

**ON DOMESTIC DEMAND AND EXPORT PERFORMANCE IN THE EURO AREA COUNTRIES: DOES EXPORT CONCENTRATION MATTER? 2017**

Paulo Soares Esteves and Elvira Prades

**Documentos de Trabajo  
N.º 1719**

**BANCO DE ESPAÑA**  
Eurosistema



**ON DOMESTIC DEMAND AND EXPORT PERFORMANCE IN  
THE EURO AREA COUNTRIES: DOES EXPORT CONCENTRATION MATTER?**

**ON DOMESTIC DEMAND AND EXPORT PERFORMANCE  
IN THE EURO AREA COUNTRIES:  
DOES EXPORT CONCENTRATION MATTER? (\*)**

Paulo Soares Esteves<sup>(\*\*)</sup>

BANCO DE PORTUGAL

Elvira Prades<sup>(\*\*\*)</sup>

BANCO DE ESPAÑA

(\*) The authors would like to thank António Rua for helpful comments and suggestions. The authors would also like to thank the participants in the Competitiveness Research Network meeting held at Banco de España in March 2015, where a preliminary version of this paper was presented, and an anonymous referee.

(\*\*) Banco de Portugal, Office of the Governor, pmesteves@bportugal.pt

(\*\*\*) Banco de España, Directorate General Economics, Statistics and Research, elvira.prades@bde.es

The Working Paper Series seeks to disseminate original research in economics and finance. All papers have been anonymously refereed. By publishing these papers, the Banco de España aims to contribute to economic analysis and, in particular, to knowledge of the Spanish economy and its international environment.

The opinions and analyses in the Working Paper Series are the responsibility of the authors and, therefore, do not necessarily coincide with those of the Banco de España or the Eurosystem.

The Banco de España disseminates its main reports and most of its publications via the Internet at the following website: <http://www.bde.es>.

Reproduction for educational and non-commercial purposes is permitted provided that the source is acknowledged.

© BANCO DE ESPAÑA, Madrid, 2017

ISSN: 1579-8666 (on line)

## **Abstract**

During economic downturns, weak domestic demand developments seem to be an additional driver of exports, as firms increase their efforts to serve markets abroad to compensate the fall in domestic sales. This may constitute an additional mechanism adjustment for the euro area countries where real exchange rate variations are limited by the common currency itself and the present low inflation environment. However, this substitution effect between domestic and foreign sales could be different across euro area members. This paper uses panel data techniques to assess the role of the export structure in explaining these differences. Building a novel indicator for product concentration, the results suggest that domestic demand developments are more relevant to explain exports in countries with a lower product concentration index (that is, more diversified exports). This contributes to explain why euro area countries under stress registered different economic performance during the most recent years.

**Keywords:** exports, domestic demand pressures, external adjustment.

**JEL classification:** C22, E03, F10.

## **Resumen**

Durante las crisis económicas, la debilidad de la demanda doméstica se ha mostrado como un determinante adicional para explicar la evolución de las exportaciones. Las empresas, con el fin de compensar la debilidad del mercado doméstico, optan por llevar a cabo un mayor esfuerzo para aumentar las ventas en el extranjero. Para las economías del área del euro con tipo de cambio fijo y en un contexto de baja inflación este comportamiento puede ser un mecanismo de ajuste adicional. No obstante, se observa que este efecto sustitución de ventas domésticas hacia ventas al extranjero ha sido dispar entre los países miembros del área del euro. Para explicar estas diferencias se utilizan técnicas de datos de panel con el fin de valorar qué papel desempeña la estructura exportadora. Basándonos en un indicador de concentración de las exportaciones a nivel producto, los resultados sugieren que el papel de la demanda doméstica es más relevante a la hora de explicar la evolución de las exportaciones cuando el nivel de concentración de producto es menor, esto es, cuando las exportaciones están más diversificadas. Este factor contribuye a explicar por qué las economías del área del euro registraron un comportamiento tan dispar en su desempeño económico en los años más recientes.

**Palabras clave:** exportaciones, demanda doméstica, ajuste exterior.

**Códigos JEL:** C22, E03, F10.

## Non-technical summary

Usually export developments in the euro area are mainly driven by foreign demand and price competitiveness indicators. Recently, several empirical results claim that an additional channel could have emerged during the European crises. Domestic firms substitute sales between domestic and foreign markets, particularly when domestic demand is depressed. This increase of exports could therefore reduce the costs of an economic adjustment process, contributing also to a faster improvement of external accounts.

This may constitute an additional mechanism adjustment for the euro area where real exchange rate variations are limited by the common currency itself and the present low inflation environment. Nevertheless, this negative empirical relationship between exports and domestic demand developments varies across economies, helping to explain why the external adjustment has been substantially different in some stressed euro area countries. This paper explores the role of the export structure in terms of product concentration in explaining these differentiated reactions of exports to domestic developments.

The analysis is conducted building a novel concentration export indicator covering both goods and services and applying dynamic panel data techniques to a traditional export equation model. The sample considers a period running from 1997 to 2014 and 12 euro area economies.

In line with findings from previous literature, the paper points first to a negative relationship between export performance and domestic demand developments. Moreover, this effect seems to be larger and more significant during economic downturns. A possible explanation for this asymmetry is the presence of uncertainty and sunk costs, which would prevent firms from exiting foreign markets when domestic activity starts to recover.

The main finding of the paper is that countries where exports are more concentrated in certain products tend to be less sensitive to this substitution effect between sales to domestic and foreign markets. The underlying intuition is the following: if a country is particularly focused on exporting a certain raw material, very specific industrial goods or specific types of financial, tourism or transport services, export developments are more linked to external demand and less sensitive to fluctuations of domestic demand. The idea is that domestic demand for these products is proportionately much smaller than production and exports, such that its fluctuation is not relevant to sales abroad. A very simple example is an oil-exporting country, whose world market share does not depend on its domestic consumption of oil.

These results help explain the differences in the adjustment processes witnessed in certain stressed countries of the euro area. Greece emerges as a notable case, with its high concentration of exports in some products while also being the one euro area country whose exports did not gain market share.

## 1. Introduction

Recent studies point to a negative relationship between exports' market shares and domestic demand pressure in the euro area countries, which represent an additional adjustment channel given the real exchange rate rigidity implied by the low inflation environment in a common currency area [Esteves and Rua (2013, 2015), Belke et al. (2014, 2015) and Bobeica et al. (2015)]. This paper explores the role of the export structure in terms of product concentration in explaining the differentiated reaction to domestic developments.

The relationship between domestic demand and exports from a macroeconomic perspective builds on the seminal paper by Ball et al. (1966) for the case of the UK. This framework has found support in recent microeconomic theory and empirical evidence – see for example Vannoorenberghe (2012) for French firms and Altomonte, et al. (2013) for a dataset covering four European countries – France, Germany, Italy and UK. A survey of the literature rationalising the negative effect of domestic demand on exports performance is presented in Esteves and Rua (2013, 2015), which also presents an application for the Portuguese economy, emphasizing that this negative relationship is stronger and more significant when domestic demand is declining. An explanation for this asymmetry is the presence of uncertainty and sunk costs for entering in the foreign market – following the literature on investment under uncertainty [see, for example, Impullitti et al. (2012)]. In periods of economic stress, firms are more willing to pay the sunk cost for entering a new market abroad, the so-called survival-driven exports [see Belke et al. (2014)]. Belke et al. (2014, 2015) investigate the relationship between domestic conditions and exports for several individual euro area countries. Using a non-linear smooth transition regression model, they find different results across countries.<sup>4</sup> Bobeica et al. (2015) explore this type of relationship using a quarterly panel dataset for 11 of the 12 former euro area countries (Greece is excluded given the lack of long-time span quarterly data), extending for the euro area the results presented for the Portuguese economy in Esteves and Rua (2013, 2015), i.e. a negative and asymmetric relationship between sales for domestic and foreign markets.

The main idea of this paper is to explore why this relationship may differ across countries. In fact, despite being significant for the average of the euro area countries, some differences may emerge between the various euro area countries. This work suggests that this link between exports and domestic demand is weaker when exports are more concentrated, i.e. when the country is more specialized in exporting a restricted set of products. This could explain some important differences concerning the recent adjustment process in some countries under stress.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the panel data model used and the data definitions and sources. Section 3 presents an initial exercise that tries to illustrate how this relationship between exports and domestic demand could diverge across euro area countries, motivating the objective of the paper. Section 4 presents the main results of the model, while section 5 synthesizes the main conclusions.

## 2. The model and the data

An annual panel data model is used to explore why the substitution between sales to domestic and foreign markets might differ across countries. In line with Esteves and Rua (2013, 2015) and Bobeica et

---

<sup>4</sup> As a common result, four countries (France, Italy, Portugal and Spain) exhibit a substitutive relationship between domestic demand and exports during business cycle troughs, while for Greece this type of substitution is not found for any stage of the cycle.



al. (2015) the model assumes that exports' market shares for each country  $i$  at period  $t$  (the difference between exports ( $X_{t,i}$ ) and external demand ( $D_{t,i}$ )) is explained by its own evolution in the previous year, and the present and past developments of the real exchange rate ( $E_{t,i}$ ) and domestic demand ( $DD_{t,i}$ ).

$$\Delta X_{t,i} - \Delta D_{t,i} = \alpha_i + \beta(\Delta X_{t-1,i} - \Delta D_{t-1,i}) + \sum_{j=0}^1 \varphi_j \Delta E_{t-j,i} + \sum_{j=0}^1 \omega_j \Delta DD_{t-j,i} \quad (1)$$

The model considers all the variables measured in log first differences, allowing for a maximum of one lag and not trying to explore any long-run relationship between the variables. Using this model, the paper contribute to explain why the relationship between domestic demand and export performance (i.e. the coefficient  $\omega$ ) may be different across countries, allowing for the export structure to influence this coefficient.

Concerning a possible long-run relationship, it should be mentioned that it is not clear from a theoretical point of view what would be its expected sign or magnitude. Moreover, both Esteves and Rua (2013, 2015) and Bobeica et al. (2015) do not obtain a significant coefficient when including domestic demand in a long-run correction mechanism along real exchange rate for explaining the evolution of exports' market shares. In addition, the short sample availability when working with annual figures and the presence of some possible structural breaks would hinder the estimation of a long run relationship. Nevertheless, some additional tests concerning the role of this possible long-run relationship are produced. The same kind of robustness analysis is provided concerning some possible structural breaks related to the introduction of the euro currency.

All the estimation results are obtained using the usual fixed effects estimator, and keeping only the coefficients that are statistically significant. The presence of the lagged endogenous variable might suggest the use of the Arellano and Bond (1991) procedure. However, this method has been developed for panels with a short time dimension and a very large number of cross-section observations. When the number of periods is large and the cross section is small, the use of this alternative estimator may lead to a loss of efficiency, while the fixed effects estimator becomes consistent (see Nickell (1981) and Alvarez and Arellano (2003)). Nevertheless, the estimations were replicated using the Arellano and Bond procedure.

The data covers the period from 1997 up to 2014 and are obtained from Ameco - the annual macro-economic database of the European Commission. Exports are measured in volumes, including both goods and services. The foreign demand indicator is a geometric weighted average of the import volumes of the main trading partners (see Hubrich and Karlsson (2010)). Domestic demand is retrieved also from this database, referring to domestic demand including stocks. Finally, real exchange rates are based on the unit labour cost in the total economy vis-à-vis 37 industrial countries.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> The use of alternative indicators based on CPI or GDP deflators does not seem to influence the results [Esteves and Rua (2013, 2015) and Bobeica et al. (2015)].

### 3. An initial illustrative exercise

In order to motivate the objective of the paper an initial exercise was done covering the former 12 euro countries. Given the annual periodicity, it is assumed that the substitution effect between domestic and foreign markets sales occurs contemporaneously. The results are the following:<sup>6</sup>

$$\Delta X_{t,i} - \Delta D_{t,i} = 0.002 + 0.255(\Delta X_{t-1,i} - \Delta D_{t-1,i}) - 0.400\Delta E_{t,i} - 0.089\Delta DD_{t,i} \quad (2)$$

(4.47)<sup>\*\*\*</sup>      (5.28)<sup>\*\*\*</sup>      (6.45)<sup>\*\*\*</sup>      (1.24)

Observations = 216 (12 countries during 18 periods)

Parameters = 19 (3 variables plus constant, 11 specific effects and 4 dummies)

t-ratios in parentheses: \*\*\*p<0.01, \*\*p<0.05, \*p<0.10.

R<sup>2</sup> = 0.498

The results point to some inertia concerning the evolution of exports' market shares given the importance of its autoregressive term, and to a strong significance of the contemporary real exchange rate. In this initial exercise, the coefficient of domestic demand has the expected sign but is clearly less significant than the ones previously obtained [Bobeica et al. (2015)].

One illustrative and very simple exercise was carried-out to increase the intuition of the paper. If the coefficient and its significance depend clearly on the countries included in the sample, it could be interpreted as a signal that the coefficient could be different across the economies. After several experiments, the previous estimation was replicated excluding Ireland and Greece:

$$\Delta X_{t,i} - \Delta D_{t,i} = 0.003 + 0.194(\Delta X_{t-1,i} - \Delta D_{t-1,i}) - 0.306\Delta E_{t,i} - 0.237\Delta DD_{t,i} \quad (3)$$

(4.84)<sup>\*\*\*</sup>      (2.67)<sup>\*\*\*</sup>      (5.13)<sup>\*\*\*</sup>      (2.79)<sup>\*\*\*</sup>

Observations = 180 (10 countries during 18 periods)

Parameters = 14 (3 variables plus constant, 9 specific effects and 4 dummies)

t-ratios in parentheses: \*\*\*p<0.01, \*\*p<0.05, \*p<0.10.

R<sup>2</sup> = 0.370

The results allow a stronger significance of the domestic demand coefficient. After this initial estimation, another illustrative exercise is computed. Specifically, regression 2 was replicated several times, (i) excluding one country at a time from the sample; (ii) including each country excluded from this partial sample, i.e. Ireland and Greece. The results for the domestic demand coefficient and its statistical significance are shown in Table 1.

<sup>6</sup> The results include dummy variables for Greece, in 1997 and 1999, Ireland in 2010 and Finland 2009. Those dummies are selected considering the highest residuals in an initial estimation (out of a range defined by  $\pm 3.0$  standard deviations). Greek figures registered a huge market share gain for exports of around 10 per cent in each year, which was exclusively related with the service sector that grew more than 40 per cent both in 1997 and 1999. Irish exports' shares declined surprisingly in 2010, at a time when they were performing better given its particular specialization in chemical and other medical products that were less affected by the international crisis. Finnish market shares decreased around 10 per cent in 2009, reflecting the product specialization in high-tech products that were particularly affected by the collapse on international trade but also the strong decline of NOKIA activity. Nonetheless, the inclusion of these dummies does not change qualitatively the results, in particular the non-significance of the term associated with domestic demand.

**Table 1 – Gains (losses) of including (excluding) each one of the countries in the baseline**

|                  | coefficient | t-value |
|------------------|-------------|---------|
| Benchmark        | -0,237      | -2,79   |
| <i>excluding</i> |             |         |
| Portugal         | -0,150      | -3,14   |
| Netherlands      | -0,224      | -2,45   |
| Belgium          | -0,227      | -2,61   |
| France           | -0,227      | -2,54   |
| Austria          | -0,234      | -2,66   |
| Italy            | -0,249      | -2,70   |
| Germany          | -0,255      | -2,94   |
| Luxemburg        | -0,260      | -2,87   |
| Finland          | -0,267      | -2,99   |
| Spain            | -0,286      | -3,03   |
| <i>including</i> |             |         |
| Ireland          | -0,143      | -1,74   |
| Greece           | -0,130      | -1,47   |

It seems clear that the relevance of domestic demand pressures on exports may differ across countries. On the one hand, including just one of the two excluded countries (Greece or Ireland) will be sufficient to jeopardize the overall results, as the domestic demand coefficient continues to be negative but not significant. On the other hand, concerning the remaining countries included in the baseline, excluding each one alternately does not significantly affect the results. Nevertheless, Portugal's inclusion increases substantially the size of the coefficient associated with domestic demand (from -0.15 to -0.24). The results are not very sensitive to the exclusion of each one of the other countries. The coefficient is always significant and ranges between -0.22 and -0.28.

This seems to confirm the findings presented in Bobeica et al. (2015), as the overall result seems to be sensitive only to a few number of countries. Nevertheless, the understanding of these countries' differences could be very important for economic policy discussion, namely to understand their different behaviour during the recent adjustment programmes.<sup>7</sup>

#### 4. Does export concentration matter?

This paper raises the hypothesis that these results may be driven by differences within the euro area economies concerning their export specialization. In particular, this paper tests if a high product concentration of exports will reduce this trade-off between sales to domestic and foreign markets. The assumption tested only covers the export structure by sectors, not accounting for the concentration at firm level, both within each sector (a firm could represent 100% of the sector) or across different sectors (a firm could export different products). This would imply another approach, using microdata, that is out of the scope of this paper, but could be a suggestion for future work.

<sup>7</sup> Since 2007, exports market shares increased by 20% in Portugal, 17% in Ireland and 8% in Spain, while for Greece this external performance indicator declined 3%. It should be mentioned that differences may reflect different specialization in markets with different dynamics. This effect is taken into account by the usual constant market share exercise which is not addressed in this paper. Cheptea et al. (2014) shows that this kind of effect did not affect the relative evolution of exports' market shares between these countries. The same conclusion is reached by Vondra (2014) for a sample that includes also the services sector.

For instance, if a country is particularly oriented to export some raw material, a very specific industrial good or some specific types of financial, tourism or transport services, export developments are more linked to external demand, being less sensitive to fluctuations of domestic demand. The idea is that domestic demand for these products is proportionately much smaller than production and exports such that its fluctuation is not relevant to affect sales abroad. One very intuitive example concerns an oil producing country: certainly its shares of the world market will not depend on its domestic consumption of oil.<sup>8</sup>

It is possible to consider a very simple and illustrative example. Assuming an economy where there is a basket of  $n$  products consumed in the same quantity,  $c = C/n$ ,  $i=1, 2, \dots, n$ . Domestic firms produce these goods and some of them are already involved in exporting activities. Figure 1 illustrates this example.

It is assumed that only firms that are already exporters are able to reallocate sales from domestic to foreign markets instantaneously (blue bars). Two extreme conditions may occur when a negative shock occur on consumption.

Firstly, the country is able to export all the  $n$  products in the same quantity. In this case the concentration of exports is zero, and the increase of exports will be equal to the decline of consumption:  $\Delta X_i = -\Delta c$ ,  $\Delta X = -\Delta C$ . Secondly, it can be assumed that exports are fully concentrated in one  $k$  product. As this sector is the only with exporter firms, the concentration is total and the overall reaction of exports will be clearly lower  $\Delta X = \Delta X_k = -\Delta c_k = -\Delta C/n$ . This example (blue bars) considers two intermediate cases related with the concentration index, where firms export 50% (CI = 0.05) and 25% (CI = 0.16) of the products.


The red bars depict an intermediate case, where a fraction of firms are able to become exporters immediately (i.e. we depict the case where 50% of the non-exporter firms can switch to become exporters). This assumption will only reduce the link connecting the concentration and the substitution between domestic and foreign markets, as the negative relationship continues to persist.

Finally, the green bars illustrate another extreme example. All the domestic firms are able to become exporters when facing a shock on domestic demand. In this case, the substitution is always total as the concentration index does not measure any structural feature of the economy given that in any moment it could become equal to zero or to one.

---

<sup>8</sup> This point was touched upon in Gnimassoun (2015) – a paper focusing on adjustments paths in sub-Saharan countries – when mentioning that the channel proposed in Esteves and Rua (2013) is unlikely to occur in countries that are primarily exporters of commodities, as the domestic consumption of those products is generally insignificant.

**Figure 1 - Increase in exports when domestic demand falls depending on the degree of concentration and the ability of firms to initiate export activities**



#### 4.1 A concentration index for exports of goods and services

There is no a concentration index for exports covering both goods and services. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) regularly computes an export concentration index for goods. Therefore the approach pursued is the construction of an overall index for measuring exports concentration, covering both goods and services for the 12 former euro area countries. In line with the UNCTAD approach, a Herfindahl-Hirschman index covering goods and services for the period from 1997 to 2013 is computed as follows:

$$CI = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n s_i^2 - \frac{1}{n}}{1 - \frac{1}{n}} \quad (4)$$


where  $s_i$  represents each sector' share of the total exports and  $n$  is the number of sectors considered. This index varies between zero (no concentration) and one (total concentration).

Concerning goods exports, information using the Harmonized System (HS) classification at two digits was obtained from the UNCTAD database, covering 65 products. The data for services exports was also obtained from UNCTAD, covering 11 sectors for all the countries considered.<sup>9</sup> Taking into consideration that the results depend on the disaggregation level and given the lack of additional disaggregated data

<sup>9</sup> In some few cases it was necessary to extrapolate values for a sector in a specific year because the information was not available. All the information is available upon request.

for services, the two-digit STCI was chosen in order to achieve a balance between the number of goods and services selected. Figure 2 presents the average results.

**Figure 2 - Herfindahl–Hirschman Concentration Index**  
goods and services, average 1997-2013



Luxembourg and Greece emerge clearly as the two countries with highest exports concentration. The result is not surprising for Luxembourg, a country where more than 60 per cent of exports comprise financial and other business services. As regards Greece, exports of tourism and transport services account for 44 per cent of overall exports. Moreover, in goods exports the concentration of Greek exports is also very high and is increasing, with oil products representing around 40 per cent of merchandise exports in 2013 (only 8 per cent in 1997).

Across the other countries, the other two with weaker evidence of substitution between sales to domestic and foreign markets are the ones with a higher concentration of exports. Ireland has high specialization in some products (chemical and pharmaceutical products represent around 45% of merchandise exports) but also in some business services (for example, computer and information services represent more than 20% in overall exports). In Finland the high concentration index is explained by the goods sector, but has been decreasing reflecting the collapse of the telecommunications sector.<sup>10</sup> Nevertheless, with the exception of Greece and Luxembourg the differences do not seem very large across the other countries.

<sup>10</sup> The weight of the telecommunications apparatus on total goods exports decreased from more than 20 per cent in 2000 to just 1 per cent in 2013.

## 4.2 Accounting for the effects of exports concentration

The results of the model using the interaction with the time average of the concentration indicator are the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta X_{t,i} - \Delta D_{t,i} = & 0.002 + 0.242(\Delta X_{t-1,i} - \Delta D_{t-1,i}) - 0.398 \Delta E_{t,i} \\ & (4.92)^{***} \quad (5.01)^{***} \quad (5.69)^{***} \\ & - 0.312 \Delta DD_{t,i} + 2.565 \Delta DD_{t,i} CI_{t,i} \\ & (2.53)^{**} \quad (2.18)^{**} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Observations = 216 (12 countries during 18 periods)

Parameters = 20 (4 variables and constant, 11 specific effects plus 4 dummies)

t-ratios in parentheses: \*\*\*p<0.01, \*\*p<0.05, \*p<0.10.

R<sup>2</sup>=0.513

where  $CI_{it}$  accounts for the export concentration index in goods and services. First of all, the inclusion of this variable allows the results to be recovered when all the countries are included, unlike the previous version of the model. The coefficients are clearly significant (at 1% and 5% for the cross-term) and their sign is as expected. In fact, the coefficient of domestic demand is negative, while the coefficient of the cross term is positive, implying that the coefficient between domestic demand and exports becomes less negative when exports are more concentrated.

An additional issue that was raised in the previous literature is the non-linearity. Esteves and Rua (2013, 2015) and Bobeica et al. (2015) present evidence that this relationship is stronger when domestic demand growth is weaker, presenting as a possible justification the presence of sunk costs to enter the foreign market. The experiment was conducted on the current model. Considering  $\Delta DD^+$  ( $\Delta DD^-$ ) the domestic demand when it is growing above (below) its average. The results are the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta X_{t,i} - \Delta D_{t,i} = & -0.001 + 0.227(\Delta X_{t-1,i} - \Delta D_{t-1,i}) - 0.390 \Delta E_{t,i} \\ & (0.89) \quad (3.85)^{***} \quad (5.01)^{***} \\ & - 0.517 \Delta DD_{t,i}^- + 6.231 \Delta DD_{t,i}^- CI_{t,i} \\ & (2.88)^{***} \quad (4.31)^{***} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Observations = 216 (12 countries during 18 periods)

Parameters = 20 (4 variables and constant, 11 specific effects plus 4 dummies)

t-ratios in parentheses: \*\*\*p<0.01, \*\*p<0.05, \*p<0.10.

R<sup>2</sup>=0.518

The results show that the substitution between internal and external markets is clearly stronger when domestic demand developments are weak. It should be mentioned that the coefficients associated with the above-average domestic demand growth are not presented as they are not significant, unlike the strong significance (both at 1%) of the coefficients associated with weaker domestic demand growth. Overall, these results are in line with previous literature, but also highlight that exports structure could

have an important role in explaining different economic performance during the lower stages of the business cycle.

#### 4.2.1 Additional robustness tests

This subsection presents some additional robustness checks on the previous model, investigating whether the results presented above are affected by the presence of structural breaks or by a long-run relation between export market shares and the real exchange rate.<sup>11</sup>

First of all, during the estimation period (1997-2014) there were important structural breaks that could have influenced the results presented, namely the introduction of the euro. Therefore, two additional estimations were made, starting in 1999 (definition of the euro conversion rates) and in 2002 (physical introduction of the euro). The results are presented in Table 2, evidencing that both the magnitude of the coefficients and their statistical significance are very similar in all three sample periods.

**Table 2**

|                                   | Baseline<br>(equation 5) | Estimation<br>since 1999 | Estimation<br>since 2002 | Inclusion of a long-run relation<br>between export market share<br>and real exchange rate |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| <i>Constant</i>                   | -0.001<br>(0.89)         | -0.001<br>(0.88)         | 0.005<br>(2.49)**        | 0.167<br>(1.23)   |
| $\Delta X_{t-1} - \Delta D_{t-1}$ | 0.227<br>(3.85)***       | 0.240<br>(5.99)***       | 0.167<br>(2.75)***       | 0.195<br>(4.85)***  |
| $\Delta E_t$                      | -0.390<br>(5.01)***      | -0.425<br>(5.12)***      | -0.452<br>(4.71)***      | -0.362<br>(4.89)***   |
| $\Delta DD_t^-$                   | -0.517<br>(2.88)***      | -0.484<br>(2.47)**       | -0.495<br>(2.29)**       | -0.490<br>(2.21)**  |
| $\Delta DD_t^- \Delta CI_t$       | 6.231<br>(4.31)***       | 6.319<br>(4.21)***       | 6.409<br>(4.34)***       | 5.806<br>(3.34)***  |
| $X_{t-1} - D_{t-1}$               | -                        | -                        | -                        | -0.229<br>(4.72)***   |
| $E_{t-1}$                         | -                        | -                        | -                        | -0.115<br>(1.65)  |
| $R^2$                             | 0.518                    | 0.506                    | 0.428                    | 0.563   |
| <i>Observations</i>               | 216                      | 192                      | 156                      | 216   |

t-ratios in parentheses: \*\*\*p<0.01, \*\*p<0.05, \*p<0.10

The other issue related to a possible long-run relationship explaining the evolution of exports that would justify the adoption of a dynamic panel error model.<sup>12</sup> Given the objective of the paper, the lack of theoretical support to include domestic demand in a long-run solution, and also the short sample with annual figures (16 periods), justified the use of a VAR panel as a baseline model. Nevertheless, an additional diagnostic test was done, considering a long-run relationship between exports' market shares

<sup>11</sup>An additional robustness check was performed. The estimation was repeated excluding each one of the countries to be sure that the results are not being affected by a specific country. The results are broadly the same, as both domestic demand coefficients are always strongly significant. All the results are available upon request.

<sup>12</sup> See, for instance, Belke and Dreger (2013) for a recent application of this modelling technique in the context of external account imbalances in the euro area countries.



and the real exchange rate – in line with the traditional export modelling strategy [see, for instance, Fagan et al (2001, 2005)]. The results are also reported in Table 2. The two long-term coefficients have the expected sign and the one associated with the adjustment speed to the ECM is particularly significant, which may suggest the relevance of a long-run solution. Nevertheless, the main conclusion is that, irrespective of the results of the several possible cointegration tests, the inclusion of a long-run relationship does not change the previous results, as the two coefficients associated with the domestic demand remain basically the same and continue to be strongly significant.

## 5. Conclusions

This paper reinforces some previous results concerning a negative relationship between domestic demand and export performance in the euro area countries, pointing to some substitution of firms' sales between domestic and foreign markets. Moreover, in line with previous literature, this substitution effect seems to be particularly important when domestic demand is depressed, constituting therefore an additional adjustment channel given the real exchange rate stickiness implied by the low inflation and the fixed exchange rate.

Despite the overall effect, this adjustment channel could be more important to some countries than to others. This paper tests for the role of exports concentration. The main conclusion is that countries where exports are more concentrated tend to be less sensitive to this substitution effect between sales to domestic and foreign markets.

This could be key to explaining differences concerning the adjustment progresses witnessed in some stressed countries. Greece is a noteworthy case as their exports exhibit a huge and increasing degree of concentration. Unlike other countries, the lack of responsiveness of Greek firms in redirecting sales from domestic to foreign markets did not lead to gains in exports' market shares nor to increase economic activity. Notwithstanding, the concentration index would just capture one of the characteristics of a country that can mitigate or reinforce the role of domestic demand developments in explaining exports. We leave for future research the analysis of other features, suggesting in particular the use of microdata at firm level.

## References

- Altomonte, C., T. Sono and H. Vandenbussche (2013), "Firm-level productivity and exporting: diagnosing the role of financial constraints", chapter 2 in Product Market Review 2013, EU publication.
- Alvarez, J. and M. Arellano (2003), "The Time Series and Cross-Section Asymptotics of Dynamic Panel Data Estimators", *Econometrica*, 71 (4), 1121-1159.
- Arellano, M. and S. Bond (1991), "Some tests of specification for panel data: Monte Carlo evidence and an application to employment equations", *Review of Economic Studies*, 58, 277-297.
- Belke, A. and C. Dreger (2013), "Current account imbalances in the euro area: Does catching up explain the development?", *Review of International Economics*, 21(1), 6-17.
- Belke, A., A. Oeking and R. Setzer (2014), "Exports and capacity constraints – A smooth transition regression model for six Euro area countries", ECB Working Paper 1740, European Central Bank, November 2014.
- Belke, A., A. Oeking and R. Setzer (2015), "Domestic demand, capacity constraints and export dynamics: for vulnerable euro area countries", *Economic Modelling* 48, 315-325.
- Bobeica, E., P. S. Esteves, A. Rua and K. Staehr (2015), "Exports and domestic demand pressures: a dynamic panel data model for the euro area countries", *Review of World Economics*, DOI 10.1007/s10290-015-0234-9.
- Cheptea, A., L. Fontagné and S. Zignano (2014) "European export performance", *Review of World Economics*, 150, 25-58.
- Esteves, P. S. and A. Rua (2013) "Is there a role for domestic demand pressure on export performance?", ECB Working Paper no 1594, European Central Bank.
- Esteves, P. S. and A. Rua (2015), "Is there a role for domestic demand pressure on export performance?", *Empirical Economics*, 49(4), 1173-1189.
- Fagan, G., J. Henry and R. Mestre (2001), "An area-wide model for the euro area", ECB Working Paper no 42, European Central Bank.
- Fagan, G., J. Henry and R. Mestre (2005), "An area-wide model for the euro area", *Economic Modelling*, 22(1), 39-59.
- Gnimassoun, B. (2015), "The importance of the exchange rate regime in limiting current account imbalances in sub-Saharan African countries", *Journal of International Money and Finance*, forthcoming.
- Hubrich, K. and T. Karlsson (2010), "Trade consistency in the context of the Eurosystem projection exercises: An Overview", ECB Occasional Paper 108, European Central Bank.
- Impullitti, G., Irarrazabal, A. and Opromolla, L. D. (2013), "A Theory of Entry into and Exit from Export Markets", *Journal of International Economics*, Vol. 90, 75-90.
- Nickell, S. J. (1981) "Biases in dynamic models with fixed effects", *Econometrica*, 49, 1417-1426.

Vannoorenberghe, G. (2012), “Firm-level volatility and exports”, *Journal of International Economics*, 86, 57-67.

Vondra, K. (2014) “Austria Holds Intra-EU Export Market Shares almost Constant despite Difficult Economic Environment” , *Monetary Policy & The Economy*, Oesterreichische National Bank, Q3/14, 54-74

## BANCO DE ESPAÑA PUBLICATIONS

### WORKING PAPERS

- 1601 CHRISTIAN CASTRO, ÁNGEL ESTRADA and JORGE MARTÍNEZ: The countercyclical capital buffer in Spain: an analysis of key guiding indicators.
- 1602 TRINO-MANUEL NÍGUEZ and JAVIER PEROTE: Multivariate moments expansion density: application of the dynamic equicorrelation model.
- 1603 ALBERTO FUERTES and JOSÉ MARÍA SERENA: How firms borrow in international bond markets: securities regulation and market segmentation.
- 1604 ENRIQUE ALBEROLA, IVÁN KATARYNIUK, ÁNGEL MELGUIZO and RENÉ OROZCO: Fiscal policy and the cycle in Latin America: the role of financing conditions and fiscal rules.
- 1605 ANA LAMO, ENRIQUE MORAL-BENITO and JAVIER J. PÉREZ: Does slack influence public and private labour market interactions?
- 1606 FRUCTUOSO BORRALLO, IGNACIO HERNANDO and JAVIER VALLÉS: The effects of US unconventional monetary policies in Latin America.
- 1607 VINCENZO MERELLA and DANIEL SANTABÁRBARA: Do the rich (really) consume higher-quality goods? Evidence from international trade data.
- 1608 CARMEN BROTO and MATÍAS LAMAS: Measuring market liquidity in US fixed income markets: a new synthetic indicator.
- 1609 MANUEL GARCÍA-SANTANA, ENRIQUE MORAL-BENITO, JOSEP PIJOAN-MAS and ROBERTO RAMOS: Growing like Spain: 1995-2007.
- 1610 MIGUEL GARCÍA-POSADA and RAQUEL VEGAS: Las reformas de la Ley Concursal durante la Gran Recesión.
- 1611 LUNA AZAHARA ROMO GONZÁLEZ: The drivers of European banks' US dollar debt issuance: opportunistic funding in times of crisis?
- 1612 CELESTINO GIRÓN, MARTA MORANO, ENRIQUE M. QUILIS, DANIEL SANTABÁRBARA and CARLOS TORREGROSA: Modelling interest payments for macroeconomic assessment.
- 1613 ENRIQUE MORAL-BENITO: Growing by learning: firm-level evidence on the size-productivity nexus.
- 1614 JAIME MARTÍNEZ-MARTÍN: Breaking down world trade elasticities: a panel ECM approach.
- 1615 ALESSANDRO GALESÌ and OMAR RACHEDÌ: Structural transformation, services deepening, and the transmission of monetary policy.
- 1616 BING XU, ADRIAN VAN RIXTEL and HONGLIN WANG: Do banks extract informational rents through collateral?
- 1617 MIHÁLY TAMÁS BORSI: Credit contractions and unemployment.
- 1618 MIHÁLY TAMÁS BORSI: Fiscal multipliers across the credit cycle.
- 1619 GABRIELE FIORENTINI, ALESSANDRO GALESÌ and ENRIQUE SENTANA: A spectral EM algorithm for dynamic factor models.
- 1620 FRANCISCO MARTÍ and JAVIER J. PÉREZ: Spanish public finances through the financial crisis.
- 1621 ADRIAN VAN RIXTEL, LUNA ROMO GONZÁLEZ and JING YANG: The determinants of long-term debt issuance by European banks: evidence of two crises.
- 1622 JAVIER ANDRÉS, ÓSCAR ARCE and CARLOS THOMAS: When fiscal consolidation meets private deleveraging.
- 1623 CARLOS SANZ: The effect of electoral systems on voter turnout: evidence from a natural experiment.
- 1624 GALO NUÑO and CARLOS THOMAS: Optimal monetary policy with heterogeneous agents.
- 1625 MARÍA DOLORES GADEA, ANA GÓMEZ-LOSCOS and ANTONIO MONTAÑÉS: Oil price and economic growth: a long story?
- 1626 PAUL DE GRAUWE and EDDIE GERBA: Stock market cycles and supply side dynamics: two worlds, one vision?
- 1627 RICARDO GIMENO and EVA ORTEGA: The evolution of inflation expectations in euro area markets.
- 1628 SUSANA PÁRRAGA RODRÍGUEZ: The dynamic effect of public expenditure shocks in the United States.
- 1629 SUSANA PÁRRAGA RODRÍGUEZ: The aggregate effects of government incometransfer shocks - EU evidence.
- 1630 JUAN S. MORA-SANGUINETTI, MARTA MARTÍNEZ-MATUTE and MIGUEL GARCÍA-POSADA: Credit, crisis and contract enforcement: evidence from the Spanish loan market.

- 1631 PABLO BURRIEL and ALESSANDRO GALES: Uncovering the heterogeneous effects of ECB unconventional monetary policies across euro area countries.
- 1632 MAR DELGADO TÉLLEZ, VÍCTOR D. LLEDÓ and JAVIER J. PÉREZ: On the determinants of fiscal non-compliance: an empirical analysis of Spain's regions.
- 1633 OMAR RACHEDI: Portfolio rebalancing and asset pricing with heterogeneous inattention.
- 1634 JUAN DE LUCIO, RAÚL MÍNGUEZ, ASIER MINONDO and FRANCISCO REQUENA: The variation of export prices across and within firms.
- 1635 JUAN FRANCISCO JIMENO, AITOR LACUESTA, MARTA MARTÍNEZ-MATUTE and ERNESTO VILLANUEVA: Education, labour market experience and cognitive skills: evidence from PIAAC.
- 1701 JAVIER ANDRÉS, JAVIER J. PÉREZ and JUAN A. ROJAS: Implicit public debt thresholds: an empirical exercise for the case of Spain.
- 1702 LUIS J. ÁLVAREZ: Business cycle estimation with high-pass and band-pass local polynomial regression.
- 1703 ENRIQUE MORAL-BENITO, PAUL ALLISON and RICHARD WILLIAMS: Dynamic panel data modelling using maximum likelihood: an alternative to Arellano-Bond.
- 1704 MIKEL BEDAYO: Creating associations as a substitute for direct bank credit. Evidence from Belgium.
- 1705 MARÍA DOLORES GADEA-RIVAS, ANA GÓMEZ-LOSCOS and DANILO LEIVA-LEON: The evolution of regional economic interlinkages in Europe.
- 1706 ESTEBAN GARCÍA-MIRALLES: The crucial role of social welfare criteria for optimal inheritance taxation.
- 1707 MÓNICA CORREA-LÓPEZ and RAFAEL DOMÉNECH: Service regulations, input prices and export volumes: evidence from a panel of manufacturing firms.
- 1708 MARÍA DOLORES GADEA, ANA GÓMEZ-LOSCOS and GABRIEL PÉREZ-QUIRÓS: Dissecting US recoveries.
- 1709 CARLOS SANZ: Direct democracy and government size: evidence from Spain.
- 1710 HENRIQUE S. BASSO and JAMES COSTAIN: Fiscal delegation in a monetary union: instrument assignment and stabilization properties.
- 1711 IVÁN KATARYNIUK and JAIME MARTÍNEZ-MARTÍN: TFP growth and commodity prices in emerging economies.
- 1712 SEBASTIAN GECHERT, CHRISTOPH PAETZ and PALOMA VILLANUEVA: Top-down vs. bottom-up? Reconciling the effects of tax and transfer shocks on output.
- 1713 KNUT ARE AASTVEIT, FRANCESCO FURLANETTO and FRANCESCA LORIA: Has the Fed responded to house and stock prices? A time-varying analysis.
- 1714 FÁTIMA HERRANZ GONZÁLEZ and CARMEN MARTÍNEZ-CARRASCAL: The impact of firms' financial position on fixed investment and employment. An analysis for Spain.
- 1715 SERGIO MAYORDOMO, ANTONIO MORENO, STEVEN ONGENA and MARÍA RODRÍGUEZ-MORENO: "Keeping it personal" or "getting real"? On the drivers and effectiveness of personal versus real loan guarantees.
- 1716 FRANCESCO FURLANETTO and ØRJAN ROBSTAD: Immigration and the macroeconomy: some new empirical evidence.
- 1717 ALBERTO FUERTES: Exchange rate regime and external adjustment: an empirical investigation for the U.S.
- 1718 CRISTINA GUILLAMÓN, ENRIQUE MORAL-BENITO and SERGIO PUENTE: High growth firms in employment and productivity: dynamic interactions and the role of financial constraints.
- 1719 PAULO SOARES ESTEVES and ELVIRA PRADES: On domestic demand and export performance in the euro area countries: does export concentration matter?