

# A Great Wall of Patents: What is behind China's recent patent explosion? \*

Albert Guangzhou Hu<sup>†</sup>

Department of Economics, National University of Singapore

Gary H. Jefferson

Department of Economics, Brandeis University

30 January 2006

## Abstract

Patenting in China has been growing at an annual double-digit rate over the past 20 years with a marked acceleration since 2000. China's patent explosion is seemingly paradoxical given the country's weak record of protecting intellectual property rights. Using a firm-level data set that spans the population of China's large and medium size industrial enterprises, this paper seeks to understand the factors that account for China's patent boom. While the intensification of research and development (R&D) in the Chinese economy tracks with patenting activity, it explains only a fraction of the patent explosion. We find that a confluence of events and developments has been driving the patent explosion. The growing intensity of foreign direct investment in China is prompting Chinese firms to file for more patent applications. Amendments to the patent law that favor patent holders and ownership reform that has clarified the assignment of property rights also emerge as significant sources of China's surge in patent activity.

JEL: O31, O34, L21

Keywords: patent explosion, R&D, FDI, China

---

\*We thank for their helpful comments Stuart Graham, Li Wei, Lim Kuanghui, Nannan Lundin and seminar and conference participants at Singapore Management University, Nanjing Workshop on Global R&D in China, May 28-29, 2005, Second Summer Industrial Organization Workshop, Tsinghua University, June 8-9, the economics seminar at University of Connecticut, October 7, 2005, Second ZEW Conference on the Empirical Economics of Innovation and Patenting, Mannheim, September 19-20, 2005, Globalization and Economic Growth, Shanghai, November 4-6, 2005, NBER China Workshop, September 30, 2005. We also acknowledge support from the National University of Singapore Academic Research Fund(R-122-000-091-112), the National Science Foundation (project#450823) and the U.S. Department of Energy (contract# DE-FG02-00ER63030).

<sup>†</sup>Corresponding author, Department of Economics, 1 Arts Link, Singapore 117570; ecshua@nus.edu.sg; Fax:(65)6752646.

# 1 Introduction

Chinese patent applications have been growing at an annual rate of over 15 percent since 1986, the year following the reinstatement of China's Patent Law. The surge is not limited to patent applications from domestic Chinese inventors, which have increased by ten fold. Since China first amended its Patent Law in 1992, patent applications filed by foreign inventors have grown at an annual rate of 22 percent. Nor is the surge confined to utility model and design patents that represent small and incremental innovations and that receive scant patent examination and limited legal protection. Following China's second amendment to its patent law in 2000, invention patent applications from both domestic and foreign inventors have grown at an annual rate of 23 percent.

China's remarkable patent explosion invites careful examination. A number of authors have observed a world wide surge in patenting, particularly that in the U.S. since the mid-1980s, patenting has been growing at an annual rate of six percent. This compares modestly with the magnitude of the Chinese patent explosion. Another and perhaps more striking feature of the dramatic upsurge in patenting in China is that it has taken place in a legal environment where intellectual property rights protection continues to be weak and the rule of law not well established. These weaknesses in China's patent system presumably lead to weak incentives to patent, which make the causes of the surge particularly challenging to unravel.

A confluence of events that have accompanied China's patent explosion also provide candidate explanations. China has twice amended its patent law by expanding the scope of patent protection, including the introduction of new mechanisms to enforce patent rights. The amendments have largely brought China's patent law in line with international norms. However, China's legal system, particularly the enforcement mechanism and the informal norms that are needed to

support it, is far from effective in protecting private property rights. Piracy remains rampant. What might lead inventors to seek out patent protection when such protection could turn out to be ineffective?

The R&D intensity of China's economy, measured by the ratio of R&D expenditure to GDP, hovered around one-half percent for much of the 1990s before rising in the late 1990s, reaching 1.0 percent in 2000, and then continuing to climb to 1.35 percent in 2004. China is now one of the few low or low-middle income countries whose level of R&D intensity has risen beyond one percent (Hu and Jefferson, 2004). One possible explanation of the surge is that China's rising R&D intensity may be creating more patentable new knowledge.

Also during the past decade, foreign direct investment of rising technological sophistication has been expanding into more Chinese industries and regions. As foreign invested firms expand and deepen their manufacturing activities in China, with some establishing R&D operations, the need to protect their intellectual property might also be expected to rise. Moreover, the use by foreign firms of legal weapons, now sharpened by the new pro-patent legislation, could be demonstrating to Chinese firms the strategic importance of patent rights. Therefore, in addition to the expansion of China's patent law and the growth of China's R&D intensity, a third hypothesis that potentially explains China's patent explosion is that the surge of FDI has raised the stakes for owning patent rights for both foreign and domestic firms thereby leading to a higher propensity to patent.

Differences in the inter-industry incidence of patenting are often associated with "complex" and "discrete" product industries. The former industries develop new products or processes that consist of numerous separately patentable elements versus relatively few patentable elements in the discrete product industries. As a consequence, firms in complex product industries typically build up portfolios of intellectual property rights in order to gain a competitive edge in licensing nego-

tiations. A structural shift of Chinese industry towards more complex industries would lead to a higher incidence of patenting.

Finally, the Chinese government accelerated ownership restructuring of the state-owned enterprises in the mid-1990s. Legislative changes that affirm private property rights and institutional changes such as the withdrawal of local governments from many collectively owned enterprises have produced less ambiguous assignments of property rights in China's enterprise system. The increasing entry of non-state enterprises and the comparatively strong incentive of these enterprises to assert their property rights including those over intellectual property could also have contributed to China's patent upsurge.

We investigate and differentiate these hypotheses by nesting them in a patents production function, which we estimate using a data set that spans the population of China's large and medium sized enterprises from 1995 to 2001. These enterprises are responsible for the bulk of China's industrial R&D.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. The next section reviews the literature that investigates the causes of the U.S. patent explosion. Section three describes China's patent system and the government's attempts to restructure it. Section four provides summary evidence on the patenting behavior of China's large and medium size enterprises. We discuss the specification and estimation of the patents production function in section five. In section six we draw inferences for the different hypotheses of China's patent explosion based on the estimation results. Section seven presents our conclusions and related discussion.

## **2 Patent explosion in the U.S. and beyond**

The incidence of patenting has grown rapidly worldwide. The patent explosion in the U.S. has particularly been well documented and analyzed. Studies have pro-

posed and examined a plethora of hypotheses that potentially explain the patent upsurge. Kortum and Lerner (1999) investigated three alternative hypotheses: the friendly court hypothesis, the fertile technology hypothesis, and the regulatory capture hypothesis. The first of these refers to a series of pro-patent legislative developments that may have increased the propensity to patent. In contrast, the fertile technology hypothesis is predicated on three conditions: the expansion of technology opportunities, particularly in industries such as biotechnology and information technology and software, higher productivity of innovation due to the applications of information technology to R&D, and innovation in the management of R&D that is characterized by a shift towards applied R&D activities. The third hypothesis - the regulatory capture hypothesis - maintains the pro-patent legal developments were driven by the efforts of large U.S. firms to weaken the competitive edge of domestic and foreign entrants. Using aggregate patent data from the U.S. and international patent data, Kortum and Lerner through a process of elimination concluded that the U.S. patent explosion has been primarily driven by “changes in the management of innovation involving a shift to more applied activities.”

Combining information from interviews and with firm-level economic data, Hall and Ziedonis (2001) examined the patenting behavior of 95 U.S. firms in the semiconductor industry, which had not traditionally relied on patents as a means to protect its intellectual property and yet had seen a sharp rise in patenting since the mid 1980s. They found evidence of “patent portfolio races” among these semiconductor firms following the series of pro-patent legislative changes in the 1980s. Such races, they argued, were driven by the firms’ incentive to enhance their bargaining position in the ensuing patenting licensing negotiations or patent litigations. In a recent synthesis, Jaffe and Lerner (2004) analyzed how the seemingly innocent pro-patent legislative changes had turned patents from a means to encourage

innovation to a strategic tool that may well stifle innovation.

There is no consensus as to what is behind the U.S. patenting surge. Given the enormous inter-industry differences in technology opportunity and propensity to patent, it seems that there is room for both the fertile technology and the strategic patenting hypotheses in accounting for the patent explosion.

## **3 China's patent system and the patent explosion**

### **3.1 China's patent system**

The People's Republic of China's first formal Patent Law, adopted March 12, 1984, went into effect on April 1, 1985.<sup>1</sup> The law helped to create a patent system that was similar to those used in Europe and Japan. China's patent office grants three types of patents: invention, utility model and design patents. Applications for invention patents need to pass a substantive examination for utility, novelty, and non-obviousness before the patents can be granted. The utility model and design patents generally cover more incremental innovations and are not subject to examination for novelty and an inventive step. Finally, like the systems of Europe and Japan, China's system is based on the first-to-file principle rather than the first-to-invent principle.<sup>2</sup>

The first major amendments of China's Patent Law came into effect January 1, 1993. The amendments extended the scope of patent protection to cover pharmaceutical products, food, beverages, flavorings, and substances obtained by means

---

<sup>1</sup>The origin of patent legislation in China can be traced to a prototype of patent law entitled the Charter of Rewards on Invigoration of Industry and Art the Qing Dynasty promulgated in 1889.

<sup>2</sup>Like Europe and Japan, China's patent law also includes a pre-grant opposition system under which parties can file a request with the patent office to object to the grant of the patents concerned.

of chemical processes. The duration of invention patent protection was extended from 15 to 20 years, while that of utility model and design patents increased from 5 to 10 years. Protection for manufacturing processes has been extended to products that are directly obtained by the patented process. Also, a patentee has the right to prevent any other person from importing the patent related product. The grounds for granting compulsory licenses were restricted. The pre-grant opposition was replaced by a post-grant revocation procedure - as a result, the entire process of patent approval was shortened by an average of six to ten months.

In anticipation of China's accession to the World Trade Organization (WTO) and becoming a member nation of the Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS),<sup>3</sup> the National People's Congress again revised the Patent Law in August 2000.<sup>4</sup> In accordance with TRIPS requirements, the amendments provide patent holders with the right to obtain a preliminary injunction against the infringing party before filing a lawsuit. The new law also stipulates standards, not previously existing, to compute statutory damages. The amendments affirm that state and non-state enterprises enjoy equal treatment in obtaining patent rights. The amended law simplifies the patent application, examination and transfer procedures and unifies the appeal system by removing the patent revocation procedure that had also served as the invalidation procedure.

### **3.2 The patent explosion**


The incidence of both patent applications and grants surged in 2000, although prior to that there was a small blip in 1993 after the first Patent Law Amendment.

---

<sup>3</sup>Over the years China has also joined a number of international conventions for IP protection. In 1984, China became a signatory party to the Paris Convention on the Protection of Industrial Property and the Treaty on Intellectual Property in Respect of Integrated Circuits in 1990. In 1994, China joined the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT). Other treaties that China has joined include: Budapest Treaty (1995), Locarno Agreement (1996), and Strasbourg Agreement (1997), International Convention for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) (1999).


<sup>4</sup>It went into effect July 1, 2001.

Figure 1: Chinese Patent Applications, 1986-2004



Source: web site of China's National Bureau of Statistics - [www.stats.gov.cn](http://www.stats.gov.cn).

Figure 2: Chinese Patent Grants, 1986-2004



Source: web site of China's National Bureau of Statistics - [www.stats.gov.cn](http://www.stats.gov.cn).


The take-off is particularly striking for invention patents that are plotted against the right hand axis in both Figures 1 and 2. Prior to 2000, applications for invention patents had been growing by less than 10 percent a year, while all patent applications grew by over 15 percent a year. Since 2000 the annual rate of growth of invention patent applications accelerated to 23 percent, overtaking the growth rate of overall patent applications by 5 percent. The year 2000 is also a watershed for foreign patent applications, the growth of which jumped from 12 percent per annum prior to the year to 23 percent annually afterwards.

A major difference between the patenting behavior of domestic and foreign inventors is the composition of the three types of patents. More than 85 percent of foreign applications were for invention patents in 2004, while less than a quarter of domestic applications were for invention patents. However the growth of domestic patent applications since 2000 has come mostly from invention patents. In fact, over the past five years the growth of domestic invention patents has outpaced even that of foreign invention patents.

Figure 2 shows similar patterns of growth for patents granted. A noticeable feature of the figure is that it shows different success rates for invention patent applications for domestic and foreign patent applications. While foreign and domestic inventors filed similar numbers of invention patent applications from 2000 onward, the numbers of patent grants diverged considerably, suggesting a potential drop in the quality of domestic invention patent applications.

An immediate candidate explanation for the patent explosion is the intensification of R&D in the Chinese economy with the ratio of R&D expenditure to GDP more than a doubling during 1996-2003, reaching a level of 1.3 percent in 2003. Figure 3 shows that the number of domestic patent applications per billion yuan of real R&D expenditure nearly doubled in 15 years while the number of patent grants has more than tripled. Patenting growth has clearly outstripped real R&D

Figure 3: Chinese Patents-R&D and R&D-GDP Ratios



Source: web site of China's National Bureau of Statistics - [www.stats.gov.cn](http://www.stats.gov.cn).


expenditure.

## 4 Patenting by the large and medium size enterprises

The data for this research are drawn from the Survey of Large and Medium Size Enterprises (LMEs) that China's National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) conducts annually. Jefferson, Hu, Guan and Yu (2003) provided a comprehensive description of this rich data set.<sup>5</sup> Our sample spans a period of seven years from 1995 to 2001 and includes data for 29 two-digit manufacturing industries and over 500 four-digit

<sup>5</sup>To define large and medium-size enterprises, China's NBS uses either of two industry specific criteria: production capacity or original value of fixed assets. For example, an iron and steel firm must meet or exceed a production capacity of 600,000 tons to qualify as a large enterprise. For semiconductor manufacturing firms, the original value of fixed assets of a large enterprise must exceed 50 million yuan. For further elaboration of the criteria used to classify firm size, see the web site of the China's NBS ([www.stats.gov.cn](http://www.stats.gov.cn)).

Figure 4: Industry Distribution of Patent Applications




Source: authors' own tabulation using the LME data.

industries.

In 1995 LMEs invested 7.5 billion Yuan on R&D, which accounted for 22 percent of total national R&D expenditure; by 2001, the share had risen to 38. LMEs were also responsible for 4.7 percent of all domestic patent applications in 1995 and 8.5 percent in 2001. Their share of patent grants rose from 3 percent in 1995 to 4.7 percent in 1999. The patent figures most likely understate the technological capability of China's LMEs as it is reasonable to assume that relative to patents taken out by small enterprises and individual inventors, LMEs disproportionately focus on invention patents.


Firms patent for different reasons. According to the survey reported in Cohen, Nelson and Walsh (2000), the top reasons U.S. firms choose to seek out patent protection include preventing copying, blocking rival patents on related innovations, avoiding law suits, use in negotiations, and enhancing reputation. Using patents to earn licensing revenue was reported to be the least important reason for applying

Figure 5: Industry Distribution of Domestic Patent Applications



Source: authors' own tabulation using the LME data.

Figure 6: Industry Distribution of Foreign Patent Applications



Source: authors' own tabulation using the LME data.


for patents.

The propensity to patent varies from industry to industry due to differences in the nature of technology and the ease of imitation. Figures 4 to 6 plot the distribution of patent applications across China's 29 two-digit industries. Since annual patent applications are erratic at the two-digit industry level in our data, we use simple averages over two sub-periods of the sample, 1995 - 1997 and 1998 - 2001, to smooth out the fluctuations. Both figures indicate that ten industries, transportation equipment, electrical machinery and equipment, electronics and telecommunications equipment, ordinary machinery, special equipment, chemical, pharmaceutical, cultural and sports goods, food manufacture and beverage, together account for about three quarters of all LME patent applications and over 80 percent of the increase in patent applications between the two sub-periods.

Ordinary machinery, special equipment, transportation equipment, electrical machinery and equipment, and electronics have been particularly aggressive in applying for patents. We compare patent applications of domestic and foreign invested enterprises in Figures 5 and 6. Although the industry distributions of foreign and domestic patents are similar, the patenting activity of foreign firms is smaller in scale and more concentrated than that of the domestic firms. Foreign invested enterprises in the electronics industry have been most aggressive in applying for patents, whereas the transportation equipment industry has seen the biggest increase in patenting by domestic firms.

Between 1995 and 2001, the flow of foreign direct investment to China grew dramatically. As shown in Figure 7, foreign invested enterprises have expanded their share of industry value added in all Chinese industries, including tobacco that had been monopolized by the Chinese government. Over this six-year period, the average increase in foreign invested firms' shares of value added is 18 percent. In the electronics industry foreign invested firms are responsible for as much as 65

Figure 7: Industry Distribution of Foreign Direct Investment



Source: authors' own tabulation using the LME data.

percent of total value added. As foreign firms broaden their manufacturing activity in China, increasing their share of local production, the risk that their technologies will be imitated increases.

Various authors have contrasted complex and discrete products industries in explaining inter-industry differences in patenting.<sup>6</sup> Cohen, Nelson and Walsh (2000) described the key difference between the two kinds of technologies as “whether a new, commercializable product or process is comprised of numerous separately patentable elements versus relatively few.” A consequence of this feature is that firms in complex product industries usually do not control all of the patented technologies used in the manufacture of a product. Firms patent to build up a portfolio of intellectual property rights in order to gain a competitive edge in licensing negotiations. Hall (2004) suggests that “in complex product industries, firms are more likely to use patents to induce rivals to negotiate for property rights over complementary technologies.” We select beverage, textile, chemical, and pharmaceutical to represent the discrete product industries and special machinery, transport equipment, electric machinery, and electronics for complex product industries.

Table 1 summarizes the basic characteristics of the sample firms. The top two panels show that the average real R&D expenditure by LMEs tripled from 1995 to 2001, while the average number of patent applications filed more than quadrupled. But innovation activity and output are highly varied and skewed among China’s LMEs. For both years, the median R&D expenditure is zero and the variation coefficient of R&D increased from 8 to almost 13 over the six year period. Measured by the R&D to value added ratio, R&D intensity did not change from 1995 to 2001. On the other hand, the Chinese LMEs have become leaner as average employment declined from 1442 to 1056 workers. As a result of the rapid expansion of FDI the share of industry valued added accounted for by foreign firms

---

<sup>6</sup>See for example, Levin, Klevorick, Nelson and Winter (1987) and Merges and Nelson (1990).

Table 1: Summary statistics

	Patent Applications	Real R&D	R&D - Value Added	Industry FDI	Labor
<i>Full sample; Year = 1995; N = 18215</i>					
<i>Mean</i>	0.179	414.212	0.019	0.123	1442
<i>Median</i>	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.067	863
<i>Std</i>	1.593	3389.885	0.152	0.134	3347
<i>Full sample; Year = 2001; N = 19146</i>					
<i>Mean</i>	0.738	1279.329	0.019	0.302	1056
<i>Median</i>	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.268	533
<i>Std</i>	8.216	16574.502	0.078	0.205	2617
<i>Full sample; All years; N = 133444</i>					
<i>Mean</i>	0.369	775.277	0.022	0.206	1267
<i>Median</i>	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.159	704
<i>Std</i>	5.384	8795.738	0.175	0.178	3086
<i>Domestic; All years; N = 111210</i>					
<i>Mean</i>	0.365	734.345	0.023	0.183	1383
<i>Std</i>	5.673	8492.490	0.175	0.162	3334
<i>Foreign; All years; N = 19499</i>					
<i>Mean</i>	0.386	1020.136	0.018	0.331	689
<i>Std</i>	3.441	9078.021	0.188	0.209	1090
<i>Discrete; All years; N = 36940</i>					
<i>Mean</i>	0.212	476.342	0.017	0.147	1275
<i>Std</i>	2.513	2611.861	0.146	0.153	2003
<i>Complex; All years; N = 29525</i>					
<i>Mean</i>	0.763	1751.779	0.040	0.258	1360
<i>Std</i>	10.063	17568.970	0.229	0.201	2957
<i>Innovators; All years; N = 22598</i>					
<i>Mean</i>	2.013	2735.977	0.038	0.208	2595
<i>Median</i>	0.000	62.208	0.002	0.174	1096
<i>Std</i>	12.640	19230.251	0.209	0.181	6768

*Source:* Authors' own calculation

has on average increased by 18 percent.

Foreign invested firms and domestic Chinese firms are quite similar in innovation activity. They file similar numbers of patent applications and invest similar fractions of value added in R&D. However foreign firms apparently are much less labor intensive than domestic firms.

Firms from complex industries are twice as R&D intensive as those from discrete industries. They file for more three times as many patent applications and appear to be more capital intensive. Their industries also attract more foreign investment.

## **5 What is behind China's patent explosion?**

### **5.1 In search of an explanation: five hypotheses**

We have identified five hypotheses with respect to China's patent explosion. The pro-patent amendments to the Patent Law in 1992 and 2000 may have raised the overall return to seeking patent protection. The intensification of R&D in the Chinese economy has channeled more resources into innovation activities that may have led to patentable technologies. International economic integration, particularly the vast inflow of foreign direct investment, has raised the stakes for protecting intellectual property rights in China for foreign firms. It has also raised the return to patenting for domestic Chinese firms that can use patents as a strategic tool to counter competition from foreign-invested firms. Inter-industry differences, particularly differences in the incidence of patenting between complex and discrete product industries, and changing industrial structure may also raise the overall incidence of patenting. Economic reform, which has strengthened private property rights and accelerated the exit of inefficient state-owned firms and entry of non-state enterprises, has produced more non-state enterprises that are seeking patent protection more aggressively than before.

## 5.2 The patents production function: specification and estimation issues

Following the tradition of Pakes and Griliches (1984), Hausman, Hall and Griliches (1984), and Bound et al. (1984) we estimate a patents production function, which assumes that patents production follows a Poisson process with parameter,  $\lambda$ :

$$E(Y_{it}) = \lambda_{it} = \exp(X'_{it}\beta) \quad (1)$$

$$Prob(Y_{it} = y_{it}) = e^{-\lambda_{it}} \lambda_{it}^{y_{it}} / y_{it}! \quad (2)$$

Where  $Y$  is the count of patents of firm  $i$  in year  $t$ , the vector  $X$  includes R&D expenditure, firm characteristics that influence knowledge production and propensity to patent, year dummies to capture the overall trend of propensity to patent, and industry characteristics that explain inter-industry differences in patenting.

The majority of firms in our sample do not do R&D and even fewer take out patents. This results in a large number of zero observations for patent counts. The large number of zero observations raise two concerns. First, the large number of zeros leads to a non-normal distribution, which biases the estimates of standard errors. More importantly, these zero observations possibly result from two quite different data generating processes: firms that do not innovate at all and those that attempt to innovate but fail to generate patents. The economic significance of the two types of zeros is quite different. We choose to model the two processes explicitly and separately by adopting the Zero Inflated Poisson (ZIP) model proposed by Lambert (1992). We assume that firms in our sample fall into two categories, the innovators and the non-innovators. Let the likelihood of a firm being a non-innovator be  $p$ ; the probability of a firm being an innovator is therefore  $1 - p$ . With

probability  $p$ , a firm's patent count will be zero; with probability  $1 - p$ , the patent count will be subject to the Poisson process in equation (1). The full model is therefore specified as follows:

$$Pr(Y_{it} = y_{it}) = \begin{cases} p_{it} + (1 - p_{it})e^{-\lambda_{it}} & y_{it} = 0 \\ (1 - p_{it})e^{-\lambda_{it}} \lambda_{it}^n / y_{it}! & y_{it} = 1, 2, \dots \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

We further assume that the decision to innovate is determined by a logistic process with  $F$  being the logit link:

$$p_{it} = F(Z'_{it}\gamma) = \frac{1}{1 - \exp(-Z'_{it}\gamma)} \quad (4)$$

In  $Z$  are variables that determine whether a firm chooses to innovate or not. The likelihood function to be maximized is therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} L(\gamma, \beta; y, X, Z) = & \sum_{y_{it}=0} \ln\{F(Z'_{it}\gamma) + [1 - F(Z'_{it}\gamma)][-\exp(X'_{it})]\} \\ & + \sum_{y_{it}>0} \{\ln[1 - F(Z'_{it}\gamma)] - \exp(X'_{it}) + nX'_{it}\beta - \ln(y_{it}!)\} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

More general models of this type include the hurdle model of Mullahy (1986). Crepon and Duguet (1997) also considered a more general model that involves latent processes, of which the zero occurrences are realizations. Vuong (1989) proposed a test to determine whether there is a regime splitting mechanism at work or not in the ZIP model. We report the *Vuong* test statistics after estimating the ZIP model of equations (1) to (4).

Another issue that requires econometric treatment is firm heterogeneity. The variables we include in  $X_{it}$  may not capture all the firm specific characteristics that determine a firm's innovation and patenting decision and behavior. To the extent that some of these characteristics influence a firm's R&D decision, the patents-R&D elasticity estimate would be biased. For example, more capable and

motivated managers may decide to conduct more R&D and be more forceful in maintaining a portfolio of patent rights. To the extent that such characteristics are time-invariant, we use the fixed effect Poisson model developed by Hausman, Hall and Griliches (1984). This model corrects for the bias that may be introduced to the patents production function estimates by the omitted firm-specific characteristics.

### 5.3 Exploring the five hypotheses

Assuming that a constant proportion of new knowledge generated can be transformed into patents, the production of which is given by equation (1), the first variable we consider to include in  $X_{it}$  is R&D expenditure. In the absence of guidance from a theoretical model, we follow the tradition of the literature and enter R&D expenditure in the patent production process in logs, therefore implicitly assuming a proportional relationship between R&D and patents. Estimating the elasticity of patent production with respect to R&D and comparing it with that obtained for U.S. firms allows us to gauge the innovative efficiency of Chinese firms. We also include the square of the log of R&D to account for possible non-linearity in the relationship between R&D and patents production.

Although the debate over the relationship between firm size and innovation in the spirit of Schumpeter (1942) and Arrow (1962) is far from settled empirically (Cohen and Levin, 1989), we control for the scale effect from firm size on patents production by including the number of employees that are not involved in R&D activities in the regression.

We then include a number of firm specific and industry specific variables to investigate the sources of the increase in the propensity to patent in Chinese firms. Given the time span of our sample, we can only use year dummies to identify the effect on propensity to patent of the 2000 amendment to the patent law.

We measure the presence of foreign direct investment in China’s 3-digit industries by the share of industry value added accounted for by foreign invested firms. We use value added instead of sales or employment since the latter may be subject to bias due to industry variation in capital intensity. The status of foreign invested firms is determined by the National Bureau of Statistics depending on its ownership form at the time of registration. The statistical authorities distinguish between foreign investors who are from Hong Kong, Macau, and Taiwan (HMT) (i.e. “overseas” firms) and those from other locations (i.e. “foreign” firms).

The surge of FDI in China has multiple implications for the patenting behavior of both domestic Chinese firms and foreign firms operating in China. As foreign firms deepen and expand their activity in China, the need to protect their existing intellectual property against domestic Chinese firms will rise as well as the need to compete with other foreign firms in China by introducing more sophisticated products and technologies. The aggressive enforcement of patent rights by foreign invested firms may demonstrate for domestic Chinese firms the strategic value of holding patents. Anecdotal evidence suggests that Chinese firms are taking advantage of loopholes in the Chinese patent system in order to use patents to preempt competition from foreign firms.<sup>7</sup> Utility model and design patents are particularly vulnerable to such abuses as they are not subject to substantive examination for novelty and inventiveness. Our data does not distinguish between invention patents and utility model and design patents. We are therefore unable to exploit the potential differences in the motivation to apply for utility model and design patents.

---

<sup>7</sup>In a New York Times article (French, 2005), a Chinese intellectual property rights lawyer was quoted as saying “Once upon a time, the counterfeiters in China ran away when you came after them. Today, they don’t run away. Indeed, they stay put and they sue us. More and more Chinese companies are taking a so-called legal approach, taking advantage of serious weakness in the Chinese legal system.” Some Chinese firms exploit loopholes in the patent system by taking out a patent ahead of their foreign competitions in China and sue them for violating their patent rights. The time over which the legal battle will be dragged on would give Chinese firms sufficient time to exploit the copied technology particularly in industries with short product life cycles.

On the other hand, by embodying more sophisticated technology than domestic firms, increasingly establishing R&D operations in China, and through various channels of diffusion such as personnel turnover and demonstration effect, FDI could effect knowledge spillover to the firms in its vicinity. We are unable to separate analytically the effect of knowledge spillover and the strategic behavior inducing effect of FDI.<sup>8</sup> Instead we try to gauge the relative importance of these effects in the context of patents production, where we control of other inputs to knowledge production, and by comparing the magnitudes of the effect with the estimates of knowledge spillover in the literature.

The industry variation in technology opportunity and nature of technology makes it imperative to account for not just industry heterogeneity in the propensity to patent but also the knowledge production process itself. In addition to estimating an aggregate patents production function, we also estimate the individual patent production function for eight two-digit industries that have been most active in patenting. In particular, we are interested in investigating whether there is a discernible difference in the propensity to patent between complex and discrete industries.

China's enterprise restructuring in particular has given rise to a spectrum of ownership structures that include state ownership, local collective ownership, publicly-listed firms with majority of equity controlled by the state, private enterprises, foreign wholly owned and joint ventures. This gamut of ownership types in turn carries different implications with respect to the assignment of property rights. Patents taken out by state-owned enterprises belong to the state, unless the patents are a result of an inventor's effort outside his/her official duty. The two amendments to the Patent Law have clarified and affirmed the entitlement

---

<sup>8</sup>Some authors have used patent applications to examine spillover from FDI without making such distinction. For example, CheungLin04 used provincial level patent applications data to investigate whether there is technology spillover from FDI and found supporting evidence.

to intellectual property by non-state enterprises. We therefore expect the propensity to patent to vary across ownership types. As in the case of FDI, there is also a potential efficiency effect on knowledge production from ownership reform. Non-state firms may enjoy an increase in the efficiency of knowledge production due to the incentive structure in these firms. Including the ownership dummies in the presence of the control for the economy-wide year effect allows us to capture differences in the propensity to patent beyond what is induced by the legislative changes as well as the efficiency effect.

That state-owned enterprise restructuring have accelerated the exit of inefficient state-owned enterprises and the entry of non-state enterprises produces yet another implication for the patent surge. To the extent that non-state firms are more assertive of their patent rights, the changing ownership structure of Chinese industry must have led to even higher incidence of patenting.

## **6 Estimation results and discussion**

### **6.1 Accounting for the patent explosion**

We try to unravel China's patent surge paradox by analyzing the results from estimating the patents production function that are presented in Table 2. The number of patent applications measures the output of patents production. Our discussion below is based on the results using patent applications because patent grants data are missing for the last two of the seven years covered by the sample. However, we have estimated the models in Table 2 using patent grants. The results are consistent with the results in Table 2 and are available upon request.

We use real R&D expenditure as a proxy for innovation input. A number of authors have noted that R&D expenditures are highly correlated over time and usually the association between R&D expenditure and patents production exists

Table 2: Patents production estimation

	Poisson	ZIP	ZIP	ZIP
	All	All	Domestic	Foreign
log(R&D)	0.144** (0.007)	0.066** (0.006)	0.074** (0.007)	0.018* (0.008)
log(R&D) <sup>2</sup>	0.018** (0.001)	0.018** (0.001)	0.019** (0.001)	0.006** (0.002)
log(labor)	0.644** (0.039)	0.329** (0.038)	0.333** (0.043)	0.282** (0.063)
industry FDI	1.719** (0.192)	1.496** (0.199)	1.601** (0.207)	1.253** (0.363)
discrete	0.561** (0.148)	0.176 (0.178)	0.148 (0.190)	0.367 (0.483)
complex	0.887** (0.138)	0.043 (0.161)	0.040 (0.071)	0.193 (0.476)
collective	1.113** (0.107)	1.003** (0.114)	0.973** (0.111)	
private	1.379** (0.213)	0.936** (0.187)	0.939** (0.194)	
individual	0.538** (0.086)	0.283** (0.087)	0.278** (0.088)	
jointly owned	0.404 (0.311)	0.315 (0.337)	0.318 (0.341)	
public	0.873** (0.1)	0.585** (0.1)	0.588** (0.102)	
foreign	0.203 (0.108)	0.39** (0.102)		
HMT	0.706** (0.112)	0.511** (0.108)		0.081 (0.122)
1996	-.061 (0.101)	-.038 (0.108)	-.066 (0.115)	0.273 (0.276)
1997	0.089 (0.133)	0.2 (0.143)	0.201 (0.153)	0.27 (0.279)
1998	0.166 (0.136)	0.295* (0.145)	0.292 (0.157)	0.419 (0.238)
1999	0.281* (0.11)	0.338** (0.115)	0.314* (0.125)	0.564* (0.223)
2000	0.534** (0.099)	0.477** (0.105)	0.376** (0.116)	1.003** (0.225)
2001	0.606** (0.097)	0.519** (0.106)	0.474** (0.118)	0.889** (0.226)
Obs.	130603	130287	110888	19399
log likelihood	-116081.9	-72082.09	-61207.21	-9515.248
Vuong test		26.95**		

All regressions include industry dummies.

Robust standard errors in brackets

\* - significant at 95% level; \*\* - significant at 99% level

only at the contemporaneous level.<sup>9</sup> Therefore current R&D expenditure is used to estimate the patents production function. We follow this approach after experimenting with distributed lags of R&D expenditures and finding past R&D expenditures insignificant in explaining patents production. Another practical concern is that our sample is extremely unbalanced. Including a comprehensive lag structure would require us to drop a large number of observations. So would the effort to construct a knowledge stock using historical R&D expenditures. Therefore we settle for using R&D expenditure as a determinant of patent counts.

The first two columns of Table 2 include the results from estimating the patents production function using both normal Poisson and the ZIP estimators. The *Vuong* test statistics indicate that the normal Poisson model is rejected in favor of the ZIP model. The ZIP model also fits the data much better than the Poisson model - the log likelihood has increased by more than one third. Explicitly modeling the data generating process of the zeros considerably changes the estimation of the patents - R&D elasticity. ZIP generates a much smaller elasticity estimate than Poisson does, but the elasticity estimate and the estimates of the coefficients of the other variables are broadly consistent with those obtained using Poisson panel estimation, which controls for firm heterogeneity and estimating the patents production function at individual industry level. We will return to these alternative estimates in the section of robustness check. Therefore, we base our discussion and conclusion on the ZIP results.

### **6.1.1 Has the patent upsurge been driven by R&D?**

The R&D intensification of the Chinese economy together with the increasing patents-R&D ratio makes innovation a prime candidate explanation for the patent explosion. However the the patents - R&D elasticity estimate is not only small

---

<sup>9</sup>For example, see Pakes and Griliches (1984) and Hall and Ziedonis (2001)

by OECD standard; also suggests that R&D intensification is unlikely to be the primary driving force of the China's patenting boom. The ZIP estimation result in column(2) of Table 2 implies a patents-R&D elasticity of 0.066 when evaluated at the sample median level of real R&D expenditure, which is zero. The patents-R&D elasticity will be 0.3 if we evaluate the elasticity at the sample mean of the real R&D expenditure. This larger magnitude no longer represents the "typical" firm's patents-R&D elasticity since the distribution of R&D activity is highly skewed in our sample and is likely to be driven by the few extremely innovative firms - an issue we will return to below. Even this most optimistic estimate of patents-R&D elasticity is much smaller than similar estimates for the U.S. and European firms. For example, for U.S. firms, Hall and Ziedonis (2001) reported an estimate of 0.989 similar to what was obtained in Hausman, Hall and Griliches (1984) - 0.87, and Pakes and Griliches (1984) - 0.61. Crepon and Duguet (1997) estimated a patents - R&D elasticity of 0.8 for French manufacturing firms. Licht and Zoz (2000) reported an elasticity estimate of 0.9 for German firms.

The much smaller elasticity estimate could have been caused by either low productivity of R&D in Chinese firms or that Chinese firms patent a much smaller fraction of new knowledge generated by R&D than their OECD counterparts. Given the increases in patent applications and real R&D expenditure from 1995 to 2001, a patents-R&D elasticity of 0.3 would imply that R&D intensification had contributed to 24 percent of the patenting increase, leaving the bulk of the patent explosion unexplained.

### **6.1.2 Foreign direct investment and patenting**

The impact of industry FDI on patenting is large. Column (2) of Table 2 indicates a 10 percent increase in the foreign share of industry value added results in an increase in patent applications of nearly 15 percent. This elasticity translates into

an increase of patent applications of 27 percent from 1995 to 2001, or 20 percent of the total increase. In other words, FDI explains just slightly less of the patent explosion than R&D.

We then estimate the patents production function separately for domestic and foreign invested firms to examine whether the patenting behavior of foreign and domestic firms reacts differently to industry FDI. The results are reported in columns(3) and (4) of Table 2. Although the effect of industry FDI on patenting also extends to foreign invested firms, domestic firms react more aggressively to the presence of FDI in their industry. This result together with the weak patents-R&D link are consistent with the hypothesized opportunistic patenting behavior of Chinese firms. That foreign firms also patent more in FDI intensive industries suggests that the intensification of FDI is correlated with the escalation of technological intensity of a Chinese industry.

A noticeable difference between foreign and domestic firms is in the patents - R&D elasticity estimate. While foreign firms' Chinese patents are only loosely related to their R&D activity in China, R&D makes a significant contribution to patenting production among Chinese firms. This result affirms the general perception that the R&D of foreign firms in China has more to do with local customization than with generating new technologies and that the surge in foreign patent applications in China may largely take the form of seeking Chinese legal protection for foreign firms' existing patents invented elsewhere. Another possibility is that the Chinese subsidiaries of multinationals may file for Chinese patent applications on behalf of their parent companies. In the meantime we are unable to rule out the possibility that the Chinese subsidiaries assign their patents to their parent companies. In other words, the patented technologies are locally invented but the property rights of the patents may be assigned to parent companies.

Finally, column(4) shows that patenting by foreign invested firms assumed


greater urgency after 2000, more so than domestic Chinese firms. This is likely to be a result, that is the combined effect of foreign firms' anticipating China's entry to the WTO and the amendment to the patent law in 2000 that sharpened the teeth of patent rights enforcement in preparation for signing the TRIPS treaty.

As we have noted earlier, we are unable to differentiate the propensity to patent and the knowledge spillover effect of FDI. However, an examination of the findings of the literature on knowledge spillover of FDI indicates that the magnitude we obtain for the effect of FDI is simply too large to be rationalized by the spillover effect. Aitken and Harrison (1999), for example, found a negative impact of industry FDI on domestic firms' productivity. Two more recent studies on OECD countries obtained modest estimates of the spillover effect of FDI. Haskel et al. (2002) reported for UK industry a 0.5% increase in TFP for 10% increase in industry FDI. Keller and Yeaple (2003) showed that in the U.S. a 10% increase in industry FDI leads to a 5% increase in TFP for domestic firms; and for Canada, 1% increase in TFP for 10% increase in industry FDI. Our estimate of the industry FDI coefficient is an order of magnitude larger than those cited here. Clearly our results suggest a potentially large role for the strategic behavior interpretation of the effect on Chinese domestic firms' patenting of industry FDI.

### **6.1.3 Non-state enterprises vs. state-owned enterprises**

The propensity to patent varies considerably across ownership categories. We compute the marginal effect of ownership using the dummy estimates from both the normal Poisson and ZIP models and plot it in Figure 8. All the dummies are precisely estimated except that for jointly-owned enterprises, whose propensity to patent is similar to that of the reference group, state-owned enterprises. All non-state enterprises but the jointly-owned group have a higher propensity to patent than state-owned enterprises thereby confirming our conjecture that ownership

Figure 8: Enterprise Ownership and Propensity to Patent




Source: authors' own tabulation based on estimates in Table 2.

reform and pro-patent legislative changes have resulted in more clear property rights assignments, which have led non-state firms to more aggressively assert their intellectual property rights. In the non-state sector, collective-owned and private enterprises have been most aggressive in applying for patents. There is little difference between the propensity to patent between foreign invested firms and Hong Kong, Macau and Taiwan invested firms.

Since the mid 1990s enterprise restructuring has picked up speed, so that both exit of state-owned enterprises and entry of non-state enterprises have accelerated. This evolution of the structure of the ownership of Chinese industry is depicted in Figure 9. Over the 1995 to 2001 period, the proportion of state-owned enterprises among the population of large and medium size enterprises has declined from 69 percent to 30 percent. The share of collective-owned enterprises in the LME population has also fallen by more than half. Taking place of China's SOEs and COEs are most notably individual and private large and medium size enterprises that were non-existent in 1995 but whose combined share rose to a quarter of all LMEs over the following six years. This changing industry ownership structure

Figure 9: Changing ownership structure of Chinese industry



Source: authors' own tabulation.

together with the more assertiveness of the non-state enterprises in patenting can be expected to contribute substantially to the patent explosion. We quantify the effect as:

$$\sum_{i=1}^8 (s_{i,2001} - s_{i,1995}) d_i$$

where  $s_{i,t}$  refers to ownership group  $i$ 's share of total units of LMEs in year  $t$  and  $d_i$  denotes the ownership dummy estimates we obtain in column (2) of Table 2. The total effect works out to account for 7 percent of the total patent surge among LMEs from 1995 to 2001.

#### 6.1.4 Patent law amendments in 2000

The economy-wide propensity to patent as measured by the year dummies in Table 2 shows a clear and consistent pattern. Although the incidence of patenting increased somewhat in 1999, year 2000 exhibited the most robust increase in the

propensity to patent. This structural shift was reaffirmed in 2001. The data panel is perhaps too short for us to extrapolate far into the future years, but the conspicuous upward trend warrants careful scrutiny. As far as patenting is concerned, year 2000 is a watershed in the Chinese economy. Although the amendments to China's patent law and the conclusion of China's WTO negotiations with the U.S. have both increased the real or expected returns to patenting in China, it is probably reasonable to attribute most of the effect to the patent law amendments given that the trend started somewhat in 1999 and that China's WTO negotiations were only completed towards the end of 2000. The combined year effects of 2000 and 2001 explain almost 70 percent of the increase in patenting from 1995 to 2001. Naturally we cannot attribute all of this to the amendments of China's patent law.

Another interesting observation that we commented on briefly before is the noticeable differences between the year effects for domestic and foreign firms. To the extent that foreign firms have stronger R&D capabilities and larger stocks of intellectual property, they stand to benefit more from stronger patent rights. Therefore the differences in the year effects indirectly corroborate the proposition that the propensity to patent has increased as a result of stronger patent rights.

### **6.1.5 Complex vs. discrete industries**

We select four complex industries and four discrete industries to examine how inter-industry differences may have contributed to the patent explosion. The complex industries are special machinery, transport equipment, electric machinery, and electronics; the discrete group consists of the beverage, textile, chemical, and pharmaceutical industries. To gauge the group specific propensity to patent, we compute the mean and standard error of the average of the four industry dummies from each group and report them as complex and discrete in Table 2. That is, after estimating the industry dummies, which we did not report in column (2), we

use them to construct the mean and standard error of the average of the dummies for the four industries from each group.

Other than in the normal Poisson estimation, where standard errors are biased, we cannot find any difference in the propensity to patent between the complex and discrete industries. However, this does not mean that the complex-discrete distinction is inconsequential. As we will see in the industry level regressions, there is a stronger patents-R&D link in the Chinese complex industries, which are also more R&D intensive. To the extent that complex industries might grow faster than discrete industries, the changing composition of industrial structure would lead to a higher incidence of patenting. But such an effect would have been absorbed in the patents-R&D link.

Finally, we also find a quite robust firm scale effect, represented by the labor variable, on patenting. The scale elasticity hovers around 0.3, which is slightly lower than the typical finding in the OECD literature. Large firms take out more patents because there are economies of scale from preparing patent applications and potential scale economies in conducting R&D.

## **6.2 Robustness check**

### **6.2.1 The innovators**

Compared with their mature market economy counterparts, Chinese industries are fragmented. A high degree of heterogeneity among Chinese firms means that high-flying innovators operate along side technology laggards. Such firm heterogeneity is reflected in the highly skewed distribution of R&D and patents. We take a close look at these innovators in this section.

We define innovators as firms that have more than one year's representation in the sample and have been granted at least one patent over the seven years. This innovators subsample leaves us with 4514 firms and 22598 observations. Summary

Table 3: Patents production: innovators

	ZIP	Fixed effect	Random effect	Fixed effect	Fixed effect
	All	All	All	Domestic	Foreign
log(R&D)	0.066** (0.0008)	0.035** (0.001)	0.042** (0.001)	0.044** (0.001)	0.002 (0.003)
log(R&D) <sup>2</sup>	0.017** (0.0002)	0.002** (0.0003)	0.004** (0.0002)	0.004** (0.0003)	-.003** (0.0007)
log(labor)	0.321** (0.005)	0.566** (0.019)	0.365** (0.012)	0.612** (0.021)	0.124* (0.052)
industry FDI	1.479** (0.034)	0.505** (0.072)	1.006** (0.058)	0.642** (0.086)	-.061 (0.166)
1996	-.034 (0.025)	0.067** (0.025)	0.017 (0.025)	0.019 (0.027)	0.422** (0.095)
1997	0.194** (0.024)	0.167** (0.025)	0.127** (0.024)	0.135** (0.026)	0.506** (0.097)
1998	0.283** (0.024)	0.142** (0.025)	0.096** (0.024)	0.102** (0.027)	0.668** (0.092)
1999	0.324** (0.023)	0.316** (0.025)	0.247** (0.024)	0.245** (0.027)	0.957** (0.092)
2000	0.465** (0.023)	0.762** (0.025)	0.67** (0.024)	0.542** (0.027)	1.900** (0.089)
2001	0.506** (0.023)	0.869** (0.026)	0.777** (0.024)	0.714** (0.028)	1.855** (0.092)
Obs.	22693	22556	23192	19268	2431
Log likelihood	-58937.69	-30960.86	-46937.52	-24674.88	-4478.125
Hausman test ( $\chi^2$ )		788.80**			

Robust standard errors in brackets

\* - significant at 95% level; \*\* -significant at 99% level

statistics for this sub-sample are reported in the lower panels of Table 1. Innovator firms are on average about twice as big as an average LME and nearly twice as R&D intensive with the intensity measured by the real R&D to value added ratio. We first re-estimate the patents production function for the innovators using the ZIP estimator and report the results in the first column of Table 3. They are very similar to what we obtained using the full sample.

To account for firm heterogeneity, we then re-estimate the patents production function using two panel estimators: Poisson fixed effect and random effect. Both estimators generate broadly consistent results, although the Hausman test unambiguously rejects the random effect model suggesting that the firm specific effect is not uncorrelated with the included regressors in the patents production estimation. Most of the results that we obtained previously with the full sample carry through. The Poisson fixed effect estimate of the patents - R&D elasticity, between 0.04 and 0.10, depending on whether we evaluate it at the median or mean of R&D expenditure, is smaller than that for the average LME. The squared R&D variable has seen the biggest reduction in magnitude reflecting the much smaller variation in the scale of R&D operation among the innovators. The effect of industry FDI, at one third of its previous magnitude, remains robust. Unlike the results in Table 2, the propensity to patent of the innovators has been steadily increasing over the years, albeit with the same jump in 2000.

We then estimate the patents production function for domestic and foreign firms separately using the Poisson fixed effect estimator. There is now a sharper contrast between domestic and foreign firms. The previously found weak link between R&D and patents in foreign firms has become non-existent. In the full sample estimation, both domestic and foreign firms increase their patenting in response to a higher concentration of FDI in their industry with the latter's reaction slightly smaller than the former. However, a comparison of the domestic and

foreign innovating firms shows that patenting among foreign innovators does not respond to industry FDI at all, while domestic innovators' patent applications remain strongly correlated with industry FDI intensity.

Table 3 also reaffirms the much higher rate of patenting by foreign firms and domestic firms over time and the dramatic structural shift in 2000. Taken together with the non-existence of a patents-R&D link, this shows that foreign firms' patenting in China largely takes the form of patenting existing intellectual property that they created elsewhere. The rapid increase of such patenting is likely to be driven by both the change in the legal environment of patent protection in China and the lure of the Chinese market at a time when China further liberalized its economy and integrated more closely with the global economy.

### **6.2.2 Patents production at the industry level**

Given the inter-industry heterogeneity in technology opportunity and the relative importance of the means to protect intellectual property, we estimate the patents production function separately for the eight complex and discrete industries and report the results in Table 4. This set of estimates allows for a more careful examination of the differences between complex and discrete industries.

The weak patents-R&D linkage carries through to the industry level with marked differences along the complex-discrete line. The R&D coefficient is insignificantly different from zero in all four discrete industries; the R&D square term is significant in textiles and only marginally significant in chemicals. In stark contrast, all the complex industries demonstrate a statistically robust patents-R&D link with the only exception being transport equipment.

Table 4: ZIP estimates of industry patents production

	Discrete industries				Complex industries			
	Beverage	Textile	Chemical	Pharma	Special machine	Transport equipment	Electric machinery	Electronics
log(R&D)	-0.017 (0.019)	0.058 (0.033)	0.037 (0.025)	0.028 (0.021)	0.066** (0.014)	0.038 (0.036)	0.05** (0.01)	0.069** (0.011)
log(R&D) <sup>2</sup>	-0.005 (0.004)	0.022** (0.005)	0.013* (0.005)	0.001 (0.004)	0.012** (0.003)	0.009* (0.004)	0.017** (0.002)	0.02** (0.002)
log(labor)	0.639** (0.124)	-0.250 (0.155)	0.279 (0.169)	0.387** (0.077)	-0.014 (0.086)	0.194 (0.206)	0.728** (0.088)	0.486** (0.085)
industry FDI	0.867 (0.466)	-0.735 (1.491)	2.240** (0.36)	-0.231 (0.787)	-0.040 (0.669)	1.151** (0.362)	2.637** (0.745)	1.212 (0.706)
Obs.	5067	14934	11521	4584	7798	7897	7496	5694
log likelihood	-2176.698	-2574.303	-3988.485	-3686.763	-6090.79	-5611.798	-7797.747	-4500.903

All regressions include ownership and year dummies.

Robust standard errors in brackets

\* - significant at 95% level; \*\* - significant at 99% level

We do not find any systematic differences with respect to the other estimates. The finding of higher patenting rates in FDI intensive industries applies to three industries: chemicals, transport, and electric machinery. The effect of FDI intensity in the chemicals and electric machinery industries is particularly prominent with magnitudes that are larger than the coefficient we obtained using the full sample. The scale effect is most pronounced in the beverage, pharmaceutical, electric machinery, and electronics industries.

In sum, the results in Table 4 show that the driving force behind the patent surge varies from industry to industry. The electric machinery industry is in some sense a "perfect" industry that encapsulates all the driving forces we have identified. In the other industries, one factor or another stands out as the dominant explanation of the patenting surge.

## 7 Concluding remarks

China's patent explosion has taken place in an institutional environment that is not known for the rule of law and rigorous protection of intellectual property rights. Such institutional deficiencies should have substantially weakened the incentives for inventors to apply for patents. This seeming paradox has prompted this investigation of the conditions that are motivating the rapid growth of patenting in China. A confluence of events coincide with the patent explosion. The continuing surge of FDI in China, pro-patent amendments to China's patent law, China's entry to the WTO, the deepening of enterprise reform that realigns incentive structures, and above all, the intensification of R&D in Chinese industry emerge as candidate explanations of the patent boom.

We use a data set that spans the population of China's large and medium size enterprises for the period from 1995 to 2001. Although not necessarily representa-

tive of all Chinese firms, these enterprises performed nearly 40 percent of China's R&D in 2001. We investigate the different hypotheses regarding the causes of the patent surge by estimating a patents production function. ZIP and Poisson fixed effect estimators are used to obtain results that are robust to the presence of firm heterogeneity, including the large proportion of firms that do not patent.

A robust result is the rather small estimate of the incidence of patenting with respect to R&D, at least by OECD standards. The patents-R&D link is particularly weak among foreign invested firms. The phenomenon of increasing R&D intensity explains less than a quarter of the patent upsurge in our sample. This result leads us to conclude that China's recent R&D intensification is unlikely to be the primary force behind the patent explosion.

We have found that foreign direct investment significantly contributes to the rising propensity to patent among domestic Chinese firms. An increase in the FDI share of industry value added by 10 percent, increases the average domestic firm's patent applications by 15 percent. Competing with foreign firms has increased the awareness of Chinese firms of the strategic value of patents, which in a highly competitive environment can serve as a strategic competitive instrument. This industry FDI effect is most conspicuous in the electric machinery, transportation equipment, and chemical industries.

Differences in the propensity to patent across ownership groups are consistent with our conjecture that the clarification of enterprise property rights had led to the more aggressive assertion of patent rights. The changing ownership structure of Chinese industry - the accelerated exit of state-owned enterprises and entry of non-state enterprises - has produced a 10 percent increase in patent applications of the LMEs in our sample from 1995 to 2001.

The largest impact on patenting comes from the year effects of 2000 and 2001. To the extent that we can associate at least some of surge in the incidence of

patenting in 2000 with China's pro-patent legislation, a more patent-friendly legal environment emerges as an important explanation of China's patenting boom.

Clearly, China's patent explosion has not been detonated by any single event. Opening up, deepening economic reform, and a relatively stronger legal system have together created a more patents-friendly environment and have increased the return to patenting. An issue that the data does not allow us to address is differences between invention patents and the less innovative utility model and design patents. These distinctions in the form of patenting are important to understanding the nature of patenting activity in a developing economy; it is on our future research agenda.

## References

- Aitken, Brian J. and Ann E. Harrison**, “Do Domestic Firms Benefit from Direct Foreign Investment? Evidence from Venezuela,” *American Economic Review*, June 1999, 89 (3), 605–618.
- Arrow, Kenneth J.**, “Economic Welfare and the Allocation of Resources for Innovation,” in Richard R. Nelson, ed., *The Rate and Direction of Inventive Activity*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.
- Bound, John, Clint Cummins, Zvi Griliches, Bronwyn H. Hall, and Adam Jaffe**, “Who Does R&D and Who Patents?,” in Zvi Griliches, ed., *NBER Conference Report, D*, University of Chicago Press, 1984, pp. 21–54.
- Cohen, Wesley M. and Richard C. Levin**, “Empirical Studies of Innovation and Market Structure,” in Richard Schmalensee and Robert D. Willig, eds., *Handbook of Industrial Organization*, VOL 2, Amsterdam, Oxford and Tokyo: North-Holland, 1989, pp. 1059–1107.
- , **Richard R. Nelson, and John P. Walsh**, “Protecting Their Intellectual Assets: Appropriability Conditions and Why US Manufacturing Firms Patent (or Not),” *NBER Working Paper*, 2000, 7552.
- Crepon, Bruno and Emmanuel Duguet**, “Research and Development, Competition and Innovation Pseudo-Maximum Likelihood and Simulated Maximum Likelihood Methods Applied to Count Data Models with Heterogeneity,” *Journal of Econometrics*, August 1997, 79 (2), 355–78.
- French, Howard**, “Whose Patent Is It, Anyway?,” *New York Times*, 5 March 2005.

- Hall, Bronwyn H.**, “Exploring the Patent Explosion,” *NBER Working Paper*, 2004, 10605.
- **and Rosemarie Ham Ziedonis**, “The Patent Paradox Revisited: An Empirical Study of Patenting in the US Semiconductor Industry, 1979-1995,” *RAND Journal of Economics*, Spring 2001, 32 (1), 101–28.
- Haskel, Jonathan E., Sonia C. Pereira, and Matthew J. Slaughter**, “Does Inward Foreign Direct Investment Boost the Productivity of Domestic Firms?,” *NBER Working Paper*, 2002, 8724.
- Hausman, Jerry, Bronwyn H. Hall, and Zvi Griliches**, “Econometric Models for Count Data with an Application to the Patents-R&D Relationship,” *Econometrica*, July 1984, 52 (4), 909–38.
- Hu, Albert Guangzhou and Gary H. Jefferson**, “Returns to Research and Development in Chinese Industry: Evidence from State-Owned Enterprises in Beijing,” *China Economic Review*, 2004, 15 (1), 86–107.
- Jaffe, Adam B. and Josh Lerner**, *Innovation and Its Discontents: How Our Broken Patent System is Endangering Innovation and Progress, and What To Do about It*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Jefferson, Gary, Albert Guangzhou Hu, Xiaojin Guan, and Xiaoyun Yu**, “Ownership, Performance, and Innovation in China’s Large- and Medium-Size Industrial Enterprise Sector,” *China Economic Review*, 2003, 14 (1), 89–113.
- Keller, Wolfgang and Stephen R. Yeaple**, “Multinational Enterprises, International Trade, and Productivity Growth: Firm-Level Evidence from the United States,” *NBER Working Paper*, 2003, 9504.

- Kortum, Samuel and Josh Lerner**, “What Is behind the Recent Surge in Patenting?,” *Research Policy*, January 1999, *28* (1), 1–22.
- Lambert, Diane**, “Zero-Inflated Poisson Regression, with an Application to Defects in Manufacturing,” *Technometrics*, February 1992, *34* (1), 1–14.
- Levin, Richard C., Alvin K. Klevorick, Richard R. Nelson, and Sidney G. Winter**, “Appropriating the Returns from Industrial Research and Development,” *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1987, pp. 783–820.
- Licht, Georg and Konrad Zoz**, “Patents and R&D: An Econometric Investigation Using Applications for German, European and US Patents by German Companies,” in David et al. Encaoua, ed., *The economics and econometrics of innovation*, Boston, Dordrecht and London: Kluwer Academic, 2000, pp. 307–38.
- Merges, Robert P. and Richard R. Nelson**, “On the Complex Economics of Patent Scope,” *Columbia Law Review*, May 1990, *90* (4), 839–916.
- Mullahy, John**, “Specification and Testing of Some Modified Count Data Models,” *Journal of Econometrics*, December 1986, *33* (3), 341–65.
- Pakes, Ariel and Zvi Griliches**, “Patents and R&D at the Firm Level: A First Look,” in Zvi Griliches, ed., *NBER Conference Report*, D, University of Chicago Press, 1984, pp. 55–72.
- Schumpeter, Joseph A.**, *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*, New York: Harper, 1942.
- Vuong, Quang H.**, “Likelihood Ratio Tests for Model Selection and Non-nested Hypotheses,” *Econometrica*, March 1989, *57* (2), 307–33.