Insights on Productivity and Business Dynamics

France: Business Dynamics

Business and employment dynamics play a central role in market economies. Understanding the characteristics and potential of businesses that populate the economy, in different sectors of activity and over time, and the extent to which they contribute to job creation and reallocation are central for economic policy.

This Country Note presents the key findings of the OECD DynEmp project for France (Box 1) and contributes to establish evidence that is highly relevant for policy making, taking into account the country-specific context and broader economic situation of France.

Highlights

- Business dynamics in France are below the OECD benchmark and on a similar declining trajectory.
- The employment distribution is dominated by large incumbent firms. New firms are small and create few jobs.
- Firm growth does not compensate for the low levels of employment creation by entrants and has stalled over the 2000s, with the gap to the OECD benchmark widening.
- Large incumbents create more jobs in France than in the benchmark, but also are associated with relatively smaller entrants at the industry level.

Country background

France’s economic challenges are shaped on the one hand by its country-specific economic history, and on the other hand by developments common to most industrialised countries, such as demographic change and digitalisation. France enjoys high levels of productivity and GDP as well as high average well-being of its population (OECD, 2017, 2019a). The economy has recovered from the 2008/2009 financial crisis in terms of economic growth, but employment rates remain below pre-crisis levels, especially at the extremes of the working age distribution (Boulhol and Sicari, 2013a).

France has experienced a slowdown in aggregate productivity growth, as observed in many industrialised countries since the late 1990s (OECD, 2019c). There are a number of explanations for the global productivity slowdown that also apply to France, but also country-specific factors weighing down on national productivity growth (OECD, 2019c). The latter include labour market reforms drawing in low-productivity workers, high levels of regulation in product markets, and barriers to entry for several professional services (such as legal and architectural services).
Regulatory barriers in particular have been pointed out repeatedly as adverse for both productivity growth and business dynamics, and remain substantial despite recent efforts to reduce the regulatory burden (OECD, 2017, 2019a).

Changes in the demographic structure due to an ageing society are another challenge France shares with most of the industrialised world, with implications for business dynamism in terms of an increasingly important role of life-long learning and skill development. Furthermore, despite overall low levels of inequality, the country faces structurally entrenched barriers to social mobility (OECD, 2015). These not only imply an inefficient allocation of human resources, but also have negative repercussions on labour market inclusion, skill mismatch, and skill development.

Another structural characteristic of the French labour market is its segmentation into open- and fixed-term contracts. The high level of protection in open-term contracts has been shown to induce employers to resort to fixed-term options to avoid potential difficulties and risks associated with employment termination under open-term contracts, with adverse implications for inclusiveness and skill development of workers under fixed-term employment (OECD, 2017).

The rest of this Country Note is organised as follows. First, the aggregate size distributions in manufacturing and (non-financial market) services revealed by the DynEmp data are presented. Second, patterns of job reallocation, firm entry, and job creation are analysed by industry and/or over time. Finally, the discussion shifts to firm growth and upscaling.

**Employment dynamics in France**

**Size distribution**

Knowing the size and employment distribution of firms within an economy is important for policy makers. It provides an understanding of the structure of the economy and an indication of the role of large and small firms for the country’s productive fabric. It can also serve as a starting point for more detailed analysis of the most relevant groups of businesses for the economy under consideration.

**Box 1. The DynEmp project**

The DynEmp project provides a unique comprehensive overview of employment and business dynamics across countries over the last two decades. The main contribution of the project is the creation of a harmonised micro-aggregated database with which business and employment dynamics can be analysed across countries in a comparable way. The data are based on administrative records with quasi-universal coverage (such as business registers or social security records). Assessing employment and business dynamics in comparison to those of an appropriately defined benchmark group of countries can further inform and orient policy intervention.1

The DynEmp database generally covers most sectors of the economy, but in order to enhance cross-country comparability, the country profile focuses on manufacturing and non-financial market services (or “services” for brevity). The results for France rely on two data sources: fiscal data from “FICUS/FARE”, and data on employment from social security records (“DADS”), both available at the INSEE. See Desnoyers-James, Calligaris and Calvino (2019) for more details on the underlying data.

Unless otherwise specified, the presented numbers rely on averages for the period for which data are available; for France, this is 1998-2015. To allow an evaluation of France’s performance relative to that of other countries, the French results on employment and business dynamics are compared to a “benchmark” group of countries for which DynEmp data are available: Belgium, Brazil, Costa Rica, Finland, Hungary, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and Turkey. Unless indicated otherwise, all findings presented also hold when the benchmark set is restricted to a more homogeneous group consisting only of EU countries. Results presented in this paper are sourced from the DynEmp3 database as at August 2019. Owing to methodological differences, figures may deviate from officially published national statistics.

Figure 1 shows the average size distribution in France of firms with at least one employee (two persons engaged), over the period 1998-2015. The upper panel (a) treats firms as units, while the bottom panel (b) weights them by employment. Clearly, while the firm size distribution in France is quite similar to that of the benchmark, employment is much more concentrated in larger firms. By contrast, in the benchmark, most jobs are provided by small and
medium-sized firms. The difference to the benchmark is especially striking in services, where the largest firms (500+ employees) are the main employment pillar in France. This is because large firms are substantially larger in France than in the benchmark (the largest service firms employ almost 2,500 workers on average in France, compared to 1,650 in the benchmark, and the largest manufacturing firms still have over 1,500 employees in France, compared to 1,250 in the benchmark). The relatively large size of firms with more than 500 employees in the French economy drives up the average incumbent firm size, which is around 45 employees (compared to just under 30 in the benchmark). The last section of this country note elaborates further on industry differences in firm size and the potential implications for business dynamism.

**Figure 1. Size distributions**
Manufacturing and non-financial market services
France vs. benchmark countries, 1998-2015
(a) Firm distribution

(b) Employment distribution

Note: This figure reports the size distribution in France and in the benchmark group of countries for six size classes, separately for manufacturing and non-financial market services on average in the period 1998-2015. Shares are calculated in terms of (a) number of firm units and (b) employment.

Source: Calculations based on OECD DynEmp3 database, August 2019. See Box 1 for details.

Accounting for around 11.5% of value added since the mid-2000s, France has one of the smallest shares of manufacturing in the OECD (Boulhol and Sicari, 2013b; OECD, 2019b). This is mirrored in the trends in the
DynEmp data, which show a contracting manufacturing sector with low entry rates, little employment creation, and shrinking firms, as discussed in the next sections. Given that the importance of the manufacturing sector has been declining steadily (Boulhol and Sicari, 2013b), this country note will therefore focus more on developments in the service sector. Secondly, given their important role as employment providers in France, this country note pays special attention to large firms.

Patterns of business dynamism: job reallocation, firm entry, and employment creation

A first component of business dynamism, job reallocation rates are indicative of the degree to which the economy is able to (re-)allocate employment to its most productive uses. The overall job reallocation rate in France was at the benchmark level around the year 2000 (Figure 2a). It has declined over time also in the benchmark countries, but the decline has been more pronounced in France. The low of 12% in 2014 is over 6 percentage points less than the benchmark, and this shortfall in business dynamism occurs across almost all industries of the economy (the only exception being the service industries “Telecommunications” and “Media”). Rates are particularly low at incumbent firms (panel b) both in relative and absolute terms, and have been around 4 percentage points below the benchmark since the mid-2000s, with the gap widening slowly but steadily.

**Figure 2. Trends in job reallocation rates**

Manufacturing and non-financial market services
France vs. benchmark countries, 1998-2015

Note: This figure shows the estimated job reallocation rate over time, adjusted for time-constant industry and country-specific factors. It plots the estimated year dummies from a regression of the job reallocation rate on a full set of industry-country dummies, taking the estimated constant as the starting value. Incumbent firms are firms that were present in the previous year, and the job reallocation rate is defined as the sum of job creation and job destruction in an industry over its average employment between periods t and t-1.

Source: Calculations based on OECD DynEmp3 database, August 2019. See Box 1 for details.

One contributing factor to the low levels of job reallocation in France is its highly segmented labour market. The high level of protection in open-term contracts has led to a dual system of employment, characterised by, on the one hand, secure and well-paid jobs held by workers with open-term contracts (contrat de travail à durée indéterminée, CDI) and, on the other hand, an increasing share of fixed-term contracts (contrat de travail à durée déterminée, CDD) with high employee turnover of workers on the same job, and correspondingly low incentives to invest in training and skill development of workers. While fixed-term contracts make up a relatively small share (15% of total contracts), they account for one third of contracts among young workers. What is more, they are by far the main contract type used for new hires (OECD, 2017), allowing employers to circumvent the strict rules on employment termination stipulated by open-term contracts. Consequently, these types of contracts entail low levels of job security, resulting in high sensitivity to external shocks and business cycle fluctuations, and high rates of worker turnover.²

Thus, this dual system of contracts is not only unfair in terms of putting a disproportional share of the adjustment burden on those employed under CDDs, but also leads to below-optimal job turnover in jobs with open-term
contracts and an inefficient allocation of labour resources. It has also been repeatedly pointed out as deficient for tackling France’s main labour market challenges: skill mismatch and too few training opportunities, in particular for marginalised groups on the labour market (young and old workers as well as those coming from disadvantaged social backgrounds) and overall low labour market flexibility (OECD 2019a, 2017, 2015, Blanchard and Landier, 2002). Coupled with the low degree of social mobility that characterises the French education system (OECD, 2015), there is little opportunity for disadvantaged groups to improve their employment opportunities and contribute positively to filling some of the skill gaps that have been weighing down on economic growth and competitiveness over the last decade.

A number of measures have been suggested in the past (OECD, 2013, 2015, 2017) to decrease the duality in the system of labour contracts. Some of the suggestions have been implemented by the 2017 government, such as improving labour court procedures by reducing both the length for legal appeal processes against dismissals, as well as the uncertainty in the outcomes thereof, and increasing flexibility by allowing firm-level bargaining instead of extending industry agreements to firms not involved in the negotiations (OECD, 2017, 2019a). More ambitious proposals, aimed at a more unified system of contracts, have yet to put into practice. These include a simplification of dismissal procedures in open-term contracts with an accompanying change in the social security system (e.g., by raising unemployment benefit entitlements for fixed-term employees) in order to make fixed-term contracts a relatively less attractive option for employers (OECD, 2017).

Firm age structure and trends in employment creation

The age structure of small firms is particularly insightful in terms of business dynamism. A large number of small firms can originate from many small entrants (indicative of a more dynamic economy), but also from a large number of old firms that did not upscale. The latter would be indicative of a less dynamic economy and potentially raises policy concerns, as old SMEs tend to destroy jobs rather than create them (Criscuolo, Gal and Menon, 2014). The 2015 age distribution of small firms (<250 employees) in France reveals a pattern that is younger than the benchmark for micro firms due to a larger share of start-ups, but slightly older than the cross-country average for larger SMEs, as shown in Figure 3. This is in line with the levels and trends in average firm entry rates, which also closely follow those of the benchmark (Figure 4a).

**Figure 3. Age distribution of SMEs**

**Manufacturing and non-financial market services**

**France vs. benchmark countries, 2015**

Note: This figure reports the share of start-ups, young, and old units by size class of firms with employment between 2 and 249, in manufacturing and non-financial market services in 2015.

Source: Calculations based on OECD DynEmp3 database, August 2019. See Box 1 for details.

Firm entry rates have stabilised at a level of around 6% after the 2009 economic crisis period (Figure 4a) and seem to pick up slightly towards the end of the data period. From an industry perspective, entry rates are at or just below the benchmark level in services, and display a slightly larger shortfall relative to the benchmark in manufacturing,
the only exceptions being “Telecommunications” and “Food and Beverages”, where entry rates are above the benchmark level (figure not shown, but available on request).

**Figure 4. Time trends in entry rates**
Manufacturing and non-financial market services
France vs. benchmark countries, 1998-2015

(a) Unit entry
(b) Employment entry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Manufacturing</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(c) Average employment entry rates by industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; agriculture</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles &amp; apparel</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical equipment</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal &amp; transportation</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale &amp; retail</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation &amp; storage</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels &amp; restaurants</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal &amp; accounting</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific R&amp;D</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing &amp; advertising</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture &amp; engineering</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This figure reports estimated trends in unit- and employment-weighted entry rates over time in panels a) and b), and the average employment entry rate over the 1998-2015 time period by industry in panel c). The entry rate is defined as the number of entering units over the sum of entering and incumbent units in an industry. The estimated job reallocation rate over time is adjusted for time-constant industry and country-specific factors and plots the estimated year dummies from a regression of the job reallocation rate on a full set of industry-country dummies, taking the estimated constant as the starting value.

Source: Calculations based on OECD DynEmp3 database, August 2019. See Box 1 for details.

However, when entry in terms of employment rather than firm units is considered (Figure 4b), things look less positive in France. Both the trends over time and the industry averages show a large shortfall to the benchmark, which is particularly pronounced in services (Figure 4c). This fits with the fact that the share of start-ups is relatively high only in the smallest size category, implying that the contribution to job creation of entrants and young firms is not necessarily large. Indeed, net job creation rates and the relative contribution of different types of firms (shown in Figure 5) reveal small, and often negative, rates in France, as well as a small relative contribution of entrants and an unusually high contribution of incumbent firms to net job creation rates. In services, incumbents create more
than 50% of new jobs on average. This is in stark contrast to the benchmark, where incumbents only account for one third of all newly created service jobs. Given that the absolute contribution of incumbent firms to job creation in France is similar to that of the benchmark, the shortfall in overall employment creation – in particular in services – is due to the small contribution of entrants.

There are a number of potential explanations for the shortfall in employment creation through new entrants in France. An important deterrent to firm entry, administrative burdens for starting a firm are high except for sole proprietorship firms (OECD, 2015), which is in line with the comparatively higher share of entrants in the smallest size categories discussed above. Not only has the number of procedures for registering a business been high, but also the time to process them has been clearly above average (OECD, 2015). Recent reform efforts (most notably, the 2017 “Simplification Shock”) helped reduce regulatory complexity, but have also been criticised as insufficient, in particular in professional services. Accountants, pharmacists, as well as legal and architectural services remain highly regulated professions (OECD, 2019a, 2015), and net job creation appears to have been particularly low in these industries compared to the benchmark. There also seems to be a negative relationship between the absolute shortfall in employment creation through entrants and the above-average size of incumbent firms, as discussed further in the last section of this country note.

**Figure 5. Contribution to net job creation of different age categories by industry in France**

Manufacturing and non-financial market services, 1998-2015

*Note: This figure reports the contribution of different age groups of firms (entrants, incumbents, and exitors) to net job creation on average over the 1998-2015 time period.

*Source:* Calculations based on OECD DynEmp3 database, August 2019. See Box 1 for details.

Other factors that potentially contributed to skewing the size distribution of firms towards smaller entrants are size thresholds for additional formal requirements, such as e.g. having a staff representative in firms with 10 or more employees, and further obligations for firms above the 50 employee threshold. Furthermore, the complexity of the tax system has been particularly adverse for medium-sized enterprises: while the smallest firms benefit from tax exemptions, large firms are able to professionally manage their tax burden, which results in a hump-shaped effective tax rate in terms of firm size (OECD, 2015).
Growth of new and incumbent firms

Most of the issues just discussed can be expected to not only affect the size distribution of entrants, but also hamper firm growth. New firms are the engines of creative destruction, and enabling them to grow and expand is important for aggregate economic growth and productivity. Removing barriers to firm growth implies allocating resources efficiently to their most productive use. The growth profile of entrants (Figure 6) in France reveals that new firms grow less than the benchmark in manufacturing, while firm growth in services is very similar to that of other OECD countries. Given that the manufacturing sector has been shrinking over the sample period, observing lower firm growth is not surprising. Nevertheless, given that the positive relationship between firm size and productivity is much more pronounced in manufacturing than in services (Berlingieri, Calligaris and Criscuolo, 2018), allowing the best-performing firms to grow and upscale is important for the long-term success of the French manufacturing sector.

Furthermore, the growth gap to the benchmark increases the longer the time horizon considered, in both manufacturing and services. Although the absolute size of the growth gap is not particularly large, the fact that it appears to be increasing over time, including in services, is more worrisome. The relatively lower levels of growth in manufacturing go hand in hand with the low levels of dynamism observed in terms of entry rates and the negative rates of net job creation, all of which reflect the shift away from manufacturing.

Figure 6. Average growth of cohorts of entrants over different time horizons
France vs benchmark countries, 2001-15

Manufacturing

Services

Note: This figure reports the average employment growth rate of surviving firms founded in different years (t=2001, 2004, 2007, 2010 and 2012) after 3, 5, 7, 10 and 14 years.

Source: Calculations based on OECD DynEmp3 database, August 2019. See Box 1 for details.

Besides the legal and financial barriers to firm growth discussed above, skill shortages are another relevant factor that can hamper the growth dynamics of young firms in France (OECD, 2019a). On-the-job training and participation in lifelong learning activities are also low, especially for those groups who would benefit from them the most (OECD, 2015). Again, this is reinforced through the highly dualised system of contracts on the labour markets. While there are a number of reforms underway to improve access to training and re-skilling programmes, the linkages between firms and the educational system should be strengthened in parallel (OECD, 2019a).
The role of large incumbent firms

As already indicated in the discussion on the size distributions, another feature of the French business sector is the large size of incumbent firms. From an industry perspective, firms are particularly large in the “Transport equipment” (manufacturing), and “Transportation and storage” and Administrative services” (service) industries, where the average French firm is double the size of that in the benchmark (Figure 7). Firm size is also far above the benchmark in “Electrical equipment” and “Chemicals” (manufacturing) as well as “Scientific R&D” (services). While firm size per se is not a cause for concern, a relationship with entry dynamics is discernible at the industry level, where less employment is created through new entrants in industries where firms are particularly large in France compared to the benchmark.5

Importantly, net job creation by large firms is not large enough to compensate for the shortfall in employment creation through smaller young firms. As shown in Figure 8, net job creation by young and large firms is fairly close to the benchmark, in both manufacturing and services. In contrast, job creation among young SMEs in substantially lower in France. What is more, the net job destruction rate of large old firms is larger than in the benchmark, indicating again that large firms are not able to make up for the lack of net job creation by new entrants.

Figure 7. Average size of incumbents by industry
Manufacturing and non-financial market services
France vs benchmark countries, 1998-2015

Note: This figure reports the average size (number of employees) of incumbent firms by industry on average over the 1998-2015 time period.

Source: Calculations based on OECD DynEmp3 database, August 2019. See Box 1 for details.
Figure 8. Net job creation rates by age and size (largest firms vs. the rest) 
Manufacturing and non-financial market services 
France vs benchmark countries, 1998-2015

Note: This figure reports the contribution of net job creation to aggregate employment change by size (with a cut-off at ≥ 500 employees) and age (with a cut-off at ≥ 6 years) for manufacturing and non-financial market services. It is defined as net job creation (i.e., the difference of total employment at time t and t-1) of the particular group over total employment in the macro-sector on average over the period 1998-2015.

Source: Calculations based on OECD DynEmp database, August 2019. See Box 1 for details.

The overall picture that arises from the analysis of DynEmp data is that France appears to have a relatively less dynamic business sector over the 2000s compared to the OECD benchmark. The key issues for France are (1) its highly dualised labour market, resulting in low levels of job reallocation with an inefficient allocation of labour resources, (2) the dominant position of large incumbent firms for employment combined with the low levels of new employment creation by these firms, and (3) the small size of entrants, which cannot make up for the shortfall in employment creation through large incumbents - neither at the time of entry nor through later firm growth, which is at or below the OECD benchmark.

Notes

1 Additional OECD cross-country studies based on the DynEmp database (such as Criscuolo, Gal and Menon, 2014; Calvino, Criscuolo and Menon, 2015, 2016) or country-specific analyses (such as OECD, 2015, 2017, 2019) provide the interested reader with complementary policy-relevant findings.

2 Note that job reallocation is not the same as worker turnover. Job reallocation measures the extent of newly created or destroyed jobs through growing or shrinking firms as well as new firm creations. Low levels of job reallocation do not mean low worker turnover, as worker turnover can be very high also within existing jobs, or through jobs that were replaced by other jobs within the same firm without changes in the total number of employees.

3 Calculations based on the DynEmp data.

4 Other service industries where the gap to the benchmark is very large are “Wholesale & retail”, “Scientific R&D”, and “Marketing & other”, all of which have net job creation rates that are negative or below 1%.

5 The correlation of the relative deviation between France and the benchmark in incumbent firm size and employment creation for new entrants is -0.6 for averages over the entire sample period, and -0.4 when the over-time variation is taken into account.
References


OECD Insights on Productivity and Business Dynamics
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