BANK OF GREECE

EUROSYSTEM

Working Paper

Exporting and performance:
evidence from Greek firms

Heather D. Gibson
Georgia Pavlou

228

EXPORTING AND PERFORMANCE:
EVIDENCE FROM GREEK FIRMS

Heather D Gibson
Bank of Greece

Georgia Pavlou
Bank of Greece

Abstract
This paper explores differences in performance between firms that export and those that do not. With only a few exceptions, exporters have characteristics which suggest "better" performance than non-exporters, controlling for observed and unobserved heterogeneity. This paper aims to provide evidence on the differences between exporters and non-exporters in terms of labour productivity and profitability across time, different sectors of economic activity and different size groups, using data from exporting and non-exporting firms incorporated in Greece for the period 2006-2014. The results suggest that the exporter productivity premium is around 14% for the whole sample, pointing to a significant productivity advantage for exporting firms which is even stronger in certain sectors of economic activity. There is also evidence in favour of higher productivity growth for always-exporting firms and starters, while there is a negative, though insignificant, effect for stoppers.

Correspondence:
Heather Gibson
Economic Analysis and Research Department
Bank of Greece,
21 E. Venizelos Ave,
Athens 10250
Tel: +30 210 320 2415
email: hgibson@bankofgreece.gr

1. Introduction

Since 2008, Greece has lost over 25% of its GDP as a consequence of a reduction in domestic demand, both consumption and investment. The survival of many companies has thus, to a large extent, been determined by their ability to look to foreign demand to fill the gap. Indeed macro data point to an increase in exports, especially of goods, from 2010 onwards.[1] Moreover, there are also signs of sectoral reallocation towards tradable goods and services and, more generally, towards the more productive businesses across all economic sectors.[2]

An extensive literature exists exploring differences in performance between firms that export and those that do not. With only a few exceptions, exporters have characteristics which suggest "better" performance than non-exporters, controlling for observed and unobserved heterogeneity. In most empirical studies it is found that exporters are larger, more productive and more capital intensive. Findings also suggest that it is the most productive firms that usually begin exporting and that there is little evidence to support the view that exporting, through learning by doing, brings higher productivity. However, the transition of firms from producing solely for the domestic market to selling abroad involves rapid employment and output and higher productivity growth. Conversely, exiting firms experience sharp declines in output and employment. Other potential benefits of exporting firms may be located in terms of the number of jobs and, through higher plant survival rates, the stability of those jobs.

This paper aims to provide evidence on the differences between exporters and non-exporters in terms of labour productivity and profitability across time, different sectors of economic activity and different size groups, using data from exporting and non-exporting firms incorporated in Greece for the period 2006-2014. We also provide evidence on the effects of transitions in and out of exporting for our sample of firms. The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: section 2 reviews the

---

[1] Greek exports of goods and services increased by 10.9% between 2010 and 2014, with exports of goods having increased by 18.7% and of services by 3.8%, according to ELSTAT National Accounts.
[2] See Bank of Greece (2014) Governor's report for the year 2013, Box V.1 "The crisis favours a shift of productive activities to tradable goods and services" and Bank of Greece (2016) Governor's report for the year 2015, Box V.3 "The higher production share of tradables and the adjustment of the Greek economy".

relevant literature on the differences between exporters and non-exporters using various measures of firm performance. In section 3, we move on to the Greek case. Finally, section 4 concludes presenting some policy implications and avenues for further research.

2. Literature review: differences between exporters and non-exporters

The literature dealing with the links between productivity and the international activities of firms was pioneered by Bernard and Jensen (1995). They used comprehensive longitudinal data from surveys performed regularly by official statistics in the US to look at differences between exporters and non-exporters across various dimensions of a firm's performance, including productivity. The results provide evidence in favour of "better" performance of exporters compared to non-exporters: exporters are larger, more productive and more capital intensive. Labour productivity, measured as shipments per worker, was found to be 15% greater for exporters. Exporters are substantially larger than non-exporters even within industries. Employment at exporting plants is about 94% greater than at non-exporters within the same industry and wages are 9% higher on average in exporting establishments than in non-exporters. The total value of shipments is 110% higher at exporters than non-exporters. It is also found that plants that become exporters grow the most, plants that cease exporting exhibit poor relative performance and movement into exporting is associated with success.

Subsequently, there have been many other studies using firm-level micro data to investigate performance differences between exporting and non-exporting firms and the direction of causality between export activity and firm-level productivity (see Wagner 2007 and 2012a for surveys). More recently, Tavares-Lehmann and Costa (2015) in their paper on performance differences between exporters and non-exporters in Portugal provide an overview of the literature on both the exporter productivity premium and the exporter profitability premium. For the case of Greece, Papadogonas and Voulgaris (2005) investigate the determinants of labour productivity growth at the firm level in the manufacturing sector using a sample of

3035 firms that were active in the years 1995 and 1999 obtained from the icap database. The results show that labour productivity growth is positively related to the growth of net fixed assets per employee, export orientation and R&D activity. Firm size, employment growth and industry age negatively affect labour productivity growth. To our knowledge there is no study addressing the issue of export premia for firms' performance in the Greek industry as a whole and for the most recent period.

In the literature the empirical strategies used to investigate the exports/performance relationship (see Wagner, 2007) first address the issue of whether there exist export premia for plant/firm characteristics, controlling for industry and plant size:

$$\ln X_{it} = \alpha + \beta Export_{it} + \gamma\, Control_{it} + e_{it} \tag{1}$$

where i is the firm, t is the year (t=0…T), X_{it} is the plant/firm performance measure, '$Export_{it}$' is a dummy for current export status and '$Control_{it}$' is a set of control variables (usually including industry, region, firm size measured by number of employees, exporter size captured by an interaction term between export status and size and year). The export premium, computed from the estimated coefficient β, shows the average percentage difference between exporters and non-exporters controlling for the characteristics included in the vector, Control. Export premia are found to be positive and significant for almost every performance characteristic through time and across countries.

With respect to labour productivity, it appears to be a stylized fact that exporters are more productive than non-exporters. Most studies for specific countries find a positive and significant export productivity premium; Bernard and Jensen (1995, 1999) for the USA, Bernard and Wagner (1997) and Vogel (2011) for Germany, De Loecker (2007) for Slovenia, Stöllinger et al. (2012) for Austria, Grazzi (2012) for Italy, Fariñas and Martin-Marcos (2007) for Spain, Tavares-Lehmann and Costa (2015) for Portugal and Van Biesebroeck (2005) for nine African countries. By contrast, studies by Girma et al. (2004) for Ireland and Greenaway et al. (2005) for Sweden find no productivity differences between exporters and non-exporters, while Fu and Wu (2013) for China find that exporters are less productive than non-

exporters (see Wagner 2012a and Tavares-Lehmann and Costa (2015) for a survey of the relevant literature). The International Study Group on Exports and Productivity (ISGEP, 2008) shows that "the average exporter premium in 14 countries, after controlling for individual fixed effects, is 7 per cent". Berthou et al. (2015) provide a cross-country evaluation for a panel of 15 European economies and 23 manufacturing sectors during the 2000s.[3] Exporters are found to be more productive than non-exporters and this productivity premium rises with the export experience of firms, with 'always exporters' being much more productive than starters. The evidence suggests that beyond entry into the export market, productivity is also an important determinant of firms' survival over a longer time period. It is also shown that both the level and the growth of firm-level exports rise with firm productivity, and that the bulk of aggregate exports in each country are made by a small number of highly productive firms. Finally, Berthou et al. provide evidence that during the crisis, the growth of exports of high productivity firms contributed to the current account adjustment of European "stressed" economies.

When measuring firm performance by profitability, the results are less clear cut, as emphasized in Wagner (2012a) and Tavares-Lehmann and Costa (2015). Yet the majority of the studies in the literature find a positive exporter profitability premium allowing them to bear the costs of internationalization. Melitz (2003) in his theoretical model shows that exporters are more profitable than non-exporters because they are also more productive. Fryges and Wagner (2010) demonstrate that there is an exporter profitability premium, allowing exporters of German manufacturing firms to face all costs of internationalization and still have profits afterwards. Kneller and Pisu (2010), based on survey data for the UK, find that exporting generate higher profitability and this ex-post effect of exporting is greater for continuous exporters and to a lesser extent for starters. On the contrary, Girma et al. (2004) find that there is no significant exporter profitability premium in Ireland. Helpman et al. (2004) find that exporters are less profitable than firms serving only their domestic market due to the fixed costs associated with internationalization and the same line of reasoning is shared by Vogel and Wagner (2009) and Vogel (2009)

---

[3] The study does not include Greece.

for German business services sector. Grazzi (2012) finds ambiguous evidence about exporter profitability premium with exporters being more profitable than non-exporters only for some sectors and years. Vu et al. (2014) use quantile regression to find higher profitability growth of exporters only in the highest percentiles (percentiles 70 and 80), but lower for percentile 10, as for firms with low profit growth profitability advantages are absorbed by the costs of internationalization.

In the literature, to better understand the transformations that occur in firms when they start and stop exporting, and to better identify any potential benefits from exporting, growth rate regressions in the following spirit are estimated:

$$\Delta X_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 Start_{it} + \beta_2 Both_{it} + \beta_3 Stop_{it} + \gamma\ Control_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \tag{2}$$

where ΔX_{it} is the change in the performance measure; 'Start' is a dummy which identifies firms that start exporting during the sample period; 'Both' identifies firms that exported throughout; 'Stop' identifies firms that stop exporting during the period; and 'Control$_{it}$' is a set of control variables (usually including industry, region, firm size measured by number of employees, exporter size captured by an interaction term between export status and size and year). Thus, the coefficients β_1, β_2, β_3 give the differential in growth rates for entrants, exporters throughout the sample and exits relative to firms that never exported controlling for the characteristics included in the vector 'Control'.

The conclusions are clear. Movements in and out of exporting generate more substantial changes. Exiting the export market is associated with bad outcomes for plants/firms, with significantly slower growth rates in the dependent variable being recorded compared to firms that do not exit. The year of entry into the export market is also a time of substantial improvement in firm performance.

In the literature there are two alternative but not mutually exclusive hypotheses why exporters can be expected to be more productive than non-exporting firms (see Clerides et al., 1998; Bernard and Jensen, 1999; Bernard and Wagner, 1997; International Study Group on Exports and Productivity (ISGEP), 2008; Máñez-Castillejo et al., 2010; Yang and Mallick, 2010). They differ in terms of the direction of causality between exporting and productivity. In the "self-selection

hypothesis", the causality runs from productivity to exporting in which only firms with high productivity ex-ante choose to export because exporting involves large sunk costs. The theoretical support for this hypothesis can be found in the seminal paper by Melitz (2003), that allows for within-industry heterogeneous productivity firms, in which only the most productive firms export whilst less productive firms either supply only the domestic market or exit the market. Furthermore, the behaviour of firms might be forward-looking in the sense that the desire to export tomorrow leads a firm to improve performance today to be competitive on the foreign market, too. Cross-section differences between exporters and non-exporters may partly be explained by *ex-ante* differences between firms: the more productive firms become exporters. By contrast, the "learning-by-exporting hypothesis" proposes that firms gain higher ex-post productivity after exporting. This is due to a number of factors such as new knowledge and expertise from buyers (innovation), scale economies, and exposure to competition (which provides incentives to reduce inefficiency).

A standard approach to examine the direction of causality between exporting and productivity is found in Bernard and Jensen (1999).[4] To test the first hypothesis of self-selection of the more productive firms into export markets, they assume that if good firms become exporters then we should expect to find significant differences in performance measures between exporters and non-exporters several years before the former begin to export. To provide evidence on ex-ante characteristics a sub-sample of firms is created including only firms that did not export for at least three years in a row, i.e. plants that did not export in years t-3, t-2 and t-1 but may or may not have exported in year t. Then, they regress the levels of performance measures in year t-3 on the export status of the plant in year t, along with fixed effects and time dummies.

$$\ln X_{it-3} = \alpha + \beta Export_{it} + \varepsilon_{it-3} \tag{3}$$

---

[4] Many studies, such as Wagner (2002), Máñez-Castillejo et al. (2010), Yang and Mallick (2010), use the matching approach to test the direction of causality between exports and productivity.

The results from their analysis are quite clear. Good firms do become exporters. Future exporters already have most of the desirable performance characteristics several years before they enter the export market.

To test the hypothesis that exporting fosters productivity, the post-entry differences in productivity growth between export starters and non-exporters are investigated (see ISGEP, 2008). This test is based on a comparison of firms that did not export in years t-3 to t-1, but exported in year t and in at least two years between the years t+1 and t+3 – these are the export starters – with firms from a control group that did not export in any year between t-3 and t+3. The empirical model used is:

$$\ln LP_{it+3} - \ln LP_{it+1} = \alpha + \beta \, Export_{it} + \gamma \, Control_{it} + e_{it} \qquad (4)$$

where ln LP is the log of labour productivity, 'Export' is a dummy variable that equals 1 for export starters and that equals zero for the firms from the control group and 'Control$_{it}$' is a set of control variables (usually including industry, region, firm size measured by number of employees, exporter size captured by an interaction term between export status and size and year). Evidence regarding the hypothesis of post-entry productivity growth of exporters is more mixed; exporting does not necessarily improve a firm's performance.

A further strand of the literature recognizes that labour productivity is persistent (Clerides et al. 1998, Helpman et al. 2004 and Fariñas and Martin-Marcos 2007). Clerides et al. (1998), as a robustness check, used a generalized method of moments (GMM) estimator to deal with endogeneity and serial correlation in the estimation of marginal cost functions. Fariñas and Martin-Marcos (2007) apply instrumental variables to address the endogeneity problem in the estimation of production functions. Unobserved heterogeneity and potential simultaneity in the estimation of the production function are addressed using the GMM first differenced estimator (Arellano and Bond, 1991). Thus, to address the persistence of productivity, Equation 1 is re-estimated to include a lagged dependent variable. To deal with the possible bias introduced, especially in panels with a short time series (Galvao, 2011), it is necessary to use the Arellano-Bond GMM estimator.

Finally a number of papers use quantile regressions with fixed effects and instrumental variables (Wagner 2012b, Powell and Wagner 2011; Powell, 2016). The rationale stems from the observation that there is considerable firm heterogeneity along the distribution with both low and high productivity firms that export and many that do not. Thus it is better to estimate the export premium along the productivity distribution and not just at the mean. These studies generally show that the export premium does indeed vary along the distribution.

3. Empirical investigation

3.1 Data and descriptive statistics

We use data from icap with information on annual balance sheets and profit and loss accounts at firm-level, as well as data on the sector of economic activity to which each firm belongs, the number of employees, the year of establishment and exporting status. We delete the consolidated accounts of company groups, preferring to work with individual firms that make up the group. In this way, it is easier to assign firms to a particular industry. The data are available for 2006-2014 and consist of 60,325 firms across all industries. This amounts to 312,734 observations, after having removed outliers in the calculation of financial indices.[5]

Since this paper's focus is on the differences distinguishing exporting from non-exporting firms, we created six different binary variables depending on the exporting status of the firm – exporters, non-exporters, 'always exporters' (i.e. firms exporting throughout the period), never having exported, starters (firms not exporting in t-1 and engaging in export activity in t) and stoppers (firms initially exporting in t-1, but stopping their exporting activity in t). Table 1 provides a clear overview of firms according to their exporting status: 81% of firms for the whole sample never exported, while 13% of firms always exported and 6% switched status across years. Interestingly, in the period reviewed the percentage of firms entering in export

---

[5] We chose not to remove outliers using automatic methods such as winsorising. The period under examination, by its very nature, is likely to contain "outliers". Their automatic removal, however, would introduce a bias into the sample of companies, for example, by removing failing companies that record large negative profits in their last years of life.

market ("starters") exceeds the percentage of firms exiting the export market ("stoppers") suggesting that Greek firms were becoming more open; though the number of companies changing status is small.

Table 2 presents a more detailed decomposition of firms by exporting status and sector of economic activity[6]. As expected, "Manufacturing", "Agriculture, forestry and fishing" and "Wholesale and Retail Trade" as well as "Mining and Quarrying" are the sectors mostly involved in exporting activity and register the highest rates of "starters".

Most sectors of economic activity show increased – albeit slightly higher – exporting activity, measured by the number of exporting firms in our sample, in the crisis period (see Figure 1) with traditionally tradable sectors, such as agriculture, forestry and fishing, manufacturing, mining and quarrying, wholesale and retail trade and transport and communication sectors, exhibiting higher openness. As the crisis has proceeded there has been a tendency for mainly micro SMEs ("1-9" and "10-19") to become more export oriented. By contrast, the share of bigger exporting firms in the total number of exporters has declined. This reflects a structural characteristic of Greek industry where SMEs – and in particular micro SMEs – predominate (see Figure 2). Exporting firms with "1-9" employees increased as a share of total exporters from 25.1% in 2006 to 33.3% in 2014 and "10-19" size firms also increased from 23.5% in 2006 to 24.9% in 2014. This finding is in line with Nassr et al. (2016) who also find that Greece has one of the highest shares of micro SMEs in its business demography among OECD countries.

Before proceeding with the estimation of whether exporting firms are more productive and more profitable than non-exporting ones, we provide a descriptive analysis of the two main variables related to firms' performance – labour productivity and profitability.[7] Once the ratios are computed using the firm-level

---

[6] The sectors of economic activity correspond to NACE Rev. 2 classification: "Agriculture, forestry and fishing" ("AG") comprises codes 01-03, "Mining and quarrying" ("MQ") codes 05-09, "Manufacturing" ("M") codes 10-33, "Construction" ("C") codes 41-43, "Wholesale and Retail Trade" ("WRT") codes 45-47, "Accommodation and food service activities" ("HR") codes 55-56, "Transport and Communication" ("TC") codes 49-53 and 58-63, "Energy" ("E") codes 35-39, "Financial intermediation activities" ("FI") codes 64-66 and 69-82, "Real estate" ("RE") code 68 and "Other services" ("OS") codes 84-96.
[7] The description of the data largely follows Ferrando et al. (2015).

data, they are aggregated along five dimensions: time, 2-digit sectoral level (NACE rev. 2), 1-digit sectoral level, size class and exporting status.[8] To better assess the firms characteristics before the crisis and during the crisis, the indicators are reviewed for two sub-periods, 2006-2009 and 2010-2014.

Labour productivity is defined as real turnover (sales and other operating income deflated using the output deflator at A64 sector level from ELSTAT national accounts) over number of employees. This is one of the most important measures of a firm's performance and an index of competitiveness. Figures 3-6 provide some descriptives for our sample of companies. Median labour productivity fell in the crisis period in all sectors with the exception of Agriculture, forestry and fishing (Figure 3); nevertheless, exporting firms exhibit a steadily significantly higher labour productivity across time and sectors of economic activity (Figures 4-5). Labour productivity of exporting firms has followed a downward path since 2008, before registering an upturn in 2012. Sectoral data on labour productivity at the 2-digit level point to higher productivity of exporting firms in the crisis period in crop and animal production, fishing and aquaculture, coke and refined petroleum products, electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply, manufacture of food and beverage products, land transport, warehousing and support activities for transportation, programming and broadcasting activities and telecommunications. The performance of firms across different size categories indicates that median labour productivity is mostly higher in upper size classes. The smallest companies which exhibited dynamic productivity in the pre-crisis years appear to have been particularly badly hit by the crisis, though this could also reflect that as firms fail and their turnover declines they lay off workers and move into the smallest size category, that is, it is a compositional effect (Figure 6).

The rate of return on assets (RoA) defined as earnings before interest, taxes and depreciation over total assets is used to estimate the quality of a company's earnings as it shows how efficiently the company is using its assets to collect cash from sales and customers. Median RoA started falling in 2007, bottomed out in 2012

---

[8] In Appendix I, we review other indicators relating to firm performance. The results are in line with expectations, providing reassurance about the quality of the data.

before rising again. The performance of exporting firms across different size-categories shows that medium-sized firms do tend to have higher profitability than very large or very small firms (Figure 7). Exporters are more profitable than non-exporters throughout time and across all sectors (Figure 8). Higher profitability was recorded, in terms of median RoA, during crisis mainly due to the performance of exporting firms in certain industries; median RoA was higher in 2010-2014 period in agriculture, forestry and fishing (crop and animal production, fishing and aquaculture), mining and quarrying, in manufacture of food products, in coke and refined petroleum products, in energy (sewerage, waste collection and waste management services), in the tourism sector, in financial services (mainly insurance) as well as other services sector (Figure 9).[9]

Our second measure of profitability is **median operating profits to total assets,** defined as median operating profits over total assets. It is an important measure of firm's profitability as it explains how much earnings were generated from operations per se and it is often thought less amenable to accounting manipulation. It followed the same path through time as median RoA, falling and bottoming out in 2012 before rising again. Medium-sized firms had higher profitability compared to small and large firms (Figure 10). Operating profits fell in all broad sectors in the crisis period (Figure 11), but when examining the performance of firms by their exporting status (Figure 12), exporting firms are more profitable than non-exporting throughout time. At the 2-digit level, firms exhibited higher profitability in "coke and refined petroleum products" mainly as a result of their exporting activity, in "insurance, reinsurance and pension funding", in "telecommunications" and "warehousing and support activities for transportation".

In conclusion the descriptive statistics are consistent with the hypothesis that exporting firms exhibit superior performance to their purely domestically focused counterparts. However, to understand whether it is exporting per se or some

---

[9]Although median RoA slightly fell in 2010-2014 period in the broad sector Transport and Communication "TC" (Figure 9), the analysis at 2-digit level shows higher performance in the sectors of "land transport", "transport via pipelines", "air transport", "warehousing and support activities for transportation" and in "telecommunications".

characteristic correlated with being an exporter requires a more formal multivariate analysis.

3.2 Econometric model and estimations

3.2.1 Investigating the exports/productivity relationship[10]

To investigate differences in productivity between exporters and non-exporters we follow the methodology introduced by Bernard and Jensen (1995 and 1999) and compute the so-called exporter premia, defined as the *ceteris paribus* percentage difference of labour productivity between exporters and non-exporters. These premia are computed from the regression given in equation (1). To control for unobserved firm heterogeneity due to time-invariant firm characteristics which might be correlated with the variables included in the empirical model thus leading to a biased estimate of exporter premia, equation (1) is estimated with fixed effects. Time dummies are also included. The current export status dummy takes a value of 1 in time t if the firm exports at time t and zero otherwise. The set of control variables includes firm size, exporter size and the age of the company. The size of the firm is proxied by the number of employees. To test for the existence of a quadratic relationship between productivity and size, we also add as an independent variable the squared number of employees (a similar test was applied by Fryges and Wagner (2010) and Tavares-Lehmann and Costa (2015)). Following Tavares-Lehmann and Costa (2015), an interaction term for exporter and size is also included, computed as the multiplication between the dummy for export status and total employment. The age of the company from its establishment (company age) is also included. To test for the existence of a quadratic relationship we also add the squared age of the company (company age^2).

The export premium, computed from the estimated coefficient β (100(exp(β)–1)), shows the average percentage difference between exporters and non-exporters, controlling for the other characteristics included. Table 3 summarizes the results of estimating equation (1), excluding other control variables across sectors. As

---

[10] We test the sensitivity of our results to dropping banks and insurance companies from the sample. The results are qualitatively similar.

expected, exporting has a positive effect on labour productivity in full sample and in the sectors of Agriculture, forestry and fishing, Manufacturing, Wholesale and Retail Trade, Accommodation and food service activities and Financial intermediation activities. The impact of exporting strengthens when we control for firm size, exporter companies' size and company age (see Tables 4a and 4b). As regards the size effect, there exists a U-shaped relationship between labour productivity and size. The minimum is at the logarithm of employment equal to 9.8; the logarithm of employment has a range of 0 to 10 in our data. Thus, for the sample, the effect of size on labour productivity is largely negative. This finding is not consistent with most of the literature which finds that labour productivity rises with size. The negative relationship between firm size and productivity could reflect a structural characteristic of Greek industry where SMEs prevail. Company age and exporter size are not significant (exporter size appears positive and significant only in the sector of Accommodation and food service activities).

To provide a better understanding of the productivity trajectory of firms as a function of their exporting status, differences in productivity growth between exporters and non-exporters are investigated based on the empirical model given in equation (2) where non-exporting in all years is the reference category. The regression coefficients β_1, β_2 and β_3 are estimates of the impact on labour productivity growth of starting exporting, being an exporter throughout and stopping exporting, respectively, controlling for firm characteristics included in the vector Control (employment, employment^2, company age, company age^2, size interacted with export dummy).

Tables 5a and 5b present the results. Firms that exported throughout the period have higher labour productivity growth. Starters, however, experience an even bigger effect on labour productivity growth, while stopping has a negative but not significant effect on labour productivity growth. Firm size has a positive effect on the growth of labour productivity; there exists a U-shaped relationship between labour productivity growth and employment. The minimum is at the logarithm of employment equal to 3.86: the logarithm of employment has a range of 0 to 10 in our data. Thus for the sample, firm size has a positive effect on the growth of labour

15

productivity for firms with more than 48 employees. Looking at the results by sector (Table 5b), starters make the difference in Agriculture, forestry and fishing. In Manufacturing, Wholesale and retail trade and Transport and communication sectors both "always exporters" and "starters" have higher productivity growth, while starters have higher productivity growth in financial intermediation sector. Firm size has a positive impact on labour productivity growth in Manufacturing, Wholesale and retail trade and Transport and communication. Again there exists a U-shaped relationship between labour productivity growth and employment in these sectors and, for the sample, firm size has a positive effect on the growth of labour productivity for firms with more than 33, 14 and 81 employees, for Manufacturing, Wholesale and retail trade and Transport and communication, respectively.

We then examine whether the relationship between exporting and productivity growth differs across firms of different sizes. The regression on labour productivity growth is estimated by size band (see Table 6)[11]. For firm sizes "1-9", "10-19" and "20-49" there is a positive and significant effect of exporting activity on labour productivity growth; when examining the impact of exporting by sector, there is a positive and significant effect in manufacturing and wholesale and retail trade. It should be noted though that the positive effect of exporting on labour productivity growth becomes less strong as we move up size bands. Turning to "50-249" firm size, the findings point to a positive and significant effect of exporting on labour productivity growth for starters in all sectors and in Transport and communication. Finally, for firms "250+" there is no effect of exporting on labour productivity growth. This provides evidence of the importance of exporting for small Greek companies and/or the fact that smaller companies can be very productive and thus not excluded from exporting. This is consistent with Máñez-Castillejo et al. (2010) who find evidence in favour of the existence of a process of self-selection into exporting for small firms, but do not find this result for large firms.

Next, following Bernard and Jensen (1995), we also examine whether exporters also increase employment faster than non-exporters considering the

---

[11] In Appendix II (Tables II.1 – II.5) we present the estimated impact of exporting on labour productivity by firm size and sector of economic activity.

relationship between export status and job growth. The dependent variable is employment growth captured by the growth in the number of employees at firm level. Table 7 indicates a positive impact of exporting on employment growth for starters in most sectors, and for 'always exporters' in wholesale and retail trade, in line with the evidence from the literature.

We now test the two hypotheses articulated in the literature regarding the direction of causality between labour productivity and exporters, namely the "self-selection" hypothesis and the "learning by exporting" hypothesis. To shed light on the empirical validity of the hypothesis that firms succeed before they begin exporting – the "self-selection" hypothesis – we test the differences in labour productivity before firms begin exporting on the basis of equation (3). The estimation is based on a sample of firms with business activity throughout the period 2006-2014. One group of firms never export. The other was non-exporters in t-1, t-2 and t-3 and started to export in period t (defined as either 2010 or 2011) and continued exporting up to 2014. We end up with a sample of 6,256 observations, of which 146 firms are starters. The estimated coefficient β on the export dummy is negative and insignificant, thus providing no evidence in favour of the self-selection of the most productive firms in the export market. We then provide another check of the relationship between exporting and ex-ante performance in terms of labour productivity growth (see Bernard and Wagner, 1997). We consider the performance of labour productivity growth of future exporters in the years prior to entry, i.e. from year t-3 to t-2 for firms starting exporting in 2010 and from year t-2 to t-1 for firms starting exporting in 2011, in a regression of the following form:

$$\Delta \ln LP_{it-x(x=1|x=2)} = \alpha + \beta Export_{it(t=2011|t=2010)} + \gamma Control_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad\quad (5)$$

Here, we find positive but insignificant coefficient on the export dummy; thus there is no strong evidence in favour of the "self-selection hypothesis".

To evaluate the learning-by-doing hypothesis, we estimate equation (4). The results point to negative and insignificant effect of export activity on post entry productivity growth of export starters. Nevertheless, the number of export starters

that can be monitored with the dataset available for this study are too small to offer a solid basis for a reliable empirical investigation.[12]

Finally, we investigate the robustness of our basic results in Table 4a,b to adding lagged productivity and using different estimators.[13] First, we add lagged productivity and report results for OLS with fixed effects. The results are given in Table 8a and suggest that the export premium is 10.5% for all sectors of the economy and still significant for a number of sectors – Manufacturing, Wholesale and retail trade, Accommodation and food service activities and Financial intermediation. Including lagged productivity, however, introduces a bias because of endogeneity. Hence we also report the results of using the Arellano-Bond GMM estimator. The estimated premium for all sectors is lower at 3.9% suggesting the presence of bias. However, it is still significant. Second, we investigate whether the export premium varies along the distribution of labour productivity using the quantile regression for panel data developed by Powell (2016). The results in Table 8b suggest that the export premia do differ across the labour productivity distribution with premia being particularly high in lower labour productivity firms. These results confirm the general finding that firms are very heterogeneous and that relying on results at the mean could be misleading. The results are in line with Powell and Wagner (2011) who also find the largest premium at the bottom of the labour productivity distribution.

3.2.2 Investigating the exports/profitability relationship

To test the hypothesis that exporters are more profitable than non-exporters we estimate regression (1) using as dependent variable both earnings before interest and taxes over total assets (RoA) and operating profits over total assets. Table 9 summarizes the results for the effect of exporting on RoA using fixed effects and time dummies equation. Exporting has a positive and significant effect on RoA in full sample and in the sectors of Agriculture, forestry and fishing and Manufacturing.

---

[12] The drastic reduction in the sample size when investigating the two hypotheses is also a feature of the data sets available for the empirical investigation of ex ante and ex post productivity premia by the International Study Group on Exports and Productivity (2008).
[13] The detailed results of these robustness tests are presented in Appendix III.

When controlling for firm size, company age and exporter size (see Table 10), the effect of exporting activity is still positive but it is insignificant in the full sample. Taking operating profits as a measure of profitability, the impact of exporting becomes insignificant in full sample and across sectors. These results are in line with much of the literature which finds weaker effects of exporting on profitability.

4. Conclusions

In this paper, we have used firm-level data to explore performance differences between exporters and non-exporters in Greece. In line with the findings of the extant literature, being an exporter leads to an advantage over domestically-oriented firms for productivity (both level and growth rates), profitability and employment growth.

The exporter productivity premium is estimated at 14% for the whole sample, pointing to a significant productivity advantage for exporting firms which is even stronger in certain sectors of economic activity. The existence of an export productivity premium is one of the strongest results in the economics literature. We also find evidence in favour of higher productivity growth for always-exporting firms and starters, while there is a negative, though insignificant, effect for stoppers. The relationship between exporting activity and labour productivity growth weakens as we move up the firm size band; the results point to higher productivity growth for exporting SMEs – and in particular for micro SMEs. Finally, we checked the robustness of these results by including lagged productivity to account for productivity persistence and various estimators to correct for endogeneity and the fact that the premium may vary along the productivity distribution. The export productivity premia largely remain positive and significant.

The export profitability premium, when profitability is proxied by RoA, is estimated at 2.8% for whole sample in the reviewed period, and even higher in some sectors of economic activity, lending some support to the hypothesis that exporters can be more profitable than companies serving only their home market.

In terms of policy implications, the productivity differentials between exporters and non-exporters suggest that Greece should continue to promote an environment which encourages high-productivity firms and export-oriented production in order to achieve sustainable growth. Given that productivity differentials are particularly significant for SMEs than for large firms, industrial policies should continue to have a firm-size dimension. Different incentives and support services are needed for SMEs and for large firms given the differences in importance of productivity differentials between exporters and non-exporters. A recent OECD report (Nassr et al. 2016) discussing the export potential of SMEs in Greece, their possible contribution to strengthening Greece's export performance thereby helping economic growth, suggests policy measures in the areas of finance, regulation, R&D and innovation.

Topics for further research would be to identify the impact of firms' export intensity on productivity growth, should firm-level data on export volume become available and to better assess the direction of causality of exports and measures of firm performance when a larger number of observations is available to allow such an analysis.

References

Bank of Greece (2014), Governor's report for the year 2013, Box V.1 "The crisis favours a shift of productive activities to tradable goods and services".

Bank of Greece (2015), Monetary Policy – Interim Report December 2015, Box IV.2 "Sectoral productivity and export activity" (in Greek edition).

Bank of Greece (2016), Governor's report for the year 2015, Box V.3 "The higher production share of tradables and the adjustment of the Greek economy" (in Greek edition).

Bardakas, I. (2014), "Financing exports of goods: a constraint on Greek economic growth", Bank of Greece Working Paper 178.

Bernard, A. B. and J. B. Jensen (1995), "Exporters, Jobs, and Wages in the U.S. Manufacturing: 1976-1987", Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, pp. 67-119.

Bernard, A. B. and J. B. Jensen (1999), "Exceptional exporter performance: cause, effect, or both?", Journal of International Economics, Vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 1-25.

Bernard, A. B. and J. B. Jensen (2004), "Exporting and Productivity in the USA", Oxford Review of Economic Policy, Vol. 20, no. 3, pp. 343-357.

Bernard, A. B. and J. Wagner (1997), "Exports and success in German manufacturing", WeltwirtschaftlichesArchiv / Review of World Economics, Vol. 133, no. 1, pp. 134-157.

Bernard, A. B., J. Eaton, J. B. Jensen and S. Kortum (2003), "Plants and productivity in international trade", The American Economic Review, Vol. 93, no. 4, pp. 1268- 1290.

Berthou A., E. Dhyne, M. Bugamelli, A. Cazacu, C. Demian, P. Harasztosi, T. Lalinsky, J. Merikull, F. Oropallo and A. Soares (2015), "Assessing European firms' exports and productivity distributions: the CompNet trade module", ECB Working Paper 1788.

Clerides, S. K., S. Lach and J. R. Tybout (1998), "Is Learning by Exporting Important? Micro-Dynamic Evidence from Colombia, Mexico, and Morocco", The Quarterly Journal of Economics, Vol. 113, no. 3, pp. 903-947.

De Loecker, J. (2007), "Do exports generate higher productivity? Evidence from Slovenia", Journal of International Economics, Vol. 73, no. 1, pp. 69-98.

Delgado, M. A., J. C. Fariñas and S. Ruano (2002), "Firm productivity and export markets: a non-parametric approach", Journal of International Economics, Vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 397-422.

Fariñas, J. C. and A. Martín-Marcos (2007), "Exporting and Economic Performance: Firm-level Evidence of Spanish Manufacturing", The World Economy, Vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 618-646.

Ferrando A., M. Iudice, C. Altomonte, S. Blank, M. Felt, P. Meinen, K. Neugebauer and I. Siedschlag (2015), "Assessing the financial and financing conditions of firms in Europe: the financial module in CompNet", ECB Working Paper 1836.

Fryges, H. and J. Wagner (2010), "Exports and Profitability: First Evidence for German Manufacturing Firms", The World Economy, Vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 399-423.

Fu, D. and Y. Wu (2013), "Export wage premium in China's manufacturing sector: A firm level analysis", China Economic Review, Vol. 26, pp. 182-196.

Galvao A. (2011), "Quantile regression for dynamic panel data with fixed effects", Journal of Econometrics, Vol. 164, issue 1, pp. 142-157.

Gibson, H. D. (2010), "Sectoral Growth in the Greek economy 1995-2003", study 4.2 in "The Greek current account: causes of imbalances and proposed policy solutions", Bank of Greece (in Greek – mimeo available in English).

Gibson, H. D. and J. Malley (2008), "The Contribution of Sectoral Productivity Differentials to Inflation in Greece", Open Economies Review, 19, 629-50.

Girma, S., H. Görg and E. Strobl (2004), "Exports, international investment, and plant performance: evidence from a non-parametric test", Economics Letters, Vol. 83, no. 3, pp. 317-324.

Grazzi, M. (2012), "Export and Firm Performance: Evidence on Productivity and Profitability of Italian Companies", Journal of Industry, Competition and Trade, Vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 413-444.

Greenaway, D., J. Gullstrand and R. Kneller (2005), "Exporting May Not Always Boost Firm Productivity", Review of World Economics, Vol. 141, no. 4, pp. 561-582.

Greenaway D., A. Guariglia and R. Kneller (2007), "Financial factors and exporting decisions", Journal of International Economics 73 (2007) 377-395.

Helpman, E., M. J. Melitz and S. R. Yeaple (2004), "Export Versus FDI with Heterogeneous Firms", The American Economic Review, Vol. 94, no. 1, pp. 300-316.

International Study Group on Exports and Productivity (ISGEP) (2008), "Understanding Cross-Country Differences in Exporter Premia: Comparable Evidence for 14 Countries", National Bank of Belgium Working Paper No. 128.

Kneller, R. and M. Pisu (2010), "The returns to exporting: evidence from UK firms", Canadian Journal of Economics / Revue Canadienne d'Economique, Vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 494-519.

Lee, C. (2014), "The Exporting and Productivity Nexus: Does Firm Size Matter?", ISEAS Economics Working Paper No. 2014-1.

Malliaropulos, D. and T. Anastasatos (2013), "The improvement in the Competitive Position of the Greek Economy and Prospects for an Export-led Growth Model", Economy & Markets, Eurobank research, January 2013.

Malliaropulos, D., (2010), How much did competitiveness of the Greek economy decline since EMU entry? In: Economy and Markets, Eurobank Research, July 2010.

Máñez-Castillejo, J. A., M. E. Rochina-Barrachina and J. A. Sanchis-Llopis (2010), "Does Firm Size Affect Self-selection and Learning-by-Exporting?", The World Economy, Vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 315-346.

Melitz, M. J. (2003), "The Impact of Trade on Intra-Industry Reallocations and Aggregate Industry Productivity", Econometrica, Vol. 71, no. 6, pp. 1695-1725.

Nassr I., V. Robano and G. Wehinger (2016), "Unleashing the Export Potential of SMEs in Greece", OECD Working Papers on Finance, Insurance and Private Pensions, No. 41.

NBG – National Bank of Greece (2014), Survey of Greek SMEs: First half 2014, July 2014.

Papadogonas, T. and F. Voulgaris (2005), "Labour Productivity Growth in Greek Manufacturing Firms", Operational Research. An International Journal. Vol.5, No.3 (2005), pp. 459-472.

Powell, David and Joachim Wagner (2011), The Exporter Productivity Premium along the Productivity Distribution: Evidence from Unconditional Quantile Regression with Firm Fixed Effects. RAND Working Paper WR-837, February.

Powell, D. (2016), "Quantile Treatment Effects in the Presence of Covariates", unpublished paper.

Stöllinger, R., R. Stehrer and J. Pöschl (2012), "Austrian exporters: unique or alike? New insights and missing puzzle pieces", Empirica, Vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 375-405.

Tavares-Lehmann, A., D. Costa (2015), "Performance Differences between Exporters and Non-Exporters: the Case of Portugal, FEP Working Papers.

Van Biesebroeck, J. (2005), "Exporting raises productivity in sub-Saharan African manufacturing firms", Journal of International Economics, Vol. 67, no. 2, pp. 373-391.

Vogel, A. (2009), "Exporter performance in the German business services sector", The Service Industries Journal, Vol. 31, no. 7, pp. 1015-1031.

Vogel, A. and J. Wagner (2009), "Exports and Profitability: First Evidence for German Business Services Enterprises", University of Lüneburg Working Paper Series in Economics, no. 129.

Vu, H., M. Holmes, S. Lim and T. Tran (2014), "Exports and profitability: a note from quantile regression approach", Applied Economics Letters, Vol. 21, no. 6, pp. 442-445.

Wagner, J. (2002), "The causal effects of exports on firm size and labor productivity: first evidence from a matching approach", Economics Letters, Vol. 77, no. 2, pp. 287-292.

Wagner, J. (2007), "Exports and Productivity: A Survey of the Evidence from Firm-level Data", World Economy, Vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 60-82.

Wagner, J. (2012a), "International trade and firm performance: a survey of empirical studies since 2006", Review of World Economics, Vol. 148, no. 2, pp. 235-267.

Wagner, J. (2012b), "New Methods for the Analysis of Links between International Firm Activities and Firm Performance: A Practitioner's Guide", University of Lüneburg, Working Paper No. 227.

Yang, Y. and S. Mallick (2010), "Export Premium, Self-selection and Learning-by-Exporting: Evidence from Chinese Matched Firms", The World Economy, Vol. 33, no. 10, pp. 1218-1240.

Tables and Figures

Table 1: Number of firms (and percentage) in each category of firm for 2006-2014 period

Exporters	9,076 (15.1%)
Non-exporters	51,249 (85.0%)
Always exporters	7,676 (12.7%)
Firms that have never exported	48,898 (81.1%)
Starters	2,659 (4.4%)
Stoppers	1,713 (2.8%)

Source: own calculations from icap database.

Table 2: Share of firms by exporting status and sector of economic activity in 2006-2014 period

	Exporters	Always exporters	Starters	Stoppers	Never exported
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	35.7	26.5	14.4	10.1	54.7
Mining and Quarrying	22.4	20.1	2.3	1.0	76.6
Manufacturing	53.2	44.1	12.8	7.9	38.6
Construction	2.7	1.6	2.0	1.6	95.5
Wholesale and Retail Trade	29.6	22.0	10.9	7.4	62.6
Accommodation and food service activities	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	99.6
Transport and Communication	9.5	6.2	5.7	2.4	86.8
Energy	2.6	1.3	2.3	0.9	95.9
Financial intermediation	4.3	2.3	3.3	1.7	93.2
Other services	0.9	0.6	0.7	0.4	98.5

Source: own calculations from icap database.
Note: The sectors of economic activity correspond to NACE Rev. 2 classification (see footnote 6).

Table 3: Impact of exporting on labour productivity in 2006-2014 period

	Fixed effects equation	Exporter premium
	β (p-value)	100(expβ-1)
All sectors	0.05 (0.000)	5.1
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	0.46 (0.000)	58.4
Mining and Quarrying	-0.85 (0.063)	-
Manufacturing	0.09 (0.000)	9.4
Construction	-0.17 (0.094)	-
Wholesale and Retail Trade	0.03 (0.015)	3.0
Accommodation and food service activities	0.58 (0.000)	78.6
Transport and Communication	0.005 (0.899)	-
Energy	0.006 (0.967)	-
Financial intermediation	0.15 (0.002)	16.2
Other services	-0.002 (0.987)	-

Notes: β is the estimated regression coefficient from a fixed effects regression of the logarithm of labour productivity on a dummy variable for exporting firms and year dummies. The numbers in brackets are p-values.
The sectors of economic activity correspond to NACE Rev. 2 classification (see footnote 6).

Table 4a: Impact of exporting on labour productivity with control variables in 2006-2014 period

Fixed-effects (within) regression			Number of obs = 212,052			
Group variable: icapid			Number of groups = 40,491			
R-sq:			Obs per group:			
within = 0.1234			min = 1			
between = 0.0050			avg = 5.2			
overall = 0.0062			max = 9			
corr(u_i, Xb) = -0.3803			F(14,171547) = 1725.37			
			Prob > F = 0.0000			
lnLabour productivity	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P>|t|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Export dummy	0.135	0.010	13.340	0.000	0.115	0.155
lnEmployment	-0.633	0.010	-61.230	0.000	-0.653	-0.613
lnEmployment^2	0.032	0.002	16.620	0.000	0.028	0.036
Company age	0.000	0.000	0.850	0.395	0.000	0.001
Company age^2	0.000	0.000	-0.670	0.501	0.000	0.000
Exporter size	0.000	0.000	-1.420	0.156	0.000	0.000
dum06	0.490	0.008	59.330	0.000	0.473	0.506
dum07	0.534	0.008	66.900	0.000	0.518	0.550
dum08	0.503	0.008	64.620	0.000	0.488	0.518
dum09	0.376	0.008	49.300	0.000	0.361	0.391
dum10	0.241	0.008	32.270	0.000	0.227	0.256
dum11	0.094	0.007	13.570	0.000	0.080	0.107
dum12	-0.030	0.007	-4.370	0.000	-0.044	-0.017
dum13	-0.043	0.007	-6.260	0.000	-0.056	-0.030
dum14	0	(omitted)				
Constant	12.519	0.017	740.99	0.000	12.486	12.552
sigma_u	1.5111					
sigma_e	0.6692					
Rho	0.8360					
F test joint significance of fixed effects: F(40490, 171547) = 16.67					Prob > F = 0.0000	
Hausman Test: $X^2(13)$ = 6807.72 (prob>X^2 = 0.000)						

Table 4b: Impact of exporting on labour productivity with control variables in 2006-2014 period (total economy and by sector of economic activity)

	Fixed effects	Exporter premium	Employment	Employment^2	Company age	Company age^2	Exporter Size
	β	100(expβ-1)					
	(p-value)		(p-value)	(p-value)	(p-value)	(p-value)	(p-value)
All sectors	0.135	14.5	-0.632	0.032	0.000	0.000	0.000
	(0.000)		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.395)	(0.501)	(0.156)
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	0.299	34.9	-1.059	0.088	-0.014	0.001	-0.001
	(0.021)		(0.000)	(0.124)	(0.566)	(0.148)	(0.683)
Mining and Quarrying	-0.110	-	-1.109	0.123	-0.029	0.001	-0.011
	(0.805)		(0.000)	(0.004)	(0.287)	(0.091)	(0.029)
Manufacturing	0.168	18.3	-0.575	0.039	0.000	0.000	0.000
	(0.000)		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.538)	(0.937)	(0.004)
Construction	0.049	-	-0.849	0.027	0.005	0.000	0.000
	(0.630)		(0.000)	(0.003)	(0.228)	(0.206)	(0.594)
Wholesale and Retail Trade	0.089	9.3	-0.589	0.044	0.000	0.000	0.000
	(0.000)		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.647)	(0.348)	(0.992)
Accommodation and food service activities	0.441	55.4	-0.885	0.056	-0.011	0.000	0.002
	(0.003)		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.008)
Transport and Communication	0.085	8.9	-0.517	0.011	0.003	0.000	0.000
	(0.040)		(0.000)	(0.062)	(0.231)	(0.539)	(0.909)
Energy	0.216	-	-0.956	0.084	-0.006	0.000	0.000
	(0.127)		(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.795)	(0.402)	(0.018)
Financial intermediation	0.302	35.3	-0.719	0.038	0.004	0.000	0.000
	(0.000)		(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.176)	(0.242)	(0.565)
Other services	0.206	-	-0.596	0.008	0.004	0.000	0.000
	(0.323)		(0.000)	(0.489)	(0.488)	(0.271)	(0.986)

Notes: β is the estimated regression coefficient from a fixed effects regression of the logarithm of labour productivity on a dummy variable for exporting firms controlling for the number of employees and its squared value, exporter size captured by an interaction term between export status and size, and company's age and company's age squared. We also add year dummies. The numbers in brackets are p-values. The sectors of economic activity correspond to NACE Rev. 2 classification (see footnote 6).

Table 5a: The impact of exporting on labour productivity growth in 2006-2014 period

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs =	170,453
Model	1307.0855	94	13.9052	F(94, 170358) =	26.87
Residual	88160.3466	170,358	0.51750	Prob > F =	0.000
Total	89467.4321	170,452	0.52488	R-squared =	0.015
				Adj R-squared =	0.014
				Root MSE =	0.719

ΔlnLabour productivity	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P>|t|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Always Exporters	0.0359	0.0054	6.66	0.000	0.025	0.046
Export Starters	0.0627	0.0067	9.38	0.000	0.050	0.076
Export Stoppers	-0.0042	0.0079	-0.53	0.597	-0.020	0.011
lnEmployment	-0.0432	0.0042	-10.38	0.000	-0.051	-0.035
lnEmployment^2	0.0056	0.0007	7.94	0.000	0.004	0.007
Company age	0.0001	0.0002	0.73	0.466	0.000	0.000
Company age^2	0.0000	0.0000	-0.48	0.634	0.000	0.000
Exporter Size	0.0000	0.0000	-1.21	0.227	0.000	0.000
dum06	0.0000	(omitted)				
dum07	0.0487	0.0071	6.81	0.000	0.035	0.063
dum08	-0.0288	0.0071	-4.04	0.000	-0.043	-0.015
dum09	-0.1279	0.0072	-17.87	0.000	-0.142	-0.114
dum10	-0.1329	0.0072	-18.39	0.000	-0.147	-0.119
dum11	-0.1507	0.0073	-20.64	0.000	-0.165	-0.136
dum12	-0.1413	0.0073	-19.27	0.000	-0.156	-0.127
dum13	-0.0330	0.0074	-4.46	0.000	-0.047	-0.018
dum14	0	(omitted)				
constant	0.0982	0.0406	2.42	0.016	0.019	0.178

Note: These results are from an OLS regression.

Table 5b: Impact of exporting on labour productivity growth in 2006-2014 period (total economy and by sector of economic activity)

	Always exporters	Starters	Stoppers	Employment	Employment^2	Company age	Company age^2	Exporter size
	(p-value)	(p-value)	(p-value)	(p-value)	(p-value)	(p-value)	(p-value)	(p-value)
All sectors	0.036	0.063	-0.004	-0.043	0.006	0.000	0.000	0.000
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.597)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.466)	(0.634)	(0.227)
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	0.012	0.205	-0.083	-0.058	0.012	-0.005	0.000	0.000
	(0.897)	(0.026)	(0.475)	(0.675)	(0.700)	(0.573)	(0.675)	(0.825)
Mining and Quarrying	-0.043	-0.116	0.620	0.068	-0.016	-0.003	0.000	0.001
	(0.751)	(0.624)	(0.112)	(0.611)	(0.536)	(0.882)	(0.966)	(0.417)
Manufacturing	0.059	0.084	0.001	-0.114	0.016	0.000	0.000	0.000
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.908)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.989)	(0.689)	(0.008)
Construction	0.069	0.041	0.069	-0.078	0.008	0.002	0.000	0.000
	(0.357)	(0.572)	(0.360)	(0.005)	(0.128)	(0.122)	(0.149)	(0.448)
Wholesale and Retail Trade	0.023	0.051	0.000	-0.022	0.004	-0.001	0.000	0.000
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.984)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.030)	(0.019)	(0.224)
Accommodation and food service activities	-0.113	0.172	-0.114	-0.027	0.002	-0.001	0.000	0.000
	(0.178)	(0.108)	(0.203)	(0.012)	(0.258)	(0.165)	(0.120)	(0.321)
Transport and Communication	0.059	0.051	-0.002	-0.036	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000
	(0.016)	(0.042)	(0.965)	(0.010)	(0.051)	(0.910)	(0.891)	(0.631)
Energy	-0.023	0.012	-0.081	-0.083	0.011	-0.027	0.000	0.000
	(0.842)	(0.905)	(0.537)	(0.097)	(0.170)	(0.001)	(0.005)	(0.442)
Financial intermediation	0.033	0.059	-0.062	-0.027	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000
	(0.358)	(0.053)	(0.136)	(0.034)	(0.103)	(0.638)	(0.413)	(0.745)
Other services	0.140	0.014	0.065	-0.003	-0.001	-0.005	0.000	0.001
	(0.905)	(0.884)	(0.591)	(0.898)	(0.777)	(0.011)	(0.019)	(0.840)

Notes: These results are from an OLS regression. The numbers in brackets are p-values.
The sectors of economic activity correspond to NACE Rev. 2 classification (see footnote 6).

Table 6: Impact of exporting on labour productivity growth in 2006-2014 period across different firm size

	Always exporters	Starters	Stoppers	Employment	Employment^2	Company age	Company age^2	Exporter size
	(p-value)	(p-value)	(p-value)	(p-value)	(p-value)	(p-value)	(p-value)	(p-value)
"1-9"	0.063	0.097	0.014	-0.123	0.037	0.000	0.000	-0.006
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.379)	(0.005)	(0.014)	(0.668)	(0.998)	(0.031)
"10-19"	0.059	0.070	0.005	0.128	-0.018	0.000	0.000	-0.003
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.730)	(0.776)	(0.836)	(0.598)	(0.421)	(0.016)
"20-49"	0.049	0.040	-0.022	-0.014	0.003	0.0005	0.000	0.000
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.072)	(0.963)	(0.939)	(0.034)	(0.120)	(0.319)
"50-249"	0.020	0.026	-0.010	0.033	-0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000
	(0.219)	(0.098)	(0.575)	(0.857)	(0.873)	(0.572)	(0.199)	(0.780)
"250+"	0.024	0.022	-0.018	-0.014	0.001	-0.001	0.000	0.000
	(0.586)	(0.623)	(0.733)	(0.938)	(0.969)	(0.278)	(0.402)	(0.787)

Note: These results are from an OLS regression. The numbers in brackets are p-values.

Table 7: Impact of exporting on employment growth in 2006-2014 period

	Always exporters (p-value)	Starters (p-value)	Stoppers (p-value)	Company age (p-value)	Company age^2 (p-value)	Exporter size (p-value)
All sectors	0.003 (0.208)	0.033 (0.000)	-0.051 (0.000)	-0.001 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	0.026 (0.360)	-0.019 (0.544)	0.067 (0.064)	-0.003 (0.346)	0.000 (0.793)	0.000 (0.145)
Mining and Quarrying	-0.059 (0.345)	0.018 (0.885)	-0.795 (0.000)	0.019 (0.030)	0.000 (0.064)	0.001 (0.439)
Manufacturing	-0.001 (0.822)	0.036 (0.000)	-0.051 (0.000)	-0.001 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)
Construction	-0.050 (0.069)	0.054 (0.036)	-0.066 (0.017)	-0.003 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)
Wholesale and Retail Trade	0.006 (0.047)	0.029 (0.000)	-0.041 (0.000)	-0.003 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)
Accommodation and food service activities	-0.016 (0.648)	0.036 (0.414)	-0.049 (0.176)	0.000 (0.004)	0.000 (0.021)	0.000 (0.685)
Transport and Communication	-0.013 (0.200)	0.028 (0.009)	-0.050 (0.001)	-0.003 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.315)
Energy	-0.182 (0.641)	0.086 (0.007)	-0.013 (0.766)	-0.007 (0.012)	0.000 (0.087)	0.000 (0.640)
Financial intermediation	-0.01 (0.440)	0.03 (0.006)	-0.11 (0.000)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.000)	0.00 (0.000)
Other services	-0.066 (0.157)	0.066 (0.094)	-0.136 (0.005)	-0.003 (0.001)	0.000 (0.068)	0.001 (0.691)

Notes: These results are from an OLS regression. The numbers in brackets are p-values.
The sectors of economic activity correspond to NACE Rev. 2 classification (see footnote 6).

Table 8a: Exporter productivity premium: robustness checks

	All sectors	Agriculture, forestry and fishing	Mining and Quarrying	Manufacturing	Construction	Wholesale and Retail Trade	Accommodation and food service activities	Transport and Communication	Energy	Financial intermediation	Other services
Exporter premium with lagged productivity	10.5	-	-	15.0	-	6.2	7.7	-	-	23.4	-
Exporter premium using Arellano-Bond estimator	3.9										

Note: The sectors of economic activity correspond to NACE Rev. 2 classification (see footnote 6).

Table 8b: Impact of exporting on labour productivity: Quantile regressions

	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7	0.8	0.9
Exporter premia without instruments	31.0	16.2	8.3	11.6	10.5	4.1	4.1	44.8	43.3
Exporter premia with instruments	49.2	55.3	11.6	31.0	-	-17.3	28.4	11.6	-

Table 9: Impact of Exporting on RoA in 2006-2014 period

	Fixed effects equation	Exporter premium
	β	$100(\exp\beta-1)$
	(p-value)	
All sectors	0.0274	2.8
	(0.042)	
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	0.3573	42.9
	(0.027)	
Mining and Quarrying	-0.5419	-
	(0.576)	
Manufacturing	0.084	8.8
	(0.000)	
Construction	0.1681	-
	(0.074)	
Wholesale and Retail Trade	0.0285	-
	(0.117)	
Accommodation and food service activities	0.3781	-
	(0.116)	
Transport and Communication	-0.0452	-
	(0.423)	
Energy	-0.5588	-
	(0.000)	
Financial intermediation	-0.0014	-
	(0.981)	
Other services	-0.0554	-
	(0.793)	

Notes: β is the estimated regression coefficient from a fixed effects regression of the logarithm of RoA on a dummy variable for exporting firms and year dummies. The numbers in brackets are p-values. The sectors of economic activity correspond to NACE Rev. 2 classification (see footnote 6).

Table 10: Impact of exporting on RoA with control variables in 2006-2014 period by sector of economic activity

	Fixed effects equation	Export premium	Employment	Employment^2	Company age	Company age^2	Exporter size
	β (p-value)	100(expβ-1)	(p-value)	(p-value)	(p-value)	(p-value)	(p-value)
All sectors	0.0003 (0.981)	-	0.032 (0.032)	0.016 (0.000)	-0.003 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.215)
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	0.338 (0.059)	40.3	0.427 (0.219)	-0.086 (0.276)	0.018 (0.539)	-0.001 (0.320)	0.022 (0.425)
Mining and Quarrying	-0.395 (0.653)	-	0.335 (0.472)	-0.057 (0.462)	0.112 (0.135)	-0.001 (0.233)	-0.026 (0.024)
Manufacturing	0.032 (0.168)	-	0.087 (0.021)	0.025 (0.001)	-0.007 (0.000)	0.000 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.024)
Construction	0.237 (0.013)	26.7	-0.046 (0.341)	0.019 (0.054)	0.000 (0.974)	0.000 (0.897)	0.000 (0.097)
Wholesale and Retail Trade	-0.005 (0.808)	-	0.012 (0.639)	0.030 (0.000)	-0.005 (0.000)	0.000 (0.018)	0.000 (0.261)
Accommodation and food service activities	-0.134 (0.627)	-	-0.168 (0.010)	0.053 (0.000)	-0.010 (0.067)	0.000 (0.646)	0.006 (0.001)
Transport and Communication	-0.043 (0.458)	-	0.073 (0.190)	-0.013 (0.182)	0.002 (0.469)	0.000 (0.652)	0.000 (0.628)
Energy	-0.499 (0.001)	-	0.180 (0.135)	-0.058 (0.024)	0.010 (0.627)	0.000 (0.768)	0.000 (0.423)
Financial intermediation	-0.006 (0.931)	-	0.050 (0.246)	0.004 (0.583)	-0.009 (0.025)	0.000 (0.094)	0.001 (0.002)
Other services	-0.356 (0.333)	-	-0.123 (0.257)	0.037 (0.032)	-0.008 (0.349)	0.000 (0.949)	0.015 (0.194)

Notes: β is the estimated regression coefficient from a fixed effects regression of the logarithm RoA on a dummy variable for exporting firms controlling for the ln number of employees and its squared value, exporter size captured by an interaction term between export status and size, and company's age and company's squared age. We also add year dummies. The numbers in brackets are p-values. The sectors of economic activity correspond to NACE Rev. 2 classification (see footnote 6).

Figure 1: Share (in percent total) of exporting firms by sector of economic activity

Source: own calculations from icap database.
Note: "AG" = Agriculture, forestry and fishing , "MQ" = Mining and Quarrying, "M" = Manufacturing, "C" = Construction, "WRT" = Wholesale and Retail Trade, "HR" = Hotels and Restaurants, "TC" = Transport and Communication, "E" = Energy, "FI" = Financial intermediation activities and "OS" = Other services (see also footnote 6).

Figure 2: Share of exporting firms by size class in 2006-2014 period

Source: own calculations from icap database.

**Figure 3**

Median labour productivity

Legend: 2006-2009, 2010-2014

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.
Note: AG = Agriculture, forestry and fishing, C = Construction, E = Energy, FI = Financial Intermediation, HR= Hotels and Restaurants, M = Manufacturing, MQ = Mining and Quarrying, OS = Other Services, RE = Real Estate, TC = Transport and Communication, WRT = Wholesale and Retail Trade (see also footnote 6).

Figure 4

Median labour productivity

Legend: exporting firms, non-exporting firms

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.
Note: AG = Agriculture, forestry and fishing, C = Construction, E = Energy, FI = Financial Intermediation, HR= Hotels and Restaurants, M = Manufacturing, MQ = Mining and Quarrying, OS = Other Services, RE = Real Estate, TC = Transport and Communication, WRT = Wholesale and Retail Trade (see also footnote 6).

Figure 5

Labour productivity, median, by exporting status

Legend: exporting firms, non-exporting firms

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.

Figure 6

Labour productivity median, by size class

Legend: 1-9, 10-19, 20-49, 50-249, 250+

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.

Figure 7

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.

Figure 8



Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.

Figure 9

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.
Note: AG = Agriculture, forestry and fishing, C = Construction, E = Energy, FI = Financial Intermediation, HR= Hotels and Restaurants, M = Manufacturing, MQ = Mining and Quarrying, OS = Other Services, RE = Real Estate, TC = Transport and Communication, WRT = Wholesale and Retail Trade (see also footnote 6).

Figure 10

operating profit, median, by size class

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.

Figure 11

Median operating profits to total assets

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.
Note: AG = Agriculture, forestry and fishing, C = Construction, E = Energy, FI = Financial Intermediation, HR= Hotels and Restaurants, M = Manufacturing, MQ = Mining and Quarrying, OS = Other Services, RE = Real Estate, TC = Transport and Communication, WRT = Wholesale and Retail Trade (see also footnote 6).

Figure 12

operating profit, median, by exporting status

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.

Appendix I

In this Appendix, we present some more descriptive statistics relating to our sample and focus again on differences in either performance or financial indicators across time, sector, size and exporting activity.

Looking at the evolution of **median investment ratio** across sectors (defined as the change in stock of fixed capital over total assets) it appears that all sectors were hit severely by the crisis (Figure I.1). The median investment ratio rises with rising size of the company, perhaps reflecting relatively looser financial conditions in larger companies (Figure I.2). The median investment ratio is slightly higher for exporting firms compared to non-exporting (Figure I.3).

There is evidence in the literature both at the euro area level (Ferrando et al. 2015) and for Greece (Bardakas, 2014) that financing of corporates and their ability to access external financing has a direct impact on export activity and performance. In this respect, it is useful to review some indices capturing the structure of external funding.

Mean debt over equity. The mean is preferred to the median for this indicator due to the presence of many zeros which results in the median for many sectors being zero. The ratio generally followed a downward trend in the crisis period and across broad sectors, with the exception of the tourism sector, other services and real estate (Figure I.4). At the two-digit industry level, the mean debt equity ratio was also higher in fishing and aquaculture, basic metals, basic pharmaceutical products, furniture, manufacture of paper and paper products, motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers sector, other non-metallic mineral products, printing and reproduction of recorded media, air transport and repair of motor vehicles and motor cycles. The debt to equity ratio is generally higher for exporters compared to non-exporters and for larger firms (Figures I.5, I.6).

Median equity to total assets rose through the crisis for most sectors (Figure I.7) and size categories of firms with the exception of large companies (250+) (Figure I.8). As expected and shown in Figure I.8, the median equity to total assets ratio is

inversely related to size, as smaller firms cannot easily get access to debt. Non-exporting firms have experienced a higher rise in the median equity to total assets ratio compared to exporting probably suggesting that exporting firms can more easily obtain external funding (Figure I.9).

Mean leverage (debt over total assets) generally fell across sectors in the crisis period (a pick-up is only observed for large companies in 2011), with the exception of a rise in the energy and tourism sectors (Figure I.10). This result reflects the general trend observed towards deleveraging following the outbreak of the international financial crisis. Unsurprisingly, leverage is positively related to size (Figure I.11) and exporting activity (Figure I.12).

Finally, **median trade credit** (accounts payable over total assets) fell through crisis for most sectors, except for agriculture, forestry and fishing (mainly related to fishing and aquaculture) and energy (Figure I.13). It seems to be an important source of finance mainly for SMEs. As shown in Figure I.14, it fell sharply in 2007-2010 and then started recovering to stabilize at a lower level compared to pre-crisis period. The Figure shows the expected procyclical pattern of trade credit. Median trade credit is steadily higher for exporting firms compared to non-exporting ones, again reflecting the generally easier credit conditions for firms to export (Figure I.15).

Figure I.1

Median investment ratio

Figure I.2

Investment ratio, median, by size class

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.
Note: AG = Agriculture, forestry and fishing, C = Construction, E = Energy, FI = Financial Intermediation, HR= Hotels and Restaurants, M = Manufacturing, MQ = Mining and Quarrying, OS = Other Services, RE = Real Estate, TC = Transport and Communication, WRT = Wholesale and Retail Trade (see also footnote 6).

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.

Figure I.3

Investment ratio, median, by exporting status

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.

Figure I.4

Mean debt equity ratio

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.
Note: AG = Agriculture, forestry and fishing, C = Construction, E = Energy, FI = Financial Intermediation, HR= Hotels and Restaurants, M = Manufacturing, MQ = Mining and Quarrying, OS = Other Services, RE = Real Estate, TC = Transport and Communication, WRT = Wholesale and Retail Trade (see also footnote 6).

Figure I.5

debt-equity ratio, mean, by size class

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.

Figure I.6

Mean debt equity ratio

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.

Figure I.7

Median equity to total assets

Figure I.8

equity to total assets, median, by size class

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.
Note: AG = Agriculture, forestry and fishing, C = Construction, E = Energy, FI = Financial Intermediation, HR= Hotels and Restaurants, M = Manufacturing, MQ = Mining and Quarrying, OS = Other Services, RE = Real Estate, TC = Transport and Communication, WRT = Wholesale and Retail Trade (see also footnote 6).

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.

Figure I.9

equity to total assets, median, by exporting status

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.

Figure I.10

Mean leverage

Figure I.11

leverage, mean, by size class

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.

Note: AG = Agriculture, forestry and fishing, C = Construction, E = Energy, FI = Financial Intermediation, HR= Hotels and Restaurants, M = Manufacturing, MQ = Mining and Quarrying, OS = Other Services, RE = Real Estate, TC = Transport and Communication, WRT = Wholesale and Retail Trade (see also footnote 6).

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.

Figure I.12

leverage, mean, by exporting status

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.

Figure I.13

Median trade credit

Figure I.14

trade credit, median, by size class

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.

Note: AG = Agriculture, forestry and fishing, C = Construction, E = Energy, FI = Financial Intermediation, HR= Hotels and Restaurants, M = Manufacturing, MQ = Mining and Quarrying, OS = Other Services, RE = Real Estate, TC = Transport and Communication, WRT = Wholesale and Retail Trade (see also footnote 6).

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.

Figure I.15

trade credit, median, by exporting status

Source: own calculations from ICAP dataset.

Appendix II

Table II.1: Impact of exporting on labour productivity growth in 2006-2014 period for firm size "1-9"

	Always exporters (p-value)	Starters (p-value)	Stoppers (p-value)	Employment (p-value)	Employment^2 (p-value)	Company age (p-value)	Company age^2 (p-value)	Exporter size (p-value)
All sectors	0.063 (0.000)	0.097 (0.000)	0.014 (0.379)	-0.123 (0.005)	0.037 (0.014)	0.000 (0.668)	0.000 (0.998)	-0.006 (0.031)
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	-0.370 (0.132)	0.102 (0.527)	-0.091 (0.698)	-0.250 (0.738)	0.033 (0.901)	-0.009 (0.686)	0.000 (0.557)	0.024 (0.488)
Mining and Quarrying	0.608 (0.508)	0.528 (0.570)	0.544 (0.412)	-1.367 (0.507)	0.556 (0.428)	-0.055 (0.269)	0.001 (0.326)	-0.109 (0.444)
Manufacturing	0.114 (0.000)	0.126 (0.000)	0.019 (0.482)	-0.274 (0.011)	0.077 (0.037)	-0.001 (0.066)	0.000 (0.132)	-0.011 (0.024)
Construction	-0.093 (0.698)	-0.029 (0.864)	0.044 (0.793)	0.192 (0.484)	-0.088 (0.373)	0.003 (0.432)	0.000 (0.505)	0.030 (0.356)
Wholesale and Retail Trade	0.050 (0.010)	0.084 (0.000)	0.018 (0.304)	-0.072 (0.224)	0.030 (0.156)	-0.002 (0.025)	0.000 (0.019)	-0.005 (0.112)
Accommodation and food service activities	0.407 (0.351)	1.190 (0.180)	0.624 (0.069)	-0.160 (0.078)	0.050 (0.107)	-0.004 (0.026)	0.000 (0.150)	-0.151 (0.177)
Transport and Communication	0.084 (0.383)	0.113 (0.090)	-0.008 (0.929)	-0.349 (0.053)	0.107 (0.086)	-0.001 (0.806)	0.000 (0.714)	-0.005 (0.696)
Energy	0.037 (0.908)	0.069 (0.783)	-0.269 (0.351)	-0.701 (0.256)	0.263 (0.252)	-0.103 (0.000)	0.003 (0.001)	-0.025 (0.596)
Financial intermediation	0.068 (0.506)	0.065 (0.395)	-0.022 (0.774)	-0.171 (0.213)	0.060 (0.215)	-0.001 (0.627)	0.000 (0.323)	0.002 (0.870)
Other services	-0.057 (0.893)	0.165 (0.508)	0.000 (omitted)	0.392 (0.221)	-0.142 (0.201)	-0.018 (0.040)	0.000 (0.084)	-0.034 (0.757)

Notes: These results are from an OLS regression. The numbers in brackets are p-values. The sectors of economic activity correspond to NACE Rev. 2 classification (see footnote 6).

Table II.2: Impact of exporting on labour productivity growth in 2006-2014 period for firm size "10-19"

	Always exporters (p-value)	Starters (p-value)	Stoppers (p-value)	Employment (p-value)	Employment^2 (p-value)	Company age (p-value)	Company age^2 (p-value)	Exporter size (p-value)
All sectors	0.059	0.070	0.005	0.128	-0.018	0.000	0.000	-0.003
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.730)	(0.776)	(0.836)	(0.598)	(0.421)	(0.016)
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	0.187	0.278	-0.400	12.513	-2.465	-0.046	0.001	-0.008
	(0.684)	(0.319)	(0.307)	(0.582)	(0.579)	(0.357)	(0.425)	(0.784)
Mining and Quarrying	1.101	0.444	0.000	2.370	-0.504	-0.016	0.000	-0.066
	(0.554)	(0.756)	(omitted)	(0.849)	(0.834)	(0.689)	(0.654)	(0.591)
Manufacturing	0.073	0.110	-0.011	0.347	-0.06359	0.002	0.000	-0.003
	(0.005)	(0.000)	(0.600)	(0.680)	(0.696)	(0.105)	(0.512)	(0.091)
Construction	0.220	-0.095	0.278	-2.988	0.587	0.013	0.000	-0.017
	(0.319)	(0.490)	(0.045)	(0.348)	(0.342)	(0.007)	(0.056)	(0.195)
Wholesale and Retail Trade	0.040	0.047	0.000	-0.067	0.024	-0.002	0.000	-0.002
	(0.044)	(0.002)	(0.992)	(0.914)	(0.844)	(0.049)	(0.098)	(0.119)
Accommodation and food service activities	1.094	0.000	-0.006	0.863	-0.161	0.001	0.000	-0.068
	(0.063)	(omitted)	(0.981)	(0.433)	(0.447)	(0.626)	(0.694)	(0.052)
Transport and Communication	0.043	0.052	0.055	-0.156	0.039	0.000	0.000	-0.001
	(0.609)	(0.389)	(0.461)	(0.927)	(0.906)	(0.862)	(0.796)	(0.774)
Energy	0.639	-0.171	0.368	2.986	-0.611	-0.075	0.002	-0.023
	(0.110)	(0.499)	(0.225)	(0.752)	(0.739)	(0.028)	(0.154)	(0.280)
Financial intermediation	0.0656	0.129	0.024	0.747	-0.142169	-0.007	-0.003	-0.003
	(0.563)	(0.099)	(0.800)	(0.716)	(0.722)	(0.041)	(0.681)	(0.681)
Other services	0.555	0.026	0.019	-0.340	0.060	-0.019	0.000	-0.004
	(0.299)	(0.941)	(0.894)	(0.886)	(0.895)	(0.000)	(0.012)	(0.902)

Notes: These results are from an OLS regression. The numbers in brackets are p-values. The sectors of economic activity correspond to NACE Rev. 2 classification (see footnote 6).

Table II.3: Impact of exporting on labour productivity growth in 2006-2014 period for firm size "20-49"

	Always exporters (p-value)	Starters (p-value)	Stoppers (p-value)	Employment (p-value)	Employment^2 (p-value)	Company age (p-value)	Company age^2 (p-value)	Exporter size (p-value)
All sectors	0.049 (0.001)	0.040 (0.001)	-0.022 (0.072)	-0.014 (0.963)	0.003 (0.939)	0.0005 (0.034)	0.000 (0.120)	0.000 (0.319)
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	0.089 (0.724)	0.162 (0.462)	-0.008 (0.958)	4.723 (0.411)	-0.669 (0.430)	0.020 (0.359)	0.000 (0.351)	0.001 (0.887)
Mining and Quarrying	0.906 (0.099)	0.000 (omitted)	0.000 (omitted)	-7.647 (0.337)	1.137 (0.340)	0.013 (0.526)	0.000 (0.428)	-0.031 (0.123)
Manufacturing	0.084 (0.000)	0.075 (0.000)	0.000 (0.979)	-0.392 (0.384)	0.062 (0.351)	0.000 (0.717)	0.000 (0.979)	-0.001 (0.139)
Construction	-0.196 (0.287)	0.080 (0.429)	-0.143 (0.224)	1.590 (0.490)	-0.239 (0.481)	0.004 (0.109)	0.0000 (0.118)	0.005 (0.267)
Wholesale and Retail Trade	0.039 (0.029)	0.030 (0.043)	-0.022 (0.154)	0.280 (0.528)	-0.038 (0.565)	0.001 (0.174)	0.000 (0.686)	-0.001 (0.260)
Accommodation and food service activities	-0.089 (0.831)	0.129 (0.600)	-0.117 (0.524)	0.312 (0.707)	-0.047 (0.699)	-0.002 (0.283)	0.000 (0.134)	-0.001 (0.928)
Transport and Communication	0.075 (0.235)	-0.018 (0.704)	0.005 (0.925)	-0.522 (0.634)	0.074 (0.649)	-0.002 (0.305)	0.000 (0.374)	-0.001 (0.769)
Energy	-0.121 (0.616)	-0.005 (0.977)	-0.078 (0.767)	-6.310 (0.224)	0.948 (0.213)	-0.044 (0.150)	0.001 (0.204)	0.004 (0.529)
Financial intermediation	0.1297 (0.127)	0.010 (0.847)	0.007 (0.911)	0.022 (0.986)	-0.008 (0.966)	-0.007 (0.024)	0.000 (0.022)	-0.003 (0.178)
Other services	-0.084 (0.690)	-0.088 (0.463)	-0.074 (0.691)	-1.391 (0.282)	0.209 (0.271)	-0.001 (0.692)	0.000 (0.597)	0.002 (0.653)

Notes: These results are from an OLS regression. The numbers in brackets are p-values. The sectors of economic activity correspond to NACE Rev. 2 classification (see footnote 6).

Table II.4: Impact of exporting on labour productivity growth in 2006-2014 period for firm size "50-249"

	Always exporters (p-value)	Starters (p-value)	Stoppers (p-value)	Employment (p-value)	Employment^2 (p-value)	Company age (p-value)	Company age^2 (p-value)	Exporter size (p-value)
All sectors	0.020 (0.219)	0.026 (0.098)	-0.010 (0.575)	0.033 (0.857)	-0.003 (0.873)	0.000 (0.572)	0.000 (0.199)	0.000 (0.780)
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	-0.529 (0.358)	-0.321 (0.530)	-0.399 (0.448)	-1.211 (0.813)	0.120 (0.842)	-0.002 (0.944)	0.000 (0.669)	0.002 (0.698)
Mining and Quarrying	-5.424 (0.049)	0.000 (omitted)	0.000 (omitted)	56.984 (0.054)	-7.036 (0.051)	0.487 (0.076)	-0.009 (0.063)	0.069 (0.048)
Manufacturing	0.047 (0.101)	0.033 (0.216)	0.008 (0.791)	0.345 (0.243)	-0.034 (0.306)	0.000 (0.942)	0.000 (0.697)	0.000 (0.396)
Construction	0.151 (0.279)	0.057 (0.600)	0.139 (0.202)	-1.285 (0.322)	0.136 (0.341)	-0.003 (0.670)	-0.0032 (0.670)	-0.001 (0.397)
Wholesale and Retail Trade	0.020 (0.375)	0.020 (0.345)	-0.005 (0.842)	0.499 (0.107)	-0.053 (0.117)	-0.004 (0.001)	0.000 (0.002)	0.000 (0.781)
Accommodation and food service activities	-0.756 (0.001)	0.134 (0.269)	-0.335 (0.006)	0.117 (0.820)	-0.016 (0.784)	0.002 (0.182)	0.000 (0.517)	0.005 (0.002)
Transport and Communication	0.077 (0.155)	0.133 (0.006)	-0.040 (0.499)	-1.281 (0.030)	0.142 (0.028)	0.000 (0.902)	0.000 (0.886)	-0.001 (0.148)
Energy	0.015 (0.951)	-0.132 (0.394)	0.070 (0.648)	-0.307 (0.901)	0.024 (0.928)	-0.011 (0.417)	0.000 (0.512)	-0.001 (0.510)
Financial intermediation	-0.0707 (0.385)	0.017 (0.792)	-0.125 (0.129)	-0.622 (0.373)	0.067 (0.374)	-0.002 (0.546)	0.000 (0.723)	0.001 (0.348)
Other services	-0.578 (0.391)	-0.189 (0.557)	-0.234 (0.434)	0.181 (0.836)	-0.023 (0.806)	0.001 (0.744)	0.000 (0.984)	0.001 (0.764)

Notes: These results are from an OLS regression. The numbers in brackets are p-values. The sectors of economic activity correspond to NACE Rev. 2 classification (see footnote 6).

Table II.5: Impact of exporting on labour productivity growth in 2006-2014 period for firm size "250+"

	Always exporters (p-value)	Starters (p-value)	Stoppers (p-value)	Employment (p-value)	Employment^2 (p-value)	Company age (p-value)	Company age^2 (p-value)	Exporter size (p-value)
All sectors	0.024 (0.586)	0.022 (0.623)	-0.018 (0.733)	-0.014 (0.938)	0.001 (0.969)	-0.001 (0.278)	0.000 (0.402)	0.000 (0.787)
Agriculture, forestry and fishing	0.000 (omitted)	0.000 (omitted)	0.000 (omitted)	0.000 (omitted)	0.000 (omitted)	0.000 (omitted)	0.000 (omitted)	0.000 (omitted)
Mining and Quarrying	0.000 (omitted)	0.000 (omitted)	0.000 (omitted)	0.000 (omitted)	-0.530 (0.271)	0.651 (0.317)	-0.007 (0.242)	-0.005 (0.808)
Manufacturing	0.017 (0.917)	0.061 (0.696)	0.020 (0.893)	0.216 (0.909)	-0.020 (0.902)	-0.011 (0.001)	0.000 (0.006)	0.000 (0.772)
Construction	0.219 (0.295)	0.019 (0.927)	0.231 (0.315)	-0.387 (0.855)	0.026 (0.864)	0.023 (0.239)	-0.0003 (0.388)	0.000 (0.553)
Wholesale and Retail Trade	-0.014 (0.705)	-0.012 (0.766)	-0.007 (0.880)	-0.5246 (0.014)	0.0356 (0.021)	-0.003 (0.0363)	0.000 (0.477)	0.000 (0.784)
Accommodation and food service activities	-0.294 (0.685)	0.232 (0.790)	0 (omitted)	0.369 (0.927)	-0.034 (0.917)	0.007 (0.438)	0.000 (0.597)	0.000 (0.870)
Transport and Communication	0.218 (0.114)	0.038 (0.729)	-0.009 (0.950)	0.349 (0.444)	-0.029 (0.363)	-0.003 (0.341)	0.000 (0.351)	0.000 (0.287)
Energy	0.561 (0.538)	0.086 (0.767)	0.000 (omitted)	-1.382 (0.337)	0.099 (0.318)	0.008 (0.700)	0.000 (0.686)	0.000 (0.210)
Financial intermediation	0.085 (0.727)	0.036 (0.754)	-0.129 (0.442)	0.105 (0.796)	-0.003 (0.920)	0.001 (0.852)	0.000 (0.672)	0.000 (0.932)
Other services	0.000 (omitted)	0.000 (omitted)	0.000 (omitted)	0.643 (0.707)	-0.065 (0.616)	0.082 (0.000)	-0.001 (0.001)	0.000 (omitted)

Notes: These results are from an OLS regression. The numbers in brackets are p-values. The sectors of economic activity correspond to NACE Rev. 2 classification (see footnote 6).

Appendix III

Table III.1: Impact of exporting on labour productivity: Quantile regressions with size control and without instruments

Quantiles	All sectors	Agriculture, forestry and fishing	Mining and Quarrying	Manufacturing	Construction	Wholesale and Retail Trade	Accommodation and food service activities	Transport and Communication	Energy	Financial intermediation	Other services
0.1	31.0	-	-	27.1	97.4	31.0	-	-	-	76.8	219.0
0.2	16.2	116.0	-	25.9	46.7	22.1	-	25.9	-	47.7	161.2
0.3	8.3	-	698.2	25.9	46.2	-3.9	-	36.3	-	35.0	101.4
0.4	11.6	-	-	12.7	47.7	22.1	-	27.1	-	41.9	107.5
0.5	10.5	-	-	16.2	49.2	-	-	19.7	-	27.1	-
0.6	4.1	-	-	19.7	49.2	4.1	-	18.5	-	28.4	64.9
0.7	4.1	84.1	-	17.4	35.0	-	-	-	-	22.1	-
0.8	44.8	95.4	-	15.0	41.9	27.1	-	-	-	19.7	-
0.9	43.3	95.4	-	29.7	53.7	28.4	-	-	-	-	-

Note: The sectors of economic activity correspond to NACE Rev. 2 classification (see footnote 6).

Table III.2: Impact of exporting on labour productivity: Quantile regressions with size control and instruments

Quantiles	All sectors	Agriculture, forestry and fishing	Mining and Quarrying	Manufacturing	Construction	Wholesale and Retail Trade	Accommodation and food service activities	Transport and Communication	Energy	Financial intermediation	Other services
0.1	49.2	-	-	40.5	-	-13.9	-	-	-	-	91.6
0.2	55.3	-	-	31.0	-	13.9	-	-	-	-	-
0.3	11.6	-	-	22.1	-	6.2	-	-	49.2	-	-
0.4	31.0	-	-	24.6	55.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
0.5	-	-	-	-	-	6.2	-	-	-	-	-
0.6	-17.3	-	-	-	52.2	-	-	-	-	22.1	-
0.7	28.4	-	-	-	-	-	200.4	-40.0	-	-	-
0.8	11.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
0.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Note: The sectors of economic activity correspond to NACE Rev. 2 classification (see footnote 6).

BANK OF GREECE WORKING PAPERS

210. Malliaropulos, D., and P.M. Migiakis, "The Re-Pricing of Sovereign Risks Following the Global Financial Crisis", July 2016.

211. Asimakopoulos, I., P.K. Avramidis, D. Malliaropulos, N. G. Travlos, "Moral Hazard and Strategic Default: Evidence from Greek Corporate Loans", July 2016.

212. Tavlas, S.G., "New Perspectives on the Great Depression: a Review Essay", September 2016.

213. Papapetrou, E. and P. Tsalaporta, "Inter-Industry Wage Differentials in Greece: Rent-Sharing and Unobserved Heterogeneity Hypotheses", November 2016.

214. Gibson, D.H, S.G. Hall, and G.S. Tavlas, "Self-Fulfilling Dynamics: the Interactions of Sovereign Spreads, Sovereign Ratings and Bank Ratings during the Euro Financial Crisis", November 2016.

215. Baumann, U. and M. Vasardani, "The Slowdown in US Productivity Growth - What Explains it and Will it Persist?", November 2016.

216. Tsionas. G.M., "Alternative Bayesian Compression in Vector Autoregressions and Related Models", November 2016.

217. Tsionas. G.M., "Alternatives to Large VAR, VARMA and Multivariate Stochastic Volatility Models", December 2016.

218. Balfoussia, H. and D. Papageorgiou, "Insights on the Greek Economy from the 3D Macro Model", December 2016.

219. Anastasiou, D., H. Louri and M. Tsionas, "Non-Performing Loans in the Euro Area: are Core-Periphery Banking Markets Fragmented?," December 2016.

220. Charalambakis, E., Y. Dendramis, and E. Tzavalis, "On the Determinants of NPLS: Lessons from Greece", March 2017.

221. Christou, G. and P. Chronis, Markups and fiscal policy: analytical framework and an empirical investigation, April 2017.

222. Papadopoulos, S., P. Stavroulias, T. Sager and E. Baranoff, "A Ternary-State Early Warning System for the European Union", April 2017.

223. Papapetrou, E. and P. Tsalaporta, "Is There a Case for Intergenerational Transmission of Female Labour Force Participation And Educational Attainment? Evidence from Greece during the Crisis, April 2017.

224. Siakoulis V., "Fiscal policy effects on non-performing loan formation", May 2017.

225. Hondroyiannis G. and D. Papaoikonomou, "The Effect of Card Payments on VAT Revenue in Greece", May 2017.

226. Mamatzakis E.C. and A.N. Vu, "The interplay between quantitative easing and risk: the case of the Japanese banking", May 2017.

227. Kosma, T., E. Papapetrou, G. Pavlou, C. Tsochatzi and P. Zioutou, "Labour Market Adjustments and Reforms in Greece During the Crisis: Microeconomic Evidence from the Third Wave of the Wage Dynamics Survey", June 2017.