 2018; Ning et al., 2015; Puri and Zarutskie, 2012; Samila and Sorenson, 2011). Therefore, the determinants of private equity investment had received considerable attention (Bernoth and Colavecchio, 2014; Bernstein et al., 2016; Black and Gilson, 1998; Félix et al., 2013; Henn et al., 1997; Gompers and Lerner, 1998; Precup, 2015) such as the real GDP growth, the market capitalization, the interest rate, the capital formation, the unemployment rate, the tax rate, the institutional and legal environment, the productivity index, the corruption index, the inflation rate, and the R&D expenditure.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section two is divided into two parts. The first part presents the determinants and criteria that influence the private equity industry. The second part investigates the impact of the status quo. Section three describes our empirical method. Section four presents the dataset and the main statistics. Section five sets out our results.

Despite the existing literature, there is still no broad consensus on the influence of the status quo bias on PE investments. It is important to mention that private equity investors are professionals who dedicate time to collect and analyze information before making an investment decision. For that reason, their decisions should be more rational (i.e. less affected by cognitive biases) than those of individuals. However, a review of studies undertaken looking at the existence of SQB at the institutional level (Elert et (Harbi and Toumia, 2020) had shown the vulnerable power of the status quo. We seek to develop a novel approach, to detect the SQB on the investment choice of PE investments across 24 countries for nine years (from 2007 to 2015) using the dynamic panel probit (respectively logit) model. In the present work, we extend the previous work of Harbi and Toumia (2020) in which they proved the existence of SQB in the venture capital industry at the country level. More

precisely, we expect the presence of SQB in the private equity at the country level if the influence of the previous choice of the investment industry depends positively on the present one.

Section six concludes the paper and explains its main implications.

2 II.

3 Literature Review

To date, the bulk of the academic and practitioner literature focuses on the determinants of private equity decisions and their role in economic growth. Bernoth and Colavecchio (2014) affirmed that private equity includes five investment stages which are venture capital, growth capital, replacement capital, rescue/turnaround, and buyouts. The role of this mode of financing is not limited to provide financial resources, but they also added value to their companies by assisting with a variety of services. They helped in establishing strategies, providing technical and commercial advice, attracting key personnel, enhancing the design process, and developing the portfolio companies, (Bygrave and Timmons, 1992; De Clercq, et al., 2006; Gompers and Lerner, 2001; Gorman and Sahlman, 1989; Lerner, 1995; Sapienza, 1992; Schwienbacher, 2008). Bloom et al. (2015) added that private equity-owned firms have significantly welled management practices 3 Given the fact that is not a broad consensus on the macroeconomic determinants of private equity investments in the Central and Eastern European countries, Bernoth and Colavecchio (2014) tried to fill this gap. They identified the determinants of private equity in Central and Eastern European and Western European countries from 2001 to 2011. They showed that economic activity, the inflation rate, equity market capitalization, unit labor costs, unemployment, the than other ownership groups (i. e. government, family, and privately-owned companies).

Understanding the factors which influence private equity has interested a lot of researchers. Among these factors, we state the real GDP growth, the market capitalization, the interest rate, the unemployment rate, the tax rate, and the R&D expenditure (Black and Gilson, 1998; Félix et al., 2013; Gompers and Lerner, 1998). Gompers and Lerner (1998) found that the GDP growth, interest, tax rate, and R&D expenditure are key factors in the evolution of venture capital; however, there is no relationship between the number of IPOs and the funds raised for the venture capital investments. In the same vein, Félix et al. (2013) To have an in-depth insight into the decisions of private equity firms, several researchers had analyzed the quasi-rational decision-making under risk and uncertainty by proposing several formal theories (e.g., prospect theory (Kahneman and Tversky, 1979) and regret theory (Bell, 1982)). Kahneman and Tversky (1979) had proposed the prospect theory, which is an alternative to the expected utility theory (also called Morgenstern-Von Neumann utility theory). It is a descriptive model of decision-making under risk by which the decisions made by individuals do not follow rational calculation. However, Bell's (1982) regret theory announced that an individual may recognize by observing the relevant outcomes that another alternative would have been preferable after deciding under uncertainty. This knowledge may yield a sense of loss or regret. Overall, the irrationality of the decision-maker has been analyzed in several types of research, and the explanations of this behavior have not gone unnoticed. From this perspective, many studies confirm the fact that both individuals and institutions do not behave rationally ??) have focused on the impact of status quo in financial decisions. Among these studies, we find the work of Samuelson and Zeckhauser (1988). They demonstrated the presence of SQB when they examine the pension plans of Harvard employees. Indeed, it is well documented that mutual fund investors are subject to the status quo bias (Kempf and Ruenzi, 2006; Patel et al., 1991; Patel et al., 1994). In the same line, Agarwal et al., (2003) confirmed that hedge fund investors are influenced by the status quo bias. Barber et al., (2005) proved that investors have a great tendency to buy stocks they have already bought in the past. Agnew et al. (2003) found that U.S. investors prefer to maintain their initial asset allocation. Johnson et al. (1993) showed in their experimental study that the status quo intervenes in the choice of an insurance policy. Schweitzer (1995) addressed questionnaires to 400 staff at a large University. He found that status quo bias affects health care financing decisions. More concretely, individuals selected status quo alternatives more often than other alternatives. Madrian and Shea (2001) found a positive relationship between retirement savings and the status quo by using a database that contains information on 401(k) participation and savings behavior in the health care and insurance industry. Cronqvist and Thaler (2004) confirmed the consensus that inertia has also been found in U.S. 401(k) plans (Madrian and Shea, 2001; Samuelson and Zeckhauser, 1988). They found that recent returns influence the investments of participants. Indeed, the percentages of participants who remained with their portfolio during the three first years were 98.3, 97.3, and 96.9, respectively. Kempf and Ruenzi (2006) found strong evidence of the SQB by examining the U.S. equity mutual fund market. Moreover, Tekçe et al. (2016) argued that Turkish individual stock investors are subject to the status quo bias. Furthermore, they found that gender affects the choice of status quo alternatives. More precisely, female investors are more biased toward the status quo more than male investors. Burmeister and Schade (2007) extended previous studies (Busenitz and Barney, 1997; Parlich and Bagby, 1995) in which it is shown that entrepreneurs exhibit cognitive biases and they are more affected by cognitive biases than other individuals. They used an experimental study to compare the decisions of entrepreneurs with those made by students and bankers in an experimental study. They found that the three categories (i.e. entrepreneurs, students, and bankers) are affected by the status quo. However, bankers are more affected by the status quo than both entrepreneurs and students. Harbi and Toumia (2020) reported the influence of status quo bias on the venture

capital industry at the country level. They used a dynamic panel probit (respectively logit) model for 24 OECD member countries from 2007 to 2015.

4 III.

5 Empirical Model

The main aim of our paper is to provide a deeper understanding of the influence of status quo bias in the private equity market. To do so, we look at the impact of the previous choice of the investment sector on the present ones. We follow the method used in the work of Harbi and Toumia (2020). More precisely, they expect the presence of SQB in the venture capital industry when there is a positive relationship between the actual choice of the investment industry and the present one. Similar to Harbi and Toumia (2020), we use the conditional maximum likelihood (CML) estimator proposed by Wooldridge (2005). This estimator allows the estimation of the dynamic panel probit model for the balanced panel. So, our model is the following: $P(\text{choice}_{i,t} = 1 | \text{choice}_{i,t-1}, \text{choice}_{2007}, \text{VA}_{i,t}, \text{PEindex}_{i,t}, \text{R\&D}_{i,t}, c_i), t=2008, \dots, 2015$

$$(1) = \delta_0 + \delta_1 \text{choice}_{i,t-1} + \delta_2 \text{choice}_{2007} + \delta_3 \text{VA}_{i,t} + \delta_4 \text{PEindex}_{i,t} + \delta_5 \text{R\&D}_{i,t} + c_i, t=2008, \dots, 2015 \quad (2)$$

Where the choice i,t is our binary dependent variable that equals 1 when the percentage of PE investment in ICT and "healthcare & LS" is the maximum and 0 otherwise., choice $i,t-1$ is the main independent variable of interest which is the choice of PE investment sector in the previous, δ_1 is the coefficient of the lagged dependent variable, VA it denotes the added value by the activity of PE investment sector in a year "t", PE index it denotes PE Country Attractiveness Index in a year "t", R & D it represents the R&D expenditure of a country in a year "t", choice 2007 is the initial choice in 2007 and c_i is the unobserved effect.

IV.

6 Data and Statistics

The data used comes from many online databases that contain annual information: Invest Europe/ PEREP_Analytics, World Bank, OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development), and IESE Business School. In sum, we get a data set that covers 24 4 European countries from 2007 to 2015. We are limited to this period because the reports provided by the Private Equity and Venture Capital association contain data only for the years 2007 to 2015. Table 2 presents the main variables and descriptive statistics. Table 3 The Pearson correlation coefficients are not significant and low for most pairs of variables. Among all the correlation coefficients, the only highest one is between the PE index i,t and the R & D i,t (correlation = -0.7330). Thus, there isn't a multicollinearity problem. This ascertainment was further supported by the use of VIF. Kennedy (1992) and Marquardt (1970), revealed the existence of major multicollinearity when a VIF is greater than 10. In the same vein, O'Brien (2007) stated that high correlation may be problematic and should be treated with caution in the case where the VIFs are greater than 5 or 10 or 30. As shown in Table 3, the VIF is under 3, so there is a limited threat of multicollinearity. So, we may assume that the regression coefficients are well-conditioned estimated and the multiple correlations with other variables aren't high.

7 VIF

V. Also, the initial choice in 2007 (choice 2007) is not significant. Furthermore, we find that the added value by activity, the private equity country attractiveness index, and the research & development expenditures have a positive significant impact on the choice of the investment sector.

8 Estimations Results

This finding is in line with previous studies (Gompers and Lerner, 1998; Groh et al., 2010; Harbi and Toumia, 2020; Hellmann and Puri, 2000; Lahr and Mina, 2016). The p-value of the Wald test and LR test are less than 5%, implying that the coefficients are not simultaneously equal to zero. Moreover, the rho differs from zero, concluding the difference between the panel estimator and the pooled estimator.

However, this finding suffers from a possible limitation notably related to the consideration of the regression results of a combined variable (ICT + healthcare & LS). These two sectors may have different economic drivers that may influence our results. For the sake of clarity and better analysis, we examined each PE investment sector as a separate dependent variable (see table ??). Column 2 in Table ?? presents the results of regression when the binary dependent variable is equal to 1 if the percentage of PE investment in ICT is the maximum and 0 otherwise. Column 4 in Table ?? presents the case when the dependent variable is 1 if the percentage of PE investment in healthcare & LS is the maximum and 0 otherwise. Similar to previous results, we find that the previous choice of divestment is not significant for both models (see table ??).

9 VI.

10 Conclusion

So far, there is a huge literature that enumerates the determinants of private equity activity because of its major impact on economic development and entrepreneurship, (Bonini and Alkan, 2012; Gompers and Lerner, 1998).

Nevertheless, the influence of the status quo on the private equity investments' decision has never been discussed beforehand. Hence our contribution is unique in trying to filling the gap in the existing literature by investigating if private equity firms are subject to the status quo. Contrary to the work of Harbi and Toumia (2020), we find that the previous choice of the investment industry doesn't depend on the present one.

Although this study provided an empirical model to show how private equity firms make their decisions, it is essential to recognize the influence of other factors that do not change over time that may influence the decision of private equity firms. Thus we tried to control the influence of some variables which are recognized as determinants of the private equity market. Indeed, following previous contributions (Gompers and Lerner, 1998; Groh et al., 2010; Harbi and Toumia, 2020; Hellmann and Puri, 2000; Lahr and Mina, 2016), the added value by activity, the private equity country For organizations, our findings can help to further understanding why the status quo occurs. Using the results of our research, private equity investors may better frame their decisions to overcome this bias. Moreover, the status quo is considered a critical barrier to organizational change and development. Investors may not recognize that they are too attached to their ideas, opinions, and decision-making. Thus they may interpret the status quo as signaling success and they feel no need to search for novel perspectives or ideas. Being aware of this limit, it would be advisable for managers to adopt a proactive behavior ?? Since we are entirely interested in our analysis on the impact of the status quo, we have not included other macroeconomic determinants of the private equity investment industry. We only include variables that measure economic activity. Hence, our contribution provides a better understanding of the behavior of private equity firms, however, our results may not be considered as definitive. Indeed our sample is composed of European countries; although we are not sure that our findings would also hold with, e.g., African countries, Asian countries, or American countries. So, we should not underestimate the relevance of country differences, that's why; we recommend performing other studies to confirm our result.

11 Declarations

[Note: 1 Ghai et al. (2014) stated that the private equity grew approximately 1.5% of global stock-market capitalization in 2000 compared to 3.9% in 2012.]

Figure 1:

institutional and legal environment influence the private equity activity. Precup (2015) extended previous literature by identifying the major determinants of the European private equity market. He used data on 27 European countries in his empirical panel analysis from 2000 to 2013. Among several determinants already tested in previous works (GDP growth, Market Capitalization, investigated the determinants of the European private equity market for a group of 23 European countries for the period 1998-2003. They found that the GDP growth, market capitalization, the number of IPOs, the number of mergers and acquisitions (M&A), the interest, and the unemployment rate were considered as drivers of the private equity market in Europe. Contrary to Gompers and Lerner (1998), they found that R&D expenditure has no impact on private equity activity.

Figure 2:

Figure 3:

1

investment shows the percentage of PE for Information & Communication Technology (ICT) and healthcare & life sciences (LS). A closer look at these percentages reveals a preference for both sectors. So, we construct a variable "choice of PE investment sector". It takes a value of 1 if the percentage of PE investment in ICT and "healthcare and LS" is the maximum and 0 otherwise.

Figure 4: Table 1

184

1 2 3

¹Examples of management practices: hiring, firing, pay, promotions, lean manufacturing, continuous improvement, and monitoring.

²© 2021 Global Journals Does the Status Quo Affect the Private Equity Investment Decisions?

³Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Slovakia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom.

1

2013	33.2%	37.8%	23.7%	84%	59.5%	59.6%
2014	29.5%	49.7%	34.3%	100%	5%	64.6%
2015	56.5%	21.1%	67.7%	100%	1.7%	39.1%
	Italy	Hungary	Portugal	Poland	Czech Republic	Luxembourg
2007	9.8%	15.3%	28.1%	21.9%	49.4%	11.8%
2008	28%	94.8%	6.1%	12.7%	75.1%	59.9%
2009	17.4%	95.1%	37.7%	55.1%	15.4%	80.2%
2010	39.9%	32.4%	5.7%	16.9%	45.1%	7.6%
2011	16.1%	17.4%	14.4%	45.8%	16.9%	16.9%
2012	31.7%	29%	10.7%	16.3%	85.7%	30.7%
2013	20.1%	16%	8.7%	23.7%	16.9%	12.9%
2014	5.7%	38.6%	22.8%	50.1%	76.1%	45.3%
2015	10.9%	6.6%	38.1%	12.1%	20.3%	0.6%
	Ireland	Netherlands	France	Finland	Norway	United Kingdom
2007	72.8%	30.8%	24.3%	43.9%	40.7%	29.7%
2008	36.1%	13.4%	37.2%	38.2%	27%	28.5%
2009	19.8%	34.8%	32.1%	44.5%	22.6%	30.1%
2010	31.7%	21.9%	35.5%	53.5%	65.4%	25.4%
2011	35.7%	12.5%	27.5%	54.6%	24.9%	42.7%
2012	35.7%	27.1%	17.4%	19.2%	40.7%	32.8%
2013	67.9%	34.8%	18.9%	75.8%	17%	28.2%
2014	93%	72.4%	39.9%	34.7%	34%	31.3%
2015	28.5%	23.6%	31.2%	16.1%	44.6%	25.8%

Nonetheless, we also include other variables such as the added value by activity, the private equity country attractiveness index, and the research & development expenditures (see for a review, Gompers and Lerner, 1998; Groh et al., 2010; Harbi and Toumia, 2020; Hellmann and Puri, 2000; Lahr and Mina, 2016).

Figure 5: Table 1 :

2012 Variable	31.3% 17.4% SourceN	14.3% Mean	0% Descriptive statistics	79.1% SD Min	64% Max
choice i,t	216	0.514	0.501	0	1
choice i,t-1	192	0.526	0.501	0	1
choice 2007	192	0.536	0.500	0	1
VA i,t	216	3.513	8.611	- 19.47	44.47
PEindex i,t	216	30.041	18.934	2	90
R&D i,t	216	1.720	0.899	0.382	3.750

Figure 6:

choice i,t-1	choice i,t	Wooldridge's (2005) Probit VCE	robust Wooldridge's (2005) Logit VCE	robust Estimator
2007	VA			
PEindex i,t	R&D i,t			
Constant	Number of observation			
Number of groups	Log pseudo-likelihood			
Wald	chi2(5)			
Prob>chi2	LR			
chi2(5)	Prob>chi2			
Sigma u	Rho			
AIC		258.805		258.351
BIC		281.607		281.154
Legend: * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001				
©				
2021				
Global				
Jour-				
nals				

Figure 7: Table 4

Figure 8: Table 2 :

Figure 9: Table 4 :

3

	ICT VCE Robust		LS VCE Robust	
	Estimates (P > z)	dy/dx	Estimates (P > z)	dy/dx
choice i,t-1	-0.474 (0.098)	-	-0.139 (0.730)	-
		0.141		0.029
choice 2007	0.219 (0.371)	0.0656	0.605 (0.096)	0.126
VA i,t	0.031 (0.084)	0.0093	0.044** (0.010)	0.009
PEindex i,t R&D i,t	0.0120 (0.255) 0.111	0.0036	0.0268** (0.002) 0.312	0.0055
	(0.563)	0.0333 (0.161)		0.0651
Constant	-1.2967* (0.046)		-2.599*** (0.000)	
Number of observation				
Number of groups	24		24	
Log pseudo-likelihood	-103.81708		-72.913689	
Wald chi2(5)	7.11		12.41	
Prob>chi2	0.2126		0.0296	
LR chi2(5)	8.26		13.64	
Prob>chi2	0.1425		0.0180	
Sigma u	0.293		0.0005	
Rho	0.079		2.55 e -07	
AIC	221.634		159.827	
BIC	244.436		182.629	
Le gend: * p<0.05; ** p<0.01; *** p<0.001				

Figure 10: Table 3 :

Funding

Bibliography

Figure 11: Funding :

-
- [O'Brien ()] 'A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors'. R M O'Brien . *Quality & quantity* 2007. 41 (5) p. .
- [Kennedy ()] *A Guide to Econometrics*, P Kennedy . 1992. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT press.
- [Gaede and Meadowcroft ()] 'A question of authenticity: Status quo bias and the International Energy Agency's World Energy Outlook'. J Gaede , J Meadowcroft . *Journal of environmental policy & planning* 2016. 18 (5) p. .
- [Barberis and Thaler ()] 'A survey of behavioral finance'. N Barberis , R Thaler . *Handbook of the Economics of Finance* 2003. 1 p. .
- [De Clercq et al. ()] *An entrepreneur's guide to the venture capital galaxy*, D De Clercq , V H Fried , O Lehtonen , H J Sapienza . 2006. Academy of Management Perspectives. 20 p. .
- [Burmeister and Schade ()] 'Are entrepreneurs' decisions more biased? An experimental investigation of the susceptibility to status quo bias'. K Burmeister , C Schade . *Journal of Business Venturing* 2007. 22 (3) p. .
- [Lerner ()] 'Assessing the contribution of venture capital'. J Lerner . *The RAND Journal of Economics* 2000. 31 (4) p. .
- [Shefrin ()] 'Behavioral corporate finance'. H Shefrin . *Journal of applied corporate finance* 2001. 14 (3) p. .
- [Hartman et al. ()] 'Consumer rationality and the status quo'. R S Hartman , M J Doane , C K Woo . *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 1991. 106 (1) p. .
- [Cronqvist and Thaler ()] 'Design choices in privatized social-security systems: Learning from the Swedish experience'. H Cronqvist , R H Thaler . *American Economic Review* 2004. 94 (2) p. .
- [Busenitz and Barney ()] 'Differences between entrepreneurs and managers in large organizations: Biases and heuristics in strategic decision-making'. L W Busenitz , J B Barney . *Journal of business venturing* 1997. 12 (1) p. .
- [Bloom et al. ()] 'Do private equity-owned firms have better management practices?'. N Bloom , R Sadun , J Van Reenen . *American Economic Review* 2015. 105 (5) p. .
- [Cangiano et al. ()] 'Does daily proactivity affect well-being? The moderating role of punitive supervision'. F Cangiano , S K Parker , G B Yeo . *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 2019. 40 (1) p. .
- [Belke et al. ()] *Does Venture Capital Investment Spur Employment Growth?-Further Evidence*, A Belke , R Fehn , N Foster . 2003. 2003. Germany. Department of Economics, University of Hohenheim
- [Kelly ()] 'Drivers of private equity investment activity: are buyout and venture investors really so different?'. R Kelly . *Venture Capital* 2012. 14 (4) p. .
- [Thomas et al. ()] 'Employee proactivity in organizations: A comparative meta-analysis of emergent proactive constructs'. J P Thomas , D S Whitman , C Viswesvaran . *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology* 2010. 83 (2) p. .
- [Kuran ()] 'Explaining the economic trajectories of civilizations: The systemic approach'. T Kuran . *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 2009. 71 (3) p. .
- [Levine ()] 'Financial Development and Economic Growth: Views and Agenda'. R Levine . *Journal of Economic Literature* 1997. 35 (2) p. .
- [Engel and Keilbach ()] 'Firm-level implications of early-stage venture capital investment-An empirical investigation'. D Engel , M Keilbach . *Journal of Empirical Finance* 2007. 14 (2) p. .
- [Agarwal et al. ()] 'Flows, performance, and managerial incentives in the hedge fund industry'. V Agarwal , N Daniel , N Y Naik . *Working Paper* 2003. 7 (24) p. 3. Georgia State University and London Business School
- [Johnson et al. ()] 'Framing, probability distortions, and insurance decisions'. E J Johnson , J Hershey , J Meszaros , H Kunreuther . *Journal of Risk and Uncertainty* 1993. 7 (1) p. .
- [Marquardt ()] 'Generalized inverses, ridge regression, biased linear estimation, and nonlinear estimation'. D W Marquardt . *Technometrics* 1970. 12 (3) p. .
- [Sandri et al. ()] 'Holding on for too long? An experimental study on inertia in entrepreneurs' and non-entrepreneurs' disinvestment choices'. S Sandri , C Schade , O Musshoff , M Odening . *Journal of economic behavior & organization* 2010. 76 (1) p. .
- [Schwienbacher ()] 'Innovation and venture capital exits'. A Schwienbacher . *The Economic Journal* 2008. 118 (533) p. .
- [Freiburg and Grichnik ()] 'Institutional Reinvestments in Private Equity Funds as a Double-Edged Sword: the Role of the Status Quo Bias'. M Freiburg , D Grichnik . *Journal of Behavioral Finance* 2013. 14 (2) p. .
- [Patel et al. ()] *Investment flows and performance: Evidence from mutual funds, cross-border investments, and new issues. Japan, Europe and the financial markets: Analytical and empirical perspectives*, J Patel , R J Zeckhauser , D Hendricks . 1994. p. .

- [Khan et al. (2018)] N Khan , Q She , L Zhang , I Ahmad . *Does Venture Capital Investment Spur Innovation? Cross Countries Analysis. Cross Countries Analysis*, 2018. December 19. 2018.
- [Bohlmann and Zacher ()] ‘Making Things Happen (Un) Expectedly: Interactive Effects of Age, Gender, and Motives on Evaluations of Proactive Behavior’. C Bohlmann , H Zacher . *Journal of Business and Psychology* 2020. p. .
- [Parker et al. ()] ‘Making things happen: A model of proactive motivation’. S K Parker , U K Bindl , K Strauss . *Journal of management* 2010. 36 (4) p. .
- [Parker et al. ()] ‘Modeling the antecedents of proactive behavior at work’. S K Parker , H M Williams , N Turner . *Journal of applied psychology* 2006. 91 (3) p. 636.
- [Schweitzer ()] ‘Multiple reference points, framing, and the status quo bias in health care financing decisions’. M Schweitzer . *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 1995. 63 (1) p. .
- [Li et al. ()] ‘National distances, international experience, and venture capital investment performance’. Y Li , I B Vertinsky , J Li . *Journal of Business Venturing* 2014. 29 (4) p. .
- [Bindl and Parker ()] *New perspectives and directions for understanding proactivity in organizations*, U K Bindl , S K Parker . 2017.
- [Puri and Zarutskie ()] ‘On the life cycle dynamics of venture-capital-and non-venture-capital -financed firms’. M Puri , R Zarutskie . *The Journal of Finance* 2012. 67 (6) p. .
- [Barber et al. ()] ‘Out of sight, out of mind: The effects of expenses on mutual fund flows’. B M Barber , T Odean , L Zheng . *The Journal of Business* 2005. 78 (6) p. .
- [Antonczyk and Salzmman ()] ‘Overconfidence and optimism: The effect of national culture on capital structure’. R C Antonczyk , A J Salzmman . *Research in International Business and Finance* 2014. 31 (C) p. .
- [Agnew et al. ()] ‘Portfolio choice and trading in a large 401 (k) plan’. J Agnew , P Balduzzi , A Sundén . *American Economic Review* 2003. 93 (1) p. .
- [Bernstein et al. ()] ‘Private equity and industry performance’. S Bernstein , J Lerner , M Sorensen , P Strömberg . *Management Science* 2016. 63 (4) p. .
- [Ghai et al. ()] *Private equity: Changing perceptions and new realities*, S Ghai , C Kehoe , G Pinkus . 2014. Mc Kinsey Quarterly.
- [Thompson ()] ‘Proactive personality and job performance: a social capital perspective’. J A Thompson . *Journal of Applied psychology* 2005. 90 (5) p. 1011.
- [Kahneman and Tversky ()] ‘Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision under Risk’. D Kahneman , A Tversky . *Econometrica* 1979. 47 (2) p. .
- [Bell ()] ‘Regret in decision making under uncertainty’. D E Bell . *Operations research* 1982. 30 (5) p. .
- [Fu and Li ()] ‘Reputation-concerned policy makers and institutional status quo bias’. Q Fu , M Li . *Journal of Public Economics* 2014. 110 p. .
- [Milosevic ()] ‘Skills or networks? success and fundraising determinants in a low performing venture capital market’. M Milosevic . *Research Policy* 2018. 47 (1) p. .
- [Kempf and Ruenzi ()] ‘Status quo bias and the number of alternatives: An empirical illustration from the mutual fund industry’. A Kempf , S Ruenzi . *The journal of behavioral finance* 2006. 7 (4) p. .
- [Samuelson and Zeckhauser ()] ‘Status quo bias in decision making’. W Samuelson , R Zeckhauser . *Journal of risk and uncertainty* 1988. 1 (1) p. .
- [Elert and Henrekson ()] ‘Status Quo Institutions and the Benefits of Institutional Deviations’. N Elert , M Henrekson . *International Review of Entrepreneurship* 2017. 15 (1) p. .
- [Parker and Collins ()] ‘Taking stock: Integrating and differentiating multiple proactive behaviors’. S K Parker , C G Collins . *Journal of management* 2010. 36 (3) p. .
- [Félix et al. ()] ‘The determinants of venture capital in Europe-Evidence across countries’. E G S Félix , C P Pires , M A Gulamhussen . *Journal of Financial Services Research* 2013. 44 (3) p. .
- [Ning et al. ()] ‘The driving forces of venture capital investments’. Y Ning , W Wang , B Yu . *Small Business Economics* 2015. 44 (2) p. .
- [Groh et al. ()] ‘The European venture capital and private equity country attractiveness indices’. A P Groh , H Von Liechtenstein , K Lieser . *Journal of Corporate Finance* 2010. 16 (2) p. .
- [Precup ()] ‘The Future of Private Equity in Europe-The Determinants Across Countries’. M Precup . *Romanian Journal of European Affairs* 2015. 15 (4) p. .
- [Hellmann and Puri ()] *The interaction between product market and financing strategy: The role of venture capital. The review of financial studies*, T Hellmann , M Puri . 2000. 13 p. .

294 [Bernoth and Colavecchio ()] ‘The macroeconomic determinants of private equity investment: a European
295 comparison’. K Bernoth , R Colavecchio . *Applied Economics* 2014. 46 (11) p. .

296 [Bonini and Alkan ()] ‘The political and legal determinants of venture capital investments around the world’. S
297 Bonini , S Alkan . *Small Business Economics* 2012. 39 (4) p. .

298 [Madrian and Shea ()] ‘The Power of Suggestion: Inertia in 401 (k) Participation and Savings Behavior’. B C
299 Madrian , D F Shea . *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 2001. 116 (4) p. .

300 [Liang and Prowse ()] ‘The private equity market: An overview. Financial Markets’. G W Liang , N Prowse , S
301 . *Institutions &* 1997. 6 (4) p. .

302 [Patel et al. ()] ‘The rationality struggle: Illustrations from financial markets’. J Patel , R Zeckhauser , D
303 Hendricks . *The American Economic Review* 1991. 81 (2) p. .

304 [Gompers ()] ‘The rise and fall of venture capital’. P Gompers . *Business and Economic History* 1994. 23 (2) p. .

305 [Harbi and Toumia ()] ‘The status quo and the investment decisions’. S E Harbi , O Toumia . *Managerial Finance*
306 2020. 46 (9) p. .

307 [Gompers and Lerner ()] ‘The venture capital revolution’. P Gompers , J Lerner . *Journal of economic*
308 *perspectives* 2001. 15 (2) p. .

309 [Palich and Bagby ()] ‘Using cognitive theory to explain entrepreneurial risk-taking: challenging conventional
310 wisdom’. L Palich , D Bagby . *Journal* 1995. 10 (6) p. .

311 [Hung and Tsai ()] *Value Creation and Value Transfer of Leveraged Buyouts: A Review of Recent Developments*
312 *and Challenges for Emerging Markets. Emerging Markets Finance and Trade*, Y D Hung , M H Tsai . 2017.
313 53 p. .

314 [Black and Gilson ()] ‘Venture capital and the structure of capital markets: banks versus stock markets’. B S
315 Black , R J Gilson . *Journal of financial economics* 1998. 47 (3) p. .

316 [Bygrave and Timmons ()] *Venture capital at the crossroads*, W D Bygrave , J A Timmons . 1992. Harvard
317 Business Press.

318 [Lahr and Mina ()] ‘Venture capital investments and the technological performance of portfolio firms’. H Lahr ,
319 A Mina . *Research Policy* 2016. 45 (1) p. .

320 [Samila and Sorenson ()] ‘Venture capital, entrepreneurship, and economic growth’. S Samila , O Sorenson . *The*
321 *Review of Economics and Statistics* 2011. 93 (1) p. .

322 [Lerner ()] ‘Venture capitalists and the oversight of private firms’. J Lerner . *The Journal of Finance* 1995. 50
323 (1) p. .

324 [Gompers et al. ()] ‘What do private equity firms say they do?’. P Gompers , S N Kaplan , V Mukharlyamov .
325 *Journal of Financial Economics* 2016. 121 (3) p. .

326 [Seibert et al. ()] ‘What do proactive people do? A longitudinal model linking proactive personality and career
327 success’. S E Seibert , M L Kraimer , J M Crant . *Personnel psychology* 2001. 54 (4) p. .

328 [Gorman and Sahlman ()] ‘What do venture capitalists do?’. M Gorman , W A Sahlman . *Journal of business*
329 *venturing* 1989. 4 (4) p. .

330 [Gompers and Lerner ()] ‘What drives venture capital fundraising’. P Gompers , J Lerner . *Brookings Papers on*
331 *Economic Activity* 1998. 29 p. .

332 [Tekçe et al. ()] ‘What factors affect behavioral biases? Evidence from Turkish individual stock investors’. B
333 Tekçe , N Yılmaz , R Bildik . *Research in International Business and Finance* 2016. 37 p. .

334 [Franke et al. ()] ‘What you are is what you like-similarity biases in venture capitalists’ evaluations of start-up
335 teams’. N Franke , M Gruber , D Harhoff , J Henkel . *Journal of Business Venturing* 2006. 21 (6) p. .

336 [Sapienza ()] ‘When do venture capitalists add value?’. H J Sapienza . *Journal of Business Venturing* 1992. 7 (1)
337 p. .