Prof. Dr. Paul J.J. Welfens, president of the European Institute for International Economic Relations at the University of Wuppertal (EIIW), Jean Monnet Professor for European Economic Integration and Chair for Macroeconomics at the Schumpeter School of Business and Economics, University of Wuppertal;, Rainer-Gruenter-Str. 21, D-42119 Wuppertal; +49 202 4391371, Alfred Grosser Professorship 2007/08, Sciences Po, Paris, Research Fellow, IZA, Bonn, Non-Resident Senior Fellow at AICGS/Johns Hopkins University, Washington DC

Tony Irawan, M.App.Ec, Schumpeter School of Business and Economics at the University of Wuppertal; Research Assistant at European Institute for International Economic Relations (EIIW) at the University of Wuppertal, Rainer-Gruenter-Str. 21, D-42119 Wuppertal, Phone: +49-202-4391371, Fax: +49-202-4391377. Lecturer at Faculty of Economics and Management, Bogor Agricultural University, Indonesia

European Product Innovation Dynamics and US Economic Impact: Theory and Empirical Analysis

welfens@eiiw.uni-wuppertal.de, irawan@eiiw.uni-wuppertal.de; www.eiiw.eu;

File jour2014WelfensIrawanProductinnovations

Advance version, July 2014

edited

preliminary, comments welcome

.

European Product Innovations Dynamics and US Economic Impact: Theory and Empirical Analysis

Table of Content

Abstract: The role of product innovations is growing in the world economy and the EU and the US are key players here. The analysis presented herein explains product innovations in the EU25 for the period 2006-2012, namely through lagged R&D (relative to GDP), cumulated FDI inflows – relative to the host country capital stock -,and cumulated FDI inflows – relative to the host country capital stock -, joint internet intensity, broadband intensity and potential competition. For the first time we can offer a broad analysis of product innovation dynamics in Europe which should be the basis for not only better supply-side policy in EU countries and growth policy, respectively, but also it suggests a strong role for international digital communication in relation to product innovation dynamics. Moreover, the approach gives new important arguments in favor of the TTIP negotiations between the US and the EU and it suggests a broader analytical link between trade, FDI, innovation, employment and output growth.

We appreciate editorial support of David Hanrahan (EIIW); the usual disclaimer applies

1. Introduction

The dynamics of process innovations have received broad attention in the literature while much less attention has been devoted to product innovations. There are few exceptions in the advanced macroeconomic analysis; e.g. Welfens (2011) has presented a Mundell Fleming model with product innovations where such innovations stimulate consumption and exports; in a modified approach product innovations also affect the demand for money and additionally the role of inward FDI is considered (Welfens, 2014b); product innovations raise the equilibrium real output and affect key policy multipliers and foreign direct investment – relative to the domestic capital stock – is an important variable in a Schumpeterian Mundell Fleming model. As regards the economic relevance of product innovations in a transatlantic perspective one may point out that the medium term trade and foreign direct investment (FDI) dynamics associated with the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP) project could go along with higher FDI and increased innovation intensity (Irawan and Welfens, 2014); at the same time it should be emphasized that traditional TTIP modeling has largely ignored the role of foreign direct investment dynamics and innovations.

Patents are an obvious source for relevant data for innovation dynamics – but not all innovative products and services are covered by patents - and a considerable share of patents are related to process innovations; patents obtained by firms in the sector of machinery and equipment and also in transport equipment can be classified to a large extent as reflecting process innovations. Product innovations are rather difficult to define in a clear way. There is, however, a broad body of literature on the diffusion of product innovations (i.e. Gort and Konakayama, 1978; Gort and Klepper, 1982; Jovanovic and Lach, 1989; Agarwal and Bayus, 2002). Javanovic/Lach (1997) have shown that US output variance – relative to trend – is influenced by product innovations: roughly 20% of output variance is explained by product innovations. As regards the empirical analysis of product innovations there is a narrow range of studies; e.g. for Taiwan Lin and Lin (2010) have presented evidence that both inward FDI and outward FDI plus trade have an effect on product innovations (as covered by survey data for firms).

Key issues in product innovations concern macroeconomic issues, namely to what extent output, the price level and the exchange rates are affected by product innovations. Typically, product innovations will be launched in lead markets in which the demand for novel products is relatively high – e.g. as a consequence of high per capita income - and where the responsiveness of consumers/users is considerable so that firms can benefit from a fast feedback from consumers/users (Beise, 2005). Effectively the demand side co-determines the first user advantages of firms.

Product innovations may typically be expected to play a strong role in leading OECD countries so that the US, EU countries, Switzerland, Norway, Japan, Korea and a few other countries should get particular attention with both respect to empirical aspects and to policy issues. In open economies there are three natural bridges across countries when it comes to product innovations:

- Trade among OECD countries will be relatively high as the real GDP of these countries is relatively high – however, there could be, of course, spatially determined trading patterns as is indicated by standard gravity modeling.
- Multinational companies will play a major role: In the case of horizontal foreign direct investment one may immediately expect that foreign subsidiaries will quickly launch similar product innovations as those launched in the markets of the parent country; hence FDI inflows from a leading OECD country into EU countries could be a driver of product innovations in EU countries. There are certain information transmission links that should be relevant for getting news on product innovations in the countries considered and in the US, respectively. To some extent we follow the logic emphasized by Jungmittag and Welfens (2009) who have shown, in an augmented trade gravity modeling, that international telecommunications between countries i and j are highly significant for international trade dynamics of EU countries. In the modern digital age one may, however, focus rather on a joint internet variable.

The specific interest of our research focus is to understand European product innovation dynamics and the role of US companies for those Schumpeterian dynamics. Subsequently we will take a look at first at theoretical considerations before the following sections present empirical findings and then the policy implications. The key insights in this paper are for EU countries that, besides past R&D (relative to GDP) cumulated inward FDI from the US – a country considered as leading in product innovations in many fields – , are highly significant for product innovations in the EU; this is a new finding along with the result that "joint communication density", namely the internet density in EU host countries and in the US significantly contribute to product innovations in the EU; moreover, the broadband density is an additional impact factor for product innovations. This suggests again that ICT dynamics are often underestimated in Economics (Welfens/Perret, 2014). There also is evidence that potential competition plays a role for product innovations.

All this has interesting implications for policymakers, but also for the dynamics of current account behavior of the euro area (and the US). From a Vernon-type product cycle trade approach one would clearly conclude that FDI inwards dynamics and OECD internet expansion dynamics have a strong impact on the current account position of the EU and the euro area, respectively. Since one may expect that product innovation improve the current account position there is a double benefit of EU inward FDI inflows from the US: There is more long term current account financing and there are impulses for product innovations and hence transitorily higher exports in the future.

2. Theoretical Aspects

Product innovations can stimulate demand in relevant markets and firms launching product innovations will typically fetch higher prices than firms offering only standardized products. If marginal production costs are given product innovations can be understood as an upward rotation of the demand curve – the saturation point is unchanged, but the prohibitive price is raised (e.g. as in the case of introducing color TV sets in an initial product setting with black and white TV sets). If there is only one firm that launches the product innovation the firm will have a monopoly position and it will enjoy transitorily high profits. As opposed to this particular product innovation setting, one also could consider a market with differentiated products: all firms provide particular products: From a microeconomic perspective a market with differentiated products – if that is what product innovation means – is characterized by an equilibrium in which the long run average cost curve is tangent to the demand curve. The quantity is lower and the price is higher than under perfect competition whose long run equilibrium is characterized by firms producing in the minimum of the average cost curve which itself is a point of the marginal cost curve (assuming positive marginal costs). Differentiated products could be particularly expected in a market with a wide oligopoly where the product of firm i will encourage firm j to also launch additional product innovations. Bertschek (1995) and Blind/Jungmittag (2004) have presented empirical evidence inward FDI – and trade - can explain innovation dynamics in host countries.

Product innovations can represent products that offer more inherent services, have a longer life time or offer specific prestige. For example new perfumes are not necessarily offering more services and rarely will they last longer, but a specific prestige could be associated with a certain brand name. The fact that the price of product innovations often are above the price of standard products often gives a certain exclusivity that is part of the "prestige utility" obtained by customers willing to use novel products. It is not clear whether or not the rise of the price for a product innovation – compared to a standard benchmark product – will raise more than utility of the consumers/user. If the utility is rising more than the price there is an analytical challenge with respect to calculating hedonic prices. To put this in a different perspective: If the quality of all products is raised through product innovations and prices increase less than utility, one may argue that the effective general price level has decreased so that a wave of product innovations in a specific setting of rather modest price increases will go along with a positive aggregate real income effect. In open economies this can also be relevant for partner countries with whom the innovative home country (country I) has trading relations or foreign direct investment links; alternatively, the innovative country could be country II, but again one may raise the question about the relevance of trade links and foreign direct investment links.

If product innovation concerns intermediate tradable products the importing country will benefit by the ability of firms selling final product – at home or in the world market – to fetch higher prices than before. Assuming that Schumpeterian

rents are raising along the value-added chain, that is the final producer gets an over proportionate share of the increase in the export unit value (in case the novel final product is exported), countries that are specialized at the end of the value-added chain will have relatively large welfare gains from product innovations in the field of intermediate products. To the extent that intermediate product innovations come from offshoring, the respective multinational company is likely to get the whole Schumpeterian rent from the product innovation recorded for the final product. Here one has a certain problem with surveys among firms in the home country and abroad since product innovations recorded abroad could concern intermediate products for a final product assembled in country I – in this case the same product is covered under product innovations twice; to cope with this problem one would have to add the question whether the product innovation is mainly due to intermediate foreign product innovations, to both domestic product innovation activities and intermediate foreign product innovations or to domestic product innovation activities only.

As regards the role of inward FDI inflows actual cumulated FDI relative to the capital stock should be a relevant driver of product innovations in the host country: With US multinational subsidiaries active in the EU countries (or other host countries) one may expect that innovative US companies – US multinationals in particular – will positively affect product innovations in host countries. However, considering the role of potential competition in some cases the presence of MNCs in host countries is not the only important factor – proxied by the stock of inward FDI relative to the capital stock – but potential competition could also stimulate product innovations. Assuming, in line with the role of FDI gravity models, that the distance to the headquarter country negatively affects FDI flows one can take distance to the leading OECD country as a proxy for potential competition.

Among the related body of literature relevant for product innovations there is a rather limited number of papers. Faber/Hesen (2004) is an important contribution as patents in 15 EU countries 1992-96 are shown to depend on product innovation sales; and both national innovation performance indicators are shown to largely depend on similar macro- and micro-economic conditions, however, they differ in additional explanatory variables of the national innovation system, namely governmentally regulated institutional conditions for patents and firm specific traits for sales of product innovations. In the subsequent analysis product innovations of EU countries are the key focus of analysis and 25 countries are covered for the period 2006-2012.

Product innovation dynamics in EU countries are covered by the EU innovation scoreboard. The performance of the research and innovation of each EU country is measured using a composite index which is known as the Summary Innovation Index (SII). The Summary Innovation Index covers three main aspects (enablers; firm activities and outputs) and 8 innovation dimensions (human resources; open, excellent research system; finance and support; firm investment; linkages and entrepreneurship; intellectual assets; innovators; economic effects). In total, the composite index captures 25 indicators.

The subsequent table gives some insights into product innovations across EU countries – there is indeed some variety of product innovation dynamics. Note that

the countries have been ordered by per capita income at purchasing power parity; naturally, one should expect product innovations to play a rather important role in high income countries since the demand structure will be shaped by a high share of expenditures for differentiated products: the latter is often synonymous for product innovations.

Table 1. Product Innovations in Selected EU Countries (countries are ordered by per capita income – on the basis of purchasing power parity figures; 2012)

Country	2013	2012	2011	2010	2009	2008	2007	2006
EU	0.554	0.545	0.532	0.531	0.516	0.504	0.506	0.493
Luxembourg	0.646	0.627	0.593	0.601	0.616	0.594	0.593	0.57
Austria	0.599	0.599	0.583	0.571	0.597	0.583	0.527	0.516
Ireland	0.606	0.594	0.586	0.568	0.574	0.554	0.569	0.567
Netherlands	0.629	0.644	0.6	0.596	0.591	0.583	0.566	0.561
Sweden	0.75	0.752	0.746	0.739	0.737	0.732	0.729	0.732
Denmark	0.728	0.722	0.697	0.705	0.673	0.657	0.693	0.684
Germany	0.709	0.708	0.694	0.701	0.687	0.671	0.656	0.646
Belgium	0.627	0.627	0.612	0.605	0.597	0.594	0.601	0.588
Finland	0.684	0.685	0.685	0.676	0.67	0.66	0.631	0.63
France	0.571	0.579	0.57	0.567	0.541	0.53	0.523	0.517
United Kingdom	0.613	0.618	0.617	0.616	0.585	0.575	0.601	0.59
Italy	0.443	0.446	0.427	0.427	0.406	0.394	0.393	0.38
Spain	0.414	0.411	0.395	0.391	0.395	0.389	0.381	0.375
Cyprus	0.501	0.498	0.499	0.48	0.461	0.485	0.411	0.414
Slovenia	0.513	0.495	0.508	0.481	0.474	0.458	0.431	0.427
Czech Republic	0.422	0.405	0.416	0.411	0.374	0.369	0.39	0.374
Greece	0.384	0.38	0.372	0.37	0.379	0.375	0.349	0.353
Portugal	0.41	0.402	0.415	0.42	0.396	0.374	0.33	0.314
Slovakia	0.328	0.35	0.304	0.299	0.312	0.304	0.302	0.296
Estonia	0.502	0.488	0.474	0.453	0.452	0.411	0.382	0.388
Lithuania	0.289	0.271	0.26	0.24	0.239	0.233	0.254	0.241
Poland	0.279	0.268	0.282	0.272	0.276	0.265	0.275	0.263
Hungary	0.351	0.335	0.344	0.341	0.315	0.314	0.303	0.298
Latvia	0.221	0.234	0.228	0.216	0.209	0.195	0.188	0.174
Romania	0.237	0.229	0.258	0.24	0.257	0.242	0.219	0.208
Bulgaria	0.188	0.191	0.234	0.232	0.198	0.189	0.168	0.158

Source: Innovation Union Scoreboard database, 2014

3. Empirical Analysis: New Findings

As discussed in the previous section, product innovation can be determined by several factors. The basic hypothesis here is that product innovations are a positive function of lagged R&D relative to GDP, the US FDI inward stock relative to the host country capital stock and a joint communication variable (internet density of the host country times US internet density); the latter is a proxy for communication channels about product innovations, where several aspects could be relevant for innovations – there could be an awareness affect and international social network effects that are typical for popularity waves or fads in high per capita income markets. It is obvious that past research and development – relative to gross domestic product – should have a positive impact on product innovations.

The presence of foreign investors in host countries is assumed to encourage product innovations since the subsidiaries of foreign investors coming from the US (or other advanced OECD countries) are assumed to represent ownership-specific advantages (Dunning, 1980), particularly technological advantages. Moreover, domestic firms will face pressure to launch more own product innovations in a setting with monopolistic competition – and hence ongoing product innovations - in many markets. One cannot rule out that a dominant position of foreign investors in the host country could undermine competition and product innovations, respectively, but in most EU countries this should not be an issue of concern. Very small countries could, however, be a problem here. How strong is the demand for product innovations? This could depend on specific demand characteristics, e.g. per capita income and the median age of the population – the latter should have a negative effect on product innovations, namely as one will expect older strata of the population to be more "conservative" with respect to buying new products. Here the role of international communication is emphasized on the one hand, on the other hand the US is considered to be the main source of global product innovations; hence a joint internet communication variable – reflecting the news impact of information & communication technology – is considered in the regressions. Moreover, the paper also considers the quality of communication services by introducing a joint broadband internet variable in the regression.

In the theoretical chapter, the paper has defined that one should also consider the role of potential competition which can be proxied by the distance. As our focus will be on EU countries on the one hand, and since the US is considered to be the leading OECD country on the other, we can take the distance ij (EU countries are i=1, 2…28; the US is country j), the distance between EU countries and the US is expected to have negative impact on the product innovation (as in the standard gravity model).

The data for the regression analysis is taken from several sources, such as Eurostat, AMECO database, World Development Indicator, Innovation Union Scoreboard Database 2014 and CEPII. Unfortunately, the data for several variables are not available for all EU countries. Moreover, there are some changes in the calculation of the Summary Innovation Index (SII) across years of publication. In this paper, we use the latest publication, Innovation Union Scoreboard (IUS)

2014 Database. To sum up, we have 175 observations for 25 EU countries during the period 2006-2012 in our regression model. The list of countries and the relevant variables are indicated in Table 2 and Table 3 respectively.

Table 2. List of Countries

Austria	Denmark	Hungary	Luxembourg	Slovakia
Bulgaria	Estonia	Ireland	Netherlands	Slovenia
Croatia	Finland	Italy	Poland	Spain
Cyprus	France	Latvia	Portugal	Sweden
Czech Republic	Germany	Lithuania	Romania	United Kingdom

Table 3. Data

Variable	Definition	Source	Unit
Product Innovation	Composite Innovation Index	IUS Database 2014	Index
R&D per GDP (t-2)	Total Intramural R&D expenditure per GDP in period t-2	Eurostat	Percent
FDI inward per capital stock	FDI inward (stock) from US per Capital-stock	FDI inward (stock) from US (Eurostat) Capital stock (AMECO)	
Internet	Internet user per 100 people in the EU multiply by Internet user per 100 people in the US	WDI	Natural logarithm
Broadband	Fixed broadband internet subscribers per 100 people in the EU multiply by Fixed broadband internet subscribers per 100 people in the US	WDI	Natural logarithm
FDI outward per capital stock	FDI outward (stock) to US per Capital-stock	FDI outward (stock) from US (Eurostat) Capital stock (AMECO)	
Distance	The distance between the EU countries and the US	CEPII	Natural logarithm

The diagnostic tests of the standard regression approaches (pooled, fixed effect, and random effect) suggest that the standard regression suffers from autocorrelation and heteroskedasticity. Moreover, the further test statistics also suggest that the model with time fixed effect is more preferable. Thus, the paper presents

the product innovation model with time effect which is estimated by using the Panel Corrected Standard Error (PCSE) and the Feasible Generalized Least Square (FGLS) method.

Table 4. Regression results

Variable	PCSE			FGLS		
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI
R&D per GDP (t-2)	0.112*** (10.833)	0.111*** (11.149)	0.110*** (10.310)	0.114*** (15.660)	0.110*** (15.229)	0.111*** (15.461)
FDI Inward per capital stock	0.054* (2.159)	0.051* (1.977)	0.048 (1.626)	0.064*** (4.398)	0.051*** (3.530)	0.044** (3.076)
Internet	0.078* (2.165)	0.069* (1.996)	0.070* (2.560)	0.080*** (3.753)	0.079*** (3.648)	0.059** (3.283)
Broadband	0.052* 2.314	0.047* (2.173)	0.047 (1.863)	0.048*** (3.770)	0.039** (2.954)	0.030* (2.544)
Distance		-0.109 (-1.474)	-0.117** (-2.725)		-0.160* (-2.391)	-0.209** (-3.193)
FDI Outward per capital stock			-0.002 (-0.761)			-0.003 (-0.904)
R-squared	0.876	0.878	0.881			
Time effect	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
N	175	175	166	175	175	166

Note: * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Table 4 presents six alternative models of product innovation. Generally, the results are consistent with our hypothesis. The coefficients of all independent variables from both approaches, across 6 alternative models, are roughly equal. The coefficient of lagged R&D-GDP ratios (lag is two years) is 0.112 under PCSE (Model I) and 0.114 under FGLS (Model IV) in the approach without the distance variable and the FDI outward variable; the coefficient is highly significant. If we consider the model with all possible independent variables, the coefficient of lagged R&D-GDP ratios is slightly lower, as much as 0.110 under PCSE (Model III) and 0.111 under FGLS (Model VI). It is noteworthy that the PCSE regression results have a high R-squared, namely about 0.88.

The US FDI inward variable is expected to have positive and significant impact on product innovation (except in Model III). The magnitude of the coefficient is between 0.044 - 0.064. This also implies the potential positive impact of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership project. The coefficients of both communication variables (internet and broadband) are positive and statistically significant. In terms of the magnitude, internet is expected to have stronger positive impact on product innovation relative to broadband. The proxy of potential competition is also significant and consistent with our hypothesis. It is noteworthy that the coefficient for the FDI inward variable is smaller once we introduce the distance variable, but this in turn is consistent with the logic of traditional FDI

gravity models; thus, however, it is not fully clear to what extent the distance variable reflects rather an FDI-related impact or a pure potential competition impact. Lastly, the FDI outward stock relative to the capital stock (of the home country) is not significant in all model specifications - with less number of observations, due to data availability problems.
A rather parsimonious specification – without the distance variable and outward FDI – shows highly significant results in the FGLS regression (FGLS IV) and, in the PCSA I regression, the analysis is also quite satisfactory. If the impact of US cumulated inward FDI in other regions of the world has a similar impact on host countries' product innovation dynamics – e.g. in Asia or Latin America – and if in turn product innovation dynamics explain a considerable part of output variance relative to trend, the global direct impact of US innovation dynamics would be much higher than traditionally thought. Here additional research should be conducted.

4. Policy Conclusions

It is fairly obvious that policymakers in low per capita income countries of the EU could try to encourage product innovations strongly, not least in order to improve the current account position. For all euro crisis countries, plus Italy and France, these considerations also seem to be particularly relevant. Countries could try to stimulate FDI inflows from the US and in this respect not only national measures are to be considered but also the potential impact of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership project. Moreover, it would be wise to invest more in digital networks and to encourage the broad use of fixed and mobile internet services in EU countries. In addition, policymakers could consider options for stronger R&D promotion in many EU countries, however, not in those where government R&D expenditures have exceeded that of the private sector for years (e.g. Portugal). It is highly implausible that the optimum R&D promotion would imply government R&D expenditures to exceed that of the private sector. In many leading OECD countries the split between the private sector and the government sector is roughly 2:1.

There are additional insights to be obtained from spatial regression analysis which is beyond the scope of the analysis presented here. To the extent that product innovations in country i have a positive spillover effect on country i' governments should consider a joint R&D promotion program. Jointly financing R&D is quite an exception to the rule in the EU, only some supranational R&D projects are financed from Brussels, the national policy layer clearly dominates R&D promotion.

To the extent that venture capital financing is important for young innovative firms one may emphasize that the lack of venture capital funding in many EU countries could also be considered as a barrier to higher R&D-GDP ratios and thus to higher future product innovation dynamics.

An interesting question for future research is to what extent the current account is shaped by relative product innovation dynamics. In the context of the Vernon (1966) approach one may expect that more product innovations – relative to the rest of the world – should improve the current account position. If more data on product innovations for Europe and Asia become available one will have an interesting new research agenda for this issue, including the role of US FDI flows to European and Asian countries. It is also obvious that the TTIP negotiations between the EU and the US could have much higher benefits than the existing contributions in the literature – with a dominant focus on trade dynamics – suggest. Transatlantic trade and investment partnership could stimulate transatlantic foreign direct investment and thus reinforce product innovation dynamics that, in turn, will have considerable impact on output growth, employment and economic welfare. To the extent that transatlantic economic integration will bring about more transatlantic FDI flows – reflecting technology-intensive and knowledge-intensive production – there will be a rise of product innovations in the US and the EU which in turn will raise output and employment; the demand for skilled labor is expected to increase. Moreover, one should not rule out that insider problems in the labor market in the EU, emphasized e.g. by Hofer/Pichelmann (1999), will reduce through the presence of more inward FDI, as multinational companies could be less inclined than domestic firms to accept insider wage advantages. Economic policymakers should also, however, not underestimate other problems, namely biased allocation of capital caused by rather inefficient banking markets and capital markets with artificially low risk risk premiums: Those were typical in OECD capital markets in 2003-2006 and could bring about distortions in capital allocation, namely overinvestment in relatively risky sectors.

A critical issue is the distinction of product innovations and process innovations, particularly in the context of FDI inflows; and with respect to process innovations there is an additional need to distinguishing between FDI inflows into the manufacturing industry and in banking/services sector: The empirical evidence for Germany and the UK in the context of the EU single market is such (BARREL/PAIN, 1997) that significant technology transfer effects were only observed in the field of manufacturing industry in the UK and Germany.

Policymakers should thus carefully study both the different role of process innovations and product innovations on the one hand, on the other hand they should look at the differential impact of inward FDI flows in the financial sector and the real economy, respectively. The EU2020 program is not very specific in this field and also leaves room for improvement in the field of international technology spillovers. The more such spillovers play a role in OECD countries – as may be expected in a world with increasing internet density – the more some form of international coordination of national R&D would be appropriate.

References

Agarwal R; Bayus BL (2002), The market evolution and sales takeoff of product innovations. *Management Science* 48(8): 1024-1041

Barrel, R.; Pain, N. (1997), Foreign Direct Investment, Technological Change, and Economic Growth within Europe, The Economic Journal, Vol. 107, 1770-1786.

Beise M (2005), Lead markets, innovation differentials and growth. *International Economics and Economic Policy* 1(4): 305-328

Bertschek I (1995), Product and process innovation as a response to increasing imports and foreign direct investment, *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 341-357.

Blind K; Jungmittag A (2004), Foreign Direct Investment, Imports and Innovation in the Service Industry. *Review of Industrial Organization*, 205-227.

Dunning JH (1980), Towards an eclectic theory of international production: some empirical tests. *Journal of International Business Studies* 11(1):9-31

Faber-Jan H, Barbara A (2004), Innovation capabilities of European nations: Cross-national analyses of patents and sales of product innovations. *Research Policy* 33: 193–207

Gort M; Klepper S (1982), Time paths in the diffusion of product innovations. *The Economic Journal* 92: 630-653

Gort M; Konakayama A (1982), A model of diffusion in the production of an innovation. *The American Economic Review* 72(5): 1111-1120

Irawan T; Welfens PJJ (2014), Transatlantic trade and investment partnership: sectoral and macroeconomic perspectives for Germany, the EU and the US. *International Economics and Economic Policy*, Forthcoming (online first May 2014)

Jovanovic B, Lach S (1989), Entry, exit and diffusion with learning by doing. The *American Economic Review* 79(4): 690-699

Jovanovic B; Lach S (1997), Product Innovation and the Business Cycle, *International Economic Review*, 3-22.

Jungmittag A; Welfens PJJ (2009), Liberalization of EU telecommunications and trade: theory, gravity equation analysis and policy implications. *International Economics and Economic Policy* 6: 23-39

Lin H; Lin E (2010), FDI, Trade and Product Innovations: Theory and Evidence, *Southern Economic Journal*, 434-464.

Vernon R (1966), International investment and international trade in the product cycle. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 80(2):190-207

Welfens PJJ (2011), Innovations in Macroeconomics, 3rd revised and enlarged edition, Heidelberg and New York: Springer

Welfens PJJ (2014), Product Innovations in a Schumpeterian Mundell Fleming Modell, Paper to be presented at the World Conference of the International Joseph A. Schumpeter Society, Jena, July 27-30, 2014, EIIW working paper 207.

Welfens PJJ; Perret JK (2014), Information & communication technology and true real GDP: economic analysis and findings for selected countries. *International Economics and Economic Policy* 11(1-2): 5-27