

# Technological Innovations and the expected Demand for skilled labour at the firm level\*

Martin Falk<sup>†</sup>

October 20, 1999

## Abstract

This paper analyses the link technological product and processes innovations and expectations about future employment for different types of labour in manufacturing. The empirical model allows for endogeneity of the firm's innovation decision in the labour demand equations. The system of probit equations is estimated using simulated ML based on 800 West German firms. The empirical evidence for different measures of technological innovations indicates that introduction of new market products is more important than any other measure of product innovation in determining the expected employment probabilities for homogeneous labour. Furthermore, as expected, technological innovations have the strongest impact on university graduates. Labour quality and turnover growth are also important factors of employment growth. Finally, tests of the exogeneity assumption of new market products in the labour demand equations can not be rejected.

**Keywords:** labour demand, educational qualification structure, product and process innovations, R&D,

**JEL Classification:** J23, O33

---

\*I thank Herbert Buscher, Geog Licht, Johannes Ludsteck, Ralf-Henning Peters and Viktor Steiner for helpful comments on an earlier draft of the paper. This paper was presented at the WIFO/ZEW workshop in Vienna 1999. Furthermore, I have greatly benefitted from the cooperation with Katja Seim. I also thank Sabine Botterer and Hans-Jörg Beilharz for proof-reading. The author acknowledges financial support from the German Science Foundation within its programme of Industrial Economics and Input Markets.

<sup>†</sup>Centre for European Economic Research, L7,1, D-68161 Mannheim; phone: (0621) 1235-153; fax: (0621) 1235-225; e-mail: [falk@zew.de](mailto:falk@zew.de)

## 1. Introduction

It is well known that technological innovations create jobs which require a different skill level. Employment effects of innovations may also be different according to the type of product innovations. For instance, new products can be either new to the firm or new to the market. Brouwer and Kleinknecht (1996) emphasize that the type of innovation most important for the creation of employment and output are new market products. The distinction between product and process innovations is also relevant, in particular with respect to employment. Since most firms introduce product and process innovations simultaneously, it is difficult to evaluate the effects only due to process innovations.

The link between advanced technologies and the demand for skilled labour has been empirically analysed by a number of studies (for a survey of the literature, see Chennells and Van Reenen, 1999). Blechinger et al. (1998) investigate the impact of innovation on employment for eight EU member states based on the first Community Innovation Survey (CIS). König et al. (1994) find for the first wave of the Mannheim Innovation Panel that product innovations have significant positive employment effects. For process innovations there are no positive employment effects. Leo and Steiner (1994) and Rottmann and Ruchinsky (1997) found that product innovations have stronger employment effects than process innovations. Based on 1000 West German firms, Roper (1997) found a strong correlation between innovation and output growth, but a less direct link between innovation and employment growth. Research has only for a short time been focussing both on the innovation decision and simultaneously on the labour demand for different types of workers. For instance, Duguet and Greenan (1998) explained the decision for innovation by various input factors and include innovation output as an additional right-hand variable in heterogeneous employment equations.

The analysis of innovation determinants has a long tradition in empirical industrial economics. Among various factors innovation output depends on R&D, demand conditions, firm size and on concentration (see Cohen and Levin 1989, Brouwer and Kleinknecht 1996) as well as on labour quality (Huiban and Bouhsina 1998). Doms, Dunne and Troske (1997) also pointed out that firms that use skilled labour intensively are more likely to adopt new technologies.

This paper examines the relationship between firms' employment expectations for different types of labour and the innovation output by using firm data for the West German manufacturing industries. Since longer time series for different types of educational qualifications have not been available, we focus on employ-

ment expectations rather than on actual employment growth rates. The system of equations is assumed to be of probit types explaining employment expectations for different types of educational qualification. Since the error terms of employment expectation equations are likely to be correlated, the resulting system of equation is a multivariate probit model. The Geweke-Hajivassiliou-Keane (GHK) simulated maximum likelihood estimator is employed to estimate the multi-dimensional integrals required by the probit structure of different employment equations.

A special focus is directed to the measurement of innovation. Innovations vary enormously in their technological significance (see Brouwer and Kleinknecht 1996). The impact of different innovation indicators will be analysed using a variety of innovation measures [i.e. new product introduction, patent, new market product, cost-reducing process innovation]. Another special focus is directed to potential endogeneity of technological innovation (i.e. R&D dependence of technological innovations) in the labour demand equations. Among other factors, R&D intensive firms are more likely to bring new products to the market. Since non-innovative firms are not compelled to answer to all questions about innovation input, endogeneity of product or process innovations can not be examined. Restricting the sample to innovative firms only allows us to control for possible endogeneity of some forms of product innovations, for instance new market products. To account for endogeneity of new market products in the expected labour demand function an innovation selection equation is added to the system of equations.

The data is drawn from the fifth wave of the Mannheim Innovation panel (ZEW-MIP), which has previously been analysed by Janz and Licht (1999). The study focuses on West German manufacturing for at least two reasons. First, the 1997 ZEW-MIP gathered detailed information about innovation output indicators as well as employment expectations for different types of educational qualification. Second, for manufacturing firms the distinction between product and process innovation is less difficult than for service firms.

The layout of the paper is the following. Section 2 outlines the econometric model. Data used for the study is discussed in section 3. Section 4 presents the results for multivariate probit models. Section 5 gives the conclusions.

## 2. The modelling framework

### 2.1. Factor demand model

To examine the relationship between the employment expectations for different types of labour and technological innovations a factor demand model based on a cost function can be derived. Rather than investigating the relationship between the levels of different types of labour as a function of the technology level, we develop a model that relates the change in different types of labour to the introduction of technological innovations. Assuming zero substitution possibilities between different types of labour the short-run labour demand system for different types of labour may be described as:

$$\Delta l_i^m = f_1(\Delta p_i^m, \Delta y_i, \Delta inno_i; \alpha) + \zeta_i \quad (2.1)$$

where  $i, \dots, N$ , is the firm index and  $\Delta l_i^m = (\Delta l_i^1, \Delta l_i^2, \Delta l_i^3)$  are the employment growth rates for different types of labour. The vector of labour input is defined as follows:  $\Delta l_i^1$  denotes university graduates,  $\Delta l_i^2$  denotes masters and technicians and  $\Delta l_i^3$  denotes total number of employees.<sup>1</sup> Factor price changes for different types of labour are labeled as  $\Delta p_i^m$ . Growth of total output is  $\Delta y_i$ . The innovation output,  $\Delta inno_{it}$ , is defined as a discrete event, which describes, whether or not firms introduce technological innovations. The parameter vector to be estimated is denoted by  $\alpha$ . Unfortunately, information about employment growth rates in period  $t+1$  is not available. Instead, categorical information on expected employment growth is available. Consequently, ordered probit models can be used to estimate employment expectations (see Kaiser 1999). Since only 5 percent of the firms expect a decrease in both university graduates or masters and technicians, little information will be lost if a binary measure of employment expectations is used instead. Consequently, a dummy variable whether or not firms plan to increase employment for different types of labour is substituted for the employment growth rate. Furthermore, I assume a time lag between expected employment growth and the right-hand variables. Adding a vector of firm characteristics,  $z_{it}$ , the factor demand system is given by:<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Since information on the educational qualification structure is only available for white collar workers, differentiating between university graduates and masters on the one hand and technicians on the other hand is the maximum we can do with the data.

<sup>2</sup>Since there are no wages in the employment equations, this approach is a very restricted specification of factor demand.

$$E(\Delta l_{it+1}^m) = f_2 \left( \Delta inno_{it,t-1}, \Delta y_{it}, \Delta l_{it}^m, \frac{L_{it}^H}{L_{it}}, z_{it}; \alpha \right) + \nu_{in}. \quad (2.2)$$

where subscript t denotes time. The variables are denoted as:

$E(\Delta l_{it+1}^m)$	expected employment growth in t+1 (1997-99) at time t, for m=1,..3.
$\Delta inno_{it,t-1}$	indicator for innovation, three year interval, 1994-96
$\Delta y_{it}$	current output (sales) growth rate, 1996
$\Delta l_{it}^m$	current employment growth rate, 1996
$L_{it}^H/L_{it}$	university graduates or high-skilled labour share, 1996
$z_{it}$	size, sector and other control variables, 1996

The dependent variable is represented by the expected employment growth for different types of labour in the following period,  $E(\Delta l_{it+1}^m)$ . The right-hand variables are indicators for innovation, labour quality measured as the high-skilled or the university employment share, current output and employment growth rate as well as the vector of control variables,  $z_{it}$ . Since there is a time lag between employment expectations and the right-hand variable, causation clearly goes from innovation to employment. The expected derivatives are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial E(\Delta l_{i,t+1}^m) / \partial \Delta inno_{it,t-1} &> 0; \quad \partial E(\Delta l_{i,t+1}^m) / \partial \Delta y_{it} > 0; \\ \partial E(\Delta l_{i,t+1}^m) / \partial \Delta l_{it}^m &> 0; \quad \partial E(\Delta l_{i,t+1}^m) / \partial \frac{L_{it}^H}{L_{it}} > 0 \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

The main hypothesis is that technological innovations should be strongly related to the employment expectations for different types of labour,  $\partial E(\Delta l_{i,t+1}^m) / \partial \Delta inno_{it,t-1} > 0$ , for m= 1, 2, 3. The effects of product innovations should be stronger for university graduates and masters as well as for technicians than for total employment. A positive relationship between employment expectations and the high-skilled employment share is also expected. At the sectoral level employment growth depends positively on the skill intensity. A measure of output change is included in all employment equations. Output should be positively related to employment expectations of different types of labour. Two measures of output change are available, the current output growth rate,  $\Delta y_{it}$ , and an ordered categorical variable for expected output. Since it is likely that causality goes in both directions, current output growth rather than expected output should be included

in the employment equations. Furthermore, since it is likely that employment expectations depend on realized employment changes in the past, the observed one year employment growth rate can be included.

Estimating the effects of technological innovations raises the question about definition and measurement of innovation output (see Cohen and Levin (1989), Crepon et al. (1998), Meyer-Krahmer (1984) and the literature cited in Symeonidis (1997)). According to Brouwer and Kleinknecht (1996) product innovations can be divided into innovations that are new to the firm and innovations that are new to the market. Furthermore, information about the introduction of a new product can be combined with information about whether or not firms gained positive revenues by the introduction of new products. This measure may give some indication of the commercial significance of the product change. Patents are an alternative indicator for innovation output. The single measure for product innovation can be replaced by various terms of interaction with other types of product or process innovations:

$$\Delta inno_{it,t-1} = g_1(\Delta new\ prod_{it,t-1}, rev_{it} \times \Delta new\ prod_{it,t-1}) \quad (2.4)$$

$$\Delta inno_{it,t-1} = g_2(\Delta new\ prod_{it,t-1}, \Delta new\ market_{it,t-1} \times \Delta new\ prod_{it,t-1})$$

$$\Delta inno_{it,t-1} = g_3(\Delta new\ prod_{it,t-1}, \Delta process_{it,t-1} \times \Delta new\ prod_{it,t-1})$$

$$\Delta inno_{it,t-1} = g_4(\Delta new\ prod_{it,t-1}, \Delta patent_{it,t-1} \times \Delta new\ prod_{it,t-1})$$

where the variables are defined as follows:

$\Delta new\ prod_{it,t-1}$	introduction of new or improved products (0/1), 1994-96
$rev_{it}$	whether or not firms gained positive revenues due to new or radically changed products, (0/1), 1994-96
$\Delta new\ market_{it,t-1}$	whether or not firms introduced new market products, (0/1), 1994-96
$\Delta process_{it,t-1}$	either process innovations, (0/1), 1994-96 or cost reducing process innovations, (0/1), 1994-96
$\Delta patent_{it,t-1}$	patent application, (0/1), 1995-97

Various indicators for product innovations are used:  $\Delta new\ prod_{it,t-1}$  denotes whether or not firms introduced new or improved products;  $rev_{it}$  denotes whether

or not firms gained positive revenues from the new or radically changed product and  $\Delta new\ market$  denotes whether or not firms introduced new market products. The first measure for product innovation,  $\Delta new\ prod_{it,t-1}$ , covers new or improved products. The second product innovation measure is  $\Delta new\ prod_{it,t-1} \times rev_{it}$  and the third is  $\Delta new\ prod_{it,t-1} \times \Delta new\ market_{it,t-1}$ . We expect that the employment effects are stronger for new market products as well as for new or radically changed products with positive revenues.

An additional test analyzes whether a joint implementation of new products and processes innovations will have different employment effects for different types of labour. Process innovations are often carried out by the replacement of existing capital with new machines. This clearly favours high-skilled labour rather than unskilled labour.<sup>3</sup> Two further interaction terms are introduced. The first combines product and process innovation. The second is a combination of product innovations and cost reducing process innovations ( $\Delta new\ prod_{it,t-1} \times cost-red_{it}$ ). The latter is defined as whether or not firms achieved a cost reduction by the introduction of new processes.

## 2.2. Innovation equation

Innovation output is not exogenous to the firm. Estimation of the determinants of the employment expectations must take into account the selection bias thereby induced. To account for this bias, an innovation selection equation is introduced. Innovation determinants have been clearly identified in the literature (see literature cited in Cohen and Levin 1989 and Symeonidis 1997). The usual innovation determinants are R&D intensity, firm size, market structure, capital intensity, and advertising expenditures. Innovation may also be positively related to the firms' labour quality. According to Huiban and Bouhsina (1998), a number of activities closely related to R&D activities require formal knowledge. They propose the engineering share as an additional variable in the innovation equation.

Unfortunately, non-innovative firms are not compelled to answer to all questions about innovation input, so that the relationship between innovation output and innovation inputs can only be analysed for firms that carried out some form of product or process innovations. One solution is to drop non-innovative firms from our sample and restrict the extended model to innovative firms. Another solution

---

<sup>3</sup>However, preliminary calculations suggest that only 1% of the innovating firms introduce process innovations but no product innovations. Therefore, it makes little sense to distinguish between product and process innovations.

is to introduce a R&D selection equation. Since exclusive restrictions are hard to find, we restrict the following analysis on the restricted sample and only control for potential endogeneity of some forms of innovations (new market products). New market products can be related to R&D activities, the high-skilled employment share, size and sector dummies and a diversification variable:

$$\Delta inno_{it} = f_2 \left( L_{it}^H / L_{it}, R\&D_{it}, sub_{it}, div_{it}, z_{it}; \beta \right) + \epsilon_i. \quad (2.5)$$

where the variables are defined as follows:

$R\&D_{it}$	whether or not firms are engaged in R&D, distinction between continuously and occasionally engaged in R&D
$sub_{it}$	whether or not firms received loans, 1996
$div_{it}$	diversification index
$z_{it}$	firm size and industry dummies

The identifying variables consist of the R&D and the diversification variable. R&D is measured as a dummy variable whether or not firms are continuously engaged in R&D. One important point concerns the distinction between permanent and occasional engagement in R&D. According to Brouwer and Kleinknecht (1996), firms that are permanently engaged in R&D are more likely to be engaged in innovation compared to those occasionally engaged in R&D. Consequently, a second R&D dummy variable can be included indicating whether firms are occasionally engaged in R&D. Alternatively, R&D activity can be measured as R&D intensity. The clear advantage of the first measurement concept is that the R&D dummies do not refer to a specific period of time. Moreover, the inclusion of current R&D intensity in the innovation output equation can be criticized because of the adjustment lag between innovation output and R&D investment. Furthermore, the sales share of the most sales-intensive product is taken as an indicator for the degree of diversification.

The expected derivatives are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial \Delta inno_{it} / \partial (L_{it}^H / L_{it}) &> 0; \partial \Delta inno_{it} / \partial R\&D_{it} > 0; \\ \partial \Delta inno_{it} / \partial sub_{it} &> 0; \partial \Delta inno_{it} / \partial div_{it} < 0; \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

Firms that are continuously engaged in R&D should have a higher innovation probability. Since employment of university graduates or masters and technicians may have a particularly beneficial impact on the firms' innovation capability, due to the link to higher education institutes, we expect a positive coefficient on

the high-skilled employment share. Finally, we expect the firm size as well as the subsidy dummy to have a positive effect (sign), but diversification to have a negative effect on the innovation probability.

### 2.3. Estimation techniques of the multivariate probit model

The argument of estimation of a system of equations is stronger if either theory predicts cross-equation restrictions (i.e., symmetry restrictions) or if an endogenous variable is included on the right hand-side. Since in absence of factor prices symmetry restrictions do not exist, endogeneity of innovation is more important. There are few applications of multi-equation probit models with one endogenous dummy variable on the right-hand-side. One exception is Greene (1998), who uses the bivariate probit model with one endogenous variable taken as an additional regressor on the right hand side. The multivariate probit model is a generalization of the bivariate probit model.<sup>4</sup> The multivariate model contains four structural equations: three employment expectation equations and one innovation equation (subscript t is suppressed for convenience):<sup>5</sup>

$$\begin{aligned}
 y_m^* &= \gamma_m y_n + \beta_m' x_m + \epsilon_m, \quad m = 1, 2, 3 \\
 y_n^* &= \beta_n' x_n + \epsilon_n, \quad ; n = 4 \\
 y_m, &= 1 \text{ if } y_m^* > 0; y_n, = 1 \text{ if } y_n^* > 0 \\
 \epsilon' &= [\epsilon_m, \epsilon_n] \sim N(0, \Sigma)
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{2.7}$$

where  $y_m^*$  represents the employment expectations for different types of educational qualifications during the period between 1997 and 1999 and  $y_n^*$  denotes indicators for technological innovations. The vector  $x_m$  contains control variables. The vector  $x_n$  contains both control and identifying variables. The latter contains variables which are assumed to be exogenous and are not included in the employment equations.  $\epsilon'$  is assumed to be jointly four variate normally distributed with zero mean vector. Given that the variance is 1, the variance-covariance matrix,  $\Sigma$ , consists of a correlation matrix including six free parameters:

---

<sup>4</sup>See Greene (1997) for a description of the multivariate probit model.

<sup>5</sup>In principle, the model can be easily extended by including additional innovation equations for different types of educational qualifications and different innovation indicators. Note, that the inclusion of further employment equations is not without cost. The amount of computation increases more than linearly with the number of equations.

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho_{12} & \rho_{13} & \rho_{14} \\ & 1 & \rho_{23} & \rho_{24} \\ & & 1 & \rho_{34} \\ & & & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.8)$$

For the multivariate probit model marginal effects of the following form can be obtained : The expected value of  $Y_1$  given that all other  $Y$ 's equal 1 is:

$$E[Y_1|Y_2 = 1, \dots, Y_4 = 1] = Prob(Y_1 = 1, \dots, Y_4 = 1)/Prob(Y_2 = 1, \dots, Y_4 = 1) \quad (2.9)$$

Alternatively, the expected value of  $Y_1$  is given that innovation equals one,  $Y_4=1$ , but expected employment for total number of employees as well as for masters and technicians equals 0,  $Y_2=0$ ,  $Y_3=0$ . All effects can be calculated at the means of the right-hand variables.

The multivariate probit model offers several testable hypotheses. The first is that the error terms between the innovation equation and each employment expectation are correlated. It is easy to see, that the multivariate probit model assuming exogeneity arises as a special case with  $\rho_{14} = \rho_{24} = \rho_{34} = 0$ . When the error terms are correlated, excluding the innovation selection equation will not yield consistent estimates of the parameters on new market products. A Wald test or a likelihood ratio test can be carried out to test whether innovation is exogenous. The null hypothesis  $H_0 : \rho_{14} = \rho_{24} = \rho_{34} = 0$  is tested against  $H_1 : \rho_{m4} \neq 0$ , for  $m=1, \dots, 3$ . The number of degrees of freedom is 3. In case of exogeneity of innovation, the coefficient on innovation in the expected labour demand equations can be estimated consistently by simple univariate probit models. However, the error-terms in the employment equations of different types of labour may be still correlated because of unobserved firm specific characteristics. Therefore, estimation by seemingly unrelated probit regression should be preferred in order to exploit all information and provide the most efficient estimator. An additional Wald test can be performed to test the correlation of the error-terms in the three equation model. If the null of no correlation between the error term in the innovation equation and each employment equation is rejected, independent binary probit models are adequate.

The multivariate probit model described above (2.7) will be estimated by the simulated MLE separately for different measures of innovation output. The simulated MLE method will be described briefly in the following. The probability for the random vector  $u$  is given by:

$$\Pr(a < u < b) = \int_a^b \dots \int_{a_2}^{b_2} \int_{a_1}^{b_1} \phi_J(u) du_i \quad (2.10)$$

where  $u$  is assumed to be distributed multivariate normal with mean 0 and variance  $\Omega$  and  $\phi_J$  is the density function of a  $J$ -variate normal distribution with the correlation matrix  $\Sigma$ . It is obvious that in the case of more than three probit equations more than three levels of numerical integrations are required. Therefore, the integral can not be calculated analytically and exact MLE is not possible. Instead, the probability is approximated through simulation:<sup>6</sup>

$$\Pr(a < u < b) \approx \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R \prod_{k=1}^K Q_{rk} \quad (2.11)$$

where  $R$  are the number of replications and  $Q_{rk}$  are univariate probabilities. The idea of the simulated MLE method is that the integral of interest represents the probability of an event in a population. Therefore, we only need to replace the choice probabilities in the likelihood function by the simulated probabilities. The first step is, that  $u$  in the left hand side of expression (2.11) is replaced by a random vector of independent standard normal variables  $\epsilon$  multiplied by a lower triangular matrix  $L$ . The probability on the left hand side in (2.11) can now be written as:

$$P(a < L\epsilon < b) = P[a_1 < l_{11}\epsilon_1 < b_1, a_2 < l_{12}\epsilon_1 + l_{22}\epsilon_2 < b_2, \dots \quad (2.12)$$

$$a_k < l_{1k}\epsilon_1 + \dots + l_{kk}\epsilon_k < b_k]$$

where  $L$  is the lower triangular Cholesky factor of  $\Omega = LL'$  and  $l_{km}$ ,  $a_i$  and  $b_i$  are the corresponding elements of  $L$ ,  $a$  and  $b$ . The triangular structure of constraints makes it easier to simulate the probabilities. After rearranging terms in equation (2.12), the intervals defining the events can be written as:

$$A_1 = \left\{ \frac{a_1}{l_{11}} < \epsilon_1 < \frac{b_1}{l_{11}} \right\} \quad (2.13)$$

$$A_2 = \left\{ \frac{a_2 - l_{12}\epsilon_1}{l_{22}} < \epsilon_2 < \frac{b_2 - l_{12}\epsilon_1}{l_{22}} \right\}$$

---

<sup>6</sup>See Hajvassiliou (1993), Keane (1994) and Greene (1997: 192) for an exposition of the simulated maximum likelihood estimator.

$$A_k = \left\{ \frac{a_k - l_{1k}\epsilon_1 - \dots - l_{k-1,k}\epsilon_{k-1}}{l_{kk}} < \epsilon_k < \frac{b_k - l_{1k}\epsilon_1 - \dots - l_{k-1,k}\epsilon_{k-1}}{l_{kk}} \right\}$$

Combing equation (2.12) and equation (2.13) the probability can be expressed as the product of univariate probabilities:

$$P(a < L\epsilon < b) = P(A_1)P(A_2 | A_1)P(A_3 | A_1, A_2)\dots P(A_n | A_1, \dots, A_{n-1}) \quad (2.14)$$

The choice probabilities in equation (2.14) will be replaced by simulated probabilities:

$$P(a < \epsilon < b) = \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R P(A_1)P(A_2 | \epsilon_{1r})P(A_3 | \epsilon_{1r}, \epsilon_{2r})\dots P(A_k | \epsilon_{1r}, \dots, \epsilon_{k-1,r}) \quad (2.15)$$

$$= \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R \prod_{k=1}^K Q_{rk}$$

where R are the number of replications and  $\epsilon_{1r}$  are drawn sequentially from truncated independent standard normal distributions. Once the  $\epsilon_{1r}$  are drawn the product of the estimated probabilities is calculated (see Greene 1997: 196):

$$Q_{r1} = \phi\left(\frac{b_k}{l_{kk}}\right) - \phi\left(\frac{a_k}{l_{kk}}\right) \quad (2.16)$$

$$Q_{r2} = \phi\left(\frac{b_k - l_{1k}\epsilon_{1r}}{l_{kk}}\right) - \phi\left(\frac{a_k - l_{1k}\epsilon_{1r}}{l_{kk}}\right)$$

$$Q_{rk} = \phi\left(\frac{b_k - \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} l_{km}\epsilon_{rm}}{l_{kk}}\right) - \phi\left(\frac{a_k - \sum_{m=1}^{k-1} l_{km}\epsilon_{rm}}{l_{kk}}\right)$$

where  $\phi$  is the cumulative distribution function of a standard normal distribution function. This process is repeated R times and the average is taken as the approximate probability. Börsch-Supan and Hajivassiliou (1993) proved that the

probability simulator is an unbiased estimator of the true probability. One problem of the simulation methods is the creation of noise. Hajivassiliou (1997) noted that accuracy of the probability simulators can be increased by the number of replications per estimation. However, the increase in computer time may become unacceptably large. Furthermore, the amount of computation in the multivariate probit models varies both linearly with the number of observations and the number of replications. It also varies somewhat more than linearly with the number of independent variables (Hajivassiliou 1997).

### 3. The data

The data set employed for the subsequent empirical analysis contains the fifth wave of the Mannheim Manufacturing Innovation panel 1997 (MIP). Most of the continuous variables, such as R&D intensity or innovation sales ratio are from 1996. For some variables, i.e. total sales and total employment, information about the period of 1994 to 1996 is available. Information about the educational qualifications of the workforce is available for the two year period of 1995 and 1996. Approximately 2400 firms participated in the fifth wave of MIP from which non-manufacturing firms as well as East German firms are removed.

The first set of dependent variables consists of employment expectations for different types of labour. In the 1997 questionnaire managers are asked about their expectations for total sales, total employment and different types of educational qualifications in three years, i.e. from the period 1997 to 1999. Five categories for employment expectations can be distinguished: strong increase, slight increase, unchanged, slight decrease, strong decrease. For each employment variable the 5 categories are regrouped into two categories: expected increase equals '1', unchanged or decrease equals '0'. Since only very few firms expect employment to decrease, the distinction between the decreasing employment category and the stable employment category is not very important. Unreported results show that only 3.6 percent of the firms expect the employment of university graduates with an engineering or a natural science degree to decrease. For the social science group 5.0 percent of the firms expect a decrease.

Since information on educational qualification classes is only available for white collar workers, separating labour into two groups (university graduates on one hand and masters and technicians on the other hand) is the maximum that we could implement with this data. Expected change in university graduates is constructed as follows. Two groups of university graduates can be distinguished:

the first group consists of workers having attained a university degree or a higher polytechnical degree ("Fachhochschule") in engineering or natural science and the second group contains graduates with a degree in social or other sciences. Following Kaiser (1999), the engineering/natural science and the social science group are regrouped into one group of university graduates. The reason is that in manufacturing the share of university graduates (including higher technical college graduates) who gained a natural science or engineering degree amounts to 76 percent of all university graduates (based on calculations of the 1995 micro census). If a firm expects an increase in either the engineering/natural science or the social science group the variable expected change is recoded 1 and 0 else. Firms are also assigned to the "1" group when they show decreasing employment for one university graduates group but increasing employment for the other university graduates group. Only very few firms expect increasing employment for engineering/natural science graduates but decreasing employment for the social science group. The other dependent variables are considered to be expected employment change for the total number of employees and expected employment for masters and technicians. Both variables are also recoded to 1 if firms plan to expand the total number of employees for the period of 1997 to 1999 and 0 if the employment is stable or falling.

The second set of dependent variables contains different innovation indicators for the 3-year period introduced between 1994 and 1996. In general, technological innovations can be divided into process and product innovations. For product innovations three definitions can be used. The first measure are new or better products that had not been produced before and were introduced during the period of 1994 and 1996. These products may be new to the firm, but they may also be new to the market. The second product innovation measure combines information on production innovation and the revenues due to the introduction of the new and radically renewed product. Innovative firms are asked about their percentage of sales share in 1996 achieved by the new or radically changed product.<sup>7</sup> Approximately 15 percent of the firms in the estimation sample refused the answer about the revenue share, mostly product innovators. The second product innovation measure equals 1 if firms introduce new products and gained positive revenues by the new or radically changed product, and otherwise zero. Finally, the third product innovation measure refers to new market products. It covers the introduction of new or noticeably improved products which are not only new to

---

<sup>7</sup>Firms are also questioned about the turnover due to new and incrementally improved products in 1996.

the firm but also new to the firm's market. As Brouwer and Kleinknecht (1996) have already noted, new market products allow us to distinguish between imitations of innovations and true innovations. The introduction of products new to the firm is often based on some degree of imitation, whereas products new to the market may be considered as true innovations. In the questionnaire all firms were asked about whether or not new market products are introduced.<sup>8</sup> Finally, another innovation measure, the application for a patent between 1995 and 1997, is considered. For the process innovation indicators two definitions can be used. The first definition covers process innovations and equals 1 if new processes are introduced during the period between 1994 and 1996. The second definition comprises those firms, which reported cost reductions due to the introduction of new processes.<sup>9</sup>

The left hand variables in the innovation equations may be a dummy variables indicating whether or not firms are either continuously or occasionally engaged in R&D. Alternatively, R&D intensity or the innovation expenditures sales ratio can be used as a substitute for the R&D dummy variables. Other control variables are the sales share of the product most intensive in sales, and a complete set of sector and size dummies. In distinguishing between firm size, dummy variables based on the number of full time equivalent workers are used. Five classes of size are considered: 5 – 49, 50 – 99, 100 – 249, 250 – 499, and more than 499 employees. Three measures of the high-skilled share are calculated. The first employment share contains workers with a university degree. The second one covers masters and technicians and the third contains both. Each high-skilled share is expressed as the percentage of the sum of all the five skill groups.

The initial sample for West German firms contains information on 1600 firms. Exclusion of firms belonging to sectors other than manufacturing as well as firms with less than 5 employees, leaves us with 1334 firms). Incomplete information on firms' expectations for the change in the number of total employment, employment by educational qualification and sales led to a sample reduction to 959 firms. A further sample reduction is caused by missing information on R&D activities, subsidies and the sales share of the most sales intensive product. For

---

<sup>8</sup>Similar as before, the question whether new market products are included or not can be combined with the question whether firms gained positive revenues by the product. This question is only asked to firms with new market products. Among the innovators approximately 20 percent of the firms refused the answer about revenues on new market products. The remaining firms all have positive revenues.

<sup>9</sup>Approximately 11.5 percent of the firms refused the answer about cost reducing process innovations. In case of non process innovative firms missing values are replaced by "0".

approximately 90 firms the innovation sales ratio multiplied by the factor 0.5 was substituted for the R&D intensity. Finally, the estimation sample contains 837 West German manufacturing firms. If one restricts the sample for which information on the other product innovation indicators are available, the sample reduces to 768 firms in case of new markets. Excluding non-innovators reduces the sample to 574 firms.

Table A1 shows descriptive statistics for both estimation samples. Average employment of the manufacturing firms is 450 with one quarter in the smallest size category (5 – 49 employees). Employment growth rate in 1996 amounts to –1.4 percent. For aggregate West German manufacturing the 1996 employment growth rate amounts to –3.3 percent. In 1997 63 percent of the manufacturing firms expect sales to increase for the medium-term period 1997 to 1999.

While in 1997 42 percent anticipated an increase in the employment of university graduates for the period between 1997 and 1999, only 21 percent of the firms expected total employment levels to increase. Thus, the majority of the manufacturing firms expected unchanged or decreasing numbers of total employees. For the masters/technicians 31 percent of the firms expected employment to increase. Approximately 77 percent of the respondents indicated that they carried some form of product or process innovations over the period between 1994 and 1996. The introduction of new and improved products is reported by 75 percent of the firms. This number falls to 63 percent when new or radically changed products combined with positive revenues are considered. About 41 percent of the firms introduced new market products. Furthermore, only 2.3 percent of the firms introduced new processes not combined with product innovations making the distinction between product and process innovations less meaningful. Cost reducing process innovations combined with new and improved products are reported by 48 percent of the firms. Patents applications accounted for 45 percent of the estimation sample. In the questionnaire R&D performing firms can be distinguished into firms that are occasionally or continuously engaged in R&D. Approximately 43 percent of the firms carried out continuous R&D activities. One fourth of the firms reported that they are occasionally engaged in R&D. Table A1 also includes high-skilled employment shares. In 1995, the portion of university graduates as percentage of the total of employees amounts to 9.0 percent, which is fairly comparable to 8.7 percent employment share based on the Labour Force Survey. The masters and technicians employment share is 8.0 percent which is slightly below the calculations based on the Labour Force Survey.

Table A2 presents simple cross-tabulations between employment expectations

and different innovation output indicators. The percentage of firms with an expected increase for one of three employment categories is compared between innovators and non-innovators. This table also includes statistical tests examining the relationship between the different performance expectations and different innovation activities. Cramer's V provides an index of the strength of the relationship between two variables.<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, the two-sided Fisher's exact marginal significance levels can be calculated to determine if there are nonrandom associations between technological innovations and employment on one hand and technological innovations output on the other hand. In general, innovators reported higher output and employment expectations than did non-innovative firms. In particular, job creation for university graduates is actually more common in the innovative group: between 49 and 57 percent expect employment to increase, depending on the type of innovation. For the non-innovative group only between 21 and 33 percent expect the employment of university graduates to increase. Cramer's V indicates that expectations for high-skilled labour and different types of innovations are correlated with a positive sign. The strength of the index ranges between .18 and .25 for the pairs of high-skilled employment and innovation. The Fisher tests shows, that the difference between innovators and non-innovators is significant in all cases.

The difference in expected employment between innovators and non-innovators can also be noticed for total employment. The difference between these groups is, however, quite small and often not significant at the 5 percent level, except for new market products with a 3 percent significance level. Similar to university graduates, employment expectations for masters and technicians differ significantly between innovators and non-innovators. Not surprisingly, expected output change is a major determinant of job creation for all employment categories.

Cross-correlations in Table A3 confirm that there is a positive relationship between R&D activities and the introduction of new market products. Moreover, the distinction between permanent and occasional R&D activities is important. The highest proportion of new market product innovators (67 percent of all firms based on restricted sample) can be found in firms that are continuously engaged in R&D. For instance, firms that are occasionally engaged in R&D are less likely to introduce new market products than firms that are continuously engaged in R&D.

---

<sup>10</sup>The Cramer's V method measures the degree of association between the values of the row and column variables on a scale of 0 to 1, based on the usual chi-square statistic.

## 4. Empirical results

### 4.1. Employment expectations and exogenous technological innovations

To assess the importance of technological innovations to job creation, firms expectations for different types of labour are examined. Different functions will be estimated for different types of innovations. We also include various interaction terms between different types of innovations. We first start to estimate multivariate probit models explaining employment expectations for different types of labour, whereas technological innovations are assumed to be exogenous. For new market products this assumption will be relaxed in the following section. The dependent variables is whether or not firms plan to increase employment for employees with a university degree, for masters/technicians or for the total number of employees in the period between 1997 and 1999. Since regression results for different types of innovations indicate that the introduction of new market products (associated with positive sales gained from the new product) is more important than any other measure of product innovation in determining the expected employment probabilities, we first report the results using new market products. Furthermore, since the sample size reduction due to missing information on current sales growth rate is quite large, we substitute the expected output growth rate for the actual sales growth rate.

The top panel of Table A4 shows the results for the multivariate probit model estimated by simulated MLE. We use 200 replications for the GHK estimator. For the sake of comparison, the lower panel of Table A4 also includes simple univariate probit models for each employment group. Column 1 and 2 show the coefficients on the probability that firms expect an increase in university graduates and master/technicians, respectively. Column 3 shows the coefficient on the probability that firms expect an increase in total employment. All equations include 14 two-digit industry dummies. The reference group is machinery, NACE 291 and NACE 294. For the three equation multivariate probit models two out of three correlation coefficients of the error terms are significantly positive at the 5 percent level. Not surprisingly, a Wald test clearly supports the seemingly unrelated probit model over the independent univariate probit model with a p-value of less than 0.01. The positive correlation coefficients indicate that firms expecting an increase for one employment group are also expecting an increase for the other employment group. Accounting for cross-correlation of the error terms should produce some efficiency gains. A comparison of the t-values of the multivariate probit model with the univariate probit model shows little evidence for efficiency gains which

is somehow surprising.

Hajivassiliou (1997) shows that bias due to simulation noise decreases with the number of replications used for the GHK estimator.<sup>11</sup> The multivariate probit models are also estimated with different replications (R=300, R=400, R=500). Unreported results show that 100 replications are sufficient to stabilize both the log likelihood and the coefficients. However, for a small number of replications (R<50) the coefficients are quite different.

Table A4 shows that new market products enter significantly positive in all three employment expectation equations. For the employment expectations of university graduates and masters/technicians the coefficients on new market products are significant at the 1 percent level. For expected change in total employment, the coefficient on new market products is significant at the 8 percent level. Since the coefficients are similar for the SUR probit model with those for the univariate probit model, marginal effects from the univariate probit can be used to compare the employment effects of new market products. The marginal effects for university graduates, masters and technicians and total employment are 0.13, 0.12 and 0.05 respectively, indicating a higher magnitude for higher qualifications. This means that the average innovator is between 5 percent and 13 percent more likely to increase employment of different types of labour in the future.

Looking at the other coefficients, we see that all coefficients have the predicted signs. Expected employment growth for different types of labour is rather responsive to expected output growth. The estimated coefficient on the employment share of university graduates and as well as that of masters and technicians are positive and significant at the 5 percent level. This is not very surprising, since employment growth is higher in industries that are intensive in human capital. Furthermore, job creation for university graduates is much more likely in medium sized firms (100 – 249 and 250 – 499 employees) and in large sized firms than in both very small (up to 50) and small sized (50 – 99). In contrast, employment expectations for total employees are clearly negatively related to firm size. The highest employment expectations for masters and technicians can be found in the medium sized grouped.

The innovation effects may also be different for firms that introduce product and process innovations simultaneously compared to product innovations only. Therefore, a number of multivariate probit models are fitted including different measures of innovation. Table A5 shows the estimation results for the five different

---

<sup>11</sup>Hajivassiliou (1997) proposed a test for the bias generated by simulation noise in MSL estimation.

specifications. Specification (1) includes the broadly defined product innovation measure. Specification (2) includes the broadly defined product innovation measure and an interaction term between products and processes. Specifications (3) and (4) also include an interaction term between product innovation and the other two product innovation concepts. Specification (5) includes new market products and an interaction term between new market products and processes. Table A4 also includes a Wald test for joint significance of the innovation indicator and the interaction term.

The most important result is that new market products have stronger effects on the employment expectation probability than the other two product innovation measures. The coefficient on the interaction term of new market products and new or improved products is significant positive in each of the employment equations. Furthermore, a joint test reject the null hypothesis that both new and improved products and the interaction term are all equal to zero at the 5 percent level. The value of the test statistics ranges between 17.1 for the university graduates equation and 12.0 for the masters and technicians equation. The corresponding p-values are less than 0.01. In case of total employment both new products and the interaction term are not jointly significant at the 5 percent level. This indicates that based on the broader measure of product innovation (new and improved products) the positive effect of innovation on employment expectations of the total number of employees disappears.

For university graduates as well as for the masters and technicians the positive interaction terms between product and process innovations suggest that joint implementation of new products and new processes have stronger effects than product innovations only. In contrast, for total employment, the interaction term between products and new processes is close to zero and not significant. Finally, unreported regression indicates that the combination of new products and cost reducing process innovations has similar effects on the employment probabilities.<sup>12</sup>

Some additional sensitivity checks are presented. The first point is that employment expectations may depend on the current employment growth rate. Reestimating each multivariate probit model with the current employment growth rate in 1996 as an additional right-hand variable shows that employment expectations depend positively on realized current employment growth rates. The coefficient on the current employment growth rate is significant for each type of labour. More important, the inclusion of past employment growth rates leaves the coefficient on new market product unchanged. However, due to missing information on lagged

---

<sup>12</sup>Furthermore, interaction terms between patents and product innovations are not significant.

levels, the sample reduces to 547 observations, which means a loss of 23 percent. The second point concerns the simultaneity between expected sales growth and expected employment growth. This could lead to biased estimates of the expected sales coefficient. Moreover, expected employment change may be influenced by current sales growth rates rather than by its sales expectations. Similar to previous analyses, the inclusion of the current growth rate of sales leaves the coefficients on different innovation activities unchanged. The current growth rate of sales has a positive impact on the expected labour demand but is not significant at the 5 percent level. For instance, the coefficient on the current growth rate of sales in 1996 on the expected employment of university graduates is 0.24 with a t-value of 0.6. In contrast, the effects of the current growth rate of sales in 1996 on the expectations for the total employment is significantly positive. Finally, the last point refers to heteroscedasticity. Modelling the variance of the error term as a function of R&D intensity, high-skilled employment share and its squared variables leaves the basic estimates unchanged. Not surprisingly, heteroscedasticity is rejected at the 5 percent level.

#### **4.2. Accounting for endogeneity of new market products**

Since non-innovative firms are not compelled to answer all questions about innovation input we restricted the following analysis to innovative firms, that are, firms that either introduce product or process innovations. This only allows us to control for the possible endogeneity of new market products in the labour demand equations but not for the broader defined measures of innovation output. Excluding non-innovative firms leads to an estimation sample of about 574 firms. To account for endogeneity of new market products in the labour demand equations an innovation output selection equation is added to the system of equations. Table A6 shows the results for the baseline multivariate probit model which contains three different equations of employment expectation and one new market product equation. The innovation probit model identifies factors influencing the probability that the firms introduce new market products during the period between 1994 and 1996. To compare the multivariate probit models assuming exogenous new market products with those that consider these as endogenous, we also show multivariate probit results assuming exogenous new market products. Again, for all specifications we use 200 replications for the GHK estimator. Different values for the number of replications indicate that the likelihood values have already stabilized using 100 replications.

Column 1 and 2 in Table A6 show the coefficients on the probability that firms expect an increase in university graduates and master/technicians, respectively. Column 3 shows the results for employment expectations for the total numbers of employees. Column 4 shows the coefficients influencing the probability that a firm has introduced new market products between 1994 and 1996. The coefficients on 14 two digit industry dummies are not reported due to space limitations, but they are jointly significant at the 5 percent level. Table A6 also includes the estimated correlation matrix for the four equations. The correlation coefficients of the error terms are significant at the 5 percent level in two out of six cases. In general, the correlations are quite reasonable, with the highest correlation between the two skilled labour groups. However, the insignificant correlation coefficients between the errors in the employment equations and the new market products equation indicate that the new market product equation could be excluded from the model. In addition to the t-test on the correlation coefficients between the error terms in the employment expectation equation and in the new market product innovation equation, an exogeneity test can be performed. A Wald test is carried out for the null hypothesis  $H_0 : \rho_{n4} = 0, n=1,..3$ , against  $H_1 : \rho_{n4} \neq 0, n=1,..3$ . For the baseline specification the chi squared test statistic is 2.4 and therefore considerably below the 5 percent critical value with 3 degrees of freedom.<sup>13</sup>

The inclusion of an innovation selection equation makes some difference in the magnitude of the coefficients on new market products in the labour demand equations. Since the exogeneity assumption of new market products can not be rejected, separate estimates for the system of employment equations and the innovation equation are more efficient. Therefore, the interpretation of the coefficients in the labour demand equations should be based on the three equation multivariate probit model and the univariate probit model for the innovation equation. Column 4 shows the coefficients influencing the probability that a firm has introduced new market products between 1994 and 1996. The significantly positive coefficient on the R&D dummy variable defined as whether or not firms are continuously engaged in R&D, indicates that the probability to innovate depends on the firms' R&D activity. Furthermore, the second R&D dummy variable defined as whether or not firms are occasionally engaged in R&D is also significantly positive at the 5 percent level. The positive relationship between innovation output and R&D has also been found by most previous studies (see for example Brouwer

---

<sup>13</sup>I also estimated bivariate probit models for each pairs of employment expectation and new market products. In general, the null hypothesis of exogeneity of new market products can not be rejected at the 5 percent level.

and Kleinknecht (1996) based on Dutch manufacturing firms). The high-skilled employment share and the dummy variable for subsidies are both positive but not significant at the 5 percent level. Furthermore, the introduction of new market products depends significantly positively on firms size. The coefficients on the firm size dummies, however, should be interpreted with caution. One reason for the positive relationship between the innovation probability and the firm size is that in small firms product innovation is incremental, so the discrete innovation variable will underestimate the level of innovative activity (see Roper (1997)). Large firms are more likely to be successful innovators.

Furthermore, as can be seen in Table A8 in Appendix, the results based on the restricted sample are quite similar to those reported in Table A4 based on the full sample. There is again a strong positive correlation between the successful introduction of new market products during the period between 1994 and 1996 and the probability to increase employment in the future period between 1997 and 1999. However, the coefficient on new market products in the university graduates equation is only significant at the 10 percent level.

In unreported regressions, we experimented with alternative measures of innovation input. The first alternative measure is the R&D intensity and the second the innovation sales ratio. The results for the exogeneity tests based on the additional specifications are presented in Table A7 in Appendix. This table also includes the exogeneity test for the baseline specification in Table A6. The Wald tests suggest that endogeneity of new market products is important for the alternative measures of innovation inputs such as the R&D intensity as well as the innovation sales ratio. Given the values of the Wald test statistics for specification (ii) and (iii) the null hypothesis of exogeneity of new market products,  $H_0 : \rho_{14} = \rho_{24} = \rho_{34} = 0$ , can be clearly rejected at the 1 percent level. Moreover, when controlling for endogeneity an insignificant relationship between new market products and the employment expectations for both university graduates and masters and technicians arises which is somehow surprising.<sup>14</sup>

However, the interpretation of the results based on the R&D intensity as measure of innovation input should be interpreted with caution. Innovation output as a function of R&D intensity can be criticized because of the possible adjustment lags between innovation output and R&D investment as well as simultaneity. Since R&D dummy variables based on the question whether or not firms are continuously or occasionally engaged in R&D do not refer to a specific time period,

---

<sup>14</sup>Results for the multivariate probit model that contains R&D intensity instead of a R&D dummy is available on request.

the simultaneity problem between R&D and innovation output can be avoided.

Another point refers to the specification of the innovation equation. According to the demand-pull hypothesis, firms' prospects regarding future sales could affect their innovation activities (see Brouwer and Kleinknecht (1996)). Including expected sales growth as an additional regressor in the innovation equation leaves the basic results unchanged. The coefficient on expected sales is very small and not significant at the 5 percent significance level.

## 5. Conclusions

The paper deals with the relation between technological innovations and the firms' present expectations for future employment. A multivariate probit model explaining employment expectations for different types of labour is estimated using simulated ML methods. Special attention is directed to the measurement of innovation as well as the potential endogeneity of innovation output in the expected employment equations. The main findings of this analysis are the following: Firms that introduced new market products in the past are more likely to plan increased employment in the future. More important, the employment effects of new market products have a higher magnitude for higher educational qualifications. For total employment the results suggest that the introduction of new market products is more important than any other measure of product innovation in determining job creation. For instance there are no positive total employment effects when innovation is measured either as the introduction of new and improved products or as a combination of product and process innovations. In contrast, for both university graduates and masters and technicians employment effects of joint implementation of new products and new processes are stronger than the introduction of new and improved products not combined with new processes. Labour quality and expected turnover are also important determinants of expected labour demand.

Concerning possible endogeneity of new market products in the labour demand equations, the exogeneity assumption of new market products can not be rejected at conventional significance levels. Estimation results for the innovation equation indicate that the probability whether or not new market products are introduced is significantly higher for firms that are continuously engaged in R&D.

# Appendix:

Table A1: Summary Statistics, Means (percent)

	period	full sample		restr. sample	
		obs.	means	obs	means
employment (FTE), numbers	96	837	450	574	571
total sales (DM million)	96	837	141	574	181
expected employment	97-99	837	21.4	574	23.0
expected university graduates	97-99	837	41.8	574	49.7
expected master/technicians	97-99	837	30.8	574	34.8
product innovation only, (pd)	94-96	837	12.7	574	16.9
pd and process innovation	94-96	837	62.2	574	80.8
process innovations only	94-96	837	2.3	574	3.3
no innovations	94-96	837	22.8	574	0.0
pd×positive new prod. revenues	94-96	729	63.1	483	85.7
new market products	94-96	768	40.6	574	54.2
pd and cost-reducing process inno.	94-96	803	47.7	544	63.4
expected sales (0/1)	97-99	837	63.0	574	67.9
growth rate total sales	95; 96	533 <sup>a</sup>	6.8; 3.1	377 <sup>a</sup>	7.0; 2.6
university graduates share	95; 96	837 <sup>a</sup>	9.0; 9.7	574 <sup>a</sup>	10.2; 10.9
master/technicians share	95; 96	837 <sup>a</sup>	8.0; 8.6	574 <sup>a</sup>	8.5; 9.1
growth rate university grad.	96	679	9.2	491	9.8
growth rate masters/techn.	96	645	6.5	458	6.5
growth rate total employ.	95; 96	756 <sup>a</sup>	0.0; -1.4	516 <sup>a</sup>	0.0; -1.7
R&D doing firms, continuous	<sup>b</sup>	837	45.7	574	59.8
R&D doing firms, occasional	<sup>b</sup>	837	23.2	574	30.0
R&D intensity	96	837	1.6	574	2.2
sales share of prod 1	96	837	62.5	574	58.8
subsidies (0/1)	96	837	16.8	574	22.8
size 1 (0/1): $5 \leq L < 50$	96	837	25.6	574	19.5
size 2 (0/1): $50 \leq L < 100$	96	837	15.4	574	14.3
size 3 (0/1): $100 \leq L < 250$	96	837	21.5	574	22.3
size 4 (0/1): $250 \leq L < 500$	96	837	19.8	574	20.7
size 5 (0/1): $L \geq 500$	96	837	17.2	574	22.6

Notes: <sup>a</sup>Obs. for 1996 values. In 1995 less observations are available due to missing values. <sup>b</sup>Do not refer to a specific time period. Dummy var. are multiplied by 100.

Source: ZEW Mannheim Innovation Panel, fifth wave, 1997, own calculations.

## Appendix:

Table A2: Output and employment growth expectations for innovators and non-innovators

$y_j$	expected increase between 1997-99								
	obs	for university grad.				for masters/techn.			
		means if $y_j = 0$	means if $y_j = 1$	CR V	F $\rho$	means if $y_j = 0$	means if $y_j = 1$	CR V	F $\rho$
product innov, (pd)	837	0.21	0.49	0.24	0.00	0.22	0.34	0.11	0.00
pd and process inno.	837	0.27	0.51	0.24	0.00	0.21	0.37	0.17	0.00
pd and cost-re. proc.	803	0.33	0.51	0.18	0.00	0.26	0.34	0.09	0.00
new prod., pos. rev.	729	0.27	0.50	0.22	0.00	0.22	0.35	0.14	0.00
new market prod.	768	0.33	0.57	0.25	0.00	0.26	0.39	0.14	0.00
exp. sales growth	837	0.24	0.52	0.28	0.00	0.20	0.36	0.18	0.00
patent application	733	0.33	0.57	0.25	0.00	0.29	0.32	0.04	0.34

  

$y_j$	total employment								
	obs	total employment				total sales			
		means if $y_j = 0$	means if $y_j = 1$	CR V	F $\rho$	means if $y_j = 0$	means if $y_j = 1$	CR V	F $\rho$
product innov, (pd)	837	0.17	0.23	0.07	0.06	0.47	0.68	0.19	0.00
pd and process inno.	837	0.18	0.24	0.07	0.05	0.52	0.70	0.19	0.00
pd and cost-re. proc.	803	0.19	0.24	0.06	0.12	0.57	0.70	0.14	0.00
new prod., pos. rev	729	0.17	0.23	0.06	0.13	0.52	0.68	0.16	0.00
new market prod.	768	0.18	0.25	0.08	0.03	0.58	0.70	0.13	0.00
exp. sales growth	837	0.04	0.32	0.31	0.00				
patent application	733	0.21	0.22	0.01	0.79	0.59	0.70	0.11	0.00

Notes: Cr.V: Cramers V measures the degree of association between two dummy variables. F, $\rho$  : Probability(=marginal sig. level) of the two sided Fisher exact test.  
Table A3: Cross Table: R&D doing firms and new market products

	obs	no new market	new market
		products, 94-96	products, 94-96
R&D doing firms: permanent	343	0.33	0.67
R&D doing firms: occasional	172	0.60	0.40
non R&D doing firms	59	0.81	0.19

Notes: Restricted sample, observations 574. Non-innovators are excluded.  
Source: ZEW Mannheim Innovation Panel 1997, own calculations.

## Appendix:

Table A4: Multivariate probit estimates for firms' employment expectations

	university graduates		masters/ technicians		total employment	
	coeff	t-stat	coeff	t-stat	coeff	t-stat
multivariate probit:						
new market prod.	0.34	3.05	0.38	3.37	0.23	1.73
university grad. sh.	2.51	4.82				
masters/techn. share			1.20	2.34		
high-skilled share					0.60	1.62
expected sales	0.72	6.47	0.49	4.38	1.33	7.14
50 ≤ L < 100	0.11	0.64	0.08	0.46	-0.25	-1.23
100 ≤ L < 250	0.54	3.48	0.34	2.26	-0.17	-0.95
250 ≤ L < 500	0.75	4.64	-0.01	-0.05	-0.24	-1.35
L ≥ 500	0.61	3.72	0.19	1.14	-0.54	-2.62
industry dummies	yes		yes		yes	
constant	-1.19	-5.35	-1.11	-5.17	-1.77	-6.44
$\rho_{1,2}$	0.43	7.17				
$\rho_{1,3}$	0.21	2.54				
$\rho_{2,3}$	0.04	0.01				
log-likelihood			-1172.6			
univariate probit:						
new market prod.	0.34	3.12	0.36	3.33	0.21	1.69
university grad. sh.	2.35	4.63				
masters/techn. sh.			1.27	2.67		
high-skilled share					0.62	1.82
expected sales	0.72	6.70	0.49	4.48	1.32	8.41
50 ≤ L < 100	0.12	0.68	0.09	0.53	-0.24	-1.29
100 ≤ L < 250	0.54	3.58	0.35	2.43	-0.15	-0.93
250 ≤ L < 500	0.75	4.84	0.01	0.07	-0.22	-1.30
L ≥ 500	0.60	3.76	0.22	1.35	-0.52	-2.78
industry dummies	yes		yes		yes	
Constant	-1.19	-5.31	-1.12	-5.11	-1.78	-6.69
log-likelihood	-432.2		-437.0		-330.5	

Notes: Number of observations 768. Upper panel: multivariate probit model estimated by simulated MLE. Replications for simulated probabilities=200. Reference industry is Nace 291, 294.

## Appendix:

Table A5: Multivariate probit estimates for firms' employment expectations

specification		university graduates		masters/ technicians		total employment	
(obs)		coeff.	t-stat	coeff.	t-stat	coeff.	t-stat
1	product inno.,(pd)	0.43	3.22	0.31	2.42	0.04	0.03
(837)	$\rho_{1,2}; \rho_{1,3}; \rho_{2,3}$ (t-st)	0.42(7.56); 0.21(2.65); 0.01(0.13)					
	Log-likelihood;obs.	-1286.8					
2	product inno.,(pd)	0.27	1.45	-0.11	-0.56	-0.10	-0.51
(837)	pd×process inn.(pz)	0.19	1.21	0.49	2.77	0.12	0.75
	$\rho_{1,2}; \rho_{1,3}; \rho_{2,3}$ (t-st)	0.44(7.78); 0.20(2.51); -0.01(-0.03)					
	Log-likelihood	-1280.0					
	Wald test	13.4*		15.4*		0.60	
3	pd	0.39	2.59	0.15	0.92	-0.11	-0.65
(768)	pd×new market p.	0.20	1.62	0.33	2.56	0.26	1.82
	$\rho_{1,2}; \rho_{1,3}; \rho_{2,3}$ (t-st)	0.43(7.16); 0.22(2.61); 0.00(0.02)					
	Log-likelihood	-1167.9					
	Wald test	17.1*		12.0*		3.3	
4	pd	0.47	2.22	-0.10	-0.43	-0.07	-0.28
(729)	pd×pos.rev	0.00	0.00	0.43	2.01	0.11	0.50
	$\rho_{1,2}; \rho_{1,3}; \rho_{2,3}$ (t-st)	0.42(6.60); 0.23(2.57); -0.01(-0.05)					
	Log-likelihood	-1086.2					
	Wald test	12.3*		8.6*		0.3	
5	new market product	0.26	1.15	-0.12	-0.42	0.39	1.60
(768)	new market×pz	0.08	0.36	0.57	2.05	-0.20	-0.79
	$\rho_{1,2}; \rho_{1,3}; \rho_{2,3}$ (t-st)	0.44(7.34); 0.21(2.52); 0.01(0.14)					
	Log-likelihood	-1065.0					
	Wald test	9.9*		16.4*		3.4	

Notes: Multivariate probit model estimated by simulated MLE. Replications for simulated probabilities=200. Reference industry is Nace 231, 294. Wald test for joint significance of the innovation indicator and the interaction term with two degrees of freedom.

## Appendix:

Table A6: Multivariate probit estimates: expected employment growth and introduction of new market products

	expected change 1997-99						new market product 1994-96	
	university graduates		masters and technicians		total employment		coeff.	t-stat
	coeff.	t-stat	coeff.	t-stat	coeff.	t-stat		
new market pr.	0.11	0.21	0.01	0.03	0.87	1.86		
univ. grad sh.	2.29	3.68						
masters sh.			1.30	2.03				
high-skilled sh.					0.63	1.37	0.43	1.20
exp. sales	0.74	5.39	0.51	3.75	1.16	4.22		
R&D continuous							0.97	4.02
R&D occasional							0.40	1.67
subsidies							0.20	1.24
sales sh. pr. 1							-0.09	-0.34
50 ≤ L < 100	0.11	0.52	0.09	0.45	-0.30	-1.33	-0.12	-0.55
100 ≤ L < 250	0.39	2.02	0.33	1.72	-0.41	-1.91	-0.12	-0.63
250 ≤ L < 500	0.69	3.20	0.06	0.26	-0.52	-2.40	0.34	1.75
L ≥ 500	0.57	2.60	0.25	1.09	-0.82	-3.41	0.41	2.06
Constant	-1.40	-6.15	-0.90	-2.78	-1.81	-5.80	-0.49	-2.08
$\rho_{1,2}$	0.47	6.21						
$\rho_{1,3}$	0.22	1.68						
$\rho_{2,3}$	-0.03	-0.23						
$\rho_{1,4}$	0.06	0.19						
$\rho_{2,4}$	0.20	0.69						
$\rho_{3,4}$	-0.41	-1.31						
Log-L								-1257.6

Notes: Obs=574. Ind. dummies included. Replications for simulated probabilities=200.

Table A7: Wald test of exogeneity of new market products

specification: measures of innovation input	test statistic	p-value
(i) R&D dummies (continuously , occasionally)	2.37	.50
(ii) R&D intensity	32.4	.00
(iii) innovation sales ratio	63.3	.00

Notes: Wald test of the Exogeneity assumption:  $H_0 : \rho_{14} = \rho_{34} = \rho_{34} = 0$ . Degrees of freedom is 3. Number of obs. 574.

## Appendix:

Table A8: Multivariate probit estimates for firms' employment expectations (restricted sample) and univariate probit model for firms' new market product decision

	multivariate probit model						univ. probit	
	university graduates		masters/technicians		total employment		new market products	
	coeff	t-stat	coeff	t-stat	coeff	t-stat	coeff	t-stat
new market pr.	0.20	1.60	0.33	2.53	0.25	1.69		
univ. grad. sh.	2.26	3.92						
mast./tech. sh.			1.27	2.06				
high-skilled sh.					0.84	2.10	0.42	1.21
expected sales	0.73	5.63	0.50	3.72	1.27	5.69		
R&D continuo.							1.07	4.84
R&D occasion.							0.48	2.16
subsidies							0.16	1.13
sales sh. pr. 1							-0.10	-0.40
$50 \leq L < 100$	0.11	0.52	0.08	0.40	-0.31	-1.34	-0.09	-0.43
$100 \leq L < 250$	0.38	2.06	0.33	1.84	-0.42	-1.99	-0.12	-0.66
$250 \leq L < 500$	0.67	3.59	-0.01	-0.04	-0.40	-1.94	0.32	1.74
$L \geq 500$	0.56	3.04	0.17	0.90	-0.67	-2.62	0.40	2.10
ind. dummies		yes		yes		yes		
constant	-1.01	-3.81	-1.05	-4.32	-1.66	-5.28	-0.74	-2.41
$\rho_{1,2}$	0.45	6.67						
$\rho_{1,3}$	0.24	2.54						
$\rho_{2,3}$	0.01	0.15						
log-likelihood				-923.0				-336.7

Notes: Multivariate probit model estimated by simulated MLE. Replications for simulated probabilities=200. Reference industry is Nace 291, 294.

## References

- [1] Blechinger, D., A. Kleinknecht, G. Licht and F. Pfeiffer (1998), The Impact of Innovation on Employment in Europe - An Analysis Using CIS Data, ZEW Dokumentationen 2.
- [2] Börsch-Supan, A. and V.A. Hajivassiliou (1993), Smooth Unbiased Multivariate Probability Simulators for Maximum Likelihood Estimation for Limited Dependent variable Models, *Journal of Econometrics* 58, 347-368.
- [3] Brouwer, E. and A. Kleinknecht (1996), Firm Size, Small Business Presence and Sales of Innovative Products: A Micro-Econometric Analysis, *Small Business Economics* 8 (3), 189-201.
- [4] Brouwer, E., A. Kleinknecht and J. O. N. Reijnen (1993), Employment Growth and Innovation at the Firm Level: An Empirical Study, *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* 3 (2), 153-159.
- [5] Chennells, L. and J. Van Reenen (1999), Technical Change and the Structure of Employment of Wages: A Survey of the Micro-Econometric Evidence, *Institute for Fiscal Studies*, London.
- [6] Cohen, W. and R. Levin (1989), *Empirical Studies of Innovation and Market Structure*, in: R. Schmalensee and R. Willig, eds, Handbook of Industrial Organization, Vol 2, 1059-1092.
- [7] Crepon, B, E. Duguet and J. Mairesse (1998), Research, Innovation, and Productivity: An Econometric Analysis at the Firm Level, *NBER Working Paper* 6696.
- [8] Doms, M., T. Dunne and K. R. Troske (1997), Workers, Wages, and Technology, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112 (1), 253-290.
- [9] Duguet, E. and N. Greenan (1998), Skilled Biased Technological Change: Econometric Evidence at the Firm Level, *Universite de Paris 1*.
- [10] Greene, W. (1997), *Econometric Analysis*, Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- [11] Greene, W. (1998), Gender Economics Courses in Liberal Arts Colleges: Further Results, *Journal of Economic Education* 29, 291-300.

- [12] Hajivassiliou, V.A. (1993), Simulation Estimation Methods for Limited Dependent Variable Models, in: Maddala, G. S., C. R. Rao and H. D. Vinod (eds.), *Handbook of Statistics*, Vol. 11, Amsterdam: North-Holland, 519-43.
- [13] Hajivassiliou, V. A. (1997), Some Practical Issues in Maximum Simulated Likelihood, in: R. Mariano, M. Fuss and T. Schuermann (eds), *Simulation-Based Inference in Econometrics: Methods and Applications*, Cambridge University Press.
- [14] Huiban, J. P and Z. Bouhsina (1998), Innovation and the Quality of Labour Factor. An Empirical Investigation in the French Food Industry, *Small Business Economics* 10, 389-400.
- [15] Kaiser, U. (1999), New Technologies and the Demand for Heterogeneous Labour, *ZEW Discussion Paper 99-07*, Centre for European Economic Research, Mannheim.
- [16] Keane, M. P.(1994), A Computationaly Practical Simulation Estimator for Panel data, *Econometrica* 62, 95-116.
- [17] König, H., H. S. Buscher and G. Licht (1995), *Employment, Investment and Innovation at the Firm Level*, The OECD Jobs Study: Investment, Productivity and Employment, Paris,
- [18] Leo, H. and V. Steiner (1994), *Innovation and Employment at the Firm Level*, Studie des Österreichischen Instituts für Wirtschaftsforschung im Auftrag des Bundesministeriums für wirtschaftliche Angelegenheiten. Wien.
- [19] Meyer-Krahmer, F. (1984), Recent Results in Measuring Innovation Output, *Research Policy* 13, 175-182.
- [20] Roper, S. (1997), Product Innovation and Small Business Growth: A Comparison of the Strategies of German, UK and Irish Companies, *Small Business Economics* 9 (6), 523-537.
- [21] Rottmann H. and M. Ruschinski (1997), *The Labour Demand and the Innovation Behavior of Firms: An Empirical Investigation for West-German manufacturing firms*. Ifo discussion paper 67-84.
- [22] Symeonidis, G. (1997), Innovation, Ffirm Size and Market Structure: Schumpeterian Hypothesis and Some New Themes, *OECD Economic Studies* 27, 35-70.