Exploiting Entrepreneurial Opportunities: The Impact of Entrepreneurship on Growth

Pamela Mueller

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.

KEYWORDS: Regional growth, knowledge, entrepreneurship.

JEL CLASSIFICATIONS: L26, M13, O18, O31.

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; Davidsson, 2005 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 (2006) 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

Pamela Mueller
Entrepreneurship, Growth and Public Policy
Max Planck Institute of Economics
Kahlaische Str. 10, 07745, Jena, Germany
E-mail: pmueller@econ.mpg.de

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.

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.

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 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

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

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).

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,

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.

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, 2006 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 (2006) 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.

Notes

[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.
[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.

References

Acs, Z. J., D. B. Audretsch , P. Braunerhjelm and B. Carlsson, 2005, *The Knowledge Filter and Entrepreneurship in Endogenous Growth*, Jena, Germany: Papers on Entrepreneurship, Growth and Public Policy, No. 08, Max Planck Institute of Economics.

Acs, J. Z. and L. Plummer, 2005, 'Penetrating the 'knowledge filter' in regional economies', *The Annals of Regional Science* **39**(3), 439–456.

Agarwal, R., R. Echambadi, A. M. Franco and M. B. Sarkar, 2004, 'Knowledge Transfer through Inheritance: Spin-out Generation, Development and Survival', *Academy of Management Journal* **47**(4), 501–522.

Almus, M., D. Engel and S. Prantl, 2002, 'Die Mannheimer Gründungspanels des Zentrums für Europäische Wirtschaftsforschung GmbH (ZEW)', in M. Fritsch and M. Grotz (eds.), *Das Gründungsgeschehen in Deutschland, Darstellung und Vergleich der Datenquellen*, Heidelberg: Physica, 79–102.

Anselin, L., A. Varga and Z. J. Acs, 1997, 'Local geographic spillovers between university research and high technology innovations', *Journal of Urban Economics* **42**(3), 422–448.

Anselin, L., A. Varga and Z. J. Acs, 2000, 'Geographic and Sectoral Characteristics of Academic Knowledge Externalities', *Papers in Regional Science* **79**(4), 435–448.

Arundel, A. and A. Geuna, 2004, 'Proximity and the Use of Public Science by Innovative European Firms', *Economics of Innovation and New Technology* **13**(6), 559–580.

Audretsch, D. B., 1995, *Innovation and Industry Evolution*, Cambridge: MIT Press.

Audretsch, D. B. and M. P. Feldman, 1996, 'R&D Spillovers and the Geography of Innovation', *American Economic Review* **86**(3), 630–640.

Audretsch, D. B. and M. Keilbach, 2004a, 'Entrepreneurship Capital and Economic Performance', *Regional Studies* **38**(8), 949–960.

Audretsch, D. B. and M. Keilbach, 2004b, 'Entrepreneurship and Regional Growth: An Evolutionary Interpretation', *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* **14**(5), 605–616.

Audretsch, D. B., M. C. Keilbach and E. E. Lehmann, 2006, *Entrepreneurship and Growth*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Audretsch, D. B. and E. E. Lehmann, 2005, 'Mansfield's Missing Link: The Impact of Knowledge Spillovers on Firm Growth', *Journal of Technology Transfer* **30**, 207–210.

Audretsch, D. B., E. E. Lehmann and S. Warning, 2004, 'University Spillovers: Does the Kind of Science Matter?', *Industry and Innovation* **11**(3), 193–205.

Baumol, W. J., 2004, 'Entrepreneurial enterprises, large established firms and other components of the free-market growth machine', *Small Business Economics* **23**(1), 9–21.

Baumol, W. J., J. C. Panzar and R. D. Willig, 1988, *Contestable Markets and the Theory of Industry Structure*, revised edition, San Diego: Harcourt Brace.

Christensen, C. M., 1993, 'The Rigid Disk Drive Industry: A History of Commercial and Technological Turbulence', *Business History Review* **67**(4), 531–588.

Cohen, W. M. and D. A. Levinthal, 1989, 'Innovation and Learning: The Two Faces of R&D', *Economic Journal* **99**(397), 569–596.

Cohen, W. M. and D. A. Levinthal, 1990, 'Absorptive Capacity: A New Perspective on Learning and Innovation', *Administrative Science Quarterly* **35**(1), 128–152.

Davidsson, P., 2005, 'Nascent Entrepreneurship: Empirical Studies and Developments', *Foundation and Trends in Entrepreneurship* **2**(1).

Franco, A. M. and D. Filson, 2000, *Knowledge Diffusion Through Employee Mobility*, Iowa City: Working Paper, University of Iowa.

Fritsch, M., 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, M. and U. Brixy, 2004, 'The Establishment File of the German Social Insurance Statistics', *Journal of Applied Social Science Studies* **124**(1), 183–190.

Fritsch, M. and P. Mueller, 2004, 'Effects of New Business Formation on Regional Development over Time', *Regional Studies* **38**(8), 961–975.

Geroski, P., 1995, 'What do we know about entry?' *International Journal of Industrial Organization* **13**(4), 421–440.

Gorman, M. E., 2002, 'Types of Knowledge and Their Roles in Technology Transfer', *Journal of Technology Transfer* **27**(3), 219–231.

Hippel, E., 1987, 'Cooperation between Rivals: Informal Know-How Trading', *Research Policy* **16**(6), 291–302.

Jaffe, A. B., M. Trajtenberg and R. Henderson, 1993, 'Geographic Localization of Knowledge Spillovers as Evidenced by Patent Citations', *Quarterly Journal of Economics* **108**(3), 577–598.

Klepper, S., 2001, 'Employee Startups in High-tech Industries', *Industrial and Corporate Change* **10**(3), 639–674.

Klepper, S. and S. Sleeper, 2005, "Entry by Spinoffs", *Management Science* **51**(8), 1291–1306.

Kronthaler, F., 2005, 'Economic Capability of East German Regions: Results of a Cluster Analysis', *Regional Studies* **39**(6), 739–750.

Lucas, R. E., 1988, 'On the Mechanism of Economic Development', *Journal of Monetary Economics* **22**(1), 3–42.

Maskell, P. and A. Malmberg, 1999, 'Localised Learning and Industrial Competitiveness', *Cambridge Journal of Economics* **23**(2), 167–175.

Mueller, P., 2006, 'Exploring the Knowledge Filter: How Entrepreneurship and University-Industry Relations Drive Economic Growth', *Research Policy* **35**(10), 1499–1508.

Parker, S., 2004, *The Economics of Self-employment and Entrepreneurship*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Plummer, L. A., 2005, Localized Knowledge Spillovers and New Venture Creation, in S. A. Zahra, C. G. Brush and P. Davidsson et al. (eds.), *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research 2005*, Babson Park, MA: Babson College, 148–161.

Pavitt, K. L. R., 2001, 'Public Policies to Support Basic Research: What Can the Rest of the World Learn form US Theory and Practice? (and What they Should Learn)', *Industrial and Corporate Change* **10**(2), 761–779.

Romer, P. M., 1986, 'Increasing Returns and Long-Run Growth', *Journal of Political Economy* **94**(5), 1002–1037.

Schumpeter J. A., 1911, *Die Theorie wirtschaftlicher Entwicklung*, Berlin: Duncker & Humblot, English edition: *The Theory of Economic Development* (1934). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Senker, J., 1995, 'Tacit Knowledge and Models of Innovation', *Industrial and Corporate Change* **2**(2), 425–447.

Zucker, L. G., M. R. Darby and M. B. Brewer, 1998, 'Intellectual Human Capital and the Birth of U.S. Biotechnology Enterprises', *American Economic Review* **88**(1), 290–306.