

ANALYSIS

The Importance of Imports for Productivity and Exports



Table of contents

1.	Introduction	3
2.	Literature review	4
3.	Data and methodology	5
4.	Description	6
5.	How import shape firms	8
	5.1 What determines where companies import from?	8
	5.2. What happens to companies when they start importing?	9
	5.3 Imports and exports	.10
6.	Summary	.12

Utredare: Roger Bandick, Patrik Karpaty, Patrik Tingvall.

1 Introduction

It is well known that global trade is of great importance for welfare and economic growth and that openness is of particular importance for small economies. One way of measuring openness and trade dependence is to look at the proportion of companies involved in exports or imports. In the Swedish manufacturing industry, almost 80 per cent of companies with at least 10 employees import and/or export goods, and this is in many ways beneficial to companies. Imports enable access to the best inputs. This in turn contributes to competitive production, increased productivity and increased export capacity. Despite this close link between imports and exports, most of the analysis and policy discussions have traditionally focused on how to strengthen exports, without further consideration of the potential for imports. Against this background, this paper aims to highlight the link between imports, productivity and exports.

The analysis is divided into two parts. First, the aim is to empirically analyse how firm characteristics such as size, industry, etc., affect the import decision and where firms import from. The second purpose is to analyse whether productivity and export performance differ between importing and non-importing firms.

2 Literature review

Current research on the importance of imports has focused on either the firm-specific characteristics that are important for firms in becoming importers (e.g., Mol et al., 2005; Lewin et al., 2009; Kedia and Mukherjee, 2009); the choice of importing country (e.g., Doh et al., 2009; Rasciute and Downward, 2017); the effect of imports on labour market outcomes (e.g., Feenstra and Hanson 1999; Head and Ries 2002; Hummels et al., 2014; Bandick, 2016; Abramovsky et al., 2017); and how imports affect firm productivity and other performance (e.g., Hijzen et al., 2010; Jabbour, 2010; Bertrand, 2011; Aristei et al., 2013; Smeets and Warzynski, 2013; Bas and Strauss-Kahn, 2014; Elliott, 2014; et al., 2016). For a review of the literature on international trade and economic growth, see Irving (2019).

Another issue that has been widely studied is how firms' productivity and growth are affected when firms enter import and/or export markets (Ethier, 1982; Markusen, 1989; Young, 1991; Grossman and Helpman, 1991; Aristei et al., 2013; Smeets and Warzynski, 2013; Bas, 2012; Castellani et al, 2010; Muuls and Pisu, 2009; Kugler and Verhoogen, 2009; Kasahara and Rodrigue, 2008; Amiti and Konings, 2007). Examples of questions that these studies have investigated include whether there are differences in how firms are affected depending on the choice of country/trading partner. Elliott et al. (2016) find that there are greater productivity gains when firms import from highwage countries compared to imports from low-wage countries. Bas and Strauss-Kahn (2014) also find that imported inputs from developed countries have positive productivity effects. In contrast to these studies, Jabbour (2010) shows that inputs from developing countries increase firm productivity while inputs from developed countries have no significant effect on productivity. Overall, we see that imports can give rise to a number of (positive) effects in the importing country, while the effect on the country of origin is somewhat unclear. What we can note, however, is that in relation to studies on the importance of exports, the importance of imports is not as well documented.

3 Data and methodology

The data used in this report stem from Statistics Sweden (SCB) and cover all companies with at least 10 employees in the manufacturing industry during the period 2007 to 2020. The register-based information at company level is linked to the companies' foreign trade. Companies' foreign trade has been aggregated to the 6-digit level (HS-6 codes). One reason for focusing on companies with at least ten employees is that for trade within the EU (intra-stat) there is a cut-off point where companies whose intra-stat trade amounts to less than SEK 9 million in imports or less than SEK 4.5 million when exports are excluded. For trade with non-EU countries, all transactions are included. This means that intra-stat trade is underestimated, especially for small enterprises. Another reason for excluding micro enterprises is that they account for a smaller share of total exports. By excluding the smallest companies, the upcoming analysis will be more accurate when comparing trade with different countries and company size.

The analytical methods used to estimate the effects of imports are so-called event studies (described by, among others, Sun and Abraham, 2020; Clarke and Schythe, 2020; and de Chaisemartin and D'Haultfoeuille, 2022). As an alternative to event studies, a difference-in-differences (DiD) analysis is also used.

4 Description

The following description is based on Table 1–5 in the Appendix. Enterprises with less than 10 employees have been excluded.

When we compare Swedish companies with varying degrees of foreign trade, we see that internationalised companies differ from other companies in a number of different areas and show an interesting development over time.

- A comparison between companies with at least 10 employees in 2020 shows that:
 - o companies have an average of 88 employees
 - the corresponding figure for companies that only import is 38 employees
 - \circ companies that only export have an average of 25 employees, and
 - the largest companies are among those that both import and export, with 128 employees.
- Among companies trading with other countries, they are more likely to engage in both imports and exports than only imports or only exports.
 - around 80 per cent of enterprises with at least 10 employees are engaged in some form of foreign trade.
 - around 60 per cent of companies are involved in both imports and exports
 - \circ only 7.6 per cent of enterprises import but do not export
 - 11.6 per cent of enterprises export without importing.
- The share of firms importing from both high-wage and low-wage countries has increased over time.
 - the share of companies importing from both high-wage and low-wage countries has increased from 40 per cent in 2007 to 56 per cent in 2020.
- Large companies import more products than small companies.
 - In terms of the number of HS-6 codes, small enterprises (10-49 employees) import on average 4 different products while the corresponding figure for enterprises with at least 50 employees is 14 different products. Refers to the year 2020.
- Large companies import goods from more countries than small companies.
 - Small enterprises with 10–49 employees import, on average, goods from 3.9 countries while the corresponding figure for enterprises with at least 50 employees is 13.8 countries.

- Relative to non-importing firms, importing firms are typically:
 - o more productive
 - have higher exports
 - \circ have more employees
 - \circ are more capital intensive, and
 - \circ have a higher average wage cost per employee.

The positive relationship between imports and firm characteristics such as productivity, exports and employment seems to be stronger when we look at imports from highwage countries compared to imports from low-wage countries. A related question is therefore whether it is already-competitive firms that import or whether firms become more competitive as a result of imports, especially imports from high-wage countries. The answer to this question will be answered in next chapter.

To summarise, this section has shown that a large proportion of Swedish manufacturing companies are involved in international trade, either as importers, exporters or both. There is a clear ranking of companies where companies that are twoway traders have more employees than companies that only import, export or operate without international exchange. The majority of imports, regardless of firm size, come from high-wage countries. Finally, importing firms appear to exhibit firm-specific characteristics that indicate a higher competitiveness than non-importing firms.

5 How import shape firms

The previous chapter compared importing and non-importing companies. Among the former, there is a mixture of companies that have just started importing and companies that have been importing for several years. The difference between importers and non-importers may be due to the fact that it is a certain type of company that chooses to import (self-selection), but it is also possible that the companies change when they start importing, thus taking a step in their internationalisation process (the effects of starting to import). In this chapter, we take a closer look at the type of company that chooses to start importing. The results in this chapter are based on Table 6-7 in the Appendix.

In short, the analysis in Table 6–7 shows through a probit analysis that the probability of a firm starting to import increases with these firm-specific characteristics:

- productivity
- number of people employed
- growth rate
- average wage cost and
- and whether it already has its own exports.

The fact that high productivity is associated with entering international trade is in line with modern trade theory and the so-called Melitz model of trade, which in brief states that a certain level of productivity is required to overcome the barriers associated with international trade. The fact that we find a positive link between firms' exports and the probability of starting to import may be a reflection of the fact that, by exporting, the company already has a sufficiently high productivity for coping with the costs associated with international trade. There may also be a learning dimension. The knowledge that companies have acquired by exporting can also be useful when importing.

5.1 What determines where companies import from?

In this section, only importing companies are included when we analyse in more detail whether there are any systematic differences between companies depending on whether they import from high-wage countries, low-wage countries or both. The comparison group we use is companies that only import from low-wage countries. The results below are based on a multivariate probit analysis (Table 7 in Appendix).

From the analysis on what determines whether imports come from high-wage countries,

low-wage countries or both high and low-wage countries, we found the following:

- Companies that import from both high-wage and low-wage countries are the most productive companies; they also show a higher average wage cost compared to other importers.
- Being an exporter is closely linked to the likelihood that companies also import goods, both from low- and high-wage countries.
- The impact of imports on the relative growth of firms is independent of whether imports come from low or high wage countries.
- The results do not seem to differ between large and small companies.

Overall, the results show that there is a ranking where the most productive and largest firms with high average wage costs are most likely to import from both low and high wage countries, followed by those that only import from either low or high wage countries. Finally, there are the small, low-productivity, low-average-wage firms that do not import at all.

5.2. What happens to companies when they start importing?

In the analysis above, we have seen that there is self-selection regarding imports. More precisely, we have seen that companies seem to start importing only after they have reached a certain level of productivity and size, etc.

In this section, we take a closer look at what happens to companies that have started importing. Do firms transform after becoming importers? The results presented below are based on a statistical analysis where we seek to find a causal relationship. This means that efforts have been made to ensure that any effects found are due to the initiation of imports and nothing else. More specifically, the results presented below are based on a difference-in-difference (DiD) analysis and event study design. The results below are taken from Figure 1–2 and Table 8–9 in the Appendix. The results suggest the following:

With a so-called event analysis, we see that (Appendix, Figure 1–2):

- Over the course of three years after the start of imports, we find no statistically significant impact on firms' productivity growth
 - the results apply to both large and small companies and regardless of where the imports come from (high-wage or low-wage countries).
- Over the course of three years after starting imports, we find no statistically significant impact on firms' exports.

• the results apply to both large and small companies and regardless of where the imports come from (high-wage or low-wage countries).

In summary, the results show that the commencement of imports has no statistically significant impact on firms' exports or productivity growth. One question to ask is whether this result holds regardless of the origin of the imports (high-wage country or low-wage country) and firm size.

There are currently different views on which analysis method is most suitable for capturing this type of "treatment effect", i.e., the effect of initiated imports. As a robustness test, we have conducted the analysis described below with perhaps the most widely used evaluation method in the field, a so-called difference-in-difference (DiD) analysis. In this analysis, the comparison group consists of a matched sample of similar companies where the only observable difference between the two groups is that the control companies do not start any import activities. The results of the DiD analysis, where we now also take into account the origin of the imports and the size of the firms, indicate the following:

- Small firms that start importing from both high-wage and low-wage countries have around a 1.5 percentage point higher productivity growth than would be the case without imports.
- Small firms that start importing only from high-wage countries have about a 0.9 percentage point higher productivity growth than would be the case without imports.
- Imports from low-wage countries have no statistically significant effect on productivity.
- For large firms, we do not see a statistically significant effect of import initiation on productivity.

When we summarise the results from the DiD analysis, a picture emerges that suggests that initiating imports leads to higher productivity growth and that this relationship is mainly driven by small firms' imports from high-wage countries. Since the results are to some extent dependent on the design of the analysis, the results should be interpreted with some caution. However, there is no evidence to suggest that imports inhibit firms' productivity growth.

5.3 Imports and exports

Finally, we analyse how imports affect firms' exports and choice of export market (Table 9, Appendix). Since the focus is on the structure of exports, non-exporting firms are excluded here. Since it can take a long time before the effect of starting to import is

reflected in firms' exports and productivity, we look not only at firms that start exporting but at all exporting firms. The disadvantage of this analysis is that the estimated causal relationship between imports and other performances will be less precise compared to an analysis that only looks at firms that start importing. Against this background, we found the following:

- Imports from both high-wage and low-wage countries positively associated with exports to several countries.
 - this applies to both large and small companies
- The volume of exports does not seem to be affected by the origin of imports
 - this applies to both large and small companies.

6 Summary

There is now convincing evidence that international trade is beneficial to productivity and economic growth. This relationship applies both to productivity at the firm level as well as to differences in economic growth across countries. In particular, small economies with a limited domestic market have benefited from the possibility of international exchange.

The impact of international exchange differs across firms. There is evidence that when opening a market to international exchange the most productive firms dominate international trade while the less productive ones tend to be squeezed out. These findings warrant a closer examination of the relationship between firms' imports and competitiveness.

The focus of this report is to examine the relationship between imports, productivity and export performance. The data material used covers all Swedish manufacturing companies with at least 10 employees during the period 2007–2020.

Several important observations are highlighted. The first to note is that almost 80 per cent of enterprises with at least 10 employees are involved in international trade. The smallest enterprises act only as exporters or importers while the largest enterprises are two-way traders.

Second, the majority of imports, regardless of firm size, come from high-wage countries. However, we observe an increasing share of imports from low-wage countries over the years.

Third, there is a clear ranking of which firms become importers and where they import from. Firms with the highest productivity import from both low- and high-wage countries, whereas medium productivity firms are engaged in import-only or exportonly activities and the lowest productivity firms are non-importers.

Finally, we have some evidence that small firms that start importing, particularly from high-wage countries, have faster productivity growth than those that abstain from such activity.

Overall, the evidence presented here suggest that efforts taken to reduce obstacles to trade in general and to ease imports in particular can be beneficial for productivity and exports.

Bibliography

Abraham, K.G. and Taylor, S.K. (1996) Firms' Use of Outside Contractors: Theory and Evidence, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 14(3), 394–424.

Abramovsky, L., Griffith, R. and Miller, H. (2017) Domestic effects of offshoring high-skilled jobs: complementarities in knowledge production, *Review of International Economics*, 25(1), 1–20.

Amiti, M. and Konings, J. (2007) Trade Liberalization, Intermediate Inputs and Productivity: Evidence from Indonesia, *American Economic Review*, 97(5), 1611–1638.

Aristei, D., Castellani, D. and Franco, C. (2013) Firms' exporting and importing activities: Is there a twoway relationship?, *Review of World Economics/Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, 149(1), 55–84.

Bandick, R. (2016) Offshoring, Plant Survival and Employment Growth. *The World Economy*, 39(5), 597–620.

Bandick, R. (2020) Global sourcing, productivity and export intensity, *The World Economy*, *43*(3), 615–643.

Bas, M. (2012) Input-trade liberalization and firm export decisions: Evidence from Argentina, *Journal of Development Economics*, 97(2), 481–493.

Bas, M. and Strauss-Kahn, V. (2014) Does importing more inputs raise exports? Firmlevel evidence from France, *Review of World Economics/Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, 150, 241–275.

Bertrand, O. (2011) What goes around, comes around: Effects of offshore outsourcing on the export performance of firms, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 42, 334–344.

Callaway, B. and Sant'Annac, P.H.C. (2021) Difference-in-Differences with multiple time periods, *Journal of Econometrics*, 225(2), 200–230.

Castellani, D., Serti, F. and Tomasi, C. (2010) Firms in international trade: importers' and

exporters' heterogeneity in Italian manufacturing industry, *World Economy*, 33, 424–457.

Clarke, D. and Tapia-Schythe, K. (2021) Implementing the panel event study, *The Stata Journal*, 21(4), 853–884.

Crinò, R. (2009) Offshoring, Multinationals and Labor Market: A Review of the Empirical Literature, *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 23, 197–249.

de Chaisemartin, C. and D'Haultfoeuille, X. (2022) Difference-in-Differences Estimators of Intertemporal Treatment Effects (tech. rep.), National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA.

Debaere, P., Görg, H. and Raff, H. (2013) Greasing the Wheels of International Commerce: How Services Facilitate Firms' International Sourcing, *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 46(1).

Doh, J., Bunyaratavej, K. and Hahn, E. (2009) Separable but not equal: The location determinants of discrete services offshore activities, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 40(6), 926–943.

Elliott, R., Jabbour, L. and Zhang, L. (2016) Firm productivity and importing: evidence from Chinese manufacturing firms, *Canadian Journal of Economics* 49(3), 1086–1124.

Ethier, W. (1982) National and International Returns to Scale in the Modern Theory of International Trade, *American Economic Review*, 72(3), 389–405.

Fariñas, J.C., López, A. and Martín-Marcos, A. (2010) Foreign sourcing and productivity: Evidence at the firm level, *The World Economy*, 33(3), 482–506.

Feenstra, R.C. and Hanson, G.H. (1999) The impact of outsourcing and hightechnology capital on wages: Estimates for the United States, 1979–1990, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 114, 907–940.

Grossman, G. and Helpman, E. (1991) Innovation and Growth in the Global Economy, Ambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Grossman, G. M. and Rossi-Hansberg, E. (2006) The rise of offshoring: It's not wine for cloth anymore. In: The new economic geography: Effects and policy implications, Jackson Hole Conference Volume, Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, pp. 59–102.

Görg, H., Hanley, A. and Strobl, E. (2008) Productivity effects of international outsourcing: evidence from plant-level data, *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 41(2), 670–688.

Heckman, J.J., (1978) Dummy endogenous variables in a simultaneous equation system, *Econometrica*, 46, 931–59.

Head, K. and Ries, J. (2002) Offshore production and skill upgrading by Japanese manufacturing firms, *Journal of International Economics*, 58(1), 81-105.

Hijzen, A., Inui, T. and Todo, Y. (2010) Does Offshoring pay? Firm-level Evidence from Japan, *Economic Inquiry*, 48(4), 880–895.

Hummels, D., Jørgensen, R., Munch, J. and Xiang, C. (2014) The Wage Effects of Offshoring: Evidence from Danish Matched Worker-Firm Data, *American Economic Review*, 104w(6), 1597–1629.

Jabbour, L. (2010) Offshoring and Firm Performance: Evidence from French Manufacturing Industry, *The World Economy*, 33, 507–524.

Kasahara, H. and Rodrigue, J. (2008) Does the Use of Imported Intermediates Increase Productivity? Plant-Level Evidence, *Journal of Development Economics*, 87, 106–118.

Kedia, B.L. and Mukherjee, D. (2009) Understanding offshoring: a research framework based on disintegration, location and externalization advantages, *Journal of World Business*, 44(3), 250–261.

Kimura, E. (2002) Subcontracting and the Performance of Small and Medium Firms in Japan, *Small Business Economics*, 18, 163–175.

Kugler, M. and Verhoogen, E. (2009) Plants and Imported Inputs: New Facts and an Interpretation, *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings*, 99, 2, 494–500.

Levinsohn, J. and Petrin, A. (2003) Estimating Production Functions using Inputs to Control for Unobservables, *Review of Economic Studies*, 70, 317–41.

Lewin, A., Massini, S. and Peeters, C. (2009) Why are companies offshoring innovation? The emerging global race for talent, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 40, 901–925.

Markusen, J. (1989) Trade in Producer Services and in Other Specialized Intermediate Inputs, *American Economic Review*, 79(1), 85–95.

Merino, F. and Rodriguez, D. (2007) Business Services Outsourcing by Manufacturing Firms, *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 16(6), 1147–1173.

Mol, M., Van Tulder, R. and Beije, P. (2005) Antecedents and performance consequences of international outsourcing, *International Business Review*, 14(5), 599–617.

Muuls, M. and Pisu, M. (2009) Imports and exports at the level of the firm, *The World Economy* 32, 692–734.

Olsen, K.B. (2006) Productivity Impacts of Offshoring and Outsourcing: A Review, OEDC, *STI Working Paper 2006/1*.

Roth, J. (2022) Pretest with caution: Event-study estimates after testing for parallel trends, *American Economic Review: Insights*, 4(3), 305–22.

Rasciute, S. and Downward P. (2017) Explaining variability in the investment location choices of MNEs: An exploration of country, industry and firm effects, *International Business Review*, 26, 604–613.

Sharma, C. and Mishra, R.K. (2015) International trade and performance of firms: Unraveling export, import and productivity puzzle, *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 57, 61–74.

Sethupathy, G. (2013) Offshoring, wages, and employment: Theory and evidence, *European Economic Review*, 62, 73–97.

Smeets, V. and Warzynski, F. (2013) Estimating productivity with multi-product firms, pricing heterogeneity and the role of international trade, *Journal of International Economics*, 90(2), 237–244.

Sun, L. and Abraham, S. (2021) Estimating dynamic treatment effects in event studies with heterogeneous treatment effects, *Journal of Econometrics*, 225(2), 175–199.

Young, A. (1991) Learning by Doing and the Dynamic Effects of International Trade, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106, 369–405.

Wagner, J. (2011) Offshoring and firm performance: Self-selection, effects on performance, or both?, *Review of World Economics*, 147(2), 217–247.

Appendix

Table 1. Number of importing and exporting companies, 2007-2020									
Year	All com	ipanies	Impor	t only	Expor	t only	Imports a	and exports	
	Number	Emplo-	Per	Emplo-	Per cent	Emplo-	Per	Emplo-	
	of firms	yees	cent%	yees	%	yees	cent	yees	
							%		
2007	6724	86	7.2	28	12.9	23	57.4	133	
2008	6761	82	7.4	30	12.9	31	57.3	125	
2009	6313	79	6.7	28	13.8	24	57.2	120	
2010	6061	79	7.1	30	14.0	30	57.4	119	
2011	5964	82	6.8	37	12.9	27	58.0	123	
2012	5837	82	7.2	31	12.9	28	57.5	124	
2013	5621	82	7.1	34	12.6	24	58.2	124	
2014	5483	82	7.2	29	13.7	24	58.1	124	
2015	5390	80	7.1	33	12.5	25	59.0	119	
2016	5343	81	7.1	31	12.4	28	58.6	121	
2017	5266	83	7.6	38	12.4	24	58.7	125	
2018	5236	86	7.7	38	12.6	24	59.0	129	
2019	5137	88	7.7	34	11.7	25	60.0	129	
2020	5003	88	7.6	38	11.6	25	60.5	128	
Means	5724	83	7.2	33	12.8	26	58.4	124	

Table 1. Number of importing and exporting companies, 2007-2020

Note: Companies with at least ten employees. Source: SCB own calculations.

Table 2. Share of firms importing from low and high wage countries. Share of all enterprises in brackets

Year	Low-wage countries only	Only high-wage countries	Both low and high wage countries
2007	1.6 (1.0)	58.5 (37.8)	39.9 (25.8)
2008	2.2 (1.4)	56.5 (36.5)	41.3 (26.7)
2009	1.9 (1.2)	54.2 (34.6)	43.9 (28.1)
2010	2.7 (1.7)	52.2 (33.6)	45.1 (29.1)
2011	3.3 (2.2)	50.9 (33.0)	45.7 (29.6)
2012	3.4 (2.2)	49.8 (32.1)	46.8 (30.2)
2013	3.1 (2.0)	49.0 (31.9)	47.8 (31.2)
2014	3.5 (2.3)	46.5 (30.4)	50.0 (32.6)
2015	4.2 (2.8)	42.4 (28.0)	53.4 (35.3)
2016	4.0 (2.6)	43.2(28.4)	52.7 (34.6)
2017	4.3 (2.9)	41.4 (27.5)	54.3 (36.0)
2018	4.3 (2.8)	40.2 (26.8)	55.6 (37.1)
2019	4.7 (3.2)	38.0 (25.8)	57.3 (38.9)
2020	5.4 (3.7)	38.6 (26.3)	56.0 (38.1)

Note: Companies with at least ten employees, source: Statistics Sweden's own calculations.

-								
		Impo	rts/sales	Share of inte in tota	rmediate goc I imports	#imported products		
	Year	10-50 employee:	+50 employe	10-50 employees	+50 employe	10-50 employees	+50 employees	
	2007	6.7	15.9	12.0	28.9	3.6	11.8	
	2008	6.7	16.0	12.0	29.3	3.6	11.9	
	2009	6.0	14.9	10.5	28.2	3.5	12.0	
	2010	6.3	16.4	10.7	30.4	3.4	12.5	
	2011	6.2	16.6	10.5	30.5	3.5	12.5	
	2012	6.0	15.9	10.6	29.5	3.6	12.8	
	2013	6.0	16.5	11.1	31.9	3.7	13.2	
	2014	6.4	17.0	11.7	32.7	3.7	13.5	
	2015	5.8	16.7	10.2	31.4	3.5	13.4	
	2016	5.4	16.6	9.9	31.9	3.5	13.6	
	2017	5.8	16.9	10.1	30.8	3.6	13.7	
	2018	6.1	17.3	10.5	31.3	3.7	13.8	
	2019	6.3	17.2	10.8	31.4	3.9	14.1	
1	2020	6.2	16.8	10.5	31.7	3.9	13.8	

Table 3. Import intensity of firms, number of products imported, and firm size

Note: Companies with at least ten employees. Source: SCB own calculations.

Table 4. Number of countries that companies import from

		10-50 em	ployees		+50 employees			
Year	EU15 countries	EU27 countries	High- wage	Low- wage	EU15 countries	EU27 countries	High- wage	Low- wage
2007	1.6	1.9	3.2	0.5	5.4	6.5	10.0	1.9
2008	1.6	1.9	3.2	0.4	5.4	6.6	10.0	1.9
2009	1.5	1.8	3.1	0.4	5.3	6.6	10.0	2.0
2010	1.3	1.6	3.0	0.5	5.5	6.8	10.4	2.2
2011	1.4	1.6	3.0	0.5	5.4	6.9	10.4	2.1
2012	1.4	1.7	3.0	0.5	5.5	7.0	10.5	2.3
2013	1.4	1.7	3.1	0.6	5.7	7.3	10.8	2.4
2014	1.4	1.7	2.8	0.6	5.7	7.4	11.1	2.3
2015	1.0	1.3	2.8	0.7	5.3	7.0	10.8	2.6
2016	1.0	1.3	2.9	0.7	5.4	7.2	11.0	2.6
2017	1.0	1.3	2.9	0.7	5.5	7.3	11.0	2.6
2018	1.1	1.4	3.0	0.7	5.5	7.3	11.1	2.7
2019	1.2	1.5	3.2	0.8	5.6	7.5	11.3	2.8
2020	1.3	1.6	3.1	0.8	5.6	7.5	11.2	2.6

Note: Companies with at least ten employees. Source: SCB own calculations.

	Imports only from low- wage countries vs. Non-importers		Imports only from high-wage countries vs. Non-importers		Imports from both low- and high-wage countries vs. Non-importers	
	10-50 +50 employees employees		10-50 employees	+50 employees	10-50 employees	+50 employees
<i>In</i> (productivity)	0.140 (9.78) ^{***}	-0.065 (1.14)	0.328 (5.63) ^{***}	0.241 (13.21) ^{***}	0.456 (72.95) ^{***}	0.390 (22.17) ^{***}
<i>In</i> (export)	0.725 (8.18) ^{***}	-0.464 (1.50)	1.720 (47.31) ^{***}	1.763 (16.10)***	2.900 (81.25) ^{***}	3.662 (41.98) ^{***}
# export destinations	0.837	1.251	2.056	5.019	11.249	24.178
	(7.45)***	(2.39)***	(25.51)***	(11.17)***	(75.91)***	(27.68)***
In(number of employees)	0.084	-0.077	0.195	0.284	0.313	0.690
omployooo,	(8,09)***	(1.77)*	(47.67)***	(14.25)***	(68.63)***	(25.90)***
<i>In</i> (capital stock)	0.222	0.069	0.507	0.807	0.428	1.177
,	(5.39)***	(0.45)	(32.66)***	(16.22)***	(24.73)***	(22.49)***
Average wage cost	0.099 (6.65) ^{***}	0.011 (0.22)	0.119 (21.73) ^{***}	0.062 (3.92) ^{***}	0.227 (36.62) ^{***}	0.197 (12.81) ^{***}

Table 5. Firm characteristics. Importing vs. non-importing firms

Note: Companies with at least ten employees. Source: SCB own calculations.

Table 6. Probit analysis for imports

Variables	All companies	10-50 employees	+50 employees
Labour productivity	0.349 (0.012)***	0.367 (0.013) ^{***}	0.173 (0.031)***
Number of employees	0.568	0.489	0.505
	(0.010)***	(0.015)***	(0.033)***
Capital stock	-0.040	-0.041	-0.022
	(0.004)***	(0.004)***	(0.013)*
Growth rate relative to industry average	1.101	0.852	1.273
	(0.457)**	(0.504)*	(1.031)
Average wage cost	0.523	0.594	0.281
	(0.024)***	(0.027)***	(0.051)***
Has export	1.227	1.205	1.422
	(0.013)***	(0.014)***	(0.043)***
Pseudo R ²	0.209	0.234	0.193
Obs.	67,783	49,452	18,331

Note: Dependent variable is a dummy variable equal to 1 if firm *i* imports in period *t* but not in *t*-1 and 0 if the firm does not import in these two periods. Std.err. (clustered at the firm level) in brackets. All other explanatory variables are lagged by one year except for the variable growth in relation to industry and exporter. Year dummies included in all regressions. ***, ** and * indicate significance at the 1, 5 and 10 per cent level, respectively. Companies with at least ten employees. Source: Statistics Sweden's own calculations.

·	(1) All enterprises +10 employees	(2) 10-50 employees	(3) +50 employees
	Imports only from hig imports only from	gh wage countries vs. Iow wage countries	
Labour productivity	0.264 (0.028)***	0.212 (0.031)***	0.468 (0.076)***
Number of employees	0.201 (0.028)***	0.156 (0.042)***	0.383 (0.103)***
Capital stock	0.042 (0.012)***	0.043 (0.012)***	0.022 (0.037)
Growth rate relative to industry average	-0.249 (1.063)	-0.331 (1.152)	0.565 (2.796)
Average wage cost	0.339 (0.055)***	0.560 (0.071)***	-0.018 (0.980)
Has export	0.025 (0.041)	0.028 (0.043)	0.061 (0.125)
Imj	ports from both low- ar imports only from	nd high-wage countries v low-wage countries	S.
	• •		
Labour productivity	0.407 (0.029)***	0.376 (0.032)***	0.569 (0.075)***
Number of employees	0.765 (0.028)***	0.638 (0.043)***	0.986 (0.103)***
Capital stock	-0.083 (0.012)***	-0.077 (0.013)***	-0.117 (0.037)***
Growth rate relative to industry average	1.558 (1.081)	1.395 (1.088)	2.440 (2.801)
Average wage cost	0.893 (0.056)***	1.013 (0.073)***	0.686 (0.099)***
Has export	1.391 (0.046)***	1.266 (0.049)***	2.117 (0.137)***
Forest chi2 Note	7,242 45,494	3,009 28,343	1,920 17,151

Table 7. Import country selection. Multinomial Probit

Note: Dependent variable equals 0 if the firm imports only from low-wage countries, 1 if the firm imports only from highwage countries, and 2 if the firm imports from both low- and high-wage countries. Std.err. (clustered at firm level) in brackets. All other explanatory variables are lagged by one year except for the Growth in relation to industry and exporter variables. Annual dummies are included. ***, ** and * indicate significance at 1, 5 and 10 per cent level, respectively. Companies with at least ten employees. Source: Statistics Sweden's own calculations.



Figure 1. Productivity effect of starting imports. Event analysis.

Note: Companies with at least ten employees. Source: SCB own calculations.

Figure 2. Evolution of exports of imports started. Event analysis.



Note: Companies with at least ten employees. Source: SCB own calculations.

	(1) Only high-wage countries	(2) Only low-wage countries	(3) Low and high wage countries
Specification (1) 10-50 employees	0.009 (0.004)**	0.016 (0.023)	0.015 (0.007)**
Specification (2) 10-50 employees	-0.014 (0.026)	-0.011 (0.053)	-0.017 (0.024)

Table 8. Imports and productivity. DiD analysis on matched sample

Note: Std.errors. (clustered at firm level) in brackets. ***, ** and * indicate significance at 1, 5 and 10 per cent level, respectively. Source: SCB own calculations.

	•	Export grow	rth	Number	Number of export destinations			Number of export destinations		
					·			high-wage countries		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	
		Imports from	m		Imports from			Imports from		
	High	Low-	High and	High	Low-wage	High and	High	Low-wage	High and	
	income countries	wage countries	low wage countries	income countries	countries	low wage countries	income countries	countries	low wage countries	
Model 1 10-50										
employees	0.009 (0.062)	-0.168 (0.160)	0.059 (0.057)	-0.083 (0.098)	0.204 (0.180)	10.483 (0.343) ^{***}	-0.039 (0.089)	-0.422 (0.149)***	8.096 (0.258) ^{***}	
Model 2 +50										
employees	0.492 (0.431)	-0.499 (1.014)	0.281 (0.465)	-1.936 (0.753)**	-0.800 (2.387)	4.045 (1.383) ^{***}	-1.617 (0.604) ^{***}	-1.200 (2.332)	3.636 (1.146) ^{***}	

Table 9. Impact of imports on firms' export performanceport growth and export destinations

Note: Analysis based on importing companies. Source: SCB own calculations.

The National Board of Trade Sweden is the government agency for international trade, the EU internal market and trade policy. Our mission is to facilitate free and open trade with transparent rules as well as free movement in the EU internal market.

Our goal is a well-functioning internal market, an external EU trade policy based on free trade and an open and strong multilateral trading system.

We provide the Swedish Government with analyses, reports and policy recommendations. We also participate in international meetings and negotiations.

The National Board of Trade, via SOLVIT, helps businesses and citizens encountering obstacles to free movement. We also host several networks with business organisations and authorities which aim to facilitate trade.

As an expert agency in trade policy issues, we also provide assistance to developing countries through trade-related development cooperation. One example is Open Trade Gate Sweden, a one-stop information centre assisting exporters from developing countries in their trade with Sweden and the EU.

Our analyses and reports aim to increase the knowledge on the importance of trade for the international economy and for the global sustainable development. Publications issued by the National Board of Trade only reflect the views of the Board.

National Board of Trade Sweden, May 2023. ISBN: 978-91-89742-13-0



Box 6803, S-113 86 Stockholm, Sweden Phone +46 8 690 48 00 E-mail registrator@kommerskollegium.se www.kommerskollegium.se