PUBLIC AND PRIVATE FINANCING OF INNOVATION:

Assessing constraints, selection process and firm performance

Anabela MARQUES SANTOS

Thèse présentée en vue de l'obtention du grade de

Docteur en sciences économiques et de gestion

Année Académique 2018-2019

Université libre de Bruxelles

Solvay Brussels School of Economics and Management

International Centre for Innovation, Technology and Education Studies (iCite) & Centre Emile Bernheim (CEB)

Anabela SANTOS

Université libre de Bruxelles

Solvay Brussels School of Economics and Management

Av. FD. Roosevelt, 50 - CP146

B-1050 Bruxelles – BELGIUM

Email: asantos@ulb.ac.be

Membres du Jury

Directeur de Thèse	Prof. Michele CINCERA (Université libre de Bruxelles, BE)
Autres membres du Jury	Prof. Bruno VAN POTTELSBERGHE (Université libre de Bruxelles, BE) Prof. Julien RAVET (Université libre de Bruxelles, BE) Prof. Pierre MOHNEN (Maastricht University, NL) Prof. Maria Luisa MANCUSI (Università Cattolica, IT)

Acknowledgments

First of all, I express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Michele Cincera for the support and assistance over the four years of my research project. I also want to thank Prof. Henri Capron who suggested I should contact Prof. Michele Cincera to be my supervisor. My thanks go also to Prof. Paulo Neto from Universidade de Évora (Portugal) and Prof. Maria Manuel Serrano from Universidade de Évora (Portugal), co-authors in Chapter 3, and Dr. Giovanni Cerulli (IRCrES – CNR, National Research Council of Italy), co-author in Chapter 5. Financial support from Université libre de Bruxelles and European Commission under H2020 is gratefully acknowledged. Special thanks go also to the members of the jury, Prof. Maria Luisa Mancusi (Università Cattolica), Prof. Pierre Mohnen (Maastricht University), Prof. Bruno van Pottelsberghe (Université libre de Bruxelles) and Prof. Julien Ravet (Université libre de Bruxelles), for the valuable comments received in the private defence.

All the work developed in the thesis has been presented and discussed at several conferences, workshops, internal iCite seminars and I3U project meetings. Earlier versions of **Chapter 2** have benefited from the comments of Dr. Marius Berger from the University of Mannheim and participants in the 7th ZEW/MaCCI Conference (Mannheim, Germany), CONCORDi 2017 (Seville, Spain) and 22éme Congrés des Economistes (Brussels, Belgium). **Chapter 3** received constructive remarks from Mr. Peter Berkowitz (DG-Regio), Mr. Wolfgang Petzold (Committee of the Regions), Prof. Frank Crowley (University College Cork), Prof. Oto Potluka (University of Basel), Prof. Joaquim Ramalho (ISCTE Business School), Prof. Esmeralda Ramalho (ISEG - Lisbon School of Economics & Management) and the two anonymous referees of *Portuguese Economic Journal*, as well as from the participants in the 24th APDR Workshop 2016 (Lisbon, Portugal) and in the RSA Workshop 2016 (Brussels, Belgium). **Chapter 4** received valuable suggestions from Prof. Hugues Pirotte (Université libre de Bruxelles), Dr.Giovanni Cerulli (IRCrES – CNR, National Research Council of Italy), Prof. Adão Carvalho (Universidade de Évora), Enrique Pinzon (StataCorp) and the two anonymous referees of *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, as well as from the participants in the 1st Master and Doctoral Consortium for Research on Public Policy 2016 (Évora, Portugal) and in CONCORDi 2017 (Seville, Spain). In **Chapter 5** valuable remarks were received from the participants of Spring of Innovation 2018 (Rome, Italy), namely from Prof. Bianca Potì (IRCrES – CNR, National Research Council of Italy), Prof. Jaime Sierra (Pontifica Universidad Javeriana-Bogota, Colombia) and Prof. Blandine Laperche (Université du Littoral Côte d'Opale), as well as from the participants in the Economic Seminar in STATEC (Institut national de la Statistique et des Études Économiques) on 29 May 2018 in Luxembourg, namely Dr. Cesare Riillo and Dr. Serge Allegrezza. I am also grateful to the participants in the 2nd Master and Doctoral Consortium for Research on Public Policy 2018

(Évora, Portugal), specifically Prof. Adão Carvalho (Universidade de Évora), for their suggestions regarding **Chapter 5**.

Special thanks go also to the European Central Bank for providing access to the SAFE database used in **Chapters 2** and **5**, as well as to the *Comissão de Coordenação e Desenvolvimento Regional do Alentejo* (CCDRA) for the information provided in the framework of the activities developed by UMPP (Unidade de Monitorização de Políticas Públicas/ Planning and Evaluation Unit for Public Policies, University of Évora - Portugal) which was used in **Chapters 3** and **4**. I also express my gratitude to Jacques Hellmans (Université libre de Bruxelles) and Bureau Van Dyck for access to the historical data about Portuguese firms used in **Chapter 4**.

I am also grateful to my colleagues, Virginie Maghe, Palina Shauchuk, Nicola Dotti, Pietro Moncada-Paterno-Castello, Nicolas Ameye, Samira Bakkali, Lauriane Dewulf and Gilles Fombasso, for the support in carrying out this research project, as well as the administrative assistance given by Anne-Marie Notarianni, Aurélie Rousseaux, Anne-Lise Remy, Nancy de Munck and Marie Cambie. I also wish to acknowledge Andrew Thomson for the English revision of the papers presented in conferences and workshops.

Finally, I want to express my deepest gratitude to my friends and my parents for moral support over the many years that this research has taken.

Index

Index v
List of Tables vii
List of Figures x
I. Introduction 13
1.1. Context and motivation 14
1.2. Research objectives 17
1.3. Structure of the thesis 19
II. Determinants of financing constraints 21
2.1. Introduction 23
2.2. Background theory and literature review 24
2.2.1. Measuring financing constraints through a survey 26
2.2.2. Determinants of financing obstacles – Which firms are more constrained? 27
2.2.3. Determinants of innovation behavior – Which firms are more likely to innovate? 30
2.3. Database and sample selection 32
2.4. Conceptual framework and methodology 34
2.5. Results and discussion 39
2.5.1. Sample description: financially constrained vs non-constrained firms 39
2.5.2. Interpretation of model estimations: Financing constraints for growth ambitions: 40
2.5.3. Complementary analysis: assessing differences regarding innovative and non-innovative firms 46
2.6. Conclusion and policy recommendations 48
Appendix A 50
III. Which projects are selected for an innovation subsidy? 67
3.1. Introduction 69
3.2. Literature review 71
3.2.1. Public support for innovation and firms' competitiveness and internationalization 71
3.2.2. Determinants of participation in innovation and R&D subsidy programs 72
3.3. Portuguese Innovation Incentive System (SI Innovation) 74
3.3.1. Programme description: aim, targets and selection process 74
3.3.2. Programme execution: description of approved application 80
3.4. Data and methodology 81
3.5. Results and discussion 88
3.5.1. Sample description 88
3.5.2. Probability of having an application approved 90

3.5.3. Assessing differences between approved and non-approved applications 92
3.5.4. Assessing regional differences between approved and non-approved applications .. 95
3.6. Conclusion and policy recommendations 96
Appendix B 99
IV. Do Selected firms show higher performance? 109
4.1. Introduction 111
4.2. Literature review 112
4.3. Data and methodology 116
4.4. Results and discussion 124
4.4.1. Descriptive statistics 124
4.4.2. Results of Propensity Score Matching 128
4.4.3. Results of Difference-in-Difference with panel data 134
4.5. Conclusion 138
Appendix C 140
V. Financing, innovation and growht Linkage 149
5.1. Introduction 151
5.2. Literature review 152
5.2.1. The financing of innovation – instruments and effectiveness 152
5.2.2. The effect of innovation on firm growth or performance 160
5.3. Data and methodology 161
5.4. Results and discussion 165
5.4.1. Data description 165
5.4.2. Impact of financing on innovation 168
5.4.3. Assessing output additionality on firm growth 172
5.4.4. Assessing complementarity among different sources of financing 173
5.4.5. Assessing the impact of different financing combination on innovation 175
5.5. Conclusion and policy recommendations 176
Appendix D 178
VI. Conclusion 205
6.1. Main lessons of research 206
6.2. Main limitations of the research 212
6.3. Further research 214
References 215

List of Tables

Table II-1. Definition of Micro, small and medium-sized enterprises....33
Table II-2. Results of Recursive Bivariate Probit Model....42
Table II-3. Some marginal effects of RBPM with panel data: results of equation 2 – Being financially constrained....45
Table II-4. Marginal effects of Probit model: Being financially constrained, by innovation behaviour....47
Table II-5. Survey of literature: Financing constraints, R&D investment and Innovation....50
Table II-6. Variable definition and description....54
Table II-7. Assessing the relationship between future expectation and present statement....56
Table II-8. T-tests on the equality of means: financing constrained versus non-constrained....57
Table II-9. Collinearity Diagnostics: correlation matrix and VIF....58
Table II-10. Defining financing constraints level: results univariate Probit Model....59
Table II-11. Robustness test: RBPM without weighted sample....60
Table II-12. Robustness test: Descriptive statistics panel data (2014 and 2015)....61
Table II-13. Robustness test: RBPM with panel data (2014 - 2015)....62
Table II-14. Robustness test: Results of Seemingly Unrelated Regression (SURE)....63
Table II-15.Robustness test: Results of Pooled OLS for the degree of access to finance pressing problem....64
Table II-16. Results Probit Model: Being financially constrained, by innovation behavior....65
Table II-17. T-tests on the equality of means: innovative versus non-innovative firms....66
Table III-1. Common selection criteria for SI Innovation....78
Table III-2. Approved applications to SI Innovation, 2007 – 2013, by region at NUTS 2 level: N° of applications, investment (€ millions) and subsidy (€ millions)....80
Table III-3. Covariate description....84
Table III-4. Innovative behavior in pre-intervention period by activity sector....89
Table III-5. Results of logistic regression: Probability of having an application to SI Innovation approved....90
Table III-6. ATET: Foreseen impact of investment project to SI Innovation....93
Table III-7. Comparing performance between regions NUTS 2 level....96
Table III-8. Survey of literature: Determinants of receiving a public subsidy....99
Table III-9. Descriptive Statistics: Mean, Standard deviation, Minimum and Maximum....100
Table III-10. Mean-comparison tests: approved versus non-approved applications....101
Table III-11. Economic activities by sector groups....102
Table III-12. Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) and correlation matrix....104
Table III-13. Results of logistic regression: Probability of having an application to SI Innovation approved (alternative models)....105
Table III-14. Propensity Score (PS) before and after matching,....106
Table III-15. Co-variants means before and after matching....107
Table III-16. ATET: Foreseen impact of investment project in SI Innovation, by NUTS 2 level region....108

Table IV-1. List of data sources 118
Table IV-2. Steps in sample construction 118
Table IV-3. Assessing the representativeness of the sample (treated firms) 119
Table IV-4. Co-variants included in PS model: variable name and description 122
Table IV-5. T-tests on the equality of means by groups in pre-intervention period 124
Table IV-6. Achieved outcome, mean value, by time period 125
Table IV-7. Achieved outcome (% planned outcome), mean value, by time period 127
Table IV-8. N° of firms achieving the planned outcome, by time period 127
Table IV-9. Results of Logit Estimation: probability of having an application approved 129
Table IV-10. Average treatment effect on the treated firms (ATET), differences compared to pre-intervention, by period 132
Table IV-11. Average treatment effect on the treated firms (ATET), achieved outcome (% planned outcome), by time period 133
Table IV-12. Results of Difference-in-Differences models 135
Table IV-13. Results of Difference-in-Differences models by years 135
Table IV-14. Results of Difference-in-Differences models, for innovation indicators 137
Table IV-15. Survey of literature: Regional and Industrial Policy – impact assessment of subsidized firms' performance 141
Table IV-16. Survey of literature: Innovation Policy – impact assessment of subsidized firms' performance 143
Table IV-17. Descriptive Statistics: Mean, Standard Deviation, Minimum and Maximum 145
Table IV-18. VIF and Correlation Matrix 146
Table IV-19. Robustness Test - Probability Function: Logit model 147
Table IV-20. Balancing test - Difference of means before and after matching 148
Table V-1. Main financing sources by type of expenditure 158
Table V-2. Different link function for binary choice models 164
Table V-3. Financing instruments by innovation behavior 166
Table V-4. Financing instruments: used alone or in combination with other(s) 167
Table V-5. Combination of two financing instruments 167
Table V-6. Effect of financing in period 'T-1' on innovation behavior in period 'T' 168
Table V-7. Effect of financing in period 'T-1' on innovation behavior in period 'T-1' 171
Table V-8. Complementary log-log regression results: average marginal effect of output additionality on firm growth by source of financing 172
Table V-9. Effect of different financing in period 'T-1' on innovation behavior in period 'T' 173
Table V-10. Complementary log-log regression results: average marginal effect of output additionality on firm growth by n° of financing sources 174
Table V-11. Effect of different financing combinations in period 'T-1' on innovation behavior in period 'T' 175
Table V-12. Definition of main types of PE investors 178
Table V-13. Survey of literature: effect of public support on firm innovation 179
Table V-14. Survey of literature: effect of equity financing on firm innovation 181

Table V-15. Survey of literature: effect of innovation on firm growth or performance 183
Table V-16. Variable name and description 185
Table V-17. Descriptive Statistic: Mean, Standard Deviation, Minimum and Maximum 187
Table V-18. Collinearity diagnostics: VIF and correlation matrix and (co-variants in PS) 188
Table V-19. Results of Propensity Score model: Probability to obtain or to use a source of financing ... 189
Table V-20. Propensity Score (PS) before and after matching, by financing instrument 190
Table V-21. Selecting link function for binary choice models: Probability of increase turnover using equity financing 191
Table V-22. Results of Cloglog regression estimation: Probability of increasing turnover with dummy innovation measure 192
Table V-23. Results of Cloglog regression estimation: Probability of increasing employment with dummy innovation measure 193
Table V-24. Results of Cloglog regression estimation: Probability of increasing turnover with count data innovation measure 194
Table V-25. Results of Cloglog regression estimation: Probability of increasing employment with count data innovation measure 195
Table V-26. Propensity Score (PS) before and after matching, by n° financing instruments used together 196
Table V-27. Results of Cloglog regression estimation: Probability of increasing turnover with dummy innovation measure 197
Table V-28. Results of Cloglog regression estimation: Probability of increasing employment with dummy innovation measure 198
Table V-29. Results of Cloglog regression estimation: Probability of increasing turnover with count data innovation measure 199
Table V-30. Results of Cloglog regression estimation: Probability of increasing employment with count data innovation measure 200
Table V-31. Assessing the relationship between financing need, innovation and growth: T-test differences of mean for the size of bank loan by innovative behavior and growth status' 201
Table V-32. Assessing the relationship between financing need, innovation and growth: Spearman's rank correlation coefficients 201
Table V-33. Propensity Score (PS) before and after matching, by financing instrument combination 202
Table V-34. Results Z-test differences between coefficients (ATET): financing in T-1 in innovation T 203
Table V-35. Results Z-test differences between coefficients (ATET): combination of financing instruments 204

List of Figures

Figure I-1. Main sources of finance 15
Figure I-2. Main dimensions of public policy evaluation 17
Figure I-3. The link between the chapters of the thesis 18
Figure II-1. Sample repartition by group 33
Figure II-2. Conceptual framework timeline 35
Figure II-3. Model structure 37
Figure II-4.Average probability of being financially constrained, by country 44
Figure II-5. Geographical distribution of the sample 55
Figure II-6. Robustness test: Geographical distribution of the sample - panel data (2014 - 2015) 61
Figure III-1. National Strategic Reference Framework, Portugal 2007 – 2013, budget allocation by programme and funds 75
Figure III-2. Axis of Operational Competitiveness Programme (COMPETE) 75
Figure III-3. Interaction and mechanism behind SI Innovation 76
Figure III-4. From knowledge and creativity to innovation 77
Figure III-5. Innovation score of approved applications to SI Innovation, 2007-2013, by region NUTS II level 81
Figure III-6. Translation of SI Innovation objectives in quantifiable individual targets 85
Figure III-7. Kernel density plots for raw and balanced data: all Portuguese regions 106
Figure III-8. Kernel density plots for raw and balanced data: Norte region 106
Figure IV-1. Effects of public support on firm investment: additionality and crowding-out 113
Figure IV-2. Timeline analysis – conceptual framework 116
Figure IV-3. Kernel density plots for raw and balanced data 130
Figure IV-4. Evolution DID – N° Employees 136
Figure IV-5. Evolution DID – Sales 136
Figure IV-6. Evolution DID – TFP 136
Figure IV-7. Evolution DID – Fixed Assets 136
Figure IV-8. Gross domestic product at market prices (volume change rate), Portugal, 2006 - 2014 140
Figure IV-9. Work productivity, constant price (2006), Portugal, 2006 - 2014 140
Figure IV-10. Unemployment rate (%), Portugal, 2006 - 2014 140
Figure IV-11. Innovation Union Scoreboard, EU28 and Portugal, 2006 – 2014 140
Figure V-1. Timeline of the database 162
Figure V-2. Steps of methodological approach 163
Figure V-3. Financing effect on innovation (dummy variable: Yes/No), by time period 171
Figure V-4. Financing effect on innovation (count data: 0-4), by time period 171
Figure V-5. Balancing test: Distribution of treated and non-treated firms according to the covariates by source of financing 190

Figure V-6. Balancing test: Distribution of treated and non-treated firms according to the covariates by n° financing instruments used together 196

Figure V-7. Balancing test: Distribution of treated and non-treated firms according to the covariates by financing instrument combination 202

Figure VI-1. Methodological approach Chapter 5 209

Figure VI-2. Effect of different types of financing on the number of different types of innovation 209

Figure VI-3. Average marginal effect of output additionality on firm growth (TURNOVER) by source of financing 210

Figure VI-4. Average marginal effect of output additionality on firm growth (EMPLOYMENT) by source of financing 210