Swedish Business R&D and its Export Dependence[1]

Karin Bergman[†] and Olof Ejermo[*]

Abstract

Sweden has seen a rise in business R&D-intensities and dependence on exports to make its economy grow since the early 1990s. This paper examines the role of foreign sales in stimulating R&D as compared to a domestic sales effect, and finds, in line with the literature, that R&D rises proportionally to sales in cross-sections from 1991 to 2001. Among manufacturing firms, foreign sales are distinctly more associated with an increase in R&D than domestic sales. For service firms, domestic sales are as important as foreign. The results are consistent with the hypotheses that manufacturing firms more easily separate production from R&D, economize on transport costs and are subject to learning-by-exporting effects. In general, the results highlight the dependence on openness in stimulating R&D in a small economy, especially among manufacturing firms.

Keywords: R&D, size, exports, Sweden

JEL Classification: D22, O32, L23

[1] The authors are grateful for helpful comments and suggestions from Martin Andersson, Johan Blomquist and seminar participants at 'The 12th Uddevalla Symposium' in Bari, June 2009, and at the Department of Economics in Lund.

[†] Department of Economics, Lund University, P.O. Box 7082, SE-220 07 Lund, Sweden, karin.bergman@nek.lu.se

[*] CIRCLE (Centre for Innovation, Research and Competence in the Learning Economy), Lund University, P.O. Box 117, SE-22100 Lund, Sweden, olof.ejermo@circle.lu.se

1 Introduction

Sweden's research and development (R&D) expenditures, as a share of GDP, is among the highest in the world with business R&D being the most important constituent. The trend towards such a high business R&D ratio originated in the mid-1980s (Table 1) and continued at least throughout the 1990s. Other countries, especially among the Nordic group, have seen similar upward trends, but this trend has been more pronounced in Sweden than elsewhere.

Parallel with this rising trend there has been a shift in terms of the Swedish economy's dependence on trade. Trade has always been important and for decades Sweden has had an unusually high concentration of multinationals; of 12 European countries Sweden actually had the highest share of large firms in 1988-91 (Henrekson and Johansson 1999, Henrekson and Jakobsson 2001). From 1950 until the mid-1970s exports as a share of GDP were stable at 20-25 percent. Then, after a series of devaluations in the 1970s and early 1980s, exports temporarily rose above 30 percent. An increasing problem of high domestic inflation forced the government to float the currency in 1992, and the Swedish krona immediately lost 25 percent in value, which seems to have become permanent. At the same time Sweden experienced a permanent shift towards higher levels of trade, in part stimulated by EU membership in 1995. Export and import levels are now firmly established above 40 percent as a share of GDP (Statistics Sweden 2011).

TABLE 1

Business R&D as a share of GDP 1981-2008 in selected OECD countries, percent

	1981	1985	1989	1993	1997	2001	2005	2008
Denmark	0.5	0.7	0.8	1.0	1.2	1.6	1.7	2.0
Finland	0.6	0.9	1.1	1.2	1.8	2.4	2.5	2.8
France	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.3
Germany	1.6	1.9	2.0	1.5	1.5	1.7	1.7	1.9
Israel	..	..	..	1.4	1.9	3.5	3.4	3.8
Japan	1.4	1.8	2.0	1.9	2.1	2.3	2.5	2.7
Netherlands	0.9	1.1	1.2	0.9	1.1	1.1	1.0	0.9
Norway	0.6	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.8	0.9
Sweden	1.4	1.9	1.8	2.2	2.6	3.2	2.6	2.7
Switzerland	1.6	..	2.0	..	..	..	..	2.2
United Kingdom	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.1
United States	1.6	2.0	1.8	1.7	1.9	2.0	1.8	2.0
OECD Total	1.2	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.5	1.6

Source: OECD (2010) and own calculations. '..' denotes missing data.

In practice, there could be many reasons for why Swedish firms increasingly chose R&D intensive paths relative to firms in other countries. According to Schumpeter (1934), small

firms, more flexible by nature, might derive an advantage from R&D. Large firms, on the other hand, have advantages that stem from such things as scale economies (Schumpeter 1950). Thus, two economies with different size distributions may have different R&D intensities. It is also possible that Swedish firms might have been especially concentrated in sectors where technological opportunities were emerging, or there might have been a supply effect from budding inventors inspired by the higher education system. Another explanation might be that the Swedish wage structure was institutionally compressed compared to other countries, with lower wages among engineers and other highly educated professions compared to, for instance, German workers. These low wages could have induced a higher demand for R&D services.

Yet another explanation might be increased exports. In fact, there are several reasons why firms engaging internationally are more likely to do R&D. Foreign sales provide a way for firms to spread fixed costs incurred by R&D. Moreover, as stressed by recent literature (see e.g. Keller 2010), by learning from exporting, firms may enter virtuous circles where exports enhance the productivity effects of R&D, which induce further R&D and so on.

The purpose of this paper is to re-investigate the classic size-R&D relationship but with a focus on the size effect of foreign sales. We use data on the firm level for the years 1991-2001 and divide total sales into foreign and domestic to ascertain which is more important for stimulating R&D. As Sweden has continuously increased its trade dependence, we investigate whether the effect of foreign sales on R&D has increased in importance over time. We further argue that there is a qualitative difference between manufacturing and service sectors as the former can more easily separate R&D activities from production. Service development cannot be easily standardized as solutions need to be more adapted to local conditions. Moreover, overseas sales often induce production establishment there. Hence, scale effects from R&D should be more pronounced in manufacturing sectors.

Recognizing the potentially endogenous nature of R&D and foreign sales we pursue our empirical analysis by first examining the extent to which endogeneity is an issue. Moreover, R&D is an activity likely to be carried out in firms of higher quality, while firms of less quality may exit. Thus, samples of R&D performers are likely to suffer from selection bias. Therefore, we estimate two-step Heckman selection equations of the relationship between R&D and size, correcting for sample selection bias. Regression analysis, as specified here, gives us information about the average relationship of size to R&D, but not about whether the

relationship differs across the sample distribution. The knowledge of such a difference can offer useful policy advice as it provides information on how trade policies might affect R&D investments for *different* types of firms. Accordingly, we examine the relative role of foreign vs. domestic sales across the distribution of firms in terms of their R&D expenditures in quantile regressions in order to shed further light on the size-R&D relationship studied in the literature.

Our findings generally support the idea that foreign sales are more important than domestic to stimulate R&D, which suggests that open trade policies aimed at stimulating competitiveness are effective ways to raise R&D expenditures at the firm level. We also find, in line with our hypothesis, that this effect is clearly more pronounced for manufacturing than for service sector firms. Although our results cannot decisively support a conclusion that the foreign sales effect has increased systematically in importance over time, foreign sales did increase dramatically during the investigated period. In all, our results imply that R&D increases by about the same proportion relative to foreign sales, but since foreign sales have picked up speed – R&D has as well. However, we find that the distributional differences differ somewhat over time. Our quantile regressions reveal that the sales effect, mainly that of domestic sales, is more important in later years for high level R&D performers than for low level R&D performers.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 provides a literature review where we first summarize the theoretical arguments in favour of small and large firms in innovation processes, which the literature refers to as the Schumpeterian hypotheses. We then also demonstrate the link to the literature on why foreign sales are an important factor determining R&D investments,[2] and discuss recent developments in the literature on export and learning. Section 3 contains a description of the database at hand, the empirical strategy and the results of the empirical analysis. Section 4 summarizes the results and policy conclusions are drawn.

2 Size and innovation – theory and evidence

2.1 Why does size matter?

Any attempt to explain the level of R&D conducted in firms should recognize the work of Schumpeter (1934, 1950), which has led to two conflicting hypotheses – 'The Schumpeterian hypotheses' (Breschi et al. 2000). In *The Theory of Economic Development* Schumpeter

[2] Formally, R&D expenditures comprise current costs and investments. We use R&D expenditures and R&D investments although our data is always on R&D expenditures.

(1934) discussed how innovations tended to arrive in swarms in the wake of pioneering entrepreneurs. Seemingly in contrast, Schumpeter (1950) noted in *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* the efficiency with which large corporations handled their innovation processes in formalized R&D departments. Indeed, the development of firms in western economies seemed to follow trajectories of scale economies from the 1950s to the 1970s.

Theoretical arguments rest ambiguously on whether large firms should have advantages over smaller ones when it comes to the implementation of innovation processes in production. Cohen (2010) surveys the literature and mentions several possible explanations for large firm advantages. These explanations include (i) scale economies in R&D, where higher returns from R&D arise as innovators can spread the fixed costs of R&D over larger volumes of sales, (ii) complementarities between R&D and other activities and (iii) fewer financial constraints due to capital market imperfections. These advantages also suggest that large firms may be inclined to direct their innovative efforts towards incremental, process-oriented innovations, which can be applied to large production volumes. On the other hand, organization theory stresses the inability of large firms to foresee shifts in new modes of production. That is, the same bureaucracies that render large corporations more effective under a regime of gradual innovation, 'static efficiency', inhibit them in situations of fast technological change, where 'dynamic progressivity' is required (Nelson and Winter 1982, Tidd et al. 2005).

2.2 The role of foreign markets

In a static product quality setting, process R&D can be seen as having a fixed cost part (e.g. lab equipment) and a variable part that cuts unit costs. As specified in a model by Cohen and Klepper (1996), large-sales firms have an opportunity to spread their fixed costs of R&D, and the marginal effect of an R&D dollar spent is higher than for smaller firms as a cost-cutting effect can be applied on many units. From this perspective, exports are no different from ordinary sales as both would equally induce a size effect given that the *same* good is exported. But export goods are not the same; they are likely to be more competitive than goods intended for a domestic market. Consistent with this idea, Andersson and Ejermo (2008) find that Swedish regions more specialized in certain technologies tend to export goods of higher prices. The home market effect described by Krugman (1980) suggests that countries with initially high domestic demand for a differentiated product produced under monopolistic competition, i.e. subject to scale economies, will tend to export this good later on. This idea has links to that of R&D scale economies. Innovation scholars (e.g. Edquist et

al. 2000, Klepper and Malerba 2010) stress the role of demand and cite many case studies of technology where government has played a role in formulating demand for a product. A Swedish example from history is the role of the former government monopoly Televerket, which worked with Ericsson to develop telephone services. Mowery and Rosenberg (1998) describe the development of several industries in the U.S., for instance the aircraft, pharmaceuticals and electronics industries in which innovation development was highly influenced by federal government programs, civilian or military. In the small market of Sweden, domestic competence (and incompetence!) is sometimes developed in firms which are sheltered from international competitiveness, but flourish (or perish) as the economy opens up.

Recent literature (Keller 2010) emphasizes that exported goods are subject to *dynamic* learning effects, in the sense that the product is prone to change when subject to international competitive pressure, and the firm gets feedback from customers and suppliers. By this reasoning, producers, by being active in other markets, learn about product characteristics that appeal to a more diverse set of customers than in domestic markets. This learning effect might stimulate further R&D that generates more exports and so on. For small countries these dynamic effects may be substantial given their limited potential to exploit domestic scope effects.

Another potential link between R&D and the export market concerns the need to establish production activities in the foreign country to economize on transport costs. Thus, a firm might keep R&D in the home country to exploit scale economies of R&D and apply production techniques overseas. This behaviour might also prevent knowledge from spilling over to foreign competition. The extent to which R&D is kept in the home country is labelled a home bias effect (Belderbos et al. 2011), which results not only from capital used for R&D, but primarily from trained human capital and the need to transfer important (tacit) knowledge within the firm through face-to-face communication. These knowledge attributes tend to lead to path dependence in the location of R&D activities. As it is generally more costly, in terms of transports, to export manufactured goods than services, manufacturing R&D should be more closely linked to a foreign sales effect. This reasoning makes the division between manufacturing and service firms relevant for the study of sales effects. In addition, a sales variable indicating size is likely to be downward biased as production operations opened up abroad and subsequent sales are not included.

2.3 Empirical findings

2.3.1 The size-innovation relationship

Studies of the size-R&D relationship usually aim to study the size-innovation relationship, but, as innovation is difficult to measure, they tend to rely on R&D as an indicator of innovation. R&D is, however, an input into the innovation process, not necessarily linked to innovation.[3]

As has been discussed, the theoretical motivations for a large firm advantage in innovative activity are mixed, and size-advantages have also been difficult to establish empirically. Many studies examine the link between innovation and size (see e.g. Scherer 1965, Bound et al. 1984, Cohen and Klepper 1996), where size is usually measured by sales or number of employees and innovation by R&D expenditures. Bound et al. (1984) found that R&D intensity fell slightly with size among the very smallest firms and rose somewhat with size among the very largest firms and Scherer (1965) found that R&D personnel increased more than proportionally with firm size up to a threshold, after which the relationship became proportional. However, the consensus view has become that R&D rises proportionately with firm size among R&D performers, with an elasticity of close to unity (Cohen 1995).

At the same time several studies suggest that the number of innovations per employee declines with firm size (Pavitt et al. 1987, Acs and Audretsch 1990, Acs and Audretsch 1991, Kleinknecht et al. 1993, Santarelli and Piergiovanni 1996), so that small firms account for a disproportionately large share of innovations relative to their size. There are exceptions to this finding; Acs and Audretsch (1990) point out that the pattern varies across industries and Pavitt et al. (1987) suggest that the relationship is somewhat U-shaped.

These results indicate that although there might be scale advantages to R&D, these are in a sense offset by a lowered productivity in terms of product innovations, not giving rise to a general advantage for large firms in innovation. However, not all studies control for sample selection bias, a possible problem as surviving small firms recorded in the samples also tend to be the successful ones (Bound et al. 1984).

A few studies analyze the size-innovation relationship using Swedish data. Wallmark and McQueen (1991) presented the '100 most important innovations' in Sweden 1945-1980. Granstrand and Alänge (1995) examined and extended this data. They found that 20 percent

[3] Discussions on different innovation indicators can be found in Kleinknecht et al. (2002) and Smith (2005).

of the innovations originated from autonomous entrepreneurs, 76.5 percent from corporate entrepreneurship and 3.5 percent from state entrepreneurship. After dividing the period into four subperiods, the authors noted that the role of autonomous entrepreneurs increased over time despite the fact that the economic system favoured large firms.

In a Swedish firm-level study focusing on market concentration and R&D, Gustavsson Tingvall and Karpaty (2011) also controls for size in terms of the number of employees and find the elasticity to be clearly above unity, indicating a large firm advantage in R&D.

2.3.2 Exports, R&D and productivity

Fors and Svensson (2002) examine how foreign sales affect R&D intensity (R&D/total sales) in Swedish multinationals and find a two-way relationship where a higher intensity of foreign sales increases the R&D intensity, and that a higher R&D intensity increases the foreign sales intensity. They also control for the size of the firm, in terms of employment, in one of their specifications and find a very small insignificant effect indicating a proportional relationship between size and R&D.

With regard to the potential role of export in learning, discussed earlier, and hence in providing a theoretical link that export may foster learning, Keller (2010) reports mixed evidence of a variety of approaches investigating such a link, although later studies tend to find some effects of learning. It is well known that exporting firms are more productive than non-exporting firms, but the fundamental reason could well be that firms self select into exporting. In other words, since they are already more productive than the average firm, they choose to enter the export market. Clerides et al. (1998) examine whether average costs, as a symptom of learning effects, are affected by exports among firms in Columbia, Morocco and Mexico. They control for the selection effect in a first-step equation but find no effect of starting to export. Similar to Clerides et al. (1998), van Biesebroeck (2005) investigates average cost effects of exporting for firms in nine African sub-Saharan countries and reveals a 25 percent productivity boost which is attributable to previously non-exploited scale effects. Hallward-Driemeier et al. (2002) find that South Asian firms that are planning to start exporting invest more resources to raise productivity and quality than non-exporters. Keller (2010), however, argues that such investments should be deducted from any learning effects as they consume real resources. De Loecker (2007) employs a matched firm sample of Slovenian firms and finds that exporting firms become more productive after they start exporting. Andersson and Lööf (2009) differentiate between small and large exporters (in

terms of export intensity), and between temporary and persistent exporters among Swedish firms. They find that learning effects require persistent export activity for small and large firms, while large firms also need a high export intensity to be effective. Fryges and Wagner (2010) construct profitability measures rather than productivity measures for German firms, which enables them to distinguish productivity effects from those of rising wages. They find a small statistically significant productivity premium for exporting firms which is not absorbed by higher wages.

3 Empirical analysis

3.1 Data and variables

The data for our analysis consists of firm-level observations from different databases compiled by Statistics Sweden (SCB). With respect to R&D we have had the choice of two sources of data. One source is the Swedish firm register (Structural Business Statistics – SBS) that has annual R&D data between 1985 and 2002, but data is only given for an interval for firms with R&D expenditures less than 10 MSEK. Another source is the data that forms the foundation for the Swedish official R&D statistics used in reports to the OECD. This data on R&D expenditures is collected from a biennial R&D survey which is more specific. However, it only covers the period from 1991 to 2005 and in practice the time limit is 2001 in order to match it with our other sources of data. This data set covers all firms with reported R&D expenditures over 5 MSEK and a sample of firms reporting less than 5 MSEK. Because the quality of the data from the R&D statistics is higher and more comprehensive, we have chosen this source of data, even though we get a smaller sample. However, the qualitative nature of the main relationships does not change when using annual data instead.[4] The average time span is rather short when using the biennial data; the average number of observations per firm being only 2.4. Hence, panel estimations are of limited use, which is why we have chosen to use cross section estimation methods and present the results for a few specific years (1993, 1997 and 2001).[5] Table 2 shows the number of firms in the sample for the investigated years divided by size groups in terms of the number of employees. The sample frame is restricted to firms with more than 50 employees, though the number of employees may have changed from the population frame to the actual sampling, so that a few firms exist in the smallest group. The majority of firms are in the group with at least 200 employees.

[4] Both sources of data on R&D expenditures show a very high correlation on the firm level.
[5] Despite this short time horizon, we ran panel estimations which gave similar results to those in this paper.

TABLE 2

Number of firms in the sample per year and size class

	Size class (number of employees)			
Year	< 50	50-199	≥ 200	Total
1993	6 (1.3 %)	195 (43.5 %)	247 (55.1 %)	448 (100 %)
1997	2 (0.6 %)	82 (26.4 %)	227 (73.0 %)	311 (100 %)
2001	5 (1.4 %)	109 (31.1 %)	236 (67.4 %)	350 (100 %)

The sales variables come from the Structural Business Statistics. The foreign sales variable is exports, which is the sum of sales to foreign firms within the corporate group and sales to other foreign customers.

We also include a number of control variables. Since the level of R&D is likely to be affected by the education level at the firm, we have gathered information on the share of employees with any type of post-gymnasium education at each firm.[6] Capital intensity, measured as the book value of capital divided by total sales, is also included on the basis that technological progress is usually interlinked with capital investments.

The nature of R&D and innovation can be expected to differ between sectors, and technological opportunities differ as well. We include industry dummies to pick up some of these differences as well as possible differences in the market structure. Following Ejermo and Kander (2011), firms have been classified as belonging to one of ten sectors. Sectors 1-7 belong to manufacturing, while sectors 8-10 are in services. This division of sectors is based on different R&D intensities. Moreover, as mentioned earlier, we expect R&D in manufacturing firms to be more strongly linked to foreign sales, and therefore conduct estimations for manufacturing and service industries separately.

The R&D activities in large corporations could be organized in sub-parts, or specific firms, of the larger corporation. Thus, in practice the R&D levels could be misleading as one firm within the larger corporate group could draw on investments made elsewhere in the corporation. We have analyzed our main equation using the corporate level as our unit of analysis with no difference in results. Hence, using the firm level does not seem to significantly bias our results.

Another aspect of the organization of R&D activities concerns the possibility of a differential effect between Swedish vs. foreign owned firms. As mentioned earlier, home bias effects in

[6] Swedish gymnasium education roughly corresponds to upper secondary education in the American education system (years 10-12).

terms of the localization of R&D might induce foreign owned firms active in Sweden to reduce their R&D levels in Sweden relative to sales. To test for this possibility we introduce a dummy variable for foreign-owned firms, hypothesized to impact negatively on R&D levels. However, this variable is only available from 1997 and hence is not included in the regressions for the years before that.

All nominal variables are deflated using an index of civil engineering wages (Ljungberg 1990), and are expressed in 1985-year prices. Table 3 shows summary statistics for 1997, which is representative for all years between 1991 and 2001.

TABLE 3

Descriptive statistics of variables for 1997 in all sectors, manufacturing and services

	Variable	Obs.	Mean	Sd.	Min	Max
All sectors	R&D	311	75445	254683	1102	2620000
	Foreign sales	311	728111	2460000	37	30800000
	Domestic sales	311	444255	1390000	649	19000000
	Capital intensity	311	0.25	0.46	0	6.93
	Highly educated, share	311	0.31	0.2	0.05	0.89
	Foreign ownership	311	0.38	0.49	0	1
Manufacturing sectors	R&D	261	76324	267451	1102	2620000
	Foreign sales	261	838901	2670000	837	30800000
	Domestic sales	261	351875	666379	649	5800000
	Capital intensity	261	0.23	0.25	0	1.81
	Highly educated, share	261	0.26	0.16	0.05	0.77
	Foreign ownership	261	0.4	0.49	0	1
Service sectors	R&D	50	70860	175464	2885	1130000
	Foreign sales	50	149785	437860	37	2820000
	Domestic sales	50	926477	3090000	682	19000000
	Capital intensity	50	0.31	0.99	0	6.93
	Highly educated, share	50	0.58	0.18	0.12	0.89
	Foreign ownership	50	0.28	0.45	0	1

R&D and the sales variables are in thousands of SEK (1985-year prices).

3.2 Time trends in the distribution of innovative activities and exports

Figures 1-4 summarize trends in R&D expenditures and exports in Sweden, and include the observations for 2003. Figure 2 shows that large firms have a somewhat decreasing share of total R&D expenditures. Nonetheless, we should note that R&D expenditures are still extremely concentrated in large firms, since almost 94 percent were in firms with at least 200

employees in 1991, a figure that only dropped to 91 percent in 2003. Figure 2 shows that mean R&D expenditure per firm clearly has increased over the period even though it diminished from 1991 to 1993 and from 2001 to 2003.

Figure 1. Share of R&D in firms with at least 200 employees



Figure 2. Mean R&D expenditure per firm (in 1985-year prices)



Figure 3 shows that R&D still takes place predominantly in the manufacturing sector. Manufacturing firms conduct about 80 percent of total R&D in Sweden, with only slowly increasing shares for service firms. Figure 4 shows the development of the export intensity (exports/total sales) for firms with positive R&D expenditures. This intensity increased from 0.43 in 1991 to 0.57 in 2003, showing the increased trade dependency of Swedish R&D performers.

Figure 3. Share of R&D in manufacturing and service sectors



Figure 4. Export intensity for R&D performing firms



3.3 Regressions on the size-R&D relationship

In this section we conduct the regression analysis, which enables us to sort out the role of the two sales variables – foreign and domestic – in R&D expenditures, while also taking into account effects related to the sample at hand. Equation (1) depicts the main estimated equation.

$$\ln RD_{it} = \beta_1 lnS_{it}^F + \beta_2 lnS_{it}^D + \gamma' X_{it} + u_{it}, \quad (1)$$

where *i* is a firm and *t* denotes year. The dependent variable is the log of R&D expenditures, the explanatory variables of main interest are the log of foreign sales (S^F) and the log of domestic sales (S^D), *X* is a vector of control variables including capital intensity, the share of highly educated, a dummy for foreign ownership, industry dummies for our ten sectors and a constant, and *u* is an idiosyncratic error term. For reasons of space we only present regressions for the years 1993, 1997 and 2001, even though we have also run the regressions for 1991, 1995 and 1999. These latter regressions are presented in the Appendix, Tables 9-11.

If $\beta_1 = \beta_2$ then there is no difference in the effect on R&D expenditures of changes in these two types of sales variables, but if $\beta_1 > \beta_2$ then changes in foreign sales have a larger impact than changes in domestic sales. There would then be evidence of a learning-by-exporting effect or of scale economies in R&D. We expect this latter effect to be more pronounced for manufacturing than for service sectors. Following the literature, we expect $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = 1$ resulting in a proportional relationship between R&D expenditures and size.

Several issues with the estimation of this equation need attention. First, due to the log specification, we exclude non-R&D performers, which might lead to biased results when using OLS estimation. To correct for sample selection bias concerning the R&D variable, we use the Heckman (1979) two-step estimator where, in the first stage, we specify an equation for the probability of engaging in R&D. From this stage, an inverted Mills ratio is estimated and used to correct for selection. Because the R&D data only includes R&D performers, we construct the selection variable with the help of the Structural Business Statistics data set. We believe that zero values can be expected to be accurate from the SBS, and thus complement the data from the R&D statistics. Therefore, the selection variable is created as follows:

$$s(R\&D) = \begin{cases} 1 & if \quad R\&D_{stat} > 0 \\ 0 & if \quad R\&D_{stat} = 0 \\ 0 & if \quad R\&D_{stat} = missing \; and \; R\&D_{SBS} = 0 \\ missing & if \quad R\&D_{stat} = missing \; and \; R\&D_{SBS} = missing \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

where $R\&D_{stat}$ is R&D data from the R&D statistics and $R\&D_{SBS}$ is from the Structural Business Statistics.

As we also log the export variable, we exclude the non-exporters who constitute about ten percent of the R&D performers in the data. There is no easy way to control for this exclusion,

and hence we just have to acknowledge that this exclusion is a shortcoming, and that our results are valid only for firms with positive domestic and foreign sales.

Second, another major issue is the possibly endogenous relationship between R&D and the sales variables, and specifically the variable for foreign sales. It is rather well documented in the literature that the decisions to perform R&D and to export are made simultaneously (Fors and Svensson 2002, Lileeva and Trefler 2007, Aw et al. 2008). However, Lileeva and Trefler (2007) point out that it is exporting that makes it more profitable to improve productivity (investing in R&D) because it increases the output over which the productivity gains will be spread. We deal with this possible endogeneity problem by using an instrumental variable estimator and instrument foreign sales with its lagged values.

3.3.1 Estimation results

First we examine the results from our three estimators, OLS, IV and Heckman, for one specific year, 1997, gauging if there are problems of endogeneity and/or selection bias.

For the IV estimation we use the two-stage least squares estimator where we instrument foreign sales with its first and second lag. Including more than one instrument allows us to test the validity of the instruments using the Hansen test of overidentifying restrictions, a test which our instruments pass. However, whether the first lag of foreign sales is actually an appropriate instrument, despite passing the validity test, is debatable. Therefore, we have also tried with only the second and third lag as instruments but we get no differences in the results or in the validity tests. In addition, we have also instrumented domestic sales and the human capital variable and tested these variables for endogeneity. We conclude that they can be treated as exogenous and do not need to be instrumented.

For the selection equation in the two-step Heckman estimator, all the previously discussed variables are included in addition to variables for competition, total (logged) R&D in the region and metropolitan area. Following the Industrial Organization literature we include a measure of competition to control for effects of market structure (see e.g. Vossen 1999, Aghion et al. 2005, Gustavsson Tingvall and Karpaty 2011). We use the Hirschmann Herfindahl Index (HHI), defined as

$$HHI_k = \sum_{i \subset k} s_i^2, \tag{3}$$

where s_i^2 is the squared market share of firm i belonging to sector k.[7] The variable for total R&D in the region is intended to capture the potential for knowledge spillovers measured by the total R&D (minus R&D of the own firm) of the county where the firm has its main workplace. Other firms' R&D may stimulate own R&D investments in order to 'absorb' their results (Cohen and Levinthal 1989), and may make it more profitable to invest in own R&D (Audretsch and Feldman 1996). The metropolitan variable shows the share of employees that reside in one of the counties of Stockholm, Gothenburg or Malmoe. The variable uses the location of the individual rather than that of the firm, as the firm's county judicial seating does not always appropriately reflect the true county of the firm's activity. Both the R&D county and the metropolitan variable are intended to capture the advantages of being located in an agglomeration where much R&D activity takes place, and hence may have a positive influence, a spillover effect, on the probability of engaging in R&D.

Table 4 shows the results for the OLS, the IV and the second stage Heckman for the year 1997. The samples for the OLS and the Heckman estimations are limited to only those observations for which the first and second lags of log foreign sales are available, in order to use the same observations as for the IV.

We can observe that the estimates are very similar across the OLS and the IV estimations, indicating that there is effectively no problem of endogeneity, even though we reject exogeneity of foreign sales for this year. Thus, we can rely on the OLS in this sense. Comparing the OLS estimates with those of the Heckman estimator, we see that the Heckman estimates for the sales variables are higher than when we use OLS, especially for foreign sales. The other variable estimates are pretty similar. This higher elasticity in the Heckman estimates indicates the existence of sample selection bias and the lambda coefficient, i.e. for the Mill's ratio, is significantly different from zero. These results show that the sample selection bias is the most important to control for, and the Heckman estimator is therefore our most preferred estimator even though we cannot control for endogeneity. Moreover, in the IV estimations we reject that foreign sales are exogenous only for about half of the years.

[7] The results are mainly unchanged when using the market share of the top four firms (C4) in the sector instead. The HHI index carries information on the dispersion of all firms in a sector whereas the C4 only considers the top four.

TABLE 4

OLS, IV and second stage Heckman, 1997

Dependent variable: Log R&D expenditures			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	OLS	IV	Heckman
Log foreign sales	0.37***	0.40***	0.60***
	(0.045)	(0.050)	(0.076)
Log domestic sales	0.33***	0.32***	0.43***
	(0.041)	(0.041)	(0.055)
Capital intensity	0.20	0.20	0.19
	(0.319)	(0.311)	(0.283)
Highly educated, share	3.67***	3.65***	5.69***
	(0.481)	(0.467)	(0.739)
Foreign ownership	-0.14	-0.15	-0.10
	(0.111)	(0.108)	(0.123)
Constant	1.43**	1.37**	-2.51*
	(0.726)	(0.653)	(1.318)
Observations	275	275	275
Censored observations			907
R-squared	0.686	0.685	
Lambda			1.31***
			(0.297)
Hansen		0.900	

Standard errors in parentheses. ***, **, * Coefficients are significant on the 1, 5 and 10 % levels respectively. Sector dummies not reported. P-value is reported for the Hansen test of overidentifying restrictions. In the IV estimation, the variable for log foreign sales is instrumented with its first and second lag.

Now that our strategy[8] for the estimation has been laid out, we present the Heckman estimates for the first stage, i.e. the selection equation, in Table 5.[9] Here, we also differentiate between manufacturing and service sectors.

The results show that both foreign and domestic sales are important determinants for the decision to perform R&D and the coefficient of foreign sales is significantly higher than that of domestic sales in each of the investigated years except for 1991, when firms from both sectors are examined together. Moreover, the coefficient of foreign sales is higher for the manufacturing sector than when all firms are included. For the service sector the results are somewhat more varied. Domestic sales are only significant in 1997 and 2001 and the estimates of the sales variables are much lower than for the manufacturing sector.

[8] The panel regressions reported on in footnote 5 have been done using an IV fixed effect estimator since no Heckman panel estimator could be found.

[9] In Table 8 in the Appendix, we present descriptive statistics of all firms, i.e. including those firms that are only used in the first stage.

TABLE 5

First stage Heckman estimates

Dependent variable: s(R&D)									
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	1993 – All	1993 – M	1993 – S	1997 – All	1997 – M	1997 – S	2001 – All	2001 – M	2001 – S
Log foreign sales	0.28***	0.38***	0.10**	0.38***	0.56***	0.15***	0.33***	0.55***	0.13***
	(0.023)	(0.030)	(0.041)	(0.030)	(0.045)	(0.042)	(0.024)	(0.040)	(0.032)
Log domestic sales	0.15***	0.24***	-0.03	0.21***	0.17***	0.16***	0.09***	0.06*	0.08*
	(0.033)	(0.041)	(0.065)	(0.035)	(0.045)	(0.058)	(0.027)	(0.038)	(0.041)
Capital intensity	0.02	-0.02	-0.01	0.10	-0.05	0.16*	-0.06	-0.21*	0.00
	(0.080)	(0.152)	(0.079)	(0.076)	(0.133)	(0.083)	(0.074)	(0.129)	(0.056)
Highly educated,	1.26***	1.14***	1.34***	3.70***	4.47***	2.89***	2.49***	2.24***	2.42***
share	(0.295)	(0.430)	(0.411)	(0.330)	(0.496)	(0.432)	(0.234)	(0.360)	(0.324)
Log county R&D	-0.07*	-0.03	-0.10	-0.02	-0.10**	-0.07	0.04	-0.00	0.04
	(0.035)	(0.041)	(0.071)	(0.041)	(0.044)	(0.074)	(0.032	(0.038)	(0.057)
Metro	0.15	0.18	-0.30	-0.21	-0.01	-0.80**	-0.17	0.09	-0.61*
	(0.122)	(0.134)	(0.352)	(0.144)	(0.163)	(0.163)	(0.152)	(0.181)	(0.332)
HHI sector 10	14.85	-1490.32***	-114.79	-63.15***	-2491.92***	-4078.73***	-75.19***	-3113.25***	-3655.56***
	(0.000)	(156.135)	(228.207)	(9.972)	(204.431)	(1,027.015)	(8.899)	(246.948)	(639.418
Observations	1428	966	462	2185	1176	1009	2398	1297	1101

Turning to the specification of main interest – the determinants of the amount of R&D conducted at the firm – Table 6 displays the second stage Heckman estimates for the three chosen years, 1993, 1997 and 2001 where we now include all available observations.

TABLE 6

Second stage Heckman estimates

Dependent variable: Log R&D expenditures			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	1993	1997	2001
Log foreign sales	0.65***	0.58***	0.60***
	(0.081)	(0.068)	(0.098)
Log domestic sales	0.45***	0.38***	0.29***
	(0.050)	(0.044)	(0.042)
Capital intensity	0.60**	0.46***	-0.12
	(0.255)	(0.112)	(0.174)
Highly educated, share	6.25***	5.59***	5.10***
	(0.577)	(0.614)	(0.696)
Foreign ownership		-0.09	-0.24**
		(0.108)	(0.109)
Constant	-3.80***	-2.60**	-2.27
	(1.251)	(1.266)	(1.719)
Uncensored observations	448	311	350
Censored observations	980	1874	2048
Lambda	1.45***	1.08***	1.37***
	(0.432)	(0.265)	(0.413)
T-test log foreign sales = log domestic sales (p-value)	0.013	0.005	0.001
T-test log foreign sales + log domestic sales = 1 (p-value)	0.365	0.664	0.378

Standard errors in parentheses. ***, **, * Coefficients are significant on the 1, 5 and 10 % levels respectively. Sector dummies not reported.

In line with our expectations, the elasticity with respect to foreign sales is again generally higher than for domestic sales. The estimate for foreign sales ranges between 0.47 (in 1991) and 0.65 (in 1993 and 1995), whereas for domestic sales it ranges between 0.29 (in 2001) and 0.45 (in 1991 and 1993). This difference between the estimates of the sales variables is significant and rather constant over the years except for 1991 when the estimates are almost the same. Thus, when studying all firms together, we cannot really claim that Swedish firms increasingly link their R&D behaviour to foreign sales relative to their domestic sales.

The combined elasticity ranges from 0.82 (in 1999) to 1.05 (in 1995), which is very close to one, and we can only reject that it is one for 1999. Thus, on average, R&D expenditures increase at the same pace as sales, and there does not seem to be a large firm advantage in performing R&D.

With regard to the control variables, capital intensity is not very robust. Most of the time it is significant but the size of the estimate changes a lot. On the other hand, the share of highly educated is significant and positive for all years, indicating that, in line with our expectations, having a well educated work force is an important determinant for the amount of R&D undertaken at the firm. As expected, the variable for foreign ownership, which is only available from 1997, is negative for all years, and significant for both 1999 and 2001.

To investigate if the results differ between manufacturing and service sectors, Table 7 shows the second stage Heckman estimates for these sectors separately. The first thing to note is that the coefficient of lambda is insignificant for all years except 1999 for the service sector, indicating that the Heckman estimator is not always needed for this sector.

TABLE 7

Second stage Heckman for manufacturing and service sectors respectively

Dependent variable: Log R&D expenditures						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	1993 - M	1993 - S	1997 - M	1997 - S	2001- M	2001 - S
Log foreign sales	0.68***	0.15	0.65***	0.23**	0.88***	-0.03
	(0.078)	(0.131)	(0.075)	(0.110)	(0.129)	(0.128)
Log domestic sales	0.46***	0.42***	0.32***	0.24***	0.21***	0.17
	(0.053)	(0.128)	(0.042)	(0.093)	(0.052)	(0.108)
Capital intensity	0.43	0.69*	-0.05	0.45***	0.58**	-0.61**
	(0.316)	(0.415)	(0.272)	(0.176)	(0.296)	(0.247)
Highly educated, share	6.03***	3.67***	5.56***	2.63*	4.37***	1.18
	(0.581)	(1.263)	(0.579)	(1.385)	(0.667)	(2.119)
Foreign ownership			-0.10	-0.05	-0.22	-0.27
			(0.110)	(0.382)	(0.135)	(0.274)
Constant	-7.03***	2.51	-4.77***	2.87	-6.93***	9.60*
	(1.500)	(2.669)	(1.296)	(3.291)	(2.092)	(5.387)
Uncensored observations	398	50	261	50	273	77
Censored observations	568	412	915	959	1024	1024
Lambda	1.25***	-1.16	0.95***	-0.01	1.57***	-1.48
	(0.343)	(0.988)	(0.239)	(0.610)	(0.399)	(1.167)
T-test log foreign sales = log domestic sales (p-value)	0.005	0.222	0.000	0.914	0.000	0.060
T-test log foreign sales + log domestic sales = 1 (p-value)	0.173	0.002	0.729	0.001	0.504	0.000

Standard errors in parentheses. ***, **, * Coefficients are significant on the 1, 5 and 10 % levels respectively. Sector dummies not reported.

The elasticity for foreign sales ranges from 0.48 (in 1991) to 0.88 (in 2001) for the manufacturing sector. It ranges from -0.03 (in 2001) to 0.23 (in 1997), and is not always significant, for the service sector. The domestic sales elasticity ranges from 0.21 (in 2001) to 0.47 (in 1991) for the manufacturing sector and from -0.27 (in 1991 and not significant) to 0.42 (in 1993) for services. The difference between the estimates for foreign and domestic

sales becomes increasingly bigger over the years for the manufacturing sector, indicating that manufacturing firms increasingly link their R&D spending to exports. The post 1994 period is one where Swedish exports have increased dramatically, following a depreciated currency and membership of the European Union. Our results suggest that R&D has been affected as well by these trends. For the service sector, on the other hand, domestic sales seems to be slightly more important in determining the amount of R&D than foreign sales, although we can only reject equality between the coefficients for two of the years (1999 and 2001).

The combined elasticity ranges from 0.93 (in 1999) to 1.14 (in 1993) for the manufacturing sector and from 0.03 (in 1991) to 0.57 (in 1993) for the service sector, though the sales variables are not always significant. For the service sector we reject that the combined elasticity equals one for all time periods, whereas we never reject it for the manufacturing sector. Hence, for the service sector there seems to be a small firm advantage in R&D.

Turning to the control variables, the capital intensity variable is again shown not to be very robust, it is only significant for two of the years for manufacturing firms and three of the years for service firms, and it shows up with opposite signs. The share of highly educated is positive and significant for all years in the two sectors except in 1991 and 2001 for the service sector. In general, the size of the estimate is also lower for service sectors, but it is clearly important to have a highly educated work force for the amount of R&D. The variable for foreign ownership is still negative for all years but significant only for the manufacturing sector in 1999.

3.4 Quantile regressions

In this section we report on quantile regressions that allow us to investigate in more detail if and how the estimated effects vary across the distribution of R&D expenditure values. It also allows us to more clearly understand the role of the two sales effects for different levels of R&D performers. This understanding may also be important for policies which try to stimulate R&D. The technique is based on the minimization of the sum of absolute residuals which sorts the dependent variable by size and then changes the weight in the regression depending on which part of the sample is addressed.

Formally, the θth regression quantile of the dependent variable y is the solution to (Buchinsky 1998)

$$\min_{\beta}\left(\sum_{i:y\geq x'\beta}|y_i - x_i'\beta|\theta + \sum_{i:y<x'\beta}|y_i - x_i'\beta|(1-\theta)\right). \quad (4)$$

Hence, the estimated coefficients vary as residuals are successively given different weights in the estimation procedure. For the median regression, all residuals receive equal weight. However, when estimating the 75th percentile, negative residuals are weighted with 0.25 and positive residuals with 0.75. The criterion is minimized, when 75 percent of the residuals are negative.[10]

It is not easy to control for sample selection bias in the quantile regressions, even though Buchinsky (1998, 2001) has done some work in this direction. Moreover, it is not evident if the selection bias changes or not with the amount of R&D expenditures. To get some idea of the size of the selection bias over the distribution, we have reestimated our regression separately using only those firms with high R&D expenditures (above the 75th percentile) and those with low R&D expenditures (below the 25th percentile). In these regressions we see that the selection bias seems to be greater for firms with high R&D levels, and the coefficient of lambda is not even significant for the firms with low R&D levels. Hence, if the estimated elasticity differs with the amount of R&D when using quantile regression, it is reasonable to assume that the same pattern would occur if we could control for the sample selection, but that the estimates for high R&D performers would in general be higher.

Quantile regressions are run every fifth quantile (Q5, Q10, … , Q95) for all firms. Quantile regressions are more robust to outliers, but are subject to heteroscedasticity problems. In order to solve potential heteroscedasticity problems, bootstraps with 3000 replications are conducted.[11] The 95 percent confidence band from bootstrapped estimation errors are shown as shaded (grey) areas in the figures. We show results on the marginal effects of (log) sales for 1993 and 2001 in Figures 5 and 6.

The graph for 1993 is also representative for the situation in 1991 and the graph for 2001 is representative for the distribution of marginal effects for 1995, 1997 and 1999 as well. The difference is dramatic; while the marginal effects are fairly stable for both foreign and domestic sales in 1993, the marginal effects for domestic sales rise, as we move to higher values for R&D, from about 0.10 to 0.25 in 2001. This result means that firms increasingly link their R&D expenditures to domestic sales the more R&D they conduct, which is possibly explained by the fact that Swedish customers could be advanced users of new products. As sales start to pick up on the domestic market, they start to stimulate R&D as there is an

[10] Koenker and Hallock (2001) provide an intuitive explanation.
[11] See Rogers (1993) and Gould (1993). This procedure is automated in the Stata statistical package.

expectation that the product may take off, possibly also on the international market. In a range of products such as mobile telephones and broadband, Swedish customers have been early to adopt new technology. The elasticity for foreign sales has somewhat of an inverted U-shaped pattern with values ranging from 0.18 to 0.40 and back to 0.25. When R&D expenditures start to increase, they quickly become more and more sensitive to changes in foreign sales, but after a while the level of sensitivity stabilizes and even diminishes to some extent. However, since the sample selection bias seems to be more pronounced for high R&D performers, this stabilization or fall in the estimates should be considered with care. It should also be noted that the foreign sales effect is almost invariably stronger than that of domestic sales for the entire R&D distribution.

Figure 5. Quantile regressions for R&D in 1993



Figure 6. Quantile regressions for R&D in 2001



Thus, during the 1990s, the sensitivity of R&D expenditures to changes in sales changed over the distribution of firms. In the early 1990s, all firms were more or less equally sensitive to changes in sales, whereas in the later 1990s and early 2000s the firms with high levels of R&D were the most responsive to changes in sales, especially concerning domestic sales. This result shows that, in these later years, the level of sales was not that important as a determinant for R&D expenditures in firms with lower levels of R&D, and that we need to look for other variables to explain the R&D efforts.

4 Summary and conclusions

The Swedish economy has undergone dramatic changes in the last decades in terms of openness. This paper examines whether exports have had an impact on firms' R&D efforts. We divide firms into manufacturing and service sectors and compare effects at different points in time. In line with the 'stylized fact' presented in Cohen and Klepper (1996), we find the average combined elasticity of sales to R&D to be close to one, suggesting a proportionate relationship. This average relationship masks several differences revealed after more detailed analyses. For service firms the elasticity is less than one, which indicates that, among service firms, a small firm advantage is discerned, implying that being small and flexible might be advantageous for service firms. In the words of Breschi et al. (2000) they would belong to the Mark I regime, referring to Schumpeter's (1934) notion of the dynamic young entrepreneurial (and small) firms. Another possibility is that smaller firms cater for the R&D needs of large corporations to a larger extent and R&D is increasingly being conducted by smaller consultancy firms in services. For manufacturing firms there is clear evidence that foreign sales have a stronger effect on R&D expenditures than domestic sales. There are several reasons why foreign markets can be expected to provide more stimulus to R&D. First, learning-by-exporting may have firms enter into virtuous circles of export-R&D-export. Second, we argue that export sales are in a sense a low estimate of the sales effect. In multinational firms with production operations abroad, of which Sweden has many, the exported good is often refined in foreign affiliates and hence the total sales effect becomes underestimated. Third, we have argued that scale effects should be more pronounced in manufacturing firms, as production and R&D can be more distinctly separated. Moreover, for manufacturing firms the weight of goods may make it more economical to establish plants abroad to economize on transport costs. Our results support these hypotheses in general, but our study does not distinguish between the alternative hypotheses explaining the link from exports to R&D; this issue is left to future research.

Neither does our study differentiate between the type of products that are exported or to which markets they are sold, something that could influence the sensitivity to changes in sales. The R&D expenditures of a firm that exports an R&D intensive product are probably more sensitive to changes in the exports of that product than the R&D expenditures of a firm that exports low R&D intensive products. The same reasoning goes for the markets receiving the exports. If the exported goods are sold to R&D intensive countries, then a firm probably needs to put more resources into R&D itself to keep the products competitive, in line with the 'advanced user' argument put forward above. Support for these conjectures can be found in Andersson and Ejermo (2008). Deeper exploration of these hypotheses is left to future research.

Over the course of the period investigated here, Sweden experienced a sharp depreciation of its currency (1992-93) and became a member of the European Union (1995). The 1990s was a period of export-led recovery. Some Swedish policy discussions (Braunerhjelm 1998, Edquist and McKelvey 1998) have concluded that Sweden 'underperforms' with respect to R&D in terms of innovative performance, exports and growth, at times referred to as the Swedish paradox. Recent contributions examining productivity of R&D in terms of patents suggest, however, a much more positive outlook and a taxonomy based on growth patterns (Ejermo and Kander 2011). Ejermo et al. (2011) demonstrate that it is the growing sectors that are responsible for R&D expenditures, which suggests that growth effects might be undervalued. Our results support this idea; 'underperformance' may simply arise from a neglect of accounting for sales effects abroad, i.e. the reasons for investing in R&D depend on the degree of internationalization and exports of the firm. Interestingly, foreign ownership of Swedish firms may result in less R&D being allocated to Sweden, which fuels the discussion of cross-border ownership. Our results also suggest that the export-led growth experienced since the 1990s has led to a two-tiered structure in terms of R&D organization. On the one hand, manufacturing firms' R&D efforts are to some extent driven by economies of scale. On the other hand, R&D in the service sector has been on the rise, with the R&D efforts appearing to be relatively more linked to domestic sales at the same time as making small firms more important. Again, a clear possibility is that these firms cater for the needs of multinationals at home in the sense that they conduct R&D based on the needs of these large firms. It is also possible that these firms represent increasing dynamics in terms of innovation and entrepreneurship. We believe that these are important avenues for further research.

References

Acs, Z. J. and Audretsch, D. B. (1990) *Innovation and Small Firms,* MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Acs, Z. J. and Audretsch, D. B. (1991). 'R&D, Firm Size and Innovative Activity', in ACS Z J and AUDRETSCH D B (eds.), *Innovation and Technological Change: An International Comparison.* The University of Michigan Press, pp. 39-59.

Aghion, P., Bloom, N., Blundell, R., Griffith, R. and Howitt, P. (2005). 'Competition and Innovation: An Inverted-U Relationship', *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* Vol. 120, No. 2, pp. 701-728.

Andersson, M. and Ejermo, O. (2008). 'Technology Specialization and the Magnitude and Quality of Exports', *Economics of Innovation and New Technology,* Vol. 17, No. 4, pp. 355-375.

Andersson, M. and Lööf, H. (2009). 'Learning-by-Exporting Revisited: The Role of Intensity and Persistence', *Scandinavian Journal of Economics,* Vol. 111, No. 4, pp. 893-916.

Audretsch, D. B. and Feldman, M. P. (1996). 'R&D Spillovers and the Geography of Innovation and Production', *American Economic Review,* Vol. 86, No. 3, pp. 630-640.

Aw, B. Y., Roberts, M. J. and Xu, D. Y. (2008). 'R&D Investments, Exporting, and the Evolution of Firm Productivity', *American Economic Review,* Vol. 98, No. 2, pp. 451-456.

Belderbos, R., Leten, B. and Suzuki, S. 'How Global is R&D? Determinants of the Home Country Bias in R&D Investment', *Paper Presented at the DIME Final Conference*, Maastricht, 6-8 April 2011.

Bound, J., Cummins, C., Griliches, Z., Hall, B. H. and Jaffe, A. (1984). 'Who Does R&D and Who Patents?', in GRILICHES Z (ed.), *R&D, Patents and Productivity.* University of Chicago Press, pp. 21-54.

Braunerhjelm, P. (1998). 'Varför leder inte ökade FoU-satsningar till mer högteknologisk export?', *Ekonomiska samfundets tidskrift,* Vol. 2, pp. 113-123.

Breschi, S., Malerba, F. and Orsenigo, L. (2000). 'Technological Regimes and Schumpeterian Patterns of Innovation', *The Economic Journal,* Vol. 110, No. 463, pp. 388-410.

Buchinsky, M. (1998). 'Recent Advances in Quantile Regression Models: A Practical Guideline for Empirical Research', *Journal of Human Resources,* Vol. 33, No. 1, pp. 88-126.

Buchinsky, M. (2001). 'Quantile Regression With Sample Selection: Estimating Women's Return to Education in the U.S.', *Empirical Economics,* Vol. 26, No. 1, pp. 87-113.

Clerides, S. K., Saul, L. and James, R. T. (1998). 'Is Learning by Exporting Important? Micro-Dynamic Evidence from Colombia, Mexico, and Morocco', *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* Vol. 113, No. 3, pp. 903-947.

Cohen, W. M. (1995). 'Empirical Studies of Innovative Activity', in STONEMAN P (ed.), *Handbook of the Economics of Innovation and Technological Change.* Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 182-264.

Cohen, W. M. (2010). 'Fifty Years of Empirical Studies of Innovative Activity and Performance', in HALL B H and ROSENBERG N (eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Innovation.* North-Holland, Amsterdam, pp. 129-213.

Cohen, W. M. and Klepper, S. (1996). 'A Reprise of Size and R&D', *The Economic Journal,* Vol. 106, No. 437, pp. 925-951.

Cohen, W. M. and Levinthal, D. A. (1989). 'Innovation and Learning: The Two Faces of R&D', *The Economic Journal,* Vol. 99, No. 397, pp. 569-596.

De Loecker, J. (2007). 'Do Exports Generate Higher Productivity? Evidence from Slovenia', *Journal of International Economics,* Vol. 73, No. 1, pp. 69-98.

Edquist, C., Hommen, L. and Tsipouri, L. (eds.) (2000). *Public Technology Procurement and Innovation,* Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston/Dordrecht/London.

Edquist, C. and McKelvey, M. (1998). 'High R&D Intensity Without High Tech Products: The Swedish Paradox', in NIELSEN K and JOHNSON B (eds.), *Institutions and Economic Change: New Perspectives on Markets, Firms and Technology.* Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham, pp. 131-149.

Ejermo, O. and Kander, A. (2011). 'Swedish Business Research Productivity', *Industrial and Corporate Change,* Vol. 20, No. 4, pp. 1081-1118.

Ejermo, O., Kander, A. and Henning, M. (2011). 'The R&D-Growth Paradox Arises in Fast-Growing Sectors', *Research Policy,* Vol. 40, No. 5, pp. 664-672.

Fors, G. and Svensson, R. (2002). 'R&D and Foreign Sales in Swedish Multinationals: A Simultaneous Relationship?', *Research Policy,* Vol. 31, No. 1, pp. 95-107.

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

Gould, W. W. (1993). 'Quantile Regression with Bootstrapped Standard Errors', *Stata Technical Bulletin,* Vol. 2, No. 9, pp. 19-21.

Granstrand, O. and Alänge, S. (1995). 'The Evolution of Corporate Entrepreneurship in Swedish Industry - Was Schumpeter Wrong?', *Journal of Evolutionary Economics,* Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 133-156.

Gustavsson Tingvall, P. and Karpaty, P. (2011). 'Service-Sector Competition, Innovation and R&D', *Economics of Innovation and New Technology,* Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 63-88.

Hallward-Driemeier, M., Iarossi, G. and Sokoloff, K. L. (2002). 'Exports and Manufacturing Productivity in East Asia: A Comparative Analysis with Firm-Level Data'. *NBER Working Paper*, No. 8894, NBER.

Heckman, J. (1979). 'Sample Selection Bias as a Specification Error', *Econometrica,* Vol. 47, No. 1, pp. 153-161.

Henrekson, M. and Jakobsson, U. (2001). 'Where Schumpeter Was Nearly Right - the Swedish Model and Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy', *Journal of Evolutionary Economics,* Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 331-358.

Henrekson, M. and Johansson, D. (1999). 'Institutional Effects on the Evolution of the Size Distribution of Firms', *Small Business Economics,* Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 11-23.

Keller, W. (2010). 'International Trade, Foreign Direct Investment, and Technology Spillovers', in HALL B H and ROSENBERG N (eds.), *Handbook of the Economics of Innovation.* North-Holland, Amsterdam, pp. 793-829.

Kleinknecht, A., Jeroen, O., Reijnen, N. and Smits, W. (1993). 'Collecting Literature-Based Innovation Output Indicators: The Experience in the Netherlands', in KLEINKNECHT A and BAIN D (eds.), *New Concepts in Innovation Output Measurement.* St. Martin's Press, New York, pp. 42-84.

Kleinknecht, A., van Montfort, K. and Brouwer, E. (2002). 'The Non-Trivial Choice Between Innovation Indicators', *Economics of Innovation and New Technology,* Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 109-121.

Klepper, S. and Malerba, F. (2010). 'Demand, Innovation and Industrial Dynamics: An Introduction', *Industrial and Corporate Change,* Vol. 19, No. 5, pp. 1515-1520.

Koenker, R. and Hallock, K. F. (2001). 'Quantile Regression', *Journal of Economic Perspectives,* Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 143-156.

Krugman, P. (1980). 'Scale Economies, Product Differentiation, and the Pattern of Trade', *American Economic Review,* Vol. 70, No. 5, pp. 950-959.

Lileeva, A. and Trefler, D. (2007). 'Improved Access to Foreign Markets Raises Plant-Level Productivity... for Some Plants'. *NBER Working Paper*, No. 13297, NBER.

Ljungberg, J. (1990) *Priser och marknadskrafter i Sverige 1885-1969: en prishistorisk studie,* Ekonomisk-historiska föreningen, Lund.
Mowery, D. C. and Rosenberg, N. (1998) *Paths of Innovation,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
Nelson, R. R. and Winter, S. G. (1982) *An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
OECD (2010). 'Main Science and Technology Indicators', *OECD Science, Technology and R&D Statistics (database)*, OECD.
Pavitt, K., Robson, M. and Townsend, J. (1987). 'The Size Distribution of Innovating Firms in the UK - 1945-1983', *Journal of Industrial Economics,* Vol. 35, No. 3, pp. 297-316.
Rogers, W. H. (1993). 'Quantile Regression Standard Errors', *Stata Technical Bulletin,* Vol. 2, No. 9, pp. 16-19.
Santarelli, E. and Piergiovanni, R. (1996). 'Analyzing Literature-Based Innovation Output Indicators: The Italian Experience', *Research Policy,* Vol. 25, No. 5, pp. 689-711.
Scherer, F. M. (1965). 'Firm Size, Market-Structure, Opportunity, and the Output of Patented Inventions', *American Economic Review,* Vol. 55, No. 5, pp. 1097-1125.
Schumpeter, J. (1934) *The Theory of Economic Development,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
Schumpeter, J. (1950) *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy,* Harper and Row, New York.
Smith, K. (2005). 'Measuring Innovation', in FAGERBERG J, MOWERY D C and NELSON R R (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation.* Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 148-179.
Statistics Sweden (2011) *Statistical Yearbook of Sweden 2011,* Statistics Sweden, Örebro.
Tidd, J., Bessant, J. and Pavitt, K. (2005) *Managing Innovation,* John Wiley, Hoboken, NJ.
Wallmark, T. and McQueen, D. (1991). 'One Hundred Major Swedish Technical Innovations, from 1945 to 1980', *Research Policy,* Vol. 20, No. 4, pp. 325-344.
Van Biesebroeck, J. (2005). 'Exporting Raises Productivity in Sub-Saharan African Manufacturing Firms', *Journal of International Economics,* Vol. 67, No. 2, pp. 373-391.
Vossen, R. (1999). 'Market Power, Industrial Concentration and Innovative Activity', *Review of Industrial Organization,* Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 367-378.

Appendix

TABLE 8

Descriptive statistics for 1997 for all firms that are in the first stage of Heckman

	Variable	Obs.	Mean	Sd.	Min	Max
All sectors	R&D	2185	10738	99509	0	2620000
	Foreign sales	2185	138746	971200	1	30800000
	Domestic sales	2185	190436	727586	379	19000000
	Capital intensity	2185	0.22	0.58	0	11.64
	Highly educated, share	2185	0.22	0.2	0	1
	Foreign ownership	1807	0.23	0.42	0	1
	County R&D (total)	2185	2820000	3050000	15737	8110000
	Metro	2185	0.53	0.41	0	1
	HHI	2185	0.02	0.03	0	0.36
Manufacturing sectors	R&D	1176	16939	129749	0	2620000
	Foreign sales	1176	218659	1300000	5	30800000
	Domestic sales	1176	140291	378478	493	5800000
	Capital intensity	1176	0.23	0.45	0	8.97
	Highly educated, share	1176	0.15	0.13	0	0.77
	Foreign ownership	1031	0.24	0.43	0	1
	County R&D (total)	1176	1810000	2400000	15737	8110000
	Metro	1176	0.42	0.43	0	1
	HHI	1176	0.03	0.04	0	0.36
Service sectors	R&D	1009	3511	41634	0	1130000
	Foreign sales	1009	45608	238654	1	5010000
	Domestic sales	1009	248880	986743	379	19000000
	Capital intensity	1009	0.21	0.7	0	11.64
	Highly educated, share	1009	0.29	0.24	0	1
	Foreign ownership	776	0.22	0.42	0	1
	County R&D (total)	1009	4010000	3290000	15737	8110000
	Metro	1009	0.65	0.35	0	1
	HHI	1009	0.01	0.01	0	0.09

R&D and sales variables are in thousands of SEK (1985-year prices).

TABLE 9

First stage Heckman estimates for 1991, 1995 and 1999

Dependent variable: s(R&D)	(1) 1991 – All	(2) 1991 – M	(3) 1991 – S	(4) 1995 – All	(5) 1995 – M	(6) 1995 – S	(7) 1999 – All	(8) 1999 – M	(9) 1999 – S
Log foreign sales	0.31***	0.34***	0.20**	0.27***	0.35***	0.12***	0.38***	0.64***	0.15***
	(0.028)	(0.031)	(0.088)	(0.022)	(0.029)	(0.036)	(0.027)	(0.046)	(0.036)
Log domestic sales	0.26***	0.31***	-0.01	0.12***	0.16***	0.04	0.10***	0.09**	0.07
	(0.039)	(0.043)	(0.105)	(0.030)	(0.038)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.042)	(0.051)
Capital intensity	0.50**	0.39	2.38**	-0.05	-0.13	0.70***	-0.08	0.04	-0.07
	(0.245)	(0.256)	(1.064)	(0.051)	(0.176)	(0.269)	(0.097)	(0.134)	(0.123)
Highly educated, share	2.64***	2.37***	2.59***	2.54***	2.52***	2.45***	2.94***	3.18***	2.35***
	(0.430)	(0.541)	(0.849)	(0.296)	(0.461)	(0.399)	(0.268)	(0.400)	(0.352)
Log county R&D	0.01	0.01	0.18	-0.05	-0.03	-0.09	0.02	0.01	-0.04
	(0.038)	(0.040)	(0.161)	(0.033)	(0.038)	(0.064)	(0.040)	(0.048)	(0.068)
Metro	-0.12	-0.05	-1.70**	-0.01	0.04	-0.35	-0.36**	-0.09	-1.00**
	(0.135)	(0.139)	(0.739)	(0.119)	0.130)	((0.338)	(0.155)	(0.187)	(0.313)
HHI sector 10	-3.28	-2156.16***	-1466.79***	21.58	-1124.97***	-583.75**	-30.51***	-3416.29***	-2949.09***
	(0.000)	(187.120)	(549.700)	(0.000)	(124.868)	(253.673)	(5.141)	(296.045)	(898.582)
Observations	1504	1031	473	1564	1049	515	2177	1194	983

TABLE 10

Second stage Heckman for 1991, 1995 and 1999

Dependent variable: Log R&D expenditures			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	1991	1995	1999
Log foreign sales	0.47***	0.65***	0.51***
	(0.073)	(0.077)	(0.064)
Log domestic sales	0.45***	0.40***	0.31***
	(0.061)	(0.047)	(0.031)
Capital intensity	0.16***	0.36	0.41**
	(0.047)	(0.267)	(0.202)
Highly educated, share	5.49***	6.27***	4.64***
	(0.659)	(0.702)	(0.464)
Foreign ownership			-0.20**
			(0.089)
Constant	-2.57	-3.66***	-0.40
	(1.629)	(1.347)	(0.982)
Uncensored observations	310	515	341
Censored observations	1194	1049	1836
Lambda	0.97***	1.71***	0.83***
	(0.350)	(0.425)	(0.247)
T-test log foreign sales = log domestic sales (p-value)	0.790	0.003	0.006
T-test log foreign sales + log domestic sales = 1 (p-value)	0.506	0.594	0.012

Standard errors in parentheses. ***, **, * Coefficients are significant on the 1, 5 and 10 % levels respectively. Sector dummies not reported.

TABLE 11

Second stage Heckman for manufacturing and service sectors respectively, for 1991, 1995 and 1999

Dependent variable: Log R&D expenditures						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	1991 - M	1991 - S	1995 - M	1995 - S	1999 - M	1999 - S
Log foreign sales	0.48***	0.30	0.66***	0.14	0.66***	0.09
	(0.073)	(0.273)	(0.069)	(0.093)	(0.074)	(0.068)
Log domestic sales	0.47***	-0.27	0.39***	0.23***	0.27***	0.30***
	(0.064)	(0.357)	(0.041)	(0.067)	(0.034)	(0.066)
Capital intensity	0.16***	-0.40	0.38	0.35	0.15	0.69**
	(0.046)	(3.867)	(0.300)	(0.522)	(0.264)	(0.344)
Highly educated, share	5.45***	1.63	5.62***	3.16***	4.55***	2.17***
	(0.635)	(1.636)	(0.539)	(1.222)	(0.425)	(0.841)
Foreign ownership					-0.19**	-0.12
					(0.093)	(0.226)
Constant	-4.02**	6.91*	-5.85***	3.02	-3.84***	5.15***
	(1.686)	(3.549)	(1.277)	(2.371)	(1.193)	(1.760)
Uncensored observations	298	12	447	68	278	63
Censored observations	733	461	602	447	916	920
Lambda	0.92***	0.95	1.22***	0.03	0.92***	-0.96**
	(0.333)	(1.002)	(0.333)	(0.685)	(0.227)	(0.435)
T-test log foreign sales = log domestic sales (p-value)	0.922	0.339	0.000	0.486	0.000	0.044
T-test log foreign sales + log domestic sales = 1 (p-value)	0.644	0.000	0.558	0.000	0.348	0.000

Standard errors in parentheses. ***, **, * Coefficients are significant on the 1, 5 and 10 % levels respectively. Sector dummies not reported.