RESEARCH

The Founder Marketing Gap

Why the people who most need to be seen are the least likely to show up — and why the one channel they already own sits switched off. An evidence review.

Rowan Lemley

Founder & CEO, Groundworks AI · nearly two decades in B2B SaaS marketing

September 21, 2026 · 20 min read · Download the PDF

GROUNDWORKS AI RESEARCH · EVIDENCE REVIEW · V1.0 · SEPTEMBER 2026

Executive summary

Founders and small-business owners know marketing matters. The evidence says they do not do it — and the reason is not the one the industry keeps solving for.

This review assembles published research on what founders and small businesses *say* about marketing and what they *measurably do*, then asks why the two diverge and which channel, if any, a company of one to three people can realistically use. Every figure was read at its source in September 2026; sources are graded in the appendix, and three widely circulated statistics were excluded because they cannot be traced.

Five findings.

1. **The gap is real and it is not a budget gap.** Owners rank marketing as their top concern and plan to spend more, yet 70% give it fewer than five hours a week, over half routinely put it off, and a peer-reviewed study finds more than half of early-stage B2B start-ups do no systematic marketing at all — the group that would benefit most.
2. **Effort is rising and confidence is falling.** Small-business AI adoption in marketing went from 26% to 87% in three years. Over the same period the share "very confident" in their marketing fell from 27% to 18%, and the share of content marketers reporting strong results hit a twelve-year low. Fluency was never the bottleneck.
3. **The gap has four causes, and only one is friction.** Initiation (nothing forces it), substance (nothing to say), judgment (the audience is real peers), and endurance (the payoff lags by quarters). Most tools address the second and call it a product.

4. **For a B2B company with no list, no domain authority and no budget, LinkedIn is the channel that is left** — and the buyer research is unusually strong: 73% of decision-makers trust a supplier's thought leadership over its marketing material, 71% of hidden buyers barely speak to sales, and 53% say strong thinking makes brand recognition matter much less.
5. **The counter-evidence is stated, not buried.** Established owners in high-income economies rate email above social media, and no published study settles whether founders who don't post *can't* or *won't*. We treat that as the open question it is.

70%

of small-business owners spend fewer than five hours a week on marketing, while naming it their top concern

FIVERR, 2025

>½

of early-stage B2B start-ups do no systematic marketing — the category that gains most from it

MINTZ & LILIEN, *IMM*, 2024

18%

of SMBs are "very confident" in their marketing, down from 27% a year earlier

CONSTANT CONTACT, 2025

CONTENTS

1. The question, and how we answered it

Two claims circulate in every conversation about small-company marketing. The first is that founders know marketing matters but do not do it. The second is that LinkedIn, for a business-to-business founder, is the channel doing the least work relative to what it could. Both are usually asserted. This review asks what the published evidence actually supports.

Method. This is a structured evidence review, not primary research. We collected the published surveys and studies that bear on the two claims, opened each at its source rather than through secondary coverage, and recorded the exact figure, the sample, the fielding date and the sponsor. Each source is graded in the appendix: *green* where the methodology is named and the publisher is not selling the conclusion; *amber* where the sponsor has a commercial interest or the figure reached us second-hand. Three statistics that appear in most articles on this subject were excluded because no primary document could be found for them: "only 1% of LinkedIn members post weekly", "600 million entrepreneurs worldwide", and "80% of B2B social leads come from LinkedIn". A review that repeats a number it cannot trace is not a review.

Scope. The subject is the founder or owner of a company of roughly one to twenty people that sells to other businesses, in English-speaking and Northern European markets. Several of the surveys cited are broader than that — they include consumer-facing trades and retail — and where that matters, we say so.

Interest. Groundworks AI sells a product built on the thesis this review examines. The body of the review names no product. The conclusion states our position and is labelled as such.

2. Part I — What founders say, and what they do

2.1 They say it matters

The stated importance of marketing among founders and owners is not in doubt, and it shows up in three independent kinds of evidence.

The first is intent. In the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor's 2024/2025 survey of more than 150,000 adults across 51 economies, 60% of early-stage entrepreneurs in the United States and 62% in the United Kingdom said they expected to use *more* digital marketing in the next six months to sell their products; GEM notes that in high-income economies this expectation was "sharply up on last year". Sixty-two per cent of new US entrepreneurs rate social media "very important" to their business, and 58% say the same of email.[3]

The second is priority. When Fiverr surveyed nearly 6,000 small-business owners across 25 countries between July 2024 and March 2025, marketing challenges — brand awareness (42%), creating engaging content (40%), retaining customers (33%) — were the top concerns named, ahead of everything else, and 49% said digital marketing and social media were where they would prioritise investment.[12] In Constant Contact's 2024 survey of 1,300 small businesses, 39% planned to increase their marketing budget that year; in the 2025 edition, 37% had.[6] [15]

The third is hindsight. When CB Insights analysed 101 start-up post-mortems written by founders, "poor marketing" appeared in 14% of them, described in the founders' own words: *"It was a time to do some marketing. Unfortunately no one of us was skilled in that area. Even worse, no one had enough time to fill the gap."*[5] These are founders who learned the value of marketing by running out of it.

2.2 They do not do it

Against that stated importance, the behavioural evidence is consistent across sponsors, samples and years.

The most rigorous source is a 2024 study in *Industrial Marketing Management*, a peer-reviewed journal. Mintz and Lilien set out to establish whether start-ups "allocate scarce resources to conduct systematic marketing", using interviews, secondary data and a follow-up survey across two samples of several hundred firms. Their abstract states the finding without hedging: *"investments in systematic marketing by early-stage B2B start-ups increase firm valuation, yet more than half of early-stage B2B start-up firms choose not to invest in systematic marketing, apparently believing such investments will not pay off."* The authors go further: while systematic marketing is *more* beneficial to early-stage B2B firms than to any other category of start-up, "those firms are the least likely to do so."[8]

> “While investing in systematic marketing is more beneficial to early-stage B2B start-up firms than to any other category of start-up, those firms are the least likely to do so.”
>
> MINTZ & LILIEN, *INDUSTRIAL MARKETING MANAGEMENT*, 2024

The survey evidence describes the same behaviour from the inside. In Constant Contact’s 2024 study, 56% of small businesses said they had an hour or less *per day* for marketing, and 52% said they “routinely put off marketing in favour of other activities”. The task they found most time-consuming was posting on social media (51%), and it was also, in the report’s words, among the areas they were “most likely to avoid”.[6] Fiverr’s larger sample a year later found 70% spending fewer than five hours a week on marketing in total.[12] By 2026, 47% of owners were handling all of their social media themselves, with nobody else involved.[7]

Two things about these numbers deserve notice. The sponsors are vendors with an interest in the finding, and the samples skew towards consumer-facing small business; we grade them accordingly. But the direction is corroborated by the peer-reviewed study, the figures are stable across three annual editions, and no published survey we could find points the other way.

2.3 Effort is rising, and confidence is falling

The most striking pattern is not the gap itself but what has happened to it as tools have improved. Constant Contact’s 2024 survey found 73% of small businesses lacked confidence in the effectiveness of their marketing. A year later, with budgets up and a wave of new tools adopted, the share describing themselves as *very* confident had fallen from 27% to 18%. The report’s own summary: “activity is high, but certainty is low … the gap isn’t ambition; it’s in insight and direction.” The single most-cited frustration (23%) was not knowing what drives results, and only 16% were confident they were using the right channels at all.[6] [15]

TABLE 1 — THE GAP, SOURCE BY SOURCE

WHAT THEY SAY	WHAT THEY DO	SOURCE
Marketing challenges are the top concern; 49% will prioritise digital marketing investment	70% spend fewer than 5 hours a week on it	Fiverr, n≈6,000, 2025 AMBER
39% plan to raise the marketing budget	56% have ≤1 hour a day; 52% routinely put it off; posting on social is the most avoided task	Constant Contact, n>1,300, 2024 AMBER
37% raised the budget	Only 18% “very confident” (was 27%)	Constant Contact, n=2,500, 2025 AMBER
60% of US early-stage entrepreneurs expect to use more digital marketing within six months	Among established US owners, social media is rated very important by 42% — twenty points below the early-stage figure	GEM 2024/2025, Table A7 GREEN

WHAT THEY SAY	WHAT THEY DO	SOURCE
Systematic marketing raises early-stage B2B valuations more than for any other start-up type	More than half of early-stage B2B start-ups do none	Mintz & Lilien, *IMM*, 2024 GREEN
“It was a time to do some marketing”	Poor marketing cited in 14% of founder post-mortems	CB Insights, 101 post-mortems AMBER

3. Part II — Four failures, not one

The standard explanation for the gap is time, and the standard remedy is a tool that makes producing content faster. The confidence data in §2.3 is the first sign that this explanation is incomplete: the tools arrived, production got faster, and confidence fell. The evidence supports a model with four distinct failures, of which only one is a friction problem.

3.1 Initiation — nothing forces it

Every item on a marketing to-do list shares one property: it is free to skip today and expensive only in aggregate. Skip a post and nothing happens on Tuesday; the cost arrives a quarter later, as a feed that went quiet, and by then it does not present as “we skipped the work” but as “LinkedIn didn’t work for us”. Against a founder’s other obligations — all of which punish neglect immediately — a task with no deadline structurally loses. The survey data is the aggregate of that design: 52% “routinely put off marketing”, and the most time-consuming task is the most avoided one.[6] A non-marketer does not post four times a week and taper off; they post twice a year. You cannot make someone *easier* into remembering.

3.2 Substance — nothing to say, and fluency does not fix it

The second failure is the belief that what one knows is obvious. It is obvious *to the founder*; it is precisely what the buyer wants. Edelman and LinkedIn’s 2024 survey of 3,484 B2B decision-makers asked what marks the highest-quality thought leadership: the top answer, at 55%, was that it “references strong research and data”, followed by helping the reader understand a challenge in their own business (44%) and concrete guidance with cases (43%). The same respondents rated what they actually read: only 48% called it “good”, and just 15% “very good or excellent”.[1]

15%

of B2B decision-makers rate the thought leadership they read “very good or excellent”

EDELMAN-LINKEDIN, N=3,484, 2024

92%

of content marketers now use AI — “and it correlates with nothing”; strong results are at a twelve-year low

ORBIT MEDIA, N=1,042, 2026

What the last three years have tested is whether making writing cheap closes that gap. It has not. In the United States, small-business adoption of AI tools for marketing rose from 26% in 2023 to 87% by April 2026.[7] Orbit Media’s thirteenth annual survey of 1,042 content marketers found

92.4% now use AI in their content, that the average marketer spends fifty fewer hours a year writing than in 2022 — and that the share reporting "strong results" fell over the same period from 26% to 14%, the lowest in the survey's history. AI users and non-users were equally likely to report strong results. The strategies that *do* correlate with performance — original research, a formal editing process, actually reading the analytics — were all in decline. The report's summary is blunt: "Marketers just got faster at making the same things."[16]

The implication for the founder is direct. The scarce input was never the sentence. It was the specific thing that happened on Tuesday — the client conversation, the number, the decision — that only the founder holds and that no generator can supply. A tool that removes the writing and leaves the founder to supply the substance has removed the part that was not the problem.

3.3 Judgment — the audience is real

The third failure is specific to LinkedIn and is usually missed. The founder's audience there is not strangers; it is clients, former colleagues, investors and peers. A bad post costs standing with people who matter, which is why the blank page feels heavier than the same page would on a blog nobody reads. The buyer research says the fear is aimed at the wrong target. Asked what they prefer, 65% of hidden decision-makers chose "a more human, less formal tone" over an intellectual one, 57% preferred quick takeaways to academic depth, and 53% of decision-makers agreed that if a supplier's thinking is good, "it matters much less to me how well known they are".[2] The bar that matters is substance and plainness, not polish. But the founder does not know that, and the cost of finding out the hard way is real. Anyone can tell whether a draft sounds like them; almost nobody can produce one at eight in the morning. Judgment is a skill founders already have. Authorship is the one they don't.

3.4 Endurance — the payoff lags the effort

The fourth failure is the one nobody says out loud. The Ehrenberg-Bass Institute's work with the LinkedIn B2B Institute puts the share of B2B buyers in the market for a given category at any moment at around 5%; the other 95% "won't buy for months or even years", and cannot be persuaded to, because they already have what you sell.[9] Marketing therefore works by being remembered when the buyer's own moment arrives — which means the effort and the result are separated by quarters. The same institute's survey found 95% of B2B marketers expect significant sales within two weeks of a campaign. If professional marketers hold that expectation, a founder posting into silence for two months will conclude it does not work and stop, at roughly the moment it would have begun to.

Edelman's producer-side data shows how little feedback exists to sustain anyone through that stretch: 19% of organisations producing thought leadership have no process at all for measuring its effect, only 29% can link a sales lead back to a specific piece, and 30% say their organisation "does not really know how to use thought leadership as a sales or marketing tool".[1] Those are companies with marketing departments. The founder has less — and a shorter horizon in which to wait: US Census administrative data shows 36.4% of sole proprietors operating in one year were inactive or gone by the next.[4] A payoff that arrives in month nine is no use to a business deciding in month four whether any of this works.

Only one of the four failures is friction. A tool that makes writing faster addresses the second, partially, and leaves the other three untouched — which is what the confidence data looks like from the inside.

4. Part III — The channel that is left

The value-framing literature argues LinkedIn is undervalued. For a company of one to three people selling to other businesses, a narrower and stronger claim holds: it is the only channel available on day one. This is an argument by elimination, and each step can be checked.

Email requires a list, and a new company has nobody to email. Cold outreach to strangers is now a gated activity: since 2024, Google requires senders to Gmail accounts to authenticate their domain and, at volume, to offer one-click unsubscribe and hold spam-complaint rates below 0.10%, with 0.30% as a hard ceiling.[14] A new domain starts with no reputation and earns one slowly. Email is a channel you grow into, not one you start from.

Search requires either a domain with authority, which a new company does not have, or a paid-search budget, which it also does not have. We do not cite a timeline figure here: the one most often quoted — "four months to a year" — was attributed to Google's own guidance, and Google's current page no longer says it. The direction is not in dispute; the number is.

LinkedIn is free, immediate, and the audience is already assembled: over a billion members, and the founder's own network among them, built over a career.[10] Among B2B marketers, 85% name it the social platform delivering the best value for their organisation — the next platform, Facebook, is at 28% — and 68% increased their use of it in the past year.[17]

What makes the case unusually strong is the buyer-side evidence, which is the best-documented body of research in this review. Edelman and LinkedIn have surveyed B2B decision-makers annually since 2017; the 2024 wave covered 3,484 executives in seven countries, the 2025 wave 1,934 in the United States, in both cases with roughly half at companies of under 200 people.[1] [2]

73%

of decision-makers say a supplier's thought leadership is a more trustworthy basis for judging its capabilities than its marketing material

EDELMAN-LINKEDIN 2024

71%

of hidden buyers — the finance, ops and procurement people who decide — have little or no interaction with sales

EDELMAN-LINKEDIN 2025

53%

agree that if the thinking is good, "it matters much less how well known they are"

EDELMAN-LINKEDIN 2025

The findings form a chain. Buyers read: 52% of decision-makers and 54% of C-suite executives spend an hour or more a week on thought leadership — more time, note, than 70% of small-business owners spend *producing* all of their marketing.[1] [12] Buyers trust it over collateral (73%). It moves them: 75% say a piece has led them to research a product they were not considering, and among those, 23% went on to buy. It opens doors sales cannot: 71% of hidden decision-makers rarely meet a salesperson, yet 95% say strong thought leadership makes them more receptive to outreach, and 79% would champion that supplier's proposal in an RFP. It commands price: 60% say good thought leadership makes them willing to pay a premium. And it levels the field: 53% say brand recognition matters much less when the thinking is good — which is, for a company nobody has heard of, the whole game.[1] [2]

Audiences also expect it of the person at the top. In Brunswick's 2022 survey, 86% of readers of financial publications and 73% of employees said it is important for a CEO to communicate actively on social media about their company; employees preferred working for such a CEO by four to one.[13] That study concerns large companies, but the expectation does not scale down to zero.

4.1 The evidence that cuts against this

A review that finds only supporting evidence is not a review. Three things cut against the argument above, and they belong in the body, not a footnote.

Established owners rate email above social. GEM's 2024/2025 data separates new entrepreneurs from established business owners, and the two groups disagree. Among established US owners, social media is rated very important by 42% against 57% for email communication; in the UK the figures are 35% and 57%. Across the twenty high-income economies, half or more of established owners rate email very important in sixteen; social media clears that bar in three.[3] Two readings are available. One is that mature businesses have a list and a base, and email is what you use once you have those — consistent with §4. The other is that the social-first entrepreneur is a feature of Brazil and the Gulf rather than of Sweden and Germany, and that in our markets the enthusiasm for social media fades with experience. GEM's base also includes trades, retail and personal services, where the finding is unsurprising. The elimination argument survives the narrowing to B2B; it does not survive being applied to "entrepreneurs" in general.

62% → 42%

US entrepreneurs rating social media "very important": early-stage vs established. In the UK the drop is 60% → 35%

GEM 2024/2025, TABLE A7

16 of 20

high-income economies where half or more of established owners rate email very important; for social media, 3 of 20

GEM 2024/2025, TABLE 7.1

Reach is falling, so sporadic posting no longer clears the bar. The largest published practitioner dataset on the LinkedIn feed — Richard van der Blom's analysis of 1.8 million posts across 58,000 profiles in the year to February 2025 — reports organic post views down roughly 50% and follower growth down 59% year on year.[11] The report is gated and not peer-reviewed; we cite it as reported and as directional. If it is even half right, the implication is uncomfortable for the argument: the channel rewards consistency more than it used to, and consistency is the thing §3 says founders cannot supply. The channel being *available* does not make it *cheap*.

Nobody has tested whether non-posting is a capability problem or a preference problem. This is the load-bearing assumption of the whole argument and no study we found addresses it. If founders who do not post would post given the material and the time, the gap is closable. If they do not post because they do not want to be visible, no tool changes that. Desk research cannot settle it; fifty conversations could. Until then this review states it as a bet, not a finding.

5. Part IV — What would have to be true to close the gap

If the four-failure model in §3 is right, it specifies what any remedy must do, and it explains why the current generation of remedies has not moved the confidence numbers.

1. **It must initiate.** A remedy that waits for the founder to open it inherits the initiation failure intact. The thought has to arrive on its own, on a schedule the founder agreed to once.
2. **It must bring the substance, not ask for it.** The blank prompt box is the substance failure in a new costume. The material has to come from what the business actually does and says — its site, its calls, its numbers, its decisions — and the buyer research says that is what is wanted: research, data, specifics, plainly put.
3. **It must convert authorship into editing.** The founder is already competent at the editorial task — *does this sound like me, is this true, would I say this to a client* — and incompetent, through no fault, at the authoring one. Approval is not a compromised form of autonomy; it puts the founder in the one role they are good at.
4. **It must persist and report.** Because the payoff lags by quarters, the remedy has to keep going through the unrewarded stretch and show the founder what is happening, or the founder will do what 95% of professional marketers do and quit at week two.

Measured against that list, the "content tool" category solves the second requirement partially and none of the others. Orbit Media's finding that AI use "correlates with nothing" is what a partial solution to one of four problems looks like at scale.[16]

6. Limitations

- **Vendor surveys.** Constant Contact and Fiverr sell to the people they surveyed, and their samples are their users. We use them for direction and for the consistency of the pattern across years, never as precise rates, and we mark them amber throughout.
- **SMB is not founder.** Most small-business surveys include consumer-facing trades and retail. The peer-reviewed study (Mintz & Lilien) and the GEM early-stage data are the closest fits to the B2B founder; the rest are broader.
- **Attitudes, not behaviour.** Edelman measures what buyers say they trust and do; GEM measures how important a tool is *perceived* to be. Neither is an observed behavioural rate, and we have deliberately not cited one for LinkedIn because none we could trace exists.

- **Dates.** The Census figure on self-employment is from a 2025 paper reporting 2019 data; the CB Insights post-mortem analysis is the original 101-case edition, and the current edition no longer carries a marketing line. Both are used only for what they are.
- **The open question.** Capability versus preference (§4.1) is untested and cannot be resolved from published work.
- **Interest.** The publisher sells a product built on this thesis. The evidence and grading are laid out so that a reader who distrusts the conclusion can check the premises.

7. Conclusion — where Groundworks AI stands

The evidence supports both claims this review set out to test, with one honest caveat each.

Founders and small-business owners do know marketing matters — they rank it their top concern, plan to spend more on it, and name its absence in their own post-mortems — and they do not do it: 70% give it under five hours a week, half routinely put it off, and more than half of early-stage B2B start-ups do none at all. The caveat is that the reason is not laziness or ignorance. It is a task that punishes neglect invisibly and late, competing with tasks that punish it immediately, and the tools that made producing content fast have not moved the needle because production was not the constraint. Confidence fell as adoption rose.

And for a B2B company of one to three people, LinkedIn is the channel that is left: the audience is assembled, the buyer research is the strongest in the field, and the thing buyers say they want — specific, plain, grounded thinking from the people who do the work — is the thing a founder has more of than anyone. The caveat is that the channel now rewards consistency, and consistency is exactly what the four failures prevent.

That is the gap we built Groundworks AI to close, and the four requirements in §5 are the specification we built to. **Scout** drafts a LinkedIn post for the founder every weekday, so the thought arrives rather than waits (initiation). It writes from what the business actually says and sells — the site, the positions, the founder's own phrasing, learned the longer it runs — rather than from a prompt (substance). The founder approves, edits or skips each one in a couple of minutes, and nothing publishes without that yes (judgment: the founder is the editor, never the author). It keeps going on a quarterly theme the founder signed off once, publishes to their own profile at a chosen time, and shows what happened (endurance). It is a subscription for the company where nobody does marketing, priced for that company, and it removes all four barriers rather than the one that was easiest to remove.

We hold the thesis with the confidence the evidence allows and no more. The bet in §4.1 — that the founders who are silent would speak, given the material and the rhythm — is the bet the company is making. The research says it is a good one. It does not yet say it is won.

Sources and grading

Every source below was opened at the publisher in September 2026 unless marked otherwise. *Green*: named methodology, publisher not selling the conclusion. *Amber*: sponsor has a commercial interest, or the figure reached us through a secondary report of the primary document. A working trace of every figure, with page references, is held by the publisher.

1. Edelman & LinkedIn, *2024 B2B Thought Leadership Impact Report: Reaching Beyond the Ready*. n=3,484 management-level professionals, seven countries, fielded 30 Nov–14 Dec 2023, ±2.8%. Full report read. GREEN
2. Edelman & LinkedIn, *2025 B2B Thought Leadership Impact Report: Invisible Influence*. n=1,934 US business executives, fielded 17 Mar–3 Apr 2025, ±2.0%. Full report read. GREEN
3. Global Entrepreneurship Monitor, *GEM 2024/2025 Global Report: Entrepreneurship Reality Check*, 2025. 51 economies, >150,000 respondents. Chapter 7 and Table A7 read; country figures quoted from Table A7. GREEN
4. Goetz, Hyatt, Kroff, Sandusky & Stinson, *Business Owners and the Self-Employed: 33 Million (and Counting!)*, US Census Bureau CES-WP-25-60, 2025 (data year 2019). Read for context on the self-employed base; 36.4% of sole proprietors inactive or exited within a year. GREEN
5. CB Insights, *The Top 20 Reasons Startups Fail*, analysis of 101 founder post-mortems (undated; the original edition of a series CB Insights has since re-based). “Poor marketing” in 14%. The current edition (March 2026, 431 VC-backed shutdowns) no longer reports a marketing category. VC-backed sample. AMBER
6. Constant Contact, *Small Business Now* 2024, press release 23 Apr 2024. Survey by Ascend2, Feb 2024, n>1,300 SMB decision-makers (<250 employees), US/UK/AU/CA. AMBER
7. Constant Contact, *Small Business Now* Q2 2026, summary published 3 Aug 2026. n>5,000 owners and consumers, US/UK/CA/AU/NZ. AMBER
8. Mintz, O. & Lilien, G. L., “Should B2B start-ups invest in marketing?”, *Industrial Marketing Management*, 2024, doi 10.1016/j.indmarman.2024.01.003. Abstract read verbatim; body quotations via secondary coverage. GREEN (abstract)
9. Ehrenberg-Bass Institute for Marketing Science, “The 95:5 rule is the new 60:40 rule” (Weinberg & Lombardo, LinkedIn B2B Institute, with Prof. John Dawes), 2021. GREEN
10. LinkedIn, *About LinkedIn*, about.linkedin.com: “more than 1 billion members” (registered, not active). GREEN
11. van der Blom, R., *Algorithm InSights Report 2025* (Just Connecting HUB): 1.8M posts, 58K profiles, 31K company pages, twelve months to Feb 2025. Gated; figures as reported by Agorapulse, 3 Sep 2025. Not peer-reviewed. AMBER
12. Fiverr International Ltd., *Small Business Month Survey*, press release 8 May 2025. n≈6,000 owners and entrepreneurs, 25 countries, Jul 2024–Mar 2025; sample is active Fiverr users. AMBER
13. Brunswick Group, *Connected Leadership 2022*. Survey of 2,800 financial-publication readers and 3,600 employees of 1,000+-employee companies, seven markets. GREEN
14. Google, *Email sender guidelines*, Gmail Help (support.google.com/a/answer/81126), current as at Sep 2026. GREEN
15. Constant Contact, *Small Business Now* 2025, summary published 2 Sep 2025. n=2,500 SMB decision-makers, US/ANZ/CA/UK. AMBER
16. Orbit Media, *Blogging Statistics 2026: What 1,042 Content Marketers Told Us*, thirteenth annual survey. GREEN

17. Content Marketing Institute / MarketingProfs, *B2B Content Marketing Benchmarks, Budgets, and Trends: Outlook for 2025*. Fielded 25 Jun–16 Aug 2024; 980 B2B respondents. GREEN

Excluded. “Only ~1% of LinkedIn members post weekly” (every instance traces to aggregator sites citing 2019 session data with no primary document); “600 million entrepreneurs worldwide” (attributed to GEM; the GEM report contains no such figure); “80% of B2B social leads come from LinkedIn” (no traceable primary study); “four months to a year” for SEO (attributed to Google; no longer on Google’s page). Brunswick’s 2019 finding that one in four large-company CEOs had posted in the past year could not be opened at source this session and is not used.

Rowan Lemley is the founder and CEO of Groundworks AI and spent nearly two decades running B2B SaaS marketing before becoming, in his own description, a founder who wants to do marketing and does not have the time. This review may be quoted with attribution to *Groundworks AI Research, The Founder Marketing Gap (2026)* and a link to this page.