

WORKING PAPER

**Exports and Profitability –
First Evidence for German Manufacturing Firms**

by
Helmut Fryges and Joachim Wagner

University of Lüneburg
Working Paper Series in Economics

No. 102

October 2008

www.leuphana.de/vwl/papers

ISSN 1860 - 5508

Exports and Profitability – First Evidence for German Manufacturing Firms

Helmut Fryges * and Joachim Wagner **

October 20, 2008

Abstract:

Using unique recently released nationally representative high-quality longitudinal data at the enterprise level for Germany, this paper presents the first comprehensive evidence on the relationship between exports and profitability. It documents that the positive profitability differential of exporters compared to non-exporters is statistically significant, though rather small, when observed firm characteristics and unobserved firm specific effects are controlled for. In contrast to nearly all empirical studies on the relationship between productivity and exports we do not find any evidence for self-selection of more profitable firms into export markets. Due to the sampling frame of the data used we cannot test the hypothesis that firms which start exporting perform better in the years after the start than their counterparts which do not start. Instead, we use a newly developed continuous treatment approach and show that exporting improves the profitability almost over the whole range of the export-sales ratio. Only firms that generate 90 percent and more of their total sales abroad do not benefit from exporting in terms of an increased rate of profit. This means, that the usually observed higher productivity of exporters is not completely absorbed by the extra costs of exporting or by higher wages paid by internationally active firms.

Keywords: exports, profitability, micro data, Germany

JEL classification: F14, D21

* Helmut Fryges, ZEW Centre for European Economic Research, Department of Industrial Economics and International Management, P.O. Box 10 34 43, D-68034 Mannheim, Germany
Phone: +49-621-1235-189, Fax: +49-621-1235-170, e-mail: fryges@zew.de, <http://www.zew.de>

** **Corresponding author:** Prof. Dr. Joachim Wagner, University of Lueneburg, Institute of Economics
PO Box 2440, D-21314 Lueneburg, Germany
Phone: +49-4131-677-2330, Fax: +49-4131-677-2026, e-mail: wagner@uni-lueneburg.de
<http://www.uni-lueneburg.de/fb2/vwl/wifo>

Acknowledgement: All computations for this study were done inside the Research Data Centre of the Statistical Office of Berlin. A first version of this paper was presented at the workshop of the International Study Group on Exports and Productivity at Nottingham University in February 2008. Furthermore, this paper was presented at the Applied Micro Workshop at Pennsylvania State University in September 2008, while Helmut Fryges was visiting Penn State University during the fall semester 2008. Helpful suggestions by Mark Roberts, James Tybout and other participants of the Applied Micro Workshop are highly acknowledged.

1. Motivation

A huge and emerging literature on the micro-econometrics of international trade demonstrates that exporting firms are more productive than otherwise identical firms that sell on the national market only (see Bernard et al. (2007) for the U.S., Mayer and Ottaviano (2007) for European countries, Wagner (2007a) for a survey of studies from countries all over the world, and The International Study Group on Exports and Productivity (2008) for strictly comparable results from 14 countries). Exporting firms have to bear extra costs due to, among others, market research, adoption of products to local regulations, or transport costs. These extra costs are one reason for a self-selection of the more productive firms on international markets. Furthermore, exporting firms tend to pay higher wages than non-exporting firms (see Schank, Schnabel and Wagner (2007) for a survey). Germany, one of the leading actors on the world market for goods, is a case in point: After controlling for observable and unobservable firm characteristics, productivity is significantly and substantially higher in exporting than in non-exporting firms (Wagner 2007b), and compared to identical non-exporting firms exporting firms pay significantly and substantially higher wages to workers with the same observable and unobservable characteristics (Schank, Schnabel and Wagner 2007).

A question that has (to the best of our knowledge) not been investigated in this literature is whether the productivity advantage of exporting firms does lead to a profitability advantage of exporters compared to otherwise identical non-exporters even when exporters are facing extra costs and pay higher wages. Profitability is a performance dimension that is not investigated empirically in the literature dealing

with the micro-econometrics of international trade (see the recent survey papers by Bernard et al. (2007) and by Mayer and Ottaviano (2007)).¹

The situation differs when the literature on international management is considered. Here empirical investigations of the relationship between internationalisation (measured by the percentage of exports in total sales, or by various other indicators including foreign assets to total assets, or the number of foreign subsidiaries) and firm performance (measured by various accounting indicators like return on assets, or return on equity) have a long tradition lasting at least 40 years. This literature has produced a great number of studies based on various methods. Glaum and Oesterle (2007, p. 308) recently argued that these empirical studies have come to heterogeneous and sometimes contradictory results. Similarly, Ruigrok, Amann and Wagner (2007, p. 350) state that the findings generated by this research stream have been inconclusive and contradictory. In a meta-analysis that covers 36 studies Bausch and Krist (2007) find a positive and statistically significant overall relationship between internationalisation and firm performance, although the effect size is small in magnitude. Furthermore, they find evidence that this relationship is highly context-dependent, and that R&D intensity, product diversification, country of origin, firm age, and firm size significantly affect performance gains attributable to internationalisation (see Bausch and Krist (2007), p. 337).

Given that the samples used in these studies from the literature on international management tend to be small cross-section samples that do not allow to control for unobserved heterogeneity by including fixed firm effects, and that various measures of both internationalisation and performance are used (see Bausch and

¹ Note that the recent paper by Asiedu and Freeman (2007) has a different focus – it examines the within-region effect of globalisation, i.e. the extent to which the level of globalisation in the region in which a firm operates affects its performance.

Krist (2007), p. 332), we cannot find an answer to our question – whether the productivity advantage of exporting firms does lead to a profitability advantage of exporters compared to otherwise identical non-exporters even when exporters are facing extra costs and pay higher wages – from this literature.

This paper contributes to the literature by using unique recently released nationally representative high-quality longitudinal data for German enterprises to conduct the first comprehensive empirical study on the relationship between exports and profitability. We document a positive profitability differential of exporters compared to non-exporters that is statistically significant, though rather small, when observed firm characteristics and unobserved firm specific effects are controlled for. In contrast to nearly all empirical studies on the relationship between productivity and exports we do not find any evidence for self-selection of more profitable firms into export markets. Due to the sampling frame of the data used we cannot test the hypothesis that firms which start exporting perform better in the years after the start than their counterparts which do not start. Instead, we use a newly developed continuous treatment approach and show that exporting improves the profitability almost over the whole range of the export-sales ratio. This means, that the usually observed higher productivity of exporters is not completely absorbed by the extra costs of exporting or by higher wages paid by internationally active firms. This evidence presented here for Germany, a leading actor on the world market for manufactured goods, is interesting on its own, and it can serve as a benchmark for future studies using comparable data from other countries.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows: Section 2 introduces the newly available data set. Section 3 presents results from descriptive comparisons of exporting and non-exporting firms. Section 4 reports estimations of exporter profitability premia after controlling for observed and unobserved differences between

exporters and non-exporters. Section 5 investigates the causal effect of exporting on profitability using the recently developed generalised propensity score (GPS) methodology.

2. Data

The data used in this study are merged from two surveys conducted by the German Statistical Offices. One source is a monthly report for establishments in manufacturing industries that covers all local production units that have at least 20 employees itself or that belong to an enterprise with a total of at least 20 employees. Information from the monthly surveys is either summed up for a year, or average values for a year are computed, and a panel data set is build from annual data. A detailed description of these data is given in Konold (2007). For this project the information collected at the establishment level has been aggregated at the enterprise level to match the unit of observation from the second source of data used here, the cost structure survey for enterprises in the manufacturing sector. This survey is carried out annually as a representative random sample survey (stratified according to the number of employees and the industries) of around 18.000 enterprises. While all enterprises with 500 or more employees are included in each survey, a stratified random sample of smaller firms with 20 to 499 employees is drawn that remains in the survey sample for four years in succession and that is replaced by a new stratified random sample afterwards. Therefore, data from the cost structure survey can be used to build an unbalanced panel containing all enterprises with at least 500 employees (in a year) plus a sample of smaller firms with a rotating panel design. A detailed description of the cost structure survey can be found in Fritsch et al. (2004).

Data from the two sources are matched using the enterprise identifier available in both surveys. The resulting panel used in this study covers the years from 1999 to 2004.² These data are confidential but not exclusive. They can be used by researchers on a contractual basis via controlled remote data access inside the research data centres of the German Statistical Offices (see Zühlke et al. (2004) for details).³

3. Descriptive analysis

As a first step in our empirical investigation we compare the profitability of exporting and non-exporting firms. Information on exports is based on data taken from the monthly report for establishments in manufacturing industries, and an enterprise is considered to be an exporter in a year if at least one of its establishments (or, in case of single-establishment enterprises, the enterprise itself) reported a positive amount of sales to a customer in a foreign country or to a German export trading company. Using information from the cost structure surveys, the rate of profit of a firm is computed as a rate of return, defined as gross firm surplus (computed as gross value added at factor costs – gross wages and salaries – costs for social insurance paid by the firm) divided by total sales (net of VAT) minus net change of inventories.⁴

² The data are available for 1995 to 2004. Due to the introduction of a new industry classification new samples were drawn after two years in 1997 and in 1999. This leads to a highly unbalanced panel when data for 1995 to 2004 are used (see Brandt et al. (2008), p. 221), and these data are not useful for the empirical investigation performed here. Furthermore, information on employees in R&D is available from 1999 onwards only.

³ To facilitate replication the Stata do-files used in the computations are available from the authors upon request.

⁴ Note that the data set does not have any information on the capital stock, or the sum of assets or equity, of the firm, so that it is not possible to construct profit indicators based thereon like return on assets or return on equity.

Our profit measure is a measure for the price-cost margin which, under competitive conditions, should on average equal the required rental on assets employed per money unit of sales (see Schmalensee (1989), p. 960f.). Differences in profitability between firms, therefore, can follow from productivity differences, but also from different mark-ups of prices over costs and from differences in the capital intensity. Given that our data set does not have information on the capital stock employed by the firms in our econometric investigations we control for differences in the capital intensity by including a complete set of industry dummy variables at the most disaggregated (4-digit) level.

Table 1 reports the mean and selected percentiles of the distribution of the rate of profit for exporting and non-exporting enterprises for each year between 1999 and 2004. The mean and the median is higher for exporters compared to non-exporters in every year, and with the exception of the first percentile in three of the six years this holds for the other percentiles of the distribution of the rate of profit reported here, too.

[Table 1 and Table 2 near here]

According to the results from a t-test (that does not assume equal variances for both groups of enterprises) reported in Table 2 the difference in the mean value is highly statistically significant in five years. Note, however, that this difference in the rate of profit is rather small; it rarely exceeds one percentage point with a mean of the rate of profit for exporters around 12 percent.

If one looks at differences in the mean value for two groups only, one focuses on just one moment of the profitability distribution. A stricter test that considers all moments is a test for stochastic dominance of the profitability distribution for one group over the profitability distribution for another group. More formally, let F and G denote the cumulative distribution functions of profitability for exporters and for non-

exporters. Then first order stochastic dominance of F relative to G means that $F(z) - G(z)$ must be less or equal zero for all values of z , with strict inequality for some z . Whether this holds or not is tested non-parametrically by adopting the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (see Conover (1999), p. 456ff.). Furthermore, exporters and non-exporters are not equally distributed over the industries, and the level of the rate of profit might vary across industries due to, for example, differences in the degree of competition or regulation. To control for the different industries, for the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test the rate of profit of a firm is calculated as the deviation from the mean value in the 4-digit industry.

The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is used here to test three hypotheses, i.e., that the distributions of the rate of profit are different for exporting and non-exporting enterprises, that the distribution of the rate of profit for exporting enterprises first order stochastically dominates the distribution of the rate of profit for non-exporting enterprises, and that distribution of the rate of profit for non-exporting firms first order stochastically dominates the distribution of the rate of profit for exporting firms. Results reported in Table 2 show that the first two hypotheses cannot be rejected at a five percent level, while the third hypothesis is clearly rejected.

A comparison of the rate of profit between exporting and non-exporting firms neglects that exporters distinguish from each other with respect to the share of total sales they generate abroad (the so-called export-sales ratio or export intensity). Fryges and Wagner (2008) showed that the relationship between labour productivity growth and the export-sales ratio is nonlinear. Thus, it can be expected that similar to the relationship between the export-sales ratio and labour productivity growth the firms' profitability also varies between firms with different export intensities. Table 3 displays the rate of profit for enterprises within different classes of the export-sales ratio. The descriptive results demonstrate that enterprises that exhibit a higher

export-sales ratio tend to have higher levels of the rate of profit. However, for all years covered by our data set the mean profitability of firms that export only a small share of their total sales (less than 5 percent) falls below that of non-exporting firms. For the two years 1999 and 2004, firms that export more than 5 percent and not more than 10 percent of their total sales also show a mean rate of profit smaller than the comparable rate of non-exporting firms. Enterprises with an export-sales ratio of more than 10 percent exhibit a rate of profit that, on average, exceeds the profitability of firms without any exports and that increases with the export intensity. Moreover, Table 3 shows that the standard deviation of the rate of profit also tends to increase with the export-sales ratio. In four out of six years in our sample the first percentile of the rate of profit of those enterprises that sell more than half of their total sales abroad is smaller than the first percentile of non-exporters. This points out that intense export activities are not only associated with a higher mean rate of profit but also with a higher risk of losses.

[Table 3 near here]

The results from the descriptive comparison of exporters and non-exporters reported here indicate that exporting enterprises are more profitable than non-exporting enterprises not only on average but over the whole distribution of the rate of profit. The statistically significant difference, however, is small from an economic point of view. Moreover, the rate of profit tends to increase with the firms export-sales ratio. However, firms that export only a very small share of their total sales exhibit a rate of profit that falls below that of non-exporting firms.⁵

⁵ Results reported in the appendix in Tables A.1, A.2 and A.3 show that the exclusion of the enterprises with the one percent lowest and highest values for the rate of profit leads to the same conclusions.

4. Exporter profitability premia

The next step in our empirical investigation consists of the estimation of so-called exporter profitability premia that indicate the ceteris paribus difference in profitability between exporting and non-exporting enterprises, controlling for other characteristics of the enterprises. In analogy with the now standard approach in the micro-econometric literature on exports and productivity (see The International Study Group on Exports and Productivity (2008)) pooled data are used to regress the rate of profit on the export activity of the enterprise plus a set of control variables including firm size (measured as the number of employees and its squared value), share of employees in R&D, and a full set of interaction terms of the year of observation and the 4-digit industry the enterprise is active in.⁶

Export activity of an enterprise is measured in four different ways, i.e. by a dummy variable that takes on the value of one if an enterprise is an exporter (and zero otherwise), by the share of exports in total sales, by the share of exports in total sales and its squared value, and by the share of exports in total sales plus its squared and its cubic value. While the dummy variable for exporting firms tests for the presence or not of an exporter profitability premium per se, the estimated coefficient of the share of exports in total sales shows whether or not this premium increases with an increase in the relative importance of exports for an enterprise. The quadratic terms test for the presence or not of a so-called threshold of internationalisation – whether the positive effects vanish and become even negative

⁶ The set of control variables used is motivated by the evidence reported by Bausch and Krist (2007, p. 337) from their meta-analysis of results from the literature in international management. The authors find that the relationship between firm performance and internationalisation is highly context-dependent, and that R&D intensity, product diversification, country of origin, firm age, and firm size significantly affect performance gains attributable to internationalisation. While country of origin does not matter in our study using data for Germany only, information on firm age and product diversification in exporting is not available in the data at hand.

when the optimal share of exports in total sales is exceeded because increasing costs of exporting exceed the extra benefits. The cubic term tests for an s-shaped relationship between profitability and the share of exports in total sales that is suggested in recent studies from the international management literature.⁷

Results for empirical models using pooled data without fixed enterprise effects are reported in columns 1 to 4 of Table 4. According to the results in column 1 exporting firms have a rate of profit that is one percentage point higher *ceteris paribus* than in non-exporting firms (a difference that matches the order of magnitude showing up in the descriptive analysis that does not control for firm size, R&D intensity, and industry and time effects reported in Table 1), and from column 3 we see that the pattern of the relationship between export intensity and profitability is inversely u-shaped with an estimated maximum at a level of exports to sales of 65 percent. According to column 4, there is no evidence for an s-shaped relationship.⁸

When unobserved firm heterogeneity is controlled for by including fixed enterprise effects a different picture emerges. From column 5 we see that exporting *per se* is not accompanied by higher profits – the estimated coefficient of the exporter dummy variable is statistically insignificant at any conventional level. Column 6 shows that there is a statistically significant relationship of exporting and profitability that increases with a rise in the share of exports in total sales. According to this result, an increase in the exports to sales ratio of ten percentage points is accompanied by an increase in the profit rate by 0.3 percentage points. Therefore, a

⁷ See Contractor (2007) for a discussion of this s-shaped relationship in a longitudinal perspective that investigates the relationship between internationalisation and performance when a firm increases its international activities over time.

⁸ The conclusions are identical when the enterprises with the one percent lowest and highest values for the rate of profit were excluded from the calculations; see Table A.4, columns 1 to 4, in the appendix. Descriptive statistics for the samples used in the regressions for Tables 4 and A.4 are reported in Table A.5 in the appendix.

firm that exports 50 percent of its products has on average a rate of profit that is 1.5 percentage points higher than a firm from the same industry and size, and with the same share of employees in R&D, that does not export at all.⁹

[Table 4 near here]

According to the results reported in columns 1 to 4 compared to the results given in columns 5 to 8 in Table 4 unobserved enterprise characteristics that are correlated with the level of export activity of the firm do matter.¹⁰ This leads to the conclusion that exporting *per se* is not positively related to profitability. Therefore, the results reported in columns 1 to 4 should be interpreted in a way that the positive effect of the export activities on profitability encompasses the influence of unobserved firm characteristics that are correlated with firms' export activities.

The exporter premia detected by estimating regression models using pooled data for exporters and non-exporters cannot be interpreted as indicators for a positive causal effect of exporting on profitability. On the one hand, it might well be the case that there is self-selection of more productive and, net of any higher costs related to exporting, more profitable firms into exporting. On the other hand, exporting might increase profitability by learning from foreign customers and competitors, by realising scale effect on markets larger than the national market, or by earning monopoly rents from firm specific advantages on more than one market. Obviously, for any given firm both directions of causality might be important.

⁹ From the models with fixed enterprise effects we do not have any evidence that the relationship between the share of exports in total sales and profitability is nonlinear. While the estimated coefficient for the quadratic term in column 7 and for the cubic term in column 8 are both statistically different from zero at an error level of five percent (pointing to non-linearity), this does not hold when the enterprises with the one percent lowest and highest values for the rate of profit were excluded from the calculations; see Table A.4, columns 7 and 8, in the appendix.

¹⁰ These characteristics may include such factors as the age of the firm, the geographical scope of exports, financial constraints, or the degree of risk aversion and international orientation of the managers.

Again following the now standard approach in the micro-econometric literature on exports and productivity (see The International Study Group on Exports and Productivity (2008)) the next step in our empirical investigation, therefore, consists in testing whether we can document any self-selection of more profitable firms into exporting. To do so, we identify a group of firms that did not export over a time span of the three years $t-3$ to $t-1$. Some of these firms started to export in year t (these are called export starters of cohort t), some did not (these are called non-starters of cohort t). We then compare the export starters and the non-starters of cohort t

- in the year t
- three years back in year $t-3$.

Given that our data set covers the year 1999 to 2004, we can investigate three cohorts for $t = 2002, 2003, \text{ and } 2004$. Results are reported in Table 5. It turns out that export starters are not more profitable than non-starters in t , the year of start. For the cohort 2002 we even have (although somewhat weak) evidence from both the t -test and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test that the non-starters have a higher level of the rate of profit than the starters.

The ex-ante profitability premia in year $t-3$ is the estimated regression coefficient of a dummy variable (taking the value one for export starters in t , and zero for non-starters) from an OLS-regression of the rate of profit in $t-3$ on this dummy, controlling for firm size (number of employees and number of employees squared), share of employees in R&D, and the 4-digit industry, all measured in year $t-3$.¹¹ This coefficient is never significantly different from zero. Therefore, we conclude that in contrast to nearly all empirical studies on the relationship between productivity and exports we have no evidence for self-selection of more profitable firms into exporting.

¹¹ At first sight it might confuse that we regress the rate of profit in $t-3$ on a dummy variable measured later in year t . Note, however, that this regression is not meant to “explain” past profits by today’s exports – it is just a way to test whether or not profits did differ between today’s starters and today’s non-exporters three years before the start.

However, as a caveat we add that the number of starters in the cohorts tends to be small, and that this may contribute to imprecise estimates of any profitability differences.

[Table 5 near here]

When the rate of profit between exporting and non-exporting firms does differ at a point in time – and this is the case according to both the descriptive evidence reported in section 3 and the results of the econometric investigation presented in Table 4 – and when there is no evidence for self-selection of more profitable firms into export activities, this points to positive effects of exporting on the rate of profit. However, due to the sampling frame of the data used we cannot test the hypothesis that firms which start exporting perform better in the years after the start than their counterparts which do not start. As pointed out in section 2, the cost structure survey that is the basis for the computation of the profit rate is a survey based on a stratified random sample with a rotating panel design, and all but the largest firms with 500 and more employees in the sample usually are replaced every four years. Therefore, it is not possible to follow the cohorts of starters from 2002 or 2003 over the next year(s).

5. Causal effect of exports on profitability

In the last step of our analysis we examine whether there is a causal effect of a firm's export activity on its rate of profit. As stated in the previous section, we cannot evaluate post-entry differences in profitability between export starters and non-starters due to the panel design of the German cost structure survey. Nonetheless, the question of whether exports improve profitability is crucial for our analysis. Since we demonstrated that there is no evidence for self-selection of more profitable firms into the export market, the absence of a causal effect of exports on profitability would

suggest that a firm's international business activities and its rate of profit are unrelated. In this case, exporting may result in a higher labour productivity but this increase is then completely absorbed by higher wages and higher costs related to exporting.

The hypothesis of a positive causal effect of exporting on profitability is tested using a newly developed econometric technique, the generalised propensity score (GPS) methodology recently developed by Imbens (2000) and Hirano and Imbens (2004). The GPS methodology was introduced to the literature examining the export-performance relationship by Fryges (2008) and applied by Fryges and Wagner (2008) who estimated the relationship between exports and labour productivity growth using a sample of German manufacturing firms.

The GPS methodology has a number of advantages compared to other econometric techniques. Firstly, the GPS method allows for continuous treatment, i.e., different levels of the firms' export-sales ratio. In this way, we are able to determine the causal relationship between profitability and the export-sales ratio (the treatment) at each value of firms' export intensity in the interval from zero to one. Thus, the second important advantage of the GPS method is that it enables us to identify the entire function of the rate of profit over all possible values of the continuous treatment variable. This property of the GPS methodology might be important in our case. The OLS regression of the determinants of the rate of profit in Table 4 pointed out that there might be a nonlinear relationship between profitability and the share of exports in total sales – at least if we restrict ourselves on the estimations without unobserved heterogeneity. Fryges and Wagner (2008) showed that the relationship between the export-sales ratio and labour productivity growth is nonlinear and that exporting causally affects labour productivity growth only within a sub-interval of the domain of the share of exports in total sales. The GPS

methodology is flexible allowing to test how the causal impact of exporting on profits varies along the range of the export-sales ratio from zero to one.

Thirdly, the continuous treatment approach allows us to analyse the level of the export intensity at which profitability is maximised (or minimised) or whether the relationship between the export-sales ratio and the rate of profit exhibits turning points or discontinuities (cf. Flores 2004). A detailed description of the GPS methodology is presented in appendix A.1.

Using the GPS methodology, we do not compare export starters versus non-starters. Export starters that have entered the foreign market during the previous year generally show a very small export-sales ratio. Thus, restricting the analysis to export starters precludes a reliable estimation of the causal effect of medium-sized and large export-sales ratios on profitability. Our causal analysis in this section therefore includes export starters as well as firms that export for decades. In this way, the GPS method is an appropriate econometric technique that provides an analysis of the causal effect of exporting on profitability despite, due to data restrictions, we cannot follow cohorts of starters over the next years after foreign market entry.

Hirano and Imbens (2004) suggest a three-stage approach to implement the GPS method. In the first stage, the conditional distribution of the treatment variable given the covariates is estimated. In our case, the distribution of the treatment variable, i.e. the export-sales ratio, is highly skewed. In particular, it has many limit observations at the value zero, representing firms without any exports. The latter group of firms decided that their optimal volume of exports was zero. Following Wagner (2001, 2003), we apply the fractional logit model developed by Papke and Wooldridge (1996) to estimate the export intensity of the firms in our sample.¹² In the second stage of the GPS method the conditional expectation of outcome (rate of

¹² Hirano and Imbens (2004) use a normal distribution for (the logarithm of) the treatment variable of their model. However, they emphasise that more general models may be considered.

profit in our case) is modelled as a function of the treatment and the (estimated) generalised propensity score. In the last stage, we estimate a dose-response function that depicts the conditional expectation of profitability given the continuous treatment (export-sales ratio) and the GPS, evaluated at any level of the continuous treatment variable in the interval from zero to one.

As stated above, we first estimate the conditional distribution of the export-sales ratio given the covariates, applying the fractional logit model. The exogenous covariates of the fractional logit model include firm size (measured as the log of number of employees and its squared value), the log of wages and salaries per employee, the share of employees in R&D, and the log of the firms' lagged labour productivity (measured as sales per employee in $t-1$). The average wage per employee is used to proxy differences in firms' human capital. A firm with a highly qualified human capital and with extensive R&D activities is likely to generate intangible assets (e.g., a technologically superior product) leading to a competitive advantage of the firm over its (international) rivals and enabling the firm to realise a high export intensity. The lagged labour productivity is included as a covariate in order to account for self-selection of more productive firms into the international market. While we did not find any evidence for a self-selection effect of more profitable firms (see section 4), most studies in the literature confirm the self-selection hypothesis of firms with higher labour productivity (cf. Wagner (2007a) for a survey and The International Study Group on Exports and Productivity (2008) for an international comparison). Thus, firms with a higher labour productivity in $t-1$ are expected to generate a higher share of total sales abroad. The set of covariates finally contains a full set of interaction terms of the year of observation and the 4-digit industry the enterprise is active in.

The results of the fractional logit model are presented in Table 6. Firm size has a significantly positive effect on the export-sales ratio. The significantly negative sign of the squared value of the number of employees, however, shows the familiar picture that the export-sales ratio tends to increase with firm size at a decreasing rate.¹³ As hypothesised, firms with a higher average wage per employee and a higher share of employees in R&D realise a higher export intensity, reflecting the importance of a firm's intangible assets by which a firm is able to create a competitive advantage over its international rivals. The lagged labour productivity is also positively correlated with the share of exports in total sales: Firms that exhibited a higher labour productivity in the past are able to bear the additional costs of exporting and to extend their international business activities. It can also be argued that more productive firms have a competitive advantage when compared with their (foreign) counterparts. Thus, more productive firms are more likely to generate a higher share of total sales abroad.

[Table 6 near here]

The fractional logit model is estimated in order to calculate the generalised propensity score (GPS). As Imbens (2000) shows, adjusting for the GPS removes all the bias associated with differences in covariates between treated (exporting) and non-treated (non-exporting) firms. This allows us to identify a possibly causal influence of the export-sales ratio on profitability. This is done by calculating pairwise treatment effects: we compare the expected rate of profit at one deliberately chosen export-sales ratio with the estimated value of profitability at another deliberately chosen export intensity. If the difference in these two expected rates of profits is

¹³ The negative sign of the squared value of the number of employees actually points out to an inversely u-shaped relationship between the export-sales ratio and the number of employees. However, the estimated maximum of this relationship lies at 3,148 employees. Since only few firms in Germany (less than one percent) have a number of employees that exceeds the estimated maximum, our results should better be interpreted to indicate that the export-sales ratio increases with firm size but with a decreasing rate.

significantly positive (negative) a hypothetical switch between the two deliberately chosen export-sales ratios at which the rate of profit is measured increases (decreases) firms' profitability. Since the GPS methodology controls for differences in covariates, the increase (decrease) in the rate of profit can be interpreted as a causal effect of the varying export-sales ratio on profitability (see appendix A.1 for more details). The dose-response function that represents the expected profitability conditional on the export-sales ratio and the GPS is depicted in Figure 1.

[Figure 1 near here]

Overall, the estimated dose-response function shows an inversely u-shaped relationship between profitability and firms' export-sales ratio. The maximum value of the rate of profit is reached at an export-sales ratio of 49 percent, where the expected value of the rate of profit amounts to 13.5 percent. Establishments that do not export show an expected rate of profit of 11.2 percent. Calculating the pairwise treatment effect reveals that at an export-sales ratio of 49 percent profitability is significantly larger than at an export intensity of zero (p-value: 0.000). In other words, at an export-sales ratio of 49 percent a firm's export activities have a causal effect on the rate of profit. The difference in the expected rate of profit accounts for 2.3 percentage points.

In order to find out whether profitability is positively improved by a firm's export activities over the whole range of the export-sales ratio or whether the effect is restricted to a sub-interval of the domain of the share of exports in total sales, we calculated pairwise treatment effects at each export intensity from one to 100 percent, always comparing the expected value of the rate of profit in the case of exporting with the respective value of non-exporting firms. According to conventional t-tests at the 5 percent level of significance, exporting increases profitability almost over the whole range of the export-sales ratio. Even firms that generate a very small

share of their total sales in the international market do show a rate of profit that exceeds that of non-exporting firms.¹⁴ This result corresponds to that obtained by Fryges and Wagner (2008) who demonstrate that exporting increases labour productivity growth even for firms with very small export-sales ratios. Thus, learning from foreign customers and competitors is relevant and the positive effect of learning-by-exporting is not completely absorbed, e.g. by higher wages or by the costs of entry into a foreign market, even if firms carry out only limited export activities.¹⁵

As already discussed above, the rate of profit is maximised at an export-sales ratio of 49 percent. Beyond this threshold of internationalisation, firms exhibit a decrease in profitability compared to firms with lower export intensities. This decrease might be a result of additional costs of exporting, for instance due to rising costs of coordination and control of a firm's export activities or higher transportation costs due to the increasing geographical distance of the foreign markets a firm has entered. Nevertheless, the rate of profit for firms of which the export intensity exceeds the threshold of internationalisation is still significantly higher than the profitability of non-exporting firms – provided that the firms realise an export-sales ratio of less than 90 percent. Firms that generate an export intensity of at least 90 percent do not benefit from a higher rate of profit if compared with non-exporting firms. Thus, there is a sub-interval of the domain of the export-sales ratio where exporting does not significantly improve profitability. However, there are only very few exporters in our sample (less than three percent) that realise an export intensity that

¹⁴ Firms that realise an export intensity of only one percent do not show a significantly positive effect of exporting on profitability.

¹⁵ As discussed in section 2, differences in the rate of profit might also be explained by varying mark-ups of prices over costs. Firms that possess a competitive advantage over their (international) rivals, due to, for instance, intense R&D activities or a highly qualified human capital, might be able to realise a higher mark-up. However, differences in profitability that result from intense R&D activities or a highly qualified human capital (and consequently from a higher mark-up) have been eliminated since we included these variables in the vector of covariates of the fractional logit model estimated in the first step of GPS methodology. Thus, the different rates of profit depicted by the estimated dose-response function can primarily be interpreted as an effect of differences in labour productivity resulting from learning-by-exporting.

lies in the range between 90 and 100 percent. Therefore, we can conclude that almost all exporters in the German manufacturing sector benefit from their international business activities in terms of an increased rate of profit.

The results we obtained in this section are very similar to those described in section 4. At least the estimation results without fixed enterprise effects as reported in columns 1 to 4 of Table 4 show an inversely u-shaped relationship between profitability and the export-sales ratio. Based on the results in Table 4, the estimated threshold value of internationalisation amounts to 65 percent whereas according to the estimated dose-response function the rate of profit reaches its maximum at an export-sales ratio of 49 percent. According to the results in section 4, the difference in profitability between exporting and non-exporting firms is rather small. The analysis based on the estimated dose-response function can confirm this result: the maximum difference in the rate of profit is 2.3 percentage points. The advantage of the continuous treatment approach applied in the section is that we can prove that differences in profitability are caused by differences in the share of exports in total sales. Furthermore, the dose-response function shows that firms with very high export intensities do not benefit from their export activities – at least not in terms of an increase in the rate of profit.

6. Conclusion

The relationship between productivity and a firm's export activities has been studied extensively in the literature on the micro-econometrics of international trade. Stylised facts point out that exporting firms exhibit a higher productivity and higher wages. Econometric analyses proved that there is a self-selection of the more productive firms into the international market. A question that has not been investigated so far is whether the productivity advantage of exporting firms does lead to a profitability

advantage of exporters compared to non-exporting firms even when exporters are facing extra costs and pay higher wages.

Looking at profitability instead of productivity is more appropriate from a theoretical point of view, too. Even if productivity and profitability are positively correlated (which tends to be the case) productivity is, as was recently pointed out by Foster, Haltiwanger and Syverson (2008, p. 395), only one of several possible idiosyncratic factors that determine profits. Success of firms in general, and especially survival, depends on profitability. Often profitability is viewed both in theoretical models of market selection and in empirical studies on firm entry and exit as a positive monotonic function of productivity, and selection on profits then is equivalent to selection on productivity. In empirical studies the use of productivity instead of profitability is usually due to the fact that productivity is easily observed in the data sets at hand while profitability is not. Fortunately, our data set is rich enough to allow to measure profitability.

Our findings illustrate that using profitability sheds new light on the relationship between exports and firm performance. Using a unique recently released data set on German manufacturing firms, we demonstrate that exporters show a positive profitability differential compared to non-exporters and that this differential is statistically significant, though rather small. However, in contrast to nearly all empirical studies on the relationship between productivity and exports we find no evidence for self-selection of more profitable firms into export activities. Conversely, exporting has a positive causal effect on profitability almost over the whole domain of the export-sales ratio from zero to one. The only exceptions are firms that realise an export-sales ratio of 90 percent and more.

The maximisation of the rate of profit is one of the main objectives of a firm. This paper shows that exporting leads to a higher rate of profit. This means that the

higher productivity usually observed in the group of exporting firms is not completely absorbed by higher wages and higher costs related to exporting. However, the positive effect of exporting on profitability varies along the range of the export-sales ratio. The effect reaches its maximum for firms that generate 49 percent of their total sales abroad and it is zero for firms with very high export intensities. As a rule, therefore, we conclude that exporting pays for German manufacturing firms.

References

- Asiedu, Elizabeth and James A. Freeman (2007), The Effect of Globalization on the Performance of Small- and Medium-Sized Enterprises in the United States: Do Owners' Race/Ethnicity Matter? *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings* 97, 2, 368-372.
- Bausch, Andreas and Mario Krist (2007), The Effect of Context-Related Moderators on the Internationalization-Performance Relationship: Evidence from Meta-Analysis. *Management International Review* 47, 3, 319-347.
- Bernard, Andrew B., Bradford J. Jensen, Stephen J. Redding and Peter K. Schott (2007), Firms in International Trade. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 21, 3, 105-130.
- Brandt, Maurice, Stefan Dittrich and Michael Konold (2008), Wirtschaftsstatistische Längsschnittdaten für die Wissenschaft. *Wirtschaft und Statistik* 3/2008, 217-224.
- Conover, William J. (1999), *Practical Nonparametric Statistics*. Third Edition. New York etc.: Wiley.
- Contractor, Farok J. (2007), Is International Business Goof for Companies? The Evolutionary or Multi-Stage Theory of Internationalization vs. the Transaction Cost Perspective. *Management International Review* 47, 3, 453-475.
- Flores, Carlos A. (2004), *Estimation of Dose-Response Functions and Optimal Doses with a Continuous Treatment*. Job Market Paper, University of California, Berkeley.
- Foster, Lucia, John Haltiwanger and Chad Syverson (2008), Reallocation, Firm Turnover, and Efficiency: Selection on Productivity or Profitability? *American Economic Review* 98, 1, 394-425.

- Fritsch, Michael, Bernd Görzig, Ottmar Hennchen and Andreas Stephan (2004), Cost Structure Surveys for Germany. *Schmollers Jahrbuch / Journal of Applied Social Science Studies* 124, 4, 557-566.
- Fryges, Helmut (2008), The Export-Growth Relationship: Estimating a Dose-Response Function. *Applied Economics Letters*, forthcoming.
- Fryges, Helmut and Joachim Wagner (2008), Exports and Productivity Growth – First Evidence from a Continuous Treatment Approach. *Review of World Economics / Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, forthcoming.
- Glaum, Martin and Michael-Jörg Oesterle (2007), 40 Years of Research on Internationalization and Firm Performance: More Questions than Answers? *Management International Review* 47, 3, 307-317.
- Hennart, Jean-Francois (2007), The Theoretical Rationale for a Multinationality-Performance Relationship. *Management International Review* 47, 3, 423-452.
- Hirano, Keisuke and Guido W. Imbens (2004). *The Propensity Score with Continuous Treatments*. in: Gelman, A. and X.-L. Meng (eds.). *Applied Bayesian Modeling and Causal Inference from Incomplete-Data Perspectives*, Chichester: Wiley, 73-84.
- Imbens, Guido W. (2000). The Role of the Propensity Score in Estimating Dose-Response Functions. *Biometrika*, 83, 706-710.
- Konold, Michael (2007), New Possibilities for Economic Research through Integration of Establishment-level Panel Data of German Official Statistics. *Schmollers Jahrbuch / Journal of Applied Social Science Studies* 127, 2, 321-334.
- McCullagh, Peter and John A. Nelder (1989), *Generalized Linear Models*, second edition. New York: Chapman and Hall.

- Mayer, Thierry and Gianmarco I. P. Ottaviano (2007), The Happy Few: The internationalisation of European firms. New facts based in firm-level evidence. Brussels: Bruegel.
- Papke, Leslie E. and Jeffrey M. Wooldridge (1996), Econometric Methods for Fractional Response Variables with an Application to 401(K) Plan Participation Rates. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 11, 4, 619-632.
- Rosenbaum, Paul R. and Donald B. Rubin (1983), The Central Role of the Propensity Score in Observational Studies for Causal Effects. *Biometrika* 70, 1, 41-55.
- Ruigrok, Winfried, Wolfgang Amann and Hardy Wagner (2007), The Internationalization-Performance Relationship at Swiss Firms: A Test of the S-Shape and Extreme Degree of Internationalization. *Management International Review* 47, 3, 349-368.
- Schank, Thorsten, Claus Schnabel and Joachim Wagner (2007), Do exporters really pay higher wages? First evidence from German linked employer-employee data. *Journal of International Economics* 72, 1, 52-74.
- Schmalensee, Richard (1989), Inter-Industry Studies of Structure and Performance, in: Richard Schmalensee and Robert D. Willig (Ed.), Handbook of Industrial Organization, Volume II, Amsterdam etc.: North-Holland, 951-1009.
- The International Study Group on Exports and Productivity (2008), Understanding Cross-Country Differences in Exporter Premia – Comparable Evidence for 14 Countries. *Review of World Economics / Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, forthcoming.
- Wagner, Joachim (2001), A Note on the Firm Size – Export Relationship. *Small Business Economics* 17, 4, 229-237.

- Wagner, Joachim (2003), Unobserved Firm Heterogeneity and the Size-Exports Nexus: Evidence from German Panel Data. *Review of World Economics* 139, 1, 161-172.
- Wagner, Joachim (2007a), Exports and Productivity: A Survey of the Evidence from Firm Level Data. *The World Economy* 30, 1, 60-82.
- Wagner, Joachim (2007b), Exports and Productivity in Germany. *Applied Economics Quarterly* 53, 4, 353-373.
- Zühlke, Sylvia, Markus Zwick, Sebastian Scharnhorst and Thomas Wende (2004), The research data centres of the Federal Statistical Office and the statistical offices of the *Länder*. *Schmollers Jahrbuch / Journal of Applied Social Science Studies* 124, 4, 567-578.

Table 1: Rate of profit (percentage) in exporting and non-exporting enterprises (1999 – 2004)¹

| Year | | Number of enterprises | Mean | Standard deviation | p1 ² | p25 ² | p50 ² | p75 ² | p99 ² |
|------|---------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1999 | Exporters | 11726 | 12.84 | 13.88 | -21.06 | 5.06 | 11.22 | 19.24 | 55.20 |
| | Non-Exporters | 5049 | 12.42 | 13.90 | -20.58 | 4.76 | 10.98 | 19.11 | 54.28 |
| 2000 | Exporters | 11744 | 12.90 | 13.64 | -17.89 | 5.04 | 11.03 | 19.15 | 54.80 |
| | Non-Exporters | 4890 | 11.76 | 13.60 | -20.05 | 4.22 | 10.17 | 18.04 | 53.07 |
| 2001 | Exporters | 11241 | 12.29 | 13.70 | -19.39 | 4.55 | 10.49 | 18.55 | 54.35 |
| | Non-Exporters | 4412 | 11.24 | 13.04 | -19.42 | 3.66 | 9.81 | 17.26 | 51.50 |
| 2002 | Exporters | 10885 | 11.84 | 13.52 | -20.09 | 4.05 | 10.07 | 17.95 | 53.25 |
| | Non-Exporters | 4098 | 10.56 | 12.94 | -21.48 | 3.17 | 8.97 | 17.01 | 49.94 |
| 2003 | Exporters | 11911 | 11.82 | 14.13 | -20.20 | 4.29 | 10.08 | 18.18 | 52.90 |
| | Non-Exporters | 4005 | 11.14 | 12.86 | -18.27 | 3.77 | 9.76 | 17.67 | 49.69 |
| 2004 | Exporters | 11776 | 12.37 | 14.03 | -20.50 | 4.76 | 10.64 | 18.51 | 52.59 |
| | Non-Exporters | 3954 | 11.53 | 12.60 | -18.84 | 4.13 | 9.97 | 17.67 | 49.69 |

¹ For definition of the rate of profit see text.

² p1, p25, p50, p75 and p99 are the first, 25th, 50th, 75th and 99th percentile of the distribution of the rate of profit.

Table 2: Tests for differences in the rate of profit between exporting and non-exporting enterprises (1999 – 2004)¹

| Year | t-test for difference in the mean (p-value) ² | Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (p-value) ³ | | |
|------|---|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| | | Difference: yes | Exporters > Non-Exporters | Non-Exporters > Exporters |
| 1999 | 0.075 | 0.044 | 0.023 | 0.997 |
| 2000 | 0.000 | 0.021 | 0.011 | 0.997 |
| 2001 | 0.000 | 0.016 | 0.009 | 0.911 |
| 2002 | 0.000 | 0.004 | 0.002 | 0.992 |
| 2003 | 0.005 | 0.015 | 0.008 | 0.961 |
| 2004 | 0.000 | 0.007 | 0.004 | 0.955 |

¹ For definition of the rate of profit see text.

² The t-test does not assume equal variances for both groups. A p-value of 0.05 (or smaller) indicates that the null hypothesis of equal mean values for exporters and non-exporters can be rejected at an error level of five percent (or less).

³ The rate of profit is measured as the deviation from the mean value in the 4-digit industry; see text. A p-value of 0.05 (or smaller) indicates that the hypothesis mentioned in the header of the column cannot be rejected at an error level of five percent (or less), meaning that

- the distributions of the rate of profit differ between exporting and non-exporting enterprises.
- the distribution of the rate of profit for exporting enterprises first order stochastically dominates the distribution of the rate of profit for non-exporting enterprises.
- the distribution of the rate of profit for non-exporting enterprises first order stochastically dominates the distribution of the rate of profit for exporting enterprises.

Table 3: Rate of profit (percentage) for firms in different classes of the export-sales ratio (1999 – 2004)¹

| Year | | Number of enterprises | Mean | Standard deviation | p1 ² | p25 ² | p50 ² | p75 ² | p99 ² |
|------|-----------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1999 | 0% | 5049 | 12.42 | 13.90 | -20.58 | 4.76 | 10.98 | 19.11 | 54.28 |
| | > 0% and ≤ 5% | 2340 | 12.22 | 13.70 | -21.06 | 4.77 | 10.48 | 18.30 | 53.84 |
| | > 5% and ≤ 10% | 1329 | 11.97 | 14.61 | -33.16 | 4.43 | 10.32 | 18.34 | 53.48 |
| | > 10% and ≤ 20% | 2093 | 12.96 | 13.58 | -16.89 | 4.76 | 10.48 | 18.73 | 56.49 |
| | > 20% and ≤ 50% | 3921 | 13.19 | 13.46 | -19.17 | 5.34 | 11.76 | 19.61 | 55.20 |
| | > 50% | 2043 | 13.31 | 14.66 | -28.91 | 5.44 | 12.22 | 20.27 | 57.48 |
| 2000 | 0% | 4890 | 11.75 | 13.60 | -20.05 | 4.22 | 10.17 | 18.04 | 53.07 |
| | > 0% and ≤ 5% | 2175 | 11.66 | 13.95 | -18.33 | 4.13 | 10.02 | 17.30 | 54.61 |
| | > 5% and ≤ 10% | 1312 | 11.92 | 13.34 | -16.76 | 4.54 | 9.93 | 17.61 | 54.50 |
| | > 10% and ≤ 20% | 2048 | 12.61 | 13.40 | -13.13 | 4.62 | 10.08 | 18.28 | 55.60 |
| | > 20% and ≤ 50% | 3917 | 13.36 | 13.23 | -18.21 | 5.57 | 11.68 | 19.72 | 53.42 |
| | > 50% | 2292 | 14.13 | 14.26 | -19.14 | 5.79 | 12.36 | 21.20 | 56.65 |
| 2001 | 0% | 4412 | 11.24 | 13.04 | -19.42 | 3.66 | 9.81 | 17.26 | 51.50 |
| | > 0% and ≤ 5% | 1985 | 10.74 | 13.40 | -20.30 | 3.62 | 9.45 | 16.54 | 50.44 |
| | > 5% and ≤ 10% | 1209 | 12.29 | 14.51 | -16.77 | 4.69 | 10.01 | 17.99 | 54.84 |
| | > 10% and ≤ 20% | 1887 | 12.06 | 13.22 | -19.02 | 4.62 | 9.96 | 16.90 | 56.00 |
| | > 20% and ≤ 50% | 3824 | 12.54 | 13.29 | -18.17 | 4.77 | 10.81 | 19.12 | 52.14 |
| | > 50% | 2336 | 13.37 | 14.42 | -21.51 | 4.92 | 11.84 | 20.51 | 55.18 |
| 2002 | 0% | 4098 | 10.56 | 12.94 | -21.48 | 3.17 | 8.97 | 17.01 | 49.94 |
| | > 0% and ≤ 5% | 1817 | 10.40 | 13.44 | -20.59 | 3.22 | 8.93 | 16.01 | 52.29 |
| | > 5% and ≤ 10% | 1099 | 11.23 | 13.12 | -20.46 | 3.48 | 9.13 | 16.47 | 54.24 |
| | > 10% and ≤ 20% | 1756 | 11.74 | 13.09 | -17.46 | 4.16 | 9.58 | 17.18 | 52.70 |
| | > 20% and ≤ 50% | 3779 | 12.09 | 13.22 | -20.09 | 4.39 | 10.45 | 18.34 | 51.40 |
| | > 50% | 2434 | 12.90 | 14.40 | -20.07 | 4.61 | 11.27 | 20.27 | 56.19 |

Continued next page

Continued from Table 3

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------|-----------------|------|-------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| 2003 | 0% | 4005 | 11.14 | 12.86 | -18.27 | 3.77 | 9.76 | 17.25 | 49.07 |
| | > 0% and ≤ 5% | 2039 | 11.16 | 14.38 | -18.35 | 3.50 | 9.34 | 17.30 | 55.04 |
| | > 5% and ≤ 10% | 1170 | 11.17 | 15.59 | -25.19 | 4.13 | 9.92 | 17.36 | 53.53 |
| | > 10% and ≤ 20% | 1989 | 11.46 | 13.78 | -21.05 | 4.27 | 9.48 | 16.99 | 56.95 |
| | > 20% and ≤ 50% | 3960 | 12.23 | 13.21 | -18.72 | 4.80 | 10.30 | 18.45 | 50.29 |
| | > 50% | 2753 | 12.27 | 14.78 | -25.89 | 4.32 | 11.09 | 19.55 | 53.93 |
| 2004 | 0% | 3954 | 11.53 | 12.60 | -18.84 | 4.13 | 9.97 | 17.67 | 49.69 |
| | > 0% and ≤ 5% | 1906 | 10.89 | 14.90 | -24.50 | 3.88 | 9.70 | 16.86 | 52.50 |
| | > 5% and ≤ 10% | 1123 | 11.38 | 13.43 | -25.35 | 4.18 | 9.88 | 17.22 | 48.36 |
| | > 10% and ≤ 20% | 1935 | 11.95 | 13.66 | -18.87 | 4.25 | 9.63 | 17.31 | 54.42 |
| | > 20% and ≤ 50% | 4021 | 12.82 | 13.76 | -17.33 | 5.35 | 11.13 | 19.01 | 51.96 |
| | > 50% | 2791 | 13.42 | 14.18 | -22.41 | 5.27 | 11.78 | 20.01 | 54.71 |

¹ For definition of the rate of profit see text.

² p1, p25, p50, p75 and p99 are the first, 25th, 50th, 75th and 99th percentile of the distribution of the rate of profit.

Table 4: Exports and profits: Evidence from regression models (1999 – 2004)
Endogenous variable: Rate of profit (percentage)

| Exogenous variable | Model | Pooled data | | | | Fixed enterprise effects | | | |
|--|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Exporter (Dummy; 1 = yes) | β p | 0.962 0.000 | | | | 0.298 0.210 | | | |
| Share of exports in total sales (percentage) | β p | | 0.031 0.000 | 0.065 0.000 | 0.049 0.000 | | 0.030 0.000 | -0.005 0.728 | 0.048 0.072 |
| Share of exports in total sales (squared) | β p | | | -0.0005 0.000 | 0.0001 0.815 | | | 0.0005 0.021 | -0.001 0.109 |
| Share of exports in total sales (cubic) | β p | | | | 4.48e-6 0.132 | | | | 0.0001 0.037 |
| Number of employees | β p | 0.001 0.000 | 0.001 0.000 | 0.001 0.000 | 0.001 0.000 | -4.5e-5 0.833 | -0.0001 0.644 | -0.0001 0.733 | -0.0001 0.706 |
| Number of employees (squared) | β p | -3.78e-9 0.000 | -3.41e-9 0.000 | -3.37e-9 0.000 | -3.36e-9 0.000 | -1.24e-9 0.295 | -1.50e-9 0.205 | -1.36e-9 0.249 | -1.14e-9 0.232 |
| Share of employees in R&D | β p | -0.015 0.298 | -0.032 0.027 | -0.032 0.026 | -0.032 0.027 | -0.002 0.935 | -0.004 0.856 | -0.004 0.827 | -0.005 0.825 |
| Constant | β p | 11.284 0.000 | 11.366 0.000 | 11.148 0.000 | 11.192 0.000 | -0.012 0.611 | -0.011 0.615 | -0.012 0.614 | -0.012 0.614 |
| Interaction terms of year and 4-digit industry | | included | included | included | included | included | included | included | included |
| Number of observations | | 95644 | 95644 | 95644 | 95644 | 95644 | 95644 | 95644 | 95644 |
| R ² | | 0.083 | 0.084 | 0.084 | 0.084 | 0.0002 | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.001 |

Table 5: Rate of profit in export starters and non-starters in the start year and three years before start

| Cohort of starters | | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 |
|---|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Number of enterprises | Starters | 159 | 307 | 138 |
| | Non-starters | 3497 | 3172 | 2854 |
| Rate of profit in start year (percentage): Mean (standard deviation) | Starters | 11.16 (0.92) | 12.61 (14.15) | 11.22 (11.29) |
| | Non-starters | 12.94 (0.22) | 12.23 (13.06) | 11.72 (12.89) |
| t-test for difference in the mean ¹ | p-value | 0.062 | 0.650 | 0.618 |
| Kolmogorow-Smirnov test ² | | | | |
| - Difference: yes | p-value | 0.077 | 0.422 | 0.383 |
| - Starters > Non-starters | p-value | 0.922 | 0.229 | 0.215 |
| - Non-starters > Starters | p-value | 0.046 | 0.744 | 0.276 |
| Profit premia of export starters (percentage points) ³ | β | -1.554 | 0.392 | 1.378 |
| | p-value | 0.105 | 0.642 | 0.157 |

¹ The t-test does not assume equal variances for both groups. A p-value of 0.05 (or smaller) indicates that the null- hypothesis of equal mean values for export starters and non-starters in the start year can be rejected at an error level of five percent (or less).

² A p-value of 0.05 (or smaller) indicates that the hypothesis stated in the first column of the row cannot be rejected at an error level of five percent (or less), meaning that


- the distributions of the rate of profit differ between export starters and non-starters in the start year.
- the distribution of the rate of profit for export starters first order stochastically dominates the distribution of the rate of profit for non-starters in the start year.
- the distribution of the rate of profit for non-starters first order stochastically dominates the distribution of the rate of profit for export starters in the start year.

³ The profit premia is the estimated regression coefficient of a dummy variable (taking the value one for export starters, and zero for non-starters) from an OLS-regression of the rate of profit on this dummy, controlling for the number of employees and its squared value, the share of employees in R&D in all employees, and a complete set of 4-digit industry dummy variables, all measured three years before the export start.

Table 6: Determinants of the export-sales ratio (endogenous variable) – results of the fractional logit model

| Exogenous variable | Pooled data | |
|---|-------------|---------|
| Number of employees (log) | β | 0.785 |
| | p | 0.000 |
| Number of employees (squared) (log) | β | -0.049 |
| | p | 0.000 |
| Share of employees in R&D | β | 2.307 |
| | p | 0.000 |
| Wage per employee (log) | β | 0.619 |
| | p | 0.000 |
| Labour productivity (sales per employee) in t-1 (log) | β | 0.307 |
| | p | 0.000 |
| Constant | β | -13.507 |
| | p | 0.000 |
| Interaction terms of year and 4-digit industry | included | |
| Number of observations | 89,417 | |
| Log-likelihood | -30,006.91 | |
| R ² | 0.410 | |

Figure 1: Estimated dose-response function



Solid lines: estimated conditional expectation of firms' profits given the export-sales ratio in t and the estimated generalised propensity score (GPS).

Dotted lines: simulated 90% confidence interval, using the 5th and 95th percentiles of the bootstrap distribution (100 replications).

Appendix

A.1 The generalised propensity score (GPS) method

This paper applies the generalised propensity score (GPS) method developed by Imbens (2000) and Hirano and Imbens (2004). The GPS method allows for continuous treatment, that is, in our case, different levels of firms' export-sales ratios. It is a generalisation of the binary treatment propensity score methodology as derived by Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983).

The key assumption of the GPS method is a generalisation of the strong unconfoundedness assumption made by Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983) for binary treatments (cf. Imbens (2000)). Let the treatment D take on values in the interval $D = [d_0, d_1]$. Assignment to treatment D is *weakly unconfounded*, given a vector of pre-treatment variables X , if

$$(1) \quad Y(d) \perp D | X \quad \text{for all } d \in D,$$

with $Y(d)$ as the outcome associated with treatment level d . It is important to note that this assumption does not require joint independence of all potential outcomes $\{Y(d)\}_{d \in D}$. Instead, weak unconfoundedness only requires pairwise independence of the treatment with each of the potential outcomes. In other words, the random variable D (the treatment) is assumed to be conditionally independent with the random variable Y (the outcome), measured at an arbitrarily chosen treatment level d .

Let further $r(d, x)$ be the conditional density of the treatment given the covariates:

$$(2) \quad r(d, x) = f_{D|X}(d|x).$$

Then the generalised propensity score is defined as $R = r(D, X)$ (Hirano and Imbens (2004), p. 74). Assuming that assignment to treatment D is weakly unconfounded given pre-treatment variables X , it can be proved that for every treatment level d

$$(3) \quad f_d(d|r(d, X), Y(d)) = f_d(d|r(d, X)),$$

i.e., assignment to treatment D is unconfounded given the GPS (Hirano and Imbens (2004), p. 75). Equation (3) shows that the conditional density of the treatment level at d is calculated using the GPS at the corresponding level of the treatment. Thus, the GPS methodology uses as many propensity scores as there are levels of the treatment.

In the case of binary treatment, Rosenbaum und Rubin (1983) demonstrate that conditioning on the one-dimensional propensity score (i.e. the conditional probability of receiving the treatment given pre-treatment variables) is sufficient to remove all the bias associated with differences in pre-treatment variables between treated and non-treated individuals or firms. With continuous treatment, Hirano and Imbens (2004) prove that adjusting for the GPS eliminates any biases associated with differences in the pre-treatment variables. Assuming that assignment to treatment D is weakly unconfounded given pre-treatment variables X and using the result from equation (3), it can be shown that

$$(4) \quad \eta(d, r) = E[Y(d)|r(d, X) = r] = E[Y|D = d, R = r] \quad \text{and}$$

$$(5) \quad \mu(d) = E[\beta(d, r(d, X))] = E[Y(d)].$$

Thus, the bias-removing property is obtained in two steps. In the first step, the conditional expectation of the outcome Y is estimated as a function of the treatment D and the GPS R , $\eta(d, r) = E[Y|D = d, R = r]$. Hirano and Imbens (2004) stress, however, that the regression function $\eta(d, r)$ does not have a causal interpretation. In the second step, the conditional expectation $\eta(d, r)$ is averaged over the GPS evaluated at a particular level of the treatment $r(d, X)$. This leads to an estimation of the dose-response function $\mu(d)$ at any level or dose of the continuous treatment variable.

Hirano and Imbens (2004) suggest a three-stage approach to implement the GPS method. In the first stage, the conditional distribution of the treatment variable given the covariates is estimated. In our case, the distribution of the treatment variable D , i.e. the firms' export-sales ratios, is highly skewed. In particular, it has many limit observations at the value zero, representing firms without any international sales. Following Wagner (2001, 2003), we apply the fractional logit model developed by Papke and Wooldridge (1996) to estimate the export intensity of the firms in our sample. Papke and Wooldridge assume that, for all observations i , the expected value of D_i conditional on a vector of covariates X_i is given by

$$(6) \quad E(D_i|X_i) = F(X_i\beta),$$

with $0 < F(X_i\beta) < 1$ for all $X_i\beta \in \mathbb{R}$, ensuring that the predicted values of D_i lie in the interval (0, 1). Nevertheless, equation (6) is defined even if D_i takes the limit observations zero or one. The function $F(\cdot)$ is assumed to be the cumulative distribution function (cdf) of the logistic distribution:

$$(7) \quad F(X_i\beta) \equiv \Lambda(X_i\beta) \equiv \frac{\exp(X_i\beta)}{1 + \exp(X_i\beta)}.$$

Papke and Wooldridge propose a quasi-maximum likelihood estimator (QMLE) of β .

The estimation procedure maximises the Bernoulli log-likelihood function given by

$$(8) \quad l_i(\beta) \equiv D_i \cdot \log[\Lambda(X_i\beta)] + (1 - D_i) \cdot \log[1 - \Lambda(X_i\beta)]$$

using the generalised linear models (GLM) framework developed by McCullagh and Nelder (1989). The estimated GPS based on the Bernoulli log-likelihood function defined in equation (8) is then given by

$$(9) \quad \hat{R}_i = [\Lambda(X_i\hat{\beta})]^{D_i} \cdot [1 - \Lambda(X_i\hat{\beta})]^{(1-D_i)}.$$

In the second stage of Hirano and Imbens' GPS methodology the conditional expectation of outcome Y_i (the rate of profit in our case) is modelled as a function of the treatment D_i and the (estimated) generalised propensity score \hat{R}_i . Following Hirano and Imbens, we use a quadratic approximation for the conditional expectation of Y_i :

$$(10) \quad E\left[Y_i \mid D_i, \hat{R}_i\right] = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \cdot D_i + \alpha_2 \cdot D_i^2 + \alpha_3 \cdot \hat{R}_i + \alpha_4 \cdot \hat{R}_i^2 + \alpha_5 \cdot D_i \cdot \hat{R}_i.$$

Equation (10) corresponds to equation (4) and is estimated by OLS. As Hirano and Imbens point out, the estimated regression coefficients $\hat{\alpha}$ do not have any direct meaning and will therefore not be reported in section 5 for reasons of space.

In the last stage of the GPS method, the average expected outcome at treatment level d is estimated, using the regression coefficients $\hat{\alpha}$ from the second stage of the GPS method:

$$(11) \quad \bar{E}[Y(d)] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\hat{\alpha}_0 + \hat{\alpha}_1 \cdot d + \hat{\alpha}_2 \cdot d^2 + \hat{\alpha}_3 \cdot \hat{r}(d, X_i) + \hat{\alpha}_4 \cdot \hat{r}(d, X_i)^2 + \hat{\alpha}_5 \cdot d \cdot \hat{r}(d, X_i) \right),$$

with N as the number of observations. Equation (11) corresponds to equation (5). In order to obtain an estimate of the entire dose-response function, equation (11) is calculated at each export intensity d in the interval from zero to one. Hirano and Imbens (2004) state that asymptotic normality for the estimator in equation (11) can be proved. However, following the same procedure as Hirano and Imbens, the confidence intervals of the dose-response functions in this paper are determined via bootstrapping.

Applying the GPS methodology, we do not calculate the effect of the treatment per se, that is, we do not compare the potential outcome for non-treated individuals or firms with that for all treated entities simply allowing for different levels or doses of the treatment variable. Instead, the dose-response function we estimate shows the average potential outcome at each dose of the treatment and how average responses vary along the interval

$D = [d_0, d_1]$. From this curve we can calculate pairwise treatment effects of the form (cf.

Flores 2004):

$$(12) \quad E(\Delta^{d' d''}) = E[Y(d') - Y(d'')] \quad \text{for } d', d'' \in D.$$

In other words, we estimate the average response of outcome at one particular treatment level and compare this outcome with the average outcome at any other, deliberately chosen treatment level. Since the GPS model controls for differences in pre-treatment variables, potential differences between the average outcomes at two deliberately chosen levels of treatment can be interpreted as a causal effect of varying doses of the continuous treatment variable.

Table A.1: Rate of profit (percentage) in exporting and non-exporting enterprises (1999 – 2004) – without enterprises with extreme values for the rate of profit¹

| Year | | Number of enterprises | Mean | Standard deviation | p1 ² | p25 ² | p50 ² | p75 ² | p99 ² |
|------|---------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1999 | Exporters | 11486 | 12.80 | 11.83 | -13.57 | 5.16 | 11.21 | 19.01 | 48.16 |
| | Non-Exporters | 4953 | 12.48 | 11.67 | -13.01 | 4.88 | 10.99 | 18.97 | 47.13 |
| 2000 | Exporters | 11514 | 12.83 | 11.63 | -11.14 | 5.13 | 11.01 | 18.96 | 47.95 |
| | Non-Exporters | 4793 | 11.85 | 11.47 | -12.80 | 4.41 | 10.20 | 17.89 | 47.18 |
| 2001 | Exporters | 11012 | 12.22 | 11.65 | -12.74 | 4.67 | 10.48 | 18.31 | 47.09 |
| | Non-Exporters | 4330 | 11.26 | 11.08 | -11.90 | 3.78 | 9.82 | 17.10 | 45.06 |
| 2002 | Exporters | 10665 | 11.77 | 11.69 | -12.77 | 4.18 | 10.06 | 17.70 | 46.47 |
| | Non-Exporters | 4021 | 10.59 | 11.14 | -14.13 | 3.29 | 8.99 | 16.89 | 43.79 |
| 2003 | Exporters | 11674 | 11.88 | 11.65 | -12.99 | 4.43 | 10.09 | 17.98 | 46.49 |
| | Non-Exporters | 3937 | 11.12 | 11.10 | -13.45 | 3.84 | 9.76 | 17.00 | 43.96 |
| 2004 | Exporters | 11536 | 12.42 | 11.49 | -11.80 | 4.88 | 10.64 | 18.28 | 46.63 |
| | Non-Exporters | 3888 | 11.50 | 10.96 | -13.22 | 4.22 | 9.98 | 17.51 | 44.17 |

¹ For definition of the rate of profit see text. The enterprises with the one percent lowest and highest values for the rate of profit were excluded from the calculations.

² p1, p25, p50, p75 and p99 are the first, 25th, 50th, 75th and 99th percentile of the distribution of the rate of profit.

Table A.2: Tests for differences in the rate of profit between exporting and non-exporting enterprises (1999 – 2004) – without enterprises with extreme values for the rate of profit¹

| Year | t-test for difference in the mean (p-value) ² | Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (p-value) ³ | | |
|------|--|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| | | Difference: yes | Exporters > Non-Exporters | Non-Exporters > Exporters |
| 1999 | 0.112 | 0.020 | 0.010 | 0.998 |
| 2000 | 0.000 | 0.005 | 0.003 | 1.000 |
| 2001 | 0.000 | 0.010 | 0.005 | 0.935 |
| 2002 | 0.000 | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.998 |
| 2003 | 0.000 | 0.125 | 0.065 | 0.981 |
| 2004 | 0.000 | 0.006 | 0.003 | 0.992 |

¹ For definition of the rate of profit see text. The enterprises with the one percent lowest and highest values for the rate of profit were excluded from the calculations.

² The t-test does not assume equal variances for both groups. A p-value of 0.05 (or smaller) indicates that the null hypothesis of equal mean values for exporters and non-exporters can be rejected at an error level of five percent (or less).

³ The rate of profit is measured as the deviation from the mean value in the 4-digit industry; see text. A p-value of 0.05 (or smaller) indicates that the hypothesis mentioned in the header of the column cannot be rejected at an error level of five percent (or less), meaning that

- the distributions of the rate of profit differ between exporting and non-exporting enterprises.
- the distribution of the rate of profit for exporting enterprises first order stochastically dominates the distribution of the rate of profit for non-exporting enterprises.
- the distribution of the rate of profit for non-exporting enterprises first order stochastically dominates the distribution of the rate of profit for exporting enterprises.

Table A.3: Rate of profit (percentage) for firms in different classes of the export-sales ratio (1999 – 2004)¹ – without enterprises with extreme values for the rate of profit

| Year | | Number of enterprises | Mean | Standard deviation | p1 ² | p25 ² | p50 ² | p75 ² | p99 ² |
|------|-----------------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1999 | 0% | 4953 | 12.48 | 11.67 | -13.01 | 4.88 | 10.99 | 18.97 | 47.13 |
| | > 0% and ≤ 5% | 2294 | 12.23 | 11.58 | -14.22 | 4.89 | 10.48 | 18.05 | 47.62 |
| | > 5% and ≤ 10% | 1301 | 12.34 | 11.77 | -10.86 | 4.62 | 10.44 | 18.33 | 47.96 |
| | > 10% and ≤ 20% | 2056 | 12.64 | 12.05 | -11.69 | 4.80 | 10.45 | 18.52 | 49.55 |
| | > 20% and ≤ 50% | 3850 | 13.10 | 11.66 | -13.42 | 5.41 | 11.73 | 19.44 | 47.00 |
| | > 50% | 1985 | 13.36 | 12.20 | -15.35 | 5.69 | 12.25 | 20.02 | 48.23 |
| 2000 | 0% | 4793 | 11.85 | 11.32 | -12.80 | 4.41 | 10.20 | 17.89 | 47.18 |
| | > 0% and ≤ 5% | 2132 | 11.67 | 11.47 | -10.43 | 4.23 | 10.01 | 17.09 | 48.78 |
| | > 5% and ≤ 10% | 1288 | 11.81 | 11.29 | -12.52 | 4.74 | 9.93 | 17.43 | 47.39 |
| | > 10% and ≤ 20% | 2013 | 12.30 | 11.71 | -10.40 | 4.63 | 10.04 | 17.96 | 48.63 |
| | > 20% and ≤ 50% | 3847 | 13.38 | 11.66 | -11.40 | 5.74 | 11.71 | 19.55 | 47.83 |
| | > 50% | 2234 | 14.05 | 11.83 | -10.85 | 6.00 | 12.33 | 20.79 | 48.01 |
| 2001 | 0% | 4330 | 11.26 | 11.08 | -11.90 | 3.78 | 9.82 | 17.10 | 45.06 |
| | > 0% and ≤ 5% | 1949 | 10.82 | 11.10 | -12.08 | 3.73 | 9.47 | 16.50 | 47.01 |
| | > 5% and ≤ 10% | 1183 | 12.09 | 11.52 | -13.57 | 4.72 | 10.00 | 17.78 | 46.89 |
| | > 10% and ≤ 20% | 1849 | 11.74 | 11.50 | -12.92 | 4.65 | 9.94 | 16.45 | 49.20 |
| | > 20% and ≤ 50% | 3755 | 12.52 | 11.59 | -12.49 | 4.88 | 10.81 | 18.90 | 45.84 |
| | > 50% | 2276 | 13.40 | 12.27 | -12.87 | 5.08 | 11.85 | 20.18 | 48.22 |
| 2002 | 0% | 4021 | 10.59 | 11.14 | -14.13 | 3.29 | 8.99 | 16.89 | 43.79 |
| | > 0% and ≤ 5% | 1781 | 10.46 | 11.25 | -12.29 | 3.39 | 8.94 | 15.79 | 45.04 |
| | > 5% and ≤ 10% | 1075 | 11.01 | 11.56 | -13.22 | 3.51 | 9.11 | 16.27 | 46.53 |
| | > 10% and ≤ 20% | 1726 | 11.59 | 11.68 | -11.77 | 4.22 | 9.53 | 16.98 | 47.43 |
| | > 20% and ≤ 50% | 3708 | 12.07 | 11.69 | -12.83 | 4.48 | 10.45 | 18.16 | 46.19 |
| | > 50% | 2375 | 12.74 | 11.99 | -13.09 | 4.70 | 11.17 | 19.89 | 46.53 |

Continued next page

Continued from Table A.3

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------|-----------------|------|-------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| 2003 | 0% | 3937 | 11.12 | 11.10 | -13.45 | 3.84 | 9.76 | 17.00 | 43.96 |
| | > 0% and ≤ 5% | 2002 | 10.92 | 11.58 | -13.35 | 3.54 | 9.27 | 17.06 | 47.40 |
| | > 5% and ≤ 10% | 1143 | 11.45 | 10.77 | -10.28 | 4.41 | 9.94 | 17.19 | 43.91 |
| | > 10% and ≤ 20% | 1944 | 11.32 | 11.22 | -12.03 | 4.40 | 9.47 | 16.72 | 45.27 |
| | > 20% and ≤ 50% | 3903 | 12.29 | 11.68 | -12.96 | 4.90 | 10.31 | 18.37 | 47.18 |
| | > 50% | 2682 | 12.57 | 12.24 | -13.91 | 4.57 | 11.17 | 19.42 | 46.57 |
| 2004 | 0% | 3888 | 11.50 | 10.96 | -13.22 | 4.22 | 9.98 | 17.51 | 44.17 |
| | > 0% and ≤ 5% | 1859 | 11.18 | 11.16 | -14.39 | 4.07 | 9.70 | 16.72 | 44.24 |
| | > 5% and ≤ 10% | 1103 | 11.84 | 10.97 | -9.26 | 4.33 | 9.97 | 17.22 | 46.63 |
| | > 10% and ≤ 20% | 1895 | 11.82 | 11.46 | -11.26 | 4.33 | 9.58 | 17.15 | 47.60 |
| | > 20% and ≤ 50% | 3952 | 12.76 | 11.34 | -11.87 | 5.41 | 11.08 | 18.79 | 45.66 |
| | > 50% | 2727 | 13.45 | 12.02 | -12.12 | 5.42 | 11.78 | 19.77 | 47.91 |

¹ For definition of the rate of profit see text. The enterprises with the one percent lowest and highest values for the rate of profit were excluded from the calculations.

² p1, p25, p50, p75 and p99 are the first, 25th, 50th, 75th and 99th percentile of the distribution of the rate of profit.

Table A.4: Exports and profits: Evidence from regression models excluding enterprises with extreme values for the rate of profit (1999 – 2004)¹
 Endogenous variable: Rate of profit (percentage)

| Exogenous variable | Model | Pooled Data | | | | Fixed enterprise effects | | | |
|--|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| Exporter (Dummy; 1 = yes) | β p | 0.874 0.000 | | | | 0.186 0.344 | | | |
| Share of exports in total sales (percentage) | β p | | 0.029 0.000 | 0.058 0.000 | 0.049 0.000 | | 0.027 0.000 | 0.012 0.324 | 0.029 0.188 |
| Share of exports in total sales (squared) | β p | | | -0.0004 0.000 | -0.0001 0.792 | | | 0.0002 0.216 | -0.0003 0.579 |
| Share of exports in total sales (cubic) | β p | | | | 2.70e-6 0.283 | | | | 4.15e-6 0.384 |
| Number of employees | β p | 0.0005 0.000 | 0.0004 0.000 | 0.0004 0.000 | 0.0004 0.000 | -4.53e-5 0.818 | -0.0001 0.627 | -0.0001 0.668 | -0.0001 0.658 |
| Number of employees (squared) | β p | -3.23e-9 0.000 | -2.88e-9 0.000 | -2.85e-9 0.000 | -2.84e-9 0.000 | 1.26e-9 0.245 | 1.51e-9 0.166 | 1.44e-9 0.183 | 1.46e-9 0.178 |
| Share of employees in R&D | β p | 0.030 0.002 | 0.014 0.155 | 0.014 0.155 | 0.014 0.151 | 0.021 0.157 | 0.019 0.195 | 0.019 0.205 | 0.019 0.207 |
| Constant | β p | 11.282 0.000 | 11.351 0.000 | 11.158 0.000 | 11.184 0.000 | -0.002 0.925 | -0.001 0.954 | -0.001 0.961 | -0.001 0.960 |
| Interaction terms of year and 4-digit industry | | included | included | included | included | included | included | included | included |
| Number of observations | | 93762 | 93762 | 93762 | 93762 | 93762 | 93762 | 93762 | 93762 |
| R ² | | 0.092 | 0.094 | 0.094 | 0.094 | 0.0003 | 0.003 | 0.003 | 0.003 |

¹ The enterprises with the one percent lowest and highest values for the rate of profit were excluded from the calculations.

Table A.5: Descriptive statistics for the samples used in the regressions for Table 4 and A.4¹

| Variable | All enterprises | Without enterprises with extreme values for the rate of profit ² |
|---|------------------------|--|
| Rate of profit (percentage) | 12.11 (13.67) | 11.10 (12.10) |
| Exporter (Dummy; 1 = yes) | 0.72 (0.45) | 0.72 (0.45) |
| Share of exports in total sales (percentage) | 21.14 (24.47) | 21.09 (24.41) |
| Share of exports in total sales (squared) | 1045.75 (1805.00) | 1040.65 (1797.04) |
| Share of exports in total sales (cubic) | 63635.91 (144739.8) | 63182.28 (143908.2) |
| Number of employees | 301.64 (2244.02) | 301.67 (2253.54) |
| Number of employees (squared) | 5126570 (2.27e+8) | 5169404 (2.75e+8) |
| Share of employees in R&D | 1.73 (4.80) | 1.71 (4.73) |
| Number of observations | 95644 | 93762 |

¹ Mean values; standard deviations in brackets

² The enterprises with the one percent lowest and highest values for the rate of profit were excluded from the calculations.

Working Paper Series in Economics

(see www.leuphana.de/vwl/papers for a complete list)

- No.101: *Heike Wetzel*: Productivity Growth in European Railways: Technological Progress, Efficiency Change and Scale Effects. October 2008
- No.100: *Henry Sabrowski*: Inflation Expectation Formation of German Consumers: Rational or Adaptive? October 2008
- No.99: *Joachim Wagner*: Produktdifferenzierung in deutschen Industrieunternehmen 1995 – 2004: Ausmaß und Bestimmungsgründe, Oktober 2008
- No.98: *Jan Kranich*: Agglomeration, vertical specialization, and the strength of industrial linkages, September 2008
- No.97: *Joachim Wagner*: Exports and firm characteristics - First evidence from Fractional Probit Panel Estimates, August 2008
- No.96: *Nils Braakmann*: The smoking wage penalty in the United Kingdom: Regression and matching evidence from the British Household Panel Survey, August 2008
- No.95: *Joachim Wagner*: Exportaktivitäten und Rendite in niedersächsischen Industrieunternehmen, August 2008
[publiziert in: Statistische Monatshefte Niedersachsen 62 (2008), 10,552-560]
- No.94: *Joachim Wagner*: Wirken sich Exportaktivitäten positiv auf die Rendite von deutschen Industrieunternehmen aus?, August 2008
[publiziert in: Wirtschaftsdienst, 88 (2008) 10, 690-696]
- No.93: *Claus Schnabel & Joachim Wagner*: The aging of the unions in West Germany, 1980-2006, August 2008
[forthcoming in: Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik]
- No.92: *Alexander Vogel and Stefan Dittrich*: The German turnover tax statistics panels, August 2008
[forthcoming in: Schmollers Jahrbuch 128 (2008)]
- No.91: *Nils Braakmann*: Crime does pay (at least when it's violent!) – On the compensating wage differentials of high regional crime levels, July 2008
- No.90: *Nils Braakmann*: Fields of training, plant characteristics and the gender wage gap in entry wages among skilled workers – Evidence from German administrative data, July 2008
- No.89: *Alexander Vogel*: Exports productivity in the German business services sector: First evidence from the Turnover Tax Statistics panel, July 2008
- No.88: *Joachim Wagner*: Improvements and future challenges for the research infrastructure in the field *Firm Level Data*, June 2008
- No.87: *Markus Groth*: A review of the German mandatory deposit for one-way drinks packaging and drinks packaging taxes in Europe, June 2008
- No.86: *Heike Wetzel*: European railway deregulation. The influence of regulatory and environmental conditions on efficiency, May 2008
- No.85: *Nils Braakmann*: Non scholae, sed vitae discimus! - The importance of fields of study for the gender wage gap among German university graduates during market entry and the first years of their careers, May 2008

- No.84: *Markus Groth*: Private ex-ante transaction costs for repeated biodiversity conservation auctions: A case study, May 2008
- No.83: *Jan Kranich*: R&D and the agglomeration of industries, April 2008
- No.82: *Alexander Vogel*: Zur Exporttätigkeit unternehmensnaher Dienstleister in Niedersachsen - Erste Ergebnisse zu Export und Produktivität auf Basis des Umsatzsteuerstatistikpanels, April 2008
- No.81: *Joachim Wagner*: Exporte und Firmenerfolg: Welche Firmen profitieren wie vom internationalen Handel?, März 2008
- No.80: *Stefan Baumgärtner*: Managing increasing environmental risks through agro-biodiversity and agri-environmental policies, March 2008
- No.79: *Thomas Huth*: Die Quantitätstheorie des Geldes – Eine keynesianische Reformulierung, März 2008
- No.78: *Markus Groth*: An empirical examination of repeated auctions for biodiversity conservation contracts, March 2008
- No.77: *Nils Braakmann*: Intra-firm wage inequality and firm performance – First evidence from German linked employer-employee-data, February 2008
- No.76: *Markus Groth*: Perspektiven der Nutzung von Methanhydraten als Energieträger – Eine Bestandsaufnahme, Februar 2008
- No.75: *Stefan Baumgärtner, Christian Becker, Karin Frank, Birgit Müller & Christian Quaas*: Relating the philosophy and practice of ecological economics. The role of concepts, models, and case studies in inter- and transdisciplinary sustainability research, January 2008
[published in: *Ecological Economics* 67 (2008), 3, 384-393]
- No.74: *Thorsten Schank, Claus Schnabel & Joachim Wagner*: Higher wages in exporting firms: Self-selection, export effect, or both? First evidence from German linked employer-employee data, January 2008
- No.73: *Institut für Volkswirtschaftslehre*: Forschungsbericht 2007, Januar 2008
- No.72: *Christian Growitsch and Heike Wetzel*: Testing for economies of scope in European railways: An efficiency analysis, December 2007
[revised version of Working Paper No. 29, forthcoming in: *Journal of Transport Economics and Policy*]
- No.71: *Joachim Wagner, Lena Koller and Claus Schnabel*: Sind mittelständische Betriebe der Jobmotor der deutschen Wirtschaft?, Dezember 2007
[publiziert in: *Wirtschaftsdienst* 88 (2008), 2, 130-135]
- No.70: *Nils Braakmann*: Islamistic terror, the war on Iraq and the job prospects of Arab men in Britain: Does a country's direct involvement matter?, December 2007
- No.69: *Maik Heinemann*: E-stability and stability learning in models with asymmetric information, December 2007
- No.68: *Joachim Wagner*: Exporte und Produktivität in Industriebetrieben – Niedersachsen im interregionalen und internationalen Vergleich, Dezember 2007
- No.67: *Stefan Baumgärtner and Martin F. Quaas*: Ecological-economic viability as a criterion of strong sustainability under uncertainty, November 2007
- No.66: *Kathrin Michael*: Überbrückungsgeld und Existenzgründungszuschuss – Ergebnisse einer schriftlichen Befragung drei Jahre nach Gründungsbeginn, November 2007

- No.65: *The International Study Group on Export and Productivity*: Exports and Productivity – Comparable Evidence for 14 Countries, November 2007
[forthcoming in: *Review of World Economics* 144 (2008), 4]
- No.64: *Lena Koller, Claus Schnabel und Joachim Wagner*: Freistellung von Betriebsräten – Eine Beschäftigungsbremse?, November 2007
[publiziert in: *Zeitschrift für Arbeitsmarktforschung*, 41 (2008), 2/3, 305-326]
- No.63: *Anne-Kathrin Last*: The Monetary Value of Cultural Goods: A Contingent Valuation Study of the Municipal Supply of Cultural Goods in Lueneburg, Germany, October 2007
- No.62: *Thomas Wein und Heike Wetzel*: The Difficulty to Behave as a (regulated) Natural Monopolist – The Dynamics of Electricity Network Access Charges in Germany 2002 to 2005, September 2007
- No.61: *Stefan Baumgärtner und Martin F. Quaas*: Agro-biodiversity as natural insurance and the development of financial insurance markets, September 2007
[published in: A. Kontoleon, U. Pascual and M. Smale (eds.): *Agrobiodiversity, conservation and economic development*, Routledge, London, 293-317]
- No.60: *Stefan Bender, Joachim Wagner, Markus Zwick*: KombiFiD - Kombinierte Firmendaten für Deutschland, September 2007
- No.59: *Jan Kranich*: Too much R&D? - Vertical differentiation in a model of monopolistic competition, August 2007
- No.58: *Christian Papilloud und Ingrid Ott*: Convergence or mediation? Experts of vulnerability and the vulnerability of experts' discourses on nanotechnologies – a case study, July 2007
[published in: *European Journal of Social Science Research* 21 (2008), 1, 41-64]
- No.57: *Ingrid Ott und Susanne Soretz*: Governmental activity, integration and agglomeration, July 2007
[published in: *ICFAI Journal of Managerial Economics* 5 (2008), 2, 28-47]
- No.56: *Nils Braakmann*: Struktur und Erfolg von Ich-AG-Gründungen: Ergebnisse einer Umfrage im Arbeitsagenturbezirk Lüneburg, Juli 2007
[revidierte Fassung erscheint in: Richter, J., Schöning, S. & Wetzel, H., *Mittelstand 2008. Aktuelle Forschungsbeiträge zu gesellschaftlichen und finanzwirtschaftlichen Herausforderungen*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2008]
- No.55: *Nils Braakmann*: Differences in the earnings distribution of self- and dependent employed German men – evidence from a quantile regression decomposition analysis, July 2007
- No.54: *Joachim Waagner*: Export entry, export exit, and productivity in German Manufacturing Industries, June 2007
[published in: *International Journal of the Economics of Business* 15 (2008), 2, 169-180]
- No.53: *Nils Braakmann*: Wirkungen der Beschäftigungspflicht schwerbehinderter Arbeitnehmer – Erkenntnisse aus der Einführung des „Gesetzes zur Bekämpfung der Arbeitslosigkeit Schwerbehinderter“, Juni 2007
[revidierte Fassung erscheint in: *Zeitschrift für Arbeitsmarktforschung/ Journal for Labour Market Research* 41 (2008),1]

- No.52: *Jan Kranich und Ingrid Ott*: Regionale Spitzentechnologie auf internationalen Märkten, Juni 2007
[erscheint in: Merz, J. und Schulte, R. (Hrsg.): Neue Ansätze der MittelstandsForschung, Münster, 2007]
- No.51: *Joachim Wagner*: Die Forschungspotenziale der Betriebspaneldaten des Monatsberichts im Verarbeitenden Gewerbe, Mai 2007
[erscheint in: AStA – Wirtschafts- und Sozialwirtschaftliches Archiv]
- No.50: *Stefan Baumgärtner, Frank Jöst und Ralph Winkler*: Optimal dynamic scale and structure of a multi-pollution economy, May 2007
[forthcoming in: Ecological Economics]
- No.49: *Helmut Fryges und Joachim Wagner*: Exports and productivity growth – First evidence from a continuous treatment approach, May 2007
[forthcoming in: Review of World Economics]
- No.48: *Ulrich Kaiser und Joachim Wagner*: Neue Möglichkeiten zur Nutzung vertraulicher amtlicher Personen- und Firmendaten, April 2007
[publiziert in: Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik 9 (2008), 3, 329-349]
- No.47: *Joachim Wagner*: Jobmotor Mittelstand? Arbeitsplatzdynamik und Betriebsgröße in der westdeutschen Industrie, April 2007
[publiziert in: Vierteljahrshefte zur Wirtschaftsforschung, 76 (2007), 3, 76-87]
- No.46: *Christiane Clemens und Maik Heinemann*: Credit Constraints, Idiosyncratic Risks, and the Wealth Distribution in a Heterogenous Agent Model, March 2007
- No.45: *Jan Kranich*: Biotechnologie und Internationalisierung. Ergebnisse der Online-Befragung, März 2007
- No.44: *Joachim Wagner*: Entry, exit and productivity. Empirical results for German manufacturing industries, March 2007
[forthcoming in: German Economic Review]
- No.43: *Joachim Wagner*: Productivity and Size of the Export Market Evidence for West and East German Plants, 2004, March 2007
[publiziert in: Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik, 227 (2007), 4, 403-408]
- No.42: *Joachim Wagner*: Why more West than East German firms export, March 2007
- No.41: *Joachim Wagner*: Exports and Productivity in Germany, March 2007
[publiziert in: Applied Economics Quarterly 53 (2007), 4, 353-373]
- No.40: *Lena Koller, Klaus Schnabel und Joachim Wagner*: Schwellenwerte im Arbeitsrecht. Höhere Transparenz und Effizienz durch Vereinheitlichung, Februar 2007
[publiziert in: Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik, 8 (2007), 3, 242-255]
- No.39: *Thomas Wein und Wiebke B. Röber*: Sind ausbildende Handwerksbetriebe erfolgreicher?, Januar 2007
- No.38: *Institut für Volkswirtschaft*: Forschungsbericht 2006, Januar 2007
- No.37: *Nils Braakmann*: The impact of September 11th, 2001 on the job prospects of foreigners with Arab background – Evidence from German labor market data, January 2007
- No.36: *Jens Korunig*: Regulierung des Netzmonopolisten durch Peak-load Pricing?, Dezember 2006

- No.35: *Nils Braakmann*: Die Einführung der fachkundigen Stellungnahme bei der Ich-AG, November 2006
[erscheint in: Schulte, Reinhard: Neue Ansätze der MittelstandsForschung, Münster etc.: Lit, 2008]
- No.34: *Martin F. Quaas and Stefan Baumgärtner*: Natural vs. financial insurance in the management of public-good ecosystems, October 2006
[published in: Ecological Economics 65 (2008), 2, 397-406]
- No.33: *Stefan Baumgärtner and Martin F. Quaas*: The Private and Public Insurance Value of Conservative Biodiversity Management, October 2006
- No.32: *Ingrid Ott and Christian Papilloud*: Converging institutions. Shaping the relationships between nanotechnologies, economy and society, October 2006
[published in: Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society 2007 (27), 4, 455-466]
- No.31: *Claus Schnabel and Joachim Wagner*: The persistent decline in unionization in western and eastern Germany, 1980-2004: What can we learn from a decomposition analysis?, October 2006
[published in: Industrielle Beziehungen/The German Journal of Industrial Relations 14 (2007), 118-132]
- No.30: *Ingrid Ott and Susanne Soretz*: Regional growth strategies: fiscal versus institutional governmental policies, September 2006
[published in: Economic Modelling 25 (1008), 605-622]
- No.29: *Christian Growitsch and Heike Wetzel*: Economies of Scope in European Railways: An Efficiency Analysis, July 2006
- No.28: *Thorsten Schank, Claus Schnabel and Joachim Wagner*: Do exporters really pay higher wages? First evidence from German linked employer-employee data, June 2006
[published in in: Journal of International Economics 72 (2007), 1, 52-74]
- No.27: *Joachim Wagner*: Markteintritte, Marktaustritte und Produktivität
Empirische Befunde zur Dynamik in der Industrie, März 2006
[publiziert in: AStA – Wirtschafts- und Sozialwirtschaftliches Archiv 1 (2007), 3, 193-203]
- No.26: *Ingrid Ott and Susanne Soretz*: Governmental activity and private capital adjustment, March 2006
[forthcoming in: Icfai Journal of Managerial Economics]
- No.25: *Joachim Wagner*: International Firm Activities and Innovation:
Evidence from Knowledge Production Functions for German Firms, March 2006
[published in: The Icfai Journal of Knowledge Management VI (2008), 2, 47-62]
- No.24: *Ingrid Ott und Susanne Soretz*: Nachhaltige Entwicklung durch endogene Umweltwahrnehmung, März 2006
publiziert in: Clemens, C., Heinemann, M. & Soretz, S., Auf allen Märkten zu Hause (Gedenkschrift für Franz Haslinger), Marburg: Metropolis, 2006, 233-256
- No.23: *John T. Addison, Claus Schnabel, and Joachim Wagner*: The (Parlous) State of German Unions, February 2006
[published in: Journal of Labor Research 28 (2007), 3-18]

- No.22: *Joachim Wagner, Thorsten Schank, Claus Schnabel, and John T. Addison: Works Councils, Labor Productivity and Plant Heterogeneity: First Evidence from Quantile Regressions*, February 2006
[published in: *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik* 226 (2006), 505 - 518]
- No.21: *Corinna Bunk: Betriebliche Mitbestimmung vier Jahre nach der Reform des BetrVG: Ergebnisse der 2. Befragung der Mitglieder des Arbeitgeberverbandes Lüneburg Nordostniedersachsen*, Februar 2006
- No.20: *Jan Kranich: The Strength of Vertical Linkages*, July 2006
- No.19: *Jan Kranich und Ingrid Ott: Geographische Restrukturierung internationaler Wertschöpfungsketten – Standortentscheidungen von KMU aus regionalökonomischer Perspektive*, Februar 2006
[publiziert in: Merz, J. und Schulte, R. (Hrsg.): *Fortschritte in der MittelstandsForschung*, Münster, 2006, 113-129]
- No.18: *Thomas Wein und Wiebke B. Röber: Handwerksreform 2004 – Rückwirkungen auf das Ausbildungsverhalten Lüneburger Handwerksbetriebe?*, Februar 2006
- No.17: *Wiebke B. Röber und Thomas Wein: Mehr Wettbewerb im Handwerk durch die Handwerksreform?*, Februar 2006
- No.16: *Joachim Wagner: Politikrelevante Folgerungen aus Analysen mit wirtschaftsstatistischen Einzeldaten der Amtlichen Statistik*, Februar 2006
[publiziert in: *Schmollers Jahrbuch* 126 (2006) 359-374]
- No.15: *Joachim Wagner: Firmenalter und Firmenperformance*
Empirische Befunde zu Unterschieden zwischen jungen und alten Firmen in Deutschland, September 2005
[publiziert in: Lutz Bellmann und Joachim Wagner (Hrsg.), *Betriebsdemographie (Beiträge zur Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung, Band 305)*, Nürnberg: IAB der BA, 83-111]
- No.14: *Joachim Wagner: German Works Councils and Productivity: First Evidence from a Nonparametric Test*, September 2005
[published in: *Applied Economics Letters* 115 (2008), 727-730]
- No.13: *Lena Koller, Claus Schnabel und Joachim Wagner: Arbeitsrechtliche Schwellenwerte und betriebliche Arbeitsplatzdynamik: Eine empirische Untersuchung am Beispiel des Schwerbehindertengesetzes*, August 2005
[publiziert in: *Zeitschrift für ArbeitsmarktForschung/ Journal for Labour Market Research* 39 (2006), 181-199]
- No.12: *Claus Schnabel and Joachim Wagner: Who are the workers who never joined a union? Empirical evidence from Germany*, July 2005
[published in: *Industrielle Beziehungen/ The German Journal of Industrial Relations* 13 (2006), 118-131]
- No.11: *Joachim Wagner: Exporte und Produktivität in mittelständischen Betrieben*
Befunde aus der niedersächsischen Industrie (1995 – 2004), June 2005
[publiziert in: *Niedersächsisches Landesamt für Statistik, Statistische Berichte Niedersachsen, Sonderausgabe: Tagung der NLS am 9. März 2006, Globalisierung und regionale Wirtschaftsentwicklung - Datenlage und Datenbedarf in Niedersachsen*. Hannover, Niedersächsisches Landesamt für Statistik, Juli 2006, 18 – 29]

- No.10: *Joachim Wagner*: Der Noth gehorchend, nicht dem eignen Trieb.
Nascent Necessity and Opportunity Entrepreneurs in Germany.
Evidence from the Regional Entrepreneurship Monitor (REM), May 2005
[published in: RWI: Mitteilungen. Quarterly 54/ 55 (2003/04), 287-303
{published June 2006}]
- No. 9: *Gabriel Desgranges and Maik Heinemann*: Strongly Rational Expectations Equilibria with
Endogenous Acquisition of Information, March 2005
- No. 8: *Joachim Wagner*: Exports, Foreign Direct Investment, and Productivity: Evidence from
German Firm Level Data, March 2005
[published in: Applied Economics Letters 13 (2006), 347-349]
- No. 7: *Thomas Wein*: Associations' Agreement and the Interest of the Network Suppliers – The
Strategic Use of Structural Features, March 2005
- No. 6: *Christiane Clemens and Maik Heinemann*: On the Effects of Redistribution on Growth
and Entrepreneurial Risk-Taking, March 2005
- No. 5: *Christiane Clemens and Maik Heinemann*: Endogenous Redistributive Cycles – An
overlapping Generations Approach to Social Conflict and Cyclical Growth, March 2005
- No. 4: *Joachim Wagner*: *Exports and Productivity*: A Survey of the Evidence from Firm Level
Data, March 2005
[published in: The World Economy 30 (2007), 1, 60-82]
- No. 3: *Thomas Wein and Reimund Schwarze*: Is the Market Classification of Risk Always
Efficient? - Evidence from German Third Party Motor Insurance, March 2005
- No. 2: *Ingrid Ott and Stephen J. Turnovsky*: Excludable and Non-Excludable Public Inputs:
Consequences for Economic Growth, June 2005 (Revised version)
[published in: *Economica* 73 (2006), 292, 725-742
also published as CESifo Working Paper 1423]
- No. 1: *Joachim Wagner*: Nascent and Infant Entrepreneurs in Germany.
Evidence from the Regional Entrepreneurship Monitor (REM), March 2005
[erschienen in: Joachim Merz, Reinhard Schulte (Hrsg.), *Neue Ansätze der
MittelstandsForschung*, Berlin: Lit Verlag 2008, S.395-411]

Leuphana Universität Lüneburg
Institut für Volkswirtschaftslehre
Postfach 2440
D-21314 Lüneburg
Tel.: ++49 4131 677 2321
email: brodt@leuphana.de
www.leuphana.de/vwl/papers