

Bosma, Niels; Stam, Erik; Schutjens, Veronique

Working Paper

Creative destruction and regional productivity growth: evidence from the dutch manufacturing and services industries

Jena Economic Research Papers, No. 2009,003

Provided in Cooperation with:
Max Planck Institute of Economics

Suggested Citation: Bosma, Niels; Stam, Erik; Schutjens, Veronique (2009) : Creative destruction and regional productivity growth: evidence from the dutch manufacturing and services industries, Jena Economic Research Papers, No. 2009,003, Friedrich Schiller University Jena and Max Planck Institute of Economics, Jena

This Version is available at:
<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/31788>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



JENA ECONOMIC RESEARCH PAPERS



2009 – 003

Creative Destruction and Regional Productivity Growth: Evidence from the Dutch Manufacturing and Services Industries

by

**Niels Bosma
Erik Stam
Veronique Schutjens**

www.jenecon.de

ISSN 1864-7057

The JENA ECONOMIC RESEARCH PAPERS is a joint publication of the Friedrich Schiller University and the Max Planck Institute of Economics, Jena, Germany. For editorial correspondence please contact markus.pasche@uni-jena.de.

Impressum:

Friedrich Schiller University Jena
Carl-Zeiss-Str. 3
D-07743 Jena
www.uni-jena.de

Max Planck Institute of Economics
Kahlaische Str. 10
D-07745 Jena
www.econ.mpg.de

© by the author.

Creative Destruction and Regional Productivity Growth: Evidence from the Dutch Manufacturing and Services Industries

December 2008

Niels Bosma

Urban and Regional research Centre Utrecht (URU), Utrecht University, Utrecht ,
The Netherlands

Erik Stam

Tjalling Koopmans Institute, Utrecht School of Economics, Utrecht University,
Utrecht, The Netherlands (e.stam@econ.uu.nl);
Centre for Technology Management, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United
Kingdom; Scientific Council for Government Policy (WRR), The Hague, The
Netherlands; Max Planck Institute of Economics - Entrepreneurship, Growth and
Public Policy group, Jena, Germany

Veronique Schutjens

Urban and Regional research Centre Utrecht (URU), Utrecht University, Utrecht,
The Netherlands

Abstract

Do firm entry and exit improve the competitiveness of regions? If so, is this a universal mechanism or is it contingent on the type of industry or region in which creative destruction takes place? This paper analyses the effect of firm entry and exit on the competitiveness of regions, measured by total factor productivity (TFP) growth. Based on a study across 40 regions in the Netherlands over the period 1988-2002, we find that firm entry is related to productivity growth in services, but not in manufacturing. The positive impact found in services does not necessarily imply that new firms are more efficient than incumbent firms; high degrees of creative destruction may also improve the efficiency of incumbent firms. We also find that the impact of firm dynamics on regional productivity in services is higher in regions exhibiting diverse but related economic activities.

JEL-classification: L10, M13, O18, R11

Keywords: firm entry, firm exit, turbulence, regional competitiveness, total factor productivity
Contact: Niels Bosma, Urban and Regional research Centre Utrecht (URU), Utrecht University, Utrecht , The Netherlands

‘...The fundamental impulse that sets and keeps the capitalist engine in motion comes from the newcomers’ goods, the new methods of production or transportation, the new markets, the new forms of industrial organisation that capitalist enterprise creates. ... [This is a] process of industrial mutation – if I may use that biological term – that incessantly revolutionises the economic structure *from within*, incessantly destroying the old one, incessantly creating a new one. This process of Creative Destruction is the essential fact about capitalism.’ (Schumpeter 1942, p.83)

‘... a large portion of aggregate productivity growth is attributable to resource reallocation. The manufacturing sector is characterized by large shifts in employment and output across establishments every year – the aggregate data belie the tremendous amount of turmoil underneath. This turmoil is a major force contributing to productivity growth, resurrecting the Schumpeterian idea of creative destruction.’ (Bartelsman and Doms 2000, p.571)

1 Introduction

In the last few decades, entrepreneurship has increasingly been linked with economic growth (Wennekers and Thurik 1999; Carree and Thurik 2003). Rooted in Schumpeter’s seminal work (Schumpeter, 1934), there is now widespread agreement that entrepreneurship is important for the competitiveness of nations (Porter 1990), particular with respect to productivity growth (Baumol 2004). At the same time, many authors have argued that, in the current era of globalization, regions have become more important than countries in the creation of economic growth (Castells and Hall 1994; Storper 1997; Porter 2000; Camagni 2002) and competitiveness (Krugman 2005). Entrepreneurship is also highly sensitive to regional conditions (Feldman 2001; Bosma and Schutjens 2007). These findings suggest that, in establishing a link between entrepreneurship and economic growth, the region is a more appropriate unit of analysis than the nation. For entry, competition, and learning in particular, the regional level might be more relevant than the national level (Fritsch and Schmude 2006).¹ In addition, Audretsch and Keilbach (2004a), found that entrepreneurship stimulates labour productivity at the regional level.

In this paper, we seek to clarify the combined effects of entry and exit (as a measure of creative destruction) on competitiveness within a national policy setting (the Netherlands) that is characterized by a consistent emphasis on entrepreneurship, particularly on early-stage

¹ Competition in product markets, and especially in labour markets, is likely to be concentrated in the home region of the firm. The learning that takes place through knowledge spillovers is probably even more localized (see Jaffe et al. 1993; Breschi and Lissoni 2003).

entrepreneurship. For the Netherlands, it can be said that, at the national level, there was a pronounced and stable policy program directed to stimulating entrepreneurship during 1988-2002, the period we feature in this paper (Stevensson and Lundström 2001; Wennekers 2006).² Our study analyses the dynamics in firm entry and exit in two distinctive sectors at the regional level. This regional orientation results from the fact that most firm founders set up their businesses in the location where they were born (Michelacci and Silva 2007) or where they were previously employed (Stam 2007). In addition, the market scope of these entrepreneurs is largely local or regional, since their knowledge of the specific business and market environment leads to a better exploitation of regional opportunities (Bosma et al. 2008a). According to Schutjens and Stam (2003), this regional focus on market and business relationships is quite persistent, since "...firms even tend to narrow their spatial scope in their first three years..." (Schutjens and Stam 2003, p. 115). In addition, challenges by new competitors are better recognized if this entry occurs in close proximity to the incumbents.

This paper contributes to the existing literature in three ways. First, we acknowledge that entrepreneurship (as a determinant of productivity growth) includes both firm entry and exit. Second, we analyse firm entry and exit and their effect on productivity growth at the most relevant level of analysis, namely the region, and allow the effects of firm dynamics on regional growth to differ along some specific attributes of the region. Third, the effect of firm entry and exit is studied in both manufacturing and services. For the services sector in particular, new firms' orientation can be expected to be primarily local or regional.

The paper is organized as follows. First, we review the literature on (elements of) creative destruction and its effect on competitiveness. We then present the data, method, and outcomes of our empirical analyses. We report our analyses of the effect of entry and turbulence (defined as the sum of firm entry and exit) on regional competitiveness (measured as total-factor productivity growth) across 40 regions in the Netherlands over the period 1988-

² In the Netherlands there are practically no regions where regulations differ from those set by national legislation.

2002. Our analyses suggest that firm entry and exit lead to productivity growth in services, but not in manufacturing. Finally, we discuss our findings and put forward our conclusions.

2 Creative destruction and regional competitiveness

Many studies on competitiveness are inspired by Schumpeter's (1934; 1942) work on the mechanisms of economic development, especially the role of entrepreneurship. These studies tend to equate entrepreneurship with new firm formation and disregard the firm exit mechanism. Schumpeter's (1942) theory of *creative destruction* involves both creation (new firm formation) and destruction (firm exit). Firm exit reflects the selection mechanism that is a crucial outcome of the competition process and one of the causes of territorial competitiveness (Porter 1990). The Schumpeterian argument on creative destruction (*entrepreneurial regime*) runs as follows (cf. Eliasson 1996). Entrepreneurs introduce new combinations embodied in new firms. These innovative entrants enforce incumbents either to adapt to the new efficiency standard or to exit the industry. As a consequence, a new situation emerges in which the productivity of the industry has improved. This improvement is brought about by innovative entrants who are more productive than the average incumbent, and the exit of less productive incumbents via the competition process. These exits are important, because resources are released that can be reallocated to more productive activities. The productivity gains might be reinforced if incumbents are able to improve their productivity (cf. Aghion and Bessonova 2006). The competitive threat of entrants in the same region and sector as the incumbent is likely to be much higher than that of entrants in other regions and sectors. Consequently, the productivity of incumbents is most likely to be spurred by entrants in the same sector and region. Eventually, creative destruction leads to improved total factor productivity, although not necessarily to higher employment levels: more output is realized with the same amount of labour and capital inputs.

However, if new entrants are less efficient than the incumbents, the efforts involved in the emergence of entrants may even waste valuable resources. In the latter situation entrepreneurship – measured as new firm formation – is not a driver of competitiveness at all.³ This situation has been identified in the literature as a *revolving door regime*: entrants have to exit relatively soon after start-up owing to an insufficient level of efficiency (Audretsch and Fritsch 2002). This revolving door regime reflects a situation with high entry rates, but with no subsequent improvement of either employment levels or productivity. There are several explanations for this phenomenon. For example, Jovanovic's (1982) theory of passive learning assumes that individuals do not know what entrepreneurial talents they have in advance, and can only find out by experience in a spell of entrepreneurship. Many individuals start inefficient firms, only to find out that they are not successful in entering the market with a new firm. Relatively many individuals will set up firms if the prospects of business ownership are perceived to be attractive, for example in the emergence of a new industry or a substantial upturn of the economy (as in the late 1990s). A completely different situation with inefficient entry might occur in a period of economic depression, when individuals are pushed into self-employment.

A more structural view of economic change provides a different role for entrepreneurship. New entrants cause structural change when they introduce innovations that create completely new knowledge (Metcalf 2002) and possibly new markets. In this respect, Audretsch and Keilbach (2004b) have argued that there is a gap between scientific and technological knowledge (developed in research and development activities) and economic knowledge. In their view, economic knowledge emerges from a selection process across the generally available body of knowledge. They suggest that entrepreneurship is an important mechanism in driving that selection process, thereby creating the diversity of knowledge that in turn serves as a mechanism facilitating its spillover. Audretsch and Keilbach (2004b)

³ Perhaps innovative entrants are the strongest stimulators of competitiveness. For example, Geroski (1989) found that higher entry rates led to higher productivity growth, which he explains by assuming that entry stimulates competition, and greater competition spurs on productivity growth. But he also showed that innovation was an even more important driver of productivity (cf. Baily and Chakrabarti 1985).

provide empirical evidence that regions with higher levels of entrepreneurship indeed exhibit stronger growth in labour productivity. This kind of entry does not necessarily drive out incumbents, but might do so when new markets substitute existing markets (such as personal computers driving out typewriters, and digital cameras driving out analogue film cameras). The situation where incumbent firms are not affected might be called creative *construction* (Agarwal et al. 2007), whereas the crowding out of incumbents reflects creative *destruction*. This structural change might improve total factor productivity, and possibly employment, if the newly created market does not fully cannibalize existing markets.

Several studies have confirmed the effect of turbulence on total factor productivity growth in manufacturing; see for example Geroski (1989); Bailey et al. (1992); Liu (1993); Carlin et al. (2001); Callejón and Segarra (1999); and for a review Bartelsman and Doms (2000). Recent studies by Braunerhjelm and Borgman (2004) and Dejardin (2009) have also analysed the services sector and found a positive effect of firm entry on labour productivity in regions, and of net entry rates on value added growth in Belgium.

Since we have adopted a regional approach in the present study, it is important to highlight some specific regional features that may have an impact on regional competitiveness. First, we have *urbanization economies* that reflect external economies available to all local firms, irrespective of sector and arising from population density. High population density might stimulate competitiveness, because of the high levels of competition between different suppliers (reducing input costs) and the possibilities of achieving economies of scale with relatively large demand. Possible negative effects of high population density on competitiveness arise when low entry barriers give room to too many inefficient entrants and when cost levels (housing, wages) increase along with population density. The latter could deter employment growth, but might also stimulate entrants to be more labour productive (cf. Kleinknecht 1998; Madsen and Damania 2001).

Second, we have *Jacobs externalities* involving external economies available to all local firms stemming from a variety of sectors. The latter externalities are best captured with the notion of *related variety* (see Frenken et al. 2007). It reflects both sector diversity and the

degree to which sectors are related. Related variety is assumed to have a positive effect on the probability of new combinations given the opportunities to combine ideas from different, but related sectors (Jacobs 1969; Frenken et al. 2007). High levels of related variety in a region are likely to have a catalyzing effect on variety creation; this has been regarded as a source of competitiveness (Jacobs 1969; Glaeser et al. 1992; Van Oort 2002). In our analysis, we control for these regional features, but we also allow for a moderating effect when investigating the impact of firm dynamics on regional productivity growth. In accordance with the findings of Fritsch and Schroeter (2009), who analyse several regional characteristics, we expect a positive impact of firm dynamics in particular for regions with higher population density and greater related variety.

3 Data and methodology

3.1 Measurement issues

To date, most regional studies linking entrepreneurship with economic growth have measured entrepreneurship in terms of firm formation rates and regional competitiveness as employment growth (Van Stel and Storey 2004; Acs and Armington 2004). Both indicators are open to improvement. First, these studies have been inspired by Schumpeter's work (1934; 1942) on the mechanisms of economic development, in which the role of entrepreneurship was central. Although these studies equate entrepreneurship with new firm formation, Schumpeter's (1942) original theory of *creative destruction* involved both creation (new firm formation) *and* destruction (firm exit). This latter aspect reflects the selection mechanism that is a crucial outcome of the competition process and a cause of competitiveness and economic growth. In this paper, we analyse entry rates, but also take into account the combined measure of entrepreneurship – that is, turbulence rates defined as the

*sum of entry and exit rates.*⁴ With regard to the measurement of firm dynamics, the sectors under consideration are situated in a certain territorial context. In this study, we have adopted the regional approach and specify firm dynamics (entry and turbulence) relative to the stock of firms in two different sectors.

Although regional competitiveness is a frequently-used term, it is hard to define (Kitson et al. 2004). Even though employment growth is indeed an important element of economic development, productivity growth might be a better measure of competitiveness as it reflects increasing economic efficiency within firms and regions.⁵ Authors like Porter (1990; 1998) and Krugman (1990) have made a plea for using productivity as the indicator of competitiveness. In the long run, a rising standard of living depends on the productivity with which resources are employed. An important empirical drawback of this indicator is that hardly any data is available at the sub-national scale (Kitson et al. 2004), or from industries other than manufacturing (Van Ark et al. 1999; Bartelsman and Doms 2000). Another possible drawback is that productivity might reveal perverse effects, when labour shedding (for example, with an extensive shakeout of workers and closure of plants) is the cause of improved (labour) productivity. Ideally, both employment growth and productivity growth should go together: a virtuous circle of increasing productivity causing improved competitiveness, which leads to higher demand for the goods and services produced, which then leads to an increased demand for labour inputs.

In addition to these measurement issues, there is also a need to improve our insight into the role of creative destruction in the service sector. Although this sector has become more dominant than manufacturing in capitalist economies, most studies on productivity growth are based on the manufacturing sector.

⁴ Turbulence rates are often also defined as firm turnover rates, see e.g. Caves (1998).

⁵ Competitiveness is often measured as either employment growth or growth in total factor productivity (TFP). There are some notable differences between these measures. For example, during a recession, the efficiency measures by managers in incumbent firms might lead to employment loss and TFP growth in the short term. In the medium term, unemployment-push entrepreneurship might absorb the employment loss, and decrease TFP.

3.2 Dataset

We have specified two sectors: manufacturing (ISIC 15-37) and services (ISIC 65-74, 85, 90-93). The distinction between these two major sectors is primarily data-driven: that is, by the limited availability of TFP data in the Netherlands. As a result, we are unable to disaggregate the data into more specific industries.⁶ We prefer a measure of TFP to labour productivity, because capital deepening may have a serious impact and labour productivity would therefore be biased. We have used the most suitable level of territorial aggregation for the Netherlands: the Corop level of analysis (EU Nuts 3) (cf. Van Stel and Nieuwenhuijsen 2004; Kleinknecht and Poot 1992). The division into 40 Corop regions is based on regional commuting patterns that indicate regional labour markets.

For deriving TFP growth, we have taken data on annual employment, value added, and investment at the regional level from Statistics Netherlands. The capital stock was calculated using the Perpetual Inventory Method (PIM, see e.g. Hall and Mairesse 1995). An initial regional capital stock level for 1989 was derived based on investments at the regional level for 1977-1988; assuming a constant annual growth rate g of investments in the period before 1977; this growth rate g was estimated at 4.5 percent using available time-series data on investments between 1960 and 1976. The capital stock for every following year has been calculated as the sum of the depreciated capital stock plus investments in the current year. The depreciation rates for both sectors have been estimated using the initial levels of the capital stock in 1989 and investment levels from 1960-1976 per region.⁷

The panel dataset on annual entry and exit and the total number of existing firms for 40 regions in the Netherlands is available for a 15-year period (1988-2002). Registrations and

⁶ As a robustness check, we excluded five regions from the analysis in the manufacturing sector, because their regional growth rates were heavily determined by extraction (gas and electricity), which could possibly interfere with our model since regional output may primarily be caused by one or two large companies. There appears to be no significant change in the results if we exclude these five regions.

⁷ The derived depreciation rates were 5.8 percent for manufacturing and 4.7 percent for services.

deregistrations are available from the Dutch Chambers of Commerce. Entries include independent new businesses as well as subsidiaries; exits include bankruptcies together with other modes of firm exit.⁸ Unfortunately, we cannot distinguish between an exit resulting from business closure (varying from simply finishing economic activity to forced liquidation) and an exit resulting from changes in ownership (mergers or acquisitions). Firm relocations within Corop regions are not counted as entry or exit. The dataset excludes inactive firms. The sector structure varies over the regions. There are more firms in services than in manufacturing in every region, with even higher concentrations of service firms in urban regions. The ratio of service firms to manufacturing firms varies between 2 and 10. The importance of the services sector is clear if we examine the levels of gross value added. Fig. 1 shows the share of gross value added in services as a percentage of value added for manufacturing and services combined.

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

Two control variables reflect the nature of the region and the possible economic advantages stemming from this: urbanization economies and Jacobs externalities. Urbanization economies are measured in terms of *population density*. This is defined as the percentage of people in the region living in urbanized or highly urbanized areas, in 2000. Jacobs externalities are captured by the notion of *related variety*. This measure was introduced by Frenken et al.. (2007) and involves both sector diversity (variety) and the degree to which the sectors are related. Entropy statistics have been used to calculate this

⁸ We use a general measure of firm entry, and – apart from the distinction between manufacturing and services - do not concentrate on a specific type of entry. Aghion and Bossanova (2006), for instance, focus on the entry of foreign firms. They argue that these are on average larger and more likely to enter at the technological frontier than domestic entrants are, and are thus more likely to be a threat to incumbents, triggering a process of creative destruction. Our data does not enable us to test the differential impact of foreign entries.

measure. *Related variety* is thus measured for each region as the weighted sum of industrial variety (over 5-digit classes) within each of two digit classes (for a detailed description and formal computation see Frenken et al. 2007).

Ideally, we would require variables capturing urbanization and Jacobs externalities to vary with time, but unfortunately we only have a single year at our disposal for population density (2000) and two years for related variety (1996 and 2002). Including these determinants is still worthwhile, however, since their variation over time is limited.⁹ They are useful for controlling for structural regional differences in explaining TFP growth without making inferences on causality over time. The geographical patterns of both measures are shown in Figs. 2 and 3.

INSERT FIGURES 2 & 3 ABOUT HERE

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics of our dependent and independent variables for services and manufacturing, while Table 2 shows the correlation coefficients for both sectors. Averages over the 40 Dutch regions for TFP growth and firm dynamics are also depicted over five time frames. The average turbulence rates rose gradually in the period 1988-2002, in particular in services. Although the turbulence rates are somewhat lower than those Bartelsman et al. (2005) found for the 1989-1994 period, the rate in the service sector is still higher than in manufacturing. This difference is probably the result of the lower start-up costs in the service sector. There appears to be a substantial variation between these firm-dynamics measures across regions, especially where turbulence is concerned.¹⁰ Figs.4 and 5 depict these regional differences in turbulence rates for manufacturing and services. Since the business

⁹ Indeed, the 1996 values for related variety appeared to be strongly correlated with the 2002 values. Because of the time frame explored in our study (1990-2002), we chose to include only the 1996 level.

¹⁰ The F-statistics with respect to variance between regions for turbulence in services amounts to 20.7. In manufacturing, the corresponding F-value is 9.0; all significantly different from zero ($p > 0.95$).

cycle may be affecting our analysis of productivity growth, we have accounted for business cycle effects in our regression model in order to minimize the possible effects of spurious correlations.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

INSERT FIGURES 4 & 5 ABOUT HERE

3.3 National and historical context

Since 1988, the annual number of new firms in the Netherlands has expanded enormously, as our data confirms. The increase in the annual number of new firms has been promoted by several institutional changes (see also Bosma et al. 2005). One of the most important institutional changes is the Treaty of Wassenaar (1982), which started a long period of wage restraint. The limited wage increases may have contributed to the attractiveness of becoming self-employed.¹¹ Occupational choices are influenced by the risks of entrepreneurship (failure) versus those of wage employment (dismissal). In this respect, the increased flexibility of the labour market in the Netherlands as a result of the 1982 Treaty reduced the opportunity costs of entrepreneurship. Further major general policy initiatives implemented in the past two decades include (i) a significant relaxation of the (old) Establishment Act of 1937, implemented in several steps between 1993 and 2006; (ii) a persistent effort to diminish

¹¹ The Treaty of Wassenaar resulted in long-term agreements between the national government and representatives of the employers federations and labour unions.

administrative burdens for entrepreneurs (see World Bank 2007); (iii) a modernization of the bankruptcy regulations, in particular enabling a timely intervention in the case of problems that challenge the survival of a firm (in terms of the early closure of hopeless cases and of providing assistance in re-starting ventures); (iv) ongoing deregulation of several markets; (v) a recent simplification of the juridical aspects associated with limited liability companies.

Although it is hard to establish the effect of this package of policy initiatives conducive to entrepreneurship on observed entrepreneurial behaviour empirically, the circumstantial evidence at least points in this direction. Controlling for a range of determinants, Bosma et al. (2008b) have found entry rates to be significantly higher for the years after 1993 and attribute this rise to Dutch policy, in particular the relaxation of the Establishment Act.¹² Carree and Nijkamp (2001) have found evidence for the Dutch retail sector after the relaxation; they found that the number of entries increased significantly, especially in the non-food retail sector. In addition, Kloosterman (2003) argues that immigrants have particularly benefitted from the relaxation. A joint characteristic of the policy package is that, throughout, it is directed in particular at the entry and exit of small firms. The policy measures will have limited success if the minimum efficient scale (MES) in the market is high and entry barriers remain. This argument is reflected in our distinction drawn between manufacturing and services. The minimum efficient scale in manufacturing is much higher than in services (see Audretsch et al. 2004), where new firm formation rates have grown less (if at all).

3.4 Empirical Model

Following Geroski (1989) and Calléjon and Segarra (1999), we model firm dynamics as a component of the total productivity in region i and year t , controlling for the effects of labour

¹² The most important change in the Establishment Act has been the abolishment of mandatory self-employment exams in most industries.

and capital. For region i and year t , the quantity of output (value added) Y_{it} is the result of the combination of capital and labour:

$$Y_{it} = F(A_{it}, K_{it}, L_{it}) \quad (1)$$

where output depends on the number of employees (L), the stock of physical capital (K), and a productivity index (A) that captures the variations in production that are not attributable to changes in the use of labour or capital. More specifically, we specify equation (1) in growth rates, and assume constant returns to scale in terms of output in labour and capital:

$$dy_{it} = da_{it} + \alpha dl_{it} + (1 - \alpha) dk_{it} + \eta_{it}, \quad (2)$$

where the operator d reflects the growth rates and is expressed as first differences in logarithms. Suppose that the growth of the corrected productivity index (da) can be modelled by several components for region i and year t : percentage changes in industry productivity that are constant over time and region (θ); improvements in productivity resulting from firm dynamics (FD); the degree of related variety in the region (RV); and population density (PD). We minimize the danger of reversed causality by incorporating the lagged effects of firm dynamics on TFP growth. After subtracting $\alpha_{it} dl_{it} + (1 - \alpha_{it}) dk_{it}$ from both sides, this extension of equation (2) leads to an expression in which the dependent variable is Solow's residual θ_{it}^s :

$$\theta_{it}^s = \theta + \beta_1 FD_{i,t-p} + \beta_2 RV_i + \beta_3 PD_i + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (3)$$

$$\text{with } i \in (1, \dots, n), t \in (T_0, \dots, T), 0 \leq p \leq T - T_0$$

In our empirical analysis, the values of α are based on cost components (for the argumentation, see e.g. Griliches and Lichtenberg (1984, p. 486-488)). An advantage of this method is that weightings depend on region and sector. We have controlled for general

business-cycle effects (affecting all regions) by including dummy variables representing each year of observation. Summarizing, equation (3) measures total factor productivity growth or Solow's residual for region i in year t as the sum of: (i) technical industrial progress in the strict sense (θ), (ii) additional efficiency caused by firm dynamics (coefficient β_1), the degree of related variety (coefficient β_2), and population density effects (coefficient β_3). We also tested for spatial autocorrelation, that is, the possibility that benefits in one region spill over to neighbouring regions. To this end, we examined the residuals by region (for separate years and averaged over the years) and examined the Moran's-I values, using a spatial weight matrix identifying each neighbouring region. The Moran-I values indicated that spatial errors were not a problem in our models¹³. This finding is different from those reported in studies investigating the impact of entry rates on employment growth (e.g. Van Stel and Storey 2004; Fritsch and Mueller 2004; Van Stel and Suddle 2008). In our case with TFP as the dependent variable, the size and significance of the Moran-I increase dramatically if we exclude year dummies in the regression.¹⁴ To prevent multicollinearity problems, we do not model entry and turbulence together in one single model, but use separate models for entry rates and the combined measure of turbulence. In line with the arguments put forward in the theoretical section, we have allowed a time lag for entry, but not for exit; the exit of inefficient firms should have a direct positive impact on regional productivity growth.

We estimated equation (3) using ordinary least squares while including the lagged dependent variable. In addition, and as a test for robustness, we discuss a dynamic panel data regression in the Appendix. The panel nature of our data combined with the temporal correlation of some of our variables (hinting at the probability of spurious correlations) calls for the dynamic panel-data estimation technique known as the GMM-sys estimator. GMM-sys is appropriate to our model, because it takes care of endogeneity issues exploiting the

¹³ Using spatial weight matrices on distances rather than neighbouring regions produced very similar results.

¹⁴ This suggests that the (designed) spatial autocorrelation effect may unintentionally pick up some temporal autocorrelation as a result of business cycles. It is therefore important to account for business cycle effects.

panel data structure. However, the advantage comes at the cost of losing observations (degrees of freedom) and therefore we consider it as a check for the robustness of our results using ordinary least squares.

4 Results

Estimation results of equation (3) are depicted in Table 3 and Table 4 for manufacturing and services respectively. The first two columns in both tables (model A) present the results of a basic model, excluding moderating effects, for entry rates and turbulence rates respectively. Our analyses thus suggest that, for the Netherlands, entry and turbulence rates are important drivers of productivity growth in services, but not in manufacturing.

We find some evidence of the moderating effects of urbanization economies and Jacobs externalities, in particular for the effect of firm dynamics on productivity growth in services. Firm dynamics have an additional positive effect on productivity growth in regions with relatively high population density or relatively high related-variety (see Table 2, models B and C). The moderating effect with related variety seems to dominate the effect with population density as the outcomes in model D show.

We also tested for the presence of a curvilinear effect in the sense that, at a certain point, increases in entry or turbulence rates might *deter* rather than increase competitiveness. In this case, optimal levels of entry and turbulence can be derived, as Fritsch and Schroeter (2009) found for German regions, but which other studies have been unable to identify (see Robinson et al. 2006). The likelihood ratio test supports the relevance of the inclusion of a quadratic term ($p < 0.05$) for services, but not for manufacturing. Fig. 6 describes the curvilinear effects for model C2 in services. The top of the curve (indicating maximum effect) occurs at turbulence rates around 15 percent, whereas observed regional turbulence rates range from 7 percent to 22 percent. The maximum effect for entry rates occurs between 10

percent and 11 percent.¹⁵ Fig. 6 also displays the curve that would result from related variety of relatively high and low degrees (plus and minus one standard deviation from the mean), taking into account the estimated negative effect of related variety (single effect) on regional productivity growth in services. Thus, Fig. 6 gives the total picture of the combined effect of turbulence and related variety resulting from model C2, *ceteris paribus*.

 INSERT FIGURE 6 ABOUT HERE

The results of the GMM-sys approach are shown in the appendix and confirm the main findings. Productivity growth in manufacturing seems to be driven mainly by the restructuring of the incumbents. In manufacturing, the most spectacular improvements in TFP are shown to go hand in hand with a severe decline in employment, indicating labour-shedding processes. We tested some further models. For instance, in accordance with the arguments on creative destruction in the theoretical section, we allowed exit rates to have a moderating effect on the impact of entry rates on TFP growth. We did not find any evidence of this relationship, but this may be the result of the high sectoral aggregation in our study. We also specified models with longer time lags in manufacturing (3-9 years). These did not improve the model fit and the effects of entry and turbulence were still insignificant.¹⁶ Allowing a one-year lag and a three-year lag for entry and turbulence to impact TFP growth in services yielded results very similar to those presented in Table 2.¹⁷

¹⁵ The estimated maximum effect by Fritsch and Schroeter (2009), who also find an inverse U-shaped impact, occurs at a start-up rate of about 8 percent. However, the percentages are not directly comparable. First, their estimated curve is for manufacturing, while we only find such a curve in services. Second, their approach differs in that they use the workforce as a denominator when deriving entry rates, and use employment growth as the dependent variable.

¹⁶ Also, we did not find a polynomial lag impact structure that resembles the one discussed in Fritsch (2008) This lag structure is characterized by positive short-term employment effects (typically between 0-2 years) diminishing effects because of replacement effects that may even become negative (3-7 years) and positive long term (carrying capacity) effects surfacing only after that.

¹⁷ The results of these additional analyses are not reported, but are available on request.

5 Discussion

Despite a long tradition of productivity studies, it is still hard to explain productivity growth. In this study, we have attempted to analyse the effects of firm entry and turbulence on competitiveness at the most relevant level of analysis, namely the region. We have used total factor productivity growth as a measure of competitiveness, and regressed firm entry and exit onto TFP growth in manufacturing and services in regions in the Netherlands over a 14 year period. Our results suggest that firm entry and exit are important for regional competitiveness in services, but not in manufacturing.

Why do firm entry and exit in manufacturing not have a positive effect on TFP growth? One reason might be that productivity growth in manufacturing in the Netherlands is driven by a few large players, and that new entrants and firm exits have only marginal effects on aggregate productivity growth. This intuition seems to be confirmed by the relatively low explained variance of the statistical models of TFP growth in manufacturing in comparison to the services models. In addition, most studies on the effect of entry on TFP growth in manufacturing are based on data from the 1970s and 1980s, while our study is based on data from a much more recent period. In recent decades, productivity growth in manufacturing has increasingly been driven by the incumbents (through industry restructuring, de-industrialization), while the contribution made by new entrants (and exits) has declined over time (see Baldwin and Gu 2006). This might partly explain the different outcomes of our study in comparison with previous research on the role of entry in productivity growth in manufacturing.

One reason why entry and exit *do* have a positive effect on productivity growth in services may be the relatively low minimum efficient scale of service activities (see Audretsch et al. 2004), which means that (often small) entrants in services contribute more easily to productivity improvements in the sector than entrants in manufacturing do.

However, we know that most new firms are relatively inefficient and do not contribute directly to productivity improvements in the sector (Bartelsman and Doms 2000). This paradox can be explained by the difference in the level of analysis. While, relative to incumbent firms, entrants may not be more efficient in the initial phase, their potential pressure may provoke incumbents in the same region to stay alert and improve their efficiency; in an extreme case, established companies could even be induced to acquire new and promising firms or else to appropriate the new knowledge provided by the new firms, a process of creative construction. Such a spillover process, although well-documented in the literature, is not verified by directly comparing productivity rates at the firm level. The research design of our study enables the inclusion of potential spillover processes by analysing the effects of firm entry and exit at the regional level and allowing for time lags for the changes in firm dynamics to affect productivity growth. In comparison with the manufacturing sector, where the appropriability of new knowledge is easier (for example via patents), knowledge spillovers may take place quicker and more often in the service sector. Of course, sectors are linked and it is conceivable that entry in services has an impact on regional productivity growth in manufacturing. We did not account for this in our model and future research might take a closer look at these interlinkages.

We should note that we did not control for the innovativeness of entrants, which is an important part of the creative destruction story; entrants should be innovative in order to destruct less innovative (or construct better) incumbents. Our approach basically assumes that an increase in regional entry rates goes together with an increase in regional innovative potential stemming from new firms. For innovative potential, the creative *use* of technology that has recently become available is just as relevant as the *production* of innovation. Inklaar et al. (2003), for instance, show that productivity growth is particularly high in ICT-using sectors. This also links to the policy conclusion for the Netherlands by Bartelsman (2004) where, commenting on Baumol (2004), he stresses that policy should not aim at entry or small businesses in general, but at “..the number of firms (...) that experiment with new methods to serve the market...” (Bartelsman 2004, p. 361). Future research might take a closer look at

this and make an attempt to separate new firm activity with innovative potential from new firm activity that has no innovative potential - regardless of sector classification (cf. Stam and Wennberg 2009). Similarly, it will also be fruitful to explore different types of exit; in our study we were not able to distinguish between exits that recently entered the market and exits of firms that had been operational for several years. A distinction between voluntary and involuntary exit would also be highly relevant.

Policymakers increasingly aim to foster entrepreneurship to stimulate the competitiveness of regions. Previous studies have shown that entrepreneurship is an important vehicle for achieving employment growth in many settings. Our study for the Netherlands shows that entrepreneurship can be important for regional competitiveness. In order to increase the effectiveness of public policy in economies like the Netherlands, perhaps one should not stimulate entry and possibly exit in general, but focus on lowering the entry and exit barriers in the service sector. Policymakers should also be aware that firm dynamics will have a greater impact on regional competitiveness in some regions, especially those with higher degrees of industrial relatedness and, to a lesser extent, higher population density. Finally, one should know where to stop when stimulating entrepreneurship; our results also indicate that too much entry can lead to decreases in competitiveness.

Acknowledgements The authors would like to thank Koen Frenken, Michael Fritsch, Frank Neffke, Richard Nelson, Roderik Ponds, André van Stel and two anonymous referees for comments on previous versions. Previous versions of this paper have been read at the International Schumpeter Society Conference 2006 (Sophia-Antipolis, Nice, 21-24 June 2006), and the DIME Workshop “Policy Implications from Recent Advances in the Economics of Innovation and Industrial Dynamics (Open University London, 15-16 December 2006). All errors are ours.

References

- Acs, Z. J. & Armington, C. (2004). Employment Growth and Entrepreneurial Activity in Cities. *Regional Studies*, 38, 8, 911-927
- Agarwal, R, Audretsch, D.B. & Sarkar, M.B. (2007). The Process of Creative Construction: Knowledge Spillovers, Entrepreneurship and Economic Growth, *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 1, 263-286.
- Aghion, P. & Bessonova, E. (2006). On entry and growth: Theory and evidence. *Revue de l'OFCE* June 2006: 259-278.
- Arellano, M. & Bond, S. (1991). Some tests of specification for panel data: Monte Carlo evidence and an application to employment equations. *Review of Economic Studies*, 58, 277-97.
- Audretsch, D.B. & Fritsch, M. (2002). Growth regimes over time and space. *Regional Studies*, 36, 113-124.
- Audretsch, D.B. & Keilbach, M. (2004a). Does Entrepreneurship Capital Matter? *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 28, 5, 419-430.
- Audretsch, D.B. & Keilbach, M. (2004b), Entrepreneurship Capital and Economic Performance. *Regional Studies*, 38, 949-959.
- Audretsch, D. B., Klomp, L., Santarelli, E. & Thurik, A.R. (2004). Gibrat's Law: Are the Services Different? *Review of Industrial Organization*, 24, 3, 301-324.
- Baily, M.N. & Chakrabarti, A.K. (1985). Innovation and Productivity in U.S. Industry. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 2, 609-639.
- Baily, M.N., Hulten, C. & Campbell, D. (1992). Productivity Dynamics in Manufacturing Plants. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity: Microeconomics*, 187-267.
- Baldwin, J.R. & Gu, W. (2006). Plant turnover and productivity growth in Canadian manufacturing. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 15,3, 417-465.
- Bartelsman, E.J. (2004). Firm Dynamics and Innovation in the Netherlands; A comment on Baumol. *De Economist*, 152,3, 353-363.

- Bartelsman, E.J. & Doms, M. (2000). Understanding Productivity: Lessons from longitudinal microdata. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 38, 569-594.
- Bartelsman, E.J., Scarpatta, S. & Schivardi, F. (2005). Comparative analysis of firm demographics and survival: evidence from micro-level sources in OECD countries. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 14, 365-391.
- Baumol, W.J. (2004). Four Sources of Innovation and Stimulation of Growth in the Dutch Economy. *De Economist*, 152, 3, 321-351.
- Blundell, R. & Bond, S. (1998). Initial conditions and moment restrictions in dynamic panel data models. *Journal of Econometrics*, 87, 115-143.
- Bosma, N.S., De Wit, D. & Carree, M.A. (2005). Modeling Entrepreneurship: Unifying The Equilibrium and Entry/Exit Approach. *Small Business Economics*, 25, 1, 35-48.
- Bosma, N.S. & Schutjens, V.A.J.M. (2007). Outlook on Europe: Patterns of Promising Entrepreneurial Activity in European Regions. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 98, 5, 675-686.
- Bosma, N.S., Suddle, K. & Schutjens, V.A.J.M. (2008a). *Whither a flat landscape? Regional differences in Entrepreneurship in the Netherlands*. EIM SCALES Paper, nr. H200805 (Zoetermeer: EIM).
- Bosma, N.S., Van Stel, A.J. & Suddle, K. (2008b). The Geography of New Firm Formation: Evidence from Independent Start-ups and New Subsidiaries in the Netherlands. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 4, 2, 129-146.
- Braunerhjelm, P. & Borgman, B. (2004). Geographical concentration, entrepreneurship and regional growth: Evidence from regional data in Sweden, 1975-99. *Regional Studies*, 38, 8, 929-947.
- Breschi, S. & Lissoni, F. (2003). *Mobility and Social Networks: Localised Knowledge Spillovers Revisited*. CESPRI Working Papers 142 (Milano: CESPRI, Centre for Research on Innovation and Internationalisation, Universita' Bocconi).
- Callejón, M. & Segarra, A. (1999). Business Dynamics and Efficiency in Industries and Regions: The Case of Spain. *Small Business Economics*, 13, 253-271.

- Camagni, R. (2002). On the concept of territorial competitiveness: sound or misleading? *Urban Studies*, 39, 13, 2395–2411.
- Carlin, W., Haskel, J. & Seabright, P. (2001). Understanding ‘the essential fact about capitalism’: Markets, competition and creative destruction. *National Institute Economic Review*, 175, 67-84.
- Carree, M.A. & Nijkamp, J. (2001). Deregulation in retailing: The Dutch experience. *Journal of Economics and Business*, 53, 2-3, 225-235.
- Carree, M.A. & Thurik, A.R. (2003). The impact of entrepreneurship on economic growth. (In Z.J. Acs & Audretsch, D.B. (Eds.), *Handbook of Entrepreneurship Research* (pp. 437-472). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers).
- Castells, M. & Hall, P. (1994). *Technopoles of the World: The making of 21st Century Industrial Complexes*. (London: Routledge).
- Caves, R. (1998). Industrial Organization and New Findings on the Turnover and Mobility of Firms. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 36, 1947-1982.
- Dejardin, M. (2009). Linking Net Entry to Regional Economic Growth. *Small Business Economics*, AA, B, xxx-yyy (this issue).
- Eliasson, G. (1996). *Firm Objectives, Controls and Organization*. (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers).
- Feldman, M.P. (2001), The entrepreneurial event revisited: Firm formation in a regional context. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 10, 4, 861-891.
- Frenken, K., Van Oort, F. & Verburg, T. (2007). Related variety, unrelated variety and regional economic growth. *Regional Studies*, 41, 5, 685-697.
- Fritsch, M. & Mueller, P. (2004). The Effects of New Business Formation on Regional Development over Time. *Regional Studies*, 38, 961-975.
- Fritsch, M. & Schmude, J. (Eds.)(2006). *Entrepreneurship in the Region. International Studies in Entrepreneurship*, 14 (New York: Springer Science).
- Fritsch, M. & Schroeter, A. (2009). *Why Does the Effect of New Business Formation Differ Across Regions?* *Small Business Economics*, AA, B, xxx-yyy (this issue).

- Geroski, P. A. (1989). Entry, Innovation and Productivity Growth. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 71, 572-578.
- Glaeser, E.L., Kallal, H.D., Scheinkman, J.A. & Shleifer, A. (1992). Growth in Cities. *Journal of Political Economy*, 100, 6, 1126-1152.
- Griliches, Z. and F.Lichtenberg (1984). Productivity and R&D at the Firm Level. in: Z. Griliches (ed.), *R&D, Patents and Productivity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 330-74.
- Hall, B.H., and J. Mairesse (1995), Exploring the relationship between R&D and productivity in French manufacturing firms, *Journal of Econometrics*, 65, 263-293.
- Inklaar, R., O'Mahony, M., Robinson, C. & Timmer, M.P. (2003). Productivity and competitiveness in the EU and the US. In M. O'Mahony & B. van der Ark (Eds.), *EU productivity and competitiveness: An industry perspective* (pp. 73-147). (Luxembourg: Office for Official Publication of the European Communities).
- Jacobs, J. (1969). *The Economy of Cities*. (New York: Random House).
- Jaffe, A.B, Trajtenberg, M. & Henderson, R. (1993). Geographic Localization of Knowledge Spillovers as Evidenced by Patent Citations. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 108, 3, 577-598.
- Jovanovic, B. (1982). Selection and the Evolution of Industry. *Econometrica*, 50, 649-670.
- Kitson, M., Martin, R. & Tyler, P. (2004). Regional Competitiveness: An elusive yet key concept? *Regional Studies*, 38, 9. 991-999.
- Kleinknecht, A. & Poot, T. (1992). Do regions matter for R&D? *Regional Studies*, 26, 221-232.
- Kleinknecht, A. (1998). Is Labor Market Flexibility Harmful to Innovation? *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 22, 387-396.
- Kloosterman, R. C. (2003). Creating opportunities. Policies aimed at increasing openings for immigrant entrepreneurs in the Netherlands. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 15(2), 167-181.
- Krugman, P. (1990). *The Age of Diminished Expectations*. (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).


- Krugman, P. (2005). Second winds for industrial regions? (In D. Coyle, W. Alexander and B. Ashcroft (Eds), *New Wealth for Old Nations: Scotland's Economic Prospects* (pp. 35-47). Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Liu, L. (1993). Entry-exit, learning, and productivity change Evidence from Chile. *Journal of Development Economics*, 42, 2, 217-242.
- Madsen, J.B. & Damania, R. (2001). Labor Demand and Wage-induced Innovations: evidence from the OECD countries. *International Review of Applied Economics*, 15, 3, 323-334.
- Metcalf, J.S. (2002). Knowledge of growth and growth of knowledge. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 12, 3-15.
- Michelacci, C. & Silva, O. (2007). Why so many local entrepreneurs? *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 89, 4, 615-633.
- Porter, M.E. (1990). *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*. (New York: The Free Press).
- Porter, M.E. (1998). *On Competition*. (Boston: Harvard Business School Press).
- Porter, M.E. (2000). Location, competition and economic development: local clusters in the global economy. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 14, 15-31.
- Robinson, C., O'Leary, B. & Rincon, A. (2006). *Business start-ups, closures and economic churn. A review of the literature*. (London: National Institute of Economic and Social Research).
- Roodman, D. (2006). *How to Do xtabond2: An Introduction to "Difference" and "System" GMM in Stata*. Working Paper 103 (Washington DC: Center for Global Development).
- Schumpeter, J.A. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development*. (Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press).
- Schumpeter, J.A. (1942). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. (New York,: Harper and Row).
- Schutjens, V. & Stam, E. (2003). The Evolution and Nature of Young Firm Networks: A Longitudinal Perspective. *Small Business Economics*, 21, 115-134.

- Stam, E. (2007). Why Butterflies Don't Leave: Locational Behavior of Entrepreneurial Firms. *Economic Geography*, 83, 1, 27-50.
- Stam, E. & Wennberg, K. (2009). The role of R&D in new firm growth. *Small Business Economics*, forthcoming.
- Stevenson, L. & Lundström, A. (2001). *Patterns and trends in entrepreneurship/SME policy and practice in ten economies*. Entrepreneurship Policy for the Future Series 3 (Stockholm: Swedish Foundation for Small Business Research).
- Storper, M. (1997). *The Regional World: Territorial Development in a Global Economy*. (New York: Guilford Press).
- Van Ark, B., Monnikhof, E. & N. Mulder (1999). Productivity in services: an international comparative perspective. *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 33 ,2, 471-499.
- Van Leeuwen, G. & Van der Wiel, H. (2003). *Do ICT spillovers matter?. Evidence from Dutch firm-level data*. CPB Discussion paper 26. (The Hague: CPB).
- Van Oort, F. (2002). Agglomeration, economic growth and innovation; Spatial analysis of growth- and R&D externalities in the Netherlands. Dissertation Tinbergen Institute, Erasmus University Rotterdam.
- Van Stel, A.J. & Nieuwenhuijsen, H.R. (2004). Knowledge Spillovers and Economic Growth: An Analysis Using Data of Dutch Regions in the Period 1987-1995. *Regional Studies*, 38, 393-407.
- Van Stel, A.J. & Storey, D.J. (2004). The Link Between Firm Births and Job Creation: Is there a Upas Tree Effect? *Regional Studies*, 38, 893-909.
- Van Stel, A.J. & Suddle, K. (2008). The Impact of New Firm Formation on Regional Development in the Netherlands. *Small Business Economics*, 30, 1, 31-47.
- Wennekers, A.R.M. (2006), Entrepreneurship at country level; Economic and non-economic determinants. Dissertation, Erasmus University Rotterdam.
- Wennekers, A.R.M.. & Thurik, R. (1999). Linking entrepreneurship and economic growth. *Small Business Economics*, 13, 27-55.

Windmeijer, F. (2005). A finite sample correction for the variance of linear efficient two-step GMM estimators. *Journal of Econometrics*, 126, 25–51.


Worldbank (2007). *Review of the Dutch Administrative Burden Reduction Programme*. (Washington: Worldbank Group).

Fig. 1 Gross value added in services, as a percentage of gross value added in manufacturing and services combined




Source: Statistics Netherlands

Fig. 2 Related variety by Nuts3 regions in the Netherlands, in quartiles




Source: Frenken et al (2007)

Fig. 3 Population density, by Nuts3 regions in the Netherlands, in quartiles




Source: Statistics Netherlands

Fig. 4 Turbulence rates in Manufacturing, by Nuts3 regions in the Netherlands, averages over 1988-2000



Source: Dutch Chambers of Commerce

Fig. 5 Turbulence rates in Services, by Nuts3 regions in the Netherlands, averages over 1988-2000



Source: Dutch Chambers of Commerce


Fig. 6 Graphical representation of the curvilinear impact of firm dynamics on TFP and the moderating role of related variety in the region – based on coefficients Table 4, model C2.**Table 1** Descriptive statistics of the variables, non-weighted averages

Table 1 Descriptive statistics of the variables; non-weighted averages							
	Mean	St. .Dev	Averages over each time period				
			1990-1991	1992-1994	1995-1997	1998-2000	2001-2002
<i>Manufacturing</i>							
TFP	0.03	0.06	0.01	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.03
Entry (t-2)	0.06	0.02	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.07	0.06
Turbulence	0.11	0.03	0.09	0.10	0.11	0.11	0.10
<i>Services</i>							
TFP	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	-0.01
Entry (t-2)	0.09	0.02	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.11
Turbulence	0.13	0.03	0.11	0.12	0.13	0.15	0.16
<i>Regional demography</i>							
Population density	0.32	0.22					
Related variety	0.93	0.09					

Table 2 Correlation matrices

	<i>Manufacturing</i>				<i>Services</i>			
	1.	2.	3.	4.	1.	2.	3.	4.
1. TFP								
2. Entry (t-2)	0.06				-0.01			
3. Turbulence	0.06	0.71			-0.06	0.95		
4. Related variety	0.15	0.27	0.24		-0.03	0.23	0.16	
5. Population density	0.05	0.29	0.36	0.45	0.02	0.16	0.12	0.45

Table 3 Regression results for TFP growth in manufacturing.

	A1		A2		B1		B2		C1		C2		D1		D2	
<i>Lagged dependent</i>																
TFP (t-1)	-0.07		-0.07		-0.07		-0.07		-0.07		-0.07		-0.07		-0.07	
	(0.07)		(0.07)		(0.07)		(0.07)		(0.07)		(0.07)		(0.07)		(0.07)	
<i>Firm dynamics</i>																
Entry (t-2)	0.15				0.11				0.21				0.29			
	(0.16)				(0.17)				(0.16)				(0.17)			
Turbulence: Entry (t-2) + Exit (t)			0.03				0.03				0.08				0.07	
			(0.07)				(0.07)				(0.07)				(0.07)	
<i>Regional demography</i>																
Related variety	0.17	**	0.18	**	0.18	**	0.19	**	0.24	**	0.24	**	0.24	**	0.23	**
	(0.04)		(0.04)		(0.04)		(0.04)		(0.06)		(0.06)		(0.06)		(0.06)	
Population density	-0.01		-0.01		0.01		0.01		-0.01		-0.01		0.00		0.00	
	(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.02)		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.02)		(0.02)	
<i>Firm dynamics in regions</i>																
<i>With high levels of...</i>																
Population density					-0.17	*	-0.20	**					-0.14		-0.14	
					(0.10)		(0.10)						(0.11)		(0.11)	
Related variety									-0.22	*	-0.21	*	-0.20		-0.16	
									(0.12)		(0.12)		(0.14)		(0.13)	
Constant	-0.14	**	-0.14	**	-0.15	**	-0.15	**	-0.20	**	-0.20	**	-0.21	**	-0.19	**
	(0.04)		(0.04)		(0.04)		(0.04)		(0.06)		(0.06)		(0.04)		(0.06)	
Number of obs.	511		511		511		511		511		511		511		511	
F statistic	5.15		4.95		4.90		4.69		5.00		4.78		4.75		4.52	
R ²	0.178		0.177		0.182		0.183		0.186		0.184		0.189		0.186	

Year dummies included but not reported. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Outliers (absolute value of standardized residuals > 2.5) are removed from the analysis

* p< .10, ** p< .05

Table 4 Regression results for TFP growth in services.

	A1		A2		B1		B2		C1		C2		D1		D2	
<i>Lagged dependent</i>																
TFP (t-1)	0.32	**	0.31	**	0.31	**	0.30	**	0.31	**	0.29	**	0.31	**	0.29	**
	(0.06)		(0.06)		(0.07)		(0.06)		(0.07)		(0.07)		(0.07)		(0.07)	
<i>Firm dynamics</i>																
Entry (t-2)	1.01	**			0.92	**			1.05	**			1.02	**		
	(0.42)				(0.42)				(0.42)				(0.42)			
Turbulence: Entry (t-2) + Exit (t)			1.20	**			1.13	**			1.24	**			1.22	**
			(0.32)				(0.32)				(0.32)				(0.33)	
Squared term	-4.54	**	-3.86	**	-4.12	**	-3.67	**	-4.93	**	-4.19	**	-4.90	**	-4.12	**
	(1.98)		(1.02)		(1.98)		(1.03)		(2.03)		(1.04)		(2.00)		(1.07)	
<i>Regional demography</i>																
Related variety	-0.00		-0.00		-0.01		-0.00		-0.04	**	-0.04	**	-0.04	**	-0.04	**
	(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.02)		(0.02)		(0.02)		(0.02)	
Population density	0.00		-0.00		-0.00		-0.01		0.00		-0.01		-0.00		-0.00	
	(0.00)		(0.00)		(0.00)		(0.01)		(0.00)		(0.00)		(0.01)		(0.01)	
<i>Firm dynamics in regions</i>																
<i>With high levels of...</i>																
Population density					0.04	*	0.03						0.02		0.01	
					(0.02)		(0.02)						(0.03)		(0.03)	
Related variety									0.06	**	0.08	**	0.07	**	0.08	**
									(0.03)		(0.03)		(0.03)		(0.03)	
Constant	-0.04	*	-0.08	**	-0.03		-0.07	**	-0.04		-0.07	**	-0.03		-0.07	**
	(0.02)		(0.03)		(0.02)		(0.03)		(0.03)		(0.03)		(0.03)		(0.03)	
Number of obs.	513		513		513		513		514		514		513		514	
F statistic	16.86		17.54		16.29		16.80		16.49		17.37		15.74		17.37	
R ²	0.379		0.381		0.382		0.391		0.379		0.392		0.381		0.392	

Year dummies included but not reported. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Outliers (absolute value of standardized residuals > 2.5) are removed from the analysis

* p< .10, ** p< .05

Appendix Alternative Specifications Using Dynamic Panel Data Estimation Techniques

Since we have a panel of regional observations, and temporal correlation of some of our variables is likely, it is appealing to employ the dynamic panel data estimation technique developed by Arellano and Bond (1991), and Blundell and Bond (1998) also known as the GMM-sys estimator. GMM-sys is appropriate to our model, not only because of potential endogeneity issues, but also because it includes a level and a difference equation. This implies that (i) potential multicollinearity issues arising from including multiple lags of independent variables are sufficiently dealt with, (ii) estimated effects are truly dynamic and (iii) it is still possible to control for regional effects – in our case related variety and population density.

The GMM-sys technique is particularly appropriate for panel data with a limited number of time observations. When the number of years increases, the number of instruments involved will increase exponentially and the GMM-sys technique becomes less applicable (Roodman 2006). In this respect the length of our observed time period (14 years) is not particularly low relative to the number of regions. As a check for robustness, however, we do present our results based on GMM-sys estimation techniques. To this end we use the averages of non-overlapping periods; this implies we lose (time) observations but it renders the data more suitable for this kind of GMM panel data analysis. We use the two-step procedure and the finite-sample correction by Windmeijer (2005) in order to obtain robust estimation results. We compare our results with the outcomes using OLS techniques. The results for TFP growth are presented in Table A1 and Table A2. Firm dynamics seem to induce TFP growth in services but not in manufacturing. This is consistent with the OLS results in Tables 2 and Table 3.

Table A1 Regression results for TFP growth in manufacturing, non-overlapping periods

	Firm dynamics:	Turbulence		Entry	
		OLS	GMM-sys	OLS	GMM-sys
TFP (lagged)	-0.09 (0.08)	-0.06 (0.10)	-0.09 (0.08)	-0.08 (0.08)	
Firm Dynamics		-0.34 (0.54)		-0.66 (1.26)	
Firm Dynamics (lagged)	0.01 (0.25)	0.07 (0.54)	0.30 (0.48)	0.05 (0.45)	
Related variety	0.28** (0.07)	0.40 (0.40)	0.27** (0.07)	0.63 (0.45)	
Population density	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.11 (0.16)	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.08 (0.21)	
Spatial autocorrelation	0.01 (0.12)	-0.37 (0.22)	0.01 (0.12)	-0.47** (0.19)	
Constant	-0.12* (0.07)	-0.18 (0.57)	-0.13** (0.07)	-0.45 (0.56)	
Number of observations	200	200	200	200	
Number of instruments		40		40	
F statistic	8.2	10.5**	8.3	17.8**	
Adj. R ²	0.27		0.27		
AR(1) in first differences		-2.47**		-2.26**	
AR(2) in first differences		-0.07		-0.45	
Hansen test of overid. restrictions		25.2		24.5	
Prob. > chi2		0.52		0.66	

* p< .10, ** p< .05

Period dummies included (estimates not reported): 1990-1991, 1992-1994, 1995-1997, 1998-2000, and 2001-2002

Note: all difference-in-Sargan tests of exogeneity of instrument subsets did not reject the Null hypothesis of exogenous instruments in the GMM-sys models. GMM-sys regressions were performed using Stata, xtabond2 procedure..

Table A2 Regression results for TFP growth in services, non-overlapping periods

	Firm dynamics:	Turbulence	Entry	
	OLS	GMM-sys	OLS	GMM-sys
TFP (lagged)	0.65** (0.07)	0.31** (0.15)	0.65** (0.07)	0.45** (0.16)
Firm Dynamics		1.74** (0.64)		1.71** (0.84)
Firm Dynamics (lagged)	0.05 (0.13)	-0.21 (0.56)	0.01 (0.18)	-0.36 (0.73)
Related variety	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.15 (0.18)	-0.02 (0.03)	-0.13 (0.15)
Population density	0.01 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.05)	0.01 (0.01)	-0.04 (0.05)
Spatial autocorrelation	-0.25 (0.17)	-0.05 (0.47)	-0.25 (0.17)	-0.23 (0.43)
Constant	0.03 (0.03)	-0.10 (0.28)	0.04 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.21)
Number of observations	200	200	200	200
Number of instruments		40		40
F statistic	22.3**	20.0**	22.3**	25.3**
Adj. R ²	0.52		0.52	
AR(1) in first differences		-2.75**		-2.62**
AR(2) in first differences		-1.05		-0.88
Hansen test of overid. restrictions		27.9		32.8
Prob. > chi2		0.47		0.24

* p< .10, ** p< .05

Period dummies included (estimates not reported): 1990-1991, 1992-1994, 1995-1997, 1998-2000, and 2001-2002

Note: all difference-in-Sargan tests of exogeneity of instrument subsets did not reject the Null hypothesis of exogenous instruments in the GMM-sys models. GMM-sys regressions were performed using Stata, xtabond2 procedure.