WP5 - The double role of innovation and technical change: demand/job-creation *vs* job-destruction

Units involved: SSSA, SPO, UNIBI

ISIgrowth General Assembly - Brussels, June 2016

Introduction

- Technology is tacit, rarely transferable and not easily substitutable. The innovation-employment nexus is highly complex.
- Understanding this nexus is crucial to deliver smart, sustainable and inclusive growth,

Introduction

- Technology is tacit, rarely transferable and not easily substitutable. The innovation-employment nexus is highly complex.
- Understanding this nexus is crucial to deliver smart, sustainable and inclusive growth,

Des ha hills a shart an anna shart an an 200 ha a dan dah

• ... and maybe also to save you from unemployment.

Job	Probability
Recreational therapists	0.003
Dentists	0.004
Athletic trainers	0.007
Clergy	0.008
Chemical engineers	0.02
Editors	0.06
Firefighters	0.17
Actors	0.37
Health technologists	0.40
Economists	0.43
Commercial pilots	0.95

WP5 Objectives

- Understand the relation between innovation activities and firms performance
- Clarify relation between innovation and employment dynamics, disentangling the role of different forms of innovation on different type of workers
- Investigate transmission channels through which innovation affects firms performance
- Study the role of fiscal end monetary policies in shaping the relation between technological change and employment dynamics

WP5 Deliverables

- DD 5.1 [Jun 2016, SSSA done]: empirical wp on R&D effort and performance
- DD 5.2 [Jun 2017, SPO tbc]: empirical wp on product and process innovation and job-creation and job-destruction
- DD 5.3 [Dec 2016, SPO tbc]: effect of innovation on different types of workers
- DA 5.4 [Dec 2017, tbd]: theoretical paper on transmission channels
- DP 5.5 [Jun 2018, tbd]: theoretical paper on the complementarity between Schumpeterian, fiscal and monetary policies.

DD 5.1 Persistence of innovation and patterns of firm growth

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● のへぐ

Contributors

D. Guarascio and F. Tamagni

Background

- Large literature on innovation and firm growth (for reviews, see Audretsch et al., 2014; Bianchini et al., 2016)
- Large literature on persistence of innovation and its determinants (reviews in Le Bas and Scellato, 2014; Raymond et al., 2010)
- ⇒ Here: what is the link between persistence in innovation and <u>sales</u> growth ?

Research questions

- Do persistent innovators grow more than other firms ?
- Do persistent innovators exhibit higher persistence in their growth trajectories ?

Key contributions

- Exploiting a long in time (1990-2012) panel of Spanish firms (ESEE dataset, maintained by SEPI and Spanish Ministry of Industry), we:
 - Provide a "long-run" notion of persistent innovator, more precise than relying on CIS waves
 - Consider persistence in different innovation activities: R&D, product and process innovation, patenting
 - Address not only if there is a "growth-premium" for persistent innovators, along the different innovation indicators, but also if persistence in innovation associates with persistence of growth (growth-persistence premium)
 - Explore heterogeneity in the two premia along the quantiles of the sales growth rates distribution, via standard quantile regressions

Empirical setting

- ▶ We divide the dataset in two sub-periods: 1990-1999 and 2000-2012
- We use the first period to identify persistent innovators:
 - For each innovation proxy we count the number of years a firm is engaging that specific innovation activity
 - We define a persistent innovator dummy (*Pers*) equal to 1 if a firm performs innovation for at least 7 out of 10 years
- We use the second period to regress:

$$G_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \operatorname{Pers}_i + \beta_2 X_{it} + u_{it}$$
(1)

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

where β_1 is the growth-premium for persistent innovators, and

$$G_{it} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \ G_{it-1} + \alpha_2 \ Pers_i + \alpha_3 (G_{it-1} \times Pers_i) + X_{it} + u_{it}$$
(2)

where α_3 is the "growth-persistence" premium.

Notes:

- > This setting intended to break simultaneity between definition of Pers and growth
- We address "selectivity" into *Pers* via a first-step Probit on the probability to be persistent, and then adding the fitted probabilities (p-score) to the controls *X*

Persistent innovators

- Out of 5304 firms in the sample, we identify:
 - ✓ 428 persistent innovators in R&D
 - 113 persistent product innovators
 - ✓ 268 persistent process innovators
 - ✓ 36 persistent patenters
- The groups are not fully overlapping
- Growth distribution of Pers. and Non-Pers. innovators do not differ much
- Pers. Innovators are (in median and in distribution): older, larger, more productive and more R&D intensive

Results

- \checkmark No clearcut growth-premium for persistent innovators.
- \checkmark No growth-persistence premium for persistent innovators.

◆□▶ ◆■▶ ◆ ■▶ ◆ ■▶ ○ ■ ○ ○ ○ ○

Future developments

- Within this specific work:
 - ✓ Compare results with other definitions of persistent innovators (other identification criteria in the literature)
 - \checkmark Extend the analysis to growth of employees
- Within the project:
 - Repeat the exercise on comparable data from other countries available to partner units ?
 - ✓ If similar data (long panel) not available, at least on CIS waves ?

DD 5.2 Technological innovation and the distribution of employment growth

Contributors

F. Calvino, L. Nesta and A. Secchi

Background

- Positive effect of product innovation on employment growth at the firm-level. Process innovation has more ambiguous effects (compensation?) (for reviews, see Calvino and Virgillito, 2016; Vivarelli, 2014)
- Few contributions use longitudinal data (notable exceptions Triguero et al., 2014; Lachenmaier and Rottmann, 2011)
- ⇒ Here: what is the link between technological innovation and employment growth?

Research questions

What is the *firm-level* relationship between *different* types of innovation and employment growth? Does this relationship change along the employment growth distribution?

Key contributions

- Exploiting a panel of Spanish manufacturing firms (PITEC dataset) between 2004-2012, we:
 - Carry on a dynamic panel analysis of the effects of different types of product and process innovation on employment growth
 - Split product and process innovation into their building blocks (goods, services, methods, auxiliary processes and logistics)
 - Depart from conditional averages via quantile regression in order to focus on the role of innovation driving employment growth of fast-growing or shrinking firms

Variables of interest

Employment growth (log differences)

$$G_{i,t} = log(E_{i,t}) - log(E_{i,t-1})$$
 (3)

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Product Innovation – new to the market

- Goods
- Services

Process Innovation

- Methods of production
- Logistics, delivery or distribution systems
- Auxiliary processes (IT, maintenance, accounting)

Empirical setting

The estimated regression is:

$$G_{i,t} = \alpha G_{i,t-1} + \beta_1 ProdInn_{i,t} + \beta_2 ProcInn_{i,t} + \beta_3 log(age_{i,t}) + \beta_4 group_{i,t} + \mu_i + \nu_{i,t}$$
(4)

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Industry and year dummies (robustness year dummies alone)

Methods

- Difference GMM (takes into account autocorrelation in growth rates and potential endogeneity issues)
- Quantile regression ($\epsilon_{i,t} = \mu_i + v_{i,t}$)

Results

- Positive effect of product innovation (especially goods new to the market). No effect of process innovation.
- ✓ U-shaped effect of product innovation, process innovation decreasing in conditional quantiles.
- ✓ Do cannibalization effects and compensation mechanisms act differently over the conditional growth distribution?

Discussion

- Effect of innovation of employment growth depends on the *type* of technological innovation undertaken
- Product innovation (especially goods new to the market) has positive effects while process innovation has more ambiguous effects
- Effects are *heterogeneous* over the conditional quantile of the employment growth distribution
- This might reflect the role of cannibalization and compensation mechanisms (over the conditional distribution)

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □▶ ▲ □ ● ● ● ●

Future developments

- Within the framework of this work:
 - ✓ Repeat the exercise on comparable data for France and other countries
 - ✓ Different types of workers [DD 5.3]
- Within the project:
 - \checkmark Complementarity of product and process innovation
 - ✓ Dynamic effects of innovation
 - ✓ Extension to a multi-equation framework to include sales and profits

DA 5.4 Theoretical paper on transmission channels.

SSSA and SPO are taking care of this project

DP 5.5 Role of fiscal end monetary policies in shaping the relation between technological change and employment dynamics

< □ > < 同 > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

SSSA and SPO are taking care of this project

- AUDRETSCH, D. B., A. COAD, AND A. SEGARRA (2014): "Firm growth and innovation," Small Business Economics, 43, 743–749.
- BIANCHINI, S., G. PELLEGRINO, AND F. TAMAGNI (2016): "Innovation Strategies and Firm Growth," LEM Working Papers 2016/03, Laboratory of Economics and Management (LEM), Sant'Anna School of Advanced Studies, Pisa, Italy.
- CALVINO, F. AND M. E. VIRGILLITO (2016): "The innovation-employment nexus: a critical survey of theory and empirics," LEM Working Paper Series No. 2016/10, Scuola Superiore Sant'Anna.
- LACHENMAIER, S. AND H. ROTTMANN (2011): "Effects of innovation on employment: A dynamic panel analysis," International Journal of Industrial Organization, 29, 210–220.
- LE BAS, C. AND G. SCELLATO (2014): "Firm innovation persistence: a fresh look at the frameworks of analysis," *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, 23, 423–446.
- RAYMOND, W., P. MOHNEN, F. PALM, AND S. S. VAN DER LOEFF (2010): "Persistence of Innovation in Dutch Manufacturing: Is It Spurious?" *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 92, 495–504.
- TRIGUERO, A., D. CORCOLES, AND M. C. CUERVA (2014): "Persistence of innovation and firmâĂŹs growth: evidence from a panel of SME and large Spanish manufacturing firms," Small Business Economics, 43, 787–804.
- VIVARELLI, M. (2014): "Innovation, Employment and Skills in Advanced and Developing Countries: A Survey of Economic Literature," Journal of Economic Issues, 48, 123–154.