

Title	Dynamics among Learning, Assimilation Capacity, and R&D Spillovers
Author(s)	Asgari, Behrooz; 渡辺, 千仞
Citation	年次学術大会講演要旨集, 15: 398-401
Issue Date	2000-10-21
Type	Conference Paper
Text version	publisher
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/10119/5884
Rights	本著作物は研究・技術計画学会の許可のもとに掲載するものです。This material is posted here with permission of the Japan Society for Science Policy and Research Management.
Description	一般論文

○ Behrooz Asgari, 渡辺千仞 (東工大社会理工学)

Abstract

Introduction of innovations in electrical machinery industry largely depends on R&D and intensive resources of R&D are required for generating new products. However, smaller firms usually find it difficult to challenge R&D mainly due to the high cost of R&D resources. Such firms tend to depend on the effective utilization of research results produced by their competitors. Effective and efficient utilization of these technologies depends on assimilation capacity and learning effects.

This paper makes empirical analysis of R&D activities focusing on inter-firm technology spillovers in 24 Japan's leading R&D intensive electrical machinery firms. This analysis covers the last two decades explaining the sources of success in constructing a highly productive R&D structure.

I. Introduction

R&D intensity (the ratio of R&D expenditure and sales) in Japan's electrical machinery was 6.3% in 1998 which is well higher than the manufacturing industry average of 3.9%. (Fig. 1)




Fig. 1. R&D Intensity in the Japanese manufacturing industry in 1998 (R&D expenditure per sales (%))

Such highly intensive R&D activities need huge investments in R&D resources. These R&D resources being beyond the reach of smaller firms, necessitates more effective and efficient utilization of technologies developed elsewhere which "spill over" into the market. Following Cohen and Levinthal (1989) and Watanabe et al (2000), effective utilization of potential spillover pool largely depends upon assimilation capacity. Assimilation capacity is a function of the level of technology stock and the ability to maximize the benefits of a learning exercise (Watanabe et al, 2000) and, it depends on the level of R&D

expenditures. This paper demonstrates this hypothetical view taking 24 leading R&D intensive Japanese electrical machinery firms and examines their R&D activities during the last two decades. Many scholarly works have been done on elucidating high R&D intensity in the electrical machinery industry. However, none has looked at the relationship between R&D intensity, technology spillovers and assimilation capacity.

Section 2 reviews the state of R&D structure in electrical machinery industry. Section 3 analyzes the state of technology spillovers between electrical machinery firms. Section 4 describes the mathematical development. Section 5 briefly summarizes the implications.

II. State of High-level R&D Intensity

Table 1 summarizes the state of sales and R&D structure of 24 leading R&D intensive Japanese electrical machinery firms in 1998 which covers 56% sales and 82% of R&D expenditure of entire electrical machinery industry. Table 1 suggests that the 24 firms may be classified in two clusters (Group 1: 1-9, Group 2: 10-24) by indigenous technology stock ratio (T_1/T_3).

Figure 2 demonstrates the correlation between technology stock and sales of 24 leading R&D intensive Japanese electrical machinery firms over the last two decades. Looking at Fig. 2 we note that there exists a strong correlation between technology stock and sales over the entire period examined. This demonstrates that technology stock is really a source of sales increase for electrical machinery industry compelling these firms to depend on further intensive R&D investment.

Table 1 State of Sales and R&D Structure of 24 R&D Intensive Japanese Electrical Machinery Firms in 1998: ¥ bil. at 1990 fixed prices

No.	Firm	Sales	R&D Expenditure	R&D Intensity	T ₁	T ₁ /T ₃ (*)
1	Mitsubishi Electric Industrial Co., Ltd.	6247.7	478.4	7.6	478.4	3.31
2	Nippon Electric Industry Co., Ltd.	5065.5	316.5	6.2	316.5	2.11
3	Hitachi, Ltd.	5161.4	362.4	7.0	362.4	2.50
4	Toshiba Corp.	4659.8	281.6	6.0	281.6	1.85
5	Fujitsu Ltd.	4284.9	318.3	7.4	318.3	2.10
6	Mitsubishi Electric Corp.	3723.0	179.5	4.8	179.5	1.13
7	Sony Corp.	3248.0	291.9	8.9	291.9	1.87
8	Canon Corp.	2087.0	186.1	8.9	186.1	1.15
9	Sharp Corp.	1757.3	125.8	7.1	125.8	0.77
10	Sanyo Electric Co., Ltd.	1456.5	86.0	5.9	86.0	0.52
11	Matsushita Electric Works, Ltd.	1331.4	50.1	3.7	50.1	0.30
12	Victor Co. of Japan, Ltd.	793.3	38.1	4.8	38.1	0.23
13	Fuji Electric Co., Ltd.	733.2	32.8	4.4	32.8	0.20
14	Kyocera Corp.	620.0	24.9	4.0	24.9	0.15
15	Oki Electric Industry Co., Ltd.	674.6	33.8	5.0	33.8	0.20
16	Pioneer Electronic Corp.	459.2	26.5	5.7	26.5	0.16
17	Alps Electric Co., Ltd.	442.4	12.8	2.8	12.8	0.08
18	Casio Keisanki Co., Inc.	475.4	19.9	4.1	19.9	0.12
19	Rehm C., Ltd.	358.8	17.3	4.8	17.3	0.10
20	Aiwa Co., Ltd.	424.9	20.1	4.7	20.1	0.12
21	Yokogawa Electric Corp.	230.2	17.2	7.4	17.2	0.10
22	Japan Radio Co., Ltd.	233.3	14.0	6.0	14.0	0.08
23	Meidensha Corp.	231.8	8.0	3.4	8.0	0.05
24	Kokusai Electric Co., Ltd.	159.4	7.4	4.6	7.4	0.04
Total 24 Firms		44858.8	2949.2	6.6	2949.2	
Total Electric Machinery Industry		79604.7	3589.2	4.5	1998.0	




Fig. 2. Correlation between Indigenous Technology Stock and Sales in 24 R&D Intensive Japanese Electrical Machinery Firms (1991-94)

Table 2 Technology Contribution to Sales in 24 R&D Intensive Japanese Electrical Machinery Firms (1979-98)

$\ln S = 1.98 + 0.8 \ln T_1 + 0.84 \ln T_2$	adj. R^2	DW
(5.64) (16.40) (11.31)	0.954	1.86

where S: sales, T: technology stock; and D_1, D_2 : dummy variables (D_1 : firms 1-9, D_2 : Firms 10-24)

III. State of Inter-firm Technology Spillovers

1. Mathematical Approach

As shown in Fig. 1., electrical machinery industry is a R&D driven industry. Its production (S: sales) can be depicted by the following equation:




Fig. 3. Spillover and Assimilation Capacity Dynamics

$$S = S(T) \quad (1)$$

where T: technology stock¹. Technology stock is composed of indigenous technology (T_i) as well as technology spillovers developed by other firms and assimilated by the host firm. (Fig.3.)

¹ The structure in equation (2) is proved to be the most significant. The case of Fuji Electric Co. is presented here as an example:

$T = T_i + ZT_s$	λ	α	β	β_1	β_2	adj. R^2	DW
	-0.21	0.29	2.24			0.995	1.83
	(-5.40)	(1.03)	(7.85)				
$T = T_i + T_s$	-0.29	0.15	2.97			0.899	1.71
	(-5.57)	(0.53)	(4.98)				
$T = T^{\beta_1} T^{\beta_2}$	-0.28	0.16	0.02	2.90	0.893	1.71	
	(-3.81)	(0.53)	(0.26)	(3.38)			

$$T = T_i + ZT_s \quad (2)$$

Potential spillover pool is calculated as follows:

$$T_s = \sum_j T_j - T_i$$

We use the following equation to measure assimilation capacity (see Watanabe et al., (2000) for details):

$$Z = \left(1 - \frac{1}{\phi}\right) \frac{T_i}{T_s}, \quad 0 < Z < T_i / T_s \quad (3)$$

Since production can be expressed as a function of technology as indicated in equation (1), taking time difference of equation (1), change in sales can be expressed only by technology stock as follows:

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = \frac{\partial S}{\partial T} \frac{dT}{dt} \quad (4)$$

In order to maximize the effects of technology spillovers, the host firm treats technology spillovers and indigenous technology homogeneously (Watanabe et al., 2000):

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = \frac{\partial S}{\partial T_i} \frac{dT_i}{dt} \quad (5)$$

$$\frac{dS}{dt} = \frac{\partial S}{\partial (ZT_s)} \frac{d(ZT_s)}{dt} \approx \frac{\partial S}{\partial (ZT_s)} \frac{ZdT_s}{dt} \quad \text{Since } Z \text{ is}$$

$$\text{small and } \Delta Z \approx 0, \quad (6)$$

From equation (12) and (13) marginal productivity of T_i and ZT_s can be obtained as follows:

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial T_i} = \frac{\Delta S}{\Delta T_i} \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{\partial S}{\partial (ZT_s)} = \frac{\Delta S}{Z\Delta T_s} \quad (8)$$

Substituting equations (14) and (15) in equation (16), ϕ can be measured as follows:

$$\phi = \frac{\Delta S / ZT_s}{\Delta S / \Delta T_i} = \frac{\Delta T_i}{Z\Delta T_s} \quad (9)$$

Substituting equation (9) in equation (3):

$$Z = \left(1 - \frac{Z\Delta T_s}{\Delta T_i}\right) \frac{T_i}{T_s} \quad (10)$$

From equation (10), Z can be measured as:

$$Z = \frac{\Delta T_i T_i}{\Delta T_i T_s + \Delta T_s T_i} = \frac{T_i}{T_s} \frac{\Delta T_i}{\Delta T_i + \frac{\Delta T_s}{T_s} T_i} = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{\Delta T_s}{T_s} \frac{T_i}{T_i}} \quad (11)$$

2. Trends in Assimilation Capacity

Results of the measurement of assimilation capacity of 24 electrical machinery firms over the period 1979-1998 by using equation (17) is summarized and illustrated in Fig. 4.




Fig. 4. Trends in the Assimilation Capacity in 24 R&D Intensive Japanese Electrical Machinery

IV. Optimal Dependency between Indigenous Technology and Spillovers Technology

1. Mathematical Model

The assimilation capacity in time t can be expressed by the following equation:

$$Z_t = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{1}{w}} \cdot \frac{T_t}{T_s} = \frac{w}{w+1} \frac{T_{i0} \cdot e^{g_i t}}{T_{s0} \cdot e^{g_s t}} = \left(\frac{T_{i0}}{T_{s0}} \right) \cdot \frac{w}{w+1} \cdot e^{(w-1)g_s t} \quad (12)$$

where $g_i = \frac{\Delta T_i}{T_i}$, $g_s = \frac{\Delta T_s}{T_s}$, change rates of

indigenous technology sock and technology stock in potential spillover pool, respectively, and T_{i0} and T_{s0} initial stages of T_i and T_s respectively Utilizing this equation technology stock at time t in equation (2) can be expressed as follows:

$$T_t = T_i + ZT_s = T_i \left(1 + \frac{w}{w+1} \right) = T_{i0} \cdot \frac{2w+1}{w+1} \cdot e^{w \cdot g_s t} \quad (13)$$

Given the production function (1), sales at time t can be depicted by the simple Cobb-Douglas function as follows:

$$S_t A T_t^\alpha = A T_{i0}^\alpha \left(\frac{2w+1}{w+1} \right)^\alpha e^{\alpha \cdot w \cdot g_s t} \quad (A: \text{scale factor; and } \alpha: \text{elasticity.}) \quad (14)$$

Since R&D expenditure of host at time t can be expressed by the equation (25), R&D productivity (sales by R&D investment) can be expressed by equation (26):

$$R_t \approx \Delta T_t = g_t T_t = T_{i0} \cdot g_i \cdot e^{g_i t} = T_{i0} w g_s e^{w g_s t} \quad (15)$$


$$\frac{S_t}{R_t} = A T_{i0}^{\alpha-1} \left(\frac{2w+1}{w+1} \right)^\alpha \frac{1}{w} e^{(\alpha-1)w g_s t} \quad (16)$$

R&D intensity is the reverse of equation (16).

2. Empirical analysis


Utilizing equations developed in section IV.1, empirical analysis of the optimal dependency between indigenous technology stock and spillover technology in 24 R&D intensive Japanese electrical machinery firms over the period of 1979-1998 were conducted by dividing 5 periods: 1979-1982; 1983-1986; 1987-1990; 1991-1994; 1995-1998. Results of 1991-94 are illustrated in Figs 5 and 6. All supporting observations are obtained by numerical simulation. Fig 5 demonstrates that indigenous technology stock contributes to sales increase in all of the firms examined and this contribution is more significant in larger firms (Group 1) than smaller firms (Group 2).

Fig. 7 demonstrates that an increase in indigenous technology is the major source of assimilation capacity increase. Furthermore, the magnitude is more significant in larger firms. Fig. 8 shows the contribution of total technology stock to sales increase.




		adj. R ²	DW
Total	$\ln S = 2.16 + 0.82 \ln T_i$ (10.60) (22.33)	0.955	1.74
Group1	$\ln S = 2.09 + 0.82 \ln T + 0.25 D_{1,6}$ (4.06) (10.99) (2.70)	0.947	2.17
Group 2	$\ln S = 1.96 + 0.86 \ln T_i$ (4.08) (8.12)	0.823	1.65

Fig. 5. Correlation between Indigenous Technology Stock and Sales in 24 R&D Intensive Japanese Electrical Machinery Firms (1991-94)




		adj. R ²	DW
Total	$\ln Z = 4.44 + 2.77 \ln R/S$ (2.22) (20.97)	0.464	0.79
Group 1	$\ln Z = 2.50 + 1.90 \ln R/S + D_1$ (0.85) (1.92) (1.81)	0.320	0.938
Group 2	$\ln Z = -3.82 + 0.52 \ln R/S$ (1.72) (0.82)	0.226	0.37

Fig. 6. Correlation between R&D Intensity and Assimilation Capacity in 24 R&D Intensive Japanese Electrical Machinery Firms (1991-94)



		adj. R ²	DW
Total	$\ln Z = -10.22 + 1.31 \ln T_i$ (-70.39) (39.42)	0.985	1.72
Group 1	$\ln Z = -10.21 + 0.1.03T_i$ (-23.13) (16.25)	0.970	2.44
Group 2	$\ln Z = -9.92 + 0.96T_i$ (-29.25) (12.78)	0.920	1.55

Fig. 7. Correlation between Indigenous Technology Stock and Assimilation Capacity in 24 R&D Intensive Japanese Electrical Machinery Firms (1991-94)



		adj. R ²	DW
Total	$\ln S = -1.82 + 0.82 \ln T$ (-8.43) (22.66)	0.957	1.73
Group 1	$\ln S = 1.26 + 0.89T$ (1.74) (9.08)	0.909	2.47
Group 2	$\ln S = 1.53 + 0.88T$ (2.98) (8.45)	0.834	1.67

Fig. 8. Correlation between Total Technology Stock and Sales in 24 R&D Intensive Japanese Electrical Machinery Firms (1991-94)

V. Implications

This paper attempts to elucidate the structural sources of the high-level of R&D intensity in electrical machinery firms. Focusing on their interactions with competitors by the assimilation of spillovers, the motivations of R&D investment and increase in R&D intensity are identified. On the basis of a numerical analysis and empirical demonstration, the following findings provide an explanation of the structural sources of the high level of R&D intensity in the electrical machinery industry.

- (i) Technology significantly contributes to sales in this industry, and, therefore, an increase in technology stock by R&D investment.
- (ii) In order to increase technology stock, not only indigenous R&D investment, but also effective utilization of spillover is essential.
- (iii) Improvement of assimilation capacity is essential for effective utilization of spillover, and this depends on the level of technology stock in the host side.

References

- [1] A. B. Jaffe, Technological Opportunity and Spillovers of R&D: Evidence from Firm's Patents, Profits and Market Value, *American Economic Review* 76, NO. 5 (1986) 984-1001.
- [2] C. Watanabe, B. Zhu, C. Griffy-Brown and B. Asgari, Global Technology Spillover and Its Impact on Industry's R&D Strategies, *Technovation* 20 (2000) in print.
- [3] W. M. Cohen and D. A. Levinthal, Innovation and Learning: The Two Faces of R&D, *The Economic Journal* 99 (1989) 569-596.