



Do firms benefit from being present in technology clusters? Evidence from a panel of biopharmaceutical firms.

Catherine Lecocq, Bart Leten, Jeroen Kusters and Bart Van Looy

DEPARTMENT OF MANAGERIAL ECONOMICS, STRATEGY AND INNOVATION (MSI)

Do Firms Benefit from Being Present in Technology Clusters? Evidence from a Panel of Biopharmaceutical Firms.

Catherine Lecocq^{1,2}

Bart Leten¹

Jeroen Kusters^{1,3}

Bart Van Looy^{1,4}

¹ Department of Managerial Economics, Strategy and Innovation. Faculty of Business and Economics, K.U. Leuven (Belgium)

² Policy Research Center for Entrepreneurship and International Entrepreneurship (Belgium)

³ Deloitte Consulting (Belgium)

⁴ Policy Research Center for R&D Indicators (Belgium)

Abstract

This paper investigates whether firms active in biotechnology can improve their technological performance by developing R&D activities in technology clusters. Regions that host a concentration of biotechnology activity are identified as technology clusters (level of US states, Japanese prefectures and European NUTS2 regions). A fixed effect panel data analysis on a set of 59 biopharmaceutical firms (period 1995-2002) provides evidence for a positive, albeit diminishing (inverted-U shape) relationship between the number of technology clusters in which a firm is present and its total technological performance. This effect is distinct from a mere multi-location effect.

Keywords: Cluster; Innovation; Biotechnology.

JEL classification: O30, R12 and R30.

Introduction

Corporate activities, especially in knowledge-intensive industries, display a tendency to cluster geographically (AUDRETSCH and FELDMAN, 1996; FELDMAN and FLORIDA, 1994). Following MARSHALL (1920), presence in clusters enhances the innovative capacity of firms through the presence of localized knowledge spillovers, and access to a pool of highly-skilled labor and specialized suppliers that agglomerate in such regions. Innovation dynamics in clusters are further stimulated by the presence of local competition and peer pressure among firms (PORTER, 1990). Empirical studies stemming from the economic geography literature indeed provide evidence that firms located in clusters are more innovative than counterparts located elsewhere (BAPTISTA and SWANN, 1998; BATEN et al., 2007; BEAUDRY and BRESCHI, 2003; DEEDS, DECAROLIS and COOMBS, 1999; VAN GEENHUIZEN and REYER-GONZALES, 2007). At the same time, little is known about the relationship between presence in multiple clusters and the overall technological performance of multi-locations firms. Exploring this relationship is relevant because firms increasingly organize R&D activities within multiple units - located in different regions - to benefit from local agglomeration externalities (GASSMAN AND VON ZEDTWITZ, 1999; KUEMMERLE, 1997; GRANSTRAND, 1999). In this paper, we engage in such analysis by means of a panel dataset of 59 US, European and Japanese biopharmaceutical firms (period 1995-2002). The focus of the paper is on the relationship between the technological performance of consolidated firms (i.e. the parent firm and its subsidiaries) and the number of technology clusters in which they develop R&D activities. Clusters are identified at the level of US states, European NUTS2 regions and Japanese prefectures as regions with a critical mass of technological activities in the field of biotechnology. Whereas previous economic geography studies controlled only to a limited extent¹ for the heterogeneity of firms in

terms of innovative efforts and capabilities, this study uses fixed effect panel data techniques and include controls for time-varying firm differences in R&D expenditures and past experience. This allows to distinguish cluster presence from firm-specific performance effects (BEUGELSDIJK, 2007). The analyses confirm the presence of an inverted-U shape relationship between the number of technology clusters in which a firm is present and its total technological performance. This effect is distinct from a mere multi-location effect.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. First, an overview of prior research on clusters and firm performance is provided, resulting in hypotheses on the relationship between cluster presence and firm's technological performance. Next, the data sources and variables used in this study are presented, followed by the empirical results. Conclusions, limitations and directions for further research are discussed in the final section.

Industry and technology clusters

The clustering of *industrial* activity in well-defined and relatively small geographic areas has been observed for long time by economic geographers and regional scientists (e.g. MARSHALL 1920; KRUGMAN 1991; PORTER 1990). Famous examples of industrial clusters include Detroit's car manufacturing industry, the entertainment industry of Hollywood and the fashion industry in northern Italy. Clustering remains a striking feature of national and regional economies, despite the availability of better transportation and communication infrastructure and the presence of global markets from which capital, talent and technology can be sourced (PORTER, 1998; 2000). Following the success of Silicon Valley in California and Route 128 in Boston (SAXENIAN, 1994), there has been a wide interest of researchers and policy makers in

the innovative and economic potential of *technology* clusters. Unlike industry-focused clusters, where inter-firm connections are predominantly vertical, technology clusters exhibit a more lateral structure consisting of direct and indirect competitors developing diversified applications of the same core technology within different markets or industries (ST. JOHN and POWDER, 2006). Value dynamics in technology clusters or “technology districts” build on unique technological resources - the technological infrastructure - which supports firms’ innovation activities (FELDMAN et al, 1994; STORPER, 1992). Sources of knowledge in technology clusters are diverse, ranging from universities and public research institutes to firms, suppliers and customers.

MARSHALL (1920) highlighted three incentives for firms to cluster geographically: (i) broader access to specialized, highly-skilled labor; (ii) access to specialized suppliers; and (iii) the presence of inter-organizational knowledge spillovers among similar firms². The broad concept of knowledge spillovers is probably the most frequently invoked source of agglomeration economies (HEAD et al, 1995) and has been widely investigated in literature (e.g. DÖRING and SCHNELLENBACH, 2006; BRESCHI and LISSONI, 2001). Knowledge spillovers arise through labor mobility (ALMEIDA and KOGUT, 1999) and exchange processes involving competitors, suppliers, customers and providers of professional services (VON HIPPEL, 1988; ROSENKOPF and ALMEIDA, 2003). They can be considered as an externality which allows firms to achieve similar R&D results faster and/or with fewer resources. Empirical work has shown the existence and geographically bounded nature of knowledge spillovers (JAFFE et al., 1993; ALMEIDA and KOGUT, 1999; VARGA, 2000; RODRÍGUEZ-POSE and CRESCENZI, 2008). Spillovers are more local to the extent that the relevant knowledge base is tacit (POLANYI, 1966; NONAKA, 1994;

VON HIPPEL, 1994). This is particularly true for emerging, complex technologies like biotechnology (LECOCQ and VAN LOOY, 2009). PORTER (1990; 1998) provided two additional reasons why firms located in clusters are more innovative than firms located outside clusters. First, opportunities for innovation (both new buyer needs and new technological opportunities) are more visible in clusters. Next, competitive and/or peer pressure among local firms stimulates firms to be more innovative and increases the efficiency of their operations.

While clusters are often associated with positive effects on firm performance, potential disadvantages can be noticed as well. First, costs of resources (e.g. labor, real estate, professional services) might be significantly higher in clusters due to congestion effects (BEAUDRY & BRESCHI, 2003). In addition, cluster membership might lead to an inward orientation whereby relevant developments situated outside the cluster are neglected (PORTER, 1998). Finally, firms located in clusters might be confronted with higher levels of unintended (outward) knowledge spillovers, affecting the firm's competitive advantage in a negative way (SHAVER and FLYER, 2000). While such disadvantages might occur, they are not directly relevant for the research questions addressed in this paper as the focus is on the firm's technological performance (as opposed to the overall competitive position of the firm or the efficiency implications of being present in clusters).

Clusters and Firm Performance

The capacity of firms to innovate is not limited to the boundaries of the firm and increasingly depends on external resources that agglomerate in specific places

(FELDMAN and FLORIDA, 1994; STORPER, 1992). If knowledge spillovers are an essential characteristic of clusters, the beneficial effects from being present in a cluster should manifest themselves in the first place on the innovative output of firms rather than on the firm's financial or growth performance (BAPTISTA and SWANN, 1998). Studies in the *economic geography* literature have investigated whether firms (plant level) located in an industrial or technological cluster are more innovative than firms outside clusters³. These studies can be classified in two groups based on the methodologies used to measure clusters.

A first set of studies investigated whether firms located in industrial clusters are more innovative. The concentration of industrial activity in a region is measured by sector level employment data. BAPTISTA and SWANN (1998) found a positive effect of own sector employment in the region on the likelihood of manufacturing firms in the United Kingdom to innovate. In contrast, BEAUDRY and BRESCHI (2003) found no effect of own sector employment on firms' innovative performance for a sample of UK and Italian firms. Only the concentration of innovative firms (and the size of their accumulated knowledge base) in the own industry was found to positively impact the technological performance of firms. Similar results were found in the study of BATEN et al. (2007) for firms trading in the state of Baden (Germany) around 1900. These findings suggest that for firms' innovative performance, the presence of critical mass in terms of knowledge creation activities in a region is more important than the overall industrial activity per se.

A second set of studies classified regions in clusters and non-clusters based on the amount of technological activity observed in the region, and examined whether firms located in technology clusters are more innovative than firms located elsewhere. DEEDS et al. (1999) classified eight regions in the United States (MSA level), that host

the largest number of biotechnology firms, as clusters and found that biotechnology firms located in clusters are more innovative than firms located outside the clusters. For the Netherlands, VAN GEENHUIZEN and REYER-GONZALES (2007) defined clusters as regions with at least one knowledge institute and 10 young entrepreneurial biotechnology firms. Their analyses showed no significant effect from cluster location on the innovativeness of biotechnology firms. However, when only the largest and oldest biotechnology cluster in the Netherlands - the Leiden region - is considered, cluster presence had a significant positive effect on firm performance. These results suggest that a critical mass of technological activity is needed before positive cluster effects can be observed at level of the firm.

Aforementioned economic geography studies, used cross-sectional data at the level of single plants to investigate whether clusters are supportive to firms' innovation activities. While the results indicate that firms in clusters are more innovative than firms located elsewhere, they do not provide evidence whether firms can improve their technological performance by extending their presence within multiple clusters. This research question is addressed in this paper. More specifically, the relationship between the number of technology clusters in which a firm is present and its total technological performance is studied. Exploring this relationship is relevant because firms increasingly organize R&D activities within multiple units – located in different regions- to benefit from agglomeration externalities (GASSMAN and VON ZEDTWITZ, 1999; KUEMMERLE, 1997; GRANSTRAND, 1999). R&D location choices are not confined to national borders, but take place on a global scale. As such, empirical analyses assessing the impact of cluster presence should not be limited to one particular country or region, but consider technology clusters on a more global scale. Likewise on the firm level, studying the impact of cluster presence requires

taking into account the location of all firms' R&D facilities (headquarters and subsidiaries).

In this paper, such an analysis is performed by means of a panel dataset on the technological activities of 59 US, European and Japanese biopharmaceutical firms (1995-2002). In line with economic geography studies, locations of firms' R&D activities (including cluster presence) are analyzed at the regional level (US states, European NUTS2 regions and Japanese prefectures). Technology clusters are defined as worldwide leading regions in technology development. The models in this study control for firm-level heterogeneity in innovative efforts and capabilities by employing fixed effects panel data techniques and including firm-level controls on R&D expenditures and innovation experience. This allows to clearly distinguish between cluster presence and firm-specific performance effects (BEUGELSDIJK, 2007).

A positive effect on a firm's overall technological performance is expected from being present in multiple clusters, as this coincides with an increased access to state-of-the-art knowledge available within each of these regions. At the same time, the more one is already involved in different clusters, the smaller the additional effects in terms of access to new, relevant knowledge might become. In addition, the costs of coordinating multiple R&D units and leveraging and integrating knowledge from multiple locations will increase with the number of locations in which a firm is present. Building on the aforementioned research, it is expected that location benefits principally stems from presence in technology clusters with a critical mass of relevant knowledge, as opposed to other regions. Therefore, the effects of cluster membership on the overall technological performance of firms should be distinctive from a mere multiple location effect. The following hypotheses are guiding the empirical study:

Hypothesis 1: Firms will improve their technological performance when extending their presence in technology clusters.

Hypothesis 2: Firms extending their presence in technology clusters will gain additional benefits in terms of technological performance, albeit of a diminishing nature (inverted U-shape relationship).

Hypothesis 3: The relationship between cluster membership and overall technological performance is distinct from a mere multi-location effect.

Data and methodology

Panel data on the technological activities of 59 biopharmaceutical firms with parent firms located in the United States, Europe and Japan, have been collected to study the relationship between the location of R&D activities in multiple clusters and regions and the overall technological performance of firms. Patent data is used to create indicators of firms' technological activities (location and performance) and to identify biotechnology clusters on a global scale (US states, NUTS 2 regions in Europe and prefectures in Japan). The use of patent data has several advantages (PAVITT, 1985; GRILICHES, 1990). They are easy to access, cover long time series and contain detailed information on the technological content, owners and inventors of patented inventions. This allows to mark out biotechnology patents, construct indicators of the technological performance of firms and regions and identify the locations where inventions took place. At the same time, patent indicators also have some deficits: not all inventions are patented, patent propensities vary across industries and firms, and patented inventions vary in technical and economic value (MANSFIELD, 1986; GAMBARDELLA et al, 2008). One can lessen these problems by restricting patent

analyses to technologies with high propensities to patent such as biotechnology (ARUNDEL and KABLA, 1988), and by weighting patent counts (technological performance indicator) by the number of forward citations received (HALL et al, 2005). Despite their shortcomings, there is simply no other indicator that provides the same level of detail on firms' technological activities as patents do (GRILICHES, 1990). Further, studies have found a strong correlation between patent counts and other technology indicators (e.g. new product announcements and expert opinions) on the level of firms (HAGEDOORN and CLOODT, 2003; NARIN and NOMA, 1987) and regions (ACS et al, 2002), establishing patents as a valid indicator of novel technological activity.

In this study, patent indicators are based on data from the European Patent Office (EPO). The choice for EPO rather than US Patent and Trademark (USPTO) patents is motivated by two factors. First, EPO patents are considered to be, on average, of a higher quality than USPTO patents as the cost of patenting is two to five times higher at EPO than USPTO, and EPO has a 20-30 percent lower patent granting rate than USPTO (VAN POTTELSBERGHE DE LA POTTERIE and FRANÇOIS, 2006; QUILLEN and WEBSTER, 2001). Second, inventor address information on USPTO patents – used to identify the location of R&D activities – is incomplete for a large number of USPTO patents. As a result, these patents can not be assigned to US states, European regions or Japanese prefectures. For the analyses, patent application data rather than patent grants are used because of the extensive time periods observed between application and granting decisions at the European Patent Office (especially for biotech)⁴.

The geographic location of inventions is identified via inventor address information. Allocation based on inventor addresses is the most commonly used

approach in patent studies since – especially for large firms - allocation based on assignee addresses might signal the location of corporate headquarters rather than research laboratory where the invention took place (DEYLE and GRUPP, 2005; KHAN and DERNIS, 2006). The use of inventor addresses may however also introduce some bias since inventors may not live in the same region as they work. LANDONI et al. (2008) performed a validation exercise where both allocation methods (inventor and applicant addresses) are compared with the real R&D locations of inventions. Their work confirmed the superiority of the inventor’s address criterion, especially for patent statistics at a disaggregated geographical level (NUTS2 and NUTS3).

Sample of Biopharmaceutical Firms

Parent firms with the largest biotech patent portfolio are identified from a dataset with all EPO patent applications in the field of biotechnology (time period 1978-2001). This dataset is the result of a study by GLÄNZEL et al. (2004) to delineate technological activity in the field of biotechnology⁵. The selected firms are active in different sectors: mostly in biotechnology, the pharmaceutical or chemical industry, but the list of parent firms also includes producers of consumer products, energy concerns and breweries. For consistency of the sample, only the biopharmaceutical firms (75 largest patenting firms) were retained. Due to missing financial data on firm controls and / or incomplete information on the group structure of parent firms, the list of firms was further reduced to 59 biopharmaceutical firms. All these firms have headquarters in the United States, Japan or Europe (EU-15 and Switzerland). Appendix 1 contains a complete list of the firms under study.

For this sample of 59 biopharmaceutical firms, patent data were collected at the consolidated parent level, i.e. comprising headquarters and all (majority-owned)⁶

subsidiaries of the parent firm. This consolidation process implied the mapping of all changes in the group structure of the 59 parent firms due to acquisitions, mergers, green-field investments and spin-offs during the period 1995 to 2002. For this purpose, yearly lists of subsidiaries included in annual reports were used, as well as yearly 10-K reports filed with the SEC in the US and, for Japanese firms, information on foreign subsidiaries published by Toyo Keizai in the yearly Directories of Japanese Overseas Investments. Using consolidated patent data is important to get a complete picture of firms' technological activities as a significant part of large firms' patents are not filed under the parent firm name (LETEN et al, 2007). Firm financial data are also collected at the consolidated firm level via corporate annual reports, Worldscope and Compustat financial databases.

Biotechnology Clusters

Biotechnology is a knowledge-intensive technology field, which from its origin has developed within a limited number of regions of excellence, such as California and the Boston area in the United States, and Cambridge in the United Kingdom. To identify biotechnology clusters worldwide, the dataset with all EPO patent applications in the field of biotechnology created by GLÄNZEL et al. (2004) is used. The dataset shows that, for the period 1990-1999, almost all patenting activity in the domain of biotechnology (94%) takes place in the United States, Europe (EU-15 and Switzerland) and Japan. In this study, the focus is therefore on regions in the United States, Europe and Japan⁷.

Regions are defined at the level of following national subdivisions: European NUTS 2 regions (n=220), US states (n=50), and Japanese prefectures (n=47). The NUTS classification⁸ provides a breakdown of European countries into regions, primarily based on institutional divisions currently in force in the country. The limits

of the regions are fixed according to population size. For the NUTS2 level, minimum and maximum thresholds for the average population size of the regions are respectively 800.000 and 3 million. The United States of America consist of 50 sub-national entities called states, having their own state government with substantial state responsibilities. The population in the US states varies from 500,000 to 36 million. The prefectures of Japan consists of 47 sub-national jurisdictions with an own governor and parliament. The size of prefectures vary between 600,000 and 12 million inhabitants. Cluster boundaries do not necessarily coincide with the boundaries of administrative regions. Clusters may well spread over more than one region (e.g. the tri-state cluster in the states of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania and the cluster covering the prefectures of Tokyo and Kanagawa). Alternatively, regions may enclose more than one cluster (e.g. the triangle San Francisco - San Jose - Sacramento, better known as Silicon Valley, and the region between Los Angeles and San Diego in the state of California). Despite these concerns, an analysis of regions coinciding with the boundaries of the administrative subdivisions (US states, European NUTS 2 regions and Japanese prefectures) was chosen⁹, as it is believed that they provide comparable regional units of analysis.

The amount of biotechnological R&D activities in a region is measured by the number of EPO patents in that regions during the period 1990-1999. Patent applications are allocated to regions based on inventor addresses. When a patent contains multiple inventors in different regions, the patent is fully counted in each region. Table 1 shows the 50 regions with the highest technological performance in the field of biotechnology. VAN GEENHUIZEN and REYER-GONZALES (2007) showed that agglomeration effects only take place in regions that host a minimum critical mass of technological activity. In line with this observation, a region is defined as a

biotechnology cluster if it contains at least 2.5% of the total number of EPO patent applications in the field of biotechnology. Ten regions satisfy this condition. Together they account for 45% of biotechnology patents worldwide. Most biotechnology clusters are located in the United States, with a clear supremacy of the state of California, which account for almost 15% of all biotechnology patents. Other regions with a substantial amount of activity in biotechnology are Massachusetts, Maryland, Pennsylvania, New York and New Jersey. Europe has one top region located in France (the region of Paris). With Tokyo, Kanagawa and Osaka, Japan counts three top regions in biotechnology.

Insert Table 1 about here

Firm Variables and Model

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable in the study is the technological performance of firms in biotechnology. This is measured by the number of biotech patent applications applied by a firm in a certain year, weighted by the number of forward patent citations received over a fixed four year time window. The ‘weighting’ is done to control for variation in the technological and economic importance of patented inventions (HARHOFF et al., 1999; TRAJTENBERG, 1990; HALL et al, 2005)¹⁰. The dependent variable is a count variable with only non-negative integer values. In this case, non-linear count data models are preferred to standard linear regression models as the former explicitly take into account the non-negativity and discreteness of the

dependent variable (CAMERON and TRIVEDI, 1998). Negative binomial models used in the study allow for overdispersion in the dependent variable. To control for the presence of unobserved firm-specific effects (which may correlate with, and bias the effect of explanatory variables in the models, if not controlled for), fixed effects panel data estimators are used. This estimation technique removes (time constant) unobserved firm-specific factors by time-demeaning all variables (dependent and explanatory) before performing regressions.

Presence in Technology Clusters

To identify the regions in which firms are present, inventor address information on the biotechnology patents of the firms is used. More specifically, a firm is considered to have undertaken biotechnology R&D activities in a region if the firm has at least two inventors residing in that region during the last two years. Given the fact that R&D collaboration is quite widespread in the field of biotechnology (LECOQ and VAN LOOY, 2009), it was decided to consider presence in a region only on the firm's *fully owned patents*, thus reflecting the number of regions (clusters and other regions) in which a firm is present through its fully owned or single parent patents. For co-owned patents, i.e. patents with multiple assignees from different parent organizations, it is not possible to identify to which assignee an inventor belongs. Therefore using inventor address information on such patents may not only pick up a firm's own R&D locations, but also the R&D locations of co-assignees.

Three indicators related to the location of the biotechnology R&D activities of a firm are created: (i) *clusters*, reflecting the number of R&D biotechnology clusters in which a firm is present, (ii) *other regions*, reflecting the number of other regions, not defined as clusters, in which a firm undertakes R&D activities, and (iii) *countries*,

the number of countries in which a firm is present¹¹. To test for non-linear relationships between the R&D location variables and the firm's overall technological performance, both linear and squared terms of the location variables are included in the empirical models. Applying fixed effect panel data models require that there is enough within-firm variation in the number of R&D locations over time. This is the case for the sample firms, as they all engaged in M&A activities, opened new laboratories and/or close down existing ones over the time period 1995-2002.

Control Variables

Several (time varying) variables that might affect the technological performance of firms are included as controls in the analyses. First, an indicator for the size of a firm's existing *technology portfolio in biotech* is included, measured by the number of biotech patents applied for by the firm in the last 5 years. Firms with large technology portfolios are more experienced in innovation, and may be better positioned to develop new technological competences (NESTA and SAVIOTTI, 2006). In previous studies, a time period of 5 years has been considered as appropriate for assessing the validity of knowledge bases in a given technology (STUART and PODOLNY, 1996; AHUJA and LAMPERT, 2001). Second, differences in the *size of firms' R&D effort* are included, measured by one-year lagged R&D expenditures¹². Firms that have more R&D resources, are expected to have a higher technological performance. Third, *year dummies* are included in the models to control for changes over time in the propensity of firms to patent.

Descriptive statistics and correlation coefficients for the dependent and explanatory variables are reported in table 2. The mean (yearly) number of citation-weighted patents for the firms in the sample is 20, and firms' average R&D

expenditures amount to 452 million US dollars a year. The sample firms are, on average, present in 1.6 biotechnology clusters and 2.6 other regions, spread over 2 countries. None of the reported correlations are excessively high.

Insert Table 2 about here

Empirical results

The results of the fixed effects negative binomial models on the relation between cluster membership and firms' overall technological performance are presented in Table 3. Model 1 is the baseline model including the control variables. Both the lagged biotech patent portfolio and the R&D expenditure variable are positive and significant. In model 2, the cluster variable is introduced, which indicates the number of *clusters* in which a firm develops R&D activities. The cluster variable is positive and significant, indicating that firms can enhance their technological performance by performing R&D activities in technology clusters (confirming hypothesis 1). In model 3, the *other regions* variable is added to the set of control variables, reflecting the number of regions, outside clusters, in which a firm develops R&D activities. This variable is not significant. In addition, the log likelihood ratio test reveals that including the other region variable does not add significantly to the explanatory power of the baseline model (Chi2 LR test = 0.60). Model 4 includes both the cluster and other regions variables. A positive and significant coefficient is found for the cluster variable, while the coefficient of the other regions variable remains insignificant.

Together, the findings from models 2 to 4 suggest that only location in technology clusters, and not in other regions, has a positive impact on the technological performance of firms.

Insert Table 3 about here

Model 5 is the most complete model and includes, besides the linear terms, also the quadratic terms of the cluster and the other regions variables. Including quadratic terms allows to check for non-linear relationships between the location variables and firm performance. The log likelihood ratio test indicates that model 5 significantly adds to model 4 in terms of explanatory power (Chi2 LR test =11.04***). The cluster variable has a positive and significant linear term, and a negative and significant quadratic term. This confirms hypothesis 2: there is an inverted U-shape relationship between the number of technology clusters in which firms develop R&D activities and their total technological performance. The coefficients of the cluster variables in model 5 further indicate that biopharmaceutical firms should – ideally – be present in 4 biotechnology clusters. Since the average biopharmaceutical firm in the sample is present in less than 2 biotech clusters, most firms can still improve their technological performance by setting up R&D activities in additional biotechnology clusters¹³. In line with previous models, no significant effects are found for the other regions variables in model 5. Taken together, the findings show that presence in technology clusters, and not presence in other

locations, has a significant effect on firms' technological performance (confirming hypothesis 3).

In model 6, an additional regression is ran to check whether the cluster effect is distinctive from a R&D internationalization effect. Therefore, the linear and quadratic term of the *countries* variable are added to the base line model, reflecting the number of countries in which a firm is present. The countries variables are not significant, and the model does not significantly improve compared to the baseline model containing only the control variables (Chi2 LR test = 0.95). This again confirms hypothesis 3 that presence in multiple technology clusters and not the mere presence in multiple locations, is contributing to firms' technological performance.

Conclusions

Firms active in knowledge-intensive fields such as biotechnology, are increasingly developing global R&D activities, with location choices for an important degree being determined by the presence of local technological capabilities. Studies in the economic geography literature have shown that firms located in regions where technological activities agglomerate (technology clusters), are more innovative than firms located elsewhere (BAPTISTA and SWANN, 1998; BEAUDRY and BRESCHI, 2003; DEEDS, DECAROLIS and COOMBS, 1999; VAN GEENHUIZEN and REYER-GONZALES, 2007; BATEN et al., 2007). However, so far, little is known about the impact of presence in multiple clusters and regions on the technological performance of multi-location firms.

In this study, such an analysis is performed, based on a panel dataset (period 1995-2002) of 59 biopharmaceutical firms with headquarters in the United States, Europe or Japan. Firm-level differences in innovative capabilities are taken into

account by including firm-fixed effects and control variables for R&D efforts and past innovation experience. Biotechnology clusters are defined as worldwide leading regions in terms of technology development in the field of biotechnology. The study provide evidence for an inverted U-shape relationship between the number of technology clusters in which a firm is present and it's total technological performance.

The findings suggest that biopharmaceutical firms can enhance their technological performance by developing R&D activities in multiple technology clusters. The results also reveal that boundaries exist in terms of the net beneficial effects of spreading R&D activities over multiple locations. When the number of clusters in which a firm is carrying out R&D activities becomes too large, increasing costs in terms of coordinating and integrating geographically dispersed R&D units might start to prevail over the marginal benefits from getting access to new, relevant knowledge. At the same time, the observed diminishing effects might also be caused by insufficient critical mass in terms of technological activity (economies of scale and scope) when R&D activities are over-dispersed.

The analyses provide evidence that the cluster effect is distinctive from a mere multi-location effect: the presence in technology clusters, and not the presence in multiple regions and countries, is contributing to a better technological performance of firms. As such, the study provides interesting insights for the R&D internationalisation literature. Recently, this stream of literature started to investigate the relationship between the geographical dispersion of firms' R&D activities and firm performance. Some studies (SINGH, 2008; FURMAN et al, 2006) found negative effects, while other studies (CRISCUOLO and AUTIO, 2008; IWASA and ODAGIRI, 2004; PENNER-HAHN and SHAVER, 2005; TODO and SHIMIZUTANI, 2008) found positive

effects of geographical dispersion on firms' performance. These studies did not take into account the technological characteristics of regions in which R&D activities are deployed (clusters or non-cluster regions)¹⁴. This may be one factor explaining their mixed results.

Further investigating aforementioned potential drivers of the observed declining effect of cluster membership on firm performance might be an interesting area for further research. Within this study, the focus was on regional technological capabilities within the same field (biotechnology); as such, a natural extension of the research reported here implies an examination of 'Jacobs' externalities as well: what is the impact of regional capabilities situated within different technological fields on the performance of firms? Finally, within this analysis, the micro-dynamics underlying the observed positive technological performance effects were treated as a 'black box'. While the findings are interesting within the framework of R&D location decisions, identifying the most effective mechanisms (e.g. collaboration with local firms and/or research institutes, technology acquisition, researcher mobility,...) through which firms can benefit from agglomeration externalities in technology clusters might be highly relevant to ensure that firms yield results once location decisions have been made. We do hope that our analysis and findings inspire colleagues in the fields of economic geography and R&D internationalisation to engage in such endeavours.

Appendix 1: List of biopharmaceutical firms

Abbott Laboratories	Innogenetics
Affymetrix Inc.	Invitrogen
Ajinomoto	Isis Pharmaceuticals Inc
Amgen	Johnson Johnson
Applera	Kyowa Hakko Kogyo
Astrazeneca	Lonza Ag
Aventis	Martek Biosciences
Beckman Coulter	Maxygen Inc
Becton Dickinson And Company	Merck Co
Biogen Idec	Merck Kgaa
Boehringer Ingelheim	Millennium Pharmaceuticals
Bristol Myers Squibb	Mochida Pharmaceutical
Cell Genesys Inc	Myriad Genetics Inc
Chiron	Nanogen Inc
Diversa Corp	Novartis
Eli Lilly	Novo Nordisk As
Fujisawa Pharmaceutical	Pfizer
Gen Probe Inc	Regeneron Pharmaceuticals
Genelabs	Ribozyme Pharmaceuticals
Genencor	Schering
Genentech Inc	Schering Plough
Genzyme	Scios Inc
Geron Corp	Seikagaku
Gilead Sciences	Sequenom Inc
Heska Ag	Shionogi
Human Genome Sciences	Solexa
Hybridon	Tanox Inc
Icos Corporation	Transgene
Idexx Laboratories	Wyeth
Incyte Corporation	

¹ Prior studies used cross-sectional data analysis techniques, and did not control for differences in firms' innovation efforts (absolute level of R&D expenses) when studying the impact of cluster membership on firms' technological performance.

² MARSHALL (1920), ARROW (1962) and ROMER (1986) (henceforth M-A-R) suggest that knowledge spillovers mainly arise among firms in the same industry. On the contrary, JACOBS (1969) believes that the most important knowledge spillovers occur across industries. Empirical results on the relative importance of both type of knowledge externalities are mixed (see for example GLAESER et al, 1992; FELDMAN and AUDRETSCH, 1999; HENDERSON et al, 1995; BEAUDRY and SCHIFFAUEROVA, 2009; FRENKEN et al, 2007).

³ Other studies (ex. HILL and NAROFF, 1984; SWANN and PREVEZER, 1996 and HENDRY and BROWN, 2006) have studied the impact of cluster location on the financial performance and growth of firms.

⁴ We calculated that for EPO biotechnology patents applied for in 1995 and granted by 2006, only 40% of the patents were granted within 6 years after application.

⁵ GLÄNZEL et al. (2004) defined and validated a search key to retrieve all EPO patents in the biotechnology domain in the period 1978-2001.

⁶ A subsidiary is considered as majority owned if the parent firm holds at least a 50% share in the subsidiary.

⁷ Note that no other region outside the United States, Europe (EU-15 and Switzerland) and Japan has sufficient patent applications to qualify as a cluster.

⁸ NUTS stands for Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics and is the three-level hierarchical classification of regions established by Eurostat.

⁹ Analyses in which we combine administrative subdivisions to better follow the actual boundaries of biotechnology clusters, yield similar results.

¹⁰ The number of citations received by a patent correlates significantly with indicators of patent value such as patent renewal rates (HARHOFF et al., 1999), consumer-surplus generated (TRAJTENBERG, 1990) and expert evaluation (ALBERT et al., 1991).

¹¹ Analogous to the cluster and other regions variables, we only count countries from EU-15, Switzerland, US and Japan.

¹² Firm level R&D expenses specifically related to biotechnology activities are not available.

¹³ Only in 5.45% of the observations (firm-year), firms develop biotech activities in more than 4 technology clusters.

¹⁴ Notable exception is IWASA and ODAGIRI (2004). They take into account the local technological strengths of US states in which the US subsidiaries of Japanese manufacturing firms are located.

References

ACS, Z. J., ANSELIN, L., and VARGA, A. (2002). Patents and innovation counts as measures of regional production of new knowledge. *Research Policy*, 31(7); pp. 1069-1085.

AHUJA, G. and LAMPERT, C.M. (2001). Entrepreneurship in the large corporation: a longitudinal study of how established firms create breakthrough innovations. *Strategic Management Journal* 22, pp.521-543.

ALBERT, MB, AVERY, d. and NARIN, F. (1991). Direct validation of citation counts as indicators of industrially important patents. *Research Policy* 20(3), pp. 251-259.

ALMEIDA, P. and KOGUT, B. (1999). Localization of Knowledge and the Mobility of Engineers in Regional Networks. *Management Science* 45 (7), pp. 905-917.

ARROW, K.J. (1962). The implications of Learning by Doing. *Review of economic studies* 29; pp 155-173.

ARUNDEL, A. and KABLA, I. (1988). What percentage of innovations are patented? Empirical estimates for European firms. *Research Policy* 27 (2), pp. 127-141.

AUDRETSCH, D. and FELDMAN, M. (1996). R&D spillovers and the geography of innovation and production. *The American Economic Review* 86(3), pp.630-640.

BAPTISTA, R. and SWANN, P. (1998). Do Firms in Clusters Innovate More? *Research Policy* 27, pp.522-540.

BATEN, J., SPADAVECCHIA A., STREB J. and YIN, S. (2007). What made southwest German firms innovative around 1900? Assessing the importance of intra- and inter-industry externalities. *Oxford Economic Papers* 59, i105-i106.

BEAUDRY, C. and BRESCHI, S. (2003). Are Firms in Clusters Really more Innovative? *Economics of Innovation and New Technology* 124, pp.325-342.

BEAUDRY, C. and SCHIFFAUEROVA, A. (2009). Who's right, Marshall or Jacobs? The localization versus urbanization debate. *Research Policy* 38 (2), pp. 318-337.

BEUGELSDIJK, S. (2007). The regional environment and a firm's innovative performance: A plea for a multilevel interactionist approach. *Economic Geography* 83 (2), pp. 181-199.

BRESCHI, S. and LISSONI, F. (2001). Knowledge spillovers and local innovation systems: a critical survey. *Industrial and Corporate Change* 10 (4), pp.975-1005.

CAMERON, A. and TRIVEDI, P. (1998). *Regression analysis of count data*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

CRISCUOLO, P. and AUTIO, E. (2008). The impact of internationalization of research on firm market value. Working paper.

DEEDS, D.L.; DECAROLIS, D. and COOMBS, J. (1999). Dynamic capabilities and new product development in high technology ventures: an empirical analysis of new biotechnology firms. *Journal of Business Venturing* 15, pp 211–229.

DEYLE, H. and GRUPP, H. (2005). Commuters and the regional assignment of innovative activities: A methodological patent study of German districts. *Research Policy* 34, pp.221-234.

DÖRING, T. and SCHNELLENBACH, J. (2006). What do we know about geographical knowledge spillovers and regional growth?: A survey of the literature. *Regional Studies* 40 (3), pp.375-395.

FELDMAN, MP. and AUDRETSCH, DB. (1999). Innovation in cities: Science-based diversity, specialization and localized competition. *European Economic Review* 43(2), pp. 409-429.

FELDMAN, M. and FLORIDA, R. (1994). The geographic sources of innovation: Technological infrastructure and product innovation in the United States. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 84(2), pp.210-229.

FRENKEN, K., VAN OORT, F. and VERBURG, T. (2007). Relate variety, unrelated variety and regional economic growth. *Regional Studies* 41(5), pp. 685-697.

FURMAN, J., KYLE, M., COCKBURN, I. and HENDERSON, R. (In press). Public and private spillovers location and the productivity of pharmaceutical research. *Annales d'Economie et de Statistique*. Forthcoming.

GAMBARDELLA, A., HARHOFF, D. and VERSPAGEN, B. (2008). The value of European patents. CEPR discussion paper no 6848.

GASSMANN, O. and VON ZEDTWITZ, M. (1999). New concepts and trends in international R&D organization. *Research Policy* (28), pp. 231–250.

GLAESER, E. L., KALLAL, H. D., SCHEINKMAN, J. A., and SHLEIFER, A. (1992). Growth in Cities. *Journal of Political Economy* 100, pp. 1126-1152.

GLÄNZEL W., MEYER M., SCHLEMMER B., DU PLESSIS M., THIJS B., MAGERMAN T. and DEBACKERE K. (2004). Domain study “Biotechnology” – An analysis based on publications and patents. Report published by Steunpunt O&O indicators; www.steunpuntooi.be

GRANSTRAND, O. (1999). Internationalisation of corporate R&D: A study of Japanese and Swedish corporations. *Research Policy*, 28, pp. 275-302.

GRILICHES, Z. (1990). Patent statistics as economic indicators – a survey. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 28(4): pp.1661-1707.

HAGEDOORN, J. and CLOODT, M. (2003). Measuring innovative performance: is there an advantage in using multiple indicators? *Research Policy* 32, pp. 1365-1379.

HALL, B., JAFFE, A. and TRAJTENBERG, M. (2005). Market value and patent citations. *Rand Journal of Economics* 36(1), pp16-38.

HARHOFF, D., NARIN, F., SCHERER, F. and VOGEL, K.(1999). Citation frequency and the value of patented inventions. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 81 (3), pp. 511-515.

HEAD K., RIES, J., and SWENSON, D. (1995). Agglomeration benefits and location choice: Evidence from Japanese manufacturing investments in the United States. *Journal of International Economics*. 38, pp. 223-247.

HENDERSON, V., KUNCORO, A., and TURNER, M. (1995). Industrial-Development in Cities. *Journal of Political Economy* 103, pp.1067-1090.

HENDRY, C. and BROWN, J. (2005). Dynamics of clustering and performance in the UK opto-electronics industry. *Regional Studies* 40 (7), pp. 707-725.

HILL J. and NAROFF J. (1984). The Effect of Location on the Performance of High Technology Firms. *Financial Management*, pp. 27-36.

IWASA, T. and ODAGIRI, H. (2004). Overseas R&D, knowledge sourcing and patenting: an empirical study of Japanese R&D investments in the US. *Research Policy* 33(5), pp. 807-829.

JACOBS, J. (1969). *The economies of cities*. New York: Vintage.

JAFFE, A., TRAJTENBERG, M. and HENDERSON, R. (1993). Geographic localization of knowledge spillovers as evidenced by patent citations. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 108, pp.577–598.

KHAN, M and DERNIS, H. (2006). Global overview of innovative activities from patent indicators perspective. OECD Science, Technology and Industry working papers 2006/3, OECD Publishing.

KRUGMAN, P. (1991). Increasing returns and economic geography. *Journal of Political Economy* 99 (3), pp.483-499.

KUEMMERLE, W. (1999). Foreign direct investment in industrial research in the pharmaceutical and electronics industries—results from a survey of multinational firm. *Research Policy* (28), pp. 179–193.

LANDONI P., LETEN, B. and VAN LOOY, B. (2008). Localization of innovative activities: Myths and facts of methodologies to assign patents to spatial areas. Paper presented at the 10th International Conference on Science and Technology Indicators (Vienna, September 2008).

LECOCQ, C. and VAN LOOY, B. (2009). The impact of collaboration on the technological performance of regions: time invariant or driven by life cycle dynamics? An explorative investigation of European regions in the field of Biotechnology. Forthcoming in *Scientometrics* 80(3).

LETEN, B., BELDERBOS, R. and VAN LOOY, B. (2007). Technological diversification, coherence and performance of firms. *The Journal of Product Innovation Management* 24(6), pp567-579.

MARSHALL, A. (1920). *Principles of economics*; London, Macmillan.

MANSFIELD, E. (1986). Patents and innovation: an empirical study. *Management Science* 32(2), pp173-181.

NARIN F. and NOMA E. (1987). Patents as indicators of corporate technological strength. *Research Policy* 16 (2-4), pp.143-155.

NESTA, L. and SAVIOTTI, P.P. (2006). Coherence of the knowledge base and the firm's innovative performance: Evidence from the US pharmaceutical industry. *Journal of Industrial Economics* 53(1), pp123-142.

NONAKA I., (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science* 5(1), pp. 14-37.

PAVITT, K. (1985). Patent statistics as indicators of innovative activities. Possibilities and problems. *Scientometrics* 7(1), pp. 77-99.

PENNER-HAHN, J. and SHAVER, M. (2005). Does international research and development increase patent output? An analysis of Japanese pharmaceutical firms. *Strategic Management Journal* 26, pp. 121-140.

POLANYI, M. (1966). *The tacit dimension*. Doubleday Anchor, New York.

PORTER, M. (1998). Clusters and the new Economics of Competition. *Harvard Business Review*, November - December, pp. 77-90.

PORTER, M. (1990). *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*, Macmillan, London.

PORTER, M. (2000). Location, Competition, and Economic Development: Local Clusters in a Global Economy. *Economic Development Quarterly* 14(1), pp 15-34.

QUILLEN, C. and WEBSTER, O. (2001). Continuing patent applications and performance of the US patent office. *Federal Circuit Bar Journal* 11(1), pp.1-21.

RODRÍGUEZ-POSE, A. and CRESCENZI, R. (2008). Research and Development, Spillovers, Innovation Systems, and the Genesis of Regional Growth in Europe. *Regional Studies* 42(1), pp. 51-67.

ROMER, P.M. (1986). Increasing returns and long-run growth. *Journal of Political Economy* 94 (5), pp. 1002-1037.

ROSENKOPF, L. and ALMEIDA, P. (2003). Overcoming Local Search through Alliances and Management Science 49 (6), pp. 751-766.

SAXENIAN, A. (1994). *Regional advantage – Culture and Competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

SHAVER, J.M. and FLYER, F. (2000). Agglomeration economies, firm heterogeneity, and foreign direct investment in the United States. *Strategic Management Journal* 21(12), pp. 1175-1193.

SINGH, J. (2008). Distributed R&D, cross-regional knowledge integration and quality of innovative output. *Research Policy* 37, pp. 77–96.

ST. JOHN, C. and POUDER, R.W. (2006). Technology Clusters versus Industry Clusters: Resources, Networks, and Regional Advantages. *Growth and Change* 37 (2), pp. 141–171.

STORPER, M. (1992). The Limits to Globalization: Technology Districts and International Trade. *Economic Geography* 68(1), pp 60-93.

STUART, T. and PODOLNY, J. (1996). Local search and the evolution of technological capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal* 17, pp21-38.

SWANN, P. and PREVEZER, M. (1996). A comparison of the dynamics of industrial clustering in computing and biotechnology. *Research Policy* 25, pp.1139-1157.

TODO, Y. and SHIMIZUTANI, S. (2008). Overseas R&D activities and home productivity growth: evidence from Japanese firm level data. *Journal of Industrial Economics* 56(4), pp. 752-777.

TRAJTENBERG, M. (1990). A penny for your quotes: Patent citations and the value of innovations. *Rand Journal of Economics* 21, pp.172-187.

VAN GEENHUIZEN, M. and REYER-GONZALES, L. (2007). Does a clustered location matter for high-technology companies' performance? The case of biotechnology in the Netherlands. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change* 74, pp.1681-1696.

VAN POTTELSBERGHE DE LA POTTERIE, B. and FRANÇOIS, D. (2006). The cost factor in patent systems. EPO working papers CEB 06-002.

VARGA A. (2000). Local academic knowledge spillovers and the concentration of economic activity. *Journal of Regional Science*, 40, pp. 289-309.

VON HIPPEL, E. (1994). Sticky information and the locus of problem solving: Implications for innovations. *Management Science* 40(3), pp. 429-439.

VON HIPPEL, E. (1988). *The Sources of Innovation*. New York, Oxford University Press.

Table 1 Top Biotechnology regions (period 1990-1999)

	Region	Country	Patents	%	Cum %
1	California	United States	4,162	15.4%	15.4%
2	Massachusetts	United States	1,853	6.8%	21.6%
3	Maryland	United States	1,285	4.7%	25.5%
4	Pennsylvania	United States	1,264	4.7%	29.6%
5	New York	United States	1,072	4.0%	32.8%
6	New Jersey	United States	1,005	3.7%	34.9%
7	Tokyo	Japan	916	3.4%	38.2%
8	Île de France	France	873	3.2%	41.1%
9	Kanagawa	Japan	724	2.7%	42.8%
10	Osaka	Japan	672	2.5%	44.9%
11	Denmark	Denmark	643	2.4%	47.1%
12	Washington	United States	619	2.3%	48.8%
13	Oberbayern	Germany	593	2.2%	50.8%
14	Illinois	United States	473	1.7%	52.1%
15	East Anglia	United Kingdom	463	1.7%	53.6%
16	Texas	United States	446	1.6%	54.7%
17	Darmstadt	Germany	443	1.6%	56.1%
18	Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire	United Kingdom	434	1.6%	57.4%
19	North Carolina	United States	416	1.5%	58.4%
20	Zuid-Holland	Netherlands	410	1.5%	59.7%
21	Indiana	United States	406	1.5%	60.9%
22	Ibaraki	Japan	394	1.5%	61.8%
23	Hyogo	Japan	394	1.5%	62.3%
24	Connecticut	United States	385	1.4%	63.1%
25	Kyoto	Japan	377	1.4%	63.6%
26	Rhône-Alpes	France	339	1.3%	64.5%
27	Wisconsin	United States	320	1.2%	65.2%
28	Inner London	United Kingdom	319	1.2%	66.0%
29	Saitama	Japan	317	1.2%	66.4%
30	Ohio	United States	308	1.1%	67.2%
31	Karlsruhe	Germany	305	1.1%	67.9%
32	Köln	Germany	292	1.1%	68.7%
33	Missouri	United States	280	1.0%	69.3%
34	Chiba	Japan	276	1.0%	69.6%
35	Michigan	United States	265	1.0%	70.3%
36	Iowa	United States	261	1.0%	70.9%
37	Berlin	Germany	258	1.0%	71.7%
38	Colorado	United States	251	0.9%	72.2%
39	Shizuoka	Japan	245	0.9%	72.7%
40	Région lémanique	Switzerland	239	0.9%	73.4%
41	Nordwestschweiz	Switzerland	234	0.9%	74.0%
42	Delaware	United States	232	0.9%	74.3%
43	Minnesota	United States	213	0.8%	74.8%
44	Düsseldorf	Germany	213	0.8%	75.1%
45	Virginia	United States	211	0.8%	75.3%
46	Florida	United States	207	0.8%	75.7%
47	Noord-Holland	Netherlands	199	0.7%	76.1%
48	Prov. Vlaams-Brabant	Belgium	192	0.7%	76.6%
49	Shiga	Japan	191	0.7%	76.7%
50	Lombardia	Italy	191	0.7%	77.3%

Cumulative % excludes double counts due to co-patenting in multiple regions

Table 2 Descriptive statistics

	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Biotech patents	Biotech portfolio	R&D	Clusters	Other regions	Countries
Weighted number of Biotech patents	422	21.1	36.2	1					
Size of Biotech Patent Portfolio (5year)	422	57.2	61.9	0.4834	1				
R&D Expenditures (in thousands USD)	422	452.4	760.3	0.0681	0.4350	1			
Number of clusters	422	1.6	1.5	0.3260	0.5985	0.3983	1		
Number of other regions	422	2.6	3.3	0.1181	0.4977	0.5458	0.3865	1	
Number of countries	422	2.0	1.5	0.0930	0.4257	0.5579	0.3455	0.7729	1

Table 3 Fixed Effect Negative Binomial Regressions:

Weighted Number of Biotech Patents Acting as Dependent Variable

	Model1	Model2	Model3	Model4	Model5	Model6
Biotech portfolio	0.0046*** (0.0009)	0.0039*** (0.0010)	0.0044*** (0.0010)	0.0039*** (0.0010)	0.0040*** (0.0010)	0.0045*** (0.0010)
R&D expenditures	0.0004*** (0.0001)	0.0003*** (0.0001)	0.0004*** (0.0001)	0.0003*** (0.0001)	0.0004*** (0.0001)	0.0004*** (0.0001)
Clusters		0.1015** (0.0455)		0.0991** (0.0471)	0.3962*** (0.1005)	
Clusters ²					-0.0492*** (0.0147)	
Other regions			0.0152 (0.0194)	0.004 (0.0201)	-0.0457 (0.0377)	
Other regions ²					0.0033 (0.0021)	
Countries						-0.0296 (0.0976)
Countries ²						0.008 (0.0114)
Time dummies	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Constant	0.1621 (0.1545)	0.0437 (0.1638)	0.131 (0.1602)	0.0376 (0.1668)	-0.1544 (0.1845)	0.1845 (0.2088)
Number Obs	422	422	422	422	422	422
Wald Chi ²	125.61***	133.31***	127.82***	133.67***	150.32***	130.96***

Remarks: Standard errors are reported between parentheses; *, **, *** indicate significance at the 10%

5% and 1% levels