

Mueller, Pamela

Working Paper

Exploiting entrepreneurial opportunities: the impact of entrepreneurship on economic growth

Freiberger Arbeitspapiere, No. 2005/16

Provided in Cooperation with:

TU Bergakademie Freiberg, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration

Suggested Citation: Mueller, Pamela (2005) : Exploiting entrepreneurial opportunities: the impact of entrepreneurship on economic growth, Freiberger Arbeitspapiere, No. 2005/16, Technische Universität Bergakademie Freiberg, Fakultät für Wirtschaftswissenschaften, Freiberg

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/27104>

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



Pamela Mueller

Exploiting Entrepreneurial Opportunities: The Impact of Entrepreneurship on Economic Growth

FREIBERG WORKING PAPERS
FREIBERGER ARBEITSPAPIERE

16
2005

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>.

Address for correspondence:

Dipl.-Volkswirtin Pamela Mueller
Technische Universität Bergakademie Freiberg
Fakultät für Wirtschaftswissenschaften
Lessingstraße 45, 09596 Freiberg (Germany)
Phone: ++49 / 3731 / 39 36 76
Fax: ++49 / 3731 / 39 36 90
Max-Planck-Institute für Ökonomik
Kahlaische Str. 10, 07745 Jena
E-mail: pmueller@econ.mpg.de

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 Fritsch

All rights reserved.

Contents

Abstract / Zusammenfassung	II
1. Introduction	1
2. Knowledge, Entrepreneurial Opportunities and their Impact on Economic Growth	2
3. Data and Methodology	5
4 Entrepreneurial Opportunities and Economic Growth.....	8
5 Discussion and Possible Policy Implications	10
References	13

Abstract

Knowledge is recognized as an important ingredient for economic growth in addition to physical capital and labor. While transforming knowledge into products and processes it is exploited commercially. Nevertheless, the existing knowledge stock and the absorptive capacity of actors like employees at firms and researchers at universities and research institutions are conditional for the ability to produce, identify, and exploit knowledge. Since incumbent firms do not exploit new knowledge to the full extent, realized entrepreneurial opportunities may arise. This paper tests the hypothesis whether or not entrepreneurship is an important vehicle for knowledge flows and economic growth. The empirical results indicate that an increase in innovative start-up activity is more effective than an increase in general entrepreneurship for economic growth.

JEL Classification: M13, O18, O31

Keywords: Regional growth, knowledge, entrepreneurship.

Zusammenfassung

“Realisieren von Gründungsmöglichkeiten: Der Einfluss von Unternehmensgründungen auf wirtschaftliches Wachstum”

Wissen wird neben Arbeit und Kapital als wichtige Determinante für wirtschaftliches Wachstum angesehen. Wissen wird kommerzialisiert, indem es in Produkte und Produktionsprozesse einfließt. Der Bestand an Wissen und die absorptive Kapazität von Beschäftigten und Wissenschaftlern in Forschungseinrichtungen sind unerlässlich für die Generierung, Identifikation und Verwertung von Wissen. Gründungsmöglichkeiten entstehen unter anderem dadurch, dass bestehende Unternehmen nicht das gesamte neugenerierte Wissen nutzen und verwerten. Ziel dieses Aufsatzes ist es zu testen, ob Unternehmensgründungen ein relevantes Instrument für den Wissenstransfer und wirtschaftliches Wachstum sind. Die empirischen Ergebnisse zeigen, dass insbesondere ein Anstieg von Gründungen in innovativen Branchen einen positiven Einfluss auf das regionale Wirtschaftswachstum hat.

JEL-Klassifikation: M13, O18, O31

Schlagworte: Regionales Wirtschaftswachstum, Wissen, Unternehmensgründungen.

1. Introduction

Entrepreneurial opportunities exist and individuals just need to recognize them. If they have the willpower and decide to exploit an existing opportunity, this will lead to economic growth. Stop – is it really that easy? There are at least two arguments which indicate that the relationship between opportunities, entrepreneurship, and economic growth is more complicated. First, opportunities do not fall from heaven like manna – they need to be created. Second, an individual needs to make the decision about whether or not to exploit the opportunity. Demographic and psychological characteristics are a powerful influence on the individual's decision to start a business (see Parker, 2004 and Davidsson, 2006 for an overview of the literature). The process of generating opportunities involves individuals, firms, universities, and other research institutions. Their research and development activities not only create new knowledge, they are also the precondition for the ability to identify, absorb, and exploit knowledge (Cohen and Levinthal, 1989). This knowledge may have also been generated by other actors in the same or different industry. Entrepreneurial opportunities particularly arise if existing organizations do not capitalize knowledge to the full extent. Therefore, firms engaged in R&D activities that do not exploit their generated knowledge to the full extent may serve as seedbed for new ventures (Agarwal et al., 2004; Franco and Filson, 2000; Klepper and Sleeper, 2005).

This paper analyzes the relationship between the exploitation of entrepreneurial opportunities, namely start-up activity, and regional economic growth. In particular, this paper explores if those regions that increased their new firm formation activity also experienced an increase in GDP. The results of Mueller (2006b) and Audretsch, Keilbach and Lehmann (2006) indicate that regional variations in economic performance, measured in GDP or labor productivity, can be explained by differences in the regional start-up activity. Assuming that entrepreneurship challenges and displaces less innovative incumbents, especially an increase in entrepreneurial activity may lead to a higher degree of economic growth (see also

Schumpeter, 1911; Baumol et al. 1988; Fritsch and Mueller, 2004; Audretsch, Keilbach and Lehmann, 2006).

New ventures are presumed to be a mechanism for knowledge diffusion and knowledge exploitation (see also Acs et al., 2005; Acs and Plummer, 2005; Plummer, 2005). New firms, founded to capitalize knowledge, may amplify innovation by introducing new products and processes to the market (Audretsch, 1995). However, the origin of opportunities is also driven by the presence of R&D intensive incumbent firms. The greater the presence of knowledge- and technology-intensive incumbent firms the more entrepreneurial opportunities may arise and be exploited. Certainly, regional economic growth is only partly stimulated by entrepreneurship but mainly determined by research and development activities in existing firms, investments in physical capital stocks, and human capital. Knowledge generated through R&D activities of existing firms represents the knowledge stock for firms in this particular region. Consequently, regions with firms that are less engaged in research and development activities are expected to experience lower growth rates.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the theoretical framework and links the exploitation of entrepreneurial opportunities to economic growth. The methodology and database is described in section 3. It is empirically tested if the development of start-ups is a mechanism to facilitate knowledge spillover and thus stimulate growth in economic output (section 4). Section 5 provides a summary and a conclusion.

2. Knowledge, Entrepreneurial Opportunities and Their Impact on Economic Growth

With the new growth theory, knowledge is recognized as an essential driver of economic growth. Knowledge may increase productivity by stimulating technological progress. Romer (1986) and Lucas (1988) explained economic growth through the accumulation and spillover of technological knowledge. New knowledge may lead to innovations and is capitalized by

transforming it into new products, processes, and organizations. Private businesses, universities, and other research institutions generate new knowledge through research and development. The created knowledge may be exploited by the knowledge-producer or by other organizations; therefore, knowledge flows are crucial. These other organizations may be other existing firms in the same industry, related or different industries or disciplines, or individuals who decide to leave their current employer to start their own venture. In order to identify, assimilate, and exploit externally created knowledge research and development activities are also necessary (Cohen and Levinthal, 1989, 1990; Zucker et al., 1998).

Nevertheless, knowledge spillovers are spatially bounded (Jaffe et al., 1993; Anselin et al., 1997, 2000; Audretsch and Feldman, 1996; Audretsch and Lehmann, 2005; Audretsch et al., 2004). Knowledge depends on a strong regional component, taking advantage of spatial proximity to research facilities, universities, and industry specific agglomerations. Analyzing patent citations, Jaffe et al. (1993) found that knowledge spillovers from academic research to private industries have a strong regional component (see also Arundel and Geuna, 2004). The argued explanation for the regional localization of knowledge is usually the tacit nature of knowledge which requires direct, inter-personal contacts to be obtained (Anselin et al., 1997, 2000; Maskell and Malmberg, 1999; Hippel, 1987; Senker, 1995). Arundel and Geuna (2004) propose that as long as there is a delay between the discovery of knowledge and its codification, inter-personal interactions are premier mechanisms for knowledge flows. Hence, proximity may be relevant because local, direct, and inter-personal contacts enable businesses to access knowledge faster and more successfully and firms are more likely to know the source of new knowledge where they can draw from (see Gorman, 2002 for an overview of the different types of knowledge).

Starting a firm in order to realize an entrepreneurial opportunity is assumed as a mechanism for knowledge diffusion and for the exploitation of knowledge. If the founders of

new ventures worked for incumbent firms or universities before commercializing their new knowledge, they inherit knowledge from their former employer. Studies on spin-offs have found that the reasons that cause individuals to leave their employer and to create their own firm are mainly frustration with their current employer and the expectation of greater financial rewards (Klepper, 2001; Klepper and Sleeper, 2005; Agarwal et al., 2004 for an overview). Agarwal et al. (2004) found that, in particular, incumbent firms with abundant underexploited knowledge represent seed beds for spin-offs. According to Audretsch (1995), many radical innovations have been introduced by new firms rather than by incumbents. Especially in high-tech industries, employee mobility and spin-offs are an important mechanism for knowledge diffusion. In these industries, a high share of the new ventures is started by employees from incumbent firms by using some of the technological know-how of their former employer (Klepper, 2001). Franco and Filson (2000) propose that existing firms characterized by technological know-how and continuous innovation provide a training ground for future entrepreneurs.

Therefore, it can be expected that new firms in knowledge or technology-intensive industries are highly relevant for a region's economic growth. Firms in knowledge and technology-intensive industries tend to be more innovative and to be of higher quality than other entrants, and these characteristics are conducive to economic growth (Baumol, 2004). Innovative start-ups may greatly challenge incumbent firms, thereby, securing their efficiency and enhancing structural change. Due to their innovativeness, these start-ups are most likely to amplify innovation and increase product variety. Christensen (1993) analyzed entry in the U.S. disk drive industry between 1976 and 1989; he found that spin-offs were more successful in surviving and that they generated more revenues than the non-spin-off entrants. Agarwal et al. (2004) found that higher technological know-how positively affects the survival chance of entrants in the disk drive industry between 1977 and 1997.

New firms recognize entrepreneurial opportunities that may arise from underexploited knowledge. Underexploited knowledge may emerge if incumbent firms chose not to commercialize the created knowledge to full extent because they do not want to take the risk combined with new products or processes or they do not value the emerged new opportunities to be profitable. Incumbents could be more interested in exploiting the profit possibilities of their given product program than realizing new opportunities (Audretsch, 1995; Geroski, 1995). Internal constraints (e.g., financial resources) might also hinder the commercialization of knowledge in these firms. Another reason might be that the research at universities and research institutions, in particular, is hardly translated into new products or services (Pavitt, 2001). Consequently, unexploited knowledge exists, which may spur economic growth if it is also commercialized.

3. Data and Methodology

The purpose of the paper is to develop a regional model of economic growth for the West German regions between 1990 and 2002 and empirically test the hypothesis if an increase in entrepreneurship explains an increase in economic output. The analysis is restricted to West Germany because East Germany can be regarded as a special case with very specific conditions not comparable to the West in the 1990s (Fritsch, 2004; Kronthaler, 2005). Kronthaler's study (2005) indicates that East German regions have not reached the economic level of the West German regions. East Germany has reached only about 65 percent of the per-capita GDP of the average West German region. The economic weakness is evidenced in innovation activity, business density, entrepreneurial initiative and industrial investments and the loss of human capital. The analysis focuses on the 1990s because data on innovative start-ups were not available for the 1980s. The spatial framework is on the level of planning regions, which are functional units that consist of at least one core city and the surrounding area. Planning regions are somewhat larger than labor market areas in Germany. There are 74 planning regions in West Germany. Planning regions account for economic interaction and

the fact that core cities are usually strongly interwoven with their surrounding area and the degree of spatial autocorrelation can be assumed to be rather low.

Table 1: Summary statistics of variables used in regression

	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum
GDP (Y) (million DM, Price 1995)	38,598.79	35,760.71	7,243.25	192,091.70
Capital (K) (million DM, Price 1995)	22,973.27	21,523.78	3,096.28	102,538.60
Employees (L) (number, employees without R&D employees)	288,158.10	233,684.80	63,683	1,179,767
R&D employees private firms (KNOWI) (number)	7,579.41	9,880.79	688	62,163
R&D employees public organizations (KNOWP) (number)	288.27	518.50	0	3,693
Start-ups (number)	2521.64	2334.75	340	14,257
Start-up rate (start-ups per 1.000 employees)	8.38	2.03	4.66	19.18
Start-ups in innovative industries (number)	345.93	460.44	19	3,459
Start-up rate in innovative industries (start-ups per 1.000 employees)	1.00	0.44	0.28	4.50

All values for years 1990-2002

The basis of the empirical investigation is a production function augmented with entrepreneurial activity. The specification is a Cobb-Douglas type, where K refers to *physical capital*, L refers to *labor*, $KNOWI$ and $KNOWP$ represent *knowledge creation* in private firms and public organizations and E represents *entrepreneurial activity*:

$$Y_{it} = \beta K_{it}^{\alpha_1} L_{it}^{\alpha_2} KNOWI_{it}^{\alpha_3} KNOWP_{it}^{\alpha_4} E_{it}^{\alpha_5} e^{\varepsilon_i}$$

The subscript i denotes the region and the subscript t denotes the time period from 1990 until 2002. The analysis focuses on the increase of the output and input variables compared to their initial condition in 1990, therefore, for each year t the growth rate to the initial condition in 1990 is calculated. Thus, the empirical analysis accounts for the initial condition of each region.¹ It may be assumed that the knowledge created in adjacent regions also affects the regions economic performance. Therefore, R&D employees in adjacent regions are included in order to control for regional spillovers.

¹ In order to check for robustness, the regressions were also executed with a fixed effect estimator. In this case not the initial condition but the regional mean values account for region specific effects. The results are robust and are available upon request.

Regional gross value added of all industries measures the regional aggregate output Y (at constant 1995 prices). The physical capital stock K is calculated from gross fixed capital formation (investments, at constant 1995 prices) following the perpetual inventory method (see also Audretsch and Keilbach, 2004a, b). All data on regional gross value added and gross fixed capital formation (investments) are from various publications of the Federal Statistical Office and statistical offices of each state (*Bundeslaender*).² Two planning regions had to be excluded from the data set because gross fixed capital formation was not reported due to confidentiality, leaving 72 regions for observation.

The number of employees in private and public organizations measures labor L , however, R&D employees are not included since they are measured with *KNOWI* and *KNOWP*. The number of employees in each region is from the establishment file of the German Social Insurance Statistics. In Germany all public and private employees must be reported to the Federal Employment Office for enrollment in the social insurance system. However, civil servants, army personnel, and self-employed are not obliged to contribute to the social insurance system and are, therefore, not included (for details see Fritsch and Brixy, 2004).

The knowledge created in a region is measured by R&D activities in private businesses (*KNOWI*) and organizations of the public sector (*KNOWP*) (e.g., research institutions, universities, and other public organizations). Since research and development is carried out by individuals and has a strong tacit dimension, the number of employees devoted to research and development is used as an approximation. The German Social Insurance Statistics provided the data, which were obtained from the employment statistics and are comprised of

² Data on gross fixed capital formation (investment) are annually published by each Statistical Office of the German Federal States (series E I 6). Data on regional gross value added are published by the working group of the Statistical Offices of the German Federal States, *Volkswirtschaftliche Gesamtrechnung der Laender* biennially between 1976 and 1990 and annually since 1992.

information on education and occupation of the listed employees. Employees are counted as R&D employees if they have a university degree in natural science or engineering.

Regional entrepreneurship activity is measured by new firm creation in each region. The number of new firms was provided by the Centre for European Economic Research (ZEW) and was taken from their ZEW Firm Foundation Panel. The foundation panel is based on data provided biannually by Creditreform, the largest German credit-rating agency (Almus et al., 2002). The data contain virtually all entries in the German Trade Register. Especially firms with large credit requirements such as high-technology firms are completely recorded. In 2002 about 180,000 entries were listed in Creditreform's database for West Germany. The information is available on the regional level and for a relatively long time period, between 1990 and 2003. The ZEW also provided the aggregated number of innovative start-ups for each region, which includes start-ups in knowledge- and technology-intensive industries. Therefore, the empirical analysis specifically differentiates between the impact of start-ups in innovative and the remaining industries. It is assumed that entrepreneurship in knowledge or technology-intensive industries has a stronger impact on economic growth because these start-ups are expected to be of higher quality and higher survival chances. Thus, they greatly challenge incumbent firms.

4. Entrepreneurial Opportunities and Economic Growth

Knowledge creation and entrepreneurial activity in a region are expected to have a strong impact on regional economic growth: regions benefit from research and development activities and from individuals who exploit new knowledge by realizing entrepreneurial opportunities. The results indicate that regions which increased R&D employees in private industries compared to their initial conditions in 1990 and which increased their new firm formation activity compared to 1990 realize an increase in economic performance (table 2).

Table 2: Impact of entrepreneurship on regional economic growth

	Regional economic growth		
	(I)	(II)	(III)
Capital	0.110*** (3.04)	0.107*** (3.00)	0.108*** (3.00)
Labor (without R&D employees)	0.275*** (5.62)	0.306*** (5.98)	0.307*** (5.97)
KNOWI (R&D employees in private industries)	0.240*** (10.19)	0.230*** (9.61)	0.226*** (9.31)
KNOWP (R&D employees in public organizations)	0.009** (2.15)	0.008* (1.86)	0.007* (1.81)
Entrepreneurship (all private industries)	—	0.028** (2.47)	—
Entrepreneurship (private industries, except knowledge- and technology-intensive)	—	—	0.008 (0.50)
Entrepreneurship (technology- and knowledge-intensive industries)	—	—	0.019* (1.76)
Knowledge creation in adjacent regions (possible spillovers from adjacent regions)	0.340*** (11.74)	0.342*** (11.92)	0.335*** (11.63)
Constant	0.089*** (7.38)	0.086*** (7.28)	0.087*** (7.21)
R ² -adjusted	0.8409	0.8418	0.8422
F-Value	71.36	69.71	70.82
Observations (13 observations in each of 72 regions)	936	936	936

Notes: *** significant at 1%-level, ** significant at 5%-level, * significant at 10%-level, t-values in parentheses, pooled regression accounting for initial condition, regional dummies included but not reported.

It is very apparent that knowledge created by private businesses has a much higher impact than knowledge from public organizations. The coefficient for the development of public R&D is lower and less significant. Reasons for the lower effect of knowledge created in public organizations could be that this knowledge, especially if it is created in universities or research institutions, hardly results in ready-to-produce innovations and is rarely translated into new products or services in the short run (Pavitt, 2001). A capitalization of the public knowledge stock is facilitated by different mechanisms such as private firms hiring researchers or graduates, research partnerships with private firms, or spin-offs from universities. The results indicate that an increase in the region's knowledge stock generated by R&D carried out in private businesses is the fundamental determinant of economic growth. Therefore, regions were able to perpetuate and increase economic growth if they developed a strong regional knowledge stock.

Entrepreneurship proves to be an important vehicle for exploiting opportunities and stimulating growth: an increase in new firm formation activity stimulates economic growth. The results support Audretsch and Keilbach (2004a, b) and Acs et al. (2005) who also found a positive relationship between entrepreneurship and economic performance (see also Mueller, 2006b for results on labor productivity). Nevertheless, it is crucial to raise innovative start-up activity, which is more important than an increase in general start-up activity. A distinction between technology- and knowledge-intensive industries and the remaining industries demonstrates that the positive impact is based upon an enhancement of new innovative ventures. Innovative start-ups represent a greater challenge for incumbent firms and enhance the efficiency of incumbents which may lead to greater economic growth. While Mueller (2006b) showed that innovative new firms are a premium on top of general entrepreneurship, the results of this study indicate that it is crucial to increase start-up activity in innovative industries to realize stronger growth rates of gross value added. The results also show that an increase in the knowledge stock in adjacent regions also affects economic growth.

5. Discussion and Possible Policy Implications

The findings of the empirical analyses suggest that a strongly developed regional knowledge stock is a crucial determinant of economic growth. Particularly, research and development activities in the private sector are a fundamental element of growth. R&D in the public sector also affects economic growth but the magnitude is smaller. The differences in the magnitude of the effects are not surprising. New knowledge in private firms is more likely to be translated into new products or services and more likely without delay than knowledge, which is generated in universities or research institutions. Nevertheless, research in public organizations is often characterized by fundamental research and very important for the regional or national knowledge stock. Transmission channels for this kind of knowledge could result in joint research projects or the transition of researchers into the private sector (see Arundel and Geuna, 2004 for different vehicles for private firms to assess public

research). A high level of research and development is also more likely to guarantee that individuals or firms have the ability to apply and assimilate newly generated internal or external knowledge. Regions with strength in research and development activities may expect higher growth.

According to the empirical results, new firms are a vehicle to transfer and capitalize knowledge. The exploitation of entrepreneurial opportunities has a positive impact on economic growth. However, an increase in innovative start-up activity is more effective than an increase in general entrepreneurship. New firms in high-tech industries may reflect a higher quality and a higher probability of survival; therefore, these firms are more likely to contest market positions of incumbent firms and amplify innovations which lead to growth. Furthermore, a major number of entries in knowledge-intensive or technology-intensive industries could be the result of spin-offs from existing firms, an example of employee mobility and knowledge diffusion. Especially, firms with an abundant amount of underexploited knowledge act as seedbed for spin-offs (Agarwal et al., 2004) and are a playground for new founders (Franco and Filson, 2000).

Governments should not be misled in believing that more entrepreneurship will ultimately lead to higher economic growth. Entrepreneurship promotion policy may, however, start by stimulating entrepreneurial awareness and developing entrepreneurial skills. This is important since the discovery and evaluation of entrepreneurial opportunities go ahead the exploitation of opportunities in the entrepreneurial process. Empirical studies in the field of nascent entrepreneurship showed that only a small proportion of those, who are in the discovery and evaluation process, make the actual transition to entrepreneurship (see Davidsson, 2005 for an overview). Furthermore, founders with few assets and low quality start-ups have high failure rates and will suffer the most if they end up failing. Public policy should not focus on confidence and optimism of future entrepreneurs but rather on the quality of new firms and firms

in high-tech industries. These start-ups, particularly, struggle with an imperfect financial market and are subject to financial constraints. Starting points could be, for instance, the establishment of a well-functioning venture capital market since loan capital is not their major source of financing.

References

- Acs, Zoltan J., David B. Audretsch, Pontus Braunerhjelm and Bo Carlsson, 2005, *The Knowledge Filter and Entrepreneurship in Endogenous Growth*, Papers on Entrepreneurship, Growth and Public Policy, No. 08, Max Planck Institute of Economics, Jena, Germany.
- Acs, Zoltan J. and Lawrence Plummer, 2005, Penetrating the ``knowledge filter" in regional economies, *The Annals of Regional Science* **39** (3), 439–456.
- Agarwal, Rajshree, Raj Echambadi, April M. Franco, and MB Sarkar, 2004, ‘Knowledge Transfer through Inheritance: Spin-out Generation, Development and Survival’, *Academy of Management Journal* **47** (4), 501–522.
- Almus, Matthias, Dirk Engel and Susanne Prantl, 2002, ‘Die Mannheimer Gründungspanels des Zentrums für Europäische Wirtschaftsforschung GmbH (ZEW)’, in Michael Fritsch and Reinhold Grotz (eds.), *Das Gründungsgeschehen in Deutschland, Darstellung und Vergleich der Datenquellen*, Heidelberg: Physica, pp. 79–102.
- Anselin, Luc, Attila Varga and Zoltan J. Acs, 1997, ‘Local geographic spillovers between university research and high technology innovations’, *Journal of Urban Economics* **42** (3), 422–448.
- Anselin, Luc, Attila Varga and Zoltan J. Acs, 2000, ‘Geographic and Sectoral Characteristics of Academic Knowledge Externalities’, *Papers in Regional Science* **79** (4), 435–448.
- Arundel, Anthony and Aldo Geuna, 2004, ‘Proximity and the Use of Public Science by Innovative European Firms’, *Economics of Innovation and New Technology* **13** (6), 559–580.
- Audretsch, David B., 1995, *Innovation and Industry Evolution*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Audretsch, David B. and Maryann P. Feldman, 1996, ‘R&D Spillovers and the Geography of Innovation’, *American Economic Review* **86** (3), 630–640.
- Audretsch, David B. and Max Keilbach, 2004a, ‘Entrepreneurship Capital and Economic Performance’, *Regional Studies* **38** (8), 949–960.
- Audretsch, David B. and Max Keilbach, 2004b, ‘Entrepreneurship and Regional Growth: An Evolutionary Interpretation’, *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* **14** (5) 605–616.
- Audretsch, David B., Max C. Keilbach and Eric E. Lehmann, 2006, *Entrepreneurship and Growth*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Audretsch, David B. and Erik E. Lehmann, 2005, Mansfield’s Missing Link: The Impact of Knowledge Spillovers on Firm Growth. *Journal of Technology Transfer* **30**, 207–210.
- Audretsch, David B., Erik E. Lehmann and Susanne Warning, 2004, ‘University Spillovers: Does the Kind of Science Matter?’, *Industry and Innovation* **11** (3), 193–205.
- Baumol William J., 2004, ‘Entrepreneurial enterprises, large established firms and other components of the free-market growth machine’, *Small Business Economics* **23** (1), 9–21.
- Baumol William J., John C. Panzar and Robert D. Willig, 1988, *Contestable Markets and the Theory of Industry Structure*, revised edition, San Diego: Harcourt Brace.
- Christensen, Clayton M., 1993, ‘The Rigid Disk Drive Industry: A History of Commercial and Technological Turbulence’, *Business History Review* **67** (4), 531–588.
- Cohen, Wesley M. and Daniel A. Levinthal, 1989, ‘Innovation and Learning: The Two Faces of R&D’, *Economic Journal* **99** (397), 569–596.

- Cohen, Wesley M. and Daniel A. Levinthal, 1990, 'Absorptive Capacity: A New Perspective on Learning and Innovation', *Administrative Science Quarterly* **35** (1), 128–152.
- Davidsson, Per, 2005, 'Nascent Entrepreneurship: Empirical Studies and Developments', *Foundation and Trends in Entrepreneurship* **2** (1).
- Franco, April M. and Darren Filson, 2000, *Knowledge Diffusion Through Employee Mobility*, Working Paper, University of Iowa, Iowa City.
- Fritsch, Michael, 2004, 'Entrepreneurship, Entry and Performance of New Businesses Compared in Two Growth Regimes: East and West Germany', *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* **14** (5), 525–542.
- Fritsch, Michael and Udo Brix, 2004, 'The Establishment File of the German Social Insurance Statistics', *Journal of Applied Social Science Studies* **124** (1), 183–190.
- Fritsch, Michael and Pamela Mueller, 2004.
- Garvin, David A., 1983, 'Spin-Offs and the New Firm Formation Process', *California Management Review* **25** (2), 3–20.
- Geroski, Paul, 1995, 'What do we know about entry?' *International Journal of Industrial Organization* **13** (4), 421–440.
- Gorman, Michael E., 2002, 'Types of Knowledge and Their Roles in Technology Transfer', *Journal of Technology Transfer* **27** (3), 219–231.
- Hippel, Eric von, 1987, 'Cooperation between Rivals: Informal Know-How Trading', *Research Policy* **16** (6), 291–302.
- Jaffe, Adam B., Manuel Trajtenberg and Rebecca Henderson, 1993, 'Geographic Localization of Knowledge Spillovers as Evidenced by Patent Citations', *Quarterly Journal of Economics* **108** (3), 577–598.
- Klepper, Steven, 2001, 'Employee Startups in High-tech Industries', *Industrial and Corporate Change* **10** (3), 639–674.
- Klepper, Steven and Sally Sleeper, 2005, 'Entry by Spinoffs', *Management Science* **51** (8), 1291–1306.
- Kronthaler, Franz, 2005, 'Economic Capability of East German Regions: Results of a Cluster Analysis', *Regional Studies* **39** (6), 739–750.
- Lucas, Robert E., 1988, 'On the Mechanism of Economic Development', *Journal of Monetary Economics* **22** (1), 3–42.
- Maskell, Peter and Anders Malmberg, 1999, 'Localised Learning and Industrial Competitiveness', *Cambridge Journal of Economics* **23** (2), 167–175.
- Mueller, Pamela, 2006a, 'Entrepreneurship in the Region: Breeding Ground for Nascent Entrepreneurs?', *Small Business Economics* (forthcoming).
- Mueller, Pamela, 2006b, 'Exploring the Knowledge Filter: How Entrepreneurship and University-Industry Relations Drive Economic Growth', *Research Policy* (forthcoming).
- Pavitt, Keith L. R., 2001, 'Public Policies to Support Basic Research: What Can the Rest of the World Learn from US Theory and Practice? (and What they Should Learn)', *Industrial and Corporate Change* **10** (2), 761–779.
- Romer, Paul M., 1986, 'Increasing Returns and Long-Run Growth', *Journal of Political Economy* **94** (5), 1002–1037.

- Romer, Paul M., 1990, 'Endogenous Technological Change', *Journal of Political Economy* **98** (5), S71–S102.
- Schumpeter Joseph A., 1911, *Die Theorie wirtschaftlicher Entwicklung*, Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, English edition: *The Theory of Economic Development* [1934]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Senker, Jacqueline, 1995, 'Tacit Knowledge and Models of Innovation', *Industrial and Corporate Change* **2** (2), 425–447.
- Zucker, Lynne G., Michael R. Darby and Marilyn B. Brewer, 1998, 'Intellectual Human Capital and the Birth of U.S. Biotechnology Enterprises', *American Economic Review* **88** (1), 290–306.

**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 Stützel 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.