Firm R&D Investment and Export Market Exposure*

Bettina Peters
Centre for European Economic Research (ZEW)
and University of Luxembourg

Mark J. Roberts
Pennyslvania State University, NBER and ZEW

Van Anh Vuong
University of Cologne

June 2018

Abstract

In this article we study differences in the returns to R&D investment between firms that sell in international markets and firms that only sell in the domestic market. We use German firm-level data from the high-tech manufacturing sector to estimate a dynamic structural model of a firm's decision to invest in R&D and use it to measure the difference in expected long-run benefit from R&D investment for exporting and nonexporting firms. The results show that R&D investment leads to a higher rate of product and process innovation among exporting firms and these innovations have a larger impact on productivity improvement in export market sales. As a result, exporting firms have a higher payoff from R&D investment, invest in R&D more frequently than firms that only sell in the domestic market, and, subsequently, have higher rates of productivity growth. The endogenous investment in R&D is an important mechanism that leads to a divergence in the long-run performance of firms that differ in their export market exposure.

*We are grateful to Pere Arque-Castells, Bronwyn Hall, Eric Bartelsman, Jordi Jaumandreu, Hans Lööf, Jacques Mairesse, and Pierre Mohnen for helpful comments and discussions. We thank the Centre for European Economic Research (ZEW) for providing data access and research support. Contact information: Peters (b.peters@zew.de), Roberts (mroberts@psu.edu), Vuong (vananh.vuong@ewi.uni-koeln.de)

1 Introduction

The theoretical and empirical literature on international trade has emphasized the difference in performance between firms that engage in international markets, through either trade or investment activities, and those that do not. A large empirical literature has quantified differences in productivity and growth between exporting and nonexporting firms as well as between firms that purchase inputs from foreign sources and ones that source their inputs domestically.[1] The theoretical literature, much of it based on the model by Melitz (2003), has shown how differences in underlying firm characteristics, particularly productivity, can lead to differences in the incentives to export or import and the self-selection of firms into those activities. A common starting point seen in both the theoretical and empirical literature is to identify a dimension in which firms are heterogenous, such as productivity, and study the effects of this disparity on a firm's choice to participate in international markets and the subsequent impact on their performance.

In contrast, the theoretical literature on growth and trade as developed by Grossman and Helpman (1990, 1995) has emphasized the endogenous nature of technological improvements and the role that international trade can play in affecting the speed and direction of technological change.[2] For example, a firm operating in large international markets may be better able to realize profit opportunities that result from their own innovation which, in turn, increases the firm's incentive to invest in innovation activities. In this article, we develop an empirical model to quantify two components of the endogenous growth framework. The first component accounts for the fact that innovation is expensive and that firms choose to undertake investments in R&D when the expected discounted payoff from the investment overweighs the cost. The second considers the payoff from an innovation, which may be affected by the firm's presence in international markets. For example, a firm selling in foreign markets may be better able to profit from a new product or new production process than a firm that only sells in its domestic

[1] See Greenaway and Kneller (2007) and Keller (2010) for reviews of the empirical literature on exporting, foreign direct investment, and firm productivity. Goldberg, Khandelwal, Pavcnik, and Topalov (2010) document the importance of imported inputs as a source of firm growth.

[2] Constantini and Melitz (2008), Atkinson and Burstein (2010) and Long, Raff, and Stähler (2011) develop models of endogenous productivity growth and show that reductions in trade costs can increase firm incentives to invest in R&D or new technologies.

market. This can lead to differences in the expected return to R&D investment, which, in turn, leads to different patterns in R&D investment and alters the subsequent productivity or output growth between domestic and exporting firms.

A large empirical literature has studied the relationship between firms' investments in R&D, technology adoption, or innovation rates and firms' productivity and export market participation. Virtually all studies find evidence of positive cross-sectional and intertemporal correlations between R&D, innovation, exporting, and productivity at the firm level.[3] An additional group of papers have focused on identifying the causal links between trade exposure and R&D investment. Bustos (2010) and Lileeva and Trefler (2010) study environments where there are exogenous reductions in trade costs and show that these lead to increased firm innovation or technology adoption. Aw, Roberts, and Xu (2011) estimate a dynamic structural model of export choice and R&D investment using firm data for Taiwanese electronics producers. They find that export market sales increase firm productivity and the return to R&D. The resulting endogenous investment in R&D contributes to the productivity gap between exporting and non-exporting firms. Using a similar framework, Máñez, Rochina-Barrachina, and Sanchis-Llopis (2015) analyze Spanish firm data and find that the two activity variables, exporting and R&D, increase both productivity and the probability of undertaking the complementary activity in future periods. Bøler, Moxnes, and Ulltveit-Moe (2015) find that a Norwegian R&D tax credit stimulated both R&D investment and purchases of imported intermediate inputs, which acted as complements and contributed to technological change. Overall, this empirical literature has identified positive causal linkages between trade exposure and R&D investment or technology upgrading but, with the exception of Aw, Roberts, and Xu (2011), has not quantified the return to R&D investment or how it differs across firms based on their trade exposure.[4]

In this article, we develop and estimate a dynamic, structural model of the R&D process,

[3]This literature includes Bernard and Jensen (1997), Baldwin and Gu (2004), Aw, Roberts, and Winston (2007), Aw, Roberts, and Xu (2008), Van Beveren and Vandenbussche (2010), Cassiman and Golvko (2011), Becker and Egger (2013), Altomonte, Aquilante, Bekes and Ottaviano (2013), and Damijan, Kostevc, and Rojec (2017). A very robust conclusion from this literature is that firm's that export are more likely to invest in R&D and report product and process innovations.

[4]An exception to the finding of a positive relationship between trade exposure and technology upgrading is the study by Santos (2017). He finds that reductions in trade costs increase competition among domestic firms and reduce their incentives to adopt new technologies.

including firm R&D investment, innovation outcomes, and productivity growth and measure how the expected benefits of R&D investment vary with trade exposure. We use firm-level data for five high-tech German manufacturing industries. Following the model of R&D investment by Peters, Roberts, Vuong, and Fryges (2017) (herafter, PRVF) we quantify three stages linking R&D investment and the firm's expected long-run return. First, R&D investment will change the probability of developing new products or process innovations. Second, these innovations can improve future firm productivity and, hence third, improve the path of future profits and firm value. We allow each stage in this process to differ between exporting and nonexporting firms and measure how they contribute to differences in the long-run payoff to R&D.

The empirical results reveal substantial differences in the R&D process between exporting and nonexporting firms. Exporting firms that invest in R&D are more likely to realize product and process innovations. These innovations, on average, have a larger impact on future productivity and profits for export sales as opposed to sales in the domestic market. This leads to a higher expected benefit from R&D investment for exporting firms and a higher probability of investing. These findings are consistent with the mechanism underlying the endogenous growth models. The fact that exporters are more likely to realize innovations can reflect learning effects through technological spillovers or knowledge transmissions from abroad. The fact that these innovations have a larger impact on profits can reflect the larger size of international markets as well as the larger set of innovative opportunities for firms that sell abroad. Overall, the empirical findings in this article indicate a very large difference in the return to R&D and the incentives to invest in R&D between exporting and nonexporting German high-tech firms. This endogenous process of R&D investment contributes to the divergence in performance observed between exporting and nonexporting firms.

In the next section, we extend the PRVF model of R&D choice to recognize differences in the productivity process between exporting and nonexporting firms. In the third section, we discuss the data, which is drawn from the Mannheim Innovation Panel (the German contribution to the Community Innovation Surveys). In the fourth section, we present the empirical model and estimation method and present the empirical results in the fifth section. Section six provides concluding remarks.

2 Theoretical Model

This section develops a theoretical model of a firm's dynamic decision to undertake R&D investment while accounting for their involvement in international markets. The model is structured into three stages. In the first stage, the firm makes a choice of whether or not to invest in R&D. The second stage of the model describes the effect of a firm's R&D choice on their probability of receiving a product or process innovation. In the third stage, the realized innovations can improve the distribution of firm productivity, affecting its short-run output and profits. Moreover, if productivity improvements are long-lived, an innovation also impacts the stream of future profits.[5] A firm that invests in R&D to maximize the discounted sum of expected future profits will recognize that the expected benefits of the R&D choice made in stage one depend on the expected outcomes of the innovation realized in stage two and productivity improvement in stage three. The dynamic model of firm R&D choice developed in PRVF ties together all three stages of this innovation framework and measures the expected long-run benefits of R&D investment. The next section develops the theoretical model for each stage, beginning with the linkage between productivity and profits and working backward to the firm's choice of R&D. Our framework extends the model of PRVF, which only treats firms as selling in a single market, to allow R&D to have a different impact on innovation and firm sales in the export and domestic market. This will lead to a difference in the incentive for firms to invest in R&D and their subsequent long-run performance based on their exposure to the export market.

2.1 Profits, Productivity, and Innovation

We start by defining firm productivity and linking it to the firm's profits. Firm i's short-run marginal production cost is represented by

$$c_{it} = \beta_t + \beta_k k_{it} + \beta_a a_{it} - \psi_{it}, \tag{1}$$

[5] Griliches (1979) developed the "knowledge production function" framework linking R&D with firm output. In his model, R&D investment creates a stock of knowledge that enters as an input into the firm's production function. This was extended to the three-stage process which includes innovation outcomes by Crepon, Duguet, and Mairesse (1998). Their model has been widely used in empirical studies using firm data on R&D, innovation outcomes, and productivity. Recent surveys of the empirical literature are provided in Hall, Mairesse, and Mohnen (2010) and Hall (2011).

where c_{it} is the log of marginal cost, k_{it} is the log of firm capital stock, and a_{it} is firm age. The intercept β_t is allowed to vary over time to reflect changes in the market price of variable inputs that are assumed to be the same for all firms in period t. The firm-specific production efficiency ψ_{it} captures differences in technology or managerial ability that are known by the firm but not observable to the econometrician.[6] The capital stock is treated as a fixed factor in the short-run. Thus, we allow for three sources of cost heterogeneity across firms: capital stock, firm age, and unobserved production efficiency.[7]

Each firm can sell in two markets, the home market (h) and the foreign market (f). A nonexporting firm i faces the demand for its product q_{it}^h in the home market given by:

$$q_{it}^h = Q_t^h \left(\frac{p_{it}^h}{P_t^h} \right)^{\eta^h} \exp(\phi_{it}^h) = \Phi_t^h (p_{it}^h)^{\eta^h} \exp(\phi_{it}^h), \tag{2}$$

where Q_t^h is the aggregate domestic output in period t and P_t^h is the domestic price index for the industry in which the firm operates. These are combined into the industry aggregate Φ_t^h. The firm-specific variables are the domestic output price p_{it}^h and a demand shifter ϕ_{it}^h that reflects product desirability, product appeal or product quality. This demand shifter is known by the firm but also not observed by the econometrician. The elasticity of demand η^h is negative and assumed to be constant for all firms in the industry.

Exporting firms face a similar demand structure for their product in the home market, where the demand parameters η^h and Φ_t^h are allowed to differ between exporting and nonexporting firms. Exporting firms also face a demand curve in the foreign market given by:

$$q_{it}^f = Q_t^f \left(\frac{p_{it}^f}{P_t^f} \right)^{\eta^f} \exp(\phi_{it}^f) = \Phi_t^f (p_{it}^f)^{\eta^f} \exp(\phi_{it}^f). \tag{3}$$

Importantly, the firm-level demand shifter in the foreign market ϕ_{it}^f is different from the one

[6] Variation in input quality, which leads to variation in input prices, across firms is also captured in ψ. We model this source of quality variation as part of the unobserved firm efficiency.

[7] Equation (1) implies that, in the short run, the firm can expand or contract output at constant marginal cost. This is a reasonable assumption if, along with the variable inputs, the firm can also adjust the utilization of its fixed capital stock in order to expand or contract its output in the short run. In addition, in micro panel data of the type we utilize, most of the variation in firm sales is in the across-firm rather than within-firm dimension. To account for this, our marginal cost model relies on three factors, the capital stock, firm age, and production efficiency, that primarily vary across firms. Economies or diseconomies of scale are unlikely to be the source of the firm sales variation we observe in the data.

operating on domestic sales. An exporting firm can have a product with high appeal in the home market but low appeal in the export market or vice-versa.

Assuming the firm operates in a monopolistically competitive market, it maximizes its short-run profit by setting the price for its output in each market equal to a constant markup over marginal cost: $p_{it}^l = \left(\frac{\eta^l}{1+\eta^l}\right)\exp(c_{it})$ where $l = h, f$. Given this optimal price, the log of the firm's revenue in each market $l = h, f$ is

$$r_{it}^l = (1+\eta^l)\ln\left(\frac{\eta^l}{1+\eta^l}\right) + \ln \Phi_t^l + (1+\eta^l)\left(\beta_t + \beta_k k_{it} + \beta_a a_{it} - \omega_{it}^l\right). \quad (4)$$

The term ω_{it}^l denotes the revenue productivity in market $l = h, f$. It is a combination of cost-side and demand-side shocks, defined as $\omega_{it}^l = \psi_{it} - \frac{1}{1+\eta^l}\phi_{it}^l$. Equation (4) implies that, for a given level of capital stock and firm age, heterogeneity in the firm's revenue in each market is driven by differences in production efficiency ψ and the demand shifter in that market ϕ^h or ϕ^f. We refer to the unobserved revenue productivity ω_{it}^h and ω_{it}^f simply as productivity. These will be the key state variables the firm can affect through its choice of R&D. Since revenue productivity contains demand shocks that can vary by market, the level of productivity itself, and its evolution over time, can be different for sales in each market. For example, a firm may have a product that is especially well-suited to domestic customers and invest in R&D to improve its product appeal at home, but not have a product of equal attractiveness to foreign buyers.

Given the firm's pricing rule, there is a simple relationship between the firm's short-run profits and its revenue in each market $l = h, f$:

$$\pi_{it}^l = \pi_t^l(\omega_{it}^l, k_{it}, a_{it}) = -\frac{1}{\eta^l}\exp(r_{it}^l). \quad (5)$$

The total profits of the firm depend on the markets it sells to. In our German manufacturing data, we observe that virtually all firms sell either solely in the domestic market or in both domestic and export market in all years they are observed. None of the firms sell only in the foreign market and only very few firms move in or out of the foreign market.[8] Due to

[8] Of the firms that export, 98.4 percent remain exporters in all years. Of the nonexporters, 95.3 percent never enter the export market. For the small number of firms that switch status, we treat them as different firms during the two periods. We have also estimated the model after dropping these firms and it has no effect on the results.

this feature of our data, we develop the model for two types of firms: a pure domestic seller whose total short-run profits are Π^h_{it}, which are determined only by conditions in the home market, and a mixed domestic-export market seller whose total short-run profits Π^f_{it} depend on conditions in both the home and foreign market.[9] In particular, a firm that sells in only the domestic market will have its profits depend on only the domestic market revenue productivity (in addition to capital and age), while the firm that operates in both markets will have total profits that reflects productivities in both markets. The total short-run profit for each type of firm is therefore defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi^h_{it} &= \Pi^h_t(\omega^h_{it}, k_{it}, a_{it}) = \pi^h_t(\omega^h_{it}, k_{it}, a_{it}) \\ \Pi^f_{it} &= \Pi^f_t(\omega^h_{it}, \omega^f_{it}, k_{it}, a_{it}) = \pi^h_t(\omega^h_{it}, k_{it}, a_{it}) + \pi^f_t(\omega^f_{it}, k_{it}, a_{it}) \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

We link the firm's R&D choice to domestic and export profits in two steps. In the first step, the firm makes a discrete decision to invest in R&D, $rd_{it} \in \{0, 1\}$, and this affects the probability the firm realizes a process or product innovation in year $t+1$, denoted z_{it+1} and d_{it+1}, respectively. Both are discrete variables equal to 1 if firm i realizes a process or product innovation in year $t+1$ and 0 otherwise. We allow this linkage between R&D and innovation to differ between firms that operate solely in the domestic market and firms that sell in both domestic and foreign markets. The linkage between R&D and innovation is represented by the cumulative joint distribution of product and process innovations, conditional on whether or not the firm invests in R&D and whether or not it sells in foreign markets, $F(d_{it+1}, z_{it+1}|rd_{it}, I(f_i))$. In this specification, $I(f_i)$ is a discrete variable equal to 1 if the firm sells in foreign markets and 0 if it is a pure domestic seller.

This specification of the innovation process is simple and recognizes the key feature that R&D investment does not guarantee innovation success, furthermore, that innovations may occur even without formal R&D investment by the firm. This latter effect can result from luck, the effect of expenditures on R&D in the more distant past even if the firm is not currently

[9] Aw, Roberts, and Xu (2011) also allow the firm to choose its export market participation in each year, so that firms would be choosing which markets to sell in, and the productivity levels in both markets would be important to the firms' export and R&D decisions. Because we have few firms in our sample that export in only a subset of the years we do not have the information to estimate a model of export market choice. Instead, we treat export participation as a firm characteristic and estimate how the payoff to R&D differs between exporting and nonexporting firms.

investing, ideas that are brought to the firm by hiring experienced workers or other spillover channels, or changes in the production process that result from learning-by-doing without formal R&D investment. The specification also recognizes that a firm that operates in foreign markets may benefit from alternative pathways for innovations. They may have both the opportunity and the incentive to introduce product innovations in one of its foreign markets but not in its domestic market. The firm's R&D investment may also result in product innovations that are variations on the domestic product but designed for consumers in the foreign market.

In the second step, firm productivity in each market is treated as a state variable that evolves over time as a Markov process, and is shifted by product or process innovations. Using the discrete innovation indicators, z_{it} and d_{it}, we model the evolution of revenue productivity in market $l = h, f$ for firms that sell in both markets as:

$$\omega_{it+1}^l = \alpha_0^l + \alpha_1^l \omega_{it}^l + \alpha_2^l (\omega_{it}^l)^2 + \alpha_3^l z_{it+1} + \alpha_4^l d_{it+1} + \alpha_5^l z_{it+1} d_{it+1} + \varepsilon_{it+1}^l. \quad (7)$$

The parameters α_0, $\alpha_1, ...\alpha_5$ differ between the export and domestic market sales, which allows for different patterns of productivity evolution in the two markets. The parameters α_1 and α_2 capture the persistence in firm productivity over time, $\frac{\partial \omega_{t+1}}{\partial \omega_t}$, while α_3, α_4, and α_5 measure how the mean of future productivity shifts when the firm realizes one or both innovations. The randomness in the productivity processes is captured by $(\varepsilon_{it+1}^h, \varepsilon_{it+1}^f)$ which we assume are *iid* draws across time and firms from a joint normal distribution with zero mean and variance-covariance matrix Σ. Notice that shocks to productivity are not transitory, but rather persist and affect future productivity levels through the coefficients α_1 and α_2.

A similar model is adopted for productivity evolution for the firms that sell only in the domestic market. In this case, the firm's home market productivity evolves as:

$$\omega_{it+1}^h = \beta_0^h + \beta_1^h \omega_{it}^h + \beta_2^h (\omega_{it}^h)^2 + \beta_3^h z_{it+1} + \beta_4^h d_{it+1} + \beta_5^h z_{it+1} d_{it+1} + \varepsilon_{it+1}^h. \quad (8)$$

In the empirical model, we will estimate the coefficients of equations (7) and (8) recognizing that the productivity process can differ for sales in the home market between nonexporting and exporting firms and between home and foreign market sales for exporting firms. To simplify notation in the dynamic model described in the next section, we denote the nonexporting firms' productivity evolution process by a cdf $G^h(\omega^h_{it+1}|\omega^h_{it}, d_{it+1}, z_{it+1})$ and that of exporting firms by $G^f(\omega^h_{it+1}, \omega^f_{it+1}|\omega^h_{it}, \omega^f_{it}, d_{it+1}, z_{it+1})$, respectively.

2.2 The Firm's Dynamic Decision to Invest in R&D

This section develops the firm's decision rule for whether or not to invest in R&D. In contrast to the majority of the empirical innovation literature that aims at measuring the correlation between R&D investment and observed firm and industry characteristics, we structurally model the firm's optimal R&D choice. The firm's investment choice depends on both the effect of R&D on the firm's expected future profits and the cost the firm has to incur for the productivity improvement. In this model, the firm's cost is the expenditure it must make to generate a process or product innovation. This cost may vary across firms for many reasons such as the nature of the investment project, the firm's expertise in creating innovation, its ability to access capital, differences in the type of new products that are desirable in foreign markets versus the domestic market, as well as its prior R&D experience. The fact that some firms are better in the innovation process or have a larger set of technological opportunities for innovation is captured in this model by lower innovation costs.

To capture this heterogeneity in firm's innovation cost, we assume that the firm i's cost is a random draw from an exponential distribution which has a mean that depends on the firm's export status, represented by $I(f_i)$, prior R&D experience, rd_{it-1}, and other observable firm characteristics X_{it}. The indicator variable for whether or not the firm invested in R&D in the previous year, rd_{it-1}, takes the value 1 if the firm was engaged in R&D in $t-1$ and 0 otherwise. This captures differences in the cost of innovation when the firm is maintaining ongoing R&D operations versus the innovation costs if they are beginning to invest in R&D. Other variables that can be included in X_{it} are firms' industry affiliation, age or a measure of firm size.[10] We represent the parameter of the innovation cost distribution, which is the mean of the distribution, faced by firm i as $\gamma(I(f_i), rd_{it-1}, X_{it})$. The innovation cost for firm i in

[10] In PRVF (2017) we let the innovation cost vary with the firm's capital stock and in Peters, Roberts, and Vuong (2017) we included an indicator of the firm's financial strength measured by its credit rating. We simplify the framework here to focus on the differences between exporting and nonexporting firms by industry.

year t is therefore modeled as an *iid* draw from the following exponential distribution:

$$C_{it} \tilde{} \exp(\gamma(I(f_i), rd_{it-1}, X_{it})). \tag{9}$$

The timing of the firm's decision problem is assumed to be the following: at the start of period t, the firm observes its current domestic sales productivity ω_{it}^h and, if it is an exporter, the foreign sales productivity ω_{it}^f, as well as its short-run profit function, the process for productivity evolution in each market, equation (7) or (8), and the probability of an innovation $F(d_{it+1}, z_{it+1}|rd_{it}, I(f_i))$. The state variables for a pure domestic firm are $s_{it}^h = (\omega_{it}^h, rd_{it-1})$ and for an exporting firm are $s_{it}^f = (\omega_{it}^h, \omega_{it}^f, rd_{it-1})$ and they evolve endogenously as the firm makes its decision whether or not to conduct R&D.[11] The value function differs for pure domestic firms and exporting firms. Before the nonexporting firm observes its innovation cost realization, its value function can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} V^h(s_{it}^h) &= \pi(\omega_{it}^h) + \\ &\int_{C_{it}} \max_{rd \in \{0,1\}} \left(\beta E_t V^h(s_{it+1}^h|\omega_{it}^h, rd_{it} = 1) - C_{it}; \beta E_t V^h(s_{it+1}^h|\omega_{it}^h, rd_{it} = 0) \right) dC, \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where β denotes the firm's discount factor. The nonexporting firm's expected future value is defined as an expectation over possible future levels of domestic productivity and innovation outcomes:

$$E_t V^h(s_{it+1}^h|\omega_{it}^h, rd_{it}) = \sum_{(d,z)} \int_{\omega^h} V^h(s_{it+1}^h) dG^h(\omega_{it+1}^h|\omega_{it}^h, d_{it+1}, z_{it+1}) F(d_{it+1}, z_{it+1}|rd_{it}, I(f_i) = 0). \tag{11}$$

Using these equations, we can characterize the nonexporter's optimal R&D choice rd_{it}. If it does not invest in R&D, its discounted expected future profits are $\beta E_t V^h(s_{it+1}^h|\omega_{it}^h, rd_{it} = 0)$. If it does invest in R&D the discounted expected future profits are $\beta E_t V^h(s_{it+1}^h|\omega_{it}^h, rd_{it} = 1)$ and they will incur cost C_{it}. The marginal benefit of investing in R&D is the difference in the two expected future profits:

$$\Delta EV^h(\omega_{it}^h) \equiv \beta E_t V^h(s_{it+1}^h|\omega_{it}^h, rd_{it} = 1) - \beta E_t V^h(s_{it+1}^h|\omega_{it}^h, rd_{it} = 0). \tag{12}$$

[11] Firm capital stock, age, and variables that shift the cost of innovation are exogenous state variables as well. We omit them from s_{it}^h and s_{it}^f to simplify the notation and to focus on the role of the R&D, innovation, and productivity. In the empirical model, we define different firm types based on the exogenous variables and calculate the profit and value functions separately for each type.

The difference between these two measures of expected future profits is driven by the effect of R&D on the firm's future productivity. The firm selling only in the domestic market will choose to make the investment if the marginal benefit of R&D is larger than its cost: $\Delta EV^h(\omega_{it}^h) \geq C_{it}$.

A firm that sells in both the home and foreign market faces a similar problem except its firm value and the expected marginal benefit of conducting R&D now depend on the evolution of productivities in both markets. The value function for this firm is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} V^f(s_{it}^f) &= \pi(\omega_{it}^h, \omega_{it}^f) + \\ &\int_{C_{it}} \max_{rd \in \{0,1\}} \left(\beta E_t V^f(s_{it+1}^f | \omega_{it}^h, \omega_{it}^f, rd_{it}=1) - C_{it}; \beta E_t V^f(s_{it+1}^f | \omega_{it}^h, \omega_{it}^f, rd_{it}=0) \right) dC. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

The exporter's expected future value becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} E_t V^f(s_{it+1}^f | \omega_{it}^h, \omega_{it}^f, rd_{it}) &= \sum_{(d,z)} \int_{\omega^h, \omega^f} V^f(s_{it+1}^f) dG^f(\omega_{it+1}^h, \omega_{it+1}^f | \omega_{it}^h, \omega_{it}^f, d_{it+1}, z_{it+1}) \cdot \\ & F(d_{it+1}, z_{it+1} | rd_{it}, I(f_i) = 1)). \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

Compared to a nonexporting firm, a firm selling in both markets can have a different probability of an innovation and its productivity in each market can evolve in a different way, both in terms of its persistence and how it responds to product and process innovations. These factors are used in the empirical model to explain the differences in the R&D choice of exporting and nonexporting firms.

A firm operating in both markets makes the same benefit-cost comparison as the pure domestic seller and will choose to invest in R&D if the expected marginal benefit is greater than the cost, $\Delta EV^f(\omega_{it}^h, \omega_{it}^f) \geq C_{it}$, where the expected benefit is defined as:

$$\Delta EV^f(\omega_{it}^h, \omega_{it}^f) \equiv \beta E_t V^f(s_{it+1}^f | \omega_{it}^h, \omega_{it}^f, rd_{it}=1) - \beta E_t V^f(s_{it+1}^f | \omega_{it}^h, \omega_{it}^f, rd_{it}=0). \tag{15}$$

The key difference in the return to R&D activities between a pure domestic firm and a firm that sells in both markets is the additional gain from innovation in the foreign market. This difference, along with possible differences in the cost of innovation, drives the disparity in firms' R&D choices and leads to differences in their productivity growth, sales, and profits.

Overall, our model endogenizes the firm's choice to undertake R&D investments allowing it to depend on the net expected gain in long-run profits of each option. This model places structure on the firm's decision rule and ties the firm's choice to invest in R&D explicitly to the resulting expected innovation and productivity outcomes. The key structural components that we estimate from the data are (i) the firm revenue functions in both markets, equation (4), (ii) the process for productivity evolution in each market, equations (7) and (8), (iii) the innovation rates $F(d_{it+1}, z_{it+1}|rd_{it}, I(f_i))$, and (iv) the γ parameters describing the cost of innovation, equation (9). The complete model can be estimated with data on the firm's discrete decision to invest in R&D, rd, discrete indicators of innovation, d and z, sales in the home and foreign markets, r^h and r^f, the firm's capital stock and age, k and a, and other cost shift variables in X. In the next two sections we describe the data and develop the empirical model.

3 Data

The data we use to analyze the role of R&D in the productivity evolution of German firms are taken from the Mannheim Innovation Panel (MIP) survey collected by the Centre for European Economic Research (ZEW). This survey is the German component of the Community Innovation Survey which is administered in all EU countries.[12] We use a sample of firms from five high-tech manufacturing sectors: chemicals (NACE rev 1.0 codes 23, 24), nonelectrical machinery (29), electrical machinery (30, 31), instruments (33) and motor vehicles (34, 35). Our sample covers the years 1994-2008 and include 540 observations (after taking lags) from 247 domestic firms and 2590 observations from 1041 exporting firms.

For the estimation of the model, we use data on firm sales in the German domestic market and total sales in all of its export markets, variable costs, capital stock, firm age, innovation expenditures and product and process innovations. The firm's total revenue is the sum of domestic and export sales. Total variable cost is defined as the sum of expenditure on labor,

[12] Details of the sampling design are discussed in PRVF and Rammer and Peters (2013).

materials and energy. The firm's short-run profit is constructed as the difference between total revenue and total variable cost. The firm's value is the discounted sum of the future short-run profits and thus measures the long-run resources available to pay its capital expenses plus the economic profits.

In this article, we use the measures of both innovation inputs and innovation outputs collected in the Community Innovation Surveys. The firm's innovation input is measured by the firm's expenditure on innovative activities which includes R&D plus spending on worker training, acquisition of external knowledge and capital, marketing, and design expenditures for producing a new product or introducing a new production process. The discrete R&D variable that we analyze in the empirical model (rd_{it}) takes the value one if the firm reports a positive level of spending on innovation activities and zero otherwise. We also utilize two discrete variables for innovation output. In the survey in year t, the firms are asked whether they introduced new or significantly improved products or services during the years $(t-2)$, $(t-1)$, or t. The discrete variable product innovation d_{it} takes the value one if the firm reports yes to the question. The discrete variable for process innovation z_{it} equals one if the firm reports new or significantly improved internal processes during the years $(t-2)$ to t.[13]

Table 1 reports the differences in total revenue between exporting and nonexporting firms and the share of export sales for the exporters. Nonexporting firms have, on average, lower revenue than exporting firms. The difference could be due to the fact that nonexporting firms are on average smaller, have lower productivity, or have less investment activities. The difference in revenue between exporting and nonexporting firms is highly heterogeneous across industries. We observe the smallest difference in the chemical industry where exporting firms have twice as much revenue as nonexporting firms. In the vehicle industry this difference amounts to 27 times.

The last three columns summarizes the export intensity for exporting firms. Across all industries, the export intensity ranges between 4.7 percent (10th percentile) and 72.1 percent

[13] In the empirical model, this outcome is related to R&D spending in the previous year $(t-1)$, so there is not a perfect match between the timing of the R&D and the realization of the innovations. This may lead us to overestimate the effect of R&D on innovation since the innovation variable could be capturing outcomes from two years earlier. Attempting to use more distant lags of R&D spending exaggerates the problems caused by sample attrition and reduces the number of observations containing the necessary current and lagged variables.

(90th percentile). This indicates high heterogeneity in the relative importance of the export markets for firms. There is a substantial number of firms that are most active in the domestic market (median of export intensity is 32.5 percent) and other firms with the export market being their main source of revenue.

Table 1: Firm Sales in Domestic and Export Markets (millions of euros)

	Nonexporting Firms	Exporting Firms			
	Average Firm Sales	Average Firm Sales	Export Sales/Total Sales		
			10th percentile	Median	90th percentile
Chemicals	58.905	122.034	0.051	0.325	0.724
Machinery	7.429	80.305	0.043	0.360	0.769
Electronics	17.970	114.405	0.033	0.278	0.643
Instruments	3.391	39.324	0.057	0.341	0.732
Vehicles	6.583	178.078	0.032	0.291	0.697
Total Sample	**17.175**	**96.597**	**0.047**	**0.325**	**0.721**

Table 2 summarizes the differences in R&D investment rates and innovation rates between nonexporting and exporting firms for each industry. Overall, there is a very clear and robust pattern between the two groups across all five industries: exporters are more likely to invest in R&D and have higher realization rates for innovations. We focus on the average across all industries reported in the final row. The second and third columns give the fraction of firm-year observations that report positive spending on R&D and other innovation inputs. The rate for nonexporters is 0.441, while it is substantially higher, 0.853, for exporters. This is likely to be an important source of the often-observed productivity difference between exporting and nonexporting firms. The fourth and fifth columns present the rates of new product innovation for the two groups of firms and there is a substantial difference here as well. On average, the proportion of firm-year observations with product innovations is 0.385 for nonexporters and 0.786 for exporters. Finally, the rates of process innovation, while lower than the rates of product innovation, show a similar pattern, with the rate for exporters being much larger than the rate for nonexporters, 0.315 versus 0.586. The model developed in the previous section allows innovations to occur at different rates for exporting and nonexporting firms. Moreover, it allows innovation to have different impacts on the future productivity of domestic and export sales. These two features contribute to the differences in the expected benefits of R&D between exporting and nonexporting firms and subsequently help explain the difference in the proportion of firms engaging in R&D.

Table 2: Rates of R&D Investment and Product and Process Innovation

	R&D Investment Rate		Product Innovation		Process Innovation	
	Nonexporter	Exporter	Nonexporter	Exporter	Nonexporter	Exporter
Chemicals	0.587	0.790	0.460	0.715	0.460	0.569
Machinery	0.383	0.842	0.321	0.774	0.276	0.580
Electronics	0.539	0.903	0.513	0.837	0.400	0.600
Instruments	0.431	0.915	0.385	0.875	0.239	0.602
Vehicles	0.329	0.811	0.286	0.711	0.271	0.589
Average	**0.441**	**0.853**	**0.385**	**0.786**	**0.315**	**0.586**

4 Empirical Model

4.1 Productivity Evolution

We estimate the probability of innovation directly from the data as the fraction of observations reporting each of the four combinations of d_{it+1} and z_{it+1} conditioning on previous R&D choices $rd_{it} \in \{0,1\}$ and the firm's export status $I(f_i) \in \{0,1\}$. The innovation probabilities are estimated separately for each industry. For exporting firms we estimate the industry elasticity of demand for home and foreign sales using the method in Das, Roberts, and Tybout (2007). We regress the firm's total variable cost (the sum of expenditure on labor, materials and energy) on the sales in each market and the coefficient on the sales variable in market l can be interpreted as $1 - \frac{1}{\eta^l}$. For nonexporters, this is equivalent to the mean of the ratio of total variable cost to total sales.

Unlike the data on firm exports, domestic sales, and capital stock, which are observable to us, firm productivity in each market is not. We use the proxy variable approach of Olley and Pakes (1996) as applied by Doraszelski and Jaumandreu (2013) and PRVF (2017) to estimate the parameters of the revenue function, equation (4), and the productivity process, equation (7), and construct estimates of productivity in each market. Focusing on the firms that sell in both markets, in order to implement their methodology we need a control variable for each market that will depend on firm productivity. In general, firms with high productivity in the domestic market will have large output and thus large material expenditures for domestic production m^h_{it}. Similarly, high productivity in foreign market sales will result in large production for the export market and large expenditures on materials for export production m_{it}^f. We do not directly observe m_{it}^h and m_{it}^f but construct them by dividing total material expenditures, which we observe, into these two components using the markup-weighted share of sales in each market. The markup-weighted share of sales in market l is equal to the physical quantity of sales in market l. Specifically, the share of material expenditure allocated to sales in market l is:

$$m_{it}^l = \exp(r_{it}^l)(1 - \frac{1}{\eta^l})/\sum_{l=h,f}(\exp(r_{it}^l)(1 - \frac{1}{\eta^l}))$$

This assumption is restrictive, because it assumes that the expenditure on materials is used in fixed proportions to the quantity of output in each market, but it is a practical way to incorporate information on the firm's relative size in the domestic and export market. Our constructed material variables will contain information on both the firm's total size and its relative size in each market.

Using the structure of our model, we can solve for the demand functions for the material inputs. The factor demand equation for the log of materials used for production in each market $l = h, f$ is:

$$m_{it}^l = \beta_t^l + (1 + \eta^l)\beta_k k_{it} + (1 + \eta^l)\beta_a a_{it} - (1 + \eta^l)\omega_{it}^l. \quad (16)$$

In this equation, the intercept β_t^l depends on the common time-varying components in the model which include the intercept of the demand function in market l and the variable input prices. The material demand depends on the observed capital stock, age, and unobserved market productivity. Solving equation (16) for productivity gives:

$$\omega_{it}^l = (\frac{1}{1 + \eta^l})\beta_t^l + \beta_k k_{it} + \beta_a a_{it} - (\frac{1}{1 + \eta^l})m_{it}^l \quad (17)$$

We substitute this expression into the productivity evolution process, equation (7), lag it one period and substitute it for ω_{it}^l in the revenue equations (4). This allows us to express revenue in each market as a function of current and lagged capital, lagged age, lagged materials, and the product and process innovations.

$$
\begin{aligned}
r_{it}^{l} &= \lambda_0^l + \lambda_t^l + (1+\eta^l)\beta_k k_{it} - \alpha_1 \left[\beta_{t-1}^l + (1+\eta^l)\beta_k k_{it-1} + (1+\eta^l)\beta_a a_{it-1} - m_{it-1}^l\right] \quad (18)\\
&-(\frac{\alpha_2}{1+\eta^l})\left[\beta_{t-1}^l + (1+\eta^l)\beta_k k_{it-1} + (1+\eta^l)\beta_a a_{it-1} - m_{it-1}^l\right]^2\\
&-(1+\eta^l)\left[\alpha_3^l z_{it} + \alpha_4^l d_{it} + \alpha_5^l z_{it} d_{it}\right] - (1+\eta^l)\varepsilon_{it}^l + \upsilon_{it}^l.
\end{aligned}
$$

The error term υ_{it}^l is a transitory shock to the firm's revenue function which is not observed by the firm prior to choosing its variable inputs or making its R&D decision. For estimation we utilize the moment conditions implied by the fact that the error term $-(1+\eta)\varepsilon_{it}^l + \upsilon_{it}^l$ is uncorrelated with all right-hand side variables, $a_{it-1}, k_{it}, k_{it-1}, m_{it-1}^l, z_{it}, d_{it}$, and $z_{it}d_{it}$. The intercept λ_0^l is a combination of the intercepts of the revenue function and the productivity evolution equation α_0^l. We can separately identify the α_0^l parameter from the revenue function intercepts using the moment condition that ε_{it}^l has a zero mean. The time coefficients λ_t^l and β_{t-1}^l are functions of the common time-varying variables including the demand intercept and factor prices. The β_{t-1}^l coefficients are identified, up to a base-year normalization, and can be distinguished from the λ_t^l coefficients because of the higher-order power on ω_{it-1}^l in equation (7). We allow the intercept λ_0^l to vary across the two-digit industries in each group, reflecting industry differences in the revenue functions and include the industry-specific estimate of the demand elasticity as data. We also allow the β_k and β_a parameters to differ in the two markets, rather than constraining them to be equal as in the theoretical model, to allow for possible differences in the marginal cost of production in each market.

After estimation of the revenue function parameters, firm-level productivity in each market is constructed from the inverted material demand function equation (17). Using this method, we recover the unobserved productivity state variables ω_{it}^h and ω_{it}^f for each exporting firm as well as their transition process. The same estimation procedure is used for nonexporting firms except we use the total material expenditures of the firm as the control function. Productivity in the foreign sales cannot be constructed for the nonexporting firms, but this is not a problem because it is not a state variable for these firms.[14] Finally, using the estimated residuals in the

[14] Productivity in foreign sales is a relevant state variable when the firm's decides to enter the export market. Das, Roberts, and Tybout (2007) and Aw, Roberts, and Xu (2011) model the export market participation decision and develop a methodology for imputing the foreign sales productivity from information on the firm's

productivity evolution equations, we estimate the variance and covariance of the productivity shocks.

4.2 Value Function and the Dynamic Choice of R&D

Given estimates of the state variables and structural parameters described in the last section we can solve for the value functions, equations (13) and (10) and, importantly, the expected payoff to each firm from investing in R&D, $\Delta EV^h(\omega_{it}^h)$ if the firm is a nonexporter and $\Delta EV^f(\omega_{it}^h, \omega_{it}^f)$ if it sells in both markets. We use the nested fixed-point algorithm developed by Rust (1987) to estimate the structural parameters. At each iteration of the structural parameters, we approximate each of the value functions as a weighted sum of Chebyshev polynomials and include the weights as additional parameters to estimate. We use separate approximations for the domestic firms, whose state space is $s_{it}^h = (\omega_{it}^h, rd_{it-1})$ and exporting firms, which have the state space $s_{it}^f = (\omega_{it}^h, \omega_{it}^f, rd_{it-1})$. The other variables that shift the profit and cost function, age, capital stock, and industry, are treated as fixed firm characteristics in the value function calculation.[15]

The probability that a firm chooses to invest in R&D is given by the probability that its innovation cost C_{it} is less than the expected payoff. For nonexporting firms this is:

$$Pr\left(rd_{it} = 1 | s_{it}^h\right) = Pr\left[C_{it} \leq \Delta EV^h(\omega_{it}^h)\right] \tag{19}$$

and for exporting firms it is

$$Pr\left(rd_{it} = 1 | s_{it}^f\right) = Pr\left[C_{it} \leq \Delta EV^f(\omega_{it}^h, \omega_{it}^f)\right]. \tag{20}$$

Assuming the firm's state variables are independent of the cost draws and that the costs are *iid* draws from the distributions in equation (9), across all firms and time, conditional on the observable characteristics X, the likelihood function for the firms' discrete R&D choice can be expressed as

$$L(\gamma | rd, s) = \prod_i^N \prod_t^{T_i} \Pr(rd_{it} | s_{it}; \gamma), \tag{21}$$

domestic market sales. This imputation is not necessary in this case because our data do not allow estimation of the export participation decision.

[15] The profit function also depends on year dummies. After estimation there is no trend in the time estimates. We treat the value functions as stationary and use the average over the time coefficients when calculating the value function.

where γ is the vector of innovation cost function parameters. The vectors rd and s contain every firm's R&D choice and state variables for each period, respectively. The total number of firms is denoted by N and T_i is the number of observations for firm i.

5 Empirical Results

In the next subsection we provide the estimated relationships from the first-stage model linking R&D, innovation, and productivity. The second subsection reports results from the dynamic model for the cost and the long-run expected benefits of R&D.

5.1 R&D, Innovation, and Productivity

Table 3 summarizes the empirical relationship between firm R&D investment and innovation, $F(d_{it+1}, z_{it+1}|rd_{it}, I(f_i))$. It reports the estimated probability a firm introduces successful innovations conditional on their R&D choices and export status $I(f_i)$. If a firm does not invest in R&D in period t, columns (2) - (5) report the probability of realizing either no innovation, only product innovation, only process innovation, or both types of innovations in the next period. On average, nonexporting firms that do not invest in R&D report no innovation with a frequency of 0.827 and at least one type of innovation with a frequency of 0.173 (sum of columns (3) to (5)). The equivalent estimates for exporting firms are 0.736 for no innovation and 0.264 for at least one type of innovation. In addition, in every industry exporting firms have a higher frequency of innovation than nonexporters. In the case where the firm invests in R&D, the innovation probabilities are reported in columns (6) - (9). When investing, the frequency of innovation (sum of columns (6) to (9)) increases substantially to 0.768 for nonexporting and 0.913 for exporting firms. In every industry, exporters have a higher frequency of innovation than nonexporters.[16] This higher rate of innovation contributes to exporters having higher productivity levels, yielding them higher profits.

How these differences in the innovation rates affect the incentive of exporting and nonexporting firms to invest in R&D depends on how ΔEV in equations (12) and (15) is affected

[16] For firms that report innovations, realizing both product and process innovations is the most common outcome for all industries. Stand alone product innovations are realized with a higher frequency than process innovations for both exporting and nonexporting firms, regardless of their R&D investments.

by the difference in innovation rates when $rd_t = 0$ versus $rd_t = 1$. In this case, there is a minor difference between exporters and nonexporters. For nonexporters, the probability of an innovation increases, on average, by 0.595 (from 0.173 to 0.768) if they invest in R&D. The increase in this probability for exporters is slightly larger, 0.649 (from 0.264 to 0.913). Overall, for both domestic and exporting firms, investment in R&D substantially increases the probability of innovation. The impact is slightly larger for exporters. However, whether this leads to a higher R&D investment rate or not will also depend on how much the realized innovations shift the productivity evolution processes.

Table 3: Probability of Innovation Conditional on Past R&D: $\Pr(d_{t+1}, z_{t+1}|\ rd_t, I(f_i))$

	$rd_t = 0$				$rd_t = 1$			
Product innovation	$d = 0$	$d = 1$	$d = 0$	$d = 1$	$d = 0$	$d = 1$	$d = 0$	$d = 1$
Process innovation	$z = 0$	$z = 0$	$z = 1$	$z = 1$	$z = 0$	$z = 0$	$z = 1$	$z = 1$
Nonexporting Firms								
Chemicals	0.833	0.042	0.042	0.083	0.154	0.179	0.179	0.487
Machinery	0.841	0.024	0.008	0.127	0.271	0.200	0.100	0.429
Electronics	0.786	0.089	0.000	0.125	0.153	0.186	0.051	0.610
Instruments	0.836	0.055	0.018	0.091	0.315	0.315	0.056	0.315
Vehicles	0.824	0.020	0.039	0.118	0.263	0.158	0.053	0.526
Average	**0.827**	**0.042**	**0.016**	**0.115**	**0.232**	**0.216**	**0.087**	**0.465**
Exporting Firms								
Chemicals	0.766	0.054	0.054	0.126	0.097	0.223	0.036	0.644
Machinery	0.721	0.096	0.059	0.125	0.089	0.258	0.034	0.619
Electronics	0.625	0.075	0.075	0.225	0.084	0.285	0.025	0.605
Instruments	0.821	0.026	0.000	0.154	0.059	0.301	0.007	0.633
Vehicles	0.735	0.122	0.020	0.122	0.127	0.186	0.059	0.629
Average	**0.736**	**0.077**	**0.048**	**0.139**	**0.087**	**0.258**	**0.030**	**0.625**

The next stage of the empirical model uses equation (18) to estimate the parameters of the revenue functions and processes of productivity evolution. The estimation results, together with the estimates of the demand elasticities, are reported in Table 4.

Table 4: Productivity Evolution and Profit Function Parameters (standard errors)			
	Exporting Firms		Nonexporting Firms
	Domestic Revenue	Export Revenue	Domestic Revenue
Productivity Evolution			
ω_{t-1}	0.761 (0.018)**	0.896 (0.023)**	0.558 (0.048)**
ω_{t-1}^2	0.087 (0.008)**	0.059 (0.006)**	0.213 (0.019)**
d	0.027 (0.011)*	0.061 (0.018)**	0.016 (0.029)
z	0.046 (0.020)*	0.012 (0.033)	0.056 (0.044)
$d * z$	-0.007 (0.022)	0.021 (0.036)	-0.049 (0.054)
$Var(\varepsilon)$	0.037	0.085	0.072
$Cov(\varepsilon^h, \varepsilon^f)$		0.016	
Revenue Function			
k	-0.065 (0.004)**	-0.065 (0.004)**	-0.102 (0.009)**
age 10-19	-0.005 (0.018)	0.013 (0.030)	0.023 (0.037)
age 20-49	-0.099 (0.027)**	-0.129 (0.050)**	-0.043 (0.046)
age >50	-0.202 (0.033)**	-0.226 (0.064)**	-0.086 (0.060)
Intercept	1.138 (0.319)**	0.760 (0.701)	0.782 (0.241)**
Chemicals	0.136 (0.044)**	-0.038 (0.066)	-0.013 (0.103)
Machinery	0.070 (0.037)	0.005 (0.060)	0.087 (0.086)
Electronics	0.099 (0.041)*	0.088 (0.068)	0.207 (0.094)*
Instruments	0.051 (0.041)	0.165 (0.067)*	0.001 (0.096)
Demand Elasticity			
Chemicals	-3.045 (0.055)**	-3.989 (0.206)**	-2.981 (0.116)**
Machinery	-4.220 (0.071)**	-4.287 (0.128)**	-4.207 (0.124)**
Electronics	-4.254 (0.091)**	-3.794 (0.186)**	-4.260 (0.181)**
Instruments	-4.235 (0.074)**	-3.506 (0.135)**	-3.480 (0.097)**
Vehicles	-4.737 (0.135)**	-4.557 (0.312)**	-4.604 (0.255)**
sample size	2,590	2,590	540
The models also include a full set of year dummies			
** significant at the .01 level, * significant at the .05 level			

The second and third columns of Table 4 report estimates of the productivity evolution process for domestic and export market sales for the exporting firms. The first two coefficients jointly determine the persistence of the productivity process, $\frac{\partial \omega_{t+1}}{\partial \omega_t}$. Productivity persistence averages 0.79 in the domestic market and 0.86 in the export market. In both cases, productivity is highly persistent, implying a long-lived productivity impact of innovations. This further enhances the gain from investing in R&D. The coefficients on d, z, and dz measure the impact of product and process innovations on revenue productivity. In the domestic market, both innovations have a significant positive effect on productivity, increasing it by 2.7 percent for a product innovation and 4.6 percent for a process innovation. Firms that report both types of innovations have productivity that is 6.6 percent (=0.027 + 0.046 - 0.007) higher than noninnovators. In the export market, product innovation is particularly important, increasing productivity by 6.1 percent. Process innovations increase it by 1.2 percent and firms with both types of innovations have productivity levels that are 9.4 percent higher than noninnovators.

The relative importance of the domestic versus export market channel to the exporting firm's R&D choice is determined by both the productivity persistence and the impact of innovation in each market. The results in Table 4, which indicate that there is both higher productivity persistence and a larger impact of innovation on productivity in the export market, imply that R&D investment will have a larger impact on firm profits through the export channel. The impact of R&D investment on firm value will increase with the share of the firm's sales in the export market. Holding innovation costs constant, this will lead to a greater incentive to invest in R&D by exporting firms with larger export shares.

The last column of the table reports the productivity coefficients for the firms that only sell in the domestic market. The productivity process of nonexporters is persistent. The average persistence level is $\frac{\partial \omega_{t+1}}{\partial \omega_t} = 0.72$, thus is slightly lower than that of exporters. The productivity impact of product innovation for nonexporting firms is smaller than that of exporting firms while the productivity effect of process innovation is larger for the nonexporting firms. However, none of the innovation coefficients are significant for the nonexporting firms. Overall, we find strong evidence that innovation has a significant effect on both domestic and export market productivity for exporting firms but much weaker evidence of any impact for nonexporting firms. This difference contributes to a widening gap between exporting and nonexporting firm productivity over time.

The remaining rows in Table 4 report the coefficients of the profit function, equations (4) and (5). Capital has a negative coefficent implying that firms with larger capital stocks have lower variable costs and thus higher revenues and profits. The firm age coefficients measure the deviation from the youngest group of firms and the negative signs imply that more mature firms have, on average, lower variable production costs, hence higher profits. The highest profits will be earned by the oldest firms. The demand elasticities are reported in the bottom panel of Table 4. Profits are inversely related to the demand elasticity. While the demand elasticities are fairly similar across the markets and industries, the smaller elasticities for the chemical industry imply that profits will be higher in this industry for a given level of sales. In the electronics, instruments, and vehicle industries, the smaller demand elasticity for export sales, compared to the elasticity for domestic sales, will contribute to a larger impact of export sales on profits for the exporting firms. This will increase the value of exporting in generating a larger expected benefit from R&D and increase the probability of investing in R&D. Given the parameter estimates in Table 4, we construct estimates of revenue productivity $\hat{\omega}_{it}^h$ and $\hat{\omega}_{it}^f$ for sales in each market using equation (17).

Before proceeding to the dynamic estimation we estimate the reduced-form policy function for the discrete R&D choice. The policy function depends on the state variables ω^h and ω^f as well as the variables that define the firm types, industry, capital stock, and age. Probit estimates for the discrete R&D variable using a simple linear specification of the explanatory variables are reported in Table 5. For exporting firms, both foreign market productivity ω^f and capital are positively correlated with the firm's decision to invest in R&D and, for nonexporting firms, capital is positively correlated with R&D choice. These effects are statistically significant. In contrast, domestic market productivity is negatively correlated with R&D choice for both groups of firms and the coefficients are not statistically significant, suggesting a more complex relationship between the state variables and R&D choice than this specification allows.

The coefficient estimates in Table 5 reflect a combination of the underlying structural components: the innovation process, productivity evolution, profit function, and innovation costs, and cannot be interpreted as causal effects. We have already seen that R&D investment increases the probability of innovation and innovations increase domestic and export market productivity. In the next section we report estimates from the dynamic component of the model: the cost of innovation and the expected benefit of investing in R&D, $\Delta EV^f(\omega_{it}^h, \omega_{it}^f)$ for exporting firms and $\Delta EV^h(\omega_{it}^h)$ for nonexporters. These allow us to quantify how differences in domestic and foreign productivity affect the payoff to R&D and the probability of R&D investment by the firm, factors which cannot be learned from studying the reduced-form policy function coefficients in Table 5.

Table 5: Probit Estimates of Policy Functions for rd_{it}

	Exporting Firms	Nonexporting Firms
ω^h	-0.127 (0.079)	-0.074 (0.118)
ω^f	0.284 (0.056)**	
k	0.120 (0.022)**	0.180 (0.034)**
age 10-19	-0.110 (0.094)	-0.319 (0.156)*
age 20-49	-0.295 (0.092)**	-0.141 (0.161)
age >50	-0.044 (0.010)	-0.678 (0.229)**
Intercept	0.587 (0.136)**	-0.519 (0.237)**
Chemicals	-0.004 (0.112)	0.651 (0.245)**
Machinery	0.263 (0.010)**	0.327 (0.210)
Electronics	0.707 (0.127)**	0.782 (0.229)**
Instruments	0.888 (0.130)**	0.423 (0.230)

All regressions include a full set of year dummies.

** significant at the .01 level, * significant at the .05 level

5.2 The Cost of Innovation and the Expected Benefits of R&D

Table 6 reports the final set of parameter estimates: the dynamic costs of innovation. These are estimated by maximizing the likelihood function in equation (21) with respect to the parameter vector γ. We allow the distribution of startup and maintenance costs to differ across industry and with firm export status. Each parameter is the mean of the untruncated distribution of costs that firms face when investing to develop a product or process innovation.

Table 6: Innovation Cost Parameters (standard errors)

Industry	Startup Cost	Maintenance Cost
Chemical	13.941 (1.952)**	3.845 (8.365)
Machinery	10.968 (1.635)**	4.899 (1.176)**
Electronics	9.356 (1.935)**	3.590 (1.073)**
Instruments	3.330 (6.128)	0.450 (1.172)
Vehicles	17.216 (3.396)**	10.446 (6.074)
Exporting Firms	17.850 (3.059)**	1.709 (3.362)
Nonexporting Firms	0.918 (4.384)	0.442 (1.984)

** significant at the .01 level, * significant at the .05 level

There are several clear patterns in the cost estimates. The first finding is that maintenance costs are smaller than startup costs for all industries and both export status groups. This means that, comparing two firms with the same characteristics and thus the same expected payoff to R&D, the firm that has previously engaged in R&D will, on average, find it less expensive to develop an innovation than a firm with no prior R&D experience. The cost differential is substantial. The ratio of the mean startup cost to maintenance cost varies from 1.6 (vehicles) to 7.3 (instruments) across the industries. Prior R&D experience induces a cost saving in the innovation process so that firms with prior experience will be more likely to continue investing in R&D. A second finding is that startup costs are significantly higher for exporting firms. In the estimated model, the payoff to conducting R&D is going to be larger for exporting firms because of the larger impact of R&D on innovation (as seen in Table 3) and the larger impact of innovation on productivity (as seen in Table 4). Due to a larger payoff to R&D, exporting firms are willing to incur higher R&D expenditures to get the expected productivity gain resulting from R&D investment. The final pattern concerns cost variation across industries. Estimated cost differences across industries reflect the difference in long-run profits that must be earned from firm's successful innovation. Firms in the vehicles industry face, on average, the highest innovation cost, whereas firms in the instrument industry have the lowest costs among the five industries. An exporting firm in the vehicles industry with no previous R&D experience faces, on average, an innovation cost of 35.07 million euros while a nonexporting firm with previous R&D engagement would have an innovation cost of 10.89 million euros. These costs amounts to 21.18 million and 0.89 million Euro for firms in the instrument industry, respectively.

As part of the estimation algorithm, we solve for the value functions and construct the expected payoff to R&D, $\Delta EV^h(\omega_{it}^h)$ for firms that sell only in the domestic market and $\Delta EV^f(\omega_{it}^h, \omega_{it}^f)$ for firms that sell in both markets. These payoffs are functions of the firm's respective revenue productivities. Table 7 summarizes the firm's expected payoffs to R&D at the 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles of the productivity distributions, ω_{it}^h, and ω_{it}^f. The payoffs are reported for a firm between 10 and 19 years old with capital stock at the median level in each industry. The variations in ΔEV reflects the differences in expected benefit from R&D investment that arises solely from differences in productivity levels.

Table 7 : $\Delta EV^h(\omega^h)$ and $\Delta EV^f(\omega^h,\omega^f)$ (millions of euros)			
	Percentile of the distribution of ω^h		
	25th percentile	50th percentile	75th percentile
Nonexporting firms $\Delta EV^h(\omega^h)$			
Chemicals	0.665	0.774	0.963
Machinery	0.597	0.852	1.021
Electronics	1.243	1.681	2.221
Instruments	0.298	0.445	0.616
Vehicles	0.321	0.411	0.630
Exporting firms $\Delta EV^f(\omega^h,\omega^f)^a$			
Chemicals	10.600, 17.295	11.355, 18.033	12.044, 18.702
Machinery	15.678, 20.223	16.732, 21.258	18.212, 22.702
Electronics	10.676, 15.116	13.583, 17.912	16.462, 20.662
Instruments	7.059, 9.456	7.451, 9.831	7.923, 10.281
Vehicles	21.950, 38.007	24.787, 40.772	27.567, 43.441

[a] The two entries are constructed at the 25th and 75th percentile of the distribution of ω^f

The top panel summarizes the benefit for nonexporting firms. In the chemical industry, a firm that only sells its output on the domestic market and has a productivity level of $\omega^h = 0.46$ (25th percentile of the productivity distribution) earns an expected long-run profit of 0.665 million euros if it invests in R&D. The expected earning rises with higher domestic sales productivity and equal 0.963 million euros at $\omega^h = 0.95$ (75th percentile of the distribution). The expected benefit for nonexporting firms in the electronics industry is higher than in the remaining four industries, ranging between 1.243 to 2.221 million euros. Overall, the expected benefit roughly doubles as we move from the 25th to the 75th percentile of the productivity distribution for all industries.

The bottom panel of Table 7 summarizes the expected benefit for the exporting firms. Each cell reports two numbers, the expected benefit at the 25th and 75th percentiles of ω^f. For example, an exporting chemical firm with ω^h at the 25th percentile and a level of ω^f equal to the 25th percentile of that distribution would earn 10.600 million euros from R&D investment. Holding ω^h fixed, this would rise to 17.295 million if ω^f increased to the 75th percentile.

Three patterns are evident in this table. First, holding ω^h fixed, the level of the expected payoff to R&D for exporting firms is substantially higher than that of nonexporting firms, $\Delta EV^f(\omega^h,\omega^f) > \Delta EV^h(\omega^h)$. This reflects the higher probability of successful innovations for exporting firms, their advantages in capitalizing and implementing these innovations, and also any scale advantages of serving a larger market than nonexporting firms. Furthermore, the productivity impacts of innovations for exporters persist longer over time, setting them on more favorable productivity paths, resulting in a higher expected benefit than that of nonexporting firms. Second, increases in export market productivity from the 25th to 75th percentile generate larger improvements in $\Delta EV^f(\omega^h, \omega^f)$ than comparable increases in domestic market productivity. This is particularly noticeable in the vehicle industry, where an interquartile increase in ω^h increases the expected benefit by approximately 6 million euros, but an interquartile increase in ω^f results in approximately 16 million euro increase. Third, among the exporting firms, ones with high foreign productivity will have larger expected payoffs than ones with high domestic productivity. Together, these patterns indicate that exporting firms and, in particular, those with high foreign-market productivity will have the highest expected benefits from investing in R&D.

The results in Table 7 show how the payoff to R&D varies with the key state variables ω^h and ω^f. Using the model parameters, we can calculate $\Delta EV^f(\omega^h, \omega^f)$ or $\Delta EV^h(\omega^h)$ for each data point in our sample. In addition to varying with industry and firm productivity, these will also vary with the other firm characteristics, capital stock and age. Based on the constructed measures ΔEV and the cost of innovation, which varies with the firms' R&D history, we calculate the probability of R&D investment, equations (19) and (20).

Table 8 summarizes the distribution of ΔEV and $Pr\left(rd_{it} = 1\right)$ across the data observations for exporting and nonexporting firms. These distributions capture variations in firm's $R\&D$ history, its characteristics, and in particular variations in productivity. Three patterns are evident in the data. First, as was seen in Table 7, there is a large difference in the expected benefits of R&D between exporting and nonexporting firms in the same industry. For example, in the chemical industry the median of $\Delta EV^f(\omega^h, \omega^f)$ for the exporting firms is 23.26 million euros while the median value of $\Delta EV^h(\omega^h)$ for nonexporting chemical producers is 1.16 million. This pattern occurs for all industries and is reflected in the higher probabilities of investing in R&D by the exporting firms that are reported in the last three columns of the table. Second, the within-industry differences in ΔEV are substantial and much larger than the across-industry differences at a given percentile. In the case of chemicals, the firm at the 10th percentile of $\Delta EV^f(\omega^h, \omega^f)$ has an expected benefit of R&D of 5.99 million euros, while the firm at the 90th percentile has a value of 49.19 million. This within-industry heterogeneity reflects the productivity effects seen in Table 7, but also the differences due to the firm's size (capital stock) and age. The heterogeneity in expected benefit leads to variation in firms' R&D probability. In our data, exporting firms have a high probability of investing in R&D, above 0.95 for the median firm in each industry. The within-industry differences in $\Delta EV(\omega^h)$ for nonexporting firms lead to substantial variation in the probability of R&D investment, from less than 0.08 at the 10th percentile to over 0.90 at the 90th percentile in some industries.

Table 8: Distribution of R&D Benefits

	Percentiles of ΔEV			Percentiles of $Pr\,(rd_{it} = 1)$		
	10th	50th	90th	10th	50th	90th
Nonexporting Firms						
Chemicals	0.50	1.16	7.61	0.041	0.219	0.710
Machinery	0.63	1.73	6.16	0.052	0.170	0.571
Electronics	0.47	3.00	18.88	0.057	0.360	0.981
Instruments	0.30	0.86	2.92	0.079	0.314	0.930
Vehicles	0.54	1.54	3.83	0.033	0.087	0.392
Exporting Firms						
Chemicals	5.99	23.26	49.19	0.459	0.963	0.999
Machinery	8.78	24.18	54.51	0.464	0.967	0.999
Electronics	6.97	22.47	50.07	0.629	0.977	0.999
Instruments	3.84	9.88	21.33	0.670	0.989	0.999
Vehicles	6.50	45.09	105.76	0.270	0.962	0.999

The clear conclusion that emerges from the estimates of the structural model is that exporting firms have higher expected benefits from investing in R&D. This leads to higher R&D investment rates relative to nonexporters. The higher benefit for exporters is the result of a higher probability of innovation if they do R&D and a higher profit return if they realize an innovation. The cost of an innovation is only modestly higher for the exporting firms but, when combined with the substantially higher expected benefits, results in a greater propensity to invest in R&D. Because productivity in both the domestic and export market sales is highly persistent, the impact of R&D investment is long-lived and even more so for the export sales productivity. The higher productivity raises the incentives to invest in R&D in future periods.

Because R&D investment has a larger impact on the productivity process for exporting firms and, particularly for their export sales, this will contribute to a divergence between the future productivity paths of exporting and nonexporting firms. In effect, firms operating in export markets realize greater returns to R&D than nonexporters leading them to invest more which further increases the productivity and profit advantage they have relative to nonexporters.

5.3 Sensitivity Analysis for Exporting Firms

In this section we use the structural model to simulate how firms would optimally respond to changes in their economic environment. In the last section, we report substantial differences in the expected return to R&D and in the incentives to do R&D between exporting and non-exporting firms. Changes in the economic environment, such as the imposition of an export tariff, or changes in the productivity process, such as a change in the economic return to innovation, will impact those differences but do little to narrow the substantial differences in R&D incentives between the two groups of firms. In this section we focus on the exporting firms and report how changes in the economic environment or productivity process impact their expected benefits and R&D probability. We further quantify how much of the changes in the expected benefits comes from the export market sales versus domestic market sales.

In the structural model, a product or process innovation can have a different impact on sales and profits in the export and domestic markets (equation (7)). The parameter estimates in Table 4 indicate that product innovations have a larger impact on productivity in export market sales while process innovations have a larger impact on domestic sales. Firms with both types of innovations will realize a larger productivity and profit impact on their foreign market sales. This implies that the economic return to innovations will depend on the firm's total sales and how they are allocated between the two markets. Two otherwise identical firms can have different returns to R&D if they have a different mix of domestic and export sales.

We simulate four different changes in the economic environment. The first three simulate changes in the environment that are consistent with policy changes. In the first exercise, we examine the impact of an export tariff which effectively increases the firm's output price in the foreign market, hence reduces its profit in that market. The second exercise simulates the impact of a reduction in the cost of innovation for a firm already conducting R&D and the third exercise looks at a reduction in the innovation cost for a firm that is just starting R&D investment. These cost reductions could result from policies that subsidize R&D investment. In the fourth exercise, we remove all persistence in the productivity process so that $\frac{\partial \omega^f_{t+1}}{\partial \omega^f_t} = \frac{\partial \omega^h_{t+1}}{\partial \omega^h_t} = 0$. This setting implies that the impact of innovation on productivity only lasts for one period and allows us to measure how much of the incentive to invest in R&D comes from the dynamic impact of R&D on future productivity. We use the model to simulate the effect of these changes in the environment on the firms' optimal R&D decisions and their firm value over a five-year period. The results are reported in Table 9.

The second column reports the average change in ΔEV due to changes in the environment across all observations. The benefit of conducting R&D results from the long-run gain in firm profits, which depends on the productivity impacts of R&D investment in the domestic and export markets. In particular, changes in ΔEV can be written as $\frac{d\Delta EV}{ds} = \frac{\partial \Delta EV}{\partial \omega^h}\frac{\partial \omega^h}{\partial rd}\frac{drd}{ds} + \frac{\partial \Delta EV}{\partial \omega^f}\frac{\partial \omega^f}{\partial rd}\frac{drd}{ds}$, where s denotes the exogenous changes in the economic environment such as a tariff. The term $\frac{\partial \Delta EV}{\partial \omega^h}\frac{\partial \omega^h}{\partial rd}\frac{drd}{ds}$ for $l = h, f$ denotes the changes in the long-run gain from R&D resulting from profit changes in market l caused for instance by an exogenous change in market conditions. We report the contribution of the domestic and export market to the long-run gain from R&D in the third and fourth column, respectively. The change in the endogenous R&D rate is reported in the last column.

First, we consider the effect of a permanent export tariff on German products imposed by the importing countries. In our model, the tariff raises the price of German goods in the destination country by $(1+\tau)$ where τ is the tariff rate, and reduces firm's demand and profit in the foreign market.[17] An export tariff of $\tau = 0.10$ causes a substantial decrease in average firm values in all five industries. In the instrument industry, firms lose on average 2.77 million euros in their return to R&D investment. The vehicle industry is more vulnerable to an export tariff, with firm R&D investment yields falling on average by 14.91 million euros. Comparing the change in benefit to its initial value ΔEV the reduction in the return to R&D due to a tariff increase amounts to more than 26 percent across all industries. The main source of

[17] Increasing output prices in the destination country by $1+\tau$ is equivalent to shifting the intercept in the foreign demand curve equation (3) to $\Phi^f_t(1+\tau)^{\eta_f}$ which reduces export profits by a factor of $1-(1+\tau)^{\eta_f}$.

the reduction in R&D return is the reduction in long-run payoff from the export market. The reduction in R&D returns due to the fall in the export market payoff accounts for 57.7 percent of the total in the instrument and 81.2 percent in the chemical industry. Imposing a tariff of 10 percent significantly reduces the incentive of the firm to invest in R&D. The model predicts that the proportion of firms investing in R&D would decline between 6.4 (machinery) and 12.9 (chemicals) percentage points due to the reduced profitability of the export market. It is interesting to note that even though the main source of the reduction in firm value due to the tariff arises from the loss of profit in the export market, the impact from the domestic market is not zero. In the presence of a tariff and the resulting lower R&D investment rate, domestic productivity ω^h is put on a less favorable path. This further reduces the incentive to invest in R&D in the future relative to that in an environment absent a tariff.

Second, we examine the impact of a reduction in the cost of innovation for firms already conducting R&D. We implement this by reducing the R&D maintenance cost by 20 percent which mimics a subsidy on the firm's ongoing R&D expenditures. The lower maintenance cost reduces the barrier for firms to continue their R&D activities. This change generates an increase in the return to R&D and the R&D participation rate. The gain from investing in R&D increases on average between 0.86 (instrument) and 2.59 (vehicles) million euros. This amounts to 8.9 and 8.1 percent of the initial value of ΔEV for exporting firms, respectively. This additional gain from R&D arises primarily from the long-run effect of innovations on productivity and profits in the export market. On average, between 57.9 and 83.7 percent of the total gain in firm value results from increased long-run export market payoff. Finally, as shown in the last column, the probability of investing in R&D in each industry is predicted to increase between 4.1 and 5.8 percentage points. In our sample, the R&D participation rate for exporting firms is high, averaging 0.853 across all industries (Table 1). The change in R&D rate reported for this exercise captures in particular the participation in R&D by firms that would have stopped their R&D activity under the higher innovation cost regime.

The third panel of Table 9 reports the results from a 20 percent reduction in the cost of innovation for firms that are just beginning to invest in R&D. This change is consistent with a subsidy to R&D expenditure for firms that are just starting their R&D investment. In contrast to the effect of a maintenance cost reduction, lower startup cost decreases the return to R&D investment. The reduction varies between 1.06 and 3.00 million euro and arises from two opposing sources. First, reducing the innovation cost for startups makes it less costly for firms with no R&D experience to conduct R&D which increases the return to R&D. However, the difference between a subsidy to starting R&D versus continuing R&D is a crucial component of the return to R&D as well because it drives the decision between continuing R&D in the current period or restarting R&D in later periods. The second effect of a lower startup cost is that it "encourages" firms to disrupt their R&D and restart at another time. By reducing the difference in the cost of innovation between ongoing and startup R&D investments the startup cost subsidy reduces the incentive for firms to continue R&D. Our model predicts this second effect is strong and outweighs the first effect leading to average reducction in the return to R&D. Overall, we see a slight reduction in R&D participation between 0.2 and 0.6 percentage points for the chemical, machinery, electronics and instrument industry. These are mainly firms that discontinue their R&D activities. They would not have done so absent the subsidy for startup expenditures. The results for the vehicle industry show, on average, 0.4 percentage point higher participation in. These are mainly firms with no prior R&D experience that now benefit from less costly access to R&D and who would have stayed idle given the initial innovation costs facing a startup. The comparison of the two innovation cost subsidies emphasizes that subsidies to induce participation can have subtle effects on the incentive to make ongoing investments. These countervailing effects are not present when subsidies are directed at continuous R&D operations.

The final simulation in Table 9 examines the importance of the dynamic impact of R&D. In this simulation, the persistence in the productivity process is removed. This implies that innovation affects only current period profit and thus R&D investment has no impact on future firm value. Our results show a dramatic reduction in the average firm return to R&D of between 11.8 to 45.1 million euros. This represents, on average, 90 percent of the return to R&D in the estimated model. In the machinery, electronics and instrument industry the reduction in return results primarily from a reduction in the payoff in the export market, whereas the chemical and vehicles industry display a stronger role for the domestic market. This exercise illustrates the importance of the dynamic characteristics of R&D. Slow depreciation of productivity gains over long time periods is a key source of the benefit of investing in R&D. Rapid depreciation of the productivity gains reduces the benefit of R&D and innovation leading in our sample to a reduction in the R&D participation rate of between 65 and 81 percentage points. The combination of innovation rates and the impact of innovation on future productivity is the trigger that starts generating payoffs to R&D but it is the long-lasting nature of these productivity gains that substantially contributes to the payoff of R&D investment.

Table 9: Simulation Effects on Exporting Firms (Average Change)

	ΔEV (millions of euro)			$Pr(rd_{it} = 1)$
Industry	Total	Export %	Domestic %	
	Export Tariff of 10 %			
Chemicals	-7.494	0.812	0.188	-0.103
Machinery	-7.284	0.727	0.273	-0.064
Electronics	-4.458	0.617	0.383	-0.114
Instruments	-2.773	0.577	0.423	-0.072
Vehicles	-14.910	0.675	0.325	-0.129
	Reduce R&D Maintenance Cost by 20 %			
Chemicals	1.726	0.837	0.163	0.058
Machinery	1.811	0.770	0.230	0.043
Electronics	1.530	0.669	0.331	0.044
Instruments	0.863	0.579	0.421	0.041
Vehicles	2.597	0.737	0.263	0.049
	Reduce R&D Startup Cost by 20 %			
Chemicals	-2.044	0.852	0.148	-0.002
Machinery	-2.326	0.778	0.222	-0.002
Electronics	-2.015	0.655	0.345	-0.003
Instruments	-1.061	0.592	0.408	-0.006
Vehicles	-3.005	0.623	0.377	0.004
	Remove Persistence in Productivity Process			
Chemicals	-25.335	0.326	0.674	-0.757
Machinery	-30.054	0.643	0.357	-0.703
Electronics	-25.309	0.713	0.287	-0.726
Instruments	-11.801	0.918	0.082	-0.814
Vehicles	-45.067	0.319	0.681	-0.653

6 Conclusion

A large empirical literature in international trade has documented substantial and persistent differences in firm performance between firms that engage in international markets, through either sales, input purchases or capital investment, and those that limit their business activities to the domestic market. The theoretical literature on growth and trade has emphasized that the superior performance of firms that participate in international markets may reflect the endogenous decisions of these firms to invest in R&D that generates innovations and productivity improvements. Firms engaging in international markets may have better opportunities to realize profits that become available as a result of their endogenous innovative activities and this, in turn, creates greater incentives for them to invest in R&D. The superior long-run performance of these firms is the result of greater endogenous investment in innovative activities.

In this article, we provide empirical evidence on this endogenous investment mechanism and measure how it differs for two groups of German high-tech manufacturing firms, one that exports and one that does not. In our empirical model, firm R&D investment generates new product and process innovations which then improve the productivity and future profits of the firm. The investment and innovation process is allowed to differ between exporting and nonexporting firms. In addition, for exporting firms we allow the impact of innovations on productivity to differ between their domestic and export market sales. This generates different R&D investment incentives among firms that differ in their export intensity. Using the model estimates, we construct a measure of the firm's expected long-run payoff to R&D investment, that differs by firm characteristics and most importantly by the firm's export market participation.

The empirical results show that exporting firms are more likely to introduce product and process innovations than nonexporting firms. R&D investment increases the probability of innovation for exporting firms by 65 percent and 59.5 percent for nonexporting firms. Even without R&D investment, exporting firms have an innovation rate that is 9.1 percentage points higher than their nonexporting counterparts. The average productivity impact of these innovations and their persistence is larger for exporting firms leading to a higher expected return to R&D for exporting firms. The median firm that sells its output only in the domestic market expects an average long-run payoff from R&D investment between 0.41 million euros in the vehicle and

1.68 million euros in the electronics industry. The corresponding expected payoff for a median exporting firm is at least ten times larger in every industry. The difference in expected payoff to R&D investment between exporting and nonexporting firms is reflected in the higher R&D investment rate among the exporting firms.

Using the model estimates we simulate the effect of exogenous changes in the economic environment, such as export tariff or R&D subsidy, on the firm's expected return to R&D and R&D choice. An export tariff of 10 percent on output prices that effectively reduces firm's profit in the foreign markets lowers the return to R&D investment on average by 26 percent and reduces R&D participation by 8.8 percentage points across industries. A 20 percent reduction in the cost of innovation implemented by an R&D subsidy on ongoing investment increases firm's return by 8.3 percent and induces higher R&D participation rates by 4.6 percentage points. Different results are found for a 20 percent reduction in innovation costs for R&D startups. This reduces the incentives for firms to continue R&D reflected in a 7.2 percent reduction in the expected return to R&D. The R&D rate decreases slightly as a result in four of the five industries. Across the exercises, we see that the long-run payoff from export market sales is an important source of the expected payoff to R&D investment.

Overall, our findings provide evidence that firms that participate in the export market have a greater incentive to invest in R&D. This endogenous difference in R&D investment between exporting and nonexporting firms reinforces any initial differences in productivity between the two groups and contributes to a greater divergence in performance between them over time. Among the exporting firms, R&D investment has a greater impact on the future profits from export sales than domestic sales. This provides greater incentives for export intensive firms to invest in R&D. In summary, our findings are consistent with the ideas underlying models of endogenous growth and trade which emphasize that participation in international markets can affect the speed and direction of technological improvements because of the incentives it creates for firms to invest in R&D.

References

[1] Altomonte, Carlo, Tommas Aquilante, Gabor Bekes, and Gianmarco Ottaviano (2013), "Internationalization and Innovation of Firms: Evidence and Policy," *Economic Policy*, Vol. 28, No. 76, pp. 663-700.

[2] Atkeson, Andrew and Ariel Burstein (2010), "Innovation, Firm Dynamics, and International Trade," *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 118, No. 3, pp. 433-484.

[3] Aw, Bee Yan, Mark J. Roberts and Tor Winston (2007), "Export Market Participation, Investments in R&D and Worker Training, and the Evolution of Firm Productivity," *The World Economy*, Vol. 14, No. 1, pp. 83-104.

[4] Aw, Bee Yan, Mark J. Roberts and Daniel Yi Xu (2008), "R&D Investments, Exporting, and the Evolution of Firm Productivity," *American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings*, Vol. 98, No.2 (May), pp. 451-456.

[5] Aw, Bee Yan, Mark J. Roberts, and Daniel Yi Xu (2011), "R&D Investment, Exporting and Productivity Dynamics," *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 101, No. 4 (June), pp. 1312-1344.

[6] Baldwin, John R and Wulong Gu (2004), "Export Market Participation and Productivity Performance in Canadian Manufacturing," *Canadian Journal of Economics*, Vol. 36, pp. 634-657.

[7] Becker, Sacha O. and Peter H. Egger (2013), "Endogenous Product vs Process Innovation and a Firm's Propensity to Export," *Empirical Economics*, Vol. 44, No. 1, pp. 329-354.

[8] Bernard, Andrew B. and J. Bradford Jensen (1997), "Exporters, Skill Upgrading, and the Wage Gap," *Journal of International Economics*, Vol. 42, pp. 3-31.

[9] Bøler, Esther Ann, Andreas Moxnes, Karen Helene Ulltveit-Moe (2015), "R&D, International Sourcing, and the Joint Impact on Firm Performance," *American Economic Review*, Vol 105, No. 12, pp. 3704-3739.

[10] Bustos, Paula (2010), "Multilateral Trade Liberalization, Exports and Technology Upgrading: Evidence on the Impact of MERCOSUR on Argentinean Firms," *American Economic Review*. Vol 101, No. 1, pp. 304-340.

[11] Cassiman, Bruno and Elena Golvko (2011), "Innovations and Internationization Through Exports," *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol 42, No. 1, pp. 56-75.

[12] Constantini, James A., and Marc J. Melitz (2008), "The Dynamics of Firm-Level Adjustment to Trade Liberalization," in *The Organization of Firms in a Global Economy*, E. Helpman, D. Marin, and T. Verdier (eds.), Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

[13] Crépon, Bruno, Emmanuel Duguet, and Jacques Mairesse (1998), "Research Innovation and Productivity: An Econometric Analysis at the Firm Level," *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 115-158.

[14] Damijan, Jože, Črt Kostevc and Matija Rojec (2017), "Exporting Status and Success in Innovation: Evidence from CIS Micro Data for EU Countries, *The Journal Of International Trade & Economic Development*, Vol. 26, No. 5, pp. 585-611.

[15] Das, Sanghamitra, and Mark J. Roberts, and James R. Tybout (2007), "Market Entry Costs, Producer Heterogeneity, and Export Dynamics," *Econometrica*, Vol. 75, No. 3, pp. 837-873.

[16] Doraszelski, Ulrich and Jordi Jaumandreu (2013), "R&D and Productivity: Estimating Endogenous Productivity," *Review of Economic Studies*, Vol. 80, No. 4, pp. 1338-1383.

[17] Goldberg, Pinelopi Koujianou, Amit K. Khandelwal, Nina Pavcnik, and Petia Topalova (2010), "Imported Intermediate Inputs and Domestic Product Growth: Evidence from India," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 125, No. 4, pp. 1727-1767.

[18] Greenaway, David and Richard Kneller (2007), "Firm Heterogeneity, Exporting and Foreign Direct Investment," *Economic Journal*, Vol 117, No. 517, (February), pp. F134-F161.

[19] Griliches, Zvi (1979), "Issues in Assessing the Contribution of Research and Development to Productivity Growth," *Bell Journal of Economics*, Vol. 10, No. 1 (Spring), pp. 92-116.

[20] Grossman, Gene M. and Elhanan Helpman (1990), "Trade Innovation, and Growth," *American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings,* Vol. 80, No. 2, pp. 86-91.

[21] Grossman, Gene M. and Elhanan Helpman (1995), "Technology and Trade," in *Handbook of International Economics,Vol. III*, G Grossman and K. Rogoff (eds.), Elsevier Science B.V., pp. 1279-1337.

[22] Hall, Bronwyn H. (2011), "Innovation and Productivity," NBER Working Paper No. 17178.

[23] Hall, Bronwyn H., Jacques Mairesse, and Pierre Mohnen (2010), "Measuring the Returns to R&D," in *Handbook of the Economics of Innovation,* Bronwyn H. Hall and Nathan Rosenberg (eds.), Vol. 2, Chapter 22, Elsevier, pp. 1033-1082.

[24] Hallward-Driemeier, Mary, Giuseppe Iarossi, and Kenneth L. Sokoloff (2002), "Exports and Manufacturing Productivity in East Asia: A Comparative Analysis with Firm-Level Data," NBER Working Paper No. 8894.

[25] Keller, Wolfgang (2010), "International Trade, Foreign Direct Investment, and Technology Spillovers," in *Handbook of the Economics of Innovation,* Bronwyn H. Hall and Nathan Rosenberg (eds.), Vol. 2, Chapter 19, Elsevier North-Holland, pp. 793-829.

[26] Lileeva, Alla and Daniel Trefler (2010), "Improved Access to Foreign Markets Raises Plant-Level Productivity...For Some Plants," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 125, No. 3, 1051-1099.

[27] Máñez, Juan A., Maria Rochina-Barrachina, and Juan A. Sanchis-Llopis (2015), "The Dynamic Linkages Among Exports, R&D, and Productivity," *The World Economy*, Vol. 38, No. 4, pp. 583-612.

[28] Melitz, Marc J. (2003), "The Impact of Trade on Aggregate Industry Productivity and Intra-Industry Reallocations," *Econometrica*, Vol. 71, No. 6, pp. 1695-1725.

[29] Olley, G. Steven and Ariel Pakes (1996), "The Dynamics of Productivity in the Telecommunications Equipment Industry," *Econometrica,* Vol. 64, No. 6 (November), pp. 1263-1297.

[30] Peters, Bettina, Mark J. Roberts, Van Anh Vuong and Helmut Fryges (2017), "Estimating Dynamic R&D Demand. An Analysis of Costs and Long-run Benefits," *Rand Journal of Economics*, Vol. 48, No. 2, pp. 409-437.

[31] Peters, Bettina, Mark J. Roberts, Van Anh Vuong (2017), "Dynamic R&D Choice and the Firm's Financial Strength," *Economics of Innovation and new Technology*, Vol. 26, No. 1-2, pp. 134-149.

[32] Rammer, Christian and Bettina Peters (2013), "Innovation Panel Surveys in Germany," in *Handbook of Innovation Indicators and Measurement* Fred Gault (ed.), Edward Elgar: Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA, pp. 135-177.

[33] Roberts, Mark J. and James R. Tybout (1997), "The Decision to Export in Colombia: An Empirical Model of Entry with Sunk Costs," *American Economic Review,* Vol. 87, No. 4 (September), pp. 545-564.

[34] Santos, Carlos Daniel, (2017), "Sunk Costs of R&D, Trade, and Productivity: The Moulds Industry Case," *Economic Journal,* Vol. 127, No. 63, pp. 1626-1664.

[35] Rust, John (1987), "Optimal Replacement of GMC Bus Engines: An Empirical Model of Harold Zurcher," *Econometrica*, Vol. 55, No. 5 (September), pp. 999-1033.

[36] Van Beveren, Ilke and Hylke Vandenbussche (2010), Product and Process Innovation and Firms' Decision to Export, *Journal of Economic Policy Reform*, Vol. 13, pp. 3-24.

[37] Van Long, Ngo, Horst Raff, and Frank Stähler (2011), "Innovation and Trade with Heterogenous Firms," *Journal of International Economics*, Vol. 84, pp. 149-159.