Rethinking the import-productivity nexus for Italian manufacturing

Giuliano Conti, Alessia Lo Turco and Daniela Maggioni*

August 6, 2012

Abstract

We provide evidence on the firm level productivity effects of imports of intermediates. Exploiting a large panel of Italian manufacturing firms we are able to separately test the role of importing from high and low income countries. Although import market entry positively affects the firm productivity, such gain is only temporary and vanishes afterwards. Importing does not permanently affect the firm productivity growth. This finding holds both when we test for the import entry by means of Propensity Score Matching techniques and when we analyse the import intensity within a dynamic panel data model framework. On the contrary, we confirm the existence of self-selection into importing. Also, our evidence supports the learning-by-exporting effects in Italian manufacturing and we prove that this result is robust to the control of firm import activity.

JEL: F14, D24

Keywords: Imports, Exports, Productivity

*Università Politecnica delle Marche, Department of Economics; Ancona - Italy; Corresponding author: *d.maggioni@univpm.it*. We are grateful to Davide Castellani and to the SIE conference participants in Rome for their useful comments and suggestions.

1 Introduction and relevant literature

The widespread documented expansion of production fragmentation across countries is posing new questions to the academic debate and the policy makers. In particular, it is of interest to understand the firm level impact of offshoring practices and whether heterogeneous effects emerge according to the income level of the import origin country. From a developing country perspective, imports of intermediates may allow firms to use higher quality inputs, to exploit new complementarities in production and to take advantage from potential technology transfers from advanced partners. Then, as the empirical evidence confirms (Kasahara and Rodrigue, 2008; Paul and Yasar, 2009), *learning by importing* may be at work, i.e. the foreign sourcing of inputs may enhance firm productivity. From a developed country perspective, instead, imports from other advanced partners may present only a slight technological superiority and the consequent efficiency gains may be negligible. On the contrary, even if intermediate purchases from developing countries often hide a cost saving motivation, moving abroad the less efficient production stages may deliver static gains from specialisation. Also, if firms turn to specialise in growth promoting activities (e.g. R&D), it is very likely that they will enjoy a permanent higher efficiency growth rate. Thus, for developed countries, the existence and/or the extent of the productivity effects stemming from intermediate imports is not clear and may be strictly related to the inputs origin. To shed some light on this issue, we dissect the role of imports from high and low income countries for a developed economy, focusing our analysis on Italian manufacturing firms.

To identify the causal effect of importing on the firm productivity we follow a two-fold empirical strategy. Firstly, we adopt a Propensity Score Matching (PSM) with difference-in-differences estimator. We consider starting to import from high and low income countries as two separate treatments and we disclose the impact of foreign input market entry. To assess, instead, the role of the import intensity from the two country groups, in a second step, we estimate a linear dynamic panel data model for the firm Total Factor Productivity (TFP)[1]. We, thus, explore whether it is the intensity of the involvement in the import market, more than the import status, that may enhance the firm efficiency. However, importing represents only one of the firm international activities which may affect its efficiency. As a matter of fact, established literature suggests that exporting may importantly shape the firm efficiency (Van Biesebroeck, 2005; De Loecker, 2007; Maggioni, 2012) and the existence of such learning effects stemming from the

[1] This strategy is close to the one in Görg, Hanley, and Strobl (2008) and Forlani (2010).

firm penetration of foreign markets has been detected for Italy (Serti and Tomasi, 2008a). Resting on the latter finding together with the evidence of a strict linkage existing between the purchasing of foreign inputs and the export activity (Castellani, Serti, and Tomasi, 2010; Lo Turco and Maggioni, 2011), it emerges the need to control for the impact of exports on firm efficiency. Its omission might erroneously deliver a positive impact of imports on productivity even when there is a simple spurious correlation. As a consequence, we will try to dissect the role of importing, once accounted for the efficiency enhancement effect of exports.

Our work adds to the recent empirical literature investigating the consequences of imports in terms of firm productivity. In line with the above discussion, while the evidence on developing and transition economies confirms the positive productivity effect of imported inputs[2], the empirical work on developed economies conveys more mixed results. Görg, Hanley, and Strobl (2008) using plant-level data for Irish manufacturing between 1990 and 1998 show that only offshoring of service inputs enhances TFP and the positive effect is confined to exporting firms, while non exporting firms are not significantly affected. This finding is at odds with the one in Forlani (2010) on the same country for the years 2000-2006 and the opposite result might be related to the different period of analysis. The latter study corrects for the endogeneity of the imported inputs via Difference GMM and discloses that the intensity of foreign material inputs, instead of service inputs, is the main driver of productivity improvements in manufacturing, especially as long as domestic laggards are concerned. On the contrary, Vogel and Wagner (2010), for the case of German manufacturing, adopt a difference-in-differences PSM strategy and find no evidence of learning-by-importing at all, supporting instead the self-selection hypothesis.

All the works reviewed so far treat imports from developed and developing countries as having a homogeneous impact on efficiency. This is a strong assumption as the quality and technological content of inputs may well change according to the development stage of the source country. In this respect, closer to our line of research, Lööf and Andersson (2010) find that the share of imports from highly R&D intensive countries (the G7 countries) in total imports is an important source of productivity in their sample of Swedish firms, especially for small and non affiliated firms, while it does not matter for persistent exporters. In the same line, Jabbour (2010) studies the relationship between offshoring -

[2]See Halpern, Koren, and Szeidl (2005) for Hungary, Kasahara and Rodrigue (2008) for Chile, and Paul and Yasar (2009) for Turkey. Some relevant papers also investigate and confirm the role of trade liberalisation episodes in fostering productivity (Amiti and Konings, 2007; Fernandes, 2007).

measured as the share of both imports from foreign independent suppliers and imports from foreign affiliates - by French manufacturing firms to developed and developing countries and productivity and profitability. The author does not test for the causal effect of importing, nevertheless her results point at an opposite insight: both performance measures are positively related to international outsourcing to developing countries only, even if the stronger correlation with profitability suggests that outsourcing to low income economies is especially motivated by profit more than efficiency enhancing reasons.

Within this framework, our work is one of the very few papers focusing on the efficiency enhancing effect of imports from different sources. Similarly to Lööf and Andersson (2010) we estimate the causal impact of importing by input origin on the firm level productivity. Nevertheless, whereas they focus on the total value of imports from different sources and on their relative weight in total imports, we depart from them in studying the impact of the import market entry too and, especially, in assessing the impact of the import intensity in production. The latter choice allows to account for the actual importance of importing within the overall firm activity. Secondly, from the recent evidence on the strict linkage between importing and exporting (Muûls and Pisu, 2009; Kasahara and Lapham, 2008; Aristei, Castellani, and Franco, 2011; Lo Turco and Maggioni, 2011) and on learning-by-exporting, throughout our work we dissect the role of importing once accounted the role of exporting too. Finally our focus on the Italian case can be considered of particular interest. Compared to other advanced countries, the country manufacturing is specialised in low skilled labour intensive productions and the country has recently experienced a sharp increase in intermediate imports from developing countries. Ascertaining whether the proved short run labour market adjustment costs (Lo Turco, Maggioni, and Picchio, 2012) and the reduced labour intensity of production (Lo Turco and Maggioni, 2012) in Italian manufacturing are compensated by increased efficiency at the firm level is an important step for the overall evaluation of the firm internationalisation strategies on the contribution to the national welfare. To the best of our knowledge this is the first piece of research to investigate the firm level effects of imports on productivity in Italy[3]. Some previous industry level studies have shown, even if focusing on different sample periods, that the material intermediates import intensity positively affects productivity (Lo Turco, 2007; Daveri and Jona-Lasinio,

[3] Mazzola and Bruni (2000) and Calabrese and Erbetta (2005) have focused on firms' production linkages respectively for a sample of southern firms and for firms in the automotive industry respectively, finding important effects of outsourcing on the firms' performance, however they do not deal with international linkages.

2008). However, these papers exploit National Input-Output Tables to measure offshoring and, thus, neglect the origin of imported inputs that we address in the present work. Furthermore, whereas industry level studies may better capture the extent of reallocations across firms in the same industry following the increase in import openness, our work is meant to assess the direct effects of the firm internationalisation strategies that the sector level aggregation of data may conceal.
Anticipating our results, importing does not relevantly affect the Italian firm productivity. Although inputs sourced abroad - from low income economies, especially - seem to drive some gains these ones are only temporary and never turn into permanent dynamic gains.

Our work is structured as follows: the next section presents the data and some descriptive evidence on the import-productivity nexus, section 3 presents the empirical strategy and results from the PSM and the dynamic linear model. Finally, conclusions are drawn in section 4.

2 Data and descriptive evidence

The main data source for this work consists in a balanced panel of Italian limited companies covering a 5-year period from 2000 to 2004. The dataset has been used by the National Statistical Institute (Istat) for a descriptive analysis on offshoring practices by Italian firms published in the Istat Annual Report for 2006 and it has been obtained merging custom trade and balance sheet data. The sample represents about 40% of total manufacturing employment and output and reproduces their sectoral distribution[4]. The dataset provides detailed information for about 40,000 firms[5] on revenues, intermediate and labour costs, tangible and intangible fixed assets, exports, control participation and imports of intermediates. The amount of imported inputs are split according to their ori-

[4]Details on the sample representativeness are available from the authors upon request.

[5]The original number of firms was slightly higher, however, as standard we cleaned the sample removing firms in NACE sectors 16 and 23 (these sectors include a small number of firms and for the nature of the performed activities they may behave differently from the rest of manufacturing sectors) and firms with some anomalous (zero or negative) or missing values for the main variables (output, materials, value added or capital). We have also excluded firms which are considered as outliers for at least one year in the sample period. We consider as outliers those observations from the bottom and top 0.5 percent of the distribution of some main ratio (value added on labour and capital on labour).

gin, developed or developing countries[6]. The firm activity sector is available at 3-digit NACE.

Table 1 reports the overall share of importers and the share of firms importing from different origin country groups. About 31% of our sample in 2004 is composed by firms purchasing inputs from developed countries; this share lowers to about 25% when we turn on the firms offshoring to developing economies. One half of importers from high income economies is also importing from the other country group, while about 70% of importers from low labour cost economies are purchasing inputs from both origins. Thus, even if there exists some overlap between purchases from the two kinds of country groups, some firms only rest on one type of origin. It follows that the two international linkages may present different underlying motivations and characteristics and this may drive to a different impact on the firm production processes.

Concerning the time evolution, the most interesting finding is the deepening of firms involvement with developing suppliers, jointly with an unchanged share of importers from advanced economies. The growing role of low wage countries in Italian firms purchases is mainly due to their recent economic growth and opening to international trade in last decades together with the Italian specialisation in labour intensive productions where the search for cheaper intermediates may represent a successful competitive strategy. Thus, from our evidence it emerges that, even if Italian manufacturing firms are highly integrated in international networks with suppliers from advanced countries, in recent years developing economies have become an important market where firms outsource parts of their production process and buy intermediates at lower prices.

As standard in the literature, in Table 2 we present the importers' premia on a set of firm level characteristics which are captured by the coefficients associated to the import status from Low and High Income countries (respectively $\gamma 0$ and γ_1) in the following regressions:

$$y_{it} = \alpha + \gamma 0 Imp_{it}^{LI} + \gamma_1 Imp_{it}^{HI} + \beta size_{it} + \delta_0 D_j + \delta_1 D_t + \eta_i + \epsilon_{it} \qquad (1)$$

where y_{it} is the variable we are interested in and it is alternatively the labour productivity of firm *i* at time *t*, lp, its total factor productivity index computed following Caves, Christensen, and Diewert (1982), tfp, its average unit wage, $wage$, its capital-labour ratio, kl, and export status and share, Exp and $ExpSh$. Imp^{LI} and Imp^{HI} are two dummies capturing the import status from low and

[6]This breakdown has been performed by ISTAT researchers according to the income level of countries.

high income countries respectively. All regressions also include a control for the firm size, measured by the logarithm of the employment, and sector and time dummies (D_j and D_t). Estimates are obtained both from Pooled Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) and Fixed Effects (FE) regressions. The definition and the detailed description of the variables used in this and the following sections is contained in Appendix A. Results show that firms purchasing inputs from both country groups are more productive than non importers, and this finding is confirmed regardless of the estimator (Pooled or FE) and the productivity indicator (labour productivity or TFP index). Also, importers present a significantly higher average wage and capital intensity. The existence of import premia for firm productivity and other firm level characteristics is in line with previous literature (Vogel and Wagner, 2010; Kasahara and Lapham, 2008), even if they shrink when firm fixed effects are controlled for. Also, the premia are significantly higher for the import status from advanced countries than the one from low income countries. This result suggests the opportunity to treat the two types of importing activity as two different treatments the firm may undergo since they may potentially lead to different efficiency effects both in terms of significance and magnitude. Consistently with the evidence on two-way traders (Altomonte and Bekes, 2009; Vogel and Wagner, 2010; Castellani, Serti, and Tomasi, 2010), from the Table it turns out that export and import activities are strictly linked: importers have a higher probability to sell in foreign markets and this holds true for both import origins. This evidence together with the potential existence of learning-by-exporting reveal the importance to control for the firm export activity when the productivity gains of importing are investigated.

In the Appendix we also show the kernel density of labour productivity for the three different groups of firms: importers from the two origins and non importers. Figure B.1 delivers us the same insights gathered from the estimated import premia in Table 2 along all the firm productivity distribution. The distribution for importers is shifted to the right of that of non importers, and this proves the productivity superiority of firms buying foreign intermediates. The graph also suggests that, even if importers from high income countries seem to be slightly more productive, as also reported by the above import premia, this difference is not pronounced.

The evidence we have shown only reveals a positive correlation between importing strategies of firms and their efficiency and does not give any information about the causal nexus that we investigate in the following section.

Table 1: Distribution of Importers (%)

	2000	2004
Importers	37.32	38.89
Importers LIc	20.88	24.99
Importers HIc	31.44	31.50
Importers Hic & LIc	15.00	17.59

Our elaborations from ISTAT dataset.

Table 2: Import Premia

		Imp^{LI}		Imp^{HI}	
		Coeff	P-value	Coeff	P-value
Pooled	*lp*	0.084	0.000	0.200	0.000
	tfp	0.060	0.000	0.166	0.000
	Wage	0.008	0.003	0.093	0.000
	kl	0.167	0.000	0.239	0.000
	Exp	0.163	0.000	0.231	0.000
	ExpSh	0.019	0.000	0.023	0.000
Fixed Effects	*lp*	0.014	0.000	0.030	0.000
	tfp	0.014	0.000	0.028	0.000
	Wage	0.004	0.005	0.014	0.000
	kl	0.012	0.013	0.021	0.000
	Exp	0.113	0.000	0.120	0.000
	ExpSh	0.010	0.000	0.014	0.000

The Table refers to the estimation of equation 1 and displays the γ_0 and γ_1 coefficients. All Variables are in logarithm with the exception of Exp and $ExpSh$, being a dummy and a share respectively. The difference between the coefficients of Imp^{LI} and Imp^{HI} are always statistically significant with the exception of the difference in *kl* and *Exp* in Fixed Effects estimations.

3 The empirical strategy

3.1 Evaluating the impact of import entry

Compared to the opposite causal direction, the investigation of the causal nexus running from importing to the firm productivity can be considered a more relevant issue, as it may deliver important insights in terms of policy implications. Indeed, the finding of beneficial effects of imports for the firm efficiency and competitiveness may drive policy makers to adopt interventions aimed at easing the access to foreign supply markets. In order to test the learning-by-importing hypothesis, i.e. the hypothesis on whether the firm import activity enhances its productivity growth, we exploit a treatment framework, where the treatment is the import entry. The measure of interest in this empirical setting is the Average Treatment Effect on the Treated (ATT) that, in our context, is represented by the difference between the efficiency importers attain when purchasing inputs abroad and the one they would have experienced if had they not imported at all. As usual, the latter counterfactual outcome is not observable and we have to rely on the post-treatment efficiency level of non importers. To attenuate the issue of simultaneity, we focus on import starters as treated units and never importers as untreated units. As documented in the previous section, important differences exist between the two groups of firms and, to account for this, we apply PSM techniques that allow for the selection of a proper control group. The latter is, then, made up of those never importers that are the most similar to the import starters in all relevant pre-treatment observable characteristics, so as summarised by their propensity score (Blundell and Dias, 2000). In our analysis, we define as import *starters* those firms starting to import in year t and not importing in the previous three years (i.e. *t-1*, *t-2* and *t-3*). As a consequence, the sample of starters consists of two cohorts: firms that start importing in 2003 and the ones that start importing in 2004. We consider imports from low income countries and imports from high income countries as two different treatments, following the prior, supported by our descriptive evidence, that the two types of activity may partially reflect different underlying reasons and may drive to different consequences in the firm production processes. We end up with 2,636 starters for imports from low income countries and 1,898 starters for imports from developed economies. In oder to select the never importers to match to the import starters, we rest on the propensity score retrieved from the estimation of a probit model for the probability to import from each origin county group for the first time. To account for any observed difference between starters and controls in the

pre-entry period, in both probit models we include the first, second and third lag of the following variables as regressors: firm size measured in terms of units of labour, lab, TFP index, tfp, capital-labour ratio, kl, real average wage, $wage$, stock of intangible assets, k_{int}, export share, $ExpSh$, and import share from high (low) income countries, $ImpSh^{HI}$ ($ImpSh^{LI}$) for the probability of importing from low (high) income countries. Finally, the models contain a full set of two-digit sector[7] and year dummies. It is worth to notice that in the control group selection equation for each treatment we include a variable to control for firms undergoing the other treatment (in terms of share) and we also include the firm export share, thus taking into account the degree of firm involvement in foreign markets in terms of export activity in the period before the import entry. As mentioned above, this choice follows from the recent evidence on the existence of important complementarity between importing and exporting (Muûls and Pisu, 2009; Kasahara and Lapham, 2008; Aristei, Castellani, and Franco, 2011) and from our descriptive evidence too. Resting on these findings, we select never importers that in the pre-entry period do not present a significant difference in the export activity with respect to future importers.

Table 3 shows the results from the probit estimations of the import entry in both source markets. The estimated propensity scores will, then, be used for the selection of the control units. From the results it emerges that the most relevant differences between import starters and the remaining firms especially concern the pre-entry year, with a few exceptions mostly related to exporting and importing. Columns 1 and 3, indeed, confirm our expectations: larger and more productive firms are more likely to start importing, the same is true for firms characterised by a higher capital intensity and having a larger endowment of intangible assets. This evidence supports the validity of the self-selection into importing hypothesis in line with Vogel and Wagner (2010). Also, previous internationalisation strategies, both in terms of exports and imports from other origins, ease the establishment of linkages with suppliers in new foreign origins. The role of all determinants is pretty similar between the two import status. The only exception concerns the average wage that has no significant impact on the probability of starting importing from advanced countries, while, when measured in $t-2$, it has a negative and slightly significant effect on the purchases from suppliers in developing economies. The usual interpretation of the average wage as a proxy

[7] The inclusion of three digit sector dummies caused convergence problems so we decided to stick to the use of two digit dummies, also not to incur in the inconsistent parameter estimates related to the presence of a large number of fixed effects in short T panels when estimating a model with Maximum Likelihood (see Wooldridge, 2002, page 484).

for the average firm skill intensity (Bernard and Jensen, 1999, 2004) may suggest that, *ceteris paribus*, firms with higher skill intensity have a lower probability to start importing from low income countries. This may be due to the kind of activity these firms perform requiring more technology and quality intensive inputs that are more likely to be found in high income countries. The estimated probit specification allows us to correctly classify most of the observations (95% for imports from low income countries and 96% for imports from high income countries).

Exploiting the estimated scores, we then apply the "Nearest Neighbour" (NN) matching on the "common support", that is we match the starter with the single never importer having the most similar propensity score. The matching is applied "with replacement" and cross-section by cross-section, so that the same never importer may be used as a match more than once and import starters are matched with controls from the same year.

To appraise the quality of our matching procedure, columns 2 and 4 of Table 3 display the goodness of the matching emerging from the re-estimation of the probit on the sample of treated units and matched controls. We find that all coefficients are not significant, with the exception of the second lag of the TFP measure in the probit for importing from high income countries in column 2. Nevertheless, the pseudo-R^2 is not statistically different from 0 for both probit models run on the starters and the matched controls. This implies that treated units and their matched controls have the same probability to start importing from low income or high income countries. Also, in Table B.1 in the Appendix, we also show the t-tests of the differences in the relevant characteristics in $t-1$[8]: while before the matching there are large and significant gaps in the pre-treatment variables, afterwards any difference disappears. Also, the quasi-totality of treated are in the common support and can be matched with convenient controls. Furthermore, figure B.2 in the Appendix shows that the distribution of the propensity score for matched controls overlaps the one of treated firms after the matching procedure for both the treatments. All this evidence confirms the validity of the matching for the two treatments, i.e. importing from high and low income countries.

After the implementation of the matching algorithm, which controls for any observable characteristic driving the selection into the "treatment", we apply the Difference-In-Difference (DID) estimator on the matched sample. Thus, com-

[8] As from the probit models on the overall sample the lags of the variables dated $t-2$ and $t-3$ were not significant in most of the cases, the t-tests of the differences in the relevant characteristics in $t-2$ and $t-3$ are not shown for the sake of brevity, but they are readily available from the authors upon request.

paring the after/before productivity differences for import starters to the same differences for the matched controls, we also allow for selection into importing to occur on time invariant unobservables[9]. Once defined t as the starting year of the intermediate import activity, we compare the productivity growth between t and $t-1$ and between $t+1$ and $t-1$. The average treatment effects on the treated (ATT) are then calculated as follows:

$$M^{DID-PSM} = \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{i \in I} [(Y_{i,post} - Y_{i,pre}) - \sum_{j \in C} \omega(i,j)(Y_{j,post} - Y_{j,pre})] \quad (2)$$

Y is the outcome (in our case the productivity), subscripts *post* and *pre* denote that the variable concerns the pre $(t-1)$ or post-entry period (t and $t+1$); I denotes the group of import starters in the region of common support, while C denotes the control group of never importers, always in the region of common support. n_i is the number of treated units on the common support. $\omega(ij)$ is a weight equal to the inverse of the number of control firms that are matched with a starter and, in our analysis it is equal to 1 due to the single nearest neighbour matching. We compute the ATT effects for both Total Factor Productivity and labour productivity.

Results - Table 4 shows the ATT effects from PSM-DID estimations both for imports from high and low income countries. Starting to purchase abroad has a significant impact on the firm's productivity growth only upon entry in the import market, as from the bootstrapped standard errors the impact on the difference between $t-1$ and $t+1$ never turns significant, thus revealing that any possible benefit is only temporary. Even if the sign of the effect is similar across the two import activities, the coefficient size and significance level are higher for the first time sourcing from developing countries. This finding confirms the recent increase in the relative importance of these economies for manufacturing firms in developed economies. Furthermore, the lack of any significant growth effect after the entry is supports the existence of static, more than dynamic, gains from importing stemming from specialisation, and these gains are only temporary.
In this respect, if learning-by-importing is interpreted as the process through which import starters permanently attain a higher growth performance after the entry in the import market, compared to their counterfactual, our data do sup-

[9] As affirmed by Blundell and Dias (2000) the use of matching estimator in combination with difference-in-difference approach can "improve the quality of non-experimental evaluation results significantly".

port such outcome. However, dynamic benefits originating from the firm specialisation in growth promoting activities may take time to permanently affect the firm productivity growth. Nevertheless, while we cannot exclude that dynamic gains may flow in the future, we cannot support this view from our data. On the contrary, our PSM strategy highlights a temporary benefit only for the firm entering the import market. As a matter of fact, the entry affects the efficiency and competitiveness of firms in the very first moment firms access foreign inputs, so that import starters immediately jump to a higher total factor productivity level, compared to the one they would have enjoyed had they stayed in the national market for intermediates. It is worth to highlight, though, that more than just importing or not, the extent of involvement in international markets might prove the key factor for productivity growth. For this reason, we will pursue this view in the next section by testing the impact of import intensity from high and low income countries on the firm TFP growth in a linear dynamic panel data model.

Table 3: Probit for First-time Import Entry

	Import from LI Countries			Import from HI Countries	
	All Sample	Matched Sample		All Sample	Matched Sample
	[1]	[2]		[3]	[4]
lab_{t-1}	0.434***	-0.042	lab_{t-1}	0.536***	-0.005
	[0.066]	[0.113]		[0.072]	[0.133]
tfp_{t-1}	0.193***	-0.025	tfp_{t-1}	0.346***	0.089
	[0.050]	[0.086]		[0.058]	[0.101]
kl_{t-1}	0.074***	-0.001	kl_{t-1}	0.060**	-0.009
	[0.024]	[0.042]		[0.026]	[0.045]
$wage_{t-1}$	0.032	-0.031	$wage_{t-1}$	0.096	-0.077
	[0.084]	[0.143]		[0.093]	[0.175]
$k_{int\ t-1}$	0.023***	-0.012	$k_{int\ t-1}$	0.004	-0.006
	[0.006]	[0.010]		[0.006]	[0.012]
$ExpSh_{t-1}$	1.021***	0.008	$ExpSh_{t-1}$	1.061***	0.005
	[0.118]	[0.187]		[0.133]	[0.207]
$ImpSh^{HI}_{t-1}$	0.656***	0.221	$ImpSh^{LI}_{t-1}$	0.788***	0.194
	[0.165]	[0.257]		[0.271]	[0.442]
lab_{t-2}	-0.169*	0.061	lab_{t-2}	-0.231**	0
	[0.090]	[0.158]		[0.096]	[0.174]
tfp_{t-2}	0.049	0.073	tfp_{t-2}	0.073	-0.228**
	[0.057]	[0.098]		[0.064]	[0.112]
kl_{t-2}	-0.031	0.009	kl_{t-2}	0.005	0.013
	[0.032]	[0.057]		[0.035]	[0.059]
$wage_{t-2}$	-0.168*	0.003	$wage_{t-2}$	-0.016	0.15
	[0.099]	[0.177]		[0.106]	[0.194]
$k_{int\ t-2}$	0.003	0.016	$k_{int\ t-2}$	0.018**	-0.001
	[0.008]	[0.013]		[0.008]	[0.016]
$ExpSh_{t-2}$	0.097	0.077	$ExpSh_{t-2}$	0.115	0.082
	[0.153]	[0.226]		[0.173]	[0.279]
$ImpSh^{HI}_{t-2}$	-0.084	-0.231	$ImpSh^{LI}_{t-2}$	0.015	-0.021
	[0.203]	[0.301]		[0.361]	[0.600]
lab_{t-3}	-0.017	0.01	lab_{t-3}	-0.057	0.024
	[0.053]	[0.096]		[0.056]	[0.101]
tfp_{t-3}	0.096*	-0.079	tfp_{t-3}	-0.009	0.066
	[0.050]	[0.086]		[0.055]	[0.096]
kl_{t-3}	0.039*	-0.01	kl_{t-3}	0.02	-0.034
	[0.023]	[0.041]		[0.025]	[0.044]
$wage_{t-3}$	-0.096	0.118	$wage_{t-3}$	-0.048	0.043
	[0.076]	[0.138]		[0.081]	[0.143]
$k_{int\ t-3}$	0.001	-0.008	$k_{int\ t-3}$	-0.003	0.01
	[0.006]	[0.010]		[0.006]	[0.011]
$ExpSh_{t-3}$	0.214*	-0.126	$ExpSh_{t-3}$	0.294**	-0.168
	[0.125]	[0.191]		[0.143]	[0.231]
$ImpSh^{HI}_{t-3}$	0.459***	-0.063	$ImpSh^{LI}_{t-3}$	0.464	0.041
	[0.161]	[0.226]		[0.302]	[0.489]
$Cons.$	-1.693***	-0.97	$Cons.$	-4.101***	-0.941
	[0.490]	[0.859]		[0.561]	[1.031]
Firms	27816	4859	Firms	23984	3540
Observations	53020	4859	Observations	46115	3540
Pseudo-R2	0.159	0.002	Pseudo-R2	0.135	0.003
Wald Chi2	3264	16.82	Wald Chi2	2106	17.66
Log-lik	-8660	-3557	Log-lik	-6725	-2557

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. All regressions include a full set of two-digit sector and time dummies. Robust standard errors are in brackets.

Table 4: ATT effects of Import Entry

	Import from LI Countries			
	$\Delta tfp_{t,t-1}$	$\Delta tfp_{t+1,t-1}$	$\Delta lp_{t,t-1}$	$\Delta lp_{t+1,t-1}$
ATT	0.028	0.036	0.026	0.037
SE	[0.007]***	[0.018]**	[0.007]***	[0.018]**
SE boot	[0.008]***	[0.023]	[0.008]***	[0.022]
Treated Units	2572	579	2572	579
	Import from HI Countries			
	$\Delta tfp_{t,t-1}$	$\Delta tfp_{t+1,t-1}$	$\Delta lp_{t,t-1}$	$\Delta lp_{t+1,t-1}$
ATT	0.019	0.035	0.017	0.027
SE	[0.009]**	[0.023]	[0.009]*	[0.023]
SE boot	[0.009]**	[0.026]	[0.009]*	[0.026]
Treated Units	1853	401	1853	401

*, ** and *** indicate the significance at 10, 5 and 1%.
Both Analytical, SE, and bootstrapped (with 250 draws), $SEboot$, standard errors are reported.
The reduction in the number of firms at time *t+1* is due either to some missing values or to the lack of time *t+1* for the 2004 wave of starters and their relative control units.

3.2 Appraising the role of import intensities

To assess the role of the extent of involvement in foreign input markets in shaping firm productivity, we explore the relationship between import intensities and productivity in a linear dynamic model for the whole sample of importers and non importers. Since in the previous section the use of Total Factor Productivity and Labour Productivity indicators delivered very similar results, for the sake of brevity henceforth we will only focus on the former that presents the advantage to take into account the differences across firms in the capital intensity. We assume that firm Total Factor Productivity, *TFP*, is a function of the import share from developed and developing economies:

$$TFP_{it} = e^{\gamma_0 ImpSh_{it}^{LI} + \gamma_1 ImpSh_{it}^{HI} + \delta_0 D_j + \delta_1 D_t}$$

Thus, taking the logs of variables and including the lag of TFP to account for the autoregressive nature of productivity, we obtain the following equation to estimate:

$$tfp_{it} = \alpha\, tfp_{it-1} + \gamma_0\, ImpSh_{it}^{LI} + \gamma_1\, ImpSh_{it}^{HI} + \delta_0\, D_j + \delta_1\, D_t + \mu_i + \epsilon_{it} \qquad (3)$$

tfp is the TFP index, $ImpSh^{LI}$ and $ImpSh^{HI}$ are respectively the firm import shares from Low and High Income countries over total output, D_j and D_t are two digit sector and time dummies, μ_i is the firm level unobserved heterogeneity, and ϵ_{it} is an idiosyncratic shock.

The presence of the lagged dependent variable represents a source of endogeneity for our estimates and, in order to evaluate the performance of different estimators and choose the more appropriate one, we compare the resulting estimates from four candidates: OLS, FE, the Difference Generalised Method of Moments (GMM-DIFF) (Arellano and Bond, 1991) and the System Generalised Method of Moments (GMM-SYS) (Blundell and Bond, 1998). GMM-DIFF and GMM-SYS also allow us to correct for the potential endogeneity of imports: the lagged levels of the dependent variable and import intensities are used as instrument in the differenced equation in both GMM-SYS and GMM-DIFF while the lagged differences of the variables become instruments for the level equation in GMM-SYS. It is known that in this framework FE deliver a downward biased estimate of the lagged dependent variable, while OLS delivers an upward bias, and, in line with our expectations, we find that both the GMM-DIFF and GMM-SYS

coefficient estimate of the lagged TFP fall within this range. Concerning the instruments choice in GMM estimations, when we use the second - and deeper - lags of the variables in levels to instrument the differenced equation as suggested in Blundell and Bond (1998), the Hansen test of over-identifying restrictions does not fail to reject the validity of lagged levels dated $t-2$ and we can not reject the null of no second order autocorrelation ($AR2$ test). This is consistent with the presence of measurement errors as also shown in Bond (2002) and, as suggested by the latter, we use instruments dated $t-3$ and $t-4$ of both import intensities and TFP that are, instead, not rejected in GMM-DIFF[10]. Blundell and Bond (1998) advise to combine the difference equation with the equation in levels in a system estimation since GMM-DIFF may be characterized by weak instruments if the series has a near unit root behaviour and if cross-section variability dominates time variability. However, in our empirical context GMM-DIFF proves to perform better than GMM-SYS, where Hansen test does not support the validity of the estimations. We then prefer the former to the latter.

Results - Table 5 displays the results from the estimation of the base model 3 by means of different methods. It emerges that only OLS estimation displays a significant impact of import activity on firm efficiency. From FE purchasing inputs abroad does not enhance the productivity regardless of the origin country. The same holds for GMM-DIFF estimations, where we also control for the potential endogeneity of our right hand side variables. On the contrary, turning on GMM-SYS, whereas the finding of no role for imports from high income economies is confirmed, an efficiency enhancing effect stems from purchases from low wage countries. However, it is worth to notice that, as already mentioned, the Hansen test reveals some problems about the validity of the instruments. For this reason, in the rest of the paper we stick to GMM-DIFF[11].

[10] Unfortunately, due to our sample time span, we are not able to test for third order autocorrelation. However, we rest on the Hansen test to evaluate the goodness of the instruments.

[11] GMM-SYS estimations are available from the authors upon request. They mimic the findings of GMM-DIFF, and the impact of offshoring to low income countries turns to be non significant when the firm involvement in export markets is accounted for. However, even if the Hansen test often reject the null in this set of estimates, the Hansen/Sargan test is found to be inclined to some weakness (Roodman, 2006). As a matter of fact, Blundell and Bond (2000) observe some tendency for the Sargan/Hansen test statistics to reject a valid null hypothesis too often in their experiments, and this tendency is greater at higher values of the autoregressive parameter. Furthermore, the Hansen test rejection in large firm level samples is not an uncommon feature (Bontempi and Mairesse, 2008). Meschi, Taymaz, and Vivarelli (2011), indeed, discuss that the very large number of observations makes the occurrence of a significant Sargan/Hansen more

Table 5: TFP impact of Import Intensity

	Ols	Fixed Effects	GMM-DIFF	GMM-SYS
$L.tfp$	0.780***	0.045***	0.362***	0.547***
	[0.002]	[0.004]	[0.031]	[0.026]
$ImpSh^{LI}$	0.104***	0.146	0.344	0.187***
	[0.011]	[0.033]	[0.329]	[0.060]
$ImpSh^{HI}$	0.143***	-0.024	-0.224	-0.241
	[0.017]	[0.016]	[0.259]	[0.163]
Cons	-0.028***	-0.209***		-0.030***
	[0.003]	[0.051]		[0.008]
Obs.	161758	161758	121285	161758
Number of firms	40468	40468	40455	40468
R^2	0.435	0.009		
Hansen			0.104	0.000
AR1			0.000	0.000
AR2			0.000	0.000

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. All regressions include a full set of two-digit sector and time dummies. Robust standard errors are in brackets. $L.tfp$ denotes the lagged Total Factor Productivity. GMM-SYS and GMM-DIFF estimates are obtained using the 3^{rd} and 4^{th} lags of the dependent variable and regressors as instruments for the equation in differences, additionally GMM-SYS uses the 2^{nd} lag of the differenced variables for the equation in levels. $Hansen$ shows the P-value of the test of the validity of the over-identifying restrictions. $AR(1)$ and $AR(2)$ show the P-value for the tests of the null hypothesis of no first and second order serial correlation in the differences of residuals.

To prove the robustness of our findings we have accounted for a set of firm level and sectoral variables. First of all, some recent work on Italian manufacturing has shown robust evidence on learning-by-exporting (Serti and Tomasi, 2008b; Bratti and Felice, 2011). When we include the firm experience in foreign markets, estimates, as displayed in Table 6, confirm the lack of any role of import activity in the efficiency improvement. Firm export share instead significantly contributes to boost firm productivity. The same results hold when we add other firm level variables, that is the stock of intangible assets, k_{int}, and the firm share of domestic materials, $MatSh_{dom}$, and when we test for the sector level import penetration, imp_pen_{sect}, export openness, exp_open_{sect}, and the sectoral skill ratio, $skill_{sect}$. It is interesting to notice that the stock of intangible assets, k_{int}, that may capture the investments of firms in innovation, quality, R&D, advertisement, and thus the level of sophistication of their activity[12], drives to efficiency gains even if the significance is low. Also, the activity of domestic outsourcing, as captured by the intensity in domestic intermediates, has no impact, thus disclosing that purchases of inputs have no role regardless of their origin, domestic or foreign. Concerning the sectoral context, the significant coefficient on the sector import penetration, imp_pen_{sect}, that should catch the pressure from foreign competition, may reveal that firms invest in efficiency improvements to escape from a deepening of foreign competitive pressures[13]. On the contrary, no role is found out for the skill intensity and the export orientation of the sector.

Summing up, an increase in the firm import intensity, regardless of the input origin, does not affect the firm efficiency growth in Italian manufacturing and

---

likely. They report that when in their work they repeat the test over random subsamples the test was not significant most of the times.

[12] As a matter of fact, we observe in our sample that the largest stock of these assets is recorded for firms in High Tech sectors while the lowest stock is for firms in Traditional sectors.

[13] Unfortunately, we are not able to control for the foreign ownership of the firm in this sample. We also lack any information on the firm foreign investments abroad. The inclusion of inward and outward FDI dummies would be desirable here, due to the large intra-firm share of trade that is generally operated by multinationals and to the higher efficiency stemming from being a multinational. To assess whether the omission of such controls may result in a serious misspecification of our empirical model, we made a check on the EFIGE representative database on manufacturing firms from seven European countries (for the details see $http://www.efige.org$). This database reports that foreign owned firms (firms with 10% or more of foreign owned capital) represent in Italy about 5% of all manufacturing firms. At the same time, only 2.5% of Italian firms declare to invest abroad. In addition, only 7% of exporters and 9% of importers are foreign owned and only 4% of exporters and 5% of importers are foreign investors. These figures confirm that multinational activity is not very common within the Italian manufacturing sectors, and that the majority of importers and exporters are not part of a multinational group.

this finding is in line with the previous evidence on the lack of a permanent shift in the TFP growth path after entry.

The lack of learning-by-importing mimics the finding highlighted by Vogel and Wagner (2010) for Germany, while it is at odds with the evidence on Irish, Swedish and French manufacturing (Forlani, 2010; Görg, Hanley, and Strobl, 2008; Jabbour, 2010; Lööf and Andersson, 2010). However, results in some of the latter works may be driven by the omission of any control concerning firm export strategies that, indeed, emerge from our analysis as an important driver of firm productivity growth. Then, our evidence would suggest that, as already shown by Serti and Tomasi (2008b), learning-by-exporting is at work in Italy and this is a peculiar finding for advanced economies where usually no gain stems from export activity (ISGEP, 2008). Finally, our firm level evidence appears to at odds with the positive productivity effect stemming from the sector level studies by Lo Turco (2007) and Daveri and Jona-Lasinio (2008). One possible explanation is related to the across firms reallocation that may originate from increased sector level intermediate import penetration. Both studies use two digit industry measures of imports of intermediates and productivity, then it is highly likely that in response to increased imported intermediates intensity the less productive intermediate good producers, classified in the same two digit industry of the final good producers, go out of the market. The consequent reallocation of resources to higher productivity firms, then, increases the sector level productivity. In line with the theory on heterogeneous firms in international trade(Melitz, 2003; Melitz and Ottaviano, 2008), evidence in this direction for the Italian manufacturing is shown by Del Gatto, Ottaviano, and Pagnini (2008). Then, the overall sector and firm level evidence would suggest that imports do not induce important within firm productivity, nevertheless higher competition in intermediate production may well generate overall productivity gains at the sector level.

Table 6: TFP impact of Import Intensity: Controls

	Firm level controls				Sector level controls		
	Adding $ExpSh$	Lagged Regressors	Adding k_{int}	Adding $MatSh_{dom}$	Adding imp_pen_{sect}	Adding exp_open_{sect}	Adding $skill_{sect}$
$L.tfp$	0.414***	0.359***	0.460***	0.422***	0.421***	0.419***	0.411***
	[0.037]	[0.031]	[0.053]	[0.037]	[0.038]	[0.038]	[0.037]
$ImpSh^{LI}$	-0.147	0.127	-0.088	-0.178	-0.193	-0.157	-0.107
	[0.460]	[0.385]	[0.566]	[0.450]	[0.476]	[0.473]	[0.460]
$ImpSh^{HI}$	-0.199	-0.048	-0.087	-0.139	-0.183	-0.179	-0.188
	[0.279]	[0.059]	[0.209]	[0.218]	[0.272]	[0.271]	[0.275]
$ExpSh$	1.106***	0.239*	1.416***	1.213***	1.082***	1.051***	1.095***
	[0.294]	[0.128]	[0.356]	[0.315]	[0.291]	[0.287]	[0.293]
k_{int}			0.033*				
			[0.020]				
$MatSh_{dom}$				-0.280			
				[0.900]			
imp_pen_{sect}					0.043**		
					[0.022]		
exp_open_{sect}						-0.008	
						[0.021]	
$skill_{sect}$							0.033
							[0.034]
Obs.	120305	120320	102595	119627	107294	107294	120195
Number of firms	40243	40240	36408	40110	36346	36346	40243
Hansen	0.178	0.003	0.078	0.172	0.073	0.086	0.201
AR1	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AR2	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. GMM-DIFF estimates are reported. See footnote of Table 5 for more details.

4 Conclusion

Within the recent strand of literature on the role of intermediate inputs in the manufacturing firm performance, we contribute offering evidence on the effect of imports from high and low labour cost countries on the Italian firms' productivity. By means of PSM techniques and of the estimation of a linear dynamic panel data model of the firm TFP, we appraise the effect of both the import status and intensity on the efficiency of import starters and all importing firms, respectively. At a first glance imports from developing economies seem to boost productivity more than imports from developed partners, thus corroborating our prior on the two activities hiding partially different motivations. However, regardless of the foreign input origin, our overall evidence points at import entry fostering temporary static gains from specialisation, whereas dynamic gains are not supported by our findings. As byproduct of the empirical analysis, we find the existence of self-selection into importing, as also highlighted by Vogel and Wagner (2010), and we confirm the relevant role of exporting in shaping the Italian manufacturing firm productivity, in line with Serti and Tomasi (2008b) and Bratti and Felice (2011). An increase in the export intensity, indeed, positively affects the firm TFP. Thus, we confirm the validity of learning-by-exporting effects, when the firm import activity is controlled for.
Our findings, together with other evidence on advanced countries in the literature, suggest that gains from imports may be rather modest for developed economies, thus marking an important distinction with respect to the evidence on the relevant role of imports for manufacturing in developing countries. The availability of a longer time span and of more detailed data on the firm internationalisation and its sophistication could help to refine this analysis in order to shed further light on the overall effect of each international strategy. Further evidence on advanced countries would be needed to explore in other contexts the simultaneous role of imports and exports on productivity.

In conclusion, as no efficiency gain emerges from our data, policy makers should be more concerned on the actual consequences of integration in the intermediate input markets. As a matter of fact, if more than positively affecting the firm efficiency, importing only caused the exit of less productive firms from the market, national policies should be tailored at helping the resource reallocation process, especially as far as human capital and, in general, workers are concerned.

References

ALTOMONTE, C., AND G. BEKES (2009): "Trade Complexity and Productivity," IEHAS Discussion Papers 0914, Institute of Economics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

AMITI, M., AND J. KONINGS (2007): "Trade Liberalization, Intermediate Inputs, and Productivity: Evidence from Indonesia," *American Economic Review*, 97(5), 1611–1638.

ARELLANO, M., AND S. BOND (1991): "Some Tests of Specification for Panel Data: Monte Carlo Evidence and an Application to Employment Equations," *Review of Economic Studies*, 58(2), 277–97.

ARISTEI, D., D. CASTELLANI, AND C. FRANCO (2011): "Firms' exporting and importing activities: is there a two-way relationship?," Discussion paper, mimeo.

BERNARD, A., AND J. JENSEN (1999): "Exceptional exporter performance: cause, effect, or both?," *Journal of International Economics*, 47(1), 1–25.

——— (2004): "Why some firms export," *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, (86), 561–569.

BLUNDELL, R., AND S. BOND (1998): "Initial conditions and moment restrictions in dynamic panel data models," *Journal of Econometrics*, (87), 115–143.

——— (2000): "GMM Estimation with persistent panel data: an application to production functions," *Econometric Reviews*, 19(3), 321–340.

BLUNDELL, R., AND M. C. DIAS (2000): "Evaluation methods for non-experimental data," *Fiscal Studies*, 21(4), 427–468.

BOND, S. (2002): "Dynamic panel data models: a guide to microdata methods and practice," Discussion paper.

BONTEMPI, M. E., AND J. MAIRESSE (2008): "Intangible Capital and Productivity: An Exploration on a Panel of Italian Manufacturing Firms," NBER Working Papers 14108, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.

BRATTI, M., AND G. FELICE (2011): "Are Exporters More Likely to Introduce Product Innovations?," Development Working Papers 306, Centro Studi Luca dÁgliano, University of Milano.

CALABRESE, G., AND F. ERBETTA (2005): "Outsourcing and Firm Performance: Evidence from Italian Automotive Suppliers," *International Journal of Automotive Technology and Management*, 5(4), 461–479.

CASTELLANI, D., F. SERTI, AND C. TOMASI (2010): "Firms in International Trade: Importers' and Exporters' Heterogeneity in Italian Manufacturing Industry," *The World Economy*, 33(3), 424–457.

CAVES, D. W., L. R. CHRISTENSEN, AND W. E. DIEWERT (1982): "Multilateral Comparisons of Output, Input, and Productivity Using Superlative Index Numbers," *Economic Journal*, 92(365), 73–86.

DAVERI, F., AND C. JONA-LASINIO (2008): "Off-shoring and Productivity Growth in the Italian Manufacturing Industries," *CESifo Economic Studies*, 54(3), 414–450.

DE LOECKER, J. (2007): "Do exports generate higher productivity? Evidence from Slovenia," *Journal of International Economics*, 73(1), 69–98.

DEL GATTO, M., G. I. P. OTTAVIANO, AND M. PAGNINI (2008): "Openness To Trade And Industry Cost Dispersion: Evidence From A Panel Of Italian Firms," *Journal of Regional Science*, 48(1), 97–129.

FERNANDES, A. M. (2007): "Trade policy, trade volumes and plant-level productivity in Colombian manufacturing industries," *Journal of International Economics*, 71(1), 52–71.

FORLANI, E. (2010): "Irish firms' productivity and imported inputs," Core discussion papers, Université catholique de Louvain, Center for Operations Research and Econometrics (CORE).

GÖRG, H., A. HANLEY, AND E. STROBL (2008): "Productivity effects of international outsourcing: evidence from plant-level data," *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 41(2), 670–688.

HALPERN, L., M. KOREN, AND A. SZEIDL (2005): "Imports and Productivity," CEPR Discussion Papers 5139, C.E.P.R. Discussion Papers.

ISGEP (2008): "Understanding Cross-Country Diffences in Exporter Premia: Comparable Evidence for 14 Countries," *Review of World Economics (Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv)*, 144(4), 596–635.

JABBOUR, L. (2010): "Offshoring and Firm Performance: Evidence from French Manufacturing Industry," *The World Economy*, 33(3), 507–524.

KASAHARA, H., AND B. LAPHAM (2008): "Productivity and the Decision to Import and Export: Theory and Evidence," CESifo Working Paper Series 2240, CESifo Group Munich.

KASAHARA, H., AND J. RODRIGUE (2008): "Does the use of imported intermediates increase productivity? Plant-level evidence," *Journal of Development Economics*, 87(1), 106–118.

LÖÖF, H., AND M. ANDERSSON (2010): "Imports, Productivity and Origin Markets: The Role of Knowledge-intensive Economies," *The World Economy*, 33(3), 458–481.

LO TURCO, A. (2007): "International Outsourcing and Productivity in Italian Manufacturing Sectors," *Rivista Italiana degli Economisti*, 12(1), 125–146.

LO TURCO, A., AND D. MAGGIONI (2011): "On the role of imports in enhancing manufacturing exports," DISES Working Paper Series 363, Università Politecnica delle Marche.

LO TURCO, A., AND D. MAGGIONI (2012): "Offshoring to High and Low Income Countries and the Labour Demand. Evidence from Italian Firms," *Review of International Economics*, forthcoming.

LO TURCO, A., D. MAGGIONI, AND M. PICCHIO (2012): "Offshoring and Job Stability: Evidence from Italian Manufacturing," mimeo, Università Politecnica delle Marche.

MAGGIONI, D. (2012): "Learning by Exporting in Turkey: An Investigation for Existence and Channels," *Global Economy Journal*, 12.

MAZZOLA, F., AND S. BRUNI (2000): "The role of linkages in firm performance: evidence from southern Italy," *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 43(2), 199–221.

MELITZ, M. J. (2003): "The Impact of Trade on Intra-Industry Reallocations and Aggregate Industry Productivity," *Econometrica*, 71(6), 1695–1725.

MELITZ, M. J., AND G. I. P. OTTAVIANO (2008): "Market Size, Trade, and Productivity," *Review of Economic Studies*, 75(1), 295–316.

MESCHI, E., E. TAYMAZ, AND M. VIVARELLI (2011): "Trade, technology and skills: Evidence from Turkish microdata," *Labour Economics*, (doi:10.1016/j.labeco.2011.07.001).

MUÛLS, M., AND M. PISU (2009): "Imports and Exports at the Level of the Firm: Evidence from Belgium," *The World Economy*, 32(5), 692–734.

PAUL, C. J. M., AND M. YASAR (2009): "Outsourcing, productivity, and input composition at the plant level," *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 42(2), 422–439.

ROODMAN, D. (2006): "How to do xtabond2: An introduction to difference and system GMM in Stata," CGD working paper 103, Center for Global Development (CGD), Washington DC.

SERTI, F., AND C. TOMASI (2008a): "Self-Selection and Post-Entry Effects of Exports: Evidence from Italian Manufacturing Firms," *Review of World Economics*, 144(4), 660–694.

SERTI, F., AND C. TOMASI (2008b): "Self-Selection and Post-Entry Effects of Exports: Evidence from Italian Manufacturing Firms," *Review of World Economics (Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv)*, 144(4), 660–694.

VAN BIESEBROECK, J. (2005): "Exporting raises productivity in sub-Saharan African manufacturing firms," *Journal of International Economics*, 67(2), 373–391.

VAN BIESEBROECK, J. (2007): "Robustness of productivity estimates," *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 55(3), 529–569.

VOGEL, A., AND J. WAGNER (2010): "Higher productivity in importing German manufacturing firms: self-selection, learning from importing, or both?," *Review of World Economics (Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv)*, 145(4), 641–665.

WOOLDRIDGE, J. (2002): "Econometric analysis of cross-section and panel data," *MIT Press*.

Appendix

A Variables Definition and Description

- tfp: total factor productivity. Throughout the paper the latter is computed following Caves, Christensen, and Diewert (1982)[14] as:

$$lnTFP_{ft} = lnY_{ft} - ln\bar{Y}_t + \sum_{s=2}^{t}(ln\bar{Y}_s - ln\bar{Y}_{s-1}) + \\ -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(S_{fit} + \bar{S_{it}})(lnX_{fit} - ln\bar{X}_{it}) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{s=2}^{t}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(\bar{S_{is}} + \bar{S_{is-1}})(ln\bar{X}_{is} - ln\bar{X}_{is-1}) \tag{A.1}$$

  with Y and X respectively measuring real value added and the quantities of the $n = 2$ primary factors of production, i.e. labour and capital[15]. S refers to the expenditure share of each factor and the bar indicates the average over the relevant quantity. We define a hypothetical firm having input cost shares equal to the arithmetic mean cost shares over all observations, and with input and output levels equal to the geometric mean of inputs and output over all observations. The terms in the first sum describe the difference between the firm f and the hypothetical firm at time t, while the terms in the second sums chain together the hypothetical firms back to the base period. The index measure the productivity in each year relative to a hypothetical firm that represents the average firm in the sector in the first year of our sample time span.

- lp: labour productivity, measured as the logarithm of the firm real value added over firm total employment;

- Imp^{LI}: import status from low income economies, measured as a dummy variable taking value 1 if the firm imports from low income countries and 0 otherwise;

[14] The choice of this index is motivated by its robustness. Van Biesebroeck (2007) shows that, apart the case of large measurement errors in the data, the index produces consistently accurate productivity growth estimates, even when firms are likely to employ different technologies.

[15] Labour is measured as the number of employees in the firm, while capital is proxied by the balance sheet value of material assets.

- Imp^{HI}: import status from high income economies, measured as a dummy variable taking value 1 if the firm imports from high income countries and 0 otherwise;
- $ImpSh^{LI}$: import intensity from low income economies, measured as the share of imported inputs from low income countries over total output;
- $ImpSh^{HI}$: import intensity from high income economies, measured as the share of imported inputs from high income countries over total output;
- Exp: export status, measured as a dummy variable taking value 1 if the firm exports;
- $ExpSh$: export intensity, measured as the value of total exports over total output;
- $wage$: average wage, logarithm of total labour cost over total employment;
- kl: capital labour ratio, measured as the logarithm of the ratio between the firm real material assets and the firm total employment;
- $MatSh_{dom}$: firm level intensity in domestic materials, measured as the share of material inputs purchased domestically over total material purchases;
- lab: size, measured as the logarithm of firm employment;
- k_{int}: intangible capital stock, measured as the logarithm of the firm real intangible assets;
- imp_pen_{sect}: sector level import penetration, measured as the three digit level sector imports over the summation of the total three digit level sector output and imports minus exports;
- exp_open_{sect}: sector level export openness, measured as the three digit level sector exports over total sectoral output;
- $skill_{sect}$: sector level skill ratio, measured as the ratio between the three digit level sector share of white collars over total sectoral employment.

B Additional Tables and Graphs

Figure B.1: Productivity - Kernel Density



Figure B.2: Propensity Score - Kernel Density

Importing from Low Income Countries



Importing from High Income Countries



Table B.1: T-Tests

	Imp^{LI}			Imp^{HI}	
	Before Matching	After Matching		Before Matching	After Matching
lab_{t-1}	32.19	1.65	lab_{t-1}	22.24	0.98
tfp_{t-1}	16.95	0.23	tfp_{t-1}	13.88	0.13
kl_{t-1}	9.85	-0.03	kl_{t-1}	7.73	1.15
$wage_{t-1}$	16.27	1.12	$wage_{t-1}$	14.26	0.44
$k_{int\ t-1}$	17.26	0.08	$k_{int\ t-1}$	18.50	0.18
$ExpSh_{t-1}$	46.01	0.50	$ExpSh_{t-1}$	37.13	0.67
$ImpSh^{HI}_{t-1}$	44.82	0.12	$ImpSh^{LI}_{t-1}$	6.58	0.92
Treated on the common support	97.6%		Treated on the common support	97.6%	