



Entrepreneurship, economic growth, and innovation: Are feedback effects at work? [☆]



Miguel-Ángel Galindo ^{a,*}, María Teresa Méndez ^{b,**}

^a University of Castilla-La Mancha, Spain

^b University Complutense de Madrid, Spain

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 1 April 2013

Received in revised form 1 August 2013

Accepted 1 November 2013

Available online 12 December 2013

Keywords:

Innovation

Knowledge

Economic growth

Schumpeter

Entrepreneurship

Income distribution

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the relationships between entrepreneurship, innovation and economic growth, and to show the feedback effects in these relationships. A Schumpeterian approach considering three equations linking GDP, innovation, and entrepreneurship facilitates this analysis. This paper presents empirical analysis of entrepreneurial activity in 13 developed countries. Panel data with fixed effects methodology, for the period 2002 to 2007, provides the means to estimate the equations. The analysis shows that several factors have positive impacts on innovation and entrepreneurship, including monetary policy and social climate. Additionally, a feedback effect is at work: economic activity promotes entrepreneurship and innovation activities, and the latter enhances economic activity. Therefore, policymakers must consider this effect when designing economic policies.

© 2013 Published by Elsevier Inc.

1. Introduction

As an important part of the innovation process, economists traditionally consider knowledge diffusion as a key factor for encouraging economic growth. Several behaviors support this statement. First, innovation makes products more competitive, and allows firms to introduce products into more markets. In this sense, Adam Smith (1776) states that the division of labor, an essential element of the wealth of nations, depends on the extension of markets, which in turn depends heavily on innovation processes. Second, modern theoretical approaches stress the relevance of innovation processes by explicitly introducing factors that encourage innovation in firms. In this case, events in the real economy point out which qualitative variables to consider, in addition to the quantitative ones, because social behavior has the capacity to facilitate or discourage the innovation process. If economic agents reject or are unable to use innovations, the innovation processes would grind to a halt. As Schumpeter states, society must create a social climate that favors the innovation process.

This point is relevant because knowledge diffusion has important effects on economic agents, especially workers. Some traditional literature

shows that such diffusion could have negative effects on the employment rate because of the resulting unemployment as technology takes the place of humans (Easterly, 2001; Mortensen & Pissarides, 1998; Vivarelli & Pianta, 2000, among others). An adequate social climate enables the reduction or mitigation of the negative consequences of such unemployment, allowing workers to improve their skills and access new job opportunities.

This paper aims to analyze the factors that promote knowledge diffusion as a component of the innovation process, and entrepreneurship activity as a key factor for introducing this knowledge into the production process, using a Schumpeterian approach to carry out the analysis. Section 2 considers the innovation process. Section 3 expands on the role of innovation in a Schumpeterian model, and Section 4 presents the results of the empirical analysis. Finally, Section 5 sets out the study's main conclusions.

2. The innovation process and economic growth

Innovation is far from being a recent phenomenon, and is inherent to human development. The emergence of innovations with the capacity to change people's behavior, labor methods, and work characterizes the history of humanity. This study, however, also analyzes the problems that innovation implementation can bring about.

Despite its pivotal role throughout human history, economists on occasions overlook innovation, often addressing the broad concepts of the subject with only indirect references to the process. For example, capital accumulation is a frequent and longstanding topic of academic discussion, in which classical economists concentrate on market

[☆] The authors are grateful to María Soledad Castaño and two anonymous referees for comments on an earlier draft of this paper. The authors alone are responsible for all limitations and errors that may relate to the study and the paper.

* Correspondence to: M.-Á. Galindo, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha, Facultad de Derecho y Ciencias Sociales, Ronda de Toledo, s/n 13071 Ciudad Real, Spain.

** Correspondence to: M.-T. Méndez, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Facultad de CC. Económicas y Empresariales, Campus de Somosaguas, 28223 Madrid, Spain.

E-mail addresses: mgalindomar@orange.es (M.-Á. Galindo), mmendezpi@ccee.ucm.es (M.T. Méndez).

performance and progress instead of mechanical innovation. Although some historical contributions do emphasize the role of innovation, as is the case with Schumpeter, this general neglect of innovation is now well and truly disappearing.

Fagerberg (2006, pp. 4–5) delineates an important distinction between innovation and invention, stating that, “Invention is the first occurrence of an idea for a new product or process, while innovation is the first attempt to carry it out into practice.” As Fagerberg shows, the two have close ties, making distinguishing one from another very difficult. But in many cases, a considerable lag exists between the two. Crucially, however, a major difference between invention and innovation is that the former may occur anywhere, while innovation occurs mainly in firms that need to combine several different kinds of capabilities, knowledge, resources, and skills (Fagerberg, 2006, p. 5). In this sense, an innovator, or an entrepreneur in Schumpeterian terms, must carry out all of these tasks.

Schumpeter, along with other economists, stresses the prominent role of entrepreneurship and innovation in the economic growth process. In “Theoretical Problems of Economic Growth”, Schumpeter (1947) shows that scholars consider different factors that enhance economic growth: physical environment, social organization, institutions, technology, and so forth (Schumpeter, 1947, pp. 2–3). He goes on to explain, however, that all these factors are insufficient to explain the economic growth process because, “economic growth is not autonomous, being dependent upon factors outside of itself, and since these factors are many, no one-factor theory can ever be satisfactory” (p. 4). At the end of the paper, Schumpeter (1947, p. 8) concludes, “...since creative response means, in the economic sphere, simply the combination of existing productive resources in new ways or for new purposes, and since this function defines the economic type that we call the entrepreneur, we may reformulate the above suggestions by saying that we should recognize the importance of, and systematically inquire into, entrepreneurship as a factor of economic growth.”

In the first of the above quotations, Schumpeter states that an entrepreneur is a leader, who leads the means of production into new channels (Schumpeter, 1911, p. 89) and the entrepreneur is not necessarily, “a genius or benefactor to humanity” (p. 90ff). Entrepreneurs set profit forecasts as a precondition for innovation decisions. From Schumpeter’s point of view, entrepreneurial profit “is a surplus over costs [that is] the difference between receipts and outlay in a business” (p. 128). In this context, an entrepreneur in a better situation would achieve higher profits; that is, an improvement of the product thanks to the innovation process creates a better position for the entrepreneur, who then has the opportunity to achieve higher profits. Innovation performs this function. Therefore, the innovation process is growth and profit enhancing.

The role of financial institutions is also relevant in this process. Entrepreneurs need financial resources to carry out their activity and to finance innovations. For this reason, an adequate policy whose design sets out to increase savings is necessary to facilitate the credit process. Additionally, the social climate is important in encouraging entrepreneurial activity and facilitating the introduction of innovations. A reduction in social stress would encourage entrepreneurs to carry out their activities. Measuring this factor is of primary importance, and income distribution is the most representative variable of this concept.

In this analysis, the feedback effect is also of interest. In this sense, better economic activity would create new opportunities for entrepreneurs and would stimulate innovation. Thus, economic growth would have a positive effect on this process. Conversely, as Drucker (1998) points out, innovation is a key process in entrepreneurship activity, promoting such business, thereby bringing to the fore another feedback effect: entrepreneurs innovate and their innovations stimulate other entrepreneurs to carry out their activity and to create more innovations.

3. Empirical estimation

To carry out analysis of the relationship between entrepreneurship, economic growth and innovation, this study develops a model

on the basis of three equations that reflect both direct and indirect effects.

The three equations are:

$$\ln(y)_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln(In)_{it} + \beta_2(\Phi)_{it-2} + \beta_3 \ln(I)_{it} + \beta_4(KHU)_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

$$\ln(In)_{it} = \beta_5 + \beta_6(ms)_{it-1} + \beta_7 \ln(\Phi)_{it-1} + \beta_8(y)_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (2)$$

$$\ln(\Phi)_{it} = \beta_9 + \beta_{10}(\ln)_{it} + \beta_{11} \ln(\lambda)_{it} + \beta_{12} \ln(ms)_{it} + \beta \ln(y)_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (3)$$

Eq. (1) is the GDP equation, where y is Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in millions of United States dollars (USD), using data from the World Bank’s World Database Indicators (WDI) database; In is innovation, which is measured via the proxy of patents, measured in number of patent issues; Φ is entrepreneurship; I is private investment in millions of USD; and KHU is human capital in millions of USD, again using the WDI as a source.

Φ is entrepreneurship whose measurement relies on the proxy, Total Entrepreneurship Activity (TEA), from the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM). Every year, the GEM carries out a research program that estimates the national entrepreneurial activity in each country that participates in the survey to construct the TEA index. In this case, the focus of the GEM study is on opportunity-driven entrepreneurs. In this group, the GEM includes entrepreneurs that embark on this activity primarily to pursue an opportunity; namely, they engage in entrepreneurship because of the prospect of opportunity. Furthermore, these individuals may desire greater independence in their professional lives, or be seeking to improve their income. Therefore, Φ is the percentage of individuals with involvement in TEA who: (i) claim to be driven by opportunity rather than a failure to find other work opportunities; and (ii) who indicate that the main driver for their involvement in this opportunity is the prospect of achieving independence or increasing their income, rather than just maintaining their earnings.

The sources for the variables appear below each table.

Eq. (2) is the innovation equation, which incorporates the effect of monetary policy through the money supply term ms (sourcing its data from the WDI), as well as the effects of entrepreneurship and GDP. Therefore, this equation considers the feedback effect between innovation and GDP.

Finally, Eq. (3) is the entrepreneurship equation, where ϕ is entrepreneurship activity, λ is the Gini index (i.e., the income distribution of the population, according to WDI data), ms is the money supply, In is innovation, and y is GDP. In this case, the Gini index represents the Schumpeterian social climate and Drucker’s (1998) statement that entrepreneurship activity exists when innovations exist.

3.1. Estimation method

Panel data with fixed effects methodology, for data from 13 countries (Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, United Kingdom and Spain), for the period 2002 to 2011, provides the means to estimate these hypotheses. The general specification of panel data with fixed effects is:

$$Y_{it} = \alpha_{it} + \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_{kit} X_{kit} + U_{it}$$

where i denotes the countries and t the time periods. α_{it} is a parameter that represents the specific effects of each cross-section; namely, each country. This parameter is constant over time. U_{it} gathers the effects of any absent variables that are specific to cross-section and period.

The panel data methodology combines cross-sections (information from several individuals at a given moment) for several points in time. Panel data has several advantages for econometric estimation. For example, panel data allow for controlling for individual or time

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/1017827>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/1017827>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)