

Cilekoglu, Akin A.

Article

Export destination and firm upgrading: Evidence from Spain

Journal of Applied Economics

Provided in Cooperation with:

University of CEMA, Buenos Aires

Suggested Citation: Cilekoglu, Akin A. (2024) : Export destination and firm upgrading: Evidence from Spain, Journal of Applied Economics, ISSN 1667-6726, Taylor & Francis, Abingdon, Vol. 27, Iss. 1, pp. 1-23,
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15140326.2024.2427408>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/314297>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Export destination and firm upgrading: evidence from Spain

Akin A. Cilekoglu

To cite this article: Akin A. Cilekoglu (2024) Export destination and firm upgrading: evidence from Spain, *Journal of Applied Economics*, 27:1, 2427408, DOI: [10.1080/15140326.2024.2427408](https://doi.org/10.1080/15140326.2024.2427408)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/15140326.2024.2427408>



© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



[View supplementary material](#)



Published online: 20 Nov 2024.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 333



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)

RESEARCH ARTICLE



Export destination and firm upgrading: evidence from Spain

Akin A. Cilekoglu^{a,b}

^aKing Abdullah Petroleum Studies and Research Center (KAPSARC), Riyadh, Saudi Arabia; ^bAQR-IREA Research Group, University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the role of export destinations on firm upgrading. I exploit the real effective exchange rate devaluation in Spain during the Great Recession to identify the unusual export performance of manufacturing firms. Using directly observable measures of firm upgrading, I find that increased share of exports to low-income destinations in sales reduced productivity and upgrading efforts of firms. However, real effective exchange rate devaluation did not affect the share of exports to high-income destinations in sales as well as productivity and upgrading efforts. The results are consistent with the quality sorting hypothesis that suggests a positive relationship between firm productivity and product quality. The findings in this paper emphasize that export market destination is an important determinant in analysing the gains from exporting.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 4 September 2024
Accepted 18 October 2024

KEYWORDS

Exports; firm upgrading;
market destination;
exchange rate

1. Introduction

One of the main established facts of trade literature is the superior performance of exporters to non-exporters, but the causal direction of this relationship has been a particular subject of study. One explanation for this pattern is that exporters are ex-ante better performing firms even before entering export markets (e.g., Bernard & Jensen, 1999; Clerides et al., 1998). On the other hand, increased volume of exports due to larger market size encourages investments in new technologies which reduces the fixed costs per unit product and makes upgrading more profitable (e.g., Bustos, 2011; Yeaple, 2005). Another explanation is the learning-by-exporting mechanism which suggests that firms entering into export markets upgrade their technology and raise productivity through learning (e.g., Bustos, 2011; De Loecker, 2007; Lileeva & Trefler, 2010; Van Biesebroeck, 2005).

Market destination might play a role in explaining the impact of exporting on productivity because consumers in richer countries tend to have higher willingness to pay for high-quality products. Previous studies documented that firms exporting to high-income countries produce higher quality products (e.g., Atkin et al., 2017; Crozet et al., 2012; Khandelwal, 2010), charge higher price for their products (e.g., Bas & Strauss-Kahn,

CONTACT Akin A. Cilekoglu ✉ acilekoglu@ub.edu 📧 King Abdullah Petroleum Studies and Research Center (KAPSARC), PO Box 88550, Riyadh 11672, Saudi Arabia

© 2024 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

2015; Bastos & Silva, 2010; Hallak, 2006; Hummels & Klenow, 2005; Manova & Zhang, 2012; Schott, 2004) and use high-quality input factors and technology (e.g., Bas & Strauss-Kahn, 2015; Bastos et al., 2018; Brambilla et al., 2012; Hallak & Sivadasan, 2013; Kugler & Verhoogen, 2012).¹ Firms may also improve their performance to compete in tougher markets by reducing marginal costs (e.g., Aghion et al., 2024; Mayer et al., 2014; Melitz & Ottaviano, 2008). On the other hand, customer's expectation of better product standards and qualities or customer's willing to share specific information might lead the exporter to increase quality. Finally, firms may be attracted to higher quality inputs from export markets or exposed to other firms/trainers/consultants.²

Does destination matter for firm-level upgrading and productivity improvements from exporting? This paper studies the changes in exports of Spanish manufacturing firms during the Great Recession to provide evidence on whether export destination is an important determinant of firms' upgrading efforts and productivity gains from exporting. I exploit the change in real effective exchange rate (REER) in Spain to isolate the causal effect of exporting to low- and high-income countries on firm productivity. Using devaluation in REER based on unit labor costs after 2008 to identify exogenous variation in exports across destinations (e.g., Bastos et al., 2018; Brambilla et al., 2012; Park et al., 2010; Verhoogen, 2008), I find differential effects on firms exporting to low-income and high-income destinations. In response to REER devaluation, firms exported to low-income destinations substantially increased their share of exports in sales but experienced a fall in productivity and reduced their attempts for upgrading activities. On the contrary, the share of exports to high-income countries in sales remained relatively stable and there has not been a significant impact on productivity and upgrading efforts during the period 2008–2012.

This paper is primarily related to the empirical literature that examines the role of export destination on firm-level outcomes. Previous literature has predominantly studied the firms exporting to countries with similar (e.g., Bustos, 2011; Lileeva & Trefler, 2010) or higher income level (e.g., Atkin et al., 2017; Van Biesebroeck, 2005).³ The analysis in this paper differs from and contributes to the literature by showing that export destination can be an important factor determining the relationship between exporting and firm performance.

This paper is most closely related to Park et al. (2010) who study how increased exports in China during the Asian financial crisis driven by currency depreciation increased firm performance. They find that larger exports to high-income destinations experienced productivity movements, but their analysis includes only foreign owned firms.⁴ However, empirical evidences suggest that foreign ownership induces productivity improvements and higher skill (e.g., Guadalupe et al., 2012; Koch & Smolka, 2019). Hence, I restrict the sample to domestically owned firms.

¹Crozet et al. (2012) and Atkin et al. (2017) use directly observable dimensions of product quality. Using free on board prices that excludes transport costs and controlling for distance and other destination characteristics, Bastos and Silva (2010) show that firms charge higher prices for goods sold to richer markets. Manova and Zhang (2012), Martin (2012), Görg et al. (2017) provide similar findings for China, France and Hungary.

²Verhoogen (2021) surveys the related literature and explains various channels of firm upgrading.

³One exception is De Loecker (2007) who reports that the TFP increases are lower for Slovenian firms exporting low-income countries.

⁴Supporting this hypothesis, De Loecker (2007) and Coelli et al. (2022) also find some evidence of smaller productivity gains and innovation activities for exporting to low-income countries than high-income countries.

This paper is also related to the empirical literature that investigates productivity effects of exporting. One strand of the literature uses TFP as a measure of productivity gains, but TFP measures may be erroneous particularly in the studies identifying the learning-by-exporting mechanism of exporting because TFP typically reflects the changes in markups, markdowns, product quality and product mix which would vary with exporting across destinations (e.g., De Loecker & Goldberg, 2014; Garcia-Marin & Voigtländer, 2019).⁵ Other common measures used in the literature are spending on technology and innovation activities (e.g., Bustos, 2011; Lileeva & Treffer, 2010). This paper departs from these studies by using the data on direct upgrading activities. Particular advantage of this analysis is that it captures firms' efforts and attempts for upgrading in various ways without necessarily using technology investments or the outcomes of technology investments (e.g., innovation).

Spain experienced a relatively recent transformation from an autarkic economy to an active global integration since 1970s. The country has undergone a structural change and alignment with international markets through a series of reforms, particularly after joining the European Union (EU) which facilitated greater access to European markets, attracted foreign investments, enhanced innovation and improved productivity and competitiveness. The Great Recession following the 2007–2008 financial crisis allowed the country to prove its ability to leverage its global integration to cushion itself against external shocks. While the overall economy experienced a significant turmoil, exporters demonstrated a remarkable performance (e.g., Almunia et al., 2021) despite soaring unemployment, fall in consumption and a severe contraction in economic output. This study contributes to the literature by documenting how Spanish exporters navigated a devastating financial crisis and offering policy-relevant insights for the implications of exporter behavior during the economic downturns.⁶

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the dataset used in the paper and provides a descriptive analysis. Section 3 introduces the empirical analysis, and Section 4 reports the results. Section 5 concludes.

2. Data and context

In this section, I explain the details of the firm-level dataset and present the preliminary results of the descriptive analysis on the export performance of manufacturing firms during the Great Recession.

Firm-level data used in this paper come from the Encuesta Sobre Estrategias Empresariales (ESEE) provided by the SEPI foundation in Madrid. The empirical

⁵Estimating TFP typically relies on strong assumptions. Moreover, it may be considered as a determinant of subsequent upgrading rather than an outcome of upgrading efforts. See Verhoogen (2021) for discussions on various upgrading measures used in the literature.

⁶I also would like to emphasize the fact that the Small and Medium Size Enterprises (SMEs) comprise the significant proportion of Spanish economy. The predominance of the SMEs could make the case more interesting since they have typically lower rate of survival during the economic downturns because of limited resources and lower probability of international engagement. In the context of this study, I also would like to argue that larger firms may benefit from increased opportunities of exporting in response to devaluation. However, in many countries in the EU, including those with higher-income level than Spain such as Germany, SMEs represent the majority of the firms in the economy. Therefore, I believe that the Spanish case would not significantly diverge from the other countries, particularly in Europe. Yet, the findings in this paper could be considered as more relevant for countries predominantly consist of the SMEs.

analysis (regressions) focus on the activities of firms from 2008 to 2012, the period of the Great Recession, and I use the performance of firms (export intensity and export status) in 2007 for the identification strategy. The ESEE survey is a representative panel data set for the Spanish manufacturing sector which provides substantial amount of information from around 2000 firms with 10 or more employees every year. It distinguishes between 20 different industries at the two-digit level of the NACE classification and 17 regions of NUTS2 classification. Additionally, industry-level price indices are obtained from the Spanish Statistical Office (Instituto Nacional de Estadística, INE) and real effective exchange rate (REER) based on unit labor costs come from the IMF.

Obtaining directly observable measures of firm upgrading is often difficult. Some researchers use R&D expenditures, patents, total factor productivity (TFP), technology adoption and product choices while it is yet unclear which alternative most appropriately characterizes firm upgrading or attempts of upgrading.⁷ In the sample, I observe whether firms involved in technological collaborations, attempted to learn new technologies, conducted innovative activities such as R&D, and whether these efforts led to innovation-related outcomes such as patents, product and process innovations. Hence, the dataset is unique as it includes direct measures of firm-level information on upgrading efforts and innovation activities.

The data also incorporate information on the export destinations of firms and specify whether the export revenues are generated in the OECD countries, Latin American countries or the Rest of the World that typically represents low- and middle-income markets. In the analysis, I define the Rest of the World as low-income destination and OECD countries as high-income destination, which is in accordance with the World Bank country classification.⁸ The main analysis does not incorporate exports to Latin America because they remained relatively stable during the Great Recession. The ESEE dataset is suitable for the research question investigated in this paper even though the ideal dataset would report the value-added and input used for each product produced and exported separately for corresponding destinations.

The ESEE dataset includes other variables such as wage, input price index and debt-to-equity ratio. These variables play a crucial role in the analysis as they allow for controlling the cost shocks and financial health of firms. The panel also gives information on whether firms exited the market or were acquired by foreign investors in a given year. As I will discuss in the following sections, conditioning on survival and foreign ownership may generate bias in the estimations. Hence, I exclude the foreign owned firms and those exited the market between 2008 and 2012 from the main analyses.

Spain introduced the Employment Protection Legislation in 2012 that extended trial period of hiring additional workers for smaller firms with less than 50 employees. Garcia-Vega et al. (2021) find that this labor market reform increased innovative activities of

⁷Verhoogen (2021) provides a very detailed survey on this topic. Braguinsky et al. (2021) study the cotton spinning industry in early industrialization period in Japan. They compute firms' product upgrade trials as a measure of upgrading efforts.

⁸As an exception, several countries such as Chile (member since 2010), Türkiye (member since 1961) and Mexico (member since 1964) can arguably considered as middle-income countries. I rely on the World Bank classification in the analysis as Brambilla et al. (2012) that use the same classification in defining high-income and low-income countries. I would like to emphasize that Spanish producers usually heavily export to the EU countries which are also the OECD members. However, Spain has been forming trade relations with other high-income partners as well. For instance, Canada and South Korea are among some countries that are not within the European Union but the member of the OECD in which the exports to the OECD is included in the analysis.

firms by raising the flexibility in employment decisions. I take into account the possibility that labor market reform in 2012 might have had heterogeneous effects on firms with different characteristics. Therefore, I focus on the 2008–2012 period in order to abstract from productivity improving and innovative activities of exporters in response to the labor market reform.

Figure 1 provides graphical view of the underlying mechanism for the identification strategy. The change in the REER based on the unit labor costs is shown on the left panel. The REER has jumped to above 105 level in 2008 from 90 level in 2004 and declined thereafter to around 93 level by 2012. Many of the OECD countries and Spain are using the same currency (Euro) and experienced severe depression during the crisis. Thus, depreciation must have raised particularly the exports to low-income countries in destination portfolio while not affecting the OECD countries significantly. On the other hand, the movements in exports-to-sales ratio for each destination are displayed on the right panel. During the devaluation period, the share of exports in sales has increased sharply for the Rest of the World while remaining stable for the OECD countries and Latin America. The visual presentations suggest that firms' export intensity to low-income markets and exchange rate movements are evidently associated though it does not necessarily induce a causal relationship.

Table 1 reports summary statistics for firms exporting to low-income destinations, high-income destinations and to both destinations in the pre-crisis year of 2007. It appears that high-income exporters initially depict better performance measures than low-income exporters: they have higher export share in sales, labor productivity, sales, capital investments, R&D expenses and patents. Additionally, Table 2 reports the low-income exports over sales across industries from 2008 to 2012. In almost each industry, there has been an increase in low-income export intensity during the Great Recession.⁹ In particular, some industries (e.g., Meat products, Beverage, Textiles and clothing, Timber, Printing, Nonmetal mineral products, Machinery and equipment, Computer products, electronics




Figure 1. Real effective exchange rate and exports by destination. The left panel uses the IMF data on the real effective exchange rate based on unit labor costs normalized to 100 in 2010. The right panel uses the ESEE data and shows destination-specific export intensities defined as the share of exports to a destination (the Rest of the World, OECD countries and Latin America) in total sales.

⁹Table B1 in the Appendix B shows the natural logarithm of total exports to low-income countries for each industry for each year.

Table 1. Summary statistics, firm characteristics, 2007.

| (lr)2-4(lr)5-7(lr)8-10 | Low-income exporter | | | High-income exporter | | | All exporters | | |
|---------------------------|---------------------|-------|------|----------------------|--------|------|---------------|-------|------|
| | Mean | SD | Obs. | Mean | SD | Obs. | Mean | SD | Obs. |
| Export/Sales (%) | 0.368 | 0.278 | 704 | 0.414 | 0.277 | 578 | 0.361 | 0.278 | 846 |
| Labor productivity (log) | 11.628 | 0.635 | 704 | 11.659 | 0.658 | 578 | 11.619 | 0.646 | 846 |
| Sales (log) | 17.979 | 1.735 | 704 | 18.112 | 1.696 | 578 | 17.939 | 1.757 | 846 |
| Capital investments (log) | 13.068 | 4.264 | 704 | 13.193 | 4.371 | 578 | 12.917 | 4.407 | 846 |
| R&D expenditure (log) | 8.322 | 6.851 | 702 | 8.766 | 6.828 | 577 | 8.024 | 6.903 | 844 |
| Number of Patents | 0.962 | 6.029 | 704 | 1.510 | 11.665 | 578 | 1.142 | 9.716 | 846 |

Table reports mean values, standard deviations and the number of observations of firm characteristics for the year 2007. Firms are grouped according to their status of exporting to low-income, high-income destinations and to both destinations, i.e., those exporting to both Rest of the World and the OECD countries. Firms exiting the market during the Great Recession and those acquired by foreign investors before and during the Great Recession are excluded.

Table 2. Exports to low-income destinations in sales across industries 2008–2012.

| Industries | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1. Meat products | 0.006 | 0.007 | 0.010 | 0.011 | 0.019 |
| 2. Food and tobacco | 0.013 | 0.016 | 0.013 | 0.017 | 0.019 |
| 3. Beverage | 0.016 | 0.018 | 0.040 | 0.042 | 0.042 |
| 4. Textiles and clothing | 0.020 | 0.020 | 0.022 | 0.028 | 0.037 |
| 5. Leather, fur and footwear | 0.022 | 0.025 | 0.027 | 0.031 | 0.031 |
| 6. Timber | 0.002 | 0.003 | 0.009 | 0.011 | 0.009 |
| 7. Paper | 0.025 | 0.022 | 0.029 | 0.034 | 0.025 |
| 8. Printing | 0.004 | 0.002 | 0.005 | 0.004 | 0.008 |
| 9. Chemicals and pharmaceuticals | 0.075 | 0.071 | 0.072 | 0.072 | 0.094 |
| 10. Plastic and rubber products | 0.026 | 0.031 | 0.027 | 0.027 | 0.037 |
| 11. Nonmetal mineral products | 0.028 | 0.025 | 0.041 | 0.049 | 0.065 |
| 12. Basic metal products | 0.046 | 0.041 | 0.052 | 0.059 | 0.073 |
| 13. Fabricated metal products | 0.020 | 0.020 | 0.025 | 0.029 | 0.034 |
| 14. Machinery and equipment | 0.094 | 0.095 | 0.160 | 0.166 | 0.178 |
| 15. Computer products, electronics and optical | 0.079 | 0.086 | 0.118 | 0.137 | 0.175 |
| 16. Electric materials and accessories | 0.053 | 0.052 | 0.061 | 0.071 | 0.097 |
| 17. Vehicles and accessories | 0.030 | 0.033 | 0.027 | 0.026 | 0.031 |
| 18. Other transport equipment | 0.061 | 0.071 | 0.067 | 0.070 | 0.093 |
| 19. Furniture | 0.023 | 0.029 | 0.035 | 0.038 | 0.048 |
| 20. Other manufacturing | 0.038 | 0.030 | 0.034 | 0.039 | 0.044 |

Table reports the average level of exports to low-income destinations in sales (the share of exports to low-income countries in overall sales of the firm), i.e., expressed in percentage, across firms for each industry from 2008 to 2012. Low-income destinations are classified as countries except the OECD and the Latin American countries.

and optical, Furniture), the share of exports to low-income countries over sales more than doubled by the end of the period.

3. Empirical strategy

This section presents the empirical strategy. I introduce the empirical model and discuss the issues concerning the identification.

I start the analysis by investigating whether export status in 2007 can explain differential responses of the exports share to low-income and high-income destinations over sales to REER movements. To understanding this mechanism, I use the OLS regression. Thus, I estimate the following equation:

$$\ln(E_{it}^d) = \alpha + \beta \ln(REER_t) * 1\{exports_{i2007} > 0\} + \gamma_i + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad (1)$$

where E_{it}^d is the exports to destination d over sales and γ_i is the firm fixed effects. $1\{\text{exports}_{i2007} > 0\}$ denotes the dummy for exporter status in 2007 that takes the value 1 if the firm was an exporter at that time and 0 otherwise. $REER_t$ is the real effective exchange rate, α is the constant and ε_{it} is the error term.

I am particularly interested in how destination of exports affected productivity improving activities and productivity gains of manufacturing firms in Spain. The 2008 global financial crisis provides a quasi-natural experiment with a sharp decline in REER in Spain during the Great Recession. As shown visually in the previous section, the REER devaluation must have increased the exports to low-income countries as products of Spanish exporters have become cheaper for consumers in low-income markets. Firms must have exported lower quality products to low-income markets due to lower willingness to pay of consumers for high quality, creating less incentive for upgrading despite an increased share of exports to low-income destinations in sales.

The main empirical concern in studying the effect of exporting on upgrading is the endogeneity of exporting. I overcome the endogeneity concern in this paper by exploiting the variations in REER during the Great Recession interacted with the firms' initial exports in sales, i.e., export intensity.¹⁰ As shown on the left panel of Figure 1, the REER dropped sharply after 2008 despite a consistent increase in the pre-crisis period. I consider that Spanish firms must have gained international competitiveness against other countries due to lower growth of real wages to productivity, i.e., devaluation in the REER. In fact, within-firm technological enhancements or resource allocation may also explain improved international competitiveness of firms, but Eppinger et al. (2018) find that most of the manufacturing industries in Spain experienced a decline in TFP during the Great Recession, suggesting that they are unlikely the reasons of increased international competitiveness of firms.¹¹ Moreover, although the member states within the European Monetary Union share a common currency and monetary policy, there are differences in wage growth and labor market flexibility among the EU countries. In fact, labor market-related factors might impact the international competitiveness of Spanish exporters, which I control for the wage in my estimations to minimize biases. Hence, the changes in international competitiveness of Spanish exporters during the Great Recession appear to be due to the changes in unit labor costs reflected in REER.

For the identification, I utilise the instrumental variable strategy. The instrument I need for the analysis must be correlated with the composition of exports across destinations. The exclusion restriction assumption requires that the instrument is exogenous to other determinants of productivity, innovation and upgrading activities of firms. To identify the causal effect of export intensity across destinations on firm productivity and upgrading, the instrument should predict the changes in export intensity across destinations and should not be correlated with firm productivity and cost shocks that may affect firm performance and upgrading efforts.

During the Great Recession, the changes in REER generated exogenous variations in exports to low-income countries because majority of the OECD countries use Euro as

¹⁰Previously Park et al. (2010), Brambilla et al. (2012) and Bastos et al. (2018) used similar firm-level instruments based on various exchange rate measures. Gopinath and Neiman (2014) also highlights the role of firm behaviour in responses to exchange rate shocks that lead to the changes in aggregate productivity.

¹¹Their findings correspond to the results presented in this paper such that firms experienced a reduction in productivity and efficiency measures though they increased their exports.

a national currency, i.e., relative competitiveness should not have altered much, and the effects of the crisis largely transmitted across developed economies. Given the large amount of tradable goods that are excluded from the consumption basket, I use the REER based on unit labor costs rather than based on consumer prices in construction of the instrument. To identify a source of variation in exports at the firm level, I use pre-determined export intensity, i.e., exports in sales, to exploit that firms those with initial attachments to export markets will differ in terms of their response to the changes in REER. Previously more intensely exporting firms should have adjusted by moving away from high-income markets (including domestic market, see Almunia et al. (2021)) and exported more to low-income destinations as they experience an increased competitiveness. Since consumers in low-income destinations have lower willingness to pay for higher quality, firms must have increased exports to low-income destinations because of devaluation against the currencies of low-income countries.

The instrument I use for the instrumental variable approach is defined as

$$z_{it} = \ln \left(\frac{E_{i2007}}{R_{i2007}} \times REER_t \right). \quad (2)$$

where the first term in the parenthesis is export intensity in which E_{i2007} and R_{i2007} denote firm's export and sales in 2007, respectively. Figure A1 in Appendix A plots the distribution of exports over sales in 2007 for firms exporting to low-income and high-income destinations. Distributions for both group display similar patterns, whereas low-income exporters are initially less export intensive than high-income exporters.

I use Equation (2) to instrument for export intensity in each destination denoted as E_{it}^d and estimate the following equation:

$$\ln(\varphi_{it}) = \alpha \ln(E_{it}^d) + \beta X_{it} + \gamma_i + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (3)$$

where φ_{it} denotes the outcome variable of firm upgrading measures. X_{it} denotes control variables, γ_i denotes firm fixed effects and ε_{it} is the error term.

The crisis might have changed the workforce composition and affected cost structure of the firm. Exchange rate depreciations followed by large crises typically lead to substantial reductions in imports at the intensive margin (e.Gopinath & Neiman, 2014). Devaluation during the Great Recession might have made the access to imports more expensive or disruptions in labor market might have affected the wages, generating a differential cost shock for Spanish firms. To address these concerns, I control for average wage and input price at the firm level.¹²

Exporters may be financially healthier than non-exporters (e.g., Greenaway et al., 2007) though tighter credit constraints may disrupt international trade more than domestic sales because exporting is finance intensive compared to domestic sales (e.g., Amiti & Weinstein, 2011; Feenstra et al., 2014).¹³ During the Great Recession, the role of financial constraints in export fall was limited in France Bricongne et al. (2012) and in Belgium Behrens et al. (2013) but imports in the US were severely affected by credit

¹²Both devaluation in REER and reduced domestic demand might have restricted the access to Spanish market which limits the potential threat to identification that may arise from import competition.

¹³Exporters tend to be more exposed to financial constraints than firms selling only in domestic market because of higher input use, longer transaction and shipment times as they generate higher default risk and require external financing.

constraints Chor and Manova (2012). Hence, I control for debt capital in total equity to overcome the liquidity concerns of firms. I additionally control for industry fixed effects since financially more vulnerable industries might have reduced their exports more Bricongne et al. (2012); Chor and Manova (2012).

Another concern for the identification is foreign ownership of firms. Foreign owned firms tend to perform better than domestic firms during the financial crises Alfaro and Chen (2012); Manova et al. (2015) and they are less affected because they have easier access to foreign capital markets Amiti and Weinstein (2011). Moreover, it might be cheaper to acquire a firm during the crisis because of devaluation or increased exports of firms might have attracted foreign investors. Foreign acquired firms might also more easily transfer technology and become more productive. For these reasons, I exclude foreign owned firms and whose share of foreign ownership increased above 50% during the Great Recession from the sample.

Furthermore, conditioning on firm survival may be important in identifying the true effect of exporting on productivity as well Bernard and Jensen (1999), p. I might underestimate the coefficient on exporting if I do not condition on firm survival because including exiting firms with low productivity would lead to downward bias in the estimations. To overcome this concern, I restrict the sample to firms surviving during this period in the estimations.

Finally, some regions that have high concentration of low-technology in production or industries with low productivity, those exporting more heavily to low-income markets, may have absorbed more labor due to increased export competitiveness. I control for this potential bias by including region fixed effects. Moreover, labor mobility is low in Spain and particularly might be even more difficult during the periods of economic downturns.

4. Results

This section presents the results. I estimate the model using labor productivity, innovation and various upgrading measures. Finally, I test the robustness of the underlying mechanism.

Table 3 reports the regression results from estimating Equation (1). The parameter of interest β is negative in all specifications. Since the REER was declining

Table 3. Real effective exchange rate movements and initial exporting status.

| | Low-income Exports/Sales | | High-income Exports/Sales | |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| $\log(\text{REER}) \times \text{Exporting status in 2007 (= 0)}$ | -0.112*** (0.0232) | -0.0414* (0.0232) | -0.0236 (0.0203) | -0.00971* (0.00510) |
| $\log(\text{REER}) \times \text{Exporting status in 2007 (= 1)}$ | -0.100*** (0.0230) | -0.145*** (0.0319) | -0.0148 (0.0202) | -0.0446 (0.0310) |
| Observations | 5662 | 5593 | 5662 | 5593 |
| Firm fixed effects | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| Industry fixed effects | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| Region fixed effects | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| R^2 | 0.079 | 0.832 | 0.063 | 0.799 |

Table reports how real effective exchange rate movements affected exports to low-income and high-income destinations in sales conditional on the exporting status in 2007. Firms exiting the market during the Great Recession and those acquired by foreign investors before and during the Great Recession are excluded from the estimations. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level. ***, ** and * Significant at 1, 5 and 10 percent level, respectively.

from 2008 to 2012, the results indicate that lower REER (devaluation) is associated with higher exports to each destination. Notice that exporters in 2007 increased their share of exports to low-income destinations in sales more than non-exporters in 2007 as shown in columns (1) and (2), while the effect on exporters and non-exporters are significant at the 1% and 10% levels, respectively. On the other hand, columns (3) and (4) show that devaluation in REER is also associated with larger exports to high-income destinations over sales. Similar to firms exporting to low-income destinations, exporters in 2007 experienced larger increases in the share of exports to high-income destinations in sales over time, but the coefficient estimate for exporters in 2007 is insignificant.

The results suggest that previously exporting firms responded to REER devaluation by increasing the share of exports to low-income destinations in sales more than firms only attached to local market in 2007. In contrast, for firms attached to export markets before the Great Recession, devaluation in the REER did not affect the share of exports to high-income destinations in sales.

This finding indicates that exporter status in the pre-crisis period is an important determinant in explaining the impact of REER devaluation on exports across different destinations, justifying the validity of the components of the instrument. However, exports over sales provide a broader measure than export status because it captures both intensive and extensive margins of trade activity. Therefore, to construct the instrument in the following part of the analysis, I interact the exports over sales rather than using a dummy for exporting status with the REER.

4.1. Export destinations and labor productivity

I proceed the analysis by estimating Equation (3) with labor productivity as the outcome variable. Table 4 reports the results of IV regressions for each destination. Columns (1)-

Table 4. Export destinations and labor productivity.

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Low-income Exports/Sales | -0.0820*** (0.0231) | -0.0691*** (0.0201) | -0.0694*** (0.0201) | | | |
| High-income Exports/Sales | | | | -0.384 (0.395) | -0.317 (0.318) | -0.326 (0.333) |
| Input price change (%) | | -0.0207 (0.124) | -0.0205 (0.124) | | -0.0855 (0.314) | -0.0865 (0.323) |
| Log wage | | 0.850*** (0.0583) | 0.850*** (0.0584) | | 0.923*** (0.167) | 0.924*** (0.172) |
| Debt/Equity | | | 0.0183* (0.0101) | | | 0.106 (0.0897) |
| Observations | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 |
| Firm fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Industry fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Region fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| First-stage <i>F</i> -statistic | 16.07 | 16.07 | 16.20 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.96 |

Dependent variable is log labor productivity, i.e., value-added per worker. Columns (1)-(3) report the coefficients for exports to low-income destinations in sales and Columns (4)-(6) report the coefficients for exports to high-income destinations in sales. Columns (3) and (6) include the full set of controls. Firms exiting the market during the Great Recession and those acquired by foreign investors before and during the Great Recession are excluded from the estimations. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level in the parentheses. ***, ** and * Significant at 1, 5 and 10 percent level, respectively.

(3) present the estimation results for how exports to low-income destinations impacted labor productivity. All specifications include firm, industry and region fixed effects. Column (1) presents the results with only fixed effects. The parameter of interest is negative and statistically significant at the 1% level. Column (2) shows that the impact on labor productivity is slightly smaller in magnitude when controlled for input materials price and wage. Notably, wage is positively and significantly associated with labor productivity. Column (3) reports the coefficient estimated as debt-to-equity ratio is additionally controlled for. Conditional on cost shocks and financial health of the firm, the estimation results for the exports to low-income destinations in sales are robustly negative and always statistically significantly different from zero at 1% level. The instrument predicts the endogenous regressor at the first stage and Kleibergen-Paap F -statistic is sufficiently large around 16 in all specifications.

Columns (4)-(6) present the results for how exports to high-income destinations in sales affected labor productivity. Column (1) reports baseline regression results without controls, Column (2) includes input material price and wage to control for cost shocks and Column (3) includes debt-to-equity ratio to control for financial health of firms. On the contrary to the findings for the exports to low-income destinations, the coefficient estimate on exports to high-income destinations in sales is never statistically significant, suggesting that the changes in the intensity of exports to high-income destinations did not affect labor productivity. Moreover, Kleibergen-Paap F -statistic for the first-stage estimation is very weak in each specification. Overall, I find that one unit increase of exports to low-income destinations in sales reduces labor productivity by around 6.9% but higher share of exports to high-income destinations does not. The results indicate that the movements in REER raised the share of exports to low-income destinations in sales that led to lower labor productivity while did not affect the share of exports to high-income destinations in sales and they remained robust to various identification threats.

Table B2 in the Appendix B partially tests the validity of exclusion restriction assumption by regressing the control variables on the instrument. Wage is positively and input price is negatively correlated with the instrument, significant at the 1% level. Although the control variables are significantly associated with the instrument, the findings are robust to inclusion of controls, suggesting that control variables do not violate exclusion restriction assumption.

Recall that labor productivity is defined as value-added per worker. Hence, the negative coefficients presented in Table 4 might be because employment increased more than value-added, employment increased while value-added decreased or employment decreased less than value-added. I present the results of estimating value-added and employment separately in Table B3. The coefficient estimates for both value-added and employment are negative and statistically significantly different from zero at the 1% level. However, notice that the fall in value-added (-0.135 in the specification with full controls) is larger than the fall in employment (-0.065 in the specification with full controls), inducing a decrease in labor productivity.

Table B4 reports the additional results by including exiting firms between 2008 and 2012. As explained in Section 3, the coefficients for these regressions in Columns (1), (2) and (3) are smaller in magnitude than Table 4 because of downward bias arising from including exiting low productivity firms. The coefficient estimates are robust to the inclusion of full set of controls. Again, first-stage

Kleibergen-Paap F -statistic is sufficiently large for low-income exporters but very weak for high-income exporters. Additionally, Table B5 presents the results when foreign owned firms are included in the estimations. In this case, the estimations are slightly upward biased because foreign owned firms tend to be more resilient to financial crises and have higher productivity (Alfaro and Chen (2012); Amity and Weinstein (2011); Manova et al. (2015)). Table B6 in Appendix provides reduced form estimation results with labor productivity is the dependent variable, and the instrument is independent variable.

4.2. Export destinations and innovation activities of firms

I reestimate the model by using various innovation activity measures. Table 5 reports the results from regressing innovation measures on the shares of exports to low-income and high-income destinations in sales while controlling for cost

Table 5. Export destinations and innovation activities.

| | (1) R&D | (2) Patents | (3) Product Innovation | (4) Process Innovation |
|---|---------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>Panel A: Low-income destination</i> | | | | |
| Low-income Exports/Sales | -0.323** (0.133) | -0.0338*** (0.0128) | -0.0142 (0.00977) | -0.0255* (0.0136) |
| Input price change (%) | 0.0720 (0.671) | -0.0122 (0.0604) | -0.0843 (0.0589) | 0.0347 (0.0929) |
| Log wage | -0.123 (0.259) | -0.0146 (0.0321) | -0.0292 (0.0247) | 0.0220 (0.0365) |
| Debt/Equity | -0.0683 (0.0478) | -0.0152*** (0.00538) | -0.00104 (0.00400) | -0.000401 (0.00725) |
| Observations | 5220 | 5220 | 5220 | 5220 |
| Firm fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Industry fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Region fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| First-stage F -statistic | 16.95 | 16.95 | 16.95 | 16.95 |
| <i>Panel B: High-income destination</i> | | | | |
| High-income Exports/Sales | -1.603 (1.769) | -0.167 (0.183) | -0.0702 (0.0872) | -0.126 (0.146) |
| Input price change (%) | -0.234 (1.598) | -0.0441 (0.168) | -0.0977 (0.0841) | 0.0106 (0.147) |
| Log wage | 0.237 (0.858) | 0.0231 (0.0899) | -0.0134 (0.0430) | 0.0504 (0.0731) |
| Debt/Equity | 0.360 (0.448) | 0.0296 (0.0493) | 0.0177 (0.0218) | 0.0334 (0.0363) |
| Observations | 5220 | 5220 | 5220 | 5220 |
| Firm fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Industry fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Region fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| First-stage F -statistic | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.89 |

Table reports the effects of exports to low-income and high-income destinations on innovative activities. Panel A and B show the results for low-income and high-income export destinations, respectively. Dependent variables are log R&D expenses in Column (1), inverse hyperbolic sine of patents in Column (2), dummy product innovation in Column (3) and dummy process innovation in Column (4). All regressions include the full set of controls. Firms exiting the market during the Great Recession and those acquired by foreign investors before and during the Great Recession are excluded from the estimations. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level in the parentheses. ***, ** and * Significant at 1, 5 and 10 percent level, respectively.

shocks (wage and input price), financial health (debt-to-equity ratio) and firm, industry, region fixed effects. Panel A presents the results for the exports to low-income destinations. The estimated coefficient on log R&D expenditure is equal to -0.323 (significant at the five percent level), and the estimated coefficient on log patents is equal to -0.0338 (significant at the one percent level). Column (1) and (2) report that one unit increase in the share of low-income exports in sales reduces R&D expenditures by 32 percentage points and patents 3.3 percentage points, respectively. Specifications in Column (3) and (4) present the results for binary product and process innovation indicators. Both of the coefficient estimates are negative while only process innovation is statistically significant at the 10% level. Furthermore, first-stage F -statistics are sufficiently above the conventional threshold of 10.

Results for the exports to high-income destinations are shown in Panel B. The estimated coefficients are statistically insignificant in all specifications. As in previous estimations, the instrument is not able to predict the changes in the share of exports to high-income destinations in sales at the first stage. These findings suggest that firms which raised share of exports to low-income destinations in total sales during the crisis period reduced their innovative activities in addition to labor productivity. However, the share of exports to high-income destinations in sales has remained unchanged and did not affect the innovation activities of firms.

4.3. Efforts for upgrading

The regression results show that firms experienced a fall in various productivity measures. One reason of this might be that firms intentionally reduced their efforts for upgrading in order to adjust the quality of their product portfolio to low-income destinations where the willingness to pay for high-quality product is low. An alternative explanation for this pattern is that they might have received a specific shock that led to lower productivity. I investigate how exports to low-income and high-income destinations affected various direct measures of upgrading efforts to test which mechanism is inducing a reduction in productivity.

Table 6 reports the results. All specifications have dummy dependent variables and include the full set of controls. Column (1) reports the coefficient estimate on technological cooperation agreements. Column (2), (3), (4) and (5) present the estimates for technological collaboration with customers, competitors, suppliers and universities and/or technological parks, respectively. Column (6) shows the estimated coefficient for whether firms used advisors and/or experts for obtaining information about technology.

Panel A presents the estimates for the exports to low-income destinations with all coefficients are negative but only technological cooperations with customers in Column (2) and with universities or technological parks in Column (5) are statistically significant at the 10% level. The first-stage estimates in each specification suggest that Kleibergen-Paap F -statistics are sufficiently strong. In Panel B, I report the results for the exports to high-income destinations. As expected, my instrument does not predict the regressor of the share of exports to high-income destinations in sales at the first-stage and the coefficient estimates are never significant in any specification. These results indicate

Table 6. Upgrading efforts with technological cooperations.

| | (1) Agreements | (2) Customers | (3) Competitors | (4) Suppliers | (5) Universities | (6) Advisors |
|---|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| <i>Panel A: Low-income destination</i> | | | | | | |
| Low-income Exports/Sales | 0.0000191 (0.00464) | −0.0132* (0.00792) | −0.00211 (0.00452) | 0.00855 (0.00952) | −0.0163* (0.00979) | −0.0124 (0.00979) |
| Input price change (%) | 0.0536* (0.0274) | 0.0456 (0.0529) | 0.0227 (0.0301) | 0.0856 (0.0676) | 0.0192 (0.0593) | 0.0164 (0.0607) |
| Log wage | −0.0119 (0.00780) | −0.0208 (0.0172) | −0.00723 (0.00582) | −0.00231 (0.0210) | −0.00931 (0.0211) | −0.00185 (0.0230) |
| Debt/Equity | 0.000565 (0.00149) | −0.00349 (0.00224) | −0.000384 (0.00158) | −0.000306 (0.00349) | −0.0242*** (0.00773) | 0.00940 (0.0134) |
| Observations | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 |
| Firm fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Industry fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Region fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| First-stage <i>F</i> -statistic | 16.20 | 16.20 | 16.20 | 16.20 | 16.20 | 16.20 |
| <i>Panel B: High-income destination</i> | | | | | | |
| High-income Exports/Sales | 0.0000894 (0.0218) | −0.0621 (0.0731) | −0.00990 (0.0227) | 0.0401 (0.0588) | −0.0764 (0.0888) | −0.0580 (0.0720) |
| Input price change (%) | 0.0537* (0.0283) | 0.0330 (0.0817) | 0.0207 (0.0335) | 0.0937 (0.0742) | 0.00376 (0.0936) | 0.00469 (0.0798) |
| Log wage | −0.0120 (0.00857) | −0.00677 (0.0367) | −0.00499 (0.00905) | −0.0114 (0.0295) | 0.00799 (0.0485) | 0.0113 (0.0364) |
| Debt/Equity | 0.000541 (0.00494) | 0.0133 (0.0184) | 0.00229 (0.00531) | −0.0111 (0.0141) | −0.00365 (0.0215) | 0.0250 (0.0255) |
| Observations | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 |
| Firm fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Industry fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Region fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| First-stage <i>F</i> -statistic | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 |

Table reports the effects of exports to low-income and high-income destinations on upgrading efforts of firms. Panel A and B show the results for low-income and high-income export destinations, respectively. All dependent variables are dummy variables; technological cooperation agreements in Column (1), technological collaboration with customers in Column (2), technological collaboration with competitors in Column (3), technological collaboration with suppliers in Column (4), technological collaboration with universities and/or technological parks in Column (5) and using advisors and/or experts for getting information about technology in Column (6). All regressions include the full set of controls. Firms exiting the market during the Great Recession and those acquired by foreign investors before and during the Great Recession are excluded from the estimations. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level in the parentheses. ***, ** and * Significant at 1, 5 and 10 percent level, respectively.

that firms did not attempt to upgrade their technology by collaborating with different agents or receiving consultancy service on technology use. Hence, it is not surprising that firms experienced a decline in productivity given the evidence that they reduced their efforts for upgrading.

4.4. Quality downgrading

Several recent studies find that firms adjust the quality of their products in response to the changes in exchange rate movements. For instance, Fauceglia (2020) and Freitag and Lein (2023) document that Swiss appreciation induced an increase in quality of exported goods. Similarly in Spain, firms might have adjusted to REER devaluation by producing lower quality products to increase exports to low-income destinations and this quality downgrading mechanism might explain lowered productivity during the Great Recession. Finding direct measure of product quality is often difficult and the literature generally used the output price as a proxy. I only observe the sales price changes of firms

in the dataset that might reflect the product quality and regress the log output price index on the share of exports to low-income and high-income destinations in sales to test quality downgrading mechanism.

Table 7 present the results. Column (1) includes only fixed effects and the coefficient on exports to low-income destinations is 0.0126 statistically significant at the 1% level. In Column (2), I lose the significance on the coefficient estimate and the magnitude drops sharply while controlling for input materials price and wage. The coefficient on input material price is 0.186 and statistically significant at the 1% level. Thus, these findings suggest a pass-through effect of input price on output price. As shown in Column (3), the coefficient on the share of exports to low-income destinations in sales remains largely the same in magnitude and statistically not different from zero when debt-to-equity ratio is additionally controlled for. In all specifications, first-stage estimates are sufficiently strong.

Columns (4) reports the estimated coefficient with only fixed effects that is positive but statistically insignificant. Column (5) and (6) present the results while controlling for cost shocks and financial health. The coefficient on the share of exports to high-income destinations in sales remains insignificant. In all specifications, the instrument fails to predict changes in exports to high-income destinations with weak first-stage *F*-statistics. Using the output price as quality, I find that firms passed the input materials price changes through their output prices.

Table 7. Export destinations and quality downgrading.

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Low-income Exports/Sales | 0.0126*** (0.00385) | 0.000755 (0.00276) | 0.000763 (0.00275) | | | |
| High-income Exports/Sales | | | | 0.0627 (0.0720) | 0.00590 (0.0250) | 0.00618 (0.0261) |
| Log input price | | 0.186*** (0.0315) | 0.186*** (0.0315) | | 0.178*** (0.0541) | 0.178*** (0.0551) |
| Log wage | | -0.00362 (0.00733) | -0.00362 (0.00733) | | -0.00534 (0.0102) | -0.00539 (0.0104) |
| Debt/Equity | | | -0.000467 (0.000815) | | | -0.00204 (0.00612) |
| Observations | 5394 | 5394 | 5394 | 5394 | 5394 | 5394 |
| Firm fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Industry fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Region fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| First-stage <i>F</i> -statistic | 18.05 | 15.76 | 15.87 | 0.79 | 0.32 | 0.30 |

Table reports the response of output prices to the changes in exports to low-income and high-income destinations in sales. Dependent variable is firm-level log output price index. Columns (1)-(3) report the coefficients for low-income exports in sales and Columns (4)-(6) report the coefficients for high-income exports in sales. Columns (3) and (6) include the full set of controls. Firms exiting the market during the Great Recession and those acquired by foreign investors before and during the Great Recession are excluded from the estimations. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level in the parentheses. ***, ** and * Significant at 1, 5 and 10 percent level, respectively.

5. Conclusion

This paper investigated the effects of exports to low-income and high-income destinations on firm productivity and upgrading efforts in Spanish manufacturing industries from 2008 to 2012. I exploited the changes in REER during the Great Recession for the identification of heterogeneous effects on firms exporting to low-

income and high-income destinations. I find that devaluation raised the share of exports to low-income destinations which induced a decline in productivity and upgrading efforts. In contrast, the share of exports to high-income destinations did not change in response to REER devaluation as well as productivity and upgrading efforts.

The findings in this paper suggest that market destination can determine the gains from exporting rather than exporting per se. The results emphasize that export destination plays a crucial role in determining the gains from exporting. However, external validity of the results are worth to investigate in the future work. An advantage of this paper is that I use the data on both direct upgrading activities and firms' attempts for upgrading in the analysis, which allows me to abstract from the shortcomings of TFP measures Verhoogen (2021). The results support quality sorting hypothesis that links product quality to firm productivity.

The important question unanswered is whether increased share of exports to low-income destinations induced a decline in productivity and upgrading efforts because of lower competition in low-income markets, lower willingness to pay of low-income consumers for high-quality products or different technology and skills required for producing low-quality products. The dataset used in the analysis does not provide information on the market structure and consumer preferences in export destinations. Hence, I regard exploring these channels as interesting avenues for future research.

This paper highlights that considering market destination in studies examining the effects of exporting on efficiency improvements and upgrading efforts may be particularly important for policymakers. They can support for product quality enhancements and encourage firms to diversify their export markets with a particular focus on high-income destinations. Governments could also offer subsidies for upgrading activities or incentives for training programs for firms predominantly exporting to low-income countries. Advocating the contents of globalization may require evaluating the gains from trade from a broader perspective and additional policy tools to promote firm-level upgrading might be needed to maximize trade-related efficiency gains.

Market diversification can help firms reduce reliance on low-income markets. Firms could also focus on product differentiation into high-income markets and target the markets that can pay a premium for quality. While firms can benefit from greater demand for high-quality products, investing in technology and collaborating with various agencies can allow to enhance productivity even in low-income markets by fostering innovation and providing access to new technologies. By adopting long-term strategies, firms could shift their focus towards markets with higher willingness to pay for their products and ensure long-term competitiveness.

Acknowledgments

This project started during my visiting at Ludwig Maximilian University of Munich (LMU) in Munich. I would like to thank Claudia Steinwender for her support as my host at LMU, my PhD advisors Raul Ramos and Rosina Moreno as well as Martina Magli, Andreas Baur and Jonas Casper for the comments and suggestions.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Funding

This work was supported by the Societat Economica Barcelonesa d'Amics del Pais. I am currently employed at the King Abdullah Petroleum Studies and Research Center (KAPSARC).

Notes on contributor

Akin Ayberk Cilekoglu, male, is a postdoctoral researcher in the Climate & Sustainability Department at the King Abdullah Petroleum Studies and Research Center (KAPSARC). His research interests are firm behavior, climate change, environment and energy.

References

- Aghion, P., Bergeaud, A., Lequien, M., & Melitz, M. J. (2024). The heterogeneous impact of market size on innovation: Evidence from French firm-level exports. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 106(3), 608–626. https://doi.org/10.1162/rest_a_01199
- Alfaro, L., & Chen, M. X. (2012). Surviving the global financial crisis: Foreign ownership and establishment performance. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy*, 4(3), 30–55. <https://doi.org/10.1257/pol.4.3.30>
- Almunia, M., Antràs, P., Lopez-Rodriguez, D., & Morales, E. (2021). Venting out: Exports during a domestic slump. *The American Economic Review*, 111(11), 3611–3662. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20181853>
- Amiti, M., & Weinstein, D. E. (2011). Exports and financial shocks. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 126(4), 1841–1877. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjr033>
- Atkin, D., Khandelwal, A. K., & Osman, A. (2017). Exporting and firm performance: Evidence from a randomized experiment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 132(2), 551–615. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjx002>
- Bas, M., Strauss-Kahn, V. (2015). Input-trade liberalization, export prices and quality upgrading. *Journal of International Economics*, 95(2), 250–262. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2014.12.005>
- Bastos, P., & Silva, J. (2010). The quality of a firm's exports: Where you export to matters. *Journal of International Economics*, 82(2), 99–111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2010.07.001>
- Bastos, P., Silva, J., & Verhoogen, E. (2018). Export destinations and input prices. *The American Economic Review*, 108(2), 353–392. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20140647>
- Behrens, K., Corcos, G., & Mion, G. (2013). Trade crisis? what trade crisis? *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 95(2), 702–709. https://doi.org/10.1162/REST_a_00287
- Bernard, A. B., & Jensen, J. B. (1999). Exceptional exporter performance: Cause, effect, or both? *Journal of International Economics*, 47(1), 1–25. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1996\(98\)00027-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1996(98)00027-0)
- Braguinsky, S., Ohyama, A., Okazaki, T., & Syverson, C. (2021). Product innovation, product diversification, and firm growth: Evidence from japan's early industrialization. *The American Economic Review*, 111(12), 3795–3826. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20201656>
- Brambilla, I., Lederman, D., & Porto, G. (2012). Exports, export destinations, and skills. *The American Economic Review*, 102(7), 3406–3438. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.102.7.3406>
- Bricongne, J.-C., Fontagné, L., Gaulier, G., Taglioni, D., & Vicard, V. (2012). Firms and the global crisis: French exports in the turmoil. *Journal of International Economics*, 87(1), 134–146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2011.07.002>
- Bustos, P. (2011). Trade liberalization, exports, and technology upgrading: Evidence on the impact of Mercosur on Argentinian firms. *The American Economic Review*, 101(1), 304–340. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.101.1.304>

- Chor, D., & Manova, K. (2012). Off the cliff and back? credit conditions and international trade during the global financial crisis. *Journal of International Economics*, 87(1), 117–133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2011.04.001>
- Clerides, S. K., Lach, S., & Tybout, J. R. (1998). Is learning by exporting important? micro-dynamic evidence from Colombia, Mexico, and morocco. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 113(3), 903–947. <https://doi.org/10.1162/003355398555784>
- Coelli, F., Moxnes, A., & Ulltveit-Moe, K. H. (2022). Better, faster, stronger: Global innovation and trade liberalization. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 104(2), 205–216. https://doi.org/10.1162/rest_a_00951
- Crozet, M., Head, K., & Mayer, T. (2012). Quality sorting and trade: Firm-level evidence for French wine. *Review of Economic Studies*, 79(2), 609–644. <https://doi.org/10.1093/restud/rdr030>
- De Loecker, J. (2007). Do exports generate higher productivity? evidence from slovenia. *Journal of International Economics*, 73(1), 69–98. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2007.03.003>
- De Loecker, J., & Goldberg, P. (2014). Firm performance in a global market. *Annual Review of Economics*, 6(1), 201–227. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-economics-080113-104741>
- Eppinger, P. S., Meythaler, N., Sindlinger, M.-M., & Smolka, M. (2018). The great trade collapse and the Spanish export miracle: Firm-level evidence from the crisis. *World Economy*, 41(2), 457–493. <https://doi.org/10.1111/twec.12530>
- Faucegla, D. (2020). Exchange rate fluctuations and quality composition of exports: Evidence from Swiss product-level data. *World Economy*, 43(6), 1592–1618. <https://doi.org/10.1111/twec.12852>
- Feenstra, R. C., Li, Z., & Yu, M. (2014). Exports and credit constraints under incomplete information: Theory and evidence from china. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 96(4), 729–744. https://doi.org/10.1162/REST_a_00405
- Freitag, A., & Lein, S. M. (2023). Endogenous product adjustment and exchange rate pass-through. *Journal of International Economics*, 140, 103706. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2022.103706>
- Garcia-Marin, A., & Voigtländer, N. (2019). Exporting and plant-level efficiency gains: It's in the measure. *Journal of Political Economy*, 127(4), 1777–1825. <https://doi.org/10.1086/701607>
- Garcia-Vega, M., Kneller, R., & Stiebale, J. (2021). Labor market reform and innovation: Evidence from spain. *Research Policy*, 50(5), 104213. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2021.104213>
- Gopinath, G., & Neiman, B. (2014). Trade adjustment and productivity in large crises. *The American Economic Review*, 104(3), 793–831. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.104.3.793>
- Görg, H., Halpern, L., & Muraközy, B. (2017). Why do within-firm–product export prices differ across markets? evidence from hungary. *World Economy*, 40(6), 1233–1246. <https://doi.org/10.1111/twec.12442>
- Greenaway, D., Guariglia, A., & Kneller, R. (2007). Financial factors and exporting decisions. *Journal of International Economics*, 73(2), 377–395. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2007.04.002>
- Guadalupe, M., Kuzmina, O., & Thomas, C. (2012). Innovation and foreign ownership. *The American Economic Review*, 102(7), 3594–3627. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.102.7.3594>
- Hallak, J. C. (2006). Product quality and the direction of trade. *Journal of International Economics*, 68(1), 238–265. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2005.04.001>
- Hallak, J. C., & Sivadasan, J. (2013). Product and process productivity: Implications for quality choice and conditional exporter premia. *Journal of International Economics*, 91(1), 53–67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2013.05.001>
- Hummels, D., & Klenow, P. J. (2005). The variety and quality of a nation's exports. *The American Economic Review*, 95(3), 704–723. <https://doi.org/10.1257/0002828054201396>
- Khandelwal, A. (2010). The long and short (of) quality ladders. *Review of Economic Studies*, 77(4), 1450–1476. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-937X.2010.00602.x>
- Koch, M., & Smolka, M. (2019). Foreign ownership and skill-biased technological change. *Journal of International Economics*, 118, 84–104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2019.01.017>
- Kugler, M., & Verhoogen, E. (2012). Prices, plant size, and product quality. *Review of Economic Studies*, 79(1), 307–339. <https://doi.org/10.1093/restud/rdr021>
- Lileeva, A., & Trefler, D. (2010). Improved access to foreign markets raises plant-level productivity... for some plants. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 125(3), 1051–1099. <https://doi.org/10.1162/qjec.2010.125.3.1051>

- Manova, K., Wei, S.-J., & Zhang, Z. (2015). Firm exports and multinational activity under credit constraints. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 97(3), 574–588. https://doi.org/10.1162/REST_a_00480
- Manova, K., & Zhang, Z. (2012). Export prices across firms and destinations. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 127(1), 379–436. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjr051>
- Martin, J. (2012). Markups, quality, and transport costs. *European Economic Review*, 56(4), 777–791. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.euroecorev.2012.02.004>
- Mayer, T., Melitz, M. J., & Ottaviano, G. I. (2014). Market size, competition, and the product mix of exporters. *The American Economic Review*, 104(2), 495–536. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.104.2.495>
- Melitz, M. J., & Ottaviano, G. I. (2008). Market size, trade, and productivity. *Review of Economic Studies*, 75(1), 295–316. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-937X.2007.00463.x>
- Park, A., Yang, D., Shi, X., & Jiang, Y. (2010). Exporting and firm performance: Chinese exporters and the asian financial crisis. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 92(4), 822–842. https://doi.org/10.1162/REST_a_00033
- Schott, P. K. (2004). Across-product versus within-product specialization in international trade. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 119(2), 647–678. <https://doi.org/10.1162/0033553041382201>
- Van Biesebroeck, J. (2005). Exporting raises productivity in sub-saharan African manufacturing firms. *Journal of International Economics*, 67(2), 373–391. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2004.12.002>
- Verhoogen, E. A. (2008). Trade, quality upgrading, and wage inequality in the Mexican manufacturing sector. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 123(2), 489–530. <https://doi.org/10.1162/qjec.2008.123.2.489>
- Verhoogen, E. A. (2021). Firm-level upgrading in developing countries. *NBER working paper* (w29461).
- Yeaple, S. R. (2005). A simple model of firm heterogeneity, international trade, and wages. *Journal of International Economics*, 65(1), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2004.01.001>

Appendices

Appendix A. Figure




Figure A1. Distributions of export intensity in 2007. Graph shows the distribution of export intensities (exports in sales) of low-income and high-income exporters in 2007.

Appendix B. Tables

Table B1. Total low-income exports across industries 2008–2012.

| Industries | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1. Meat products | 17.297 | 17.415 | 17.978 | 18.153 | 18.503 |
| 2. Food and tobacco | 19.842 | 19.971 | 19.552 | 19.899 | 19.871 |
| 3. Beverage | 18.057 | 17.696 | 17.999 | 18.019 | 18.079 |
| 4. Textiles and clothing | 17.529 | 17.394 | 17.737 | 17.767 | 17.747 |
| 5. Leather, fur and footwear | 15.343 | 15.567 | 16.344 | 16.463 | 16.887 |
| 6. Timber | 16.532 | 16.206 | 16.621 | 16.925 | 16.017 |
| 7. Paper | 19.209 | 19.166 | 19.719 | 19.737 | 19.625 |
| 8. Printing | 16.756 | 16.106 | 16.549 | 16.438 | 16.218 |
| 9. Chemicals and pharmaceuticals | 21.081 | 20.959 | 20.807 | 20.897 | 20.978 |
| 10. Plastic and rubber products | 19.828 | 19.655 | 18.569 | 18.638 | 18.831 |
| 11. Nonmetal mineral products | 19.495 | 19.390 | 19.574 | 19.728 | 19.817 |
| 12. Basic metal products | 20.455 | 20.008 | 20.896 | 20.852 | 20.750 |
| 13. Fabricated metal products | 19.586 | 19.354 | 19.351 | 19.522 | 19.579 |
| 14. Machinery and equipment | 19.682 | 19.316 | 19.762 | 19.757 | 19.871 |
| 15. Computer products, electronics and optical | 19.224 | 19.065 | 18.870 | 19.145 | 19.383 |
| 16. Electric materials and accessories | 19.872 | 19.620 | 20.054 | 20.179 | 20.237 |
| 17. Vehicles and accessories | 20.760 | 20.693 | 21.197 | 21.650 | 21.650 |
| 18. Other transport equipment | 20.291 | 20.957 | 20.990 | 20.784 | 20.813 |
| 19. Furniture | 16.706 | 16.963 | 17.652 | 17.910 | 17.946 |
| 20. Other manufacturing | 17.312 | 16.214 | 16.080 | 16.075 | 16.154 |

Table reports total annual low-income exports (expressed in natural logarithm) in the sample across industries from 2008 to 2012. Low-income destinations are classified as countries except the OECD and the Latin American countries.

Table B2. Relationship between the instrument and the control variables.

| | Log Wage | | Input price(%) | | Debt/Equity | |
|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| Instrument | 0.224*** (0.0604) | 0.224*** (0.0606) | −0.0918*** (0.0279) | −0.0918*** (0.0280) | −0.286 (0.258) | −0.286 (0.259) |
| Observations | 5256 | 5256 | 5256 | 5256 | 5256 | 5256 |
| Firm fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Industry fixed effects | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| Region fixed effects | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| R ² | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.25 | 0.25 |

Table reports the correlations between the instrument and the control variables used in the analysis. Dependent variables are log wage in Columns (1)–(2), percentage change in input price in Columns (3)–(4) and debt to equity ratio in Columns (5) and (6). Firms exiting the market during the Great Recession are excluded but those acquired by foreign investors are included. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level in the parentheses. ***, ** and * Significant at 1, 5 and 10 percent level, respectively.

Table B3. Export destinations, value-added and employment.

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| <i>Panel A: Value-Added</i> | | | | | | |
| Low-income Exports/Sales | −0.139*** (0.0367) | −0.135*** (0.0359) | −0.135*** (0.0357) | | | |
| High-income Exports/Sales | | | | −0.650 (0.668) | −0.618 (0.619) | −0.633 (0.645) |
| Input price change (%) | | −0.00587 (0.182) | −0.00591 (0.181) | | −0.133 (0.596) | −0.134 (0.609) |
| Log wage | | 0.257*** (0.0885) | 0.257*** (0.0885) | | 0.399 (0.319) | 0.400 (0.327) |
| Debt/Equity | | | −0.00507 (0.0123) | | | 0.166 (0.169) |
| Observations | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 |
| Firm fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Industry fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Region fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| First-stage F-statistic | 16.07 | 16.07 | 16.20 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.96 |
| <i>Panel B: Employment</i> | | | | | | |
| Low-income Exports/Sales | −0.0567*** (0.0158) | −0.0655*** (0.0179) | −0.0650*** (0.0177) | | | |
| High-income Exports/Sales | | | | −0.265 (0.274) | −0.300 (0.302) | −0.305 (0.313) |
| Input price change (%) | | 0.0139 (0.0826) | 0.0137 (0.0821) | | −0.0476 (0.289) | −0.0481 (0.294) |
| Log wage | | −0.581*** (0.0591) | −0.580*** (0.0590) | | −0.512*** (0.160) | −0.511*** (0.163) |
| Debt/Equity | | | −0.0234** (0.0111) | | | 0.0589 (0.0797) |
| Observations | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 |
| Firm fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Industry fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Region fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| First-stage F-statistic | 16.07 | 16.07 | 16.20 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.96 |

Table reports the effects of exports to low-income and high-income destinations on value-added and employment. Panel A presents the results for value-added and Panel B presents the results for employment. Columns (3) and (6) include the full set of controls. Firms exiting the market during the Great Recession and those acquired by foreign investors before and during the Great Recession are excluded from the estimations. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level in the parentheses. ***, ** and * Significant at 1, 5 and 10 percent level, respectively.

Table B4. Export destinations and labor productivity, including exiting firms.

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Low-income Exports/Sales | −0.0897*** (0.0255) | −0.0765*** (0.0223) | −0.0768*** (0.0223) | | | |
| High-income Exports/Sales | | | | −0.427 (0.455) | −0.355 (0.368) | −0.365 (0.386) |
| Input price change (%) | | −0.00270 (0.129) | −0.00259 (0.129) | | −0.0901 (0.346) | −0.0919 (0.355) |
| Log wage | | 0.880*** (0.0615) | 0.880*** (0.0616) | | 0.966*** (0.180) | 0.968*** (0.185) |
| Debt/Equity | | | 0.0164 (0.0101) | | | 0.113 (0.101) |
| Observations | 5504 | 5504 | 5504 | 5504 | 5504 | 5504 |
| Firm fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Industry fixed effects | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Region fixed effects | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| First-stage <i>F</i> -statistic | 15.37 | 15.38 | 15.51 | 0.89 | 0.94 | 0.90 |

Dependent variable is log labor productivity, i.e., value-added per worker. Columns (1)–(3) report the coefficients for low-income exports in sales and Columns (4)–(6) report the coefficients for high-income exports in sales. Columns (3) and (6) include the full set of controls. Firms exiting the market during the Great Recession are included but those acquired by foreign investors are excluded. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level in the parentheses. ***, ** and * Significant at 1, 5 and 10 percent level, respectively.

Table B5. Export destinations and labor productivity, including foreign acquired firms.

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|---------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| Low-income Exports/Sales | −0.0743*** (0.0216) | −0.0680*** (0.0200) | −0.0682*** (0.0199) | | | |
| High-income Exports/Sales | | | | −3.152 (27.59) | −2.966 (26.68) | −3.631 (39.69) |
| Input price change (%) | | 0.0136 (0.125) | 0.0138 (0.125) | | 0.651 (6.203) | 0.806 (9.115) |
| Log wage | | 0.851*** (0.0546) | 0.851*** (0.0546) | | 1.100 (2.507) | 1.144 (3.492) |
| Debt/Equity | | | 0.0160 (0.0118) | | | 0.899 (9.527) |
| Observations | 6243 | 6243 | 6243 | 6243 | 6243 | 6243 |
| Firm fixed effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Industry fixed effects | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Region fixed effects | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| First-stage <i>F</i> -statistic | 15.96 | 15.99 | 16.12 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.01 |

Dependent variable is log labor productivity, i.e., value-added per worker. Columns (1)–(3) report the coefficients for low-income exports in sales and Columns (4)–(6) report the coefficients for high-income exports in sales. Columns (3) and (6) include full controls. Firms exiting the market during the Great Recession are excluded but those acquired by foreign investors are included. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level in the parentheses. ***, ** and * Significant at 1, 5 and 10 percent level, respectively.

Table B6. Reduced form estimations.

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Instrument | 0.0856*** (0.00790) | 1.252*** (0.170) | 1.252*** (0.170) | 1.056*** (0.166) | 1.066*** (0.162) |
| Input price change (%) | | | −0.00573 (0.101) | −0.0195 (0.0986) | −0.0192 (0.0986) |
| Log wage | | | | 0.848*** (0.0518) | 0.847*** (0.0518) |
| Debt/Equity | | | | | 0.0358** (0.0162) |
| Observations | 5312 | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 | 5226 |
| Firm fixed effects | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Industry fixed effects | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Region fixed effects | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| R ² | 0.07 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.74 | 0.74 |

Table reports the reduced form estimations. Dependent variable is log labor productivity. Firms exited the market during the Great Recession and those acquired by foreign investors before and during the Great Recession are excluded from the estimations. Standard errors are clustered at the firm level in the parentheses. ***, ** and * Significant at 1, 5 and 10 percent level, respectively.