IDB WORKING PAPER SERIES No. IDB-WP-205

Public Programs to Promote Firms' Export in Developing Countries:

Are There Heterogeneous Effects by Size Categories?

Christian Volpe Martincus
Jerónimo Carballo
Pablo M. García

August 2010

Inter-American Development Bank
Integration and Trade Sector

Public Programs to Promote Firms' Export in Developing Countries:

Are There Heterogeneous Effects by Size Categories?

Christian Volpe Martincus
Jerónimo Carballo
Pablo M. García

Inter-American Development Bank

Inter-American Development Bank
2010

Cataloging-in-Publication data provided by the
Inter-American Development Bank
Felipe Herrera Library

Volpe Martincus, Christian.
Public programs to promote firms' exports in developing countries : are there heterogeneous effects by size categories? / Christian Volpe Martincus, Jerónimo Carballo, Pablo García.
p. cm. (IDB working paper series ; 205)
Includes bibliographical references.
1. Foreign trade promotion—Argentina. 2. Export trading companies—Argentina. 3. Exports—Argentina. I. Carballo, Jerónimo. II. Inter-American Development Bank. Integration and Trade Sector. III. Title. IV. Series.
HF1509.V65 2010

Correspondence Address: Inter-American Development Bank, Stop W0610, 1300 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20577, United States of America. E-mail: christianv@iadb.org. Tel.: +1 202 623 3199. Fax: +1 202 623 2995

Abstract ♦

Several countries have implemented programs to support their firms' internationalization efforts. Their impacts are likely to be heterogeneous over firm size categories because these programs are primarily intended and expected to benefit smaller companies. Whether this is or not the case is still an open question. In this paper we aim at filling this gap in the literature by providing evidence on the effects of trade promotion programs on the export performance of firms within different size segments using a rich firm-level dataset for Argentina over the period 2002-2006. We find that these effects are indeed larger for smaller firms.

Keywords: Public Programs, Export Promotion, Heterogeneous Effects, Argentina
JEL-Code: F13, F14, L15, L25, D21, H32, H43.

♦ This version: July 2009. The final version of this paper has been accepted for publication at *Applied Economics*. We would like to thank the Monitoring Unit of Foreign Trade at the Secretary for Industry, Trade, and SMEs (UMCE-SICP); AFIP; and Fundación ExportAR who kindly provided us with export, employment, and assistance data for Argentinean firms. We owe gratitude to Alberto Barreix for his unconditional support in helping us build up the dataset used in this paper, Oscar Mitnik who generously shared with us his code to implement the nonparametric tests of treatment effect heterogeneity; Juan Blyde and Mauricio Mesquita Moreira for insightful and useful comments; and Markus Frölich, José Martinez, and Jeffrey Racine for valuable background suggestions. The views and interpretation in this document are strictly those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Inter-American Development Bank, its executive directors, its member countries; the Secretary for Industry, Trade, and SMEs; AFIP; or Fundación ExportAR, Usual disclaimers apply.

1 Introduction

Many countries around the world have established public agencies that perform activities to promote their firms' exports. These agencies are endowed with annual budgets ranging from a few hundred thousand dollars as in Uruguay to more than hundred millions as in Spain (see Jordana et al., 2009). Allegedly, their activities aim at correcting market failures associated with information spillovers originated in successful searches of business opportunities abroad (see, e.g., Rauch, 1996).[1] In particular, supporting small and medium-sized companies (SMEs) in their incursion in international markets is a common goal of export promotion agencies as declared by their lead officials and even in their legal statements of purposes. Indeed, these companies are more likely to be affected by barriers to exporting, in general, and those related to imperfect information, in particular, and accordingly appear as the primary beneficiaries of public trade promotion programs. Hence, the valued added by such programs to the firms' own internationalization efforts can be expected to differ depending on their size. In other words, heterogeneous effects of export assistance actions over firm size categories can be anticipated. Is this really the case? Although there are some previous attempts to uncover the distributional impacts of export promotion programs (see, e.g., Volpe Martincus and Carballo, 2009), there is virtually no study that systematically examines whether there is a relationship between the size of the firms as conventionally measured in public policy (i.e., number of employees) and the size of these impacts.[2] This paper aims at filling this gap in the literature. We assess whether the effects of trade supporting activities by Argentina's national agency Fundación ExportAR on firms' export performance varies with their size and, specifically, whether these effects are larger for smaller companies, in accordance to both what it could be expected *a priori* given the differential deterring impacts of export obstacles for firms featuring different scales of production and what policymakers usually declare regarding whom these activities are primarily intended to benefit. In doing this, we use a rich dataset including highly disaggregated export as well

[1] Some authors argue, in addition, that informational asymmetries provide a rationale for trade policy (see, e.g., Mayer, 1984; Grossman and Horn, 1986; Bagwell and Staiger, 1989).

[2] Volpe Martincus and Carballo (2009) estimate quantile treatment effects of trade promotion programs managed by PROCHILE thus examining how their impact varies over the distribution of the relevant export outcomes.

as export assistance and employment data for (almost) the whole population of Argentinean exporters over the period 2002-2006.[3]

Relevant, accurate, and timely information is a key input to effective marketing decisions. Given the diversity of business environments, the multiplicity of factors to be considered when selling abroad, and, in particular, the need to deal with elements not involved in domestic operations, this is especially true for firms transcending national boundaries (see Czinkota and Ronkainen, 2001; and Leonidou and Theodosiu, 2004). A shortfall of information can accordingly cause major marketing difficulties and can therefore erect a barrier to increased international activities (see Suárez-Ortega, 2003). In fact, lack of information is one of the most relevant export barriers both in terms of frequency appearance and degree of severity (see, e.g., Leonidou, 1995). In particular, many firms tend to find hard to locate and analyze foreign markets, which involves both knowledge of the sources of information and ability to retrieve complete and updated international market data; learn about foreign business practices and foreign consumer preferences; identify business opportunities abroad; contact and communicate with overseas customers; and access appropriate distribution and advertising channels (see, e.g., Rabino, 1980; Albaum, 1983; Czinkota and Ricks, 1983; Katiskeas and Morgan, 1994; and Leonidou, 2004). Most of these information problems are perceived to have high to very high impact on exporting (see, e.g., Keng and Jiuan, 1988; Katsikeas and Morgan, 1994; Suárez-Ortega, 2003; Leonidou, 2004).

Export promotion agencies run a variety of programs intending to help firms overcome these informational barriers. This is precisely the case of Fundación ExportAR.[4] This agency underneath the Ministry of Foreign Relations and International Trade has about 85 employees and an annual budget of approximately 4.5 millions dollars (see Jordana et al., 2009). These resources are used to finance a series of activities aiming at supporting firms in selling their goods in foreign markets, including training on the export process to firms that are new to the trade business; market intelligence to generate relevant background information and uncover specific commercial opportunities abroad; organizing and co-financing the participation of Argentinean firms in

[3] Section 3 includes a precise description of our dataset and its coverage.
[4] An appendix explaining the institutional organization of Fundación ExportAR and describing the export promotion programs that this agency runs is available from the authors request.

international marketing events such as trade fairs, exhibitions, and missions; arranging meetings with potential foreign buyers; and supporting the association of small companies to operate more effectively in external markets.

Smaller firms face greater limitations than larger firms in trading across borders (see, e.g., Roberts and Tybout, 1997; Bernard and Jensen, 1999, 2004; and Wagner, 2001, 2007). These differences across firm-sizes are likely to be at least partially related to heterogeneity in access to and ability to use information.[5] More concretely, information gathering and communication with foreign markets seem to be greater obstacles for smaller than for larger firms (see, e.g., Katsikeas and Morgan, 1994). Thus, for instance, collecting information requires performing market studies which entail fixed costs. Larger firms are in a better position to absorb these costs because they can distribute them over a greater number of units and can accordingly elicit by themselves the information needed to formulate an effective export market strategy from such studies (see Wagner 1995, 2001).[6] Furthermore, others' information on the companies which are critical inputs for business decisions such as that concerning reliability as a provider and the quality of their products is likely to be poorer for smaller firms.

Given that information-related impediments are likely to have differential deterring effects for firms with different sizes, we can conceivably think that given trade supporting actions may potentially have heterogeneous impacts on firms' export performance over size categories. However, so far there is no empirical evidence on whether this is indeed the case. More precisely, the existing empirical literature includes both studies that have examined the effects of public policies on firm export behavior without discriminating among firms with different sizes (see, e.g., Girma et al., 2007; Görg et al., 2008; and Volpe Martincus and Carballo, 2008a) and analyses of these effects that exclusively focus on small and medium-sized companies generally based on small samples (see, e.g., Denis and Depelteau, 1985; Howard and Borgia, 1990; Moini, 1998, Gencturk and Kotabe, 2001; Álvarez, 2004; Francis and Collins-Dodd, 2004;

[5] Other factors that may also play a role are, e.g., the ability to cope with other sunk cost of entry such as those originated in setting up an export department or redesigning products for foreign customers and differences in access to management capability and financial resources in capital markets.

[6] Hirsch and Adar (1974) show that large firms can afford to assume more risks than small ones. Further, their risks from foreign operations are less than those of small firms because the large firms benefit from economies of scale in foreign marketing. Hence, the risk premium demanded by large firms from foreign marketing is less than the premium insisted upon by small firms. As a result the former export a larger fraction of their output.

Wilkinson and Brouthers, 2006), but no systematic examination of the potential existence of different effects for firms in different size segments as conventionally defined in public policy, i.e., in terms of employment levels.[7] In this paper we precisely aim at providing insights on these effects. Hence, we contribute to the existing literature by primarily assessing, for the first time to our knowledge, whether and how the effects of public programs of export promotion on firms' export performance vary with firm size, either for a developed or a developing country. This analysis allows ascertaining whether such public interventions are overall well targeted as policymakers will tend to evaluate differently two programs with the same average positive effect but whose benefits are mostly accruing to smaller firms in the first case and to larger firms in the second case. Henceforth, this information is extremely relevant from an economic policy point of view as it can help guide the allocation of resources invested in export promotion and thereby enhance the design of existing policies.

We specifically address three main questions: Are trade promotion programs effective in improving firms' export performance? Are impacts of these programs heterogeneous across firm size categories? Are these impacts larger for smaller firms? In answering these questions, we apply variants of the difference-in-differences approach on a rich firm-level dataset primarily containing data on exports by product and destination countries and employment over the period 2002-2006 for the virtually whole population of Argentinean exporters.

We find that export promotion programs administered by Fundación ExportAR have been effective in favoring the growth of Argentinean firms' exports, primarily along the country-extensive margin, i.e., the number of destination markets. Importantly, these programs do not seem to have affected all firms to the same extent. More specifically, as expected, smaller companies derive larger benefits from these public initiatives than larger firms in terms of improved export performance. Thus, trade supporting actions are associated with increased rate of growth of total exports and number of countries in the case of small and medium-sized companies, but they do not seem to have any distinguishable impact on the export outcomes of large firms. These results are robust

[7] Most of these studies show that smaller-sized firms seem to benefit from export assistance programs. However, it should be mentioned that this literature is far away from having reached a clear consensus, as some authors claim that evidence on effectiveness of export promotion activities is limited and inconclusive (see, e.g., Seringhaus, 1986; and Kotabe and Czinkota, 1992).

across alternative specifications of the estimating equations and to using different econometric methods.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 explains the empirical methodology. Section 3 presents the dataset and descriptive evidence. Section 4 reports and discusses the econometric results, and Section 5 concludes.

2 Empirical Methodology

We aim at estimating the effects of trade promotion assistance provided by Fundación ExportAR on Argentinean firms' export performance and assessing whether these effects are heterogeneous across firms within different size categories. In order to identify such effects, one would need to compare a firm's export behavior when receiving export support with that when not receiving such a support. Since export outcomes under both states cannot be simultaneously observed for the same firm, the individual treatment effect can never be observed. This is the so-called *fundamental problem of causal inference* (see Holland, 1986). Furthermore, notice that the policy intervention under examination is not a randomized trial. We therefore resort below to non-experimental methods that reproduce the missing counterfactual under reasonable conditions thus allowing estimating the aforementioned effects.

Formally, let Y_{it} be (the natural logarithm of) firm *i*'s total exports in year *t*.[8] Each year firm *i* may either participate in export promotion programs ("1") or not participate in these programs ("0"), but not both. Hence, firm *i* has two potential export outcomes: Y_{it}^1 and Y_{it}^0, which correspond to the participation and non-participation states, respectively. Further, let D_{it} be an indicator codifying information on assistance by *Fundación ExportAR*. Specifically, D_{it} takes the value 1 if firm *i* has been assisted by the agency in

[8] The use of (natural) logarithm is partially motivated by the scale problem originated in the fact that our binary variable *D* does not capture the size of the assistance (see Lach, 2002). The presentation hereafter focuses on firms' total exports, but *mutatis mutandis* also applies to measures of export performance along the extensive margin (number of destination countries and the number of products exported) and the intensive margin (average exports per country, average exports per product, and average exports per country and product).

year *t* and 0 otherwise.[9] In this case, firm *i*'s observed export outcome can be expressed as follows:[10]

$$Y_{it} = D_{it}Y_{it}^{1} + (1 - D_{it})Y_{it}^{0} \tag{1}$$

and the impact of trade support is therefore given by: $\Delta Y_{it} = Y_{it}^{1} - Y_{it}^{0}$. Since it is impossible to observe Y_{it}^{1} and Y_{it}^{0} for the same unit, the population of firms is generally used to learn about the properties of the potential outcomes and compute an average treatment effect. More specifically, when participation in the programs under consideration is voluntary, it seems more relevant to determine their effects on those who participated and accordingly an average treatment effect on the treated is estimated:

$$\gamma = E\left(Y_{it}^{1} \mid D_{it} = 1\right) - E\left(Y_{it}^{0} \mid D_{it} = 1\right) = E\left(\Delta Y_{it} \mid D_{it} = 1\right) \tag{2}$$

The parameter γ measures the average rate of change in exports between the actual exports of those firms that have been assisted by Fundación ExportAR and the exports of these had they not been assisted by Fundación ExportAR (see Lach, 2002). Clearly, when $\gamma \rangle 0 \,(= 0)$, the export promotion service stimulates (does not have any impact on) firms' exports.

In the empirical exercise below we use the firms that do not receive a service from *Fundación ExportAR* as the control group to derive the counterfactual and accordingly estimate γ. The main issue to deal with when proceeding so is that there may be non-random differences between supported and non-supported firms that are potentially correlated with export performance (see Galiani et al., 2008; and Volpe Martincus and Carballo, 2008a). Failure to account for these differences would clearly produce a selection bias in estimated impacts (see, e.g., Heckman et al., 1998; Klette et al., 2000). Thus, firm heterogeneous characteristics need to be controlled for get comparable groups of firms and a consistent estimate of γ.[11] Notice that many of these characteristics (e.g.,

[9] We will use interchangeably assistance, support, treatment, and participation throughout the paper.

[10] This is the potential outcomes framework due to, among others, Fisher (1935), Roy (1951), and Rubin (1974).

[11] In this exercise, we ignore general equilibrium effects so that outcomes for each firm do not depend on the overall level of participation in the activities performed by the agency (see Heckman et al., 1998). Further, we do not consider information spillovers either. It is well known that firms may learn about export opportunities from other firms through employee circulation, customs documents, customer lists, and other referrals (see Rauch, 1996). Evidence on spillovers has been presented in several papers, e.g., Aitken et al. (1997), Greenaway et al. (2004), and Álvarez et al. (2007). Thus, Aitken et al. (1997) and Greenaway et al. (2004) report significant spillovers from multinational enterprises (MNEs) to domestic firms in Mexico and the United Kingdom, respectively. More precisely, MNE activity is positively related to export propensity of local firms. Álvarez et al. (2007) find that the probability that firms introduce given products to new countries or different products to the same countries increases with the number of firms exporting those products and to those destinations, respectively. If these spillovers would be associated with participation in export promotion activities, i.e., untreated firms obtain business information from treated firms, then the treatment effects, as estimated here, would be underestimated.

sector of activity, location of headquarters, etc) are likely to be fixed over time, especially over relatively short horizons such as those considered here. When repeated observations on firms are available, this time-invariant heterogeneity can be properly accounted for using the *difference-in-differences* estimator. This estimator is a measure of the difference between the before and after change in exports for assisted firms and the corresponding change for non assisted firms (see Smith, 2000; Jaffe, 2002). The latter change serves here as an estimate of the true counterfactual, i.e., the export behavior that the firms in the treatment group would have experienced if they had not received trade promotion support, which allows identifying temporal variations in outcomes that are not due to exposure to treatment (see Abadie, 2005). Hence, by comparing the aforementioned changes, the difference-in-differences estimator permits controlling for observed and unobserved time-invariant firm characteristics as well as time-varying factors common to both treated and control firms that might be correlated with participation in export promotion programs and export outcomes (see, e.g., Galiani et al., 2008).

In general, in order to calculate standard errors and perform weighted estimations aiming at addressing potential biases of this estimator, a regression approach is used to implement it (see Ravallion, 2008). Thus, allowing for covariates *X* and assuming that the conditional expectation function $E(Y \mid X, D)$ is linear and that unobserved characteristics, μ_{it}, can be decomposed into a firm-specific fixed-effect, λ_i; a year, common macroeconomic effect, ρ_t; and a temporary firm specific effect, ε_{it}, leads to the following error-components specification:

$$Y_{it} = X_{it}\theta + \gamma D_{it} + \lambda_i + \rho_t + \varepsilon_{it} \qquad (3)$$

This specification allows selection into treatment on unobservable characteristics thus permitting for correlation between time-invariant firm-specific and time-specific effects and D_{it}, the binary variable indicating assistance by Fundación ExportAR. Identification of the effects is therefore based on the assumption that selection into the treatment is independent of the temporary firm-specific effect. We estimate this equation on the whole sample and, to create a common "baseline" before-treatment period, on two alternative sub-samples, namely, the sub-samples formed by those firms that were never treated before or those that were not treated in the previous period (see Lach, 2002).

Estimation of Equation (3) can be potentially affected by severe serial correlation problems (see Bertrand, et al., 2004). First, estimation of this kind of equations relies on non-trivial time series. Second, exports (and number of countries and products as well) tend to be highly positively serially correlated (see, e.g., Roberts and Tybout, 1997; Bernard and Jensen, 2004). We therefore allow for an unrestricted covariance structure over time within firms, which may differ across them (see Bertrand et al., 2004).

Importantly, so far we have assumed a common treatment effect, i.e., $\gamma = \gamma_i \forall i$. However, as discussed in Section 1, effects can be anticipated to systematically vary with firm size. More formally, they are likely to be heterogeneous by observed covariates. We therefore test whether this is the case using the non-parametric test proposed by Crump et al. (2008). This test is based on a sieve approach to non-parametric estimation for average treatment effects (see, e.g., Hahn, 1998; Imbens et al., 2006; Chen et al., 2008). Given the particular choice of the sieve, the null hypothesis of interest can be formulated as equality restrictions on subsets of the parameters. Specifically, in our case, the null hypothesis is that the average treatment effect conditional on the covariates is identical for all subpopulations. If heterogeneity were to be detected, then the correct specification of the estimating equation would be (see Djebbari and Smith, 2008):

$$Y_{it} = X_{it}\theta + (\gamma + \gamma_X X_{it})D_{it} + \lambda_i + \rho_t + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (4)$$

In Section 4 we estimate Equation (3) and, since we do find evidence of impact heterogeneity, we also estimate Equation (4) for both the whole sample and the two sub-samples with common pre-intervention states.

3 Data and Descriptive Evidence

Our dataset combines three main databases. The first database has annual firm-level export data disaggregated by product (at the 10-digit HS level) and destination country over the period 2002-2006 from Argentinean customs. Second, Fundación ExportAR kindly provided us with a list of the firms assisted by the agency in each year of the period 2002-2006. It is worth mentioning that this list primarily includes firms that have

interacted closely with the agency.[12] Finally, we have data on employment and location from the National Administration of Public Revenues, AFIP.[13] These databases have been merged using the firms' tax ID. We have been granted access to the combined dataset after these IDs had been removed and replaced with generic firm identifiers. This dataset covers almost the whole population of Argentinean exporters. In particular, the sum of these firms' exports virtually adds up to the total merchandise exports as reported by the National Statistical Office INDEC, with the annual difference being always less than 4.0%, and the total number of destination countries and products exported are virtually the same.

Table 1 presents the evolution of aggregate export indicators from 2002 to 2006. Exports grew approximately 81.0% between 2002 and 2006. Even though there have been increases in the number of countries the firms export to and the number of products exported, most of this expansion is accounted for by a larger intensive margin, i.e., larger average shipments by product and country.

The first panel of Table 2 characterizes the average Argentinean exporter over the sample period. The number of exporters rose 19.2% from 2002 to 2006. These firms have on average 92 employees. The average exporter sells abroad 9.2 products to 3.6 countries. These figures are similar to those of the United States in 2000 but larger than those of Peru in 2005, 8.9 and 3.5 and 7.5 and 2.6, respectively (see Bernard et al., 2005; and Volpe Martincus and Carballo, 2008b). The proportion of exporters assisted by Fundación ExportAR has moved up from 1.5% to 4.2% over the period, which, given the larger presence of Argentinean firms in export markets, implies a significant increase in the absolute number of firms being supported.

Second to fourth panels of Table 2 present basic statistics on the relationship between size and exports for Argentina. Specifically, this table breaks down the export and treatment indicators into three size categories defined in terms of employment: up to 50 employees (small), between 51 and 200 employees (medium), and more than 200

[12] More concretely, these firms have had more than one direct contact with Fundación ExportAR within the year being considered. The typical cases are those that participated in international fairs and missions. Thus, for instance, firm just visiting the agency's website to access public reports on foreign trade or requesting specific information (e.g., tariff applied on a given good in a certain destination country) are not identified as assisted. Data on these assistances are unfortunately not consistently available over the sample period.

[13] These data can then be seen as a census of formal Argentinean employment. There is of course some risk of misreporting, which would generate measurement errors. As long as these are systematic across firms, they will be eliminated by the time differentiation implemented in the estimation methods used in this paper.

employees (large).[14] We observe that, on average, larger firms export more; they export to more countries and more products.[15] These firms explain together more than 75% of aggregate exports. In turn, small firms account for approximately 73% of the exporters and account for 7.8% of Argentinean total exports. In addition, these firms represent the largest category in the group of firms assisted by Fundación ExportAR, i.e., 56.1% in 2002 and 59.0% in 2006 and together, small and medium-sized firms, explain for more than 80% of the firms supported by this agency over the period.

Figures 1 and 2 provide a detailed visual representation of the distribution of firms' exports discriminating over size categories for the final sample year, 2006, thus going beyond the simple averages presented before. Figure 1 shows that most Argentinean exporters are small firms selling abroad a few goods to a few countries. In particular, approximately 60% of the exporters are small companies trading less than 10 products to less than 10 countries and, remarkably, about 20% are small firms exporting just one good to one external market. Further, 37.6% of the exporting companies are small ones that only trade with one country and 23.0% are similar firms that only ship one product abroad. In contrast, the fewer large firms have more diversified export patterns along both the country and product dimensions. Thus, in 2006 these companies trade with up 118 countries and up to 510 goods. Figure 2 reveals that these firms account for the larger shares of Argentinean total exports. More specifically, in 2006, the 303 large companies that exported more than 10 products to more than 10 countries explained 64.7% of aggregate exports as reported in our dataset.

In this section, we have presented basic evidence of export outcomes for the companies engaged in international trade and on the amount and profile of the firms assisted by Fundación ExportAR. We will next econometrically explore whether and how trade promotion programs run by this agency have affected these export outcomes both overall and across different firm size categories.

[14] This is the standard classification used in the literature (see, e.g., Álvarez, 2004; Hollenstein, 2005; and Observatorio PyME, 2008).

4 Econometric Results

In this section we first present the estimation results when pooling over all firms. In particular, we report the average assistance effect of trade support programs on the assisted firms as obtained with the difference-in-differences estimator from both the whole sample and the two sub-samples with common pre-intervention states for the two groups of firms. Second, we assess whether there is impact heterogeneity and evaluate the effectiveness of these programs for the three firm size categories previously identified, small, medium, and large. Finally, we go through several robustness check exercises.

4.1 Average Assistance Effect

The top panel of Table 3 reports difference-in-difference estimates of the average treatment effects on the treated, i.e., the average effect of assistance by Fundación ExportAR on assisted firms for six firm's export performance indicators, namely, total exports, the number of destination countries, the number of products exported, average exports per country and product, average exports per country, and average export per product, for two alternative specifications, with and without time-varying (one year lagged) binary variables accounting for the firm's size category.[16] The adjusted-R^2*s* of these regressions range between 0.825 and 0.894, with an average of 0.857.

The estimated treatment effects are similar in order of magnitude across specifications, but, as expected, they are smaller when these firm level time-varying covariates are included. Overall the estimates clearly suggest that participation in export promotion programs managed by Fundación ExportAR is associated with an increased rate of growth of firm's total exports, number of countries the firms export to, and number of products exported. In particular, according to the specification including the

[15] This adds to the evidence reported in the empirical international trade literature suggesting that larger firms are more likely to export (see, e.g., Roberts and Tybout, 1997; Bernard and Jensen, 2004), tend to export more (see, e.g., Görg et al., 2007), and have a higher export intensity (see, e.g., Barrios et al., 2003).

[16] There might be other attributes that are, unfortunately, not observable to us but are observable to both Fundación ExportAR officials and firms. Typical examples in this regard are the managerial attitudes, qualification profile of personnel, and innovation capabilities. Admittedly, these unobserved characteristics may play a role in determining both service usage and export performance. Notice, however, that these features only change slowly over time. Given the length of our sample period, they can be safely considered as mostly fixed and therefore controlled by the firm fixed effects.

binary variables that control for the companies' size, the rate of growth of exports is 14.1% (($e^{0.132}$-1)x100=14.01) higher for firms assisted by Fundación ExportAR, while those of the number of countries and the number of products are 10.4% (($e^{0.099}$-1)x100=10.4) and 9.7% (($e^{0.093}$-1)x100=9.7) higher, respectively. Thus, for instance, the sample average (logarithm) annual growth rate of total exports is 11.9%, so this would imply that treated firms would have a rate 1.7 percentage points higher than non-treated firms. In contrast, the impact on the remaining export outcomes is substantially weaker and evidently less robust. These results are consistent with our priors. Export promotion activities aiming at attenuating information problems are likely to have a stronger effect when these problems are acuter, namely, when entering new markets rather than when expanding operations in already served markets.[17] Moreover, they are broadly similar to those found in Peru (see Volpe Martincus and Carballo, 2008b).

We then replicate these estimations on two alternative samples: first, we exclude those firms that have been assisted by Fundación ExportAR in the previous year; second, we exclude those firms that have been assisted by Fundación ExportAR (at least once) in the past. This allows us to generate a common before treatment period and to consider a more homogeneous set of firms in this period.[18] Estimation results are shown in the second and third panels of Table 3.[19] These results essentially confirm our main findings. Notice, however, that, in this case, the effect on product diversification appears to be weaker and less robust. Hence, export promotion programs seem to have been effective in facilitating an increase of firms' exports along the extensive margin, primarily in terms of destination countries, but not along the intensive margin.[20]

[17] In general, it can be expected that, over time, growth in the number of total destinations (products) will be associated with introduction of new trade partners (products). In particular, this is indeed the case in our sample.

[18] While the original sample corresponds to the period 2002-2006 and has 41,224 observations, these restricted samples only cover the period 2003-2006 and have 39,286 and 37,217 observations, respectively.

[19] The R^2s are similar to those reported for our benchmark estimations.

[20] It is well known that the conventional difference-in-differences estimator is based on the assumption that, in absence of the treatment, the average outcomes for firms participating in export promotion programs and firms not participating in these programs would have followed parallel paths over time, i.e., both average outcomes would have experience the same variation over time (see Abadie, 2005). This can be informally assessed by performing a so-called "placebo test". If we are accurately identifying the impact of these programs, we should see no difference between the average export outcomes of the treated and control groups in the pre-intervention period. We therefore compare the rate of change of each export indicator for firms that have been assisted in at least one sample year with those of non-assisted firms over periods in which the formers have not received yet their first assistance. More specifically, we carry out t-tests for differences in means for the logarithmic differences of the variables in question. Reassuringly, the relevant test statistics suggest that these differences are not significant, i.e., supported and never-supported firms seem to behave similarly when no participation in export promotion programs takes place. A table with these test statistics is available from the authors upon request.

So far we have assumed that trade promotion programs have a common effect for firms with different sizes and have accordingly just estimated an overall average treatment effect. As discussed before, these effects may be heterogeneous over size categories. In the next sub-section, we will explicitly investigate whether this is the case.

4.2 Are There Heterogeneous Effects by Firm Size Category?

In order to assess whether there are heterogeneous treatment effects by observed covariates, we use the non-parametric test proposed by Crump et al. (2008). This is formally a test for the null hypothesis that the average effect conditional on the covariates is identical for all subpopulations. The test statistics and the corresponding p-values under both the standard normal distribution and the approximation, the chi-squared distribution with degrees of freedom equal to the number of covariates minus one, obtained when applied to our data are presented in Table 4. These tests clearly indicate that there is indeed strong evidence of heterogeneity for all export outcomes, but for the growth of the number of products sold abroad.

We therefore turn to estimating Equation (4), which basically expands Equation (3) by adding interactions between the treatment indicator and the binary variables capturing firm size categories. The estimated coefficients on these interactions are presented in the first panel of Table 5. The estimation results suggest that the positive effects of export promotion programs administered by Fundación ExportAR on total exports and number of destination countries are clearly stronger for small and medium-sized firms. Thus, the growth rates of exports and number of countries are 10.7% (($e^{0.102}$-1)x100=10.7) and 10.4% (($e^{0.099}$-1)x100=10.4) higher, respectively, for small firms that have participated in these programs than for comparable non-participating firms. Similarly, these rates are 16.2% (($e^{0.150}$-1)x100=16.2) and 8.9% (($e^{0.085}$-1)x100=8.9) higher, respectively, for medium-sized companies assisted by Fundación ExportAR than for companies within the same size category that have not received this assistance. With average growth rates of total exports of 10.8% and 14.7% for small and medium-sized firms, these estimates mean that supported firms in these size segments would have rates 1.2 and 2.4 percentage point higher than non-supported pairs, respectively. Finally, we should stress herein that,

with the exception of a weak impact on the change in the number of goods sold abroad, no significant impacts are observed on the export outcomes of large firms.

As before, we replicate these estimations for the two sub-samples with common pre-intervention states, i.e., on the sample excluding for each year firms that have been assisted in the past, either in the year immediately before or in some other previous year. Results from these estimations are shown in the second and third panels of Table 5. They essentially confirm our main conclusions. Notice that now no significant effects are detected on the export performance of large firms.

Hence, in the previous sub-section we have seen that trade promotion actions performed by Fundación ExportAR help firms expand their total exports, primarily along the country-extensive margin. In this sub-section we have learned that these positive effects are mainly concentrated in small and medium-sized companies. This is also consistent with what one would expect *a priori*. As mentioned above, imperfect information is a more important deterrent for these kinds of companies, so that public programs aiming at overcoming limited information problems are more likely to benefit their export performance as compared with that of larger firms which in principle have the scale and resources to address these problems by themselves.

4.3 Robustness

In this subsection we examine the robustness of our findings to changes in the definitions of the firm types as well as to corrections for potential econometric problems performing several checks.

Although standard in the empirical literature, our segmentation of firm sizes admits of course alternatives.[21] We therefore explore whether our results are sensitive to slight variations in the thresholds delimiting the size categories. In particular, we re-estimate Equations (3) and (4) using the following specification of these categories: (i) large firms are those whose number of employees exceeds 250 and small firms are those whose number of employees does not exceed 40; (ii) larger firms are those whose number of employees exceeds 150 and small firms are those whose number of employees does not

[21] See, e.g., Wagner (1995), Argentinean Law 24.476/1995 (reformed), Burdisso et al. (2001), OECD (2005), and Gallup (2007).

exceed 60; and (iii) small and medium-sized firms are pooled together and large firms are defined are those whose number of number of employees exceeds 250.[22] We report the estimation results based on this size segmentation in Table 6. These results do not significantly differ from those presented before, which makes as confident that our estimates do not depend on the specific values used to discretize the distribution of employment levels.

Unbalance in the characteristics that are thought to be associated with the dynamics of the export outcome variables between the treated and control groups may create unparallel trajectories in these variables thus contaminating the difference-in-differences estimates (see Abadie, 2005). This would happen if a relevant covariate is omitted and thus the parametric models defined in Equations (3) and (4) are misspecified. This would be the case, for instance, with previous export experience. More concretely, participants in export promotion programs run by Fundación ExportAR may tend to have experienced exceptionally low (or high) exports, so that the process determining D_{it} would involve lagged dependent variables. Thus, if participation is more likely when a temporary fall in exports occurs just before going to the agency, then higher export growth should be expected among the treated, even without participation.[23] In this case, the difference-in-differences estimator is likely to overestimate the impact of the programs and would be inconsistent (see Blundell and Costa Dias, 2002).

A strategy that allows achieving some robustness to such kind of misspecification is the so-called *double robust estimation* (see, e.g., Robins and Rotznisky, 1995; Imbens, 2004; Imbens and Wooldridge, 2008: and Chen et al., 2009).[24] This consists of combining regression with weighting by the propensity score, in our case, the probability to participate in trade promotion activities organized by Fundación ExportAR conditional on observed covariates, including lagged export outcomes, i.e., lagged total exports, lagged number of destination countries, and lagged number of exported products. In particular, this estimator may eliminate remaining biases leading to a consistent estimate

[22] We have also performed estimations based on alternative definitions that only change one of the limits, namely, (i') large firms are those whose number of employees exceeds 250; (ii') small firms are those whose number of employees does not exceed 40; (iii') larger firms are those whose number of employees exceeds 150; (iv') small firms are those whose number of employees does not exceed 60. The estimation results are similar to those reported here and are available from the authors upon request.

[23] In the labor market literature this is known as Ashenfelter´s dip (see Ashenfelter, 1978).

[24] Estimators of treatment effects that weight on functions of the probability of treatment are based on the statistic proposed by Horvitz and Thompson (1952) (see Abadie, 2005).

of the treatment effect as long as the parametric model for the propensity score or the regression function is specified correctly (see Robins and Ritov, 1997).[25] Further, precision can be improved when covariates are incorporated to the regression function (see Imbens, 2004). Hence, as a robustness check, we also estimate Equations (3) and (4) with weights equal to unity for assisted firms and $\hat{P}(X)/1-\hat{P}(X)$ for non-assisted firms, where $\hat{P}(X)=P(D_i=1|X_i)$ is a consistent estimate of $P(X)$ and $0<\hat{P}(X)<1$ (see, e.g., Hirano and Imbens, 2001; Hirano et al., 2003; and Chen et al., 2009). Estimates of these equations, based on both the whole sample and two sub-samples excluding previously assisted firms, are presented in Table 7.[26] These estimates essentially convey the same message as those shown in Table 5.[27]

As additional robustness checks, we also compare our baseline estimates with those obtained using estimators that impose less parametric restrictions, namely, the semiparametric difference-in-differences estimator proposed by Abadie (2005) and the matching difference-in-differences estimator proposed among others by Blundell and Costa Dias (2002). In both cases, the initial step consists of estimating the propensity scores. In the second step, the before and after differences for assisted and non-assisted firms are re-weighted to account for their differences in the distribution of observed characteristics using the propensity scores.[28] In particular, the second estimator compares the change in exports of assisted firms with that of paired non-assisted firms as determined on the basis of their propensity scores and the significance of the resulting treatment effect is assessed using both analytical and bootstrapped standard errors.[29] We present the results from applying the aforementioned methods in Tables 8 and 9, respectively. These results also corroborate our main findings.

[25] More precisely, combining regression with weighting can lead to additional robustness by both removing the correlation between omitted variables and by reducing the correlation between omitted and included variables (see Imbens and Wooldridge, 2008).
[26] The estimation of the propensity score is discussed in detail in an appendix available from the authors upon request.
[27] Notice that, despite the fact that we are including lagged values controlling for previous export performance, these estimates are also based on the period 2002-2006 because we are using export data from 2001 as firms' export outcomes antecedents in 2002.
[28] These procedures also rely for identification on the assumption that there are no time-varying unobserved effects influencing selection into trade promotion programs and exports.
[29] We use here a result from Rosenbaum and Rubin (1983), according to which matching can be performed on the propensity score instead of on whose set of observable characteristics. This allows significantly reducing the dimensionality problem associated with comparison of multiple characteristics. Notice, however, that the propensity score is in fact based on fitting a parameter structure (probit or logit). It is therefore necessary to test whether the estimated propensity score is successful in balancing the values of covariates between matched treatment and comparison groups. We assess the matching quality using five alternative tests: the stratification test; the standardized differences test; the t-test for equality of means in the matched sample; the test for joint equality of means in the matched sample or Hotelling test; and the pseudo R^2 and the joint insignificance test of all regressors included in the propensity score specification (see, e.g., Smith and Todd, 2005b; Girma and Görg, 2007; and Caliendo and Kopeinig, 2008). These tests are reported in an appendix available from the authors upon request.

By using the propensity score as defined before, we are in principle able to control for firm size and previous export experience. However, there may be additional time-varying characteristics that are correlated with selection into trade promotion programs and export outcomes, thus generating a violation of the main identifying assumption behind the estimators used in this paper. We address below two important cases. First, the export promotion agency may prioritize specific sectors and specific destination countries in particular years. We account for this possibility adding two control variables in the propensity score, namely, for each firm-year we include the shares of exporters participating in export support programs in the main 2-digit sectors and in the main country market in which the firm is an active exporter, and re-estimating the assistance effects applying the methods that use this score, namely, weighted difference-in-differences, semiparametric difference-in-differences à la Abadie (2005), and matching difference-in-differences.

Second, a similar problem would arise if firms' changing mix of products results in different demand of promotion services over time. It is well known that firms selling abroad differentiated products tend to face more severe information problems. Thus, firms with an increasing share of these products in their export baskets are likely to resort to support. The same argument can apply to firms exporting to more sophisticated markets such as those of the OECD countries. Types of goods traded and destination may also contribute to shape export outcomes. Differentiated goods are heterogeneous both in terms of their characteristics and their quality. This interferes with the signaling function of prices thus creating trade frictions. This is especially important for firms from a developing country such as Argentina, whose products, due to national reputation effects, might be perceived by buyers as less technologically advanced and of poorer quality than those from developed countries (see, e.g., Chiang and Masson, 1988; Hudson and Jones, 2003).[30] Exigencies when exporting to well-known neighbor countries tend to be smaller for than those faced when exporting to distant, developed country markets. In this latter case, firms must undergo product upgrades as well as marketing upgrades to succeed in

[30] Export promotion activities are likely to have different effects on export performance over firms exporting good bundles with different degrees of differentiation and thus facing varying levels of information incompleteness (see Volpe Martincus and Carballo, 2008b).

exporting goods to these markets.[31] We therefore include the lagged ratio of exports of differentiated products as defined in terms of the liberal version of the classification proposed by Rauch (1999) to firms' total exports and the lagged ratio of exports to OECD countries also to firms' total exports, and re-estimate the program relative effects using the propensity score based-procedures. Estimation results based on these two modified versions of the propensity score are fully consistent with our baseline estimates.[32]

To sum up, there is strong robust evidence that trade supporting programs managed by Fundación ExportAR have promoted Argentinean firms' export growth mainly by facilitating an increase in the number of countries they sell to. However, these effects do not distribute uniformly over firm size categories. More concretely, as expected, the positive impacts are primarily observed in small and medium-sized companies.

5 Concluding Remarks

Trade impediments such as informational barriers may affect differently firms with different sizes. In particular, they are likely to have stronger deterring effects on smaller companies because they lack the scale and thus the resources to perform the gathering and disseminating activities by themselves. Public programs aiming at addressing such information problems implemented in several countries around the world can therefore be expected to have larger impacts on these firms' export performance than on that of large firms. In fact, smaller companies are the declared primary beneficiaries of these public interventions. Even though the overall effectiveness of these trade promotion initiatives has been documented and there is some partial and limited evidence on their specific effects on small and medium-sized enterprises, the empirical literature is still silent on whether these effects are heterogeneous over firm size categories as conventionally defined by policymakers, i.e., in term of employment levels. Knowing this is critical to assess to what extent these public activities are well targeted. In this paper, we contribute to this literature by carefully examining whether and how export promotion programs

[31] Properly shaping the marketing strategy to meet these markets' requirements is an information-intensive activity. For instance, firms need to learn and understand the preferences of foreign consumers; the nature of competition in foreign markets; the structure of distribution networks, and the requirements, incentives and constraints of the distributors (see, e.g., Artopoulos et al., 2007).

executed by Argentina's national agency Fundación ExportAR affect export outcomes of firms belonging to different size segments. In doing this, we have performed conventional difference-in-differences estimation along with several variants of this method on a rich dataset including firm-level data on exports by product and country of destination and employment for virtually whole population of Argentinean exporters.

We find that indeed these public programs have non-uniform effects over the size distribution of firms. They seem to be well targeted in the sense that significant effects are only registered for small and medium-sized companies. More specifically, support from Fundación ExportAR seem to have resulted in increased exports from firms within these size categories and this has mainly taken place through an expansion of the set of destination countries. This is consistent with our priors since information barriers tend to be more severe when attempting to enter new export markets than when pursuing to expand exports to countries that are already among firms' destination markets and, as referred to above, their trade inhibiting effects are especially strong for smaller business units.

[32] Detailed tables reporting these estimation results are available from the authors upon request.

References

Abadie, A., 2005. Semiparametric difference-in-differences estimators. Review of Economic Studies, 72.

Aharoni, Y., 1966. The foreign direct investment decision process. Harvard Graduate School of Business Administration. Boston.

Ahmed, Z; Mohamed, O.; Johnson, J.; and Meng, L., 2002. Export promotion programs of Malaysian firms: International marketing perspective. Journal of Business Research, 55, 10.

Aitken, B.; Hanson, G.; and Harrison, A., 1997. Spillovers, foreign investment, and export behavior. Journal of International Economics, 43, 1-2.

Albaum, G., 1983. Effectiveness of government export assistance for U.S. smaller-sized manufacturers: Some further evidence. International Marketing Review, 1,1.

Álvarez, R., 2004. Sources of export success in small- and medium-sized enterprises: The impact of public programs. International Business Review, 13.

Álvarez, R.; Faruq, H.; and López, R., 2007. New products in export markets: Learning from experience and learning from others. Indiana University, mimeo.

Angrist, J. and Krueger, A., 1999. Empirical strategies in labor economics, in Ashenfelter, O. and Card, D. (eds), Handbook of Labor Economics. Elsevier.

Arnold, J. and Javorcik, B., 2005. Gifted kids or pushy parents? Foreign acquisitions and plant performance in Indonesia. CEPR Discussion Paper 3193.

Artopoulos, A.; Friel, D.; and Hallak, J., 2007. Challenges of exporting differentiated products to developed countries: The case of SME-dominated sectors in a semi-industrialized country. Paper prepared in the framework of the project “The emergence of new successful export activities in Latin America”, Inter-American Development Bank.

Ashenfelter, O., 1978. Estimating the effect of training programs on earnings. Review of Economics and Statistics, 67.

Bagwell, K. and Staiger, R., 1989. The role of export subsidies when quality is unknown. Journal of International Economics, 27, 1-2.

Barrios, S.; Görg, H.; and Strobl, E., 2003. Exporting firms' export behaviour: R&D, spillovers, and destination market. Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics, 65.

Becker, S. and Ichino, A., 2002. Estimation of average treatment effects based on propensity scores. STATA Journal, 2, 4.

Becker, S. and Egger, P., 2007. Endogenous product versus process innovation and a firm's propensity to export. Ludwig-Maximilian-Universität München, mimeo.

Bernard, A. and Jensen, B., 1999. Exceptional exporter performance: Cause, effect, or both? Journal of International Economics, 47, 1.

Bernard, A. and Jensen, B., 2004. Why some firms export? Review of Economics and Statistics, 86, 2.

Bernard, A.; Jensen, B.; and Schott, P., 2005. Importers, exporters, and multinationals: A portrait of firms in the U.S. that trade goods. NBER Working Paper 11404.

Bernard, A.; Redding, S.; and Schott, P., 2006. Multi-product firms and product switching. NBER Working Paper 12293.

Bertrand, M.; Duflo, E.; and Mullainathan, S., 2004. How much should we trust difference-in-differences estimates? Quarterly Journal of Economics.

Blundell, R. and Costa Dias, M., 2002. Alternative approaches to evaluation in empirical microeconomics. CEMMAP Working Paper CWP10/02.

Burdisso, T.; D'Amato, L.; Escudé, G.; and McCandless, G., 2001. How much do SMEs borrow from the Banking System in Argentina? Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Asociación Argentina de Economía Política, Buenos Aires.

Caliendo, M. and Kopeinig, S., 2008. Some practical guidance for the implementation of propensity score matching. Journal of Economic Surveys, 22, 1.

Chen, X.; Hong, H.; and Tarozzi, A., 2008. Semiparametric efficiency in GMM models with auxiliary data. The Annals of Statistics, 36.

Chen, S.; Mu, R.; and Ravallion, M., 2009. Are there lasting impacts of aid to poor areas? Journal of Public Economics, forthcoming.

Chiang, S. and Masson, R., 1988. Domestic industrial structure amd export quality. International Economic Review, 29, 2.

Crump, R.; Hotz, J.; Imbens, G.; and Mitnik, O., 2008. Nonparametric tests for treatment effect heterogeneity. Review of Economics and Statistics, 90, 3.

Czinkota, M. and Ricks, D., 1983. The use of multi-measurement approach in the determination of company export priorities. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 11, 3.

Czinkota, M. and Ronkainen, I., 2001. International marketing. The Dryden Press.

Denis, J. and Depelteau, D., 1985. Market knowledge, diversification, and export expansion. Journal of International Business Studies, 16, 3.

Djebbari, H. and Smith, J., 2008. Heterogeneous impacts in PROGRESA. Journal of Econometrics, 145.

Fisher, R., 1935. The design of experiments. Olivier and Boyd, London.

Francis, J. and Collins-Dodd, C., 2004. Impact of export promotion programs on firm competencies, strategies and performance: The case of Canadian high-technology SMEs. International Marketing Review, 21, 4/5.

Fundación ExportAR, 2007. Balance de Gestión.
http://www.exportar.org.ar/web2006/index.php?modulo&s=1&r=01#pa

Galiani, S.; Gertler, P.; and Schargrodsky, E., 2008. School decentralization: Helping the good get better, but leaving the poor behind. Journal of Public Economics, 92.

Gallup, 2007. Observatory of European SMEs: Analytical report. DG Enterprise and Industry, European Commission.

Gencturk, E. and Kotabe, M., 2001. The effect of export assistance program usage on export performance: A contingency explanation. Journal of International Marketing, 9, 2.

Girma, S. and Görg, H., 2007. Evaluating the foreign ownership wage premium using a difference-in-differences matching approach. Journal of International Economics, 72, 1.

Girma, S. ; Görg, H.; and Strobl, E., 2007. The effects of government grants on plant survival: A micro-econometric analysis. International Journal of Industrial Organization, 25, 4.

Görg, H. and Strobl, E., 2007. The effect of R&D subsidies on private R&D. Economica, 74, 294.

Görg, H.; Henry, M.; and Strobl, E., 2008. Grant support and exporting activity, Review of Economics and Statistics, 90, 1.

Greenaway, D.; Sousa, N.; and Wakelin, K., 2004. Do domestic firms learn to export from multinationals? European Journal of Political Economy, 20, 4.

Gronhaug, K. and Lorentzen, T., 1983. Exploring the impact of governmental export subsidies. European Journal of Marketing, 17, 2.

Grossman, G. and Horn, H., 1988. Infant-industry protection reconsidered: The case of informational barriers to entry. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 103.

Hahn, J., 1998. On the role of the propensity score in efficient semiparametric estimation of average treatment effects. Econometrica, 66.

Heckman, J.; Ichimura, H.; and Todd, P., 1997. Matching as an econometric evaluation estimator: Evidence from evaluating a job training programme. Review of Economic Studies, 64, 4.

Heckman, J.; Ichimura, H.; Smith, J.; and Todd, P., 1998. Characterizing selection bias using experimental data. Econometrica, 66, 5.

Hirano, K. and Imbens, G., 2001. Estimation of causal effects using propensity score weighting: An application to data on right ear catheterization. Health Services and Outcomes Research Methodology, 2.

Hirano, K.; Imbens, G.; and Ridder, G., 2003. Efficient estimation of average treatment effects using the propensity score. Econometrica, 71, 4.

Hirsch, S. and Adar, Z., 1974. Firm size and export performance. World Development, 2, 7.

Holland, P., 1986. Statistics and causal inference. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 81, 396.

Hollenstein, H., 2005. Determinants of international activities: Are SMEs different? Small Business Economics, 24.

Horvitz, D. and Thompson, D., 1952, A generalization of sampling without replacement from a finite universe. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 47.

Howard, D. and Borgia, D., 1990. Exporting and firm size: Do small exporters have special needs? Journal of Global Marketing 4, 1.

Hudson, J. and Jones, P., 2003. International trade in "quality goods": Signalling problems for developing countries. Journal of International Development, 15.

Imbens, G., 2004. Nonparametric estimation of average treatment effects under exogeneityÑ A review. Review of Economics and Statistics, 86, 1.

Imbens, G.; Newey, W.; and Ridder, G., 2006. Mean-squared-error calculations for average treatment effects. Harvard University, mimeo.

Imbens, G. and Wooldridge, J., 2008. Recent developments in the econometrics of program evaluation. IZA Discussion Paper 3640.

Jaffe, A., 2002. Building program evaluation into the design of public research support programs. Oxford Review of Economic Policy, 18, 1.

Jordana, J.; Volpe Martincus, C.; and Gallo, A., 2009. Latin American and Caribbean export promotion agencies: An institutional characterization. IDB, forthcoming.

Katsikeas, C. and Morgan, R., 1994. Differences in perceptions of exporting problems based upon firm's size and export experience. European Journal of Marketing, 28, 5.

Keng, K. and Jiuan, T., 1989. Differences between small and medium sized exporting and non-exporting firms: Nature or nurture. International Marketing Review, 6, 4.

Kedia, B. and Chhokar, J., 1986. An empirical investigation of export promotion programs. Columbia Journal of World Business, 21, 4.

Klette, T.; Moen, J.; and Griliches, Z., 2000. Do subsidies to commercial R&D reduce market failures? Microeconomic evaluation studies. Research Policy 29, 4-5.

Kotabe, M. and Czinkota, M., 1992. State government promotion of manufacturing exports: A gap analysis. Journal of International Business Studies, 23, 4.

Lach, S., 2002. Do R&D subsidies stimulate or displace private R&D? Evidence from Israel. Journal of Industrial Economics, L, 4.

Lee, M., 2005. Micro-econometrics for policy, program, and treatment effects. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Lee, W., 2006. Propensity score matching and variations on the balancing test. University of Melbourne, mimeo.

Leonidou, L., 1995. Empirical research on export barriers: Review, assessment, and synthesis. Journal of International Marketing, 3, 1.

Leonidou, L., 2004. An analysis of the barriers hindering small business export development. Journal of Small Business Management, 42, 3.

Leonidou, L. and Theodosius, M., 2004. The export marketing information system: An integration of the extant knowledge. Journal of World Business, 39.

Leuven, E. and Sianesi, B., 2003. PSMATCH2: Stata module to perform full Mahalanobis and propensity score matching, common support graphing, and covariate imbalance testing. University of Amsterdam and Institute for Fiscal Studies, mimeo.

Mayer, W., 1984. The infant export-industry argument. Canadian Journal of Economics, 17.

Moini, A., 1998. Small firms exporting: How effective are government export assistance programs? Journal of Small Business Management, 36, 1.

Observatorio PyME, 2008. Informe 2007/2008: Evolución reciente, situación actual y desafíos futuros de las PYME industriales. Buenos Aires.

OECD, 2005. OECD SME and entrepreneurship outlook.

Rabino, S., 1980. An examination of barriers to exporting encountered by small manufacturing companies. Management International Review, 20, 1.

Rauch, J., 1996. Trade and search: Social capital, Sogo Shosha, and spillovers. NBER Working Paper 5618.

Rauch, J., 1999. Networks versus markets in international trade. Journal of International Economics, 48, 3.

Ravallion, M., 2008. Evaluating anti-poverty programs, in Evenson, R., and Schultz, P.(eds.), Handbook of Development Economics. North-Holland, Amsterdam.

Reid, S., 1984. Information acquisition and export entry decisions in small firms. Journal of Business Research, 12.

Roberts, M. and Tybout, J., 1997. The decision to export in Colombia: An empirical model of entry with sunk costs. American Economic Review, 87, 4.

Robins, J. and Rotnitzky, A. Semiparametric efficiency in multivariate regression models for repeated outcomes in the presence of missing data. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 90.

Robins, J. and Ritov. J., 1997. Towards a curse of dimensionality appropriate (CODA) asymptotic theory for semi-parametric models. Statistics in Medicine, 16.

Rosenbaum, P. and Rubin, D., 1983. The central role of the propensity score in observational studies for causal effects. Biometrika, 70, 1.

Rosenbaum, P. and Rubin, D., 1985. Constructing a control group using multivariate matched sampling methods that incorporate the propensity score. American Statistician, 39, 1.

Roy, A., 1951. Some thoughts on the distribution of earnings. Oxford Economic Papers, 3.

Rubin, D., 1974. Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. Journal of Educational Psychology, 66.

Seringhaus, F., 1986. The impact of government export marketing assistance. International Marketing Review, 3, 2.

Sianesi, B., 2004. An evaluation of the active labour programme in Sweden. Review of Economics and Statistics, 86, 1.

Smith, J., 2000. A critical survey of empirical methods for evaluating active labor market policies. Zeitschrift für Volkswirtschaft and Statistik, 136, 3.

Smith, J. and Todd, P., 2005a. Does matching overcome Lalonde's critique of nonexperimental estimators? Journal of Econometrics, 125.

Smith, J. and Todd, P., 2005b. Rejoinder. Journal of Econometrics, 125.

Suárez-Ortega, S., 2003, Export barriers: Insights from small and medium-sized firms. International Small Business Journal, 21, 4.

Volpe Martincus, C. and Carballo, J., 2008a. Is export promotion effective in developing countries? Firm-level evidence on the intensive and the extensive margins of exports. Journal of International Economics, 76, 1.

Volpe Martincus, C. and Carballo, J., 2008b. Export promotion activities in developing countries: What kind of trade do they promote? IDB, mimeo.

Volpe Martincus, C. and Carballo, J., 2009. Beyond the average effects: The distributional impacts of export promotion programs in developing countries. Journal of Development Economics, forthcoming.

Wagner, J., 1995. Exports, firm size, and firm dynamics. Small Business Economics, 7.

Wagner, J., 2001. A note on the firm size export relationship. Small Business Economics, 17, 4.

Wagner, J., 2007. Exports and productivity: A survey of the evidence from firm-level data. The World Economy, 30, 1.

Wilkinson, T. and Brouthers, L., 2006. Trade promotion and SME export performance. International Business review, 15, 3.

Table 1

Aggregate Export Indicators			
Year	**Total Exports**	**Number of Countries**	**Number of Products**
2002	25,218	181	11,883
2003	28,996	185	11,289
2004	33,837	196	11,669
2005	38,887	193	12,031
2006	45,504	194	12,128

Source: Own calculations on data from UMCE-SICP, Fundación ExportAR and AFIP.
Total exports are expressed in millions of US dollars.
Number of products is based on the HS 10-digit classification.

Table 2

Average Exports and Assistance Indicators					
Year	**Number of Firms**	**Average Exports**	**Average Number of Countries**	**Average Number of Products**	**Number of Firms Assisted by ExportAR**
All Firms					
2002	10,216	2,468.49	3.34	9.51	155
2003	10,797	2,685.51	3.51	8.93	319
2004	11,408	2,966.09	3.62	8.99	419
2005	12,173	3,194.53	3.78	9.22	423
2006	12,649	3,597.41	3.79	9.35	526
Small (<=50 Employees)					
2002	7,868	302.84	2.35	6.89	87
2003	8,169	334.13	2.45	6.45	198
2004	8,494	369.00	2.51	6.28	242
2005	9,004	382.48	2.62	6.38	217
2006	9,256	381.43	2.61	6.40	312
Medium (50<Employees<=200)					
2002	1,698	2,507.17	5.07	12.67	43
2003	1,890	2,308.11	5.20	11.96	77
2004	2,104	2,158.53	5.23	12.00	114
2005	2,257	2,413.05	5.40	12.05	128
2006	2,421	2,637.44	5.31	11.78	143
Large (>200 Employees)					
2002	650	28,581.85	10.86	32.93	25
2003	738	29,679.76	10.93	28.61	44
2004	810	32,297.90	11.13	29.69	63
2005	912	32,891.40	11.21	30.20	78
2006	972	36,613.02	11.24	31.38	71

Source: Own calculations on data from UMCE-SICP, Fundación ExportAR, and AFIP.
Average exports are expressed in thousands of US dollars.

Table 3

Average Effect of Assistance by Fundación ExportAR Difference-in-Differences Estimates		
Full Sample, 2002-2006		
Export Outcome	**Without Covariates Controlling for Size**	**With Covariates Controlling for Size**
Total Exports	0.193***	0.132***
	(0.0304)	(0.037)
Number of Countries	0.137***	0.099***
	(0.0140)	(0.017)
Number of Products	0.098***	0.093***
	(0.018)	(0.024)
Average Exports per Country and Product	-0.042	-0.006
	(0.026)	(0.035)
Average Exports per Country	0.056**	0.034
	(0.024)	(0.032)
Average Exports per Product	0.095***	0.039
	(0.028)	(0.034)
Firms Not Assisted the Previous Year, 2003-2006		
Export Outcome	**Without Covariates Controlling for Size**	**With Covariates Controlling for Size**
Total Exports	0.228***	0.141***
	(0.054)	(0.051)
Number of Countries	0.136***	0.080***
	(0.024)	(0.022)
Number of Products	0.104***	0.060*
	(0.032)	(0.033)
Average Exports per Country and Product	-0.0132	-0.0490
	(0.049)	(0.047)
Average Exports per Country	0.091**	0.011
	(0.046)	(0.044)
Average Exports per Product	0.123**	0.031
	(0.050)	(0.047)
Firms Never Assisted Before, 2003-2006		
Export Outcome	**Without Covariates Controlling for Size**	**With Covariates Controlling for Size**
Total Exports	0.202***	0.177**
	(0.050)	(0.081)
Number of Countries	0.180***	0.123**
	(0.062)	(0.068)
Number of Products	0.091***	0.069
	(0.033)	(0.095)
Average Exports per Country and Product	-0.004	-0.0150
	(0.047)	(0.147)
Average Exports per Country	0.018	0.055
	(0.044)	(0.139)
Average Exports per Product	0.031	0.208
	(0.047)	(0.154)

Source: Own calculations on data from UMCE-SICP, Fundación ExportAR, and AFIP.
The table reports estimates of Equation (3). The dependent variables are the natural logarithm of the export performance indicators listed in the first column. The firm-level time-varying covariates controlling for size are two binary variables identifying whether the firm is small (up to 50 employees) or medium-sized (between 51 and 200 employees). The large category is the omitted variable. Firm fixed effects and year fixed effect included (not reported). Robust standard errors, clustered by firm, reported in parentheses below the estimated coefficients. * significant at the 10% level; ** significant at the 5% level; *** significant at the 1% level.

Table 4

Non-Parametric Test for Heterogeneous Effects
Constant Conditional ATE

Export Outcome	Test	Chi-square	Normal
Total Exports	**Statistics**	19.751	3.970
	p-value	[0.003]	[0.000]
Number of Countries	**Statistics**	20.597	4.214
	p-value	[0.002]	[0.000]
Number of Products	**Statistics**	2.213	-1.093
	p-value	[0.899]	[0.137]
Average Exports per Country and Product	**Statistics**	13.641	2.206
	p-value	[0.034]	[0.014]
Average Exports per Country	**Statistics**	17.146	3.217
	p-value	[0.009]	[0.001]
Average Exports per Product	**Statistics**	23.196	4.964
	p-value	[0.001]	[0.000]

Source: Own calculations on data from UMCE-SICP, Fundación ExportAR and AFIP.
The table reports the test statistics and the p-values of the non-parametric test of the null hypothesis that the average effect conditional on the covariates is identical for all subpopulations proposed by Crump et al. (2008), under both the standard normal distribution and the approximation, the chi-squared distribution with degrees of freedom equal to the K-1 where K is number of covariates.

Table 5

Average Effect of Assistance by Fundación ExportAR by Size Category
Difference-in-Differences Estimates
Full Sample, 2002-2006

Export Outcomes	Small	Medium	Large
Total Exports	0.102*	0.150**	0.138
	(0.053)	(0.069)	(0.088)
Number of Countries	0.099***	0.085***	0.061*
	(0.026)	(0.032)	(0.028)
Number of Products	0.071*	0.103**	0.079
	(0.036)	(0.044)	(0.052)
Average Exports per Country and Product	-0.068	-0.038	-0.022
	(0.050)	(0.065)	(0.090)
Average Exports per Country	0.003	0.065	0.057
	(0.046)	(0.061)	(0.080)
Average Exports per Product	0.032	0.047	0.059
	(0.048)	(0.065)	(0.090)
Firms not Assisted the Previous Year, 2003-2006			
Export Outcomes	**Small**	**Medium**	**Large**
Total Exports	0.077**	0.126**	0.104
	(0.036)	(0.064)	(0.133)
Number of Countries	0.099***	0.050	0.064
	(0.034)	(0.044)	(0.046)
Number of Products	0.040	0.060	0.073
	(0.051)	(0.065)	(0.069)
Average Exports per Country and Product	-0.062	0.016	-0.033
	(0.071)	(0.079)	(0.138)
Average Exports per Country	-0.022	0.076	0.040
	(0.068)	(0.071)	(0.119)
Average Exports per Product	0.037	0.067	0.031
	(0.072)	(0.076)	(0.143)
Firms Never Assisted Before, 2003-2006			
Export Outcomes	**Small**	**Medium**	**Large**
Total Exports	0.130**	0.252**	0.389
	(0.061)	(0.123)	(0.300)
Number of Countries	0.170**	0.233**	0.264
	(0.080)	(0.100)	(0.167)
Number of Products	0.025	0.108	0.513
	(0.116)	(0.162)	(0.466)
Average Exports per Country and Product	-0.065	0.027	-0.066
	(0.163)	(0.036)	(0.079)
Average Exports per Country	-0.040	0.038	-0.144
	(0.158)	(0.040)	(0.493)
Average Exports per Product	0.105	0.054	-0.124
	(0.179)	(0.064)	(0.194)

Source: Own calculations on data from UMCE-SICP, Fundación ExportAR, and AFIP.
The table reports estimates of Equation (4). The dependent variables are the natural logarithm of the export performance indicators listed in the first column. The firm-level time-varying covariates controlling for size are two binary variables identifying whether the firm is small (up to 50 employees) or medium-sized (between 51 and 200 employees). The category large is the omitted variable. Firm fixed effects and year fixed effect included (not reported). Robust standard errors, clustered by firm, reported in parentheses below the estimated coefficients. * significant at the 10% level; ** significant at the 5% level; *** significant at the 1% level.

Table 6

Average Effect of Assistance by Fundación ExportAR by Size Category											
Difference-in-Differences Estimates, Alternative Definitions of Size Categories											
Category Definition	**Small: <= 40 Employees; Large > 250 Employees**				**Small: <= 60 Employees; Large > 150 Employees**				**Small and Medium Pooled Together**		
Full Sample, 2002-2006											
Export Outcomes	**All Firms**	**Small**	**Medium**	**Large**	**All Firms**	**Small**	**Medium**	**Large**	**All Firms**	**Non-Large**	**Large**
Total Exports	0.133***	0.101*	0.149**	0.137	0.130***	0.104*	0.152**	0.14	0.135***	0.156***	0.138
	(0.037)	(0.053)	(0.069)	(0.088)	(0.037)	(0.053)	(0.069)	(0.088)	(0.037)	(0.064)	(0.088)
Number of Countries	0.099***	0.099***	0.085***	0.061**	0.098***	0.100***	0.086***	0.062**	0.100***	0.098***	0.061**
	(0.017)	(0.026)	(0.032)	(0.028)	(0.017)	(0.026)	(0.032)	(0.028)	(0.017)	(0.029)	(0.028)
Number of Products	0.094***	0.070*	0.102**	0.078	0.092***	0.072**	0.104***	0.080	0.078**	0.123***	0.079
	(0.024)	(0.036)	(0.044)	(0.052)	(0.024)	(0.036)	(0.044)	(0.052)	(0.037)	(0.029)	(0.052)
Average Exports per Country and Product	-0.006	-0.068	-0.038	-0.022	-0.060*	-0.007	-0.004	-0.002	0.076	0.003	-0.022
	(0.035)	(0.05)	(0.065)	(0.090)	(0.035)	(0.050)	(0.065)	(0.09)	(0.052)	(0.044)	(0.09)
Average Exports per Country	0.034	0.003	0.065	0.057	0.032	0.003	0.069	0.061	0.035	0.054	0.057
	(0.032)	(0.046)	(0.061)	(0.080)	(0.032)	(0.046)	(0.061)	(0.08)	(0.032)	(0.054)	(0.080)
Average Exports per Product	0.039	0.032	0.047	0.059	0.038	0.033	0.048	0.061	0.040	0.087	0.059
	(0.034)	(0.048)	(0.065)	(0.090)	(0.034)	(0.048)	(0.065)	(0.09)	(0.034)	(0.058)	(0.090)
Firms Not Assisted the Previous Year, 2003-2006											
Export Outcomes	**All Firms**	**Small**	**Medium**	**Large**	**All Firms**	**Small**	**Medium**	**Large**	**All Firms**	**Non-Large**	**Large**
Total Exports	0.188***	0.082**	0.134**	0.111	0.188***	0.082**	0.134**	0.111	0.190**	0.083**	0.104
	(0.051)	(0.036)	(0.064)	(0.133)	(0.050)	(0.035)	(0.063)	(0.130)	(0.051)	(0.036)	(0.133)
Number of Countries	0.079***	0.098***	0.049	0.063	0.079***	0.098***	0.049	0.063	0.080***	0.099***	0.064
	(0.022)	(0.034)	(0.044)	(0.046)	(0.022)	(0.034)	(0.044)	(0.046)	(0.022)	(0.034)	(0.046)
Number of Products	0.059*	0.039	0.059	0.072	0.059*	0.039	0.059	0.072	0.060*	0.040	0.073
	(0.033)	(0.051)	(0.065)	(0.069)	(0.033)	(0.051)	(0.065)	(0.069)	(0.033)	(0.051)	(0.069)
Average Exports per Country and Product	-0.050	-0.063	0.016	-0.034	-0.050	-0.063	0.016	-0.034	-0.049	-0.062	-0.033
	(0.047)	(0.071)	(0.079)	(0.138)	(0.047)	(0.071)	(0.079)	(0.138)	(0.047)	(0.071)	(0.138)
Average Exports per Country	0.009	-0.018	0.062	0.033	0.009	-0.018	0.062	0.033	0.010	-0.020	0.040
	(0.044)	(0.068)	(0.071)	(0.119)	(0.044)	(0.068)	(0.071)	(0.119)	(0.044)	(0.068)	(0.119)
Average Exports per Product	0.029	0.035	0.063	0.029	0.029	0.035	0.063	0.029	0.031	0.037	0.031
	(0.047)	(0.072)	(0.076)	(0.143)	(0.047)	(0.072)	(0.076)	(0.143)	(0.047)	(0.072)	(0.143)
Firms Never Assisted Before, 2003-2006											
Export Outcomes	**All Firms**	**Small**	**Medium**	**Large**	**All Firms**	**Small**	**Medium**	**Large**	**All Firms**	**Non-Large**	**Large**
Total Exports	0.273*	0.124**	0.241*	0.372	0.265*	0.147**	0.286**	0.441	0.282**	0.186**	0.389
	(0.161)	(0.061)	(0.123)	(0.300)	(0.160)	(0.064)	(0.129)	(0.315)	(0.120)	(0.090)	(0.300)
Number of Countries	0.221***	0.214***	0.293***	0.302	0.217***	0.210***	0.288***	0.296	0.225***	0.218***	0.240
	(0.068)	(0.080)	(0.100)	(0.190)	(0.068)	(0.080)	(0.100)	(0.190)	(0.068)	(0.080)	(0.19)
Number of Products	0.066	0.024	0.103	0.491	0.063	0.023	0.099	0.468	0.071	0.026	0.513
	(0.095)	(0.116)	(0.162)	(0.466)	(0.095)	(0.116)	(0.162)	(0.466)	(0.095)	(0.116)	(0.466)
Average Exports per Country and Product	-0.015	-0.065	0.027	-0.066	-0.016	-0.069	0.029	-0.070	-0.014	-0.061	-0.066
	(0.147)	(0.163)	(0.036)	(0.079)	(0.147)	(0.163)	(0.036)	(0.079)	(0.147)	(0.163)	(0.079)
Average Exports per Country	0.052	-0.038	0.036	-0.136	0.047	-0.034	0.032	-0.123	0.058	-0.042	-0.144
	(0.140)	(0.159)	(0.040)	(0.497)	(0.139)	(0.158)	(0.040)	(0.493)	(0.139)	(0.158)	(0.493)
Average Exports per Product	0.207	0.104	0.054	-0.123	0.202	0.102	0.052	-0.120	0.211	0.107	-0.124
	(0.154)	(0.179)	(0.064)	(0.194)	(0.153)	(0.178)	(0.064)	(0.193)	(0.153)	(0.178)	(0.194)

Source: Own calculations on data from UMCE-SICP, Fundación ExportAR, and AFIP.

The table reports estimates of Equations (3) and (4) for alternative definitions of the firm size categories. The dependent variables are the natural logarithm of the export performance indicators listed in the first column. Firm fixed effects and year fixed effect included (not reported). Robust standard errors, clustered by firm, reported in parentheses below the estimated coefficients. * significant at the 10% level; ** significant at the 5% level; *** significant at the 1% level.

Table 7

Average Effect of Assistance by Fundación ExportAR by Size Category
Propensity Score-Weighted Difference-in-Differences Estimates

Full Sample, 2002-2006

Export Outcomes	All Firms	Small	Medium	Large
Total Exports	0.237***	0.214***	0.302***	0.176
	(0.042)	(0.057)	(0.067)	(0.109)
Number of Countries	0.162***	0.180***	0.167***	0.140***
	(0.022)	(0.030)	(0.036)	(0.047)
Number of Products	0.140***	0.142***	0.180***	0.110**
	(0.027)	(0.040)	(0.042)	(0.061)
Average Exports per Country and Product	-0.055	-0.053	-0.044	-0.147
	(0.041)	(0.054)	(0.068)	(0.107)
Average Exports per Country	0.085**	0.056	0.135**	-0.004
	(0.037)	(0.048)	(0.062)	(0.105)
Average Exports per Product	0.098**	0.104**	0.122*	0.033
	(0.038)	(0.051)	(0.064)	(0.100)

Firms Not Assisted the Previous Year, 2003-2006

Export Outcomes	All Firms	Small	Medium	Large
Total Exports	0.148**	0.119**	0.146**	0.203
	(0.046)	(0.062)	(0.073)	(0.384)
Number of Countries	0.126***	0.165**	0.114**	0.251
	(0.024)	(0.079)	(0.057)	(0.205)
Number of Products	0.065*	0.016	0.087	0.348
	(0.035)	(0.119)	(0.154)	(0.499)
Average Exports per Country and Product	-0.053	-0.062	-0.024	-0.070
	(0.050)	(0.166)	(0.041)	(0.072)
Average Exports per Country	0.012	-0.046	0.332	-0.348
	(0.049)	(0.160)	(0.386)	(0.568)
Average Exports per Product	0.044	0.103	0.458	-0.145
	(0.052)	(0.177)	(0.386)	(0.222)

Firms Never Assisted Before, 2003-2006

Export Outcomes	All Firms	Small	Medium	Large
Total Exports	0.147***	0.124**	0.166**	0.163
	(0.062)	(0.053)	(0.083)	(0.144)
Number of Countries	0.169***	0.145**	0.121**	0.214
	(0.068)	(0.069)	(0.050)	(0.167)
Number of Products	0.069	0.023	0.065	0.148
	(0.098)	(0.089)	(0.099)	(0.141)
Average Exports per Country and Product	-0.021	-0.042	0.0245	-0.0696
	(0.146)	(0.106)	(0.048)	(0.102)
Average Exports per Country	0.038	-0.06	0.132	-0.084
	(0.140)	(0.097)	(0.086)	(0.068)
Average Exports per Product	0.108	0.103	0.108	-0.095
	(0.151)	(0.177)	(0.106)	(0.102)

Source: Own calculations on data from UMCE-SICP, Fundación ExportAR, and AFIP.
The table reports estimates of Equations (3) and (4) weighted by the propensity score as indicated in the text. The dependent variables are the natural logarithm of the export performance indicators listed in the first column. Firm fixed effects and year fixed effect included (not reported). Robust standard errors, clustered by firm, reported in parentheses below the estimated coefficients. * significant at the 10% level; ** significant at the 5% level; *** significant at the 1% level.

Table 8

Average Effect of Assistance by Fundación ExportAR by Size Category
Semiparametric Difference-in-Differences Estimates based on the Abadie (2005) Estimator

Full Sample, 2002-2006

Export Outcomes	All Firms	Small	Medium	Large
Total Exports	0.143***	0.165***	0.147***	0.116**
	(0.045)	(0.04)	(0.044)	(0.051)
Number of Countries	0.162***	0.228***	0.150***	0.109***
	(0.020)	(0.018)	(0.023)	(0.019)
Number of Products	0.088***	0.086***	0.120***	0.058*
	(0.028)	(0.025)	(0.028)	(0.031)
Average Exports per Country and Product	-0.012	-0.015	-0.015	-0.005
	(0.046)	(0.04)	(0.041)	(0.057)
Average Exports per Country	-0.03	-0.063	-0.033	0.007
	(0.044)	(0.045)	(0.037)	(0.049)
Average Exports per Product	0.044	0.078*	-0.003	0.058
	(0.046)	(0.04)	(0.043)	(0.055)

Firms Not Assisted the Previous Year, 2003-2006

Export Outcomes	All Firms	Small	Medium	Large
Total Exports	0.074**	0.121***	0.080**	0.020
	(0.037)	(0.036)	(0.035)	(0.046)
Number of Countries	0.124***	0.191***	0.114***	0.068***
	(0.017)	(0.015)	(0.018)	(0.017)
Number of Products	0.058***	0.069***	0.074***	0.032
	(0.024)	(0.021)	(0.024)	(0.027)
Average Exports per Country and Product	-0.012	-0.014	-0.015	-0.008
	(0.039)	(0.034)	(0.034)	(0.048)
Average Exports per Country	-0.006	-0.007	-0.007	-0.005
	(0.035)	(0.032)	(0.03)	(0.043)
Average Exports per Product	0.000	0.005	-0.003	-0.001
	(0.039)	(0.035)	(0.034)	(0.048)

Firms Never Assisted Before, 2003-2006

Export Outcomes	All Firms	Small	Medium	Large
Total Exports	0.057***	0.134***	0.060***	-0.022
	(0.022)	(0.019)	(0.02)	(0.028)
Number of Countries	0.068***	0.116***	0.061***	0.028***
	(0.010)	(0.011)	(0.01)	(0.01)
Number of Products	-0.002	0.024*	0.012	-0.041
	(0.025)	(0.014)	(0.012)	(0.05)
Average Exports per Country and Product	-0.015	-0.016	-0.016	-0.012
	(0.021)	(0.024)	(0.02)	(0.02)
Average Exports per Country	-0.015	-0.014	-0.015	-0.016
	(0.020)	(0.024)	(0.018)	(0.017)
Average Exports per Product	-0.022	-0.046	-0.01	-0.009
	(0.026)	(0.036)	(0.02)	(0.021)

Source: Own calculations on data from UMCE-SICP, Fundación ExportAR , and AFIP.
The table reports semi-parametric difference-in-differences estimates (see Abadie, 2005) of the average assistance effect on assisted firms both pooling over firms and discriminating across their size categories for the six export performance indicators. Standard errors reported in parentheses below the estimated coefficients. * significant at the 10% level; ** significant at the 5% level; *** significant at the 1% level.

Table 9

Average Effect of Assistance by Fundación ExportAR by Size Category
Matching Difference-in-Differences Estimates based on the Kernel Estimator

Full Sample, 2002-2006

Export Outcomes	All Firms	Small	Medium	Large
Total Exports	0.160	0.169	0.124	0.106
	(0.028)***	(0.039)***	(0.047)***	(0.066)
	(0.033)***	(0.036)***	(0.042)***	(0.053)*
Number of Countries	0.177	0.195	0.143	0.123
	(0.013)***	(0.018)***	(0.024)***	(0.024)***
	(0.016)***	(0.015)***	(0.021)***	(0.021)***
Number of Products	0.074	0.086	0.109	0.072
	(0.017)***	(0.025)***	(0.029)***	(0.037)*
	(0.019)***	(0.027)***	(0.028)***	(0.036)**
Average Exports per Country and Product	-0.009	-0.011	-0.015	-0.007
	(0.028)	(0.04)	(0.045)	(0.07)
	(0.031)	(0.033)	(0.043)	(0.061)
Average Exports per Country	-0.017	-0.026	-0.038	0.000
	(0.025)	(0.035)	(0.042)	(0.064)
	(0.029)	(0.039)	(0.038)	(0.055)
Average Exports per Product	0.086	0.083	-0.003	0.051
	(0.028)***	(0.039)**	(0.045)	(0.068)
	(0.031)***	(0.037)**	(0.042)	(0.058)

Firms Not Assisted the Previous Year, 2003-2006

Export Outcomes	All Firms	Small	Medium	Large
Total Exports	0.240	0.214	0.141	0.204
	(0.037)***	(0.067)***	(0.061)**	(0.123)
	(0.039)***	(0.098)**	(0.063)**	(0.136)
Number of Countries	0.187	0.181	0.106	0.062
	(0.016)***	(0.028)***	(0.036)***	(0.037)
	(0.018)***	(0.04)***	(0.037)***	(0.055)
Number of Products	0.105	0.107	0.112	0.113
	(0.022)***	(0.039)***	(0.048)***	(0.08)
	(0.024)***	(0.052)**	(0.054)**	(0.089)
Average Exports per Country and Product	0.053	-0.073	-0.077	-0.010
	(0.037)	(0.065)	(0.067)	(0.131)
	(0.039)	(0.092)	(0.099)	(0.159)
Average Exports per Country	0.052	0.033	0.035	0.103
	(0.033)	(0.06)	(0.055)	(0.117)
	(0.035)	(0.085)	(0.085)	(0.135)
Average Exports per Product	0.135	0.107	0.029	0.092
	(0.036)***	(0.066)	(0.064)	(0.133)
	(0.038)***	(0.097)	(0.096)	(0.153)

Firms Never Assisted Before, 2003-2006

Export Outcomes	All Firms	Small	Medium	Large
Total Exports	0.468	0.383	0.513	0.238
	(0.102)***	(0.117)***	(0.172)***	(0.041)***
	(0.107)***	(0.161)*	(0.177)***	(0.078)***
Number of Countries	0.251	0.204	0.272	0.057
	(0.042)***	(0.046)***	(0.102)***	(0.301)
	(0.049)***	(0.061)***	(0.106)***	(0.31)
Number of Products	0.113	0.100	0.158	0.374
	(0.052)**	(0.059)*	(0.111)	(0.414)
	(0.055)**	(0.084)	(0.116)	(0.463)
Average Exports per Country and Product	0.104	0.079	0.083	-0.107
	(0.095)	(0.106)	(0.213)	(0.087)
	(0.098)	(0.14)	(0.279)	(0.103)
Average Exports per Country	0.217	0.179	0.241	-0.196
	(0.092)***	(0.103)*	(0.178)	(0.332)
	(0.095)**	(0.144)	(0.24)	(0.362)
Average Exports per Product	0.355	0.283	0.355	0.004
	(0.097)***	(0.110)***	(0.189)*	(0.385)
	(0.099)***	(0.146)**	(0.204)	(0.407)

Source: Own calculations on data from UMCE-SICP, Fundación ExportAR, and AFIP.
The table reports matching difference-in-differences estimates of the average assistance effect on assisted firms both pooling over firms and discriminating across their size categories for the six export performance indicators. Kernel matching is based on the Epanechnikov kernel with a bandwidth of 0.04. Analytical and bootstrapped standard errors based on 500 replications are reported in parentheses. * significant at the 10% level; ** significant at the 5% level; *** significant at the 1% level. The significance indicator is reported with the standard errors corresponding to each method used to compute these errors.

Figure 1
Distribution of Firms across Product-Market Export Patterns (2006)

Small **Medium** **Large**



Figure 2
Distribution of Export Shares across Firms with Different Product-Market Export Patterns

Small **Medium** **Large**



Source: Own elaboration on data provided by UMCE-SICP, Fundación ExportAR and AFIP.