

Graf, Holger; Henning, Tobias

Working Paper

Research in regional networks of innovators: a comparative study of four East-German regions

Freiberger Arbeitspapiere, No. 2006/14

Provided in Cooperation with:

TU Bergakademie Freiberg, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration

Suggested Citation: Graf, Holger; Henning, Tobias (2006) : Research in regional networks of innovators: a comparative study of four East-German regions, Freiberger Arbeitspapiere, No. 2006/14, Technische Universität Bergakademie Freiberg, Fakultät für Wirtschaftswissenschaften, Freiberg

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/27114>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY BERGAKADEMIE FREIBERG
TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT BERGAKADEMIE FREIBERG

FACULTY OF ECONOMICS AND BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
FAKULTÄT FÜR WIRTSCHAFTSWISSENSCHAFTEN



Holger Graf
Tobias Henning

Public Research in Regional Networks
of Innovators: A Comparative Study of
Four East-German Regions

FREIBERG WORKING PAPERS
FREIBERGER ARBEITSPAPIERE

14
2006

The Faculty of Economics and Business Administration is an institution for teaching and research at the Technische Universität Bergakademie Freiberg (Saxony). For more detailed information about research and educational activities see our homepage in the World Wide Web (WWW): <http://www.wiwi.tu-freiberg.de/index.html>.

Addresses for correspondence:

Dr. Holger Graf
Friedrich-Schiller University
Economics Department
Carl-Zeiss-Str. 3, D-07743 Jena
Tel.: ++49 / 3641 / 943 204
E-mail: holger.graf@wiwi.uni-jena.de

Tobias Henning
Technische Universität Bergakademie Freiberg
Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
Lessingstr. 45, D-09596 Freiberg
E-mail: tobias.henning@tu-freiberg.de

An earlier version of this paper was published as working paper at the University of Jena (Jenaer Schriften zur Wirtschaftswissenschaft, No. 19/2006, <http://ideas.repec.org/p/jen/jenasw/2006-19.html>). Changes are not substantial but were made in an attempt to improve readability.

ISSN 0949-9970

The Freiberg Working Paper is a copyrighted publication. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, translating, or otherwise without prior permission of the publishers.

Coordinator: Prof. Dr. Michael Nippa

All rights reserved.

Contents

Abstract / Zusammenfassung	II
1. Introduction	1
2. The Regions: Dresden, Jena, Halle, and Rostock	2
2.1 Selection of Regions	2
2.2 Innovative Potential and Patent Output	3
3. Regional Innovator Networks and the Role of Research Institutions	5
3.1 Patent Data and Social Network Analysis	5
3.2 Patent Data from Research Institutions: Critical Remarks	7
3.3 Graphical Analysis	7
3.4 Comparative Network Structures	14
3.4.1 Static Analysis	14
3.4.2 Network Dynamics	19
4. Research Institutions as Distinguished Network Actors	22
5. Conclusion	28
References	30
Appendix: Actor Centrality	32

Abstract

Universities and public research organisations play a vital role not only in the generation of new technological knowledge, but also in its diffusion. We analyse four East German local networks of innovators which differ in structure and innovative performance and investigate the characteristic role of public research within these local systems of innovation by applying methods of social network analysis on patent data. Our results show that public research organisations are key actors in all regional networks of innovators both in terms of patent output and in terms of centrality of their position in the networks. Further we find the ‘thicker’ networks to have more central public research organisations.

JEL classification: O31, Z13, R11.

Keywords: Innovator networks, public research, R&D cooperation, mobility.

Zusammenfassung

*„Öffentliche Forschungseinrichtungen in regionalen Netzwerken von Innovatoren:
Ein Vergleich zwischen vier ostdeutschen Regionen“*

Hochschulen und öffentliche Forschungseinrichtungen spielen eine entscheidende Rolle sowohl bei der Produktion als auch der Diffusion von Wissen. Wir analysieren die Netzwerke von Innovatoren in vier ostdeutschen Regionen, die sich in ihrer Struktur und Innovationskraft unterscheiden, und untersuchen die besondere Rolle der öffentlichen Forschungseinrichtungen innerhalb dieser Netzwerke auf Basis von Patentdaten mit Hilfe der Methode der sozialen Netzwerkanalyse. Unsere Ergebnisse zeigen, dass öffentliche Forschungseinrichtungen in allen Netzwerken eine Schlüsselstellung einnehmen, sowohl bezüglich des Patentoutputs als auch bezüglich der Zentralität ihrer Position in den Netzwerken. Darüber hinaus zeigt sich, dass die öffentlichen Forschungseinrichtungen in den „dichter geknüpften“ Netzwerken zentraler positioniert sind.

JEL-Klassifikation: O31, Z13, R11.

Schlagworte: Netzwerke von Innovatoren, Öffentliche Forschungseinrichtungen, FuE-Kooperationen, Mobilität.

1. Introduction

We analyse local networks of patent innovators in four East German regions with special attention to the role of public research within these networks. The work is exploratory in nature and led by the general assumption that a region's innovative output is influenced by the quality and intensity of regional innovative networking, and this in turn is somehow influenced by the presence of public research in the region. In a first step we describe the structural differences *between* the four regional networks. We then demonstrate the constitutive role of public research *within* each of the local networks. Across our sample of four regional networks we find correspondence between the connectedness of the network, the importance of public research organisations within the network, and regional innovative output.

Adopting the system of innovation approach as a conceptual framework (Edquist, 1997), we view innovative activity as a collective process characterised by a transfer of knowledge between networked actors. Knowledge, especially if it is partly tacit, can only be transferred via personal relationships. Geographical proximity facilitates these face-to-face contacts. Therefore, regions are a reasonable level of analysis (Cooke, 1998). Innovative activity can then be modelled as a social network “boxed” in a region. Following Cantner and Graf (2006), we use relational patent data to build the networks. More precisely, we link patent innovators both by joint application and the mobility of inventors switching between them, and we interpret these links as knowledge flows. According to a distinction put forth by Breschi and Lissoni (2004), we analyse relationships based on co-patenting as well as on co-invention. However, patents are also used in the traditional way as an indicator of innovative output both to weight the network actors and to assess the innovative performance of the regions as a whole.

Among the network actors we are explicitly interested in public research organisations, i.e., universities and non-university publicly funded research institutes. One function public research is usually expected to serve within local innovation systems is to provide innovative input to the region: i) Generating and accumulating basic scientific knowledge, ii) collecting knowledge external to the region and integrating it into the regional knowledge stock, and iii) educating a highly skilled workforce to keep the region's private economy capable of performing high-level industrial R&D (Fritsch and Schwirten, 1999). However, university professors and even

more so researchers at public research organisations devoted to applied research have always been involved in direct cooperation with industry and have patented the results. Besides the creation of academic spin-offs, patenting is an important element of the emerging new entrepreneurial role of public research (Etzkowitz, 2003), encouraged by policy programs trying to enhance the impact of public research outcomes on national economic growth (Mowery and Sampat, 2005). Despite these recent developments, patents are one of the few accessible sources reporting standardised larger scale information about the knowledge flows between public research and private economy. As we will show in our analyses, public research patenting can in fact play a significant role in local innovation systems. Moreover public research organisation shape these networks and, since they still have different motives and incentives than private actors, may well serve specific and presumably essential functions within the process of collective invention.

The paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 introduces the four sample regions and compares their innovative performance using patent output data. Section 3 exposes the methodological approach, presents visualisations of the regional networks of innovators and comparatively analyses the networks' structures and characteristics. Section 4 elaborates the distinctive role of public research organisations as network actors. Section 5 concludes.

2. The Regions: Dresden, Jena, Halle, and Rostock

2.1 Selection of Regions

In our explorative study, we restrict the analysis to four East German regions: Dresden, Jena, Halle, and Rostock.¹ With the exception of Rostock all regions are of similar size with roughly one million inhabitants (table 1). Each region exhibits a research university and a number of public research organisations such as institutes of the Fraunhofer-Gesellschaft, the Leibniz Association, and the Max Planck Society. All regions have considerable tradition in manufacturing industries: electronics and mechanical engineering in Dresden, optics and precision mechanics in Jena, chemicals in Halle, shipbuilding and mechanical engineering in Rostock. Two types of regions can

¹ A comprehensive investigation of the role of public research in local innovator networks should include all 97 planning regions or at least those which meet the requirement of local public research organisations. Unfortunately, we have not been able to do the necessary data processing for all regions yet.

roughly be distinguished as Jena and Dresden on the one hand are often labelled as East-German boom regions that have successfully managed the economic transformation after German reunification, whereas Rostock and Halle on the other hand are said to lag behind. We will confirm this preconception by reporting pronounced regional differences in innovative performance and attempt to explain these differences as a consequence of the role of public research in the respective innovation systems.

The geographical boundaries of the regions are defined as German planning regions (“Raumordnungsregionen”). Designed to represent socio-economic entities, they normally comprise several districts (“Kreise”, i.e., German NUTS3 level units), namely a core city and its surrounding area. We consider planning regions to be more suitable than districts. Firstly, the core city districts seem to be too small because local innovation systems may well include some R&D capacities located somewhat beyond the boundaries of the core city. The second reason is methodological: Because patents are assigned to regions in accordance with the inventors’ residence, this larger regional unit allows accounting for commuting inventors who work in the city but live in the surroundings.

2.2 Innovative Potential and Patent Output

As a starting point and to provide a reference framework for the following investigation of the networks of innovators we present basic comparative data of the regions and their economic potential for patenting as well as of regional patent efficiency (table 1). The regional differences are small with respect to the share of private sector employees in total population (25% up to 28%) as well as to the average firm size (10.0 up to 11.5 employees per firm). But we observe striking differences regarding the share of private sector natural scientists and engineers. Halle displays only about 75% of the Dresden value, Rostock and Jena only about 62%. The absolute number of natural scientists and engineers employed is by far highest in Dresden.

Why do we stress this point? Most patents refer to technical solutions applicable in the fields of natural science and engineering. Performing research with a patentable output normally requires skilled experts in these fields. Yet the number of natural scientists and engineers employed is a reasonable proxy for the regional pool of

potential inventors.² In a similar way the scientific staff at universities in natural sciences and engineering disciplines may be interpreted as the pool of potential academic inventors. Again, Dresden shows the most distinctive orientation towards these fields most likely to generate academic patents. In absolute figures the number of natural scientists and engineers in Dresden employed by the university is twice as high as in Halle which ranks second. In all regions the pool of potential inventors at universities is of significant size compared to the respective private sector pool (between 16% in Halle and 23% in Rostock).

Table 1: Regional innovative potential and patent output (mean yearly values)

	Dresden	Jena	Halle	Rostock
Population (1994-2000)	1,035,486	794,471	893,614	438,643
Private sector (1994-2000 ^a)				
Firms ^b	26,976	20,059	19,775	10,923
Employees	291,791	201,167	226,668	111,401
Natural scientists and engineers ^c	12,052 (4.13%)	5,170 (2.57%)	6,990 (3.08%)	2,901 (2.60%)
Universities ^d (1994-2000)				
Total research and teaching staff	3,775	2,633	2,642	1,741
in natural sciences and engineering ^e	2,172 (58%)	918 (35%)	1,098 (42%)	656 (38%)
Professors	704	452	425	289
in natural sciences and engineering	454 (64%)	193 (43%)	185 (44%)	142 (49%)
Patents (1995-2001)				
per year	467.0	253.7	167.0	67.1
per 100,000 inhabitants	45.1	31.9	18.7	15.3
per 1,000 employees ^f	1.16	0.94	0.53	0.42
per 1,000 natural scientists and engineers ^f	32.0	38.1	21.0	17.3

^a Engineers and natural scientists in Dresden: 1996-2000.

^b Includes all firms with at least one employee.

^c Employees with tertiary education in natural science or engineering.

^d Includes research universities and technical colleges ("Fachhochschulen").

^e Includes three groups of scientific disciplines: natural sciences, agricultural and nutritional sciences, and engineering. Excludes medical sciences, cultural and social sciences, law and economics, and arts.

^f Total of private and public sector.

Source: German statistical office (population, university staff), establishment file of the German social insurance statistics (firms, employees), German patent office (patents).

Relating patent numbers to the numbers of potential inventors results in patent efficiency measures as reported in the last section of table 1. A substantial gap between the leading regions of Dresden and Jena on the one side and the lagging regions of Halle and Rostock on the other side can be observed. The three different measures of patent

² In fact the number of private sector natural scientists and engineers turns out to be highly significant in

efficiency can be read as a step-by-step approximation to the relevant input pool as reference for patent output. Patent density, defined as patents per capita, is highest in Dresden, followed by Jena, Halle, and Rostock. With an average yearly patent density of 45 patent applications per 100,000 inhabitants Dresden is ranked somewhere in the middle of all German planning regions (Greif and Schmiedl, 2002). The order between the regions is left unchanged, but with Jena closing the gap to Dresden and leaving Halle behind, if employees are used as a more appropriate measure of innovative potential. Finally, if we apply the number of natural scientists and engineers that we assume to best represent the pool of potential patent inventors Jena takes the lead from Dresden and the gap between the leading regions and Halle and Rostock widens.

This short inspection of the regions' innovative potential and performance revealed two main results: First, Dresden is the region with the largest potential to generate patents both in terms of the share of natural scientists and engineers and in terms of their absolute number. Second, natural scientists and engineers in Jena exhibit the highest patenting productivity though Jena's pool of potential inventors relative to all employees is not larger than in Rostock and is still smaller than in Halle in absolute figures. To explain these differences in patenting efficiency the theory of innovation systems suggests to investigate the relationships between the actors involved in regional innovative activity, especially, how easily they allow knowledge flows between the actors as the key prerequisite for generating higher innovative output. In the following section we construct networks of personal relationships between patent innovators which can be interpreted as channels of knowledge transfer. The characteristics of the networks as a whole, and the special role of public research organisations within them, will be presented and used to derive some possible explanations for the observed regional differences in innovative performance.

3. Regional Innovator Networks and the Role of Research Institutions

3.1 Patent Data and Social Network Analysis

There is a growing number of studies in which patent information is used to apply social network analysis in the economics of innovation. Most authors link the inventors of the patents directly (Balconi, Breschi and Lissoni, 2004; Fleming, King and Juda, 2004;

explaining regional patent output (Fritsch and Slavtchev, 2005).

Fleming, Colfer, Marin and McPhie, 2004) and some link the assignees (the innovators) via common inventors (Breschi and Lissoni, 2003; Singh, 2003, 2004; Cantner and Graf, 2006). We pursue the latter approach to map the regional networks of innovators and analyse patent applications at the German Patent Office which were disclosed from 1995 to 2001. The regional assignments of patents are based on the inventors' residence, i.e., we use all patent applications with at least one inventor residing in the respective region to build the networks.

On each patent application we find information about the applicant (innovator) and the persons involved in the process of development of the patent, the inventors. We assume two innovators to be related if at least one inventor has developed a patent for both innovators. In other words, a relation is established between innovators A and B if we find an inventor on a patent applied for by A and on a patent applied for by B. There are two possibilities of how this might occur:

- (1) The innovators are joint applicants of the same patent. In this case we assume a previous research *cooperation*.
- (2) The same inventor is named on two distinct patents applied for by different innovators. In this case we assume *mobility* of the inventor between the innovators.³

As these two cases are quite different from each other we analyse them separately throughout the paper and combine them to the network of personal relationships whenever it seems appropriate.

The sub-sample of public research includes the following organisations: research universities, technical colleges ("Fachhochschulen"), and non-university scientific institutes. The latter are in most cases members of one of the big German scientific institutions: the Max Planck Society, the Leibniz Association and the Fraunhofer-Gesellschaft. In addition we include a heterogeneous group of research organisations which are in many cases the successors of former socialist applied research institutes with close ties to industrial R&D. To enter the group of public research applicants an organisation had to rely at least partly on public funds to finance its regular budget.

³ Mobility, in this definition, includes also cases of inventors contracted by different innovators without actually being their employee, e.g., consulting inventors.

3.2 Patent Data from Research Institutions: Critical Remarks

Until 2002, the German patent law allowed university professors to patent for their own account and not under the name of their university. In private firms as well as in non-university public research organisations the intellectual property rights connected to employees' inventions have always been in possession of the employer. As our data refer to a period previous to 2002 the number of university patent applications is underestimated. In refining the database we made an effort to compensate this bias by checking each individual applicant with a professor's degree as part of his name, if he or she was enrolled at one of the regional universities within the inspected period. If this was confirmed the patent was added to the respective university's account.

The number of patent applications from public research is further underestimated because intellectual property rights are often traded against financial support. In university-industry cooperation projects, the private firm sponsors the research carried out in the university's lab but claims the exclusive right to patent the invention in exchange. In consequence there is not only an underestimation of public research patent activity. Even more important, a number of university-industry cooperations leading to patent output will not be identified as cooperative activity at all.

Another issue related to public research patenting is headquarter application: Like big private companies, universities frequently centralise their patenting activities. They appear as monolithic actors, but actually the inventions are made in the departments. Because of disciplinary boundaries it can not be assumed that there are steady knowledge flows between the departments. Therefore, if two actors both maintain patent relationships with the same university this does not ensure that information is transferred between these two actors through the university.

3.3 Graphical Analysis

Before we investigate the network visualisations, some basic comparative statistics of the four regions are given in table 2. The first observation is that the regions differ strongly in the level of overall patent activity. Dresden shows 3,269 applications during the 1995-2001 period or 467 applications per year. Jena ranks second with slightly more than half of the Dresden numbers, followed by Halle (36% of the Dresden value), and Rostock (14%). A second observation regards the differences in the importance of

public research. In Dresden and Jena public research organisations account for more than one quarter of all patent applications. In Halle and Rostock the shares of public research are about half as much. Compared to other German regions these figures are very high. According to Greif and Schmiedl (2002), in the period 1995-2000 only Berlin and Munich filed more patents from public research than Dresden, while Jena is ranked 6th. Among all 97 German planning regions Dresden and Jena show the highest share of public research in all patent applications. The high share of cooperations in Rostock is striking but probably due to the lack of corporate applicants and the accordingly high share of inventor applications. Cooperative research then leads to co-applications where in other regions the co-researchers are more likely to work for the same single employer applicant.

Table 2: Data description

	Dresden	Jena	Halle	Rostock
Patents				
Number	3,269	1,776	1,169	470
Co-applications	343	237	154	93
Share of co-applications	10.5%	13.3%	13.2%	19.8%
Patents by private applicants	2,552	1,378	1,050	438
Patents by public applicants ^a	874	527	148	67
Share of private patents	74.5%	72.3%	87.6%	86.7%
Share of public patents	25.5%	27.7%	12.4%	13.3%
Actors				
Applicants	1,132	679	538	350
Private	1,078	629	511	336
Public	54	50	27	14
Inventors	4,127	2,686	1,682	614

^a Private and public patents do not sum up to total number since they are double counted in cases of more than one assignee.

In the following, we shortly describe the specificities of each of the four networks as revealed by the networks' graphical representations. The visualisations of the regional networks of innovators (figure 1 to figure 4) show the networks of personal relationships – cooperation and scientist mobility combined – over the whole seven-year period 1995-2001. Each innovator is represented by a node, where public research institutions are represented by square-shaped nodes and private firms or individuals by circles. The size of a node is proportional to the number of patents filed by the respective actor. Edges between the nodes represent cooperative relationships by joint patent application (dark-grey) or relationships by scientist mobility through joint inventors (light-grey). If two assignees have both types of relationships edges are black.

The width of the edges is proportional to the number of relations between the respective actors. The position of nodes and the length of the edges are produced by multidimensional scaling with node repulsion and equal edge length bias as layout in NetDraw (Borgatti, Everett and Freeman, 2002). A direct interpretation is of course difficult but more central actors are generally positioned at the centre of the network. For the sake of readability those nodes without any links to other nodes (“isolates”) are omitted. Further, of the two biggest networks, Dresden and Jena, only the largest component is shown. A network component is defined as a subset of all network nodes in which there is a path between all pairs of nodes in the subset but no path to any node in other subsets (other components). For each region detailed information about the most active patentees and their ranking is given in tables 8 to 11 in the appendix.

The innovator network of *Dresden* (figure 1) can be characterised as bi-polar. It is dominated by two big public research organisations, the Fraunhofer-Gesellschaft and the Technical University (TU) Dresden, with highest ranks in terms of centrality and the number of patents filed. Koenig & Bauer, a printing press manufacturer, has filed even more patents but ranks only 15th in terms of centrality (see table 8). This company should be seen as a special case due to the fact that its products, huge printing machines for newspapers, often have the character of singular devices adapted to each customer’s special needs where each single step of adaptation seems to be patentable. As all patents generated by one of the eleven Fraunhofer institutes located in Dresden are filed centrally at the society’s headquarters in Munich, we can not distinguish between different institutes. Taken as a single entity these institutes appear as something like a second technical university (between whose departments we can not differentiate either) covering many fields of research especially in engineering disciplines.

The two central actors are strongly connected both by cooperative relationships and by scientists moving from one organisation to the other. Each pole is the central actor of a subnet mainly consisting of private firms. The Fraunhofer subnet seems to be more tightly interconnected and more cooperative than the TU Dresden subnet. Between the two subnets there are only few linkages. While there are some intermediates like the Rossendorf Research Institute (FZ Rossendorf) and the Institute for Solid State and Materials Research (IFW Dresden) most of the connections between the subnets stem from direct relations between the two big research organisations. Seven out of the ten most central patentees are public research organisations including the technical college

(HTW Dresden) in the TU Dresden subnet and the Institute for Air-conditioning and Refrigeration Engineering (ILK Dresden) with a more independent position (see table 8 in the appendix). The other three are Siemens, Infineon, and Bosch. The very strong connection between Siemens and Infineon is due to the fact that Infineon is a 1999 semiconductor spin-off of Siemens.




Figure 1: Main component of Dresden 1995-2001. Isolates and pendants removed, cooperations – dark-grey, scientist mobility – light-grey, both – black

Different from Dresden, the network of innovators in *Jena* (figure 2) is multi-polar. The most active patentee is a private firm, Carl Zeiss, which is a successor of the former ‘Kombinat’ VEB Carl Zeiss which dominated the economic structure of Jena during the socialist era in the GDR. Carl Zeiss also ranks high in terms of centrality but the most central actor of the network is the university (FSU Jena), followed by two public institutions of applied research, the Institute for Physical High Technology (IPHT) and the Fraunhofer-Gesellschaft. In contrast to Dresden private companies such as Carl

Zeiss, Jenoptik (another successor of the Kombinat), Jenapharm, and Schneider Laser are clearly visible actors and tightly connected within the network. The same holds for non-university research institutes like the Hermsdorf Institute for Technical Ceramics (HITK), the Thuringian Institute for Textile and Plastics Research (TITK), and the Hans-Knoell Institute. The linkages between all the central actors are dense and no separated subnets can be identified. The Picture supports the assumption that Jena's lead in terms of patent efficiency might be the result of intense knowledge flows within the region's network of innovators.




Figure 2: Main component of Jena 1995-2001. Isolates and pendants removed, cooperations – dark-grey, scientist mobility – light-grey, both – black

In *Halle* (figure 3), Buna Sow Leuna, with 142 patents and first rank in terms of centrality, is the dominating actor, followed by Martin-Luther University (MLU Halle-Wittenberg), the only research organisation of importance, and the former Leuna-Works (table 10). In 1995, Dow Chemical took over the former Buna-Works, whereas Leuna

was split up into several smaller firms, like KataLeuna, Chemtec Leuna, and RMH Polymers. Strong (light-grey) ties between Leuna and its successors indicate that former Leuna researchers often work for (or are the founders of) the smaller firms which developed from former Leuna departments. The third important location of chemical industry, Bitterfeld-Wolfen, has its own subnet, too. The main actor here is FEW Chemicals. The ties between the three locations are not prominent. The university is connected with Buna Sow Leuna, but does not have direct ties with the Leuna or the Bitterfeld complex. The Leuna-Works assign for patents only until 1996, the year when Buna Sow Leuna appears in the list for the first time




Figure 3: Network of Halle 1995-2001, isolates removed, cooperations – dark-grey, scientist mobility – light-grey, both – black

At large, the innovator network of Halle is more fragmented than those of Dresden or Jena, the actors forming the main component are organised in subcomponents connected only through a few bridging actors (“cutpoints”) which makes the network vulnerable to break-up.

In Rostock patent activity is dominated by the Rostock university as the centre of the main component. The university displays many cooperative (dark-grey) links to individual applicants which is partly in consequence of the data refinement procedure by which individual applications of professors were assigned to the university. Presumably these professors often set their staff as co-applicants resulting in cooperative links between the university and these staff members which are in fact intra-university relationships. But we cannot correct for this as it is nearly impossible to verify these persons as former university staff. Around the university a number of applicants are biotech firms indicating some progress towards the officially promoted new focus on biomedical sciences. Engineering disciplines close to industries traditionally located in the region like machinery and shipbuilding do not play a prominent role in the main component around the university but still live on in the smaller components. Compared to the three other regions, the innovator network in Rostock is very small in size and faces a severe lack of private firm R&D.




Figure 4: Network of Rostock 1995-2001, isolates removed, cooperations – dark-grey, scientist mobility – light-grey, both – black

3.4 Comparative Network Structures

3.4.1 Static Analysis

The network visualisations presented above show only the largest component of the networks of Dresden and Jena. General characteristics of the complete networks for the whole 1995-2001 period are given in table 3. Looking at the most comprehensive type of network, the network of personal relationships (pr), we find that the main component integrates between 25% (Rostock) and 37% (Jena) of all innovators. This order between the four regions is reversed when it comes to the share of isolated innovators, but the inter-regional variation is lower. Assuming that knowledge flows only occur between connected actors, in Jena more actors can participate in the sharing of common knowledge. The Jena network integrates the highest share of innovators into the largest component and at the same time leaves the lowest share isolated. Rostock, in contrast, is least able to exploit its networking potential in terms of the share of actors in the largest component. The absolute size of the largest component is of course highest in Dresden.

Table 3: Network Statistics (1995-2001)

	Dresden			Jena		
	pr	ko	sm	pr	ko	sm
Nodes	1,132	1,132	1,132	679	679	679
Number of components	544	790	698	303	457	388
Size of largest component	350	136	302	254	102	236
Share in largest component	30.9%	12.0%	26.7%	37.4%	15.0%	34.8%
Isolates	405	656	629	222	374	355
Share of isolates	35.8%	58.0%	55.6%	32.7%	55.1%	52.3%
Network centralisation	0.094	0.052	0.067	0.114	0.037	0.098
Density	0.004	0.003	0.002	0.010	0.006	0.004
Mean degree	5.083	3.081	2.002	6.483	3.935	2.548
Mean degree (binary)	2.231	0.820	1.429	2.695	0.919	1.817

	Halle			Rostock		
	pr	ko	sm	pr	ko	sm
Nodes	538	538	538	350	350	350
Number of components	248	386	309	180	231	241
Size of largest component	188	22	164	88	43	64
Share in largest component	34.9%	4.1%	30.5%	25.1%	12.3%	18.3%
Isolates	193	316	283	131	180	222
Share of isolates	35.9%	58.7%	52.6%	37.4%	51.4%	63.4%
Network centralisation	0.050	0.021	0.048	0.144	0.118	0.046
Density	0.011	0.006	0.005	0.014	0.010	0.005
Mean degree	6.093	3.230	2.862	5.034	3.434	1.600
Mean degree (binary)	3.022	0.803	2.230	2.200	1.006	1.194

To analyse the cohesiveness of a network, density is a widely used measure. If g is the size of the network as measured by the number of actors and $d(n_i)$ is the degree, i.e. the number of connections, of actor i , $i = 1, \dots, g$, then the density D of the network is defined as the number of all linkages divided by the number of possible linkages within the network $D = [\sum_{i=1}^g d(n_i)] / (g^2 - g)$. This measure is somewhat problematic in comparing networks of different sizes as the number of possible linkages increases geometrically while the actual number of linkages usually does not. Therefore, we also report the mean degree, i.e. the average number of ties, of the networks based on the actual number of connections and based on the dichotomised (binary) networks to account for the number of related actors. With a mean degree of 6.483, the actors in Jena are more interrelated than actors in the other regions. If we look at the number of linkages not accounting for the intensity (based on the binary network), we find the actors in Halle to be connected to more different actors than elsewhere. The distinction between the types of relations reveals that the high level of connectedness in Halle is mainly based on linkages through scientist mobility, which is probably rather due to the reorganisation processes mentioned above than to mobility in our – idealised – interpretation.


With respect to the centralisation of the networks⁴, we observe Rostock to come closest to the extreme of a “star”. As the university is the only larger actor, this result is not really surprising. It is followed by Jena with a clear core-periphery structure and Dresden, which is slightly more dispersed. The graphical impression of Halle corresponds well to the low centralisation in this network where the large actors are lined up like pearls on a string.

We analyse the size distribution of components in figure 5. A common feature of all networks is the existence of a single main component which is at least ten times larger than the second largest component with a maximum size of 12 innovators in Halle and no more than 10 in the other regions (figure 5). This is remarkable as we do not differentiate between technological fields. The tendency to connect to a giant component does not seem to be hindered by the boundaries of disciplines. In all regional networks we also observe a considerable 12 to 16% of paired actors. To qualify pairs of

⁴ The degree centrality of actor n_i is the number of its ties divided by the number of possible ties, $C_D(n_i) = d_i / (g - 1)$.

The network centralisation is then given by $C_D = [\sum_{i=1}^g (max(C_D(n_i)) - C_D(n_i))] / (g - 2)$.



innovators as networking entities is obviously difficult to justify. Sticking to the components with at least three connected actors reveals that in Dresden, Jena and Halle half of the patentees are embedded in one of these sub-networks. In Rostock the share is slightly lower.



Note: Numbers on bar segments indicate the number of components of respective size. Example: The network of Halle consists of 248 (1+1+20+33+193) components, 33 of which consist of two innovators.

Figure 5: Component Distribution – Network of personal relationships – Period 1995-2001

So far the network of personal relationships was under inspection. As it combines both relationships based on joint application of patents and relationships based on scientist mobility, we now disaggregate these relationships to investigate them separately in figure 6. In the network of personal relationships a number of actors are connected only through paths that are composed of both cooperative (dark-grey) and mobility (light-grey) links. These paths are broken up if we inspect exclusively cooperative, or mobility, relationships. By definition, this leads to smaller main components. But the extent to which the “combined” main component drops in size is dependent on the type of relationship. If innovators are linked only by scientist mobility



Component size (number of innovators): 1 2 3-10 11-20 >20

Note: Numbers on bar segments indicate the number of components of respective size.

Figure 6: Component Distribution – Network of cooperations and network of scientist mobility – Period 1995-2001

the largest components show up only slightly smaller. In Jena the main component still includes 93% of its original actors. Even in Rostock the main component is no less than 73% of its original size. If, on the other hand, only joint patent application (cooperation) is used to build the networks the main components drop sharply in size and comprise about half the original actors in Rostock and around 40% in Jena and Dresden. In Halle, the main component is only a 12% fraction of the combined main component. With 22 versus 12 patentees the difference between the largest and the second largest component has nearly disappeared so that in the case of the network of cooperative relationships in Halle, it is hard to speak of a main component at all.

It turns out that scientist mobility is more powerful in connecting innovators than joint patenting. This is because the mobility type of relationship is more open and less formal: The innovators do not have to cooperate. They do not even need to know each other. It is only the inventor moving from one employer (or, more general, applicant) to another that constitutes the link between the innovators. In contrast to cooperative patenting reciprocity is not necessary. Instead, scientist mobility can even constitute a link between applicants of patents filed at opposite ends of the time period under inspection. Nevertheless those mobility relationships can still be a channel of knowledge transfer.

It is not only the main component that makes the difference between the two types of networks. The networks of cooperation are generally more scattered than the networks of scientist mobility. The share of isolated actors is slightly higher (exception: Rostock), and especially the share of pairs of innovators is about three times higher than in the networks of mobility (15-17% compared to 5-6%). In many cases, two actors just decide to file one or more joint patent(s), but do not have patent cooperations with other actors within the period under inspection. On the other hand, if assignees are connected through joint inventors, it is less probable that the resulting component consists of only two assignees (because each inventor who switches to any other employer will add his new employer to the component if he gets involved in patenting with his new employer). In consequence, the fraction of innovators in network components with at least three actors is generally higher in the networks linked by scientist mobility than in the networks linked by cooperative ties.

3.4.2 Network Dynamics

In general, the structure of the types of networks we analyse is highly dependent on the assumptions about the longevity of personal relations. In choosing a period from 1995 to 2001, we implicitly assume that after seven years of having worked together, there are still connections between inventors. To check for the robustness of our results, we therefore also analyse shorter time spans of three years. In dividing the sample period into three overlapping sub-periods of equal length, 1995-1997, 1997-1999, and 1999-2001 we can also inspect network dynamics. In the following we restrict ourselves to the combined network of personal relationships (table 4 and figure 7).

Table 4: Network statistics – Network of personal relations – Sub-periods


	Dresden			Jena		
	1995-97	1997-99	1999-2001	1995-97	1997-99	1999-2001
Nodes	527	535	613	281	367	398
Number of components	312	323	355	161	212	203
Size of largest component	79	95	138	60	79	122
Share in largest component	15.0%	17.8%	22.5%	21.4%	21.5%	30.7%
Isolates	234	245	276	122	161	156
Share of isolates	44.4%	45.8%	45.0%	43.4%	43.9%	39.2%
Network centralisation	0.070	0.060	0.081	0.056	0.073	0.101
Density	0.007	0.006	0.006	0.014	0.012	0.013
Mean degree	3.556	3.110	3.667	4.000	4.431	5.171
Mean degree (binary)	1.423	1.196	1.409	1.495	1.520	1.965

	Halle			Rostock		
	1995-97	1997-99	1999-2001	1995-97	1997-99	1999-2001
Nodes	238	273	300	137	152	211
Number of components	130	160	181	81	88	116
Size of largest component	24	41	27	29	27	34
Share in largest component	10.1%	15.0%	9.0%	21.2%	17.8%	16.1%
Isolates	98	125	137	63	61	83
Share of isolates	41.2%	45.8%	45.7%	46.0%	40.1%	39.3%
Network centralisation	0.065	0.039	0.053	0.160	0.126	0.122
Density	0.020	0.014	0.014	0.030	0.022	0.020
Mean degree	4.681	3.780	4.253	4.117	3.382	4.246
Mean degree (binary)	1.714	1.546	2.167	1.620	1.289	1.716

First of all, the regional networks show an increase in size, as the number of nodes in later periods is always higher than in the preceding period. Whereas in Jena and Halle growth was higher between the first and the second period, Dresden and Rostock grew faster between the second and third period. Looking at the development over three periods, Rostock, starting at the smallest network size of 137 assignees in the first

period, made the greatest step forward with a 54% growth in the number of patentees between the first and the third period. Jena, although starting at a size twice as big as Rostock, still realized a growth in the number of assignees of 42% which is also the greatest absolute increase (+117). Halle started with a size not much smaller than Jena but grew only by 26%. In Dresden the number of patentees grew only by 16%. Even if one accounts for the fact that Dresden has by far the largest pool of innovators, which leads to lower relative growth given the same absolute increase compared to regions with smaller-sized networks, the dynamic is still significantly lower than in the Jena region.

The growing number of assignees can be seen as a growing networking potential. To assess in how far the regions actually use their potential we have to look at the links between the network actors. The development of the largest component over time gives some hint about how network connectivity changes from period to period. In Jena the share of the largest component in all network actors does not change between the second and the first period despite of significant growth in the number of patentees. However, in the last period the share of the largest component in all actors rises impressively from 22% to 31% (a rise of 54%). In Dresden the share of the largest component rises continuously but only up to a level of 23%. Both Jena and Dresden manage to increase integration into the main component despite a simultaneously growing number of actors. In Halle and Rostock the main component of the third period does not integrate as many actors as in the first period. In Halle, despite a relatively slow growing number of actors, the share of the largest component drops from 10% to 9%. Besides this development, the absolute figures in Halle are of special interest. If we look at the whole period, there is almost no difference between Halle and Jena with respect to this measure. After splitting the period, we find the largest component in Halle to be broken up which documents the fragility of this network mentioned above. In Rostock, a fast growing number of patentees can not fully be integrated into the main component at the same time. This leads to a decrease in the share of main component from 21% in the first to 16% in the third period.



Note: Numbers on bar segments indicate the number of components of respective size.

Figure 7: Component distribution – Network of personal relationships – Sub-periods

If we compare the first and the last period, we observe an increasing centralisation in Dresden and Jena, while the networks in Halle and Rostock become less dominated by few main actors. The mean degree increases significantly only in Jena (from 4.0 to 5.2) and remains almost constant in Dresden and Rostock while it decreases in Halle. If we only count the related actors but not the intensity of the link, we find an increasing mean degree in all regions except for Dresden.

To summarise our descriptive results, we can state that all four networks have grown but the structural differences between regions are evident: i) only in Dresden and Jena an increasing share of actors is integrated in the largest component, ii) the average number of linkages is only increasing in Jena, iii) Dresden and Jena become more centralised while Halle and Rostock become more dispersed, iv) Dresden and Jena are especially dominated by public research. Dresden is a bi-polar network especially dominated by public research, in Jena a group of core actors is well-balanced between public research and private firms, in Halle there are large firms dominating and in Rostock there is a rather central university and a mixture of individuals and smaller patenting firms. It seems as if there is a relationship between the prevalence of valuable public research and the connectedness of local innovator networks.

4. Research Institutions as Distinguished Network Actors

To assess this relationship in greater depth, we now turn to the specific role of public research. To assess the importance of public research for local innovation activity based on patent data one fundamental point has to be stressed in the beginning. As said in section 2 patents are granted for new solutions to technical problems. To produce patentable knowledge a scientific discipline has to be in principle applicable and technical in nature. Therefore large university faculties like social sciences, cultural studies, and arts, though potentially of considerable importance for a region's economic success by providing organisational know-how and creativity (Florida, 2002), are not within the scope of this investigation. The same holds for research institutes explicitly designed to perform basic research, namely the Max-Planck institutes: Despite being well-funded and staffed they hardly show up in the networks of innovators based on patent information. In contrast, the Fraunhofer institutes, with their mission of applied research and the need to partly finance themselves through contract research for private firms, are important patentees. Furthermore, even if we stick to the fields of research

where patent output is to be expected networks built from patent relations still reflect just a fraction of the interaction actually going on between public research and private firms. Aside from measurement problems already discussed in section 3 this is because a wide variety of informal contacts as well as contract research activities just do not lead to (and are not aimed at) patent output.

The above-mentioned points hold for purely private relationships, too, but to a lesser extent: As they are forced to survive in the market private firms perform generally more applied research and have higher incentives to protect results from R&D by patents. Consequently, when interpreting the role of public research within networks of patent innovators one should keep in mind that their importance is systematically underestimated both in terms of the absolute amount of knowledge transfer and relative to exclusively private relationships.

For a first picture of the public research landscape, we provide information about the funding of local universities and technical colleges in table 5. To compare their orientation towards natural sciences and engineering we report absolute figures as well as the respective shares of these fields of study. Further, we distinguish external funding with respect to the source, where funding from firms is an indicator of market oriented research and the motivation to cooperate with actors outside academia. Funding from the federal government and the DFG (National Science Foundation in Germany) can serve as an indicator of the quality of academic research.

In general, the technical colleges have much smaller budgets and rely less on external funding than the co-located universities. The higher share of the budget devoted to natural sciences and engineering indicates their rather technical orientation. We also observe an overall high share of natural sciences and engineering in the acquisition of external funding. If we analyse the sources of external funding more deeply, we find the technical colleges to rely more on funding from private firms compared to the universities which receive most of the external funding from the state and the DFG. All these figures show that the role of the technical colleges is different from the universities in the sense that research in universities is more oriented towards fundamental insights, whereas technical colleges are more application oriented.

Table 5: External funding and patenting of research universities and technical colleges (TC) in the four regions (1,000 EUR; 1994-2000 mean yearly values)

	TU Dresden (University)	HTW Dresden (TC)	FSU Jena (University)	FH Jena (TC)	MLU Halle (University)	FH Merseburg (TC)	Uni Rostock (University)
Total budget funds	542,717	34,953	424,095	28,426	421,659	23,382	321,905
<i>Share of natural sciences and engineering¹</i>	80%	57%	79%	24%	72%	30%	75%
External research funds	61,343	1,983	24,505	431	23,363	979	16,155
<i>Share of natural sciences and engineering</i>	88%	91%	80%	62%	79%	81%	85%
<i>Share of external research funds in total budget</i>	11%	6%	6%	2%	6%	4%	5%
Funds from federal government and federal states	26,998	589	7,367	94	8,290	291	6,871
<i>Share in total external research funds²</i>	44%	30%	30%	22%	35%	30%	43%
Funds from German Science Foundation (DFG)	13,778	80	8,978	50	8,954	110	4,757
<i>Share in total external research funds</i>	22%	4%	37%	12%	38%	11%	29%
Funds from private firms	13,518	1,142	4,640	150	3,344	523	2,961
<i>Share in total external research funds</i>	22%	58%	19%	35%	14%	53%	18%
Funds from other external sources ³	7,048	172	3,520	137	2,774	54	1,565
<i>Share in total external research funds</i>	11%	9%	14%	32%	12%	6%	10%
Patent applications (1995-2001)	231	18	115	3	47	5	45
<i>Share in regional patenting</i>	7.1%	0.6%	6.5%	0.2%	4.0%	0.4%	9.6%
Co-applications	27	8	30	3	10	3	30
<i>Share in all patent applications</i>	11.7%	44.4%	26.1%	100.0%	21.3%	60.0%	66.7%

¹ Includes three groups of scientific disciplines: natural sciences, agricultural and nutritional sciences, and engineering. Excludes medical sciences, cultural and social sciences, law and economics, and arts.

² External research funds from different sources are not reported separately for disciplines.

³ Includes funds from international organisations (EU, OECD, etc.), foundations, municipalities, the national labour office, and other public organisations.

Source: German federal statistical office.

This orientation towards applied research also shows up in the co-applications of patents. Obviously, the high shares of firm funding in technical colleges compared to universities correspond to higher shares of co-applied patents. Overall, universities patent more frequently than the technical colleges and play a major role in regional patenting as documented by a share between 4% in Halle and 9.6% in Rostock. While these figures give us a hint about the importance of public research in regional innovation systems, we are now interested in the more specific role in the transmission of knowledge, i.e. their integration in the local network of innovators.

We already introduced the measure of centralisation in section 3. This property of a whole network is an aggregation of individual measures of centrality which can be calculated in different ways. We now look at the individual measures and restrict ourselves to the centrality based on degree and on betweenness. By counting the direct links between a node and its neighbours, the degree-based centrality measure provides us with an idea of how connected an actor is. The betweenness measure tells us how important an actor is for knowledge flows between other, different actors and therefore for the connectivity of the network as a whole. Technically, high betweenness centrality means that an actor lies on many shortest paths between pairs of other actors in the network.⁵ In the appendix, we report rankings based on both centrality measures of the most active patent applicants in the four regions for the networks of cooperation, scientist mobility and its aggregate – personal relationships. In the second column of each table (8 to 11), we indicate whether an actor is a public research organisation or not. From a glance at these tables it becomes apparent that Dresden and Jena are dominated by public research⁶, while in Halle and Rostock this is not so clear.

For a first systematic approach to the differences between public and private actors in terms of centrality, we calculate averages for each type in table 6. It becomes rather clear that in all regions and for all types of networks the public actors are more central than the private ones according to degree as well as betweenness centrality.

⁵ Let g_{jk} be the number of shortest paths between actor j and k , and $g_{jk}(n_i)$ the number of these paths that contain actor i . The *betweenness centrality* of actor i is then given as $C_B(n_i) = \sum_{j < k} g_{jk}(n_i) / g_{jk}$, for $i \neq j, k$.

⁶ Within the top ten central actors there appear only three (Dresden) and two (Jena) private actors respectively.

Table 6: Centrality of public and private actors – mean comparison

		Degree		Betweenness ^a	
		Private	Public	Private	Public
Network of personal relations	Dresden	4.2	22.2	89.2	3,389.3
	Jena	4.8	27.3	96.6	1,485.0
	Halle	5.8	12.6	146.0	1,279.9
	Rostock	4.5	18.1	22.5	527.6
Network of cooperations	Dresden	2.5	15.2	3.5	656.3
	Jena	2.8	17.7	6.9	355.5
	Halle	3.0	7.1	1.0	21.1
	Rostock	3.0	14.2	0.1	118.3
Network of scientist mobility	Dresden	1.8	7.0	114.3	2,406.8
	Jena	2.0	9.6	108.3	1,219.3
	Halle	2.7	5.5	131.1	705.2
	Rostock	1.5	3.9	25.7	198.6

^a dichotomised networks

Of course, centrality is not independent of the size of the innovators. Larger actors should have more cooperations and more linkages through mobility. Public research institutes are in general larger than the average innovator, which might lead to our observation of a higher centrality of public research. To control for this effect, we perform a simple OLS regression with the degree centrality as the dependent variable in table 7. The independent variables are a dummy variable for public institutions (Public) and a proxy for size. Since we cannot observe size directly, we approximate size by the number of patents filed by each innovator (Patents). In all regressions, the number of patents has a significant explanatory power for centrality. In Dresden and Jena the positions of public research are also significantly more central than those of private actors. In Halle this only holds for the overall network of personal relations and the sub-network of cooperation while in the subnet of scientist mobility the coefficients of the Public dummy are positive but not significant at a level of 5%. In Rostock public actors are more central than their private counterparts in all networks, too, but again, the differences are not significant at 5%.

Why are public research organisations still more central network actors even if size differences have been taken into account? First, what really matters may be not size but the diversity and variety of research conducted, which makes them a promising knowledge source for a great number of private firms specialised in very different business areas. This holds especially for the big research universities that are by definition ‘universal’. Second, public research organisations might be more willing to cooperate and share their knowledge. This would be in line with Dasgupta and David’s

Table 7: OLS-Regression - Dependent variable: Degree centrality

	Network of personal relations				Network of cooperation				Network of scientist mobility			
	Dresden	Jena	Halle	Rostock	Dresden	Jena	Halle	Rostock	Dresden	Jena	Halle	Rostock
C	5.883 (0.000)	4.513 (0.000)	8.626 (0.000)	0.234 (0.804)	3.194 (0.000)	2.872 (0.000)	4.511 (0.000)	-1.459 (0.088)	2.689 (0.000)	1.640 (0.000)	4.115 (0.000)	1.693 (0.000)
Public	22.544 (0.000)	27.769 (0.000)	9.323 (0.006)	7.786 (0.065)	16.266 (0.000)	20.337 (0.000)	5.794 (0.010)	6.006 (0.114)	6.277 (0.000)	7.432 (0.000)	3.529 (0.079)	1.780 (0.319)
Patents	0.976 (0.000)	2.078 (0.000)	1.201 (0.000)	5.393 (0.000)	0.667 (0.000)	1.135 (0.000)	0.645 (0.000)	4.580 (0.000)	0.309 (0.000)	0.943 (0.000)	0.557 (0.000)	0.813 (0.000)
R2	0.381	0.624	0.227	0.523	0.322	0.468	0.161	0.491	0.289	0.656	0.147	0.125
adj. R2	0.380	0.623	0.224	0.520	0.321	0.466	0.158	0.488	0.288	0.655	0.144	0.120
Obs.	1,132	679	538	350	1,132	679	538	350	1,132	679	538	350

P-values in parentheses.

(1994) concept of ‘open science’ where disclosure and diffusion of research results is seen as the original mission and fundamental norm of public research. This again holds first of all for universities. Third, and less idealistic, it may just be the need for financial capital that forces public research institutions to seek for contract research partners. This is most apparent for non-university public research institutes, e.g., the institutes of the Fraunhofer-Gesellschaft, which are only partly supported by public funds. Patent cooperations can then be seen as aiming at joint marketing of new knowledge. Public research organisations act as substitutes for private research service providers and the observed patent relations are just tracing their business relationships.

5. Conclusion

This work is an exploratory study with the goal to analyse differences between regional innovation systems by applying social network analysis methods based on patent data. Our first impressions of the networks and its actors led our research towards investigating the role of public research. It became clear that two regions, Dresden and Jena, perform quite well with respect to innovative efficiency. The innovator networks in these two regions differ from the other two networks, Halle and Rostock, as they integrate a larger share of the innovating actors. They have also been able to increase this share over time and their networks show growing centralisation. At the same time public research organisations seem to be especially prominent within these networks.

We then further investigated the role of public research as distinguished network actors to understand their special importance. The results strengthen two points i) universities and public research institutions are significantly more central, i.e., more interconnected within innovator networks than private actors, ii) there are differences between regions with respect to the centrality of public research. While in Dresden and Jena the institutions of public research seem to fulfil their function quite well, public research in Halle and Rostock seems less integrated.

Our research provides exemplary evidence that public research organisations which are well-connected within the local network of innovators are crucial for regional innovative performance. It is only through cooperating and interacting that their genuine occupation with generating new knowledge and collecting external knowledge becomes fruitful for the region. While the education of skilled labour is most important for the

long-term increase in regional absorptive capacity, patent relations are much more a reflection of what is actually at the frontier of applied research. Well-connected public research actors within networks of patent innovators provide direct input of relevant knowledge for the regional economy.

References

- Balconi, Margherita, Stefano Breschi and Francesco Lissoni (2004), Networks of inventors and the role of academia: An exploration of Italian patent data, *Research Policy*, 33, 127-145.
- Borgatti, Stephen, M. Everett and L. Freeman (2002), Ucinet for Windows: Software for Social Network Analysis, Analytic Technologies, Harvard.
- Breschi, Stefano and Francesco Lissoni (2003), Mobility and Social Networks: Localised Knowledge Spillovers Revisited, CESPRI Working Paper, No. 142, Milan: Centro di Ricerca sui Processi di Innovazione e Internazionalizzazione (CESPRI).
- Breschi, Stefano and Francesco Lissoni (2004), Knowledge Networks from Patent Data: Methodological Issues and Research Targets, CESPRI Working Paper, No. 150, Milan: Centro di Ricerca sui Processi di Innovazione e Internazionalizzazione (CESPRI).
- Cantner, Uwe and Holger Graf (2006), The Network of Innovators in Jena: An Application of Social Network Analysis, *Research Policy*, 35 (4): 463-480.
- Cooke, Philip (1998) Introduction: Origins of the concept, in Hans-Joachim Braczyk, Philip Cooke and Martin Heidenreich (eds.), *Regional Innovation Systems: The Role of Governances in a Globalized World*, 2-25, London: UCL Press.
- Dasgupta, Partha and Paul A. David (1994), Toward a new economics of science, *Research Policy*, 23 (5), 487-521.
- Edquist, Charles (1997), Systems of innovation approaches – their emergence and characteristics, in Charles Edquist (ed.), *Systems of Innovation: Technologies, Institutions and Organisations*, 1-35, London: Pinter.
- Etzkowitz, Henry (2003), Research groups as quasi-firms: The invention of the entrepreneurial university, *Research Policy*, 32 (1), 109-121.
- Fleming, Lee, Lyra Colfer, Alexandra Marin and Jonathan McPhie (2004), Why the Valley Went First: Agglomeration and Emergence in Regional Inventor Networks. Forthcoming in John Padgett and Walter Powell (eds.), *Market Emergence and Transformation*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Fleming Lee, Charles King III and Adam Juda (2004), SmallWorlds and Innovation, Harvard Business School, mimeo.
- Florida, Richard (2002), Bohemia and economic geography, *Journal of Economic Geography*, 2 (1), 55-71.

- Fritsch, Michael and Christian Schwirten (1999), Enterprise-university co-operation and the role of public research institutions in regional innovation systems, *Industry and Innovation*, 6 (1), 69-83.
- Fritsch, Michael and Viktor Slavtchev (2005), The role of regional knowledge sources for innovation, Freiberg Working Papers 2005-15, Technical University Bergakademie Freiberg.
- Greif, Siegfried and Dieter Schmiedl (2002), *Patentatlas Deutschland. Ausgabe 2002. Dynamik und Strukturen der Erfindungstätigkeit*, München: Deutsches Patent- und Markenamt.
- Mowery, David C. and Bhaven N. Sampat (2005), The Bayh-Dole act of 1980 and university-industry technology transfer: A model for other OECD governments? *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 30 (1-2), 115-127.
- Singh, Jasjit (2003), Social Networks as Drivers of Knowledge Diffusion, Harvard University, mimeo.
- Singh Jasjit (2004), Collaboration Networks as Determinants of Knowledge Diffusion Patterns, Harvard University, mimeo.

Appendix: Actor Centrality

Table 8: Centrality ranks within 25 most active patentees in Dresden

			Personal Relations		Cooperations		Scientist Mobility		Mean rank (sort)
	Patents	Public	C_D	C_B	C_D	C_B	C_D	C_B	
TU Dresden	231	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1.3
Fraunhofer	278	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1.7
IFW Institut fuer Festkoer- per- und Werkstoffforschung Dresden	68	1	4	3	4	3	5	3	3.7
Siemens AG	65	0	3	4	11	9	3	4	5.7
Forschungszentrum (FZ) Rossendorf	50	1	7	6	6	6	4	5	5.7
ILK Institut fuer Luft- und Kaeltetechnik gGmbH	98	1	6	9	5	5	5	9	6.5
HTW Dresden	18	1	5	5	3	4	14	13	7.3
Institut fuer Polymerfor- schung Dresden e.V.	27	1	8	8	7	8	9	11	8.5
Infineon AG	98	0	10	7	12	12	7	6	9.0
Robert Bosch GmbH	42	0	9	12	12	12	7	8	10.0
Feinchemie GmbH	16	0	10	11	7	10	12	10	10.0
Saechsisches Textilfor- schungsinstitut e.V.	21	0	13	10	18	12	10	7	11.7
VTD Vakuumtechnik Dres- den GmbH	15	0	12	19	7	7	12	16	12.2
Koenig & Bauer AG	427	0	15	13	18	12	15	12	14.2
von Ardenne Anlagentechnik GmbH	36	0	15	16	12	12	15	15	14.2
BASF AG	28	0	13	15	18	12	10	17	14.2
Case Harvesting Systems GmbH	21	0	19	14	18	12	17	13	15.5
Meyer, Dirk	19	0	17	20	7	11	21	20	16.0
WHD Prueftechnik GmbH	18	0	17	20	12	12	17	19	16.2
Fortschritt Erntemaschinen GmbH	19	0	19	17	18	12	17	18	16.8
Huels Silicone GmbH	58	0	21	17	12	12	21	20	17.2
ABB Patent GmbH	41	0	21	20	18	12	20	20	18.5
VEAG Vereinigte Energie- werke AG	21	0	23	20	12	12	25	20	18.7
Arzneimittelwerk Dresden GmbH	35	0	23	20	18	12	21	20	19.0
VEM-Elektroantriebe GmbH	19	0	23	20	18	12	21	20	19.0

Table 9: Centrality ranks within 26 most active patentees in Jena

	Patents	Public	Personal Relations		Cooperations		Scientist Mobility		Mean rank (sort)
			C_D	C_B	C_D	C_B	C_D	C_B	
FSU Jena	115	1	1	1	4	5	1	1	2.2
IPHT Institut fuer Physikalische Hochtechnologie e.V.	72	1	2	3	3	3	4	4	3.2
Fraunhofer	79	1	3	5	2	1	5	5	3.5
Carl Zeiss Jena GmbH	222	0	4	4	5	4	3	3	3.8
JENOPTIK	107	0	6	2	7	7	2	2	4.3
Hans-Knoell-Institut	50	1	5	6	1	2	7	8	4.8
HITK Hermsdorfer Institut fuer Technische Keramik e.V.	26	1	7	7	6	6	6	6	6.3
TITK Thuer. Institut f. Textil- und Kunststoff-Forschung e.V.	63	1	8	8	8	8	10	11	8.8
Institut fuer molekulare Biotechnologie	11	1	9	9	9	11	8	9	9.2
TRIDELTA GmbH	9	0	10	11	14	11	9	7	10.3
SCHNEIDER Laser Technologies AG	39	0	10	15	9	9	10	13	11.0
Jenapharm GmbH	54	0	12	13	19	11	12	12	13.2
Aesculap Meditec GmbH	17	0	17	10	14	11	18	10	13.3
GESO GmbH	10	0	14	12	9	10	16	20	13.5
Max-Planck	9	1	13	16	14	11	13	16	13.8
Leica Microsystems GmbH	14	0	14	18	9	11	14	18	14.0
Siemens AG	17	0	16	14	19	11	14	17	15.2
Schott Glas AG	13	0	19	20	9	11	19	14	15.3
Textilforschungsinstitut Thueringen-Vogtland e.V.	14	1	19	17	14	11	19	19	16.5
Jenaer Glaswerk GmbH	9	0	21	19	19	11	19	15	17.3
inocermic GmbH	10	0	17	21	19	11	17	21	17.7
Plasttechnik Greiz GmbH	22	0	24	22	14	11	24	22	19.5
Agfa-Gevaert AG	11	0	22	22	19	11	22	22	19.7
Altenburger Industriemaschinen GmbH	10	0	23	22	19	11	23	22	20.0
Ahlers, Horst	19	0	25	22	19	11	24	22	20.5
Geraer Maschinenbau GmbH	9	0	25	22	19	11	24	22	20.5

Table 10: Centrality ranks within 29 most active patentees in Halle

	Patents	Public	Personal Relations		Cooperations		Scientist Mobility		Mean rank (sort)
			C_D	C_B	C_D	C_B	C_D	C_B	
Buna Sow Leuna GmbH	142	0	2	1	2	3	4	1	2.2
MLU Halle-Wittenberg	47	1	2	3	3	2	2	3	2.5
Leuna-Werke GmbH	37	0	1	2	6	6	1	2	3.0
Chemtec Leuna GmbH	14	0	7	6	4	4	6	6	5.5
FEW Chemicals GmbH	22	0	8	4	4	7	9	4	6.0
Haack, Eberhard	11	0	4	11	1	1	7	16	6.7
SynTec GmbH	9	0	8	5	11	10	7	5	7.7
Inofex GmbH	8	0	5	17	8	10	4	12	9.3
Deutsche Waggonbau AG Berlin	21	0	10	12	6	8	10	13	9.8
OvGU Magdeburg	10	1	14	9	8	5	16	9	10.2
KataLeuna GmbH	12	0	12	8	11	10	13	8	10.3
Maschinenfabrik Dornhan GmbH	9	0	5	17	19	10	2	11	10.7
Paraffinwerk Webau GmbH	36	0	12	7	19	10	10	7	10.8
Schweisstechnische Lehr- und Versuchsanstalt Halle GmbH	10	0	14	13	11	10	13	14	12.5
Rothe, Lutz	30	0	11	17	11	10	10	17	12.7
Krupp VDM GmbH	22	0	17	9	19	10	16	9	13.3
BASF AG	8	0	14	14	19	10	13	15	14.2
Air Liquide GmbH	11	0	17	15	8	9	19	18	14.3
Siemens AG	11	0	20	16	11	10	20	18	15.8
Slowik, Guenter	10	0	20	17	11	10	20	18	16.0
Kohlmann, Juergen	8	0	20	17	11	10	20	18	16.0
RMH Polymers	12	0	17	17	19	10	16	18	16.2
TU Dresden	9	1	23	17	11	10	26	18	17.5
Max-Planck	14	1	23	17	19	10	20	18	17.8
Romonta GmbH	10	0	23	17	19	10	20	18	17.8
ZEMAG GmbH	8	0	23	17	19	10	20	18	17.8
KSB AG	10	0	27	17	19	10	26	18	19.5
Deutsche Telekom AG	8	0	27	17	19	10	26	18	19.5
Omros GmbH	8	0	27	17	19	10	26	18	19.5

Table 11: Centrality ranks within 22 most active patentees in Rostock

	Patents	Public	Personal Relations		Cooperations		Scientist mobility		Mean rank (sort)
			C_D	C_B	C_D	C_B	C_D	C_B	
Uni Rostock	45	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1.2
Privates Institut BioServ GmbH	8	0	2	3	6	5	1	4	3.5
BASF AG	6	0	6	2	6	5	5	2	4.3
Degussa-Huels AG	5	0	3	5	9	5	2	5	4.8
Institut fuer Organische Katalyseforschung an der Uni Rostock	10	1	4	6	4	4	4	9	5.2
Aventis GmbH & Co KG	10	0	8	4	9	5	5	3	5.7
Geier, Helrath	5	0	5	9	2	3	8	8	5.8
Energie-Umwelt-Beratung e.V.	14	0	6	7	6	5	5	7	6.0
BIOTRONIK GmbH & Co.	6	0	10	11	9	5	8	6	8.2
MaschinenBau und Umwelttechnik GmbH	5	0	10	8	9	5	8	10	8.3
Dudszus, Alfred	7	0	9	10	4	5	11	12	8.5
Stolz, Holger	7	0	10	11	3	2	16	13	9.2
GfE GmbH	6	0	13	11	9	5	11	11	10.0
Ingenieurtechnik und Maschinenbau GmbH	11	0	13	11	9	5	11	13	10.3
Gregor, Manfred Alexander	7	0	15	11	9	5	14	13	11.2
Anemometerbau GmbH	5	0	15	11	9	5	14	13	11.2
Noell-KRC GmbH	8	0	17	11	9	5	16	13	11.8
Dieselmotorenwerk Vulkan GmbH	7	0	17	11	9	5	16	13	11.8
Schnell, Ludwig	6	0	17	11	9	5	16	13	11.8
Buechler, Dirk	5	0	17	11	9	5	16	13	11.8
Kordelle, Rainer	5	0	17	11	9	5	16	13	11.8
Rossmann, Ulrich	4	0	17	11	9	5	16	13	11.8

**List of Working Papers of the Faculty of Economics and Business Administration,
Technische Universität Bergakademie Freiberg.**

2000

- 00/1 Michael Nippa, Kerstin Petzold, Ökonomische Erklärungs- und Gestaltungsbeiträge des Realoptionen-Ansatzes, Januar.
- 00/2 Dieter Jacob, Aktuelle baubetriebliche Themen – Sommer 1999, Januar.
- 00/3 Egon P. Franck, Gegen die Mythen der Hochschulreformdiskussion – Wie Selektionsorientierung, Nonprofit-Verfassungen und klassische Professorenbeschäftigungsverhältnisse im amerikanischen Hochschulwesen zusammenpassen, erscheint in: *Zeitschrift für Betriebswirtschaft (ZfB)*, 70. (2000).
- 00/4 Jan Körnert, Unternehmensgeschichtliche Aspekte der Krisen des Bankhauses Barings 1890 und 1995, in: *Zeitschrift für Unternehmensgeschichte*, München, 45 (2000), 205 – 224.
- 00/5 Egon P. Franck, Jens Christian Müller, Die Fußball-Aktie: Zwischen strukturellen Problemen und First-Mover-Vorteilen, *Die Bank*, Heft 3/2000, 152 – 157.
- 00/6 Obeng Mireku, Culture and the South African Constitution: An Overview, Februar.
- 00/7 Gerhard Ring, Stephan Oliver Pfaff, CombiCar: Rechtliche Voraussetzungen und rechtliche Ausgestaltung eines entsprechenden Angebots für private und gewerbliche Nutzer, Februar.
- 00/8 Michael Nippa, Kerstin Petzold, Jamina Bartusch, Neugestaltung von Entgeltsystemen, Besondere Fragestellungen von Unternehmen in den Neuen Bundesländern – Ein Beitrag für die Praxis, Februar.
- 00/9 Dieter Welz, Non-Disclosure and Wrongful Birth , Avenues of Liability in Medical Malpractice Law, März.
- 00/10 Jan Körnert, Karl Lohmann, Zinsstrukturbasierte Margenkalkulation, Anwendungen in der Marktzinsmethode und bei der Analyse von Investitionsprojekten, März.
- 00/11 Michael Fritsch, Christian Schwirten, R&D cooperation between public research institutions - magnitude, motives and spatial dimension, in: Ludwig Schätzl und Javier Revilla Diez (eds.), *Technological Change and Regional Development in Europe*, Heidelberg/New York 2002: Physica, 199 – 210.
- 00/12 Diana Grosse, Eine Diskussion der Mitbestimmungsgesetze unter den Aspekten der Effizienz und der Gerechtigkeit, März.
- 00/13 Michael Fritsch, Interregional differences in R&D activities – an empirical investigation, in: *European Planning Studies*, 8 (2000), 409 – 427.
- 00/14 Egon Franck, Christian Opitz, Anreizsysteme für Professoren in den USA und in Deutschland – Konsequenzen für Reputationsbewirtschaftung, Talentallokation und die Aussagekraft akademischer Signale, in: *Zeitschrift Führung + Organisation (zfo)*, 69 (2000), 234 – 240.
- 00/15 Egon Franck, Torsten Pudack, Die Ökonomie der Zertifizierung von Managemententscheidungen durch Unternehmensberatungen, April.
- 00/16 Carola Jungwirth, Inkompatible, aber dennoch verzahnte Märkte: Lichtblicke im angespannten Verhältnis von Organisationswissenschaft und Praxis, Mai.
- 00/17 Horst Brezinski, Der Stand der wirtschaftlichen Transformation zehn Jahre nach der Wende, in: Georg Brunner (Hrsg.), *Politische und ökonomische Transformation in Osteuropa*, 3. Aufl., Berlin 2000, 153 – 180.
- 00/18 Jan Körnert, Die Maximalbelastungstheorie Stützels als Beitrag zur einzelwirtschaftlichen Analyse von Dominoeffekten im Bankensystem, in: Eberhart Ketzler, Stefan Prigge u. Hartmut Schmidt (Hrsg.), *Wolfgang Stützel – Moderne Konzepte für Finanzmärkte, Beschäftigung und Wirtschaftsverfassung*, Verlag J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen 2001, 81 – 103.
- 00/19 Cornelia Wolf, Probleme unterschiedlicher Organisationskulturen in organisationalen Subsystemen als mögliche Ursache des Konflikts zwischen Ingenieuren und Marketingexperten, Juli.
- 00/20 Egon Franck, Christian Opitz, Internet-Start-ups – Ein neuer Wettbewerber unter den „Filteranlagen“ für Humankapital, erscheint in: *Zeitschrift für Betriebswirtschaft (ZfB)*, 70 (2001).

- 00/21 Egon Franck, Jens Christian Müller, Zur Fernsehvermarktung von Sportligen: Ökonomische Überlegungen am Beispiel der Fußball-Bundesliga, erscheint in: Arnold Hermanns und Florian Riedmüller (Hrsg.), *Management-Handbuch Sportmarketing*, München 2001.
- 00/22 Michael Nippa, Kerstin Petzold, Gestaltungsansätze zur Optimierung der Mitarbeiter-Bindung in der IT-Industrie - eine differenzierende betriebswirtschaftliche Betrachtung -, September.
- 00/23 Egon Franck, Antje Musil, Qualitätsmanagement für ärztliche Dienstleistungen – Vom Fremd- zum Selbstmonitoring, September.
- 00/24 David B. Audretsch, Michael Fritsch, Growth Regimes over Time and Space, *Regional Studies*, 36 (2002), 113 – 124.
- 00/25 Michael Fritsch, Grit Franke, Innovation, Regional Knowledge Spillovers and R&D Cooperation, *Research Policy*, 33 (2004), 245-255.
- 00/26 Dieter Slaby, Kalkulation von Verrechnungspreisen und Betriebsmittelmieten für mobile Technik als Grundlage innerbetrieblicher Leistungs- und Kostenrechnung im Bergbau und in der Bauindustrie, Oktober.
- 00/27 Egon Franck, Warum gibt es Stars? – Drei Erklärungsansätze und ihre Anwendung auf verschiedene Segmente des Unterhaltungsmarktes, *Wirtschaftsdienst – Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftspolitik*, 81 (2001), 59 – 64.
- 00/28 Dieter Jacob, Christop Winter, Aktuelle baubetriebliche Themen – Winter 1999/2000, Oktober.
- 00/29 Michael Nippa, Stefan Dirlich, Global Markets for Resources and Energy – The 1999 Perspective - , Oktober.
- 00/30 Birgit Plewka, Management mobiler Gerätetechnik im Bergbau: Gestaltung von Zeitfondsgliederung und Ableitung von Kennziffern der Auslastung und Verfügbarkeit, Oktober.
- 00/31 Michael Nippa, Jan Hachenberger, Ein informationsökonomisch fundierter Überblick über den Einfluss des Internets auf den Schutz Intellektuellen Eigentums, Oktober.
- 00/32 Egon Franck, The Other Side of the League Organization – Efficiency-Aspects of Basic Organizational Structures in American Pro Team Sports, Oktober.
- 00/33 Jan Körnert, Cornelia Wolf, Branding on the Internet, Umbrella-Brand and Multiple-Brand Strategies of Internet Banks in Britain and Germany, erschienen in Deutsch: *Die Bank*, o. Jg. (2000), 744 – 747.
- 00/34 Andreas Knabe, Karl Lohmann, Ursula Walther, Kryptographie – ein Beispiel für die Anwendung mathematischer Grundlagenforschung in den Wirtschaftswissenschaften, November.
- 00/35 Gunther Wobser, Internetbasierte Kooperation bei der Produktentwicklung, Dezember.
- 00/36 Margit Enke, Anja Geigenmüller, Aktuelle Tendenzen in der Werbung, Dezember.

2001

- 01/1 Michael Nippa, Strategic Decision Making: Nothing Else Than Mere Decision Making? Januar.
- 01/2 Michael Fritsch, Measuring the Quality of Regional Innovation Systems – A Knowledge Production Function Approach, *International Regional Science Review*, 25 (2002), 86-101.
- 01/3 Bruno Schönfelder, Two Lectures on the Legacy of Hayek and the Economics of Transition, Januar.
- 01/4 Michael Fritsch, R&D-Cooperation and the Efficiency of Regional Innovation Activities, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 28 (2004), 829-846.
- 01/5 Jana Eberlein, Ursula Walther, Änderungen der Ausschüttungspolitik von Aktiengesellschaften im Lichte der Unternehmenssteuerreform, *Betriebswirtschaftliche Forschung und Praxis*, 53 (2001), 464 - 475.
- 01/6 Egon Franck, Christian Opitz, Karriereverläufe von Topmanagern in den USA, Frankreich und Deutschland – Elitenbildung und die Filterleistung von Hochschulsystemen, *Schmalenbachs Zeitschrift für betriebswirtschaftliche Forschung (zfbf)*, (2002).
- 01/7 Margit Enke, Anja Geigenmüller, Entwicklungstendenzen deutscher Unternehmensberatungen, März.

- 01/8 Jan Körnert, The Barings Crises of 1890 and 1995: Causes, Courses, Consequences and the Danger of Domino Effects, *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions & Money*, 13 (2003), 187 – 209.
- 01/9 Michael Nippa, David Finegold, Deriving Economic Policies Using the High-Technology Ecosystems Approach: A Study of the Biotech Sector in the United States and Germany, April.
- 01/10 Michael Nippa, Kerstin Petzold, Functions and roles of management consulting firms – an integrative theoretical framework, April.
- 01/11 Horst Brezinski, Zum Zusammenhang zwischen Transformation und Einkommensverteilung, Mai.
- 01/12 Michael Fritsch, Reinhold Grotz, Udo Brixy, Michael Niese, Anne Otto, Gründungen in Deutschland: Datenquellen, Niveau und räumlich-sektorale Struktur, in: Jürgen Schmude und Robert Leiner (Hrsg.), *Unternehmensgründungen - Interdisziplinäre Beiträge zum Entrepreneurship Research*, Heidelberg 2002: Physica, 1 – 31.
- 01/13 Jan Körnert, Oliver Gaschler, Die Bankenkrise in Nordeuropa zu Beginn der 1990er Jahre - Eine Sequenz aus Deregulierung, Krise und Staatseingriff in Norwegen, Schweden und Finnland, *Kredit und Kapital*, 35 (2002), 280 – 314.
- 01/14 Bruno Schönfelder, The Underworld Revisited: Looting in Transition Countries, Juli.
- 01/15 Gert Ziener, Die Erdölwirtschaft Russlands: Gegenwärtiger Zustand und Zukunftsaussichten, September.
- 01/16 Margit Enke, Michael J. Schäfer, Die Bedeutung der Determinante Zeit in Kaufentscheidungsprozessen, September.
- 01/17 Horst Brezinski, 10 Years of German Unification – Success or Failure? September.
- 01/18 Diana Grosse, Stand und Entwicklungschancen des Innovationspotentials in Sachsen in 2000/2001, September.
- 2002**
- 02/1 Jan Körnert, Cornelia Wolf, Das Ombudsmannverfahren des Bundesverbandes deutscher Banken im Lichte von Kundenzufriedenheit und Kundenbindung, in: *Bank und Markt*, 31 (2002), Heft 6, 19 – 22.
- 02/2 Michael Nippa, The Economic Reality of the New Economy – A Fairytale by Illusionists and Opportunists, Januar.
- 02/3 Michael B. Hinner, Tessa Rülke, Intercultural Communication in Business Ventures Illustrated by Two Case Studies, Januar.
- 02/4 Michael Fritsch, Does R&D-Cooperation Behavior Differ between Regions? *Industry and Innovation*, 10 (2003), 25-39.
- 02/5 Michael Fritsch, How and Why does the Efficiency of Regional Innovation Systems Differ? in: Johannes Bröcker, Dirk Dohse and Rüdiger Soltwedel (eds.), *Innovation Clusters and Interregional Competition*, Berlin 2003: Springer, 79-96.
- 02/6 Horst Brezinski, Peter Seidelmann, Unternehmen und regionale Entwicklung im ostdeutschen Transformationsprozess: Erkenntnisse aus einer Fallstudie, März.
- 02/7 Diana Grosse, Ansätze zur Lösung von Arbeitskonflikten – das philosophisch und psychologisch fundierte Konzept von Mary Parker Follett, Juni.
- 02/8 Ursula Walther, Das Äquivalenzprinzip der Finanzmathematik, Juli.
- 02/9 Bastian Heinecke, Involvement of Small and Medium Sized Enterprises in the Private Realisation of Public Buildings, Juli.
- 02/10 Fabiana Rossaro, Der Kreditwucher in Italien – Eine ökonomische Analyse der rechtlichen Handhabung, September.
- 02/11 Michael Fritsch, Oliver Falck, New Firm Formation by Industry over Space and Time: A Multi-Level Analysis, Oktober.

- 02/12 Ursula Walther, Strategische Asset Allokation aus Sicht des privaten Kapitalanlegers, September.
- 02/13 Michael B. Hinner, Communication Science: An Integral Part of Business and Business Studies? Dezember.

2003

- 03/1 Bruno Schönfelder, Death or Survival. Post Communist Bankruptcy Law in Action. A Survey, Januar.
- 03/2 Christine Pieper, Kai Handel, Auf der Suche nach der nationalen Innovationskultur Deutschlands – die Etablierung der Verfahrenstechnik in der BRD/DDR seit 1950, März.
- 03/3 Michael Fritsch, Do Regional Systems of Innovation Matter? in: Kurt Huebner (ed.): *The New Economy in Transatlantic Perspective - Spaces of Innovation*, Abingdon 2005: Routledge, 187-203.
- 03/4 Michael Fritsch, Zum Zusammenhang zwischen Gründungen und Wirtschaftsentwicklung, in Michael Fritsch und Reinhold Grotz (Hrsg.), *Empirische Analysen des Gründungsgeschehens in Deutschland*, Heidelberg 2004: Physica 199-211.
- 03/5 Tessa Rülke, Erfolg auf dem amerikanischen Markt
- 03/6 Michael Fritsch, Von der innovationsorientierten Regionalförderung zur regionalisierten Innovationspolitik, in: Michael Fritsch (Hrsg.): *Marktdynamik und Innovation – Zum Gedenken an Hans-Jürgen Ewers*, Berlin 2004: Duncker & Humblot, 105-127.
- 03/7 Isabel Opitz, Michael B. Hinner (Editor), Good Internal Communication Increases Productivity, Juli.
- 03/8 Margit Enke, Martin Reimann, Kulturell bedingtes Investorenverhalten – Ausgewählte Probleme des Kommunikations- und Informationsprozesses der Investor Relations, September.
- 03/9 Dieter Jacob, Christoph Winter, Constanze Stuhr, PPP bei Schulbauten – Leitfaden Wirtschaftlichkeitsvergleich, Oktober.
- 03/10 Ulrike Pohl, Das Studium Generale an der Technischen Universität Bergakademie Freiberg im Vergleich zu Hochschulen anderer Bundesländer (Niedersachsen, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern) – Ergebnisse einer vergleichenden Studie, November.

2004

- 04/1 Michael Fritsch, Pamela Mueller, The Effects of New Firm Formation on Regional Development over Time, *Regional Studies*, 38 (2004), 961-975.
- 04/2 Michael B. Hinner, Mirjam Dreisörner, Antje Felich, Manja Otto, Business and Intercultural Communication Issues – Three Contributions to Various Aspects of Business Communication, Januar.
- 04/3 Michael Fritsch, Andreas Stephan, Measuring Performance Heterogeneity within Groups – A Two-Dimensional Approach, Januar.
- 04/4 Michael Fritsch, Udo Brixy, Oliver Falck, The Effect of Industry, Region and Time on New Business Survival – A Multi-Dimensional Analysis, Januar.
- 04/5 Michael Fritsch, Antje Weyh, How Large are the Direct Employment Effects of New Businesses? – An Empirical Investigation, März.
- 04/6 Michael Fritsch, Pamela Mueller, Regional Growth Regimes Revisited – The Case of West Germany, in: Michael Dowling, Jürgen Schmude and Dodo von Knyphausen-Aufsess (eds.): *Advances in Interdisciplinary European Entrepreneurship Research Vol. II*, Münster 2005: LIT, 251-273.
- 04/7 Dieter Jacob, Constanze Stuhr, Aktuelle baubetriebliche Themen – 2002/2003, Mai.
- 04/8 Michael Fritsch, Technologietransfer durch Unternehmensgründungen – Was man tun und realistischerweise erwarten kann, in: Michael Fritsch and Knut Koschatzky (eds.): *Den Wandel gestalten – Perspektiven des Technologietransfers im deutschen Innovationssystem*, Stuttgart 2005: Fraunhofer IRB Verlag, 21-33.

- 04/9 Michael Fritsch, Entrepreneurship, Entry and Performance of New Businesses – Compared in two Growth Regimes: East and West Germany, in: *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 14 (2004), 525-542.
- 04/10 Michael Fritsch, Pamela Mueller, Antje Weyh, Direct and Indirect Effects of New Business Formation on Regional Employment, Juli.
- 04/11 Jan Körnert, Fabiana Rossaro, Der Eigenkapitalbeitrag in der Marktzinsmethode, in: *Bank-Archiv* (ÖBA), Springer-Verlag, Berlin u. a., ISSN 1015-1516. Jg. 53 (2005), Heft 4, 269-275.
- 04/12 Michael Fritsch, Andreas Stephan, The Distribution and Heterogeneity of Technical Efficiency within Industries – An Empirical Assessment, August.
- 04/13 Michael Fritsch, Andreas Stephan, What Causes Cross-industry Differences of Technical Efficiency? – An Empirical Investigation, November.
- 04/14 Petra Rünger, Ursula Walther, Die Behandlung der operationellen Risiken nach Basel II - ein Anreiz zur Verbesserung des Risikomanagements? Dezember.

2005

- 05/1 Michael Fritsch, Pamela Mueller, The Persistence of Regional New Business Formation-Activity over Time – Assessing the Potential of Policy Promotion Programs, Januar.
- 05/2 Dieter Jacob, Tilo Uhlig, Constanze Stuhr, Bewertung der Immobilien von Akutkrankenhäusern der Regelversorgung unter Beachtung des neuen DRG-orientierten Vergütungssystems für stationäre Leistungen, Januar.
- 05/3 Alexander Eickelpasch, Michael Fritsch, Contests for Cooperation – A New Approach in German Innovation Policy, April.
- 05/4 Fabiana Rossaro, Jan Körnert, Bernd Nolte, Entwicklung und Perspektiven der Genossenschaftsbanken Italiens, in: *Bank-Archiv* (ÖBA), Springer-Verlag, Berlin u. a., ISSN 1015-1516, Jg. 53 (2005), Heft 7, 466-472.
- 05/5 Pamela Mueller, Entrepreneurship in the Region: Breeding Ground for Nascent Entrepreneurs? Mai.
- 05/6 Margit Enke, Larissa Greschuchna, Aufbau von Vertrauen in Dienstleistungsinteraktionen durch Instrumente der Kommunikationspolitik – dargestellt am Beispiel der Beratung kleiner und mittlerer Unternehmen, Mai.
- 05/7 Bruno Schönfelder, The Puzzling Underuse of Arbitration in Post-Communism – A Law and Economics Analysis. Juni.
- 05/8 Andreas Knabe, Ursula Walther, Zur Unterscheidung von Eigenkapital und Fremdkapital – Überlegungen zu alternativen Klassifikationsansätzen der Außenfinanzierung, Juli.
- 05/9 Andreas Ehrhardt, Michael Nippa, Far better than nothing at all - Towards a contingency-based evaluation of management consulting services, Juli
- 05/10 Loet Leydesdorff, Michael Fritsch, Measuring the Knowledge Base of Regional Innovation Systems in Germany in terms of a Triple Helix Dynamics, Juli.
- 05/11 Margit Enke, Steffi Poznanski, Kundenintegration bei Finanzdienstleistungen, Juli.
- 05/12 Olga Minuk, Fabiana Rossaro, Ursula Walther, Zur Reform der Einlagensicherung in Weißrussland - Kritische Analyse und Vergleich mit dem Deutschen Einlagensicherungssystem, August.
- 05/13 Brit Arnold, Larissa Greschuchna, Hochschulen als Dienstleistungsmarken – Besonderheiten beim Aufbau einer Markenidentität, August.
- 05/14 Bruno Schönfelder, The Impact of the War 1991 – 1995 on the Croatian Economy – A Contribution to the Analysis of War Economies, August.
- 05/15 Michael Fritsch, Viktor Slavtchev, The Role of Regional Knowledge Sources for Innovation – An Empirical Assessment, August.
- 05/16 Pamela Mueller, Exploiting Entrepreneurial Opportunities: The Impact of Entrepreneurship on Economic Growth, August.

- 05/17 Pamela Mueller, Exploring the Knowledge Filter: How Entrepreneurship and University-Industry Relations Drive Economic Growth, September.
- 05/18 Marc Rodt, Klaus Schäfer, Absicherung von Strompreisisrisiken mit Futures: Theorie und Empirie, September.
- 05/19 Klaus Schäfer, Johannes Pohn-Weidinger, Exposures and Exposure Hedging in Exchange Rate Risk Management, September.
- 2006**
- 06/1 Michael Nippa, Jens Grigoleit, Corporate Governance ohne Vertrauen? Ökonomische Konsequenzen der Agency-Theorie, Januar.
- 06/2 Tobias Henning, Pamela Mueller, Michael Niese, Das Gründungsgeschehen in Dresden, Rostock und Karlsruhe: Eine Betrachtung des regionalen Gründungspotenzials, Januar.
- 06/3 Dorothea Schäfer, Dirk Schilder, Informed Capital in a Hostile Environment – The Case of Relational Investors in Germany, Januar.
- 06/4 Oleg Badunenko, Michael Fritsch, Andreas Stephan, Allocative Efficiency Measurement Revisited – Do We Really Need Input Prices? Januar.
- 06/5 Diana Grosse, Robert Ullmann, Enrico Weyh, Die Führung innovativer Teams unter Berücksichtigung rechtlicher und psychologischer Aspekte, März.
- 06/6 Silvia Rogler, Vergleichbarkeit von Gesamt- und Umsatzkostenverfahren – Auswirkungen auf die Jahresabschlussanalyse, März.
- 06/7 Michael Fritsch, Dirk Schilder, Does Venture Capital Investment Really Require Spatial Proximity? An Empirical Investigation, März.
- 06/8 Michael Fritsch, Viktor Slavtchev, Measuring the Efficiency of Regional Innovation Systems – An Empirical Assessment, März.
- 06/9 Michael Fritsch, Dirk Schilder, Is Venture Capital a Regional Business? The Role of Syndication, Mai.
- 06/10 Carsten Felden, Heiko Bock, André Gräning, Lana Molotowa, Jan Saat, Rebecca Schäfer, Bernhard Schneider, Jenny Steinborn, Jochen Voecks, Christopher Woerle, Evaluation von Algorithmen zur Textklassifikation, Mai.
- 06/11 Michael Fritsch, Michael Stützer, Die Geografie der Kreativen Klasse in Deutschland, Juni.
- 06/12 Dirk Schilder, Public Venture Capital in Germany – Task Force or Forced Task?, Juni.
- 06/13 Michael Fritsch, Pamela Müller, The Effect of New Business Formation on Regional Development over Time: The Case of Germany, Juli.