UNITED NATIONS
UNIVERSITY

UNU-MERIT

Working Paper Series

#2008-040

A multilevel analysis
of innovation in developing countries

Martin Srholec

A multilevel analysis
of innovation in developing countries [*]

Martin Srholec

Centre for Technology, Innovation and Culture (TIK)
and
Centre for Advanced Study (CAS) at the Norwegian Academy of Science and Letters

(e-mail: martin.srholec@tik.uio.no)

Abstract
Innovation is a multilevel phenomenon. Not only characteristics of firms but also environment within which firms operate matter. Although this has been for long recognized in the literature, a quantitative test that explicitly concerns the hypothesis that framework conditions affect innovativeness of firms remains lacking. Using a large sample of firms from many developing countries, we estimate a multilevel model of innovation that integrates explanatory factors at different levels of the analysis. Apart from various firm's characteristics, national economic, technological and institutional conditions directly predict the likelihood of firms to innovate.

Key words: Innovation, technological capability, multilevel modeling, institutions, developing countries.
JEL codes: C30, E11, O30.

---

1. Introduction

Already Schumpeter understood the role played by the context for innovation (Schumpeter, 1934). At the most abstract level, the idea about survival of firms propelled by innovation, but determined by the environment, is central to evolutionary economics (Nelson and Winter, 1982). Less theoretical but all the more grounded is the argument about sensitivity of innovation to local conditions that is integral to the literature on technological capabilities (Kim, 1980; Dahlman, et al, 1987 and Lall, 1992). Arguing along somewhat similar lines, a need to develop favourable environment for innovation has been entertained by the technology gap perspective (Fagerberg, 1987; Verspagen, 1991) and by the concept of social capabilities (Abramovitz, 1986). An explicitly multilevel is the notion of firms embedded in innovation systems (Lundvall, 1992 and Nelson, 1993 and Edquist, 1997) that has framed most of the recent debate.

Still empirical research on innovation continues to use frameworks confined to single levels, although relations identified at different levels should be analysed by multilevel modeling (Hox, 2002; Goldstein, 2003 and Luke, 2004). Single-level models assume that observations are independent from each other. If a nested structure of data exits, however, the independence assumption is likely to be violated. By relaxing this assumption, multilevel modeling provides a tool for analysis of firms grouped at various higher levels. Even more importantly, a proper recognition of data hierarchies allows us to examine new lines of questions in a proper and concise way that could not be otherwise. Unlike any other method, multilevel modeling directly illuminates the extent to which specific differences between the relevant contexts, such as countries for example, are accountable for outcomes at the firm-level.

The aim of this paper is to demonstrate how research on innovation can benefit from multilevel modeling. Section 2 puts forward arguments for the multilevel approach, particularly in the context of developing countries. Section 3 delineates a basic outline of multilevel models and briefly overviews the methodology. Section 4 introduces the micro dataset derived from the Productivity and Investment Climate Survey (PICS) organized by the World Bank, which has been rarely used in research on innovation so far; except of the recent papers by Almeida, Fernandes (2006) and Goedhuys (2007). Section 5 brings in various measures of the national conditions. Section 6 specifies the bivariate logit multilevel model of innovation and presents results of the econometric estimate. Since to my best knowledge, the only other attempt to model innovation in an explicitly multilevel framework is the study of regional patterns by Srholec (2007), the concluding focuses on agenda for future research along these lines.

2. A need for multilevel modeling of innovation

Sociologists, geographers or even biologists have recognized for several decades that many kinds of data have hierarchical structure, and therefore should be analyzed econometrically in a multilevel framework (see, for example, Burstein, 1980; Van den Eeden, Hüttner, 1982; Blalock, 1984; and Draper, 1995). Offspring from the same parents and environment tend to be more alike that those chosen at random from the

population. School performance is not only given by the amount of study time of a child, but also by higher-level factors such as characteristics of the class, school or national educational system. Similarly innovation should be seen as a multilevel phenomenon, because not only individual characteristics and capabilities of firms, but also the environment within which firms operate matters for their success in the innovation process. Of course, however, this is not a new idea.

Already Schumpeter understood the role played by the social context for innovation (Schumpeter, 1934). A key element of his thinking about innovation was the need to overcome resistance to new ways of doing things, which is not only given by the forces of habit imprinted within an individual, but also translates into how the society is organized. Entrepreneurs need to possess special qualities, or "capabilities" in the contemporary terminology, that allow them to overcome obstacles to innovation in the economy, which has been perhaps most vividly articulated as follows: "…the reaction of the social environment against one who wishes to do something new… manifests itself first of all in the existence of legal or political impediments…" (Schumpeter, 1934, pp. 86-87). Although Schumpeter emphasized the resistance, the recent literature rather concentrates on factors inside of the firms and in the society that facilitate innovation. Let us briefly consider the most important contributions along these lines.

As has been for long understood (Gerschenkron, 1962), emerging from behind represents a great "promise" for technological catch up, but exploiting of this potential requires favourable environment. At the macro level, the idea that catching up is by no means a free ride has been formalized in the technology gap perspective (Fagerberg 1987 and Verspagen 1991). Arguing about similar lines, but without quantitative measurement or modeling of the relationship, Abramovitz (1986) entertained the idea that various "social capabilities" matter for development. An important insight from this literature, at lest implicitly, is that apart from capabilities of individual firms, there are capabilities that operate distinctly at the national level, which runs through out this paper and is explicitly modelled in the multilevel econometrics.

Studies of technological upgrading in developing countries have long argued for a need to recognize the importance of national capabilities and policies, but also to understand technological capabilities at the firm level (Kim, 1980; Dahlman, et al, 1987; Lall, 1992). Kim (1980) emphasized the role of the external environment represented by customers, suppliers, competitors, government, and last but not least local research institutions and technical information centres for the ability of local firms to import, adapt and improve foreign technologies, which by principle aired the idea about national innovation systems, although this expression has not been used by him. Also he has in fact encouraged multilevel analysis of technological catching up: "many variables both at the industry and national levels may, however, account for variations in the development patterns of industrial technology…" (Kim, 1980, pg. 273), which broadly anticipates the outline of this paper.

Another important point of this literature is the broad nature of technological capabilities (Kim, 1980, 1997; Dahlman, et al., 1987; Lall, 1992; Bell and Pavitt, 1993 and Hobday, 1995), which span much beyond the traditional focus on research and development (R&D). Innovation in developing countries, which often refers to

incremental, gradual and context-specific improvements along the prevailing technological trajectories originating from the advanced countries, is much about diffusion of technology. Bell and Pavitt (1993) argue that most firms in developing countries innovate on the basis of a broad range of practical capabilities which are typically concentrated in the departments of maintenance, engineering or quality control, although Kim (1980) emphasizes the role of local R&D efforts for firms to assimilate foreign technology, so that one should certainly not neglect the latter, especially from a certain stage of development.

Nevertheless, this approach has been never translated into formal modeling, which made Figueiredo (2006) to point in a recent survey that we need more empirical testing of the link between firms and other external factors to generate conclusive results. Although this literature has offered important practical insights about how firms innovate in developing countries and has been no doubt important for directing thinking along these lines, a testable analytical model that would allow us to replicate these findings by quantitative research on large firm-level datasets remains lacking.

As has been already anticipated above, most of the recent debate is organized around the concept of innovation systems (Lundvall, 1992; Nelson, 1993 and Edquist, 1997). A central argument underlying this literature, which is explicitly multilevel, is that innovation is determined by factors operating at different levels. Spatial concentration of the relevant actors, resources and other environmental factors conducive to learning influences firms' innovative performance. A firm embedded in a vibrant environment may therefore become a successful innovator, while the very same firm in a considerably less favourable environment may fail to innovate. Such systems can be analyzed at different hierarchical levels, and various variables can be defined at each level, however, it cannot be emphasize enough that the firm should always remain the ultimate unit of the analysis.

Most of the existing literature has used exclusively macro data to gauge differences in innovation performance across countries (Furman, at al., 2002; Archibugi, Coco, 2004; Fagerberg, Srholec, 2006; Fagerberg, et al., 2007). Some studies using micro data has been recently performed for more than one country (Janz, et al., 2004; Mohnen and Röller, 2005; Mohnen, et al., 2006; Griffith, et al., 2006; Almeida and Fernandes, 2006), but the contextual factors have been at best represented only by a set of relevant country dummies without a serious attempt to actually explain the cross-country differences. Not much can be therefore concluded from the existing literature on how the technological, economic and social environment influences the innovation process in firms. A complex phenomenon, such as the innovation process, cannot be fully understood at any single level of analysis.

An important bottleneck for future deepening of research in this tradition is that the empirical analysis is far behind our theoretical understanding of the multilevel nature of innovation. Abundance of theoretical reasoning about role of the context is in sharp contrast with the general lack of quantitative work aimed at validating these hypotheses. At this front multilevel modeling has much to offer. Using the multilevel perspective, we can reach beyond the dichotomy between methodological individualism and collectivism in empirical research on innovation, towards much needed "socially embedded methodological individualism" as Stan Metcalfe would put it. Such perspective is particularly required for research on technological catching-

up, because there is considerable variety in the contextual factors among developing countries. To show how this can be done is the main purpose of the following.

3. A logit model of firms nested in countries

A multilevel model, also known as hierarchical, random coefficient, variance component or mixed-effects model, is a statistical model that relates a dependent variable to explanatory variables at more than one level (Luke, 2004). Assume 2-level structure with firms at level-1 nested in countries at level-2. A standard 1-level model is the following:

(1) $y_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j} x_{ij} + e_{ij}$

where y_{ij} is the dependent variable, x_{ij} is the firm level explanatory variable, β_{0j} is the standard intercept, β_{1j} is the standard slope coefficient, e_{ij} is the standard residual error term, i is the firm ($i = 1…n$) and j is the country ($j = 1…m$). Although we allow for more than one country in the analysis, the equation is formulated separately for each of them. If we were interested only in this relationship, we can estimate the m models separately, assuming different parameters for each country and a common intra-country residual variance. A linear 2-level model with explanatory variables at both firm and country levels emerges, if we let the intercept β_{0j} and slope β_{1j} to become random variables:

(2)   Level-1 linear model:
$$y_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}x_{ij} + e_{ij}$$
Level-2 model:
$$\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}z_j + u_{0j}$$
$$\beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11}z_j + u_{1j}$$

where z_j is the level-2 predictor and u_{0j} and u_{1j} are normally distributed residual terms for each level-2 equation, which are independent from the level-1 residual e_{ij}. Since the level-2 effects are identified by the subscript j, we have a hierarchical system of regression equations, where we are allowing each country to have a different average outcome (β_{0j}) and a different effect of the level-1 predictor on the outcome (β_{1j}). Although a different level-1 model is estimated for each country, the level-2 equation is defined for all of them. By substituting β_{0j} and β_{1j} into the level-1 model and rearranging we can write the entire model in a single equation:

(3) $y_{ij} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}z_j + \gamma_{10} x_{ij} + \gamma_{11}z_jx_{ij} + (u_{0j} + u_{1j}x_{ij} + e_{ij})$

where in brackets is the random part and the rest contains the fixed part of the model. As discussed by Goldstein (2003), the presence of more than one residual term makes the traditional estimation procedures such as ordinary least squares inapplicable and therefore specialized maximum likelihood procedures must be used to estimate these models. For more details on these estimators see Raudenbush, et al. (2004).

So why should we use multilevel modeling? A major assumption of single-level models is that the observations are independent from each other. If a nested structure

of data exits, units belonging to the same group tend to have correlated residuals and the independence assumption is likely to be violated. By relaxing this assumption, multilevel modeling provides statistically more efficient estimates, which are more "conservative", as Goldstein (2003) puts it, than those ignoring the hierarchical nature of data. Statistically significant relationships that have been established in the literature by using the standard methods may come out not significant in the multilevel analysis. A lot that we have learned empirically about innovation in firms from research on data at the aggregate level might appear different in the multilevel framework.

Apart from the statistical consequences, a proper recognition of data hierarchies allows us to examine new lines of questions. Using the example of firms in countries, the multilevel approach enables the researcher to explore the extent to which specific differences between countries are accountable for outcomes at the firm level. It is also possible to investigate the mechanics by which the national factors operate at the firm level and the extent to which these effects differ for different kinds of firms. For example, we may analyse whether differences in national framework conditions are more important for smaller than larger firms. Such research questions can be straightforwardly examined by multilevel modeling, but can be neither easily nor properly examined by the standard methods.

A common approach to control for the compositional effects is to ignore the random variability associated with the higher-level factors and include into the estimate fixed effect dummies that correspond to the hierarchical structure of the data, such as relevant dummies for sectors, regions or countries. Using dummies might be a useful quick-fix solution, if the purpose is only to control for the compositional effects, but it is of a little help if the prime interest is in effects of the higher-level factors or cross-level interactions themselves. Although we may detect rough patterns of the structure, a dummy is only a "catch-all" variable for which we can only speculate what it really represents. After all, if these dummies significantly improve predictive power of the model, which is typically the case in econometric estimates, a multilevel analysis should be given priority.

Analyses that use exclusively micro data to study the effects of environment on firms suffer from issues of endogeneity. A good example is the set of variables on obstacles to innovation in Community Innovation Surveys (OECD, 2005). Even though most of these obstacles, such as lack of customer interest or excessive regulation, refer to factors that are supposed to be external to the firm, these variables fail to measure the environmental effects. More innovative firms systematically report more severe obstacles to innovation, because they are more aware of what is hindering innovation than the less innovative firms. An inevitable outcome of a single-level analysis is therefore highly positive correlation between innovativeness and these external obstacles to innovation (Evangelista et al., 2002; Mohnen and Röller, 2005), but this is because innovation influences firm's perception of the obstacles (Clausen, 2008), not the other way. A multilevel model should be used for this purpose, where we include objective characteristics of the environment, not only perceptions of firms about it.

As already mentioned above, furthermore, another important reason for using multilevel modeling to study innovation is theoretical. A central argument of the

literature is that firms are embedded in the environment and therefore the theory implicitly predicts a nested structure of micro data. In other words, the basic assumption of the standard multiple regression models on independent residuals is expected to be violated from the outset. Empirical research in this tradition that uses single-level models to study how characteristics of the framework conditions influence innovation therefore suffers from a methodological contradiction. Anytime a researcher aims to test hypotheses that are operating at different levels, a multilevel statistical model is appropriate.

So far we have assumed that the dependent variable is continuously distributed. If the dependent variable is binary, we need to specify a non-linear multilevel model. For this purpose, we assume a binomial sampling model and use a logit link function to transform the level-1 predicted values. Only the level-1 part of the model differs from the linear case and the multilevel model can be delineated as follows:

(4)   Level-1 logit model:
$$E\,(y_{ij} = 1 \mid \beta_j) = \varphi_{ij}$$
$$\mathrm{Log}\,[\varphi_{ij} / (1 - \varphi_{ij})] = \eta_{ij}$$
$$\eta_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}x_{ij}$$
Level-2 model:
$$\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}z_j + u_{0j}$$
$$\beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11}z_j + u_{1j}$$

where η_{ij} is the log of the odds of success, such as for example the propensity of a firm to introduce innovation. Although φ_{ij} is constrained to be in the interval $(0,1)$, the logit transformation allows η_{ij} to take any value and therefore can be substituted to the structural model. From this follows that the predicted log-odds can be reversed to an odds by $exp(\eta_{ij})$ and to the predicted probability φ_{ij} by $exp\{\eta_{ij}\}/(1+exp\{\eta_{ij}\})$. As explained in more detail by Luke (2004, pg. 55), there is no term for the level-1 residual in the model because for binary dependent variables the variance is completely determined by the mean and thus a separate error term is not estimated.

4. Micro data

At the firm-level we use a large micro dataset derived from the Productivity and Investment Climate Survey (PICS) organized by the World Bank. Firms were asked about various aspects of their business activities, including a set of questions on innovation and learning, in a questionnaire harmonized across many developing countries. For more details on methodology of the survey see World Bank (2003).

The main focus of this paper is on direct evidence on innovation in firms. INNPDT is a dummy with value 1 for firms that answered positively on a question whether they "developed a major new product line", which broadly corresponds to the concept of product innovation.[1] It is important to bear in mind that these innovations are new to

_____

[1] It is interesting to notice that apart from being rather short, there is no explicit reference to "technologically" new product in the PICS definition. One may argue, however, if a more complicated question would be feasible to ask in developing countries, including some of the least developed

the firm, but not necessarily new to the market or to the world, which is pivotal for interpretation of this information in the context of developing countries.

Besides evidence on innovation, the dataset provides information on size, age, industry and various facets of firm's technological capabilities. SIZE is natural logarithm of the number of permanent employees in the initial year of the reference period; for more about the period see below. Apart from scale economies, size is important to control for due to definition of INNPDT, which is going to be the dependent variable in the econometric estimate. Since this is a dummy for introducing at least one innovation, larger firms should be by principle more likely to report a positive answer because they often comprise multiple products under a single roof.

AGE is natural logarithm of the number of years since the firm has begun operations in the country. On one hand older firms tend to have more accumulated knowledge and other resources to capitalize on, but on the other hand newly established firms, and therefore younger firms, should appear to be more innovative because they by principle need to introduce a new product when they launch their business. It will be interesting to see, which of these effects dominate the results.

Sectors were difficult to identify because somewhat different classifications had been used in the various national datasets. For this reason we can distinguish only between 13 broad sectors as follows: 1) Agro, food and beverages; 2) Apparel, garments, leather and textiles; 3) Chemicals; 4) Wood, paper, non-metal materials and furniture; 5) Metal; 6) Machinery, electronics and automobiles; 7) Construction; 8) Hotels and restaurants; 9) Trade; 10) Transport; 11) Real estate and other business services; 12) Other industry (mining, energy, water, recycling); and 13) Other business services. SECTOR dummies are used in the econometric estimate to control for the sectoral patterns with "Agro, food and beverages" as the base category.

Structural patterns like these are necessary to control for, but even more essential predictors of success in the innovation process are capabilities and resources of firms directly devoted to search, absorption and generation of new technology. An important insight of the aforementioned literature on innovation in developing countries is the broad and multifaceted nature of technological capabilities. Since hardly any single measure could capture complexity of these capabilities, it is very fortunate for our purpose that the survey contains a battery of variables that gauge their various facets.

Research and development (R&D) is the traditional and for a long time the only seriously considered indicator of technological capabilities. R&D is a dummy with value 1 if the firm devotes expenditure on this activity. The aim of this variable is to capture general commitment to R&D, which tends to be persistent over time, such as manifested by presence of a R&D department in the firm, although the question has

---

nations, where awareness about "technological" aspects of innovation is often limited. Simpler may be actually better in this context, at least as far as the response rate and comparability of the answers is concerned. Furthermore, the 2nd revision of the Oslo Manual (OECD, 1997) emphasises "technological" nature of innovation, whereas the 3rd revision of the Oslo Manual (OECD, 2005) does not explicitly refer to "technologically new developments" anymore, which makes the idea about innovation in CIS somewhat closer to the more general definition in PICS.

not been formulated exactly this way.[2] Nevertheless, it cannot be emphasized enough that innovation is about much more than just spending on R&D, especially in the context of developing countries, so that we need to keep the eye on broader aspects of technological capabilities.

Besides the R&D variable, the dataset provides information on structure of employment by occupation, adherence to ISO norms, use of internet in the business and formal training of employees. PROF is a variable that refers to the share of professionals in permanent employment, which includes specialists such as scientists, engineers, chemists, software programmers, accountants and lawyers, and reflects the extent of qualified human capital.[3] ISO is a dummy with value 1 if the firm has received ISO (e.g. 9000, 9002 or 14,000) certification and therefore reflects a capability to conform to international standards of production. WWW is a dummy with value 1 if the firm regularly uses a website in its interaction with clients and suppliers, which captures the potential for user-producer interactions mediated by internet. And finally SKILL is a dummy with value 1 if the firm provides formal (beyond "on the job") training to its permanent employees.

It is interesting to note that many of these facets of technological capabilities, such as composition and training of human resources, systems of quality control and use of information technologies, have been emphasized as particularly relevant but under-measured in the context of developing countries in the third edition of the Oslo Manual (OECD, 2005, pp. 141-144). Along these lines the PICS data provides much richer evidence as compared to what can be derived from most the CIS surveys that have been conducted in developing countries so far.

Another major advantage of PICS is that all of the information, including the R&D, PROF, ISO, WWW and SKILL variables, is available for both firms that innovated as well as for those that did not, whereas only the innovators answer most (and the most interesting part) of the CIS questionnaire. Such design of the CIS survey severely limits any inferences that can be made about factors behind success in the innovation process, because we actually do not know much about those that do not innovate. An important side effect of this split is that every model that requires the more detailed information from CIS data must control for a potential sample selection bias, which is difficult to identify precisely due to the lack of information for the latter. But robustness with regards to identification of the selection equation is seldom discussed, although the results are often sensitive to specification of the exclusion restriction.

A basic overview of the dataset is given in Table 1. About 21,000 firms with at least some information on these variables are in the dataset. Almost 40% of the firms

---

[2] Although most of the national questionnaires include information on the actual value of R&D expenditure and sales, we refrain from using this to compute an intensity measure, because there is missing data for at least either of them in several thousands of firms, and because of concerns about comparability (and measurement error) of the amount of R&D expenditure, which is arguably based on rough estimates. To our judgement the dummy variable on whether a firm just claims to spend on R&D or not is much more robust in this respect.

[3] Since some versions of the PICS questionnaire did not distinguish between professionals and managers, the PROF variable also covers the latter category (but excluding those involved in shop floor supervision). As often happens to variables of this kind, 23 firms mistakenly reported employing more professionals than the total number of employees, for which the PROF variables was changed into missing.

answered positively on the question about INNPDT. It might seem surprising that so many firms innovated in a sample with majority of developing countries; however one needs to keep in mind that these are "new to the firm" innovations, which often reflect diffusion of existing technology, as shall be put in a broader context below. About a quarter of the sample consists of firms with less than 10, two-thirds of the firms had less than 50, whereas roughly a tenth of the sample had more than 250 permanent employees. A quick look at composition of the sample by age reveals that around 15% of the firms did not operate for more than 5 years, and a fifth of them were older than 25 years. Averages of the variables reflecting technological capabilities are self-explanatory, and shall be examined in more detail in relation to the propensity to innovate in the econometric framework later.

Table 1: Overview of micro data

Variable	Obs.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
INNPDT	20,842	0.376	0.484	0	1.00
SIZE	19,728	3.331	1.677	0	9.93
AGE	20,883	2.554	0.807	0	6.43
R&D	17,986	0.238	0.426	0	1.00
PROF	20,372	0.131	0.183	0	1.00
ISO	20,694	0.187	0.390	0	1.00
WWW	20,900	0.507	0.500	0	1.00
SKILL	20,150	0.414	0.493	0	1.00

Source: Own computations based on World Bank (2003).

5. Macro data

Since we are going to use a multilevel model, we obviously need data for specific country-level variables that can capture salient aspects of the national framework conditions. To limit influence of shocks and measurement errors occurring in specific years, we use the macro indicators in the form of three-year averages over period prior to the year when the survey was conducted, if not specified otherwise below. Also using the three-year averages limits the extent of missing data, which is crucial in a sample containing many developing countries. Still missing information at the country level had to be estimated in some cases, which is explained for particular indicators below.

A natural starting point is to look at patterns of the micro dataset by country, which is revealed in Table 2. Surveys conducted in 28 countries are included in the sample, most of which are developing countries from different corners of the globe. Although the survey has been harmonized under the aegis of the World Bank, there are differences between the national datasets that need to be addressed. Since the survey was conducted in different years, we keep this in mind when constructing the country-level variables, so that we average different three-year periods depending of timing of the survey in the particular country. Another problem is that a closer look at the national questionnaires reveals some subtle modifications in particular phrasing of the

questions in different waves of the survey. To account for these differences, we GROUP countries along these lines, see the third column of the table, and include dummies for these groups into the regression estimate. [4]

---

[4] It should be stressed, however, that only countries with rather minor differences in the questionnaire were allowed to enter the analysis. For example, INNPDT refers to a question whether the firm has "Developed a major new product" in GROUP 1, "Developed successfully a major new product line/service" in GROUP 2 and "Developed a major new product line" in GROUP 3. Even more importantly this variable refers to the period over the last three years in GROUPs 1 and 2, but over the last two years in GROUP 3. A large group of countries mostly from Latin America, where the survey has been conducted in 2006, cannot be used because this version of the questionnaire used much broader phrasing of this question. Also data from earlier surveys conducted in Brazil, Philippines and China had to be excluded, and with a heavy heart, because the questionnaire was strictly speaking not comparable for various reasons. It should be further noted that another question in the survey provides information on whether firms "substantially changed the way the main product is produced", which broadly refers to process innovation. However, this question differs between countries to the extent which makes the data incomparable, and therefore we refrain from using this information.

Table 2: Overview of the dataset by country

Country	Year	GROUP	Obs.	INNPDT	GDPCAP
Cambodia	2003	1	503	0.54	1,819
Chile	2004	3	948	0.47	9,479
Ecuador	2003	1	453	0.52	3,343
Egypt	2004	3	977	0.15	3,625
El Salvador	2003	1	465	0.62	4,597
Germany	2005	2	1,196	0.18	26,134
Greece	2005	2	546	0.25	19,313
Guatemala	2003	1	455	0.53	4,044
Honduras	2003	1	450	0.47	2,878
Hungary	2005	2	610	0.28	14,836
India	2005	3	2,286	0.40	2,673
Indonesia	2003	3	713	0.38	2,980
Ireland	2005	2	501	0.39	32,666
Kazakhstan	2005	2	585	0.28	5,921
Korea	2005	2	598	0.38	18,271
Morocco	2004	1	850	0.25	3,815
Nicaragua	2003	1	452	0.47	3,158
Poland	2005	2	975	0.35	11,608
Portugal	2005	2	505	0.14	18,849
Romania	2005	2	600	0.32	7,193
Russia	2005	2	601	0.35	8,387
Saudi Arabia	2005	3	681	0.57	13,707
South Africa	2003	1	603	0.68	8,890
Spain	2005	2	606	0.29	23,107
Thailand	2004	3	1,385	0.50	6,722
Turkey	2005	3	1,323	0.36	6,610
Ukraine	2005	2	594	0.49	5,281
Vietnam	2005	2	500	0.21	2,412

Note: Number of observations used in the estimates differs across specifications of the model due to missing data for particular variables.
Source: Own computations based on World Bank (2003).

Another issue is whether the data is representative. Since we fully acknowledge this concern, we have included into the sample only national datasets with about five hundred and more observations. Even this could be seen as a relatively low number by some observers; in particular by those who have the fortune to analyse large CIS dataset. However, we should not judge this data by the European standards, because most of this sample comes from developing countries for which micro data on innovation is extremely scarce. And one can find plethora of papers in the literature based on samples of no more than several hundreds of firms, which implicitly claim to be representative to the context in question. After all, any better micro data on innovation for a reasonably large number of developing countries that would allow for

analysis in the multilevel framework is not likely to emerge anytime in the near future.[5]

Let us focus on the patterns of INNPDT by country. Less than 20% of firms innovated in Portugal, Egypt and Germany, but more than 55% of firms claimed to introduce a major new product in Saudi Arabia, El Salvador and South Africa. What makes firms in diverse countries like these similar in terms of innovativeness, and what can account for differences between them? Why do firms seem to be "in pain" to innovate in Egypt, but find themselves "at pains" to innovate in Saudi Arabia? And why on earth appear firms in the advanced EU member countries, with the notable exception of Ireland, among the least innovative according to this data? Such questions are at the core of the interest in this paper.

An important reason for the relatively high frequency of innovation in many developing countries, as already anticipated above, is that the INNPDT variable refers to products "new to the firm", but not necessarily new to others. Since firms in developing countries can benefit from diffusion of technologies developed in frontier countries, all else equal, they should be more likely to introduce "new to the firm" innovation. A large part of what is captured by the INNPDT variable arguably reflects "innovation through imitation", which of course, however, does not at all makes this information less relevant economically, quite the opposite, especially in the context of developing countries.

Before diving more deeply into explaining these differences in the econometric framework, let us therefore briefly examine patterns along development level of the country. As an overall measure, Table 2 provides information on GDP per capita in PPP (constant 2000 international USD), which refers to the GDPCAP variable in the following. From a cursory look at the data there seems to be a connection. Statistically speaking "unconditional" correlation between the propensity of firms to innovate and development of the country is -0.33, so that the potential for diffusion is relevant, but obviously not the only or perhaps not even the main explanation. Many other national factors seem to be in play, which is encouraging for the following search for them.

A natural starting point is to consider the quality of the national science, research and educational systems, which refer to the narrow delineation of the national innovation system by Nelson (1993). Availability of research infrastructure, like universities, R&D labs and a pool of researchers in the labour force, reduce costs and uncertainties associated with firm's innovative activities. Although some part of these resources is devoted to basic research, most of research in developing countries is arguably geared toward fostering the capacity to assimilate from abroad rather than the ability to generate new knowledge at the frontier. For example, Kim (1997) was well aware of this fact, so that he used the notions of technological capability and absorptive capacity interchangeably in the Korean context.

As measures of the national research infrastructure, we use a set of indicators that has been readily employed for this purpose in the literature (Furman, et al., 2002; Archibugi and Coco, 2004; Fagerberg, et al. 2007). ARTICLE refers to the number of

---

[5] Some developing countries have conducted surveys based on the CIS methodology (UNU-INTECH 2004), but access to micro data from these surveys is limited due to confidentiality and other reasons, which prevents pooling them together for the purpose of multilevel analysis.

scientific articles published in journals covered by Science Citation Index (SCI) and Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) per capita, which has been derived from the World Bank (2007). PATENT represents the number of international PCT (Patent Co-operation Treaty) patent applications per capita recorded in the WIPO database. GERD refers to expenditure on R&D as % of GDP, which have been gathered from various sources, including UNESCO, RICYT and World Bank (2007). For these indicators only the GERD data in Saudi Arabia must have been estimated.[6]

In addition, we consider two indicators equivalent to those that are used to capture technological capabilities at the firm level, which are expected to generate "network" externalities is the economy. ISO for which data has been derived directly from this international organization refers to the number of ISO 9000 certifications per capita, and is supposed to reflect quality of the local supply base (and also of the local business customers for that matter). INTERNET is the number of internet users per capita, which refers to people with access to the worldwide network, based on data from World Bank (2007). No missing data had to be estimated here.

Another important aspect is education, which is at the heart of what Abramovitz (1986) would refer to as social capabilities, represented by LITER, EDUSEC and EDUTER variables. LITER refers to the literacy rate in adult population (% of people ages 15 and above), while EDUSEC and EDUTER are gross enrolment rates in secondary and tertiary education respectively; all derived from UNESCO. Since there is a relatively low frequency of data on literacy, we use the latest year available for this indicator, and complement the information in few cases by estimates from various issues of the Human Development Report. EDUTER in Ecuador must have been estimated by average imputation. It would be preferable to have data on net (rather than gross) enrolments or even better on education attainment of the population, but this information is not available for many countries in the sample. Similarly data specifically on science and engineering education is unfortunately not widely available.

Much broader conditions than just these are likely to be relevant for innovation in the context of developing countries. For this purpose we extend the search to a battery of indicators that proxy for differences in various aspects of institutions, macroeconomic conditions and openness to inflow of foreign technology. Importance of these factors is often cited in the various streams of literature on technological catching-up (see Westphal, 2002; Fagerberg, Godinho, 2004 and Fagerberg, Srholec, 2006 for recent overviews) and by advocates of the broad perspective on national innovation systems (Lundvall, 1993; Edquist, 2004). Some aspects of these conditions, such as the effectiveness of defining and enforcing rules, have been also put forward in the later writings of Abramovitz (1994) on social capabilities.

A salient aspect of the national framework conditions that certainly concerns every profit-seeking entrepreneur is the income tax rate, which has direct implications for net (after-tax) rewards from innovation. Since the detrimental effect should increases

---

[6] Since information on R&D employment is available for Saudi Arabia, we have used this information to estimate the GERD figure, assuming that this is proportional to the relative position of the country in terms of R&D employment per capita. Although it might have been generally preferable to use information on R&D employment in the following, we use data on expenditure, because the former is missing for three other countries in the sample, so that more data would have to be imputed.

with more progressive taxation, TAXINC refers to the highest marginal tax rate, derived from World Bank (2007). It would be more relevant to use the "effective" tax rate, because tax deductions may offset the nominal tax rate, but this information is not available for this sample of countries.

Another relevant aspect of the institutional framework is certainly regulation of business, for which data from the "Doing Business" project in the World Bank, which directly follows from the conceptual work by Djankov, et al. (2002), Djankov, et al. (2003) and Botero, et al. (2004), comes very handy. Unfortunately repertoire of these indicators for us is constrained, because data for most of them exists only for the recent years. Still we have been able to derive three variables, for which the data stretch back to 2003. ENTRY refers to the number of days required for an entrepreneur to start up a business. EMPREG is the rigidity of employment index, which overviews rules for hiring, firing and employing workers. ENFORCE measures the number of days required to resolve a commercial dispute. For more details on definitions see World Bank (2005).

Furthermore, we take into account general "rules of the game" formalized in the national constitution. An unique overall measure that provides comparison among many countries is the POLITY2 index developed by Marshall and Jaggers (2003), which measures the degree of democracy versus autocracy on a Likert scale with 20 degrees (from -10 for autocratic to +10 for democratic constitution). To make a long story short, countries with "western" institutional framework rank high on the POLITY variable, while countries with constitutions that do not conform to the democratic ideals of the west get a low mark.

Although macroeconomic instability is not a serious matter of concern in most advanced countries, at least in the recent period, turbulences along these lines are an essential part of the picture in developing countries. Since innovation is already quite uncertain venture by the very definition of itself, anything in the environment that adds extra elements of uncertainty, such as the symptoms below, should influence appetite of firms for innovation. INFLAT reflects price stability, which is measured by geometric average of inflation based GDP deflator. EXRATE refers to coefficient of variation of the official exchange rate (LCU/USD). CURRACC is current account balance in % of GDP. FISCAL refers to balance of the government budget in % of GDP. UNEMP is the unemployment rate (% of total labor force). All of these indicators come from World Bank (2007), except of FISCAL that has been derived from the IMF (International Financial Statistics).

Finally, import of technology from abroad is often cited as an indispensable element of successful technological catch up. Many different channels of international technology transfer have been considered in the literature over the years, including trade, foreign direct investment, licensing, migration or collaboration on innovation. For a lack of data on the latter channels, we take into account only IMPORT, which refers to import of goods and services, and FDI, which is inflow of foreign direct investment; both in % of GDP. Since large economies for natural reasons trade/invest relatively more internally, we control for size of the country LNPOP given by log of population, if these variables are introduced in the estimate. IMPORT and LNPOP have been derived from World Bank (2007), whereas FDI comes from UNCTAD (Foreign Direct Investment database).

Although there is a straightforward theoretical distinction between the potential for diffusion and the "conditional" factors that determine whether this "great promise" is realized, another matter is to be actually able to distinguish between them empirically. All too many relevant indicators tend to be extremely correlated to GDPCAP and to each other, which makes it problematic to use them simultaneously in a regression estimate due to concerns about multicolinearity. A cursory look at correlations between the indicators considered above reveals that indeed this is a serious problem, especially for those that reflect quality on the national innovation system in the narrow sense. Since it is empirically impossible to disentangle between the effects of GDPCAP, ARTICLE, PATENT, GERD, ISO, WWW, LITER, EDUSEC and EDUTER, we follow Fagerberg, et al. (2007) and use factor analysis to construct an overall measure that can represent their joint impact.

Table 3 shows the results. All of the indicators are used in logs, partly because non-linearity in the potential for diffusion given by the technological level of the country is commonly assumed in the literature, and also because outliers in some variables have been detected, especially for those on per capita basis. Only one factor score with eigenvalue higher than one has been detected, which explains 74.4% of the total variance. So-called factor loadings, which are the correlation coefficients between the indicators (rows) and the principal factor (column), are reported in the upper part of the table. Since all of the indicators come out with high loadings, and many of them are actually even more direct measures of technology than the GDPCAP variable itself, we shall use the factor score on TECH that has been generated by this estimate as an overall measure of technological level of the country in the following.

Table 3: Results of the factor analysis

	TECH
GDPCAP	0.93
ARTICLE	0.94
PATENT	0.80
GERD	0.77
ISO	0.94
INTERNET	0.94
LITER	0.67
EDUSEC	0.87
EDUTER	0.87
Eigenvalue 1	6.69
Eigenvalue 2	0.58
Eigenvalue 3	0.29
Eigenvalue 4	0.11
Eigenvalue 5	0.04
Eigenvalue 6	-0.03
Eigenvalue 7	-0.04
Eigenvalue 8	-0.06
Eigenvalue 9	-0.08
% of total variance explained by the retained factor	74.4
Number of observations	28

6. Econometric analysis

The aim is to explain likelihood of firms to innovate by factors operating at the firm (i) and country (j) levels. $INNPDT_{ij}$ is the dependent variable. $SIZE_{ij}$, AGE_{ij} and a vector of the firm's capabilities $CAP_{ij} \in (R\&D_{ij}, PROF_{ij}, ISO_{ij}, WWW_{ij}$ and $TRAIN_{ij})$ are the level-1 predictors, while the potential for diffusion given by the position of the country where the firm is nested at the technological ladder $TECH_j$ and a vector of the conditional factors for exploiting this potential $CON_j \in (TAXINC_j, ENTRY_j, EMPREG_j, ENFORCE_j, POLITY_j, INFLAT_j, EXRATE_j, CURACC_j, FISCAL_j, UNEMP_j, LNPOP_j, IMPORT_j$ and $FDI_j)$ are the level-2 predictors. In addition, we control for sectoral patterns and differences in the questionnaire, as explained above, by including a set of relevant dummies $DUMMY_{ij} \in (SECTOR_{ij}, GROUP_{ij})$.

Let's assume, for the sake of the exposition, that CAP_{ij}, CON_j and $DUMMY_{ij}$ include only a single variable. Full specification of the model with a complete set of fixed and random effects is then as follows:

(5) Level-1 logit model:

$$E\,(INNPDT_{ij} = 1 \mid \beta_j) = \varphi_{ij}$$

$$Log\,[\varphi_{ij} / (1 - \varphi_{ij})] = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}SIZE_{ij} + \beta_{2j}AGE_{ij} + \beta_{3j}CAP_{ij} + \beta_{4j}DUMMY_{ij}$$

Level-2 model:

$$\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}TECH_j + \gamma_{02}CON_j + u_{0j}$$
$$\beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11}TECH_j + \gamma_{12}CON_j + u_{1j}$$
$$\beta_{2j} = \gamma_{20} + \gamma_{21}TECH_j + \gamma_{22}CON_j + u_{2j}$$
$$\beta_{3j} = \gamma_{30} + \gamma_{31}TECH_j + \gamma_{32}CON_j + u_{3j}$$
$$\beta_{4j} = \gamma_{40} + \gamma_{41}TECH_j + \gamma_{42}CON_j + u_{4j}$$

where there are level-1 fixed effects ($\gamma_{00}...\gamma_{40}$), level-2 fixed effects for the intercept (γ_{01} and γ_{02}), cross-level fixed effects ($\gamma_{11}...\gamma_{42}$) and random effects ($u_{0j}...u_{4j}$); of which γ_{00} is the estimated grand average of the log-odds of firms to innovate across countries, $\gamma_{10}...\gamma_{40}$ are the estimated averages of the firm-level slopes across countries, γ_{01} is the estimated effect of the position of the country at the technological ladder, γ_{02} refers to the effect of the other national predictors, $\gamma_{11}...\gamma_{42}$ capture the cross-level interactions between the firm- and country-level predictors, u_{0j} tells us that the intercept vary around the grand average between countries, and $u_{1j}...u_{4j}$ indicate that the slopes vary not only as a function of the predictors, but also as a function of a unique country effects.

A large number of cross-level fixed effects can emerge in the full specification, depending on the number of variables included in the CAP_{ij} and CON_j vectors, many of which are often not viable to estimate for concerns about reduced parsimony, degrees of freedom, problems of multicollinearity and their difficult interpretation. Nevertheless, this is just a general outline of the model, and there is a variety of reduced specifications that can be estimated for the particular research question in mind. For example, the so-called "intercept-as-outcome" model with only the intercept as a function of level-2 predictors, without considering any of the potentially numerous cross-level fixed effects, can be delineated. Since there is relatively limited number of countries in the sample, which constrains the number of parameters to be estimated, this is the strategy that we are going to follow. Also we do not allow the set of $SECTOR_{ij}$ and $GROUP_{ij}$ dummies to vary across countries, which helps us to greatly reduce the number of random effects without losing much content.

By focusing on the "intercept-as-outcome" model, we test the hypothesis that the various national characteristics directly influence the likelihood of firms to innovate. To improve interpretability of the results, we standardized the country-level predictors by deducting mean and dividing by standard deviation, so that these variables enter the estimate with mean of zero and standard deviation equal to one. Standardization of the variables implies that all of these predictors have meaningful zero-points, which simplifies meaning of the estimated parameters. Since standardization transforms the variables to a common scale of units of standard deviation, another advantage of this procedure is that magnitude of the estimated coefficients – so-called "beta" coefficients - can be directly compared between each other.

Table 4 gives the results. [7] Fixed effects are reported in the upper part, in two sets separately for the intercept and slopes, while random effects are in the lower part of the table.[8] Since it is often illuminating to start with a basic specification and then extend the model by adding more predictors, so that we can observe how the model behaves, we include the country-level variables in three steps. Along with $TECH_j$, which is indispensable in the model as a measure of the potential for diffusion, in the first column we include the variables that reflect institutions, in the second column we add the set of variables that captures the macroeconomic conditions, and finally in the third column we extend the model by the variables on openness to imports and foreign direct investment. After considering the full set of predictors, we reduce the country-level variables to only those that came out statistically significant at conventional levels, which delineates the "best" model in the fourth column.

[7] A specialized statistical software Hierarchical Linear and Non-linear Modeling (HLM) version 6.04 was used to estimate the equations. See Raudenbush, et al. (2004) for details on the estimation procedure.
[8] For the sake of space, we do not report the estimated fixed effects of the $SECTOR_{ij}$ and $GROUP_{ij}$ dummies, which do not merit much interest here, but we indicate in the table whether these are included or not.

Table 4: Econometric results

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Fixed Effects:				
For intercept$_{ij}$ (β_{0j})				
Intercept$_{ij}$ (γ_{00})	-0.97 (0.19)***	-1.02 (0.16)***	-1.01 (0.18)***	-1.12 (0.15)***
TECH$_j$ (γ_{01})	-0.42 (0.14)***	-0.41 (0.14)***	-0.40 (0.18)**	-0.26 (0.11)**
TAXINC$_j$ (γ_{02})	-0.38 (0.09)***	-0.28 (0.07)***	-0.38 (0.08)***	-0.36 (0.06)***
ENTRY$_j$ (γ_{03})	-0.15 (0.08)*	-0.15 (0.06)**	-0.15 (0.07)**	-0.13 (0.06)**
EMPREG$_j$ (γ_{04})	-0.03 (0.08)	-0.09 (0.07)	-0.00 (0.08)	..
ENFORCE$_j$ (γ_{05})	-0.08 (0.07)	-0.13 (0.06)*	-0.01 (0.09)	..
POLITY$_j$ (γ_{06})	0.48 (0.09)***	0.64 (0.08)***	0.59 (0.09)***	0.59 (0.07)***
INFLAT$_j$ (γ_{07})	..	-0.20 (0.06)***	-0.18 (0.06)**	-0.16 (0.05)***
EXRATE$_j$ (γ_{08})	..	-0.21 (0.08)**	-0.20 (0.08)**	-0.23 (0.07)***
CURACC$_j$ (γ_{09})	..	0.18 (0.07)**	0.17 (0.08)*	0.18 (0.06)***
FISCAL$_j$ (γ_{010})	..	-0.05 (0.06)	0.09 (0.08)	..
UNEMP$_j$ (γ_{011})	..	0.27 (0.07)***	0.34 (0.07)***	0.29 (0.06)***
LNPOP$_j$ (γ_{012})	..	..	-0.12 (0.09)	..
IMPORT$_j$ (γ_{013})	..	..	0.22 (0.11)*	0.19 (0.06)***
FDI$_j$ (γ_{014})	..	..	-0.10 (0.08)	..
For slopes$_{ij}$ ($\beta_{1j} \dots \beta_{7j}$)				
SIZE$_{ij}$ (γ_{10})	0.07 (0.02)***	0.07 (0.02)***	0.07 (0.02)***	0.07 (0.02)***
AGE$_{ij}$ (γ_{20})	-0.12 (0.04)***	-0.12 (0.04)***	-0.12 (0.04)***	-0.12 (0.04)***
R&D$_{ij}$ (γ_{30})	0.63 (0.07)***	0.64 (0.07)***	0.63 (0.07)***	0.63 (0.07)***
PROF$_{ij}$ (γ_{40})	0.61 (0.20)***	0.63 (0.20)***	0.63 (0.20)***	0.63 (0.20)***
ISO$_{ij}$ (γ_{50})	0.64 (0.12)***	0.64 (0.12)***	0.64 (0.12)***	0.65 (0.13)***
WWW$_{ij}$ (γ_{60})	0.39 (0.07)***	0.39 (0.07)***	0.39 (0.07)***	0.38 (0.07)***
SKILL$_{ij}$ (γ_{70})	0.39 (0.06)***	0.38 (0.06)***	0.38 (0.06)***	0.38 (0.06)***
SECTOR$_{ij}$ dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
GROUP$_{ij}$ dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Random effects:				
Intercept$_{ij}$ (u_{0j})	0.42 (86.3)***	0.22 (62.6)***	0.22 (56.7)***	0.21 (60.8)***
SIZE$_{ij}$ slope (u_{1j})	0.01 (53.8)***	0.01 (53.5)***	0.01 (53.6)***	0.01 (53.4)***
AGE$_{ij}$ slope (u_{2j})	0.02 (57.9)***	0.02 (57.9)***	0.02 (57.9)***	0.02 (57.9)***
R&D$_{ij}$ slope (u_{3j})	0.05 (44.2)**	0.05 (44.1)**	0.05 (44.0)**	0.05 (44.0)**
PROF$_{ij}$ slope (u_{4j})	0.55 (47.6)***	0.47 (47.6)***	0.50 (47.5)***	0.47 (47.4)***
ISO$_{ij}$ slope (u_{5j})	0.31 (125.7)***	0.31 (125.2)***	0.31 (125.1)***	0.32 (125.7)***
WWW$_{ij}$ slope (u_{6j})	0.07 (59.2)***	0.07 (59.2)***	0.07 (59.0)***	0.06 (58.9)***
SKILL$_{ij}$ slope (u_{7j})	0.05 (49.0)***	0.05 (48.9)***	0.05 (49.0)***	0.05 (48.9)***
Index of dispersion	0.983	0.984	0.985	0.985
Level-1 firms	15,818	15,818	15,818	15,818
Level-2 countries	28	28	28	28

Note: Non-linear unit-specific model with the logit link function; restricted maximum likelihood (PQL) estimate; coefficients and standard errors in brackets reported for the fixed effects; variance components and Chi-square in brackets reported for the random effects; *, **, *** denote significance at the 10, 5 and 1 percent levels.

But let us first look at fixed effects ($\gamma_{10} \dots \gamma_{70}$) of the firm-level predictors. All of them are highly statistically significant and with the expected signs, which is reassuring,

because this confirms that the PICS dataset provides reliable information on these variables. As already discussed above, $SIZE_{ij}$ has a positive sign, because larger firms with many product lines are by design more likely to appear with at least one innovated product; apart from all of the other obvious advantages of scale. Similarly, the definition of the dependent variable should be primarily seen behind the negative coefficient of AGE_{ij}, because new (and therefore younger) firms are by principle more likely to introduce "new to the firm" products after they enter the business. Another reason why the negative effect of AGE_{ij} prevails might be that we account for much of firm's technological capabilities that become accumulated over time by inclusion of the other variables.

$R\&D_{ij}$ comes out with positive and highly significant coefficient, so that this aspect of technological capabilities is actually fairly relevant in the context of developing countries. It would be extremely surprising to find otherwise indeed, and therefore perhaps more substantial finding is that magnitude of the $R\&D_{ij}$ coefficient is similar to the effects of $PROF_{ij}$ and ISO_{ij}, and not that far from the effects of WWW_{ij} and $SKILL_{ij}$. R&D capabilities of firms clearly matter, but they are not the only and even not necessarily the most important input into the innovation process, especially if we consider a joint effect of the other aspects of capabilities. Just like the literature on developing countries discussed above predicts (Kim, 1980; Dahlman, et al., 1987; Lall, 1992; Bell and Pavitt, 1993; Kim, 1997), multiple facets of firm's technological capabilities appear to be associated to innovation. Not much has changed across the different columns, which indicates that results of the firm-level predictors are robust to specification of the country-level part of the model.

Let us now turn to the effects ($\gamma_{01}...\gamma_{014}$) of the country-level predictors, which are at the core of interest in this paper. As already explained above, output of the factor analysis $TECH_j$ accounts for the potential for diffusion given by the extent of technology gap with regards to the frontier countries, which is inverse to value of the factor score, and therefore we expect negative coefficient of this variable. And this interpretation is strongly supported by the estimate. Advantages of latecomers in "innovation through imitation" for firms nested in countries behind the technological frontier are clearly reflected in results of the $TECH_j$ variable, even if the other predictors, including the firm-level effects, are taken into account in the multilevel framework.

All of the other country-level predictors included in the first column, namely $TAXINC_j$, $ENTRY_j$, $EMPREG_j$, $ENFORCE_j$ and $POLITY_j$, came out with expected signs, but not all of them appear to be statistically significant at conventional levels. Not surprisingly, the detrimental effect of $TAXINC_j$ on the propensity of firms to innovate is supported by the results. A high score of a country in $POLITY_j$ that indicates democratic constitution is also significantly associated to innovation in firms. Arguably hierarchy in organization of the society, which is reflected in the constitutional rules, is not favourable environment. Autocracy not only curtails diversification of knowledge, and therefore creation of new ideas, but even more importantly their diffusion in the society, which is essential for innovation.

Somewhat less important, but at least weakly statistically significant appears to be the regulation of $ENTRY_j$, although the significance level increases a notch in the subsequent estimates Less time required to start a new business should obviously have

a positive impact. On one hand low barriers to entry should facilitate inflow of new innovative firms, which in turn provides competition effect on the existing firms and therefore stimulates their innovative efforts.

$EMPRIG_j$ did not come out with even weakly significant coefficient in any of the estimates, which suggests that rigidity (or flexibility) of the labour market regulation does not matter. Looking from the "varieties of capitalism" perspective (Hall and Soskice, 2001) this outcome actually makes sense, because according to this literature different systems of labour market regulation, among other things, might produce equally good outcomes in terms of innovation and ultimately productivity. Another and much simpler explanation is of course that the $EMPRIG_j$ composite index does not exactly measure what it is supposed to, but to our best knowledge there is not other measure of this kind that could be tested against this result in the estimate.

Even more consideration is necessary to understand the outcome for $ENFORCE_j$, which indicates that enforcement of contracts has if any rather limited effect, but this is feasible too. Again, one should not forget that the dependent variable $INNPDT_{ij}$ is essentially a measure of technology diffusion, which might be hindered by strong enforcement of property rights; especially as far as intellectual property rights are concerned, for which unfortunately there is no direct indicator that could be used in the estimate. Also note the argument made by Schumpeter (1934) quoted in full above that the existing legal framework often favours the past winners over innovators. Of course, nobody here wants to deny positive effects of smooth enforcement of contracts or anything of this sort. It well might be, however, that the positive effects on facilitating exchange of knowledge in the society tend to be counterbalanced by the potential negative consequences just explained above.

Second, we add the battery of variables on macroeconomic conditions given by $INFLAT_j$, $EXRATE_j$, $CURACC_j$, $FISCAL_j$ and $UNEMP_j$ in the estimate. Macroeconomic instability, represented by inflation $INFLAT_j$ and volatility of the exchange rate $EXRATE_j$, came out with negative and statistically significant coefficients and therefore there is reasonable support for the argument that uncertainty about these nominal parameters undermines innovative efforts of firms. Anybody who has ever attempted to make a budget of an innovation project that often requires rather long horizon in times of macroeconomic turmoil understands what this is about. Although research on innovation does not pay much attention to these factors, because most of the literature remains focused on advanced countries, where serious macroeconomic instability is rather rare, the results suggest that these factors certainly should not be neglected in the context of developing countries.

$CURACC_j$ came out significant, whereas $FISCAL_j$ does not seem to matter. Although external and fiscal deficits spiralling out of control typically hallmark the path to a monetary crisis, these conditions do not seem to have an immediate negative effect on innovation in firms. Actually even the opposite is the case for the current account deficit, which reflects the need of technologically catching-up economies to use more resources than they generate, at least at early stages of development. Since overall external balance is determined by flows of money, this should not be a serious problem even for a prolonged period, if the country manages to finance the current account deficit with inflow of financial capital from abroad; preferably of a non-debt nature such as foreign direct investment. And this arguably points to the role of

openness for innovation that is going to be further investigated below.

Another positive and statistically significant effect has been detected for $UNEMP_j$, which at the first glance might seem counterintuitive. However, idle resources should be easier for grab in the innovation projects that often involve launching of new production facility, compared to a situation when the firm needs to poach labour from existing use. At a deeper level, a society that suffers from high unemployment should be more open to new solutions and the existing elites should be in a weaker position to impediment change, so that from Schumpeter's viewpoint the "entrepreneur" should be in a better position to overcome the underlying resistance to innovation.

Third, we extend the model by the $IMPORT_j$ and FDI_j variables of inward openness and control for size of the country by adding $LNPOP_j$ along the way. Import of goods and services $IMPORT_j$ comes out with a positive and weakly statistically significant coefficient, whereas inflow of FDI_j inflow does not seem to be relevant. It should be mentioned that we have also tested a variable of inward stock (not only current inflow) of FDI (in % of GDP) with very similar results. Accounting for $LNPOP_j$ does not seem to matter, at least as far as coefficient of this variable is concerned. A cursory comparison with the previous estimates reveals that not much has changed in magnitude and statistical significance of the other coefficients, except of $ENFORCE_j$ that tends to be sensitive, but otherwise the results are robust to the different specifications.

As anticipated above, finally, the last column presents the "best" model, which includes only the statistically significant explanatory factors of differences in the propensity of firms to innovate. Since non-significant variables do not really contribute much to the model, and there is relatively low number of countries in the sample, reduction in the number of coefficients improves accuracy and efficiency of the estimate. Nevertheless, the results are not much affected, except that statistical significance of the incumbent variables increases. Moreover, we do not estimate the "best" model solely for technical reasons, but also for the purpose of more detailed examination of the predictions, as shall be seen just below.

It should be stressed, furthermore, that the results do not suffer from a serious problem of multicollinearity, neither among the firm- or country-level predictors. Among the firm-level predictors the correlation coefficient never exceeds 0.40, which confirms that these variables capture distinct characteristics of firms. A brief look at the correlation table between the country-level predictors, not reported for the sake of space here, reveals that the main suspects which could cause some problems are the correlation coefficient of 0.63 between $IMPORT_j$ and FDI_j, and to a lesser extent the correlation coefficient of 0.53 between $LNPOP_j$ and $CURACC_j$, but a closer examination of the results with this in mind revealed that the results are not seriously biased by overlap between these variables. Any other correlation coefficient between any pair of the country-level predictors does not exceed 0.50.[9]

---

[9] Every student of macroeconomics should put forward that $INFLAT_j$ and $EXRATE_j$, but also $CURACC_j$, $FISCAL_j$ and $UNEMP_j$ are intertwined to a large degree, but this is not supported by the facts, at least in this sample, because correlation between these variables is rather low.

So far we have focused only on the fixed effects. Country-level random effects are reported in the lower part of the table.[10] As envisaged by the multilevel nature of the model, the error term is split into multiple components. All of the random effects are statistically significant at conventional levels, which confirms that there are paramount differences across countries in the likelihood of firms to innovate but also in how the firm-level effects translate into this propensity. Ideally, the random effect for the intercept, which refers to the unexplained variability of firm's innovativeness across countries, should not come out significant after including the country-level predictors. Although a sizeable part of the unexplained variance has been accounted for, note that the magnitude decreased from 0.64 in a model that would have no country-level predictors to 0.42 in the first column and down to 0.21 in the last column; the residual unfortunately remains statistically significant.

At least partly the reason for this could be the relatively low number of countries in the sample, which constrains precision of the estimate. It is important to mention this reservation, even though we use the restricted maximum likelihood procedure, which should be more robust to reduced degrees of freedom than the full maximum likelihood estimate (Goldstein, 2003). Apart from including data for more countries, which is not possible given the dataset in hand, there is little we can do about this. Another caveat that needs to be aired here is that the chi-square test of the residuals should be interpreted with caution because the variances are bounded at zero, so that their distributions are not normal, whereas we generally expect them to be non-zero, and therefore the meaning of their significance test is not the same as for an ordinary variable (Luke, 2004, pg. 32). It is therefore more sensible to interpret (and compare between estimates) their magnitude rather than significance.[11]

Another diagnostic measure of multilevel models that has not been discussed yet is the so-called index of dispersion. Although logit multilevel models do not have a separate term for the level-1 error, we can calculate a level-1 error variance scaling factor that measures the extent to which the observed errors follow the theoretical binomial error distribution (Luke 2004, pg. 57). Index of dispersion equal to 1 indicates perfect fit between the observed errors and the theoretical assumptions. A significant over- or under-dispersion indicates model misspecification, the presence of outliers or the exclusion of an important level in the model. Less than 5% dispersion is usually seen as satisfactory, which is the case here, so that the estimates do not suffer from a major problem.

To further illuminate implications of the analysis, we compute the predicted probabilities of firms to innovate based on results of the "best" model in selected situations. Table 5 shows this exercise. Firms with different technological capabilities, given by scores on the variables in the CAP_{ij} vector, delineate rows of the table. We distinguish three situations: 1) $Min(CAP_{ij})$ refers to an "uncapable" firm with zero scores on technological capabilities; 2) $Mean(CAP_{ij})$ denotes a typical firm with mean scores; and 3) $Max(CAP_{ij})$ refers to a top firm, which nurtures all of the technological

---

[10] Since the HLM (version 6.04) package assumes that the variances may not be normally distributed, a chi-square test of the residuals is performed (Raudenbush, et al. 2004).

[11] For this reason some statistical packages, such as R or S-plus, do not even report any significance tests for the random part of the model.

capabilities taken into account here.[12] Alternative specifications of the country, given by the factor score on $TECH_j$ and scores on the CON_j vector of the other national conditions, are in columns. Apart from mean scores on these, we report the worst and best countries: 1) Cambodia at the bottom of the technology ladder with the lowest score on $TECH_j$; 2) Ireland at the technological frontier with the highest score on $TECH_j$; 3) Egypt with the less favourable combination of CON_j; and 4) Poland that provides the most favourable combination of CON_j. Everything else is hold constant on average.

Table 5: Selected predictions of the econometric estimate

		$Min(CAP_{ij})$	$Mean(CAP_{ij})$	$Max(CAP_{ij})$
$Mean(TECH_j)$	$Mean(CON_j)$	22.7	37.0	75.5
$Cambodia(TECH_j)$	$Mean(CON_j)$	35.0	51.9	85.0
$Ireland(TECH_j)$	$Mean(CON_j)$	16.7	28.7	67.8
$Mean(TECH_j)$	$Egypt(CON_j)$	6.6	12.4	42.7
$Mean(TECH_j)$	$Poland(CON_j)$	43.1	60.4	88.9

A number of implications come out instantly. First, firms have a lot about innovation in their own hands. All else equal to average, the estimated probability to innovate is 22.7% for a firm with the minimum technological capabilities, but 75.5% for the top firm. Second, this is not the full story, however, because the national environment also matters considerably. An otherwise average firm nested in Cambodia comes out with the probability to innovate by 23.3 percentage points higher than the same firm nested in Ireland; just thanks to the higher potential for imitation. Even more difference seems to make the joint effect of the other national conditions. A firm embedded in the Polish framework is estimated to be by 48 percentage points more likely to innovate than the same firm operating under the Egyptian conditions; holding all other factors constant. Just to give concrete examples how multilevel modeling can be used to derive insights about impact of factors operating at different levels.

7. Conclusions

The aim of this paper was to illustrate how empirical research on innovation can benefit from multilevel modeling. Using the multilevel approach we have shown that it is possible to use quantitative econometric methods to directly test hypotheses on impact of the national framework conditions on likelihood of firms to innovate. Multilevel modeling appears to be a promising new item in the tool box of research on innovation, which should allow us to formally test complex predictions of the contextual theories of innovation.

---

[12] For the $max(CAP_{ij})$ category the upper value of $PROF_{ij}$ has been truncated at 50% of employment. Although some firms can consists only of professionals (and managers), and indeed observations with this characteristics appear in the sample, apart from special circumstances, employment of only professional is not feasible strategy in most kinds of trades; and therefore not a meaningful situation to consider here.

A typical approach that remains most prevalent in the empirical literature is to ignore the hierarchical nature of innovation. Although there are many relevant hypotheses that are within any of the levels of analysis, there is a host of issues that require to consider relations between them. Arguably this "unit of analysis" problem might be elegantly resolved, at least in empirical research, by explicit multilevel modeling of innovation that would use micro data to study the interaction between firms and their surroundings, such as sectoral, regional and national innovation systems.

Although we have constrained ourselves only to the "intercept-as-outcome" multilevel model in this paper, there is a variety of specifications that can be estimated. A straightforward extension is to consider the various cross-level interaction terms between the firm- and higher-level predictors, which could not have been done here due to limits of the data. Another possible avenue for further extension of the model is to delineate more complicated hierarchical structure. For example, we can specify 3-level models with firms in regions within countries or so-called cross-classified models with firms simultaneously nested in sectors and countries. All that matters is access to suitable data, which unfortunately remains scarce.

At last but not least, policy makers should understand and utilize the potential of multilevel modeling. Some general implications have been already derived from the results presented here; however it should be emphasized that the main purpose of this paper was to highlight a promising direction for future research, rather than offer concrete guidance for policy. Since we have relatively small number of countries in the sample, the results could be sensitive to composition of the sample. Further research on even more extensive datasets is clearly needed to confirm these findings in order to safely offer practical policy recommendations.

References

Abramovitz, M. (1986) Catching Up, Forging Ahead, and Falling Behind. *Journal of Economic History*, 46, 386-406.

Abramovitz, M. (1994) The Origins of the Post-war Catch-Up and Convergence Boom, in Fagerberg, J., Verspagen, B., von Tunzelman, N. (eds), *The Dynamics of Technology, Trade and Growth*. Edward Elgar: Aldershot, 21-52.

Almeida, R., Fernandes, A. M. (2006) Openness and Technological Innovations in Developing Countries: Evidence from Firm-Level Surveys. Washington D.C: World Bank, Policy Research Working Paper 3985.

Archibugi, D., Coco, A. (2004) A new indicator of technological capabilities for developed and developing countries (ArCo). *World Development*, 32, 629-654.

Bell, M., Pavitt, K. (1993) Technological Accumulation and Industrial Growth: Contrasts between Developed and Developing Countries. *Industrial Corporate Change*, 2, 157-210.

Blalock, H.M. (1984) Contextual-Effects Models: Theoretical and Methodological Issues. *Annual Review of Sociology,* 10, 353-372.

Botero, J. C., Djankov, S., La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A. (2004) The Regulation of Labor. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 119, 1339-1382.

Burstein, L. (1980) The Analysis of Multilevel Data in Educational Research and Evaluation. *Review of Research in Education*, 8, 158-223.

Clausen, T. (2008) Search Pathways to Innovation. TIK Working Paper on Innovation Studies No.20080311, Centre for Technology, Innovation and Culture (TIK), University of Oslo, Oslo.

Dahlman, C.J., Ross-Larson, B., Westphal, L. (1987) Managing technological development. Lessons from the newly industrialized countries. *World Development*, 15, 759-775.

Djankov, S., La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A. (2002) The Regulation of Entry. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117, 1-37.

Djankov, S., La Porta, R., Lopez-de-Silanes, F., Shleifer, A. (2003) Courts. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118, 453-517.

Draper, D. (1995) Inference and hierarchical modeling in the social sciences. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, 20, 115-148.

Edquist, C. (1997) *Systems of Innovation: Technologies, Institutions and Organizations*. Pinter: London.

Edquist, C. (2004) Systems of Innovation: Perspectives and Challenges, in Fagerberg, J., Mowery, D., Nelson, R. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 181-208.

Evangelista, R., Iammarino, S., Mastrostefano, V. and Silvani, A. (2002) Looking for Regional Systems of Innovation: Evidence from the Italian Innovation Survey, *Regional Studies*, 36, 173-186.

Fagerberg, J. (1987) A Technology Gap Approach to Why Growth Rates Differ. *Research Policy*, 16, 87-99.

Fagerberg, J., Godinho, M. M. (2004) Innovation and Catching-up, in Fagerberg, J., Mowery, D., Nelson, R. (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 514-544.

Fagerberg, J. and Srholec, M. (2006) Why some countries develop (while other stay poor): The role of "capabilities" in development. Proceedings from the 4th Globelics Conference on "Innovation Systems for Competitiveness and Shared

Prosperity in Developing Countries", Trivandrum, India.

Fagerberg, J., Srholec, M., Knell., M. (2007) The Competitiveness of Nations: Why Some Countries Prosper While Others Fall Behind. *World Development*, 35, 1595-1620.

Figueiredo, P. N. (2006) Introduction. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 36, 1-13.

Furman, J. L., Porter, M. E., Stern, S. (2002) The determinants of national innovative capacity. *Research Policy*, 31, 899-933.

Gerschenkron, A. (1962) *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective*. The Belknap Press: Cambridge(MA).

Goedhuys, M. (2007) Learning, product innovation, and firm heterogeneity in developing countries: Evidence from Tanzania. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 16, 269-292.

Goldstein, H. (2003) *Multilevel Statistical Models*. Arnold: London.

Griffith, R., Huergo, E., Mairesse, J., Peters, B. (2006) Innovation and productivity across four European countries. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 22, 483-498.

Hall, P., Soskice, D. (2001) *Varieties of Capitalism: The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.

Hobday, M. (1995) East Asian latecomer firms, *World Development*, 23, 1171-1193.

Hox, J. (2002) *Multilevel Analysis*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.: Mahwah (New Jersey).

Janz, N., Lööf, H., Peters, B. (2004), Firm-Level Innovation and Productivity - Is there a Common Story across Countries? *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 184-204.

Kim L., (1980) Stages of development of industrial technology in a developing country: a model. *Research Policy*, 9, 254-277.

Kim, L. (1997) *Imitation to Innovation: The Dynamics of Korea's Technological Learning*, Harvard Business School Press: Harvard.

Lall, S. (1992) Technological capabilities and industrialization, *World Development*, 20, 165-186.

Luke, A. (2004) *Multilevel Modeling*. Sage Publications: London.

Lundvall, B. Å. (1992) *National Systems of Innovation: Towards a Theory of Innovation and Interactive Learning*. Pinter Publishers: London.

Marshall, M. G., Jaggers, K., 2003. Polity IV Dataset (Computer file; version p4v2003), Center for International Development and Conflict Management, College Park (MD), University of Maryland.

Mohnen P. and Röller L.-H. (2005) Complementarities in innovation policy, *European Economic Review*, 49, 1431-1450.

Mohnen, P., Mairesse, J., Dagenais, M. (2006) Innovativity: A comparison across seven European countries. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, 15, 391-413.

Nelson, R. R, Winter, G. W. (1982) *An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge (MA).

Nelson, R., (1993) *National Innovation Systems: A Comparative Analysis*. Oxford University Press: New York.

OECD (1997) *Oslo Manual*. 2nd edition. OECD: Paris.

OECD (2005) *Oslo Manual*. 3rd edition. OECD: Paris.

Raudenbush, S., Bryk, A., Cheong, Y. F., Congdon, R., du Toit, M. (2004) *HLM 6: Hierarchical Linear and Nonlinear Modeling*. Scientific Software International: Lincolnwood.

Schumpeter, J. (1934) *The Theory of Economic Development*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge (MA).

Srholec, M. (2007) A multilevel approach to geography of innovation. University of Oslo, TIK Working Paper on Innovation Studies 20071010, for download at http://ideas.repec.org/s/tik/inowpp.html.

UNU-INTECH (2004) Designing a policy-relevant innovation survey for NEPAD. UNU-INTECH: Maastricht.

van den Eeden, P.,Hüttner, H.J.M. (1982) A Short History of Multi-Level Research. *Current Sociology*, 30, 9-25.

Verspagen, B. (1991) A New Empirical Approach to Catching up or Falling Behind. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 2, 359-380.

Westphal, L. E. (2002) Technology strategies for economic development in a fast changing global economy. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, 11, 275-320.

World Bank (2003) Productivity and Investment Climate Survey (PICS): Implementation Manual. World Bank: New York.

World Bank (2005) Doing Business Indicators. World Bank: New York.

World Bank (2007) World Development Indicators 2007. World Bank: New York.

The UNU-MERIT WORKING Paper Series

2008-01 *Science, Technology and Development: Emerging concepts and visions* by Luc Soete

2008-02 *Reframing technical change: Livestock Fodder Scarcity Revisited as Innovation Capacity Scarcity. Part 1. A Review of Historical and Recent Experiences* by Andy Hall, Rasheed Sulaiman V., Mona Dhamankar, Peter Bezkorowajnyj & Leela Prasad

2008-03 *Reframing technical change: Livestock Fodder Scarcity Revisited as Innovation Capacity Scarcity. Part 2. A Framework for Analysis* by Andy Hall, Rasheed Sulaiman, V. and Peter Bezkorowajnyj

2008-04 *Reframing technical change: Livestock Fodder Scarcity Revisited as Innovation Capacity Scarcity.Part 3. Tools for Diagnosis and Institutional Change in Innovation Systems* by Andy Hall, Rasheed Sulaiman and Peter Bezkorowajnyj

2008-05 *Is Inter-Firm Labor Mobility a Channel of Knowledge Spillovers? Evidence from a Linked Employer-Employee Panel* by Mika Maliranta, Pierre Mohnen & Petri Rouvinen

2008-06 *Financial Constraints and Other Obstacles:Are they a Threat to Innovation Activity?* By P. Mohnen, F.C. Palm, S. Schim van der Loeff and A. Tiwari

2008-07 *Knowledge-based productivity in 'low-tech' industries: evidence from firms in developing countries* by Micheline Goedhuys, Norbert Janz and Pierre Mohnen

2008-08 *The Voyage of the Beagle in Innovation Systems Land.Explorations on Sectors, Innovation, Heterogeneity and Selection* by Martin Srholec & Bart Verspagen

2008-09 *Crafting Firm Competencies to Improve Innovative Performance* by Boris Lokshin, Anita van Gils & Eva Bauer

2008-10 *The Economics and Psychology of Personality Traits* by Lex Borghans, Angela Lee Duckworth, James J. Heckman & Bas ter Weel

2008-11 *Embedding Research in Society: Development Assistance Options for Supporting Agricultural Innovation in a Global Knowledge Economy* by Andy Hall

2008-12 *Playing in Invisible Markets: Innovations in the Market for Toilets to Harness the Economic Power of the Poor* by Shyama V. Ramani

2008-13 *Explaining Success and Failure in Development* by Adam Szirmai

2008-14 *Running The Marathon* by William Cowan, Robin Cowan and Patrick Llerena

2008-15 *Productivity effects of innovation, stress and social relations* by Rifka Weehuizen, Bulat Sanditov and Robin Cowan

2008-16 *Entrepreneurship and Innovation Strategies in ICT SMEs in Enlarged Europe (EU25)* by Kaushalesh Lal and Theo Dunnewijk

2008-17 *Knowledge Transfers between Canadian Business Enterprises and Universities: Does Distance Matter?* By Julio M. Rosa & Pierre Mohnen

2008-36 *Radical versus non-radical inventions* by Wilfred Schoenmakers, Geert Duysters & Wim Vanhaverbeke

2008-37 *Localized Innovation, Localized Diffusion and the Environment: An Analysis of CO_2 Emission Reductions by Passenger Cars, 2000-2007* by Bart Los and Bart Verspagen

2008-38 *The economic impact of AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa* by Théophile T. Azomahou, Raouf Boucekkine, Bity Diene

2008-39 *Further results on bias in dynamic unbalanced panel data models with an application to firm R&D investment* by Boris Lokshin

2008-40 *A multilevel analysis of innovation in developing countries* by Martin Srholec