



DALARNA
UNIVERSITY

Working papers in transport, tourism, information technology and microdata analysis

The unseen job creators:

Growth potential among non-growing firms

**Anders Bornhäll
Sven-Olov Daunfeldt
Niklas Rudholm**

Nr: 2014:04

Editor: Hasan Fleyeh

Working papers in transport, tourism, information technology and microdata analysis

ISSN: 1650-5581

© Authors

The unseen job creators: Growth potential among non-growing firms

Anders Bornhäll*, Sven-Olov Daunfeldt^{†‡} and Niklas Rudholm[†]

Abstract

Among 104,231 limited liability firms in Sweden with at least two employees during 1997-2010, almost 10% did not hire new employees in any given 3-year period despite having high profits. Nearly half of these firms continued to have high or medium profits in the next three-year period, but still no growth. Regression analysis indicates that these firms were not randomly distributed; rather they were small and young, did not belong to an enterprise group, and operated in local markets with high profit-opportunities. We conclude that it might be more beneficial to focus policy towards these firms instead of towards a few high-growth firms that, having just grown exponentially, may not be best positioned to grow further.

Keywords: Gazelles; high-growth firms; firm growth; growth barriers; profit persistence; job creation

*HUI Research AB, SE-103 29 Stockholm, Sweden; Department of Economics, Dalarna University, SE-781 88 Borlänge, Sweden; and School of Business, Örebro University, SE-701 82 Örebro, Sweden.

[†]HUI Research AB, SE-103 29 Stockholm, Sweden; and Department of Economics, Dalarna University, SE-781 88 Borlänge, Sweden.

[‡]Corresponding author: S-O. Daunfeldt, tel: +46(0)8 762 72 84, e-mail: sod@du.se.

JEL-codes: L11; L25.

1 Introduction

Most firms do not grow, or only grow slowly (Hodges and Østbye 2010), while a few, so-called high-growth firms (HGFs) are crucial for job creation (Birch and Medoff 1994; Brüderl and Preisendörfer 2000; Davidsson and Henrekson 2002; Delmar et al. 2003; Littunen and Tohmo 2003; Halabisky et al. 2006; Acs and Mueller 2008; Acs et al. 2008). HGFs have therefore received increasing attention in recent years. Shane (2009) argues that the importance of a small number of HGFs suggests that policy should be re-directed from promoting start-ups towards encouraging them, and Mason and Brown (2012) present several public policies that could be used to support HGFs. The Europe 2020 strategy also mentions more HGFs as a political objective (European Commission 2010).

Many studies have focused on explaining what characterizes HGFs, i.e., whether they are small (Delmar 1997; Delmar and Davidsson 1998; Weinzimmer et al. 1998; Delmar et al. 2003; Shepherd and Wiklund 2009); young (Delmar et al. 2003; Haltiwanger et al. 2013); belong to an enterprise group (Delmar et al. 2003); family-owned (Bjuggren et al. 2010); belong to a certain industry (Delmar et al. 2003; Davidsson and Delmar 2003, 2006; Halabisky 2006; Acs et al. 2008); region (Stam 2005; Acs and Mueller 2008); or country (Schreyer 2000; Biosca 2010), and so on.¹ The implicit assumption behind most studies is that we might learn something from in-

¹Henrekson and Johansson (2010) review the empirical literature on HGFs.

investigating HGFs that could be used to increase the number of fast-growing firms in the economy.

However, the recent focus on HGFs could be problematic, for at least two reasons. First, HGFs could experience high growth despite growth-barriers, removal of which might have no influence on the growth of HGFs, but could promote growth of other firms. Factors hindering firm-growth might thus not be discovered by studying HGFs, and results might be of little value in increasing job opportunities. Second, HGFs are likely to be "one-hit wonders", unlikely to repeat their high growth (Daunfeldt and Halvarsson 2012; Hölz 2013). This raises serious questions whether policymakers can target high-growth firms in order to design policies to promote future firm growth.

The characteristics and strategies of HGFs might thus not be useful for determining what needs to be improved in order to create a business environment more favorable for job creation. In fact, the focus on HGFs might be distracting. It might be more productive to focus on getting more firms that are profitable but not growing, to start employing additional personnel. This paper thus focuses on firms that have historically experienced high profitability, but no employment growth.

The purpose of this paper is twofold. First, calculating transition-probability matrices to investigate whether firms with high profits but no growth in one 3-year period continued to have high profitability but no employment growth in the next. Second, to estimate the determinants of being a firm with high profits but no growth using a linear-probability regression model. We are interested in answering questions such as: How many prof-

itable firms with no employment growth chose not to hire more employees in the next 3-year period? Which are the determinants of being a firm with high profits but no growth, and can we from this conclude possible policies to increase employment?

Our results show that firms with high profits but no growth constituted 7.88-9.42% of all firms in our sample (depending on the time period chosen). This is a much larger share of the firm population than HGFs, suggesting that Swedish unemployment would decline substantially, *ceteris paribus*, if these firms, on average, chose to hire just one more employee each.

However, the probability that firms with no employment growth – though continuing to have high profitability – will have no growth in the next period is as high as 0.25, indicating their reluctance to grow. In general, they are small and young firms; not in an enterprise group; and operates in businesses with high profits and minimum efficient scale. Regional demographic factors including educational level do not seem to influence the likelihood of being a firm with high profits but no growth.

Previous studies have focused too much on analyzing HGFs, a small fraction of the firm population which are extremely unlikely to repeat their rapid growth. More research is instead needed on solving the puzzle why so many firms have no growth despite high profits, and why they choose not to grow. Policymakers should also focus more on removing growth-barriers for these firms, since this might generate more jobs than targeting a small number of HGFs.

The next section discusses what determines firm growth theoretically, including why certain firms continue to have no growth despite high prof-

itability, while Section 3 presents the data. Section 4 then describes the empirical model, and Section 5 presents the results. Section 6 summarizes and draws conclusions.

2 Understanding firm growth

Many variables have been suggested as important for firm growth (Coad 2009), but we focus on those measurable using secondary data, which we can include as control variables in an empirical model. Thus we exclude direct measures such as growth ambitions, market orientation, business models, firm-level human assets, firm culture, governance modes and innovative orientation, whose impacts are instead assumed to be captured in regional-, industry-, and time-specific fixed effects.

A much-studied relationship is whether firm growth is contingent on firm size, usually starting from Gibrat's law which predicts that firm growth is purely random, independent of firm size (Gibrat 1931). However, already Schumpeter (1912, 1934) emphasized the importance of new and small ventures for introducing novel ideas into the economic system, thereby promoting firm growth. The later Schumpeter (1943), was of another opinion, arguing that innovation was a routinized process best performed by large firms that could use economics of scale to their advantage with respect to growth. Small sized firms were often considered as inefficient and, at times, a waste of resources (Galbraith 1956, 1967).

Birch et al. (1979) questioned this view, showing that large companies account for the largest employment share in the United States at any given

time. But companies that are large in one period may then shrink and be replaced by new firms that used to be small. Thus, with this dynamic perspective, small firms may be the job creators, while large firms lose employment, though this view has been heavily criticized (Davis et al. 1996; Kircho and Greene 1998). Nevertheless, the key findings of Birch's analysis have been confirmed in more recent studies (Van Praag and Versloot 2007), with one important addition: The majority of small firms do not grow. Instead, firm growth seems concentrated in a minority of firms (Birch and Medoff 1994). Davidsson et al. (2005), for example, noted that "Most firms start small, live small and die small". This suggests that small firms may be overrepresented among profitable firms that do not grow.

Younger firms should grow faster since they are more entrepreneurial, acting more quickly on new business opportunities (Coad 2009), while older firms are more likely to have achieved their optimal size. In fact, Haltiwanger et al. (2013) argues that after controlling for firm age, there is no systematic relationship between size and growth. This implies that older firms may be more likely to have high profits but no growth.

Ownership structure may also be relevant to growth. Multi-plant firms have been found to have higher growth than others among U.S. small businesses (Variyam and Kraybill 1992; Audretsch and Mahmood 1994); among large European corporations (Geroski and Gugler 2004); and among Italian manufacturing firms (Fagiolo and Luzzi 2006).

Multi-plant firms presumably have greater financial backing than others, and should thus making them more able to add employees when experiencing high profits. The financial strength of the firm might also determine

whether profitable firms choose to grow or not. Cressy (2006) developed a theoretical model of firm growth, showing that firms often die young because financial resources are impoverished. Santarelli and Vivarelli (2007) also claim that credit constraints and lack of financial capital in general should limit firm growth. But credit-rationing may have been overemphasized, with difficulties in getting financing not the cause of problems but their symptom. This argument is supported by De Meza (2002), who argues that asymmetric information and entrepreneurial over-optimism can cause over-lending to low-quality firms.

Local industry-specific variables might also affect the likelihood of having no growth despite high profitability. Higher profit opportunities are often thought to stimulate firm growth, though this has been difficult to prove empirically (Geroski 1995). Firms in industries with high uncertainty regarding future profits might choose not to add employees. Kan and Tsai (2006), for example, find that risk-aversion has a negative impact on the decision to become self-employed. Modern Austrian economists have a different perspective on uncertainty and the entry of new firms: "What drives the market process is entrepreneurial boldness and imagination" (Kirzner 1997: 73).

Industry minimum efficient scale (MES) might also affect growth, since the scale disadvantage of a small firm is greater in industries with a larger MES. Small firms are thus forced to grow quickly in industries with high MES (Strotman 2007: 89), implying fewer firms with high profits but no growth. On the other hand, the MES may be too high, forcing small non-profitable firms to leave the industry (Sutton, 1991).

Market concentration within industries has also been suggested as an important determinant of firm growth (Geroski 1995). There might be substantial barriers to entry and growth in industries with a high concentration – where large incumbents might engage in strategic behavior to prevent growth of smaller firms – implying more firms with high profitability but no growth.

Innovation activity might also be an industry-specific determinant of firm growth (Mansfield 1962; Scherer 1965; Mowery 1983; Geroski and Machin 1992; Geroski and Toker 1996; Roper 1997; Freel 2000; Bottazzi et al. 2001). Audretsch (1995) finds that while the likelihood of survival was lower for new entrants in innovative industries, those that survived exhibited higher growth than in other industries. Acs and Audretsch (1990) also find that the degree of industry turbulence is inhibited by the overall amount of innovative activity, but promoted by the extent to which small firms innovate. Arrighetti and Vivarelli (1999) investigated the start-up decision of 147 entrepreneurs in Italy, finding that innovative motivation and experience in innovative activities were positively related to superior post-entry performance. According to Cefis and Marsili (2006), the ability to innovate increases the survival probability of manufacturing firms in the Netherlands across most industries, with the innovative premium highest for small and young firms, thus implying fewer firms with high profits but no growth in innovative industries.

Region-specific determinants of firm growth have been very seldom analyzed, even though they might be important (Audretsch and Dohse 2007). Since entrepreneurial activity varies across regions, effects of entrepreneur-

ship and new firm start-ups ought to be particularly obvious at that level (Santarelli and Vivarelli 2007).

Endogenous growth theory (Romer 1991) and the “new economic geography” (Krugman 1995; Fujita et al. 1999) suggest that large common markets drive economic growth, with industrial networking promoting firm growth and firm survival, especially for small firms. Because of externalities, clustering might have a positive effect on human capital formation. Thus, firm growth should be higher in more densely populated regions, with more firms with high profits but no growth in smaller local markets.

Since it facilitates knowledge spillovers, regional education level might also affect whether a firms choose to expand (Acs et al. 2004; Audretsh et al. 2006). If firm growth primarily is determined by access to an educated workforce then firms should expand more in these regions compared to regions with lower educational attainment. Higher education might also encourage individuals to become entrepreneurs (Daunfeldt et al. 2006; Brixy and Grotz 2007), and the presence of a university might increase business opportunities, including university spin-offs (Goldstein and Renault 2004).

Entrepreneurial activity can also depend on its political and institutional setting (Baumol 1990), with (for example) left-of-center governments generally perceived as less favorable to entrepreneurship (Ayittey 2008: 146). Firms also value stable rules of the game, being more likely to add employees if there is political stability evidenced by a high concentration of political power in the local parliament. But a high concentration of political power might also be detrimental if it means less perceived need (by complacent politicians) to improve local business conditions.

Finally, of course, firm growth is probably lower during recessions, thus dependent on the study-period.

We still hypothesize, first, that small firms, old firms, firms that do not belong to a business group, and firms with less financial strength are more likely to have high profits but no growth. We also hypothesize that these type of firms are more common in industries with low profit opportunities, a high industry-uncertainty, low MES, high market-concentration, and a low innovation. Finally we hypothesize more firms with high profits but no growth in small regions with no universities, a less-educated workforce governed by left-wing parties in a highly fragmented local parliament and during recession years.

3 Data and identification

Data was obtained from PAR, a Swedish consulting firm that gathers economic information from PRV (the Swedish patent and registration office), used mostly by Swedish commercial decision-makers. All limited liability firms in Sweden are required to submit an annual report to PRV. The data comprises all such firms (503,985 firms in total) active at some point during 1997-2010. The data includes all variables found in the annual reports: profits, number of employees, salaries, fixed costs, and liquidity.

Our two-period analysis requires that the firms existed during at least two consecutive three-year periods. New entrants and those that exited during these periods are therefore excluded. Only active firms are included meaning that we exclude those with an annual sales turnover less than

100,000 SEK². Finally, we exclude a few (less than 1%) extreme observations, those with a return (or loss) on total assets more than 500%. These extreme observations make up for less than one percent of the observations in the original data-set.

Finally, we exclude firms with less than two employees. The reason is that a large part of all limited liability firms have no employees in addition to the owner. These businesses owners can choose to report their total income as labor income or firm profits since Sweden as a dual income taxation, with capital income taxed at a much lower rate than labor income. This means that they might report high profits even though employment expansion never is an option for them. Our final sample then consists of 104,231 firms yielding 381,706 time-period observations.³

Employment and sales are the most commonly used indicators of firm growth (Delmar 1997; Daunfeldt et al. 2013a). We define firm growth (G_{it}) in period t for firm i as the change in number of employees during a three-year period. As this fluctuates over time, the period for which growth is measured can affect the results. We focus on three-year periods since most previous studies on HGFs have measured growth over three- or four-year periods (Henrekson and Johansson 2010). We choose employment as growth indicator since our focus is on the potential job contribution of firms that do not grow despite high profitability.

To study the dynamics of firms with high profits but no growth – fol-

²About 15,200 US dollars (April 28, 2013).

³All results remain qualitatively similar if we choose to include all firms in the analysis. The share of firms with high profits and no growth is only marginally higher, and so is their persistence over time. Results are available upon request.

lowing Davidsson et al. (2009) – we use a two-dimensional growth-profits performance-space with both growth and profits divided into three categories, giving us a three-by-three matrix (Table 1). For each period, employment growth is simply classified as positive, negative or zero. Returns on total assets (ROA) are used as our profit measure, classified as low, medium or high. Above-median ROA during all three years of one period is classified as high. ROA consistently below the median is classified as low, and the rest as medium. Firms with high profits but no growth are category 6, whereas HGFs in general are defined as a subsample of 7-9.

Table 1: Classification of firms with high profits and no growth

Employment change	Return on total assets		
	Low	Medium	High
Negative	1	2	3
Zero	4	5	6
Positive	7	8	9

Despite the recessions in 2001 and 2008, and the change in national government from social democratic to liberal-conservative government in 2007, firms with high profits but no growth varied only between 7.88-9.42% during 1998-2010. Many companies were thus profitable, but chose not to expand their business (Table 2).

Table 2: Number and share of profitable but non-growing firms per 3-year period

	No. Firms	Firms in group 6	
1998-2001	99,235	7,815	7.88%
2001-2004	103,395	8,830	8.54%
2004-2007	94,333	8,425	8.93%
2007-2010	84,743	7,984	9.42%

As discussed in Section 2, we included firm-specific, industry-specific, region-specific, and time-specific explanatory variables to analyze what characterizes firms with high profits but no growth and the likelihood that they might start to grow (Table 3).

Firm size, firm age, ownership structure, and financial strength are included as firm-specific variables in the empirical analysis; whereas profit opportunities, profit uncertainty, industry minimum efficient scale (MES), and market concentration are included as industry-specific variables. The degree of innovation activities in the industry is controlled for using industry-specific fixed effects. Region-specific factors might also affect the likelihood of not observing any high growth rates, and we therefore control for population size, the presence of a university or a university college; the educational level of the population; political preferences; and political strength as explanatory variables in the estimated model. Region-specific characteristics are provided by Statistics Sweden and measured at municipality level. We also include industry-specific and region-specific fixed effects to control for time-invariant heterogeneity across industries (e.g., innovation activity) and regions. Finally, time-variant heterogeneity in growth rates are controlled for using time-specific fixed effects.

Descriptive statistics of all variables included in the empirical analysis are presented in Table 3. All variables are defined and discussed more thoroughly in Section 4.

Table 3: Summary statistics

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.	N
Firm size	16.23	164.334	0	20335.334	381706
Firm age	28.658	13.718	14	116	381706
Enterprise group	0.462	0.499	0	1	381706
Return on Total Assets	6.67	26.93	-500	500	379865
Financial strength	5.82	510.231	-47942.758	223405.328	380790
Number of firms	42.531	123.095	0	969	381706
Profit opportunities	6.671	11.393	-498.462	496.218	381640
Profit uncertainty	707.436	1601.848	0	128504.617	377548
MES	7.15	112.426	0	35622	381706
Market concentration	0.093	0.135	0	1	381706
Population	219736.665	281774.443	2521.388	811598.75	356847
Population density	960.823	1508.638	0	4315.637	374049
University	0.487	0.5	0	1	381706
Educational level	0.195	0.083	0.063	0.432	373870
Political preferences	0.289	0.453	0	1	381706
Political strength	0.225	0.039	0.092	0.491	373847

4 Dynamics of firms with high profits and no growth

Following Capasso et al. (2009), Daunfeldt and Halvarsson (2012), and Hölzl (2013), we estimate transition probabilities that a company in a given category in period t (vertical-axis) will be in that or another category in the next period (horizontal-axis). The results from the transition probability analysis are presented in Table 4. Of course, with four three-year periods a company might change category more than once.

Firms with high profits but no employment-growth (category 6 in Table 4) are very likely (Pr=0.24) to remain in this category in the next period, almost equally likely (Pr=0.25) to have medium profits and no growth (category 5) but very unlikely to (Pr=0.05) to have low profits (category 4).

Thus, almost half of the firms with no growth but high profits did not add employees in the next period despite again having high or medium profits. These firms are also less likely than other categories to lose employees in the

Table 4: Transition matrix for periods t and t+1

		To category period t+1								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
From category period t	1	0.16	0.18	0.02	0.18	0.20	0.03	0.08	0.12	0.03
	2	0.09	0.18	0.04	0.12	0.24	0.07	0.05	0.15	0.06
	3	0.05	0.16	0.11	0.04	0.17	0.15	0.02	0.13	0.17
	4	0.11	0.16	0.02	0.24	0.28	0.04	0.05	0.08	0.02
	5	0.07	0.16	0.03	0.11	0.34	0.10	0.03	0.11	0.05
	6	0.03	0.12	0.07	0.04	0.25	0.24	0.01	0.10	0.12
	7	0.19	0.24	0.03	0.07	0.12	0.02	0.12	0.16	0.04
	8	0.10	0.24	0.06	0.04	0.14	0.06	0.05	0.20	0.11
	9	0.04	0.17	0.12	0.01	0.10	0.11	0.02	0.16	0.27

Note: 1=negative growth, low profits, 2=negative growth, medium profits, 3=negative growth, high profits, 4=no growth, low profits, 5=no growth, medium profits, 6=no growth, high profits, 7=high growth, low profits, 8=high growth, medium profits, 9=high growth, high profits.

next period: Only 15% ended up in categories 1-3. Companies with medium profits but no growth (category 5) are also very likely (Pr=0.34) to be in that category again in the next period.

Companies with high growth but low profits (category 7), are very unlikely (Pr = 0.04) to have high growth and high profits in the next period (category 9). The most likely outcome is in fact that they will end up with falling employment and medium or low profits.

On the other hand, companies with high growth and high profitability (category 9), are most likely to grow again in the next period. More than a quarter of the firms with high employment growth and high profits will, for example, remain in this category during the next period. This support Davidsson et al.'s (2009) finding that companies with high profits are more likely to also have high growth than those that are growing before achieving

high profits.

It might be the case that the high degree of persistence found for firms with high profits but no growth is temporary, and that these firms eventually will increase their workforce. We therefore also estimate the probability that firms with high profits but no growth in period t will continue to have no growth despite high profits in the second 3-year period (i.e., 4-6 years after they initially were observed to have high profits but no growth). Our results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Transition matrix for periods t and $t+2$

		To category period $t+2$								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
From category period t	1	0.12	0.16	0.03	0.17	0.22	0.05	0.06	0.12	0.05
	2	0.09	0.17	0.04	0.13	0.25	0.08	0.04	0.13	0.07
	3	0.06	0.16	0.11	0.08	0.19	0.13	0.03	0.11	0.13
	4	0.09	0.16	0.03	0.18	0.29	0.07	0.04	0.1	0.03
	5	0.07	0.16	0.03	0.11	0.34	0.10	0.03	0.11	0.05
	6	0.05	0.14	0.07	0.08	0.25	0.2	0.02	0.1	0.1
	7	0.15	0.2	0.04	0.09	0.14	0.03	0.11	0.17	0.07
	8	0.09	0.21	0.06	0.06	0.16	0.06	0.05	0.19	0.12
	9	0.06	0.18	0.11	0.03	0.11	0.1	0.03	0.15	0.23

Note: 1=negative growth, low profits, 2=negative growth, medium profits, 3=negative growth, high profits, 4=no growth, low profits, 5=no growth, medium profits, 6=no growth, high profits, 7=high growth, low profits, 8=high growth, medium profits, 9=high growth, high profits.

The probability that firms with high profits continue to have no employment growth also after 4-6 years is 0.20, and their probability to have no growth despite medium-high profits is 0.25. Firms with high profits but no growth in period t are thus very likely to remain in category 6 (high profits, no growth) or move to category 5 (medium profits, no growth) also after 4-6

years. This indicates that many firms, despite high profits, do not change their number of employees over longer periods.

5 What characterizes a profitable but non-growing firm?

5.1 Empirical model

In any period some firms may choose not hire more employees despite having high profits. To analyze what characterizes these firms, we estimate the linear probability model

$$D_{it} = a_0 + \gamma'_k \mathbf{X}_{it-1} + \beta'_s \mathbf{Z}_{jmt-1} + \delta'_v \mathbf{Y}_{mt-1} + \eta'_v \mathbf{I}_j + \lambda'_l \mathbf{R}_m + \theta'_h \mathbf{T}_t + \varepsilon_t \quad (1)$$

where the dependent variable D_{it} takes the value one if firm i can be characterized as a firm with high profits but no growth (category 6) during the three-year period t , and zero otherwise. Firm-specific characteristics are captured by the vector \mathbf{X}_{it-1} ; \mathbf{Z}_{jmt-1} is a vector of industry-specific characteristics assumed to influence the probability of being a firm with high profits but no growth; \mathbf{Y}_{mt-1} is a vector of regional (municipal) characteristics; \mathbf{I}_j , \mathbf{R}_m and \mathbf{T}_t are industry, municipality, and time-specific fixed effects; and γ'_k ($k = 1, \dots, 4$), β'_s ($s = 1, \dots, 6$), δ'_v ($v = 1, \dots, 6$), η'_v ($v = 1, \dots, 318$), λ'_l ($l = 1, \dots, 24$), and θ'_h ($h = 1, 2, 3$) are the corresponding parameter vectors. All explanatory variables are lagged one period to avoid reversed causality problem since previous-period values are, by definition, pre-determined.

Among firm characteristics, firm size is measured as the average number of employees in the previous period, while firm age is defined as the observation-year minus the registered start-year (available from 1897). Ownership structure is a dummy taking value one if part of an enterprise group. Financial strength measured by equity as a share of total liabilities during the previous period.

Among industry characteristics, profit opportunities for potential entrants are measured by average ROA in the industry and municipality during the previous period. Profit uncertainty is proxied by the conditional variance of those ROAs during the same period.

Audretsch (1995) adopted the standard Comanor & Wilson (1967) proxy for measuring the minimum efficient scale, the mean size of the largest plants, accounting for half of industry sales. Other commonly used proxies are industry-mean (Daunfeldt et al. 2013b; Håkansson et al. 2013) or median (Daunfeldt et al. 2013c) size, or the ratio of that plant’s output to total industry output (Sutton 1991). Following Daunfeldt et al. (2013c), we use total sales of the median firm in the industry during the previous period.

Market concentration – indicating the potential presence of dominant incumbent firms – is measured by a Herfindahl-index, calculated as the sum of squares of firms’ market-shares, i.e., $s_{1m}^2 + s_{2m}^2 + \dots + s_{km}^2$, where k is the number of firms in the municipality for each 5-digit industry. If all firms had equal revenues, the index would be $1/k$, whereas if the entire local market were supplied by one firm, it would be one. The number of firms in the industry and municipality in the previous period is included as a measure of local competition.

Region-specific factors include population and population density. The local availability of higher education is represented by a dummy variable with value one if a university is located in the municipality. Educational level is measured as the percentage of people aged 16-74 with at least 3 years of post-secondary education. Political preferences are represented by a dummy variable with value one if non-socialist parties had a local majority. Political strength is measured by a Herfindahl-index, the sum of squares of political parties' shares in the votes for local government.

To analyze whether the existence of high profits but no growth is related to the innovative activity in the industry, we also measure fixed effects of high-tech industries and knowledge-intensive services compared to others.

5.2 Results

Equation (1) is first estimated for the all firms (Model I), both surviving and those that entered or exited during the entire study period, 1997-2010 (Table 5, first column). However, smaller firms are more likely to have zero growth, and higher exit rates (Lotti et al. 2003). Thus Equation (1) is also estimated for only firms that survived throughout the study period (column 2).

As expected – since variation in number of employees increases as firms get larger, and thus most often older – firms with high profits but no growth are generally smaller and younger than other firms. Hiring one more employee in the previous period reduces the probability of being a profitable but non-growing firm with 0.003%, while being one year older reduces it with 0.02%. Also as expected, firms in an establishment group are 1.5% less

Table 6: Linear probability model of highly profitable but non-growing firms in Sweden, 1997-2010

VARIABLES	All firms	Surviving firms
Size (L)	-2.85e-05*** (3.56e-06)	-2.77e-05*** (3.51e-06)
Age	-0.000198*** (4.02e-05)	-0.000226*** (4.43e-05)
Enterprise group	-0.0153*** (0.00121)	-0.0169*** (0.00134)
Financial strength (L)	-1.40e-06* (7.41e-07)	-1.28e-06* (6.98e-07)
Number of firms (L)	-2.28e-05*** (5.71e-06)	-2.14e-05*** (6.49e-06)
Profit opportunities (L)	0.00196*** (7.07e-05)	0.00212*** (8.11e-05)
Profit uncertainty (L)	2.37e-06*** (5.27e-07)	2.75e-06*** (6.19e-07)
Minimum efficient scale (L)	4.61e-06*** (1.73e-06)	4.56e-06*** (1.70e-06)
Market concentration	0.0104* (0.00608)	0.00579 (0.00671)
Population	1.54e-09 (7.98e-09)	3.94e-09 (8.84e-09)
Population density	-2.25e-06 (1.50e-06)	-2.88e-06* (1.66e-06)
University	-0.000739 (0.00210)	-0.000244 (0.00233)
Educational level	-0.000554 (0.0138)	0.00481 (0.0152)
Political preferences	0.00131 (0.00161)	0.000536 (0.00176)
Political strength	0.0146 (0.0180)	0.0234 (0.0196)
Constant	0.0728*** (0.0105)	0.0649*** (0.0113)
Observations	249,770	213,406
R-squared	0.015	0.016
Time FE	YES	YES
Regional FE	YES	YES
Industry FE	YES	YES

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

likely to be characterized by no growth despite high profitability.

Firms with high profits but no growth are more likely in local markets with high profit opportunities, 0.19% more likely if average returns on total assets for firms within the same industry and municipality in the previous period increases with 1%. They are also more likely in markets with greater profit uncertainty. Perhaps, despite being able to obtain high profits, they refrain from hiring due to volatile market conditions.

Degree of innovation is controlled for using industry-specific fixed effects. We find no evidence that firms with high profits but no growth are more or less common in high-tech or knowledge-intensive industries, suggesting that the existence of these firms is not related to the degree of industry innovation. None of the regional-specific characteristics are statistically significant at the conventional 5% level, suggesting that regional conditions may not be important for the emergence of firms with high profits but no growth⁴.

6 Summary and conclusions

Studies have shown that most jobs are created by a few high-growth firms (HGFs), which have therefore received increasing attention among both academic scholars and policymakers. The assumption is that we might learn something from investigating HGFs that could be used to increase their number and thus increase employment. This focus on HGFs might, however, be troublesome if we want to understand what kind of policies are important

⁴Industry, municipality and time-specific fixed effects are available from the authors upon request.

in order to create more job opportunities in the economy.

We find many firms (7.88-9.42%) that, regardless of recessions and change in national government, do not grow despite having high profits. Many new jobs could thus be created if they grew. Transition-probability analysis also revealed that these firms were very reluctant to grow. Almost one-fourth of firms with high profits but no growth remained in that category in the next three-year period, and almost half of these firms continued to have no growth despite medium or high profits. Thus, lack of growth ambitions or barriers to growth seem to keep them from growing.

Regression analysis showed that firms with high profits but no growth were not randomly distributed. They were more likely to be small and young, not in an enterprise group, and located in markets with high profit opportunities and high profit uncertainty. This suggests that policymakers should focus more on removing barriers to growth for small businesses. Regional factors do not explain the existence of profitable firms with no growth.

Frederic Bastiat once argued in his famous essay *That Which is Seen and That Which is not Seen* that we should not only focus our analyses on what we see, but also what we do not see. High-growth events are what we see. However, HGFs are unlikely to repeat their high growth rates and they might experience high growth despite the existence of growth-barriers. What is not seen is all those jobs that could have been created if growth-barriers for firms with high profits but no growth were removed. As noted by Davidsson et al. (2009), such firms are more likely to attain high profits and high growth in the future than firms that are growing before having

high profits.

A question for further research is *why* all these profitable firms chose not to grow. How much can be explained by growth barriers such as high entry-level wages, employment protection legislation, credit constraints, lack of qualified job candidates, or regulatory burden, and how much simply by lack of growth ambition? Our identification strategy could be used to conduct surveys and interviews with profitable firms that do not grow, which might provide insight into these questions.

Our study focused on observable factors that might influence growth, but unobserved firm-specific factors, such as business models (Cavalcante et al. 2011), firm-level human assets (Schiavone 2011), firm culture (Barney 1986), governance modes (Cantarello et al. 2011), and innovative orientation (Rowley et al. 2011), might also explain differences. For example, firms with high profitability might choose not to grow because of a lack of entrepreneurial skills. These factors also merit further research.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank participants at the Australian Centre for Entrepreneurship Research Exchange Conference (ACERE) in Brisbane for valuable comments. Financial support from Ragnar Söderbergs Stiftelse is gratefully acknowledged.

References

- Acs, Z. J., & Audretsch, D. B. (1990). *Innovation and Small Firms*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press,.
- Acs, Z.J., Audretsch, D.B., Braunerhjelm, P., & Carlsson, B. (2004). The knowledge spillover theory of entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 32, 15-30.
- Acs, Z. J., & Mueller, P. (2008). Employment effects of business dynamics: mice, gazelles and elephants. *Small Business Economics*, 30(1), 85–100.
- Acs, Z. J., W. Parsons, & S. Tracy (2008). High impact firms: gazelles revisited, Working Paper, Office of Advocacy, U.S. Small Business Administration.
- Arrighetti, A., & Vivarelli, M. (1999). The role of innovation in the post-entry performance of new small firms: evidence from Italy. *Southern Economic Journal*, 65(4), 927–939.
- Audretsch, D. B., & Mahmood, T. (1994). Firm selection and industry evolution: the post-entry performance of new firms. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 4(3), 243-260.
- Audretsch, D. B. (1995). Innovation, growth and survival. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 13(4), 441-457.
- Audretsch, D.B., Keilbach, M.C., & Lehman, E.E. (2006). *Entrepreneurship and economic growth*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Audretsch, D.B., & Dohse, D. (2007). Location: a neglected determinant of

- firm growth. *Review of World Economics*, 143(1), 79–107.
- Ayittey, G. (2008). The african development conundrum, in Powell, B (ed), *Making Poor Nations Rich. Entrepreneurship and the Process of Economic Development*, Stanford University Press, Washington D.C.
- Barney, J.B. (1986). Strategic factor markets: expectations, luck, and business strategy. *Management Science*, 32(10), 1231–1241.
- Baumol, W.J. (1990), Entrepreneurship: productive, unproductive and destructive, *Journal of Political Economy*, 98, 893–921.
- Birch, D. (1979). *The Job Generation Process*. MIT Programm on Neighbourhood and Regional Change. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Birch, D., & Medoff, J. (1994). Gazelles. pp. 159–167 in C.S. Lewis, R.L. Alec (eds) *Labor Markets, Employment Policy and Job Creation*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Bjuggren, C., Daunfeldt, S., & Johansson, D. (2010). Ownership and high-growth firms. Working Paper, Ratio.
- Bravo Biosca, A. (2010). Growth Dynamics: Exploring Business Growth and Contraction in Europe and the US. NESTA, London.
- Brixy, U., & Grotz, R. (2007). Regional patterns and determinants of birth and survival of new firms in Western Germany. *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, 19(4), 293–312.
- Brüderl, J., & P. Preisendörfer (2000). Fast-growing businesses: empirical evidence from a German study. *International Journal of Sociology*, 30,

45–70.

- Cantarello, S., Nosella, A., Petroni, G., & Venturini, K. (2011). External technology sourcing: evidence from design-driven innovation. *Management Decision*, 49(6), 962–983.
- Capasso, M., Cefis, E., & Frenken, K. (2009). Do some firms persistently outperform? Discussion Paper 09-28, Utrecht University.
- Cavalcante, S., Kesting, P., & Ulhøi, J. (2001). Business model dynamics and innovation: (re)establishing the missing linkages. *Management Decision*, 49(8), 1327–1342.
- Cefis, E., & Marsili, O. (2006). Survivor: the role of innovation in firms' survival. *Research Policy*, 35(5), 626–641.
- Coad, A. (2009). *The Growth of Firms: A survey of theories and empirical evidence*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Comanor, W. S., & Wilson, T.A. (1967). Advertising, market structure and performance. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 49, 423-440.
- Cressy, R. (2006). Why do most firms die young? *Small Business Economics*, 26(2), 103–116.
- Daunfeldt, S-O., Rudholm, N., & Bergström, F. (2006). Entry into Swedish retail- and wholesale trade markets. *Review of Industrial Organization*, 29, 213-225.
- Daunfeldt, S-O., & Halvarsson, D. (2012). Are high-growth firms one-hit wonders? Evidence from Sweden. Working Paper 73, HUI Research.

- Daunfeldt, S-O., Elert, N., & Johansson, D. (2013a). The economic contribution of high-growth firms: Do definitions matter? *Journal of Industry, Competition and Trade*, forthcoming.
- Daunfeldt, S-O., Lang, Å., Machucova, Z., & Rudholm, N. (2013b) Firm growth in the retail and wholesale trade sectors - evidence from Sweden. *Service Industries Journal*, 33(12), 1193-1205.
- Daunfeldt, S-O., Elert, N., & Rudholm, N. (2013c). Start-ups and Firm Immigration - Evidence from the Swedish Wholesale Trade Industry, *Annals of Regional Science*, 51(2), 479-494.
- Davidsson, P., & Henrekson, M. (2002). Determinants of the prevalence of start-ups and high-growth firms. *Small Business Economics*, 19(2), 81–104.
- Davidsson, P., & Delmar, F. (2003). Hunting for new employment: the role of high growth firms. In Kirby, D. A. & Watson, A. (eds.), *Small Firms and Economic Development in Developed and Transition Economies: A Reader* (pp. 7–19). Hampshire, U.K. and Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Davidsson, P., Steffens, P., & Fitzsimmons, J. (2009). Growing profitable or growing from profits: Putting the horse in front of the cart? *Journal of Business Venturing*, 24(4), 388–406.
- Davis, S. J., Haltiwanger, J., & Schuh S. (1996). Small business and job creation: dissecting the myth and reassessing the facts. *Small Business Economics*, 8(4), 297-315.

- De Meza, D. (2002). Overlending? *The Economic Journal*, 112(447), F17–F31.
- Delmar, F. (1997). Measuring growth: methodological considerations and empirical results. In Donkels, R., & Miettinen, A. (eds.), *Entrepreneurship and SME Research: On its Way to the Next Millenium*. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate Publishing.
- Delmar, F., Davidsson, P., & Gartner, W. (2003). Arriving at the high-growth firm. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 18(2), 189–216.
- Delmar, F., & Davidsson, P. (1998). A taxonomy of high-growth firms. 399–413 in: Reynolds, P.D., et al, (eds.), *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*. Babson College, Wellesley, MA.
- European Commission (2010). Europe 2020: A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth: Communication from the Commission. Research report.
- Fagiolo, G., & Luzzi, A. (2006). Do liquidity constraints matter in explaining firm size and growth? Some evidence from the Italian manufacturing industry. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 15(1), 1-39.
- Freel, M. S. (2000). Do small innovating firms outperform non-innovators? *Small Business Economics*, 14(3), 195-210.
- Fujita, M., Krugman, P.R., & Venables, A.J. (1999). *The spatial economy: cities, regions and international trade*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Galbraith, J.K. (1956). *American Capitalism: The Theory of Countervailing*

Power. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Galbraith, J.K. (1967). *The New Industrial State*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Geroski, P. A., & Machin, S. (1992). Do innovating firms outperform non-innovators? *Business Strategy Review*, 3(2), 79-90.

Geroski, P. A., & Toker, S. (1996). The turnover of market leaders in UK manufacturing industry, 1979-86. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 14(2), 141-158.

Geroski, P. A. (1995). What do we know about entry? *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 13(4), 421-440.

Geroski, P. A., & Gugler, K. (2004). Corporate growth convergence in Europe. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 56(4), 597-620.

Gibrat, R. (1931). *Les Inégalités Économiques*. Paris: Recueil Sirey.

Goldstein, H.A., & Renault, C.S. (2004). Contributions of universities to regional economic development: a quasi-experimental approach. *Regional Studies*, 38, 733-746.

Halabisky, D., Dreessen, E., & Parsley, C. (2006). Growth firms in Canada, 1985-1999. *Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship*, 19(3), 255.

Haltiwanger, J.C., Jarmin, R.S., & Miranda, J. (2013). Who creates jobs? Small vs. large firms. *Review of Economic and Statistics*, 95(2), 347-361.

Henrekson, M., & Johansson, D. (2010). Gazelles as job creators: a survey and interpretation of the evidence. *Small Business Economics*, 35(2),

227–244.

- Hodges, H., & Østbye, S. (2010). Is small firm gardening good for local economic growth? *Applied Economics Letters*, 17(8), 809–813.
- Håkansson, J., Machucova, Z., & Rudholm, N. (2013). Firm migration in the Swedish wholesale trade sector. *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research*, forthcoming.
- Hölzl, W. (2013). Persistence, survival & growth: A closer look at 20 years of fast-growing firms in Austria. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, forthcoming.
- Kan, K., & Tsai, W.D. (2006). Entrepreneurship and risk aversion. *Small Business Economics*, 26(5), 465–474.
- Kirzner, I.M. (1997). Entrepreneurial discovery and the competitive market process: an Austrian approach. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 325(1), 60–85.
- Krugman, P. (1995). *Development, economic geography and economic theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Littunen, H., & Tohmo, T. (2003). The high growth in new metal-based manufacturing and business service firms in Finland. *Small Business Economics*, 21(2), 187–200.
- Lotti, F., Santarelli, E., & Vivarelli, M. (2003). Does Gibrat’s Law hold among young, small firms? *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 13(3), 213–235.

- Mansfield, E. (1962). Entry, Gibrat's law, innovation and the growth of firms. *American Economic Review*, 52(5), 1023-1051.
- Mason, C., & Brown, R. (2011). Creating good public policy to support high-growth firms. *Small Business Economics*, 1-15.
- Mowery, D. C. (1983). Industrial research and firm size, survival, and growth in American manufacturing, 1921-1946: an assessment. *Journal of Economic History*, 43(4), 953-980.
- Romer, P. (1991). *Endogenous Technological Change*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, (NBER).
- Roper, S. (1997). Product innovation and small business growth: a comparison of the strategies of German, UK and Irish companies. *Small Business Economics*, 9(6), 523-537.
- Rowley, J., Baregheh, A., & Sambrook, S. (2011). Towards an innovation-type mapping tool. *Management Decision*, 49(1), 73-86.
- Santarelli, E., & Vivarelli, M. (2007). Entrepreneurship and the process of firms' entry, survival and growth. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 16, 455-488.
- Schiavone, F. (2011). Strategic reactions to technology competition: a decision-making model. *Management Decision*, 49(5), 801-809.
- Scherer, F. M. (1965). Corporate inventive output, profits, and growth. *Journal of Political Economy*, 73(3), 290-297.
- Schreyer, P. (2000). High-growth firms and employment. Research report

72, Science, Technology and Industry Working Papers, OECD.

Shepherd, D., & Wiklund, J. (2009). Are we comparing apples with apples or apples with oranges? Appropriateness of knowledge accumulation across growth studies. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 33(1), 105-123.

Schumpeter, J.A. (1912/1934). *The Theory of Economic Development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Schumpeter, J.A. (1943). *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*. New York: Harper.

Shane, S. (2009). Why encouraging more people to become entrepreneurs is bad public policy. *Small Business Economics*, 33(2), 141-149.

Stam, E. (2005). The geography of gazelles in the Netherlands. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 96(1), 121-127.

Strotman, H. (2007). Entrepreneurial survival. *Small Business Economics*, 28(1), 87-104.

Sutton, J. (1991). *Sunk costs and market structure: price competition, advertising, and the evolution of concentration*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Van Praag, C.M., & Versloot, P.H. (2007). What is the value of entrepreneurship? A review of recent research. *Small Business Economics*, 29(4), 351-382.

Variyam, J. N., & Kraybill, D. S. (1992). Empirical evidence on determinants of firm growth. *Economics Letters*, 38, 31-36.

Weinzimmer, L.G., Nystrom, P.C., & Freeman, S.J. (1998). Measuring orga-

nizational growth: issues, consequences and guidelines. *Journal of Management*, 24(2), 235–262.