

Böing, Philipp; Hünermund, Paul

Working Paper

A global decline in research productivity? Evidence from China and Germany

ZEW Discussion Papers, No. 20-030

Provided in Cooperation with:

ZEW - Leibniz Centre for European Economic Research

Suggested Citation: Böing, Philipp; Hünermund, Paul (2020) : A global decline in research productivity? Evidence from China and Germany, ZEW Discussion Papers, No. 20-030, ZEW - Leibniz-Zentrum für Europäische Wirtschaftsforschung, Mannheim

This Version is available at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10419/222264>

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.

DISCUSSION

// NO.20-030 | 07/2020

DISCUSSION PAPER

// PHILIPP BOEING AND PAUL HÜNERMUND

A Global Decline in Research Productivity? Evidence from China and Germany

A Global Decline in Research Productivity? Evidence from China and Germany

PHILIPP BOEING[†] PAUL HÜNERMUND[‡]

June 2020

In a recent paper, Bloom et al. (2020) find evidence for a substantial decline in research productivity in the U.S. economy during the last 40 years. In this paper, we replicate their findings for China and Germany, using detailed firm-level data spanning three decades. Our results indicate that diminishing returns in idea production are a global phenomenon, not just confined to the U.S.

*Keywords: Productivity; Growth; Innovation; R&D; Technological Change
JEL codes: D24, E23, O31, O47*

I. Introduction

Economists have proposed that continual decline in research productivity at the technology frontier potentially drives the observed stagnating or slowing growth rates in advanced economies over time (Gordon, 2016; Cowen, 2011). Bloom, Jones, Van Reenen and Webb (2020) present extensive empirical evidence in support of this hypothesis, and discuss implications for technological change and economic growth theories. The authors employ the following idea production function, one that is at the heart of many endogenous growth models (Romer 1990, Aghion and Howitt, 1992), as a starting point for their analysis:

$$\dot{A}_t / A_t = \alpha S_t. \quad (1)$$

S_t measures inputs to idea production, such as the number of scientists working in a specific sector, and \dot{A}_t / A_t measures total factor productivity (TFP) growth. The productivity of the research process, α , is usually assumed to be constant over time, which implies exponential growth in TFP, as well as final output, for a constant level of inputs. Bloom *et al.* present case study

[†] ZEW - Leibniz Centre for European Economic Research, Mannheim, Germany. IZA - Institute of Labor Economics, Bonn, Germany. Tsinghua University, Research Center for Technological Innovation, Beijing, China. E-mail: philipp.boeing@zew.de

[‡] Corresponding author. Maastricht University, School of Business and Economics, Tongersestraat 53, 6211 LM Maastricht, The Netherlands. E-mail: p.hunermund@maastrichtuniversity.nl

evidence from various industries, products and firms that cast doubt on this assumption though. They find input levels to be steadily increasing, while output growth remains constant, at best, implying that research productivity is actually declining over time (Bloom et al., 2020).

While the analysis of Bloom *et al.* focusses on the U.S., if replicable, their findings would have important policy implications elsewhere too. However, U.S. productivity trends might not necessarily be representative for developments in other jurisdictions. The U.S. economy has consistently been the global technology leader since WWII (Comin and Hobijn, 2010, Boeing and Mueller 2016), with exceptionally high growth rates in GDP during the postwar period (Gordon, 2016). Thus, perhaps a noticeable decline in research productivity is simply a reflection of a ‘regression to the mean’ phenomenon (Pritchett and Summers, 2014).

Our goal in this paper is to replicate the analysis in Bloom *et al.* for other countries. We thereby focus on comparative analysis at the firm-level given that it is more generalizable than case studies.¹ Since the methodology requires panel data for R&D-active firms over a long period, few data sources are suitable for this purpose. In the following, we present replication results for Germany, based on the Community Innovation Survey (CIS), and China, using data for publicly listed firms listed in the Chinese databases CSMAR, WIND and CNINFO. According to the OECD, China was the second largest, global R&D spender in 2017 (after the U.S.), and, analogously, Germany was the largest R&D spender in the E.U.

II. Data and Methodology

The CIS is conducted on behalf of Eurostat as part of the official E.U. science and innovation statistics (OECD/Eurostat, 2018) to document the innovation activities of European firms. While cross-sectional and biennial in most countries, the CIS in Germany is organized as an annual

¹ Bloom *et al.* use data for publicly listed firms from Compustat and for manufacturing firms from the U.S. Census of Manufacturing. Macro-level indicators would be unsuitable for this type of analysis because an increase in product variety could lead to growth in aggregate R&D inputs even though research productivity remains constant within each product line.

panel survey (see Peters and Rammer, 2013). It covers the entire manufacturing sector, as well as large parts of the agrarian and service sectors. The data is representative of the overall structure of the German business enterprise sector and contains many small and medium-sized enterprises (avg. firm size = 468 employees, median = 31). We collect data for a sample of 64,902 firms across the period 1992–2017. Voluntary participation, however, reduces the number of firms that can be analyzed in the long run.

For China, we observe 3,947 firms listed on the Chinese A-share market, between 2001 and 2019.² Listed firms provide the only Chinese firm-level data that span almost two decades and cover R&D expenditures. These firms are large- and medium-sized enterprises (avg. firm size = 5701 employees, median = 1775), which contributed 78.6% of the total R&D expenditures of industrial LMEs in 2018. Approximately two thirds of listed firms are in the manufacturing sector and the coastal region is represented proportionately more than inland regions. Such a composition closely resembles the sectoral and regional contribution of Chinese economic growth of the last two decades.

Following Bloom *et al.*, we calculate the research productivity parameter, α , in equation (1), by taking the average of output growth per firm and decade (1990s, 2000s, and 2010s), and dividing by average input levels. As measures for output we use sales revenue, employment, revenue labor productivity, and market capitalization (monetary units deflated by the GDP implicit price deflator). Market capitalization is not available for Germany’s predominantly privately owned companies and we substitute it with sales revenue from innovative products and services. Regarding inputs, Bloom *et al.* (2020) show theoretically that research inputs in (1) can be measured by \tilde{S}_t , the “effective number of researchers”, by deflating a firm’s R&D expenditures, S_t ,

² Chinese A-shares represent the second largest domestic equity market in the world with a total market capitalization of 8.5 trillion USD in 2019.

with the nominal wage rate for high-skilled workers in the economy.³ In line with the original methodology, we make the following sample restrictions:

- (i) firms need to be observed at least three times per decade;
- (ii) decades in which a firm experiences negative average output growth (which is assumed attributed to reasons other than innovation) are not considered; and
- (iii) the years 2008 and 2009 are dropped due to the financial crisis.

We then compute growth in research productivity over two consecutive decades⁴ and calculate an average across firms, weighted by the median number of effective researchers employed during the observation period.

III. Results and Conclusion

Table 1 depicts our results. In Germany, the effective number of researchers grows at an annual rate of 1.5% to 4.9%. Like Bloom *et al.*'s findings for the U.S., however, such input growth is not met with a proportional growth in output. As a result, we find declines in research productivity ranging from 3.7% to 7.8% per year. The average of the four estimates, equal to -5.225% , implies that research productivity halves every fourteen years, which is very close to the estimated half-life of thirteen years for the U.S. (Bloom *et al.*, 2020). In China, we observe an extremely rapid expansion of research activities during the first and second decades of the 21st century, with growth rates for effective researchers ranging between 21% and 24%.⁵ The resulting output growth, again, is not proportional to such inputs, which is reflected in a decrease in research

³ This result is based on a “lab equipment” model, in which both capital and labor are used as inputs in the idea production function (Romer, 1987). For Germany, we use gross wages in *performance group 2* (according to Destatis definition) to deflate R&D spending. For China, we take wages in the science sector. When instead using the average of wages in the Chinese urban, ICT and science sectors, our results remain virtually unchanged.

⁴ For China, the first decade refers to the 2001–2010 period and the second decade to the 2011–2019 period. Bloom *et al.* also look at changes across three and four decades, which is, unfortunately, infeasible with our data.

⁵ This represents growth at the intensive margin, given our methodology. The sharp increase in research is also reflected by an increase in the number of firms conducting R&D activities though: from 40.3% to 90.6% in the first and second decade.

productivity estimated between 15.4% and 29.3%. Averaged across estimates, this amounts to a decline of -23.775% per year, or a half-life of around 3 years.⁶

Figure 1 depicts distributions of factor changes in China and Germany. We find levels of heterogeneity across firms that are similar to Bloom *et al.* The null hypothesis of a constant research productivity (i.e., a factor change of one) can be rejected for the majority of firms in both countries. In Germany, with its many SMEs, the (unweighted) distributions of factor changes visually appear to be closer together than in the U.S.; while the weighted averages, calculated in Table 1, are quite similar to the magnitudes found by Bloom *et al.* This suggests that the average decline in research productivity in Germany is mainly driven by larger firms with generous R&D budgets. By contrast, in China, the distributions of factor changes are located much further apart, which reflects a substantial increase in research input levels coupled with a sharp decline in research productivity.

Overall, ideas are not only getting harder to find in the U.S., but that the same holds true for the largest R&D-spending countries in Europe and Asia respectively. Although estimates are difficult to compare, due to differences between data sources, negative growth rates are, in fact, remarkably similar across Germany and the U.S. China has undergone an even larger decline in research productivity in the last two decades, which reflects its rapid transformation from principally capital-driven growth toward more innovation-led growth. It remains to be seen whether China will start to follow productivity trends of advanced economies. The increasingly inward-looking and mission-driven nature of Chinese innovation policy (Chinese State Council, 2020), however, suggests that research productivity might continue to decline faster in China than elsewhere. Knowledge production at the technology frontier crucially relies on creative freedom, serendipitous discovery, and exchange (Stephan, 2010). If these important channels of idea creation

⁶ We caution against a naïve extrapolation though, as the decline in research productivity amounts to only 7.3% per year in the last decade (calculated in 5-year intervals, 2010–2014 to 2015–2019), indicating that China is converging to the global research frontier.


are further curtailed, significant knowledge-based productivity growth will be harder to sustain in the future.

Tables and Figures

TABLE 1 — RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY IN GERMANY AND CHINA

	Effective research (avg. growth, % p.a.)	Research productivity (avg. growth, % p.a.)
<u>Germany</u>		
Sales revenue (1,121 firms)	3.8	-7.8
Employment (1,317 firms)	2.8	-7.0
Revenue labor productivity (966 firms)	1.5	-2.4
Sales with new products (230 firms)	4.9	-3.7
<u>China</u>		
Sales revenue (516 firms)	21.4	-27.3
Employment (332 firms)	24.0	-15.4
Revenue labor productivity (480 firms)	21.0	-23.1
Market capitalization (601 firms)	21.2	-29.3

FIGURE 1 — FACTOR CHANGES IN RESEARCH PRODUCTIVITY AND NUMBER OF RESEARCHERS



References

- Aghion, P., and P. Howitt.** 1992. “A Model of Growth through Creative Destruction.” *Econometrica* 60 (2): 323–51.
- Bloom, N., Jones, C. I., Van Reenen, J., and Webb M.** 2020. “Are Ideas Getting Harder to Find?” *American Economic Review* 110 (4): 1104–1144.
- Boeing, P., and E. Mueller.** 2016. “Measuring Patent Quality in Cross-country Comparison.” *Economics Letters* 149: 145–147.
- Comin D. A., and B. Hobijn.** 2010. “Technology Diffusion and Postwar Growth.” *NBER Working Paper* 16378, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Cowen, T.** 2011. *The Great Stagnation: How America Ate All the Low-Hanging Fruit of Modern History, Got Sick, and Will (Eventually) Feel Better*. New York: Dutton.
- Gordon, R. J.** 2016. *The Rise and Fall of American Growth: The US Standard of Living since the Civil War*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- OECD/Eurostat.** 2018. *Oslo Manual 2018: Guidelines for Collecting, Reporting and Using Data on Innovation, 4th Edition, The Measurement of Scientific, Technological and Innovation Activities*. OECD Publishing, Paris/Eurostat, Luxembourg.
- Peters, B., and C. Rammer.** 2013. “Innovation panel surveys in Germany.” In Gault F, ed. *Handbook of Innovation Indicators and Measurement*. Edward Elgar Publishing: Cheltenham, UK, 135–177.
- Pritchett, L. and L. H. Summers.** 2014. “Asiaphoria Meets Regression to the Mean.” *NBER Working Paper* 20573, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Romer, P. M.** 1987. “Growth Based on Increasing Returns Due to Specialization.” *American Economic Review* 77 (2): 56–62.
- Romer, P. M.** 1990. “Endogenous Technological Change.” *Journal of Political Economy* 98 (5): 71–102.
- State Council of the Communist Party of China Central Committee.** 2020. Opinions on Speeding Up the Perfection of the Socialist Market Economic System in the New Era.
- Stephan, P. E.** 2010. “The Economics of Science.” In *Handbook of the Economics of Innovation*, vol. 1, chap. 5: 217–273.



Download ZEW Discussion Papers from our ftp server:

<http://ftp.zew.de/pub/zew-docs/dp/>

or see:

<https://www.ssrn.com/link/ZEW-Ctr-Euro-Econ-Research.html>

<https://ideas.repec.org/s/zbw/zewdip.html>



IMPRINT

**ZEW – Leibniz-Zentrum für Europäische
Wirtschaftsforschung GmbH Mannheim**

ZEW – Leibniz Centre for European
Economic Research

L 7,1 · 68161 Mannheim · Germany

Phone +49 621 1235-01

info@zew.de · zew.de

Discussion Papers are intended to make results of ZEW research promptly available to other economists in order to encourage discussion and suggestions for revisions. The authors are solely responsible for the contents which do not necessarily represent the opinion of the ZEW.