Volume Title: The Role of Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Economic Growth

Volume Authors/Editors: Michael J. Andrews, Aaron Chatterji, Josh Lerner, and Scott Stern, editors

Volume Publisher: University of Chicago Press

Volume ISBNs: 978-0-226-81078-2 (cloth), 978-0-226-81064-5 (electronic)

Volume URL: https://www.nber.org/books-and-chapters/role-innovation-and-entrepreneurship-economic-growth

Conference Date: January 7-8, 2020

Publication Date: Februrary 2022

Chapter Title: Panel Remarks: Measuring Business Innovation Using a Multidimensional Approach

Chapter Author(s): Lucia Foster

Chapter URL: https://www.nber.org/books-and-chapters/role-innovation-and-entrepreneurship-economic-growth/panel-remarks-measuring-business-innovation-using-multidimensional-approach

Chapter pages in book: p. 569 – 575

Panel Remarks
Measuring Business
Innovation Using a
Multidimensional Approach

Lucia Foster

Advancing the US Census Bureau's mission "to serve as the nation's leading provider of quality data about its people and economy" requires a robust and agile research and development (R&D) program working in close collaboration with external experts and Census Bureau programmatic staff. Even straightforward concepts, such as the use of industrial robotics in manufacturing, can require a multidimensional measurement approach. While the Census Bureau is known for its surveys, some of our most innovative work combines survey data with administrative data or combines multiple sources of administrative data.

Here I discuss the multidimensional R&D approach that the Center for Economic Studies (CES) at the Census Bureau takes in attempting to better understand business innovation.[1] Since it is not possible to provide details on these many interrelated efforts, I highlight our multidimensional approach by giving examples of research using administrative data, survey data, and

1. Jarmin (2019) discusses enhancing and improving economic measurement at the Census Bureau.

indirect inference. A more complete view of CES research activities is provided in our annual reports and working paper series.[2]

Context

Census is one of 13 principal statistical agencies in the US. The missions of these other agencies are often complementary to the Census mission and hence one important activity of CES is outreach to other agencies to partner on topics of mutual interest. When the topic is innovation, we often partner with the National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics (NCSES), but we also partner with other federal agencies, state governments, and other institutions (such as universities). Further, we work with individuals, especially academic experts, to help us improve our measures of the US economy and its people. Many of these researchers conduct work through one of the 30 locations in the Federal Statistical Research Data Center (FSRDC) system.[3] Most of the examples given below are based on research conducted with academic experts.

In all this work, we support U.S.C. Title 13, which allows the use of microdata to provide a benefit to the Census Bureau with conditions to protect the confidentiality of our respondents. Operationally, this pledge of confidentiality may constrain the granularity of publicly available information. For research questions that cannot be answered using published data, researchers can apply to use the data through the FSRDC system.

Measuring Business Innovation Using Administrative Data

I start by describing two large R&D projects attempting to measure innovation using administrative data: the Business Dynamics Statistics for Patenting Firms (BDS-PF) and the Innovation Measurement Initiative (IMI). Together they represent the collection and use of administrative data from the federal government, state governments, and universities, and they demonstrate our collaborations with academic researchers.

The Business Dynamics Statistics (BDS) program provides annual information for the US non-farm economy on firm startups and shutdowns, establishment entry and exit, and job creation and destruction. Core data for the BDS come from the Census Bureau's business frame, which relies heavily on federal administrative data.[4] CES has embarked on a multi-year project to enhance the BDS to include a series of indicators enabling us to provide information on business dynamics by firm characteristics, including

2. See https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/ces/research.html.
3. See https://www.census.gov/fsrdc.
4. Researchers at CES developed the Longitudinal Business Database from the business frame (Jarmin and Miranda 2002; Chow et al. 2021), and the BDS is the public product derived from the Longitudinal Business Database.

globalization (exporting, importing, and multinational), human capital (of workers and owners), and innovation (patents, trademarks, R&D expenditures, and other inputs or outcomes of innovative activities). This section focuses on the component of the innovation project identifying firms that patent (BDS-PF).[5]

Multiple research teams have linked patent data to Census business data. An early part of the BDS-PF included a collaboration between the Census Bureau and US Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO). This team improved on the existing linkage (previously done through linking assignee information from patent documents to the business register) by incorporating additional inventor information from the same patent documents linked to the Longitudinal Employer-Household Dynamics (LEHD) data. The LEHD data rely on administrative jobs data from state agencies, federal agencies, and the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages provided by states (Abowd et al. 2009). The researchers triangulate these two independent sources of information (assignees and inventors) to link granted patents to their firm owners, allowing them to substantially improve match rates over earlier studies (Graham et al. 2018).

The latest research at Census for the BDS-PF focuses on patents related to artificial intelligence (AI) and uses natural language processing and machine learning to conduct this research. While the USPTO classifies the technologies embedded in patents according to preexisting classification systems with hundreds of classes and thousands of subclasses, Alderucci et al. (2019) argue that using these and/or keywords will miss much potential AI use, since AI is becoming a general-purpose technology. Alderucci et al. (2019) train a machine learning algorithm to identify 52,000 AI-related patents (or up to 140,000 patents using a looser definition), which, they note, is about 3 to 10 times the number of AI patents first identified by Cockburn, Henderson, and Stern (2019). The same methodology can potentially be applied across other technology fields.

An entirely different set of metrics comes from the joint IMI, which links Census data to the Institute for Research on Innovation and Science (IRIS) UMETRICS data from universities on federally sponsored research at the project level. The IRIS data include project-level financial transactions, such as payments to internal personnel, payments to outside vendors, and payments to contractors as part of sub-awards. As Lane et al. (2018) note in their overview of the IMI project, the IRIS builds on long-running efforts to demonstrate the innovation flowing from federally funded R&D.

IRIS currently includes over 30 universities with the goal of partnering with 150 universities (IRIS targets every university with at least $100 million in R&D). The data include 392,000 funded awards covering 643,000 research

---

5. Goldschlag and Perlman (2017) provide an overview of the larger project, Business Dynamics of Innovative Firms.

employees, $84 billon in award spending, and $61 billion in vendor and subcontract spending.[6] Dissemination of results from this project currently occurs in three ways: research papers, research datasets for qualified users on approved projects, and two quarterly reports (a vendor report and an employee report) at the campus level for participating universities. Additionally, Census and IRIS are developing other publicly available data products.

Researchers have combined the IMI data with Census datasets to examine such subjects as the gender gaps in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) occupations (Buffington et al. 2016), outcomes of PhD recipients (Zolas et al. 2015), and the impact of workers' research experience on new firm outcomes. For the latter, Goldschlag et al. (2021) link the employee data with Census data on startups to look at the link between research experience and young firm outcomes, including survival, growth, and innovation. They find that workers' research experience is correlated with an "up-or-out" firm dynamic (negatively correlated with survival, but conditional on survival, and positively correlated with growth) and with innovative activities (as measured by patent and trademark filings).

Measuring Business Innovation Using Survey Data

To understand technology adoption and diffusion, we turn to survey data. The Annual Business Survey (ABS) is a relatively new survey (starting with reference year 2017) and represents a partnership between Census and NCSES. This firm-level survey covers all sectors of the non-agricultural economy.[7] The ABS 2018 was mailed to about 850,000 firms (about 560,000 firms responded) and includes sections on innovation (16 questions), technology (three questions), and intellectual property (four questions). My focus is on the three questions in the technology section.

These three questions concern the digital share of business activity (digitization), cloud service purchases, and advanced business technologies for reference year 2017. The digitization question asks firms for the extent to which certain information types (such as personnel or financial data) are stored in digital format. Similarly, the cloud services purchases question asks firms about which of their information technology functions in eight different areas (such as servers and data storage) are stored in the cloud. The third question asks directly about the testing or use of nine advanced business technologies (for example, machine learning, natural language processing, and robotics).

The survey results suggest that adoption of digitization is widespread, with the use of cloud computing being less so, and adoption of many of the advanced technologies still in their infancy (Zolas et al. 2020). We find nearly

6. For more information, see: https://iris.isr.umich.edu.
7. See also the Business Research and Development and Innovation Survey and the Annual Survey of Entrepreneurs.

70 percent of the firms have adopted some form of digitization (mainly for personnel and financial information), while more than 50 percent of firms report either no cloud purchases or that they are not necessary. Turning to advanced technologies, we find that 2.2 percent of respondents are using machine learning and less than 1 percent are testing its use.

Looking forward, the ABS 2019 has two sections especially relevant for innovation. The "Products and Processes" section has nine questions concerning new or improved goods, services, and business processes. Follow-up questions further distinguish between "new to the business" and "new to the market." The "Technology and Workforce" section has 32 questions about workforce composition and demand, and five advanced technologies (including AI, robotics, and specialized software). Researchers interested in innovation may find the question concerning factors prohibiting technology adoption and utilization in production especially interesting. At the time of this writing, the responses from the 300,000 firms surveyed have been collected and are being processed.

Applying Indirect Inference to Identify Innovative Activities

Given the challenges associated with measuring innovation directly, the last approach relies on indirect inference to identify areas in the economy with innovative activity. Using micro-level data on productivity growth and business entry and exit, Foster et al. (2021) identify patterns in these dynamics that are suggestive of innovative activity. We build on the stages of firm dynamics in response to innovation developed by Gort and Klepper (1982) which we summarize as: innovation leads to a burst of business entry, which is followed by experimentation and adoption, and ultimately a period in which businesses who have successfully responded to the innovation grow while those that have not, shrink and exit.

Foster et al. (2021) apply findings from the literature on the importance of reallocation for aggregate productivity growth to these stages of firm dynamics. Thus, following an innovation, we expect to see business entry, which leads to productivity dispersion as businesses experiment, then rising productivity growth as some businesses become more productive and resources reallocate toward successful businesses. Eventually, productivity dispersion compresses as the sector matures and settles down. Their analysis comparing outcomes of high-tech versus non-high-tech industries suggests that these patterns may be useful guides when looking for industries with innovation.

Conclusion

The Census microdata referenced here are available for qualified researchers on approved projects through the FSRDC system. The CES Working Paper Series and Technical Working Paper series include many papers doc-

umenting various Census surveys and research data sets. As these panel remarks have made clear, the Census Bureau leverages its partnership with academic experts to continually improve our measures of our nation's people and economy. Understanding innovation is a critical component in this work, and perhaps these panel remarks will inspire more researchers to utilize the FSRDC network to help us better understand business innovation.

References

Abowd, John M., Bryce E. Stephens, Lars Vilhuber, Fredrik Andersson, Kevin L. McKinney, Marc Roemer, and Simon D. Woodcock. 2009. "The LEHD Infrastructure Files and the Creation of the Quarterly Workforce Indicators." In *Producer Dynamics: New Evidence from Micro Data*, edited by Timothy Dunne, J. Bradford Jensen, and Mark J. Roberts, 149–230. Studies in Income and Wealth Vol. 68. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Alderucci, Dean, Lee Branstetter, Eduard Hovy, Andrew Runge, and Nikolas Zolas. 2019. "Quantifying the Impact of AI on Productivity and Labor Demand: Evidence from U.S. Census Microdata." Presented at Poster Session at 2019 NBER Summer Institute on IT and Digitization.

Buffington, Catherine, Benjamin Cerf, Christina Jones, and Bruce Weinberg. 2016. "STEM Training and Early Career Outcomes of Female and Male Graduate Students: Evidence from UMETRICS Data Linked to the 2010 Census." *American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings* 106: 333–38.

Chow, Melissa, Teresa C. Fort, Christopher Goetz, Nathan Goldschlag, James Lawrence, Elisabeth Ruth Perlman, Martha Stinson, and T. Kirk White. (2021). "Redesigning the Longitudinal Business Database." Working Paper 21-08, Center for Economic Studies, US Census Bureau.

Cockburn, Iain, Rebecca Henderson, and Scott Stern. 2019. "The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Innovation: An Exploratory Analysis." In *The Economics of Artificial Intelligence: An Agenda*, edited by Ajay Agrawal, Joshua Gans, and Avi Goldfarb, 115–46. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foster, Lucia, Cheryl Grim, John Haltiwanger, and Zoltan Wolf. 2021. "Innovation, Productivity Dispersion, and Productivity Growth." In *Measuring and Accounting for Innovation in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Carol Corrado, Jonathan Haskel, Javier Miranda, and Daniel Sichel, 103–36. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Goldschlag, Nathan, and Elisabeth Perlman. 2017. "Business Dynamics of Innovative Firms." Center for Economic Studies Working Papers 17–72. Washington, DC: US Census Bureau.

Goldschlag, Nathan, Ron Jarmin, Julia Lane, and Nikolas Zolas. 2021. "Research Experience as Human Capital in New Business Outcomes." In *Measuring and Accounting for Innovation in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Carol Corrado, Jonathan Haskel, Javier Miranda, and Daniel Sichel, 229–54. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gort, Michael, and Steven Klepper. 1982. "Time Paths in the Diffusion of Product Innovations." *Economic Journal* 92(367): 630–53.

Graham, Stuart J., Cheryl Grim, Tariqul Islam, Alan C. Marco, and Javier Miranda.

2018. "Business Dynamics of Innovating Firms: Linking US Patents with Administrative Data on Workers and Firms." *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy* 27(3): 372–402.

Jarmin, Ron S. 2019. "Evolving Measurement for Evolving Economy: Thoughts on 21st Century US Economic Statistics." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 33(1): 165–84.

Jarmin, Ron, and Javier Miranda. 2002. "The Longitudinal Business Database." Center for Economic Studies, Working Paper 02-17. Washington, DC: US Census Bureau.

Lane, Julia, Jason-Owen Smith, Joseph Staudt, and Bruce Weinberg. 2018. "New Measurement of Innovation." In *Center for Economic Studies and Research Data Centers Research Report*: *2017*. Washington, DC: US Census Bureau.

Zolas, Nikolas, Nathan Goldschlag, Ron Jarmin, Paula Stephan, Jason Owen-Smith, Rebecca F. Rosen, Barbara McFadden Allen, Bruce A. Weinberg, and Julia I. Lane. 2015. "Wrapping It Up in a Person: Examining Employment and Earnings Outcomes for Ph.D. Recipients." *Science* 350(6266): 1367–1371.

Zolas, Nikolas, Zachary Kroff, Erik Brynjolfsson, Kristina McElheran, David Beede, Catherine Buffington, Nathan Goldschlag, Lucia Foster, and Emin Dinlersoz. 2020. "Advanced Technologies Adoption and Use by U.S. Firms: Evidence from the Annual Business Survey." Center for Economic Studies Working Paper 20-40, US Census Bureau.