## THE EFFECT OF TECHNOLOGICAL, COMMERCIAL AND HUMAN RESOURCES ON THE USE OF NEW TECHNOLOGY

JAIME GÓMEZ PILAR VARGAS

FUNDACIÓN DE LAS CAJAS DE AHORROS DOCUMENTO DE TRABAJO Nº 505/2010 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 pro-

gramas de la Fundación de las Cajas de Ahorros.

Las opiniones son responsabilidad de los autores.

### THE EFFECT OF TECHNOLOGICAL, COMMERCIAL AND HUMAN RESOURCES ON THE USE OF NEW TECHNOLOGY

Jaime Gómez\* Pilar Vargas\*\*

#### Abstract

Our objective in this paper is to analyze the determinants of the use of process technologies among in manufacturing firms. We go beyond more traditional approaches and consider the role of complementarities in technology adoption at two levels. First, we adapt Teece's (1986) framework study the incentives to use new technology that stem from investments in the knowledge base of the firm and in marketing assets. We also take into account the quality of the services provided by employees. Second, we analyze whether technology use is conditioned by a system effect that arises from the use of related technologies. We test our hypotheses on a representative sample of manufacturing firms.

*Key words*: Technology adoption, diffusion, complementarily, multivariate probit. *JEL classification*: O33, M19.

**Corresponding author:** Pilar Vargas Montoya, Dept. Economía y Empresa, Facultad de Ciencias Empresariales, Universidad de La Rioja, Cigüeña 60 (26004), Logroño, Spain. E-mail: <u>pilar.vargas@unirioja.es</u>, teléfono: 34 941 299 572, fax: 34 941 299 393.

\*\* Departamento de Economía y Empresa. Universidad de La Rioja. Spain.

Acknowledgements: We acknowledge financial support from the Spanish Ministry of Science and Technology and FEDER (project ECO2008-04129), the Regional Government of Aragón (project S09/PI138-08) and Universidad de La Rioja (project API 19/08). We are grateful for the comments and suggestions provided by Dolores Añón, Sergio Palomas and participants at seminars held at the Universities of Zaragoza and La Rioja.

<sup>\*</sup>Departamento de Economía y Dirección de Empresas. Universidad de Zaragoza. Spain.

#### 1. INTRODUCTION

Our objective in this paper is to understand the role of complementarities in explaining technology use in firms. This question lies at the heart of the explanation of performance differences. Although some authors have stressed the commodity character of new technologies and they have been defined as strategic necessities (Clemmons and Kimbrough, 1986; Clemmons and Row, 1991), it has recently been shown (Greve, 2009) that differences in technology adoption could be more persistent than predicted by traditional economic models. Proving that complementarities between firm resources and new technologies are important in explaining adoption would provide us with an additional reason to reassess the idea that new technologies do not have any durable impact on performance. In other words, firm heterogeneity could provide an additional explanation to the observation that firm performance differs after adoption.

Rather than paying attention to more traditional explanations of diffusion, such as the ones provided by epidemic models, we focus on the interaction of firm resources and new technologies when developing our hypotheses. In doing so, we contribute to the literature by conciliating the idea that the returns on new technology are difficult to appropriate with the observation that the incentives to use new technologies are different, which suggests that firms could expect different returns from them, at least in the short run. More precisely, and taking into account the arguments provided by the resource-based view (Wernerfelt, 1984, Barney, 1986), we examine the role of the differences in resource endowments through the framework provided by Teece (1986, 2006). Given the weak appropriability of new technologies our attention focuses on the role of certain difficult-to-obtain assets in explaining the different stimuli that firms may have to use new technologies. Accordingly, we develop hypotheses that relate the presence of technological, commercial and human resources within the firm with the likelihood of observing technology use.

We test our hypotheses on a representative sample of firms operating in the manufacturing sector of the Spanish economy. The available information allows us to calculate the stock of technological and commercial resources and to evaluate the quality of the services provided by employees. We are also able to relate this information to the use of certain process technologies within firms from 1994 to 2006. The four technologies that we examine are numerically controlled machines, robotics, computer aided design and flexible manufacturing. Given that the literature has shown that the factors explaining new technology adoption are, to some extent, technology dependent, the use of different technologies will help us to understand the degree to which our predictions are generalizable. Using information on several technologies is in line with the suggestion of the literature on technology diffusion that, rather than analyzing technologies in isolation, the fact that they frequently appear forming systems implies that their adoption could be related. This helps us to explore the hypothesis that the use of any technology could also be explained by the use of other technologies with which it forms a system (Colombo and Mosconi, 1995; Sinha and Noble, 2008).

A problem introduced by the consideration of the role of complementarities is that the decisions to adopt several technologies could be related. In such a setting, the independent estimation of the models explaining the use of each technology would be inadequate, given that the decisions to adopt are potentially correlated. A solution to this problem may be through the estimation of a multivariate model, which takes the potential correlation into account. Looking at the correlations before and after the consideration of complementary assets would also allow us to evaluate the extent to which they are due to complementarities among the technologies or among these and firm resources.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we integrate Teece's (1986) framework, the resource-based view and the literature on technology diffusion in order to develop four hypotheses on the role of complementary assets. This is followed by a section that explains the methodology, describes the sample and defines the variables that are going to be used in the empirical estimation. Section 4 presents the results of the estimation of our empirical model and performs some robustness test in order to confirm our

results. The final section concludes and discusses the implications for new technology management.

#### 2. HYPOTHESES

To understand the factors that explain technology use by firms, we need to understand how firms profit from it. Early work on the diffusion of new technologies tended to concentrate upon epidemic models (Karshenas and Stoneman, 1993). However, contemporary approaches are characterized by less emphasis on information spreading and more attention on the heterogeneity in the population of potential adopters (rank models) in order to explain the incentives to adopt (see, for example, Karshenas and Stoneman, 1993). In this paper, we follow this second line of research and offer a view on technology use that is based on the differences in a firm's endowment of complementary resources. In order to do this, we first briefly outline Teece's (1986) framework on profiting from innovation and adapt it to the opportunities for profiting from technology use. We then focus on the analysis of complementarities. Accordingly, we develop hypotheses that relate technology use to the amount and/or quality of technological, marketing and human resources within the firm. Finally, we also consider the possibility that technology use could be driven by the presence of complementary technologies within the firm.

The capacity of a firm to appropriate the returns from innovation mainly depends on two types of factors (Teece, 1986): the appropriability regime and the possession of complementary assets. The appropriability regime is defined by (1) legal and (2) technological factors. The first refer to the degree to which intellectual property rights in the form of patents, copyrights or trademarks secure the rent of the innovator. The second include two characteristics of the innovation that limit the ability of other firms to imitate or copy: the degree of complexity and codificability of the knowledge embodied in the innovation.

The rents accruing to the innovator also depend on the possession of complementary assets. By complementary assets, Teece (1986) understands all the resources that need to be jointly used with the innovation in order to exploit it. They include, for example, the manufacturing, distribution or service resources that

are needed to operate the different stages of the value chain. The lack of these resources would oblige the firm to look outside its boundaries in order to acquire the services needed to extract the returns from the innovation. However, this would be done at the risk of revealing critical information and, hence, increasing the capacity of competitors to copy it. Therefore, the possession of complementary resources becomes a determinant of the ability of the firm to profit from the innovation.

Teece's framework could be easily adapted to the analysis of how adopting firms profit from new technologies. The fact that new technologies are freely available in the market (there are no legal barriers protecting the adopter) has led some researchers to conclude that, in the long run, technology adoption might only provide competitive parity (Barney, 1991). Some authors have enunciated this as the strategic necessity hypothesis (Clemmons and Kimbrough, 1986; Clemmons and Row, 1991). Following this hypothesis, a focal firm would have incentives to adopt a valuable new technology. However, this would create incentives in rival firms to invest in the same technology in order not to obtain below normal profits. As long as new technologies are freely available in the market, the long-run result would be that rival firms would erode the rents accruing to first adopters, leading to competitive parity.

However, despite the weak appropriability regime of new technologies, the returns from their use could be captured if the firm possesses complementary resources that are difficult to obtain. Research has shown that the link between information technologies and profitability is frequently explained through the consideration of complementary resources under the control of the firm (Powell and Dent-Micallef, 1997). Despite the clear relationship between technology adoption and innovation (Koellinger, 2008; Santamaría, Nieto and Barge-Gil, 2009), the consideration of complementary resources in the context of technology adoption has mainly focused on their moderating role between the use of new technologies and performance. In other words, their use as determinants of adoption has been scarce. However, the existence of complementary resources could be an indicator of the stimuli that a firm has to adopt a new technology, given

that their combination could provide the basis for sustainable competitive advantage. The idea that the combination of different resources could explain superior long-run performance is not only present in Teece's framework, but also in other papers. For example, trying to explain the sustainability of competitive advantage, Dierickx and Cool (1989: 1508) use the concept "interconnectedness" to reflect the fact that "the difficulty of building one stock of resources is related not to the initial level of that stock, but to the low initial level of another stock which is its complement". Similarly, Rivkin (2000) suggests that the complexity created by a large number of elements that positively interact can deter imitation.

Selecting the types of resources more likely to be positively combined with new technologies in order to provide competitive advantages is a difficult task. Although both tangible and intangible assets play an important role in creating an organization's value, intangible assets frequently present time compression diseconomies and they are typically tacit and hard to codify (Kogut and Zander, 1992; Conner and Prahalad, 1996). Additionally, they are likely to be traded in imperfect factor markets (Barney, 1986) and are not consumed by their use (Collins and Montgomery, 1998). Teece (2000) suggests that a firm's superior performance depends on its ability to defend and use the intangible assets it creates. Accordingly, in the following lines, we argue that technology adoption is conditioned by the possession of certain complementary resources that are difficult to acquire or copy, namely, technological, commercial and human resources.<sup>1</sup> Given that the use of new technologies could also be conditioned by the presence of other related technologies within the firm, we also analyze the presence of complementary relationships between technologies.

#### Technological resources and technology adoption.

Investments in research and development contribute to the knowledge base of the firm, increasing their capabilities, and may also result in process or product innovations. Like other intangible resources, they tend to be tacit, idiosyncratic and

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> We are not claiming that difficult-to-imitate complementary resources are the only ones likely to interact with new technologies to provide competitive advantage. In fact, Rivkin (2000) points out that complex systems could be inimitable, even if their elements are not.

deeply embedded in the firm (Winter, 1987), which makes it difficult for competitors to copy them. Imitation may be also complicated by the fact that this knowledge may be path dependent and subject to time compression diseconomies (Dierickx and Cool, 1989).

There are different ways in which the knowledge base of the firm interacts with new technologies to allow the firm to generate and capture value. On the one hand, the knowledge base of the firm has frequently been related to technology adoption through the absorptive capacity concept. A firm's absorptive capacity is defined as the "ability of a firm to recognize the value of new, external information, assimilate it and apply it to commercial ends" (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990:128). Although absorptive capacity tends to be related to adoption through the greater ability of firms to understand valuable information, we should emphasize its role in the exploitation of new technologies. In other words, once a new technology is adopted, its use would require relating the knowledge embodied in the innovation to the internal processes taking place inside the organization. Therefore, a better knowledge base could help firms to exploit new technologies more effectively and to capture the results. For example, this knowledge could be used to better understand and to refine a firm's productive process.

On the other hand, new technologies may also help the firm to take advantage of the results of the innovation process. In fact, research has shown that new technologies frequently enable process and product innovations (Koellinger, 2008). Therefore, new technologies may provide an adequate channel for converting the knowledge base of the firm into profitable products and services.

Hypothesis 1: firms with more technological resources are more likely to use a new technology

#### Commercial resources and technology adoption.

Complementarities are also present in marketing activities (Teece, 1986). Like technological resources, investments in marketing create intangible resources, such as reputation, brand image or closer relationships with customers. These resources are frequently difficult to imitate: they may be subject to time compression diseconomies (Dierickx and Cool, 1989) or be socially complex (Barney, 1991). Marketing assets interact with new technologies in several ways. Investments in marketing activities help the firm to develop a good reputation or a brand image. These assets are quasi-public, in the sense that they can continue to deliver services after being used. In other words, once they have been developed, they can be used to support product development, market development or diversification (Ansoff, 1965). New technologies leverage the effects of reputation and brand image by allowing the firm to increase the frequency of product improvements. Product improvements may, for example, be facilitated by the use of design technologies such as computer aided manufacturing (Thomke, 1998). Similarly, new technologies also allow more frequent changes in the line of production, which could be used to satisfy the diverse needs of consumers and provide the firm with a way to obtain scope economies. Investments in marketing may also be used to improve the relationship with customers and to acquire information on their needs. New technologies may also complement marketing resources by making an improved use of this information. For example, computer aided design technologies are used to foster cooperation with providers and customers (Bharadwaj, 2000), because they provide a common language for electronic communication between firms (Sánchez, 1996). As mentioned above, new technologies could also be used to better adapt the product to consumer requirements, detected through investments in market research.

Hypothesis 2: firms with more commercial resources are more likely to use a new technology

#### Human resources qualifications and technology adoption.

The use of new technologies could be also related to workers' qualifications. The most common theory is the skill-bias technical change hypothesis, which states that there is a relationship of complementarity between new technologies and skilled workers because the latter are the only ones able to fully implement these technologies (Piva *et al.*, 2005:143). Doms *et al.*, 1997 maintain that the positive correlation between technologies and the attributes of the workforce may

be explained using three arguments. First, at a general level, process technologies increase the level of automation in a factory. Workers using these machines must, at least, have reasonable language, reading and basic math skills. Thus, more automated plants will employ relatively more educated and skilled workers. Second, the introduction of a more technology-specific level may affect the organization of the workforce and will require skilled operators and technicians who replace skilled craftspeople but also less skilled workers. Finally, many of these technologies require qualified support staff to install and maintain them.

More qualified workers also provide other abilities related to innovation and management that are important in the use of new technologies. First, as mentioned above, new technologies frequently enable process and product innovations (Koellinger, 2008). Education contributes to the innovation process by increasing a "person's capacity to think systematically and creatively about techniques" (Wozniak, 1984: 71). Second, education may also be related to management skills, in other words, the increasing ability of educated workers to effectively integrate new technologies into the activities of the firm. In fact, given that technology related knowledge may be contracted and it is not firm (but technology) specific, it has been argued that management skills are the only likely source of competitive advantage: they are path dependent, they tend to be tacit and firm specific, and they may be socially complex (Mata, Fuerst and Barney, 1995).

Hypothesis 3: firms with more highly qualified personnel are more likely to use a new technology

#### **Complementarities between technologies**

As well as the complementarities between the use of new technologies and firm assets, complementarities between technologies may also arise (Stoneman and Kwon, 1994). According to Milgron and Roberts (1990), the adoption of a cluster of technological innovations, which share some basic technological properties, is subject to significant complementarities. Under such circumstances, interdependences must be taken into account as they are likely to affect diffusion.

Adopting powerful combinations of technologies can leverage the technology gap a firm possesses over its competitors (Castelacci, 2002). The key advantage which arises from the use of multiple process technologies is that they can build complex manufacturing systems, which make manufacturing programmable and lead to timely information transfer across departments, employees, customers and suppliers. These systems are important since most manufacturing technologies are relatively available on the open market and any particular competitive advantage is difficult to defend. One way to achieve this consists of building systems in which the number of elements and the degree of interaction among them is what makes them inimitable (Rivkin, 2000). In other words, while the adoption of individual technologies may no have effect on competitive advantage, certain technology combinations may help in building and sustaining it (Sinha and Noble, 2008) due to complementarities with past adoptions (Colombo and Mosconi, 1995).

Previous work on complementary technologies has provided theoretical arguments and empirical evidence on the existence of complementarities between different process technologies (Milgrom and Roberts, 1990, Stoneman and Kwon, 1994, Colombo and Mosconi, 1995, Arvantis and Hollestein, 2001, Astebro *et al.*, 2005). From an empirical point of view, Stoneman and Kwon (1994), Colombo and Mosconi (1995), Arvantis and Hollestein, (2001) and Gómez and Vargas (2009) demonstrate the importance of complementarities across adopted technologies. Beede and Young (1996) found enormous diversity in adoption patterns within the same industry, as well as important differences in the effect of various technology combinations on performance, suggesting the need to consider technology bundles in assessing adoption scenarios. More recently, Sinha and Noble (2008) found that firms that adopted several technologies were best positioned to survive, illustrating the importance of cumulative technology adoption.

Hypothesis 4. The use of a technology is positively related to the use of the other technologies with which it forms a system

#### 3. METHODOLOGY, SAMPLE AND VARIABLES

#### Sample description

The dataset used for this study is drawn from the Survey of Business Strategies (ESEE). This is an annual survey on the activity of Spanish manufacturing firms and their business strategies financed by the Ministry of Industry and carried out by the SEPI foundation. Although it is not specifically designed to analyze technology adoption, it includes information on a number of technologies that are used by firms. Among them, we focus on numerically controlled machines, computer aided design, robotics and flexible manufacturing, given that these are the technologies for which a longer observation window is available. The survey covers firms which have 10 or more employees and whose principal economic activity is listed in one of the two digit manufacturing industries of the NACE-Rev.1. In the base year, surveyed firms employing between 10 and 200 people were selected by means of a random sampling scheme, while firms with more than 200 were surveyed on a census basis. Although the survey has been administered annually to firms since 1990, questions regarding adoption behavior were only included in 1994, 1998, 2002 and 2006. This does not permit us to establish causality relationships because the date of adoption of the technology is unknown. Fortunately, we do have lagged information on other firm and market characteristics that will be used as explanatory variables, as is explained below. Therefore, our objective is to find the combination of resources that is more likely to be used with new technologies. After selecting all the observations for which data on the independent variables is available, we are left with 4,418 observations that will be used in the empirical analysis.<sup>2</sup>

As mentioned above, we examine four manufacturing technologies whose use is very common and has been the subject of previous diffusion studies. In fact, they are part of what is termed Advance Manufacturing Technologies (AMT). AMT is used as an umbrella term to describe "an automated production system of people, machines and tools for the planning and control of the production process,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> The usual tests show that the sample is representative of the total population.

including the procurement of raw materials, parts and components and the shipment and service of finished products" (Pennings, 1987: 198). These technologies tend to be classified into three types: (1) design related technologies; (2) process related shop floor technologies and (3) information and control related technologies (Swamidass and Kotha, 1998:25).

A characteristic of these technologies is that they are easy to integrate electronically. The key advantage of AMT is that complex manufacturing systems may be built that make manufacturing programmable and lead to timely information transfer across departments, employees, customers and suppliers. This adds a new element to the study of complementarities: these technologies not only interact with the endowment of resources of the firm, but they are frequently used as a system. This reinforces the idea that complementarities have a key role to play in the understanding of performance differences and adoption behaviour.

Table 1 offers a first approximation to the data, showing the distribution of adopters and non adopters by technology, firm size and year. Given the different sampling procedures used to select firms depending on their size, we have chosen to perform the descriptive analysis by splitting the sample into the group of firms with fewer than 200 employees and those with more than 200 employees. As can be seen the number of adopters is different depending on the technology. CNC is the most used technology (51% in 2006), followed by CAD (40% in 2006). Robotics and flexible manufacturing systems show the lowest figures (32% and 22%). A second clear conclusion from the data is that firm size conditions the introduction of the new technologies. For all the technologies and the years included in the sample, the group of firms with more than 200 employees presents a higher percentage of adopters than their smaller counterparts.

|     |                                |                    |   |                      |  | ROBOTICS   |   |   
   
  |  | CAD                     |  |  |   |   | SSFN   |  
  |  
  |  |   
   |  |  |   |
|-----|--------------------------------|--------------------|---|----------------------|--|--|---
--
--|--|-------------------------
--|--|---|---|--
---
---|--
---|--|--
---|
| al  | Firm s<br>< 20<br>employ       | size<br>)0<br>yees | Firm<br>>= 2<br>emplo   | size<br>200<br>Dyees | Tot  | tal  | Firm<br>< 2<br>emplo  | size<br>00<br>oyees   
   
  | Firm s<br>>=200<br>emplo   | size<br>)<br>)<br>)yees | То   | tal  | Firm<br>< 2<br>emple  | size<br>200<br>oyees  | Firm s<br>>= 2<br>emplo  | size<br>200<br>oyees   
  | Тс   
  | otal   | Firm<br>< 2<br>emple  
   | size<br>200<br>oyees   | Firm s<br>>= 2<br>emplo  | size<br>200<br>oyees  |
| No  | Yes                            | No                 | Yes   | No                   | Yes  | No   | Yes   | No  
   
  | Yes  | No                      | Yes  | No   | Yes   | No  | Yes  | No   
  | Yes  
  | No   | Yes   
   | No   | Yes  | No  |
| 572 | 149                            | 434                | 134   | 138                  | 155  | 700  | 54  | 529   
   
  | 101  | 171                     | 207  | 648  | 86  | 497   | 121  | 151  
  | 183  
  | 672  | 63  
   | 520  | 120  | 152   |
| 667 | 271                            | 518                | 250   | 149                  | 312  | 876  | 112   | 677   
   
  | 200  | 199                     | 420  | 768  | 196   | 593   | 224  | 175  
  | 317  
  | 871  | 117   
   | 672  | 200  | 199   |
| 679 | 409                            | 567                | 225   | 112                  | 346  | 967  | 168   | 808   
   
  | 178  | 159                     | 485  | 828  | 300   | 676   | 185  | 152  
  | 293  
  | 1020   | 157   
   | 819  | 136  | 201   |
| 515 | 326                            | 404                | 221   | 111                  | 334  | 728  | 155   | 575   
   
  | 179  | 153                     | 425  | 637  | 245   | 485   | 180  | 152  
  | 288  
  | 774  | 141   
   | 589  | 147  | 185   |
|     | No<br>572<br>667<br>679<br>515 | I         < 20     | No         Yes         No           572         149         434           667         271         518           679         409         567           515         326         404 | I         <200       | No         Yes         No         Yes         No           572         149         434         134         138           667         271         518         250         149           679         409         567         225         112           515         326         404         221         111 | Image         Firm size         Firm size         Firm size         Firm size         To           (I         < 200         >= 200         employees         To           employees         employees         employees         for size         To           No         Yes         No         Yes         No         Yes           572         149         434         134         138         155           667         271         518         250         149         312           679         409         567         225         112         346           515         326         404         221         111         334 | No         Yes         Y | I         Size         Firm size         Size </th <th>No         Yes         No         Yes         Yes         Yes         Yes         Yes         Yes</th> <th>I</th> <th>I         Size         Firm size         &lt;</th> <th>Image: size         Firm size         Size</th> <th>ISizeFirm sizeFirm sizeFirm sizeFirm sizeFirm size<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees&gt;= 200<br/>employeesTotal<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees&gt;= 200<br/>employeesTotalNoYesNoYesNoYesNoYesNo57214943413413815570054529101171207648667271518250149312876112677200199420768679409567225112346967168808178159485828515326404221111334728155575179153425637</th> <th>Image: size of the size</th> <th>Image: space of the size of the size</th> <th>Image: size infinitize       Firm size infinitie       Firm size infinitie       <th< th=""><th>I<th>I<br/>&lt; 200<br/>employeesFirm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br/></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></th><th>I<th>I<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees&gt;= 200<br/>employeesTotal<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees&gt;= 200<br/>employeesTotal<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employeesTotal<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employe</th><th>Image: space of the size of the size</th><th>Irmm size<br/>employeesrmm size<br/>sizermm size<br/><math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employeesrmm size<br/><math>&lt; 200</math>rmm size<br/><math>&lt; 200</math>&lt;</th></th></th></th<></th> | No         Yes         Yes         Yes         Yes         Yes         Yes | I                       | I         Size         Firm size         < | Image: size         Firm size         Size | ISizeFirm sizeFirm sizeFirm sizeFirm sizeFirm size $< 200$<br>employees>= 200<br>employeesTotal $< 200$<br>employees>= 200<br>employeesTotalNoYesNoYesNoYesNoYesNo57214943413413815570054529101171207648667271518250149312876112677200199420768679409567225112346967168808178159485828515326404221111334728155575179153425637 | Image: size of the size | Image: space of the size | Image: size infinitize       Firm size infinitie       Firm size infinitie <th< th=""><th>I<th>I<br/>&lt; 200<br/>employeesFirm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br/></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></th><th>I<th>I<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees&gt;= 200<br/>employeesTotal<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees&gt;= 200<br/>employeesTotal<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employeesTotal<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employe</th><th>Image: space of the size of the size</th><th>Irmm size<br/>employeesrmm size<br/>sizermm size<br/><math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employeesrmm size<br/><math>&lt; 200</math>rmm size<br/><math>&lt; 200</math>&lt;</th></th></th></th<> | I <th>I<br/>&lt; 200<br/>employeesFirm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br/><br/><br/>Firm size<br/><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br><br><br><br><br/></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></br></th> <th>I<th>I<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees&gt;= 200<br/>employeesTotal<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees&gt;= 200<br/>employeesTotal<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employeesTotal<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employe</th><th>Image: space of the size of the size</th><th>Irmm size<br/>employeesrmm size<br/>sizermm size<br/><math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employeesrmm size<br/><math>&lt; 200</math>rmm size<br/><math>&lt; 200</math>&lt;</th></th> | I<br>< 200<br>employeesFirm size<br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br>Firm size<br><br><br><br>Firm size<br><br> | I <th>I<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees&gt;= 200<br/>employeesTotal<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees&gt;= 200<br/>employeesTotal<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employeesTotal<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employees<math>&gt;= 200</math><br/>employees<math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employe</th> <th>Image: space of the size of the size</th> <th>Irmm size<br/>employeesrmm size<br/>sizermm size<br/><math>&lt; 200</math><br/>employeesrmm size<br/><math>&lt; 200</math>rmm size<br/><math>&lt; 200</math>&lt;</th> | I $< 200$<br>employees>= 200<br>employeesTotal $< 200$<br>employees>= 200<br>employeesTotal $< 200$<br>employeesTotal $< 200$<br>employees $>= 200$<br>employees $< 200$<br>employees $< 200$<br>employees $>= 200$<br>employees $< 200$<br>employees $< 200$<br>employees $< 200$<br>employees $>= 200$<br>employees $< 200$<br>employees $< 200$<br>employees $>= 200$<br>employees $< 200$<br>employees $>= 200$<br>employees $< 200$<br>employees $>= 200$<br>employees $< 200$<br>employe | Image: space of the size | Irmm size<br>employeesrmm size<br>sizermm size<br>$< 200$<br>employeesrmm size<br>$< 200$ rmm size<br>$< 200$ < |

Table 1. Number of adopters and non adopters by technology, firm size and year

The expressions "Yes" and "No" indicate whether the firms have adopted or not

Looking at the distribution of adopters by industry (Table 2) we can detect clear differences. Firms in the "Motors and autos" industry are the most active in the adoption of CNC machines, followed by the ones operating in "Other transport material" and "Furniture". The adoption of robotics shows its highest values in the "Motors and autos" sector, with the "Beverages" industry and "Other transport material" following. Firms belonging to "Other transport material", "Motors and Autos" and "Machinery for agriculture and industry" are the most frequent users of computer aided design. Finally, in the case of flexible manufacturing systems the industries are "Motors and Autos", "Other transport material" and "Paper". In contrast, "Meat products" is the least active industry when adopting CNC, CAD and Flexible manufacturing and "Other manufacturing" in the case of Robotics.

	C	NC	Rob	otics	C	٩D	SS	FN
Industry	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Meat products	8	20	6	22	1	27	2	26
Food and tobacco	39	55	26	68	10	84	19	75
Beverages	6	10	7	9	4	12	6	10
Textiles and clothing	31	53	14	70	36	48	18	66
Leather and footwear	8	15	4	19	4	19	2	21
Wood industry	19	21	10	30	7	33	5	35
Paper	22	17	16	23	18	21	15	24
Edition and graphical arts	22	36	10	48	18	40	14	44
Chemical products	24	45	13	56	16	53	22	47
Plastic and rubber	32	29	26	35	26	35	18	43
Non-metallic minerals	35	41	27	49	24	52	17	59
Metallurgy	31	19	21	29	28	22	19	31
Metallic products	77	47	43	81	56	68	37	87
Machinery for agriculture and industry	49	27	25	51	53	23	24	52
Machinery for offices, data processing, etc.	6	7	4	9	7	6	3	10
Electrical material and accessories	31	23	21	33	31	23	17	37
Motors and autos	46	15	38	23	43	18	28	33
Other transport material	12	4	7	9	14	2	7	9
Furniture	41	20	13	48	24	37	12	49
Other manufactures	8	11	3	16	5	14	3	16
Total manufacturing	547	515	334	728	425	637	288	774
$\chi^2$	72.2	22***	68.	50***	160.	.18 <sup>***</sup>	44.(	)1***

Table 2. Number of adopters and non adopters in 2006 by technology and industry

#### Hypotheses measurement

Stock of technological resources. We approximate the stock of technological resources by using the ratio of research and development capital to sales<sup>3</sup>. For any given year (t) for which data on technology adoption is available, we compute research and development capital (K) through a partial inventory of past (3 previous years) and present annual internal R&D expenditures (R) with a constant depreciation rate,  $\delta$ :

$$K_t = \sum_{k=0}^{3} (1-\delta)^k \times R_{t-k}$$

The annual depreciation rate ( $\delta$ ) was assumed to be 15% in accordance with Griliches (1981), Griliches *et al.*, (1981), Adams (1999) or Villalonga (2004). The use of a depreciation rate can be explained by the decay of knowledge over time (Argote et al., 1990) and by the loss of economic value due to the development of new knowledge and technologies (Oriani and Sobrero, 2003).

Stock of commercial resources. Similarly to technological resources, the stock of commercial resources is measured as the ratio of commercial capital to sales. As with technological capital, for any given year (t) for which data on technology adoption is available, the value of commercial capital (P) is constructed using a partial inventory of past (3 previous years) and present annual advertising expenditures (A) with a constant depreciation rate,  $\delta$ :

$$P_t = \sum_{k=0}^{3} (1-\delta)^k \times A_{t-k}$$

Even though there is no consensus in the literature on the rate of depreciation, we follow Hirchey and Weygandt (1985) and Villalonga (2004) and use a depreciation rate of 45% for previous year's expenditures going back four years.

*Human resources.* The available information also allows us to calculate a measure of employee skills, using the number of employees who possess a university degree. With this information, we calculate the ratio of the number of employees with a university degree to the total number of employees of the organization. This measure has been used in previous papers (Doms et al., 1997; Arvanitis and Loukis, 2009).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Sales, R&D Spending and advertising have been deflated using the Industrial Index (IPRI).

#### **Control variables**

Firm Size. Firm size has traditionally played a prominent role in rank models of diffusion, usually presenting a positive effect on the probability of adoption. The explanations provided for this positive impact are different and, despite recent efforts (see, for example, Astebro, 2002), some confusion about the underlying mechanism still remains. Firm size has been positively related to the existence of complementary assets within the firm. Under this interpretation, the interaction of the technology with other resources and capabilities that the firm possesses in areas such as production or marketing would positively influence profitability. Hence, larger firms would obtain more profitability from the technology and would have more incentives to adopt it early (Teece, 1986; Colombo and Mosconi, 1995). A second explanation focuses on the concept of economies of scale. Larger firms are able to spread the cost of investing in a new technology among a higher number of units (Cohen and Levin, 1989), making adoption more profitable. Finally, firm size has also been specifically related to the possession of financial resources (Canepa and Stoneman, 2005). Larger firms are likely to have more financial resources and, therefore, are more likely to be able to finance an investment and to absorb a loss. The adoption of certain technologies is frequently associated with large investments in fixed capital as well as significant costs for training human resources (Mansfield, 1993; Romeo, 1975). Therefore, larger firms would be better able to finance the adoption of new technologies.

Although there are some studies that have found a negative impact of firm size on inter-firm diffusion (Oster, 1982), the empirical evidence tends to favour the positive effect (Astebro, 2002). This positive influence is consistent across different sectors and technologies and examples are found in the electric utility industry (Rose and Joskow, 1990), in the engineering and metalworking industries (Baptista, 2000, Swamidass, 2003) and in the banking industry (Hannan and McDowell, 1984a,b,1986; Sharma, 1993, Buzzachi *et al.*, 1995). Hence, a positive relationship between firm size and the probability of adoption is hypothesized. We measure firm size through the number of workers of each firm.

*Financial constraints.* The literature on diffusion attributes a role to financial constraints in the determination of a firm's adoption behaviour. Despite the foreseeable significance of this variable at explaining diffusion, only a few papers pay

attention to it, separating the effect of firm size from financial constraints. For example, Romeo (1975) and Mansfield (1963) find a positive influence of liquidity on the rate of intrafirm diffusion. Fuentelsaz, Gómez and Polo (2003) assess the impact of firm profitability and total reserves on the intra-firm diffusion process of automated teller machines. Similarly, Canepa and Stoneman (2005) consider the effect of cash flow on the decision to adopt computerised numerically controlled machine tools in an inter-firm diffusion context.

The arguments in favour of a positive relationship between financial constraints and adoption take three factors into account: uncertainty, information asymmetries and specific assets (Stoneman, 2001; Canepa and Stoneman, 2005). First, the existence of uncertainty on the cash flows to be perceived from adoption creates difficulties to raise funds externally. Second, the existence of information asymmetries between borrowers (the firm adopting the technology) and lenders and the moral hazard resulting from the separation of ownership and control may also have a role to play. Finally, in some settings, the diffusion process will be associated with investments in intangible or technology specific assets, whose economic value could be very difficult to recover. As a consequence, we expect the availability of financial resources to have a positive impact on technology adoption. This variable is measured as the ratio of debts to total assets.

*Corporate status.* The corporate status of a firm may also have an impact on the decision to adopt. By corporate status we mean whether the firm is a part of a larger business group or not. As noted by Rose and Joskow (1990), Karshenas and Stoneman (1993), Baptista (2000), Bartoloni and Baussola (2001), the effect of this variable on the adoption decision is likely to be ambiguous. On the one hand, independent firms may be better positioned with regard to implementation, once the decision to adopt has been made. On the other, firms that are part of a larger institution may be better informed and bear less risk in adopting new technologies. Corporate status is measured through a dummy that takes a value of "one" in the cases in which the firm is part of a larger corporate unit.

*Ownership.* The fourth variable considered in the analysis is the type of ownership. In the case of diffusion, the literature has analyzed the extent to which the firm is owned by a national or a foreign firm. The argument in favour of a positive effect is that the subsidiaries of a foreign firm may have access to the resources of

the parent firm. Foreign investment may be a vehicle for the introduction of superior technology and scientific knowledge. However, arguments in favour of a negative relationship have also been put forward based upon an underlying product life cycle. According to this view, multinationals tend to transfer new technology as it approaches the late stages of its life cycle (Kleinknecht and Poot, 1992). Previous evidence on adoption models revealed a positive impact of foreign ownership (Baldwin and Diverty, 1995; Bosworth, 1996; Faria *et al.*, 2003), although this relationship was only significant in the case of certain technologies. The presence of foreign capital in the focal firm is measured through a dummy that takes a value of one when the presence of foreign investors in the capital is higher than 30%.

*Propensity to export.* The literature on adoption considers that the propensity of a firm to sell its products abroad is a determinant of adoption. Exporting firms can be expected to face more competitive international markets. This, in turn, would provide them with incentives to adopt new technologies in order to confront the higher levels of competition in the international arena. Research on the determinants of R&D investments has shown a positive association between export intensity and R&D (Veugelers and Cassiman, 1999, and Beneito, 2003). However, the available evidence in a context of technology adoption does not offer conclusive results. Cohen (1975) and Riedel (1975) analyzed the relationship between the adoption of new technologies and the export performance of electronic firms in developing countries, finding a positive relationship between the use of advanced technologies and exports. However, more recently, Lal (1999, 2002) found that export intensity did not affect the adoption of information technologies. The ratio of total exports to sales is used in order to capture the effect of this variable.

Industry specific rank effects. We also consider two industry specific influences on technology adoption. First, market structure has been frequently linked to the incentives of the firm to adopt a new technology. However, the arguments focus on two conflicting predictions (Reinganum, 1981). On the one hand, competition could provide firms with an incentive to adopt new technologies. On the other hand, as the appropriability of the returns depends on the intensity of competition, profiting from technology adoption would be more difficult in less concentrated markets. We measure market concentration through the market share of the four largest firms (CR<sub>4</sub>). Second, one of the conclusions from the literature on technology diffusion is the importance of industry effects. Technology diffusion is largely determined by the technological characteristics of a given production process and this, in turn, is intimately linked to the sector of activity in which the firm is operating. As such, one might expect different technological trajectories (Pavitt, 1984) across different industries. Although we do not make any conjecture on the effect of the industry on technology adoption, our empirical model does consider the fact that some technologies may not be as adequate in some industries as in others. Accordingly, we introduce 19 dummy variables to account for the 20 different sectors identified in the survey.

Finally, and due to the fact that traditional models of diffusion have also taken into consideration other determinants of technology use, we introduce epidemic and stock effects into our model (Karshenas and Stoneman, 1993). Both effects are taken into account through the inclusion of time variables. The passage of time has two opposite influences on technology adoption. On the one hand, the stock effect should mean that, as the number of adopters grows, the probability of adoption should be lower, given the lower returns. On the other, the epidemic effect acts through a learning-by-contact process. Hence, the number of previous adopters would also produce a positive effect on adoption as information flows increase in the industry. Such an effect could counteract the expected stock effects, making the net effect ambiguous (Baptista, 2000; Luque, 2002). We measure epidemic and stock effects through three dummy variables that take a value of one for the years 1998, 2002 and 2006, leaving 1994 as the base year. Therefore, if learning effects are strong enough to compensate for stock effects, the technology should continue its diffusion and we would find that the three variables are positive and significant.

Table 3 shows a first assessment of the hypotheses developed above. It presents mean values and standard deviations for the variables defined in this section and for the different technologies considered, distinguishing between firms that use the technology and those which do not. Table 3 also provides evidence about the existence of a positive relationship between technology use and several of the variables considered in this research, namely, firm size, the stock of technological resources, human resources, export propensity, the fact that the firm is integrated in a business group and the presence of foreign investors in its capital.

19

		Nume	erically	cont	rolled m	achines	Robotics					CAD					SSFN				
			<b>Yes</b>			No		Yes		No	D 7 1	Ye	S 7		No	1		Yes		<b>No</b>	
			1900	:	4	433		1147		321		153	57		200			001	. –	3337	
		Me	an		SD	Z	Me	ean		SD	Z	Меа	an		SD	Z	Me	ean		SD	Z (p v)
		Yes	No	Yes	No	(P V)	Yes	No	Yes	s No	(p v)	Yes	No	Yes	No	(p v)	Yes	No	Yes	s No	
Firm siz	e	0.31	0.15	0.78	0.44	8.08***	0.48	0.14	1.03	0.35	11.20***	0.37	0.16	0.83	0.46	8.43***	0.49	0.14	1.09	9 0.32	10.36***
Firm debt r	ratio	0.55	0.56	0.22	0.23	-0.37	0.53	0.56	0.21	0.23	-4.08***	0.50	0.55	0.21	0.23	$2.08^{**}$	0.53	0.56	0.21	1 0.23	-4.16***
Stock										1											
technolog	ical	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.04	$5.88^{***}$	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.03	$7.14^{***}$	0.03	0.00	0.04	0.03	$10.72^{***}$	0.02	0.01	0.05	5 0.03	8.30***
resource	es									1											
Stock					i			i							i					i	
commerc	ial	0.02	0.03	0.05	0.16	-2.29**	0.03	0.02	0.13	0.12	1.96**	0.06	0.03	0.12	0.05	-2.08**	0.02	0.03	0.06	6 0.14	-0.35
resource	es				i			i							i						
Human		0.10	0.00	0.10	0.10	***	0.10	0.00	0.10	0.10	<b>a</b> 0 <b>0</b> ***	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00***	0.14	0.10	0.1		0.40***
resource	es	0.12	0.09	0.12	0.13	5.52	0.13	0.09	0.12	0.13	7.82	0.12	0.09	0.23	0.13	9.02	0.14	0.10	0.14	4 0.13	9.49
Export						***				!	***					***					***
propensi	itv	0.24	0.15	0.27	0.24	11.51	0.30	0.15	0.27	0.24	16.04	0.21	0.14	0.28	0.23	14.55	0.27	0.16	0.2	/ 0.20	11.11
Market		0.40	0.40			0.07					a**	0.40	0.40				0.40	0.40			
concentrat	tion	0.40	0.40	0.13	0.12	0.96	0.41	0.40	0.13	0.13	2.17	0.40	0.40	0.14	0.12	1.33	0.40	0.40	0.13	3 0.12	-0.73
		Nume	erically	cont	rolled m	achines			Rob	otics				CA	D				SSF	FN	
		Yes	N	D	$\chi^2$	Phi	Yes	No		$\chi^2$	Phi	Yes	No		$\chi^2$	Phi	Yes	No		$\chi^2$	Phi
Integrated	Yes	852	62	4		- i	660	816			1	696	780	)		Î	580	896			1
in	100	002		· :	146 62**	* 0.19	000			405 55 <sup>***</sup>	0.20	000			110 20**	*	000			262 67***	0.24
business group	No	1133	180	)9	140.03	0.18	487	245	5	405.55	0.30	841	210	1	149.38	0.18	501	244	1	203.07	0.24
	Vas	472	34	0		-	387	125			[	303	/10	<u>,                                     </u>		1	325	/87			
Foreign	103	712	1 34	° ¦	70 03***	0.13	507	-23	420 243 67 <sup>***</sup>		0.24	333 419		í i	81 22*** 0 14		525	407		130 27 <sup>**0</sup>	0 17
capital	No	1513	209	93	. 0.00	0.10	760	2846		210.07	0.27	1144	246	2	J1.22	0.14	756	2850	)	100.21	0.17

Table 3. Explanatory variables and the adoption of manufacturing technologies in Spanish manufacturing

\*, \*\*, \*\*\* coefficient statistically significant at a 90%, 95% or 99% level.

Table 3 shows a first assessment of the hypotheses developed above. It presents mean values and standard deviations for the variables defined in this section and for the different technologies considered, distinguishing between firms that use the technology and those which do not. Table 3 also provides evidence about the existence of a positive relationship between technology use and several of the variables considered in this research, namely, firm size, the stock of technological resources, human resources, export propensity, the fact that the firm is integrated in a business group and the presence of foreign investors in its capital.

#### **Estimation strategy**

The data set we use describes adoption as a discrete choice, which suggests using qualitative dependent variable models (either logit or probit). In other words, we model the probability of adoption of the technology as a function of multiple explanatory variables capturing the rank, stock and epidemic effects described above. The probability of adoption may be expressed as a function of a vector of variables reflecting all the three effects. Given the documented similarities between the logit and probit specifications and the considerations that we make below, we chose the probit link to perform our estimations.

As mentioned when developing our empirical model, technologies may be complementary. In the case of the technologies analyzed here, it has been argued that they form a cluster in which we could include numerically controlled machines, computer aided design or robots. Recent research has extended the number of factors affecting adoption in order to take into account that technologies are complementary. The idea is that some technologies are difficult to use in isolation and, therefore, need to be adopted as systems that are jointly used in the development of certain activities. From an empirical perspective, the assumption that technologies do not operate in isolation has an important methodological implication. If the profitability of adopting a given technology is related to the adoption of some other technology, this means the two decisions are interdependent. Therefore, the estimation of any model of adoption should consider the fact that the firm may be using other complementary technologies.

Given that our data on adoption provides us with information on the use of several technologies, we estimate the decision to use the technology through a multivariate probit model. This model can be seen as a generalization of the bivariate probit model, allowing more than two equations to be simultaneously estimated. The model captures the complementarities in the adoption of different technologies by allowing the disturbances of the different equations to be correlated. Such to complementarities correlations may be due (positive correlation) or substitutabilities (negative correlation) between different technologies. Nevertheless, correlation could also be the result of unobservable firm-specific characteristics that affect adoption decisions but that are not easily captured by measurable proxies (Belderbos et al, 2004; Santamaria and Rialp, 2007). In fact, the arguments that we have used in this paper about the existence of complementarities between resources and technology could be extended to other assets that are unobservable. The multivariate probit model takes into account the interrelationships arising in adoption, although it is not able to distinguish between the two sources of correlation described. However, if correlation exists, the estimates of the separate equations would provide us with inefficient estimates.

The estimation is carried out using Stata's myprobit command which applies the method of simulated maximum likelihood (SML) that uses the Geweke-Hajivassiliour-Keane (GHK) smooth recursive conditioning simulator to evaluate the multivariate normal distribution. Following Cappellari and Jenkins (2003), the simulated probabilities are unbiased and bound within the (0, 1) interval. The variance-covariance matrix *V* of the cross-equation error terms has values of 1 on the leading diagonal, and the off-diagonal elements, correlations  $\rho j k = \rho k j$ , are to be estimated. The parameter  $\rho j k$  is the co-variance between the error terms of equations *j* and *k*.

#### 4. RESULTS

Table 4 shows the results of estimating a multivariate probit on the 4,418 observations available. Columns 1 to 4 estimate four models in which only control variables are included. They are used as a benchmark. A second set of estimations is presented in columns 5 to 8, which introduce the variables that help us to test our hypotheses. As we can see, all the models are globally significant, given the high values of the LR statistic. Furthermore, their comparison favors the estimations presented in columns 5 to 8. As shown at the bottom of Table 1, the LR test is highly significant, pointing to the importance of complementary resources for explaining adoption. Importantly, not only the coefficients but also the t-ratios accompanying

them remain fairly stable across the two sets of estimations.

Hypothesis 1 argued that firms with more technological resources would be more likely to use new technologies. This is, in fact the case for the four technologies. In all the cases, the variables accompanying the "technological resources" variable present a positive and significant coefficient. Therefore, the evidence confirms our hypothesis that the use of new technologies is favoured by the presence of higher levels of R&D-derived knowledge inside the firm.

Similarly, Hypothesis 2 stated that firms with more marketing resources would be more likely to use new process technologies. In this case, we find clear differences between the four technologies analyzed. Whereas the variable "commercial stock" is significant for robotics and, to a lesser extent, for computer aided manufacturing, marketing resources are not significant in the case of numerically controlled machines and flexible manufacturing. This result contradicts our expectations to find a positive effect for all the technologies considered.

Finally, Hypothesis 3 stated that technology adoption should be also conditioned by the qualifications of human resources. Again, we observe clear differences between the different technologies analyzed. The variable "human resources" is highly significant in the case of computer aided design and flexible manufacturing, whereas the other two technologies do not show any impact. This result seems to resemble that of Dunne and Troske's (2005) paper. These authors found that the effect of skilled labour on technology use varied across technologies, finding a stronger correlation between technologies associated with design and engineering functions and human resources than those more closely associated with production activity.

Our analysis also included a set of control variables that are frequently used in the literature. Firm size is an important predictor of the likelihood of using a technology. Having controlled for size, the importance of financial constraints is also significant for both robotics and flexible manufacturing.

	CNC(1)	Robotics(2)	CAD (3)	SSFN (4)	CNC (1)	Robotics (2)	CAD (3)	SSFN (4)		
	0,17***	0.38***	0.19***	0.48***	0.16***	0.36***	0.17***	0.46***		
Firm size	(3.76)	(7.77)	(4.47)	(9.35)	(3.50)	(7.28)	(3.89)	(8.82)		
	-0.08	-0.29***	0.10	-0.33***	-0.07	-0.28***	0.12	-0.33****		
Firm debt ratio	(-0.87)	(-2.92)	(1.11)	(-3.41)	(-0.83)	(-2.80)	(1.29)	(-3.36)		
Stock of toobpological recourses	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		, , ,	1.61 <sup>***</sup>	2.42***	3.66***	2.81***		
Stock of technological resources					(2.86)	(4.12)	(6.32)	(4.86)		
Stock of commercial resources					-0.22	0.42***	0.32*	-0.33		
					(-0.91)	(2.70)	(1.74)	(-0.95)		
Human resources					0.12	0.14	0.66	0.71		
	<b>a</b> ***	a a a ****	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	a a a ****	(0.71)	(0.73)	(3.64)	(3.88)		
Export propensity	0.44	0.63	0.51	0.33	0.41	0.60	0.44	0.28		
	(5.17)	(7.13)	(5.74)	(3.75)	(4.81)	(6.65)	(4.92)	(3.13		
Market concentration	-0.38	-0.26	0.20	0.31	-0.35	-0.23	0.23	0.32		
	(-1.32)	(-0.84)	(0.04)	(0.99)	(-1.22)	(-0.74)	(0.75)	(1.0Z		
Integrated in a business group	0.30	(8 30)	(6.01)	(7 10)	0.29	(7.05)	(4.03)	(6.21)		
	(0.09)	0.39)	-0.04	-0.01	(3.37)	0.18***	-0.01			
Foreign capital	(-0.02)	(2.49)	-0.04	(-0.21)	(-0.08)	(2.82)	(-0.22)	(0.00		
	0.24	0.23	0.35	0.14	0.24	0.25	0.37***	0.14**		
Year 1998	(3.98)	(3.36)	(5.37)	(2.16)	(4.02)	(3.64)	(5.60)	(2.17		
×	0.34	0.27***	0.38***	0.02	0.34***	0.29***	0.39***	0.01		
Year 2002	(5.69)	(3.95)	(5.84)	(0.31)	(5.66)	(4.17)	(5.87)	(0.09)		
V	0.40***	0.39**	0.45*	0.13	0.40***	0.42***	0.47***	0.11		
fear 2006	(6.48)	(5.72)	(6.84)	(1.93)	(6.44)	(5.98)	(6.88)	(1.68)		
Industry dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Constant	-0.87***	-1.44	-2.47***	-1.74	-0.89***	-1.49***	-2.54	-1.76***		
Constant	(-4.32)	(-6.30)	(-9.28)	(-7.32)	(-4.38)	(-6.52)	(-9.52)	(-7.36)		
Rho2,1		0.409 (	17.46)		0.409 (17.40)					
Rho3,1		0.457 (	21.18)			0.458	(21.16)			
Rho4,1		0.292 (	11.80)			0.290	(11.67)			
Rho3,2		0.405 (	16.77)			0.403	(16.53)			
Rho4,2		0.297 (	11.69)			0.294	(11.48)			
Rho4,3		0.413 (	17.13)			0.404	(16.54)			
No. Observations		4,41	8		4,418					
Wald Test		1907.	70		1992.44					
LR test of Rho2,1=Rho3,1=Rho4,1=		1047.1	75***			1025.	56 <sup>***</sup>			
Rho3,2= Rho4,2=0 Rho4,3=0						1020.				

## Table 4. The effect of technological, commercial and human resources on new technology adoption

\*, \*\*, \*\*\* coefficient statistically significant at the 90%, 95% or 99% level.

Three other firm-specific variables present a significant impact on the adoption of new technologies. The propensity to export and the integration of the firm into a business group is positively associated with adoption in all the cases. Foreign ownership is only significant in the case of robotics. This is consistent with previous literature on the diffusion of new technologies, in which the variable is significant depending on the technology (Faria *et al.*, 2003; Gómez and Vargas, 2009). Finally, our results are also generally consistent with the persistence of an epidemic effect. The time dummies show that the use of all the four technologies is more frequent in 2006.

Apart from assessing the impact of certain complementary resources on adoption, the use of the multivariate probit model also allows us to estimate the correlations between the technologies once the variables included in Table 1 have been controlled for. These correlations are presented at the bottom of Table 1 and provide us with a way of testing Hypothesis 4. They could be interpreted in two ways. First, a positive correlation could be due to the influence of firm-specific factors that are not included in our estimations and that determine the propensity of some firms to adopt all the technologies. Therefore, they provide us with a way of assessing the influence of unobservable firm effects. Second, a positive correlation could mean that the technologies form part of a system. Hence, the adoption of one technology would increase the probability of the adoption of the other technologies of the system. The comparison of the changes in the value of the correlations between the first (first four columns) and the second (from the fifth to the eighth column) set of estimations provides us with some information on their origin. As can be observed, the variation is almost negligible, which leads us to think that positive values of the correlations are motivated by the fact that the technologies analyzed tend to be used jointly.

A possibility to further investigate Hypothesis 4 could be to re-estimate our full model adding other technologies that we suspect of not being related to advanced manufacturing technologies. In other words, the correlations between non-related technologies should capture the influence of non-observable firm-specific effects related to the adoption of *all* the technologies. Fortunately, our data set also contains information on the adoption of three Internet technologies. In particular, from 2002, and every four years, the survey includes a question on whether the firm "buys goods or services (providers) through the Internet" (S2B), whether "it sells to final consumers through the Internet" (B2C) and whether "it sells to firms through the

Internet" (B2B). Given that the three technologies supporting these systems are not obviously related to advanced manufacturing technologies, a dramatic reduction in the value of the correlations should be observed. Unfortunately, this significantly restricts our observation window (to years 2002 and 2006) and the number of available observations (to 2,367).

The correlations resulting from estimating a full model<sup>4</sup> with the seven technologies are presented in Table 5. The conclusion is that the correlations between advanced manufacturing and Internet technologies are clearly lower than the ones within the groups. The highest correlation between the two groups is 0.199 (B2B and SSFN), the value is non-significant in two of the cases (CAD-B2B and CAD-B2C) and three correlations are below 0.10. Although we cannot interpret this as conclusive evidence that the correlations are not due to firm-specific factors, given that some of the inter-group correlations are positive and significant, the data shows the importance of the identity of the technologies analyzed. In other words, our results do confirm that complementarities between related technologies exist and that they are very different from the ones corresponding to unrelated technologies, confirming Hypothesis 4.

	CNC	Robotics	CAD	SSFN	B2B	B2C
CNC	1					
Robotics	0.414	1				
CAD	0.470	0.396	1			
SSFN	0.337	0.357	0.436	1		
B2B	0.105	0.090	0.075	0.122	1	
B2C	0.138	0.130	0.009	0.199	0.797	1
S2B	0.080	0.067	0.131	0.178	0.373	0.355

Table 5. Correlation matrix between process and information technologies

\*, \*\*, \*\*\* coefficient statistically significant at the 90%, 95% or 99% level.

#### 5. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

In this paper, we have argued that complementary resources are one of the mechanisms that firms use to profit from the use of new technologies. One implication of this hypothesis is that the use of new technologies should be more likely in those firms that possess more complementary assets. The evidence presented in this paper seems to confirm our conjecture: complementary resources are associated with a firm's technology use.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Results of the multivariate probit model are shown in appendix 1.

Clear differences in adoption behaviour are identified depending on the technologies analysed. More precisely, only technological resources are unequivocally related to the use of new technologies in manufacturing firms. The fact that we have studied the use of advanced manufacturing technologies could help us to understand this result. These technologies are related to product manufacturing and design. Therefore, investments in the knowledge base of the firm could have served to understand and refine both processes, detecting the need and the role of new technologies. Marketing and human resources are also important, although they present different effects depending on the technologies analyzed. Marketing investments are only related to robotics and computer aided design, whereas the quality of the services provided by human resources is positively related to computer aided design and flexible manufacturing.

Finally, we also explain the use of new technologies through the complementarities that arise within systems of technologies. In fact, the interrelations between some of the technologies are the main reason that we observe positive correlations between them, once we control for the determinants of adoption. This supports the view of those that contend that the diffusion of new technologies should not be analysed in isolation.

Our results have implications for the study of technology diffusion and competitive advantage. With respect to the former, they support the move from epidemic to rank models undertaken by the literature on diffusion in recent years. Epidemic models contend that firms adopt new technologies once information on their characteristics reduces the uncertainty surrounding the innovation. However, although important, research has shown that information diffusion is not the only mechanism that explains why some firms are early users and others delay the adoption of the technology until the latest stages of the diffusion process or do not invest in it at all. Although the range of factors involved adds complexity to any explanation provided, the literature and our results show that complementarities play an important role.

These results also have implications for understanding firm heterogeneity and competitive advantage in the context of technology diffusion. The main argument for maintaining that, despite their positive effects on firm activities, new technologies are not related to sustainable competitive advantage is based on the idea that they can be acquired in the market. The literature on information systems has coined the term *strategic necessity hypothesis* to refer to this idea (Clemmons and Kimbrough, 1986; Clemmons and Row, 1991). However, recent research in strategic management has concluded that the process of technology diffusion among firms may not be as regular and widespread as expected. Greve (2009) has shown that social networks and cluster theory affect the diffusion of technologies. Our results contribute to this line of research by showing that the initial levels of heterogeneity of firm resources could produce very different results. In fact, they suggest that complementarities between firm resources and new technologies create varying incentives for firms to adopt, providing an additional dimension (the technology) through which to differentiate themselves.

In other words, far from leading to resource similarity and competitive parity, the process of technology diffusion could create further heterogeneity, at least in the short run. The questions that remain are whether this increased heterogeneity is permanent and whether it can create competitive advantages. The answer, again, seems to depend on the balance between differentiation and homogenization. Although research on the interfirm dimension of diffusion tends to show that the process of adoption affects the majority of the firms operating in an industry (but see Greve, 2009), research on the intrafirm dimension shows that differences in the intensity of technology adoption increase over time (Fuentelsaz, Gómez and Palomas, 2009). However, the role of competitive imitation seems to be important when determining the effect on performance. Although research on the diffusion of new technologies has recognized that a firm's returns cannot be assessed in isolation when arguing in favour of stock and order effects (see, for example, Kashernas and Stoneman, 1993) and has also studied the influence of rivals' adoptions on the diffusion of new technologies (Hannan and McDowell, 1994), the predominant view conceives competitors as information diffusers. Therefore, the role of competition, heterogeneity generation and competitive advantage creation should be more explicitly considered in technology diffusion studies. In the end, imitation would depend on the characteristics of the systems created and their inimitability and on the actions of competitors, which could progressively erode the rents of early adopters (Koellinger, 2008). In any case, the confirmation of the idea that complementary resources explain technology adoption and increase firm heterogeneity should not necessarily lead us to conclude that the net effect of technology on profitability is positive. Even if the relative positions of the firms are maintained or even if some firms improve their advantage over their rivals, the high investments necessary to acquire new technologies could imply that all the firms reduce their initial levels of profitability if they are not able to compensate for them.

#### 6. REFERENCES

- Adams, J. D., 1999. The structure of firm R&D, the factor intensity of production, and skill bias. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 81 (3), 499-510.
- Ansoff, I., 1965. Corporate strategy: An analytic approach to business policy for growth and expansion. McGraw-Hill. New York
- Argote, L.; Beckman, S. L.; Epple, D. 1990. The persistence and transfer of learning in industrial settings. *Management Science*, 36, 140-154.
- Arvanitis, S., Hollenstein, H., 2001. The determinants of the adoption of advanced manufacturing technology. An empirical analysis based on firm-level data for Swiss manufacturing. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, 10, 377-414.
- Arvanitis, S., Louikis, E., 2009. A comparative study of the effect of the ICT, organizational and human capital on labour productivity in Greece an Switzerland. *Information Economics and Policy* 21, 43–61.
- Astebro, T., 2002. Noncapital investment costs and the adoption of CAD and CNC in U.S. metalworking industries. *Rand Journal of Economics*, 33,(4), 672-688.
- Astebro, T.; Colombo, M.G.; Seri, R., 2005. The diffusion of complementary technologies: an empirical test. Available at SSRN: http://ssrn.com/abstract=690981.
- Baldwin, J.; Diverty, B., 1995. Advanced Technology Use in Canadian Manufacturing
   Establishments. *Research Paper*, 85. Analytical Studies Branch. Statistics
   Canada, Ottawa.
- Baptista, R., 2000. Do innovations diffuse faster within geographical clusters?. *International Journal of Industrial Organisation* 18, 515-535.
- Barney J., 1991. Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management* 17 (1): 99-120
- Barney, J. B., 1986. Strategic factors markets: expectations, luck and business strategy. *Management Science*, 32 (10), 1231-1241.

- Bartoloni, E.; Baussola, M., 2001. The determinants of technology adoption in Italian manufacturing industries. *Review of Industrial Organization*, 19, 305-328.
- Beede, D.N.; Young, K.H., 1996. Patterns of advanced technology adoption and manufacturing performance: employment growth, labor productivity and employee earnings. Research paper: *Economics and Statistic Administration, Office of Policy Development*, Washington, D.C.
- Belderbos, R.; Carree, M.; Diederen, B.; Lokshin, B.; Veugelers, R., 2004. Heterogeneity in R&D cooperation strategies. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 22, 1237-1263.
- Beneito, P., 2003. Choosing among alternative technological strategies: an empirical analysis of formal sources of innovation. *Research Policy*, 32(4), 693-713.
- Bharadwaj, A., 2000. A resource-based perspective on information technology capability an firm performance: An empirical investigation. *Management Information System*, 24(1), 169-196.
- Bosworth, D., 1996. Determinants of the use of advanced technologies. *International Journal of the Economics of Business*, 3 (3), 269-293.
- Buzzachi, L., Colombo, M.G.; Mariotti, S., 1995. Technological regimes and innovation in services: the case of the Italian banking industry. *Research Policy*, 24, 151-168.
- Canepa, A.; Stoneman, P., 2005. Financing Constraints in the inter firm diffusion of new process technologies. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, Springer, 30(2-2), 159-169.
- Cappellari, L.; Jenkins, S.P., 2003. Multivariate probit regression using simulated maximum likelihood. *The Stata Journal*, 3(3), 278-294.
- Castellaci F., 2002. Technology gap and cumulative growth: models and outcomes. *International Review of Applied Economics*, 16(3), 333-346.
- Clemons E. K, Kimbrough S., 1986. Information systems, telecommunications, and their effect on industrial organization. *Proceedings of the* 7<sup>th</sup> *International Conference on Information Systems, San Diego, CA.*

- Clemons E. K, Row MC., 1991. Sustaining IT advantage. The role of structural differences. *MIS Quarterly* 15 (3): 275-292
- Cohen, B., 1975. *Multinational Firms and Asian Exports*. Yale Univ. Press, New Haven, CT.
- Cohen, W. M.; Levinthal, DA. (1990). Absorptive Capacity: A New Perspective on Learning and Innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35: 128-152.
- Cohen, W; Levin, R., 1989. Empirical studies of innovation and market structure. In Schmalensee, R.; R. Willing, (Eds.). *Handbook of Industrial Organisation*. 1059-1107, North Holland.
- Colombo, M. G.; Mosconi, R., 1995. Complementary and cumulative learning effects in the early diffusion of multiple technologies. *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 43, 13-48.
- Conner, K. R.; Prahalad, C.K. 1996. A resource-based theory of the firm: knowledge versus opportunism. *Organizational Science*, 7 (5), 477-501.
- Cuneo, P.; Mairesse, J., 1984. Productivity and R&D at the firm level in French manufacturing in Griliches, Z. (ed.), *R&D*, *patents and productivity, National Bureau of Economic*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 375-392.
- Dierickx I, Cool K., 1989. Asset stock accumulation and sustainability of competitive advantage. *Management Science* 35 (12): 1504-1511
- Doms, M.; Dunne, T.; Troske, K., 1997. Workers, wages and technology. *The Quaterly Journal of Economics*, 112 (1), 253-290.
- Dunne, T.; Troske, K., 2005. Technology adoption and the skill mix of US manufacturing plants. *Scott Journal of Political Economy*, 52 (3), 387-405.
- Faria, A., Fenn, P.; Bruce, A., 2003. A count data model of technology adoption. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 28, 63-79.
- Fuentelsaz, L., Gómez, J.; Palomas, S., 2009. The effects of new technologies on productivity: An intrafirm difusión-based assessment. *Research Policy*, 38, 1172-1180.

- Fuentelsaz, L., Gómez, J.; Polo, Y., 2003. Intrafirm diffusion of new technologies: An empirical application. *Research Policy*, 32, 533-551.
- Gómez, J.; Vargas, P., 2009: The effect of financial constraints, absorptive capacity and complementarities on the adoption of multiple process technologies. *Research Policy*, 38 (1), 106-119.
- Greve, H., 2009. Bigger and safer: The diffusion of competitive advantage. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30 (1), 1-23.
- Griliches, Z., 1981. Market value, R&D and patents. *Economic Letters*, 7, 183-187.
- Griliches, Z.; Hall, B.H.; Pakes, A., 1981. R&D, patents and market value revisited: is there a second technological opportunity factor?. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, 1, 183-202.
- Griliches, Z.; Mairesse, J., 1984. *Productivity and R&D at the firm level*, in Griliches,Z. (ed.), R&D, patents and productivity, National Bureau of Economic, Chicago:The University of Chicago Press, 339-374.
- Hannan, T.H.; McDowell J.M., 1986. Rival precedence and the dynamics of technology adoption: an empirical analysis. *Economica*, 54, 155–171.
- Hannan, T.H.; McDowell, J.M., 1984a. The Determinants of Technology Adoption: The Case of the Banking Firm. *Rand Journal of Economics*, 15 (3), 328-335.
- Hannan, T.H.; McDowell, J.M., 1984b. Market Concentration and the Diffusion of New Technology in the Banking Industry. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 66, 686-691.
- Hirchey, M.; Weygandt, J.J., 1985. Amortization policy for advertising and research and development expenditures. *Journal of Accounting Research*, 23, 326-335.
- Karshenas, M., Stoneman, P., 1993. Rank, stock, order, and epidemic effects in the diffusion of new process technologies: an empirical model. Rand Journal of *Economics*, 24 (4), 503-528.
- Kleinknecht, A.; Poot, T. P., 1992. Do Regions Matter for R&D?. *Regional Studies*, 26(3), 221-232.

Koellinger, P., 2008. The relationship between technology, innovation, and firm

performance – Empirical evidence form e-business in Europe. *Research Policy*, 37, 1347-1328

- Kogut, B.; Zander, U., 1992. Knowledge of the firm, combinative capabilities, and replication of technology. *Organization Science*, 3 (3) 383-397
- Lal, K., 1999. Determinants of the adoption of Information Technology: a case study of electrical and electronic goods manufacturing firms in India. *Research Policy*, 28, 667–680.
- Lal, K., 2002. E-business and manufacturing sector: a study of small and mediumsized enterprises in India. *Research Policy*, 31, 1199–1211.
- Luque, A., 2002. An option value approach to technology adoption in U.S. manufacturing: Evidence from microdata. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, 11(6), 543-568.
- Mansfield, E., 1993. The diffusion of flexible manufacturing systems in Japan, Europe and the United States. *Management Science*, 39(2), 149-159.
- Mansfield, E., 1963. Intrafirm rates of diffusion of an innovation. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 348–359.
- Mata, F.J.; Fuerst, W.L.; Barney, J., 1995. Information technology and sustained competitive advantage: A resource based analysis. *Management Information System*, 19 (4), 487-505.
- Milgrom, P., Roberts, J., 1990. The economics of modern manufacturing: technology, strategy and organization. *The American Economic Review*, 80 (3), 511-528.
- Oriani, R.; Sobrero, M., 2003. A meta-analityc study of the relationship between R&D investments and corporate value in Caldirini, M.; Garrone, P.; Sobrero, M. (eds), *Corporate governance, market structure and innovation*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar, 177-199.
- Oster, S., 1982. The diffusion of innovation among Steel Firms: The basic oxigen furnace. *The Bell Journal of Economics*. 13 (1), 45-56.
- Pavitt, K., 1984 Sectoral patterns of technical change: towards a taxonomy and a theory. *Research Policy*, 13, 343–373.

- Pennings, J.M., 1987. Technological innovations in manufacturing. In J. M. PenningsA. Buitendam (Eds.), New technology as organizational innovation: The development and diffusion of microelectronics. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
- Piva, M.; Santarelli, E.; Vivarelli, M., 2005. The skill bias effect of technological and organisational change: Evidence and policy implications. *Research Policy*, 34, 141-157.
- Powell T. C., Den-Micallef A., 1997. Information technology as competitive advantage: the role of human, business, and technology resources. *Strategic Management Journal* 18 (5), 375-405.
- Reinganum, J. F., 1981. Market structure and the diffusion of new technology. *The Bell Journal of Economics*, 12 (2), 618-624.
- Riedel, J., 1975. The nature and discriminants of export-oriented direct foreign investment in a developing country: a case study of Taiwan. *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv* 111, 505–528.
- Rivkin, J. W., 2000. Imitation complex strategies. *Management Science*, 46, 824-844.
- Romeo, A. A., 1975. Interindustry and interfirm differences in the rate of difussion of an innovation. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 5(3), 311-319.
- Rose, N.L., Joskow, P.L., 1990. The diffusion of new technologies: evidence from the electric utility industry. *Rand Journal of Economics*, 21 (3), 354-373.
- Sanchez, R., 1996. Strategic product creation: Managing new interactions of technology, markets and organizations. *European Management Journal*, 14, 121 138.
- Santamaria, L.; Rialp, J., 2007. La elección del socio en las cooperaciones tecnológicas: una análisis empírico. *Cuadernos de Economia y Dirección de Empresas*, 31, 67-96.
- Santamaría, L; Nieto, M. J and Barge-Gil, A., 2009. Beyond formal R&D: Taking advantage of other sources of innovation in low-and medium-technology industries. *Research Policy*, 38, 507-517.

- Sharma, S., 1993. Behind the Diffusion Curve: An Analysis of ATM adoption. *Working Paper no. 686.* Department of Economics. University of California, Los Angeles.
- Sinha R.V.; Noble, S.H., 2008. The adoption of radical manufacturing technologies and firm survival. *Strategic Management Journal*, 29 (9), 943-962.
- Stoneman, P., 2001. Technological diffusion and the financial environment. *Working paper, no- 01-3.* The United Nations University, Institute for New Technologies.
- Stoneman, P., Kwon, M.J., 1994. The diffusion of multiple process technologies. *The Economic Journal*, 104, 420-431.
- Stoneman, P.; Kwon, M.J., 1996. Technology adoption and firm profitability. *The Economic Journal*, 106 (347), 952-962.
- Swamidass, P.M., 2003. Modeling the adoption rates of manufacturing technology innovations by small US manufacturers: a longitudinal investigation. *Research Policy*, 32, 351-366.
- Swamidass, P.M.; Kotha, S., 1998. Explaining manufacturing technology use, firm size and performance using a multidimensional view of technology. *Journal of Operations Management*, 17(1), 23-37.
- Teece, D., 1986. Profiting from Technological Innovation: Implications for Integration, Collaboration, Licensing and Public Policy. *Research Policy*, 15, 285-305.
- Teece, D., 2006. Reflections on "profiting from innovation". *Research Policy*, 35 (8), 1131-1146.
- Teece, D.J., 2000. *Managing Intellectual Capital: Organizational, Strategic, and Policy Dimensions.* Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Thomke, S., 1998. Managing experimentation in the design of new products. *Management Science*, 44(6), 743-462.
- Veugelers, R.; Cassiman, B., 1999. Make and buy in innovation strategies: Evidence from Belgian manufacturing firms. *Research Policy*, 28(1), 63-80.

- Villalonga, B., 2004. Intangibles resources, Tobin's q, and the sustainability of performance differences. *Journal of Economic Behaviour and Organization*, 54 (2), 205-230.
- Wernerfelt, B., 1984. A resource based view of the firm, *Strategic Management Journal*, 5 (2), 171-180.
- Winter, S., 1987. Knowledge and competence as strategic assets in Teece, D. (ed.) *The Competitive Challenge*, Center for Research in Management, Berkeley, CA, 159-184.
- Wozniak, G.D., 1984. The adoption of interrelated innovations: A human capital approach, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 66(1), 70-79.

### **APPENDIX 1. Additional results.**

	CNC(1)	Robotics(2)	CAD (3)	SSFN (4)	B2B (5)	B2C (6)	C2B(7)
	0,15**	0.34***	0.07	0.37***	0.15**	0.11*	0.08*
Firm size	(2.36)	(5.06)	(1.21)	(5.71)	(2.94)	(1.75)	(1.72)
Firm dabt ratio	-0.04	-0.27**	0.07	-0.39**	0.20	-0.05	0.33**
	(-0.34)	(-2.04)	(0.53)	(-2.98)	(1.16)	(-0.25)	(2.40)
Stock of technological resources	-0.78	2.09	3.87	2.29	1.00	1.10	2.83
	(-0.54)	(2.35)	(4.02)	(2.63)	(0.90)	(0.81)	(3.24)
Stock of commercial resources	-0.22	: 0.44	: 0.34 :	-0.63	0.51	: 0.40	: 0.62
	(-0.54)	(1.82)	(1.14)	(-1.09)	(1.64)	(0.90)	(2.69)
Human resources	0.08	: 0.12	: 0.74	: 0.81	0.67	: 0.96	: 0.73
Tuman resources	(0.38)	(0.51)	(3.26)	(3.56)	(2.27)	(3.02)	(3.18)
Export propensity	0.45	: 0.66	: 0.51	0.18	0.18	0.03	: 0.35
	(3.94)	(5.62)	(4.31)	(1.53)	(1.11)	(0.17)	(2.82)
Market concentration	-0.39	-0.31	0.46	-0.33	-0.08	-0.12	-0.31
	(-0.75)	(-0.57)	(0.86)	(-0.60)	(-011)	(-0.13)	(-0.55)
Integrated in a business group	0.29	0.44	0.18	0.25	0.26**	0.06	0.15
integrated in a business group	(4.12)	(6.03)	(2.47)	(3.39)	(2.68)	(0.57)	(1.88)
Foreign conital	-0.02	. 0.15	-0.06	0.07	0.19 <sup>*</sup>	0.02	-0.04
i oreign capital	(-0.18)	(1.78)	(-0.64)	(0.77)	(1.78)	(0.13)	(-0.39)
Voor 2006	0.61	0.13**	0.10	0.16**	0.29***	0.07	0.45***
	(1.09)	(2.09)	(1.63)	(2.53)	(3.32)	(0.75)	(6.88)
Industry dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Constant	-0.59 <sup>*</sup>	-1.16***	-2.17***	-1.66***	-2.16***	-2.27***	-1.79***
Constant	(-1.95)	: (-3.47)	(-9.83)	(-4.35)	(-4.64)	(-4.03)	: (-5.11)
No. Observations				2367			
Wald Test				1220.78***			

## Table 6. Multivariate probit estimation with all the technologies

## 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 <i>Value at Risk</i> 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 Euro- pean 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 sumi- nistro 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 jerár- quicos 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 in- dex 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 com- mon 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 li- quidez? 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 han- dling 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 aproxi- mación 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 dis- tance functions Sergio Perelman and Daniel Santin
218/2005	La gobernanza de los procesos parlamentarios: la organización industrial del congreso de los di- putados 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 me- didas 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 Proc- essing 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: Span- ish 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 cen- tral 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 Maxi- mum 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 deter- minantes 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-Ocnoa y Carmen Almansa-Saez
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 M <sup>a</sup> Arranz y Ana I. Gil.
263/2006	Análisis de la Presencia de la Mujer en los Consejos de Administración de las Mil Mayores Em- presas 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 Econó- mica 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, M <sup>a</sup> Dolores López and Javier Rodrigo
276/2006	Investment and growth in Europe during the Golden Age Antonio Cubel and M <sup>a</sup> 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 liberali- zación del Sector Eléctrico Fernando Hernández Martínez
291/2006	Further considerations on the link between adjustment costs and the productivity of R&D invest- ment: 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 Ciu- dadanos 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, M <sup>a</sup> Dolores López y Javier Rodrigo
322/2007	Human resource management and environment management systems: an empirical study M <sup>a</sup> Concepción López Fernández, Ana M <sup>a</sup> 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 M <sup>a</sup> 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 pro- gramming 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 Know- ledge 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 pro- gramming Blanca M <sup>a</sup> Pérez-Gladish, Mar Arenas-Parra , Amelia Bilbao-Terol and M <sup>a</sup> 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 M <sup>a</sup> 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 founda- tions 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 M <sup>a</sup> 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, Maria Hierro and Jose 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 Rod- riguez 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 litera- tura 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 Autóno- mas Andrés Leal Marcos y Julio López Laborda
395/2008	Technical efficiency and productivity changes in Spanish airports: A parametric distance func- tions 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 <sub>2</sub> emissions: A computational modelling approach using Arti- ficial 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 M <sup>a</sup> 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 ana- lysis 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 sanita- rios 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 electri- cidad 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 interna- cional 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 M <sup>a</sup> 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
468/2009	Measuring international reference-cycles Sonia de Lucas Santos, Inmaculada Álvarez Ayuso & M <sup>a</sup> Jesús Delgado Rodríguez
469/2009	Measuring quality of life in Spanish municipalities Eduardo González Fidalgo, Ana Cárcaba García, Juan Ventura Victoria & Jesús García García
470/2009	¿Cómo se valoran las acciones españolas: en el mercado de capitales doméstico o en el europeo? Begoña Font Belaire y Alfredo Juan Grau Grau
471/2009	Patterns of e-commerce adoption and intensity. evidence for the european union-27 María Rosalía Vicente & Ana Jesús López

472/2009	On measuring the effect of demand uncertainty on costs: an application to port terminals Ana Rodríguez-Álvarez, Beatriz Tovar & Alan Wall
473/2009	Order of market entry, market and technological evolution and firm competitive performance Jaime Gomez, Gianvito Lanzolla & Juan Pablo Maicas
474/2009	La Unión Económica y Monetaria Europea en el proceso exportador de Castilla y León (1993- 2007): un análisis de datos de panel Almudena Martínez Campillo y M <sup>a</sup> del Pilar Sierra Fernández
475/2009	Do process innovations boost SMEs productivity growth? Juan A. Mañez, María E. Rochina Barrachina, Amparo Sanchis Llopis & Juan A. Sanchis Llopis
476/2009	Incertidumbre externa y elección del modo de entrada en el marco de la inversión directa en el exterior Cristina López Duarte y Marta M <sup>a</sup> Vidal Suárez
477/2009	Testing for structural breaks in factor loadings: an application to international business cycle José Luis Cendejas Bueno, Sonia de Lucas Santos, Inmaculada Álvarez Ayuso & M <sup>a</sup> Jesús Del- gado Rodríguez
478/2009	¿Esconde la rigidez de precios la existencia de colusión? El caso del mercado de carburantes en las Islas Canarias Juan Luis Jiménez y Jordi Perdiguero
479/2009	The poni test with structural breaks Antonio Aznar & María-Isabel Ayuda
480/2009	Accuracy and reliability of Spanish regional accounts (CRE-95) Verónica Cañal Fernández
481/2009	Estimating regional variations of R&D effects on productivity growth by entropy econometrics Esteban Fernández-Vázquez y Fernando Rubiera-Morollón
482/2009	Why do local governments privatize the provision of water services? Empirical evidence from Spain Francisco González-Gómez, Andrés J. Picazo-Tadeo & Jorge Guardiola
483/2009	Assessing the regional digital divide across the European Union-27 María Rosalía Vicente & Ana Jesús López
484/2009	Measuring educational efficiency and its determinants in Spain with parametric distance functions José Manuel Cordero Ferrera, Eva Crespo Cebada & Daniel Santín González
485/2009	Spatial analysis of public employment services in the Spanish provinces Patricia Suárez Cano & Matías Mayor Fernández
486/2009	Trade effects of continental and intercontinental preferential trade agreements Salvador Gil-Pareja, Rafael Llorca-Vivero & José Antonio Martínez-Serrano
487/2009	Testing the accuracy of DEA for measuring efficiency in education under endogeneity Salvador Gil-Pareja, Rafael Llorca-Vivero & José Antonio Martínez-Serrano
488/2009	Measuring efficiency in primary health care: the effect of exogenous variables on results José Manuel Cordero Ferrera, Eva Crespo Cebada & Luis R. Murillo Zamorano

489/2009	Capital structure determinants in growth firms accessing venture funding Marina Balboa, José Martí & Álvaro Tresierra
490/2009	Determinants of debt maturity structure across firm size Víctor M. González
491/2009	Análisis del efecto de la aplicación de las NIIF en la valoración de las salidas a bolsa Susana Álvarez Otero y Eduardo Rodríguez Enríquez
492/2009	An analysis of urban size and territorial location effects on employment probabilities: the spanish case Ana Viñuela-Jiménez, Fernando Rubiera-Morollón & Begoña Cueto
493/2010	Determinantes de la estructura de los consejos de administración en España Isabel Acero Fraile y Nuria Alcalde Fradejas
494/2010	Performance and completeness in repeated inter-firm relationships: the case of franchising Vanesa Solis-Rodriguez & Manuel Gonzalez-Diaz
495/2010	A Revenue-Based Frontier Measure of Banking Competition Santiago Carbó, David Humphrey & Francisco Rodríguez
496/2010	Categorical segregation in social networks Antoni Rubí-Barceló
497/2010	Beneficios ambientales no comerciales de la directiva marco del agua en condiciones de escasez: análisis económico para el Guadalquivir Julia Martin-Ortega, Giacomo Giannoccaro y Julio Berbel Vecino
498/2010	Monetary integration and risk diversification in eu-15 sovereign debt markets Juncal Cuñado & Marta Gómez-Puig
499/2010	The Marshall Plan and the Spanish autarky: A welfare loss analysis José Antonio Carrasco Gallego
500/2010	The role of learning in firm R&D persistence Juan A. Mañez, María E. Rochina-Barrachina, Amparo Sanchis-Llopis & Juan A. Sanchis-Llopis
501/2010	Is venture capital more than just money? Marina Balboa, José Martí & Nina Zieling
502/2010	On the effects of supply strategy on business performance: do the relationships among generic competitive objectives matter? Javier González-Benito
503/2010	Corporate cash holding and firm value Cristina Martínez-Sola, Pedro J. García-Teruel & Pedro Martínez-Solano
504/2010	El impuesto de flujos de caja de sociedades: una propuesta de base imponible y su aproximación contable en España Lourdes Jerez Barroso y Joaquín Texeira Quirós
505/2010	The effect of technological, commercial and human resources on the use of new technology Jaime Gómez & Pilar Vargas