ARE ICT USERS MORE INNOVATIVE?

AN ANALYSIS OF ICT-ENABLED INNOVATION IN OECD FIRMS

Vincenzo Spiezia

Senior Economist, OECD

vincenzo.spiezia@oecd.org

Abstract

The aim of this study is to assess the effects of information and communications technologies (ICTs) on the firms' capabilities to innovate in a selection of OECD countries. Our findings support the hypothesis that ICTs act an enabler of innovation, particularly for product and marketing innovation, in both manufacturing and services. However, we did not find any evidence that ICT use increases the capability of a firm to cooperate, to develop innovation in-house or to introduce products new-to-the-market. These results suggest that ICTs enable firms to adopt innovation but they not increase their "inventive" capabilities.

Introduction

The aim of this study is to assess the effects of information and communications technologies (ICTs) as an enabler of innovation in a selection of OECD countries. Innovation refers to product, process, organisational and marketing innovations (see OECD/Eurostat, Oslo Manual, 2005).

ICTs have the potential to increase innovation by speeding up the diffusion of information, favouring networking among firms, enabling closer links between businesses and customers, reducing geographic limitations, and increasing efficiency in communication.

Previous analysis confirms that ICTs play an important role in enabling business innovation, *e.g.* Brynjolfsson and Hitt, 2000; Gago and Rubalcaba, 2007; Crespi *et al.*, 2007; Eurostat, 2008; Van Leeuwen, 2008; Polder *et al.*, 2009. These studies, however, differ as regards their methodology and country coverage or they do not focus on the link between ICT use and innovation.

The main contribution of the present study is to address the effects of ICT use on innovation in a cross-country perspective based on a comparable data set and according to a common methodology.

The project is based on two statistical sources: the ICT Business Survey and the Innovation Survey. Information from these two surveys has been linked at the firm level. Due to confidentiality reasons, the analysis for this paper has been carried out by a network of national researchers with access to the micro-data, based on the same econometric model set by the OECD.

The network consisted of 14 researchers[1] from 9 countries: Canada, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom.

We adopted a simple approach, which is to test whether the expected effects of ICT use on innovation are supported by the data. The research, therefore, consists of a set of 19 testable hypotheses about the effects of ICT use on innovation, grouped under 3 themes:

- Innovation capabilities;

- Innovation trajectories;

- Cooperation in innovation.

As innovation is considered a key determinant of business productivity, the findings of this study would be relevant for businesses and policy makers alike.

The study is organized as follows. Section 1 summarizes the main findings by previous studies. Section 2 introduces the definitions of innovation and ICT use. Section 3 presents the dataset used in this study while Sections 4 and 5 discuss the research questions and the methodology, respectively. The main findings are discussed in Section 6. Finally, Section 7 draws the main conclusions and makes suggestions for further work.

1.   Previous findings

Business innovation is regarded as a key determinant of both individual business success and national economic growth. At the micro level, business innovation has the potential to increase consumer demand through improved product or service quality and simultaneously decrease production costs. More importantly, strong business innovation at a macro level increases multifactor productivity thus lifting international competitiveness, economic growth and real per capital incomes. Therefore, it is of great interest to businesses and policy makers alike, to identify those factors which stimulate innovation and to understand how these factors interact.

ICT is a valuable source of business innovation because it provides substantial efficiency gains. As Koellinger (2005) puts it "ICT makes it possible to reduce transaction costs, improve business processes, facilitate coordination with suppliers, fragment processes along the value chain (both horizontally and vertically) and across different geographical locations, and increase diversification."

Each of these efficiency gains provides an opportunity for innovation. For example, IT automated system links lead to more streamlined businesses processes and allow staff to be more responsive to emerging customer needs. Similarly, technologies which allow staff to effectively communicate and collaborate across wider geographic areas will encourage strategies for less centralized management, and more flexible external relations, all of which involve different types of innovative activity.

Gretton, Gali and Parham (2004) have suggested two additional reasons why business use of ICT encourages innovative activity. Firstly, ICT is a 'general purpose technology' which provides an 'indispensable platform' upon which further productivity-enhancing changes, such as product and process innovations, can be based. For example, a business which establishes a web presence sets the groundwork from which process innovations, such as electronic ordering and delivery, can be easily developed. In this way, adopting general purpose ICT makes it relatively easier and cheaper for businesses to develop innovations.

Secondly, the spillover effects from ICT usage, such as network economies, can be sources of productivity gains. For example, staff in businesses which have adopted broadband Internet are able to collaborate with wider networks of academics and international researchers more closely on the development of innovations and keep abreast of current consumer trends. These are spillover benefits because the R&D efforts of other researchers in the collaborative group can be appropriated by all.

Information and communication technologies can also be seen as a source of innovation because they enable closer links between businesses, their suppliers, customers and competitors and collaborative partners. These agents are all understood to be important sources of ideas for innovation. By enabling closer communication and collaboration, ICT assists businesses to be more responsive to innovation opportunities and provides significant efficiency gains. For example, having ICTs such as broadband Internet, web presence and automated system linkages, assists businesses to keep up with customer trends, monitor competitor's actions and get rapid user feedback, thereby assisting them to exploit opportunities for all types of innovations.

Previous econometric analysis confirms that ICTs play an important role in enabling business innovation. Gago and Rubalcaba (2007) find that businesses which invest in ICT, particularly those which regard their investment as very important, or strategically important, are significantly more likely to engage in services innovation.

The Eurostat ICT impacts project (Eurostat, 2008) reveals that – on average – ICT usage is positively related to firm performance. The strength of these results varies over countries, however, and it also appears that the benefits of different types of ICT usage are industry specific. Van Leeuwen (2008) shows that e-sales and broadband use affect productivity significantly through their effect on innovation output. Broadband use, however, only has a direct effect on productivity if R&D is not considered as an input to innovation.

This approach is further developed by Polder *et al.* (2009). Their study finds out that ICT investment is important for all types of innovation in services, while it plays a limited role in manufacturing, being only marginally significant for organisational innovation.

Another line of literature motivates the importance of ICT for organisational innovation (see Brynjolfsson and Hitt, 2000 for a survey). Case studies reveal that the introduction of information technology is combined with a transformation of the firm, investment in intangible assets, and of the relation with suppliers and customers. Electronic procurement, for instance, increases the control of inventories and decreases the costs of coordinating with suppliers, and ICT offers the possibility for flexible production: just-in-time inventory management, integration of sales with production planning, et cetera. A lack of proper control for intangible assets is seen as a possible candidate for explaining the differences in productivity growth that are observed between Europe and the US.

The available econometric evidence at firm level shows that a combination of investment in ICTs and changes in organisations and work practices facilitated by these technologies contributes to firms' productivity growth. Crespi *et al.* (2007) use CIS data for the UK and find a positive effect on firm performance of the interaction between IT and organizational innovation. They also find a significant effect of competition on organisational innovation.

These results confirm recent findings that ICTs are an important enabler of capturing and processing knowledge in the innovation throughput stage. In addition, the observed industry differences suggest that new ICT applications, such as broadband connectivity and e-commerce, are more important in services than in manufacturing.

2.   Definitions

Innovation

The Oslo Manual defines an 'innovation' as (OECD/Eurostat 2005, p. 46):

"...the implementation of a new or significantly improved product (good or service), or process, a new marketing method, or a new organizational method in business practices, workplace organisation or external relations."

A product innovation is the introduction of a good or service that is significantly improved with respect to its characteristics or intended uses and includes significant improvements in technical specifications, components and materials, incorporated software and user friendliness or other functional characteristics (Oslo Manual 2005, p. 48). Design changes which do not involve a significant change in the product's functional characteristics or intended use, such as a new flavour or colour option, are not product innovations. Product innovations in services can include significant improvements in how the product is provided, such as home pick-up or delivery services, or other features which improve efficiency or speed.

A process innovation is a new or significantly improved production or delivery method, including significant changes in techniques, equipment and/or software (Oslo Manual 2005, p. 49). For example, introduction of a new automation method on a production line, or in the context of ICT, developing electronic system linkages to streamline production and delivery processes, are both process innovations. With respect to services, it is often difficult to distinguish a product and process innovation. The Oslo Manual (2005, p. 53) contains the following guidelines to distinguish the two types of innovation:

if the innovation involves new or significantly improved characteristics of the service offered to customers, it is a product innovation;

if the innovation involves new or significantly improved methods, equipment and/ or skills used to perform the service, it is a process innovation.

An organisational or managerial innovation is the implementation of a new or significantly improved method of the firm's business practices, workplace organisation or external relations. It requires more than mere organisational change or restructure. In fact, the organisational method must not have been previously used by the business and must be the results of strategic decisions taken by management (Oslo Manual 2005, p. 49). Examples include implementation a new method for distributing responsibilities and decision making among employees, decentralising group activity, developing formal or informal work teams, new types of external collaboration with research organisations or the use of outsourcing or sub-contracting for the first time (Oslo Manual 2005, p. 52).

A marketing innovation is the implementation of a new or significantly improved marketing method involving significant changes in product design or packaging, product placement, product promotion or pricing. The marketing method must not have been previously used by the firm and must be part of a new marketing concept or strategy representing a significant departure from the firm's existing methods (Oslo Manual 2005, p. 50).

The OECD has recommended that countries collect qualitative, survey data on innovation activities. These qualitative measures of innovation are more encompassing than traditional innovation measures. For example, measures such as R&D expenditure per employee, patents received or sales derived from new products will not encompass all the innovative efforts of a business and will be biased towards particular types of innovation.

ICT use

The definition of ICT use by firm is less clear-cut and codified. Computer use does not seem a relevant criterion any longer, as virtually all firms use the computer. The use of a computer network seems to be a more appropriate measure of ICT use, although the information technology in use (*e.g.* Extranet, WAN, etc) may have different effects on innovation.

Given the dominance of IP-based networks, one may reasonably argue that Internet use, particularly broadband Internet, is what makes a firm an IC user. Some previous studies (Eurostat, 2008) have pointed out that the percentage of broadband connected employees is a better measure of the intensity of ICT use by firms.

As there is no unique measure of the intensity of ICT use, we explored the correlation between the probability to innovate and a set of potential indicators for ICT use available from the ICT Business Surveys: the number of web facilities; the number of automatic IT links; the share of employees with a broadband connection to the Internet; the value of e-sale; the value of e-purchasing; the presence of a firm's web page; the first factor from a factor analysis of all the above indicators; the simple average of the above indicators.

The number of web facilities and the number of automatic IT links turned out to have the highest correlation to innovation in all countries. Therefore, our econometric analysis included either one of these two variables as a measure of the intensity of ICT use.

The number of web facilities is computed from the answers to the following questions ("Eurostat model for a Community Survey on ICT Usage and e-Commerce in Enterprises 2006"):

B9.	Did the Web Site of your enterprise provide the following facilities, during January 2006?		
	(your enterprise <u>as provider</u> of Internet services)	Yes	No
	a) Marketing the enterprise's products	☐	☐
	b) Facilitating access to product catalogues and price lists	☐	☐
	c) Providing after sales support	☐	☐

Firms are asked to answer all questions with yes or not. Therefore, the indicator varies between 0 (firms has no web facilities) to 3 (firms has all web facilities).

The number of automatic IT links is based on the answers to the following questions from the same survey:

A9*.	Did your enterprise's IT systems for managing orders link automatically with any of the following IT systems, during January 2006?	Yes	No
	a) Internal system for re-ordering replacement supplies	☐	☐
	b) Invoicing and payment systems	☐	☐
	c) Your system for managing production, logistics or service operations	☐	☐
	d) Your suppliers' business systems (for suppliers outside your enterprise group)	☐	☐
	e) Your customers' business systems (for customers outside your enterprise group)	☐	☐

Firms are asked to answer all questions with yes or not. Therefore, the indicator varies between 0 (firms has no automatic IT link) to 5 (firms has all automatic IT links).

Strictly speaking, none of these two indicators is a measure of the intensity of ICT use by firms. They are rather a measure of the sophistication or scope of ICT use. However, both indicators are correlated to the intensity of use. Adding a new a new web facility or a new automatic link to the firm's IT system is costly and a firm would not do undertake such an investment if it did not use it.

Clearly, firms with the same automatic IT links or web facilities may use them differently and our indicators would not capture these differences. In addition, IT links and web facilities seem biased towards the use of ICTs for e-commerce and e-business but they may be a poorer proxy for other ICT-enabled activities relevant for innovation, eg: communication.

Bearing these limitations in mind, in the rest of this study we will regard the number of web facilities and of automatic IT links as a measure of the intensity of ICT use by firms.

3.   The dataset

The project relies on two statistical sources: 1. the ICT Business Survey; and 2. the Innovation Survey.

The ICT Business Survey follows the OECD Model Survey in virtually all OECD countries. Therefore, comparable statistics on ICT use in firms are easily available in all countries.

Innovation surveys, on the contrary, tend to be more country-specific. The Community Innovation Survey (CIS) is a noticeable exception, as the same questionnaire is submitted to firms in all EU countries participating in the survey. In general, however, the definitions of innovation comply with the recommendations of the OSLO manual (OECD, 2005). This is the case for two non-EU countries included in this study: Canada and Switzerland.

The analysis of the ICT effects of innovation requires "linking" the ICT survey and the Innovation survey at the level of firm. Therefore, the sample for the analysis is limited to those firms that responded to both the ICT survey and the Innovation survey.

Table 1 shows the number and percentage of firms in the innovation survey that also responded to the ICT survey in the countries considered in the present study.

Table 1: Number of firms included in both ICT and Innovation surveys – latest year available
(as a % of all firms in the Innovation Survey)

Country		Manufacturing	Services	Total	Number	Notes
Canada	2007	7%	-	7%	488	Imperfect match between ICT and Innovation surveys
Italy	2004	33%	25%	29%	4391	
Ireland	2005	47%	16%	30%	584	
Luxembourg	2007	51%	49%	49%	369	
Netherlands	2007	61%	60%	61%	3549	
Norway	2006	34%	33%	33%	1421	
Portugal	2005	16%	24%	20%	1476	
Sweden	2006	14%	20%	17%	561	
Switzerland	2008	100%	100%	100%	2555	
UK	2006	10%	19%	13%	706	

Table 1 shows that:

In most countries, only a small percentage firms in the Innovation survey responded also to the ICT survey. This percentage is particularly low for services. This raises an issue of representativeness of the joint ICT-Innovation sample, which is likely to be biased towards manufacturing industries and large firms.

In many countries, the total number of firms in the joint ICT-Innovation sample is relatively small. This implies that the number of variables that we can consider in an econometric analysis is fairly limited.

The above limitations result from the survey design currently in place for most surveys in a large majority of countries. Traditionally, surveys have been designed to estimate representative "averages" for the population and for selected groups of the population. In order to reduce the burden on the respondents, samples for different surveys have been designed as to reduce overlapping or even to exclude it (eg: the ICT survey and the CIS in France).

As the capability to analyse micro data increases, largely due to ICT, the survey design has to be reconsidered in order to facilitate data linking between different surveys *and/or* to merge questions from different survey – eg: ICT and Innovation surveys – into the same one. Both strategies have significant implications in terms of costs for the Statistical Offices and burden for the respondents. Therefore, an assessment by the NSOs on how to meet the demand for micro data is becoming increasingly necessary.

The present analysis is based on data on manufacturing and services in all countries except Canada, where the matching between the ICT and Innovation surveys was possible only for firms in manufacturing due to the different statistical units used in the two surveys (firms for the ICT and establishment in the Innovation survey).

4.   Research questions

The aim of this research project is to assess the effects of ICTs as an enabler of innovation.

ICT has the potential to increase innovation by speeding up the diffusion of information, favouring networking among firms, reducing geographic limitations, and increasing efficiency in communication.

These effects can be analysed by looking at whether the use of ICT in firms is associated to:

Box 1. List of testable hypotheses by theme

1.   Innovation capabilities

Hypothesis 1: The probability to innovate increases with the intensity of ICT use.

Hypothesis 1a: The probability to introduce a new product increases with the intensity of ICT use.

Hypothesis 1a1: The probability to introduce a new good increases with the intensity of ICT use.

Hypothesis 1a2: The probability to introduce a new service increases with the intensity of ICT use.

Hypothesis 1b: The probability to introduce a new process increases with the intensity of ICT use.

Hypothesis 1c: The probability to introduce a new organisational model increases with the intensity of ICT use.

Hypothesis 1d: The probability to introduce a new marketing methods increases with the intensity of ICT use.

2.   Innovation trajectories

Hypothesis 2: Among all firms introducing a new product, the probability to introduce a product new-to-the-market (as opposed to new-to–the-firm) increases with the intensity of ICT use.

Hypothesis 3: Among all firms introducing a new product, the probability to introduce a new product developed in-house or in cooperation with other firms (as opposed to "developed by other firms") increases with the intensity of ICT use.

Hypothesis 4: Among all firms introducing a new process, the probability to introduce a new process developed in-house or in cooperation with other firms (as opposed to "developed by other firms") increases with the intensity of ICT use.

Hypothesis 5a: Among all innovative firms, the probability to innovate in organisation OR marketing increases with the intensity of ICT use.

Hypothesis 5b: Among all innovative firms, the probability to innovate in organisation AND marketing increases with the intensity of ICT use.

Hypothesis 5c: Among all innovative firms, the probability to innovate in organisation increases with the intensity of ICT use.

Hypothesis 5d: Among all innovative firms, the probability to innovate in marketing increases with the intensity of ICT use.

Hypothesis 6a: Among all innovative firms, the probability that product innovations are integrated to marketing innovations increases with the intensity of ICT use.

Hypothesis 6b: Among all innovative firms, the probability that process innovations are integrated to organisation innovations increases with the intensity of ICT use.

Hypothesis 6c: Among all innovative firms, the probability that product innovations were integrated to organisation OR marketing innovations increases with the intensity of ICT use.

Hypothesis 6d: Among all innovative firms, the probability that process innovations were integrated to organisation OR marketing innovations increases with the intensity of ICT use.

3.   Cooperation in innovation

Hypothesis 7: Among all innovative firms, the probability to innovate in cooperation with other firms or institutions increases with the intensity of ICT use.

1. higher probability to innovate;

2. specific features of innovation; and

3. higher probability to cooperate in innovation.

We adopted a simple approach, which is to test whether the expected effects of ICT use on innovation are supported by the data. Therefore, the research consists of a set of 19 testable hypotheses about the effects of ICT use on innovation, grouped under 3 themes (see Box 1)

5. The model

The above hypotheses have been tested through a series of "probit equations with endogenous regressors" (Wooldridge, 2002; pp. 472-478). The probability to introduce an innovation with specific features (*e.g.* product, marketing, new-to-the-market, etc.) is modelled as a function of:

- the intensity of ICT use;
- whether the firm carried out R&D;
- the firm's size (number of employees); and
- the educational attainments of its employees (as a proxy of skills).

The model was estimated through a "two-stage conditional maximum likelihood" (Rivers and Vuong, 1988) with firm or industry random effects. In order to control for the endogeneity of the ICT variable, we used and Instrumental Variable (IV) approach. We tested a number of ICT variables which are expected to be correlated to ICT use but not to innovation. The variable e-government turned out to be a valid instrument in all countries except the Netherlands and Switzerland, where we used the lagged ICT variable as an IV.

In more formal terms, we started with the following model:

(1) $\quad Inno_i^* = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln(size_i) + \beta_2 R\&D_i + \beta_3 skills_i + \sum_j \gamma_j D_{j,i} + u_i$

(2) $\quad ICT_i = \delta_0 + \delta_1 \ln(size_i) + \delta_2 R\&D_i + \delta_3 skills_i + \delta_4 IV_i + v_i$

(3) $\quad Inno_i = 1 \; if \; Inno_i^* > 0; \; Inno_i = 0 \; otherwise$

(4) $\quad D_{j,i} = 1 \; if \; ICT_i = j; D_{j,i} = 0 \; otherwise$

where *i = 1, 2, ..., N* indicates the firms; *j = 1, 2, ... 5* the frequency of ICT use; *R&D* is equal to 1 if the firm carries out R&D, 0 otherwise; and (u_i, v_i) is assumed to have a zero mean, bivariate normal distribution and to be independent of all exogenous variables in (2).

If u_i and v_i are correlated, *ICT* is endogenous and the Probit estimates of all variables in (1) are biased. Under the assumption of joint normality of (u_i, v_i), we can write

(5) $\quad u_i = \theta v_i + e_i$

where $e_i \sim N[0, Var(u_i) - Cov(u_i, v_i)]$.

Therefore, the above model can be rewritten as:

(6) $Inno_i^* = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln(size_i) + \beta_2 R\&D_i + \beta_3 skills_i + \sum_j \gamma_j D_{j,i} + \theta \hat{v}_i + e_i$

where $\hat{v}_i$ are the OLS residuals[2] of equation (2).

Equation (6) can be estimated by Probit and the Average Partial Effects (APEs) computed as the average of the Partial Effects (PEs) across $\hat{v}_i$.

Three countries (the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden) estimated the model as a panel with firms' random effects and industry dummies; due to data limitations, the remaining six countries estimated a cross-section with industries' random effects[3].

The model can be interpreted as a simultaneous model, where the decision to innovate and to use ICTs is taken jointly. In this sense, the model does not predict that ICT use is the *cause* of innovation, rather that ICTs are an *enabler* of innovation: firms use ICTs as a tool or a "platform" for innovation.

6.   Main findings

Table 2 and 3 show the findings of our analysis[4]. The intensity of ICT use was measured as the number of web facilities (0 to 3) in table 2 and as the number of automated IT links (0 to 5) in table 3. Both ICT use variables provide similar results, although the estimates based on the number of automated IT links are less stable. Therefore, in what follow, we will focus on the results based on the number of web facilities.

6.1   Innovation capabilities

- *ICT use increases the probability to innovate*

The number of web facilities increases the probability to innovate for the manufacturing firms in 4 countries out of 8. The increase is the highest in Spain and Italy, where firms with three web facilities are 81% and 66%, respectively, more likely to innovate than firms with no web facilities. In Canada and the

---

[2] As ICT is a discrete variable, the OLS estimates of $\hat{v}_i$ are not consistent. Nonetheless, they lead to consistent estimates of equation (6) because they are orthogonal to all exogenous variables – see, for instance, Heckmann (1978).

[3] We did not test for fixed effects because this would lead to inconsistent estimates in the context of the "unobserved effects probit model" used in this study (Wooldridge, 2002, p. 484). This situation is known as the "incidental parameters problem".

[4]   The results were not significant for Sweden. This is probably due to the combination of two factors: a smaller number of observations; a lower variability in the ICT indicators due to the higher sophistication of ICT use by Swedish firms. An earlier study, based on the same dataset but using a different model, found out that ICT use increases both the probability to innovate and the innovation activities among the innovators
("ICT use, Broadband and Productivity in Sweden")
http://www.scb.se/statistik/_publikationer/OV9999_2008A01_BR_X76BR0802.pdf

United Kingdom the increase is 26% and 22%, respectively. Firms with two web facilities in Norway are 8% more likely to innovate, although the effect becomes not significant for a higher number of facilities.

The number of web facilities increases the probability to innovate for the service firms in 5 countries out of 7. The increase is the highest in Spain and Italy, where firms with three web facilities are over 60% more likely to innovate than firms with no web facilities. In Norway and the United Kingdom the increase is 27% and 26%, respectively. Firms with three web facilities in Switzerland are 7% more likely to innovate than firms with no web facilities.

- *ICT use increases the probability to introduce a new product both in manufacturing and services*

The number of web facilities increases the probability to introduce a new product for the manufacturing firms in 5 countries out of 8. The increase is the highest in the Netherlands, where firms with three web facilities are 81% more likely to innovate in product than firms with no web facilities. The increase is 31% both for Canada and Italy. In the United Kingdom and Spain the increase is 23% and 11%, respectively. Firms with two web facilities in Norway are 14% more likely to introduce a new product, although the effect becomes not significant for a higher number of facilities.

The effect of ICT on the probability to introduce a new product in manufacturing seems limited to new goods. In fact, the effect on the probability to introduce a new service is lower or not significant.

The number of web facilities increases the probability to introduce a new product for the service firms in 6 countries out of 7. The increase is the highest in the United Kingdom and Italy, where firms with three web facilities are 32% and 21% more likely to innovate in product than firms with no web facilities. In Norway, the Netherlands, and Switzerland, the increase is 14%, 13 and 12%, respectively, while it is 8% in Spain.

The effect of ICT use on the probability to introduce a new product in services mainly occurs through new services. The only exception is the Netherlands, where the effect of web facilities is higher on new goods (32%) than on new services (14%).

- *ICT use has a significant effect on the probability to introduce a process innovation*

A significant effect of web facilities on the probability to introduce a new production process in manufacturing was found only in Italy, the Netherlands and Switzerland. In these countries, firms with three web facilities are 35%, 12% and 7% more likely to innovate in process than firms with no web facilities.

As for services, a significant effect was found in Spain (37%), Italy (27%) and Norway (16%).

Table 2   Probability to innovate associate to the intensity of ICT use (number of web facilities) - Manufacturing

	Canada			Italy			Luxembourg			Netherlands			Norway			Spain			Switzerland			United Kingdom		
Number of web facilities	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Innovation capabilities																								
1: Any innovation	13%	22%	26%	31%	50%	66%	71%	94%	87%	61%	95%	98%	5%	8%	7%	35%	68%	81%				.	14%	22%
1a: New product	19%	29%	31%	19%	30%	31%	9%	20%	17%	45%	70%	81%	3%	14%	10%	-3%	6%	11%				11%	15%	23%
1a1: New good	16%	27%	34%	19%	26%	29%	.	.	.	49%	69%	77%	2%	9%	0%	-5%	4%	9%				.	15%	22%
1a2: New service	-43%	-59%	-52%	4%	12%	9%	.	.	.	5%	4%	5%	1%	3%	8%	-6%	2%	3%				7%	9%	8%
1b: New process	-1%	11%	5%	19%	26%	35%	-14%	-13%	-13%	3%	7%	12%	-1%	4%	-4%	28%	44%	54%	2%	7%		.	.	.
1c: New organisation	5%	10%	24%	19%	31%	43%	10%	40%	-1%	7%	13%	16%	2%	6%	1%	3%	8%	13%				12%	13%	19%
1d: New marketing	7%	22%	29%	19%	23%	38%	7%	23%	4%	18%	26%	36%	7%	20%	18%	6%	7%	16%				.	.	18%
Innovation trajectories																								
2: New-to-the-mkt	7%	20%	12%	3%	11%	0%	26%	24%	-2%	3%	-3%	2%	3%	5%	4%	12%	-5%	-5%	5%	10%		.	.	.
3: Prod in-house/coop				2%	2%	4%	.	.	.	65%	95%	98%	-1%	-2%	-2%	9%	-4%	5%						
4: Proc in-house/coop				0%	1%	3%	.	.	.	-8%	-3%	-8%	4%	-3%	-1%	-14%	-2%	-1%				.	.	.
5a: Org OR mrktg	-3%	0%	14%	1%	3%	11%	.	.	.	4%	12%	16%	5%	13%	11%	6%	1%	7%				.	.	.
5b: Org AND mrktg	4%	17%	23%	9%	9%	20%	5%	31%	6%	13%	16%	28%	5%	15%	7%	3%	5%	13%				.	.	.
5c: Org	-4%	-4%	10%	-1%	3%	7%	-1%	18%	-3%	-1%	3%	10%	1%	6%	-2%	0%	-2%	1%				.	.	.
5d: Mrktg	6%	22%	27%	11%	10%	23%	6%	21%	2%	17%	26%	37%	8%	23%	20%	8%	7%	17%				.	.	15%
6a: Prod AND mktg	13%	27%	27%	5%	9%	16%	0%	1%	0%	8%	14%	18%	8%	20%	14%	5%	-1%	7%				.	.	23%
6b: Proc AND org	-11%	-11%	-2%	6%	14%	15%	-20%	0%	-10%	2%	5%	7%	-41%	-57%	-73%	12%	3%	5%				.	.	.
6c: Prod AND mktg/org	10%	15%	29%	3%	8%	11%	.	.	.	9%	14%	17%	3%	15%	8%	17%	1%	8%				-	14%	19%
6d: Proc AND mktg/org	-11%	-5%	-2%	6%	10%	15%	-22%	-7%	-20%	4%	6%	12%	0%	12%	1%	7%	3%	6%				30%	40%	39%
Cooperation in innovation																								
7: Coop				6%	3%	-1%	.	.	.	2%	6%	1%	0%	1%	-3%	-2%	-6%	-3%				.	16%	14%
Data **Estimation** **N. obs**	Cross-section Random Effects 488			Cross-section Random Effects 2479			Cross-section Random Effects 128			Panel Random Effects 675			Panel Random Effects 1697			Cross-section Random Effects 2569			Panel Random Effects 1888			Cross-section Random Effects 632		

Bold: significant at 10%; Underlined: significant at 5%; Double-underlined: significant at 1%; ".": non significant; <<blank>>: not available

Table 2 (continued)   Probability to innovate associate to the intensity of ICT use (number of web facilities) - Services

	Italy			Luxembourg			Netherlands			Norway			Spain			Switzerland			United Kingdom		
Number of web facilities	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2	3
Innovation capabilities																					
1: Any innovation	**42%**	**60%**	**61%**	-6%	-4%	5%	1%	3%	3%	**14%**	**23%**	**27%**	**37%**	**47%**	**60%**			**7%**	17%	18%	26%
1a: New product	**17%**	**22%**	**21%**	3%	10%	24%	4%	**14%**	**13%**	4%	**10%**	**14%**	6%	3%	**8%**			**12%**	21%	23%	32%
1a1: New good	**10%**	**11%**	**10%**	2%	8%	9%	**29%**	**35%**	**32%**	3%	**6%**	0%	10%	0%	3%			**10%**	.	.	.
1a2: New service	**13%**	**18%**	**18%**	3%	16%	**24%**	0%	**10%**	**14%**	2%	**6%**	**14%**	3%	3%	**8%**				21%	23%	32%
1b: New process	**21%**	**22%**	**27%**	-13%	-8%	-9%	-7%	-1%	-2%	7%	**8%**	**16%**	30%	**30%**	**37%**				.	.	.
1c: New organisation	**32%**	**49%**	**46%**	-6%	-20%	-7%	0%	10%	5%	5%	9%	**19%**	10%	**34%**	**42%**				18%	16%	23%
1d: New marketing	**7%**	**10%**	**14%**	-4%	-4%	5%	**12%**	**22%**	**38%**	7%	**16%**	**22%**	10%	**4%**	**10%**				12%	17%	18%
Innovation trajectories																					
2: New-to-the-mkt	-3%	5%	14%	17%	10%	10%	1%	**16%**	-2%	-10%	-19%	1%	71%	7%	13%				.	.	.
3: Prod in-house/coop	5%	-8%	14%	-13%	-17%	-8%	6%	**9%**	1%	2%	5%	8%	-18%	7%	1%				19%	19%	18%
4: Proc in-house/coop	4%	-6%	9%	.		.	-11%	0%	3%	1%	-3%	12%	15%	4%	8%				0%	0%	0%
5a: Org OR mrktg	-1%	**5%**	1%	0%	-23%	-10%	5%	**14%**	**12%**	2%	6%	8%	-38%	3%	4%				12%	-	-
5b: Org AND mrktg	5%	**9%**	**15%**	-3%	-6%	5%	-8%	-1%	4%	-7%	-2%	12%	11%	-3%	5%				34%	44%	43%
5c: Org	-4%	3%	-3%	1%	-29%	-15%	-5%	3%	-3%	-7%	-7%	4%	-34%	1%	2%				.	.	.
5d: Mrktg	**7%**	**10%**	**18%**	-3%	-2%	8%	**12%**	**22%**	**40%**	1%	10%	17%	7%	0%	7%				-	19%	16%
6a: Prod AND mktg	8%	6%	5%	-37%	-57%	-60%	3%	8%	**25%**	-1%	7%	9%	18%	-5%	-3%				27%	27%	32%
6b: Proc AND org	4%	3%	5%	-8%	-9%	-11%	**12%**	**11%**	**17%**	-3%	-10%	3%	-15%	4%	6%				.	.	.
6c: Prod AND mktg/org	**6%**	**4%**	**6%**	0%	-2%	8%	-4%	9%	8%	3%	11%	13%	21%	-1%	2%				29%	27%	38%
6d: Proc AND mktg/org	**5%**	**5%**	4%	-4%	-8%	-4%	**13%**	**14%**	**22%**	3%	2%	14%	-15%	4%	7%				.	.	.
Cooperation in innovation																					
7: Coop	3%	**4%**	3%	-2%	-4%	0%	**16%**	**17%**	**22%**	-15%	-15%	-17%	-1%	3%	8%				.	.	.
Data	Cross-section			Cross-section			Panel			Panel			Cross-section			Panel			Cross-section		
Estimation	Random Effects			Random Effects			Random Effects			Random Effects			Random Effects			Random Effects			Random Effects		
N. obs	1912			210			600			1273			2201			1469			1069		

Bold: significant at 10%; Underlined: significant at 5%; Double-underlined: significant at 1%; ".": non significant; <<blank>>: not available

Table 3 Probability to innovate associate to the intensity of ICT use (number of IT links) - Manufacturing

Number of IT links	Canada		Italy					Luxembourg					Netherlands					Norway					Spain					United Kingdom				
	1-2	3-5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Innovation capabilities																																
1: Any innovation	25%	14%	.	.	.	.	.	-1%	**26%**	**28%**	32%	27%	-8%	-3%	1%	-3%	1%	2%	-1%	**8%**	2%	0%	58%	76%	83%	86%	90%	.	.	**7%**	.	.
1a: New product	13%	-6%	**17%**	**25%**	**26%**	**33%**	**45%**	-1%	-4%	18%	-25%	14%	-12%	1%	**6%**	1%	4%	1%	4%	**6%**	-3%	1%	**9%**	**12%**	**13%**	**12%**	**12%**	**13%**	**20%**	**40%**	**44%**	**47%**
1a1: New good	14%	-2%	**16%**	**22%**	**25%**	**30%**	**41%**	.	.	.	.	.	-19%	-2%	7%	4%	6%	0%	4%	**8%**	2%	5%	6%	**9%**	**11%**	**13%**	**14%**	.	.	**13%**	**11%**	7%
1a2: New service	1%	0%	7%	**9%**	6%	10%	21%	.	.	.	.	.	2%	5%	0%	2%	-1%	0%	0%	-1%	-4%	-2%	**5%**	3%	**4%**	**6%**	2%	.	.	.	.	.
1b: New process	13%	7%	**13%**	**26%**	**28%**	**33%**	**47%**	-8%	9%	-10%	-1%	1%	-8%	-2%	-1%	0%	2%	5%	5%	-1%	-4%	-1%	5%	**9%**	**16%**	**19%**	**17%**	.	.	7%	**12%**	**11%**
1c: New organisation	**27%**	**31%**	.	.	.	.	.	0%	1%	**43%**	-8%	13%	-5%	-8%	0%	5%	**10%**	-3%	1%	**5%**	0%	5%	**14%**	**10%**	**12%**	**13%**	**13%**	.	.	.	.	.
1d: New marketing	10%	3%	**16%**	**25%**	**24%**	**33%**	**36%**	-4%	6%	9%	7%	0%	-6%	-8%	-5%	**8%**	**9%**	-5%	6%	**7%**	**12%**	**11%**	**7%**	**9%**	**11%**	**11%**	**10%**	.	.	.	.	.
Innovation trajectories																																
2: New-to-the-mkt	12%	-6%	3%	**14%**	1%	**13%**	**12%**	-14%	-28%	-9%	10%	-41%	0%	1%	0%	5%	2%	11%	-1%	1%	1%	**17%**	-2%	-1%	0%	2%	2%	.	.	.	.	.
3: Prod in-house/coop			3%	0%	3%	1%	1%	.	.	.	.	.	1%	-2%	1%	5%	2%	4%	4%	1%	4%	4%	5%	9%	6%	7%	**7%**	.	.	.	.	.
4: Proc in-house/coop			1%	1%	2%	2%	0%	.	.	.	.	.	-5%	-1%	**8%**	**15%**	6%	1%	-7%	-2%	-5%	0%	2%	4%	**5%**	4%	**6%**	.	.	.	.	.
5a: Org OR mrktg	7%	**20%**	-3%	2%	1%	3%	0%	.	.	.	.	.	-5%	-10%	-2%	**11%**	**11%**	-5%	5%	**6%**	**10%**	**12%**	**8%**	**5%**	**5%**	**6%**	**5%**	.	.	.	.	.
5b: Org AND mrktg	11%	6%	6%	2%	2%	7%	2%	1%	8%	22%	14%	0%	-1%	-4%	-4%	**6%**	**7%**	-9%	4%	0%	2%	7%	7%	7%	11%	13%	8%	.	.	.	.	.
5c: Org	14%	**26%**	-7%	0%	2%	0%	-2%	-5%	-32%	13%	-24%	-8%	-1%	-7%	-1%	7%	**10%**	-6%	1%	2%	-1%	7%	7%	3%	5%	6%	4%	.	.	.	.	.
5d: Mrktg	4%	1%	**9%**	5%	1%	**10%**	4%	-6%	-5%	0%	0%	-9%	-4%	-7%	-6%	**9%**	**9%**	-9%	**9%**	4%	**14%**	**14%**	7%	**9%**	**11%**	**12%**	**9%**	.	.	.	.	.
6a: Prod AND mktg	-9%	-6%	**10%**	3%	3%	8%	4%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	-1%	-6%	-7%	7%	**9%**	-11%	3%	-1%	1%	8%	**8%**	7%	**10%**	**12%**	5%	.	.	.	.	.
6b: Proc AND org	-4%	7%	-1%	2%	2%	**11%**	**8%**	-41%	-29%	-22%	-33%	-25%	-2%	-1%	-3%	7%	7%	-4%	5%	-1%	-5%	14%	**12%**	**11%**	**19%**	**21%**	**14%**	**15%**	.	**24%**	**31%**	**35%**
6c: Prod AND mktg/org	0%	4%	**7%**	1%	3%	**6%**	3%	.	.	.	.	.	-2%	-13%	1%	5%	**10%**	-7%	6%	1%	4%	8%	**8%**	7%	**10%**	**11%**	7%	.	**-9%**	.	.	.
6d: Proc AND mktg/org	-7%	4%	5%	0%	-1%	**9%**	**5%**	-46%	-71%	-65%	-81%	-78%	-2%	-1%	-4%	9%	7%	-4%	8%	0%	-7%	5%	**11%**	**10%**	**19%**	**20%**	**12%**	**16%**	.	**26%**	**33%**	**39%**
Cooperation in innovation																																
7: Coop			-2%	-1%	-2%	-2%	2%	.	.	.	.	.	-8%	6%	4%	**13%**	**20%**	**12%**	4%	**6%**	4%	9%	**5%**	9%	**6%**	**7%**	**7%**	.	**13%**	**29%**	**36%**	**45%**
Data	Cross-section		Panel					Cross-section					Panel					Panel					Cross-section					Panel				
Estimation	Random Effects		Random Effects					Random effects					Random Effects					Random Effects					Random Effects					Random Effects				
N. obs	488		2479					134					278					1697					1993					1446				

Bold: significant at 10%; Underlined: significant at 5%; Double-underlined: significant at 1%; ".": non significant; <<blank>>: not available

Table 3 (continued) Probability to innovate associate to the intensity of ICT use (number of IT links) - Services

	Italy					Luxembourg					Netherlands					Norway					Spain					United Kingdom				
Number of IT links	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
Innovation capabilities																														
1: Any innovation	28%	62%	56%	64%	73%	3%	8%	7%	6%	6%	0%	1%	0%	-4%	1%	15%	13%	11%	14%	22%	15%	23%	21%	18%	23%	.	.	6%	.	.
1a: New product	7%	25%	21%	23%	32%	36%	45%	40%	25%	42%	2%	3%	3%	-5%	1%	11%	7%	17%	10%	18%	2%	2%	7%	1%	6%	10%	11%	18%	22%	21%
1a1: New good	6%	17%	9%	12%	20%	9%	8%	2%	6%	6%	4%	18%	39%	17%	26%	3%	5%	13%	5%	8%	0%	1%	5%	2%	6%	4%	4%	6%	7%	7%
1a2: New service	4%	17%	17%	20%	23%	6%	13%	5%	-7%	10%	12%	5%	-2%	0%	-1%	6%	-1%	2%	8%	8%	3%	2%	7%	3%	6%	.	.	.	.	.
1b: New process	11%	28%	25%	37%	36%	-6%	-2%	-3%	17%	23%	-9%	5%	-6%	2%	-5%	3%	4%	8%	12%	24%	12%	19%	20%	18%	21%	.	.	.	-6%	.
1c: New organisation	24%	43%	47%	52%	59%	2%	6%	8%	8%	-7%	-5%	-1%	-3%	2%	-9%	11%	4%	8%	7%	15%	10%	14%	7%	13%	19%	.	.	.	.	.
1d: New marketing	0%	10%	7%	7%	18%	3%	12%	17%	6%	2%	7%	12%	21%	19%	19%	2%	5%	10%	17%	20%	-1%	4%	2%	5%	11%	11%	18%	24%	29%	32%
Innovation trajectories																														
2: New-to-the-mkt	1%	9%	-12%	-12%	0%	18%	9%	2%	10%	12%	-7%	-2%	-1%	-4%	1%	13%	17%	8%	15%	1%	-1%	14%	13%	2%	22%	.	.	.	.	.
3: Prod in-house/coop	-7%	10%	15%	0%	7%	.	.	.	.	.	5%	-5%	6%	1%	0%	1%	-2%	-6%	-8%	-8%	5%	-14%	-2%	-4%	2%	.	.	.	.	.
4: Proc in-house/coop	4%	3%	12%	10%	5%	.	.	.	.	.	-2%	-2%	2%	1%	9%	-4%	-12%	3%	-1%	-5%	1%	-1%	9%	13%	1%	.	.	.	.	.
5a: Org OR mrktg	1%	-4%	0%	-1%	0%	1%	-10%	5%	-2%	-26%	-6%	-2%	1%	5%	-6%	-4%	-2%	1%	5%	3%	-1%	-1%	-11%	-2%	4%	.	.	.	.	.
5b: Org AND mrktg	-1%	3%	15%	11%	21%	-3%	13%	17%	-3%	2%	3%	8%	12%	12%	11%	0%	-6%	11%	8%	14%	-9%	-5%	-6%	4%	8%	.	.	.	.	.
5c: Org	2%	-7%	6%	3%	1%	-11%	-14%	-7%	-15%	-33%	-6%	-1%	-3%	5%	-10%	5%	-5%	4%	-3%	3%	0%	-3%	-12%	0%	4%	.	.	.	.	.
5d: Mrktg	-2%	4%	8%	5%	17%	3%	15%	24%	5%	3%	6%	11%	21%	20%	18%	-9%	-2%	7%	16%	13%	-10%	-4%	-7%	0%	7%	.	25%	31%	41%	45%
6a: Prod AND mktg	-12%	2%	-1%	6%	4%	-11%	14%	10%	-27%	-2%	-4%	-5%	3%	7%	6%	-14%	-8%	0%	4%	19%	-2%	-5%	-3%	-2%	7%	.	.	.	.	-8%
6b: Proc AND org	3%	3%	9%	15%	11%	-5%	2%	-5%	6%	4%	-8%	0%	-8%	8%	-2%	4%	1%	12%	9%	26%	4%	9%	-1%	11%	14%	.	.	.	.	-
6c: Prod AND mktg/org	-5%	1%	1%	4%	7%	9%	2%	6%	-4%	-7%	-3%	4%	4%	1%	-3%	-1%	-1%	20%	11%	17%	6%	-5%	-1%	-4%	6%	15%	21%	27%	29%	31%
6d: Proc AND mktg/org	0%	3%	10%	10%	13%	-6%	7%	-2%	4%	10%	-6%	1%	-7%	8%	-2%	-6%	-1%	8%	8%	25%	4%	10%	3%	12%	18%	.	.	.	-8%	.
Cooperation in innovation																														
7: Coop	2%	-2%	-2%	3%	1%	3%	3%	9%	8%	5%	1%	4%	3%	-2%	7%	1%	1%	5%	-2%	1%	4%	12%	12%	16%	19%	.	.	.	.	.
Data	Cross-section					Cross-section					Panel					Panel					Cross-section					Panel				
Estimation	Random Effects					Random Effects					Random Effects					Random Effects					Random Effects					Random Effects				
N. obs	1912					210					235					1273					1336					2630				

Bold: significant at 10%; Underlined: significant at 5%; Double-underlined: significant at 1%; ".": non significant; <<blank>>: not available

- *ICT use increases the probability to introduce a new organisation*

The number of web facilities increases the probability to innovate for the manufacturing firms in 5 countries out of 8. The increase is the highest in Italy, where firms with three web facilities are 43% more likely to innovate in organization than firms with no web facilities. In Canada, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands and Spain the increase is 24%, 19%, 16% and 13%, respectively. Firms with two web facilities in Luxembourg are 40% more likely to innovate, although the effect becomes not significant for a higher number of facilities.

These effects are confirmed for services in 4 countries out of 7. The increase is the highest in Spain and Italy, where firms with three web facilities are, respectively, 46% and 43% more likely to introduce a new organization than firms with no web facilities. In Norway and the United Kingdom the increase is 19% and 23%, respectively.

- *ICT use increases the probability to innovate in marketing*

The number of web facilities increases the probability to innovate in marketing for the manufacturing firms in 6 countries out of 8. The increase is the highest in Italy and the Netherlands, where firms with three web facilities are 38% and 36%, respectively, more likely to innovate than firms with no web facilities. The increase is 29% in Canada, 18% in Norway and the United Kingdom, and 16% in Spain. Firms with two web facilities in Luxembourg are 23% more likely to innovate in marketing, although the effect becomes not significant for a higher number of web facilities.

The number of web facilities increases the probability to innovate in marketing for the service firms in 5 countries out of 7. The increase is the highest in the Netherland, where firms with three web facilities are 38% more likely to innovate than firms with no web facilities. In the remaining countries this effect seems weaker than in manufacturing. The increase in the probability to innovate in marketing is 22% in Norway, 18% in the United Kingdom, 14% in Italy and 10% in Spain.

6.2   Trajectories in innovation

- *ICT use does not increase the probability to introduce a product new-to-the-market*

The introduction a new product by a firm may result from the adoption of an existing product, *i.e.* new-to-the-firm, or by the invention of a truly new product, *i.e.* new-to-the-market. If ICT use increased the invention capabilities of a firm, one may expect new products by ICT intensive users to be new-to-the-market more often than new-to-the-firm.

Against this expectation, we found that ICT use does not increase the probability to introduce a product new-to-the-market – as opposed to new-to-the-firm. Manufacturing firms in Switzerland are the only ones to show a higher probability (10%) although the statistical significance of this result is weak (10%).

- *ICT use does not increase the probability to develop a new product or process in-house*

The introduction a new product or process by a firm may result from the adoption of an existing product/process developed by another firm or by the invention of a new product/process developed in-house. If ICT use increased the invention capabilities of a firm, one may expect new products/process by ICT intensive users to be mostly developed in-house (or in cooperation with other firms).

In general, we found little evidence that ICT use increases the probability to introduce a new product or a new process developed in-house. Service firms in the United Kingdom are the only to show a higher probability (up to 19%) to develop a new product in house or in cooperation with other firms.

- *Among all innovative firms, ICT intensive users are more likely to innovate in organisation or marketing*

The number of web facilities increases the probability to innovate in marketing for the innovative manufacturing firms in 6 countries out of 7. The increase is the highest in the Netherlands, where innovative firms with three web facilities are 37% more likely to innovate in marketing than innovative firms with no web facilities. The increase is over 20% in Canada, Italy and Norway and it is 17% and 15% in Spain and the United Kingdom, respectively. In this latter country, the probability to innovate both in process and marketing/organization increases up to 40%.

In the service industries, the intensity of ICT use increases the probability to innovate in marking among innovative firms in the Netherlands (40%) and Italy (18%). In the United Kingdom, ICT use increases the probability to innovate in process and marketing/organisation (38%) as well as in product and marketing/organisation (32%).

6.3 Cooperation in innovation

- *ICT use does not increase to probability to cooperate in innovation*

In general, we found little evidence for the hypothesis that ICT intensive users are more likely to cooperate in innovation with other firms or institutions. The only firms where ICT use is associated to a higher probability in to cooperate in innovation are manufacturing firms in the United Kingdom (16%) and services firms in the Netherlands (22%).

7. Conclusions and suggestions for further research

This study has tried to assess the effects of information and communications technologies (ICTs) as an enabler of innovation in eight OECD countries. Our findings support the hypothesis that ICTs act an enabler of innovation, in particular for product and marketing innovation. Unlike previous studies, our results show that these effects are large both in manufacturing and services.

However, we did not find any evidence that ICT use increases the capability of a firm to cooperate with other firms/institutions nor that ICT intensive firms have higher capacity to develop innovation in-house or to introduce more "innovative" (new-to-the-market) products. These results suggest that ICTs enable firms to adopt innovation but they not increase their "inventive" capabilities, *i.e.* the capability to develop new products and processes.

In interpreting these results, one should bear in mind that they are based on some "imperfect" measure of ICT use by firms. As discussed above, firms with the same automatic IT links or web facilities may use them differently and our indicators would not capture these differences. In addition, these indicators seem biased towards the use of ICTs for e-commerce and e-business but they may be a poorer proxy for other ICT-enabled activities relevant for innovation, eg: communication.

One development of the present study, therefore, would be to test the above results against some alternative indicator of ICT use. For instance, the analysis could be repeated using ICT investments for the few countries where data are available at the firm level.

If the results were confirmed, another development of the present study would be to have researchers from additional countries to joint the network and apply the research model developed for this study. In this sense, cooperation with the WPIE could be useful to reach a larger set of potential contributors to this project.

Another direction for further research would be to link the present results to an analysis of productivity at the firm level. Do ICT-enabled innovations have a different impact on productivity as compared to other types of innovation? Do they act through different channels? This line of research requires linking ICT and innovation micro data to business registers or business surveys and introducing ICT variables into a broader productivity model.

The analysis of productivity at the firm level is currently carried out by an international research network related to two OECD bodies, NESTI and WPIA. Therefore, it seems opportune to explore the scope for joint work with these two working parties.

REFERENCES

Beck, N., J. Brüderl and M. Woywode (2008), 'Momentum or deceleration? Theoretical and methodological reflections on the analysis of organizational change', *Academy of Management Journal*, 51(3), pp. 413-435.

Bhattacharya, Mita and Bloch, Harry (2004) "Determinants of Innovation" *Small Business Economics* 22:155-162.

Bloom, N., L. Garicano, R. Sadun, and J. Van Reenen (2009), 'The distinct effects of information technology and communication technology on firm organization', *mimeo*.

Brynjolfsson, E. and L.M. Hitt (2000), 'Beyond Computation: Information Technology, Organizational Transformation and Business Performance', *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 14 (4), pp. 23-48.

Brynjolfsson, E., A. McAfee, M. Sorell, and F. Zhu (2006), 'Scale without mass: business process replication and industry dynamics', working paper 07-016, Harvard Business School, Boston. 24

Crépon, B., E. Duguet, and J. Mairesse (1998), 'Research, innovation and productivity: an econometric analysis at the firm level', *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, vol. 7, pp. 115-158.

Crespi, G., C. Criscuolo, and J. Haskel (2007), 'Information technology, organizational change and productivity growth: evidence from UK firms', *CEP Discussion Paper* no. 783.

Criscuolo, C. and J. Haskel (2003), 'Innovations and productivity growth in the UK: evidence from CIS2 and CIS3', *CeRiBA Discussion Paper* EBPF03-3(10), London.

Eurostat (2008), 'Information Society: ICT impact assessment by linking data from different sources (Final Report)', August 2008.

Gago, Da. and L. Rubalcaba (2007) "Innovation and ICT in service firms: towards a multidimensional approach for impact assessment" *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* 17:25-44.

Gretton, P., J. Gali and D. Parham "The Effects of ICTs and Complementary Innovations on Australian Productivity Growth" in OECD (2004) *The Economic Impact of ICT: Measurement, Evidence and Implications,* OECD Publishing pp. 105-130.

Griffith, R., E. Huergo, J. Mairesse, and B. Peters (2006), 'Innovation and productivity across four European countries', *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 22(4), 483-498.

Griliches, Z. (1979), 'Issues in assessing the contribution of research and development to productivity growth', *Bell Journal of Economics*, 10(1), 92-116.

Heckman, J. J. (1978), Dummy Endogenous Variables in a Simultaneous Equation System, *Econometrica*, Vol. 46, No. 4, pp. 931-959.

Kox, H., G. van Leeuwen and H. van der Wiel (2007), 'Market structure, productivity and scale in European business services', CBS Discussion Paper 7013.

Leeuwen, van G. (2008), 'ICT, innovation and productivity', in: Eurostat (2008) 'Information society: ICT impact assessment by linking data from different sources'.

Leeuwen, van G. and L. Klomp (2006), 'On the contribution of innovation to multifactor productivity growth', *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, vol.15(4-5), pp. 367-390.

Lööf, H. and A. Heshmati (2002), 'Knowledge capital and performance heterogeneity', *International Journal of Production Economics*, 76(1), pp. 61-85.

Mairesse, J., P. Mohnen and E. Kremp (2009), 'The importance of R&D and innovation for productivity: a reexamination in light of the 2000 French Innovation Survey', mimeo.

Milgrom, P. and J. Roberts (1990), 'The economics of modern manufacturing, technology, strategy and organisations', *American Economic Review*, 80, 511-528.

Murphy, M. (2002), 'Organisational change and firm performance', OECD Science, Technology and Industry Working Papers, 2002/14, OECD Paris

OECD (2004) *The Economic Impact of ICT: Measurement, Evidence and Implications,* OECD, Paris.

OECD (2005) *Oslo Manual 3rd Ed, Guidelines for collecting and Interpreting Innovation Data*, OECD, Paris.

OECD (2009), 'Innovation in firms: a microeconomic perspective', OECD, Paris.

Parisi, M.L., F. Schiantarelli, and A. Sembenelli (2006), 'Productivity, innovation and R&D: micro-evidence for Italy', *European Economic Review*, 50(8), pp. 2037-2061.

Polder, M. , G. van Leeuwen, P. Mohnen and W. Raymond (2009) "Productivity effects of innovation modes", MPRA Paper No. 18893.

Rivers, D. and Q. H. Vuong (1988), Limited Information Estimators and Exogeneity Tests for Simultaneous Probit Models, *Journal of Econometrics* 39, 347-366.

Rogers, Mark (2004) "Networks, Firm Size and Innovation" *Small Business Economics,* 22:141-153.

Wooldridge, J. M. (2002) *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.