Global Embeddedness and Local Innovation in Industrial Clusters

Ekaterina Turkina and Ari Van Assche, HEC Montréal



Global Value Chains



Location: A Neglected Factor?

- The implications of GVCs for location has been understudied (*Cano-Kollmann et al., JIBS, 2016*).
 - Do GVCs lead to the hollowing out of a regional economy (Buciuni and Pisano 2015; Pisano and Shih 2009)?
 - Do GVCs create a positive productivity boost to a local economy by improving the allocation of resources (*Grossman* and Rossi-Hansberg 2008)?
 - Do they allow regions to tap into foreign knowledge pockets, stimulating technological and knowledge spillovers from abroad (*Bathelt et al. 2004; Lorenzen and Mudambi 2013*).

Network View of Industrial Clusters



- Tacit knowledge exchanges within a cluster depends on a firm's network position (*Giuliani and Bell 2005*)
- Cluster firms deliberately establish trans-local linkages to tap into complementary pockets of knowledge (*Bathelt et al. 2004; Lorenzen and Mudambi 2013*).

A cluster's structural embeddedness in the global cluster network affects the knowledge it can access through trans-local linkages

Mapping the global cluster network



HEC MONTREAL

- Identify key industrial clusters in North America and Greater Europe in three industries:
 - a. Aerospace (56)
 - b. Biotech/Biopharma (51)
 - c. IT/Telecom (47)
- Identify firms (nodes) in each cluster during the periods
 2002-2005, 2006-2010, 2011-2014.
- Identify formal linkages (edges) between each dyad of firms.

3x2 types of formal linkages

	Local	Trans-local
Vertical Buyer-supplier	Local buyer-supplier (12980)	Trans-local buyer-supplier (3340)
Horizontal Partnership	Local partnership (19968)	Trans-local partnership (2350)
Intra-firm	Local intra-firm (2233)	Trans-local intra-firm (3190)

HEC MONTREAL

The changing nature of industrial clustering





Hierarchicalization of clusters (*Turkina et al., JEG, 2016*)



2010-2014

2002-2005

HEC MONTREAL

Red lines are partnership linkages; Blue lines are buyer-supplier linkages

Linkage heterogeneity

- Horizontal linkages: connections between similar firms in the same industry segment
- Vertical linkages: ties between complementary firms specializing in sequential activities in a supply chain



HEC MONTREAL

Cluster archetypes



Hypotheses

- *Hypothesis 1:* An increase in a cluster's centrality in the horizontal sub-network leads to a larger improvement in innovation performance for globally and horizontally embedded clusters than for vertically embedded and peripheral clusters.
- *Hypothesis 2:* An increase in a cluster's centrality in the vertical sub-network leads to a larger increase in innovation for vertically embedded and peripheral clusters than for globally and horizontally embedded clusters.



Identification of Cluster archetypes



Negative binomial regression analysis

$$\begin{split} P_{ikt} &= \alpha + fe_i + fe_k + fe_t + \beta_1 H C_{ikt} + \beta_2 H C_{ikt} * T_{ikt} + \gamma_1 V C_{ikt} + \gamma_2 V C_{ikt} * T_{ikt} + \\ \mathbf{L}_{ikt} \delta + u_{ikt}, \end{split}$$

- *Pikt*: number of patents for location *i* in industry *k* in period *t*
- *HCikt:* eigenvector centrality of location *i* in industry *k* and period *t* in the horizontal sub-network
- *VCikt:* eigenvector centrality of location *i* in industry *k* and period *t* in the vertical sub-network
- *Tikt:* dummy variable that equals 1 if cluster archetype is peripheral or vertically embedded, and 0 otherwise.
 HEC MONTREAL

Dependent variable: Number of Patents

- *United States.* Cluster-specific USPTO patent data extracted from the US Cluster Mapping Project.
- *Canada.* Institute for Prosperity and Competitiveness data extracted from Canadian Cluster Observatory.
- *Mexico.* SIGA data.
- *Europe.* EPO data.



Dependent v	<i>variable:</i> number of par	tents in cluster <i>i</i> in indu	stry k and period t
	Peripheral/vertically embedded $(T=1)$ vs. horizontally/globally embedded $(T=0)$		
	Regional and international	International	
	(1)	(2)	
Ln(vertical eigen. Centrality)	4.284* (4.197)	9.005* (7.178)	
Ln(vertical eigen. Centrality) * T	81.612* (80.815)	84.701* (79.193)	
Ln(horizontal eigen. Centrality)	99.003*** (8.235)	103.205*** (8.873)	
Ln(horizontal eigen. Centrality) * T	-69.725* (69.720)	-64.684* (64.652)	
Ln (Intra-firm centrality)	73.328* (65.147)	78.276** (33.926)	
Ln(local buyer-supplier linkages)	12.682 (12.690)	12.028 (12.033)	
Ln(local intra-firm linkages)	49.016** (19.547)	42.813** (18.752)	
Ln(local partnership linkages)	64.347*** (4.012)	66.265*** (4.214)	
Ln(cluster density)	76.069* (75.135)	77.043* (76.517)	
Ln(wages)	18.557 (20.611)	21.418 (22.005)	
Ln(location quotient)	113.519*** (16.206)	115.348*** (16.017)	
Ln(R&D investments)	162.305*** (12.105)	171.782*** (14.008)	
Labor force education	1.546*** (0.108)	1.781*** (0.113)	
Industry fixed effects	Yes	Yes	
N chi2 Log likelihood LR chi2	290 624.56* -1145.89 77.01	290 621.88* -1143.45 73.97	

Table 6: Negative binomial regression results, lagged independent variables

Notes: Coefficients are reported with errors that include eigenvector terms based on the weighted residuals to adjust for spatial autocorrelation. ***, **, and * denote significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% levels, respectively. Coefficients on constant and industry fixed effects are not reported.

Conclusion

- Among the first papers that empirically investigates how a cluster's structural embeddedness in a global network of clusters affects its local innovation performance.
- We developed a new typology of four cluster archetypes based on their multiplex embeddedness in the global cluster network.
- We developed hypotheses how the relation between a cluster's global embeddedness and its local innovation performance varies across cluster archetypes.
- Using a hand-collected longitudinal dataset of formal firm linkages between 154 clusters across three industries, we find empirical support for our predictions.
 HEC MONTREAL