



BANCA D'ITALIA  
EUROSISTEMA

## Temi di Discussione

---

(Working Papers)

Exporters and importers of services: firm-level evidence on Italy

by Stefano Federico and Enrico Tosti

September 2012

Number

877





BANCA D'ITALIA  
EUROSISTEMA

# Temi di discussione

(Working papers)

Exporters and importers of services: firm-level evidence on Italy

by Stefano Federico and Enrico Tosti

Number 877 - September 2012

*The purpose of the Temi di discussione series is to promote the circulation of working papers prepared within the Bank of Italy or presented in Bank seminars by outside economists with the aim of stimulating comments and suggestions.*

*The views expressed in the articles are those of the authors and do not involve the responsibility of the Bank.*

*Editorial Board: SILVIA MAGRI, MASSIMO SBRACIA, LUISA CARPINELLI, EMANUELA CIAPANNA, FRANCESCO D'AMURI, ALESSANDRO NOTARPIETRO, PIETRO RIZZA, CONCETTA RONDINELLI, TIZIANO ROPELE, ANDREA SILVESTRINI, GIORDANO ZEVI.*

*Editorial Assistants: ROBERTO MARANO, NICOLETTA OLIVANTI.*

ISSN 1594-7939 (print)

ISSN 2281-3950 (online)

*Printed by the Printing and Publishing Division of the Bank of Italy*

# EXPORTERS AND IMPORTERS OF SERVICES: FIRM-LEVEL EVIDENCE ON ITALY

by Stefano Federico\* and Enrico Tosti\*

## Abstract

This work contributes to the small but growing body of literature on international trade in services at firm level. Our dataset, based on a new Bank of Italy survey, provides information on exports and imports of services (excluding transportation and travel) in 2008-09 for almost 3,000 Italian industrial and services firms, divided by partner country and type of service. We report a set of stylized facts on trade in services. We also analyze the choice between export and foreign direct investment in services at the firm level, thus innovating with respect to the previous literature using industry data. The main findings are as follows: the export and import of services is highly concentrated in just a few firms; firm-level variation in trade is positively correlated with firm size and productivity; country-level variation is to a large extent explained by the standard gravity variables; distance strongly reduces trade in services in spite of their intangibility; smaller and less productive firms choose to export rather than sell through foreign affiliates.

**JEL Classification:** F14, F23, L80.

**Keywords:** trade in services, firm heterogeneity, intensive and extensive margin, foreign affiliates, export versus FDI.

## Contents

1. Introduction.....	5
2. Data description .....	7
3. Main patterns .....	11
4. Analysis of firm and country-level variation.....	13
5. Trade in services and foreign affiliates.....	16
6. Concluding remarks.....	17
References .....	20
Tables and figures.....	23
Appendix .....	41

---

\* Bank of Italy, Economic Research and International Relations.



# 1 Introduction<sup>1</sup>

International trade in services is growing in importance anywhere in the world. Improvements in information and communication technologies have increased the tradability of many services (Baldwin 2006). At the same time there has also been some progress in the liberalization of trade in services. World exports of services currently represent about 20% of world exports of goods and services. Data referring to countries for which long-time statistical series on services trade are available suggest indeed an upward trend in the ratio of services trade on goods trade since the 1970s (Lipsey 2008).

Despite the increasing importance of trade in services, the empirical literature is relatively small and mainly relies on aggregate data. Firm-level evidence, in particular, is much scarcer than firm-level evidence on trade in goods (Francois and Hoekman 2010). Only very recently have the first studies using firm-level data on exporters and importers of services begun to appear, mostly as working papers (Breinlich and Criscuolo 2011 on UK, Walter and Dell'mour 2010 on Austria, Kelle and Kleinert 2010 on Germany, Ariu 2011 and Ariu and Mion 2010 on Belgium).

This paper contributes to this small but growing literature by providing firm-level evidence on exporters and importers of services in Italy. We use a new database, derived from a Bank of Italy survey, which includes detailed information on exports and imports of “other services” (i.e. services excluding transportation and travel, such as information and communication services, royalties and licences, legal, engineering, accounting and advertising services, etc.), by type of service and partner country, for 2,955 Italian manufacturing and service firms in 2008-09. Thanks to this rich set of information, we investigate the main types of services traded and the main sectors involved, the degree of concentration, the relation with firm heterogeneity and the role of standard gravity variables.

For a subsample of firms we also have detailed information on the activity of foreign affiliates. This allows us to study the relation between trade in services and ownership of foreign affiliates by firm, country and type of service and, in

---

<sup>1</sup>The authors wish to thank two anonymous referees, Andrea Ariu, Andrea Carboni, Riccardo De Bonis, Marco Magnani, Roberto Tedeschi and participants to the LETC conference in Ljubljana and to the CEPR conference on Globalization, investment and services trade in Alghero for useful comments. The views expressed in this paper are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Bank of Italy.

particular, the choice between export and foreign direct investment (FDI) in services. The provision of services through FDI is indeed often more important than the provision of services through cross-border trade (Francois and Hoekman 2010).

Our work is most closely related to Breinlich and Criscuolo (2011), who provide similar evidence on service traders in the United Kingdom. We extend their work in two ways. First, we focus on a different country, which is broadly similar in size but different under several respects (e.g., legal system, language, lower average firm size, share of manufacturing on GDP); this allows us to see whether their results are specific to the country under investigation or hold more generally. Despite Italy's lower specialization in services, trade in services is increasingly important: the sum of exports and imports in the "other services" item equals 4.8% of Italy's GDP in 2009 (5.3% in 2008, more than one tenth of the ratio of trade in goods to GDP) and has risen significantly over the last two decades (Figure 1). Second, while Breinlich and Criscuolo (2011) only include multinational activity as a binary variable, we exploit our rich firm-level information on foreign affiliates' sales by country of location and main sector of activity in order to investigate the relation between services exports, imports and FDI. There is usually no or little analysis of the relation between trade and ownership of foreign affiliates also among the other studies using detailed firm-level data on services trade (Ariu and Mion 2010, Ariu 2011, Kelle and Kleinert 2010, Walter and Dell'mour 2010).

Other studies focus instead on trade by firms in specific service sectors (Conti, Lo Turco and Maggioni 2010, Temouri, Vogel and Wagner 2010). However, trade in services is not necessarily restricted to firms whose main activity is encompassed by one of the service sectors: as we shall see, the contribution of manufacturing firms to both exports and imports of services is far from negligible (Kelle and Kleinert 2010).

There is also a wide literature using aggregate data (at the country-sector level) on trade in services (Freund and Weinhold 2002, Fillat Castejón, Francois and Woerz 2008, Head, Mayer and Ries 2009 and Christen and Francois 2010, Oldenski 2011). Christen and Francois (2010) and Oldenski (2011) are two recent studies focusing on the export versus FDI decision in services but both studies carry the analysis at the industry level.

Finally, our work also relates to the literature on goods trade. On the theoretical side, recent developments focus on heterogeneous firms (Melitz 2003,



Melitz and Ottaviano 2008) and on multi-product firms (Bernard, Redding and Schott 2011, Eckel and Neary 2010, Mayer, Melitz and Ottaviano 2010). A large set of studies explores the various margins of trade (firms, products and countries) using very rich datasets on exporters and importers of goods (Eaton, Kortum and Kramarz 2004, 2008, Bernard, Jensen, Redding and Schott 2007, Bernard, Jensen and Schott 2009, Bernard, Jensen, Redding and Schott 2009, Manova and Zhang 2012, Mayer and Ottaviano 2007 and, for Italy, Castellani, Serti and Tomasi 2010).

The data we use has several advantages. First, it includes detailed information by type of service (with almost 30 different categories) and by partner country. Second, it is based on a highly representative sample of firms, covering more than 50% of Italy's total exports and imports included in "other services". Third, it refers to very recent years (2008 and 2009), which is an important asset since trends in ICT and service tradability are changing at a very fast pace. Fourth, it can be linked to other firm-level datasets, from which information on balance-sheet variables and on foreign affiliates is derived.

On the downside, data before 2008 is not available and, as a consequence, our dataset only covers the two years in which the global financial crisis was at its peak, although trade in services proved more resilient than trade in goods. Furthermore, the sampling scheme includes medium and large firms which are likely to participate in international activities and does not cover small or very small firms. Finally, our data does not cover trade in goods.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: section 2 describes our data; section 3 and 4 report the main findings drawn from the empirical analysis of trade in services. Section 5 analyzes the relation between trade and foreign affiliates in services. Section 6 concludes.

## 2 Data description

Since 2008 the Bank of Italy collects firm-level data on international trade in services on a quarterly basis in order to compile the "services" item in the current account of Italy's balance of payments.<sup>2</sup> The survey scheme defines a threshold corresponding to about 70 million euros of sales. There are approximately 3,800

---

<sup>2</sup>Before 2008, data on services was derived from banks' aggregate reports on cross-border payment transactions, which did not include any firm-level information on exporters or importers.

non-financial firms above this threshold, accounting for 45 per cent of total sales in the reference population.<sup>3</sup> In 2009, 2,616 firms provided data for at least one quarter. Restricting the sample to those firms which provided data for all the four quarters of 2009, we are left with 2,141 firms.<sup>4</sup> Data for banks is instead on a census basis and is collected by the Bank of Italy for supervision and statistical purposes. In 2009 814 banks were authorized to operate in Italy; more than half (433) were small banks (co-operative banks). The “full sample” is then composed of 2,955 firms.

We also use a smaller “CB sample” that includes the subset of firms for which complete balance sheet data is available for 2009. Balance sheet data is derived from Centrale dei bilanci (CB) and Cerved. CB is a commercial database maintained by a consortium of banks for credit risk evaluation purposes. For firms that are not included in CB, we use data from Cerved, which records the official financial statements filed at the Italian Chambers of Commerce. The sample size is now narrowed down from 2,955 to 1,489. This drop is mainly due to the banking and insurance sector, which we do not include because the balance sheet structure for financial firms is very different compared to firms in manufacturing and other services.

Table A.1 provides a comparison of the two samples. Both samples are mainly composed of large firms. The median number of employees is 191 in the full sample, and 281 in the CB sample. The mean number of employees is 635 in the former, 755 in the latter. On average, the sum of exports and imports of services accounts for slightly more than 10 million euros in both samples.

Exports and imports of services are defined as transactions between resident units and non-resident units, in line with the 5th Balance of Payments Manual (IMF 1997). The concept of residence, which is also used in national accounts, is based on a unit having its “center of economic interest” within a country (see Lipsey 2008). For the purpose of this paper, we consider a subset of the services item that is defined as “other services” and includes the international service

---

<sup>3</sup>The reference population of the sample corresponds approximately to about 1,5 million firms whose center of economic interest is in Italy. In terms of sector coverage, the survey does not include banks, other non-insurance financial intermediaries or public administration entities.

<sup>4</sup>We chose to report results for 2009 instead of 2008, since in 2008 the sample size was smaller and the reporting quality was slightly lower, as one would indeed expect in the first year of a survey. This said, the checks we performed showed that all the main results hold for 2008 as well.

transactions which are not covered under transportation and travel.<sup>5</sup>

Exports and imports of services are disaggregated by partner country and by type of service. Types of services are defined according to the Extended Balance of Payments Services (EBOPS) classification. There are 29 types of services in our data (Table A.2)<sup>6</sup>. While being the most disaggregated level in the EBOPS classification, still it is much more aggregate than the usual product classifications available for trade in goods. Our analysis on the contribution of the “extensive margin” of service trade (i.e. variation in the number of service types traded) should take into account that available classifications for types of services are very coarse.

It is useful to compare our definition of international trade in services to the four modes through which services can be internationally traded according to the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). Mode 1 (cross-border supply) takes place when the consumer receives a service from a foreign supplier without either the consumer or the supplier leaving their own countries. In mode 2 (consumption abroad), the consumer of a service moves to another country to obtain a service, while in mode 3 (commercial presence) services are supplied through a foreign affiliate in the country of the consumer. In mode 4 (presence of natural persons) an individual moves to the country of the consumer in order to provide a service. Our definition is in line with the recent literature using balance-of-payments data (Breinlich and Criscuolo 2011, Walter and Dell’mour 2010) and includes modes 1, 2 and 4, while it excludes mode 3.

For a subsample of firms we also have information on foreign affiliates. This allows us to get an estimate of the quantitative importance of the provision of services through the activities of foreign affiliates abroad (mode 3). Starting from

---

<sup>5</sup>Breinlich and Criscuolo (2011) also exclude travel and passenger transportation, which are often derived from other surveys in which detailed firm-level information is usually not available. For Italy, travel and passenger transport data are collected directly from travellers and not from firms. The survey on merchandise transport collects data on tariffs but not on sales. We also exclude the following minor items: merchanting, which is defined as the purchase and subsequent resale of a good (without the good entering or leaving the borders) and is currently recorded on a net basis in the “other business services” (according to the IMF’s 6th Balance of Payments Manual, which will be implemented by 2014, merchanting is to be recorded under the “goods” item instead of the “services” item); construction services; government services, which cover all services associated with government sectors or with international and regional organizations and not classified under other items (i.e. such as expenditures of embassies and consulates).

<sup>6</sup>Only in one case is our classification more detailed than the EBOPS classification (the distinction between “agricultural services” and “mining and on-site processing services”).

year 2007 the Bank of Italy collected outward Foreign affiliates statistics (FATS).<sup>7</sup> The survey collects the following information on foreign affiliates: number of employees, sales, country of location and main sector of activity.<sup>8</sup> Using the VAT number as a firm identifier, we are able to match 878 firms out of 2,955 firms.<sup>9</sup>

One important issue is that foreign affiliates report only total sales, which might include also sales of manufacturing products. We therefore consider only foreign affiliates whose main sector of activity is in services. We also exclude foreign affiliates whose main sector of activity is in services but does not have any correspondence to our service types, either because it is typically not traded or because it is not included in our services trade data: holding companies, wholesale and retail trade, transportation and storage; accommodation and food service activities, public administration and defence. The type of service classification has been matched with the NACE rev. 2 classification of foreign affiliates' main sector of activity on the basis of the activity description, similarly to Christen and Francois (2010). The match results in a less detailed classification (12 types of services, Table A.3).<sup>10</sup>

A second important issue is that in our data no information is available on the destination country of foreign affiliates' sales. If host-country sales are only a small fraction of total sales, as in export-platform FDI models, our data would measure the export versus FDI decision with error. Available evidence reported by the Bureau of Economic Analysis for U.S. multinationals' foreign affiliates shows that export-platform FDI models are more common for the provision of goods than for the provision of services. According to the same source, in 2009

---

<sup>7</sup>FATS statistics include only majority-owned foreign affiliates, i.e. when the investor owns more than 50% of equity shares or voting rights. The definition is more restrictive than the one for FDI statistics, which include all foreign affiliates in which an investor owns at least 10% of equity shares or voting rights. Another difference is that FDI statistics are based on the immediate counterparty country principle, while FATS statistics are based on the ultimate country principle. For simplicity, in the rest of the paper we will use the term FDI to refer to the ownership of foreign affiliates in the FATS statistics.

<sup>8</sup>As Alfaro and Chen (2011), we choose to drop foreign affiliates with zero employees or zero sales. This excludes companies that are likely to be registered exclusively for tax purposes or that are not active yet.

<sup>9</sup>The reference population of the sample is made up of about 280,000 firms whose ultimate controlling institution is based in Italy. In terms of sector coverage, the survey does not include banks, other non-insurance financial intermediaries and the public administration. The sampling scheme is based on strata determined by the following variables: total assets, geographical area and past ownership of foreign affiliates.

<sup>10</sup>No match with NACE activity sectors was available for three types of service (“Franchises and similar rights”, “Other royalties and license fees” and “Services between affiliated enterprises, not included elsewhere”).

host-country sales of services accounted for 73% of foreign affiliates' total sales (BEA 2011). This suggests that the measurement error derived from using total sales instead of local sales is likely to be small.

### 3 Main patterns

This section presents the main patterns of trade in services.<sup>11</sup> We begin by looking at the distribution of firms in our full sample by industry and trade status (Table 1). We find that firms which export and import services represent 31.6% of our sample; if we exclude banks, the percentage goes up to 40.5%, in consequence of the weak presence of cooperative (and minor) banks in international transactions in services. It is much more likely that one is an importer without exporting (24.5%) rather than an exporter without importing (2.7%), in contrast to the findings on UK firms reported by Breinlich and Criscuolo (2011). This is in line with the differences in specialisation patterns between Italy and the United Kingdom: the former has a much larger share of activity in manufacturing and records a deficit in the other services balance, while the opposite is true for the latter.

Firms that do not export nor import represent 41.3% of our sample. This figure reflects the composition of our sample, which by construction only includes medium and large firms which are more likely to export or import services than small or very small firms.

There are some differences across industries. Firms in the “information and communication sector” and in the “professional, scientific and technical activities” sector are much more likely to be both exporters and importers. In contrast, firms in the “construction” and ‘financial and insurance’ sector are more likely to be neither exporters nor importers. It should also be noted that almost half of the firms in the “manufacturing” sector are exporters of services.

This is confirmed by Table 2, which reports the value of trade in services by industry. Manufacturing firms represent 35.5% of exports of services and 33.0% of imports. This percentage is much higher than in Belgium (about 15% for both flows, according to Ariu and Mion 2010) but only slightly higher than in Germany

---

<sup>11</sup>Since our data comes from a sample survey, we chose to report weighted data (with the exception of data on the number of firms) in order to make them representative of the reference population. The weights are based on inverse sampling probabilities and are in a range between 1 and 6. However, using unweighted data instead of weighted data does not appear to have any significant impact on all our main results.

(about 25% for exports, 30% for imports, according to Kelle and Kleinert 2010 and Kelle 2012), a country which like Italy has a relatively high share of activity in the manufacturing sector. The two other large contributions come from firms in the “financial and insurance activities” sector (31.1% of exports and 27.2% of imports) and from firms in the “information and communication” sector (12.1% of exports and 23.1% of imports).<sup>12</sup>

Table 3 reports instead the value of trade by type of service. The largest types of services for both exports and imports are “reinsurance”, “other miscellaneous business services” and “services between affiliated enterprises, n.i.e.”. Other types of services with significant flows include “telecommunication services”, “franchises and similar rights”, “other royalties and license fees”, “advertising and market research”, “research and development services”, “financial services” and “computer services”.<sup>13</sup>

The distribution of the types of services traded is strongly related to the sector of activity, on both the export and the import side. Specifically, for manufacturing firms the most frequent types include services between affiliates, royalties and franchises and advertising; firms in the information and communication sector usually export and import computer services, telecommunication services and royalties and franchises; for insurance companies, more than 80% of exports and imports are concentrated in reinsurance; firms in the professional, scientific and technical activities sector tend to trade advertising, R&D, architectural and engineering and other technical services.

Trade in services is highly concentrated among firms, as already found for the UK and for Austria by Breinlich and Criscuolo (2011) and Walter and Dell’mour (2010), respectively. Table 4 shows that the top 10 exporters account for 20.8% of the total export value in the reference population, and the top 100 exporters account for 45.5% of total export value. Imports are slightly less concentrated, with the top 100 importers accounting for 38.6% of total import value.<sup>14</sup>

Table 5 reports the distribution of exporters and export value by number of

---

<sup>12</sup>As expected, the ratio of services exports on turnover (total sales of goods and services) is relatively lower for manufacturing firms (about 3% on average) than for services firms (between 6 and 12% for information and communication, financial and insurance, transportation, professional, scientific and technical activities); for the latter, the ratio of services exports on turnover is slightly lower than the corresponding value for Austrian firms (Walter and Dell’mour 2010).

<sup>13</sup>The composition of trade by type of service is more precise under the new survey-based data collection compared to the previous settlement-based system, where a much larger share of flows was recorded under residual items such as “other miscellaneous business services”.

<sup>14</sup>Trade in goods is also concentrated, with 700 large Italian exporters (0.4% of the universe of exporters) accounting for 43% of exports in 2009, according to Istat data.

service types and countries. As it is also the case with trade in goods, there is a small number of exporters which export many products to many countries and account for a large share of total value. We find that a similar pattern holds for exports but not for imports of services. For exports, 5.1% of firms are large exporters (i.e. those exporting 5 or more service types to 10 or more countries) and account for 35.3% of total exports. For imports, instead, the share of large importers (i.e., those importing 5 or more types from 10 or more countries) is significantly higher (21.2%), and represents 50.8% of import value (Table 6).

Table 7 reports data on the distribution of the number of countries, the number of types of services, the total value of trade and the values per country, per number of types of services and per country-service combination. Looking at firms with positive exports, the median firm exports only one type of service to 4 different countries. There seems to be a larger variation in sources and types of imports: in the sample of firms with positive imports, the median firm imports 3 types of services from 5 different countries. In other terms, firms are more likely to export a single service type to many countries than to export several types of services, presumably reflecting firms' specialisation in producing a single type of service. In contrast, firms are more likely to import two or more types of services; this may be explained considering that services are often used as intermediate inputs. For a large part of firms, the value of services exported or imported is quite small: the median value equals to 0.8 EUR millions for exports and 0.7 for imports.

Trade in services is also concentrated within firms. Tables 8 and 9 report the share on firms' exports or imports of their most important partner countries or types of services, respectively. The upper panel of Table 8 shows that for a firm exporting to two countries, the top country accounts on average for 82.7% of the firm's exports. Even for a firm exporting to a number of countries between 11 and 20, the top country receives more than half of the firm's exports. A similar pattern is found for imports (lower panel of Table 8). There is also within-firm concentration by service type (Table 9, upper and lower panels).

## 4 Analysis of firm and country-level variation

This section reports the results of regressions on firm and country-level variation, using either our full sample or our CB sample. We start with the following decomposition:

$$\ln(value_i) = \ln(countries_i) + \ln(types_i) + \ln(\overline{value}_i) \quad (1)$$

where  $\ln(value_i)$  is the log of export value for firm  $i$ ,  $\ln(countries_i)$  is the log of the number of countries firm  $i$  exports to,  $\ln(types_i)$  is the log of the number of types of services exported and  $\ln(\overline{value}_i)$  is the log of the average export value per country-service type combination. The first two can be defined as the extensive margins of trade (by country and type of service), while the latter corresponds to the intensive margin of trade.

For each of the three margins in equation 1, we estimate the following equation:

$$\ln(margin_i) = \alpha + \beta \ln(value_i) + \epsilon_i \quad (2)$$

The upper panel of Table 10 shows that almost 70% of firm-level variation is explained by the intensive margin, i.e. by the export value per country-service type combination. The contribution of the intensive margin is very similar to the one found by Breinlich and Criscuolo (2011) for UK firms.

We then relate the firm-level margins of trade to firm size. Using data from the CB sample, we estimate the following equation:

$$\ln(margin_i) = \alpha + \beta_1 \ln(empl_i) + \beta_2 \ln(valadd_i) + \sum_j \gamma_j ind_j + \epsilon_i \quad (3)$$

where  $\ln(empl_i)$  is the log of the number of employees in firm  $i$ ,  $\ln(valadd_i)$  is the log of value added per employee and  $\sum_j ind_j$  is a set of two-digit industry fixed effects.

The lower panel of Table 10 shows that export value is positively correlated with both the number of employees and value added per employee. Size is positively and significantly correlated with all the three margins, while productivity is positively and significantly correlated with the intensive margin only.

A similar decomposition of import values shows that firm-level variation is again largely explained by the intensive margin (65%; Table 11). Controlling for two-digit industry fixed effects, size and productivity are positively correlated with all the three margins of firm-level variation in imports.



We then look at country-level variation of exports. The log of export value to country  $c$  is decomposed as follows:

$$\ln(value_c) = \ln(firms_c) + \ln(types_c) + \ln(\overline{value}_c) \quad (4)$$

where  $\ln(firms_c)$  is the log of the number of firms exporting to country  $c$ ,  $\ln(types_c)$  is the log of the number of service types exported to country  $c$  and  $\ln(\overline{value}_c)$  is the log of the average export value per firm-service type combination in country  $c$ . We estimate the following equation:

$$\ln(margin_c) = \alpha + \beta \ln(value_c) + \epsilon_c \quad (5)$$

where  $\ln(margin_c)$  is one of the three margins in equation 4. While firm-level variation is driven by the intensive margin, country-level variation is instead mainly driven by extensive margins: the number of firms exporting to a given country accounts for 41% of country-level variation in exports; the number of service types accounts for an additional 27% (Table 12, upper panel).

The lower panel of Table 12 regresses export value and each one of the three margins on the standard gravity variables: distance (taken from Cepii) and GDP (taken from the World Bank):

$$\ln(margin_c) = \alpha + \beta_1 \ln(dist_c) + \beta_2 \ln(GDP_c) + \epsilon_c \quad (6)$$

As expected, distance is negatively correlated with export values, with a coefficient equal to -0.64. However, the negative effect of distance only works through the extensive margins, by reducing the number of firms exporting to a given market and the number of service types exported. Distance is instead not significantly correlated with the intensive margin, as also found by Breinlich and Criscuolo (2011) in contrast with previous findings on goods trade. The coefficient on GDP is positive (1.02) and significantly correlated with all the three margins of exports. The results for imports are largely similar (Table 13).

Distance seems however to have a stronger impact on imports, with a coefficient equal to -0.85, again concentrated in the extensive margins. The impact of distance on service trade is broadly similar to that on goods trade. This finding is apparently surprising given the intangibility of services, but it can be explained by other features of services, such as the need for close interaction between producer and consumer. This is much harder to get when

there are significant language or cultural differences, which generally increase with geographical distance.

## 5 Trade in services and foreign affiliates

In this section we use detailed data on foreign affiliates that are available for a subsample of firms. We first present evidence on firms' status (exporter, importer and FDI in services). We then look at the choice between export and FDI. As mentioned in Section 2, we are able to match 878 firms; 205 firms are purely "domestic" firms, with zero exports, imports and foreign affiliates' sales. The distribution of the remaining 673 firms with at least some international activity in services is reported in Table 14. The most recurrent status is to be an exporter and importer, without any FDI. The second most recurrent status is to be only an importer. Only a very small number of firms is instead engaged in just exporting or just FDI. Firms with FDI in services represent about 18% of this subsample. In particular, firms with all three forms of international activity represent 12% of the subsample but account for an extremely large share of exports (66%), imports (53%) and especially foreign affiliates' sales (92%). Not only is trade in services highly concentrated, but foreign affiliates' activity is also extremely concentrated in a relatively small group of multinational firms that take part in all three forms of international activity.

We then focus on the export versus FDI decision<sup>15</sup>. Using data on foreign affiliates' sales, we are able to compute a measure of the propensity to export relative to sell through foreign affiliates. Table 15 reports the share of exports on the sum of exports and foreign affiliates' sales by type of service. There is a huge variability across sectors: the share goes from a minimum of 0 (news agency services) to a maximum of 0.89 (research and development services). The ranking is very similar to the one reported by Oldenski (2011) on U.S. data. As in her work, research and development, architectural and engineering and other business services tend to have a high propensity to export relative to FDI, while financial and insurance services have an extremely low share of exports on the sum of exports and foreign affiliates' sales (0.01 and 0.04 respectively).

Finally, we report the results of a simple OLS specification to explain the main determinants of the propensity to export services:

---

<sup>15</sup>Bhattacharya, Patnaik and Shah 2012 on India and Kelle, Kleinert, Raff and Toubal 2012 on Germany are contemporary papers using firm-level data on this topic.

$$\frac{exp_{ick}}{(exp_{ick} + sales_{ick})} = \alpha + \beta_1 \ln(dist_c) + \beta_2 \ln(GDP_c) + \beta_3 \ln(empl_i) + \beta_4 \ln(prod_i) + \sum_j \gamma_j ind_j + \sum_k \delta_k type_k + \epsilon_{ick} \quad (7)$$

where the dependent variable is the ratio of exports to the sum of exports and foreign affiliates' sales by firm  $i$  to country  $c$  in service type  $k$ . The dependent variable is regressed on country variables (GDP and distance) and firm-level variables (employment and productivity, which is proxied by either sales per employee or value added per employee). We also control for industry and service type fixed effects. The sample is made of all firm-country-type combinations for which we record positive exports or foreign affiliates' sales.

Table 16 shows that the export share is smaller in larger markets and in larger and more productive (when productivity is measured as sales per employee) firms. It is not significantly related to distance.<sup>16</sup> Columns (3) and (4) show that the results on firm-level variables do not change when we control for country fixed effects. Column (5) shows that, controlling for firm fixed effects, market size is still negatively related to the export share but distance now becomes significant with a positive sign. The finding that smaller and less productive firms are more likely to export than to sell through foreign affiliates is consistent with theoretical predictions in Helpman, Melitz and Yeaple (2004).<sup>17</sup>

## 6 Concluding remarks

This work contributes to the firm-level literature on international trade in services, using data derived from a new Bank of Italy survey on exports and imports of services covering almost 3,000 Italian industrial and services firms. The richness of our data, which includes information on the partner country and on the type of service traded, allows us to provide a first comparison to the stylized facts on service traders reported by previous literature, such as those reported by

<sup>16</sup>The results are unchanged even after the inclusion of a common language dummy, which is not significantly different from zero. A tobit specification also yields broadly similar findings.

<sup>17</sup>In unreported regressions on a subsample of 42 countries we also include an index of FDI regulatory restrictiveness, which varies by country and sector (OECD 2007). The coefficient on restrictions to FDI is always positive and weakly significant: exports are preferred to FDI if there are higher barriers to the latter. The findings on the other variables remain largely unchanged.

Breinlich and Criscuolo (2011) for their sample of UK firms. In addition, we are able to report detailed firm-level evidence on the relation between trade and FDI in services. This is important, given that the provision of services through foreign affiliates is often more significant than through cross-border trade.

Our main findings can be summarized as follows. Importing services is much more likely than exporting services. Firms in the services sector are not the only ones that actually export services; about one third of the total value of exports of services comes from manufacturing firms. Trade in services is highly concentrated across firms: the top 10 firms represent about 20% of the total value of exports and imports in the reference population. Firm-level variation in the value of traded services is largely driven by the intensive margin. Country-level variation is instead mainly driven by the extensive margin. The standard gravity variables explain a large fraction of country-level variation. In particular, distance reduces services trade similarly to what results from estimates for goods trade, despite the intangibility of services and the absence of physical transport costs. Further research should focus on cultural and legal determinants which may explain the negative effect of geographical distance.

We also innovate on previous literature by reporting detailed firm-level evidence on the relation between trade in services and the activity of foreign affiliates. We find a huge variability across sectors in the propensity to export relative to sell through foreign affiliates. We also find that exports are preferred to foreign affiliates' sales by smaller and less productive firms and in smaller markets.

Overall, our findings support most, but not all, the stylized facts on services trade reported by Breinlich and Criscuolo (2011) in their study of UK firms. In particular, in contrast to them we find that importing services is much more likely than exporting services; their finding presumably reflects UK's strong comparative advantage in services. Moreover, we find that FDI activity in services is even more concentrated than the already highly concentrated trade. The extremely high level of concentration is in line with the general pattern observed in services (Christen and Francois 2010) and casts some doubts on the conclusion that theoretical models of goods trade may be applied to trade in services without significant modifications.

The high level of firm heterogeneity suggests that liberalization in services trade could have significant effects on aggregate productivity, following a reallocation of market shares in favour of more productive exporters, as

pointed out in recent models of trade with heterogeneous firms (Melitz 2003). Services trade could also have important effects on productivity through the import side, since most services purchased from abroad are intermediate inputs. Further research is required to study the relation between trade in services and productivity.

## References

- Alfaro L., Chen M. 2011. Surviving the global financial crisis: foreign ownership and establishment performance, NBER Working Papers, no. 17141.
- Ariu A., 2011, The margins of trade: services vs goods, mimeo.
- Ariu A., Mion G. 2010, Trade in services: IT and task content, National Bank of Belgium Working Papers, no. 200.
- Baldwin R. 2006, Globalisation: the great unbundling(s), paper for the Finnish Prime Minister Office, Economic Council of Finland as part of EU Presidency, September.
- BEA 2011, Operations of U.S. multinational companies in the United States and abroad, November.
- Bernard A.B., Jensen J.B., Schott P. 2009. Importers, exporters and multinationals: a portrait of firms in the U.S. that trade goods, in Dunne T., Jensen J.B., Roberts M.J. Producer dynamics: new evidence from micro data, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Bernard A.B., Jensen J.B., Redding S.J., Schott P. 2007. Firms in international trade, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 21(3), 105-130.
- Bernard A.B., Jensen J.B., Redding S.J., Schott P. 2009. The margins of US trade, *American Economic Review*, 99(2), 487-493.
- Bernard A.B., Redding S.J., Schott P. 2011. Multi-product firms and trade liberalization, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 126(3), 1271-1318.
- Bhattacharya R., Patnaik I., Shah A. 2012, Export versus FDI in services, *The World Economy*, 35, 61-78.
- Breinlich H., Criscuolo C. 2011. International trade in services: a portrait of importers and exporters, *Journal of International Economics*, 84, 188-206.
- Castellani D., Serti F., Tomasi C., 2010. Firms in international trade: importers and exporters heterogeneity in the Italian manufacturing industry, *The World Economy*, 33, 424-457.
- Christen E., Francois J. 2010. Modes of delivery in services, CEPR Discussion paper. no. 7912.
- Conti G., Lo Turco A., Maggioni D. 2010. Exporters in services: new evidence from Italian firms, *Applied Economics Quarterly*, 56(1), 73-98.

- Eaton J., Kortum S., Kramarz F. 2004. Dissecting trade: firms, industries, and export destinations, *American Economic Review*, 94(2), 150-154.
- Eaton J., Kortum S., Kramarz F. 2008. An anatomy of international trade: evidence from French firms, NBER Working Paper, no. 14610.
- Eckel C., Neary J.P. 2010. Multi-product firms and flexible manufacturing in the global economy, *Review of Economic Studies*, 77(1), 188-217.
- Fillat Castejón C., Francois J., Woerz, J. 2008. Cross-border trade and FDI in services, CEPR Discussion paper. no. 7074.
- Francois J., Hoekman B. 2010. Services trade and policy, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 48, 642-692.
- Freund C., Weinhold D. 2002. The Internet and international trade in services, *American Economic Review*, 92(2), 236-240.
- Head K., Mayer T., Ries J. 2009. How remote is the offshoring threat? *European Economic Review*, 53, 429-444.
- Helpman E., Melitz M., Yeaple S.R. 2004. Export Versus FDI with heterogeneous firms, *American Economic Review*, 94(1), 300-316.
- IMF 1997, Balance of payments manual, 5th edition, Washington.
- Kelle M. 2012. Crossing industrial borders: German manufacturers as services exporters, Centro Studi Luca d'Agliano Development Studies working papers, no. 329.
- Kelle M., Kleinert J. 2010. German firms in service trade, *Applied Economics Quarterly*, 56(1), 51-71.
- Kelle M., Kleinert J., Raff H., Toubal F. 2012. Cross-border and foreign-affiliate sales of services: evidence from German micro-data, CESifo working paper, no. 3806.
- Lipsey R.E. 2008. Measuring international trade in services, in Reinsdorf M.B., Slaughter M.J. (eds) *International trade in services and intangibles in the era of globalization*, NBER.
- Manova K., Zhang Z. 2012. Export prices across firms and destinations, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 127(1), 379-436.

- Mayer T., Melitz M.J., Ottaviano G.I.P. 2010. Market size, competition and the product mix of exporters, Research series 201010-202, National Bank of Belgium.
- Mayer T., Ottaviano G.I.P. 2007, The happy few: the internationalisation of European firms. Bruegel Blueprint Series, vol. III.
- Melitz M.J. 2003. The impact of trade on intra-industry reallocations and aggregate industry productivity, *Econometrica*, 71(6), 1695-1725.
- Melitz M.J., Ottaviano G.I.P. 2008. Market size, trade, and productivity, *Review of Economic Studies*, 75(1), 295-316.
- Oldenski L. 2011, Export versus FDI and the communication of complex information, *Journal of International Economics*, forthcoming.
- Temouri Y., Vogel A., Wagner J. 2010, Self-selection into export markets by business services firms: evidence from France, Germany and the United Kingdom, IZA Discussion Paper, no. 5147.
- Walter P., Dell'mour R. 2010, Firm level analysis of international trade in services, IFC Working Papers, no. 4, March.



## Tables and figures

Figure 1: Italy: Exports and imports of other services (% of GDP)




Table 1: Number of firms by industry and trade status

Industry	Not exp, not imp	Exp only	Imp only	Exp & imp	Total
Manufacturing	203	36	300	426	965
Electricity, gas, water	33	4	47	17	101
Construction	34	6	15	13	68
Wholesale and retail trade	183	16	152	119	470
Transportation and storage	18	2	20	40	80
Accommodation and food service	3	0	6	8	17
Information and communication	7	0	21	58	86
Finance and insurance	698	12	119	170	999
Real estate	13	0	4	1	18
Professional and other activities	6	1	4	34	45
Administrative activities	9	2	20	24	55
Other	12	1	15	23	51
Total	1219	80	723	933	2955
<i>Total (row %)</i>	<i>41.3</i>	<i>2.7</i>	<i>24.5</i>	<i>31.6</i>	<i>100.0</i>

The table reports the number of firms by industry and services trade status (neither exporter nor importer; exporter only; importer only; exporter and importer). The last row reports the row percentage for the total. Full sample. Unweighted data.

Table 2: **Value of trade in services by industry**

<b>Industry</b>	<b>Exports</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Imports</b>	<b>%</b>
Manufacturing	9816	35.5	10719	33.0
Electricity, gas, water	55	0.2	393	1.2
Construction	130	0.5	127	0.4
Wholesale and retail trade	1238	4.5	1757	5.4
Transportation and storage	1853	6.7	1228	3.8
Accommodation and food service activ.	153	0.6	54	0.2
Information and communication	3343	12.1	7507	23.1
Financial and insurance (incl. banks)	8607	31.1	8844	27.2
Real estate activities	17	0.1	76	0.2
Professional, scientific and technical activ.	1180	4.3	831	2.6
Administrative and support service activ.	224	0.8	514	1.6
Other	1040	3.8	439	1.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>27657</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>32490</b>	<b>100.0</b>

The table reports the value of exports and imports of services by industry (EUR millions and column percentages). Full sample. Weighted data.

Table 3: Value of trade in services by service type traded

Type of service	Export	%	Import	%
Telecommunication services	2155	7.8	2567	7.9
Postal services	0	0.0	16	0.0
Courier services	79	0.3	70	0.2
Life insurance and pension funding	93	0.3	47	0.1
Freight insurance	14	0.1	55	0.2
Other direct insurance	389	1.4	847	2.6
Reinsurance	5833	21.1	6260	19.3
Auxiliary services	851	3.1	515	1.6
Financial services	1626	5.9	1688	5.2
Computer services	995	3.6	2399	7.4
News agency services	10	0.0	23	0.1
Other information provision services	11	0.0	87	0.3
Franchises and similar rights	1126	4.1	2639	8.1
Other royalties and license fees	1412	5.1	2208	6.8
Legal services	8	0.0	219	0.7
Accounting, auditing, book-keeping	246	0.9	524	1.6
Business and management consultancy	466	1.7	704	2.2
Advertising, market research	1331	4.8	1567	4.8
Research and development services	1605	5.8	1082	3.3
Architectural, engineering	859	3.1	1379	4.2
Waste treatment and depollution	781	2.8	189	0.6
Agricultural services	0	0.0	0	0.0
Mining and on-site processing services	3	0.0	99	0.3
Other miscellaneous business services	3717	13.4	3880	11.9
Services between affiliated enterprises, n.i.e.	3880	14.0	2993	9.2
Audio-visual and related services	136	0.5	149	0.5
Education services	4	0.0	17	0.1
Health services	3	0.0	9	0.0
Other personal services	24	0.1	260	0.8
Total	27657	100.0	32490	100.0

The table reports the value of exports and imports of services by service type traded (EUR millions and column percentages). Full sample. Weighted data.

Table 4: **Top exporters and importers of services: share on total trade value**

	<b>Top 5</b>	<b>Top 10</b>	<b>Top 20</b>	<b>Top 50</b>	<b>Top 100</b>
Export	14.7	20.8	27.9	38.2	45.5
Import	14.2	18.7	23.3	31.8	38.6

The table reports the percentage share of total trade values in reference population (weighted) accounted for by exports or imports of the top 5, 10, 20, 50 and 100 exporters or importers (unweighted). Full sample.

Table 5: **Distribution of exporters and export value by number of service types and countries**

No. types	No. countries						All
	1	2	3	4	5-9	10+	
	Number of exporters						
1	22.7	6.5	5.3	1.8	6.1	9.4	51.8
2	3.8	4.2	2.3	0.9	4.2	3.9	19.4
3	0.5	1.1	1.5	1.1	4.4	4.4	12.9
4	0.0	0.5	0.4	0.4	2.2	3.9	7.4
5+	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.6	2.3	5.1	8.4
All	27.0	12.3	9.9	4.7	19.2	26.8	100.0
	Export value						
1	6.0	1.7	0.9	1.2	2.0	14.9	26.8
2	4.4	0.6	0.6	0.2	2.4	8.3	16.5
3	0.0	1.6	1.0	0.3	3.7	4.3	11.1
4	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	1.5	5.6	7.3
5+	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.2	2.2	35.3	38.3
All	10.4	4.1	3.1	2.1	11.8	68.5	100.0

The table reports the percentage distribution of number of exporters and export value by number of exported service types and number of destination countries. For instance, the cell in second row and second column indicates that 22.7 percent of exporters export only one service type to only one country. Full sample (only firms with positive exports). Weighted data for export value.

Table 6: **Distribution of importers and import value by number of service types and countries**

No. types	No. countries						All
	1	2	3	4	5-9	10+	
	Number of importers						
1	11.9	2.9	1.8	0.8	2.0	2.5	21.8
2	3.3	5.2	1.5	1.7	2.4	2.0	16.1
3	1.3	1.6	2.1	2.0	3.7	2.5	13.2
4	0.8	0.4	1.6	0.8	4.1	3.2	11.0
5+	0.6	1.2	1.1	2.1	11.7	21.2	37.9
All	17.8	11.3	8.1	7.4	23.9	31.4	100.0
	Import value						
1	1.8	0.6	0.6	1.4	1.0	4.3	9.8
2	1.7	0.3	0.2	0.3	1.1	3.8	7.4
3	0.5	0.6	0.2	1.0	0.7	1.9	4.9
4	6.3	0.2	0.5	0.4	1.0	5.4	13.9
5+	0.3	4.7	0.2	0.3	7.6	50.8	64.0
All	10.7	6.4	1.8	3.4	11.4	66.2	100.0

The table reports the percentage distribution of number of importers and import value by number of imported service types and number of source countries. For instance, the cell in second row and second column indicates that 11.9 percent of importers import only one service type from only one country. Full sample (only firms with positive imports). Weighted data for import value.



Table 7: Number of service types and countries per firm

	No. of countries	No. of types	Value (total)	Value per country	Value per type	Value per country*type
Export						
1 pct.	1	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25 pct.	1	1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
50 pct.	4	1	0.8	0.2	0.5	0.1
75 pct.	10	3	5.7	0.8	2.7	0.4
99 pct.	63	8	239.0	43.1	105.7	37.9
Mean	8.9	2.1	14.0	2.5	6.5	1.7
Import						
1 pct.	1	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25 pct.	2	2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
50 pct.	5	3	0.7	0.1	0.2	0.0
75 pct.	13	6	4.2	0.5	0.9	0.1
99 pct.	59	14	141.1	26.0	47.5	11.2
Mean	9.9	4.2	10.2	2.0	2.6	0.7

The table reports summary statistics for the distribution per firm of the following indicators: number of trading countries, number of traded service types, trade value, trade value per country, trade value per service type, trade value per country-service type combination. Values in EUR millions. Full sample. Only firms with positive exports (1013) in the upper panel and positive imports (1656) in the lower panel. Weighted data for export and import values.

Table 8: **Concentration of firm exports and imports by country**

Country ranking	No. of partner countries							
	1	2	3	4	5	6-10	11-20	21+
Export								
1	100.0	82.7	72.7	73.3	66.0	59.5	54.9	38.7
2	.	17.3	21.5	17.2	19.2	19.6	17.1	16.2
3	.	.	5.8	6.9	9.7	9.4	9.5	10.4
4	.	.	.	2.6	3.7	5.4	5.8	7.5
5	.	.	.	.	1.3	3.2	3.8	5.3
No. firms	272	116	101	56	54	163	129	122
Import								
1	100.0	83.1	73.8	70.8	70.5	60.8	49.7	43.2
2	.	16.9	20.5	20.0	18.0	19.4	19.4	16.5
3	.	.	5.7	7.0	7.4	9.5	10.9	9.9
4	.	.	.	2.1	2.9	5.1	6.6	6.7
5	.	.	.	.	1.2	2.7	4.2	4.8
No. firms	303	184	141	119	100	337	264	208

The table reports the average fraction of a firm's exports or imports accounted for by its five most important markets for a firm exporting to or importing from a number of countries reported in the column headings. Full sample (only firms with positive exports in the upper panel and positive imports in the lower panel). Unweighted data.

Table 9: **Concentration of firm exports and imports by service type**

Service type ranking	No. of service types						
	1	2	3	4	5	6-10	11+
Export							
1	100.0	83.5	77.3	72.7	67.3	65.6	52.6
2	.	16.5	18.5	18.0	20.5	20.4	28.3
3	.	.	4.2	7.3	8.0	8.3	8.9
4	.	.	.	2.0	3.1	3.6	6.5
5	.	.	.	.	1.1	1.3	2.3
No. firms	533	191	133	73	37	44	2
Import							
1	100.0	80.5	74.9	71.9	66.6	60.9	54.8
2	.	19.5	20.2	19.2	21.0	21.3	21.3
3	.	.	4.9	6.9	8.3	9.5	10.0
4	.	.	.	2.0	3.1	4.4	5.7
5	.	.	.	.	1.0	2.3	3.3
No. firms	382	249	214	186	152	396	77

The table reports the average fraction of a firm's exports or imports accounted for by its five most important service types for a firm exporting or importing a number of service types reported in the column headings. Full sample (only firms with positive exports in the upper panel and positive imports in the lower panel). Unweighted data.

Table 10: **Firm-level margins: exports**

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Ln(Value)	Ln(No. of countries)	Ln(No. of types)	Ln(Value per country*type)
	Full sample (including banks)			
Ln(Value)	1.000***	0.216***	0.088***	0.697***
	(0.000)	(0.012)	(0.007)	(0.015)
Observations	1013	1013	1013	1013
$R^2$	1.000	0.416	0.254	0.739
	CB sample			
Ln(Employees)	0.725***	0.318***	0.159***	0.249***
	(0.087)	(0.035)	(0.025)	(0.074)
Ln(Value added per employee)	0.408**	0.064	0.035	0.309***
	(0.162)	(0.061)	(0.045)	(0.111)
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	614	614	614	614
$R^2$	0.303	0.349	0.200	0.203

The table reports OLS estimates of equation 2 (upper panel) and equation 3 (lower panel). The dependent variable is reported in the column heading (log of export value by firm  $i$  and its three margins: log of number of destination countries, log of number of exported service types, log of average export value per country-service type combination). It is regressed on the log of export value (upper panel) and on the log of employees and log of value added per employee. Two-digit industry fixed effects are included in lower panel. Full sample (only firms with positive exports). Weighted regressions. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

Table 11: **Firm-level margins: imports**

Variables	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Ln(Value)	Ln(No. of countries)	Ln(No. of types)	Ln(Value per country*type)
Full sample (including banks)				
Ln(Value)	1.000***	0.203***	0.144***	0.653***
	(0.000)	(0.009)	(0.007)	(0.014)
Observations	1656	1656	1656	1656
$R^2$	1.000	0.405	0.340	0.671
CB sample				
Ln(Employees)	0.945***	0.330***	0.190***	0.424***
	(0.081)	(0.029)	(0.023)	(0.069)
Ln(Value added per employee)	0.664***	0.182***	0.130***	0.352***
	(0.139)	(0.050)	(0.037)	(0.110)
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	987	987	987	987
$R^2$	0.350	0.314	0.221	0.189

The table reports OLS estimates of equation 2 (upper panel) and equation 3 (lower panel) (with exports replaced by imports). The dependent variable is reported in the column heading (log of import value by firm  $i$  and its three margins: log of number of source countries, log of number of imported service types, log of average import value per country-service type combination). It is regressed on the log of import value (upper panel) and on the log of employees and log of value added per employee. Two-digit industry fixed effects are included in lower panel. Full sample (only firms with positive imports). Weighted regressions. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

Table 12: **Country-level margins: exports**

Variables	(1) Ln(Value)	(2) Ln(No. of firms)	(3) Ln(No. of types)	(4) Ln(Value per firm*type)
Ln(Value)	1.000*** (0.000)	0.411*** (0.016)	0.268*** (0.010)	0.321*** (0.024)
Observations	230	230	230	230
$R^2$	1.000	0.791	0.772	0.478
Ln(Distance)	-0.644*** (0.182)	-0.467*** (0.103)	-0.267*** (0.063)	0.089 (0.086)
Ln(GDP)	1.018*** (0.060)	0.494*** (0.025)	0.301*** (0.018)	0.223*** (0.037)
Observations	191	191	191	191
$R^2$	0.697	0.766	0.675	0.139

The table reports OLS estimates of equation 5 (upper panel) and equation 6 (lower panel). The dependent variable is reported in the column heading (log of export value to country  $c$  and its three margins: log of number of exporting firms, log of number of exported service types, log of average export value per firm-service type combination). It is regressed on the log of export value (upper panel) and on the log of country  $c$ 's distance and GDP. Full sample (only firms with positive exports). Unweighted regressions. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

Table 13: **Country-level margins: imports**

Variables	(1) Ln(Value)	(2) Ln(No. of firms)	(3) Ln(No. of types)	(4) Ln(Value per firm*type)
Ln(Value)	1.000*** (0.000)	0.431*** (0.021)	0.255*** (0.011)	0.315*** (0.031)
Observations	223	223	223	223
$R^2$	1.000	0.779	0.760	0.441
Ln(Distance)	-0.847*** (0.191)	-0.559*** (0.115)	-0.279*** (0.056)	-0.009 (0.090)
Ln(GDP)	1.043*** (0.073)	0.567*** (0.029)	0.313*** (0.019)	0.163*** (0.045)
Observations	188	188	188	188
$R^2$	0.612	0.765	0.661	0.068

The table reports OLS estimates of equation 5 (upper panel) and equation 6 (lower panel) (with exports replaced by imports). The dependent variable is reported in the column heading (log of import value to country  $c$  and its three margins: log of number of importing firms, log of number of imported service types, log of average import value per firm-service type combination). It is regressed on the log of import value (upper panel) and on the log of country  $c$ 's distance and GDP. Full sample (only firms with positive imports). Unweighted regressions. Robust standard errors in parentheses. \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

Table 14: Trade and FDI status in services

<b>Status</b>	<b>Obs</b>	<b>% Obs</b>	<b>% Exp</b>	<b>% Imp</b>	<b>% FDI</b>
Only export	37	5.5	1.6	0.0	0.0
Only import	227	33.7	0.0	5.5	0.0
Only FDI	10	1.5	0.0	0.0	3.9
Export and import	289	42.9	32.7	40.1	0.0
Export and FDI	5	0.7	0.1	0.0	1.2
Import and FDI	24	3.6	0.0	1.0	2.6
Export, import and FDI	81	12.0	65.6	53.3	92.3
Total	673	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The table reports the distribution of firms by trade and FDI status in services (number of firms, percentage distribution, percentage distribution in terms of export value, percentage distribution in terms of import value, percentage distribution in terms of foreign affiliates' sales). Only firms with positive exports, imports or foreign affiliates' sales.



Table 15: **Ratio of exports to the sum of exports and foreign affiliates' sales by service type**

<b>Type of service</b>	<b>Share</b>
Research and development services	0.89
Architectural and engineering services	0.61
Advertising and market research	0.42
Computer services	0.41
Other business, professional and technical services	0.21
Communication services	0.12
Business and management consultancy	0.10
Insurance services	0.04
Audio-visual and related services	0.01
Other personal, cultural and recreational services	0.01
Financial services (except holding)	0.01
News agency services	0.00

The table reports the ratio of exports to the sum of exports and foreign affiliates' sales by type of service (ranked in decreasing order).

Table 16: **Ratio of exports to the sum of exports and foreign affiliates' sales**

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Ln(Distance)	0.000 (0.005)	-0.001 (0.005)			0.007* (0.004)
Ln(GDP)	-0.008*** (0.002)	-0.011*** (0.002)			-0.011*** (0.002)
Ln(Employees)	-0.023*** (0.003)	-0.014*** (0.003)	-0.025*** (0.003)	-0.015*** (0.003)	
Ln(Sales per employee)	-0.019*** (0.004)		-0.019*** (0.004)		
Ln(Value added per employee)		0.004 (0.003)		0.003 (0.003)	
Observations	5574	3924	5666	3978	5611
Countries	135	135	145	145	135
Country FE			X	X	
Firm FE					X
Industry FE	X	X	X	X	X
Service type FE	X	X	X	X	X
$R^2$	0.221	0.104	0.250	0.138	0.606

The table reports OLS estimates of equation 7. The dependent variable is the ratio of exports to the sum of exports and foreign affiliates' sales by firm  $i$  to country  $c$  in service type  $k$ . It is regressed on country  $c$ 's log of distance and GDP, firm  $i$ 's log of employees and productivity (measured either by the log of sales per employee or by the log of value added per employee) and two-digit industry and service type fixed effects. Columns (3) and (4) control for country fixed effects, column (5) controls for firm fixed effects. Standard errors (clustred at country level) in parentheses. \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*  $p < 0.1$ .

## Appendix

Table A.1: **Samples**

Variable	<b>Full sample</b>		<b>CB sample</b>	
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
Employees (units)	635	191	755	281
Total sales (EUR millions)	339	115	437	147
Exports of services (EUR millions)	5	0	5	0
Imports of services (EUR millions)	6	0	7	0
Value added (EUR millions)			68	21
Wage bill (EUR millions)			38	13
Value added per employee (EUR thousands)			115	75
Wages per employee (EUR thousands)			58	49
No. firms	2955	2955	1489	1489

The table reports summary statistics for the full and CB samples. Unweighted data.

Table A.2: Classification of service types

<b>Type of service</b>	<b>EBOPS code</b>
<i>Communications services</i>	<i>245</i>
Telecommunication services	247
Postal services	958
Courier services	959
<i>Insurance services</i>	<i>253</i>
Life insurance and pension funding (premiums and claims)	254
Freight insurance (premiums and claims)	255
Other direct insurance (premiums and claims)	256
Reinsurance (premiums and claims)	257
Auxiliary services	258
<i>Financial services</i>	<i>260</i>
Financial services	260
<i>Computer and information services</i>	<i>262</i>
Computer services	263
News agency services	889
Other information provision services	890
<i>Royalties and license fees</i>	<i>266</i>
Franchises and similar rights	891
Other royalties and license fees	892
<i>Other business services</i>	<i>268</i>
Legal services	275
Accounting, auditing, book-keeping and tax consulting services	276
Business and management consultancy, public relations services	277
Advertising, market research and public opinion polling	278
Research and development services	279
Architectural, engineering and other technical consultancy	280
Waste treatment and depollution	282
Agricultural services	283
Mining and on-site processing services	283
Other miscellaneous business, professional and technical services	284
Services between affiliated enterprises, n.i.e.	285
<i>Personal, cultural and recreational services</i>	<i>287</i>
Audio-visual and related services	288
Education services	895
Health services	896
Other	897

The table reports a list of service types and the corresponding EBOPS codes. Service types in italics correspond to aggregations of service types.

Table A.3: Match between EBOPS service types and NACE activities

Type of service	EBOPS code	Nace rev. 2 code
Communication services	245	53, 61
Insurance services	253	65
Financial services (except holding)	260	64 (ex.642), 66
Computer services	263	62
News agency services	889-890	63
Business and management consultancy	277	70
Advertising and market research	278	73
Research and development services	279	72
Architectural and engineering services	280	71
Other business, professional and technical services	275-276, 282-284	37-39, 68-69, 74, 77-82
Audio-visual and related services	288	59-60
Other personal, cultural and recreational services	895-897	75, 85-88, 90-96
<i>Types of services without match in NACE</i>		
Franchises and similar rights	891	
Other royalties and license fees	892	
Services between affiliated enterprises, n.i.e.	285	

The table reports the correspondence between EBOPS service types codes and NACE rev. 2 industry codes.

RECENTLY PUBLISHED “TEMI” (\*)

- N. 856 – *Optimal dynamic public communication*, by Marcello Miccoli (February 2012).
- N. 857 – *Modelling loans to non-financial corporations in the euro area*, by Christoffer Kok Sørensen, David Marqués Ibáñez and Carlotta Rossi (February 2012).
- N. 858 – *Economic (in)stability under monetary targeting*, by Luca Sessa (March 2012).
- N. 859 – *Optimal fiscal policy when agents fear government default*, by Francesco Caprioli, Pietro Rizza and Pietro Tommasino (March 2012).
- N. 860 – *The effects of unemployment benefits in Italy: evidence from an institutional change*, by Alfonso Rosolia and Paolo Sestito (March 2012).
- N. 861 – *Monetary policy and the flow of funds in the euro area*, by Riccardo Bonci (March 2012).
- N. 862 – *Does gender matter for public spending? Empirical evidence from Italian municipalities*, by Massimiliano Rigon and Giulia M. Tanzi (April 2012).
- N. 863 – *House price cycles in emerging economies*, by Alessio Ciarlone (April 2012).
- N. 864 – *Measuring the underground economy with the currency demand approach: a reinterpretation of the methodology, with an application to Italy*, by Guerino Ardizzi, Carmelo Petraglia, Massimiliano Piacenza and Gilberto Turati (April 2012).
- N. 865 – *Corporate geography in multi-plant firms*, by Rita Cappariello, Stefano Federico and Roberta Zizza (April 2012).
- N. 866 – *Don't stand so close to me: the urban impact of immigration*, by Antonio Accetturo, Francesco Manaresi, Sauro Mocetti and Elisabetta Olivieri (April 2012).
- N. 867 – *Disinflation effects in a medium-scale New Keynesian model: money supply rule versus interest rate rule*, by Guido Ascari and Tiziano Ropele (April 2012).
- N. 868 – *The economic costs of organized crime: evidence from southern Italy*, by Paolo Pinotti (April 2012).
- N. 869 – *Network effects of public transport infrastructure: evidence on Italian regions*, by Valter Di Giacinto, Giacinto Micucci and Pasqualino Montanaro (July 2012).
- N. 870 – *To misreport or not to report? The measurement of household financial wealth*, by Andrea Neri and Maria Giovanna Ranalli (July 2012).
- N. 871 – *Capital destruction, jobless recoveries, and the discipline device role of unemployment*, by Marianna Riggi (July 2012).
- N. 872 – *Selecting predictors by using Bayesian model averaging in bridge models*, by Lorenzo Bencivelli, Massimiliano Marcellino and Gianluca Moretti (July 2012).
- N. 873 – *Euro area and global oil shocks: an empirical model-based analysis*, by Lorenzo Forni, Andrea Gerali, Alessandro Notarpietro and Massimiliano Pisani (July 2012).
- N. 874 – *Evidence on the impact of R&D and ICT investment on innovation and productivity in Italian firms*, by Bronwyn H. Hall, Francesca Lotti and Jacques Mairesse (July 2012).
- N. 875 – *Family background, self-confidence and economic outcomes*, by Antonio Filippin and Marco Paccagnella (July 2012).
- N. 876 – *Banks' reactions to Basel-III*, by Paolo Angelini and Andrea Gerali (July 2012).

---

(\*) Requests for copies should be sent to:  
Banca d'Italia – Servizio Studi di struttura economica e finanziaria – Divisione Biblioteca e Archivio storico – Via Nazionale, 91 – 00184 Rome – (fax 0039 06 47922059). They are available on the Internet [www.bancaditalia.it](http://www.bancaditalia.it).

2009

- F. PANETTA, F. SCHIVARDI and M. SHUM, *Do mergers improve information? Evidence from the loan market*, Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking, v. 41, 4, pp. 673-709, **TD No. 521 (October 2004)**.
- M. BUGAMELLI and F. PATERNÒ, *Do workers' remittances reduce the probability of current account reversals?*, World Development, v. 37, 12, pp. 1821-1838, **TD No. 573 (January 2006)**.
- P. PAGANO and M. PISANI, *Risk-adjusted forecasts of oil prices*, The B.E. Journal of Macroeconomics, v. 9, 1, Article 24, **TD No. 585 (March 2006)**.
- M. PERICOLI and M. SBRACIA, *The CAPM and the risk appetite index: theoretical differences, empirical similarities, and implementation problems*, International Finance, v. 12, 2, pp. 123-150, **TD No. 586 (March 2006)**.
- R. BRONZINI and P. PISELLI, *Determinants of long-run regional productivity with geographical spillovers: the role of R&D, human capital and public infrastructure*, Regional Science and Urban Economics, v. 39, 2, pp.187-199, **TD No. 597 (September 2006)**.
- U. ALBERTAZZI and L. GAMBACORTA, *Bank profitability and the business cycle*, Journal of Financial Stability, v. 5, 4, pp. 393-409, **TD No. 601 (September 2006)**.
- F. BALASSONE, D. FRANCO and S. ZOTTERI, *The reliability of EMU fiscal indicators: risks and safeguards*, in M. Larch and J. Nogueira Martins (eds.), Fiscal Policy Making in the European Union: an Assessment of Current Practice and Challenges, London, Routledge, **TD No. 633 (June 2007)**.
- A. CIARLONE, P. PISELLI and G. TREBESCHI, *Emerging Markets' Spreads and Global Financial Conditions*, Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions & Money, v. 19, 2, pp. 222-239, **TD No. 637 (June 2007)**.
- S. MAGRI, *The financing of small innovative firms: the Italian case*, Economics of Innovation and New Technology, v. 18, 2, pp. 181-204, **TD No. 640 (September 2007)**.
- V. DI GIACINTO and G. MICUCCI, *The producer service sector in Italy: long-term growth and its local determinants*, Spatial Economic Analysis, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 391-425, **TD No. 643 (September 2007)**.
- F. LORENZO, L. MONTEFORTE and L. SESSA, *The general equilibrium effects of fiscal policy: estimates for the euro area*, Journal of Public Economics, v. 93, 3-4, pp. 559-585, **TD No. 652 (November 2007)**.
- Y. ALTUNBAS, L. GAMBACORTA and D. MARQUÉS, *Securitisation and the bank lending channel*, European Economic Review, v. 53, 8, pp. 996-1009, **TD No. 653 (November 2007)**.
- R. GOLINELLI and S. MOMIGLIANO, *The Cyclical Reaction of Fiscal Policies in the Euro Area. A Critical Survey of Empirical Research*, Fiscal Studies, v. 30, 1, pp. 39-72, **TD No. 654 (January 2008)**.
- P. DEL GIOVANE, S. FABIANI and R. SABBATINI, *What's behind "Inflation Perceptions"? A survey-based analysis of Italian consumers*, Giornale degli Economisti e Annali di Economia, v. 68, 1, pp. 25-52, **TD No. 655 (January 2008)**.
- F. MACCHERONI, M. MARINACCI, A. RUSTICHINI and M. TABOGA, *Portfolio selection with monotone mean-variance preferences*, Mathematical Finance, v. 19, 3, pp. 487-521, **TD No. 664 (April 2008)**.
- M. AFFINITO and M. PIAZZA, *What are borders made of? An analysis of barriers to European banking integration*, in P. Alessandrini, M. Fratianni and A. Zazzaro (eds.): The Changing Geography of Banking and Finance, Dordrecht Heidelberg London New York, Springer, **TD No. 666 (April 2008)**.
- A. BRANDOLINI, *On applying synthetic indices of multidimensional well-being: health and income inequalities in France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom*, in R. Gotoh and P. Dumouchel (eds.), Against Injustice. The New Economics of Amartya Sen, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, **TD No. 668 (April 2008)**.
- G. FERRERO and A. NOBILI, *Futures contract rates as monetary policy forecasts*, International Journal of Central Banking, v. 5, 2, pp. 109-145, **TD No. 681 (June 2008)**.
- P. CASADIO, M. LO CONTE and A. NERI, *Balancing work and family in Italy: the new mothers' employment decisions around childbearing*, in T. Addabbo and G. Solinas (eds.), Non-Standard Employment and Quality of Work, Physica-Verlag. A Springer Company, **TD No. 684 (August 2008)**.
- L. ARCIERO, C. BIANCOTTI, L. D'AURIZIO and C. IMPENNA, *Exploring agent-based methods for the analysis of payment systems: A crisis model for StarLogo TNG*, Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation, v. 12, 1, **TD No. 686 (August 2008)**.
- A. CALZA and A. ZAGHINI, *Nonlinearities in the dynamics of the euro area demand for M1*, Macroeconomic Dynamics, v. 13, 1, pp. 1-19, **TD No. 690 (September 2008)**.
- L. FRANCESCO and A. SECCHI, *Technological change and the households' demand for currency*, Journal of Monetary Economics, v. 56, 2, pp. 222-230, **TD No. 697 (December 2008)**.

- G. ASCARI and T. ROPELE, *Trend inflation, taylor principle, and indeterminacy*, Journal of Money, Credit and Banking, v. 41, 8, pp. 1557-1584, **TD No. 708 (May 2007)**.
- S. COLAROSSO and A. ZAGHINI, *Gradualism, transparency and the improved operational framework: a look at overnight volatility transmission*, International Finance, v. 12, 2, pp. 151-170, **TD No. 710 (May 2009)**.
- M. BUGAMELLI, F. SCHIVARDI and R. ZIZZA, *The euro and firm restructuring*, in A. Alesina e F. Giavazzi (eds): Europe and the Euro, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, **TD No. 716 (June 2009)**.
- B. HALL, F. LOTTI and J. MAIRESSE, *Innovation and productivity in SMEs: empirical evidence for Italy*, Small Business Economics, v. 33, 1, pp. 13-33, **TD No. 718 (June 2009)**.

2010

- A. PRATI and M. SBRACIA, *Uncertainty and currency crises: evidence from survey data*, Journal of Monetary Economics, v. 57, 6, pp. 668-681, **TD No. 446 (July 2002)**.
- L. MONTEFORTE and S. SIVIERO, *The Economic Consequences of Euro Area Modelling Shortcuts*, Applied Economics, v. 42, 19-21, pp. 2399-2415, **TD No. 458 (December 2002)**.
- S. MAGRI, *Debt maturity choice of nonpublic Italian firms*, Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking, v.42, 2-3, pp. 443-463, **TD No. 574 (January 2006)**.
- G. DE BLASIO and G. NUZZO, *Historical traditions of civicness and local economic development*, Journal of Regional Science, v. 50, 4, pp. 833-857, **TD No. 591 (May 2006)**.
- E. IOSSA and G. PALUMBO, *Over-optimism and lender liability in the consumer credit market*, Oxford Economic Papers, v. 62, 2, pp. 374-394, **TD No. 598 (September 2006)**.
- S. NERI and A. NOBILI, *The transmission of US monetary policy to the euro area*, International Finance, v. 13, 1, pp. 55-78, **TD No. 606 (December 2006)**.
- F. ALTISSIMO, R. CRISTADORO, M. FORNI, M. LIPPI and G. VERONESE, *New Eurocoin: Tracking Economic Growth in Real Time*, Review of Economics and Statistics, v. 92, 4, pp. 1024-1034, **TD No. 631 (June 2007)**.
- U. ALBERTAZZI and L. GAMBACORTA, *Bank profitability and taxation*, Journal of Banking and Finance, v. 34, 11, pp. 2801-2810, **TD No. 649 (November 2007)**.
- M. IACOVIELLO and S. NERI, *Housing market spillovers: evidence from an estimated DSGE model*, American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics, v. 2, 2, pp. 125-164, **TD No. 659 (January 2008)**.
- F. BALASSONE, F. MAURA and S. ZOTTERI, *Cyclical asymmetry in fiscal variables in the EU*, Empirica, **TD No. 671**, v. 37, 4, pp. 381-402 **(June 2008)**.
- F. D'AMURI, O. GIANMARCO I.P. and P. GIOVANNI, *The labor market impact of immigration on the western german labor market in the 1990s*, European Economic Review, v. 54, 4, pp. 550-570, **TD No. 687 (August 2008)**.
- A. ACCETTURO, *Agglomeration and growth: the effects of commuting costs*, Papers in Regional Science, v. 89, 1, pp. 173-190, **TD No. 688 (September 2008)**.
- S. NOBILI and G. PALAZZO, *Explaining and forecasting bond risk premiums*, Financial Analysts Journal, v. 66, 4, pp. 67-82, **TD No. 689 (September 2008)**.
- A. B. ATKINSON and A. BRANDOLINI, *On analysing the world distribution of income*, World Bank Economic Review, v. 24, 1, pp. 1-37, **TD No. 701 (January 2009)**.
- R. CAPPARIELLO and R. ZIZZA, *Dropping the Books and Working Off the Books*, Labour, v. 24, 2, pp. 139-162, **TD No. 702 (January 2009)**.
- C. NICOLETTI and C. RONDINELLI, *The (mis)specification of discrete duration models with unobserved heterogeneity: a Monte Carlo study*, Journal of Econometrics, v. 159, 1, pp. 1-13, **TD No. 705 (March 2009)**.
- L. FORNI, A. GERALI and M. PISANI, *Macroeconomic effects of greater competition in the service sector: the case of Italy*, Macroeconomic Dynamics, v. 14, 5, pp. 677-708, **TD No. 706 (March 2009)**.
- V. DI GIACINTO, G. MICUCCI and P. MONTANARO, *Dynamic macroeconomic effects of public capital: evidence from regional Italian data*, Giornale degli economisti e annali di economia, v. 69, 1, pp. 29-66, **TD No. 733 (November 2009)**.
- F. COLUMBA, L. GAMBACORTA and P. E. MISTRULLI, *Mutual Guarantee institutions and small business finance*, Journal of Financial Stability, v. 6, 1, pp. 45-54, **TD No. 735 (November 2009)**.
- A. GERALI, S. NERI, L. SESSA and F. M. SIGNORETTI, *Credit and banking in a DSGE model of the Euro Area*, Journal of Money, Credit and Banking, v. 42, 6, pp. 107-141, **TD No. 740 (January 2010)**.
- M. AFFINITO and E. TAGLIAFERRI, *Why do (or did?) banks securitize their loans? Evidence from Italy*, Journal



- of Financial Stability, v. 6, 4, pp. 189-202, **TD No. 741 (January 2010)**.
- S. FEDERICO, *Outsourcing versus integration at home or abroad and firm heterogeneity*, *Empirica*, v. 37, 1, pp. 47-63, **TD No. 742 (February 2010)**.
- V. DI GIACINTO, *On vector autoregressive modeling in space and time*, *Journal of Geographical Systems*, v. 12, 2, pp. 125-154, **TD No. 746 (February 2010)**.
- L. FORNI, A. GERALI and M. PISANI, *The macroeconomics of fiscal consolidations in euro area countries*, *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, v. 34, 9, pp. 1791-1812, **TD No. 747 (March 2010)**.
- S. MOCETTI and C. PORELLO, *How does immigration affect native internal mobility? new evidence from Italy*, *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, v. 40, 6, pp. 427-439, **TD No. 748 (March 2010)**.
- A. DI CESARE and G. GUAZZAROTTI, *An analysis of the determinants of credit default swap spread changes before and during the subprime financial turmoil*, *Journal of Current Issues in Finance, Business and Economics*, v. 3, 4, pp., **TD No. 749 (March 2010)**.
- P. CIPOLLONE, P. MONTANARO and P. SESTITO, *Value-added measures in Italian high schools: problems and findings*, *Giornale degli economisti e annali di economia*, v. 69, 2, pp. 81-114, **TD No. 754 (March 2010)**.
- A. BRANDOLINI, S. MAGRI and T. M. SMEEDING, *Asset-based measurement of poverty*, *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, v. 29, 2, pp. 267-284, **TD No. 755 (March 2010)**.
- G. CAPPELLETTI, *A Note on rationalizability and restrictions on beliefs*, *The B.E. Journal of Theoretical Economics*, v. 10, 1, pp. 1-11, **TD No. 757 (April 2010)**.
- S. DI ADDARIO and D. VURI, *Entrepreneurship and market size. the case of young college graduates in Italy*, *Labour Economics*, v. 17, 5, pp. 848-858, **TD No. 775 (September 2010)**.
- A. CALZA and A. ZAGHINI, *Sectoral money demand and the great disinflation in the US*, *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking*, v. 42, 8, pp. 1663-1678, **TD No. 785 (January 2011)**.

2011

- S. DI ADDARIO, *Job search in thick markets*, *Journal of Urban Economics*, v. 69, 3, pp. 303-318, **TD No. 605 (December 2006)**.
- F. SCHIVARDI and E. VIVIANO, *Entry barriers in retail trade*, *Economic Journal*, v. 121, 551, pp. 145-170, **TD No. 616 (February 2007)**.
- G. FERRERO, A. NOBILI and P. PASSIGLIA, *Assessing excess liquidity in the Euro Area: the role of sectoral distribution of money*, *Applied Economics*, v. 43, 23, pp. 3213-3230, **TD No. 627 (April 2007)**.
- P. E. MISTRULLI, *Assessing financial contagion in the interbank market: maximum entropy versus observed interbank lending patterns*, *Journal of Banking & Finance*, v. 35, 5, pp. 1114-1127, **TD No. 641 (September 2007)**.
- E. CIAPANNA, *Directed matching with endogenous markov probability: clients or competitors?*, *The RAND Journal of Economics*, v. 42, 1, pp. 92-120, **TD No. 665 (April 2008)**.
- M. BUGAMELLI and F. PATERNÒ, *Output growth volatility and remittances*, *Economica*, v. 78, 311, pp. 480-500, **TD No. 673 (June 2008)**.
- V. DI GIACINTO e M. PAGNINI, *Local and global agglomeration patterns: two econometrics-based indicators*, *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, v. 41, 3, pp. 266-280, **TD No. 674 (June 2008)**.
- G. BARONE and F. CINGANO, *Service regulation and growth: evidence from OECD countries*, *Economic Journal*, v. 121, 555, pp. 931-957, **TD No. 675 (June 2008)**.
- R. GIORDANO and P. TOMMASINO, *What determines debt intolerance? The role of political and monetary institutions*, *European Journal of Political Economy*, v. 27, 3, pp. 471-484, **TD No. 700 (January 2009)**.
- P. ANGELINI, A. NOBILI e C. PICILLO, *The interbank market after August 2007: What has changed, and why?*, *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, v. 43, 5, pp. 923-958, **TD No. 731 (October 2009)**.
- L. FORNI, A. GERALI and M. PISANI, *The Macroeconomics of Fiscal Consolidation in a Monetary Union: the Case of Italy*, in Luigi Paganetto (ed.), *Recovery after the crisis. Perspectives and policies*, VDM Verlag Dr. Muller, **TD No. 747 (March 2010)**.
- A. DI CESARE and G. GUAZZAROTTI, *An analysis of the determinants of credit default swap changes before and during the subprime financial turmoil*, in Barbara L. Campos and Janet P. Wilkins (eds.), *The Financial Crisis: Issues in Business, Finance and Global Economics*, New York, Nova Science Publishers, Inc., **TD No. 749 (March 2010)**.
- A. LEVY and A. ZAGHINI, *The pricing of government guaranteed bank bonds*, *Banks and Bank Systems*, v. 6, 3, pp. 16-24, **TD No. 753 (March 2010)**.

- G. GRANDE and I. VISCO, *A public guarantee of a minimum return to defined contribution pension scheme members*, *The Journal of Risk*, v. 13, 3, pp. 3-43, **TD No. 762 (June 2010)**.
- P. DEL GIOVANE, G. ERAMO and A. NOBILI, *Disentangling demand and supply in credit developments: a survey-based analysis for Italy*, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, v. 35, 10, pp. 2719-2732, **TD No. 764 (June 2010)**.
- G. BARONE and S. MOCETTI, *With a little help from abroad: the effect of low-skilled immigration on the female labour supply*, *Labour Economics*, v. 18, 5, pp. 664-675, **TD No. 766 (July 2010)**.
- A. FELETTIGH and S. FEDERICO, *Measuring the price elasticity of import demand in the destination markets of italian exports*, *Economia e Politica Industriale*, v. 38, 1, pp. 127-162, **TD No. 776 (October 2010)**.
- S. MAGRI and R. PICO, *The rise of risk-based pricing of mortgage interest rates in Italy*, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, v. 35, 5, pp. 1277-1290, **TD No. 778 (October 2010)**.
- M. TABOGA, *Under/over-valuation of the stock market and cyclically adjusted earnings*, *International Finance*, v. 14, 1, pp. 135-164, **TD No. 780 (December 2010)**.
- S. NERI, *Housing, consumption and monetary policy: how different are the U.S. and the Euro area?*, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, v.35, 11, pp. 3019-3041, **TD No. 807 (April 2011)**.
- V. CUCINIELLO, *The welfare effect of foreign monetary conservatism with non-atomistic wage setters*, *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, v. 43, 8, pp. 1719-1734, **TD No. 810 (June 2011)**.
- A. CALZA and A. ZAGHINI, *welfare costs of inflation and the circulation of US currency abroad*, *The B.E. Journal of Macroeconomics*, v. 11, 1, Art. 12, **TD No. 812 (June 2011)**.
- I. FAIELLA, *La spesa energetica delle famiglie italiane*, *Energia*, v. 32, 4, pp. 40-46, **TD No. 822 (September 2011)**.
- R. DE BONIS and A. SILVESTRINI, *The effects of financial and real wealth on consumption: new evidence from OECD countries*, *Applied Financial Economics*, v. 21, 5, pp. 409-425, **TD No. 837 (November 2011)**.

2012

- A. ACCETTURO and G. DE BLASIO, *Policies for local development: an evaluation of Italy's "Patti Territoriali"*, *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, v. 42, 1-2, pp. 15-26, **TD No. 789 (January 2006)**.

#### FORTHCOMING

- M. BUGAMELLI and A. ROSOLIA, *Produttività e concorrenza estera*, *Rivista di politica economica*, **TD No. 578 (February 2006)**.
- F. CINGANO and A. ROSOLIA, *People I know: job search and social networks*, *Journal of Labor Economics*, **TD No. 600 (September 2006)**.
- S. MOCETTI, *Educational choices and the selection process before and after compulsory school*, *Education Economics*, **TD No. 691 (September 2008)**.
- P. SESTITO and E. VIVIANO, *Reservation wages: explaining some puzzling regional patterns*, *Labour*, **TD No. 696 (December 2008)**.
- P. PINOTTI, M. BIANCHI and P. BUONANNO, *Do immigrants cause crime?*, *Journal of the European Economic Association*, **TD No. 698 (December 2008)**.
- F. LIPPI and A. NOBILI, *Oil and the macroeconomy: a quantitative structural analysis*, *Journal of European Economic Association*, **TD No. 704 (March 2009)**.
- F. CINGANO and P. PINOTTI, *Politicians at work. The private returns and social costs of political connections*, *Journal of the European Economic Association*, **TD No. 709 (May 2009)**.
- Y. ALTUNBAS, L. GAMBACORTA, and D. MARQUÉS-IBÁÑEZ, *Bank risk and monetary policy*, *Journal of Financial Stability*, **TD No. 712 (May 2009)**.
- G. BARONE and S. MOCETTI, *Tax morale and public spending inefficiency*, *International Tax and Public Finance*, **TD No. 732 (November 2009)**.
- I. BUONO and G. LALANNE, *The effect of the Uruguay Round on the intensive and extensive margins of trade*, *Journal of International Economics*, **TD No. 835 (February 2011)**.
- G. BARONE, R. FELICI and M. PAGNINI, *Switching costs in local credit markets*, *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, **TD No. 760 (June 2010)**.

- E. COCOZZA and P. PISELLI, *Testing for east-west contagion in the European banking sector during the financial crisis*, in R. Matoušek; D. Stavárek (eds.), *Financial Integration in the European Union*, Taylor & Francis, **TD No. 790 (February 2011)**.
- S. NERI and T. ROPELE, *Imperfect information, real-time data and monetary policy in the Euro area*, *The Economic Journal*, **TD No. 802 (March 2011)**.
- M. AFFINITO, *Do interbank customer relationships exist? And how did they function in the crisis? Learning from Italy*, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, **TD No. 826 (October 2011)**.
- O. BLANCHARD and M. RIGGI, *Why are the 2000s so different from the 1970s? A structural interpretation of changes in the macroeconomic effects of oil prices*, *Journal of the European Economic Association*, **TD No. 835 (November 2011)**.
- R. CRISTADORO and D. MARCONI, *Households Savings in China*, *Chinese Economic and Business Studies*, **TD No. 838 (November 2011)**.