


KONSTANTĪNS BEŅKOVSKIS  
JAAN MASSO  
OĻEGS TKAČEVŠ  
PRIIT VAHTER  
NAOMITSU YASHIRO

WORKING PAPER  
3 / 2018

## EXPORTS AND PRODUCTIVITY IN GLOBAL VALUE CHAINS: COMPARATIVE EVIDENCE FROM LATVIA AND ESTONIA



Originally published in the *OECD Economics Department Working Papers*, No. 1448, OECD Publishing, Paris. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/cd5710c4-en>

This source is to be indicated when reproduced.

© Latvijas Banka (design and layout), 2018

Benkovskis, K. et al. (2017), "Export and productivity in global value chains: Comparative evidence from Latvia and Estonia", *OECD Economics Department Working Papers*, No. 1448, OECD Publishing, Paris. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/cd5710c4-en>

OECD Working Papers should not be reported as representing the official views of the OECD or of its member countries. The opinion expressed and arguments employed are those of the author(s). Authorised for publication by Alvaro Pereira, Director, Country Studies Branch, Economics Department.

Working Papers describe preliminary results or research in progress by the author(s) and are published to stimulate discussion on a broad range of issues on which the OECD works.

Comments on Working Papers are welcomed, and may be sent to OECD Economics Department, 2 rue André-Pascal, 75775 Paris Cedex 16, France, or by e-mail to [eco.contact@oecd.org](mailto:eco.contact@oecd.org).

All Economics Department Working Papers are available at [www.oecd.org/eco/workingpapers](http://www.oecd.org/eco/workingpapers).

This document and any map included herein are without prejudice to the status of or sovereignty over any territory, to the delimitation of international frontiers and boundaries and to the name of any territory, city or area.

The statistical data for Israel are supplied by and under the responsibility of the relevant Israeli authorities.

The use of such data by the OECD is without prejudice to the status of the Golan Heights, East Jerusalem and Israeli settlements in the West Bank under the terms of international law.

## CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS	4
ABSTRACT	5
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	6
1. INTRODUCTION	7
2. DATA	9
Latvian data	9
Estonian data	9
Sample size	10
3. IMPORTANCE OF EXPORTERS IN LATVIA'S AND ESTONIA'S ECONOMY	10
Exporters are few, particularly in Latvia	11
Exporters account for a large share of total employment and turnover	12
Exports are concentrated among a few large exporters	12
4. LEARNING-BY-EXPORTING IN GLOBAL VALUE CHAINS	13
5. METHODOLOGY	14
OBSERVING THE PREMIUM OF GVC PARTICIPATION	15
EVALUATING THE EFFECT OF GVC PARTICIPATION	15
6. CHARACTERISTICS OF GVC PARTICIPANTS	17
The premium of GVC participants is large, especially in Latvia	17
GVC participants have higher productivity distribution than non-exporters	18
There are many firms that are too unproductive to enter export markets	20
Many productive firms are held back from entering export markets	20
7. DETERMINANTS OF GVC PARTICIPATION	21
8. THE EFFECT OF GVC PARTICIPATION	24
9. CONCLUSIONS	28
APPENDIX 1. THE ROLE OF SKILLS IN EXPORT ENTRY OF ESTONIAN FIRMS	30
APPENDIX 2. EXPORTS AND INNOVATION OF ESTONIAN FIRMS	34
BIBLIOGRAPHY	38

## TABLES

1. Sample size of baseline data of Latvian and Estonian firms	10
2. The share of exporters in the total number of firms (%)	11
3. The share of exporters in total employment (%)	12
4. The share of exporters in total turnover (%)	12
5. Weight of top-5% exporters in total exports (%)	13
6. Exporters' premium	18
7. The gap and overlap in the productivity distributions of exporters and non-exporters (%)	21
8. Probit estimation of the probability of export entry	23
9. Mean values of main determinants of export entry before and after matching	25
10. The effect of export entry on productivity and other measures of performance	27

11. Employment share of workers with export experience and skills composition	31
12. Regression coefficients of export experience and skills intensity	32
13. MNE experience of employees: estimated relationship with exporting	33
14. Exporters' premium in innovation	34
15. Determinants of innovation	36
16. Types of exporting and innovation	37

*FIGURES*

1. Labour productivity distribution of exporters versus non-exporters	19
2. Labour productivity distribution of goods exporters versus non-exporters	19
3. Labour productivity distribution of service exporters versus non-exporters	19

*ABBREVIATIONS*

ATT – average treatment effect on the treated
BERD – business-based R&D
BTDIXE – bilateral trade in goods by industry and end-use
CIS – community innovation survey
CN – combined nomenclature
EU – European Union
FDI – foreign direct investment
GDP – gross domestic product
GVC – global value chain
ICT – information and communications technology
ISCO – International Standard Classification of Occupations
MNE – multinational enterprise
NACE – nomenclature statistique des activités économiques dans la Communauté Européenne
OECD – Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OLS – ordinary least squares
R&D – research and development
TFP – total factor productivity
WTO – World Trade Organisation

**ABSTRACT**

This paper investigates the effect of export entry on productivity, employment and wages of Latvian and Estonian firms in the context of global value chains (GVCs). Like in many countries, exporting firms in Latvia and Estonia are more productive, larger, pay higher wages and are more capital-intensive than non-exporting firms. While this is partly because firms that are originally more productive and have better performances are more likely to enter exports, Latvian and Estonian firms also realise more than 23% and 14% higher labour productivity level respectively as the result of export entry. Export entry also increases employment and average wages. Gains in productivity and employment are particularly large when firms enter exports that are related to participation in knowledge-intensive activities found in the upstream of GVCs. For instance, Latvian firms that start exporting intermediate goods or non-transport services (which include knowledge-intensive services) enjoy significantly higher productivity gains than those starting to export final goods or transport services. These findings underscore the importance of innovation policies that strengthen firms' capabilities to supply highly differentiated knowledge-intensive goods and services to GVCs.

**Keywords:** productivity, global value chain, exports, Latvia, Estonia

**JEL codes:** F12, F14, O19, O57

Konstantīns Beņkovskis is an adviser at Latvijas Banka and associate professor at Stockholm School of Economics in Riga, Latvia. Jaan Masso and Priit Vahter are senior research fellows at the School of Economics and Business Administration of the University of Tartu, Estonia. Oļegs Tkačevs is chief econometrist at Latvijas Banka. Naomitsu Yashiro is an economist at the Economics Department in the OECD. This joint research has been conducted as an input to the 2017 OECD Economic Survey of Latvia. The authors are grateful for valuable comments by Jaanika Meriküll (Eesti Pank), Sónia Araújo, Elena Rustichelli, Åsa Johansson, Daniela Glocker, Andrés Fuentes Hutfilter, Robert Ford (OECD/Economics Department), Sebastian Benz (OECD/Trade and Agriculture Directorate) and participants at the OECD Economics Department Brown Bag Seminar. Special thanks are due to Dacil Kurzweg and Sisse Nielsen (OECD/Economics Department) for editorial support. All errors are authors' own.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This joint research by the OECD, Latvijas Banka and the University of Tartu, Estonia, explores the effect of export entry on productivity, employment and wages of Latvian and Estonian firms in the context of global value chains (GVCs). It provides a comparative analysis on the characteristics of exporters in the two countries and estimates the effect of export entry on productivity, employment and wages using propensity score matching. The research then explores whether these effects differ between exports associated with participation in different segments of GVCs, in particular, in the upstream or in the downstream of GVCs. It is found that:

- Like in many countries, only a few Latvian and Estonian firms export. In 2014, 6% of Latvian firms and 12% of Estonian firms exported. The lower export participation of Latvian firms as compared to Estonian firms remains a puzzle. One possible explanation is that Latvia's micro enterprise tax, which was introduced in 2011, encourages firms to remain small or split into smaller firms that are unable to cover the large entry costs of exports. However, considering that there are more micro enterprises in Estonia, this cannot be the main reason.
- Exporting firms are more productive, larger, pay higher wages and use more capital per worker than non-exporting firms. In Latvia and Estonia respectively, they exhibit on average 80% and 61% higher labour productivity, employ more than twice as many and 33% more workers, pay 62% and 48% higher wages and use 77% and 40% more capital per worker than non-exporting firms.
- Higher labour productivity and larger firm size increase the chance that a firm starts exporting. There are also other factors that facilitate export entry, such as hiring of workers and managers experienced with foreign markets.
- After controlling for the self-selection of more productive and larger firms into exports, it is found that export entry boosts the level of labour productivity by more than 23% (14%) among Latvian (Estonian) firms, increases employment by up to 21% (10%) among Latvian (Estonian) firms and also increases average wages of Latvian (Estonian) firms by up to 8% (7%).
- Export entry related to participation in well remunerated activities often found in the upstream of GVCs results in significant productivity and employment gains of Latvian firms. This is the case for starting exporting intermediate goods, re-exports and non-transport services. By contrast, exporting final goods or transport services yields little or no productivity or employment gains. While productivity gains from export entry are found across all types of exports in Estonia, they are the largest for exports of non-transport services.

Policies that enhance resource allocation and innovation can promote productivity growth by broadening the scope of firms participating in GVCs, especially in the upstream of GVCs.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

International trade is increasingly shaped by global value chains (GVCs)<sup>1</sup>. Participation in GVCs is considered to offer countries opportunities for knowledge transfer from multinational enterprises and intensive use of technologically advanced imported inputs that would boost productivity (OECD (2013)). Yet, aside from case studies, the empirical evidence of the effect of GVC participation on firm-level productivity is scant. This paper exploits micro data of Latvian and Estonian firms to assess whether participation in GVCs through exports raises productivity, employment and wages. In particular, the paper explores whether such effects differ across different activities found in the upstream or downstream of GVC.<sup>2</sup>

Prior empirical literature that investigated the causal relationship between productivity and exports has found abundant evidence on the self-selection of more productive firms into exports (Bernard and Jensen (1999; 2004)). On the other hand, evidence of productivity improvements following export entry – the so-called "learning-by-exporting" effects – are far from established. A large share of empirical studies shows that there is no evidence of statistically significant learning-by-exporting effects, suggesting that the large exporter productivity premium reflects primarily the self-selection<sup>3</sup>. Some authors, however, have found evidence supporting the learning-by-exporting hypothesis<sup>4</sup>. There is some evidence in favour of larger learning effects in the case of exporting to more advanced economies (De Loecker (2007)) or following entry with certain export strategies (Masso and Vahter (2015)). However, to our knowledge, there have been no attempts to assess learning-by-exporting in the context of GVC.

Latvia and Estonia are suitable countries for studying the effect of GVC participation on productivity. Due to the small size of their economies, access to the foreign markets is essential for their firms to take advantage of economies of scale and to make major qualitative changes, such as upgrading technologies or improving skills. At the same time, the low level of productivity in Estonia and Latvia, compared to the high income OECD countries, is one of key development challenges for the two countries. Higher productivity is also key for those countries to converge to the income level of the high income OECD countries (OECD (2017)). Strong upward pressure on wages (due to labour shortages related to international outward migration and population ageing) makes achieving higher productivity even more essential.

This paper identifies the effect of entry into several types of exports that are related to participation in different segments of GVC. The types of exports considered are exports of intermediate and final goods, re-exporting as well as exports of transport and non-transport services. For example, exports of intermediate goods and non-

<sup>1</sup> See, for instance, Hummels et al. (2001), Yi (2003) for earlier work on the role of GVC in rapid growth in trade volume; Koopman et al. (2012) for the implication of GVC in the value added contents of trade flow; OECD (2013) for various policy implications of GVCs.

<sup>2</sup> Admittedly, participation in GVC can take place through another channel than exports such as supplying the local affiliates of MNEs. This research focuses on GVC participation through exports, which is still the most predominant form of firm internationalisation, and also due to the relatively low FDI penetration in Latvia and Estonia compared to other emerging European countries, such as the Czech Republic or Slovakia (OECD (2017)).

<sup>3</sup> See Wagner (2012), Greenaway and Kneller (2007) for an overview, and Bernard and Jensen (1999; 2004) for examples of early and influential empirical investigations.

<sup>4</sup> For example, De Loecker (2007; 2013), Blalock and Gertler (2004), Van Biesebroeck (2005), Aw et al. (2007) and Masso and Vahter (2015).

transport services (which include knowledge-intensive services, such as R&D and ICT services) are interpreted as participation in knowledge-intensive activities often found in the upstream of GVC. The analysis is based on the most recent administrative firm-level data available for Latvia and Estonia. The inclusion of service exporters relates this study to a relatively small range of studies that uses firm-level service trade data (e.g. Breinlich and Criscuolo (2011)).

The paper finds that export entry results in a higher productivity level for Latvian and Estonian firms. The gains in productivity are long lasting. However, the magnitude of productivity gains differs across types of exports. Entry into exporting of intermediate goods or non-transport services results in sizable and statistically significant gains in productivity. On the other hand, productivity gains from entry into exporting of final goods or transport services are small or insignificant. These findings are in line with observations that knowledge- and technology-intensive activities in the upstream of GVC generate greater value added than often labour-intensive activities (such as assembly) found in the downstream of GVC (Gereffi (1999), Dedrick et al. (2010), Baldwin (2012)).

Another novel contribution of this paper is the comparative analysis of learning-by-exporting of two Baltic countries that share similar country sizes, geographic conditions and industrial structures. Despite similar fundamental environments, the two countries differ in terms of institutional framework that may affect the internationalisation of firms. In 2010, Estonia completed the accession process to the OECD, which required implementing a wide range of structural reforms to improve public governance and enhance competition. Latvia joined the OECD more recently in 2016, undergoing the same process. While sizable informal economic activities constitute a problem in both countries, some aspects, such as under-reporting of corporate profits, are considered to be more widespread in Latvia (Putniņš and Sauka (2015)). Furthermore, in 2000, Estonia introduced a corporate income tax reform which only taxes distributed profits, reducing the incentives to hide corporate profits (Masso et al. (2013)). Latvia introduced a similar tax reform in 2016. While the paper does not attempt to identify the effects of specific tax regimes or regulations on export entry or the size of productivity gains following export entry, the comparative analysis provides insights into the possible role of institutions in facilitating participation in GVCs.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 describes the datasets used in the study. Section 3 provides the descriptive analysis of Latvian and Estonian exporting firms. Section 4 explains the concept of learning by exporting in GVCs. Section 5 gives an overview of methodology employed in the paper. Section 6 examines productivity distributions of Latvian and Estonian GVC participants. Section 7 explores the determinants of export entry by estimating the probability of export entry as a function of firms' characteristics. Section 8 estimates the impact of entry into different types of exports on firm productivity by applying the propensity score matching (PSM), widely used in micro studies, including those that examine learning-by-exporting effects. Finally, Section 9 concludes with some policy implications.



## 2. DATA

This paper exploits administrative firm-level datasets comprising data on financial statements and international trade of Latvian firms over the period 2006 to 2014 and Estonian firms over the period 1995 to 2014. For some additional analysis, these data are merged with other firm-level data and employer–employee data<sup>5</sup>. Data processing of the Latvian and Estonian datasets was harmonised to the largest possible extent to allow comparison between these two countries.

### Latvian data

Data on financial statements were obtained from the **Comprehensive database of firm indicators** of the Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia, which is based on information from the State Revenue Service. It contains Latvian firms' balance sheet data, data from profit and loss statements including turnover, the number of persons employed, compensation of employees and value added. It also includes information on the sector of activity according to the 2-digit NACE 2 classification. The number of firms included in the dataset varies from 61 159 in 2006 to 99 466 in 2014. The dataset is complemented by the Database of **Firm foreign assets and liabilities** of Latvijas Banka, which allows identifying the foreign capital share of companies as well as the countries of origin of capital owners.

The dataset is matched with the **Database of trade in goods** of the Central Statistical Bureau of Latvia, which includes information on merchandise flows (exports and imports) where merchandises are classified according to the 8-digit Combined Nomenclature (CN8) classification, partner country, statistical value of transaction (in f.o.b. prices for exports and c.i.f. prices for imports), net weight of traded goods in kilograms as well as product volume in supplementary measures (if available), and time period of the trade flow (year and month). It is matched with the **Database of trade in services** of Latvijas Banka, which provides information on all types of services apart from travel, construction, insurance and government services for which detailed firm-level information is not collected. Unlike the Database of trade in goods, the service trade database does not include information on the partner country. The matched data are available for the period 2006–2014<sup>6</sup>.

### Estonian data

Data on financial statements come from the **Estonian Business Registry** by Statistics Estonia, which includes information on balance sheets, profit and loss statements, cash flow statements, and general information, such as 5-digit industry classification codes, ownership, number of employees, turnover by industries. It is complemented by **Statistical Profile of Enterprises** by Statistics Estonia, which provides information about foreign ownership, numbers of employees, turnover, legal form, etc. This is matched with the **International goods trade dataset** by Statistics Estonia based on the customs statistics. The Business Registry dataset is also matched with the **Services trade dataset** by Eesti Pank, which includes exports and imports of various types of services. The dataset includes information on the destination country. All datasets are available for the period 1995–2014 except the services trade dataset which is only available for the period 2005–2014.

<sup>5</sup> For additional analysis, where those datasets are matched with individual-level data to create employer–employee datasets, the time span is shorter due to the limited availability of individual data.

<sup>6</sup> The matched data are anonymous (i.e. individual firms cannot be identified).

### Sample size

This paper excludes firms in the following sectors: agriculture and mining (NACE 01–09), energy and water supply (NACE 35–39), construction (NACE 41–43), and public services (NACE 84–99). In addition, samples with extreme labour productivity or capital productivity exceeding the 99th percentile or lower than the 1st percentile of the distribution were dropped. After such data cleaning, about 40 000 to 70 000 Latvian firms are included in the analysis each year. For Estonia, the sample size reaches 100 000 in the most recent year. Firms with less than 10 employees account for more than 80% of the sample in both countries. The share of those very small firms has increased over time, particularly in Estonia (Table 1).

Table 1

Sample size of baseline data of Latvian and Estonian firms

	Latvia		Estonia	
	All firms	The share of firms with less than 10 employees (%)	All firms	The share of firms with less than 10 employees (%)
1995			15 799	79.0
1996			17 127	77.7
1997			21 984	78.2
1998			26 256	79.4
1999			29 121	80.8
2000			32 235	80.9
2001			34 018	80.8
2002			36 690	81.3
2003			38 207	82.3
2004			42 042	83.3
2005			47 861	84.5
2006	38 462	85.0	54 222	86.2
2007	47 694	78.5	59 464	87.2
2008	52 428	79.8	62 234	88.7
2009	55 674	84.8	74 309	93.1
2010	48 363	84.3	70 590	91.7
2011	51 252	84.9	75 555	91.6
2012	54 161	85.2	89 700	92.7
2013	62 331	86.6	90 950	92.7
2014	68 200	88.0	105 875	93.8

Source: authors' calculations.

### 3. IMPORTANCE OF EXPORTERS IN LATVIA'S AND ESTONIA'S ECONOMY

In many countries only a handful of firms export (see, e.g. Mayer and Ottaviano (2008)). The share of exporters out of all firms tends to be larger in countries with higher GDP per capita (Fernandes et al. (2016)). Exports are also often concentrated among the largest exporters. The degree of concentration of exports to a few firms tends to be higher in countries with higher GDP per capita, as more efficient resource allocation allows productive firms to attract more resources and to grow in size (Fernandes et al. (2016)).

### Exporters are few, particularly in Latvia

Exporters comprise around 6%–8% of all firms in Latvia, which is considerably lower than in Estonia where around 12% of all firms export (Table 2). Exporting is particularly uncommon among firms in non-transport services in Latvia. Lower export participation of firms in Latvia than in Estonia may be partly due to the micro enterprise tax regime introduced in 2011, which applies a flat rate on corporate income taxation and social security contribution. This tax regime is found to have encouraged Latvian firms, especially those in knowledge-intensive service sectors, to remain small or split into even smaller units. Because smaller firms are less able to cover the sunk costs associated with export entry, this tax regime may have held back export entry of Latvian firms. However, as seen in Table 1, the share of small firms out of all firms is higher in Estonia than in Latvia. Also, the share of exporting firms in Latvia is still lower than in Estonia, even when focusing on larger firms with more than 10 employees: 28% of large firms in Latvia, as compared with 42% in Estonia, exported in 2014. The difference is more striking for non-transport services where only 1.6% of Latvian firms with more than 10 employees exported as compared with 24% of Estonian firms.

The shares of exporters in various types of exports summarised in Table 2 suggest that Latvia and Estonia differ in their main roles within GVCs. Latvian exporters are mainly goods exporters, whereas service exporters are rare. In Estonia, there are as many service exporters as goods exporters. However, it should be noted that goods and service exporters are not mutually exclusive, as there are firms that export both goods and services. In Latvia, firms exporting intermediate goods, final goods or engaging in re-exports account for about 3% of all firms, while in Estonia, a larger share of firms are exporting intermediate goods (4.2%) than final goods (2.5%) or are engaged in re-exporting (1.4%). In Latvia, more than half of service exporters are exporting transport services, reflecting Latvia's role as a provider of logistic services in GVCs (OECD (2017)). In contrast, most of service exporters in Estonia are exporting non-transport services.

Table 2

#### The share of exporters in the total number of firms (%)

	Latvia				Estonia			
	2006	2009	2012	2014	2006	2009	2012	2014
All exporters (goods and services)	7.0	6.8	7.7	6.4	9.4	12.6	12.8	11.8
Goods exporters	5.8	5.6	6.9	5.9	9.4	7.1	7.5	6.6
Exporters of intermediate inputs	3.0	2.8	3.5	3.0	5.7	4.5	4.7	4.2
Exporters of final goods	2.8	2.3	3.1	2.7	3.3	2.6	2.6	2.5
Re-exporters	2.7	3.1	3.7	3.0	2.2	1.6	1.6	1.4
Service exporters	1.4	1.4	1.0	0.7	NA	7.1	7.1	7.1
Transport service exporters	0.8	0.9	0.6	0.4	NA	1.5	1.5	0.1
Non-transport service exporters	0.6	0.6	0.4	0.2	NA	5.9	5.8	7.1

Source: authors' calculations.

Note: for the sake of brevity, only the data of selected years from 2006 onward are reported.

### Exporters account for a large share of total employment and turnover

Although exporters are few, they account for disproportionately large shares of overall employment and turnover. Exporters' share in total employment is around one third and exceeds 50% in turnover both in Latvia and Estonia (Table 3 and Table 4). Latvian firms engaging in re-exports account for one third in overall turnover, a considerably larger share than that of Estonian re-exporters. The larger share of re-exporters in Latvia than in Estonia indicates the importance of transit trade in the Latvian economy and Latvia's role as the regional hub (Beņkovskis et al. (2016)).

Table 3

#### The share of exporters in total employment (%)

	Latvia				Estonia			
	2006	2009	2012	2014	2006	2009	2012	2014
All exporters (goods and services)	36.2	31.5	34.5	32.4	25.6	32.5	39.8	33.6
Goods exporters	29.4	23.0	27.1	26.0	25.6	17.7	23.5	19.7
Exporters of intermediate inputs	15.1	11.0	13.0	12.4	19.4	13.7	15.6	15.3
Exporters of final goods	16.5	12.7	14.2	13.7	11.9	8.4	9.9	10.0
Re-exporters	17.1	13.1	15.4	15.1	11.8	8.6	11.1	10.1
Service exporters	9.9	10.3	9.6	8.4	NA	20.2	25.7	20.8
Transport service exporters	5.8	4.7	4.5	5.1	NA	6.0	7.5	1.2
Non-transport service exporters	4.2	4.3	4.1	3.4	NA	16.4	21.1	20.1

Source: authors' calculations.

Note: for the sake of brevity, only the data of selected years from 2006 onward are reported.

Table 4

#### The share of exporters in total turnover (%)

	Latvia				Estonia			
	2006	2009	2012	2014	2006	2009	2012	2014
All exporters (goods and services)	46.0	52.4	57.6	54.5	35.7	71.6	53.4	55.8
Goods exporters	38.9	42.6	49.2	47.9	25.7	59.2	37.5	39.0
Exporters of intermediate inputs	16.3	17.8	20.0	19.7	27.3	54.1	26.6	28.9
Exporters of final goods	13.7	21.6	21.6	20.3	14.5	10.2	15.2	17.8
Re-exporters	29.1	30.6	34.6	35.6	21.0	12.7	22.8	25.1
Service exporters	10.8	16.4	13.9	9.7	NA	23.7	30.9	36.4
Transport service exporters	6.0	9.0	8.0	6.0	NA	8.6	13.1	1.9
Non-transport service exporters	5.4	7.6	7.0	4.3	NA	18.8	22.9	36.1

Source: authors' calculations.

Note: for the sake of brevity, only the data of selected years from 2006 onward are reported.

### Exports are concentrated among a few large exporters

Exports are concentrated among a few large exporters, especially in Estonia. The top-5% exporters made up nearly 65% of all Latvian exports and 75% of all Estonian exports in 2014 (Table 5). In Latvia, the concentration is larger in goods exports than in service exports, while it is the opposite in Estonia. Exports of non-transport services are significantly more concentrated in Estonia than in Latvia, indicating that the largest Latvian exporters of non-transport services are considerably smaller than Estonian exporters.

*Table 5*  
**Weight of top-5% exporters in total exports (%)**

	Latvia				Estonia			
	2006	2009	2012	2014	2006	2009	2012	2014
All exports	56.9	61.5	65.7	64.5	69.6	76.5	79.1	74.6
Goods exports	58.6	62.5	68.3	66.1	69.6	69.5	74.0	66.9
Exports of intermediate goods	63.1	68.1	74.2	68.4	65.5	64.6	67.4	62.6
Exports of final goods	55.9	60.5	68.5	68.5	68.9	63.9	73.1	64.4
Re-exports	60.9	61.8	64.8	67.4	65.4	57.4	70.0	56.9
Service exports	50.3	57.9	52.7	53.0	NA	86.9	86.2	84.3
Exports of transport services	51.7	63.8	58.2	59.9	NA	76.9	82.2	50.3
Exports of non-transport services	39.6	36.7	30.9	37.3	NA	86.6	77.9	85.7

Source: authors' calculations.

Note: for the sake of brevity, only the data of selected years from 2006 onward are reported.

#### 4. LEARNING-BY-EXPORTING IN GLOBAL VALUE CHAINS

International trade has long been considered a channel of knowledge transfer (Bayoumi et al. (1999), Saggi (2002)). In particular, firms that start exporting are expected to improve productivity by absorbing new knowledge transferred from foreign buyers. Yet, empirical evidence on such productivity gains associated with export entry, often referred to as learning-by-exporting, is mixed at best. Previous studies, instead, found pervasive evidence on the self-selection of more productive firms into export (see, e.g. Wagner (2007)). Literature suggests that learning-by-exporting is far from being a general phenomenon but is conditional on specific circumstances. For instance, supportive evidence is found more in developing countries with potentially larger rooms for technological catch-up (Blalock and Gertler (2004), Van Biesebroeck (2005)), or when exports are directed to advanced economies (De Loecker (2007)), or when firms are exporting multiple products to multiple destinations (Masso and Vahter (2015)). This paper explores whether the mixed evidence on learning-by-exporting can be explained by the difference in activities that exporters perform in global value chains (GVCs). Given the growing importance of GVCs in international trade, it is reasonable to expect that a significant part of exporting today is participation in GVCs rather than direct exports to foreign final consumers. In particular, exports of intermediate goods or services are often inputs to GVC that will be embodied in exports by third countries (OECD (2013)). Exports of final goods may also be participation in GVC if it involves an intensive use of imported inputs. For example, the early stage of China's integration into GVCs was mainly driven by the processing trade, where Chinese firms assembled imported parts and components into final products and exported them to final consumption destinations.

GVC is a complex network of interlinked stages of production and non-production activities. It encompasses upstream service activities, such as new product design, research and development as well as production activities, like manufacturing of key parts and core components; downstream activities, such as assembly into final products or transportation and distribution; far downstream service activities, such as marketing/branding and after-sales services. Case studies have shown that those activities are known to vary greatly in size of value added they create (Gereffi (1999), Dedrik et al. (2010)). New product designs or manufacturing of sophisticated

components are highly original and they define the competitiveness of final goods or services produced by a GVC. Such activities are disproportionately well remunerated and comprise a lion's share in the total value added generated by a GVC. On the other hand, standardised and often labour-intensive activities, like assembly or transport, generate relatively small value added, as they are subject to fierce competition which drives down the profit margin.

The essence of the so-called "high value added activities" is best described by the concept of "bottleneck" put forth by Jacobides et al. (2006). A bottleneck in a value chain is a firm that supplies scarce products or services demanded by numerous buyers, but at the same time can source inputs from numerous suppliers. Due to its strong bargaining power, the firm not only enjoys a high profit margin but also appropriates some of the value added originating from innovation or cost reduction efforts by its buyers and suppliers. This biases the value added generated by a GVC toward few bottleneck firms. The uneven distribution of value added across GVC activities is often described visually as a U-shaped "smile curve", because high value added activities are often concentrated in the upstream (and far downstream) of GVC.

The scope of learning-by-exporting should depend on which types of activity exporters are engaging in GVCs. More specifically, in order for export entry to result in a significant and long-lasting improvement in productivity, exporters have to participate in high value added activities in the upstream (or far downstream) of GVC. In case exporters participate in standardised labour-intensive activities in the downstream of GVC, their productivity may increase owing to increased capacity utilisation, but such an increase is unlikely to be sustained, as some of their productivity gains from learning may be extracted by bottleneck firms.

Unfortunately, there are not yet established theoretical frameworks that allow mapping a firm's exports into specific GVC activities or inferring the value added a firm can draw from GVC. Antràs et al. (2012) propose a measure of "upstreamness", which identifies products that go through numerous production stages before reaching final consumption. However, this measure says little about the scarcity of such products. Costinot et al. (2013) offer a theoretical model on sequential production, which provides insights on specialisation within a GVC. But the model does not capture the concentration of value added due to uneven bargaining power among participants. Thus, instead of trying to come up with a novel method that maps exporters to specific segments of GVC, this paper simply infers a firm's position within a GVC from the types of goods or services exported. For example, exports of intermediate goods and knowledge-intensive services (such as R&D and ICT services) are often related to activities in the upstream of GVC. The paper thus expects that the entry into such exports would result in larger productivity gains than the entry into exports of final goods or transport services.

For the rest of the paper, the terms "exporters" and "GVC participants" are used interchangeably, as the paper focuses on GVC participation through exports.

## 5. METHODOLOGY

For the main empirical analysis, exports are disaggregated into different types of exports that are highly relevant in the context of GVCs, such as exports of intermediate goods, re-exports, and service exports. A firm is considered to be exporting intermediate goods if its exported goods fall into this category according to

the OECD BTDIxE end-use classification. This classification is used to compute the bilateral trade flow of intermediate goods across countries, which in turn is used to construct the OECD-WTO Trade in Value Added (TiVA) database, the main workhorse of GVC analysis in global policy discussion fora (OECD (2013)).

Following Beņkovskis et al. (2016), a firm is considered to be engaging in re-exports if it imports and exports the same product within an 8-digit Combined Nomenclature (CN code) over the period of 12 months. Re-exports are estimated to account on average for 28% of Latvian merchandise exports between 2005 and 2013 (Beņkovskis et al. (2016)). These may not be just logistic services but can also include high value added activities that mediate trade between parties with large information asymmetries (Feenstra and Hanson (2004)).

The service sector plays an increasingly important role in GVCs. Services constitute a large share of value added created from exports (OECD (2013)). Service inputs increasingly define the competitiveness of manufacturing, as they allow firms to add higher value to their products by complementing them with knowledge-intensive services (Miroudot and Cadestin (2017)). This paper distinguishes between transport and non-transport service exporters, given the considerable weights of transport services in Latvian and Estonian exports. Exports of non-transport services include exports of knowledge-intensive services, such as ICT and professional services whose shares in service exports have been rising recently in both countries.

### Observing the premium of GVC participation

Before proceeding with the formal analysis of causal relationships between export entry and firm performance, it is useful to compare the average performance of exporters versus non-exporters. This is done by running a pooled OLS regression where firm performance indicators, such as productivity, employment and average wages (denoted as  $Y_{ijt}$  where subscripts indicate specific firm  $i$  in industry  $j$  at time  $t$ ), are regressed on a dummy variable that takes the value 1, if a firm  $i$  is an exporter, and is 0 otherwise (the term  $Exporter_{ijt}$  on the right-hand side), while controlling for other factors that affect performance, such as firm size, firm age, or foreign ownership (the term  $X_{ijt}$  on the right hand side). Industry and year dummies  $\eta_j$  and  $\eta_t$  are also included as explanatory variables to control for industry specific and macroeconomic conditions that affect firm performance.

$$\ln Y_{ijt} = \alpha + \beta * Exporter_{ijt} + X_{ijt} + \eta_j + \eta_t + \varepsilon_{ijt} \quad (1).$$

The coefficient  $\beta$  captures the relative performance of exporting firms versus non-exporters and is often referred to as "exporter's premium". Across countries this coefficient is found to be positive and statistically significant (ISGEP (2008)). In this study, the dummy variable for exporting is replaced by several dummies corresponding to the types of exports related to different stages of GVC participation.

### Evaluating the effect of GVC participation

The paper focuses on the entry into different types of exports. It does not investigate the expansion of incumbent exporters into additional export markets or additional products. The definition of entrants needs to be specified. The most general definition of export entrant would be firms that did not export at time  $t - 1$  but do so at time  $t$ . In Latvia, such firms constitute about 20% of exporters each year, and in Estonia the

figure is close to 50%. However, those entrants include intermittent exporters that exit immediately and thus have very limited opportunities to learn from foreign markets or global buyers.<sup>7</sup> This paper, therefore, defines export entrants as firms that did not export in period  $t - 2$  and  $t - 1$ , started to export in period  $t$ , and continued exporting in period  $t + 1$ .<sup>8</sup>

The effect of export entry can be identified by observing whether firms that started exporting experience a larger gain in productivity level compared to those that did not. However, since export entry (and participation in GVCs) is associated with large sunk costs, only firms with originally higher productivity are likely to become exporters (Melitz (2003)). In order to isolate the effect of exporting from the self-selection of productive firms into exports, a comparison is made between export entrants and a specific group of non-exporters that were initially as likely to start exporting as actual export entrants. This follows the method that has been widely employed in previous studies of learning-by-exporting effect of exports on productivity, possibly channelled by absorption of new knowledge from foreign markets (see, e.g. De Loecker (2007)).

The first step is to use a pooled probit model to estimate the probability (propensity score) of each type of export entry (see equation (2)). The probability for a firm to start exporting (left-hand side of equation (2)) is assumed to follow a normal distribution and is the function of its productivity level and other factors that are likely to enable firms to overcome the initial costs of export entry (vector  $X$  on right-hand side). The control factors include firm size, firm age, liquidity ratio, capital to labour ratio (K/L) and foreign ownership, which are used in earlier studies and also available in the dataset used in this paper.

$$Prob(\text{Export entry}_t) = \Phi(\text{Productivity}_{t-1}, X_{t-1}) \quad (2).$$

There are a number of other factors, such as managerial excellence or innovation-related variables, that are likely to drive export entry but cannot be observed or the data is not available for a large enough sample to incorporate into the calculation of propensity score of export entry. Explanatory variables of the probit model are lagged one period before the export entry to ensure that they are unaffected by the entry itself (i.e. to avoid reverse causality). One limitation of this standard analysis is that the timing of the decision of entry is unobservable and can in fact occur before the actual year of entry. Another limitation is that this framework cannot capture the export entry by firms that start exporting in the year of their creation.<sup>9</sup>

The next step is to match each export entrant with non-exporters with the closest propensity score of export entry. Two nearest neighbours are allocated to each export entrant. The standard condition of common support is used when choosing these nearest neighbours. Before calculating the average treatment effects (ATT) of export entry, the study tests whether the treatment group and the constructed control group share similar levels of productivity and other determinants of export entry prior to export entry of entrants (the balancing property test of propensity score matching).

<sup>7</sup> Past studies have shown that the share of intermittent export entrants is high. For instance, only 66% of Estonia's new exporters survive until the second year of exporting (Masso and Vahter (2014), ECB CompNet (2014)).

<sup>8</sup> The paper conducts robustness analysis, which employs a wider definition of export entry that includes intermittent exporters.

<sup>9</sup> In Latvia, such firms comprise about 15% of new exporters.



Then, the mean values of productivity level  $s$  years after the export entry are compared between the group of export entrants (the first term in equation (3)) and the matched non-exporters (the second term). The difference is interpreted as the effect of export entry.

$$E(\text{Productivity}_{t+s} | \text{Export Entry}_t = 1) - E(\text{Productivity}_{t+s} | \text{Export Entry}_t = 0), \\ s \in (0,2) \quad (3).$$

## 6. CHARACTERISTICS OF GVC PARTICIPANTS

In many countries, exporting firms are more productive and larger than non-exporting firms. This export "premium" is partly explained by the large sunk costs associated with export entry (and participation in GVCs). Only firms that are productive, so that they can capture sufficiently large export sales that cover these costs, or large enough to enjoy economies of scale enter exports (Wagner (2012), Bernard and Jensen (2004)). This section estimates the advantage of exporters over non-exporters in productivity and other measures of performance for various types of exports. It also compares distributions of productivity between exporters and non-exporters. A large gap between the distributions indicates the existence of a large mass of non-exporters that are too unproductive to participate in GVCs. A large overlap, on the other hand, suggests a large mass of non-exporters that are productive enough to export but are held back for some reason.

### The premium of GVC participants is large, especially in Latvia

The advantage of exporters over non-exporters in productivity and other performance indicators is observed by estimating equation (1) in the previous section. Table 6 summarises the estimated coefficients  $\beta$ , which are all statistically significant at 1% level.<sup>10</sup> In both Latvia and Estonia, exporters have higher productivity, hire more employees, pay higher wages, and use more capital per worker than non-exporters after controlling for firms' age, liquidity and foreign ownership. This export premium is more pronounced in Latvia than in Estonia. For instance, exporters in Latvia exhibit on average 80% higher labour productivity and 88% higher total factor productivity (TFP) than non-exporters, while in Estonia the figures are 61% and 32% respectively. Exporters' premium in employment size is also larger in Latvia than in Estonia. This finding corroborates the existence of a large mass of small unproductive non-exporters in Latvia. Non-transport service exporters have particularly large labour productivity premium in both Latvia and Estonia. Firms involved in re-exporting exhibit large productivity premium in Latvia, while it is not the case in Estonia.

<sup>10</sup> Coefficients on control variables, which are all statistically significant, are not shown for the sake of brevity.

*Table 6*  
**Exporters' premium**

	Latvia					Estonia				
	Log labour productivity	Log TFP (1)	Log wage	Log employment	Capital to labour ratio	Log labour productivity	Log TFP (1)	Log wage	Log employment	Capital to labour ratio
All exporters (goods and services)	0.802*	0.881*	0.616*	1.155*	0.766*	0.606*	0.321*	0.479*	0.328*	0.403*
Goods exporters	0.775*	0.858*	0.592*	1.100*	0.795*	0.390*	0.651*	0.243*	0.946*	0.504*
Exporters of intermediate inputs	0.749*	0.876*	0.604*	1.165*	0.754*	0.351*	0.342*	0.237*	0.383*	0.480*
Exporters of final goods	0.712*	0.774*	0.532*	1.092*	0.765*	0.286*	0.291*	0.398*	0.313*	0.336*
Re-exporters	0.966*	1.014*	0.800*	1.336*	0.901*	0.415*	0.396*	0.263*	0.934*	0.377*
Service exporters	0.896*	0.994*	0.747*	1.592*	0.588*	0.425*	0.339*	0.642*	1.024*	0.282*
Transport service exporters	0.688*	0.945*	0.456*	1.518*	0.817*	0.614*	0.522*	0.165*	1.278*	0.574*
Non-transport service exporters	1.144*	1.023*	1.209*	1.698*	0.210*	0.723*	0.384*	0.339*	0.334*	0.345*

Source: authors' calculations.

Notes: \* – significant at 1%. The table reports the coefficients from OLS regressions of log values of firm characteristics on export status. All regressions include firm age, foreign ownership dummy, capital region dummy as well as 2-digit NACE sector and year dummies.

(1) Estimated using the method of Galuscak and Lizal (2011) and Levinsohn and Petrin (2003).

### **GVC participants have higher productivity distribution than non-exporters**


Exporters' productivity premium is not only driven by a handful of exporters with very high productivity: exporters are overall more productive than non-exporters. As shown in Figure 1, the productivity distributions (kernel density of the log of labour productivity) of goods exporters and service exporters stochastically dominate the distribution of non-exporters in both Latvia and Estonia. Furthermore, service exporters are overall more productive than goods exporters, as their productivity distribution has larger weight on the right-hand side of the distribution than that of goods exporters.<sup>11</sup>

Among goods exporters, the productivity distribution of re-exporters stochastically dominates that of exporters of intermediate and final goods in both countries (Figure 2). Interestingly, the productivity distribution of exporters of intermediate goods is not statistically different from that of exporters of final goods. Among service exporters, the productivity distribution of non-transport service exporters stochastically dominates that of transport service exporters (Figure 3). Furthermore, among Estonian exporters of non-transport services, those exporting knowledge-intensive services like R&D and ICT services have a productivity distribution that stochastically dominates the distribution of other less knowledge-intensive services (such as tourism).

<sup>11</sup> These differences in productivity distributions are confirmed by the results of the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test (available upon request).

Figure 1


**Labour productivity distribution of exporters versus non-exporters**



Source: authors' calculations.  
 Note: labour productivity relative to averages of 2-digit NACE sectors.

Figure 2


**Labour productivity distribution of goods exporters versus non-exporters**



Source: authors' calculations.  
 Note: labour productivity relative to averages of 2-digit NACE sectors.

Figure 3

**Labour productivity distribution of service exporters versus non-exporters**



Source: authors' calculations.  
 Note: log labour productivity relative to averages of 2-digit NACE sectors. KI stands for "knowledge-intensive", LKI for less knowledge-intensive".

### **There are many firms that are too unproductive to enter export markets**

The sizable gap between the productivity distributions of exporters and non-exporters indicates a large number of firms that cannot access foreign markets or participate in GVCs because of their low productivity. These firms represent a concern for small open economies like Latvia or Estonia where intensive participation in GVCs could boost productivity growth by allowing more firms to exploit the economies of scale and absorb advanced technologies. To give a perspective of the mass of least productive non-exporters, the share of non-exporters with productivity level below the 10th percentile of productivity distribution of exporters is reported (left-hand side of Table 7).

In both Latvia and Estonia, this share exceeds 30%, indicating that non-exporters are disproportionately concentrated in the lower part of the productivity distribution. In Latvia, this share has been over 40% prior to the financial crisis and seems to have declined more recently. In contrast, in Estonia it was close to 32% prior to the crisis but has increased ever since. Also, this share is significantly smaller in both countries when excluding firms with less than 10 employees. This underscores the existence of many small unproductive firms that do not export. In Estonia, the share has been rather stable in the manufacturing sector, indicating that the recent productivity divergence between exporters and non-exporters is occurring mostly in the service sector, where the lack of internationalisation is increasingly recognised as the major impediment to firm growth.

### **Many productive firms are held back from entering export markets**

The large overlap of productivity distributions between exporters and non-exporters can be caused by resource misallocation that prevents productive firms from entering exporting or participating in GVCs.<sup>12</sup> For instance, poor access to credit makes it difficult for productive firms to enter exports if they have to finance entry costs upfront (Chaney (2016)). Shortages of skilled workers with knowledge of foreign markets can also hold back export entry (Masso et al. (2015), Masso and Vahter (2016)). To give an idea about the extent of such overlaps, the share of non-exporters with the labour productivity level higher than the median productivity of exporters (e.g. non-exporters that are more productive than median exporters) is reported (right-hand side of Table 7). In recent years, this share has been around 15% in Latvia, while it remained over 20% in Estonia. The shares of non-exporters with above median productivity of exporters have come down since 2006, which suggests that resource allocation has improved in both countries. The shares are higher when excluding smaller firms in both countries. This suggests that resource misallocation is mostly holding back larger firms, which are *a priori* more likely to be exporters.

---

<sup>12</sup> The large overlaps in productivity distributions of exporters and non-exporters can also occur, if entry costs of exports vary greatly across sectors and exporters are concentrated in sectors with low entry costs, while non-exporters are concentrated in sectors with high entry costs. However, there are not *a priori* reasons to think this is the case. It is also possible that some productive non-exporters are in fact participating in GVCs through other channels than exports such as supplying the local branches of multinational enterprises.

Table 7

**The gap and overlap in the productivity distributions of exporters and non-exporters (%)**

	Share of non-exporters with labour productivity below the 10th percentile of exporters' productivity distribution				Share of non-exporters with labour productivity above the median of exporters' productivity distribution			
	Latvia		Estonia		Latvia		Estonia	
	All firms	Firms with 10 or more employees	All firms	Firms with 10 or more employees	All firms	Firms with 10 or more employees	All firms	Firms with 10 or more employees
2006	45.1	22.8	31.8	24.3	19.3	29.6	24.8	31.8
2007	44.9	39.9	33.0	23.3	16.6	19.2	23.1	29.6
2008	43.6	33.3	32.8	25.4	17.4	21.3	21.8	27.0
2009	40.1	25.4	36.0	28.5	18.5	23.4	24.2	30.4
2010	43.0	34.0	36.4	26.6	18.2	19.8	20.9	26.8
2011	37.2	32.4	35.1	23.7	16.4	19.9	21.5	29.1
2012	31.0	31.1	35.4	22.5	15.4	19.7	22.2	28.8
2013	39.1	28.1	36.1	21.6	16.5	20.0	21.3	28.9
2014	31.1	25.2	36.7	25.9	14.3	21.8	21.1	25.9

Source: authors' calculations.

**7. DETERMINANTS OF GVC PARTICIPATION**

Having observed the large and statistically significant premium of GVC participants, the next step is to assess whether such an advantage attributes to the self-selection of most productive firms into exporting, or whether firms become more productive as a result of their exposure to the global market. These two explanations are not mutually exclusive, as both self-selection and learning-by-exporting can contribute to the outperformance of exporters over non-exporters.

Table 8 displays the estimation results of the probit regressions for Latvia (Panel A) and Estonia (Panel B). The explanatory variables included labour productivity, employment size and age (as well as their non-linear components), liquidity ratio, capital to labour ratio. Year and NACE 2-digit sector fixed effects were also included to control for the macroeconomic environment and industry specific conditions. In the case of Latvia, two dummies for foreign ownership (distinguishing between owners from OECD and non-OECD countries) were included to capture possible knowledge spillovers from multinational enterprises, while for Estonia a dummy variable, indicating that the firm is foreign-owned, and another dummy variable, indicating that the firm is located in Northern Estonia (Tallinn and Harju district, the wider capital region), are included.

The probit estimation results give a clear indication of self-selection of productive firms into all types of exports, as higher labour productivity increases the probability of all types of export entry in both countries. Firm size is also observed to increase the probability of export entry, suggesting the importance of economies of scale in covering the entry costs to exports. Higher capital to labour ratio is also associated with higher probability of export entry, except in that of non-transport services. Furthermore, in both countries older firms are associated with lower probability of export entry. But beyond a certain age (17 years for Latvian firms), the likelihood of

export entry increases as shown by the positive and statistically significant sign on the quadratic age term.

An interesting difference emerges between the two countries concerning the effect of cash flow on export entry. In Estonia, higher liquidity ratio is associated with higher probability of export entry, as expected from theories on the extensive margin of trade under credit constraints (Muûls (2015)). However, in Latvia a *lower* liquidity ratio in the previous period is associated with a higher probability of export entry. The negative relationship is robust to different lags and is a puzzle. One possible explanation is that stronger credit constraints motivate Latvian firms to enter exporting to increase their cash flows. Exporting may also improve access to credit by acting as a signal of regionally diversified revenue sources (Shaver (2011)).

The foreign ownership from an OECD country is significantly associated only with a higher probability of entry into service exports by Latvian firms, in particular into transport service exports. Foreign ownership is significantly associated with higher probability of entry into all types of exports by Estonian firms, with particularly strong effect in the case of service exports. The location of a firm in Northern Estonia is associated with a higher probability of entry into goods exports but not service exports, possibly indicating the relevance of proximity to ports and industrial agglomeration in those exports.

The estimated coefficients of probit regressions are used to calculate the propensity score of all firms, which is used in the next section to create counterfactual control groups of non-entrants that share similar characteristics with actual entrants.

While productivity is the main determinant of export entry, the existence of a large number of non-exporters that are as productive as exporters indicates that there are also other significant determinants. Identifying what these factors are provides rich policy implications. For example, the analysis in Appendix 1 shows that hiring more employees and managers with experience of working for exporting firms and MNEs facilitates export entry of Estonian firms. Also, the skills intensity of Estonian exporters is found to be higher than that of non-exporters: the employment structure of exporters is biased towards professionals and skilled employees. Those findings underscore the importance of skills for more intensive participation in GVCs.

*Table 8*  
**Probit estimation of the probability of export entry**

**A. Latvia**

	All exports	Type		Participation in GVCs				
		Exports of goods	Exports of services	Exports of intermediate products	Exports of final use products	Re-exports	Exports of transport services	Exports of other services
Log(labour productivity) <sub>t-1</sub>	0.188***	0.171***	0.371***	0.110***	0.206***	0.297***	0.185***	0.608***
Log(employment) <sub>t-1</sub>	0.368***	0.309***	0.884***	0.393***	0.340***	0.401***	1.180***	0.575***
Log(employment) <sub>t-1</sub> <sup>2</sup>	-0.021***	-0.011*	-0.082***	-0.024***	-0.012	-0.019**	-0.123***	-0.027
Age <sub>t-1</sub>	-0.068***	-0.058***	-0.088***	-0.078***	-0.041**	-0.062***	-0.089**	-0.083*
Age <sub>t-1</sub> <sup>2</sup>	0.002***	0.002**	0.003*	0.003***	0.001	0.002*	0.004*	0.001
Liquidity ratio <sub>t-1</sub>	-0.377***	-0.421***	-0.220	-0.638***	-0.514***	-0.497***	-0.232	-0.187
Capital to labour ratio <sub>t-1</sub>	0.078***	0.080***	0.071**	0.081***	0.085***	0.068***	0.198***	-0.053
Foreign ownership dummy (owner from OECD <sub>t-1</sub> country)	0.151	0.124	0.436***	0.008	0.387***	0.033	0.627***	0.231
Foreign ownership dummy (owner from non-OECD <sub>t-1</sub> country)	0.019	-0.125	0.348	0.076	0.146	-0.147	0.487	-0.248
Log-likelihood	-37 69.4	-34 82.6	-597.3	-20 28.4	-22 26.8	-21 92.3	-332.0	-249.3
Number of observations	50 612	50 020	24 539	45 931	48 366	43 259	1 1676	21 828
pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.19	0.20	0.32	0.21	0.23	0.25	0.35	0.36

**B. Estonia**

	All exports	Type		Participation in GVCs				
		Exports of goods	Exports of services	Exports of intermediate products	Exports of final use products	Re-exports	Exports of transport services	Exports of other services
Log(labour productivity) <sub>t-1</sub>	0.234***	0.213***	0.287***	0.236***	0.226***	0.401***	0.195***	0.304***
Log(employment) <sub>t-1</sub>	0.292***	0.264***	0.342***	0.214***	0.237***	0.258***	0.604***	0.245***
Log(employment) <sub>t-1</sub> <sup>2</sup>	-0.011**	-0.004	-0.004	0.002	-0.009	-0.002	-0.043**	0.01
Age <sub>t-1</sub>	-0.217***	-0.274***	-0.350***	-0.251***	-0.170**	-0.375***	-0.340**	-0.339***
Age <sub>t-1</sub> <sup>2</sup>	0.021*	0.055***	0.023	0.039**	0.026	0.085***	0.032	0.019
Liquidity ratio <sub>t-1</sub>	0.094***	0.114***	0.072	0.081***	0.157***	0.139***	0.148	0.06
Capital to labour ratio <sub>t-1</sub>	0.040***	0.061***	0.034***	0.032***	0.023**	0.024**	0.118***	0.011
Foreign firm dummy	0.362***	0.296***	0.688***	0.338***	0.333***	0.356***	0.649***	0.714***
Northern Estonia dummy	0.117***	0.148***	0.015	0.144***	0.280***	0.222***	-0.009	0.031
Log-likelihood	-18 610.3	-14 820.7	-3 677.34	-8 114.04	-5 014.22	-5 085.18	-1 082.51	-2 879.06
Number of observations	10 0456	99 168	30 516	96 188	93 792	94 051	23 687	28 563
pseudo R <sup>2</sup>	0.122	0.143	0.184	0.17	0.175	0.229	0.32	0.184

Source: authors' calculations.

Note: \* – significant at 10%; \*\* – significant at 5%; \*\*\* – significant at 1%.

## 8. THE EFFECT OF GVC PARTICIPATION

This section assesses the causal effect of various types of export entry using the conventional framework of propensity score matching. Each entrant is matched with two firms that have never exported during the time period from  $t - 2$  to  $t + 1$  and have the closest propensity score as the entrant. The balancing property test of pre-treatment differences between the treated (export entrants) and control group (matched non-entrants) is used to infer the quality of matching. Table 9 reports the results of the balancing property test for all exporters as an example. The  $t$  statistics and  $p$ -values after the propensity score matching indicate that the procedure eliminated statistically significant differences in the determinants of export entry<sup>13</sup>. Therefore, the control group constructed by matching can be regarded as the counterfactual for export entrants.

Following equation (3), the average treatment effect on treated firms (ATT) is computed as the average difference in productivity and other measures of performance between export entrants and control firms for up to three years after export entry (Table 10). Overall, export entry results in a significant boost in the productivity level that is long lasting both in Latvia and Estonia. Export entry raises labour productivity of Latvian firms by 23% in the year of entry and by 20% in the third year, whereas the respective figures for Estonian firms are 14% and 13.5% (the first column of Table 10).

The effect of export entry differs across types of exports. Entries into exports of intermediate goods and non-transport services (which include knowledge-intensive services) are associated with significant gains in productivity level both in Latvia and Estonia. The entry into re-exports is also associated with a sizable improvement in productivity level in both countries, indicating that re-exports are high value added activities that may go beyond simple logistic services.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>13</sup> This approach is based on the standard and potentially rather limiting assumption that the researcher observes the relevant drivers of export entry decision.

<sup>14</sup> The profit margin of re-exports is indeed large and makes an important contribution to the Latvian economy (Beņkovskis et al. (2016)).



Table 9

## Mean values of main determinants of export entry before and after matching

## A. Latvia

		Mean of treated	Mean of control	Difference (%)	<i>t</i> -statistics	<i>p</i> -value
Log(labour productivity) <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	Unmatched	2.291	1.606	60.0	17.41	0.000
	Matched	2.292	2.289	0.2	0.05	0.959
Log(employment) <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	Unmatched	2.466	1.649	65.0	21.17	0.000
	Matched	2.466	2.431	2.8	0.57	0.567
Age <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	Unmatched	8.593	9.150	-10.5	-3.17	0.002
	Matched	8.603	8.703	-1.9	-0.41	0.684
Liquidity ratio <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	Unmatched	0.098	0.147	-29.2	-7.71	0.000
	Matched	0.098	0.101	-1.6	-0.42	0.676
Capital to labour ratio <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	Unmatched	2.009	1.276	42.6	11.65	0.000
	Matched	2.011	1.981	1.8	0.43	0.667
Foreign ownership dummy (owner from OECD <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub> country)	Unmatched	0.040	0.008	20.3	9.85	0.000
	Matched	0.040	0.035	3.2	0.55	0.582
Foreign ownership dummy (owner from non-OECD <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub> country)	Unmatched	0.012	0.004	9.0	3.82	0.000
	Matched	0.012	0.011	0.6	0.11	0.914

## B. Estonia

		Mean of treated	Mean of control	Difference (%)	<i>t</i> -statistics	<i>p</i> -value
Log(labour productivity) <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	Unmatched	9.94	9.53	48.3	28.84	0.00
	Matched	9.94	9.93	0.9	0.39	0.70
Log(employment) <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	Unmatched	2.09	1.69	38.3	23.42	0.00
	Matched	2.09	2.09	0.4	0.18	0.86
Age <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	Unmatched	1.79	1.85	-8.3	-5.06	0.00
	Matched	1.79	1.8	-1.1	-0.47	0.64
Liquidity ratio <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	Unmatched	0.57	0.53	10.3	6.38	0.00
	Matched	0.57	0.56	1.2	0.53	0.60
Capital to labour ratio <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	Unmatched	8.56	8.21	22.8	13.64	0.00
	Matched	8.56	8.57	-0.7	-0.33	0.74
Foreign firm <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	Unmatched	0.11	0.03	30.2	24.37	0.00
	Matched	0.11	0.11	-0.2	-0.05	0.96
Northern Estonia <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	Unmatched	0.51	0.4	22	13.3	0.00
	Matched	0.51	0.52	-1.4	-0.61	0.54

Source: authors' calculations.

Productivity gains from entry into exports of final goods or exports of transport services are less clear. In the context of GVCs, they are associated with assembly into final products and logistic services, which are often characterised by standardised processes and strong competition pressure, thereby resulting in low profit margins (OECD (2013)). For Latvian firms, labour productivity gains from entry into such exports are smaller or statistically insignificant, even though it boosts turnover per worker. However, for Estonian firms, these entries result in significant gains in

productivity comparable to gains from exports of intermediate goods or non-transport services. The difference in productivity effect between the two countries could be driven by several factors. For instance, while 57% of Estonia's exports of final goods are directed to the OECD countries other than Latvia, 30% of Latvia's exports of final goods are directed to the OECD countries other than Estonia.<sup>15</sup> The higher share of exports to advanced economies may have encouraged final goods exporters in Estonia to upgrade product quality or allowed them to enjoy larger learning-by-exporting.<sup>16</sup> Also, Estonia's transport services may be more oriented toward passenger transportation, which has little to do with GVC participation, whereas Latvia's transport services are primarily freight.<sup>17</sup>

The estimated gains in labour productivity are often strongest in the year of export entry and level off thereafter (notable exceptions are entry to re-exports by Latvian firms and to exports of transport services by Estonian firms).<sup>18</sup> One possible explanation is that learning-by-exporting occurs quickly because export entrants have very low initial knowledge base.<sup>19</sup> An alternative interpretation is that the productivity gains are driven mostly by an increase in capacity utilisation as firms enjoy larger demand rather than absorption of new knowledge or innovation. Appendix 2 shows for Estonian firms that exporting is significantly correlated with higher probability of realising various kinds of innovation. However, this correlation becomes statistically insignificant, once major inputs to innovation, such as R&D or knowledge sourcing activities, are taken into account.

Export entry significantly increases employment, indicating that the increase in labour productivity following export entry is not driven by shedding employment. Instead, the access to larger markets seems to be allowing Latvian and Estonian firms to hire more. A significant increase in employment follows entries into exports of intermediate goods, re-exports in both countries and exports of non-transport services in Estonia. But it is less clear or weaker in the case of exports of final goods or transport services. Furthermore, export entry also results in firms paying higher wages. But this is only the case for entry into exports of intermediate goods, re-exports and exports of non-transport services. In Latvia, entry into transport services actually results in a significant decline in average wage. Overall, participation in the upstream of a GVC is more likely to increase the number of high quality jobs in both countries. Lastly, export entry increases capital intensity of Latvian firms entering goods exports but not that of Estonian firms.

<sup>15</sup> Figures are from the latest available year.

<sup>16</sup> For instance, De Loecker (2007) reported for Slovenian firms that learning-from-exporting is primarily found in the case of exports to OECD countries.

<sup>17</sup> In 2014, 49% of turnover in Latvia's transport service sector occurred in freight.

<sup>18</sup> TFP of Estonian firms is not significant in the period of entry but turns positive and significant in post-treatment periods, starting from  $t + 1$ .

<sup>19</sup> For instance, the business-based R&D (BERD) expenditure in Latvia and Estonia amounted to 0.15% and 0.7% of GDP respectively in 2015. Such R&D intensities underperform the OECD average of 1.64% (OECD (2017)).

Table 10

## The effect of export entry on productivity and other measures of performance

## A. Latvia

		All exports	Type		Participation in GVCs				
			Exports of goods	Exports of services	Exports of intermediate products	Exports of final use products	Re-exports	Exports of transport services	Exports of other services
Labour productivity	T	0.232***	0.259***	0.147	0.270***	0.121	0.237***	-0.022	0.324**
	$t+1$	0.195***	0.205***	0.118	0.207**	0.129	0.287***	0.017	0.190
	$t+2$	0.199***	0.225***	0.279**	0.218***	0.177**	0.392***	0.191	0.100
TFP (1)	T	0.268***	0.281***	0.215*	0.288***	0.087	0.252***	-0.015	0.398***
	$t+1$	0.231***	0.229***	0.203*	0.252***	0.084	0.288***	0.032	0.258
	$t+2$	0.239***	0.250***	0.344***	0.269***	0.139*	0.382***	0.185	0.172
Turnover per worker	T	0.496***	0.479***	0.341***	0.534***	0.299***	0.572***	0.319***	0.327**
	$t+1$	0.491***	0.481***	0.306***	0.562***	0.354***	0.603***	0.343***	0.219
	$t+2$	0.448***	0.451***	0.343***	0.502***	0.365***	0.569***	0.369***	0.235*
Number of employees	T	0.137***	0.105***	0.309***	0.130***	0.056	0.125***	0.217	0.230
	$t+1$	0.187***	0.158***	0.401***	0.204***	0.045	0.149***	0.242*	0.300
	$t+2$	0.214***	0.184***	0.401***	0.256***	0.037	0.161***	0.212	0.353
Average wage	T	0.040	0.038	-0.001	-0.006	-0.028	0.045	-0.220**	0.218**
	$t+1$	0.080***	0.079**	0.001	0.054	-0.005	0.085**	-0.217**	0.288***
	$t+2$	0.077**	0.073*	0.063	0.091**	-0.011	0.118**	-0.151*	0.286**
Capital per worker	T	0.047	0.075	-0.004	0.146**	0.215***	0.104	0.016	-0.221
	$t+1$	0.064	0.095	0.006	0.115	0.240**	0.159*	0.033	-0.116
	$t+2$	0.110*	0.136*	0.000	0.171*	0.211*	0.213**	0.096	-0.162
Number of treated		930	855	141	458	516	541	86	56
Number of control		1 647	1 529	255	820	900	960	143	105

**B. Estonia**

		All exports	Type		Participation in GVCs				
			Exports of goods	Exports of services	Exports of intermediate products	Exports of final use products	Re-exports	Exports of transport services	Exports of other services
Labour productivity	T	0.141***	0.105***	0.228***	0.122***	0.124***	0.161***	0.136**	0.278***
	$t + 1$	0.135***	0.119***	0.183***	0.125***	0.133***	0.207***	0.163***	0.238***
	$t + 2$	0.135***	0.103***	0.216***	0.112***	0.108***	0.186***	0.212***	0.215***
TFP (2)	T	-0.027	-0.016	0.01	-0.013	-0.013	0.005	0.071	-0.05
	$t + 1$	0.12***	0.125***	0.239***	0.137***	0.116***	0.157***	0.234**	0.289***
	$t + 2$	0.123***	0.146***	0.203***	0.138***	0.15***	0.214***	0.234*	0.276***
Turnover per worker	T	0.174***	0.156***	0.217***	0.197***	0.071	0.225***	0.336***	0.238***
	$t + 1$	0.163***	0.161***	0.177***	0.192***	0.048	0.249***	0.308***	0.202***
	$t + 2$	0.161***	0.151***	0.181***	0.184***	0.045	0.231***	0.345***	0.172***
Number of employees	T	0.058***	0.047*	0.111**	0.09**	0.025	0.053	0.081	0.095
	$t + 1$	0.089***	0.075***	0.169***	0.128***	0.064	0.082*	0.095	0.173***
	$t + 2$	0.096***	0.087***	0.168***	0.136***	0.097**	0.12***	0.118	0.179***
Average wage	T	0.045***	0.006	0.12***	0.017	0.001	0.061**	0.027	0.146***
	$t + 1$	0.063***	0.035**	0.139***	0.047**	0.027	0.101***	0.017	0.184***
	$t + 2$	0.071***	0.038**	0.192***	0.062***	0.028	0.105***	0.021	0.225***
Capital per worker	T	-0.014	-0.015	0.025	0.004	0.035	0.034	0	0.077
	$t + 1$	0.005	0.015	0.055	0.027	0.04	0.046	0.141	0.061
	$t + 2$	0.05	0.045	0.103	0.089*	0.037	0.04	0.139	0.075
Number of treated		3810	3082	647	1467	855	976	203	471
Number of control		63 922	63 913	17 417	62 812	62 514	62 593	13716	16 339

Source: authors' calculations.

Notes: \* – significant at 10%; \*\* – significant at 5%; \*\*\* – significant at 1%. Dependent variables are all in logarithms. Period  $t + 1$  denotes one year after the year of export entry. The analysis includes only the sample of export entrants and matched non-exporters. Incumbent exporters that export for the full sample period are not taken into account.

(1) Estimated using the method of Galuscak and Lizal (2011).

(2) Estimated using the method of Levinsohn and Petrin (2003).

The estimation of ATTs for some types of export entry (in particular, service exports) is constrained by the small number of treated firms. However, the ATTs for different types of export entry are fairly stable across different specifications, with alternative numbers of nearest neighbours matched to each treated unit or matching using caliper. Furthermore, similar results are obtained even when the definition of export entrants is altered to include intermittent exporters. The finding that export entry boosts productivity of Latvian and Estonian firms, especially for the type of exports related to participation in the upstream of GVC, is thus robust.

**9. CONCLUSIONS**

This study explores (in a comparative way) the causal relationship between export entry and productivity in Latvia and Estonia. It exploits recent datasets of Latvian and Estonian firms and uses the propensity score matching (PSM) approach to estimate productivity gains for different modes of participation in global value chains. In both countries, exporters have a significantly higher productivity level compared to non-exporters, even after accounting for several firm characteristics that affect productivity. Also, the productivity distribution of exporters stochastically dominates that of non-exporters. The flip side of this observation is the existence of many non-

exporting firms with productivity level that is too low to participate in GVCs through exporting. Indeed, about one third of non-exporters have a productivity level that is lower than the 10th percentile of exporters' productivity distribution. At the same time, there are also many non-exporting firms with a productivity level that is higher than the median productivity of exporters.

Corroborating results of the previous literature, this study finds that larger firms and firms with higher productivity are more likely to start exporting. It also shows that export entry boosts productivity significantly, thus supporting the learning-by-exporting hypothesis. However, export entry results in significant productivity gains only when it is related to participation in the high value added activities found in the upstream of GVC. This is the case of entry into exports of intermediate goods, non-transport services and re-exports. For export entry that is related to participation in the downstream of GVCs, such as exports of final goods or transport services, productivity gains are smaller or statistically insignificant. These empirical findings support the paper's conjecture that the empirical evidence on learning-by-exporting have so far been rather scarce because it is conditional upon export entrants participating in high-value added activities within GVC. They also underscore the importance of emerging economies to "move up the value chain" or "upgrade" their GVC activities in order to keep benefiting from GVC participation (OECD (2013), Taglioni and Winkler (2016)).

In both Latvia and Estonia, labour productivity gains following export entry are largest in the year of entry and level off thereafter. This suggests that productivity growth is at least partly driven by an increase in capacity utilisation, as Latvian and Estonian firms gain access to the world market. However, it is less clear if export entry results in qualitative changes such as stronger innovation capabilities, which would allow sustainable productivity growth. In order to realise larger and sustainable productivity gains following their export entry, Latvian and Estonian firms need to engage more in high value added activities in the upstream of GVC. Policies that invigorate innovation such as support for research co-operation between firms and research institutions would contribute to competitiveness in knowledge-intensive activities (OECD (2017)). They also improve firms' capacity to absorb knowledge transfer, thereby reinforcing learning-by-exporting.

Given that export entry increases productivity and the number of well-paid jobs, Latvia and Estonia should aim at increasing the number of exporting firms. The study raises concern regarding the large mass of firms with very low productivity that cannot cover export entry costs, as well as the non-negligible number of firms that are productive enough to enter exporting but are out of the global market. The share of exporters in Latvia is markedly lower than that in Estonia, in particular in non-transport services whose exports are often regarded as GVC activities with high value added. It is important to identify the source of such lower export entry.

## APPENDIX 1. THE ROLE OF SKILLS IN EXPORT ENTRY OF ESTONIAN FIRMS

### The role of experienced workers and skilled workers

An earlier study (Masso et al. (2015)) investigated the effect of labour mobility and spillovers on exporting by matching Estonian export data with the data on payroll tax payments. The study focused on whether hiring managers and top specialists previously working in an exporting company helps the new employer enter new export markets. This is sometime referred to as "learning by hiring". The study found a strong geographic element, namely, that hiring managers and top specialists with prior experience of exporting to a specific region is associated with higher probability of the firm starting to export to that region.

This exercise replicates and extends Masso et al. (2015) by exploiting a longer time period and more recent data. The dataset used in the baseline analysis is matched with the employee-employer data on payroll tax by Statistics Estonia. The matched data tracks employees' job-to-job mobility and thus can identify workers that moved from exporting firms to non-exporting firms. Because payroll tax is applied to all employees at the rate of 33% of the gross wage, its payment record allows researchers to identify an individual's gross wage and employment status at a particular firm at particular time. The data include social tax payments for all employees (the total number varies annually around 600 thousand) by all employers. In addition, the data also include information on an individual's gender and age.

The baseline probit model described in equation (2) in the main text is augmented by the employment share of managers with work experience in exporting firm(s). As occupational data are not available in longitudinal data, managers and top specialists have been proxied as employees with wages belonging to the upper 20% of the wage distribution in the respective 2-digit NACE industry.

To complement this exercise, the role of skills composition in exporting is explored. The analysis further matches the employer-employee data with the micro data of Estonian Population and Housing Census, which contain social-demographic information, such as age, gender, educational attainments and occupation by 4-digit ISCO codes of all Estonian individuals. The data is, however, available only for 2011. A firm's skills composition is then proxied by an index summarising the skills level of occupational structure of its employees (Davidson et al. (2014)). The index is constructed by first ranking all occupations (either at 1-digit or 2-digit ISCO occupations classification) by (1) their average wages or (2) the size of coefficient on the occupational variable in the Mincerian wage regressions. The estimated regression equation is such that  $\ln(Wage)_j = \alpha + \beta \times OCC_j + \varepsilon_i$  where the dependent variable is the log of real monthly wage for individual  $j$ , and  $OCC_j$  is the vector of 1-digit or 2-digit ISCO occupational codes. The coefficient  $\beta$  is the returns to respective occupation used for ranking the occupations.  $\varepsilon_i$  is the error term.

The skills index is then calculated for each firm as the weighted average according to its occupational mix. Following Davidson et al. (2014), the skills index for form  $f$  in year  $t$ , which is denoted as  $S_{ft}$ , is calculated as  $S_{ft} = \sum_k \frac{\lambda_{ft}^k R^k}{K}$ , where the term  $R^k$  denotes the skills ranking of occupation  $k$  with a higher  $k$  meaning a more skilled occupation. The index is bounded between 0 and 1, and a value of 0.5 of the index would indicate that the employment is evenly distributed across occupations. The

index takes higher values if the employment is allocated towards higher skilled occupations.

Because the occupational data is available only at one point of time, this exercise runs a cross-sectional OLS regression where a dummy variable, indicating that a firm is an exporter, is regressed against the skills composition. The coefficient in this regression indicates correlation between skills intensity and export status and not necessarily causality.

Exporters tend to hire a higher share of experienced workers and managers as compared to non-exporters (Table 11). For instance, on average 25% (10%) of employees (managers) in exporting firms have experience of working for other exporting firms, while merely 17% (7%) of employees (managers) with a similar work experience are employed by non-exporting firms (see Column 1 and 2). This difference is more pronounced when focusing on employees or managers who previously worked for exporting firms in the same 2-digit NACE industry (Column 3 and 4). Among different types of exporters, firms engaging in re-exporting and exports of non-transport services have a relatively lower share of experienced employees or managers from the same industry compared to exporters in general. Those exporters may be facing shortages of experienced workers that are constraining their exports and participation in GVCs. Exporters are also more skill-intensive in terms of occupational structure than non-exporters, although the difference is not so large in general and for goods exporters this observation depends on the approach to rank occupations (Column 5 and 6). It is, however, apparent that exporters of non-transport services are more skill-intensive than non-exporters, indicating that shortages of skilled workers can constrain their participation in GVCs the most.

*Table 11*

**Employment share of workers with export experience and skills composition**

Type of firm	Share of employees with export experience (%)	Share of managers with export experience (%)	Share of employees with export experience from the same industry (%)	Share of managers with export experience from the same industry (%)	Skills index: 1-digit occupations ranked by wages	Skills index: 1-digit occupations ranked by Mincerian regressions
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
All exporters	24.6	10.3	7.3	3.0	0.65	0.613
Goods exporters	27.3	11.5	9.3	4.1	0.636	0.591
Exporters of intermediate inputs	28.5	12.1	9.2	4.1	0.634	0.589
Exporters of final goods	27.4	11.1	9.7	4.1	0.629	0.583
Re-exporters	18.1	6.8	2.8	1.2	0.599	0.572
Service exporters	22.3	9.2	5.6	2.1	0.662	0.63
Transport service exporters	24.2	8.4	10.3	3.0	0.602	0.544
Non-transport service exporters	21.7	9.5	4.2	1.8	0.683	0.66
Non-exporters	17.4	6.6	2.7	1.1	0.622	0.595
All firms	18.4	7.1	3.3	1.4	0.627	0.598

Source: authors' calculations.

Note: the export experience data are for 2007–2014, the skills composition data are for 2011.

A higher share of managers with exporting experience is positively associated with the probability of export entry, except for exports of transport services. A significant conclusion is also that export experience has stronger benefit if it has a strong industry-specific focus. Furthermore, export experience has strong positive correlation with exporting in the case of almost all different export dummies (Table 12).

However, the regression analysis shows that the skills index is almost always positively correlated with exporting at least at the 5% level of significance. The correlation is stronger in the case of goods exporting as compared to service exporters. Export entry in final goods shows somewhat stronger correlation with skills as compared to other entry modes, but the same does not apply for exporting. Concerning different kinds of services, exporting of knowledge-intensive services have a strong correlation with skills index, as the production of these services probably requires high skills in the first place.

Table 12

**Regression coefficients of export experience and skills intensity**

Type of exporter	Probability of export entry				Export dummy	
	Share of employees with export experience	Share of managers with export experience	Share of employees with export experience from the same industry	Share of managers with export experience from the same industry	Skills index: 1-digit occupations ranked by wages	Skills index: 1-digit occupations ranked by Mincerian regressions
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
All exporters	0.429***	0.502***	0.426***	0.614***	0.322***	0.356***
Goods exporters	0.301***	0.450***	0.319***	0.596***	0.312*	0.510***
Exporters of final goods	0.498***	0.502***	0.454***	0.557***	0.503***	0.510***
Exporters of intermediate goods	0.405***	0.511***	0.451***	0.460**	0.489***	0.458***
Re-exporters	0.464***	0.330***	0.412***	0.563***	1.100***	0.630**
Service exporters	0.544***	0.431***	0.501***	0.474***	0.253	0.324*
Transport service exporters	0.222**	0.411***	0.439***	0.592***	0.486**	-0.203
Non-transport service exporters	0.600***	0.280**	0.647***	0.741***	0.358*	0.467**

Source: authors' calculations.

Notes: table reports the coefficients on the export experience and the skills intensity in the augmented probit model and cross-sectional OLS model. \* – significant at 10%; \*\* – significant at 5%; \*\*\* – significant at 1%. Dependent variables are dummy variables corresponding to different types of exporters and export entry. The estimation includes the same explanatory variables as the baseline probit model described in equation (2) in the main text.

**Knowledge spillovers from multinational enterprises through workers' mobility**

Labour mobility has been considered as one of the key channels of knowledge transfer from multinational enterprises (MNEs) to local firms (Dasgupta (2012), Balsvik (2011)). Whereas most literature on knowledge spillovers from MNEs focused on the impact on productivity of local firms, benefits of MNEs presence may reveal themselves via the transfer of export-related knowledge which helps local firms to start exporting or expand their scope of exports to new products or markets. This subsection examines the role of employees or managers with experience in MNEs in facilitating the export entry (more comprehensive analysis can be found in Masso and



Vahter (2016)). The analysis exploits the same matched employer–employee data used above.

The probit model described in equation (2) of the main text is augmented with the share of employees and managers that previously worked in MNEs. Furthermore, in order to address possible endogeneity between export decisions and decisions about hiring people with export experience (Masso et al. (2015)), the analysis use instrumental variable (IV) approach. The shares of ex-MNEs employees and managers in all employees are instrumented by the share of current employees, whose reason for moving to the particular enterprise was the closure of their previous employer. While such share is correlated with availability of ex-MNE employees, it should be exogenous to the firms considering export entry.

The estimation results in Table 13 show that a higher employment share of ex-MNEs employees and managers significantly increases the probability of export entry by Estonian firms, even after controlling for firm size, age, share of managers and labour productivity level. The marginal effects at sample means are also positive and significant: a 10 percentage points increase in the share of MNE-experienced employees (managers) is associated with about a 5% (10%) higher probability that the firm exports. To give further indication of the magnitude of these correlations, a standard deviation increase in the share of MNE-experienced managers in the workforce of a firm is associated with about 35% higher propensity of the firm to export.

Table 13

**MNE experience of employees: estimated relationship with exporting**

	(1)	(2)
Share of employees with experience from MNEs	0.205 (0.110)*	
Share of managers and high-wage employees with experience from MNEs		0.308 (0.134)**
Share of managers at firm	0.103 (0.052)**	0.099 (0.052)*
Log labour productivity ( $t - 1$ )	0.401 (0.019)***	0.401 (0.019)***
Number of observations	15 760	15 760
<b>Marginal effects</b>		
Share of employees with experience from MNEs	0.553 (0.105)***	
Share of managers and high-wage employees with experience from MNEs		0.965 (0.178)***

Source: authors' calculations.

Notes: Robust standard errors are in parentheses. Explanatory variables included in the estimation but not reported in the table are firm size, firm age, cash to total assets, and NACE 2-digit level sector dummies.

## APPENDIX 2. EXPORTS AND INNOVATION OF ESTONIAN FIRMS

One important channel through which exports boost productivity is stimulating innovation. There may be important learning effects from exporting that are realised in product innovation, process innovation or other types of innovation. Some types of exports, such as those to advanced economies or exports of multiple products to multiple destinations, may have larger scope for absorbing advanced technologies and other useful knowledge for innovation. Innovation in turn increases the likelihood that a firm starts exporting. Developing new products or improving product quality raises firms' competitiveness in foreign markets. Higher productivity realised by process innovation makes it easier for firms to cover the entry cost of exports.

This section investigates the relationship between exporting and innovation by exploiting micro data of the Community Innovation Survey (CIS) for 2010–2012 by the European Commission. It observes key types of innovation realised by Estonian firms during this period, such as product innovation, process innovation, organisational innovation, and marketing innovation, which are defined by the Oslo Manual of Innovation Studies. Radical product innovations, which are new-to-market product innovations, and radical process innovation, which are new-to-Estonia process innovations, are also observed. The CIS also includes information on export status during the same period which is used herein. Unfortunately, the sample size of CIS is much more smaller than the baseline dataset.

In the spirit of "innovation (or knowledge) production function" (Crépon et al. (1998), Laursen and Salter (2006), Roper et al. (2008)), this section estimates a probit model where innovation output is assumed to be a function of various innovation inputs and exports. Innovation output is proxied by various technological and non-technological innovation indicators from the CIS. The dependent variable is a dummy variable, taking value 1 if the firm reports a specific type of innovation indicator and zero value otherwise. Export status is captured by the export dummy, as in equation (1) of the main text. The probit model also includes 2-digit NACE sector dummies and firm size (log of employment) as explanatory variables. The positive and significant coefficients on export dummy summarised in Table 14 indicate that exporters are significantly more likely to be engaging in innovation, ranging from new product development to organisational changes to new marketing, compared to non-exporters of the same size and in the same industry.

Table 14

### Exporters' premium in innovation

Dependent variable	Product innovation (1)	Process innovation (2)	Radical product innovation (3)	Radical process innovation (4)	Organisational innovation (5)	Marketing innovation (6)
Export dummy	0.112** (3.25)	0.163*** (4.50)	0.0814** (2.75)	0.0247 (1.11)	0.117*** (3.55)	0.125*** (3.76)
Firm size	0.0344** (3.27)	0.0760*** (7.44)	0.0419*** (5.17)	0.0239*** (3.90)	0.0479*** (5.03)	0.0380*** (3.95)
Sector dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	1 681	1 683	1 552	1 472	1 675	1 688

Source: authors' calculations.

Notes: authors' calculations based on Estonian firm-level datasets. Marginal effects. Robust z-statistics in parentheses. \* – significant at 5%; \*\* – significant at 1%; \*\*\* – significant at 0.1%. CIS 2012 dataset, period 2010–2012.

Next, it is examined if the exporters' premium in innovation is driven by exports or innovation efforts, such as R&D, research collaboration and external knowledge sourcing activities. The probit model is augmented to include innovation input variables often employed in studies of the innovation value chain (e.g. Roper et al. (2008), Laursen and Salter (2006)) or structural models of R&D, innovation and productivity (e.g. Griffith et al. (2006)). The results summarised in Table 15 show that the coefficient on export dummy is no longer significant, once various inputs to innovation, except for marketing innovation, are taken into account. Thus exporters' premium in innovation is mostly accounted for by exporters having higher level of innovation inputs. This, however, does not mean that exports are not stimulating innovation, since higher innovation inputs can be induced by exports. For instance, numerous sources report that the export entry increases innovation inputs, such as R&D, purchase of new technology and other external knowledge sourcing (Aw et al. (2009), Bustos (2011), Criscuolo et al. (2010)).

It is worth noting that innovation inputs have the expected signs and significance in the estimated knowledge production function. Own R&D of the firm is positively associated with product and process innovation and more radical innovation, but not organisational or marketing innovation. Knowledge sourcing and formal co-operation with external partners matters a lot for successful innovation. Knowledge sourcing from clients matters for product innovation, knowledge sourcing from suppliers is associated with higher propensity of process innovation (e.g. similarly to Griffith et al. (2006) results from Western Europe).

Finally, the CIS data are matched with the firm data used in the main analysis to uncover the type of exports that is more correlated with innovation. Table 16 reports marginal effects from the estimation where the dependent variable is a dummy variable indicating specific type of innovation (columns) and the main explanatory variable is a dummy variable indicating a specific type of exports (rows). Sector dummies and firm size are included in all estimations as control variables.<sup>20</sup> Export dummy in this case indicates export status in 2010, while innovation is reported during 2010–2012. The direction of causality runs from exports to innovation rather than in the above exercises where export dummies indicated contemporaneous exports.

Overall, the association between exports and innovation is less clear than in Table 15, suggesting that there is a sizable self-selection of innovative firms into exports. Nevertheless, a clear positive relationship is still found in the case of process innovation and, to lesser extent, in the case of product, organisational or marketing innovation. Most notably, the positive correlation of exporting and innovation is clear and evident in the case of service exports. Service exports are likely to entail (radical) product innovation, process innovation and, to a weaker extent, organisational innovation. Such finding is in line with the large productivity gains found for service exports, namely, exports of non-transport services.

<sup>20</sup> Due to a very small sample size, some types of exporters are not identified.

*Table 15*  
**Determinants of innovation**

Dependent variable	Product innovation	Process innovation	Radical product innovation	Radical process innovation	Organisational innovation	Marketing innovation
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Internal R&D	0.0656** (3.23)	0.107*** (4.34)	0.0559*** (3.41)	0.0405** (2.65)	0.0252 (0.85)	0.0205 (0.70)
Continuous R&D	0.0642** (2.60)	-0.0406 (-1.31)	0.0237 (1.36)	0.00927 (0.63)	0.0488 (1.46)	0.00867 (0.27)
Buying in external R&D	0.174*** (10.34)	0.0228 (0.93)	0.0674*** (4.70)	0.0214 (1.57)	0.0492 (1.85)	0.166*** (6.80)
Formal co-operation	0.0832*** (4.56)	0.0954*** (4.53)	0.0768*** (5.23)	0.0512*** (3.76)	0.0917*** (3.58)	0.00908 (0.35)
Knowledge sourcing from within firm	0.129*** (7.00)	0.0704** (3.08)	0.0880*** (4.92)	0.0440** (3.02)	0.0817** (2.94)	0.0600* (2.18)
Knowledge sourcing from clients	0.0881*** (5.07)	0.00803 (0.34)	0.0519*** (3.72)	0.0101 (0.79)	0.0466 (1.79)	0.0322 (1.27)
Knowledge sourcing from suppliers	0.0124 (0.70)	0.223*** (13.66)	-0.0112 (-0.78)	0.0434*** (3.38)	0.0544* (2.26)	0.0910*** (3.93)
Knowledge sourcing from universities and research institutes	-0.0398 (-1.50)	-0.0910** (-3.04)	-0.0105 (-0.56)	-0.00824 (-0.53)	0.00720 (0.20)	0.0488 (1.43)
Foreign ownership	-0.00785 (-0.50)	0.0307 (1.69)	0.0134 (0.91)	0.00259 (0.19)	0.0329 (1.52)	-0.0377 (-1.71)
Export dummy	-0.0187 (-0.92)	0.0432 (1.59)	-0.00291 (-0.13)	-0.0102 (-0.52)	0.0410 (1.37)	0.0573* (1.99)
Innovation grants	0.00657 (0.27)	0.111*** (3.86)	0.0247 (1.36)	0.0285 (1.83)	0.000442 (0.01)	0.0417 (1.33)
Innovation grants from the EU	0.00542 (0.17)	-0.0159 (-0.41)	0.0332 (1.38)	-0.00333 (-0.17)	0.102* (2.36)	0.0756 (1.80)
Firm size	-0.0156* (-2.23)	0.0193* (2.38)	0.00790 (1.25)	0.00498 (0.94)	0.0129 (1.46)	0.0108 (1.21)
Share of employees with higher degree >10%	-0.00127 (-0.07)	-0.0373* (-1.98)	0.0171 (0.97)	0.00866 (0.55)	0.0368 (1.59)	0.0347 (1.52)
Sector dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N	1 681	1 683	1 552	1 472	1 675	1 688

Source: authors' calculations.

Notes: marginal effects. Robust z-statistics in parentheses. \* – significant at 5%; \*\* – significant at 1%; \*\*\* – significant at 0.1%. CIS 2012 dataset, period 2010–2012.

*Table 16*  
**Types of exporting and innovation**

Dependent variable	Product innovation	Process innovation	Radical product innovation	Radical process innovation (new to Estonia)	Organisational innovation	Marketing innovation
Goods exporters	0.00471 (0.12)	0.0688* (1.75)	0.0375 (1.16)	0.0384 (1.44)	0.0475 (1.33)	0.0485 (1.28)
Intermediate inputs exporters	0.00956 (0.23)	0.112*** (2.61)	0.0315 (0.94)	0.0290 (1.10)	0.0702* (1.78)	0.0717* (1.75)
Final goods exporters	0.0229 (0.50)	0.121*** (2.75)	0.00894 (0.22)	0.0378 (1.38)	0.103** (2.44)	0.0470 (1.08)
Service exporters	0.0726** (2.56)	0.0593** (2.03)	0.0635*** (2.67)	0.0280 (1.27)	0.0477* (1.65)	0.0300 (1.03)

Source: authors' calculations.

Notes: authors' own calculations based on Estonian firm-level datasets. Marginal effects. Robust *z*-statistics in parentheses. \* – significant at 5%; \*\* – significant at 1%; \*\*\* – significant at 0.1%. CIS 2012 dataset merged with Estonia's firm level trade data, period 2010–2012. Each cell shows marginal effect of a particular kind of exporting on a particular type of innovation. Each regression includes also size and sector controls. All regressions, except the ones on service exports, are based on the sample of manufacturing firms. Service exports' "effects" are estimated based on the sample of all firms.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- ANTRÀS, Pol, CHOR, Davin, FALLY, Thibault, HILLBERRY, Russell (2012). Measuring the Upstreamness of Production and Trade Flows. *American Economic Review*, vol. 102, issue 3, pp. 412–416.
- AW, Bee Yan, ROBERTS, Mark J., WINSTON, Tor (2007). Export Market Participation, Investments in R&D and Worker Training, and the Evolution of Firm Productivity. *The World Economy*, vol. 30, issue 1, January 2007, pp. 83–104.
- BALDWIN, Richard (2012). Global Supply Chains: Why They Emerged, why They Matter, and where They Are Going. *CEPR Discussion Paper*, No. 9103.
- BALSVIK, Ragnhild (2011). Is Labor Mobility a Channel for Spillovers from Multinationals? Evidence from Norwegian Manufacturing. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, vol. 93, issue 1, February 2011, pp. 285–297.
- BAYOUMI, Tamim, COE, David T., HELPMAN, Elhanan (1999). R&D Spillovers and Global Growth. *Journal of International Economics*, vol. 47, issue 2, pp. 399–428.
- BENKOVSKIS, Konstantīns, BĒRZIŅA, Santa, ZORGENFREIJA, Līva (2016). Evaluation of Latvia's Re-Exports Using Firm-Level Trade Data. *Baltic Journal of Economics*, vol. 16, issue 1, pp. 1–20.
- BERNARD, Andrew B., JENSEN, J. Bradford (1999). Exceptional Exporter Performance: Cause, Effect, or Both? *Journal of International Economics*, vol. 47, No. 1, February 1999, pp. 1–25.
- BERNARD, Andrew B., JENSEN, J. Bradford (2004). Exporting and Productivity in the USA. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, vol. 20, issue 3, September 2004, pp. 343–357.
- BLALOCK, Garrick, GERTLER, Paul J. (2004). Learning from Exporting Revisited in a Less Developed Setting. *Journal of Development Economics*, vol. 75, issue 2, pp. 397–416.
- BREINLICH, Holger, CRISCUOLO, Chiara (2011). International Trade in Services: A Portrait of Importers and Exporters. *Journal of International Economics*, vol. 84, issue 2, July 2011, pp. 188–206.
- BUSTOS, Paula (2011). Trade Liberalization, Exports, and Technology Upgrading: Evidence on the Impact of MERCOSUR on Argentinian Firms. *American Economic Review*, vol. 101, issue 1, February 2011, pp. 304–340.
- CHANEY, Thomas (2016). Liquidity Constrained Exporters. *Journal of Economic Dynamics & Control*, vol. 72, November 2016, pp. 141–154.
- COSTINOT, Arnaud, VOGEL, Jonathan, WANG, Su (2013). An Elementary Theory of Global Supply Chains. *Review of Economic Studies*, vol. 80, issue 1, January 2013, pp. 109–144.
- CRÉPON, Bruno, DUGUET, Emmanuel, MAIRESSE, Jacques (1998). *Research, Innovation, and Productivity: An Econometric Analysis at the Firm Level*. NBER Working Paper, August 1998, No. 6696. 44 p.

- CRISCUOLO, Chiara, HASKEL, Jonathan E., SLAUGHTER, Matthew J. (2010). Global Engagement and the Innovation Activities of Firms. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, vol. 28, issue 2, March 2010, pp. 191–202.
- DASGUPTA, Kunal (2012). Learning and Knowledge Diffusion in a Global Economy. *Journal of International Economics*, vol. 87, issue 2, pp. 323–336.
- DAVIDSON, Carl, HEYMAN, Fredrik, MATUSZ, Steven J., SJÖHOLM, Fredrik, CHUN ZHU, Susan (2014). *Global Engagement and Occupational Structure of Firms*. IFN Working Paper, No. 1026. 58 p.
- DE LOECKER, Jan (2007). Do Exports Generate Higher Productivity? Evidence from Slovenia. *Journal of International Economics*, vol. 73, pp. 69–98.
- DE LOECKER, Jan (2013). Detecting Learning by Exporting. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics*, vol. 5, No. 3, August 2013, pp. 1–21.
- DEDRICK, Jason, KRAEMER, Kenneth L., LINDEN, Greg (2010). Who Profits from Innovation in Global Value Chains?: A Study of the iPod and Notebook PCs. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, vol. 19, issue 1, February 2010, pp. 81–116.
- ECB CompNet (2014). *Micro-Based Evidence of EU Competitiveness: the CompNet Database*. ECB Working Paper, No. 1634, February 2014. 84 p.
- FEENSTRA, Robert C., HANSON, Gordon H. (2004). Intermediaries in Entrepôt Trade: Hong Kong Re-Exports of Chinese Goods. *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, vol. 13, No. 1, March 2004, pp. 3–35.
- FERNANDES, Ana M., FREUND, Caroline, PIEROLA, Martha Denisse (2016). Exporter Behavior, Country Size and Stage of Development: Evidence from the Exporter Dynamics Database. *Journal of Development Economics*, vol. 119, issue C, pp. 121–137.
- GALUSCAK, Kamil, LIZAL, Lubomir (2011). *The Impact of Capital Measurement Error Correction on Firm-Level Production Function Estimation*. Czech National Bank Working Paper, No. 2011/09.
- GEREFFI, Gary (1999). International Trade and Industrial Upgrading in the Apparel Commodity Chain. *Journal of International Economics*, vol. 48, pp. 37–70.
- GREENAWAY, David, KNELLER, Richard (2007). Firm Heterogeneity, Exporting and Foreign Direct Investment. *The Economic Journal*, vol. 117, issue 517, pp. 134–161.
- GRIFFITH, Rachel, HUERGO, Elena, MAIRESSE, Jacques, PETERS, Bettina (2006). Innovation and Productivity Across Four European Countries. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, vol. 22, issue 4, December 2006, pp. 483–498.
- HUMMELS, David, ISHII, Jun, YI, Kei-Mu (2001). The Nature and Growth of Vertical Specialization in World Trade. *Journal of International Economics*, vol. 54, issue 1, pp. 75–96.
- ISGEP (2008). Understanding Cross-Country Differences in Exporter Premia: Comparable Evidence for 14 Countries. *Review of World Economics*, vol. 144, issue 4, pp. 596–635.

JACOBIDES, Michael G., KNUDSEN, Thorbjørn, AUGIER, Mie (2006). Benefiting from Innovation: Value Creation, Value Appropriation and the Role of Industry Architectures. *Research Policy*, vol. 35, issue 8, pp. 1200–1221.

KOOPMAN, Robert, WANG, Zhi, WEI, Shang-Jin (2012). Estimating Domestic Content in Exports when Processing Trade Is Pervasive. *Journal of Development Economics*, vol. 99, issue 1, September 2012, pp. 178–189.

LAURSEN, Keld, SALTER, Ammon (2006). Open for Innovation: The Role of Openness in Explaining Innovation Performance among UK Manufacturing Firms. *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 27, issue 2, February 2006, pp. 131–150.

LEVINSOHN, James, PETRIN, Amil (2003). Estimating Production Functions Using Inputs to Control for Unobservables. *The Review of Economic Studies*, vol. 70, issue 2, April 2003, pp. 317–341.

MASSO, Jaan, MERIKÜLL, Jaanika, VAHTER, Priit (2013). Shift from Gross Profit Taxation to Distributed Profit Taxation: Are there Effects on Firms? *Journal of Comparative Economics*, vol. 41, issue 4, November 2013, pp. 1092–1105.

MASSO, Jaan, RÕIGAS, Kärt, VAHTER, Priit (2015). Foreign Market Experience, Learning by Hiring and Firm Export Performance. *Review of World Economics/Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, vol. 151, issue 4, November 2015, pp. 659–686.

MASSO, Jaan, VAHTER, Priit (2014). The Role of Product Level Dynamics in Export Growth and Productivity: Evidence from Estonia. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade*, vol. 50, issue 4, pp. 42–60.

MASSO, Jaan, VAHTER, Priit (2015). Exporting and Productivity: The Effects of Multi-Product and Multi-Market Export Entry. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 62, issue 4, September 2015, pp. 325–350.

MASSO, Jaan, VAHTER, Priit (2016). *Knowledge Transfer from Multinationals through Labour Mobility: Learning from Export Experience*. University of Tartu, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration Working Paper, No. 99. 30 p.

MAYER, Thierry, OTTAVIANO, Gianmarco I. P. (2008). The Happy Few: The Internationalisation of European Firms. New Facts Based on Firm-Level Evidence. *Intereconomics*, vol. 43, issue 3, May 2008, pp. 135–148.

MELITZ, Marc J. (2003). The Impact of Trade on Intra-Industry Reallocations and Aggregate Industry Productivity. *Econometrica*, vol. 71, No. 6, November 2003, pp. 1695–1725.

MIROUDOT, Sébastien, CADESTIN, Charles (2017). *Services in Global Value Chains: From Inputs to Value-Creating Activities*. OECD Trade Policy Papers, No. 197. 58 p.

MUÛLS, Mirabelle (2015). Exporters, Importers and Credit Constraints. *Journal of International Economics*, vol. 95, issue 2, March 2015, pp. 333–343.

OECD (2013). *Interconnected Economies: Benefiting from Global Value Chains*. 28 May 2013. 269 p.



- OECD (2017). *OECD Economic Surveys: Latvia 2017*. 15 September 2017. 140 p.
- PUTNIŅŠ, Tālis, SAUKA, Arnis (2015). Measuring the Shadow Economy Using Company Managers. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, vol. 43, issue 2, May 2015, pp. 471–490.
- ROPER, Stephen, DU, Jun, LOVE, James H. (2008). Modelling the Innovation Value Chain. *Research Policy*, vol. 37, issue 6–7, July 2008, pp. 961–977.
- SAGGI, Kamal (2002). Trade, Foreign Direct Investment, and International Technology Transfer: A Survey. *World Bank Research Observer*, vol. 17, issue 2, September 2002, pp. 191–236.
- SHAVER, J. Myles (2011). The Benefits of Geographic Sales Diversification: How Exporting Facilitates Capital Investment. *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 32, issue 10, October 2011, pp. 1046–1060.
- TAGLIONI, Daria, WINKLER, Deborah (2016). *Making Global Value Chains Work for Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank. 265 p.
- VAN BIESEBROECK, Johannes (2005). Exporting Raises Productivity in Sub-Saharan African Manufacturing Firms. *Journal of International Economics*, vol. 67, pp. 373–391.
- WAGNER, Joachim (2007). Exports and Productivity: A Survey of the Evidence from Firm-Level Data. *The World Economy*, vol. 30, issue 1, January 2007, pp. 60–82.
- WAGNER, Joachim (2012). International Trade and Firm Performance: A Survey of Empirical Studies since 2006. *Review of World Economics/Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, vol. 148, issue 2, pp. 235–267.
- YI, Kei-Mu (2003). Can Vertical Specialization Explain the Growth of World Trade? *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 111, issue 1, pp. 52–102.