


Center for Economic Institutions
Working Paper Series

No. 2011-11

**“Does Founders’ Human Capital Matter for
Innovation? Evidence from Japanese Start-ups”**

**Masatoshi Kato, Hiroyuki Okamuro,
and Yuji Honjo**

December 2011



Institute of Economic Research
Hitotsubashi University
2-1 Naka, Kunitachi, Tokyo, 186-8603 JAPAN
<http://cei.ier.hit-u.ac.jp/English/index.html>
Tel:+81-42-580-8405/Fax:+81-42-580-8333

Does founders' human capital matter for innovation?

Evidence from Japanese start-ups*

Masatoshi Kato^{†, ‡}

Hiroyuki Okamuro[§]

Yuji Honjo[¶]

Abstract

Using a sample from an original questionnaire survey in Japan, this paper explores whether and how founders' human capital affects innovation outcomes by start-ups. The results provide evidence that founders with greater human capital are more likely to yield innovation outcome. However, because certain types of founders' human capital may boost R&D investment, which possibly results in innovation outcomes, we estimate the determinants of innovation outcomes by an instrumental variable probit model taking into account the endogeneity of R&D investment. Our findings suggest that *specific* human capital for innovation, such as founders' prior innovation experience, is directly associated with innovation outcomes after start-up, while *generic* human capital, such as founders' educational background, indirectly affects innovation outcomes through R&D investment.

JEL Classification: L24; M13; O31

Keywords: Start-up; Founder; Human capital; Innovations; R&D investment.

* This study is financially supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (A) (No. 20243018) of the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science. We are grateful to the participants at *Osaka Workshop on Entrepreneurship and Innovation*, held in December 2010, for their valuable comments on an earlier version of this paper. We also thank Yoshihiko Akashi, Noriyuki Doi, and Hiroyuki Odagiri for their useful advice. Needless to say, any remaining errors are our own.

† Corresponding author

School of Economics & Innovation Research Center, Kwansei Gakuin University

E-mail: mkato@kwansei.ac.jp

‡ Institute of Economic Research, Hitotsubashi University

§ Graduate School of Economics, Hitotsubashi University

¶ Faculty of Commerce, Chuo University.

1. Introduction

It is widely recognized that the emergence of start-ups and their post-entry performance significantly contribute to economic growth and that small businesses plays significant roles in a large fraction of innovations (e.g., Acs and Audretsch, 1990). More recently, start-ups have been paid attention as the sources of innovation and productivity in regions (e.g., Audretsch et al., 2006). On the other hand, it has often been argued that, as is known as the so-called “Schumpeterian hypothesis,” large firms have more advantages in innovations than small firms.¹ In fact, it may be quite difficult for start-ups to be successful in innovations because of their limited resources and experience. Whereas scholars and policy makers pay attention to what types of start-ups contribute to innovation, there has been quite limited evidence on whether and how start-ups can be successful in innovation.

Meanwhile, it has often been argued that founders’ human capital play a critical role in determining firm performance (e.g., Cressy, 1996). Because knowledge and skills that are key components of human capital are required to generate innovations, human capital is an inevitable resource for research and development (R&D). Especially for R&D-oriented start-ups that undertake R&D activities at the start-up stage, founders’ human capital may relate more significantly to the post-entry performance of their firms. To date, nevertheless, little is known about whether and how founders’ human capital affects the firms’ innovations. In this respect, it is worth to highlight the role of founders’ human capital in determining innovation outcomes of start-ups.

¹ For more discussion on the relationship between innovation and firms size, see, for example, Cohen et al. (1987), and Acs and Audretsch (1990).

This paper explores whether and how founders' human capital affects innovations among start-ups in Japan. It is a widely held view that innovation activities differ considerably across firms, and founders' human capital may help to explain these differences. In this paper, using a sample from an original questionnaire survey in Japan, we examine whether founders' human capital affects innovations. The results provide evidence on the determinants of innovations in start-ups, and, in particular, we shed light on the role of founders' human capital in determining innovation outcomes. To better understand how start-ups achieve innovation outcomes, we identify what types of founders' human capital affect innovation outcomes in start-ups.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In the following section, we review the background and related literature to this paper. Section 3 presents some testable hypotheses. Section 4 describes the data and variables used in the analysis. The empirical methods and results are presented in Section 5. The final section includes some concluding remarks.

2. Background and related literature

Despite increasing public interest in innovation created by high-tech start-ups, many start-ups encounter difficulties in conducting R&D. This is mainly because start-ups are likely to lack capital for R&D. Not surprisingly, the access to external financial markets tends to be limited when founders start their businesses. Even if a start-up has high growth potential, external financial markets do not always provide funds because of market imperfections due to information asymmetries between the founder and the providers of external finance; that is, founders are likely to face financial constraints. In fact, a large number of studies have addressed the effects of financial constraints on the level of capital used at start-up (e.g., Evans and Jovanovic, 1989;

Åstebro and Bernhardt, 2005). Perhaps, the information asymmetries are more severe for R&D-oriented start-ups because it is quite difficult to gauge the success of R&D at the start-up stage. Therefore, these start-ups cannot easily obtain funds for R&D investment, even though they require a large amount of capital for R&D.

Whereas it is considered that the innovation outcomes of R&D-oriented start-ups depend on the amount of capital for R&D, it has often been argued that the success of start-ups is dependent on their founders' human capital. Bates (1990), for example, argued that the entrepreneurs' human capital inputs affect small business longevity, and Cressy (1996) emphasized that human capital is the true determinant of firm survival. In addition, some empirical studies have provided evidence on the relationship between firm growth and the human capital of founders or entrepreneurs (e.g., Honjo, 2004; Colombo and Grilli, 2005). These studies have indicated that founders' human capital is a valuable resource for start-ups and plays a critical role in the firm's performance, partly because it can compensate for the lack of business experience and resources.

More specifically, Bates (1990) found that human capital measured by the years of education is strongly linked to business viability. Åstebro and Bernhardt (2005) also argued that increased human capital provides founders with greater ability to create and manage viable enterprises. In addition, Colombo and Grilli (2005) indicated that individuals with greater human capital are likely to have better entrepreneurial judgment, and that firms established by founders with greater human capital outperform other firms because of their unique capabilities. They emphasize the "capability effect" of founders' human capital, which explains the positive effect of human capital on the performance. Colombo and Grilli (2005) then found that the nature of the education and

of the prior work experience of founders exerts a key influence on the growth. Colombo et al. (2004) also showed that founders' human capital, such as educational background and work experience, have a crucial influence on the start-up size of new technology-based firms (NTBFs).² These findings indicate that founders' human capital serves as a valuable resource to achieve better firm performance.

To date, however, few studies have addressed the role of founders' human capital in determining firms' innovations at the start-up stage. A related paper is Marvel and Lumpkin (2007), which studied the effects of technology entrepreneurs' human capital on innovation radicalness using a sample of 145 technology entrepreneurs operating within university-affiliated incubators. They found that entrepreneurs' human capital, such as educational background and prior technology knowledge, positively affects innovation radicalness. However, it is unclear whether innovation radicalness represents innovation outcomes, because it may depend on subjective evaluation by entrepreneurs. In this paper, we use multiple measures of innovation outcomes (product/process innovations and patent applications). Moreover, most previous studies, including Marvel and Lumpkin (2007), focus on the effects of human capital on innovation output, but not on innovation input. In this paper, we will fill these gaps by examining the effects of founders' human capital on both R&D investment (innovation input) and innovation outcomes, considering its indirect effect through the R&D investment and employing multiple measures of innovation outcomes.

² More recently, Coleman (2007) also showed that human capital, such as education and experience, plays an important role in the profitability and growth of small firms.

3. Hypotheses

In this section, we present some testable hypotheses for the role of founders' human capital in determining innovation outcomes in start-ups. As discussed in the previous section, it is considered that founders' human capital plays a more important role in R&D activities of start-ups, than in those of large and established firms, because of limited resources at the start-up stage. For R&D-oriented start-ups, founders' human capital is an essential factor in the innovative process, and it will compensate for deficiencies in physical capital at the start-up stage. As Colombo and Grilli (2005) argued, founders' human capital may reflect firms' capabilities for R&D. In addition, founders with greater human capital have better access to research network with external organizations (e.g., Okamuro et al., 2011). For these reasons, we consider that

H1: Founders with greater human capital are more likely to generate innovation outcomes in start-ups.

Previous literature often distinguishes between *generic* and *specific* human capital. According to Colombo et al. (2004), generic human capital relates to the general knowledge acquired by entrepreneurs (founders) through both formal education and professional experience, while specific human capital consists of the capabilities of individuals that can directly be applied to the entrepreneurial job in the newly created firms. Colombo et al. (2004) found that variables that reflect specific components of human capital, such as work experience in the same sector as the new firm as well as managerial and entrepreneurial experience exhibit greater explanatory power than those that reflect generic components, such as work experience in other sectors. Åstebro and Bernhardt (2003) also examined the effects of human capital on firm performance, by distinguishing between formal and informal human capital that reflects general and specific

human capital. These studies suggest that the effects of founder's human capital depend heavily on its types.

In fact, some types of founders' human capital affect organizational performance; for example, prior work experience is likely to lead to efficient production within the organization. However, it is doubtful whether this type of human capital directly relates to innovation outcomes. More specifically, managerial experience may be indispensable for management, but it is unclear if this type of human capital is significantly associated with innovation outcomes. Because technological knowledge and skills differ significantly from managerial ones, technological knowledge and skills possessed by founders would rather play a critical role in generating innovation outcomes. In this respect, we should distinguish between the types of founders' human capital. More precisely, innovation outcomes depend heavily on specific human capital for R&D activities, such as prior experience of product/process innovations. Hence, we can say that

H2: Specific human capital for R&D activities is positively and more strongly associated with innovation outcomes in start-ups than generic human capital.

Founders with greater human capital are capable of gaining better access to external finance under the financial market imperfections. As Åstebro and Bernhardt (2005) pointed out, such founders can relax financial constraints that otherwise hinder firm performance. Whereas start-ups cannot easily access external finance for R&D, some types of founders' human capital play a role in creating opportunities to access it. More specifically, work experience may be useful to negotiate with banks and investors. In addition, some types of founders' human capital, such as academic experience, may serve as a signal of creditworthiness to the providers of external

finance under information asymmetries between founders and these providers. In accordance with these arguments, it is hypothesized that founders' human capital does not only directly relate to innovation outcomes, but also facilitates access to financial capital for R&D. Hence, we hypothesize that

H3: Generic human capital is more likely to boost R&D investment rather than innovation outcomes in start-ups.

Parker and van Praag (2006) emphasize the possibility that human capital has an indirect effect on performance by facilitating access to financial capital, thus diluting any financial constraint. Following them, we argue that founders' human capital has not only a direct, but also an indirect effect on innovation outcomes. Both roles of founders' human capital are expected to be particularly important at the start-up stage because of severe information asymmetries.

4. Data

4.1. Data sources

To the best of our knowledge, there exists no publicly available data source for R&D activities by start-ups in Japan. In order to construct a data set of start-ups for our research project, we conducted a postal questionnaire survey in November 2008. We sent questionnaires to 13,582 firms in the Japanese manufacturing and software industries, which had been incorporated between January 2007 and August 2008. The list of firms for the survey was obtained from a database compiled by Tokyo Shoko Research (TSR), a major credit investigation company in Japan. In the questionnaire survey, we asked the founders about firm-specific characteristics, including R&D activities, as well as their personal attributes.

The number of effective responses was 1514 (approximately 11% of the target). With regard to industry structure and location, the respondents were not considerably different from the target firms as a whole, though software firms are more strongly represented among the respondents than manufacturing start-ups. From among the responses, we selected 1060 “real” start-ups that had started their businesses during 2007 and 2008³. Moreover, we excluded from the dataset the firms that did not invest in R&D at start up and afterwards and that provide no information on R&D investment (together approximately 250 firms). We further excluded 40 subsidiaries and affiliated firms of existing firms, because they have quite different characteristics from independent start-ups at the founder and firm levels, especially with regard to the amount and structure of initial funds. After excluding some observations due to missing values, we obtained a final sample of 204 firms.

In addition, we use another data source to collect data on industry-specific characteristics. Industry’s R&D intensity is measured by the industry’s R&D expenditures divided by its sales, which were taken from the *Results of Basic Survey of Japanese Business Structure and Activities* by the Ministry of Economy, Trade, and Industry (METI). Data on the appropriability of innovation outcomes and technological opportunities were taken and calculated from the Report on the Japanese National Innovation Survey 2003, compiled by the National Institute of Science and Technology Policy (NISTEP) of the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology (MEXT).

³ Other firms were founded before 2006 and incorporated in 2007 or 2008.

4. 2. Innovation outcomes

The effects of founders' human capital may differ according to the types of innovation outcome, but it is quite difficult to determine appropriate measures of innovation outcomes. Perhaps, profits or market values are ultimate objectives of R&D for private firms, but these values are not an appropriate index at the start-up stage because of the time lag existing between innovation and profits.

Instead, in this paper, we attempt to capture innovation outcomes by asking the founders whether or not their start-ups achieved product or process innovations in our questionnaire survey. Based on the survey, the variable for product or process innovations (*INN*) is used as a dependent variable in our empirical model.

Also, intellectual property right---that is, patent---has often been used to measure innovation outcomes in previous literature (e.g., Hausman et al., 1984). Although patent applications may not completely reflect the quality of innovation outcomes, they will be able to reveal the degree of the firm's innovative activities. In our questionnaire survey, we inquired about patent applications. Using this data, we defined the variable, *PAT*, which indicates whether or not the firm applied for patents after the foundation, as innovation outcomes. Using these variables, we attempt to understand factors affecting differences in innovation outcomes among R&D-oriented start-ups.

4. 3. Determinants of innovation outcomes

Founders' human capital is measured by founder-specific characteristics, which can be retrieved from the data source. In this paper, we define two types of variables: *generic* and *specific* human

capital for R&D. Colombo and Grilli (2004) argued that *generic* human capital is related to the general knowledge acquired by entrepreneurs through both formal education and professional experience. In fact, a number of studies have used educational attainments as a measure of founders' human capital (e.g., Bates, 1990; Åstebro and Bernhardt, 2005). Following these studies, we measure the educational background of founders by dummy variables, *UEDU* and *GEDU*, which correspond to undergraduate university education and graduate school education levels, respectively.

Also, the variables for prior work experience in the related field at start-up (*WEXP*) and prior managerial experience in other firms prior to start-up (*MEXP*) are used as independent variables representing *generic* human capital in our model. Contrary to Colombo and Grilli (2005) that considered them to be *specific* human capital for business performance, we regard them as *generic* human capital for innovative performance, because these experiences are not necessarily and exclusively associated with innovative activities.

As for *specific* human capital, we measure founders' prior innovation experience to capture founders' human capital more specified to innovative activities. A dummy variable, *INNEXP*, is used to measure founders' experience of product/process innovations prior to start-up, in the model with product/process innovations as the dependent variable (*INN*). Also, a dummy variable for founders' prior experience regarding patent applications is alternatively used as independent variables representing technological capabilities of founders in the model with patent applications (*PAT*) as another dependent variable. These may indicate the degree of founder's technological capabilities. Moreover, a dummy variable, *ACAD*, is used to measure the founder's affiliation to academic associations in the natural sciences. This may indicate the extent of founder's professional

network as well as technological capabilities. Finally, we include the variable for the founder's age, *AGE*, in order to control for differences in age and generation among founders.

With respect to independent variables other than those variables for founders' human capital, the variables for firm-specific and industry-specific characteristics are used in the analysis. First, the firm's intensity of R&D investment, *RDEXP*, which represents R&D inputs, is defined as R&D expenditures divided by the number of employees. The variable, *SIZE*, measured as the number of employees, is also used to control for differences in firm size at the start-up stage. Since some firms were established by multiple founders, a dummy variable for multiple founders, *MFOUND*, is used as a control variable. Furthermore, we use the industry's R&D intensity (*INDRD*), appropriability of technological outcomes (*APPROP*) and technological opportunities (*TECHOPP*), to control for differences in the technological characteristics across industries⁴.

5. Empirical methods and results

5. 1. Methods

Based on the sample of R&D-oriented start-ups, we examine the effects of founders' human capital on the firms' innovation outcomes at the start-up stage. As discussed, innovation outcomes depend on R&D investment because financial constraints hinder R&D activities. Moreover, as hypothesized in *H1* and *H2*, innovation outcomes may depend on founder's human capital as well. In this paper, we thus write a model explaining innovation outcomes, which is defined as the function of both R&D investment and founders' human capital. Assuming for simplicity that the relationships are linear, we estimate the effects of R&D investment and founders' human capital on

⁴ See Okamuro (2009) for details for the construction of these variables.

innovation outcomes of R&D-oriented start-ups. Since, as already mentioned, the variables for innovation outcomes are measured as binary variables, we employ a probit model to estimate the model for the determinants of innovation outcomes.

As described in *H3*, we consider that *generic* human capital affects R&D investment, rather than innovation outcomes for R&D-oriented start-ups. In this respect, R&D investment may be regarded as a function of founders' human capital. Taking into account the endogeneity of R&D investment, therefore, we employ a probit model with an endogenous regressor to estimate the model for the determinants of innovation outcomes. Assuming that R&D investment is endogenously determined, we examine whether innovation outcomes are significantly associated with R&D investment. By doing so, we can identify which type of founders' human capital affects innovation outcomes, R&D investment or both of them. In the analysis, we first estimate the model for the determinants of R&D investment, using instrumental variables for R&D investment, and then examine the determinants of innovation outcomes.

We employ the probit model with an endogenous regressor, in order to estimate the determinants of innovation outcomes. In this paper, we use two variables, *REQRD* and *IF*, as the instruments that control for differences in the demand and supply for R&D investment across firms. In the questionnaire, we asked how much firms require R&D investment for one year, in order to obtain sufficient innovation output. Using this value, we capture the demand for R&D investment, which indicates investment opportunities for R&D. Moreover, we consider that the demand for R&D investment is not directly associated with innovation outcomes because of technological and market uncertainties. Hence, the variable for the demand for R&D investment (*REQRD*) is included as an instrument in the first-stage regression.

In the traditional investment model, cash-flow has often been used to capture the availability of internal finance that hypothetically mitigates financial constraints. However, cash-flow is not appropriate as a proxy for the availability of internal finance at start-up, because most start-up firms cannot establish sufficient cash-flow at the initial stage. Alternatively, we pay attention to the sources of initial funds at start-up, because start-up firms use their initial funds for operation and investment at the early stage. In the questionnaire, we asked for the amount of initial funds obtained from each type of funding sources at start-up including founders themselves and their family and friends. We regard the initial funds provided by the founders themselves and their family and friends as internal finance and use them as a proxy for internal finance (*IF*). We argue that internal finance measured as this type of initial funds is strongly associated with R&D investment, but is not directly associated with innovation outcomes because of uncertainties of R&D, and thus include this variable as an instrument in the first-stage regression.

Table 1 summarizes the definitions of the variables used in the analysis.

5. 2. Results and discussion

Table 2 describes the summary statistics for the dependent and independent variables used in the analysis. As shown in Table 2, about 44% and 17 % of R&D-oriented start-ups have achieved product/process innovations and applied for patent applications after their start-up, respectively.

With respect to founders' human capital, as shown in Table 2, 52% of the founders had achieved a bachelor's degree and 13% a master's or doctorate degree. Table 2 also shows that, before start-up, 85% of the founders worked in a related field and 35% as managers of other firms. Moreover, founders had prior experience of product/process innovations and patent applications,

before start-up, in 36% and 22% of firms, respectively. As shown in Table 2, 18% of the founders in our sample are affiliated to academic associations in the natural sciences. The founders were on average 46 years old at start-up, with the minimum and the maximum being 20 and 80 years old, respectively. Table 3 shows the correlation matrix of these variables.

We show the estimation results in Table 4. The variables, *INN* and *PAT*, are the dependent variables of the regressions. While Columns (i) and (ii) of Table 4 describes the estimation results with *INN* and *PAT*, respectively. The numbers of observations are 179 and 174 in Columns (i) and (ii), respectively. In addition, we estimate the determinants of innovation outcomes, using the probit model with an endogenous regressor, in which R&D investment is regarded as endogenously determined. Table 5 describes the estimation results. Columns (i) and (ii) of Table 5 describe the results with *INN* and *PAT*, respectively. While the first stage regression indicates the estimation results for the determinants of R&D investment, the second stage indicates those for the determinants of innovation outcomes in Table 5.

As shown in Table 4, we find that the coefficients of *RDEXP* are positive and strongly significant, indicating that innovation outcomes are positively associated with R&D investment. This result indicates that firms investing more heavily in R&D among R&D-oriented start-ups are likely to obtain innovation outcomes. In addition to R&D investment, we find that certain types of founders' human capital have positive effects on innovation outcomes.⁵ The coefficients of *GEDU* are positive and significant in both the models of Table 4, suggesting that founders with higher educational attainments are more likely to obtain innovation outcomes. Also, the

⁵ We also employed ordinary least squares method and a negative binomial model, using data on the number of patent applications as a dependent variable and obtained similar relationships between innovation outcomes and founders' human capital.

coefficients of *INNEXP* and *PATEXP* are positive and significant in Columns (i) and (ii) of Table 4, respectively. These results indicate that founders' prior experience of product/process innovations and patent applications relates to innovation outcomes. Overall, these types of founders' human capital may reflect the firm's technological capabilities, and our findings indicate that founders' human capital is positively associated with innovation outcome for R&D-oriented start-ups. It can be concluded that founders' human capital plays a critical role in achieving innovations at the start-up stage.

Also, as shown in Table 4, founders' age positively affects innovation outcomes. This result suggests that older founders are more likely to obtain innovation outcomes, although this variable was simply included as a control variable in the regression. On the other hand, other founder-specific characteristics, such as work and managerial experiences, *WEXP* and *MEXP*, and the affiliation to academic associations, *ACAD*, are not significant in any models of Table 4. Also, Table 4 indicates that some firm-specific characteristics, *SIZE*, *IND*, and *MFOUND*, have no significant effect on innovation outcomes. Moreover, in Column (ii) of Table 4 indicates that the industry's appropriability of innovation outcomes, *APPROP*, has a significantly positive effect on innovation outcomes, while the industry's R&D intensity and technological opportunities has no significant effect. These results suggest that industry conditions matter for innovative activities.

Meanwhile, as shown in Table 5, some types of founders' human capital affect R&D investment. More specifically, the coefficient of *GEDU* is positive at the 1% significance level in the first stage regression, while no significant relationship between innovation outcomes and founders' educational background is found in the second stage. This result suggests that highly educated founders invest more in R&D, but are not more likely to achieve innovation outcomes.

Thus, such human capital has rather an indirect effect on innovation outcomes of R&D-oriented start-ups. In the second stage of Table 5, moreover, the coefficient of *RDEXP* is positive and significant, and *INNEXP* and *PATEXP* have strongly significant effects on innovation outcomes. This is consistent with the results of Table 4.

To sum up, these empirical results partially support all of our hypotheses: H1 and H2 are supported with regard to the founders' innovation experience prior to start-up (*INNEXP* and *PATEXP*), measures of *specific* human capital, while H3 is supported with regard to the founders' educational attainment at the graduate school level (*GEDU*), a measure of *generic* human capital. It is also noteworthy that not all types of founders' human capital contribute to achieving innovation outcomes, directly or indirectly.

A number of studies have pointed out the significant and direct effects of founders' human capital on firm performance until now (e.g., Colombo and Grilli, 2005). However, we argue that indirect effects of founders' human capital are also important to innovation outcomes. Indeed, as our estimation results demonstrate, founders' educational level affects R&D investment rather than innovation outcomes. Hence, we suggest that, in order to better understand the effects of founders' human capital, one should pay more attention to its indirect effects on innovation outcomes.⁶

⁶ In this paper, we considered the effects of founders' human capital on innovation outcomes through R&D investment. Needless to say, there remains the possibility that founders' human capital has an impact on innovation outcomes through another factor, such as R&D cooperation. In this respect, further investigation may be required to deepen our understanding of the complex relationships between founders' human capital and innovation outcomes of start-ups.

6. Conclusions

This paper explored the determinants of innovation outcomes of R&D-oriented start-ups. Using a sample from an original questionnaire survey in Japan, we examined whether and how founders' human capital affects innovation outcomes at the start-up stage. We provided evidence that certain types of founders' human capital, namely their innovation performance prior to start-up, are directly associated with innovation outcomes. Our findings also suggested that founders' higher (graduate school) education is associated with R&D investment, indicating that part of founders' human capital has an indirect effect on innovation outcomes through R&D investment.

While, as is often argued, Japan has achieved technological catch-up and is now striving for technological leadership in the manufacturing sector, this country is characterized by almost the lowest ratio of business start-ups among OECD countries. In this respect, policy makers are concerned about the lack of entrepreneurship. High-tech start-ups are expected to stimulate future economic growth, but indeed it is not easy for these firms to achieve successful innovation. In this regard, as this paper suggested, founders' human capital may enhance the probability of success in innovations---not only specific human capital but also generic human capital of founders has an impact, though indirectly, on innovation outcomes. Our findings imply that founders' human capital is indispensable to propel innovation introduced by high-tech start-ups. For future economy, we should pay more attention to the development of entrepreneurial human capital in support of national innovation systems in the countries with low start-up ratios, such as Japan.

References

- Acs Z. J., and D. B. Audretsch (1990). *Innovation and Small Firms*. MIT Press, Cambridge: MA.
- Åstebro, T., and I. Bernhardt (2003). "Start-up financing, owner characteristics, and survival," *Journal of Economics and Business*, 55, 303-319.
- Åstebro, T., and I. Bernhardt (2005). "The winner's course of human capital," *Small Business Economics*, 24, 63-87.
- Audretsch, D.B., M. C. Keilbach, E. E. Lehmann (2006). *Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Bates. T. (1990). "Entrepreneur human capital inputs and small business longevity," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 72, 551-559.
- Cohen, W.M., R. C. Levin, and D. C. Mowery (1987). "Firm size and R&D intensity: A re-examination," *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 35, 543-565.
- Coleman, S. (2007). "The role of human and financial capital in the profitability and growth of women-owned small firms," *Journal of Small Business Management*, 45, 303-319.
- Colombo, M. G., M. Delmastro, and L., Grilli (2004). "Entrepreneurs' human capital and the start-up size of new technology-based firms," *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 22, 1183-1211.
- Colombo, M. G., and L., Grilli (2005). "Founders' human capital and the growth of new technology-based firms: A competence-based view," *Research Policy*, 34, 795-816.
- Cressy, R. (1996). "Are business startups debt-rationed?" *Economic Journal*, 106, 1253-1270.
- Evans, D. S. and B. Jovanovic (1989). "An estimated model of entrepreneurial choice under liquidity constraints," *Journal of Political Economy*, 97, 808-827.

- Hausman, J., B. H. Hall, and Z. Griliches (1984). "Econometric model for count data with an application to the patents-R&D relationship," *Econometrica*, 52, 909-938.
- Honjo, Y. (2004). "Growth of new start-up firms: evidence from the Japanese manufacturing industry," *Applied Economics*, 36, 343-355.
- Marvel, M.R. and G.T. Lumpkin (2007). "Technology entrepreneurs' human capital and its effects on innovation radicalness," *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 31, 807-828.
- Okamuro, H. (2009). "Determinants of R&D activities by start-up firms: evidence from Japan," in: Michaels, J.E. and L.F. Piraro (Eds.), *Small Business: Innovation, Problems and Strategy*. Nova Science Publishers, New York, pp. 27-44.
- Okamuro, H., Kato, M and Y. Honjo. (2011). "Determinants of R&D cooperation in Japanese start-ups," *Research Policy*, 40, 728-738.
- Parker, S. C., and C. M. van Praag (2006). "Schooling, capital constraints, and entrepreneurial performance: The endogenous triangle," *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 24, 416-431.

Table 1: Definitions of variables

Variable	Definition
(Dependent variable)	
<i>INN</i>	Dummy variable: 1 if the firm has product/process innovations after start-up.
<i>PAT</i>	Dummy variable: 1 if the firm has conducted patent applications after start-up.
(Independent variable)	
<i>Founder-specific characteristics</i>	
<i>UEDU</i>	Dummy variable: 1 if the founder has undergraduate education, 0 otherwise.
<i>GEDU</i>	Dummy variable: 1 if the founder has graduate school education, 0 otherwise.
<i>WEXP</i>	Dummy variable: 1 if the founder has prior work experience in the related field at start-up, 0 otherwise.
<i>MEXP</i>	Dummy variable: 1 if the founder has prior managerial experience in other firms at start-up, 0 otherwise.
<i>INNEXP</i>	Dummy variable: 1 if the founder has prior experience of product/process innovations at start-up, 0 otherwise.
<i>PATEXP</i>	Dummy variable: 1 if the founder has prior experience of patent applications at start-up, 0 otherwise.
<i>ACAD</i>	Dummy variable: 1 if the founder is a member of academic association in the natural sciences, 0 otherwise.
<i>AGE</i>	Founder's age at start-up.
<i>Firm-specific characteristics</i>	
<i>RDEXP</i>	R&D expenditures (million yen) divided by the number of employees.
<i>SIZE</i>	Number of employees at start-up.
<i>SUB</i>	Dummy variable: 1 if the firm is founded a subsidiary or an affiliated firm, 0 otherwise.
<i>MFOUND</i>	Dummy variable: 1 if the firm has multiple founders, 0 otherwise.
<i>Industry-specific characteristics</i>	
<i>INDRD</i>	R&D expenditures divided by sales.
<i>APPROP</i>	Degree of appropriability of innovation outcomes.
<i>TECHOPP</i>	Degree of technological opportunities.
<i>Others: Instruments</i>	
<i>REQRD</i>	Required R&D investment (million yen)
<i>IF</i>	Amount of internal funding, measured as founder's own funding plus his or her family's and friends' funding (million yen).

Table 2: Summary statistics of variables

Variable	Obs.	Mean	S.D.	Min.	Max.
(Dependent variable)					
<i>INN</i>	179	0.436	0.497	0	1
<i>PAT</i>	174	0.172	0.379	0	1
(Independent variable)					
<i>Founder-specific characteristics</i>					
<i>UEDU</i>	179	0.520	0.501	0	1
<i>GEDU</i>	179	0.134	0.342	0	1
<i>WEXP</i>	179	0.849	0.359	0	1
<i>MEXP</i>	179	0.352	0.479	0	1
<i>INNEXP</i>	179	0.363	0.482	0	1
<i>PATEXP</i>	174	0.218	0.414	0	1
<i>ACAD</i>	179	0.179	0.384	0	1
<i>AGE</i>	179	46.330	11.357	22	80
<i>Firm-specific characteristics</i>					
<i>RDEXP</i>	179	5.297	10.389	0.050	80
<i>SIZE</i>	179	3.838	5.471	1	53
<i>MFOUND</i>	179	0.480	0.501	0	1
<i>Industry-specific characteristics</i>					
<i>RDINT</i>	179	1.489	0.601	0.364	2.656
<i>APPROP</i>	179	1.209	0.224	0.869	1.834
<i>TECHOPP</i>	179	0.897	0.171	0.559	1.071
<i>Instruments</i>					
<i>REQRD</i>	179	13.059	22.714	0.100	100
<i>IF</i>	179	6.764	10.314	0	70

Note: This table is based on the data sets used in the instrumental variable probit regressions.

Table 3: Correlation matrix of variables (Number of obs.: 169)

Variable	<i>INN</i>	<i>PAT</i>	<i>UEDU</i>	<i>GEDU</i>	<i>WEXP</i>	<i>MEXP</i>	<i>INNEXP</i>	<i>PATEXP</i>	<i>ACAD</i>	<i>AGE</i>	<i>RDEXP</i>	<i>SIZE</i>	<i>MFOUND</i>	<i>RDINT</i>	<i>APPROP</i>	<i>TECHOPP</i>	<i>REQRD</i>	<i>IF</i>
<i>INN</i>	1.000																	
<i>PAT</i>	0.295	1.000																
<i>UEDU</i>	0.060	-0.061	1.000															
<i>GEDU</i>	0.072	0.263	-0.399	1.000														
<i>WEXP</i>	0.062	-0.100	-0.022	0.157	1.000													
<i>MEXP</i>	0.034	0.025	0.029	-0.095	-0.099	1.000												
<i>INNEXP</i>	0.465	0.297	0.078	0.091	0.009	0.029	1.000											
<i>PATEXP</i>	0.184	0.386	-0.044	0.201	-0.092	-0.052	0.508	1.000										
<i>ACAD</i>	0.133	0.187	0.065	0.290	0.050	0.002	0.200	0.281	1.000									
<i>AGE</i>	0.019	0.153	-0.027	0.096	0.008	0.157	0.193	0.303	0.236	1.000								
<i>RDEXP</i>	0.270	0.252	-0.094	0.323	-0.007	0.042	0.040	0.077	0.118	-0.038	1.000							
<i>SIZE</i>	0.078	-0.029	-0.020	-0.064	-0.075	0.145	0.097	0.002	0.004	0.132	0.189	1.000						
<i>MFOUND</i>	0.109	-0.003	-0.005	-0.024	-0.148	0.121	0.021	-0.074	-0.002	-0.013	0.177	0.216	1.000					
<i>RDINT</i>	0.108	0.123	-0.141	0.098	0.153	-0.051	0.037	0.173	0.230	0.220	0.179	-0.009	0.192	1.000				
<i>APPROP</i>	0.068	0.179	0.030	-0.055	-0.051	0.110	0.115	0.004	0.014	0.075	-0.047	-0.029	0.106	0.009	1.000			
<i>TECHOPP</i>	-0.034	-0.059	0.026	0.017	0.155	-0.065	-0.088	-0.178	-0.053	-0.266	-0.046	-0.009	0.147	0.073	0.114	1.000		
<i>REQRD</i>	0.366	0.270	0.010	0.113	-0.057	0.116	0.004	0.050	0.012	-0.091	0.695	0.141	0.276	0.197	0.016	0.033	1.000	
<i>IF</i>	0.064	-0.044	-0.004	0.123	0.082	0.036	-0.031	0.030	0.196	0.069	0.299	0.349	0.056	0.064	-0.046	-0.033	0.163	1.000

Note: This table shows the correlations between all the variables used in the instrumental variable probit regressions. Thus, the number of observations is different from those of the empirical regressions.

Table 4. Estimation results: Probit model

Variable	(i) <i>INN</i>		(ii) <i>PAT</i>	
	Coef.	S.E.	Coef.	S.E.
<i>Founder-specific characteristics</i>				
<i>UEDU</i>	0.284	0.225	0.212	0.300
<i>GEDU</i>	0.028	0.352	0.694*	0.411
<i>WEXP</i>	0.175	0.301	-0.523	0.331
<i>MEXP</i>	0.078	0.222	-0.086	0.283
<i>INNEXP</i>	1.467***	0.224		
<i>PATEXP</i>			0.982***	0.271
<i>ACAD</i>	-0.111	0.308	0.223	0.315
<i>AGE</i>	-0.013	0.010	0.021*	0.012
<i>Firm-specific characteristics</i>				
<i>RDEXP</i>	0.050***	0.017	0.032**	0.013
<i>SIZE</i>	0.005	0.025	-0.042	0.038
<i>MFOUND</i>	0.059	0.216	-0.207	0.283
<i>Industry-specific characteristics</i>				
<i>RDINT</i>	0.291	0.186	-0.101	0.207
<i>APPROP</i>	-0.125	0.461	1.276**	0.542
<i>TECHOPP</i>	-0.215	0.676	0.314	0.805
Constant term	-0.817	0.935	-3.723***	1.126
Pseudo R ²	0.263		0.258	
N of obs.	204		199	
Log likelihood	-102.631		-68.716	

Note:

1. S.E. indicates robust standard errors.
2. ***, ** and * indicate significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels, respectively.

Table 5. Estimation results: Probit model with an endogenous regressor

(Second stage) Variable	(i) <i>INN</i>		(ii) <i>PAT</i>	
	Coef.	S.E.	Coef.	S.E.
<i>Endogenous variable</i>				
<i>RDEXP</i>	0.098***	0.020	0.058***	0.019
<i>Founder-specific characteristics</i>				
<i>UEDU</i>	0.021	0.233	0.130	0.326
<i>GEDU</i>	-0.599	0.392	0.446	0.495
<i>WEXP</i>	0.288	0.320	-0.553	0.367
<i>MEXP</i>	0.070	0.225	0.009	0.301
<i>INNEXP</i>	1.287***	0.268		
<i>PATEXP</i>			1.042***	0.301
<i>ACAD</i>	0.069	0.309	0.087	0.348
<i>AGE</i>	-0.005	0.011	0.021	0.014
<i>Firm-specific characteristics</i>				
<i>SIZE</i>	-0.018	0.023	-0.045	0.037
<i>MFOUND</i>	-0.014	0.220	-0.284	0.315
<i>Industry-specific characteristics</i>				
<i>RDINT</i>	0.047	0.198	-0.237	0.231
<i>APPROP</i>	0.410	0.475	1.590***	0.598
<i>TECHOPP</i>	0.135	0.697	0.211	0.878
Constant term	-1.673*	0.971	-3.817***	1.224
(First stage)	<i>RDEXP</i>		<i>RDEXP</i>	
<i>Founder-specific characteristics</i>				
<i>UEDU</i>	0.341	1.099	0.024	1.103
<i>GEDU</i>	6.569***	1.734	7.145***	1.776
<i>WEXP</i>	-1.322	1.438	-0.407	1.488
<i>MEXP</i>	-0.558	1.071	-0.426	1.082
<i>INNEXP</i>	0.487	1.060		
<i>PATEXP</i>			-0.515	1.301
<i>ACAD</i>	-0.432	1.432	0.547	1.483
<i>AGE</i>	-0.048	0.049	-0.041	0.049
<i>Firm-specific characteristics</i>				
<i>SIZE</i>	0.109	0.099	0.153	0.100
<i>MFOUND</i>	-0.497	1.069	-0.217	1.083
<i>Industry-specific characteristics</i>				
<i>RDINT</i>	0.711	0.905	0.645	0.918
<i>APPROP</i>	-1.814	2.256	-1.006	2.252
<i>TECHOPP</i>	-4.135	3.112	-4.705	3.156
<i>Instruments</i>				
<i>REQRD</i>	0.295***	0.024	0.286***	0.024
<i>IF</i>	0.175***	0.050	0.125***	0.057
Constant term	7.338	4.467	6.116	4.496
N of obs.	179		174	
Log likelihood	-671.322		-624.424	
Wald test of exogeneity	7.33***		3.34*	

Note:

1. S.E. indicates standard errors.
2. ***, ** and * indicate significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels, respectively.

Center for Economic Institutions Working Paper Series

- 2000-1 Jean Tirole, "Corporate Governance," January 2000.
- 2000-2 Kenneth A. Kim and S. Ghon Rhee, "A Note on Shareholder Oversight and the Regulatory Environment: The Japanese Banking Experience," January 2000.
- 2000-3 S. Ghon Rhee, "Further Reforms after the "BIG BANG": The Japanese Government Bond Market," June 2000.
- 2000-4 Stijn Claessens, Simeon Djankov, Joseph Fan, and Larry Lang, "Expropriation of Minority Shareholders in East Asia," July 2000.
- 2000-5 Stijn Claessens, Simeon Djankov, Joseph Fan, and Larry Lang, "The Costs of Group Affiliation: Evidence from East Asia," July 2000.
-
- 2001-1 Masaharu Hanazaki and Akie Takeuchi, "An International Comparison of Corporate Investment Behavior -Some Implications for the Governance Structure in Japan-," February 2001.
- 2001-2 Katsuyuki Kubo, "The Determinants of Executive Compensation in Japan and the UK: Agency Hypothesis or Joint Determination Hypothesis?" February 2001.
- 2001-3 Katsuyuki Kubo, "Changes in Directors' Incentive Plans and the Performance of Firms in the UK," March 2001.
- 2001-4 Yupana Wiwattanakantang, "Controlling Shareholders and Corporate Value: Evidence from Thailand," March 2001.
- 2001-5 Katsuyuki Kubo, "The Effect of Managerial Ownership on Firm Performance: Case in Japan," March 2001.
- 2001-6 Didier Guillot and James R. Lincoln, "The Permeability of Network Boundaries: Strategic Alliances in the Japanese Electronics Industry in the 1990s," March 2001.
- 2001-7 Naohito Abe, "Ageing and its Macroeconomic Implications-A Case in Japan-," May 2001.
- 2001-8 Yupana Wiwattanakantang, "The Equity Ownership Structure of Thai Firms," July 2001.
- 2001-9 Megumi Suto, "Capital Structure and Investment Behaviour of Malaysian Firms in the 1990s--A study of Corporate Governance before the Crisis--," August 2001.
- 2001-10 Naohito Abe, Noel Gaston, and Katsuyuki Kubo, "Executive Pay in Japan : The Role of Bank-Appointed Monitors and the Main Bank Relationship," September 2001.
- 2001-11 Colin Mayer, "The Financing and Governance of New Technologies," September 2001.
- 2001-12 Masaharu Hanazaki and Akiyoshi Horiuchi, "Can the Financial Restraint Hypothesis Explain Japan's Postwar Experience?" September 2001.
- 2001-13 Shin-ichi Fukuda, "The Role of Long-term Loans for Economic Development: Empirical Evidence in Japan, Korea, and Taiwan," September 2001.

- 2001-14 S. Ghon Rhee, "Further Reforms of the JGB Market for the Promotion of Regional Bond Markets," September 2001.
- 2001-15 Stijn Claessens, Simeon Djankov, Joseph P. H. Fan, and Larry H. P. Lang, "The Benefits and Costs of Internal Markets: Evidence from Asia's Financial Crisis," September 2001.
- 2001-16 Kenneth A. Kim and John R. Nofsinger, "Institutional Herding, Business Groups, and Economic Regimes: Evidence from Japan," September 2001.
- 2001-17 Mitsuhiro Fukao, "Financial Deregulations, Weakness of Market Discipline, and Market Development: Japan's Experience and Lessons for Developing Countries," September 2001.
- 2001-18 Akio Kuroda and Koichi Hamada, "Towards an Incentive Compatible Financial System: Accounting and Managing the Non-Performing Loans," September 2001.
- 2001-19 Randall Morck and Bernard Yeung, "Japanese Economic Success and the Curious Characteristics of Japanese Stock Prices," September 2001.
- 2001-20 Miguel A. García-Cestona, "Ownership Structure, Banks and the Role of Stakeholders: The Spanish Case," September 2001.
- 2001-21 Joseph P. H. Fan and T. J. Wong, "Corporate Ownership Structure and the Informativeness of Accounting Earnings in East Asia," September 2001.
- 2001-22 Heather Montgomery, "The Effect of the Basel Accord on Bank Lending in Japan," September 2001.
- 2001-23 Naoyuki Yoshino, Sahoko Kaji, and Ayako Suzuki, "The Basket-peg, Dollar-peg and Floating---A Comparative Analysis of Exchange Rate Regimes," September 2001.
- 2001-24 Colin Mayer, Koen Schoors, and Yishay Yafeh, "Sources of Funds and Investment Strategies of Venture Capital Funds: Evidence from Germany, Israel, Japan and the UK," September 2001.
- 2001-25 Yukinobu Kitamura, Megumi Suto, and Juro Teranishi, "Towards a New Architecture for the Japanese Financial System: Participation Costs, Intermediated Ownership and Wealth Distribution," September 2001.
-
- 2002-1 Evgeni Peev, "The Political Economy of Corporate Governance Change in Bulgaria: Washington Consensus, Primitive Accumulation of Capital, and Catching-Up in the 1990," March 2002.
- 2002-2 Naohito Abe, "Saving, Capital Flows, and the Symmetric International Spillover of Industrial Policies," June 2002.
- 2002-3 Masaharu Hanazaki and Akiyoshi Horiuchi, "A Review of Japan's Bank Crisis from the Governance Perspective," July 2002.
- 2002-4 Chutathong Charumirind, Raja Kali and Yupana Wiwattanakantang, "Crony Lending: Thailand before the Financial Crisis," September 2002.
- 2002-5 Maitreesh Ghatak and Raja Kali, "Financially Interlinked Business Groups," September 2002.
- 2002-6 Tarun Khanna, Joe Kogan, and Krishna Palepu, "Globalization and Similarities in Corporate Governance: A Cross-Country Analysis," September 2002.

- 2002-7 Chongwoo Choe, "Delegated Contracting and Corporate Hierarchies," September 2002.
- 2002-8 Tarun Khanna and Yishay Yafeh, "Business Groups and Risk Sharing around the World," September 2002.
- 2002-9 Yitae Kim, Kwangwoo Park, Ronald A. Ratti, and Hyun-Han Shin, "Do Main Banks Extract Rents from their Client Firms? Evidence from Korean Chaebol," September 2002.
- 2002-10 Armen Hovakimian, Edward J. Kane and Luc Laeven, "How Country and Safety-Net Characteristics Affect Bank Risk-Shifting," September 2002.
- 2002-11 Vidhan K. Goyal and Takeshi Yamada, "Asset Price Shocks, Financial Constraint, and Investment: Evidence from Japan," September 2002.
- 2002-12 Clive S. Lennox, "Opinion Shopping and Audit Committees," September 2002.
- 2002-13 Seki Obata, "Pyramid Business Groups in East Asia: Insurance or Tunneling?," September 2002.
- 2002-14 Ishtiaq Pasha Mahmood and Will Mitchell, "Two Faces: Effects of Business Groups on Innovation in Emerging Economies," September 2002.
- 2002-15 Kwangwoo Park, "Foreign Ownership and Firm Value in Japan," September 2002.
- 2002-16 Adrian van Rixtel, Yupana Wiwattanakantang, Toshiyuki Souma, and Kazunori Suzuki, "Banking in Japan: Will "To Big To Fail" Prevail?" December 2002.
- 2002-17 Stijn Claessens and Leora F. Klapper, "Bankruptcy around the World: Explanations of its Relative Use," December 2002.
-
- 2003-1 Anya Khanthavit, Piruna Polsiri, and Yupana Wiwattanakantang, "Did Families Lose or Gain Control after the East Asian Financial Crisis?" February 2003.
- 2003-2 Hidenobu Okuda, Hidetoshi Hashimoto, and Michiko Murakami, "The Estimation of Stochastic Cost Functions of Malaysian Commercial Banks and Its Policy Implications to Bank Restructuring," February 2003.
- 2003-3 Masaharu Hanazaki and Liuqun, "Asian Crisis and Corporate Governance, (in Japanese)" March 2003.
- 2003-4 Fukuju Yamazaki and Hiroyuki Seshita, "Economic Analysis of Bankruptcy law in Japan, (in Japanese)" February 2003.
- 2003-5 Hirofumi Uchida and Hiroshi Osano, "Bank Monitoring and Corporate Governance in Japan, (in Japanese)" March 2003.
- 2003-6 Fukunari Kimura and Kozo Kiyota, "Foreign Ownership and Corporate Performance: Evidence from Japanese Micro Data, (in Japanese)" March 2003.
- 2003-7 Yukinobu Kitamura, "Corporate Profit and Debt- Panel Data Analysis of The Japanese Firms in the 1990s, (in Japanese)" March 2003.
- 2003-8 Chaiyasit Aunchitworawong, Toshiyuki Soma, and Yupana Wiwattanakantang, "Do Families Control Banks Prevail after the East Asia Financial Crisis? Evidence from Thailand" March 2003.

- 2003-9 Junko Maru, Yasuhiro Yonezawa and Yuki Matsumoto, "Corporate Governance by Foreign Investors in East Asia Corporations (in Japanese)" March 2003.
- 2003-10 Sui Qing-yuan, "Declining Firm's Dependence upon Bank Borrowing and Corporate Performance (in Japanese)" March 2003.
- 2003-11 Katsumi Matsuura, "Changes in Ownership Structures and Their Impacts upon Corporate Performance in Japan (in Japanese)" March 2003.
- 2003-12 Kathy S. He, Randall Morck and Bernard Yeung, "Corporate Stability and Economic Growth," May 2003.
- 2003-13 Robert Dekle and Heajin Ryoo, "Exchange Rate Fluctuations, Financing Constraints, Hedging, and Exports: Evidence from Firm Level Data," June 2003.
- 2003-14 Tsun-Siou Lee, Yin-Hua Yeh and Rong-Tze Liu, "Can Corporate Governance Variables Enhance the Prediction Power of Accounting-Based Financial Distress Prediction Models?," June 2003.
- 2003-15 Hideaki Miyajima and Yishay Yafeh, "Japan's Banking Crisis: Who has the Most to Lose?," June 2003.
- 2003-16 Guifen Pei, "Asset Management Companies in China," June 2003.
- 2003-17 Takeshi Nagase, "The Governance Structure of IPO Firm in Japan," July 2003.
- 2003-18 Masaharu Hanazaki and Qun Liu, "The Asian Crisis and Corporate Governance — Ownership Structure, Debt Financing, and Corporate Diversification —," July 2003.
- 2003-19 Chutatong Charumilind, Raja Kali and Yupana Wiwattanakantang, "Connected Lending: Thailand before the Financial Crisis," July 2003.
- 2003-20 Gilles Hilary and Tomoki Oshika, "Shareholder activism in Japan: social pressure, private cost and organized crime," August 2003.
- 2003-21 Sanghoon Ahn, "Technology Upgrading with Learning Cost," September 2003.
- 2003-22 Masaharu Hanazaki and Akiyoshi Horiuchi, "Have Banks Contributed to Efficient Management in Japan's Manufacturing?," November 2003.
- 2003-23 Chongwoo Choe and In-Uck Park, "Delegated Contracting and Corporate Hierarchies," November 2003.
- 2003-24 Bruno Dallago, "Comparative Economic Systems and the New Comparative Economics: Foes, Competitors, or Complementary?," November 2003.
- 2003-25 Adrian van Rixtel, Ioana Alexopoulou and Kimie Harada, "The New Basel Capital Accord and Its Impact on Japanese Banking: A Qualitative Analysis," November 2003.
-
- 2004-1 Masaharu Hanazaki, Toshiyuki Souma and Yupana Wiwattanakantang, "Silent Large Shareholders and Entrenched Bank Management: Evidence from Banking Crisis in Japan," January 2004.
- 2004-2 Ming Ming Chiu and Sung Wook Joh, "Bank Loans to Distressed Firms: Cronyism, bank governance and economic crisis," January 2004.

- 2004-3 Keun Lee, Keunkwan Ryu and Jungmo Yoon, "Corporate Governance and Long Term Performance of the Business Groups: The Case of Chaebols in Korea," January 2004.
- 2004-4 Randall Morck and Masao Nakamura, "Been There, Done That –The History of Corporate Ownership in Japan," March 2004.
- 2004-5 Dong-Hua Chen, Joseph P. H. Fan and T. J. Wong, "Politically-connected CEOs, Corporate Governance and Post-IPO Performance of China's Partially Privatized Firms," March 2004.
- 2004-6 Jae-Seung Baek, Jun-Koo Kang and Inmoo Lee, "Business Groups and Tunneling: Evidence from Private Securities Offerings by Korean Chaebols," March 2004.
- 2004-7 E. Han Kim, "To Steal or Not to Steal: Firm Attributes, Legal Environment, and Valuation," March 2004.
- 2004-8 Yin-Hua Yeh and Tracie Woidtke, "Commitment or Entrenchment?: Controlling Shareholders and Board Composition," June 2004.
- 2004-9 Hugh Patrick, "Thoughts on Evolving Corporate Governance in Japan," June 2004.
- 2004-10 Utpal Bhattacharya and Hazem Daouk, "When No Law is Better than a Good Law", June 2004.
- 2004-11 Sanghoon Ahn, Utpal Bhattacharya, Taehun Jung and Giseok Nam, "Do Japanese CEOs Matter?", June 2004.
- 2004-12 Megumi Suto and Masashi Toshino, "Behavioural Biases of Japanese Institutional Investors; Fund management and Corporate Governance", July 2004.
- 2004-13 Piruna Polsiri and Yupana Wiwattanakantang, "Business Groups in Thailand: Before and after the East Asian Financial Crisis", August 2004.
- 2004-14 Fumiharu Mieno, "Fund Mobilization and Investment Behavior in Thai Manufacturing Firms in the Early 1990s", August 2004.
- 2004-15 Chaiyasit Anuchitworawong, "Deposit Insurance, Corporate Governance and Discretionary Behavior: Evidence from Thai Financial Institutions", September 2004.
- 2004-16 Chaiyasit Anuchitworawong, "Financial fragility under implicit insurance scheme: Evidence from the collapse of Thai financial institutions", September 2004.
- 2004-17 Chaiyasit Anuchitworawong, "Ownership-based Incentives, Internal Corporate Risk and Firm Performance", September 2004.
- 2004-18 Jack Ochs and In-Uck Park, "Overcoming the Coordination Problem: Dynamic Formation of Networks", September 2004.
- 2004-19 Hidenobu Okuda and Suvadee Rungsomboon, "Comparative Cost Study of Foreign and Thai Domestic Banks 1990–2002: Estimating Cost Functions of the Thai Banking Industry," February 2005.
- 2004-20 Hidenobu Okuda and Suvadee Rungsomboon, "The Effects of Foreign Bank Entry on the Thai Banking Market: Empirical Analysis from 1990 to 2002," March 2005.

- 2004-21 Juro Teranishi, "Investor Right in Historical Perspective: Globalization and the Future of the Japanese Firm and Financial System," March 2005.
- 2004-22 Kentaro Iwatsubo, "Which Accounts for Real Exchange Rate Fluctuations, Deviations from the Law of One Price or Relative Price of Nontraded Goods?," March 2005.
- 2004-23 Kentaro Iwatsubo and Tomoyuki Ohta, "Causes and effects of exchange rate regimes (in Japanese)," March 2005.
- 2004-24 Kentaro Iwatsubo, "Bank Capital Shocks and Portfolio Risk: Evidence from Japan," March 2005.
- 2004-25 Kentaro Iwatsubo, "On the Bank-led Rescues Financially Distressed Firms in Japan," March 2005.
-
- 2005-1 Yishay P. Yafeh and Tarun Khanna, "Business Groups in Emerging Markets: Paragons or Parasities?," September 2005.
- 2005-2 Renee B. Adams and Daniel Ferreira, "Do Directors Perform for Pay?," September 2005.
- 2005-3 Qun Liu, Shin-ichi Fukuda and Juro Teranishi, "What are Characteristics of Financial Systems in East Asia as a Region?," September 2005.
- 2005-4 Juro Teranishi, "Is the Financial System of Postwar Japan Bank-dominated or Market Based?," September 2005.
- 2005-5 Hasung Jang, Hyung-cheol Kang and Kyung Suh Park, "Determinants of Family Ownership: The Choice between Control and Performance," October 2005.
- 2005-6 Hasung Jang, Hyung-cheol Kang and Kyung Suh Park, "The Choice of Group Structure: Divide and Rule," October 2005.
- 2005-7 Sangwoo Lee, Kwangwoo Park and Hyun-Han Shin, "The Very Dark Side of International Capital Markets: Evidence from Diversified Business Groups in Korea," October 2005.
- 2005-8 Allen N. Berger, Richard J. Rosen and Gregory F. Udell, "Does Market Size Structure Affect Competition? The Case of Small Business Lending," November 2005.
- 2005-9 Aditya Kaul and Stephen Sapp, "Trading Activity and Foreign Exchange Market Quality," November 2005.
- 2005-10 Xin Chang, Sudipto Dasgupta and Gilles Hilary, "The Effect of Auditor Choice on Financing Decisions," December 2005.
- 2005-11 Kentaro Iwatsubo, "Adjustment Speeds of Nominal Exchange Rates and Prices toward Purchasing Power Parity," January 2006.
- 2005-12 Giovanni Barone-Adesi, Robert Engle and Loriano Mancini, "GARCH Options in Incomplete Markets," March 2006.
- 2005-13 Aditya Kaul, Vikas Mehrotra and Blake Phillips, "Ownership, Foreign Listings, and Market Valuation," March 2006.
- 2005-14 Ricard Gil, "Renegotiation, Learning and Relational Contracting", March 2006.

- 2005-15 Randall Morck, “How to Eliminate Pyramidal Business Groups -The Double Taxation of Inter-corporate Dividends and other Incisive Uses of Tax Policy-”, March 2006.
- 2005-16 Joseph P.H. Fan, T.J. Wong and Tianyu Zhang, “The Emergence of Corporate Pyramids in China”, March 2006.
- 2005-17 Yan Du, Qianqiu Liu and S. Ghon Rhee, “An Anatomy of the Magnet Effect: Evidence from the Korea Stock Exchange High-Frequency Data”, March 2006.
- 2005-18 Kentaro Iwatsubo and Junko Shimizu, “Signaling Effects of Foreign Exchange Interventions and Expectation Heterogeneity among Traders”, March 2006.
- 2005-19 Kentaro Iwatsubo, “Current Account Adjustment and Exchange Rate Pass-Through(in Japanese)”, March 2006.
- 2005-20 Piruna Polsiri and Yupana Wiwattanakantang, “Corporate Governance of Banks in Thailand”, March 2006.
-
- 2006-1 Hiroyuki Okamuro and Jian Xiong Zhang, “Ownership Structure and R&D Investment of Japanese Start-up Firms,” June 2006.
- 2006-2 Hiroyuki Okamuro, “Determinants of R&D Activities by Start-up Firms: Evidence from Japan,” June 2006.
- 2006-3 Joseph P.H. Fan, T.J. Wong and Tianyu Zhang, “The Emergence of Corporate Pyramids in China,” August 2006.
- 2006-4 Pramuan Bunkanwanicha, Jyoti Gupta and Yupana Wiwattanakantang, “Pyramiding of Family-owned Banks in Emerging Markets,” September 2006.
- 2006-5 Bernardo Bortolotti and Mara Faccio, “Reluctant privatization,” September 2006.
- 2006-6 Jörn Kleinert and Farid Toubal, “Distance costs and Multinationals’ foreign activities”, October 2006.
- 2006-7 Jörn Kleinert and Farid Toubal, “Dissecting FDI”, October 2006.
- 2006-8 Shin-ichi Fukuda and Satoshi Koibuchi, “The Impacts of “Shock Therapy” on Large and Small Clients: Experiences from Two Large Bank Failures in Japan”, October 2006.
- 2006-9 Shin-ichi Fukuda, Munehisa Kasuya and Kentaro Akashi, “The Role of Trade Credit for Small Firms: An Implication from Japan’s Banking Crisis”, October 2006.
- 2006-10 Pramuan Bunkanwanicha and Yupana Wiwattanakantang, “Big Business Owners and Politics: Investigating the Economic Incentives of Holding Top Office”, October 2006.
- 2006-11 Sang Whi Lee, Seung-Woog(Austin) Kwang, Donald J. Mullineaux and Kwangwoo Park, “Agency Conflicts, Financial Distress, and Syndicate Structure: Evidence from Japanese Borrowers”, October 2006.
- 2006-12 Masaharu Hanazaki and Qun Liu, “Corporate Governance and Investment in East Asian Firms -Empirical Analysis of Family-Controlled Firms”, October 2006.
- 2006-13 Kentaro Iwatsubo and Konomi Tonogi, “Foreign Ownership and Firm Value: Identification through Heteroskedasticity (in Japanese)”, December 2006.

- 2006-14 Kentaro Iwatsubo and Kazuyuki Inagaki, “Measuring Financial Market Contagion Using Dually-Traded Stocks of Asian Firms”, December 2006.
- 2006-15 Hun-Chang Lee, “When and how did Japan catch up with Korea? –A comparative study of the pre-industrial economies of Korea and Japan”, February 2007.
- 2006-16 Kyoji Fukao, Keiko Ito, Shigesaburo Kabe, Deqiang Liu and Fumihide Takeuchi, “Are Japanese Firms Failing to Catch up in Localization? An Empirical Analysis Based on Affiliate-level Data of Japanese Firms and a Case Study of the Automobile Industry in China”, February 2007.
- 2006-17 Kyoji Fukao, Young Gak Kim and Hyeog Ug Kwon, “Plant Turnover and TFP Dynamics in Japanese Manufacturing”, February 2007.
- 2006-18 Kyoji Fukao, Keiko Ito, Hyeog Ug Kwon and Miho Takizawa, “Cross-Border Acquisitions and Target Firms' Performance: Evidence from Japanese Firm-Level Data”, February 2007.
- 2006-19 Jordan Siegel and Felix Oberholzer-Gee, “Expropriators or Turnaround Artists? The Role of Controlling Families in South Korea (1985-2003)”, March 2007.
- 2006-20 Francis Kramarz and David Thesmar, “Social Networks in The Boardroom”, March 2007.
- 2006-21 Morten Bennedsen, Francisco Pérez-González and Daniel Wolfenzon, “Do CEOs matter?”, March 2007.
-
- 2007-1 Ichiro Iwasaki, “Endogenous board formation and its determinants in a transition economy: evidence from Russia*”, April 2007, Revised on October 2007.
- 2007-2 Joji Tokui, Tomohiko Inui, and Katsuaki Ochiai, “The Impact of Vintage Capital and R&D on Japanese Firms' Productivity”, April 2007.
- 2007-3 Yasuo Nakanishi and Tomohiko Inui, “Deregulation and Productivity in Japanese Industries”, April 2007.
- 2007-4 Kyoji Fukao, “The Performance of Foreign Firms and the Macroeconomic Impact of FDI”, May 2007.
- 2007-5 Taku Suzuki, “The Role of the State in Economic Growth of Post-Communist Transitional Countries”, June 2007.
- 2007-6 Michiel van Leuvensteijn, Jacob A. Bikker, Adrian A.R.J.M. van Rixtel and Christoffer Kok-Sørensen*, “A new approach to measuring competition in the loan markets of the euro area”, June 2007.
- 2007-7 Sea Jin Chang, Jaiho Chung, and Dean Xu, “FDI and Technology Spillovers in China”, July 2007.
- 2007-8 Fukunari Kimura, “The mechanics of production networks in Southeast Asia: the fragmentation theory approach”, July 2007.
- 2007-9 Kyoji Fukao, Tsutomu Miyagawa, Miho Takizawa, “Productivity Growth and Resource Reallocation in Japan”, November 2007.
- 2007-10 YoungGak Kim, “A Survey on Intangible Capital”, December 2007.

- 2007-11 Sea-Jing Chang and Jay Hyuk Rhee, “Rapid International Expansion Strategy of Emerging Market Enterprises: The Interplay between Speed and Competitive Risks on International performance”, November 2007.
- 2007-12 Ishtiaq Mahmood, Will Mitchell, and Chi-Nien Chung, “The Structure of Intra-Group Ties: Innovation in Taiwanese Business”, January 2008.
- 2007-13 Kyoji Fukao, Tomohiko Inui, Shigesaburo Kabe and Deqiang Liu, “ An International Comparison of the TFP Levels of Japanese, Korean and Chinese Listed Firms“, March 2008.
- 2007-14 Pramuan Bunkanwanicha and Yupana Wiwattanakantang, “Allocating Risk Across Pyramidal Tiers: Evidence from Thai Business Groups”, March 2008.
-
- 2008-1 Rüdiger Fahlenbrach and René M. Stulz, "Managerial Ownership Dynamics and Firm Value", April 2008.
- 2008-2 Morten Bennedsen, Kasper Meisner Nielsen, and, Thomas Vester Nielsen, “Private Contracting and Corporate Governance: Evidence from the Provision of Tag-Along Rights in an Emerging Market”, April 2008.
- 2008-3 Joseph P.H. Fan, Jun Huang, Felix Oberholzer-Gee, and Mengxin Zhao, “Corporate Diversification in China: Causes and Consequences”, April 2008.
- 2008-4 Daniel Ferreira, Miguel A. Ferreira, Clara C. Raposo, “Board Structure and Price Informativeness”, April 2008.
- 2008-5 Nicola Gennaioli and Stefano Rossi, “Judicial Discretion in Corporate Bankruptcy”, April 2008.
- 2008-6 Nicola Gennaioli and Stefano Rossi, “Optimal Resolutions of Financial Distress by Contract”, April 2008.
- 2008-7 Renée B. Adams and Daniel Ferreira, “Women in the Boardroom and Their Impact on Governance and Performance”, April 2008.
- 2008-8 Worawat Margsiri, Antonio S. Melloy, and Martin E. Ruckesz, “A Dynamic Analysis of Growth via Acquisition”, April 2008.
- 2008-9 Pantisa Pavabutra and Sukanya Prangwattananon, “Tick Size Change on the Stock Exchange of Thailand”, April 2008.
- 2008-10 Maria Boutchkova, Hitesh Doshi, Art Durnev, and Alexander Molchanov, “Politics and Volatility”, April 2008.
- 2008-11 Yan-Leung Cheung, P. Raghavendra Rau, and Aris Stouraitis, “The Helping Hand, the Lazy Hand, or the Grabbing Hand? Central vs. Local Government Shareholders in Publicly Listed Firms in China”, April 2008.
- 2008-12 Art Durnev and Larry Fauver, “Stealing from Thieves: Firm Governance and Performance when States are Predatory”, April 2008.
- 2008-13 Kenneth Lehn, Sukesh Patro, and Mengxin Zhao, “Determinants of the Size and Structure of Corporate Boards: 1935-2000”, April 2008.

- 2008-14 Ishtiaq P. Mahmood, Hong-Jin Zhu and Edward J. Zajac, "Where Can Capabilities Come From? How the Content of Network Ties Affects Capability Acquisition", April 2008.
- 2008-15 Vladimir I. Ivanov and Ronald W. Masulis, "Corporate Venture Capital, Strategic Alliances, and the Governance of Newly Public Firms", May 2008.
- 2008-16 Dick Beason, Ken Gordon, Vikas Mehrotra and Akiko Watanabe, "Does Restructuring Pay in Japan? Evidence Following the Lost Decade", July 2008 (revision uploaded on Oct. 2009).
-
- 2009-1 Vikas Mehrotra, Dimitri van Schaik, Jaap Spronk, and Onno Steenbeek, "Creditor-Focused Corporate Governance: Evidence from Mergers and Acquisitions in Japan," August, 2009.
- 2009-2 Debin Ma, "Law and Economic Change in Traditional China: A Comparative Perspective," September, 2009.
- 2009-3 Robert C. Allen, Jean-Pascal Bassino, Debin Ma, Christine Moll-Murata, and Jan Luiten van Zanden, "Wages, Prices, and Living Standards in China, 1738-1925: in Comparison with Europe, Japan, and India," June 2009.
- 2009-4 Jung-Wook Shim, "The Existence of Nepotism: Evidence from Japanese Family Firms," October 2009.
- 2009-5 Morten Bennedsen and Kasper Meisner Nielsen, "Incentive and Entrenchment Effects in European Ownership," March 2009.
- 2009-6 Joseph P.H. Fan, TJ Wong, Tianyu Zhang, "Founder Succession and Accounting Properties," April 2009.
- 2009-7 Hiroyuki Okamuro, Masatoshi Kato, and Yuji Honjo, "Determinants of R&D Cooperation in Japanese High-tech Start-ups," November 2009.
- 2009-8 Bill Francis, Iftekhar Hasan, Michael Koetter, and Qiang Wu, "The Effectiveness of Corporate Boards: Evidence from Bank Loan Contracting," November 2009.
- 2009-9 Allen N. Berger, Iftekhar Hasan and Mingming Zhou, "The Effects of Focus Versus Diversification on Bank Performance: Evidence from Chinese Banks," November 2009.
- 2009-10 Leonardo Becchetti, Andrea Carpentieri and Iftekhar Hasan, "The Determinants of Option Adjusted Delta Credit Spreads: A Comparative Analysis on US, UK and the Eurozone," November 2009.
- 2009-11 Luciano I. de Castro and Harry J. Paarsch, "Testing Affiliation in Private-values Models of First-price Auctions Using Grid Distributions," December 2009.
- 2009-12 Chulwoo Baek, YoungGak Kim and Heog Ug Kwon, "Market Competition and Productivity after the Asian Financial Crisis: Evidence from Korean Firm Level Data," December 2009.

- 2009-13 Jee-Hyeong Park, Stephen J. Spurr, and Sheng-Kai Chang, "A Model of Hierarchical Professionals: Cooperation and Conflict between Anesthesiologists and CRNAs," October 2009.
- 2009-14 Jee-Hyeong Park, "Enforcing International Trade Agreements with Imperfect Private Monitoring: Private Trigger Strategies and the Possible Role of the WTO," December 2009.
- 2009-15 Yuji Honjo, Masatoshi Kato and Hiroyuki Okamuro, "R&D financing of start-up firms: How much does founders' human capital matter?," March 2010.
-
- 2010-1 Sergei V. Ryazantsev, "Migrant Workers from Central Asian Russian Federation", June 2010.
- 2010-2 Tue Gørgens, Xin Meng, and Rhema Vaithianathan, "Stunting and Selection Effects of Famine: A Case Study of the Great Chinese Famine," October 2010.
- 2010-3 Masatoshi Kato and Yuji Honjo, "Heterogeneous Exits: Evidence from New Firms," November 2010.
- 2010-4 Sung-Jin Cho, Harry J. Paarsch, and John Rust, "Is the 'Linkage Principle' Valid?: Evidence from the Field," November 2010.
- 2010-5 Jean-Pascal Bassino and Noriko Kato, "Rich and slim, but relatively short Explaining the halt in the secular trend in Japan," November 2010.
- 2010-6 Robert G Gregory, Dark Corners in a Bright Economy; The Lack of Jobs for Unskilled Men," December 2010.
- 2010-7 Masatoshi Kato and Hiroyuki Odagiri, "Development of University Life-Science Programs and University-Industry Joint Research in Japan," December 2010.
- 2010-8 Han Hong, Harry J. Paarsch and Pai Xu, "On the Asymptotic Distribution of the Transaction Price in a Clock Model of a Multi-Unit, Oral, Ascending-Price Auction within the Common-Value Paradigm," January 2011.
- 2010-9 Tue Gørgens and Allan Würtz, "Testing a Parametric Function Against a Nonparametric Alternative in IV and GMM Settings," January 2011.
- 2010-10 Timothy P. Hubbard, Tong Li and Harry J. Paarsch, "Semiparametric Estimation in Models of First-Price, Sealed-Bid Auctions with Affiliation," January 2011.
- 2010-11 Yutaka Arimoto, Kentaro Nakajima, and Tetsuji Okazaki, "Agglomeration or Selection? The Case of the Japanese Silk-Reeling Clusters, 1908–1915," March 2011.
- 2010-12 Yukiko Abe, "Regional Variations in Labor Force Behavior of Women in Japan," March 2011.
- 2010-13 Takashi Kurosaki and Hidayat Ullah Khan, "Vulnerability of Microfinance to Strategic Default and Covariate Shocks: Evidence from Pakistan" , March 2011.

- 2010-14 Fumiharu Mieno, "Foreign Ownership, Listed Status and the Financial System in East Asia: Evidence from Thailand and Malaysia", March 2011.
- 2010-15 Hidenobu Okuda and Lai Thi Phuong Nhung, "Fundraising Behaviors of Listed Companies in Vietnam: An Estimation of the Influence of Government Ownership", March 2011.
-
- 2011-1 Hiroyuki Okamuro and Junichi Nishimura, "Impact of University Intellectual Property Policy on the Performance of University-Industry Research Collaboration", May 2011.
- 2011-2 Yutaka Arimoto, "Participatory Rural Development in 1930s Japan: The Economic Rehabilitation Movement", July 2011.
- 2011-3 Yutaka Arimoto, "The Impact of Farmland Readjustment and Consolidation on Structural Adjustment: The Case of Niigata, Japan", July 2011.
- 2011-4 Hidayat Ullah Khan, Takashi Kurosaki, and Ken Miura, "The Effectiveness of Community-Based Development in Poverty Reduction: A Descriptive Analysis of a Women-Managed NGO in Rural Pakistan", September 2011.
- 2011-5 Jane Harrigan, "Food Security in the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) and sub-Saharan Africa: A Comparative Analysis", September 2011.
- 2011-6 Machiko Nissanke, "International and Institutional Traps in Sub-Saharan Africa under Globalisation: A Comparative Perspective", September 2011.
- 2011-7 Hiroyuki Okamuro and Junichi Nishimura, "Management of Cluster Policies: Case Studies of Japanese, German, and French Bio-clusters", October 2011.
- 2011-8 Anne Booth, "Growing Public? Explaining the Changing Economic Role of the State in Asia over the 20th Century", December 2011.
- 2011-9 Jarko FidrmucI, Iikka KorhonenII, and Ivana BátorováIII, "China in the World Economy: Dynamic Correlation Analysis of Business Cycles", December 2011.
- 2011-10 Yutaka Arimoto, Kentaro Nakajima, and Tetsuji Okazaki, "Productivity Improvement in the Specialized Industrial Clusters: The Case of the Japanese Silk-Reeling Industry", December 2011.
- 2011-11 Masatoshi Kato, Hiroyuki Okamuro, and Yuji Honjo, "Does Founders' Human Capital Matter for Innovation? Evidence from Japanese Start-ups", December 2011.