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Abstract: Entrepreneurs take extreme risks and make rash decisions but are responsible for innovation, technological change, and economic growth. Attempts to characterize the entrepreneurial personality have had limited success. We hypothesized that elevated hypomanic tendencies (HPM), which have been linked to increased risk for psychopathology, are also associated with entrepreneurship. We tested the association of HPM with entrepreneurial activities cross-sectionally in three different populations (total N = 2,200, including 899 entrepreneurs), using three different measures of hypomanic tendencies. We report a robust positive association of HPM with several measures of entrepreneurial intent, behavior, and success. This may reflect a particular ecological fit between individual characteristics associated with HPM and unique demands of entrepreneurial lifestyle, but highlights the psychological vulnerability of entrepreneurs, especially under conditions of stress.

One Sentence Summary: A positive relationship between hypomanic tendencies and entrepreneurship is revealed in three large independent datasets.

Main Text: Joseph Schumpeter, one of the most influential economists of the 20th century, described entrepreneurs as “wild spirits” who take extreme risks and make rash decisions but are responsible for innovation and technological change, and thus for economic growth (1). Much subsequent literature has attempted to characterize the entrepreneurial personality and to identify determinants of entrepreneurial drive (2). Entrepreneurship is not associated with the dimensions of personality in the prominent ‘Big 5’ personality model (2). However, many of the documented characteristics of entrepreneurs (3-6) parallel the older construct of hypomanic personality (7-13): impulsivity (14, 15), altered perception of risk (16) and increased risk taking (17, 18), decreased tendency to think counterfactually (19), ambition and overconfidence (20), perseverance (21), positive affectivity (22), goal orientation (23, 24), little need for sleep (25, 26), and reduced regard for social norms (27, 28). Mania and hypomania have long been associated with creativity and with increased goal-directed activity (7, 10, 29-31). There have been many case studies suggesting a relationship between hypomanic tendencies and entrepreneurship (7-9, 32); but the empirical literature is limited and mixed. Some small studies have supported an association between
hypomania and entrepreneurship (32); others have found no such relationship (33). These small studies have used a range of measures of hypomania and of entrepreneurial behavior. We hypothesized that strong and persistent hypomanic traits (HPM) would be associated with entrepreneurship. We tested the association of HPM with entrepreneurial activities cross-sectionally in three different populations (total N = 2,200, including 899 individuals with a history of business creation), using three different measures of hypomanic traits (detailed below). We report a robust positive association of HPM with several different measures of entrepreneurial intent, behavior, and success. Our results thus provide empirical support for the “wild spirits” hypothesis of entrepreneurship and provide new insight into the entrepreneurial drive.

“Good science has to begin with good definitions” (34). Some have defined entrepreneurship as the creation of any new business (35), while others restrict it to the creation of innovative businesses, excluding the creation of ventures that are not innovative (like opening a franchise) (36). In either case, the success rate of new ventures is very low, across a wide array of success measures (37-42). Some researchers also include innovation within an existing and thriving corporation (42, 43) or in the sphere of social activism (44) under the umbrella of entrepreneurship. We examine several of these different notions of entrepreneurship but focus primarily on the creation of new ventures (irrespective of the level of innovation).

Hypomania has likewise been conceptualized and measured in a variety of ways (45-49). It is a risk factor for the development of bipolar disorder (~20%, versus ~1.5% in general population) (50, 51), but most individuals with HPM do not go on to develop major psychopathology (52, 53). Some studies have documented the mental health sequelae of the stress of venture creation (54-56). We posit that psychiatric difficulties in this population may derive from an interaction of this stress with an underlying temperamental vulnerability (i.e., HPM). However, we emphasize that the very factors associated with this vulnerability may simultaneously serve an important adaptive purpose, driving the creation of technological change and economic growth (57).

Whether mania exists on a continuum of severity or not, with hypomanic personality representing a mild form, depends in part on the type and level of analysis. This is one aspect of the broader question of whether continuous personality traits (e.g. hypomanic tendencies) can be truly separated from discrete pathologic entities (e.g. psychiatric illnesses such as bipolar disorder). Both biological measures (e.g. polygenic risk scores for bipolar disorder (58)) and non-biological measures (e.g. family pedigree analysis of bipolar family members (59)) may help resolve the question of whether hypomania and bipolar disorder lie on a continuum. We did not here attempt to resolve this important question.

We tested the association of HPM with entrepreneurship in three independent studies: a sample of 1387 residents of Kentucky (a primarily rural state in the U.S.), which was oversampled to include 45% (619) who reported having created a business (Study 1; Supplementary text); a sample of 417 general population respondents recruited in Connecticut, 72 of whom reported a history of creating a business (Study 2; Supplementary text); and an international group of 396 individuals from executive MBA programs, 208 of whom described themselves as having created a business (Study 3; Supplementary text). In all three samples, using different instruments to measure HPM, individuals with strong hypomanic propensities were overrepresented among individuals with a history of business creation, especially among individuals with a history of creating multiple businesses (i.e. serial entrepreneurs; Figure 1). This robustly supports the hypothesized positive association between HPM and entrepreneurship.

The Hypomanic Personality Scale (HPS) of Eckblad and Chapman (46) is the most widely used instrument to measure hypomanic tendencies in non-clinical samples, but it is inconveniently
long for large-scale surveys. In Study 1 (N = 1387), we measured HPM using a shortened version of the HPS (HPS-short, or HPS-s), which we validated against the full HPS in an independent group of subjects (Supplementary text, Figure S1). Entrepreneurial attitudes were evaluated using two validated scales: the Business Risk-Taking Scale (BRT) (60) and a shortened version of the Entrepreneurial Intentions Scale (EI) (61). Details of these scales, including the construction and validation of the shortened EI (EI-r), are given in Supplementary text, as are demographic characteristics of the sample and summary statistics of measures of HPM and entrepreneurship.

As shown in Figure 1A, there was a positive and monotonic relationship between HPS-S and history of business creation: serial entrepreneurs on average scored higher than one-time entrepreneurs, who in turn on average scored higher than individuals that never created a business. Similar significant effects were seen when we used a dichotomous measure of business entrepreneurship (i.e. “have you ever started a business [yes/no]”; Figure S2).

In this large sample we were able to examine association of HPM with current entrepreneurial activity and intentions, in addition to history. Hypomanic propensities were elevated in those with any past or present business creation, relative to those who had never started a business, but were most markedly elevated in those who were actively in the process of starting a business (nascent entrepreneurs, NE; Figure 2A; see Supplementary text) (62-64). This could be because elevated HPM represents a stable trait, and individuals with high HPM self-select into the current entrepreneur group (65). Alternatively, HPM may represent a combination of stable trait and more transient state effects (66); individuals may be drawn into venture creation during periods when their HPM is high, or elevated HPM may be triggered, in susceptible individuals, by the stress of venture creation. Our cross-sectional design does not allow us to distinguish between these possibilities.

Similarly, there was a positive association between hypomanic propensities and current entrepreneurial intentions (irrespective of actual activity), measured using the EI-r (Figure 2B). Since the variance in EI-r increased dramatically at higher levels of HPS-s (Breusch–Pagan test p < 10^{-10}), we analyzed these data using quantile regression (67), which divides EI-r into nine quantiles at each level of HPS-s, and then examines the relationship between HPS-s and EI-r in each of these subsets of the data. As shown in Figure 2C, the relationship between HPS-s and EI-r was significant and positive across all quantiles, but stronger in the higher quantiles (see also Table S9). That is, not all individuals with HPM in our sample formed entrepreneurial intentions, but almost no individuals without HPM did so.

In aggregate, these several analyses in the initial cohort of over 1,000 show a robust positive association of HPM with entrepreneurial behavior and intention.

In Study 2, we examined the specificity of the association of HPM with venture creation, relative to different personality constructs and different conceptions of entrepreneurship. Hypomanic propensities do not map cleanly onto the most widely used dimensional model of personality, the Big Five model, and no associations have been found between entrepreneurship and the dimensions of that model (2). Hypomania is specifically measured by an older, but extremely well validated and widely used, instrument for characterizing personality variation and pathology along nine dimensions: the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) (49, 68). We used a more recent version of MMPI, MMPI-2 (49), and several measures of entrepreneurship (as defined by the entrepreneurial outcomes inventory, EO (69)) to access 417 general population subjects, 72 of whom had a history of creating a business (see Supplementary text for details of these measures and descriptive statistics of the sample). As in Study 1, hypomanic tendencies (the MMPI-2 Ma subscale) were positively associated with history of
business creation, measured either across three levels (Figure 1B) or as a dichotomous variable (Table 1). The other eight MMPI-2 dimensions showed no such relationship (Table 1; Supplementary text, Table S14). Thus, the positive association of venture creation with hypomanic propensities is specific, at least amongst the nine dimensions measured by the MMPI-2.

Hitherto we have defined entrepreneurship as a history of business creation. However, entrepreneurship has been defined and studied in other ways. We examined the association of other forms of entrepreneurship with MMPI-2 personality dimensions. Significant relationships were seen between the MMPI-2 Ma subscale and both student and corporate entrepreneurship (Table 1). Negative associations emerged with MMPI-2 D and Si subscales (measuring depression and social isolation tendencies, respectively) and student and corporate entrepreneurship – that is, these dimensions work against these forms of entrepreneurship. Overall, across several different definitions of entrepreneurship, MMPI-2 Ma has the most consistent association, and the only positive one, further supporting the robustness and specificity of the relationship. There were no significant associations between any MMPI-2 dimensions and innovation entrepreneurship.

In Study 3 we tested whether the association between hypomanic tendencies and entrepreneurship would hold in individuals who self-selected to receive business education, and how it associates with entrepreneurial success. We used on-line data collection to characterize an international group of 396 individuals enrolled in executive MBA programs, currently or in the past; 208 described themselves as having created a business (Supplementary text; Table S15). Hypomanic tendencies in this sample were characterized using the full HPS. We again replicated the core finding seen in the first two studies: that a history of having started a business associated positively with HPM (Figure 1C).

Collection of the full HPS in this sample allowed us to examine three well-validated subscales that measure different aspects of HPM (70): social vitality (SV), mood volatility (MV), and excitement (Ex; see Supplementary text). These subscales are highly intercorrelated in general, and in our sample (Supplementary text). History of business creation was positively associated with SV (mean one – mean none = 0.23, mean several – mean one = 0.24; Kruskal-Wallis p = 0.001) and, more weakly, with Ex (mean one – mean none = 0.23, mean several – mean one = 0.01; Kruskal-Wallis p = 0.014); there was no consistent monotonic association with MV (mean one – mean none = 0.23, mean several – mean one = -0.12; Kruskal-Wallis p = 0.060; Table 2). This suggests that the association between hypomanic propensities and entrepreneurship is driven primarily by social vitality. Relationships of HPS subscales with the other forms of entrepreneurship measured by the EO were weaker (Table S17).

A subset of this third sample (N = 109) provided data on past entrepreneurial success, measured as peak annual revenue of the most successful business created. We examined the relationship of business success with the three HPS subscales (Supplementary text; Table S17). Since business success is highly skewed – high levels of success are rare (36-39) – analyzing this relationship again required the use of quantile regression (67), including as predictors the three HPS subscales and their squares (to allow for quadratic relationships). Only SV predicted entrepreneurial success, and only in the top quantile (Figure 3; Table S18): that is, most entrepreneurial enterprises fail, but amongst those that succeed, social vitality of the entrepreneur is a significant predictor of the degree of success, as measured by peak income.

A minority of economic actors function as entrepreneurs, and yet the actions of this subgroup are critical to innovation and economic growth (7). It has been challenging to identify personality traits of individuals who will self-select to function as entrepreneurs in the economy, and who will be successful. We provide convergent data across three large samples, supporting a positive
association between hypomanic tendencies and entrepreneurship. Notably, HPM is particularly high among serial entrepreneurs – individuals who select venture creation as a lifestyle rather than a onetime activity – and among nascent entrepreneurs, as they navigate a particularly stressful period.

Extreme personality traits are often thought to be associated with psychopathology and impaired function. HPM is no exception; elevated HPM is a predictor of the development of bipolar disorder \( (50, 51) \). However, it has been speculated that HPM (and even bipolar disorder) may have benefits as well; for example, case reports and some studies associate HPM with creativity \( (30, 31) \). We provide evidence that elevated HPM also contributes positively to entrepreneurship. This may reflect a particular ecological fit between individual characteristics associated with HPM and unique demands and opportunities of entrepreneurial lifestyle \( (71) \). This association is specific; none of the other measured personality dimensions correlate with business entrepreneurship. Social vitality (SV) appears to be the strongest predictor of both entrepreneurial activity and success. However, SV strongly correlates with other dimensions of HPM, mood volatility and excitement; this combination of intercorrelated traits may constitute the “wild spirit” of entrepreneurs.

Improved understanding of the relationship between personality variation and entrepreneurship may help policy makers, educational institutions, and support programs to identify, cultivate, and support potential and active entrepreneurs. The identification of a psychological trait (which has been suggested to be heritable \( (72) \)) that is associated both with entrepreneurship and with psychopathology highlights the psychological vulnerability of entrepreneurs and their family members \( (73) \), especially under conditions of stress. However, it is important to emphasize that most individuals with HPM (~80%) do not go on to develop major psychopathology \( (52, 53) \). Identifying resilience factors in this high-risk population is a critical topic for future research. Hypomania may be a double-edged sword. Appreciation of this fact may inform strategies to support entrepreneurs as they provide a critical engine for the economy.
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Standard regression analysis yields a similar and significant relationship
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Study 1: Hypomanic Personality scale - short

Kruskal-Wallis $p < 0.001$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>CI, 95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never started own business</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started one business</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started multiple businesses</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study 2: Hypomania subscale of MMPI-2

Kruskal-Wallis $p = 0.008$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>CI, 95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never started own business</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started one business</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started multiple businesses</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study 3: Hypomanic Personality scale

Kruskal-Wallis $p = 0.001$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>CI, 95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never started own business</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started one business</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started multiple businesses</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1. Relationship between history of entrepreneurial activities and hypomanic personality, across three studies. We collected data in three different samples, totaling 2200 individuals, and assessed hypomanic tendencies using three different instruments. In all three cases there was a monotonic relationship between history of business creation (never, once, more than once) and hypomanic tendencies. Parameter estimates (βs) and standard errors (SE) are from a regression with a heteroskedasticity-consistent variance covariance matrix (robust linear regression).
Fig. 2. Association of hypomania with entrepreneurial intentions and current entrepreneurial activity in Study 1. A. HPM was elevated in all individuals who had a history of business creation, relative to those who did not, but was most markedly elevated in individuals currently in the process of starting a new business (nascent entrepreneurs). Parameter estimates (βs) and standard errors (SE) are from a regression with a heteroskedasticity-consistent variance covariance matrix (robust linear regression). B. There was a positive relationship between hypomania and current entrepreneurial intentions (EI). Regression lines are shown for the 10%, 50%, and 90% quantiles. C. Regression coefficients (in black) and confidence intervals (in gray) across all quantiles. In red are a coefficient (solid line) and confidence intervals (dotted lines) from the ordinary linear regression.
Fig. 3. Quantile regression of the relationship between social vitality (SV) and entrepreneurial success in Study 3. Of the HPS subscales, only SV was associated with entrepreneurial success, defined as peak revenue of businesses started (Table S6.2). Most business ventures fail, and thus at lower quantiles there was little variation in peak revenue and no correlation with SV. In the top quantiles, however, a positive relationship emerged.
Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Business Entrepreneurship</th>
<th>Student Entrepreneurship</th>
<th>Corporate Entrepreneurship</th>
<th>Invention Entrepreneurship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mann-Whitney U test, p</td>
<td>Spearman's ρ</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Spearman's ρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hs</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hy</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pd</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.352</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma</td>
<td>0.006*</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>-0.21*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationship between MMPI dimensions and several types of entrepreneurship in Study 2. * - significant at a level corrected for multiple comparisons: for Mann-Whitney U tests $p \leq (0.05/9) = 0.006$; for Spearman's correlations $p \leq (0.05/27) = 0.002$. 
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Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>CI, 95%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$DV = SV$, age and gender corrected (standardized)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never started own business</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started one business</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started multiple businesses</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$DV = MV$, age and gender corrected (standardized)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never started own business</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started one business</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.522</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started multiple businesses</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$DV = Ex$, age and gender corrected (standardized)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never started own business</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started one business</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Started multiple businesses</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Association of history of entrepreneurship with HPS subscales. SV – Social Vitality; MV – Mood Volatility; Ex – Excitement.