

Karin Hoisl

**A Study of Inventors**

# GABLER EDITION WISSENSCHAFT

## **Innovation und Entrepreneurship**

Herausgegeben von  
Professor Dr. Nikolaus Franke,  
Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien, und  
Professor Dietmar Harhoff, Ph.D.,  
Universität München

Innovative Konzepte und unternehmerische Leistungen sind für Wohlstand und Fortschritt von entscheidender Bedeutung. Diese Schriftenreihe vereint wissenschaftliche Arbeiten zu diesem Themenbereich. Sie beschreiben substanzielle Erkenntnisse auf hohem methodischen Niveau.

Karin Hoisl

# **A Study of Inventors**

Incentives, Productivity, and Mobility

With a foreword by Prof. Dietmar Harhoff, Ph. D.

Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag

Bibliografische Information Der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek  
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der  
Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über  
<<http://dnb.d-nb.de>> abrufbar.

Dissertation Universität München, 2006

1. Auflage Januar 2007

Alle Rechte vorbehalten

© Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag | GWV Fachverlage GmbH, Wiesbaden 2007

Lektorat: Brigitte Siegel / Stefanie Brich

Der Deutsche Universitäts-Verlag ist ein Unternehmen von Springer Science+Business Media.  
[www.duv.de](http://www.duv.de)



Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne Zustimmung des Verlags unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Die Wiedergabe von Gebrauchsnamen, Handelsnamen, Warenbezeichnungen usw. in diesem Werk berechtigt auch ohne besondere Kennzeichnung nicht zu der Annahme, dass solche Namen im Sinne der Warenzeichen- und Markenschutz-Gesetzgebung als frei zu betrachten wären und daher von jedermann benutzt werden dürften.

Umschlaggestaltung: Regine Zimmer, Dipl.-Designerin, Frankfurt/Main

Gedruckt auf säurefreiem und chlorfrei gebleichtem Papier

Printed in Germany

ISBN 978-3-8350-0650-8

## Foreword

Inventions are the raw material of innovative success at the corporate and the national level. This statement is uncontroversial, yet it poses major problems for managers and for decision-makers in public policy alike. How are we to manage, motivate and remunerate those individuals whose creativity and ingenuity gives rise to new inventions?

Inventions are strongly driven by human capital. Most of the inventive output is accounted for by a relatively small number of highly talented individuals. The latter aspect has been widely neglected in both theoretical and empirical innovation literature since the late 1970s. In contrast to most of the literature which focuses on invention output at the firm and team level, Karin Hoisl addresses in her analysis the contributions made by individual inventors.

In her dissertation, Hoisl undertakes a study of the characteristics of individual inventors and of the inventive process itself. Hoisl applies econometric methods to a large data set that was collected in the course of a project funded by the European Commission. In a questionnaire survey, more than 3,000 German inventors responded to questions on their personal attributes, the process of invention and the institutional settings for inventive activities in firms.

The thesis consists of three chapters. The first two chapters focus on inventor productivity and on inventor mobility as well as on the complex causal relationship between these two phenomena. The third chapter addresses and discusses efficient motivation and incentive systems for inventors and studies in particular the German Employees' Inventions Act.

The thesis presented by Karin Hoisl delivers major new research results which promote our understanding of inventive processes and inventor motivation. It is a welcome complement to the existing management literature. Europe will not be able to maintain or extend current levels of wealth and technical progress unless we learn how to manage inventive processes better. This thesis is an encouraging step forward.

Prof. Dietmar Harhoff, Ph.D.

## Acknowledgements

This dissertation thesis was carried out during the past three and a half years. Even though the work on this thesis has often been highly demanding and laborious, the greater part has been exciting, instructive, and enjoyable. At the outset, I want to thank those persons who have supported me most and thus made this thesis possible:

First and foremost, I want to thank Prof. Dietmar Harhoff, my doctoral advisor, for his exceptional and motivating support and his endless patience. I would like to thank Prof. Harhoff for accepting me as a doctoral student and for providing me with the opportunity to work on the PatVal project. During the collaboration with Prof. Harhoff I learned much about how to conduct scientific research and how to write scientific papers. I am very much indebted to him.

Furthermore, I am grateful to Prof. Anton Meyer, my second advisor, for his excellent support and his advice, commencing during the MBR program and continuing later during my dissertation.

The data used within the several parts of this thesis originate from a coordinated survey carried out in six European countries: France, Germany, Great Britain, Italy, Spain, and the Netherlands. Financial support from the European Commission (Contract No. HPV2-CT-2001-00013) for this project is gratefully acknowledged.

I am also grateful to all my colleagues at the Institute for Innovation Research, Technology Management and Entrepreneurship for their support during the last three years. In particular, I owe my thanks to Marc Gruber, who has become a friend during the last years. He provided me with fruitful input for my dissertation, and numerous times I benefited from his research experience. Furthermore, we share a fondness for gummy bears. I wish him all the best for the professorship he accepted recently. I want to thank Celine Schulz, who spent a couple of weekends with my papers to correct my English. Additionally, her valuable comments on methodology and content during several fruitful discussions always hit the mark. Further on, I thank Uli Lossen, with whom I do not only share my birthday, but we also shared one room for a long time. His constructive criticism during the course of this thesis was very helpful. Additionally he saved countless hours of my time due to his EXCEL solutions. Many thanks

also go to Christian Tausend and Felix Treptow who always were there when I needed encouragement and who had a major part in the great time we had during the last years. I am grateful to the “patent-group”: Joachim Henkel, Stefan Wagner, and Georg von Graevenitz for their support and valuable comments. Special thanks go further on to Rosemarie Wilcox for her support especially during the last months of my dissertation and for the final language check of my papers.

For providing me with the essential know-how on intellectual property and for ongoing encouragement I wish to thank Dr. Jürgen Lachnit, partner at the law firm of Weickmann & Weickmann. Thanks also go to Ben Neuburger, who commented my papers from the point of view of a future patent attorney.

I also want to thank my friend Una Schulze for her support. Additional thanks go to my long-time student assistant Thomas von Eggelkraut-Gottanka (who has become a colleague in the meantime) for his help. I never had to check his work. Further thanks are given to Silvia Knittl, who helped in building the dataset for a major part of my dissertation. Thanks also go to Alina Resnik and to Jes Villa for their aid. Last but not least, a number of hard-working student assistants of the PatVal project should be mentioned in deep gratitude for supporting the project: Lydia Bojerivanova, Mehmed Celik, Paolo Colonna, Nina Kreuzpointner, Miriam Lorber, Elke Müller, Stephanie Pörschmann, Yu Quian, Dominik Rottenkolber, and Christian Schmid-Eickhoff.

My deepest and most heartfelt gratitude goes to my family, especially to my parents, my sister, and to my boyfriend Bernd, who are of capital importance to me. My parents support me in every way they can, they always believe in me and provide me with their love. I owe them so much. I want to thank my boyfriend Bernd for his love, endless patience, and for his continued interest in what I am doing.

Karin Hoisl

# Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Motivation .....	1
1.2	The Complexity of Invention and Review of the Literature .....	3
1.3	Summary of the Three Empirical Studies .....	6
<b>2</b>	<b>A Closer Look at Inventor Productivity – What Makes the Difference? .....</b>	<b>11</b>
2.1	Introduction .....	11
2.2	Theoretical Background and Empirical Evidence.....	14
2.2.1	Literature Review.....	14
2.2.2	Scientists vs. Engineers.....	17
2.3	Hypotheses .....	19
2.4	Data Source and Description of the Variables .....	22
2.4.1	Description of the Data .....	22
2.4.2	Description of the Variables.....	24
2.4.2.1	Motivation for the Different Measures of Inventive Output.....	24
2.4.2.2	Dependent Variables .....	28
2.4.2.3	Explanatory Variables .....	30
2.5	Descriptive Statistics und Multivariate Results .....	31
2.5.1	Descriptive Statistics .....	31
2.5.2	Multivariate Specification.....	42
2.6	Panel Regression .....	50
2.6.1	Description of the Methodology .....	50
2.6.2	Multivariate Results .....	53
2.7	Conclusion.....	61



<b>3</b>	<b>Tracing Mobile Inventors - The Causality between Inventor Mobility and Inventor Productivity</b> .....	<b>65</b>
3.1	Introduction .....	65
3.2	Hypotheses .....	68
3.2.1	Hypotheses on Inventor Productivity .....	68
3.2.2	Hypotheses on Inventor Mobility.....	68
3.2.3	Hypotheses on the Causality between Productivity and Mobility .....	71
3.3	Data Source and Sample .....	75
3.3.1	Description of the Data .....	75
3.3.2	Variables.....	77
3.3.2.1	Dependent Variables .....	77
3.3.2.2	Explanatory Variables.....	80
3.4	Descriptive Statistics and Multivariate Results .....	82
3.4.1	Descriptive Results.....	82
3.4.2	Multivariate Specification.....	89
3.4.3	Discussion of the Results .....	91
3.5	Difference-in-Differences Estimation.....	101
3.5.1	Data Source, Matching, and Descriptive Results.....	102
3.5.2	Description of the Results .....	106
3.6	Conclusion.....	116
<b>4</b>	<b>Institutionalized Incentives for Ingenuity – Patent Value and the German Employees’ Inventions Act</b> .....	<b>121</b>
4.1	Introduction .....	121
4.2	Invention Processes and the German Employees’ Inventions Act.....	123
4.2.1	Salient Features of Invention Processes.....	123
4.2.2	Institutionalized Compensation Schemes in Various Countries .....	125
4.2.3	Historical Aspects of the German Employees’ Inventions Act .....	128
4.2.4	Regulations of the German Employees’ Inventions Act as of 1957 .....	129
4.2.5	The Impact of the German Employees’ Inventions Act.....	132
4.3	Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	135
4.4	Data Source and Sample .....	136
4.4.1	Data Source – the German Inventor Survey.....	136
4.4.2	Variables.....	138

4.5	Survey Evidence - Descriptive Statistics .....	140
4.6	Multivariate Analysis .....	150
4.7	Conclusions .....	154
<b>5</b>	<b>Summary of the Results and Outlook .....</b>	<b>155</b>
	<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>161</b>
	<b>Annex 1.....</b>	<b>175</b>
	<b>Annex 2.....</b>	<b>177</b>
	<b>Annex 3.....</b>	<b>181</b>
	<b>Erratum.....</b>	<b>200</b>

## List of Figures

Figure 2.1:	Absorptive capacity (according to Cohen/Levinthal 1990) .....	21
Figure 2.2:	Yearly means of the number of claims specified in the patent applications and yearly means of inventor team size .....	25
Figure 2.3:	Average inventor team size by firm size .....	26
Figure 2.4:	Patent activity index per technological area.....	27
Figure 2.5:	Distribution of applications per inventor (whole counts) .....	38
Figure 2.6:	Distribution of applications per inventor (fractional counts).....	38
Figure 2.7:	Distribution of the number of citations per inventor.....	39
Figure 2.8:	Relationship between number of patent applications and number of citations (scatter plot).....	40
Figure 2.9:	Productivity differences by age groups.....	57
Figure 2.10:	Productivity differences by age groups (additional control for the priority years of the patents) .....	59
Figure 3.1:	Composition of the sample.....	76
Figure 3.2:	Distribution of the number of applications per inventor .....	87
Figure 3.3:	Distribution of inventor productivity .....	88
Figure 3.4:	Distribution of the number of moves per inventor.....	88
Figure 3.5:	Distribution of inventor mobility per 10 years inventive activity.....	89
Figure 3.6:	Untreated control group design with pre- and posttest (Cook/Campbell 1979).....	102
Figures 3.7a/b:	Difference-in-differences estimator calculated for the mean share of granted patents (4 year period and 3 year period).....	108
Figure 4.1:	Share of salary received as inventor compensation for this patent .....	141
Figure 4.2:	Share of salary received as inventor compensation for all patents, multiple inventors are included once .....	141
Figure 4.3:	Effect of the German Employees' Inventions Act on incentives for innovation.....	147

Figure 4.4: Incentives emerging from the German Employees' Incentive Act  
(positive effect to motivation)..... 148

Figure 4.5: Disincentives emerging from the German Employees' Incentive Act  
(negative effect to motivation) ..... 149

## List of Tables

Table 2.1:	25 top-productive inventors (rank 1 to rank 12) .....	33
Table 2.2:	Descriptive statistics.....	36
Table 2.3:	Pearson correlation coefficients .....	37
Table 2.4:	Number of applications (whole counts) by number of technical area .....	41
Table 2.5:	Number of applications (whole counts) by level of education .....	41
Table 2.6:	Number of applications (whole counts) by firm size .....	42
Table 2.7:	Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity .....	43
Table 2.8:	OLS regression with heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors .....	44
Table 2.9:	Robust fixed effects panel estimation (Model 1) .....	55
Table 2.10:	Robust fixed effects panel estimation (Model 2) .....	58
Table 2.11:	Robust fixed effects panel estimation (Model 3) .....	61
Table 3.1:	Example 1 (applicant sequence of inventor 1).....	78
Table 3.2:	Example 2 (applicant sequence of inventor 2).....	79
Table 3.3:	Example 3 (applicant sequence of inventor 3).....	79
Table 3.4 :	Descriptive statistics.....	83
Table 3.5:	Pearson correlation coefficients .....	85
Table 3.6:	Differences between mobile and non-mobile inventors according to different incentives.....	85
Table 3.7:	Share of mobile inventors by level of education.....	86
Table 3.8:	Share of mobile inventors by regional characteristics .....	86
Table 3.9:	2SLS regression with heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors .....	93
Table 3.10:	Descriptive statistics.....	105
Table 3.11:	T-Test of difference-in-differences estimations for 4 and 3 year periods before and after the event of a move .....	107
Table 3.12:	Difference-in-differences regression estimation (OLS regression) .....	112

Table 4.1: Descriptive statistics ..... 142  
Table 4.2: Inventor compensation by age and education ..... 144  
Table 4.3: Inventor compensation by firm size and number of inventors..... 145  
Table 4.4: Inventor compensation by monetary patent value ..... 145  
Table 4.5: Inventor compensation by strategic patent value ..... 146  
Table 4.6: Means of compensation for this patent ..... 147