THE DYNAMICS OF TRADE AND INNOVATION: A JOINT APPROACH

Silviano Esteve-Pérez
Diego Rodríguez

FUNDACIÓN DE LAS CAJAS DE AHORROS
DOCUMENTO DE TRABAJO
Nº 467/2009

De conformidad con la base quinta de la convocatoria del Programa de Estímulo a la Investigación, este trabajo ha sido sometido a evaluación externa anónima de especialistas cualificados a fin de contrastar su nivel técnico.

ISSN: 1988-8767

La serie **DOCUMENTOS DE TRABAJO** incluye avances y resultados de investigaciones dentro de los programas de la Fundación de las Cajas de Ahorros.
Las opiniones son responsabilidad de los autores.

THE DYNAMICS OF TRADE AND INNOVATION: A JOINT APPROACH

Silviano Esteve-Pérez**
Diego Rodríguez*

Abstract

This paper analyzes the joint dynamics of internationalization and innovation decisions at the firm level. A main concern is to disentangle the observed persistence that arises from true state dependence from that emerging from firm heterogeneity, which could lead to spurious state-dependence. To this end, we use alternative econometric approaches, ranging from static pooled probit to dynamic random effects probit models that deal with the initial conditions problem. Later, we explicitly account for interdependence between these two decisions and cross-persistence by estimating a bivariate extension. Export and R&D participation are initially used as indicators of internationalization and innovation decisions, respectively. Then we extend the analysis to imports and alternative measures of innovation, particularly product and process innovations. The empirical analysis is carried out using a firm-level longitudinal dataset of Spanish manufacturing over the period 1990-2006.

Keywords: innovation, exports, persistence, binary choice panel data models

JEL classification: F12, L25, C25.

* Diego Rodríguez Rodríguez, Dep, Applied Economics II, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Madrid (28233), Spain. E-mail: drodri@ccee.ucm.es
**Dep. Applied Economics II - Faculty of Economics and Business--University of Valencia

Acknowledgements: Silvio Esteve gratefully acknowledges financial support from the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (reference ECO2008-04059/ECON). Diego Rodríguez acknowledges financial support from the Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation (reference ECO2007-66520/ECON) and the Micro-Dyn Project (VI Framework Program). The usual disclaimer applies.

1. Introduction

The literature on either innovation or export decisions at the firm level has been very prolific during the last decade. Rather frequently, these studies have considered one of these activities to be a determinant of the other. However, previous research had already pointed out a close relationship between the two decisions. For instance, the global-economy models of endogenous innovation and growth (Grossman and Helpman, 1991) showed a strong interdependence between export and innovation. In addition, both innovation and internationalization strategies have been found to be rather persistent, i.e. participating in one of these activities in one period raises the probability of carrying out that activity in the next period.

Recently, both the theoretical developments of dynamic models of heterogeneous firms facing sunk costs of entering markets (Melitz, 2003), which extend previous models of firm dynamics (Jovanovic, 1982), and the availability of longitudinal datasets have boosted micro-level studies on the decision to export. These studies have showed that export activity is closely related to observed heterogeneity across firms in their efficiency levels, so that only the most efficient firms participate in export markets. They have also examined heterogeneity between exporters and non-exporters in several other performance dimensions by testing the self-selection and learning-by-exporting hypotheses (among others, Bernard and Jensen, 1999 and 2004). They find that exporters are usually larger and enjoy advantages in other features closely related to productivity, such as average wages and capital intensity (see Greenaway and Kneller, 2007, for a survey of empirical studies).

A shortcoming of these models is that the origin of the heterogeneity in efficiency levels across firms remains unexplained, that is, heterogeneity is assumed rather than derived. In other words, these models focus on the link between efficiency distribution across firms and export (and import) involvement, but do not step back to ask what the drivers of the observed differences in efficiency levels across firms are. In that sense, it seems reasonable to think that productivity is closely related to decisions previously pursued by firms, particularly those linked to innovation strategies. Indeed, endogenous growth theory has long emphasized the role played by innovation activity to explain productivity growth. The robust relationship that empirical evidence has found between export and efficiency can be driven by different causal mechanisms between innovation and export. For instance, it could be argued that exporters are ex-ante more productive because they carried out innovation activities before entering export markets, that is, a firm's decision to start exporting may be driven by its prior decision to innovate and consequently enhance its productivity. Alternatively, participation in export markets may enhance process innovation boosting exporters' productivity.

The primary goal of this paper is to shed more light on the empirical determinants of export and innovation decisions taking into account persistence and the interdependence between them. Specifically, this paper provides insights to address some interesting questions: (i) which firms engage in export and R&D activities?; (ii) are participation rates in both activities similar or is one activity more common than the other?,

and why?; (iii) is there persistence in export/innovation activities?; if so, is it "true" or spurious persistence?; (iv) is there interdependence between exports and innovation?; (v) are export and innovation decisions driven by the same observed/unobserved firm characteristics? If so, correlation between exports and innovation may be spurious; (vi) is the observed (simultaneous) correlation between exports and innovation spurious or is it real state dependence across these two participation decisions over time, due to sunk costs or learning effects?; (vii) Are exporters compelled to innovate before entering export markets and/or do exporting enhances innovation participation?

It is important to bear in mind that the dynamics of the relationship between innovation and internationalization may be complex. On the one hand, if exporters enjoy *ex-ante* efficiency advantages over non-exporters (a finding broadly supported by the empirical literature, which is consistent with the self-selection hypothesis), past innovation behaviour may be relevant to explain current export strategies. The measurement of innovation, particularly the distinction between product and process innovation, can also play a relevant role here. Product innovation rather than process innovation may enhance productivity facilitating access to export markets. Thus, firms would enjoy the monopolistic position that emerges from supplying a differentiated product from competitors making it easier access export markets. In addition, participation in export markets may enhance efficiency gains through a process of learning-by-exporting that accrues from access to technology, best international practices, and tougher competition. In this setting, exporting firms may have a stronger incentive than home-based firms to introduce process innovation as the costs of the investment can be spread over a larger amount of output. Hence, an effect may run from export towards process innovation, although the empirical support to this learning-by-exporting effect is modest (see Wagner, 2007, for a survey).

On the other hand, both innovation and export status have been found to be highly persistent (Roberts and Tybout, 1997, Geroski *et al.*, 1997, for exports and innovation, respectively). That is, being and exporter/innovator in one period raises the probability of carrying out that activity in the next period. Persistence may arise due to true state dependence (caused by sunk entry costs, *success breads success* or learning-by-doing effects) or due to observed/unobserved firm heterogeneity. A main challenge in the empirical analysis is to differentiate between the persistent behaviour that emerges from true state dependence and the persistence that arises from unobserved firm heterogeneity that could lead to spurious state-dependence. In the first case, there is a casual effect because the decision to export (or to innovate) in one period enhances the probability of exporting (or innovating) in the subsequent period. Alternatively, in the second case, firms may possess certain characteristics which make them more likely to export (to innovate). If these characteristics persist over time, they will induce persistence in the decision. Some of those characteristics will be observable (e.g., firm size, foreign ownership,..) and controlled for in the empirical analysis. The difficulties arise with unobservable characteristics (technological opportunities; managerial abilities, risk attitudes …) that affect the firms' decision to export (innovate) and that are correlated over time. Past behaviour could then affect present behaviour only due (or largely due) to these persistent unobservable

firm characteristics.

In this paper, we use firm-level data from the Encuesta Sobre Estrategias Empresariales (ESEE, hereafter), a survey conducted annually since 1990 for Spanish manufacturing firms with more than 10 employees. In particular, we use a representative longitudinal dataset of Spanish manufacturing firms for a long period of time: 1990-2006. The study of the Spanish manufacturing sector over this period merits further comments. First, exporting activities of Spanish firms grew very fast over the 1990s. The initial years of the sample period are coincident with the last phase of transitory period the Spanish economy went through after joining the EU in 1986 and the process of attaining the Single European Market. Besides, exchange rate turmoil in the EMS in early nineties and subsequent domestic currency devaluations improved price competitiveness. The combination of EU membership and currency devaluation boosted access to foreign markets by domestic firms during the 1990s. This internationalization trend has attenuated in recent years, although Spanish export share in world markets has grown over the complete period despite the increasing competition from Asian countries since the late nineties. Secondly, innovation activities have been rather modest over the whole period. In spite of policy makers concerns, aggregated innovation activities of the economy make the Spanish economy to be ranked in the last positions among European countries.

The analysis is carried out using univariate and bivariate dynamic binary choice panel data models for the decisions to export and innovate in order to take account of the interactions between these two decisions. These models allow explaining the source of persistence and cross-persistence in the two activities. One of the main features of the univariate dynamic binary choice model with random effects is that it permits distinguishing between unobserved heterogeneity and genuine state dependence. In addition, the bivariate model accounts for correlation between innovation and export activities taking into account persistence. The remarkable length of the time span of the data, seventeen years, is rather unusual in the context of firm panel datasets and may enhance the robustness of the dynamic analysis.

This paper contributes to the literature in a number of ways. First, the empirical approach takes into account the dynamic characteristics of both innovation and internationalization activities as well as the interdependence between the two decisions. The econometric methods deal with the issue of initial conditions and correlated unobserved heterogeneity in dynamic binary choice models using both Wooldridge (2005) and Heckman (1981) methods. The paper assumes explicitly that both export and innovation are endogenous variables. We use then a dynamic random effect probit to address crossed-links between both strategies. The empirical work builds upon recent papers that have applied this framework to analyze the relationship between unemployment and low-wage employment (Stewart, 2007) and the joint ownership of stocks and mutual funds (Alessie *et al.*, 2005). Other authors have also addressed the interdependence between innovation and exports using bivariate probit models [Aw *et al*., 2007, 2008; Damijan, Kostevc and Polanec, 2008; Girma *et al.*, 2008]. Secondly, the nature of both innovation and internationalization activities are carefully analyzed. We initially measure innovation with R&D expenses, a very common measurement of technological activities by firms. Later, we shift from an input to an output perspective on innovative

activities, and use both process and product innovation to proxy innovation activities. Thirdly, the robustness analysis is extended to include import activities as an alternative measurement of internationalization.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a description of the related literature on the relationship between trade and innovation. Section 3 describes the data and provides some preliminary evidence. The econometric model is sketched out in section 4, and estimation results as well as some extensions are discussed in section 5. Finally, Section 6 summarizes main conclusions.

2. Trade and innovation: a revision of related literature

The relationship between international trade and innovation has been widely addressed by the economic literature. International trade theory has long pointed to technological differences in order to explain trade patterns across countries (Bloomfield, 1994). This relationship was made more explicit when market imperfections were incorporated to trade models, as in neo-technological models that emphasized the role played by persistent technological gaps among countries (Posner, 1961) or in those models based on the effects of the product cycle life on the decision to export (Vernon, 1966). Later, several models dug deeper into the role played by technological activities in international trade flows, under the premise that these activities are a main source of product differentiation (Grossman and Helpman, 1995).

The empirical work devoted to examine the effects of innovation activities on aggregated export flows (at cross-country and/or cross-industry level) is widespread. Wakelin (1998a) estimated this relationship for a panel of OECD countries finding high inter-industry heterogeneity. The availability of micro-level data boosted firm-level empirical studies that obtained rather mixed results. For example, Hirsch and Bijauoui (1985) and Willmore (1992) did not obtain evidence in favor of a positive relationship for Israeli and Brazilian firms, respectively, while Kumar and Siddhartan (1994), Braunerhjelm (1996), and Wakelin (1998b) did find a positive association. These studies differ both in the proxies used for innovation and in the features of the samples of firms investigated (innovators, exporters…). Furthermore, most of them examined the relationship between innovation and export intensities rather than participation decisions.

Recently, a number of firm-level (and plant-level) studies have resumed the investigation of the link between innovation and internationalization. In contrast to the aforementioned studies, recent work emphasizes the importance of heterogeneity in efficiency levels across firms. Wagner (2007) summarizes the main findings of this literature. First, exporters are different from non-exporters in several dimensions (productivity, size…). Secondly, evidence is broadly consistent with self-selection hypothesis that predicts that only more efficient firms enter export markets. Thirdly, evidence supporting the existence of a productivity-enhancing effect of exporting (learning-by-exporting hypothesis) is mixed. This empirical work builds upon Clerides *et al.* (1998) and Melitz (2003) dynamic models of heterogeneous firms that face sunk costs of entering export markets, inspired by Jovanovic (1982) model of firm dynamics. A main characteristic of these models is that firms draw their productivity level from a known statistical distribution. Only more productive firms enter a market (home, foreign), or stay in if they had entered previously. Less productive

firms either do not enter or decide to exit a market. Hence, firms differ in their productivity levels, but these levels are given and not derived endogenously in the model. Thus, these theoretical models predict *ex-ante* (before entering foreign markets) productivity advantages of exporters over non-exporters, although they do not preclude additional efficiency gains that may later (after entry) accrue to exporters (learning by exporting).

Interestingly, Melitz (2003) suggests that higher productivity may also be thought of as producing a higher quality variety at equal cost. Though it might be reasonable to relate quality varieties with product innovations, there is not an explicit role for the latter in his model. More recently, Costantini and Melitz (2008) develop a model where both innovation and export are endogenous decisions. Their model predicts that the anticipation of trade liberalization brings forward the firm's decision to innovate relative to that of entering export market, which may influence the causation link between export status and productivity. Their model excludes a learning-by-exporting channel, so innovation- or productivity-enhancing effects derived from export experience are precluded. This model is similar to that by Atkeson and Burstein (2007), who also examine the two decisions though considering that each firm chooses a different level from a continuum of innovation intensities. By contrast, Costantini and Melitz (2008) consider it as a more radical decision: either adoption of a new technology or major product quality upgrades/redesign.

When assessing the direction of causality between innovations and export decision the distinction between product and process innovation may be important. On the one hand, it might be argued that product innovations are more relevant to explain the decision to export. The supply of a differentiated product confers firms some market power facilitating their access to foreign markets. This is coherent with the classical product life-cycle theory (Klepper, 1996), which suggests that product innovation dominates in early stages, while process innovations are more relevant in mature phases of the life cycle, when production scale is larger so productive efficiency becomes increasingly important. Thus, Damijan *et al.* (2008) find that product innovation is crucial to explain the export decision for Slovenian firms.[1] On the other hand, process innovation, associated to cost-savings and improvements in technical conditions, enhances firm efficiency, which could stimulate export activity. This positive effect of process innovation on export is probably more relevant in homogeneous-product industries where price competition is more intense. Recent research on the link between innovation and productivity emphasizes the role played by process innovations (Griffith *et al.*, 2006). In sum, probably both types of innovation may help explain the self-selection of more efficient firms into export markets.

The causal link between innovation and exports may be easily reversed in presence of learning effects related to the participation in foreign markets. In this case, it seems that process innovation could play a more relevant role than product innovation. Export activities allow firms to enlarge their relevant market raising the potential benefits from process innovations, given that fixed (and sunk) costs of innovation may be distributed over a larger number of lower-price units. In addition, tougher competition in international markets and access

[1] Becker and Egger (2007) and Cassiman and Golovko (2007) find similar results.

to best-practices (knowledge spillovers) also strengthen the incentive to innovate. Besides, exporting may also enhance product innovation when the dynamics of the market forces firms to introduce new varieties in order to maintain their competitive position. The empirical evidence on the effect of exporting on innovation activities is more scarce (e.g., Salomon, 2006), which is consistent with the little empirical support for the learning-by-exporting hypothesis.

The aforementioned literature suggests that the relationship between exports and innovation may run in both directions. On the one hand, the link running from product innovation to productivity and then to the decision to export may explain how a firm's decision to carry out R&D and make product innovations improves its productivity and fosters the decision to enter export markets. On the other hand, the relationship running from exporting to innovation may help explain the link between exporting activity and productivity growth.

Therefore, the analysis of this relationship ought to take this interdependence into consideration. Some recent papers have examined this issue in the context of bivariate decision analysis. Aw *et al.* (2007) estimate how participation in export and innovation influences a firm's future productivity trajectory using a selection model that accounts for the endogenous decision of a firm to exit production. Aw *et al.* (2008) develop a structural model in which a domestic firm makes three dynamic decisions in each period: a discrete decision to export and two continuous decisions regarding the level of R&D and the investment in physical capital. Girma *et al.* (2008) use R&D expenditures as an indicator of innovation for Irish and British firms. Their results are mixed: while previous exporting experience enhances the innovative capability of Irish firms through increasing R&D activity, there is no effect for British firms. Damijan *et al.* (2008) estimate a bivariate probit model to assess the two-way relationship between exports and innovation. Besides, they also use propensity-score matching techniques, applied both to the export participation equation (they compare the likelihood to start exporting of innovators and non-innovators) and to the innovation participation equation (comparing innovation efforts of exporters and non-exporters). They do not find support for the hypothesis that either product or process innovations increases the probability of becoming a first-time exporter. However, they find evidence that, in a sample of medium and large first-time exporters, process (but not product) innovations lead to productivity improvements.

Lileeva and Trefler (2007) have introduced an interesting aspect in this debate between exporting, innovation and productivity. They suggest that the effect of market openness on the incentives to start exporting and making productivity-enhancing investments differs according the initial productivity level of the firm. Lower-productivity firms will incur such investments because new access to foreign markets provides them with enough sales volumes. As a result, we should observe a complementary relationship between innovation and exports for those firms. By contrast, higher-productivity firms will export without incurring in such investment. They find support for this dichotomy analyzing the effect of the FTA on Canadian firms.

A final consideration is related to the fact that export activity is not the only channel of

internationalization that may be related to innovation. Access to best international practices and technology can take place through exports, but also through the acquisition of goods and services. However, the shift from export to imports is not straightforward and requires some caution. To some extent, the link between both activities emerges because a share of intermediate-good imports is reprocessed and later exported (Hummels *et al.*, 2001), which quite often is closely related to the role of multinational enterprises in international trade. A connection between productivity and import activities is expected insofar as these imported inputs provide access to foreign technology (Grossman and Helpman, 1991). Besides, firms can also attain a higher variety and/or quality of inputs through imports. In this line, some recent papers have started to incorporate imports to explain efficiency heterogeneity across firms (e.g., Kasahara and Rodrigue, 2005; Altomonte and Békés, 2008; Castellani *et al.*, 2008; and Fariñas and Martin, 2008, for Chilean, Hungarian, Italian and Spanish plants/firms, respectively). The results suggest that importers are more productive than non-importers. Kasahara and Lapham (2008) have developed a theoretical model in which more productive firms self-select into importing. Similarly to exports, the argument hinges on the existence of sunk costs related to start importing. In principle, the argument of sunk costs related to import activity is less compelling than in the export case. However these costs may arise when either client-supplier relationships are the result of a matching process after which both parts establish stable sourcing relationships (see, for example, Grossman and Helpman, 2002) or importers incur in complementary costs to adapt intermediate import (and incorporated technologies) to their production processes.

3. Data and preliminary evidence.

3.1. Data

The data used in this paper are drawn from the *Encuesta Sobre Estrategias Empresariales* survey (Survey on Business Strategies), for the period 1990-2006. This survey is conducted yearly since 1990 by Fundacion SEPI, on behalf of the Spanish Ministry of Industry. The sampling scheme is as follows. Manufacturing firms with less than 10 employees are excluded from the survey. Firms with 10 to 200 employees (SMEs, henceforth) are randomly sampled by industry (at two-digit NACE level) and size strata, holding around a 4% of the population. All firms with more than 200 employees (large firms, henceforth) are requested to participate, obtaining a participation rate around 60%. The ESEE is representative of Spanish manufacturing firms classified by industrial sectors and size categories and includes exhaustive information at the firm level, especially regarding exporting and innovation activities. The relatively long sample period, which comprises 17 waves, ensures that we can observe firms' innovation and exporting behaviour over different phases of the business cycle and study their dynamics.

Table 1

Characteristics of the panel

	Unbalanced with at least seven consecutive years		Balanced (t=17)	
	SMEs	Large	SMEs	Large
Number of observations	14430	7270	4505	2023
Number of firms	1202	611	265	119
Average number of consecutive obs. per firm	12.00	11.87	17	17

The ESEE survey is an unbalanced panel given that some firms exit the market, shift to non-manufacturing activities or leave the survey. These firms are replaced by others with similar characteristics in order to maintain the representativeness of the survey. Some of the econometric methods used in order to analyse the dynamics of firms' innovation and exporting behaviour require using a sample without missing data (blanks) within the temporal period for each firm. Therefore, we restrict attention to those firms that stayed in the survey at least 7 consecutive years.[2] Table 1 summarizes the main characteristics of the dataset. The sample is made up of a total of 21700 observations: 14430 observations for SMEs (those with 10 to 200 employees) and 7270 for large firms (those with more than 200 employees). These observations correspond to 1813 firms (1202 SMEs and 611 large firms) that are observed, on average, over a period of 12 consecutive years. In contrast to other studies that analyze dynamics using very short time-dimension panels, twelve years is an ample inter-temporal variation to carry out an analysis of persistence. The right column of table 1 corresponds to a full-balanced sample, comprising those firms staying in the survey over the entire period 1990-2006. This implies a huge decrease in available sample and it increases attrition problems. Unless otherwise stated, the analysis lies on the unbalanced panel.

3.2. Preliminary evidence

The focus of this paper lies in examining in depth the determinants of firm-level innovation and export participation, taking into account the dynamics and the relationship between these two decisions. Innovation is defined initially as a binary variable taking value one when the firm carries out investment in R&D in a given year t. Alternative measures of innovation will be discussed later. The export participation variable is also a binary variable that is equal to one if the firm exports in year t and zero otherwise. As figure 1 indicates, the percentage of innovating firms remains relatively stable over time, while there appears to be a smooth increase in the percentage of exporting firms, especially among SMEs, which is more intense during the nineties. The latter mimics the trend of the Spanish economy, which increased its openness over this period in the context of the fulfillment of the Single Market and consecutive phases of the EMU.

[2] We select seven years because it both coincides with the average period in which a firm is in the survey over 1990-2006, and provides a temporal window long enough to carry an analysis of persistence. In some (few) occasions, two potential spells are available for the same firm; in such cases the larger spell has been selected**.**

Figure 1
Exporters and innovators: 1990-2006





Table 2 provides a snapshot of the pattern of firm participation in export and innovative activities of large and SMEs in four different years. Each firm is classified into four categories according to whether it participated in both activities, exported only, carried out R&D only, or did carry neither of them. Among SMEs, the percentage of firms that participated in export markets rose from 32.3% in 1991 to 53.1% in 2006, whereas the percentage of firms with expenditures on R&D remained fairly stable around 20-22% over the sample period. As expected, both activities are far more common among large firms. In each year, a substantial share of exporting firms chose to invest in R&D. Over the sample period, about two thirds (15%) of large firms (SMEs) participated in both activities, while less than 10% (42-61%) of large firms (SMEs) did not participate in either activity.

Overall, participation in the export market is more common among all firms than R&D activities. While 21.3% to 29.7% (18.9%-35.4%) of large firms (SMEs) in each year chose to export but not carry out R&D, the share of firms that only invested in R&D is relatively small. Furthermore, table 2 reveals that large firms that export are far more likely to innovate than not to innovate by almost 40 percentage points. As for SMEs, the percentage of firms exporting and carrying out R&D is smaller than that of exporting but non-innovating. In addition, exporters are far more likely to innovate than non-exporters for the two size groups.

Table 2
Export and R&D in Spanish manufacturing firms
(per cent of firms of each column total)

	Year			
	1991	1996	2001	2006
SMEs firms (Nº of observations)	*656*	*913*	*971*	*691*
Export & R&D	13.4	13.8	15.1	18.1
Export & No R&D	18.9	30.7	35.4	35.0
No Export & R&D	6.7	5.4	5.2	4.5
No Export & No R&D	61.0	50.1	44.2	42.4
Large firms (Nº of observations)	*371*	*499*	*480*	*332*
Export & R&D	62.0	60.1	65.6	66.0
Export & No R&D	21.3	29.7	28.1	26.2
No Export & R&D	6.7	4.0	2.5	1.5
No Export & No R&D	10.0	6.2	3.6	6.3

The evidence so far (figure 1 and table 2) points to a positive (cross-section) relationship between exporting and innovation. However, the aggregate picture hinders the dynamics of firms' individual innovation and exporting behavior over time. Some interesting questions arise. First, is it the same group of firms that continuously carry out R&D investments and/or compete in export markets (persistence)? Or, is there a high firm turnover in each activity simultaneously, so that the aggregated picture remains rather stable over time? Secondly, are these two activities related at the firm level? If so, which is the direction of causality: innovation to exports or exports to innovation, or the relationship works in both directions? Is there cross-

persistence between the two activities? To address these questions, we start by examining persistence in each activity separately, and then we analyze the pattern of cross persistence between innovation and exporting.

a) Persistence in R&D and exporting

Table 3 provides information on the dynamics of each participation decision over the entire period. Both SMEs and large firms depict a remarkably high persistence in innovation and exporting activities. Thus, 80% (for exports) and 53% (for R&D) of large firms do not change their status. For SMEs, such percentage is similar in both activities (about 64%), but the distribution between the two persistent states (never and always) is the opposite of that for large firms. The bottom row shows that the highest share of switchers takes place for R&D activities, and then in export participation for SMEs.

Table 3
Persistent and non-persistent behaviour
(1990-2006; per cent of column total)

	Export		R&D	
	SMEs	Large	SMEs	Large
Persistent				
- Never	37.10	2.45	56.99	10.80
- Always	27.04	78.72	6.41	42.06
No persistent				
- Entrants	11.56	6.55	5.99	9.66
- Exiters	3.99	3.11	4.99	7.86
- Switchers	20.30	9.17	25.62	29.62

Table 4 depicts two-period (i.e. between period *t-1*and *t*) transition probabilities over 1990-2006. At first glance, the past (either export or innovative) status of a firm is strongly positively related with its current status. Between 94% and 99% of exporters persisted to export and 83%-93% of non-exporters continued as non-exporters. The probability of being an exporter at *t* was around 80 percentage points higher for exporters at *t-1* than for non-exporters (non-innovators). Additionally, while for SME the transition rates in both ways (from export to non-export and viceversa) are very similar, exit from export activity very seldom occurs for large firms. A similar pattern emerges for innovation activity, except for the higher probability of exiting than entering innovation activities for SMEs.

Table 4
Transition Probabilities, Whole Period 1990-2006 (univariate)

Export

	Year t					
	SMEs			Large		
Year t-1	No	Yes		No	Yes	
No	92.90	7.10	100	82.56	17.44	100
Yes	6.25	93.75	100	1.33	98.67	100
TOTAL	53.33	46.67	100	8.79	91.21	100

Innovations

	Year t					
	SMEs			Large		
Year t-1	No	Yes		No	Yes	
No	95.12	4.88	100	85.57	14.43	100
Yes	18.39	81.61	100	6.97	93.03	100
TOTAL	79.57	20.43	100	32.09	67.91	100

b) Cross-persistence in R&D and exporting

Table 5 examines the correlation between participation in one activity at *t-1* and participation in the other at *t*. The results suggest that there is cross-persistence between both activities: the probability of exporting in year *t* is larger for those firms carrying out R&D investments in year *t-1* than for those not carrying out R&D in year *t-1*. The same pattern emerges for innovation with respect to the export status at *t-1*. For example, among SMEs, 12.2% of innovators in period *t-1* make the transition to export (switched from non-exporters at *t-1* to export at period *t*). That percentage is twice the corresponding to non-innovators (6.6%). This relative difference is similar (22.6% to 14.5%) for large firms. Regarding the innovation transitions, 7.4% of SMEs exporters at *t-1* make the transition to innovate at *t* (vs. 3.3% of non-exporters), and for large firms the figure is 15.7% (vs. 9.0% of non-exporters).[3]

[3] Similarly, those SMEs (large) firms exporting and investing in R&D in *t-1* are more likely to also export in *t* than those firms exporting but not carrying out R&D (96.7% versus 92.3% for SMEs, and 99.2% versus 97.5% for large firms). Besides, 84.6% (93.6%) of SMEs (large firms) carrying out R&D and exporting in *t-1* also participate in R&D activities in *t*, and 73.0%% (82.3%) of the SMEs (large firms) investing in R&D but not exporting in *t-1* also invest in R&D in *t*.

Table 5
Transition Probabilities, Whole Period 1990-2006 (bivariate)

SMEs firms

t-1		t	
Export	Innovate	Yes export	Yes Innovate
No	No	6.57	3.31
No	Yes	12.24	73.01
Yes	No	92.33	7.43
Yes	Yes	96.66	84.56

Large firms

t-1		t	
Export	Innovate	Yes export	Yes Innovate
No	No	14.54	9.02
No	Yes	22.57	82.30
Yes	No	97.47	15.67
Yes	Yes	99.16	93.60

3.3. Determinants of export market and innovation participation

The preliminary evidence suggests the existence of persistence in each activity and a positive link between innovation and export participation. As has been indicated, the primary goal of this paper is to uncover whether this positive correlation is due to genuine state dependence effect or to (observed or unobserved) heterogeneity. This section further introduces the factors that may be driving these results.

Table 6
Unconditional and conditional probabilities of export and innovate

	Unconditional	Export at t-1	No export at t-1
EXPORT (t)			
All	0.608	0.962	0.079
Size: SMEs	0.457	0.937	0.071
Large firms	0.908	0.987	0.174
Foreign owned: Yes	0.737	1.000	0.167
No	0.527	0.952	0.072
Productivity > median	0.770	0.976	0.114
<= median	0.446	0.939	0.066
Age > median	0.751	0.977	0.090
<= median	0.469	0.937	0.074
Advertising: Yes	0.661	0.966	0.095
No	0.468	0.949	0.054
R&D: Yes	0.876	0.984	0.169
No	0.456	0.938	0.067
INNOVATE (t)	Unconditional	R&D at t-1	No R&D at t-1
All	0.361	0.888	0.065
Size: SMEs	0.201	0.816	0.049
Large firms	0.678	0.930	0.144
Foreign owned: Yes	0.631	1	0
No	0.286	0.862	0.057
Productivity > median	0.519	0.917	0.098
<= median	0.203	0.808	0.045
Age > median	0.503	0.910	0.090
<= median	0.222	0.837	0.049
Advertising: Yes	0.409	0.892	0.075
No	0.249	0.873	0.045
Export: Yes	0.523	0.908	0.102
No	0.115	0.746	0.033

The probabilities of exporting and innovating over the sample period are presented in table 6. The raw *unconditional* probability of exporting (innovating) at period *t* is 60.8% (36.1%). Columns 2 and 3 of the table provide probabilities conditional on status at *t-1*. The first row of the two panels again suggests the existence of considerable state dependence in both activities: a firm exporting (innovating) at *t-1* is about 12.2 (13.7) times as likely to be exporting at *t* as a firm not exporting (not innovating) at *t-1*.

Part, or even all, of the persistence exhibited in the first row of the two panels of Table 6 could be due to heterogeneity. To account for it, we include a set of explanatory variables: firms' age, size, productivity, foreign ownership and advertising (see table A1 for variable definitions).[4] They are control variables that may positively affect both export and innovation decisions and are widely supported by the literature. Table 7 describes their average or median values (in first year in the sample) in relationship to both innovation and exporting status. Interestingly, for the sub-sample of SMEs, exporters/innovators are clearly more productive, larger, and older than both exporters/ non-innovators, and non-exporters/innovators. Non-exporters/non-innovators are the least productive, smallest and youngest firms. Furthermore, differences between innovators and non-innovators (when export status is controlled for) in productivity, size and age are remarkable. In addition, innovation and advertising seem to be quite correlated in the sample. Finally, foreign capital participation is higher among exporters than across non-exporters. Some of these results are less clear for large firms. In particular, non-exporters/innovators seem to outperform the rest of categories. However, we must bear in mind that this is a very small group of firms, which represented 1.5% of large firms in 2006 (see table 2).

Table 7
Firm characteristics

	SME				Large			
Export:	No		Yes		No		Yes	
Innovate:	*No*	*Yes*	*No*	*Yes*	*No*	*Yes*	*No*	*Yes*
Foreign ownership	2.9	8.1	12.1	19.3	33.3	39.4	46.1	50.0
Age	9	11	11.5	17	26	32	27	33.5
Productivity	17.9	22.0	23.0	29.5	26.7	35.9	31.6	34.5
Size (employees)	19	23.5	30.5	65	347.5	442	321	413
Advertising	49.7	72.6	63.9	78.1	64.3	87.9	68.1	78.9

Notes: Firm characteristics are measured in the first year of the spell. Foreign ownership and advertising reflect the percentage of foreign owned firms and firms investing in advertising, respectively. Median values are reported for age, productivity and size. Productivity (real added value per employee, in euros) is measured at 1990 constant prices. Individually adjusted price-indexes have been used to deflate value added. The number of firms is 1202 and 611 for SME and large firms, respectively.

Turning to table 6, it also depicts the probabilities of exporting and innovating, both unconditional and conditional on status at *t-1*, for sub-samples of firms according to explanatory variables. In line with previous evidence, the probability of exporting and innovating is higher for large, foreign-owned, more productive, and older firms, as well as for those advertising. The differences between the probabilities conditional on status at *t-1* are evident across all subgroups. In addition, the first column shows that an exporter is more likely to carry out R&D by about 40% (0.876 vs. 0.456). In the same manner, an innovator is also more likely to be an

[4] Average sales and capital stock could be alternative candidates. We have decided not to include them because they are highly correlated with productivity.

exporter by 40% (0.523 vs. 0.115). Even if there were no structural persistence for individuals, this heterogeneity would cause those firms exporting (carrying out innovative effort) at *t-1* to have a higher probability of exporting (innovating) at *t* than those who were not exporting (not investing in R&D).

In sum, there seems to be a positive link between innovative activity and exporting status, even though the direction of the relationship between both activities is not evident from the above results. In addition, innovation and exporting may be driven by the same determinants. Variables such as firm size, age and foreign ownership may be positively correlated with both innovation and export and, consequently, the observed correlation between both of them may be spurious. The regression analysis investigates whether, and to which extent, the observed persistence is due to underlying differences in individual characteristics or due to a genuine causal effect of past on future status of the two decisions.

4. Model specification and estimation

Transition rates previously examined depict the degree of persistence and cross-persistence, but do not offer a clue to the causes of this phenomenon since they do not control for observed or unobserved individual characteristics. This section sets up the econometric modeling strategy and discusses some specification and estimation issues. We model two binary indicators of export participation and innovation participation, for firm i ($i=1,...,n$) in year t ($t=1,...,T$). The binary dependent variable y_{it} can be modeled in terms of a continuous latent variable y^*_{it} as given by equation (1). Each indicator variable is a function of (i) a vector of lagged observable explanatory variables, $\boldsymbol{x_{it-1}}$ (some of them may be time-invariant), including firms' age, size, productivity, foreign ownership, advertising and innovation (export) status in the export (innovation) equation;[5] (ii) state dependence through lagged export/innovation status indicator y_{it-1}; (iii) unobservable time-invariant firm-specific random effect as modeled by the component μ_i; and (iv) a time-varying idiosyncratic random error term, u_{it}:

$$y_{it} = \begin{cases} 1 & y^*_{it} > 0 \\ 0 & else \end{cases} \qquad \text{i = 1,…,N; t=2,..,T} \qquad (1)$$

$$y^*_{it} = \gamma y_{it-1} + x'_{it-1}\beta + \mu_i + u_{it}$$

We start with the estimation of pooled and random-effects univariate static models, that is, assuming implicitly no state dependence ($\gamma=0$), to later estimate pooled and random effects univariate dynamic probit models. Finally, the case of bivariate models is considered.

In dynamic probit models, it is assumed that $u_{it} \left| y_{i1}, y_{i2}, ...y_{i,t-1}, x_{it} \right.$ is iid as N(0,1) and u_{it} is uncorrelated with $\left(y_{i1}, x_i, \mu_i\right)$. A shortcoming of the standard random effects model is that it relies on the assumption that individual effects (μ_i) are uncorrelated with regressors. Alternatively, Mundlak (1978) and

[5] Explanatory variables are lagged one period to mitigate potential endogeneity problems.

Chamberlain (1984) allow correlation between the individual effects (μ_i) and the observed characteristics (x_{it}) by assuming that $\mu_i = \overline{x}_i a + \zeta_i$, ζ_i~*iid* normal and independent of x_{it} and u_{it} for all *i,t*. Additionally, for estimation of dynamic models such (1) we have to solve two important problems: (i) the treatment of initial conditions (y_{i1}); and (ii) persistence (time-series correlation)[6] and unobserved individual heterogeneity (μ_i). Furthermore, bivariate models bring about the problem of cross-persistence.

The initial conditions problem arises in a longitudinal binary process when the process has a first-order Markov property and contains unobserved heterogeneity. The data generation process is such that the first observation (initial condition) –y_{i1}- for each firm is affected by the same process and so is endogenous. In random effects modelling, because of the correlation between the individual-specific error term and the initial conditions, treating these endogenous initial conditions as exogenous leads to inconsistent estimates. There are, at least, three possible solutions. The first and simplest solution (Lee, 1997) is to assume that the initial value (y_{i1}) is exogenous, i.e. it is a non-random constant. That is, it is assumed that y_{i1} and μ_i are independent, which is a very strong and unrealistic assumption. If initial conditions are correlated with μ_i, the degree of state dependence (γ) will be overestimated. A second solution is the two-step estimation method proposed by Heckman (1981). In the first step we have to add a reduced form equation for the initial value of the latent variable y^*_{i1}, excluding the lagged dependent variable but including a set of exogenous instruments. The set of instruments must include some variables not included in the main equation. Then, in the second step the maximum likelihood estimates of the complete model are worked out. A third alternative proposed by Wooldridge (2005) is based on conditional maximum likelihood (for serially independent errors). The author assumes that y_{i1} is random and specifies the distribution of μ_i conditional on y_{i1} and x_i.

$$\begin{aligned} &\mu_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 y_{i1} + \alpha_2 \overline{x}_i + \zeta_i \qquad \zeta_i : \; iid \; N\left(0, \sigma^2_\zeta\right) \text{ and uncorrelated to } y_{i1} \text{ and } \overline{x}_i \\ &y^*_{it} = x'_{it-1}\beta + \gamma y_{it-1} + \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 y_{i1} + \alpha_2 \overline{x}_i + \zeta_i + u_{it} \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The second problem in dynamic models such as (1) is related to time-series correlation, which can arise from either true state dependence or unobserved individual heterogeneity (μ_i). These two possible origins lead to quite different interpretations of correlation over time and therefore have different policy implications (Cameron and Trivedi, 2005, p. 763). On the one hand, true state dependence occurs when correlation over time is due to the causal mechanism that the decision last period determines the decision this period [$y_{it-1} \rightarrow y_{it}$]. This dependence is relatively large if the individual effect $\mu_i \approx 0$ as then $Corr\left(y_{it}, y_{it-1}\right) \approx \gamma$. This occurs when σ_μ is very small relative to σ_u. On the other hand, correlation can be caused by unobserved individual heterogeneity. In that case, even if there is not a causal mechanism (γ=0), the correlation between

[6] In model (1), even when u_{it} are assumed serially independent, the composite error term $\left(\mu_i + u_{it}\right)$ is correlated over time due to the individual-specific time invariant μ_i term.

y_{it} and y_{it-1} is different from zero, leading to spurious state dependence.[7] Precisely, a desirable feature of random effects dynamic binary-choice models is that it allows distinguishing between unobserved heterogeneity and genuine state dependence.

Given that both export status and innovation activity are highly serially correlated and their interdependence of the two decisions (as they are both dependent and explanatory variables in equation (1)), the error terms of the two participation equations are likely to be correlated. To deal with it, we estimate the two participation decisions simultaneously by estimating a dynamic bivariate binary choice model. This model allows examining the sources of cross-persistence (see Alessie *et al.*, 2005). The following equations, in which firm indexes are suppressed, extend the previous univariate model to a bivariate context:

$$y_{jt} = \begin{cases} 1 & y_{jt}^* > 0 \\ 0 & else \end{cases} \qquad \begin{matrix} j = 1,2 \\ t = 2,...,T \end{matrix} \qquad (3)$$

$$y_{1t}^* = \gamma_{11} y_{1,t-1} + \gamma_{12} y_{2,t-1} + x_{t-1}^{'} \beta_1 + \mu_1 + u_{1t} \qquad (4)$$

$$y_{2t}^* = \gamma_{21} y_{1,t-1} + \gamma_{22} y_{2,t-1} + x_{t-1}^{'} \beta_2 + \mu_2 + u_{2t} \qquad (5)$$

where the dependent variables are binary variables that refer to exporting (y_{1t}) and innovation (y_{2t}). As in the univariate case, the same independent variables are used in the two participation equations, while (μ_1, μ_2) is assumed to be bivariate normal with variances $\sigma_{\mu_1}^2$ and $\sigma_{\mu_2}^2$ and covariance $\sigma_{\mu_1}\sigma_{\mu_2}\rho_{\mu}$. Finally, error terms ($u_{1t}$,$u_{2t}$) are assumed to be bivariate standard normal with covariance ρ and to be independent over time. It is also assumed that (μ_1, μ_2), u_{jt} and x_{t-1} are independent.

The empirical model given by equations (3)-(5) relates probabilities of exporting and innovating in period *t* to lagged firm characteristics. Lagged dummy for innovation is the key variable of interest in the exporting equation. The corresponding coefficient captures whether innovating firms are more or less likely to be exporters. The explanatory variable of particular interest in the innovation equation is the lagged export status.

Some special cases emerge. First, if $\gamma_{12} = 0$, the equation for exports does not contain the lagged innovation participation dummy. In this case, the parameters β_1, γ_{11} and $\sigma_{\mu_1}^2$ can be estimated consistently by considering only equation (4). This is the standard univariate panel data probit model for binary choice, with state dependence as well as unobserved heterogeneity. Similarly, equation (5) can be estimated as a univariate model if $\gamma_{21} = 0$. Secondly, if $y_{2,t-1}$ enters equation (4) but error terms and random effects in the fourth equation are independent of error terms and random effects in the fifth equation, then $y_{2,t-1}$ is weakly exogenous in the equation for y_{1t}. In this case (4) could be treated as a univariate model with (weakly)

[7] Specifically, $Corr\left(y_{it}, y_{it-1}\right) = \rho = \sigma_{\mu}^2 / (\sigma_{\mu}^2 + \sigma_u^2)$

exogenous regressors only. Similar arguments are applied to equation (5). In this paper we estimate a dynamic bivariate probit model in which the two components of the error terms are pooled.

5. Results

The descriptive analysis in section 3 pointed out that export and innovation activities exhibit a high degree of persistence and are highly correlated. This result can be due to a genuine effect of past behavior on future activities or to underlying differences in firm characteristics (observed and unobserved) that are permanent. The former mechanism is identified as "true" state dependence, versus the "spurious" state dependence that defines the latter (Heckman, 1981). The preliminary evidence in section 3.3 also showed remarkable differences in some firm-level characteristics according to firms' degree of involvement in both activities.

The goal of this section is to investigate the factors driving the observed persistence when controlling for a number of firm-level characteristics. We proceed in three steps. First, each decision is separately examined by means of a univariate approach. Secondly, both decisions are jointly considered using a bivariate framework. Finally, some sensitivity analyses are carried out by introducing import and product/process innovations as alternative measures of internationalization and innovation decisions, respectively.

5.1. Univariate results

In this section we start with the simplest approach to model the decisions to export and to innovate. Table 8 depicts the results obtained from the estimation of univariate probit models for export (panel A) and innovation (panel B) participation decisions. The explanatory variables are innovation, export, foreign ownership, age, productivity, size and advertising. All of them are included with one lag to reduce potential endogeneity problems, so we assume that these variables constitute the set of x_{it-1} exogeneous explanatory variables. We also include a set of industry and time dummies.

Table 8
Results: univariate probit

Panel A: Exports

	Static			Dynamic	
	Pooled (1)	Pooled Mundlak (2)	RE (3)	Pooled (4)	RE Wooldridge (5)
Export $_{t-1}$				0.836	0.600
				(63.65)	(32.28)
Innovate $_{t-1}$	0.238	0.227	0.082	0.108	0.091
	(12.19)	(11.55)	(5.43)	(8.35)	(5.79)
Foreign $_{t-1}$	0.195	0.176	0.083	0.089	0.070
	(6.9)	(6.02)	(4.71)	(5.08)	(3.11)
Size $_{t-1}$	0.284	0.269	0.510	0.130	0.137
	(11.03)	(10.41)	(9.16)	(8.45)	(6.04)
Age $_{t-1}$	0.214	0.200	0.314	0.067	0.113
	(3.75)	(3.48)	(3.76)	(2.32)	(2.55)
Productivity $_{t-1}$	0.021	0.001	0.002	0.008	0.001
	(4.4)	(0.25)	(1.24)	(3.25)	(0.36)
Advertising $_{t-1}$	0.151	0.147	0.053	0.054	0.056
	(8.12)	(7.92)	(3.96)	(4.38)	(3.61)
Mproducti		0.034			0.025
		(4.12)			(4.22)
Export $_{1}$					0.461
					(17.15)
$W_{industries}$ (*p-value*)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.011
W_{time} (*p-value*)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.003	0.003
Wald chi^2	842.4	854.7	990.7	6536.6	4498.8
(*p-value*)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Pseudo R^2	0.2853	0.2897		0.7106	
Obs. Prob	61.42	61.42	61.42	61.42	61.42
Pred. Prob	68.68	69.56	58.95	72.50	62.07
σ_u			3.163		0.887
ρ			0.909		0.441
(*p-value*)			(0.000)		(0.000)
Posit. pred.(%)	81.99	82.29	80.06	96.21	94.00
Negat. pred.(%)	68.57	69.24	65.35	92.07	91.91
N. observations	19884				

Table 8 (Continued)

Panel B: Innovation

	Static			Dynamic	
	Pooled (1)	Pooled Mundlak (2)	RE (3)	Pooled (4)	RE Wooldridge (5)
Innovate $_{t-1}$				0.753	0.530
				(59.98)	(35.6)
Export $_{t-1}$	0.232	0.232	0.129	0.110	0.102
	(11.94)	(11.92)	(8.17)	(9.04)	(6.77)
Foreign $_{t-1}$	0.017	0.016	0.026	0.002	0.004
	(0.66)	(0.64)	(1.25)	(0.17)	(0.21)
Size $_{t-1}$	0.308	0.308	0.682	0.146	0.207
	(12.56)	(12.54)	(18.73)	(10.65)	(8.55)
Age $_{t-1}$	0.139	0.139	0.231	0.059	0.065
	(3.16)	(3.18)	(3.66)	(2.54)	(1.78)
Productivity $_{t-1}$	0.022	0.022	0.012	0.012	0.010
	(6.22)	(6.17)	(4.99)	(5.56)	(4.41)
Advertising $_{t-1}$	0.112	0.112	0.066	0.052	0.047
	(6.22)	(6.23)	(5.4)	(4.29)	(3.41)
Mproducti		0.000			0.000
		(1.63)			(1.2)
Innovate $_{1}$					0.385
					(15.24)
$W_{industries}$ (*p-value*)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.011
W_{time} (*p-value*)	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.003	0.000
Wald chi^2	1030.70	1033.8	870.2	6128.9	4456.9
(*p-value*)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Pseudo R^2	0.2897	0.2898		0.6080	
Obs. Prob	36.19	36.19	36.19	36.19	36.19
Pred. Prob	31.13	31.12	31.65	28.28	34.11
σ_u			1.970		0.801
ρ			0.795		0.391
(*p-value*)			(0.000)		(0.000)
Posit. Pred.(%)	72.58	72.56	71.92	88.84	87.41
Negat. pred.(%)	82.00	82.00	80.35	93.50	90.32
N. observations			19884		

Estimators:

1. Static Pooled Probit
2. Static pooled probit with Mundlak (1978) correction for correlated individual effects
3. Static standard Random Effects Probit (initial condition taken to be exogenous)
4. Dynamic Pooled probit
5. Dynamic Random Effects Probit: Wooldridge (2005) estimator

Notes:

1. Marginal effects are reported, with t-ratios in brackets
2. Robust standard errors in pooled probit model, adjusted for clustering on firms.
3. A constant (significant at the 1% level in all cases) as well as time and industry dummies are included in each regression, but not reported

Columns 1-3 of Table 8 present the results from static probit models. In all cases partial effects, evaluated at the sample means of the regressors, are presented to make easier the interpretation of results. In pooled regression (columns 1 and 2) coefficients are consistent and standard errors are robust to intra-group (firm) correlation. All variables have a significant effect on the decision to export and to innovate. The results of column 1 indicate that firms that innovated at *t-1* have a 23.8 % higher probability of exporting at *t* than non-innovators in the previous period, conditional on average values of the rest of variables. The effect of past exports on current innovation is similar, as shown in panel B. The main difference between the two decisions relates to the effect of foreign ownership, which is non-significant in the innovation decision. Industrial and time effects are always jointly significant, while average predicted probability overestimates (underestimates) the observed proportion of exporters (innovators).

In column 1, explanatory variables and the idiosyncratic error term (μ_i) are assumed to be independent. Column 2 reports the results using Mundlak (1978) approach to deal with the possible correlation between them. We include the within-individual mean of productivity as an additional explanatory variable. The results are fairly similar to those in the previous column, except for the marginal effect of lagged productivity that loses its significance in the export decision. The differences in productivity between firms are larger than within firms, which is likely driving the observed reduction in the productivity coefficient.

The estimates in columns 1 and 2 have not made use of the panel dimension of the dataset. As is well known, the common approach with a probit is a random-effects model, because there is not a sufficient statistic for a conditional fixed-effect model. The RE probit model provides more efficient estimates and allows assessing how much of the random volatility in both decisions is attributable to the unobservable individual effect. The results of column (3) show that, though significance remains, partial effects are generally reduced when individual random effects are considered. [8] Only the partial effects for size and age are larger.[9]. The intra-class correlation coefficient ρ is large (close to one) and highly significant. This implies that a high percentage of the unexplained variation both in exporting and innovation is attributed to the individual effect, suggesting that it could explain a relevant fraction of the persistence in the two decisions.

The natural next step is to estimate a dynamic random effect probit model. However, in a dynamic context two main econometric issues emerge: unobserved heterogeneity and initial conditions. As described in Section 4, the problem with unobserved firm heterogeneity is that it can also exhibit persistence over time that, if it is not properly controlled for, leads to an overstatement of the true state dependence in each strategy (innovate or export). In that section, we sketched out two approaches proposed to deal with both issues, based on Heckman (1981) and Wooldridge (2005).

[8] We tested the stability of results using different quadrature points in reported regressions. Some initial instability led us to increase the number to 24. It improves the accuracy of results at the cost of slowing down convergence.

[9] A basic assumption of this model is that errors are not correlated with the regressors. Again, the solution in this context is to parameterize the effect by augmenting the RE model with the Mundlak specification to allow for individual effects that are correlated with the within-individual means of the regressors.

Columns 4-5 of Table 8 report the results when the lagged dependent variable is included in the set of explanatory variables in order to capture state dependence. As a benchmark, column (4) provides the results from a dynamic pooled probit model robust to clustering within individuals. Column 5 presents the results using the method proposed by Wooldridge (2005). Even after accounting for individual unobserved heterogeneity, the lagged dependent variable remains highly significant, supporting the hypotheses of true state dependence. There is some reduction in the partial effect of lagged dependent variable when the adjustment for initial conditions is included. The rest of explanatory variables reduce their marginal effect, although they are still significant. Besides, innovation (exports) at *t-1* has a positive effect on current exports (innovation). Interestingly, the intra-class correlation coefficient ρ sharply falls (when compared to the results in the random effects static model of column 3), pointing out that introducing the lagged dependent variable reduces the importance of unobserved heteregoneity in exports and innovation models. The results further show that the initial condition is also highly significant in both decisions. This implies a substantial correlation between firms' initial export status and the unobserved heterogeneity.

A potential shortcoming of Wooldridge (2005) approach is that it specifies a complete model for the individual unobserved effects (μ_i), so that the estimates could be sensitive to mis-specification of this effect. We have compared the estimated coefficients in table 8 to those obtained using the approach proposed by Heckman (1981), which rely on weaker assumptions.[10] Coefficients do not show large differences with those obtained using Wooldridge (2005) approach.

In sum, previous results indicate that the partial effect of the lagged dependent variable is large; reflecting that even after accounting for individual unobserved heterogeneity, past behaviour has a relevant effect on current decisions both for exports and R&D. This true state dependence can be caused by the presence of sunk costs or learning-by-doing effects. Particularly, sunk entry costs in both export and R&D represent a barrier for entry and exit and, as consequence, can induce state dependence. Peters (2007) also emphasizes a kind of "success breads success" effect as an important factor to explain why state dependence is expected for innovation, suggesting that successful innovations stimulate subsequent innovations due to increasing market power or broader technological opportunities. Another potential reason could be the risky nature of innovation projects and asymmetric information, which may lead to financial constraints that are probably less severe for those firms that had previously succeeded.

[10] The Heckman estimator of dynamic random effects probit model has been obtained using the *redpace* Stata command by Stewart (2006). In the reduced form for the initial period we included a binary variable that takes value one when the firm belongs to a group.

Table 9
Predicted probabilities of exporting (panel A) and innovation (panel B)

a) Export

Export:	Y_{t-1}=0		Y_{t-1}=1	
Innovation:	Y_{t-1}=0	Y_{t-1}=1	Y_{t-1}=0	Y_{t-1}=1
Firm effect				
$-2\sigma_\mu$	0.0110	0.0250	0.3883	0.5187
$-\sigma_\mu$	0.0803	0.1418	0.7271	0.8251
0	0.3033	0.4269	0.9322	0.9658
$+\sigma_\mu$	0.6454	0.7591	0.9913	0.9966
$+2\sigma_\mu$	0.8963	0.9442	0.9995	0.9998

b) Innovation

Innovation:	Y_{t-1}=0		Y_{t-1}=1	
Export:	Y_{t-1}=0	Y_{t-1}=1	Y_{t-1}=0	Y_{t-1}=1
Firm effect				
$-2\sigma_\mu$	0.0001	0.0029	0.0702	0.1274
$-\sigma_\mu$	0.0110	0.0253	0.2504	0.3679
0	0.0683	0.1245	0.5509	0.6785
$+\sigma_\mu$	0.2459	0.3625	0.8236	0.8970
$+2\sigma_\mu$	0.5452	0.6734	0.9582	0.9806

Note: Predicted probabilities are calculated using the results in column 5 of Table 8.

Table 9 presents predicted probabilities of exporting and innovating for different lagged status of export and innovation (columns) and different points along the distribution of unobserved firm effects (rows), after controlling for the rest of observable exogenous determinants (at their sample means). The predictions are derived using the dynamic random effect estimations in column 5 of Table 8. The comparison of panels A and B point out that innovation is a less likely outcome than exporting. The results suggest a considerable state dependence in both decisions. For example, for those firms with an unobserved permanent effect equal to zero, the predicted probability of exporting in period *t* for firms that neither exported nor innovated in *t-1* is 30.3%. If the firm exported in *t-1* (but did not simultaneously innovate) the probability increases to 93.2%. To carry out innovative activities has also a positive effect on the predicted probability of exporting irrespectively of previous exporting status, though its effect is relatively larger for non-exporters in *t-1* (the predicted value raises from 30.3% to 42.7%) than for exporters (it increases from 93.2% to 96.6%). As we move downwards through Table 9 the predictions correspond to firms that are above-the-mean permanent firm component μ_i. For these firms expected profits for exporting (and innovating) are higher and, accordingly, predicted probabilities are also higher. It is noteworthy that the increase in the predicted probability over the distribution of the permanent firm component is greater than that corresponding to state dependence for firms with similar characteristics and μ_i=0. For example, in panel B the predicted probability of innovating at *t* for an exporter (at

t-1) varies from 12.4% for non-innovators at *t-1* to 67.8% for innovators at *t-1*. This increase of 55.4 percentage points is smaller than 67.0 (=67.34 - 0.29), which is the variation in the probability of innovation at *t* for a firm that moves rightwards from the lower tail of the distribution of unobservables (-2σ) to the upper tail (+2σ). These results are in line to those obtained by Roberts and Tybout (1997) and Kaiser and Kongsted (2008) for Colombian and German export firms, respectively.[11]

5.2. Bivariate results

The univariate dynamic random effects model estimated in previous section allows assessing the relative importance of unobserved heterogeneity and genuine state dependence in explaining persistence in the decision to export and to innovate. In addition, the univariate regression results also pointed out to the existence of strong correlation between export and innovation, which is consistent with the preliminary evidence in section 3. The bivariate model permits the joint estimation of the two decisions allowing for correlation between the error terms in the export and innovation equations.

Table 10 reports the results of the dynamic pooled bivariate model that consists of the export and innovation decision equations. Equation (3)-(5) specify that a firm's export (R&D) participation decision in year *t* depends on the firm's participation choice of both exports and R&D in previous year, as well as on other profit-shifting characteristics. Notice that this specification does not include intertemporal correlation but it does permit the contemporaneous correlation between the two choices, $Corr\ (\varepsilon_{1it},\ \varepsilon_{2it})$, to be non-zero. The top panel of table 10 presents estimated coefficients. Previous experience in one activity has a significant effect on current participation in that activity. In addition, the results point out a positive and significant effect of past participation in exports (R&D) on current participation in R&D (exports). As for the control variables, larger, older, more productive firms that engaged in advertising in *t-1*, are more likely to participate in export and R&D activities in *t*. Foreign capital participation has a positive effect on export participation, but not in innovation. The estimated value of the correlation between the error terms of the two equations of the bivariate model is positive (0.179) and statistically significant. This implies that unobservable factors that make a firm participate in one activity tend to lead it to participate in both simultaneously.

Notwithstanding, the interpretation of bivariate binary choice model is not straightforward (Greene, 2008). Table 10 presents some relevant results in Panel A to C. Panel A shows the predicted probabilities for combinations of status at period t. Exporting is more common than innovating. Panel B reports the predicted probability of either exporting or innovating at *t*, conditional on exporting and innovation status at *t-1*. The results point out that, after controlling for explanatory variables, both decisions remain remarkably persistent. Yet, the effect of past experience is larger for exports than for innovation. The results also suggest the

[11] These authors split the columns according to 25th, 50th and 75th percentiles of the observables index. In contrast to them, most of the explanatory variables in our paper are binary, so these percentiles are less representative than average values. We have calculated Table 9 introducing these three percentiles for productivity, which is a continuous variable, and results remain qualitatively similar.

existence of cross-persistence in these activities. That is, the probability of exporting (innovating) at *t* is higher when the firm innovated (exported) at *t-1* than when it did not innovate (export), independently of the export (innovation) status at *t-1*. For example, the probability of exporting at t when the firm innovated at *t-1* is 16.8%, whereas this probability falls to 9.6% when the firm did not innovate at *t-1*.

Table 10
Export and innovation: bivariate probit

	Export		Innovation	
	Coeff.	t-ratio	Coeff.	t-ratio
Export $_{t-1}$	2.899	63.62	0.338	9.16
Innovate $_{t-1}$	0.341	8.57	2.383	59.99
Foreign $_{t-1}$	0.277	5.01	0.007	0.16
Size $_{t-1}$	0.407	8.42	0.415	10.61
Age $_{t-1}$	0.200	2.32	0.172	2.51
Productivity $_{t-1}$	0.024	3.26	0.036	5.60
Advertising $_{t-1}$	0.160	4.41	0.157	4.28
Corr (ε_{1it}, ε_{2it})	0.179			
LR Chi^2 (p-value)	41.2 (0.000)			
$W_{industries}$	0.000	0.000	0.000	
W_{time}	0.000	0.000	0.000	
Wald chi^2	12,273.5			
(prob > chi^2)	(0.000)			
Panel A: Predicted probabilities (%) of export (t), innovation (t):				
(1,1)	31.84			
(1,0)	29.60			
(0,1)	4.38			
(0,0)	34.18			
Panel B: Predicted probabilities (%):				
(export t-1,innovation t-1)	Export t		Innovation t	
(1,1)	97.50		87.29	
(1,0)	94.72		9.61	
(0,1)	16.78		78.52	
(0,0)	9.60		4.90	
Panel C: Marginal effects:				
Export t-1	Export t		Innovation t	
No	0.8377		0.0396	
Yes	0.7715		0.0561	
Innovate t-1				
No	0.0440		0.6890	
Yes	0.0254		0.7301	
N. observations	19,884			

Notes: Marginal effects in Panel C are calculated, using coefficients of Table 10, as the average change in the probability over all firms related to the variable v (i.e, Export $_{t-1}$ and Innovate $_{t-1}$):
ATE= $\Phi [X\gamma^d + \beta^d] - \Phi[X\gamma^d]$ if v = 0
ATE= $\Phi [X\gamma^d] - \Phi[X\gamma^d - \beta^d]$ if v = 1
where the superscript d indicates the decision equation (1 for the exporting decision; 2 for the innovating decision), X are firm-specific values, γ^d is the vector of estimated parameters for each equation, and β^d is the (scalar) estimated parameter related to the v variable.

Finally, Panel C shows the average treatment effect of past export and innovation status on current probabilities of exporting and innovating. For example, the effect of exporting at *t-1* for a non-exporter is an increase in the probability of exporting at *t* of 83.8%. Similarly, the reduction in the probability of exporting at t for an exporter in *t-1*, if it had not exported, would have been of 77.1%. The results of table 10 reinforce the findings of strong effects of past behaviour on current status and interdependence between both decisions.

5.3. Alternative measures of internationalization and innovation

In previous sections we have analyzed extensively the export "side" of firms' internationalization activities. This is the approach followed by the vast majority of theoretical and empirical work devoted to examine self-selection and learning-by-exporting hypotheses in relation to efficiency heterogeneity across firms/plants. However, as discussed in Section 2, the import "side" could provide useful insights about the relationship between innovation and internationalization. On the one hand, import links could have a positive effect on innovative activities of firms channelled through knowledge externalities that accrue from contact with foreign providers. For example, rather commonly a firm innovation arises from collaboration with either foreign or domestic suppliers. Indeed, the ESEE database indicates that technological collaboration with providers is the most frequent way of collaboration. Specifically, 54.7% of firms that invested in R&D in 2006 claimed to have technological collaboration with their suppliers.[12] However, the opposite direction of this causality (from innovation to imports) is less evident.

It is important to bear in mind that imports are not the mirror image of exports. Thus, when assessing imports at the firm level two broad considerations are in order. First, industrial firms tend to export their internally-produced goods, so there is an obvious connection between production and sales in foreign and domestic markets. However, imports are more heterogeneous that exports, Firms can import three main types of goods:[13] intermediate inputs, machinery and final goods. The first category refers to the type of international outsourcing that the literature has recently emphasized. Firms acquire technology that is incorporated in these intermediate good, which are later transformed, or in equipment goods. In addition, even though we are dealing with manufacturing firms, some of them also engage in wholesaling activities. In fact, the line distinguishing a "manufacturer" from a "trader" is some times very thin. For example, many footwear manufacturers use their domestic sales network to distribute their own brands as well as other foreign brands. Pharmaceutical companies also import some final products from their parent companies or affiliated in foreign countries, while they elaborate some products for domestic markets. Secondly, the acquisition of foreign inputs is not necessarily carried out by the final user, but it can be channelled through a domestic intermediary. In such a case, intermediate consumption is not longer qualified as imports. A similar problem

[12] Collaboration with clients (44.4%) and with universities and technological centres (37.2%) are other relevant ways of technological collaboration. Much less important are collaboration with competitors (3.8%) and joint-ventures (5.6%).

[13] We do not consider import of services, due to the lack of data. Complementary evidence suggests that, though the outsourcing of services is relevant, it is basically domestic. See Merino and Rodriguez (2007) for a discussion.

emerges for exports, as sometimes they use other domestic firms, usually within the same group, to channel their sales into foreign markets.[14] The evidence suggests that the extent of vertical relationships in imports is smaller.

Bernard *et al* (2007) point out that importing is relatively less common than exporting across firms. In contrast to their findings, Table A2 suggests the existence of a high coincidence between participation in export and import activities at the firm level. This correlation is particularly high for large firms: only about 10% of them exported but did not import, or *vice versa*, for selected years. The increase in the percentage of firms involved in both exports and imports is parallel to the decrease in the percentage corresponding of firms involved neither in exports nor in imports. Table A3 points out a remarkable difference between both "sides" of internalization: imports are more volatile than exports. The percentage of switchers in imports ranges between 13.7 and 28.9 for large firms and SMEs, respectively, which exceeds the corresponding figures for exports in 4 and 8. The percentage of "ones" for switching SMEs is very similar in both trade activities: 44.5% and 45.7% for export and imports, respectively. The difference is larger for large firms: 67.4% and 74.3% for exports and imports, suggesting that a switching pattern correspond to a more intensive import activity (with respect to export) for large firms (and in both cases more intensive than for SMEs).

With regard to the proxy for innovation, we have used so far a dummy variable that takes value one if R&D expenses (internal or external) are positive. This variable has been quite often used in the literature (see, for instance, Aw *et al.*, 2007). However, R&D expenses could be more adequate to measure innovative activity in large firms. In that sense, Roper (1998) pointed out that large firms undertake frequent research activities that require a larger degree of formality (i.e., laboratories), in which cost accounting may be simpler. However, costs related to more informal innovative activities could be accounted as general costs by firms, and they would not be reflected as R&D investments. An open question remains whether alternative indicators could lead to different results of the dynamic relationship between internationalization and innovation. This concern may rest upon theoretical grounds, which relates with the plausible relationship between product/process innovation and the product life cycle theories as discussed in Section 2.

Table A4 shows the degree of coincidence of participation in R&D, product and process innovation for some years in the period 1991-2006.[15] For smaller firms, in about 75-85% of cases the result is the same irrespectively of the indicator used. In any year, about 10% of SMEs do not innovate but claim to incur R&D expenses. That percentage is much higher for large firms. The explanation for these results may be twofold. On the one hand, some R&D outlays may not result in innovations. On the other hand, even if R&D leads to innovation, this outcome may arise in future periods. Both reasons seem play even a bigger role for large

[14] For that reason the ESEE survey includes exports channelled through other companies belonging to the same group. This seems to be an increasing strategy in the context of multinational groups.

[15] Other potential distinction is that between in-house R&D expenditures and outsourced R&D. The first one is probably more relevant to build up a firm's knowledge stock. If that is the case, we would expect a larger impact on export activity. This distinction has not been dealt with in this paper.

firms. A doubt remains on whether smaller firms introduce an upwards bias in the innovations results. The results in Table A4 suggest that R&D expenses may underestimate innovation activities of SMEs because the percentage of firms that never involved in R&D is clearly higher than the corresponding figures for both product and process innovations.

The non-simultaneity of R&D investment and innovation outcomes could also explain partially that some firms indicate that they do not incur R&D expenses but, at the same time, they claim to have attained innovations, particularly process innovations. In this case, some actions other than R&D outlays taken by firms may explain the innovation result. The ESEE provides information (every four years) about complementary actions to obtain innovation resources (such as the use of scientific and technical information services, standardization and quality control work, efforts for assimilating imported technologies, market research and others). We obtain that almost all firms that declare not to invest in R&D but to obtain innovations are involved in some of these complementary activities. That group of innovators not simultaneously involved in R&D is reduced over the analyzed period.

The results obtained from the estimation of the dynamic random effects probit models using Wooldridge (2005) for alternative measures of internationalization and innovation are showed in table 11. These results are qualitatively similar to those obtained with R&D and export variables. The positive correlation between innovation and internalization appears to be a robust result, irrespective of the proxies used to measure these activities. In addition, the effect of the explanatory variables are quantitatively fairly similar in the export equation (panel A), whereas some differences arise in the innovation equation (panel B) when alternative proxies of internalization and innovation are considered. In particular, the positive effect of age and productivity on export (and also on imports) when we use the R&D proxy (columns 1 and 2 of panel B) vanishes when we proxy innovation activities with either product or process innovations. This result provides support to the argument that R&D outlays boosts productivity, which is a major driver of the relationship between innovation and internationalization activities.

Table 11

Robustness analysis: Import, product and process innovations
Dynamic Random Effects Probit using Wooldridge (2005) estimator

Panel A: Internationalization

	Export			Import		
	R&D	Product innovation	Process innovation	R&D	Product innovation	Process innovation
Internationalization $_{t-1}$	0.600	0.603	0.602	0.555	0.556	0.551
	(32.28)	(32.58)	(32.36)	(30.49)	(30.4)	(29.97)
Innovation $_{t-1}$	0.091	0.058	0.041	0.079	0.046	0.036
	(5.79)	(4.05)	(3.32)	(5.46)	(3.5)	(3.12)
Foreign $_{t-1}$	0.070	0.072	0.074	0.111	0.111	0.112
	(3.11)	(3.25)	(3.31)	(5.75)	(5.69)	(5.73)
Size $_{t-1}$	0.137	0.152	0.152	0.204	0.219	0.220
	(6.04)	(6.91)	(6.86)	(10.61)	(11.68)	(11.59)
Age $_{t-1}$	0.113	0.122	0.126	0.133	0.140	0.144
	(2.55)	(2.76)	(2.81)	(3.5)	(3.67)	(3.73)
Productivity $_{t-1}$	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.008	0.009	0.008
	(0.36)	(0.49)	(0.42)	(2.42)	(2.65)	(2.59)
Advertising $_{t-1}$	0.056	0.059	0.059	0.062	0.065	0.065
	(3.61)	(3.76)	(3.78)	(4.38)	(4.51)	(4.5)
Mproducti	0.025	0.027	0.027	0.027	0.029	0.029
	(4.22)	(4.5)	(4.45)	(5.05)	(5.34)	(5.32)
Export $_{1}$	0.461	0.468	0.476	0.243	0.253	0.259
	(17.15)	(17.44)	(17.73)	(11.67)	(12.06)	(12.25)
$W_{industries}$ (*p-value*)	0.011	0.011	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000
Wald chi^2	4498.8	4520.8	4470.8	4478.4	4424.6	4356.7
(*p-value*)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Obs. Prob	61.42	61.42	61.42	61.97	61.97	61.97
Pred. Prob	62.07	62.22	62.22	62.14	62.17	62.19
σ_u	0.888	0.887	0.901	0.798	0.813	0.829
P	0.441	0.440	0.448	0.389	0.398	0.407
(*p-value*)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Posit. pred.(%)	94.00	93.89	93.76	93.08	93.10	93.01
Negat. pred.(%)	91.91	92.04	91.84	89.08	89.19	89.02
N. observations	19884					

Table 11 (Continued)

Panel B: Innovation

	R&D		Product innovation		Process innovation	
	Export	Import	Export	Import	Export	Import
Innovation $_{t-1}$	0.530	0.533	0.353	0.354	0.368	0.368
	(35.6)	(35.74)	(28.02)	(27.98)	(37.53)	(37.48)
Internationalization $_{t-1}$	0.102	0.063	0.052	0.038	0.030	0.030
	(6.77)	(4.16)	(5.52)	(4.04)	(2.76)	(2.73)
Foreign $_{t-1}$	0.004	0.008	-0.009	-0.008	0.006	0.006
	(0.21)	(0.4)	(-0.84)	(-0.75)	(0.45)	(0.42)
Size $_{t-1}$	0.207	0.217	0.052	0.054	0.106	0.105
	(8.55)	(8.86)	(3.85)	(3.99)	(6.99)	(6.94)
Age $_{t-1}$	0.065	0.074	-0.029	-0.026	-0.077	-0.077
	(1.78)	(2)	(-1.38)	(-1.24)	(-3.21)	(-3.21)
Productivity $_{t-1}$	0.010	0.011	-0.001	-0.001	0.000	0.000
	(4.41)	(4.5)	(-0.68)	(-0.65)	(-0.14)	(-0.19)
Advertising $_{t-1}$	0.047	0.051	0.037	0.039	0.019	0.020
	(3.41)	(3.76)	(4.5)	(4.77)	(1.93)	(1.99)
Mproducti	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	(1.2)	(1.29)	(1.04)	(1.11)	(-0.98)	(-0.96)
Export $_{1}$	0.385	0.393	0.150	0.155	0.138	0.138
	(15.24)	(15.45)	(10.75)	(11.01)	(9.73)	(9.79)
$W_{industries}$ (*p-value*)	0.011	0.000	0.011	0.011	0.012	0.010
Wald chi^2	4457.0	4460.7	2259.0	2530.4	2570.9	2568.9
(*p-value*)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Obs. Prob	36.19	36.19	24.78	24.78	32.65	32.65
Pred. Prob	34.11	34.14	15.91	15.91	22.75	22.67
σ_u	0.801	0.801	0.603	0.610	0.468	0.469
ρ	0.391	0.391	0.267	0.271	0.180	0.180
(*p-value*)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Posit. pred.(%)	87.41	87.52	74.71	74.65	73.63	73.56
Negat. pred.(%)	90.32	90.41	84.67	84.36	79.42	79.35
N. observations	19884					

Notes:

1. Marginal effects are reported, with t-ratios in brackets
2. A constant (significant at the 1% level in all cases) as well as time and industry dummies are included in each regression, but not reported

6. Conclusions

The findings of this paper indicate the existence of true state dependence in both export and innovation status. Firms with prior export and innovation experience are more likely to participate in export and innovation, respectively. After controlling for unobservable heterogeneity, this suggests that adjustment costs, sunk entry costs, self-enhancing success and/or learning may important factors in explaining the observed persistence. The empirical findings are consistent with the hypothesis of self-selection of more efficient firms into export. Besides, the results give also support to the hypothesis of learning-by-exporting through the innovation channel: export participation boosts innovation (R&D outlays, process as well as product innovation) given that the larger export market provides higher returns to R&D (as modeled by Lileeva and Trefler, 2007, and Constantini and Melitz, 2007), which stimulates productivity growth. Besides, the firm decisions to export and innovate are positively affected by firm productivity, size, advertising and age. These findings are broadly consistent with most previous empirical literature.

Furthermore, we find strong correlation between export and innovation and cross-persistence between the two activities. Prior innovation (exporting) is positively correlated with current export (innovation) participation. The estimation results point out a positive and significant correlation between the error terms in the innovation and export equation. Next step is to estimate a dynamic bivariate random effects model in order to disentangle the sources of cross-persistence: firm observed/unobserved heterogeneity and/or true state dependence.

Finally, it is important to point out what's behind (cross) persistence for both its policy implications and the implications on the literature on the export and productivity link (learning versus ex ante “ability” or self-selection). From a policy standpoint, it is important to disentangle the different sources of true persistence (sunk costs, learning, self-enhancing success). For instance, the distinction between permanent innovation activities due to firm-inherent factors and true state dependence has some important implications. If innovation is state dependent, innovation–stimulating policy measures such as government support programmes are supposed to have a more profound effect because they do not only affect the current innovation activities but are also likely to induce a permanent change in favour of innovation. If, on the other hand, individual heterogeneity induces persistent behaviour, support programmes are unlikely to have long–lasting effects and economic policy should concentrate more on measures which have the potential to improve innovation–relevant firm–specific factors.

References

Alessie, R., Hochguertel, S., and Van Soest, A. (2004), "Ownership of stocks and mutual funds: A panel data analysis", *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 86: 783-796.

Altomonte, C. and Bekes, G. (2008), "Trading activities, firms and productivity", mimeo.

Atkeson, Andrew and Ariel Burstein (2007), "Innovation, Firm Dynamics, and International Trade", NBER Working Paper 13326.

Aw, B. Y., Roberts, M.J. and Xu, D.Y. (2008), "R&D Investments, Exporting, and the Evolution of Firm Productivity," *American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings* 98: 451-456.

Aw, B.Y., Roberts, M.J. and Winston, T. (2007), "Export Market Participation, Investments in R&D and Worker Training, and the Evolution of Firm Productivity", *The World Economy* 14: 83-104.

Becker, S. and Egger P. (2007), "Endogenous Product Versus Process Innovation and a Firm's Propensity to Export", CESIFO Working Paper No. 1906.

Bernard, A.B. and Jensen, J.B. (1999), "Exceptional Exporter Performance: Cause, Effect, or Both?", *Journal of International Economics* 47: 1-25.

Bernard, A.B. and Jensen, J.B. (2004), "Why Some Firms Export", *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 86: 561-569.

Bernard, A.B., Jensen, J.B., Redding, S.J. and Schott, P. (2007), "Firms in International Trade", *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 21: 105-130.

Bloomfield, A. (1994): *Essays in the history of international trade theory*, Edward Elgar.

Braunerhjelm, P. (1996), "The relation between firm-specific intangibles and exports", *Economic Letters* 53: 213-219.

Cameron, A.C. and Trivedi, P.K. (2005), "Microeconometrics: Methods and Applications", Cambridge University Press, New York.

Cassiman B. and Golovko, E. (2007), "Innovation and the export-productivity link", IESE Business School, mimeo.

Castellani, D., Serti, F. and Tomasi, C. (2008), "Firms in International Trade: Importers and Exporters Heterogeneity in the Italian Manufacturing Industry", mimeo.

Chamberlain G. (1984), "Panel data", in Handbook of Econometrics, ed. by Z. Griliches and M. Intrilligator, Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Clerides, S. K., Lach, S., and Tybout, J.R. (1998), "Is learning by exporting important? Microdynamic evidence from Colombia, Mexico, and Morocco", *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 113: 903-947.

Constantini, James A., and Melitz, M.J. (2008), "The Dynamics of Firm-Level Adjustment to Trade Liberalization", in The Organization of Firms in a Global Economy, E. Helpman, D. Marin, and T. Verdier (eds.), Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Damijan, J.P., Kostevc, C., and Polanec, S. (2008), "From innovation to exporting or vice versa? Causal link between innovation activity and exporting in Slovenian microdata", LICOS Centre for Institutions and Economic Performance Discussion paper 204/2008.

Geroski, P.A., Van Reenen, J. and Walters, C.F., (1997), "How persistenly do firms innovate?", *Research Policy* 26: 33-48

Girma, S., Görg, H., *Hanley*, A. (2008), "R&D and exporting: A comparison of British and Irish firms", *Review of World Economics* 144: 749-772

Greene, W. (2008), "Discrete Choice Modeling," The Handbook of Econometrics: Vol. 2, Applied Econometrics, Part 4.2., ed. T. Mills and K. Patterson, Palgrave, London

Greenaway, D. and Kneller, R. (2007), "Firm heterogeneity, exporting and foreign direct investment", *Economic Journal* 117:134-161.

Griffith, R. Huergo, E., Mairesse, J. and Peters, B. (2006), "Innovation and productivity across four European Countries", *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 22: 483-498.

Grossman, G.M. and Helpman, E. (1991), "Innovation and Growth in the Global Economy", Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Grossman, G.M. and Helpman, E. (1995): "Technology and Trade", Handbook of International Economics III: 1279-1337.

Grossman, G.M. and Helpman, E. (2002), "Integration versus outsourcing in industry equilibrium", *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 117: 85-120.

Heckman, J. (1981), "The Incidental Parameters Problem and the Problem of Initial Conditions in Estimating a Discrete Time-Discrete Data Stochastic Process," in C.F. Manski and D.L. McFadden (eds.), Structural Analysis of Discrete Data with Econometric Applications, MIT Press, London, 179–195.

Hummels, D., Ishii, J. and Yi, K. (2001), "The nature and growth of vertical specialization in world trade", *Journal of International Economics* 54: 75–96.

Jovanovic, B. (1982), "Selection and the Evolution of Industry", *Econometrica* 50: 649-70.

Kaiser, U. and Kongsted, H. C. (2008), "True versus spurious state dependence in firm performance: The case of German exports", *Empirical Economics* 35: 207-28.

Kasahara, H. and Lapham, B. (2008), "Productivity and the decision to import and export: Theory and evidence", CESifo Working Paper 2240.

Kasahara, H., and Rodrigue, J., (2005), "Does the Use of Imported Intermediates Increase Productivity? Plant-Level Evidence", University of Western Ontario, RBC Financial Group Economic Policy Research Institute Working Paper No. 20057.

Klepper, S. (1996), "Entry, Exit, Growth, and Innovation over the Product Life Cycle", *American Economic Review* 86: 562-583.

Kumar, N. and Siddhartan, N.S. (1994), "Technology, firm size and export behaviour in developing countries: the case of Indian enterprise", *Journal of Development Studies* 32: 288-309.

Lee, L.F. (1997), "Simulated Maximum Likelihood Estimation of Dynamic Discrete Choice Statistical Models Using some Monte Carlo Results," *Journal of Econometrics* 82: 1-35.

Lileeva, A. and Trefler, D. (2007), "Improved access to foreign markets raises plant-level productivity ... for some plants", NBER working paper series, 13297.

Melitz, M.J. (2003), "The impact of trade on intra-industry reallocations and aggregate industry productivity" Econometrica 71: 1695-1725.

Merino, F. and Rodríguez, D. (2007), "Outsourcing of business services: theory and evidence", *Industrial and Corporate Change* 16: 1147-1173.

Mundlak, Y. (1978), "On the Pooling of Time Series and Cross Sectional Data." *Econometrica*, 56: 69–86.

Peters, B. (2007): "Persistence of Innovation: Stylised Facts and Panel Data Evidence", *The Journal of Technology Transfer* (forthcoming).

Posner, M.V. (1961), "International trade and technological progress", *Oxford Economic Papers* 13: 323-341.

Roberts, M.J. and Tybout, J.R. (1997), "The Decision to Export in Colombia: An Empirical Model of Entry with Sunk Costs", *American Economic Review* 87: 545-564.

Roper, S. (1998), "Under-Reporting of R&D in Small Firms: The Impact on International R&D Comparisons", *Small Business Economics* 12: 131-135.

Stewart, M. (2007), "The interrelated dynamics of unemployment and low-wage employment", *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 22: 511-531.

Salomon, R.M. (2006), "Spillovers to foreign market participants: assessing the impact of export strategies on innovative productivity", *Strategic Organization* 4: 135-164.

Vernon, R. (1966), "International investment and international trade in product cycle", *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 80: 190-207.

Wagner, J. (2007), "Exports and Productivity: A Survey of the Evidence from Firm-level Data", *The World Economy* 30: 60-82.

Wakelin, K. (1998a), "The Role of Innovation in Bilateral OECD Trade Performance", *Applied Economics* 30: 1334-46.

Wakelin, K. (1998b), "Innovation and export behaviour at the firm level", *Research Policy* 26: 829-841.

Appendix:

Table A1
Variable definitions

Variable	Type	Definition
Alternative dependent variables		
Export	0/1	1 if the firm exported at t, directly or channelling those exports through an affiliated of the group
Import	0/1	1 if the firm imported at t, directly or channelling those imports through an affiliated of the group
R&D	0/1	1 if the firm invested in R&D at t (internal or external expenses)
Product innovation	0/1	1 if the firm obtained a product innovation at t. Encompasses completely new products, or with modifications such that they are different from those produced earlier
Process innovation	0/1	1 if the firm introduced a process innovation at t
Explanatory variables		
Size	0/1	1 if a firm i has more than 200 employees at t
Productivity	Continuous	Added value (defined as the sum of the sales, the variation in stocks and other management income, minus the purchases and external services) per employee at 1990 constant price
Foreign	0/1	1 if the firm's social capital was directly or indirectly participated by foreign capital at t
Age	Continuous	Number of years since the firm was created
Adv	0/1	1 if the firm spent on advertising and/or public relations at t
Group	0/1	1 if the firm i is part of a companies' group

Table A2
Export and Import in Spanish manufacturing firms
(per cent of firms of each column total)

	Year			
	1991	1996	2001	2006
SMEs firms (Nº of observations)	*656*	*913*	*971*	*691*
Export & Import	20.7	30.6	38.1	39.4
Export & No Import	11.6	13.9	12.5	13.7
No Export & Import	13.7	10.8	11.5	12.6
No Export & No Import	54.0	44.7	37.9	34.3
Large firms (Nº of observations)	*371*	*499*	*480*	*332*
Export & Import	77.9	86.4	90.0	88.6
Export & No Import	5.4	3.4	3.7	3.6
No Export & Import	10.2	7.2	4.78	6.0
No Export & No Import	6.5	3.0	1.5	1.8

Table A3
Persistent and non-persistent behaviour
(1990-2006; per cent of column total)

	Export		Import		R&D		Product		Process	
	SMEs	Large	SMEs	Large	SMEs	Large	SMEs	Large	SMEs	Large
Persistent										
- Never	37.1	2.5	32.9	0.3	57.0	10.8	44.8	20.1	24.9	7.7
- Always	27.0	78.7	23.5	76.6	6.4	42.1	1.7	5.2	1.1	6.1
No persistent										
- Entrants	11.6	6.5	10.4	6.5	6.0	9.7	4.0	8.8	2.8	7.7
- Exiters	4.0	3.1	4.2	2.8	5.0	7.9	6.9	9.0	7.6	11.8
- Switchers	20.3	9.2	28.9	13.7	25.6	29.6	42.5	56.8	63.6	66.8

Table A4
R&D and Innovation processes in Spanish manufacturing firms
(per cent of firms of each column total)

	Product Innovation				Process Innovations			
	1991	1996	2001	2006	1991	1996	2001	2006
SMEs firms (Nº of observations)	*656*	*913*	*971*	*691*	*656*	*913*	*971*	*691*
R&D & Innovation	9.6	9.2	9.7	11.6	10.4	8.1	9.2	9.8
R&D & No Innovation	10.5	10.0	10.7	11.0	9.8	11.1	11.2	12.7
No R&D & Innovation	10.1	11.1	6.1	4.6	18.1	16.6	15.8	9.7
No R&D & No Innovation	69.8	69.7	73.5	72.8	61.7	64.2	63.8	67.7
Large firms (Nº of observations)	*371*	*499*	*480*	*332*	*371*	*499*	*480*	*332*
R&D & Innovation	34.2	31.7	33.9	27.7	42.3	38.7	40.6	32.2
R&D & No Innovation	34.5	32.5	34.2	39.8	26.4	25.4	27.5	35.2
No R&D & Innovation	5.1	5.0	4.0	4.2	13.2	10.0	7.9	6.9
No R&D & No Innovation	26.2	30.9	27.9	28.3	18.1	25.8	24.0	25.6

455/2009 Does playing several competitions influence a team's league performance? Evidence from Spanish professional football
Andrés J. Picazo-Tadeo & Francisco González-Gómez

456/2009 Does accessibility affect retail prices and competition? An empirical application
Juan Luis Jiménez and Jordi Perdiguero

457/2009 Cash conversion cycle in smes
Sonia Baños-Caballero, Pedro J. García-Teruel and Pedro Martínez-Solano

458/2009 Un estudio sobre el perfil de hogares endeudados y sobreendeudados: el caso de los hogares vascos
Alazne Mujika Alberdi, Iñaki García Arrizabalaga y Juan José Gibaja Martíns

459/2009 Imposing monotonicity on outputs in parametric distance function estimations: with an application to the spanish educational production
Sergio Perelman and Daniel Santin

460/2009 Key issues when using tax data for concentration analysis: an application to the Spanish wealth tax
José Mª Durán-Cabré and Alejandro Esteller-Moré

461/2009 ¿Se está rompiendo el mercado español? una aplicación del enfoque de feldstein –horioka
Saúl De Vicente Queijeiro, José Luis Pérez Rivero y María Rosalía Vicente Cuervo

462/2009 Financial condition, cost efficiency and the quality of local public services
Manuel A. Muñiz & José L. Zafra

463/2009 Including non-cognitive outputs in a multidimensional evaluation of education production: an international comparison
Marián García Valiñas & Manuel Antonio Muñiz Pérez

464/2009 A political look into budget deficits.The role of minority governments and oppositions
Albert Falcó-Gimeno & Ignacio Jurado

465/2009 La simulación del cuadro de mando integral. una herramienta de aprendizaje en la materia de contabilidad de gestión
Elena Urquía Grande, Clara Isabel Muñoz Colomina y Elisa Isabel Cano Montero

466/2009 Análisis histórico de la importancia de la industria de la desalinización en España
Borja Montaño Sanz

467/2009 The dynamics of trade and innovation: a joint approach
Silviano Esteve-Pérez & Diego Rodríguez

FUNDACIÓN DE LAS CAJAS DE AHORROS

DOCUMENTOS DE TRABAJO

Últimos números publicados

159/2000 Participación privada en la construcción y explotación de carreteras de peaje
Ginés de Rus, Manuel Romero y Lourdes Trujillo

160/2000 Errores y posibles soluciones en la aplicación del *Value at Risk*
Mariano González Sánchez

161/2000 Tax neutrality on saving assets. The spahish case before and after the tax reform
Cristina Ruza y de Paz-Curbera

162/2000 Private rates of return to human capital in Spain: new evidence
F. Barceinas, J. Oliver-Alonso, J.L. Raymond y J.L. Roig-Sabaté

163/2000 El control interno del riesgo. Una propuesta de sistema de límites
riesgo neutral
Mariano González Sánchez

164/2001 La evolución de las políticas de gasto de las Administraciones Públicas en los años 90
Alfonso Utrilla de la Hoz y Carmen Pérez Esparrells

165/2001 Bank cost efficiency and output specification
Emili Tortosa-Ausina

166/2001 Recent trends in Spanish income distribution: A robust picture of falling income inequality
Josep Oliver-Alonso, Xavier Ramos y José Luis Raymond-Bara

167/2001 Efectos redistributivos y sobre el bienestar social del tratamiento de las cargas familiares en el nuevo IRPF
Nuria Badenes Plá, Julio López Laborda, Jorge Onrubia Fernández

168/2001 The Effects of Bank Debt on Financial Structure of Small and Medium Firms in some European Countries
Mónica Melle-Hernández

169/2001 La política de cohesión de la UE ampliada: la perspectiva de España
Ismael Sanz Labrador

170/2002 Riesgo de liquidez de Mercado
Mariano González Sánchez

171/2002 Los costes de administración para el afiliado en los sistemas de pensiones basados en cuentas de capitalización individual: medida y comparación internacional.
José Enrique Devesa Carpio, Rosa Rodríguez Barrera, Carlos Vidal Meliá

172/2002 La encuesta continua de presupuestos familiares (1985-1996): descripción, representatividad y propuestas de metodología para la explotación de la información de los ingresos y el gasto.
Llorenc Pou, Joaquín Alegre

173/2002 Modelos paramétricos y no paramétricos en problemas de concesión de tarjetas de credito.
Rosa Puertas, María Bonilla, Ignacio Olmeda

174/2002 Mercado único, comercio intra-industrial y costes de ajuste en las manufacturas españolas.
José Vicente Blanes Cristóbal

175/2003 La Administración tributaria en España. Un análisis de la gestión a través de los ingresos y de los gastos.
Juan de Dios Jiménez Aguilera, Pedro Enrique Barrilao González

176/2003 The Falling Share of Cash Payments in Spain.
Santiago Carbó Valverde, Rafael López del Paso, David B. Humphrey
Publicado en "Moneda y Crédito" nº 217, pags. 167-189.

177/2003 Effects of ATMs and Electronic Payments on Banking Costs: The Spanish Case.
Santiago Carbó Valverde, Rafael López del Paso, David B. Humphrey

178/2003 Factors explaining the interest margin in the banking sectors of the European Union.
Joaquín Maudos y Juan Fernández Guevara

179/2003 Los planes de stock options para directivos y consejeros y su valoración por el mercado de valores en España.
Mónica Melle Hernández

180/2003 Ownership and Performance in Europe and US Banking – A comparison of Commercial, Co-operative & Savings Banks.
Yener Altunbas, Santiago Carbó y Phil Molyneux

181/2003 The Euro effect on the integration of the European stock markets.
Mónica Melle Hernández

182/2004 In search of complementarity in the innovation strategy: international R&D and external knowledge acquisition.
Bruno Cassiman, Reinhilde Veugelers

183/2004 Fijación de precios en el sector público: una aplicación para el servicio municipal de suministro de agua.
Mª Ángeles García Valiñas

184/2004 Estimación de la economía sumergida es España: un modelo estructural de variables latentes.
Ángel Alañón Pardo, Miguel Gómez de Antonio

185/2004 Causas políticas y consecuencias sociales de la corrupción.
Joan Oriol Prats Cabrera

186/2004 Loan bankers' decisions and sensitivity to the audit report using the belief revision model.
Andrés Guiral Contreras and José A. Gonzalo Angulo

187/2004 El modelo de Black, Derman y Toy en la práctica. Aplicación al mercado español.
Marta Tolentino García-Abadillo y Antonio Díaz Pérez

188/2004 Does market competition make banks perform well?.
Mónica Melle

189/2004 Efficiency differences among banks: external, technical, internal, and managerial
Santiago Carbó Valverde, David B. Humphrey y Rafael López del Paso

190/2004 Una aproximación al análisis de los costes de la esquizofrenia en españa: los modelos jerárquicos bayesianos
F. J. Vázquez-Polo, M. A. Negrín, J. M. Cavasés, E. Sánchez y grupo RIRAG

191/2004 Environmental proactivity and business performance: an empirical analysis
Javier González-Benito y Óscar González-Benito

192/2004 Economic risk to beneficiaries in notional defined contribution accounts (NDCs)
Carlos Vidal-Meliá, Inmaculada Domínguez-Fabian y José Enrique Devesa-Carpio

193/2004 Sources of efficiency gains in port reform: non parametric malmquist decomposition tfp index for Mexico
Antonio Estache, Beatriz Tovar de la Fé y Lourdes Trujillo

194/2004 Persistencia de resultados en los fondos de inversión españoles
Alfredo Ciriaco Fernández y Rafael Santamaría Aquilué

195/2005 El modelo de revisión de creencias como aproximación psicológica a la formación del juicio del auditor sobre la gestión continuada
Andrés Guiral Contreras y Francisco Esteso Sánchez

196/2005 La nueva financiación sanitaria en España: descentralización y prospectiva
David Cantarero Prieto

197/2005 A cointegration analysis of the Long-Run supply response of Spanish agriculture to the common agricultural policy
José A. Mendez, Ricardo Mora y Carlos San Juan

198/2005 ¿Refleja la estructura temporal de los tipos de interés del mercado español preferencia por la liquidez?
Magdalena Massot Perelló y Juan M. Nave

199/2005 Análisis de impacto de los Fondos Estructurales Europeos recibidos por una economía regional: Un enfoque a través de Matrices de Contabilidad Social
M. Carmen Lima y M. Alejandro Cardenete

200/2005 Does the development of non-cash payments affect monetary policy transmission?
Santiago Carbó Valverde y Rafael López del Paso

201/2005 Firm and time varying technical and allocative efficiency: an application for port cargo handling firms
Ana Rodríguez-Álvarez, Beatriz Tovar de la Fe y Lourdes Trujillo

202/2005 Contractual complexity in strategic alliances
Jeffrey J. Reuer y Africa Ariño

203/2005 Factores determinantes de la evolución del empleo en las empresas adquiridas por opa
Nuria Alcalde Fradejas y Inés Pérez-Soba Aguilar

204/2005 Nonlinear Forecasting in Economics: a comparison between Comprehension Approach versus Learning Approach. An Application to Spanish Time Series
Elena Olmedo, Juan M. Valderas, Ricardo Gimeno and Lorenzo Escot

205/2005 Precio de la tierra con presión urbana: un modelo para España
Esther Decimavilla, Carlos San Juan y Stefan Sperlich

206/2005 Interregional migration in Spain: a semiparametric analysis
Adolfo Maza y José Villaverde

207/2005 Productivity growth in European banking
Carmen Murillo-Melchor, José Manuel Pastor y Emili Tortosa-Ausina

208/2005 Explaining Bank Cost Efficiency in Europe: Environmental and Productivity Influences.
Santiago Carbó Valverde, David B. Humphrey y Rafael López del Paso

209/2005 La elasticidad de sustitución intertemporal con preferencias no separables intratemporalmente: los casos de Alemania, España y Francia.
Elena Márquez de la Cruz, Ana R. Martínez Cañete y Inés Pérez-Soba Aguilar

210/2005 Contribución de los efectos tamaño, book-to-market y momentum a la valoración de activos: el caso español.
Begoña Font-Belaire y Alfredo Juan Grau-Grau

211/2005 Permanent income, convergence and inequality among countries
José M. Pastor and Lorenzo Serrano

212/2005 The Latin Model of Welfare: Do 'Insertion Contracts' Reduce Long-Term Dependence?
Luis Ayala and Magdalena Rodríguez

213/2005 The effect of geographic expansion on the productivity of Spanish savings banks
Manuel Illueca, José M. Pastor and Emili Tortosa-Ausina

214/2005 Dynamic network interconnection under consumer switching costs
Ángel Luis López Rodríguez

215/2005 La influencia del entorno socioeconómico en la realización de estudios universitarios: una aproximación al caso español en la década de los noventa
Marta Rahona López

216/2005 The valuation of spanish ipos: efficiency analysis
Susana Álvarez Otero

217/2005 On the generation of a regular multi-input multi-output technology using parametric output distance functions
Sergio Perelman and Daniel Santin

218/2005 La gobernanza de los procesos parlamentarios: la organización industrial del congreso de los diputados en España
Gonzalo Caballero Miguez

219/2005 Determinants of bank market structure: Efficiency and political economy variables
Francisco González

220/2005 Agresividad de las órdenes introducidas en el mercado español: estrategias, determinantes y medidas de performance
David Abad Díaz

221/2005 Tendencia post-anuncio de resultados contables: evidencia para el mercado español
Carlos Forner Rodríguez, Joaquín Marhuenda Fructuoso y Sonia Sanabria García

222/2005 Human capital accumulation and geography: empirical evidence in the European Union
Jesús López-Rodríguez, J. Andrés Faíña y Jose Lopez Rodríguez

223/2005 Auditors' Forecasting in Going Concern Decisions: Framing, Confidence and Information Processing
Waymond Rodgers and Andrés Guiral

224/2005 The effect of Structural Fund spending on the Galician region: an assessment of the 1994-1999 and 2000-2006 Galician CSFs
José Ramón Cancelo de la Torre, J. Andrés Faíña and Jesús López-Rodríguez

225/2005 The effects of ownership structure and board composition on the audit committee activity: Spanish evidence
Carlos Fernández Méndez and Rubén Arrondo García

226/2005 Cross-country determinants of bank income smoothing by managing loan loss provisions
Ana Rosa Fonseca and Francisco González

227/2005 Incumplimiento fiscal en el irpf (1993-2000): un análisis de sus factores determinantes
Alejandro Estellér Moré

228/2005 Region versus Industry effects: volatility transmission
Pilar Soriano Felipe and Francisco J. Climent Diranzo

229/2005 Concurrent Engineering: The Moderating Effect Of Uncertainty On New Product Development Success
Daniel Vázquez-Bustelo and Sandra Valle

230/2005 On zero lower bound traps: a framework for the analysis of monetary policy in the 'age' of central banks
Alfonso Palacio-Vera

231/2005 Reconciling Sustainability and Discounting in Cost Benefit Analysis: a methodological proposal
M. Carmen Almansa Sáez and Javier Calatrava Requena

232/2005 Can The Excess Of Liquidity Affect The Effectiveness Of The European Monetary Policy?
Santiago Carbó Valverde and Rafael López del Paso

233/2005 Inheritance Taxes In The Eu Fiscal Systems: The Present Situation And Future Perspectives.
Miguel Angel Barberán Lahuerta

234/2006 Bank Ownership And Informativeness Of Earnings.
Víctor M. González

235/2006 Developing A Predictive Method: A Comparative Study Of The Partial Least Squares Vs Maximum Likelihood Techniques.
Waymond Rodgers, Paul Pavlou and Andres Guiral.

236/2006 Using Compromise Programming for Macroeconomic Policy Making in a General Equilibrium Framework: Theory and Application to the Spanish Economy.
Francisco J. André, M. Alejandro Cardenete y Carlos Romero.

237/2006 Bank Market Power And Sme Financing Constraints.
Santiago Carbó-Valverde, Francisco Rodríguez-Fernández y Gregory F. Udell.

238/2006 Trade Effects Of Monetary Agreements: Evidence For Oecd Countries.
Salvador Gil-Pareja, Rafael Llorca-Vivero y José Antonio Martínez-Serrano.

239/2006 The Quality Of Institutions: A Genetic Programming Approach.
Marcos Álvarez-Díaz y Gonzalo Caballero Miguez.

240/2006 La interacción entre el éxito competitivo y las condiciones del mercado doméstico como determinantes de la decisión de exportación en las Pymes.
Francisco García Pérez.

241/2006 Una estimación de la depreciación del capital humano por sectores, por ocupación y en el tiempo.
Inés P. Murillo.

242/2006 Consumption And Leisure Externalities, Economic Growth And Equilibrium Efficiency.
Manuel A. Gómez.

243/2006 Measuring efficiency in education: an analysis of different approaches for incorporating non-discretionary inputs.
Jose Manuel Cordero-Ferrera, Francisco Pedraja-Chaparro y Javier Salinas-Jiménez

244/2006 Did The European Exchange-Rate Mechanism Contribute To The Integration Of Peripheral Countries?.
Salvador Gil-Pareja, Rafael Llorca-Vivero y José Antonio Martínez-Serrano

245/2006 Intergenerational Health Mobility: An Empirical Approach Based On The Echp.
Marta Pascual and David Cantarero

246/2006 Measurement and analysis of the Spanish Stock Exchange using the Lyapunov exponent with digital technology.
Salvador Rojí Ferrari and Ana Gonzalez Marcos

247/2006 Testing For Structural Breaks In Variance Withadditive Outliers And Measurement Errors.
Paulo M.M. Rodrigues and Antonio Rubia

248/2006 The Cost Of Market Power In Banking: Social Welfare Loss Vs. Cost Inefficiency.
Joaquín Maudos and Juan Fernández de Guevara

249/2006 Elasticidades de largo plazo de la demanda de vivienda: evidencia para España (1885-2000).
Desiderio Romero Jordán, José Félix Sanz Sanz y César Pérez López

250/2006 Regional Income Disparities in Europe: What role for location?.
Jesús López-Rodríguez and J. Andrés Faíña

251/2006 Funciones abreviadas de bienestar social: Una forma sencilla de simultanear la medición de la eficiencia y la equidad de las políticas de gasto público.
Nuria Badenes Plá y Daniel Santín González

252/2006 "The momentum effect in the Spanish stock market: Omitted risk factors or investor behaviour?".
Luis Muga and Rafael Santamaría

253/2006 Dinámica de precios en el mercado español de gasolina: un equilibrio de colusión tácita.
Jordi Perdiguero García

254/2006 Desigualdad regional en España: renta permanente versus renta corriente.
José M.Pastor, Empar Pons y Lorenzo Serrano

255/2006 Environmental implications of organic food preferences: an application of the impure public goods model.
Ana Maria Aldanondo-Ochoa y Carmen Almansa-Sáez

256/2006 Family tax credits versus family allowances when labour supply matters: Evidence for Spain.
José Felix Sanz-Sanz, Desiderio Romero-Jordán y Santiago Álvarez-García

257/2006 La internacionalización de la empresa manufacturera española: efectos del capital humano genérico y específico.
José López Rodríguez

258/2006 Evaluación de las migraciones interregionales en España, 1996-2004.
María Martínez Torres

259/2006 Efficiency and market power in Spanish banking.
Rolf Färe, Shawna Grosskopf y Emili Tortosa-Ausina.

260/2006 Asimetrías en volatilidad, beta y contagios entre las empresas grandes y pequeñas cotizadas en la bolsa española.
Helena Chuliá y Hipòlit Torró.

261/2006 Birth Replacement Ratios: New Measures of Period Population Replacement.
José Antonio Ortega.

262/2006 Accidentes de tráfico, víctimas mortales y consumo de alcohol.
José Mª Arranz y Ana I. Gil.

263/2006 Análisis de la Presencia de la Mujer en los Consejos de Administración de las Mil Mayores Empresas Españolas.
Ruth Mateos de Cabo, Lorenzo Escot Mangas y Ricardo Gimeno Nogués.

264/2006 Crisis y Reforma del Pacto de Estabilidad y Crecimiento. Las Limitaciones de la Política Económica en Europa.
Ignacio Álvarez Peralta.

265/2006 Have Child Tax Allowances Affected Family Size? A Microdata Study For Spain (1996-2000).
Jaime Vallés-Giménez y Anabel Zárate-Marco.

266/2006 Health Human Capital And The Shift From Foraging To Farming.
Paolo Rungo.

267/2006 Financiación Autonómica y Política de la Competencia: El Mercado de Gasolina en Canarias.
Juan Luis Jiménez y Jordi Perdiguero.

268/2006 El cumplimiento del Protocolo de Kyoto para los hogares españoles: el papel de la imposición sobre la energía.
Desiderio Romero-Jordán y José Félix Sanz-Sanz.

269/2006 Banking competition, financial dependence and economic growth
Joaquín Maudos y Juan Fernández de Guevara

270/2006 Efficiency, subsidies and environmental adaptation of animal farming under CAP
Werner Kleinhanß, Carmen Murillo, Carlos San Juan y Stefan Sperlich

271/2006 Interest Groups, Incentives to Cooperation and Decision-Making Process in the European Union
A. Garcia-Lorenzo y Jesús López-Rodríguez

272/2006 Riesgo asimétrico y estrategias de momentum en el mercado de valores español
Luis Muga y Rafael Santamaría

273/2006 Valoración de capital-riesgo en proyectos de base tecnológica e innovadora a través de la teoría de opciones reales
Gracia Rubio Martín

274/2006 Capital stock and unemployment: searching for the missing link
Ana Rosa Martínez-Cañete, Elena Márquez de la Cruz, Alfonso Palacio-Vera and Inés Pérez-Soba Aguilar

275/2006 Study of the influence of the voters' political culture on vote decision through the simulation of a political competition problem in Spain
Sagrario Lantarón, Isabel Lillo, Mª Dolores López and Javier Rodrigo

276/2006 Investment and growth in Europe during the Golden Age
Antonio Cubel and Mª Teresa Sanchis

277/2006 Efectos de vincular la pensión pública a la inversión en cantidad y calidad de hijos en un modelo de equilibrio general
Robert Meneu Gaya

278/2006 El consumo y la valoración de activos
Elena Márquez y Belén Nieto

279/2006 Economic growth and currency crisis: A real exchange rate entropic approach
David Matesanz Gómez y Guillermo J. Ortega

280/2006 Three measures of returns to education: An illustration for the case of Spain
María Arrazola y José de Hevia

281/2006 Composition of Firms versus Composition of Jobs
Antoni Cunyat

282/2006 La vocación internacional de un holding tranviario belga: la Compagnie Mutuelle de Tram-ways, 1895-1918
Alberte Martínez López

283/2006 Una visión panorámica de las entidades de crédito en España en la última década.
Constantino García Ramos

284/2006 Foreign Capital and Business Strategies: a comparative analysis of urban transport in Madrid and Barcelona, 1871-1925
Alberte Martínez López

285/2006 Los intereses belgas en la red ferroviaria catalana, 1890-1936
Alberte Martínez López

286/2006 The Governance of Quality: The Case of the Agrifood Brand Names
Marta Fernández Barcala, Manuel González-Díaz y Emmanuel Raynaud

287/2006 Modelling the role of health status in the transition out of malthusian equilibrium
Paolo Rungo, Luis Currais and Berta Rivera

288/2006 Industrial Effects of Climate Change Policies through the EU Emissions Trading Scheme
Xavier Labandeira and Miguel Rodríguez

289/2006 Globalisation and the Composition of Government Spending: An analysis for OECD countries
Norman Gemmell, Richard Kneller and Ismael Sanz

290/2006 La producción de energía eléctrica en España: Análisis económico de la actividad tras la liberalización del Sector Eléctrico
Fernando Hernández Martínez

291/2006 Further considerations on the link between adjustment costs and the productivity of R&D investment: evidence for Spain
Desiderio Romero-Jordán, José Félix Sanz-Sanz and Inmaculada Álvarez-Ayuso

292/2006 Una teoría sobre la contribución de la función de compras al rendimiento empresarial
Javier González Benito

293/2006 Agility drivers, enablers and outcomes: empirical test of an integrated agile manufacturing model
Daniel Vázquez-Bustelo, Lucía Avella and Esteban Fernández

294/2006 Testing the parametric vs the semiparametric generalized mixed effects models
María José Lombardía and Stefan Sperlich

295/2006 Nonlinear dynamics in energy futures
Mariano Matilla-García

296/2006 Estimating Spatial Models By Generalized Maximum Entropy Or How To Get Rid Of W
Esteban Fernández Vázquez, Matías Mayor Fernández and Jorge Rodriguez-Valez

297/2006 Optimización fiscal en las transmisiones lucrativas: análisis metodológico
Félix Domínguez Barrero

298/2006 La situación actual de la banca online en España
Francisco José Climent Diranzo y Alexandre Momparler Pechuán

299/2006 Estrategia competitiva y rendimiento del negocio: el papel mediador de la estrategia y las capacidades productivas
Javier González Benito y Isabel Suárez González

300/2006 A Parametric Model to Estimate Risk in a Fixed Income Portfolio
Pilar Abad and Sonia Benito

301/2007 Análisis Empírico de las Preferencias Sociales Respecto del Gasto en Obra Social de las Cajas de Ahorros
Alejandro Esteller-Moré, Jonathan Jorba Jiménez y Albert Solé-Ollé

302/2007 Assessing the enlargement and deepening of regional trading blocs: The European Union case
Salvador Gil-Pareja, Rafael Llorca-Vivero y José Antonio Martínez-Serrano

303/2007 ¿Es la Franquicia un Medio de Financiación?: Evidencia para el Caso Español
Vanesa Solís Rodríguez y Manuel González Díaz

304/2007 On the Finite-Sample Biases in Nonparametric Testing for Variance Constancy
Paulo M.M. Rodrigues and Antonio Rubia

305/2007 Spain is Different: Relative Wages 1989-98
José Antonio Carrasco Gallego

306/2007 Poverty reduction and SAM multipliers: An evaluation of public policies in a regional framework
Francisco Javier De Miguel-Vélez y Jesús Pérez-Mayo

307/2007 La Eficiencia en la Gestión del Riesgo de Crédito en las Cajas de Ahorro
Marcelino Martínez Cabrera

308/2007 Optimal environmental policy in transport: unintended effects on consumers' generalized price
M. Pilar Socorro and Ofelia Betancor

309/2007 Agricultural Productivity in the European Regions: Trends and Explanatory Factors
Roberto Ezcurra, Belen Iráizoz, Pedro Pascual and Manuel Rapún

310/2007 Long-run Regional Population Divergence and Modern Economic Growth in Europe: a Case Study of Spain
María Isabel Ayuda, Fernando Collantes and Vicente Pinilla

311/2007 Financial Information effects on the measurement of Commercial Banks' Efficiency
Borja Amor, María T. Tascón and José L. Fanjul

312/2007 Neutralidad e incentivos de las inversiones financieras en el nuevo IRPF
Félix Domínguez Barrero

313/2007 The Effects of Corporate Social Responsibility Perceptions on The Valuation of Common Stock
Waymond Rodgers , Helen Choy and Andres Guiral-Contreras

314/2007 Country Creditor Rights, Information Sharing and Commercial Banks' Profitability Persistence across the world
Borja Amor, María T. Tascón and José L. Fanjul

315/2007 ¿Es Relevante el Déficit Corriente en una Unión Monetaria? El Caso Español
Javier Blanco González y Ignacio del Rosal Fernández

316/2007 The Impact of Credit Rating Announcements on Spanish Corporate Fixed Income Performance: Returns, Yields and Liquidity
Pilar Abad, Antonio Díaz and M. Dolores Robles

317/2007 Indicadores de Lealtad al Establecimiento y Formato Comercial Basados en la Distribución del Presupuesto
Cesar Augusto Bustos Reyes y Óscar González Benito

318/2007 Migrants and Market Potential in Spain over The XXth Century: A Test Of The New Economic Geography
Daniel A. Tirado, Jordi Pons, Elisenda Paluzie and Javier Silvestre

319/2007 El Impacto del Coste de Oportunidad de la Actividad Emprendedora en la Intención de los Ciudadanos Europeos de Crear Empresas
Luis Miguel Zapico Aldeano

320/2007 Los belgas y los ferrocarriles de vía estrecha en España, 1887-1936
Alberte Martínez López

321/2007 Competición política bipartidista. Estudio geométrico del equilibrio en un caso ponderado
Isabel Lillo, Mª Dolores López y Javier Rodrigo

322/2007 Human resource management and environment management systems: an empirical study
Mª Concepción López Fernández, Ana Mª Serrano Bedia and Gema García Piqueres

323/2007 Wood and industrialization. evidence and hypotheses from the case of Spain, 1860-1935.
Iñaki Iriarte-Goñi and María Isabel Ayuda Bosque

324/2007 New evidence on long-run monetary neutrality.
J. Cunado, L.A. Gil-Alana and F. Perez de Gracia

325/2007 Monetary policy and structural changes in the volatility of us interest rates.
Juncal Cuñado, Javier Gomez Biscarri and Fernando Perez de Gracia

326/2007 The productivity effects of intrafirm diffusion.
Lucio Fuentelsaz, Jaime Gómez and Sergio Palomas

327/2007 Unemployment duration, layoffs and competing risks.
J.M. Arranz, C. García-Serrano and L. Toharia

328/2007 El grado de cobertura del gasto público en España respecto a la UE-15
Nuria Rueda, Begoña Barruso, Carmen Calderón y Mª del Mar Herrador

329/2007 The Impact of Direct Subsidies in Spain before and after the CAP'92 Reform
Carmen Murillo, Carlos San Juan and Stefan Sperlich

330/2007 Determinants of post-privatisation performance of Spanish divested firms
Laura Cabeza García and Silvia Gómez Ansón

331/2007 ¿Por qué deciden diversificar las empresas españolas? Razones oportunistas versus razones económicas
Almudena Martínez Campillo

332/2007 Dynamical Hierarchical Tree in Currency Markets
Juan Gabriel Brida, David Matesanz Gómez and Wiston Adrián Risso

333/2007 Los determinantes sociodemográficos del gasto sanitario. Análisis con microdatos individuales
Ana María Angulo, Ramón Barberán, Pilar Egea y Jesús Mur

334/2007 Why do companies go private? The Spanish case
Inés Pérez-Soba Aguilar

335/2007 The use of gis to study transport for disabled people
Verónica Cañal Fernández

336/2007 The long run consequences of M&A: An empirical application
Cristina Bernad, Lucio Fuentelsaz and Jaime Gómez

337/2007 Las clasificaciones de materias en economía: principios para el desarrollo de una nueva clasificación
Valentín Edo Hernández

338/2007 Reforming Taxes and Improving Health: A Revenue-Neutral Tax Reform to Eliminate Medical and Pharmaceutical VAT
Santiago Álvarez-García, Carlos Pestana Barros y Juan Prieto-Rodriguez

339/2007 Impacts of an iron and steel plant on residential property values
Celia Bilbao-Terol

340/2007 Firm size and capital structure: Evidence using dynamic panel data
Víctor M. González and Francisco González

341/2007 ¿Cómo organizar una cadena hotelera? La elección de la forma de gobierno
Marta Fernández Barcala y Manuel González Díaz

342/2007 Análisis de los efectos de la decisión de diversificar: un contraste del marco teórico "Agencia-Stewardship"
Almudena Martínez Campillo y Roberto Fernández Gago

343/2007 Selecting portfolios given multiple eurostoxx-based uncertainty scenarios: a stochastic goal programming approach from fuzzy betas
Enrique Ballestero, Blanca Pérez-Gladish, Mar Arenas-Parra and Amelia Bilbao-Terol

344/2007 "El bienestar de los inmigrantes y los factores implicados en la decisión de emigrar"
Anastasia Hernández Alemán y Carmelo J. León

345/2007 Governance Decisions in the R&D Process: An Integrative Framework Based on TCT and Knowledge View of The Firm.
Andrea Martínez-Noya and Esteban García-Canal

346/2007 Diferencias salariales entre empresas públicas y privadas. El caso español
Begoña Cueto y Nuria Sánchez- Sánchez

347/2007 Effects of Fiscal Treatments of Second Home Ownership on Renting Supply
Celia Bilbao Terol and Juan Prieto Rodríguez

348/2007 Auditors' ethical dilemmas in the going concern evaluation
Andres Guiral, Waymond Rodgers, Emiliano Ruiz and Jose A. Gonzalo

349/2007 Convergencia en capital humano en España. Un análisis regional para el periodo 1970-2004
Susana Morales Sequera y Carmen Pérez Esparrells

350/2007 Socially responsible investment: mutual funds portfolio selection using fuzzy multiobjective programming
Blanca Mª Pérez-Gladish, Mar Arenas-Parra , Amelia Bilbao-Terol and Mª Victoria Rodríguez-Uría

351/2007 Persistencia del resultado contable y sus componentes: implicaciones de la medida de ajustes por devengo
Raúl Iñiguez Sánchez y Francisco Poveda Fuentes

352/2007 Wage Inequality and Globalisation: What can we Learn from the Past? A General Equilibrium Approach
Concha Betrán, Javier Ferri and Maria A. Pons

353/2007 Eficacia de los incentivos fiscales a la inversión en I+D en España en los años noventa
Desiderio Romero Jordán y José Félix Sanz Sanz

354/2007 Convergencia regional en renta y bienestar en España
Robert Meneu Gaya

355/2007 Tributación ambiental: Estado de la Cuestión y Experiencia en España
Ana Carrera Poncela

356/2007 Salient features of dependence in daily us stock market indices
Luis A. Gil-Alana, Juncal Cuñado and Fernando Pérez de Gracia

357/2007 La educación superior: ¿un gasto o una inversión rentable para el sector público?
Inés P. Murillo y Francisco Pedraja

358/2007 Effects of a reduction of working hours on a model with job creation and job destruction
Emilio Domínguez, Miren Ullibarri y Idoya Zabaleta

359/2007 Stock split size, signaling and earnings management: Evidence from the Spanish market
José Yagüe, J. Carlos Gómez-Sala and Francisco Poveda-Fuentes

360/2007 Modelización de las expectativas y estrategias de inversión en mercados de derivados
Begoña Font-Belaire

361/2008 Trade in capital goods during the golden age, 1953-1973
Mª Teresa Sanchis and Antonio Cubel

362/2008 El capital económico por riesgo operacional: una aplicación del modelo de distribución de pérdidas
Enrique José Jiménez Rodríguez y José Manuel Feria Domínguez

363/2008 The drivers of effectiveness in competition policy
Joan-Ramon Borrell and Juan-Luis Jiménez

364/2008 Corporate governance structure and board of directors remuneration policies: evidence from Spain
Carlos Fernández Méndez, Rubén Arrondo García and Enrique Fernández Rodríguez

365/2008 Beyond the disciplinary role of governance: how boards and donors add value to Spanish foundations
Pablo De Andrés Alonso, Valentín Azofra Palenzuela y M. Elena Romero Merino

366/2008 Complejidad y perfeccionamiento contractual para la contención del oportunismo en los acuerdos de franquicia
Vanesa Solís Rodríguez y Manuel González Díaz

367/2008 Inestabilidad y convergencia entre las regiones europeas
Jesús Mur, Fernando López y Ana Angulo

368/2008 Análisis espacial del cierre de explotaciones agrarias
Ana Aldanondo Ochoa, Carmen Almansa Sáez y Valero Casanovas Oliva

369/2008 Cross-Country Efficiency Comparison between Italian and Spanish Public Universities in the period 2000-2005
Tommaso Agasisti and Carmen Pérez Esparrells

370/2008 El desarrollo de la sociedad de la información en España: un análisis por comunidades autónomas
María Concepción García Jiménez y José Luis Gómez Barroso

371/2008 El medioambiente y los objetivos de fabricación: un análisis de los modelos estratégicos para su consecución
Lucía Avella Camarero, Esteban Fernández Sánchez y Daniel Vázquez-Bustelo

372/2008 Influence of bank concentration and institutions on capital structure: New international evidence
Víctor M. González and Francisco González

373/2008 Generalización del concepto de equilibrio en juegos de competición política
Mª Dolores López González y Javier Rodrigo Hitos

374/2008 Smooth Transition from Fixed Effects to Mixed Effects Models in Multi-level regression Models
María José Lombardía and Stefan Sperlich

375/2008 A Revenue-Neutral Tax Reform to Increase Demand for Public Transport Services
Carlos Pestana Barros and Juan Prieto-Rodriguez

376/2008 Measurement of intra-distribution dynamics: An application of different approaches to the European regions
Adolfo Maza, María Hierro and José Villaverde

377/2008 Migración interna de extranjeros y ¿nueva fase en la convergencia?
María Hierro y Adolfo Maza

378/2008 Efectos de la Reforma del Sector Eléctrico: Modelización Teórica y Experiencia Internacional
Ciro Eduardo Bazán Navarro

379/2008 A Non-Parametric Independence Test Using Permutation Entropy
Mariano Matilla-García and Manuel Ruiz Marín

380/2008 Testing for the General Fractional Unit Root Hypothesis in the Time Domain
Uwe Hassler, Paulo M.M. Rodrigues and Antonio Rubia

381/2008 Multivariate gram-charlier densities
Esther B. Del Brio, Trino-Manuel Ñíguez and Javier Perote

382/2008 Analyzing Semiparametrically the Trends in the Gender Pay Gap - The Example of Spain
Ignacio Moral-Arce, Stefan Sperlich, Ana I. Fernández-Saínz and Maria J. Roca

383/2008 A Cost-Benefit Analysis of a Two-Sided Card Market
Santiago Carbó Valverde, David B. Humphrey, José Manuel Liñares Zegarra and Francisco Rodriguez Fernandez

384/2008 A Fuzzy Bicriteria Approach for Journal Deselection in a Hospital Library
M. L. López-Avello, M. V. Rodríguez-Uría, B. Pérez-Gladish, A. Bilbao-Terol, M. Arenas-Parra

385/2008 Valoración de las grandes corporaciones farmaceúticas, a través del análisis de sus principales intangibles, con el método de opciones reales
Gracia Rubio Martín y Prosper Lamothe Fernández

386/2008 El marketing interno como impulsor de las habilidades comerciales de las pyme españolas: efectos en los resultados empresariales
Mª Leticia Santos Vijande, Mª José Sanzo Pérez, Nuria García Rodríguez y Juan A. Trespalacios Gutiérrez

387/2008 Understanding Warrants Pricing: A case study of the financial market in Spain
David Abad y Belén Nieto

388/2008 Aglomeración espacial, Potencial de Mercado y Geografía Económica: Una revisión de la literatura
Jesús López-Rodríguez y J. Andrés Faíña

389/2008 An empirical assessment of the impact of switching costs and first mover advantages on firm performance
Jaime Gómez, Juan Pablo Maícas

390/2008 Tender offers in Spain: testing the wave
Ana R. Martínez-Cañete y Inés Pérez-Soba Aguilar

391/2008 La integración del mercado español a finales del siglo XIX: los precios del trigo entre 1891 y 1905
Mariano Matilla García, Pedro Pérez Pascual y Basilio Sanz Carnero

392/2008 Cuando el tamaño importa: estudio sobre la influencia de los sujetos políticos en la balanza de bienes y servicios
Alfonso Echazarra de Gregorio

393/2008 Una visión cooperativa de las medidas ante el posible daño ambiental de la desalación
Borja Montaño Sanz

394/2008 Efectos externos del endeudamiento sobre la calificación crediticia de las Comunidades Autónomas
Andrés Leal Marcos y Julio López Laborda

395/2008 Technical efficiency and productivity changes in Spanish airports: A parametric distance functions approach
Beatriz Tovar & Roberto Rendeiro Martín-Cejas

396/2008 Network analysis of exchange data: Interdependence drives crisis contagion
David Matesanz Gómez & Guillermo J. Ortega

397/2008 Explaining the performance of Spanish privatised firms: a panel data approach
Laura Cabeza Garcia and Silvia Gomez Anson

398/2008 Technological capabilities and the decision to outsource R&D services
Andrea Martínez-Noya and Esteban García-Canal

399/2008 Hybrid Risk Adjustment for Pharmaceutical Benefits
Manuel García-Goñi, Pere Ibern & José María Inoriza

400/2008 The Team Consensus–Performance Relationship and the Moderating Role of Team Diversity
José Henrique Dieguez, Javier González-Benito and Jesús Galende

401/2008 The institutional determinants of CO_2 emissions: A computational modelling approach using Artificial Neural Networks and Genetic Programming
Marcos Álvarez-Díaz , Gonzalo Caballero Miguez and Mario Soliño

402/2008 Alternative Approaches to Include Exogenous Variables in DEA Measures: A Comparison Using Monte Carlo
José Manuel Cordero-Ferrera, Francisco Pedraja-Chaparro and Daniel Santín-González

403/2008 Efecto diferencial del capital humano en el crecimiento económico andaluz entre 1985 y 2004: comparación con el resto de España
Mª del Pópulo Pablo-Romero Gil-Delgado y Mª de la Palma Gómez-Calero Valdés

404/2008 Análisis de fusiones, variaciones conjeturales y la falacia del estimador en diferencias
Juan Luis Jiménez y Jordi Perdiguero

405/2008 Política fiscal en la uem: ¿basta con los estabilizadores automáticos?
Jorge Uxó González y Mª Jesús Arroyo Fernández

406/2008 Papel de la orientación emprendedora y la orientación al mercado en el éxito de las empresas
Óscar González-Benito, Javier González-Benito y Pablo A. Muñoz-Gallego

407/2008 La presión fiscal por impuesto sobre sociedades en la unión europea
Elena Fernández Rodríguez, Antonio Martínez Arias y Santiago Álvarez García

408/2008 The environment as a determinant factor of the purchasing and supply strategy: an empirical analysis
Dr. Javier González-Benito y MS Duilio Reis da Rocha

409/2008 Cooperation for innovation: the impact on innovatory effort
Gloria Sánchez González and Liliana Herrera

410/2008 Spanish post-earnings announcement drift and behavioral finance models
Carlos Forner and Sonia Sanabria

411/2008 Decision taking with external pressure: evidence on football manager dismissals in argentina and their consequences
Ramón Flores, David Forrest and Juan de Dios Tena

412/2008 Comercio agrario latinoamericano, 1963-2000: aplicación de la ecuación gravitacional para flujos desagregados de comercio
Raúl Serrano y Vicente Pinilla

413/2008 Voter heuristics in Spain: a descriptive approach elector decision
José Luís Sáez Lozano and Antonio M. Jaime Castillo

414/2008 Análisis del efecto área de salud de residencia sobre la utilización y acceso a los servicios sanitarios en la Comunidad Autónoma Canaria
Ignacio Abásolo Alessón, Lidia García Pérez, Raquel Aguiar Ibáñez y Asier Amador Robayna

415/2008 Impact on competitive balance from allowing foreign players in a sports league: an analytical model and an empirical test
Ramón Flores, David Forrest & Juan de Dios Tena

416/2008 Organizational innovation and productivity growth: Assessing the impact of outsourcing on firm performance
Alberto López

417/2008 Value Efficiency Analysis of Health Systems
Eduardo González, Ana Cárcaba & Juan Ventura

418/2008 Equidad en la utilización de servicios sanitarios públicos por comunidades autónomas en España: un análisis multinivel
Ignacio Abásolo, Jaime Pinilla, Miguel Negrín, Raquel Aguiar y Lidia García

419/2008 Piedras en el camino hacia Bolonia: efectos de la implantación del EEES sobre los resultados académicos
Carmen Florido, Juan Luis Jiménez e Isabel Santana

420/2008 The welfare effects of the allocation of airlines to different terminals
M. Pilar Socorro and Ofelia Betancor

421/2008 How bank capital buffers vary across countries. The influence of cost of deposits, market power and bank regulation
Ana Rosa Fonseca and Francisco González

422/2008 Analysing health limitations in spain: an empirical approach based on the european community household panel
Marta Pascual and David Cantarero

423/2008 Regional productivity variation and the impact of public capital stock: an analysis with spatial interaction, with reference to Spain
Miguel Gómez-Antonio and Bernard Fingleton

424/2008 Average effect of training programs on the time needed to find a job. The case of the training schools program in the south of Spain (Seville, 1997-1999).
José Manuel Cansino Muñoz-Repiso and Antonio Sánchez Braza

425/2008 Medición de la eficiencia y cambio en la productividad de las empresas distribuidoras de electricidad en Perú después de las reformas
Raúl Pérez-Reyes y Beatriz Tovar

426/2008 Acercando posturas sobre el descuento ambiental: sondeo Delphi a expertos en el ámbito internacional
Carmen Almansa Sáez y José Miguel Martínez Paz

427/2008 Determinants of abnormal liquidity after rating actions in the Corporate Debt Market
Pilar Abad, Antonio Díaz and M. Dolores Robles

428/2008 Export led-growth and balance of payments constrained. New formalization applied to Cuban commercial regimes since 1960
David Matesanz Gómez, Guadalupe Fugarolas Álvarez-Ude and Isis Mañalich Gálvez

429/2008 La deuda implícita y el desequilibrio financiero-actuarial de un sistema de pensiones. El caso del régimen general de la seguridad social en España
José Enrique Devesa Carpio y Mar Devesa Carpio

430/2008 Efectos de la descentralización fiscal sobre el precio de los carburantes en España
Desiderio Romero Jordán, Marta Jorge García-Inés y Santiago Álvarez García

431/2008 Euro, firm size and export behavior
Silviano Esteve-Pérez, Salvador Gil-Pareja, Rafael Llorca-Vivero and José Antonio Martínez-Serrano

432/2008 Does social spending increase support for free trade in advanced democracies?
Ismael Sanz, Ferran Martínez i Coma and Federico Steinberg

433/2008 Potencial de Mercado y Estructura Espacial de Salarios: El Caso de Colombia
Jesús López-Rodríguez y Maria Cecilia Acevedo

434/2008 Persistence in Some Energy Futures Markets
Juncal Cunado, Luis A. Gil-Alana and Fernando Pérez de Gracia

435/2008 La inserción financiera externa de la economía francesa: inversores institucionales y nueva gestión empresarial
Ignacio Álvarez Peralta

436/2008 ¿Flexibilidad o rigidez salarial en España?: un análisis a escala regional
Ignacio Moral Arce y Adolfo Maza Fernández

437/2009 Intangible relationship-specific investments and the performance of r&d outsourcing agreements
Andrea Martínez-Noya, Esteban García-Canal & Mauro F. Guillén

438/2009 Friendly or Controlling Boards?
Pablo de Andrés Alonso & Juan Antonio Rodríguez Sanz

439/2009 La sociedad Trenor y Cía. (1838-1926): un modelo de negocio industrial en la España del siglo XIX
Amparo Ruiz Llopis

440/2009 Continental bias in trade
Salvador Gil-Pareja, Rafael Llorca-Vivero & José Antonio Martínez Serrano

441/2009 Determining operational capital at risk: an empirical application to the retail banking
Enrique José Jiménez-Rodríguez, José Manuel Feria-Domínguez & José Luis Martín-Marín

442/2009 Costes de mitigación y escenarios post-kyoto en España: un análisis de equilibro general para España
Mikel González Ruiz de Eguino

443/2009 Las revistas españolas de economía en las bibliotecas universitarias: ranking, valoración del indicador y del sistema
Valentín Edo Hernández

444/2009 Convergencia económica en España y coordinación de políticas económicas. un estudio basado en la estructura productiva de las CC.AA.
Ana Cristina Mingorance Arnáiz

445/2009 Instrumentos de mercado para reducir emisiones de co2: un análisis de equilibrio general para España
Mikel González Ruiz de Eguino

446/2009 El comercio intra e inter-regional del sector Turismo en España
Carlos Llano y Tamara de la Mata

447/2009 Efectos del incremento del precio del petróleo en la economía española: Análisis de cointegración y de la política monetaria mediante reglas de Taylor
Fernando Hernández Martínez

448/2009 Bologna Process and Expenditure on Higher Education: A Convergence Analysis of the EU-15
T. Agasisti, C. Pérez Esparrells, G. Catalano & S. Morales

449/2009 Global Economy Dynamics? Panel Data Approach to Spillover Effects
Gregory Daco, Fernando Hernández Martínez & Li-Wu Hsu

450/2009 Pricing levered warrants with dilution using observable variables
Isabel Abínzano & Javier F. Navas

451/2009 Information technologies and financial prformance: The effect of technology diffusion among competitors
Lucio Fuentelsaz, Jaime Gómez & Sergio Palomas

452/2009 A Detailed Comparison of Value at Risk in International Stock Exchanges
Pilar Abad & Sonia Benito

453/2009 Understanding offshoring: has Spain been an offshoring location in the nineties?
Belén González-Díaz & Rosario Gandoy

454/2009 Outsourcing decision, product innovation and the spatial dimension: Evidence from the Spanish footwear industry
José Antonio Belso-Martínez

455/2009 Does playing several competitions influence a team's league performance? Evidence from Spanish professional football
Andrés J. Picazo-Tadeo & Francisco González-Gómez

456/2009 Does accessibility affect retail prices and competition? An empirical application
Juan Luis Jiménez and Jordi Perdiguero

457/2009 Cash conversion cycle in smes
Sonia Baños-Caballero, Pedro J. García-Teruel and Pedro Martínez-Solano

458/2009 Un estudio sobre el perfil de hogares endeudados y sobreendeudados: el caso de los hogares vascos
Alazne Mujika Alberdi, Iñaki García Arrizabalaga y Juan José Gibaja Martíns

459/2009 Imposing monotonicity on outputs in parametric distance function estimations: with an application to the spanish educational production
Sergio Perelman and Daniel Santin

460/2009 Key issues when using tax data for concentration analysis: an application to the Spanish wealth tax
José Mª Durán-Cabré and Alejandro Esteller-Moré

461/2009 ¿Se está rompiendo el mercado español? Una aplicación del enfoque de feldstein –horioka
Saúl De Vicente Queijeiro, José Luis Pérez Rivero y María Rosalía Vicente Cuervo

462/2009 Financial condition, cost efficiency and the quality of local public services
Manuel A. Muñiz & José L. Zafra

463/2009 Including non-cognitive outputs in a multidimensional evaluation of education production: an international comparison
Marián García Valiñas & Manuel Antonio Muñiz Pérez

464/2009 A political look into budget deficits.The role of minority governments and oppositions
Albert Falcó-Gimeno & Ignacio Jurado

465/2009 La simulación del cuadro de mando integral. Una herramienta de aprendizaje en la materia de contabilidad de gestión
Elena Urquía Grande, Clara Isabel Muñoz Colomina y Elisa Isabel Cano Montero

466/2009 Análisis histórico de la importancia de la industria de la desalinización en España
Borja Montaño Sanz

467/2009 The dynamics of trade and innovation: a joint approach
Silviano Esteve-Pérez & Diego Rodríguez