

2009/86



Product and process innovation and the decision to export:
firm-level evidence for Belgium

Ilke Van Beveren and Hylke Vandenbussche



CORE

DISCUSSION PAPER

Center for Operations Research
and Econometrics

Voie du Roman Pays, 34
B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve
Belgium

<http://www.uclouvain.be/core>

CORE DISCUSSION PAPER
2009/86

**Product and process innovation and the decision to export:
firm-level evidence for Belgium**

Ilke VAN BEVEREN¹ and Hylke VANDENBUSSCHE²

December 2009

Abstract

Using data from the Community Innovation Survey for Belgium in two consecutive periods, this paper explores the relationship between firm-level innovation activities and the propensity to start exporting. To measure innovation, we include indicators of both innovative effort (R&D activities) as well as innovative output (product and process innovation). Our results suggest that the combination of product and process innovation, rather than either of the two in isolation, increases a firm's probability to enter the export market. After controlling for potential endogeneity of the innovation activities, only firms with a sufficiently high probability to start exporting engage in product and process innovation prior to their entry on the export market, pointing to the importance of self-selection into innovation.

Keywords: exports, product innovation, process innovation, self-selection, firm heterogeneity.

JEL Classification: D24, F14, L25, O31, O33

¹ Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, LICOS and Lessuis, Antwerpen, Belgium.

² Université catholique de Louvain, CORE, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium and KULeuven, LICOS, B-3000 Leuven, Belgium. E-mail: hylke.vandenbussche@uclouvain.be. This author is also member of ECORE, the association between CORE and ECARES.

We are thankful to Bee Aw, Mark Roberts, Bruno Cassiman, Stijn Vanormelingen, Davide Castellani, Maurizio Zanardi and Marton Csillag for helpful discussions and suggestions. Participants of the International Economics Group Seminar Series at UCL, the International Trade Workshop in Brussels and the European Trade Study Group conference in Rome provided useful comments. We would also like to thank Manu Monard, Peter Teirlinck and the CFS-STAT Commission for allowing us to access the CIS data for Belgium, for answering questions related to the data and for their hospitality during visits there. While we are thankful to all of them, none of them are responsible for any errors we have made.

This paper presents research results of the Belgian Program on Interuniversity Poles of Attraction initiated by the Belgian State, Prime Minister's Office, Science Policy Programming. The scientific responsibility is assumed by the authors.

1. INTRODUCTION

There is a large and growing body of literature dealing with the link between firms' decision to export and their productivity. The seminal works of Bernard and Jensen (1999) and Melitz (2003) have shown that only the more productive firms self-select into exporting, since only firms with an efficiency level above a certain threshold, are able to overcome the fixed costs associated with entry on the export market. This literature typically assumes that firms' productivity is a random, exogenous draw from a Pareto distribution.

More recent contributions to the literature (e.g. Bustos 2005; Yeaple 2005) have sought to endogenize firm-level productivity, hence allowing for the possibility that firms can influence their own efficiency level, rather than simply observing it in each consecutive period. One of the ways in which firms can increase their productivity, is through innovation activities. In the theoretical framework of Yeaple (2005), firms have the possibility to adopt either a high-technology, low unit cost or low-technology, high unit cost production process. The low unit cost technology entails a higher fixed cost of technology adoption. In the presence of fixed costs to enter the export market, only those firms that adopt the low unit cost technology will be able to start exporting.

In response to these developments, several authors have explored the relationship between firms' innovation activities and their propensity to engage in exports. However, thus far, the empirical results on the link between innovation activities and the firm's export decision have been mixed. Moreover, results seem to depend on which innovation measures are used. Specifically, both Aw, Roberts and Winston (2007), as well as Cassiman and Martinez-Ros (2007) fail to find a significant link between firm-level R&D (innovative effort) and the probability of firms to start exporting, using firm-level data on manufacturing firms in Taiwan and Spain respectively.

When innovation output measures are considered, the link between innovation and firms' propensity to export appears to yield stronger, but mixed results. While Caldera (2009) and Cassiman and Martinez-Ros (2007) both use the Spanish ESEE data set, their analysis yields different findings. In particular, Cassiman and Martinez-Ros (2007) identify product innovation, but not process innovation, as a driver of firm-level export propensity; while Caldera (2009) finds both product and process innovation to matter, although the impact of product innovation is higher than that of process innovation. Damijan, Kostevc and Polanec (2008) on the other hand, using data on the Slovenian manufacturing sector and applying

matching techniques to account for the endogeneity of the innovation activities, find no evidence that product or process innovation acts as a significant driver of export propensity at the firm level. They do provide evidence that firms engage significantly more in process innovation after entering the export market. Finally, Becker and Egger (2007), who apply matching techniques to German survey data, find that firms introducing a product *and* process innovation simultaneously increase their propensity to export by about ten percentage points. Product innovation acts as a significant driver of firms' export propensity when introduced in isolation, but process innovation does not.

Recent theoretical models incorporating productivity improving investment in a Melitz (2003) type of model like Bustos (2008) and Bas and Ledezma (2008), show that productivity and investment are strategic complements i.e. more productive firms invest more. While these models confirm the complementarity between innovation and exporting, due to their static nature they do not solve the ambiguity surrounding the causality direction.¹ The exception is Constantini & Melitz (2007) that explore the relationship in a dynamic setting and find that only firms that anticipate export market entry engage in prior productivity improving investment. The empirical results in this paper are in line with this theoretical finding.

We explore this link between innovation and firms' export propensity further using data from a detailed innovation survey for Belgium². Belgium is a small and open economy with more than 80% of its GDP resulting from exporting. In view of the importance of exporting for the economy as a whole, it therefore offers a good opportunity to study the link between innovation and exporting. The Belgian innovation survey that we use covers two consecutive periods 1998-2000 and 2002-2004. The relatively short nature of the panel is compensated by detailed information on firms' innovation characteristics, reporting data on firms' innovative effort (R&D investment) as well as their innovative output³ (product and process innovation). The survey also records other firm-level variables, such as export status and export intensity. We combine the innovation data with firm-level company accounts data.

¹ Recent efforts to incorporate investment in a Melitz & Ottaviano (2008) type of model even get the opposite result i.e. that lowly productive firms invest more, which further enhances the ambiguity surrounding the relation between innovation and exporting (Mayneris, 2009).

² The Belgian innovation survey data are collected by a national agency (BELSPO) and are part of the Community Innovation Survey (CIS) database. We use CIS 3 (1998-2000) and CIS 4 (2002-2004). The innovation survey cover a period of two years. Firms are asked to report innovation activities between the beginning and end of this period. All financial and accounting information, such as the value of sales, export intensity and total amount spent on R&D pertains only to the last year in the data (2000 and 2004).

³ A growing number of recent papers have used data on innovative output (rather than only on R&D inputs) to analyze the innovation decisions of firms. Examples include Castellani and Zanfei (2006, 2007), Damijan et al. (2008), Griffith, Mairesse and Peters (2006) and Mairesse (2004).

In contrast to previous papers we correct for three different types of endogeneity issues that can arise when analyzing the link between firms' innovation activities and their propensity to export. First, since firms typically make their innovation and export decisions simultaneously, a *simultaneity bias* emerges. Second, since exporting activities tend to exhibit persistence over time (Aw et al. 2007), a *causality bias* arises when past exporting history is not properly controlled for. Finally, to the extent that firms can anticipate entry into the export market and their innovative efforts are driven by this future prospect, the introduction of new innovations is endogenous to firms' export decision (Costantini and Melitz⁴ 2007). This *anticipation effect* is the third source of endogeneity when analyzing the link between firm-level innovation and exporting activities⁵.

To account for the *simultaneity* of firm-level innovation and exporting decisions and to rule out past exporting history, we limit the sample used in the empirical analysis in two ways. First, we focus on firms that have answered the innovation survey in two consecutive periods. This will allow us to use lagged (initial) innovation and other firm-level characteristics as potential determinants of firms' propensity to export. This limits the sample to 600 firms. Second, to control for the *causality bias* and the persistence of firm-level exports (see for instance Aw et al. 2007), we focus our attention on firms that started exporting in 2004 (*Starters*) and compare these to a control group of firms that did not export in either period (*Non-exporters*).

Similar to previous research, we fail to find a link between firm-level internal (or external) R&D and the exporting decision. Moreover, when we add product and process innovations simultaneously as determinants of the firms' exporting decision, our findings are similar to those obtained by Cassiman and Martinez-Ros (2007), i.e. product innovation, but not process innovation, acts as a significant driver of firms' entry on the export market. However, inspection of the data reveals that more than fifty percent of innovating firms in our sample introduce a product and process innovation *simultaneously*, rather than one of the two in isolation.

Looking more closely at our data we find that a substantial share i.e. 48% of firms in our sample that introduced a product innovation between 1998 and 2000 also introduced a process innovation. Similarly, 58 % of all firms that have introduced a process innovation during the

⁴ Costantini and Melitz (2007) analyze the joint entry, exit, export and innovation decisions of firms confronted with trade liberalization in a dynamic setting. They find that the anticipation of upcoming liberalization can induce firms to innovate prior to their entry on the export market.

⁵ An alternative interpretation of the anticipation effect is that it is similar to a simultaneity effect with a lag.

same period, simultaneously introduced a product innovation. When we account for the high correlation between firms that engage in both product and process innovation, our results suggest that it is not so much product or process innovation in isolation, but rather the combination of the two, which drives firms into the export market. Process innovation is usually associated with an improvement in cost efficiency, while product innovation is associated more with an improvement in the quality of a product. When we apply this interpretation, we can infer that the results that we find suggest that firms engage in a combination of both cost reduction and quality improvement in the run up to their entering export markets.

Finally, to account for the *anticipation effect* we use an instrumental variable approach. As instruments for product and process innovation we use firm-level innovation inputs (internal and external R&D) which are highly correlated with output innovation measures but appear to have no direct impact on the exporting decision as discussed above. Another instrument we use for the innovation decision is the level of training activities at the firm-level which appears highly correlated with product and process innovation but not correlated with exporting. After controlling for endogeneity of the innovation activities, we find no evidence that firms engaging in product and/or process innovation are more likely to enter the export market. These results suggest that only firms with a sufficiently high probability to start exporting will engage in product and process innovation prior to their entry on the export market, pointing to the importance of self-selection into innovation activities of firms anticipating entry in the export market in the future. One interpretation for this result is that firms anticipating exports expect tougher competition abroad and as a result engage in cost reducing investment (process innovation) and quality upgrading (product innovation) prior to exporting. Another explanation is that when a firm starts exporting it increases its market size which makes the investment in cost reduction and product improvement more worthwhile i.e. it raises the return to investment as theoretically shown by Lileeva and Trefler (2007). For Belgian firms this is particularly relevant since they have a relatively small home market. Hence exporting offers an important potential for increasing the market they serve. Theoretically, our results are in line with the model by Constantini and Melitz (2007) stressing the importance of an anticipation effect in explaining the evolution of firm productivity. Recent industry studies also seem to confirm firms' quality upgrading in anticipation of entering the export market (Iacovone & Smarzynska Javorcik 2008).

Our analysis contributes to the existing literature in a number of important ways. First, unlike most of the existing empirical work⁶, we take the correlation between product and process innovation explicitly into account in the empirical analysis, hence allowing for potential complementarities between the two innovation types. Furthermore, our results point to the importance of accounting for all potential sources of endogeneity of firm-level innovation in the exporting decision. After accounting for the three types of endogeneity outlined above i.e. *simultaneity bias*, *causality bias* and *anticipation effect*, we find that only firms that anticipate export market entry engage in innovation activities.

The policy implications arising from our empirical analysis appear important. A more general interpretation of our results is that trade liberalization induces innovation activities. Previous literature has shown that when governments engage in trade liberalization, trade costs are reduced which leads to a larger number of exporters. The additional insight arising from this paper is that firms prepare themselves for this entry into export market by simultaneously engaging in cost reduction and quality improvement.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the relevant literature, while section 3 discusses the data and reveals interesting empirical facts. Section 4 introduces the empirical model and sections 5 and 6 presents the empirical results. The final section concludes and formulates relevant policy recommendations.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

While the literature on the relationship between firms' participation on export markets and their productivity abounds⁷, until recently, it remained largely silent on the sources of the productivity advantages associated with firms' entry on export markets. Following theoretical models of entry and exit (e.g. Jovanovic 1982; Hopenhayn 1992; Melitz 2003), researchers have long continued to assume that the productivity advantage that enabled firms to start exporting (or start producing) was exogenous in nature, hence not determined by any firm-specific effort.

From this early literature dealing with the relationship between exports and productivity, a dual relationship emerges, whereby firms exogenously self-select into the export market (i.e.

⁶ Becker and Egger (2007) are a notable exception. However their analysis includes both starters on the export market and continuing exporters, i.e. they do not control for past exporting history in their analysis.

⁷ For reviews on this extensive literature, we refer to Greenaway and Kneller (2007) and Wagner (2007).

their productivity is higher than the minimum efficiency level required to enter export markets) and, once they start exporting, have the potential to further increase their productivity through learning effects.

Recently, however, efforts have been made to endogenize firm heterogeneity, allowing firms to engage in productivity-enhancing activities prior to engaging in international markets. Important theoretical contributions in this field include Bustos (2005) and Yeaple (2005). Unlike earlier models of firm dynamics (e.g. Jovanovic 1982), in Yeaple's model firms are born identical. After being born, they have the possibility to adopt a high-technology, low unit cost production technology, or a low-technology high unit cost technology. In the presence of fixed costs associated with both technology adoption and exporting, the model shows that only those firms adopting the low unit cost technology are able to start exporting. In related work, Costantini and Melitz (2007) analyze the joint entry, exit export and innovation decisions of firms in response to or in anticipation of trade liberalization. Their findings point to the importance of taking the timing and speed of trade liberalization into account when analyzing firms' export and innovation decisions. In particular, they find that *anticipation* of upcoming trade liberalization and a slow liberalization process can motivate firms to innovate ahead of export market entry.

From these different strands of the literature, three different hypotheses concerning the link between exporting and productivity emerge (Alvarez and Lopez 2005). Apart from exogenous self-selection and learning effects, firms have the possibility to engage in investments aimed specifically at raising their productivity prior to entry on export markets (*Conscious self-selection*). Existing empirical evidence has thusfar been interpreted in favor of the exogenous self-selection hypothesis although the evidence is observationally equivalent to conscious self-selection. For learning effects the results tend to be mixed.

Recently, several empirical papers aim to provide more direct evidence on the conscious self-selection hypothesis, investigating the link between firms' export propensity and a number of firm-level investments or decisions: training and R&D (Aw et al. 2007), product and process innovation (Damijan et al. 2008) and physical investment (Alvarez and Lopez 2005; Iacovone and Smarzynska Javorcik 2008). A common feature all these papers share is that they investigate to what extent certain (investment) activities of firms increase their propensity to engage in exports. Furthermore, all of the studies cited provide evidence on the complementary nature of these investment activities and firms' export propensity.

When investigating the link between firm-level innovation activities and its propensity to (start) export(ing), two types of innovation measures have been used in the literature. Specifically, either innovation input measures, usually expressed as the ratio of R&D over sales or as a dummy variable indicating whether firms engage in R&D, or innovation output measures, typically expressed as dummy variables representing whether firms have introduced a product or process innovation; are used as measures of firm-level innovation activities. As was already noted in the introduction, the impact of firms' innovation activities on their export propensity are mixed and seem to depend on the type of measures used.

Aw, Roberts and Winston (2007) explore the link between firm-level R&D, training, productivity and exports using data on the Taiwanese electronics sector. Their findings suggest that R&D and exporting are not complementary activities, but they have a complementary effect on firm-level productivity. These results seem to imply that the combination of exporting and R&D increases productivity more than the sum of both conducted in isolation. Cassiman and Martinez-Ros (2007) find similar results for the Spanish manufacturing sector, i.e. firms engaging in R&D investment do not exhibit a significantly higher export propensity.

While research spending of firms can be considered a reasonable proxy of firm-level innovative output in the absence of information on the actual innovations firms have introduced, there are several drawbacks associated with the use of R&D spending, which is essentially an input in the innovation production function⁸, as a measure of firm-level innovation. First, not all innovation efforts actually lead to the introduction of product or process innovations, i.e. it is possible that firms' efforts to innovate fail for some reason, in which case using R&D rather than actual innovations leads to an overestimation of firms' innovative activities. Second, it is not unlikely that there is a considerable time lag between firms' investment in R&D and the actual introduction of an innovation to the market, in which case the timing of the R&D and innovation decisions do not match, leading to an overestimation of innovation in some years and an underestimation in later years, when the level of R&D spending is lower and innovative output is higher.

Several authors have taken these drawbacks into account and rely on measures of firm-level innovation output rather than inputs to investigate the link between firm-level innovation and export propensity. Becker and Egger (2007) use German survey data, Caldera (2009) and Cassiman and Martinez-Ros (2007) use data for Spain and Damijan et al. (2008) use survey

⁸ See for instance Mairesse and Mohnen (2002).

data for Slovenia to explore the relationship between firm-level innovative output, measured as the introduction of product and process innovations and firms' propensity to (start) export(ing). While these papers share a common purpose and in the case of Caldera (2009) and Cassiman and Martinez-Ros (2009) also use the same data set, some differences between them, both in terms of sample selection, methodology and empirical results are worth noting here.

As shown by Aw et al. (2007) firms' exporting status is characterized by a high persistence, a finding that is also consistent with the prediction of Melitz's model that entry into the export market leads to the incurrence of a fixed cost, which cannot be recovered. Given these preliminaries, it is not unlikely that firms' initial entry versus its continued presence on the export market have different determinants. Iacovone and Smarzynska Javorcik (2008) document, for a sample of Mexican manufacturing firms, an increase in physical investment prior to the introduction of a domestic variety on the export market, but only for new exporters. For firms with prior export experience, no such increase was recorded. These findings point to the importance of taking firms' prior export experience into account in the empirical analysis.

For this reason, Damijan et al. (2008) focus only on first-time exporters when investigating the impact of firm-level innovation activities on firms' propensity to export. While Caldera (2009) and Cassiman and Martinez-Ros (2007) both use the full sample of exporters (starters and firms with export experience) in their analysis, they both perform a number of robustness checks to account for prior experience in exporting. Specifically, Caldera (2009) estimates a dynamic model as a robustness check and Cassiman and Martinez-Ros (2007) repeat their analysis using only starters on the export market versus a control group of non-exporters. In both cases, the main findings are robust to these alternative specifications. Becker and Egger (2007) on the other hand, focus on the full sample of firms and do not differentiate between first-time exporters and continuing exporters. In the empirical analysis below, we follow Damijan et al. (2008) by focusing only on starters on the export market and a control group of non-exporters.

In terms of the methodologies used, the four papers cited above can be divided in two groups. Caldera (2009) and Cassiman and Martinez-Ros (2007) both use a probit model to investigate the relationship between firm-level innovation and export status. To control for unobserved firm heterogeneity, they add random effects to the baseline specification. Apart from a number of control variables, both papers add lagged innovation status for product and process

innovation as independent variables. This allows them to control for the simultaneity of the export and innovation decisions. However, while selection on prior export status (i.e. using only starters on the export market) and the use of lagged firm characteristics avoids the pitfalls of persistence in exports and of a simultaneity bias resulting from the timing of the innovation and export decisions, this does not rule out the existence of feedback effects, rendering firm-level innovation endogenous in the export decision framework.

Specifically, if firms have some prior knowledge of their prospects on the export market, they are likely to make their innovation decisions with this prospect in mind. In other words, to the extent that firms can anticipate their entry on the export market and if their innovation efforts are driven by this expectation, product and process innovation cannot be considered exogenous in the export decision. To take this anticipation effect into account, Caldera (2009) and Cassiman and Martinez-Ros (2007) estimate, in addition to their baseline model, several instrumental variables (IV) regressions. Caldera relies on a linear probability framework and uses firm-level funding for innovation as an instrument, while Cassiman and Martinez-Ros rely on IV probit estimation.

Becker and Egger (2007) and Damijan et al. (2008) take a more direct approach to account for the potential endogeneity of the innovation decision in the firm's exporting decision, both papers apply matching estimators.⁹ Becker and Egger (2007) focus on the causal link going from innovation to exporting; while Damijan et al. (2008) look at the bi-directional causal impact. As was noted in the introduction, Becker and Egger (2007) are among the first to take the correlation between firm-level product and process innovation explicitly into account. In their matching analysis, they distinguish between four types of firms: i) firms that did not introduce a product or process innovation, ii) firms that introduced a product, but not a process innovation, iii) firms that introduced a process, but not a product innovation and iv) firms that introduced both a product and process innovation. However, their analysis includes both continuing exporters and starters, i.e. they do not control for past exporting history in their analysis.

In terms of the empirical results, the existing literature remains inconclusive. Caldera (2009), Cassiman and Martinez-Ros (2007) and Becker and Egger (2007) find that the introduction of a product innovation results in an increase in firms' export propensity. On the other hand,

⁹ Note that matching does not necessarily deal with all kinds endogeneity. Unobservable heterogeneity surrounding the treated firms may still persist if the variables in the first order probit are not perfectly correlated with the unobservables.

Damijan et al. (2008) find no significant impact of product innovation on the export propensity of Slovenian firms. For process innovation, the findings of Becker and Egger (2007), Cassiman and Martinez-Ros (2007) and Damijan et al. (2008) suggest that process innovation does not increase firms' export propensity. Caldera (2009) on the other hand reports a positive and significant impact of process innovation on the probability of firms to export, a finding that is robust to several endogeneity controls.

From a theoretical point of view, there are reasons to expect that product innovation and not process innovation drives firms into exporting. Klepper (1996) analyzes the patterns of exit, entry, innovation and growth over the product life cycle. His findings indicate that firms are more likely to conduct product innovations in the beginning of their life cycle (prior to exporting), while they are more likely to focus on process innovations during the later stages of their life cycle. This pattern is in line with the product life cycle as put forth by Vernon (1966), where firms first introduce a product innovation on the domestic market, after which they start exporting that product. Rationalization of the production process, for instance through process innovations aimed at improving the efficiency of production only takes place at a later stage. As noted by Cassiman and Martinez-Ros (2007), process innovation is also likely to become more attractive to the firm once production volumes are large and competition is mounting.

However, to the extent that the introduction of a process innovation makes the firm more productive, process innovations can help firms to attain the minimum efficiency level needed to enter the export market in a profitable way.

3. DATA AND EMPIRICAL FACTS

To investigate the relationship between a firm's innovation activities and its probability to start exporting, we use data from an innovation survey for Belgium, obtained from the Belspo (2006). The survey is conducted every four years, the data we use are for the years 2000 and 2004. The population for each survey is selected on the basis of the full population of Belgian firms, registered at the National Office for Social Security at the end of the period considered (2000 and 2004). Of these, all firms with at least ten employees are selected. The full sample of firms in 2000 amounts to 2,100 firms; while for 2004 data are available for 3,322 firms. To

ensure that the sample is representative for the full population of firms, additional sampling is performed in each period. The final sample of firms is representative for the population in terms of sector distribution, size classes and regional distribution (Teirlinck 2005).

The survey data contain detailed information on firms' innovation activities, as well as some general information, such as firm's export intensity in 2000 and 2004. The survey further has information on both innovative efforts of the firm (internal and external R&D) as well as on its innovative output. For innovative output, a distinction is made between a product innovation, defined as a new or significantly improved good or service that is new to the market or new to the firm; and process innovation, which concerns new or significantly improved methods of production, logistics, etc¹⁰.

Apart from export intensity and innovation characteristics, the questionnaire contains information on firm-level sales and employment and identifies foreign affiliates of multinational firms. In order to obtain additional information required to calculate the productivity of firms in the sample, we merge the survey data with firm-level annual accounts information, obtained from the Belfirst database (BvDEP 2006).

As was already noted in the introduction, we restrict the sample used in the empirical analysis in two important ways. First, we limit attention to those firms that have replied to the questionnaire in two consecutive periods. Since sampling for the innovation survey is performed independently in each period, the overlap between the two periods is limited to 600 firms (i.e. these firms have responded to both questionnaires). Reducing the sample in this way allows us to use (four-year) lagged innovation and firm-level characteristics in the empirical analysis, and hence to avoid a simultaneity bias resulting from the fact that firm-level innovation and export decisions are taken at the same point in time.

Second, to control for past exporting history, we restrict the sample to two types of firms: i) firms that start exporting in 2004 (i.e. they did not export in 2000) and ii) a control group of firms that did not export in either period (Never exporters). 97 firms in the sample start exporting in 2004, while 92 firms did not export in 2000 or 2004. Hence, the total sample size amounts to 189 firms¹¹.

¹⁰ For the definitions of all variables used in the empirical analysis, we refer to Appendix A.

¹¹ The representativeness of this sample is no longer guaranteed but includes all firms for which all information necessary for our analysis could be found.

Table 1 summarizes the sector distribution specifically for our sample. As can be seen in the table, the sample covers all sectors of the economy. Apart from the number of firms, table 1 also lists the number of non-exporters and starters in each of the sectors considered.

[Table 1]

Ever since the seminal work by Bernard and Jensen (1995), many empirical papers have documented the differences between exporters and non-exporters in terms of several firm characteristics, such as size, productivity, etc. (see for instance De Loecker 2007 for Slovenia or Mûuls and Pisu 2009 for Belgium). In a similar vein, Table 2 reports summary statistics (mean and standard deviation) of a number of firm-level characteristics, separately for non-exporters and starters on the export market. However, unlike the papers cited above, Table 2 looks at the difference between exporters and non-exporters *prior* to their potential entry on the export market.

As was noted in the previous section, we will include lagged firm-level (innovation) characteristics in the empirical analysis in order to avoid a simultaneity bias, resulting from the fact that firms' innovation and export decisions, as well as decisions related to the allocation of inputs and outputs are taken at the same point in time. By including (four-year) lagged firm characteristics, we aim to control for these simultaneity issues. Analogously to the empirical analysis, Table 2 therefore reports lagged firm-level characteristics.

[Table 2]

Table 2 shows that exporters are larger and more productive¹² already four years prior to engaging on the export market. These differences are statistically significant. In the empirical analysis below, we take these differences into account, in addition to industry dummies to control for differences across sectors.

Table 3 summarizes the innovation characteristics of the sample. Similar to Table 2, the table distinguishes between non-exporters and starters on the export market. The values reported in the table refer to the number of firms engaging in a particular innovation activity, the percentages are calculated with respect to the total number of non-exporters or starters, reported in the first row of the table. Several interesting facts emerge from Table 3.

¹² Firm size is defined using employment data. Similar to Aw et al. (2007), total factor productivity is calculated using the index number methodology. While this methodology has a number of drawbacks, i.e. constant returns to scale and perfect competition are assumed and no allowance is made for unobservable factors, unlike parametric estimation, it does not assume a homogeneous production technology for all firms in a particular sector (Van Biesebroeck 2007). Variables are defined in Appendix A.

[Table 3]

First, comparing the last two columns in Table 3, it is clear that firms that will start exporting in 2004, already exert greater innovative effort in 2000 compared to non-exporters in both periods. For internal and external R&D, the differences between the two groups are relatively small. About 30 percent of the starters engage in internal R&D in 2000, compared to 26 percent for the non-exporters. For external R&D, the relevant figures are 13 and 8 percent respectively. For innovative output however, the differences between the two groups are much larger. While 58 percent of the starters introduced a product innovation in 2000, only 33 percent of the non-exporters did. Similarly, 49 percent of the starters introduced a process innovation in 2000, compared to 26 percent for the non-exporters.

Second, as can be seen in the last row of Table 3, many firms introduce a product and process innovation simultaneously. Within the group of non-exporters, this is the case for 10 firms (accounting for about 11 percent of the number of non-exporters), while for the starters on the export market, this is true for 32 firms (or 33 percent of the number of starters). Hence, it is clear that firms, and particularly those firms that will start exporting in 2004, often carry out product and process innovations simultaneously rather than in isolation. Within the group of starters, 57 percent of all firms that introduced a product innovation simultaneously introduced a process innovation and 67 percent of the firms engaging in process innovation simultaneously engaged in product innovation. For the group of non-exporters, the relevant percentages are 33 and 42 percent respectively. The correlation between the two variables amounts to 0.4428. The overlap between these two different types of innovation will be taken into account in the empirical analysis below.

4. EMPIRICAL MODEL

In order to investigate to what extent firm-level innovation activities increase firms' export propensity, we estimate the following empirical model:

$$\Pr(START_{it} = 1) = f[\ln(Size_{it-4}), \ln(TFP_{it-4}), INN_{it-4}, I_i] \quad [1]$$

where

$Size_{it-4}$ Firm-level employment in 2000;

TFP_{it-4}	Total factor productivity in 2000;
INN_{it-4}	Innovation characteristic, differs depending on specification;
I_i	Sector dummy.

The dependent variable in [1] is equal to one if the firm starts exporting in 2004 and zero otherwise. As noted before, our sample is limited to those firms that start exporting in 2004 and firms that did not export in both periods. Since we only have access to two consecutive periods for the innovation survey, the use of initial characteristics in [1] implies that we can only include one year of data in the regression (2004). The year 2000 is used to define the lagged characteristics. Total Factor Productivity (TFP) is defined according to the index number methodology (Törnqvist index). An important advantage of this method is that it allows for heterogeneity in production technology across firms. As a robustness check we also verify our results using labor productivity defined as net value added per employee. For the definitions of the variables used in the empirical analysis, we refer to Appendix A.

We will include both innovative input and output measures in [1]. All innovation measures are defined as dummy variables, indicating whether the firm has engaged in a particular activity or not. We use two input indicators, referring to whether the firm has engaged in internal or external R&D in 2000¹³ and two output indicators, referring to whether the firm has introduced a product or process innovation in 2000. As is illustrated in Table 4, the correlations between the different innovation variables are generally high. Only the correlations between the two output measures and external R&D are lower than 0.40, in all other cases, the values are larger than 0.40. As argued before, we will take this high correlation into account in the empirical analysis.

[Table 4]

Specifically, in order to avoid multicollinearity issues, which might result in the insignificance of some of the variables caused by the high correlation between them, we include only one innovation measure at a time. Moreover, to take the large degree of overlap between product and process innovation into account, we will further distinguish between

¹³ Aw et al. (2007) note that R&D intensity, unlike the discrete choice to engage in R&D, is more likely to be driven by firm-specific unobservable factors and noise. Therefore, although the innovation survey data report data on firm-level expenditures on internal and external R&D, we follow Aw et al. (2007) and rely on dummy variables, indicating whether the firm has actively engaged in R&D, to measure firms' innovation activities. This choice is consistent with the existence of a fixed setup cost of R&D, such that once this cost has been incurred, the amount of R&D actually spent matters less.

firms that have only introduced a product innovation, only a process innovation or both simultaneously. This will allow us to investigate to what extent the simultaneous introduction of a product and process innovation offers an advantage to the firm in terms of its export market prospects. In what follows, the results of the baseline specification given by [1] will be discussed.

5. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

Table 5 reports the regression results for the baseline specification given by equation [1]. All regressions in the table include a full set of industry fixed effects¹⁴ to control for differences across sectors. Each of the four columns in the table includes a different innovation measure. In the first two columns, input measures are added, while the last two columns report results using innovation output measures. All the values reported in Table 5 are marginal effects, defined as the marginal probability change at the mean of the independent variables (discrete change from 0 to 1 for dummy variables), standard errors are reported between brackets.

[Table 5]

Results in Table 5 show that productivity has a positive and significant influence on firms' propensity to start exporting. This result is in line with the theoretical and empirical self-selection literature (Melitz 2003; Muûls and Pisu 2009), i.e. only the more productive firms are able to enter the export market. Although Table 2 indicated that firms that start exporting are (on average) larger than their non-exporting counterparts, firm size is only (marginally) significant in Table 5. These results suggest that the differences between starters and non-exporters in terms of their size is mainly due to differences across sectors and not so much to differences within a sector.

Furthermore, in line with the results obtained by Aw et al. (2007) and Cassiman and Martinez-Ros (2007), our results suggest that firm-level investments in R&D (internal or external) do not result in a higher propensity to export in the next period. The last two columns of Table 5 show the results of estimating [1], but now including innovation output rather than input measures. We include product and process innovation separately here,

¹⁴ Sectors are grouped as in Table 1.

without taking into account that many firms introduce both innovations simultaneously. The results suggest that both product and process innovation (irrespective of whether they were introduced in isolation or simultaneously) have a significantly positive impact on firms' propensity to start exporting.

Specifically, the magnitude of the marginal effects implies that firms that introduce a product innovation increase their probability to start exporting by 22 percentage points, compared to 19 percentage points for process innovation. These findings are in line with those reported by Caldera (2009) for Spain. Using a similar empirical framework¹⁵, she finds that firms introducing a product innovation increase their export propensity by 16 percentage points. Firms introducing a process innovation exhibit a 7 percentage points increase in their probability to export, which is somewhat lower than in our case.

To determine to what extent the correlation between product and process innovation leads to serious multicollinearity issues, the first column of Table 6 reports the results of the baseline specification, which now includes both innovation output variables, i.e. product and process innovation are both added as independent variables in the regression. When both innovation variables are taken into account simultaneously, only product innovation emerges as a significant determinant of firms' export propensity. These results are in line with results reported by Cassiman and Martinez-Ros (2007) who also report a positive and significant effect for product innovation, but not for process innovation on firms' export propensity.

[Table 6]

However, given the high correlation between the two innovation output measures and the fact that they both act as significant drivers of firms' probability to enter the export market, it can be argued that the insignificance of the process innovation variable does not reflect its true impact. Moreover, while including the innovation measures one by one avoids the multicollinearity issues discussed above, it fails to take into account potential complementarities between firms' product and process innovation in shaping their future export prospects. As was already noted in Section 3, 49 percent of all firms that introduced a product innovation in 2000 simultaneously introduced a process innovation. Similarly, 58 percent of all process innovators were also product innovators in 2000.

¹⁵ Caldera additionally adds random effects to the baseline specification. Since we only have data for two time periods and we add lagged firm characteristics in the regression, we cannot estimate a random effects probit model.

To take this high correlation into account, Table 6 distinguishes between four types of firms: i) non-innovators (the baseline), ii) firms that only introduced a product innovation in 2000, iii) firms that only introduced a process innovation in 2000 and iv) firms that introduced both a product and process innovation simultaneously. Since these categories are mutually exclusive (a firm is never part of more than one of the four groups), we avoid potential multicollinearity issues. Moreover, by accounting explicitly for the fact that some firms introduce a product and process innovation at the same time, we are able to determine to what extent both innovation activities have complementary effects on firms' export propensity.

Results of the baseline model, but now including three rather than two innovation output measures, are reported in the second column of Table 6. Again, all regressions include sector dummies. In the regressions where only one innovation measure is included (only product, only process innovation or both), we omit all other categories from the sample, e.g. if the variable *Onlyprod* is included in the regression, we omit all firms that introduce either a process innovation in isolation, or a product and process innovation. This implies that in all regressions the baseline category (the control group) are all non-innovating firms. Similar to the results for the non-innovation characteristics reported in Table 5, total factor productivity emerges as a significant driver of firms' export propensity, while firm size is insignificant.¹⁶ For the innovation measures, results suggest that it is the simultaneous introduction of a product and process innovation, and not so much either of the two in isolation, that drives firms into exporting. Firms introducing a product or process innovation in isolation, exhibit no significant increase in their probability to start exporting.

This finding is in line with findings of Becker and Egger (2007) for Germany, who also find that the simultaneous introduction of a process and product innovation has a large impact on firms' export propensity. However, while Becker and Egger (2007) additionally find a positive and significant impact of product innovation in isolation (though not for process innovation), this is not the case here. Product or process innovations conducted in isolation exert no significant impact on the probability of firms to start exporting.

6. ACCOUNTING FOR ANTICIPATION EFFECTS

¹⁶ When using labor productivity instead of TFP all results go through be it that labor productivity itself is no longer significant.

If firms can anticipate entry on the export market and their innovation activities are driven by this prospect¹⁷, innovation cannot be considered exogenous in the analysis reported above. To control for this potential endogeneity, we will report several instrumental variable estimations for the innovation output measures. We choose to rely on two-stage least squares (instrumental variables or IV) regression to estimate the causal impact of firm-level innovation activities on its export propensity for two reasons. First, unlike linear IV models, non-linear IV estimation requires fairly strong assumptions, i.e. the error terms in the first and second stage need to be identically normally distributed and both stages need to be correctly specified for consistent estimation (Carrasco 1998). Moreover, standard IV probit estimation procedures¹⁸ require the endogenous variable to be continuous (i.e. the first estimation stage is linear), yielding inconsistent standard errors for endogenous dummy variables. We therefore follow Caldera (2009) and rely on two-stage least squares regression to investigate the causal impact of firm-level innovation activities on its export propensity.

As a first step, we estimate the preferred model of Table 6 (column II), including the three dummies representing whether the firm introduced a product or process innovation in isolation or the two of them simultaneously, but now using OLS (i.e. we estimate a Linear Probability Model or LPM). This will allow us to determine to what extent the LPM results are comparable to the probit results reported in Table 6. The results for the innovation measures are similar to the ones obtained with the probit model. Again we find that only those firms that introduce a product and process innovation simultaneously exhibit a significant increase in their probability to enter the export market.

While the coefficient on productivity is lower for the Linear Probability Model in Table 7, it is still positive and significant. The next three columns of Table 7 report results of applying an instrumental variables approach (IV) in the LPM. We account for the endogeneity of firms' innovation activities by instrumenting. Generally, instruments need to satisfy two requirements (Greene 2008). First, they cannot have a direct impact on the dependent variable (i.e. on the probability to start exporting). Second, they need to be correlated with the endogenous regressor, conditional on all other covariates. Since there are three endogenous regressors in Table 6, we need at least three instruments.

¹⁷ The prospect of export market entry can be driven by anticipated trade liberalization as in Costantini and Melitz (2007) or by firm-level considerations.

¹⁸ For instance, in Stata 10, IV Probit estimation can be achieved using the *ivprobit* command *provided* the endogenous regressors are continuous.

The insignificance of the internal and external R&D dummy in Table 5 (i.e. they have no direct impact on the probability to start exporting), combined with the fact that internal and external R&D are essentially the inputs for the innovation outcomes (the endogenous variables), suggests they might be good instruments. Additionally, it is likely that firm-level on-the-job training activities, on which we have information from the Belfirst database (BvDEP 2006) are correlated with firm-level innovation activities and in particular process innovation, since new production processes need to be executed and therefore introduced to employees and workers. While firm-level training (which is measured using a dummy variable) does not feature in Table 5 and 6, we ran an auxiliary regression¹⁹ to ensure that training is not directly related to firms' propensity to start exporting.

To investigate to what extent the instruments are sufficiently "strong", i.e. are correlated with the endogenous dummy regressors conditional on all other covariates, we estimate the baseline model of Table 6 (column II) using the three instruments above. The first-stage results of the estimation procedure are reported in the Appendix (Table A.1)²⁰. From Table A.1, it can be seen that for each of the three endogenous dummies (Only product innovation, Only process innovation and Both) at least one of the instruments yields a positive and significant coefficient. These results confirm our prior that the instruments chosen are indeed correlated with our endogenous regressors, conditional upon all other covariates.

The last four columns in Table 7 show the results for the innovation output measures, after accounting for potential endogeneity of firms' innovation activities (i.e. the anticipation effect). Similarly to Table 6, we distinguish between firms that have introduced a product or process innovation in isolation and those that have introduced both of them together. Surprisingly, both size and productivity are insignificant in all three columns.

Results in the last three columns of Table 7 suggest that, after accounting for the potential endogeneity of the innovation decision, firm-level innovation has no significant impact on firms' export propensity. While these results are not in line with those of Caldera (2009) and Cassiman and Martinez-Ros (2007) that both report a positive and significant impact of firms' innovation activities on its export propensity after accounting for the potential endogeneity of the innovation measures; they are in line with results reported by Damijan et al. (2008) for

¹⁹ Unreported, but available from the authors upon request.

²⁰ The second-stage results are reported in Table 7, last column.

Slovenia, who fail to find a significant effect of firm-level innovation on the probability of firms to enter the export market²¹.

Hence, after controlling for potential endogeneity of the innovation activities in [1], we find no evidence that firms engaging in product and/or process innovation are more likely to start exporting. These results suggest that only firms with a sufficiently high probability to start exporting will engage in product and process innovation prior to their entry on the export market, pointing to the importance of *self-selection into innovation activities*.

To test the validity and strength of our instruments, three test statistics are reported in Table 7. All test statistics are obtained using the Stata module *ivreg2*, developed by Baum, Schaffer and Stillman (2004). The Sargan-Hansen statistic tests for over-identification of the model, failure to reject the null hypothesis that the model is over-identified indicates that the instruments are valid. The Kleibergen-Paap statistic on the other hand tests for under-identification of the model by testing whether the model is of full rank. The null hypothesis states that the model is under-identified, rejection of the null implies that the model is identified. Finally, the Anderson-Rubin F-statistic tests whether the first-stage regressors are jointly significant and whether the model is identified. The Anderson-Rubin test is robust to the presence of weak instruments. Failure to reject the null hypothesis that the model is identified indicates that the instruments are valid.

Apart from the last column of Table 7, all test statistics indicate that the instruments used are indeed valid. The Sargan-Hansen test is never significant²², suggesting that the model is correctly specified. The Kleibergen-Paap test statistic rejects the null hypothesis of under-identification at the five percent level in all but the last column of Table 7. Finally, the Anderson-Rubin F-statistic is never significant, suggesting that the model is identified and the instruments are valid. However, it is worth noting that the Kleibergen-Paap test statistic points to potential under-identification of the model in the last column of Table 7, where all three

²¹ Most of the existing theoretical and empirical work to date focuses on the manufacturing sector. To verify to what extent our results are confirmed specifically for manufacturing, we have run additional regressions using only those firms who are active in this sector. While this limits the sample size further to 71 firms, our main results reported in Table 7 continue to hold. A notable exception is the result on product innovation in the first column. Specifically, for the manufacturing sector alone, product innovation conducted in isolation (so without a process innovation) is found to contribute positively and significantly to the probability that firms start exporting. However, after accounting for the anticipation effect, product and process innovation (conducted in isolation or simultaneously) are not found to have a significant impact on the firm's export status. Hence, overall the main results reported in Table 7 are very similar to those obtained for the manufacturing sector only. Results specifically for manufacturing are not reported here for brevity, but are available from the authors upon request.

²² The Sargan-Hansen test requires the model to be over-identified, i.e. there should be more instruments than endogenous variables. This implies that the test statistic cannot be calculated for the last column of Table 7, where the number of endogenous regressors equals the number of instruments.

endogenous regressors are included together in the model. Although the other identification tests do not confirm this result, some caution in the interpretation of our result is warranted. Future research, ideally based on both a larger sample and including a time dimension, needs to be undertaken to confirm these results.

7. CONCLUSION

This paper contributes to a small, but growing literature that considers firm productivity to be endogenous, rather than the result of an exogenous draw (Melitz 2003). Empirically, we analyze the relationship between firm-level innovation the propensity of firms to start exporting, using data from an innovation survey for Belgium in consecutive periods.

In our empirical analysis, we control for three potential sources of endogeneity: (i) simultaneity, which is a consequence of the simultaneous character of innovation and export decisions; (ii) causality, introduced by persistence in exporting activities and (iii) anticipation, caused by the fact that firms may innovate in anticipation of export market entry that lies ahead. We account for these sources of bias by using lagged firm-level and innovation characteristics, by focusing on starters on the export market (versus a control group of non-exporters) and by applying instrumental variable estimation. A central finding of the analysis is that it is important to take the potential complementarities between product and process innovation into account when analyzing firms' propensity to export. Accounting for the fact that about half of all innovating firms introduce a product and process innovation simultaneously, our empirical results suggest that it is the combination of product and process innovation, rather than either of the two in isolation, that is correlated with firms' entry into the export market.

Correcting further for an anticipation effects by applying an instrumental variables approach, points to the importance of self-selection into product and/or process innovation i.e. only those firms that anticipate entering the export market in the next period are more likely to invest in innovation activities such as cost reduction and quality improvement. Despite data limitations inherent in the data such as a short panel and a relatively small sample of firms, our results appear in line with both theoretical outcomes and existing industry studies.

From a policy point of view our results have important implications i.e. they suggest that governments can spur innovation by pursuing a policy of trade liberalization. In earlier

research it has been documented that the reduction of trade costs results in an increase in the number of exporting firms. This paper additionally shows that when firms have the prospect of becoming exporters in the near future, they engage in innovation activities involving cost reduction and quality improvement. This can be explained by several factors. The fact that firms expect to face more competition when they ship their goods abroad may lead them to invest more in process and product innovation prior to exporting. In addition to the prospect of more intense competition, exporting also entails an increase in firms' market size which makes it easier to recuperate the fixed cost often involved in investment in innovation and enhances the return to investment. This is particularly relevant for Belgian firms that operate from a relatively small home market which explains the importance of exporting for these firms.

References

- Alvarez, R., & Lopez, R. A. (2005), "Exporting and performance: evidence from Chilean plants", *Canadian Journal of Economics* 38 1384-1400
- Aw, B. Y., Roberts, M. J., & Winston, T. (2007), "Export market participation, investments in R&D and worker training, and the evolution of firm productivity", *The World Economy* 30 83-104
- Baum, C. F., Schaffer, M. E., & Stillman, S. (2004), "Instrumental variables and GMM: Estimation and testing", *Stata Journal* 4 1-31
- Becker, S. O., & Egger, P. (2007), "Endogenous product versus process Innovation and a firm's propensity to export", CESIFO Working Paper Series 1906
- Belspo (2006), "CIS questionnaire", Brussels: Belgian Science Policy
- Bernard, A. B., & Jensen, B. J. (1995), "Exporters, jobs and wages in US manufacturing: 1976-1987", *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity - Microeconomics* 1995 67-119
- Bernard, A. B., & Jensen, J. B. (1999), "Exceptional exporter performance: Cause, effect or both?" *Journal of International Economics* 47 1-25
- Bustos, P. (2005), "The impact of trade on technology and skill upgrading: Evidence from Argentina", Harvard University, mimeo
- BvDEP (2006), Belfirst database, DVD-rom, Bureau van Dijk Electronic Publishing
- Caldera, A. (2009), "Innovation and exporting: Evidence from Spanish manufacturing firms", ECARES Working Paper Series 2009-014
- Carrasco, R. (2001), "Binary choice with binary endogenous regressors in panel data: Estimating the effect of fertility on female labour participation", *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 19 385-394
- Cassiman, B., & Martinez-Ros, E. (2007), "Product innovation and exports: Evidence from Spanish manufacturing", unpublished manuscript
- Castellani, D., & Zanfei, A. (2006), *Multinational firms, innovation and productivity*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing
- Castellani, D., & Zanfei, A. (2007), "Internationalisation, innovation and productivity: How do firms differ in Italy?" *The World Economy* 30 156-176
- Caves, D. W., Christensen, L. R., & Diewert, W. E. (1982), "Multilateral comparisons of output, input, and productivity using superlative index numbers", *The Economic Journal* 92 73-86
- Costantini, J. A., & Melitz, M. (2007), "The dynamics of firm-level adjustment to trade

- liberalization", Princeton University, mimeo
- Damijan, J. P., Kostevc, C., & Polanec, S. (2008), "From innovation to exporting or vice versa? Causal link between innovation activity and exporting in Slovenian microdata", Licos Discussion Paper Series 204
- De Loecker, J. (2007), "Do exports generate higher productivity? Evidence from Slovenia", *Journal of International Economics* 73 69-98
- Greenaway, D., & Kneller, R. (2007), "Firm heterogeneity, exporting and foreign direct investment", *The Economic Journal* 117 F134-F161
- Greene, W. H. (2008), *Econometric Analysis*, New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Griffith, R., Huergo, E., Mairesse, J., & Peters, B. (2006), "Innovation and Productivity Across Four European Countries", *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 22 483-498
- Hopenhayn, H. A. (1992), "Entry, exit and firm dynamics in long run equilibrium", *Econometrica* 60 1127-1150
- Iacovone, L., & Smarzynska Javorcik, B. (2008), "Shipping good tequila out: Investment, domestic unit values and entry of multi-product plants into export markets", Oxford University, mimeo
- Jovanovic, B. (1982), "Selection and the evolution of industry", *Econometrica* 50 649-670
- Klepper, S. (1996), "Entry, exit, growth, and innovation over the product life cycle", *The American Economic Review* 86 562-583
- Lileeva, A., & Trefler, D. (2007), "Improved access to foreign markets raises plant-level productivity, for some plants", Princeton University, mimeo
- Mairesse, J., & Mohnen, P. (2004), "The importance of R&D for innovation: A reassessment using French survey data", *The Journal of Technology Transfer* 30 183-197
- Mairesse, J., & Mohnen, P. (2002), "Accounting for innovation and measuring innovativeness: An illustrative framework and an application", *American Economic Review* 92 226-230
- Melitz, M. J. (2003), "The impact of trade on intra-industry reallocations and aggregate industry productivity", *Econometrica* 71 1695-1725
- Muûls, M., & Pisu, M. (2009), "Imports and exports at the level of the firm: Evidence from Belgium", *World Economy* 32 692-734
- Teirlinck, P. (2005), *Report CIS 4*, Brussels: Belgian Science Policy
- Van Biesebroeck, J. (2007), "Robustness of productivity estimates ", *Journal of Industrial Economics* 55 529-569

- Vernon, R. (1966), "International investment and international trade in the product cycle",
The Quarterly Journal of Economics 80 190-207
- Wagner, J. (2007), "Exports and productivity: A survey of the evidence from firm-level data",
The World Economy 30 60-82
- Yeaple, S. R. (2005), "A simple model of firm heterogeneity, international trade, and wages",
Journal of International Economics 65 1-20

APPENDIX A: DATA AND DEFINITION OF VARIABLES.

All innovation variables and information on firms' export status were obtained from the innovation survey data for Belgium (Belspo 2006). All accounting data are obtained from the Belfirst database (BvDEP 2006). The definitions of the variables are given below, capital letters refer to dummy variables.

Dependent variable

$START_{it}$ dummy equal to one if the firm starts exporting in 2004 (no exports in 2000).

Independent variables

$Size_{it-4}$ Firm-level employment in 2000, expressed in full-time equivalents.
 TFP_{it-4} Total factor productivity in 2000, defined using index numbers.
 INN_{it-4} Innovation dummy. Seven different innovation dummies are used in the empirical analysis, see below for their definitions.

Total factor productivity

To obtain comparable levels of total factor productivity (TFP) across firms, we follow Aw et al. (2007) and apply the Caves, Christensen and Diewert (1982) methodology. Specifically, applying this methodology to a value added production function yields the following formula to calculate comparable levels of TFP across firms.

$$\ln \tilde{A}_i^{VA} = \ln A_i^{VA} - \overline{\ln A^{VA}} = (\ln Q_i - \overline{\ln Q}) - \tilde{s}_i^L (\ln L_i - \overline{\ln L}) - \tilde{s}_i^K (\ln K_i - \overline{\ln K}) \quad [\text{A.1}]$$

where \tilde{A}_i^{VA} refers to the total factor productivity index, bars over variables indicate sample means; Q_i , L_i and K_i stand for output, labour and capital respectively and s refers to factor shares, which are defined as follows.

$$\tilde{s}_i^L + \tilde{s}_i^K = 1$$

$$\tilde{s}_i^X = \frac{s_i^X + \overline{s^X}}{2} \quad \text{where } \overline{s^X} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N s_i^X, s_i^X = \frac{X_i P_i^X}{Q_i P_i} \text{ and } X = L, K$$

The index calculated on the basis of [A.1] is a Törnqvist-Theil-translog index. Intuitively, the index is calculated by comparing each firm to a hypothetical firm, where the hypothetical firm is defined as the average over all firms as illustrated above.

A number of assumptions are imposed when TFP is calculated according to [A.1] (Van Biesebroeck 2007): 1) perfect competition in output and input markets, 2) firms are profit-maximizing agents, 3) no measurement error and 4) constant returns to scale. The last of these assumptions can be relaxed if outside information on the extent of economies of scale is available to the researcher. Important advantages of the index number methodology are that it can readily be implemented and that it allows for heterogeneity in production technology across firms. Disadvantages associated with index numbers are its deterministic nature and the imposed assumptions on market structure and firm behavior (Van Biesebroeck 2007).

Innovation measures

INTERNAL R&D DUMMY

Dummy equal to one if the firm engaged in internal R&D activities in 2000. Internal R&D activities are defined as “creative work undertaken within your enterprise to increase the stock of knowledge and its use to devise new and improved products and processes (including software development)” in the questionnaire.

EXTERNAL R&D DUMMY

Dummy equal to one if the firm engaged in external R&D activities in 2000. External R&D activities are defined as “Extramural R&D: same activities as above, but performed by other companies (including other enterprises within your group) or by public or private research organisations and purchased by your enterprise.” in the questionnaire.

PRODUCT INNOVATION DUMMY

Dummy equal to one if the firm introduced a product innovation in 2000. A product innovation is defined as follows in the questionnaire: “New or significantly improved goods or services (Exclude the simple resale of new goods purchased from other enterprises and changes of a solely aesthetic nature.)”

PROCESS INNOVATION DUMMY

Dummy equal to one if the firm introduced a process innovation in 2000. A process innovation is defined as follows in the questionnaire: “i) New or significantly improved methods of manufacturing or producing goods or services, ii) New or significantly improved logistics, delivery or distribution methods for your inputs, goods or services or New or significantly improved supporting activities for your processes, such as maintenance systems or operations for purchasing, accounting or computing.”

ONLY PRODUCT INNOVATION

Dummy equal to one if the firm introduced a product innovation in 2000, but no process innovation.

ONLY PROCESS INNOVATION

Dummy equal to one if the firm introduced a process innovation in 2000, but no product innovation.

PRODUCT AND PROCESS INNOVATION

Dummy equal to one if the firm introduced a process *and* product innovation in 2000.

Instruments

Innovation measure	Instrument
ONLY PRODUCT INN	Internal R&D dummy (firm-level) in 2000 External R&D dummy (firm-level) in 2000 Training dummy (firm-level) in 2000
ONLY PROCESS INN	Internal R&D dummy (firm-level) in 2000 External R&D dummy (firm-level) in 2000 Training dummy (firm-level) in 2000
ONLY PRODUCT INN ONLY PROCESS INN	Internal R&D dummy (firm-level) in 2000 External R&D dummy (firm-level) in 2000

PRODUCT AND PROCESS	Training dummy (firm-level) in 2000
---------------------	-------------------------------------

First-stage regression (IV estimation, Table 7)

Table A.1. First-stage regression results			
Dependent variable	Onlyprod2000	Onlyproc2000	Bothinn2000
Size	-0.005	-0.04	0.067**
ln(employment) in 2000	[0.035]	[0.028]	[0.030]
Total factor productivity	-0.001	0.001	-0.001
Törnqvist index, logs, 2000	[0.001]	[0.001]	[0.001]
Internal R&D	0.231**	0.213**	0.143*
(Firm-level dummy, 2000)	[0.100]	[0.103]	[0.083]
External R&D	-0.105	-0.188	0.318**
(Firm-level dummy, 2000)	[0.145]	[0.138]	[0.125]
Training	0.107	0.153**	0.025
(Firm-level dummy, 2000)	[0.084]	[0.068]	[0.078]
Sector dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes
F-statistic	11.44	11.89	13.67
Number of observations	189	189	189

Results of first-stage regression of the IV estimation reported in the last column of Table 6. Reported values are coefficients [robust standard errors]. The dependent variables are the three innovation dummies (listed at the top of the column). Instruments are internal and external R&D dummy for 2000 and the training dummy, all observed at the firm level. Significance levels: *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$.

Table 1: Sector distribution			
<i>Sector</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Non-Exporters</i>	<i>Starters</i>
Mining (Nace 14)	2	1	1
Food, beverages and tobacco (Nace 15-16)	6	1	5
Textiles, clothing, leather (Nace 17-19)	6	2	4
Wood (products) (Nace 20)	3	1	2
Paper and publishing (Nace 21-22)	5	1	4
Fuel and chemicals (Nace 23-24)	5	1	4
Rubber and plastics (Nace 25)	4	1	3
Non-metallic minerals (Nace 26)	4	1	3
Basic and fabricated metals, machinery (Nace 27-29)	24	4	20
Electrical, optical, medical instruments (Nace 30-33)	3	1	2
Transport equipment, manufacturing n.e.c. (Nace 34-37)	9	6	3
Construction (Nace 45)	2	2	0
Wholesale and retail trade (Nace 50-52)	35	16	19
Transport and financial services (Nace 60-67)	40	30	10
Real estate and business services (Nace 70-74)	41	24	17
Total	189	92	97
The NACE (Rev. 1.1) classification is the official sector classification used by the European Union. The full classification can be downloaded from the Eurostat Ramon server.			

Table 2: Comparing starters to non-exporters: Initial firm-level characteristics		
<i>Variable</i>	<i>Non-Exporters</i>	<i>Starters</i>
Number of firms	92	97
[Percentage of total]	[48.68%]	[51.32%]
Size	3.65	3.98***
(Employment, fte, 2000, logs)	[1.28]	[1.32]
Total factor productivity	-0.2	1.90*
(Törnqvist productivity index, 2000, logs)	[1.15]	[18.78]
<p>Reported values are means [standard deviations] in 2000 (except where the number of firms is reported). Starters are firms that start exporting in 2004, non-exporters do not export in 2000 and 2004. Significance levels (***) $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$) refer to a one-tailed test on the difference between the means for the starters compared to non-exporters. Variables are defined in Appendix A.</p>		

Table 3: Comparing starters to non-exporters: Innovation characteristics		
<i>Variable</i>	<i>Non-Exporters</i>	<i>Starters</i>
Number of firms (total)	92	97
Number of firms engaging in internal R&D	24	29
	[26.09%]	[29.90%]
Number of firms engaging in external R&D	7	13
	[7.61%]	[13.40%]
No. of firms introducing product innovation	30	56
	[32.61%]	[57.73%]
No. of firms introducing process innovation	24	48
	[26.09%]	[49.48%]
No. of firms introducing both product and process innovation	10	32
	[10.87%]	[32.99%]
<p>Reported values are number of observations [percentage of total number of firms in that column]. Starters are firms that start exporting in 2004, non-exporters do not export in 2000 and 2004. Variables are defined in Appendix A.</p>		

Table 4: Correlations innovation measures				
	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]
Internal R&D dummy	1			
External R&D dummy	0.4745	1		
Product innovation dummy	0.5176	0.3074	1	
Process innovation dummy	0.4805	0.3323	0.4428	1

Table 5: Regression results				
<i>Variables</i>	<i>Input measures</i>		<i>Output measures</i>	
	<i>Internal R&D dummy</i>	<i>External R&D dummy</i>	<i>Product innovation</i>	<i>Process innovation</i>
Size (Employment, fte, 2000, logs)	0.051* [0.031]	0.044 [0.031]	0.03 [[0.031]	0.031 [0.031]
Total factor productivity (Törnqvist productivity index, 2000, logs)	0.083** [0.036]	0.077** [0.035]	0.064* [0.035]	0.077** [0.036]
Innovation measure	-0.066 [0.100]	0.064 [0.131]	0.217*** [0.082]	0.185** [0.087]
Sector dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	189	189	189	189
Pseudo R-square	0.166	0.165	0.19	0.182

Each column reports results of a probit regression, where the dependent variable is the probability to start exporting in 2004. Each column includes a different innovation dummy as independent variable (listed at the top of the column), in addition to size, productivity and sector dummies. Reported values are marginal effects [robust standard errors], defined as the marginal probability change at the mean of the independent variable or the discrete change of a dummy variable from 0 to 1. Significance levels: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1. Variables are defined in Appendix A.

Table 6: Regression results					
<i>Variables</i>	<i>I</i>	<i>II</i>	<i>III</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>V</i>
Size	0.023	0.018	0.12	0.134	0.058
(Employment, fte, 2000, logs)	[0.032]	[0.033]	[0.129]	[0.133]	[0.108]
Total factor productivity	0.066*	0.068*	0.138	0.030***	0.115
(Törnqvist index, 2000, logs)	[0.036]	[0.036]	[0.119]	[0.009]	[0.085]
Product innovation (dummy, 2000)	0.175** [0.089]	-	-	-	-
Process innovation (dummy, 2000)	0.119 [0.096]	-	-	-	-
Only product innovation	-	0.101 [0.101]	0.334 [0.293]	-	-
Only process innovation	-	0.029 [0.123]	-	0.403 [0.378]	-
Product and process (dummy, 2000)	-	0.301*** [0.086]	-	-	0.945*** [0.305]
Sector dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	189	189	117	103	137
Pseudo R-square	0.196	0.201	0.189	0.136	0.203
<p>Each column reports results of a probit regression, where the dependent variable is the probability to start exporting in 2004. Each column includes a different innovation dummy as independent variable (listed at the top of the column), in addition to size, productivity and sector dummies. In the last three columns, the control group is composed of those firms that did not innovate in 2000. This results in a different number of observations for each regression. Reported values are marginal effects [robust standard errors], defined as the marginal probability change at the mean of the independent variable or the discrete change of a dummy variable from 0 to 1. Significance levels: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1.</p> <p>Variables are defined in Appendix A.</p>					

Table 7: Instrumental variables estimation					
<i>Variables</i>	<i>Baseline model LPM</i>	<i>Output measures</i>			
		<i>IV</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>IV</i>	<i>IV</i>
Size	0.008	0.041	0.058	0.054	0.077
(Employment, fte, 2000, logs)	[0.028]	[0.043]	[0.045]	[0.040]	[0.270]
Total factor productivity	0.003**	0.004**	0.006***	0.002	-0.004
(Törnqvist index, 2000, logs)	[0.001]	[0.002]	[0.001]	[0.001]	[0.018]
Only product innovation	0.107	0.076	-	-	-5.153
(dummy, 2000)	[0.096]	[0.215]			[14.535]
Only process innovation	0.036	-	-0.184	-	4.377
(dummy, 2000)	[0.120]		[0.317]		[12.142]
Product and process	0.275***	-	-	-0.006	1.207
(dummy, 2000)	[0.092]			[0.151]	[3.576]
Instruments (dummies, 2000)	-	External R&D Internal R&D Training	External R&D Internal R&D Training	External R&D Internal R&D Training	External R&D Internal R&D Training
Sargan-Hansen overidentification test (p-value)	-	0.2543	0.5723	0.5116	-
Kleibergen-Paap underidentification test (Chi ²)	-	16.10**	7.66*	34.36***	0.13
Anderson-Rubin weak instruments robust inference test (F)	-	1.57	0.46	0.40	1.12
Sector dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	189	117	103	137	189

With the exception of the first column, each column reports results of an instrumental variables regression, where the dependent variable is a dummy equal to one if the firm starts exporting in 2004. Each column includes different innovation dummies as independent variable (listed at the top of the column), in addition to size, productivity and sector dummies. The innovation variables are instrumented using the variables listed. The first column reports OLS results for the baseline model (column II in Table 6), no variables are instrumented. In the middle three columns, the control group is composed of those firms that did not innovate in 2000. This results in a different number of observations for each regression. Reported values are coefficients [robust standard errors]. Significance levels: *** p < 0.01, ** p < 0.05, * p < 0.1. Variables are defined in Appendix A. The null hypothesis of the Sargan-Hansen test is that the instruments are valid. For the Kleibergen-Paap test, the null hypothesis is that the model is underidentified (not of full rank). The null hypothesis of the Anderson-Rubin test is that the variables in the first stage are jointly significant and that the model is identified. The Sargan-Hansen test can only be performed when the model is over-identified, i.e. there are more instruments than endogenous regressors.

Recent titles

CORE Discussion Papers

- 2009/47. Ken-Ichi SHIMOMURA and Jacques-François THISSE. Competition among the big and the small.
- 2009/48. Frédéric BABONNEAU, Yurii NESTEROV and Jean-Philippe VIAL. Design and operations of gas transmission networks.
- 2009/49. Olivier BOS. How lotteries outperform auctions for charity.
- 2009/50. Nicolas BOCCARD and Xavier WAUTHY. Entry accommodation under multiple commitment strategies: judo economics revisited.
- 2009/51. Joachim GAHUNGU and Yves SMEERS. Multi-assets real options.
- 2009/52. Nicolas BOCCARD and Xavier WAUTHY. Regulating quality by regulating quantity: a case against minimum quality standards.
- 2009/53. David DE LA CROIX and Frédéric DOCQUIER. An incentive mechanism to break the low-skill immigration deadlock.
- 2009/54. Henry TULKENS and Vincent VAN STEENBERGHE. "Mitigation, adaptation, suffering": In search of the right mix in the face of climate change.
- 2009/55. Santanu S. DEY and Quentin LOUVEAUX. Split rank of triangle and quadrilateral inequalities.
- 2009/56. Claire DUJARDIN, Dominique PEETERS and Isabelle THOMAS. Neighbourhood effects and endogeneity issues.
- 2009/57. Marie-Louise LEROUX, Pierre PESTIEAU and Maria RACIONERO. Voting on pensions: sex and marriage.
- 2009/58. Jean J. GABSZEWICZ. A note on price competition in product differentiation models.
- 2009/59. Olivier BOS and Martin RANGER. All-pay auctions with endogenous rewards.
- 2009/60. Julio DAVILA and Marie-Louise LEROUX. On the fiscal treatment of life expectancy related choices.
- 2009/61. Luc BAUWENS and Jeroen V.K. ROMBOUTS. On marginal likelihood computation in change-point models.
- 2009/62. Jorge ALCALDE-UNZU and Elena MOLIS. Exchange of indivisible goods and indifferences: the Top Trading Absorbing Sets mechanisms.
- 2009/63. Pascal MOSSAY and Pierre M. PICARD. On spatial equilibria in a social interaction model.
- 2009/64. Laurence JACQUET and Dirk VAN DE GAER. A comparison of optimal tax policies when compensation or responsibility matter.
- 2009/65. David DE LA CROIX and Clara DELAVALLADE. Why corrupt governments may receive more foreign aid.
- 2009/66. Gilles GRANDJEAN, Ana MAULEON and Vincent VANNETELBOSCH. Strongly rational sets for normal-form games.
- 2009/67. Kristian BEHRENS, Susana PERALTA and Pierre M. PICARD. Transfer pricing rules, OECD guidelines, and market distortions.
- 2009/68. Marco MARINUCCI and Wouter VERGOTE. Endogenous network formation in patent contests and its role as a barrier to entry.
- 2009/69. Andréas HEINEN and Alfonso VALDESOGO. Asymmetric CAPM dependence for large dimensions: the Canonical Vine Autoregressive Model.
- 2009/70. Skerdilajda ZANAJ. Product differentiation and vertical integration in presence of double marginalization.
- 2009/71. Marie-Louise LEROUX and Grégory PONTIERE. Wives, husbands and wheelchairs: Optimal tax policy under gender-specific health.
- 2009/72. Yu. NESTEROV and Levent TUNCEL. Local quadratic convergence of polynomial-time interior-point methods for conic optimization problems.
- 2009/73. Grégory VANDENBULCKE, Claire DUJARDIN, Isabelle THOMAS, Bas DE GEUS, Bart DEGRAEUWE, Romain MEEUSEN and Luc INT PANIS. Cycle commuting in Belgium: Spatial determinants and 're-cycling' strategies.
- 2009/74. Noël BONNEUIL and Raouf BOUCEKKINE. Sustainability, optimality, and viability in the Ramsey model.

Recent titles

CORE Discussion Papers - continued

- 2009/75. Eric TOULEMONDE. The principle of mutual recognition – A source of divergence?
2009/76. David DE LA CROIX, Pierre PESTIEAU and Grégory PONTHIÈRE. How powerful is demography? The Serendipity Theorem revisited.
2009/77. Nicola ACOCELLA, Giovanni DI BARTOLOMEO, Andrew HUGUES HALLETT and Paolo G. PIACQUADIO. Announcement wars as an equilibrium selection device.
2009/78. Julio DÁVILA. The taxation of savings in overlapping generations economies with unbacked risky assets.
2009/79. Elena DEL REY and Miguel Angel LOPEZ-GARCIA. Optimal education and pensions in an endogenous growth model.
2009/80. Hiroshi UNO. Strategic complementarities and nested potential games.
2009/81. Xavier WAUTHY. Market coverage and the nature of product differentiation: a note.
2009/82. Filippo L. CALCIANO. Nash equilibria of games with increasing best replies.
2009/83. Jacques H. DRÈZE, Oussama LACHIRI and Enrico MINELLI. Stock prices, anticipations and investment in general equilibrium.
2009/84. Claire DUJARDIN and Florence GOFFETTE-NAGOT. Neighborhood effect on unemployment? A test *à la* Altonji.
2009/85. Erwin OOGHE and Erik SCHOKKAERT. School accountability: (how) can we reward schools and avoid cream-skimming.
2009/86. Ilke VAN BEVEREN and Hylke VANDENBUSSCHE. Product and process innovation and the decision to export: firm-level evidence for Belgium.

Books

- Public goods, environmental externalities and fiscal competition: 22 selected papers in public economics by Henry Tulkens*, edited and introduced by Parkash Chander, Jacques Drèze, C. Knox Lovell and Jack Mintz, Springer, Boston 2006 (588 pp.).
- V. GINSBURGH and D. THROSBY (eds.) (2006), *Handbook of the economics of art and culture*. Amsterdam, Elsevier.
- J. GABSZEWICZ (ed.) (2006), *La différenciation des produits*. Paris, La découverte.
- L. BAUWENS, W. POHLMEIER and D. VEREDAS (eds.) (2008), *High frequency financial econometrics: recent developments*. Heidelberg, Physica-Verlag.
- P. VAN HENTENRYCKE and L. WOLSEY (eds.) (2007), *Integration of AI and OR techniques in constraint programming for combinatorial optimization problems*. Berlin, Springer.
- P-P. COMBES, Th. MAYER and J-F. THISSE (eds.) (2008), *Economic geography: the integration of regions and nations*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- J. HINDRIKS (ed.) (2008), *Au-delà de Copernic: de la confusion au consensus ?* Brussels, Academic and Scientific Publishers.
- J-M. HURIOT and J-F. THISSE (eds) (2009), *Economics of cities*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

CORE Lecture Series

- C. GOURIÉROUX and A. MONFORT (1995), *Simulation Based Econometric Methods*.
- A. RUBINSTEIN (1996), *Lectures on Modeling Bounded Rationality*.
- J. RENEGAR (1999), *A Mathematical View of Interior-Point Methods in Convex Optimization*.
- B.D. BERNHEIM and M.D. WHINSTON (1999), *Anticompetitive Exclusion and Foreclosure Through Vertical Agreements*.
- D. BIENSTOCK (2001), *Potential function methods for approximately solving linear programming problems: theory and practice*.
- R. AMIR (2002), *Supermodularity and complementarity in economics*.
- R. WEISMANTEL (2006), *Lectures on mixed nonlinear programming*.