



HAL
open science

Interdependence and spillovers: is firm performance affected by others' innovation activities?

Pedro de Faria, Francisco Lima

► To cite this version:

Pedro de Faria, Francisco Lima. Interdependence and spillovers: is firm performance affected by others' innovation activities?. *Applied Economics*, 2011, 44 (36), pp.4765-4775. 10.1080/00036846.2011.560108 . hal-00730231

HAL Id: hal-00730231

<https://hal.science/hal-00730231v1>

Submitted on 8 Sep 2012

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Interdependence and spillovers: is firm performance affected by others' innovation activities?

Journal:	<i>Applied Economics</i>
Manuscript ID:	APE-2009-0314.R1
Journal Selection:	Applied Economics
Date Submitted by the Author:	26-Jan-2011
Complete List of Authors:	de Faria, Pedro; University of Groningen, Department of Innovation Management and Strategy, Faculty of Economics and Business Lima, Francisco; Instituto Superior Tecnico, Department of Engineering and Management; CEG-IST, Centre for Management Studies
JEL Code:	D21 - Firm Behavior < D2 - Production and Organizations < D - Microeconomics, O31 - Innovation and Invention: Processes and Incentives < O3 - Technological Change Research and Development < O - Economic Development, Technological Change, and Growth, O32 - Management of Technological Innovation and R&D < O3 - Technological Change Research and Development < O - Economic Development, Technological Change, and Growth
Keywords:	Innovation, Spillovers, Firm performance, Community Innovation Survey

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

Interdependence and spillovers: is firm performance affected by others' innovation activities?

Pedro de Faria^a and Francisco Lima^{b,*}

^a *Department of Innovation Management and Strategy, Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Groningen, Nettelbosje 2, 9747 AE Groningen, The Netherlands*

^b *Instituto Superior Técnico, Technical University of Lisbon, and CEG-IST, Av. Rovisco Pais, 1049-001 Lisbon, Portugal*

*Corresponding author. E-mail: francisco.lima@ist.utl.pt

23
24
25
26
27
28

Running Title: Interdependence and spillovers

29
30
31

Abstract

32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The creation of new knowledge is a case in which agents' behaviour can affect the performance of other actors positively, given that new knowledge creates positive externalities in the market. In this context, we investigate the existence of performance spillovers associated with innovation activities by quantifying the innovation produced in surrounding firms and controlling for the fact that a firm is itself an innovation producer. We use data from the Third Community Innovation Survey that measures innovation in a broad way, not reducing it to R&D and patents, which departs from previous literature on spillovers. Furthermore, to tackle the endogeneity of the innovation variables on the firm production decision, we resort to the firm intellectual property protection methods as an instrument. We found a positive spillover of innovation on firm value added. The results also show that process innovation spillovers are more prevalent than product innovation spillovers.

I. Introduction

R&D and innovation have characteristics of public goods, since the investments and results achieved by one agent can produce knowledge that is available, almost freely, to other agents. This process is possible when the reproduction costs for information are low, allowing the diffusion of knowledge to actors who did not invest in its production. As described by Adams and Jaffe (1996), knowledge production processes have two different types of effects: one direct, to the firm enrolled in the knowledge production activity, and one indirect, to other firms that benefit from the public availability of some of the knowledge.

As for the direct effect, it is broadly accepted that R&D and innovation are essential to firm performance. There is a positive and strong relationship between R&D expenditures and both growth of output and total factor productivity (Griliches, 1986; Hall and Mairesse, 1995). As for the indirect effect, the creation of new knowledge is a case in which agents' behaviour can affect the performance of other actors positively, given that new knowledge creates positive externalities in the market. These externalities are reflected in the positive differences between social and private internal rates of return on R&D investments (Mansfield *et al.*, 1977). As noted by Nadiri (1993), the social rates of return on R&D (spillovers) are on average close to 50%, varying considerably across industries.¹ As stated by Jaffe (1986) and Geroski (1995), the technology developed by innovation projects of one firm is useful to others as well.

¹ In industries with well-defined products and strong patents, such as pharmaceuticals, firms are more successful in capturing the research results and the social rates of return are lower.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Despite the fact that this availability of knowledge could be a hampering factor for investment in knowledge production, the existence of these positive externalities – knowledge spillovers – can also generate a feedback mechanism that increases the overall returns on the initial investment in research and innovation and can benefit both producers and non-producers of knowledge. On one hand, spillovers are important for innovative firms, since knowledge production activities are associated with high levels of uncertainty and the existence of a local innovative culture allows agents to share similar experiences and ease the exploitation of new solutions to problems (Feldman, 1993). If a firm masters its absorptive capacity, it can take advantage, not only of its own innovative efforts, but also of others' investment. The right absorptive skills can enable a firm to manage the external information flows in order to maximise the incoming spillovers from other firms and, at the same time, control the spillovers to those firms (Cohen and Levinthal, 1989, 1990). In other words, the production of knowledge by other firms cannot be merely analysed as a process by which competitors increase their knowledge, since innovation activities developed in other firms can produce positive spillovers that are absorbed by firms through several means: publications, reverse engineering, trade of goods, exchange of scientists and collaborations. On the other hand, spillovers are also important to non-innovative firms, because these firms can absorb knowledge through the implementation of incremental modifications on production (products and/or processes). These effects are not usually identified by the firm as innovative efforts or adoption of organizational innovations and therefore are not captured by technological innovation surveys.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

In this context, our analysis seeks to identify the existence of knowledge spillovers that spring from innovation activities and have an impact on the performance of innovative and non-innovative firms. We use data from the Portuguese Third Community Innovation Survey (CIS III) that measures innovation in a broad way, not reducing it to R&D and patents, which departs from previous literature on spillovers. This perspective allows us to enquire if the existence of non-radical and non-science based innovation activities of firms have an impact on the performance of surrounding firms from the same industry.² Moreover, firm performance is directly measured by value added and not by alternative measures such as turnover.

Since we include variables that measure the innovation performance of firms and the dependent variable is value added, we may face an endogeneity problem.³ To tackle this issue, we instrument the innovation variable. The firm engagement in intellectual property protection methods is the instrument used as there is information on this firm decision for both innovative and non-innovative firms.

The results drove us to two main conclusions: the performance of a firm is affected by the fact that other firms innovate and the effect is positive. Firm innovation not only contributes to the performance of the investing firm, but also can produce knowledge that positively affects the performance of other firms. The

² Surrounding firms meaning: firms belonging to the same industry, in the same region and with similar size (an industry-region-firm size cell).

³ If better firms (e.g., with higher managerial capabilities) are also the ones investing in innovation, then there is a problem of a correlation between one independent variable – innovation – and the unobserved firm characteristics.

1
2
3 results also show that process innovation spillovers are more prevalent than
4
5 product innovation spillovers.
6
7

8 The remainder of the study is divided into four sections. Section II
9
10 develops the hypotheses after building a conceptual framework. Section III
11
12 describes the data and presents the model specification. In Section IV, the main
13
14 results are presented and discussed. Finally, Section V concludes and draws some
15
16 policy implications.
17
18

19 20 21 22 23 **II. Conceptual Framework** 24 25 26 27

28 The innovation capacity of firms and the diffusion, imitation and adoption of
29
30 innovations have gained increasing importance in the analysis of economic
31
32 performance of firms, and, in particular, in explaining the differences between the
33
34 rates of growth of different regions (Solow, 1956; Romer, 1990; Griliches, 1992;
35
36 Aghion and Howitt, 1992). In particular, the existence of knowledge spillovers is
37
38 a central concept of the theory of new growth economics (Romer, 1986; Aghion
39
40 and Howitt, 1992), which stresses the cumulative nature of invention at the
41
42 industry and geographical level. Romer (1986), Krugman (1991), Grossman and
43
44 Helpman (1991) and Audretsch and Feldman (1996), amongst others, have
45
46 focused on the role that spillovers of economic knowledge across agents and firms
47
48 play in creating increasing returns and economic growth.
49
50
51
52

53 Griliches (1979, 1992) distinguish two types of R&D and innovation
54
55 spillovers, knowledge and rent spillovers. Rent spillovers happen when firms pay
56
57 less for inputs than the quality of these inputs is worth, more precisely, when
58
59 quality improvements are not fully reflected in a product's price or if performance
60

1
2
3 increases in the production process lower the price of a good. Knowledge
4
5 spillovers are considered by Griliches (1992) the “true spillovers”. They are
6
7 generated when information and ideas flow from one institution to another
8
9 institution without payment (Griliches, 1992; De Bondt, 1996). Therefore, they
10
11 can generate virtuous cycles by attracting additional labour and other inputs,
12
13 further facilitating the exchange of ideas.
14
15

16
17
18 Concerning the type of relationship between the actors involved on the
19
20 knowledge exchange process, spillovers can be classified as vertical spillovers,
21
22 when there is customer/supplier link; horizontal spillovers, when the source of
23
24 spillovers is a competitor of the receiving firm; and spillovers from universities
25
26 (Nadiri, 1993; Atallah, 2002; Kaiser, 2002; Arvanitis *et al.*, 2008). In addition,
27
28 several studies analyse the differences between spillovers that flow from a firm’s
29
30 own industry, intra-industry spillovers and spillovers that occur between firms
31
32 from different industries, inter-industry spillovers (e.g. Bernstein, 1988; Steurs,
33
34 1995; Kaiser, 2002).
35
36
37

38
39 Following these works, several empirical analyses of R&D and
40
41 productivity have recognised the importance of spillovers. As referred to by
42
43 Meagher and Rogers (2004), these studies found that spillovers between firms are
44
45 important in explaining productivity growth by comparing the roles of own
46
47 research efforts against research efforts of other firms (pool of external knowledge
48
49 available to a firm).
50
51

52
53 Spillovers can also be categorized according to the geographical location
54
55 of the knowledge producer and of the knowledge receiver. The relationship
56
57 between international and national spillovers are the focus of Harabi (1997), Jaffe
58
59 and Trajtenberg (1999), Branstetter (2001), Keller (2002) and Negassi (2009),
60

1
2
3 while regional or intra-regional spillovers are the subject of several other studies
4
5 (Arndt and Sternberg, 2000; Acs *et al.*, 2002; Fritsch and Franke, 2004; Gumbau-
6
7 Albert and Maudos, 2009). Audretsch and Feldman (2004) explore the role of
8
9 geographic proximity in the diffusion of knowledge. They find that spillovers are
10
11 associated with geographic proximity since tacit knowledge is inherently non-
12
13 rival in nature. They also state that an increased concentration of a particular
14
15 industry within a specific geographic region facilitates knowledge spillovers
16
17 across firms. The best example of this process and its economic importance is the
18
19 difference in the innovative and economic performance of two different regions of
20
21 the USA: Silicon Valley and Boston's Route 128. The performance of the
22
23 California cluster is higher because the proximity and interdependence of the
24
25 different actors is also higher (Audretsch and Feldman, 2004). In line with this
26
27 work, Baptista and Swan (1998) and Jaffe *et al.* (1993) focus their analysis on the
28
29 clustering process and find that spillovers associated with R&D activity are
30
31 geographically localised. The concentration of technologically similar firms can
32
33 produce several types of economies for firms and attracts additional entrants
34
35 (Aharonson *et al.*, 2007; Fritsch and Franke, 2004).
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 The management of spillovers is also a subject of research. Using the
45
46 Belgium Second Community Innovation Survey (CIS II) database, Cassiman and
47
48 Veugelers (2002) explore the effects of knowledge flows on R&D cooperation,
49
50 focussing on the distinction between incoming spillovers (measured by the
51
52 importance of publicly available information for the innovation process of the
53
54 firm) and appropriability. They consider that the ability to absorb incoming
55
56 spillovers from other firms or institutions is linked to the innovation activities of
57
58 the firm (own R&D, for example), participation in cooperative agreements, and
59
60

1
2
3 the technological opportunities in the industry. They find that the level of
4
5 knowledge of in- and outflows is not exogenous to the firm since firms, through
6
7 their innovation activities, can model their incoming spillovers and appropriation
8
9 capabilities. Also using the Community Innovation Survey database, Crespi *et al.*
10
11 (2008) analyse, in the UK context, the effect of knowledge flows on the
12
13 productivity of firms and conclude that most relevant spillovers are associated
14
15 with competitors and that multinational presence may be an important source of
16
17 these spillovers.
18
19
20
21

22 Our analysis follows the works described above that seek to identify the
23
24 existence of knowledge spillovers that spring from innovation activities and have
25
26 an impact on the performance of the firm. More precisely, we will address the
27
28 following main research question: Is firm performance positively affected by the
29
30 fact that other firms located in the same region and from the same industry
31
32 innovate (radically or not)? Our goal is to add new evidence to the knowledge
33
34 spillovers literature, where nearly every study considers only spillovers associated
35
36 with R&D and patenting activities (Bottazzi and Peri, 2003; Chen and Yang,
37
38 2005; Aharonson *et al.*, 2007; Alcácer and Chung, 2007). In most regions and
39
40 industries, R&D and patenting are not activities widely implemented by the
41
42 majority of firms. So, if we want to study the spillovers that occur in an economy
43
44 that is not on the technological frontier and where most firms are technology
45
46 adopters and not radical innovators, we cannot focus our analysis on R&D and
47
48 patents.
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Following this perspective, we measure innovation in a broader way than
56
57 the radical innovation or scientific-based innovation, a standpoint that fits
58
59
60

1
2
3 countries like Portugal.⁴ We will enquire if firms are affected not only by the
4
5 R&D and radical innovation but also from small product and process innovation
6
7 increments developed by other firms within the same region and industry. We
8
9 seek to identify a possible effect of being included in an environment where firms
10
11 strive to evolve technologically even if not contributing with new knowledge to
12
13 society.
14
15
16

17
18 To attain this goal we use the Portuguese Third Community Innovation
19
20 Survey (CIS III) database, which provides information on the innovative
21
22 performance of manufacturing and service firms, as well as their overall
23
24 performance. Drawing on the information about the innovative behaviour of
25
26 firms, we built a variable that summarises the innovative performance of firms
27
28 from the same region, industry and size of a firm.⁵ We consider a production
29
30 function with value added as the dependent variable and the variable measuring
31
32 the innovation of other firms as a regressor to measure the indirect effect of
33
34 innovation on performance of firms of the same industry and region. In this way,
35
36 we assess regional, inter-industry knowledge spillovers associated to innovation
37
38
39
40

41
42 ⁴ Portugal has 4.8 patent applications to the EPO per million inhabitants and 0.8% of GDP
43
44 dedicated to R&D (Eurostat, 2007).

45
46 ⁵ We measure spillovers controlling for the factors that Griliches (1992) considered important:
47
48 relative position in the value chain; technological intensity; and geographic distance. Following

49
50
51 this statement, Kafouros and Buckley (2008) found that, even though all firms benefited (in terms

52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59 of productivity) from their own R&D, only small firms and firms from high tech sectors benefited
60
61 from the innovation activities undertaken by other firms of the same or other industries.

1
2
3 activities. By incorporating a measure of “borrowed” innovation into a production
4
5 function, and following the influential work of Griliches (1979), which first added
6
7 data on R&D to the list of inputs entering the production function, we verify
8
9 whether spillovers play an important role in enhancing firm performance.
10
11

12 13 14 15 **III. Data and Model Specification** 16

17
18
19
20 This section describes the data used to address the research questions. In addition,
21
22 it presents the model specification and the methodological issues associated with
23
24 it.
25
26

27 28 29 *Data* 30

31
32
33
34 Testing if the knowledge produced by firms’ innovation activities spills over to
35
36 other firms requires micro-level data with matching firm-level information on
37
38 innovation and production. This information can be found in the Portuguese
39
40 Community Innovation Survey (CIS) database. The CIS, executed under the
41
42 supervision of the European Community (EU), is focused on the observation and
43
44 collection of quantitative data on technological innovation. The sample is
45
46 representative of the population of the manufacturing sector and also of five
47
48 selected service sectors (and only firms with more than 10 employees were
49
50 considered). The usual consistency and logical tests, as well as corrections for
51
52 possible bias associated with non-responses, were performed for each country at
53
54 the firm level.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Developed under the guiding principles of the Oslo Innovation Manual (OECD, 1992), the survey aims at collecting data on innovation understood from a broad firm perspective, rather than examining just the invention process. Thus, the CIS captures a larger variety of innovation activities than just R&D expenditures, including the acquisition of patents and licenses, product design, personnel training, trial production and market analysis. Moreover, it includes measures of innovative output not reflected in the submission of patent filings, including the introduction of innovative production processes and organizational changes. The importance of the CIS data is attested by a number of recent works that draw on this survey. Results obtained by Cassiman and Veugelers (2002) and Mohnen and Dagenais (2002) are good examples of the growing use of the CIS data to further our understanding of innovation at the micro level.⁶

The survey enquires if firms have introduced at least one innovation in the period from 1998 to 2000. Specifically, the innovation question is asked as a binary query: has your firm incorporated any innovation in the last three years? This query was complemented by a validation question, which asked firms to describe the innovations. If the answer to this question was no, it asked if the firm had tried to innovate. To the firm that either introduced or attempted to introduce an innovation, a number of questions associated with the innovation process followed. The survey also collects information on the expenditures on innovation activities, such as intramural and extramural R&D, acquisition of machinery or

⁶ Smith *et al.* (2004) and Negassi (2009) are also recent studies using CIS data. These papers also show the capabilities of the survey when CIS data is merged with other data sources and where the longitudinal dimension is available and explored.

1
2
3 other external knowledge, training, market introduction of innovation, design or
4
5 other types of preparations for the production or distribution of innovation.
6
7

8 These two variables – engagement in innovation activities and
9
10 expenditures in innovation – are the critical indicators of innovative activity
11
12 considered in this paper. Using these variables provides a number of advantages.
13
14 Firstly, we look at innovation in a broad sense, not only at the adoption of a
15
16 specific technological innovation (such as computers). Secondly, it provides
17
18 information about innovations beyond that linked to patent applications. As
19
20 mentioned above, this helps to understand the innovation process in countries
21
22 where patents are not common, or that are far from the technological frontier, such
23
24 as Portugal. Finally, we can investigate differences between product and process
25
26 innovation, in order to enquire if demand enhancing and cost reducing innovations
27
28 have different effects on firms' performance, as stated in several studies
29
30 (Leiponen, 2000; Rouvinen, 2002).
31
32
33
34
35

36 Table 1 presents the mean and standard deviation of the variables used in
37
38 this study. The survey provides data on firm's value added, capital, number of
39
40 employees and their schooling levels, if the firm belongs to a national or
41
42 multinational group, the exports weight on turnover and the above measures of
43
44 innovation activities.⁷ As can be seen from Table 1, 44% of the firms that
45
46 answered the survey reported some kind of innovation activities. The innovation
47
48 activities can be separated between process and product innovation, 30% and 35%
49
50
51

52
53 ⁷ The survey does not provide information on the book values of capital stock for equipment and
54
55 structures. Therefore, we had to resort to the closest variables available: the value of gross
56
57 investment in tangible goods and an indicator of capital use calculated by the difference between
58
59 turnover and value added. We assume that the sum of these two variables reflects the relative
60
levels of capital stock employed by firms.

1
2
3 respectively. Concerning the workforce structure, on average, employees with
4 higher education are a minority in this sample. In addition, there is a higher
5 variance in the number of employees with higher education than in the number of
6 employees without this level of education, given an indication that there are
7 significant differences between firms regarding absorptive capacity. Finally, only
8 19% and 11% of the firms are part of a national and multinational group,
9 respectively; only 37% export more than ten percent of their turnover; and the
10 majority are not engaged in any intellectual property protection method (69%).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 (Insert Table 1)
26
27
28

29 *Model*

30
31
32
33
34 We consider a production function model to analyse the existence of knowledge
35 spillovers associated with innovation activities. We quantify the innovation
36 produced in surrounding firms by the percentage of innovative firms across
37 industry, sector and size and control for the fact that a firm itself can be an
38 innovation producer. We assume a value-added Cobb-Douglas production
39 function for firm i with the following specification:⁸
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

$$50 \quad Y_i = A_i L_{Hi}^{\beta_1} L_{NHi}^{\beta_2} K_i^{\beta_3} e^{u_i} \quad (1)$$

51
52
53
54
55
56
57 ⁸ Value added is used instead of productivity (value added per worker) because the use of
58 productivity implies a restriction of the coefficients and constant returns to scale. The variable
59 value added is specific to the Portuguese CIS.
60

where L_H and L_{NH} are the number of employees with higher education (college or higher) and without higher education, respectively, in order to control for the qualifications of the workforce and measure the absorptive capacity of the firm; K is capital; and u is a stochastic disturbance. The total factor productivity parameter (A) is assumed to be driven by exports, inclusion in a group (national or multinational), industry and region characteristics, and the innovation activities of the firm and surrounding firms. We define A as

$$A_i = \exp\left(\theta_1 I_i + \theta_2 S_i + \sum_k \delta_k D_k + \sum_h \lambda_h R_h + \sum_j \gamma_j G_j\right) \quad (2)$$

where I and S are indicators of innovation activities of the firm and the surrounding firms, respectively. The industry (D) and region (R) dummies capture differences in market and technological opportunities across industries and regions. The dummies for differences in internal organization and firm performance (G) are defined as firm belonging to a national group and/or a multinational group, and firm exports are higher than 10% of its turnover. Taking logarithms, the production function becomes,

$$y_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 l_{Hi} + \beta_2 l_{NH_i} + \beta_3 k_i + \theta_1 I_i + \theta_2 S_i + \sum_k \delta_k D_k + \sum_h \lambda_h R_h + \sum_j \gamma_j G_j + u_i \quad (3)$$

where the lowercase letters denote logs.

Two variables were used to measure the firm own innovation: a dummy variable indicating if a firm is engaged in innovation activities; and the logarithm of expenditures in innovation activities. We defined three different variables to

1
2
3 capture the effect of innovative performance of surrounding firms – the spillover –
4 measured across industry, sector and firm size: percentage of innovative firms;
5 percentage of product innovative firms; and percentage of process innovative
6 firms.⁹ Our choice of defining these variables restricting by location, sector and
7 size is based on the assumption, described by Griliches (1992) and more recently
8 by Aharonson *et al.* (2007), that firms can more easily capture spillovers from
9 firms located in the same region, sector and with a similar dimension. The
10 distinction between process and product spillovers is founded in the idea that,
11 although both can contribute to an increase in the output of the firm, the
12 magnitude and pervasiveness of spillovers for product and process R&D are likely
13 to be different (Ornaghi, 2006).¹⁰

14
15 We only consider knowledge produced in the region where the firm is
16 located since there is evidence that non-codified knowledge attached to people
17 and firms does not diffuse for actors located more than 300 km away from the
18 knowledge source (Kaufmann and Tödtling, 2002; Botazzi and Peri, 2003; Aldieri
19 and Cincera, 2008).¹¹ The path dependence of most of the technological

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
⁹ Industry measured by NACE sections (two digits corresponding to seven industries); region by NUTS 2 level (five regions); and size was controlled by dividing firms into two groups: small (fewer than 50 employees) and medium / large firms (more than 50 employees). These three dimensions define a space with 70 cells.

¹⁰ Several studies are focused on the spillovers associated with R&D activities, a measure of the innovative input. Our study uses measures of innovation output – engagement in innovation activities and expenditures on innovation activities – that, in our opinion, give a more trustful assessment of the real impact of innovation on the performance of firms.

¹¹ Despite the fact that Portugal is a relatively small country, the structural economic disparities between regions and the existence of several regional clusters explain option to consider only regional spillovers. There are considerable regional disparities in levels of entrepreneurial and

1
2
3 knowledge and of its market applications makes the significance of potential
4 spillovers stronger within rather than across sectors, since, in order to take
5 advantage of spillovers, firms have to share a technological knowledge base. As
6 stated by Griliches (1992), external knowledge is more valuable if it comes from a
7 player within the same industry. Cohen and Levinthal (1990) and Lane and
8 Lubatkin (1998) also argue that firms have a higher probability of absorb
9 knowledge from similar partners and in areas where a firm has knowledge and
10 experience. Acs *et al.* (1994) state that small and large firms have different
11 innovation production functions. Furthermore, Aharonson *et al.* (2007) assert that
12 small firms are more likely to capture knowledge from firms of the same
13 dimension and located in the same region.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 The inclusion of firm innovation amongst the determinants of productivity
30 raises a possible endogeneity problem as this variable is potentially correlated
31 with the error term in Equation 3.¹² In this context, using ordinary least squares
32 (OLS) does not guarantee the consistency of the estimators. The solution adopted
33 was to implement an instrumental variable (IV) approach.¹³ The success of this
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 innovation activities amongst Portuguese regions, with a high concentration of firms along the
44 coastline. Knowledge based activities are mainly concentrated in a few key regions, namely
45 Lisbon, Oporto, Aveiro, Faro, and surrounding areas, corresponding to the largest urban
46 agglomerations. Inland regions display relatively low densities of knowledge based economic
47 activities.
48
49
50
51
52

53 ¹² Moreover, the sample probably has a higher incidence of innovative firms given that the survey
54 had explicitly the objective of measuring innovation activities.
55

56 ¹³ As stressed by Angrist and Krueger (2001), using a linear regression for the first-stage estimates
57 generates consistent second-stage estimates even with a dummy or censored endogenous variable
58 (which are the cases of our innovation indicators). Wooldridge (2002) corroborates this statement
59
60

1
2
3 estimation depends on finding effective instruments that lead to the correct
4 identification of all model parameters. The instrument chosen was a dummy
5 variable that identifies if firms are engaged in any intellectual property protection
6 method: registration of design, trademarks, patents, confidentiality agreements,
7 copyright, secrecy, complexity of design and lead-time advantage on competitors.
8 This variable is correlated to the innovative performance even after partialing out
9 all the explanatory variables, and there is no apparent reason to be correlated with
10 unobserved heterogeneity in Equation 3.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **IV. Results and Discussion**

26
27
28
29
30 The estimation results from the production function model are presented and
31 discussed in this section. The objective is to have a representation of the
32 production decision of the firm. With that end, we consider the resources used by
33 the firm – measures of labour and capital – and a set of other factors affecting the
34 total factor productivity as determinants of the value-added. The firm innovation
35 activities and the possible spillovers occurring from the innovation activities of
36 other firms are among these determinants. The spillovers are measured by the
37 percentage of firms engaged in innovation activities in each cell defined by
38 industry, region and firm size. In this way, we place a firm among similar firms
39 and capture if their innovation activities have any effect on its performance. We
40 report the results in the following tables with the OLS and IV estimates. Table 2
41 shows the results of the specifications where the innovation variable was
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

stressing that discrete and endogenous variables can be used in instrumental variables, without any additional assumptions.

1
2
3 measured by the dummy variable *engagement in innovation activities*. Table 3
4
5 introduces the results of the specifications where the innovation variable was
6
7 measured by the variable *expenditures in innovation activities* (the logarithm of
8
9 expenditures in innovation activities).
10
11

12
13
14
15 (Insert Table 2)
16
17
18
19

20 All tables report three different specifications of the model estimated by
21
22 OLS and IV: the first includes capital, human capital, innovation, spillover
23
24 variables, the industry and region dummy variables and the controls for being part
25
26 of a group and for international exposure; the second and third specifications are
27
28 similar to the first specification differing only in the spillover variable: the second
29
30 includes the product innovation variable and the third the process innovation
31
32 variable.¹⁴
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 (Insert Table 3)
40
41
42

43 The estimation results do not vary substantially across specifications.
44
45 Furthermore, it does not make a difference for the effect of the remaining
46
47 variables whether innovation is included as a dummy or as expenditures. The
48
49 comparison between the OLS and IV estimations shows that the differences are
50
51 substantial at the values obtained for the estimated coefficients on innovation. The
52
53
54

55
56
57 ¹⁴ As most innovative firms report product and process innovations, the two indicators of
58
59 innovation activities (product and process) are highly collinear. The solution was to run two
60
separate specifications.

1
2
3 effect of innovation dummy increases from 0.198 in the OLS estimation
4 (specification (1) in Table 2) to 0.523 in the IV estimation (specification (4) in
5
6
7
8 Table 2). The corresponding effects of the innovation expenditures are 0.041 and
9
10
11 0.109, respectively in specification (1) and (4) of Table 2. The positive and
12
13 significant effect of the spillover – the percentage of surrounding firms with
14
15 innovation activities – is maintained with the IV method.¹⁵
16

17
18 The main result that should be highlighted is that the variables measuring
19
20 innovation and spillovers are significant and positively partially correlated with
21
22 value added. It means that value added is affected by innovation activities in two
23
24 different ways: not only when the innovation is developed by the firm, but also
25
26 when the firm is located within an innovative environment. The difference
27
28 between process innovation and product innovation spillovers, despite being
29
30 small, is also observed in the two tables. Firms capture more knowledge from
31
32 process innovation than from product innovation. A possible explanation for this
33
34 finding is that process innovations are more easily implemented by firms and have
35
36 a deeper impact on the performance of firms
37
38
39
40

41
42 As expected, the coefficients on capital and labour are significant and
43
44 positive. In addition to the expected link between firm performance and size, from
45
46 this finding we can infer that the qualification of the human resources is also a
47
48 determinant of the value added. The fact that the coefficient of the variable
49
50 *employees without higher education* is higher than the coefficient of the variable
51
52

53
54
55 ¹⁵ Note that the chosen instrument – dummy for engagement in intellectual property protection –
56
57 proved to be a strong instrument, as its estimation coefficient has the expected sign (positive) and
58
59 was significant at the 1% level in the linear projection of innovation (dummy or expenditures) onto
60
all the exogenous variables. Moreover, the partial R-squared was 8%.

1
2
3 *employees with higher education* is explained by the economic structure of
4 Portugal: labour-intensive sectors have more economic weight than knowledge-
5 intensive sectors. In traditional and labour-intensive sectors, the structure of the
6 firm is based on non-qualified personnel and the role of qualified employees may
7 be limited. In addition, the role of the qualification of the workforce is also
8 captured by the innovation variable, as the impact of innovation is also
9 determined by the absorptive capacity.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 The controls for being part of a group have a positive effect on value
21 added. In addition, the inclusion of these variables increases the magnitude and
22 significance of the innovation variable. Unexpectedly, the variable that controls
23 for the exports attitude of the firm is not significant in any specification. This
24 finding can be explained by the fact that larger firms are more export intensive
25 and thus the effect of exports is absorbed by the variables that measure capital
26 (human and tangible) and that are proxies of size.

37 38 39 **V. Conclusions**

40
41
42
43
44 This paper contains several contributions to the literature on innovation spillovers.
45 We use a more precise measure of firm performance by resorting to the value
46 added of each firm, instead of using an indirect measure like the firm total
47 revenue. In addition, the innovation variable comprises a broader definition than
48 the usual stricter one. We do not confine our analysis to R&D-based innovations
49 or patents, since we have information that includes incremental innovation
50 activities. Furthermore, we found a suitable instrument for innovation to solve the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 endogeneity on the firm production function: the firm engagement in intellectual
4 property protection methods.
5
6

7
8 A main conclusion can be drawn from the findings: innovation activity has
9 a direct and an indirect impact on firm performance. We found evidence on the
10 existence of a knowledge spillover in the context of the firm production. It
11 provides a clear answer to our main research question: the performance of a firm
12 is affected by the fact that other firms innovate and this effect is positive. Another
13 feature that is visible in this analysis is the role of the workforce qualification:
14 firms with more employees with higher education have a better performance and
15 are more able to absorb knowledge spillovers.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26
27 Using firm level data on innovation that cover not only radical and
28 patentable innovation, but also incremental and firm level innovations, this study
29 contributes to the understanding of innovation at the level below the technological
30 frontier. Most of the Portuguese economy is far from this frontier and it is relevant
31 to study how firms absorb new knowledge that, despite not being new to the
32 economy, is new to its context.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Therefore, policy implications can be drawn from our findings. Public
42 policies directly aimed at promoting firm performance should support firm level
43 innovation activities since innovation investments not only have a positive effect
44 on performance but also can have a reproductive effect on others firms'
45 performance. In addition, and in line with our finding that process and product
46 innovation activities have different effects on firm performance, policies should
47 take into attention the different nature of these innovation activities.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 At the regional level, policy makers must take into account possible
58 positive effects of these activities on the performance of other firms when
59
60

1
2
3 promoting local development through innovation activities. Policies aimed at
4
5 fostering economic development at the regional level should stimulate synergies
6
7 between firms, in order to maximise the rates on return of innovation investments.
8
9 Examples of such policies are the creation of technology and industrial parks,
10
11 where the proximity between firms is supported by an integrated management of
12
13 common infrastructures; or, when deciding on incentives to direct foreign
14
15 investment, the government has to take into account the possible knowledge
16
17 spillovers, in addition to the effects on the employment creation or direct
18
19 technology transfers between firms. In the Portuguese context, these are very
20
21 important results, given that they stress the role of two priority issues for the
22
23 country: education and institutional trust – an essential condition for the creation
24
25 of cooperation arrangements that facilitate knowledge creation and spillovers.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Acknowledgments**

35
36 The authors would like to thank Marco Vivarelli, Maria do Rosário Martins,
37
38 Tobias Schmidt, Wolfgang Sofka and the participants of the European Regional
39
40 Science Association (ERSA) 47th Congress, DRUID-DIME Academy Winter
41
42 2008 PhD Conference, and 2008 Technology, Management and Policy Graduate
43
44 Consortium Annual Meeting for their valuable comments. The research reported
45
46 in this paper was partially supported by *Gabinete de Planeamento, Estratégia,*
47
48 *Avaliação e Relações Internacionais* (GPEARI) [Statistical Office of the Ministry
49
50 for Science and Higher Education, Portugal], by the project
51
52 PTDC/ESC/67665/2006 of the Portuguese Foundation for Science and
53
54 Technology (FCT) and by the COINVEST project, www.coinvest.org.uk, funded
55
56 by the European Commission Seventh Framework Programme, Theme 9, Socio-
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 economic Science and Humanities, grant number 217512. The authors are grateful
4 to the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) – POS_C
5 Programme – for its financial support. Substantial parts of this research were
6 conducted while Pedro de Faria was at IN+ Center for Innovation, Technology
7 and Policy Research, Instituto Superior Técnico, Portugal.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

References

- Acs, Z., Audretsch, D. and Feldman, M. (1994) R&D spillovers and recipient firm size, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, **76**, 336–40.
- Acs, Z., Anselin, L. and Varga, A. (2002) Patents and innovation counts as measures of regional production of new knowledge, *Research Policy*, **31**, 1069–85.
- Adams, J. and Jaffe, A. (1996) Bounding the effects of R&D: an investigation using matched establishment-firm data, *The RAND Journal of Economics*, **27**, 700–21.
- Aghion, P. and Howitt, P. (1992) A model of growth through creative destruction, *Econometrica*, **60**, 323–51.
- Aharonson, B., Baum, J. and Feldman, M. (2007) Desperately seeking spillovers? Increasing returns, industrial organization and the location of new entrants in geographic and technological space, *Industrial and Corporate Change*, **16**, 89–130.
- Alcácer, J. and Chung, W. (2007) Location strategies and knowledge spillovers, *Management Science*, **53**, 760–76.

- 1
2
3 Aldieri, L. and Cincera, M. (2009) Geographic and technological R&D spillovers
4 within the triad: Micro evidence from US patents, *Journal of Technology*
5 *Transfer*, **34**, 196–211.
6
7
8
9
- 10 Angrist, J. and Krueger, A. (2001) Instrumental variables and the search for
11 identification: From supply and demand to natural experiments, *Journal of*
12 *Economic Perspectives*, **15**, 69–85.
13
14
15
16
- 17 Arndt, O. and Sternberg, R. (2000) Do manufacturing firms profit from
18 intraregional innovation linkages? An empirical based answer, *European*
19 *Planning Studies*, **8**, 465–85.
20
21
22
23
- 24 Arvanitis, S., Sydow, N. and Woerter, M. (2008) Is there any impact of
25 university–industry knowledge transfer on innovation and productivity? An
26 empirical analysis based on Swiss firm data, *Review of Industrial*
27 *Organization*, **32**, 77–94.
28
29
30
31
32
33
- 34 Atallah, G. (2002) Vertical R&D spillovers, cooperation, market structure, and
35 innovation, *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, **11**, 179–209.
36
37
38
- 39 Audretsch, D. and Feldman, M. (1996) R&D spillovers and the geography of
40 innovation and production, *American Economic Review*, **86**, 253–73.
41
42
43
- 44 Audretsch, D. and Feldman, M. (2004) Knowledge spillovers and the geography
45 of innovation, in *Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics (vol. 4)* (Ed.)
46 V. Henderson and J. Thisse, Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 2713–39.
47
48
49
- 50 Baptista, R. and Swann, P. (1998) Do firms in clusters innovate more?, *Research*
51 *Policy*, **27**, 525–40.
52
53
54
- 55 Bernstein, J. (1988) Costs of production, intra- and inter-industry R&D spillovers:
56 Canadian evidence, *Canadian Journal of Economics*, **21**, 324–47.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Bottazzi, L. and Peri, G. (2003) Innovation and spillovers in regions: Evidence
4 from European patent data, *European Economic Review*, **47**, 687–710.
5
6
7
8 Branstetter, L. (2001) Are knowledge spillovers international or intranational in
9 scope?, *Journal of International Economics*, **53**, 53–80.
10
11
12
13 Cassiman, B. and Veugelers, R. (2002) R&D cooperation and spillovers: Some
14 empirical evidence from Belgium, *American Economic Review*, **92**, 1169–
15
16
17
18
19
20 Chen, J.-R. and Yang, C.-H. (2005) Technological knowledge, spillover and
21 productivity: evidence from Taiwanese firm level panel data, *Applied*
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
- Cohen, W. and Levinthal, D. (1989) Innovation and learning: The two faces of R&D, *The Economic Journal*, **99**, 569–96.
- Cohen, W. and Levinthal, D. (1990) Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and innovation, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, **35**, 128–52.
- Crespi, G., Criscuolo, C., Haskel, J. and Slaughter, M. (2008) Productivity growth, knowledge flows and spillovers, NBER Working Paper No. 13959.
- De Bondt, R. (1996) Spillovers and innovation activities, *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, **15**, 1–28.
- Eurostat (2007) *Europe in figures - Eurostat yearbook 2006-07*, Eurostat, Luxembourg :.
- Feldman M. (1993) An examination of the geography of the innovation, *Industrial and Corporate Change*, **2**, 451–70.
- Fritsch, M. and Franke, G. (2004) Innovation, regional knowledge spillovers and R&D cooperation, *Research Policy*, **33**, 245–55.

- 1
2
3 Geroski, P. (1995) Markets for technology: Knowledge, innovation, and
4 appropriability, *Handbook of the Economics of Innovation and*
5
6 *Technological Change* (Ed.) P. Stoneman, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 90–131.
7
8
9
10 Griliches Z. (1979) Issues in assessing the contribution of research and
11 development to productivity growth, *Bell Journal of Economics*, **10**, 92–
12
13 116.
14
15
16
17 Griliches, Z. (1986) Productivity, R&D, and basic research at the firm level in the
18 1970s, *American Economic Review*, **76**, 141–54.
19
20
21
22 Griliches, Z. (1992) The search for R&D spillovers, *Scandinavian Journal of*
23 *Economics*, **94**, 29–47.
24
25
26
27 Grossman, G. and Helpman, E. (1991) *Innovation and growth in the global*
28 *economy*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
29
30
31
32 Gumbau-Albert, M. and Maudos, J. (2009) Patents, technological inputs and
33 spillovers among regions, *Applied Economics*, **41**, 1473–86.
34
35
36
37 Hall, B. and Mairesse, J. (1995) Exploring the relationship between R&D and
38 productivity in French manufacturing firms, *Journal of Econometrics*, **65**,
39 263–93.
40
41
42
43 Harabi, N. (1997) Channels of R&D spillovers: An empirical investigation of
44 Swiss firms, *Technovation*, **17**, 627–35.
45
46
47
48
49 Jaffe, A. (1986) Technological opportunity and spillovers of R&D, *American*
50 *Economic Review*, **76**, 984–1001.
51
52
53
54 Jaffe, A. and Trajtenberg, M. (1999) International knowledge flows: Evidence
55 from patent citations, *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, **8**,
56 105–37.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Jaffe, A., Trajtenberg, M. and Henderson, R. (1993) Geographic localization of
4 knowledge spillovers as evidenced by patent citations, *Quarterly Journal of*
5
6 *Economics*, **63**, 577–98.
7
8
9
10 Kafouros, M. and Buckley, P. (2008) Under what conditions do firms benefit from
11 the research efforts of other organizations?, *Research Policy*, **37**, 225–39.
12
13
14
15 Kaiser, U. (2002) Measuring knowledge spillovers in manufacturing and services:
16
17 An empirical assessment of alternative approaches, *Research Policy*, **31**,
18
19 125–44.
20
21
22 Kaufmann, A. and Tödting, F. (2002) How effective is innovation support for
23
24 SMEs? An analysis of the region of Upper Austria, *Technovation*, **22**, 147–
25
26 59.
27
28
29
30 Keller, W. (2002) Geographical localization of international technology diffusion,
31
32 *American Economic Review*, **92**, 120–40.
33
34
35 Krugman, P. (1991) *Geography and Trade*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
36
37
38 Lane, P. and Lubatkin, M. (1998) Relative absorptive capacity and inter-
39
40 organizational learning?, *Strategic Management Journal*, **19**, 461–77.
41
42
43
44 Leiponen, A. (2000) Competencies, innovation and profitability of firms,
45
46 *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, **9**, 1–24.
47
48
49
50 Mansfield, E., Rapoport, J., Romeo, A., Wagner, S. and Beardsley, G. (1977)
51
52 Social and private rates of return from industrial innovations, *Quarterly*
53
54 *Journal of Economics*, **91**, 221–40.
55
56
57
58 Meagher, K. and Rogers, M. (2004) Network density and R&D spillovers,
59
60 *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, **53**, 237–60.
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

- 1
2
3 *Performance: Econometric Explorations of Survey Data* (Ed.) A.
4 Kleinknecht and P. Mohnen, Palgrave, Hampshire and New York, pp. 3–30.
5
6
7
8 Nadiri, M. (1993) Innovations and technological spillovers, NBER Working Paper
9 No. 4423.
10
11
12 Negassi, S. (2009) International R& D spillovers and economic performance of
13 firms: an empirical study using random coefficient models, *Applied*
14 *Economics*, **41**, 947–76.
15
16
17 OECD (1992) *Proposed guidelines for collecting and interpreting technology*
18 *innovation data - Oslo manual*, OECD, Paris.
19
20 Ornaghi, C. (2006) Spillovers in product and process innovation: Evidence from
21 manufacturing firms, *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, **24**,
22 349– 80.
23
24
25 Romer, P. (1986) Increasing returns and long run growth, *Journal of Political*
26 *Economy*, **94**, 1002–37.
27
28 Romer, P. (1990) Endogenous technological change, *Journal of Political*
29 *Economy*, **98**, S71–S102.
30
31 Rouvinen, P. (2002) Characteristics of product and process innovators: Some
32 evidence from the Finnish innovation survey, *Applied Economics Letters*, **9**,
33 575–80.
34
35
36 Smith, V., Dilling-Hansen, M., Eriksson, T. and Madsenand, E. S. (2004) R&D
37 and productivity in Danish firms: some empirical evidence, *Applied*
38 *Economics*, **36**, 1797–806.
39
40
41 Solow, R. (1956) A contribution to the theory of economic growth, *Quarterly*
42 *Journal of Economics*, **70**, 65–94.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Steurs, G. (1995) Inter-industry R&D spillovers: What difference do they make?,
4
5 *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, **13**, 249–76.
6
7

8 Wooldridge, J. (2002) *Econometric analysis of cross section and panel data*, MIT
9
10 Press, Cambridge, MA.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review

Table 1. Descriptive statistics

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.
Value Added (log)	6.69	2.24
Engagement in innovation activities (dummy)	0.44	0.50
Expenditures in innovation activities (log)	2.13	2.76
Capital (log)	7.81	1.89
No. of employees with higher education (log)	1.18	1.40
No. of employees without higher education (log)	3.89	1.27
Part of a National Group (dummy)	0.19	0.39
Part of a Multinational Group (dummy)	0.11	0.31
Exports Dummy (> 10%)	0.37	0.48
% innovative firms by industry, region and size	43.89	17.09
% product innovative firms by industry, region and size	29.81	14.02
% process innovative firms by industry, region and size	34.03	16.09
Engagement in any intellectual property protection method	0.31	0.46

Table 2. Production function OLS and IV estimations with *engagement in innovation activities* as innovation variable

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	OLS			IV		
Engagement in innovation activities (dummy)	0.198** (0.099)	0.212** (0.099)	0.206** (0.098)	0.523* (0.306)	0.528* (0.306)	0.520* (0.306)
Capital (log)	0.175*** (0.051)	0.177*** (0.050)	0.177*** (0.051)	0.160*** (0.053)	0.161*** (0.052)	0.162*** (0.053)
No. of employees with higher education (log)	0.256*** (0.062)	0.257*** (0.063)	0.253*** (0.063)	0.234*** (0.064)	0.236*** (0.065)	0.232*** (0.064)
No. of employees without higher education (log)	0.543*** (0.084)	0.563*** (0.087)	0.548*** (0.080)	0.552*** (0.084)	0.569*** (0.087)	0.554*** (0.080)
Part of a National Group (dummy)	0.309** (0.128)	0.310** (0.128)	0.312** (0.128)	0.300** (0.126)	0.301** (0.127)	0.303** (0.126)
Part of a Multinational Group (dummy)	0.373** (0.158)	0.371** (0.158)	0.372** (0.158)	0.404** (0.159)	0.401** (0.159)	0.402** (0.159)
Exports Dummy (> 10%)	0.142 (0.102)	0.154 (0.102)	0.150 (0.102)	0.152 (0.101)	0.162 (0.101)	0.158 (0.101)
% innovative firms by industry, region and size	0.012*** (0.004)			0.010** (0.005)		
% product innovative firms by industry, region and size		0.010* (0.006)			0.009 (0.006)	
% process innovative firms by industry, region and size			0.012*** (0.004)			0.010** (0.005)
Industry Dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	1396	1396	1396	1396	1396	1396
Adjusted R-squared	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.47	0.47	0.47
F-statistic	56.94	56.88	56.83	57.36	57.31	57.22

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. The dependent variable is the firm's value added (log).

* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%.

Table 3. Production function OLS and IV estimations with expenditures in innovation activities as innovation variable

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	OLS			IV		
Expenditures in innovation activities (log)	0.041** (0.021)	0.043** (0.021)	0.043** (0.021)	0.109* (0.064)	0.110* (0.063)	0.108* (0.063)
Capital (log)	0.171*** (0.050)	0.172*** (0.050)	0.172*** (0.051)	0.148*** (0.055)	0.149*** (0.055)	0.150*** (0.056)
No. of employees with higher education (log)	0.246*** (0.065)	0.248*** (0.065)	0.243*** (0.065)	0.209*** (0.071)	0.211*** (0.071)	0.207*** (0.071)
No. of employees without higher education (log)	0.531*** (0.082)	0.550*** (0.085)	0.534*** (0.079)	0.518*** (0.083)	0.536*** (0.086)	0.519*** (0.080)
Part of a National Group (dummy)	0.306** (0.128)	0.307** (0.128)	0.309** (0.128)	0.292** (0.125)	0.292** (0.126)	0.295** (0.125)
Part of a Multinational Group (dummy)	0.382** (0.158)	0.379** (0.158)	0.381** (0.158)	0.426*** (0.163)	0.423*** (0.163)	0.424*** (0.163)
Exports Dummy (> 10%)	0.145 (0.101)	0.157 (0.101)	0.153 (0.101)	0.161 (0.101)	0.171* (0.101)	0.166* (0.101)
% innovative firms by industry, region and size	0.012*** (0.004)			0.011** (0.004)		
% product innovative firms by industry, region and size		0.011* (0.006)			0.010* (0.006)	
% process innovative firms by industry, region and size			0.012*** (0.004)			0.012*** (0.004)
Industry Dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region Dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	1396	1396	1396	1396	1396	1396
Adjusted R-squared	0.48	0.48	0.48	0.47	0.47	0.47
F-statistic	57.72	57.56	57.67	57.60	57.40	57.56

Notes: Robust standard errors in parentheses. The dependent variable is the firm's value added (log).

* significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%.