ECO-STRATEGIES AND FIRM GROWTH IN EUROPEAN SMES

Elisenda Jové-Llopis (GRIT, XREAP)
Agustí Segarra-Blasco (GRIT, XREAP)

XARXA
DE REFERÈNCIA
EN ECONOMIA APLICADA

Eco-strategies and firm growth in European SMEs

Elisenda Jové-Llopis & Agustí Segarra-Blasco (§)

Abstract:

This study investigates the effects of eco-strategies on firm performance in terms of sales growth in an extensive sample of 11,336 small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) located in 28 European countries. Our empirical results suggest that not all eco-strategies are positively related to better performance, at least not in the short term. We find that European companies using renewable energies, recycling or designing products that are easier to maintain, repair or reuse perform better. Those that aim to reduce water or energy pollution, however, seem to show a negative correlation to firm growth. Our results, also, indicate that high investment in eco-strategies improves firm growth, particularly in new members that joined the EU from 2004 onwards. Finally, we observe a U-shaped relationship between eco-strategies and firm growth, which indicates that a greater breadth of eco-strategies is associated with better firm performance. However, few European SMEs are able to either invest heavily or undertake multiple eco-strategies, thus leaving room for policy interventions.

Keywords: eco-strategy, firm growth, Europe, SMEs

(§) Research Group of Industry and Territory

Department of Economics – CREIP, Universitat Rovira i Virgili

Av. Universitat, 1, 43204 – Reus, Spain Tel. + 34 977 759 816 Fax + 34 977 300 661

1. INTRODUCTION

Although in existing research there seems to be a robust understanding of the factors that determine which innovations positively impact the environment,[1] exactly how these eco-strategies to reduce environmental impacts affect firm performance is still widely debated.

Traditional economic arguments claim that eco-strategies generate costs but no profits for firms. Some years later, Porter (1991) and Porter and Linde (1995) proposed a new green perspective emphasizing that both the environment and the firm can benefit, since stricter regulations may trigger innovation and lead to higher profitability and competitiveness in the long run.

Ambec et al., (2013), Dixon-Fowler et al., (2013), Albertini (2013), and Barbieri et al., (2016) provide recent reviews and meta-studies summarizing the empirical work on the economic effects of eco-strategies. These studies reveal the presence of considerable diversity in the empirical results, ranging from negative through non-significant to moderately (or even strongly) positive links between eco-innovation and firm performance. Such mixed results suggest that the relationship between eco-innovation strategies and firm performance is complex and poorly understood, indicating a need for a greater effort in investigating this link. This could provide a conclusive argument to help managers bring about a win-win situation in which both firms and society can benefit from eco-innovation practices. In addition, a better evaluation of this relationship would be useful to take into account, should it be necessary, when designing effective eco-innovation policies in the future.

In this study we therefore focus on the role played by eco-strategies, and we ask whether firms are creating economic opportunities (in terms of firm growth) by improving their eco-performance or missing out on a sustainable competitive advantage in today's turbulent environment. To do this we use the European Commission's Eurobarometer Survey 426 which provides a valuable opportunity to examine the role of eco-strategies in firm growth in SMEs in European countries.

Applying an ordered logistic model for 11,336 European SMEs, our empirical developments offer some interesting results. First, not all eco-strategies are positively related to better performance. We find that European firms using renewable energies perform better. In addition, undertaking eco-strategies aimed at recycling or designing

---

[1] The existing literature has mainly classified the determinants of eco-innovation into four groups: supply-side factors, demand-side factors, firm specific factors and environmental policy (Cuerva et al., 2014; Doran and Ryan, 2016; Horbach, 2008; Horbach et al., 2013; Triguero et al., 2013). Environmental policies seem to be the most important drivers for triggering eco-innovations. However, relying on external knowledge sources and cooperation are also more important for eco-innovators than general innovators (Cainelli et al., 2015; De Marchi, 2012).

products that are easier to maintain, repair or use increase firm growth in former members of the EU. Firms seeking to reduce water or energy pollution, on the other hand, seem to show a negative correlation with firm growth patterns. Second, our results indicate that high investment in eco-strategies improves firm growth, particularly in new member states that joined the EU from 2004 onwards. Finally, we observe a U-shaped relationship between eco-strategies and firm growth, meaning that a greater breadth of eco-strategies is associated with higher firm performance. However, few SMEs are able to either invest large amounts or undertake multiple eco-strategies.

This paper contributes to the previous literature in several ways. First, despite the important role that SMEs play in advanced economies, the impacts of eco-strategies on their firm performance have received less attention in the literature compared to large firms (Aragón-Correa et al., 2008). Nowadays SMEs are the economic backbone of the European Union, representing 99% of European business and accounting for more than two thirds of employment. As well as being economically important, the analysis of eco-strategies across SMEs is relevant since the costs of investing in these strategies in the short term are high and, at the same time SMEs face greater financial barriers than larger firms, namely difficulties in accessing external sources of funding (Ghisetti et al., 2016). We therefore contribute to the existing debate with a detailed investigation of SMEs.

Second, cross-country analyses of eco-strategies at firm level are still scarce (Colombelli et al., 2015; Lanoie et al., 2011). In general, empirical studies are performed focusing on either a single country or a specific sector.[2] However, this study enhances previous research by giving more clarity to the relationship between eco-innovation strategies and firm performance across 28 European countries taking into account both sector and country differences.

Finally, to compare how far eco-strategies vary across countries, we classify the EU28 countries into two clusters. The distinction between former (European Union-15) and new EU members (the group of more recent member that joined the EU from 2004 onward) is of great interest to day, bearing in mind that in a considerable number of Central and Eastern European countries have become part of the European project in recent years. Despite the fact that the connection between eco-strategies and firm performance has been examined extensively for countries that have been members of the EU for many years, the evidence is virtually non-existent for new members (Hojnik and Ruzzier, 2016; Przychodzen and Przychodzen, 2015).

---

[2] Examples of specific country analyses include: Italy (Marin and Lotti, 2017; Riillo, 2017), Germany (Ghisetti and Rennings, 2014; Rexhäuser and Rammer, 2014), Ireland (Doran and Ryan, 2012), the Netherlands (Leeuwen and Mohnen, 2017) and, Slovenia (Hojnik and Ruzzier, 2016). Analyses of specific sectors we include: automotive sector (Aragón-Correa et al., 2008) and the paper industry (Wagner et al., 2002), among others.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 consists of a literature review. Section 3 presents the database, some descriptive statistics, the variables and the econometric methodology. Section 4 shows our main findings. The final section presents our conclusions and the consequent policy implications.

2. ECO-INNOVATION STRATEGIES AND FIRM PERFORMANCE

While eco-innovation is expected to have a beneficial effect on the environment, its effect on firms' performance is less straightforward. Historically, the conventional economic approach held that investing in environmental activities to reduce an externality like pollution involved an additional cost to a firm with no resulting benefits, which in turn eroded a firm's overall competitiveness (Palmer et al., 1995; Walley and Whitehead, 1994). However, two decades ago a new green perspective emerged that considered that investments in eco-innovation activities would offset operational costs and increase firm performance in the long term (Porter and Linde, 1995).

Recently, scholars have increasingly emphasized the win-win idea (improving the environment with no reduction in firm profits). Relying primarily on case studies, Porter and Linde (1995) argue that more stringent but well-designed eco-regulation (mainly in the form of market-based instruments such as pollution taxes and tradable permits) can stimulate innovation which by enhancing productivity, increases firm benefits.[3] This is generally known in the literature as the Porter Hypothesis (henceforth PH), according to which eco-regulation is a means whereby a firm can benefit from environmental and economic performance. It has, therefore, attracted much attention among researchers and policy-makers because it goes against the conventional wisdom that environmental protection always has a negative effect on economic growth.

2.1 Existing empirical studies
Given the PH framework, a range of empirical studies have set out to analyse the relationship between eco-strategies and performance at firm-level. Despite the accumulation of empirical work on this topic over the last decade, there is no general consensus on the direction and magnitude of the relationship. The emergence of heterogeneous results can be explained in the light of several dimensions such as the scope of analysis (firm or aggregate level, small or large sample), the variety of performance measures (productivity, growth, profitability), the hybrid indicators to measure eco-strategies (clean technologies, end-of-pipe techniques, pollution prevention,

---

[3] Since eco-innovations are characterized by the "double externality" problem (Rennings, 2000), policy measures are often used to stimulate them. According to Porter and Linde (1995), regulation-induced eco-innovation is more likely to have positive impact on long-term performance than short-term measures.

resource efficiency measures, etc.), the empirical approaches adopted and the availability of data.[4] Concerning the latter, most of the empirical contributions employ two typologies of data sources to analyse the economic effects of eco-strategies: patent data or survey questionnaires (such as the Community Innovation Survey (CIS) or Eurobarometer Special surveys in the European context). Although valuable and based on official datasets, we believe that the value of evidence focusing on patent data is limited because patents are likely to be skewed towards innovation in large firms and technologically intensive sectors, whereas most of the firms in the EU28 are small or medium sized and not included in the patent data.

In the following, a summary is made of the recent empirical literature on the economic effects of eco-strategies on firm performance.[5] Different concepts are used to measure firm performance, such as productivity (including for example valued added, gross output and turnover per employee), growth (in terms of sales) and financial measures (e.g. operating margins, return on sales, Tobin's Q ratio).

In the European context, Doran and Ryan (2012), using a cross-sectional Irish sample, find that firms that engage in eco-innovation in general have higher levels of turnover per employee than firms that do not. Similarly, Hojnik and Ruzzier (2016), exploring Slovenian firms, and Przychodzen and Przychodzen (2015), examining a sample of Polish and Hungarian firms, suggest that process eco-innovation practices have no adverse effect on firm performance (in terms of profitability and growth) and conclude that it pays to be an eco-innovator. Meanwhile the study by Antonioli et al., (2016), which also analyses the general effect of eco-innovation on firm performance for a group of firms in the Emilia-Romagna region in Italy in 2010 and 2011, finds that some firms' productivity performances (such us revenues over total labour cost) are positively related to eco-innovations.[6]

However, contrary to this positive evidence of the impact of eco-innovation strategies on firm performance, some research indicates that not only is there no correlation between the two variables, there is not even a trade-off. Cainelli et al. (2011), for instance, using a sample of Italian services firms show a negative link between eco-motivations and

---

[4] See Barbieri et al., (2016) for a recent literature review on the economic effects of eco-innovations and also some examples: Ambec and Lanoie (2008); Aragón-Correa et al., (2008); Cainelli et al., (2011); Doran and Ryan (2012); Elsayed and Paton (2005); Ghisetti and Rennings (2014); Hojnik and Ruzzier (2016); Horváthová (2010); Lee and Min (2015); Riillo (2017).

[5] Note that in the literature there is also a stream of research focusing on eco-strategies and employment effects. This falls outside the scope of the present paper. For an overview of the subject see for example: Gagliardi et al., (2016); Horbach and Rennings, (2013); Kunapatarawong and Martínez-Ros (2016).

[6] In addition, Antonioli et al., (2016) show that there is no significant or even negative influence on other kinds of profitability measures such as the ratio between revenues and total labour costs in the very short run, which may probably be due to profitability taking longer to emerge in these areas than in others.

growth in employment and turnover in the short term. Wagner et al. (2002), focusing on one particular industry (paper) in four European countries (Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom), also provide evidence of a negative relationship, although only for one specific financial performance measure (return on capital employed (ROCE)), and report no evidence of a significant relationship between two other economic performance indicators (return on sales (ROS) and return on equity (ROE)). On the basis of patent analysis, Marin and Lotti (2017) more recently used a sample of Italian manufacturing firms and observed that eco-innovations exhibit a lower return relative to other innovations, at least in the short run. This differential effect seems to be especially true for polluting firms facing higher compliance costs for eco-regulations than other firms. In the context of transition economies, there is some evidence that better pollution prevention strategies, generated by improved production processes neither improve nor undermine financial success in the Czech Republic (Earnhart and Lizal, 2007).

Beyond the extensive literature that looks at the link between eco-strategies in general and firm performance, some researchers have recently started to claim that most of the empirical studies analysing the relationship between eco-innovation practices and firm competitiveness should go further, distinguishing between different types of eco-strategy, rather than just focusing on the question "whether it pays to be green" (Ghisetti and Rennings, 2014; Riillo, 2017).

Using a complementary approach on German a sample, Ghisetti and Rennings (2014) consider two typologies of eco-innovation: one aimed at reducing externalities and the other aimed at increasing energy and resource efficiency. Their econometric analysis, based on two waves of the Mannheim Innovation Panel, suggests that innovations leading to a reduction in the use of energy or materials per unit of output have a positive effect on firm competitiveness in terms of higher profits. However, innovations aimed at reducing externalities such as air, water, noise pollution, and harmful materials have the opposite effect. Using the same German data for 2009, Rexhäuser and Rammer, (2014) find similar results, as do Miroshnychenko et al., (2017) using over 3,000 publicly-traded firms across 58 countries.

Two other recent papers deal with the heterogeneity effect of eco-innovation strategies on firm performance. Doran and Ryan (2016), examining a sample of Irish firms, decompose the eco-innovation variable into nine different types of eco-innovation practices, only two of which (reduced CO footprint and recycled waste, water or materials) are able to impact positively on firm performance in terms of turnover per employee. These findings suggest that the question as to whether it pays to be green should be reformulated and better qualified, in terms of the typologies of eco-innovation orientation. Similarly Leeuwen and Mohnen (2016), using a Dutch dataset, investigate the full chain of causality from eco-regulatory stringency to environmental and firm performance. They find that only resource-saving eco-innovations (those that can be assimilated into process-integrated eco-innovations) have a positive effect on total factor

productivity (TFP), whereas pollution-reducing or end-of-pipe eco-innovations tend to reduce it.

In terms of firm growth, it is surprising that, despite the great importance of the current policy debate on green and sustainable growth in the European Union, the number of studies that examine the role of eco-innovation orientation in promoting firm growth is relatively small, especially when compared to the number of studies focusing on the growth effects of general innovations. Although technological innovations are generally recognised as contributing to firms' growth (for a review see Coad (2009)), the effects of eco-strategies are still little researched and unclear (Cainelli et al., 2011; Colombelli et al., 2015).

Cainelli et al., (2011) using the CIS sample of Italian firms, find a negative link between environmental motivations in general and growth in both employment and turnover in the short term. Colombelli et al., (2015), however, analysing a sample of over 400,000 firms located in Germany, France, Italy, Spain and Sweden during the period 2002-2011, show that those oriented towards eco-innovation (identified on the basis of green patents) are characterized by higher growth rates than those carrying out only generic innovations.

On the basis of all this and with the aim of understanding and explaining the mixed results of the empirical research into the relationship between eco-strategies and firm performance across European countries, we formulate the following overarching research question: do eco-strategies have a positive link on firm performance? To help us arrive at an answer, we coherently test three hypotheses.

The first of these, following the existing literature mentioned above, looks at the different nature of eco-strategies and their effects on firm performance.

H1: The economic effects of eco-strategies on firm growth patterns are heterogeneous and conditioned by the type of eco-strategy considered.

The second is in line with more recent studies that suggest there is a need to investigate the intensity of eco-strategies rather than the fact of their adoption.[7] Antonioli and Mazzanti (2009), using a sample of Italian firms, show that the level of eco-innovation investment plays a role in determining firms' productivity, whereas a non-significant effect is found it for the adoption. The negative or nonsignificant effect of the adoption might be explained by the fact that eco-strategies need time for their effects to be felt or because a minimum level of intensity is needed to cause a change in production efficiency or demand before any return on these strategies can be reaped (Cainelli et al., 2011). This leads us to the second hypothesis:

H2: The intensity of investments in eco-strategies triggers better firm performance.

---

[7] Nevertheless, eco-innovation intensity as a variable has scarcely been analysed since it is absent from most survey data (for instance, some waves of the CIS survey include an eco-module but do not deal with intensities).

As mentioned above, firms investing in eco-strategies have high risks and costs in the short term before they start to reap any benefit, because eco-strategies are characterized by a high level of uncertainty, novelty and the need to go beyond firms's core competencies. These characteristics are especially important for SMEs, which face major difficulties in obtaining credit for their eco-investments compared to larger firms, which often have better access to equity and long-term loans (Ghisetti et al., 2016). As known from general innovation theory, given the inherent risk of innovation, firms have the incentive to diversify or develop multiple number of external linkages and strategies in order to maximize their chances of success (Leiponen and Helfat, 2010; Quintana-García and Benavides-Velasco, 2008; Tavassoli and Karlsson, 2016). However, diversification comes at a price. A firm needs additional training for its employees, new equipment and time to integrate and assimilate new strategies.

The empirical results generally suggest that wider horizons as regards innovation objectives and knowledge sources are associated with better performance. However, studies into the effect of a greater breadth of eco-strategies on firm performance is still missing.

Using industry-level data from 12 OECD countries, Soltmann et al., (2015) show that the general relationship between the intensity of green inventions and performance is a U shape related to performance. They conclude that the turning point is quite high and consequently only relevant for a few industries. For most industries, therefore, an increasing level of green inventions has a negative effect on firm performance. The same empirical evidence of a U-shaped relationship between environmental performance and profitability for firms in the manufacturing and service industries was recently provided by Trumpp and Guenther (2017).

Our third hypothesis is therefore:

H3. Firms with a greater breadth of eco-strategies experience better firm performance.

These three hypotheses are calibrated in the econometric work developed below. This analysis was only made possible because of our dataset containing the environmental patterns of European SMEs drawn from the information obtained from a survey of a large sample of SMEs located in EU28 member countries.

3. METHODOLOGY AND DATA

3.1 Database and descriptive statistics
The source of the data used in this paper is the Flash Eurobarometer Survey 426 (FLE426) on *"Small and Medium Enterprises, Resources Efficiency and Green Markets, wave 3".*[8]

---

[8] SME enterprises are defined as those with a staff headcount below 250. In addition to the staff headcount ceiling, an enterprise qualifies as an SME whether it meets either the turnover ceiling or the balance sheet ceiling, but not necessarily both. The full definition can be found at:

It was conducted between 1 and 18 September 2015 and follows earlier Eurobarometers (FL342 in 2012 and FL381 in 2013)[9]. The database includes the 28 member states of the European Union plus Albania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, Turkey, Iceland, Moldova, Norway and the US, and covers large companies and SMEs.

In the Flash Eurobarometer Survey 426 a total of 15,020 managers (13,114 from the EU28) were selected[10] using a stratification procedure according to the dimensions of firm size (four categories: 1–9 employees, 10–49 employees, 50–249 employees, and 250 employees or more) and sector (four categories: manufacturing, retail, services, and industry).

One of the main advantages of the Flash Eurobarometer Survey 426 is that it is an extensive survey that includes three dimensions, namely country, sector and firm size. Most environmental empirical database offer only aggregate information at country level, so having three dimensions in the same database allows researchers many possible views and perspectives on the data. However, the main drawback is that it is a cross-sectional dataset, and so the problem of simultaneity is somewhat unavoidable. So far this has been a problem common to all studies that use Flash Eurobarometer datasets (Hoogendoorn et al., 2015; Marin et al., 2015).

Due to the focus of our analysis (the effect of eco-strategies on growth in SMEs across the EU28) and the data cleaning procedure (discarding observations with missing values for the relevant variables), the final sample includes 11,336 firms.

To examine the differences between EU countries in some depth, we also classify the EU28 countries into two clusters: the European Union-15 and new members of EU (the group of recent member states that joined the EU from 2004 onwards). Internal differences in eco-performance in these two clusters are found to be important, especially for the new EU members, which operate further from their respective eco-technological frontiers (Beltrán-Esteve and Picazo-Tadeo, 2017; Horbach, 2016). Table 2 gives an overview of the final sample. The former members group includes 6,104 firms and the new members group 5,232. The sample is dominated by the services and retail sectors and by very small firms with 1 to 9 employees in both country groups.

---

http://ec.europa.eu/growth/smes/business-friendly-environment/sme-definition/index_en.htm

[9] Each Flash Eurobarometer is a cross-sectional survey and consequently is conducted with a completely new sample of firms. The data are, therefore not panel data and a merging of data sets is not possible.

[10] It is important to stress that as in any survey, the information gathered relies on the interpretation made by the manager answering the questions. Despite the subjective nature of many of the questions we believe that, on average, the information obtained via these questions is a good proxy for the general attitude of top management toward eco-issues.

Table 2
Distribution of the sample by clusters, sectors and firm size

Former EU members			New EU members		
Country	Firms	Percent	Country	Freq.	Percent
FR - France	463	4.08	CY - Cyprus	184	1.62
BE - Belgium	407	3.59	CZ - Czech Republic	436	3.85
NE - The Netherlands	428	3.78	EE - Estonia	452	3.99
DE - Germany	358	3.16	HU - Hungary	423	3.73
IT - Italy	397	3.50	LV - Latvia	481	4.24
LU - Luxembourg	176	1.55	LT - Lithuania	466	4.11
DK - Denmark	413	3.64	MT - Malta	164	1.45
IE - Ireland	429	3.78	PL - Poland	456	4.02
GB - United Kingdom	375	3.31	SK - Slovakia	429	3.78
GR - Greece	452	3.99	SI - Slovenia	471	4.15
ES - Spain	441	3.89	BG - Bulgaria	411	3.63
PT - Portugal	461	4.07	RO - Romania	426	3.76
FI - Finland	452	3.99	HR - Croatia	433	3.82
SE - Sweden	457	4.03			
AT - Austria	395	3.48			
Total former EU28	*6,104*	*53.85*	*Total new EU28*	*5,232*	*46.15*

Firms by sectors					
Manufacturing (NACE C)	1,274	20.87	Manufacturing	1,286	24.58
Retail (NACE G)	1,921	31.47	Retail	1,701	32.51
Services (NACE H/I/J/K/L/M/N)	2,134	34.96	Services	1,488	28.44
Industry (NACE B/D/E/F)	775	12.70	Industry	757	14.47

Firms by employees					
1 to 9	2,681	43.92	1 to 9	2,345	44.84
10 to 49	2,228	36.50	10 to 49	1,864	35.63
50 to 249	1,195	19.57	50 to 249	1,022	19.54

Source: Flash Eurobarometer Survey #426, European Commission.

Table 3 displays the characteristics of the sample by country group. About 40% of the firms in the sample say that annual turnover increased over the previous two years while over 25% report a decrease in their growth rate. When comparing former members' against new EU members, SMEs in the first group are more likely to have increased their annual turnover (43% v. 39%).

Most of the SMEs (86% of the sample) are taking action to become more resource efficient. This may be because the period under observation was one in which major policies were being implemented at EU and national levels (Europe 2020 strategy and subsequent roadmaps). The most common resource efficiency actions taken by the EU-28 are those aimed at saving energy (63%), minimising waste (57%) and saving materials (56%). In contrast, SMEs are less likely to be taking actions to use predominantly renewable energy (13%).When we look at all the countries involved, firms implement on average of three eco-strategies to become more resource efficient. However, the country group analysis shows a slight degree of variation in the number of resource efficiency actions being taken by SMEs. Firms in the new member states that joined the EU from 2004 onwards are likely to implement fewer green practices than their counterparts.

Overall investment in resource efficiency actions is low, with almost 50% of SMEs that are taking action investing less than 1% of their turnover in this area in the previous two years, and 40% investing 1-5%. Only 10% invest more than 6% in eco-strategies. The

small amounts of money assigned to resource efficiency practices may indicate that firms invest the minimum simply to comply with environmental legislation. Otherwise there are no great differences between country groups in the proportions they invest in eco-strategies, although new members still show less favourable investment indicators.[11]

In short, the values reflected in the two clusters of countries together with the substantial significance of the t-test, suggest that the profile of SMEs from former EU member countries differs slightly from those in new member countries. The first group presents greater sensitivity to the undertaking of resource efficiency practices to be greener and invests slightly larger amounts of money in foster them thanks to their own technical expertise and greater external finance.

Table 3
Descriptive statistics by country clusters (mean values)

	Total sample	Former members	New members	Mean differences
Dependent variable: Turnover growth (% firms)				
Decrease	0.2694	0.2622	0.2779	0.0156
	(0.4437)	(0.4399)	(0.4480)	(0.0083)
Remain	0.3167	0.3078	0.3272	0.0193***
	(0.4652)	(0.4616)	(0.4692)	(0.0087)
Increase	0.4137	0.4298	0.3948	-0.0350***
	(0.4925)	(0.4950)	(0.4888)	(0.0092)
Independent variables				
Resource efficiency eco-strategies (% firms)	0.8594	0.8969	0.8157	-0.0812***
	(0.3475)	(0.3040)	(0.3877)	(0.0065)
Water reduction	0.4408	0.4441	0.4369	-0.0072
	(0.4965)	(0.4969)	(0.4960)	(0.0093)
Energy reduction	0.6289	0.6584	0.5946	-0.0638***
	(0.4831)	(0.4742)	(0.4910)	(0.0090)
Predominant use of renewable energy	0.1293	0.1671	0.0852	-0.0818***
	(0.3355)	(0.3730)	(0.2792)	(0.0062)
Material reduction	0.5578	0.5865	0.5244	-0.0620***
	(0.4966)	(0.4925)	(0.4994)	(0.0093)
Waste reduction	0.5671	0.6317	0.4917	-0.1399***
	(0.4954)	(0.4823)	(0.4999)	(0.0092)
Sale of scrap to other firms	0.3071	0.3247	0.2866	-0.0380***
	(0.4613)	(0.4683)	(0.4522)	(0.0086)
Recycling	0.3782	0.4580	0.2851	-0.1728***
	(0.4849)	(0.4982)	(0.4515)	(0.0089)
Design products easier to maintain, repair or use	0.2238	0.2644	0.1764	-0.0882***
	(0.4168)	(0.4410)	(0.3812)	(0.0078)
Breadth of strategies (number of strategies)	3.2332	3.5350	2.8813	-0.6537***
	(2.1706)	(2.1431)	(2.1484)	(0.0404)
Resource efficient investment (% firms)				
Less than 1% of turnover	0.4959	0.4792	0.5175	-0.0076
	(0.4522)	(0.4517)	(0.4528)	(0.0093)
1-5% of turnover	0.4008	0.4193	0.3769	-0.0423***

---

[11] Unfortunately our database only allows us to observe the existence of specific eco-strategies and the intensity of all strategies together (through categorical values on an interval scale), and are unable to capture each separate eco-strategy intensity.

	(0.4900)	(0.4934)	(0.4846)	(0.0999)
6-10% of turnover	0.0696	0.0697	0.0695	-0.0001
	(0.2546)	(0.2547)	(0.2544)	(0.00519)
11-30% of turnover	0.0238	0.0233	0.0243	0.0009
	(0.1524)	(0.1511)	(0.1542)	(0.0031)
More than 30% of turnover	0.0096	0.0082	0.0114	0.0032
	(0.0977)	(0.0902)	(0.1065)	(0.0019)
Control variables				
Size (% firms)				
1-9 employees	0.4434	0.4392	0.4483	0.0091
	(0.4968)	(0.4963)	(0.4973)	(0.0093)
10-49 employees	0.3609	0.3650	0.3562	-0.00873
	(0.4803)	(0.4814)	(0.4789)	(0.0090)
50-249 employees	0.1955	0.1957	0.1953	-0.0004
	(0.3966)	(0.3968)	(0.3964)	(0.0074)
Young	0.0926	0.0817	0.1047	0.0229***
	(0.2895)	(0.2740)	(0.3062)	(0.0054)
Own technical expertise	0.4972	0.5160	0.4753	-0.0407***
	(0.5000)	(0.4997)	(0.4994)	(0.0094)
Own finance	0.5832	0.5647	0.6049	0.0402***
	(0.4930)	(0.4958)	(0.4889)	(0.0092)
External finance	0.1826	0.2362	0.1202	-0.1160***
	(0.3864)	(0.4248)	(0.3252)	(0.0071)
Greenness	0.3517	0.3668	0.3340	-0.0321***
	(0.4775)	(0.4819)	(0.4717)	(0.0089)
Business opportunities	0.2027	0.2239	0.1779	-0.0460***
	(0.4020)	(0.4169)	(0.3825)	(0.0075)
Sector dummies (% firms)				
Manufacturing	0.2258	0.2087	0.2457	0.0370***
	(0.4181)	(0.4064)	(0.4305)	(0.0078)
Retail	0.3195	0.3147	0.3251	0.1043
	(0.4663)	(0.4644)	(0.4684)	(0.0087)
Services	0.3195	0.3496	0.2844	-0.0652***
	(0.4663)	(0.4768)	(0.4511)	(0.0087)
Industry	0.1351	0.1269	0.1446	0.0177
	(0.3418)	(0.3329)	(0.3518)	(0.0064)
Observations	11,336	6,104	5,232	

Source: Flash Eurobarometer Survey #426, European Commission

Note: Stander deviation parenthesis. Comparison of the two samples by the statistical t-test. *** Significant at 1%.

3.2 Empirical strategy

We estimate an ordered logit model, where we compare the impact of the various eco-innovation strategies on different exclusive categories of turnover growth: increased, unchanged and decreased (which is the base case).[12] The models for ordinal outcomes can be described in terms of a latent variable. The structural model is:

$$y_{i,c}^* = X_{i,c}\beta + \varepsilon_i \qquad\qquad \text{Eq.[1]}$$

where $y_{i,c}^*$ is the latent variable (annual turnover growth of firm i in country c), X, is a vector of explanatory and control variables and ε_i is the idiosyncratic error term. The latent variable can be divided into M ordinal categories, so the observed variable is:

---

[12] It is a limitation of our dependent variable that we do not have continuous data and therefore cannot use classic linear models.

$$y_{i,c} = j \text{ if } \alpha_j < y_{i,c}^* \le \alpha_{j+1}, \text{ for } j = 1 \text{ to } M$$

and the probabilities of observing $y_{i,c}^* = j$ are given by:

$$P(y_{i,c} = j | X_{i,c}) = F(\alpha_{j+1} - X_{i,c}\beta) - F(\alpha_j - X_{i,c}\beta)$$

where F denotes the logistic cumulative distribution function. The three categories for our growth variable $y^*$are: decreased (j = 1), unchanged (j = 2) and increased (j = 3).

To test our first hypothesis, we include a dummy variable indicating whether or not a firm is undertaking any eco-strategy to be more resource efficient (Eq. [2]). Then, following the argument that a distinction needs to be made between different typologies of eco-strategy to assess the effects of those innovations on firm growth, we specified Eq. [3]. Based on the question ''What actions is your company undertaking to be more resource efficient?'', in Eq. [3] we include a vector of eight different types of eco-strategy: water reduction, energy reduction, using renewable energy, saving materials, minimizing waste, selling scrap material to another company, recycling, and designing products that are easier to maintain, repair or use. To examine whether the intensity is more important than the adoption, we then introduce a dummy variable into Eq. [4] to account for the intensity of the eco-strategy investment.[13] This variable takes the value one whether the firm spends more than five percent of its yearly turnover on measures to improve resource efficiency.

$$Growth_{i,c} = eco - strategy_{i,c}\beta_1 + CL_{i,c}\beta_2 + \delta sector_{i,c} + \rho country_i + \varepsilon_i \qquad \text{Eq.[2]}$$

$$Growth_{i,c} = strategy1_{i,c}\beta_1 + strategy2_{i,c}\beta_2 + strategy3_{i,c}\beta_3 + strategy4_{i,c}\beta_4 \qquad \text{Eq.[3]}$$
$$+ strategy5_{i,c}\beta_5 + strategy6_{i,c}\beta_6 + strategy7_{i,c}\beta_7 + strategy8_{i,c}\beta_8$$
$$+ CL_{i,c}\beta_9 + \delta sector_{i,c} + \rho country_i + \varepsilon_i$$

$$Growth_{i,c} = high\_invesment_{i,c}\beta_1 + +CL_{i,c}\beta_{10} + \delta sector_{i,c} + \rho country_i + \varepsilon_i \qquad \text{Eq.[4]}$$

Moving on to the empirical test if breadth of eco-strategies is associated with positive firm performance we estimate the models in Equations [5] - [6]. First introducing the breadth variable that refers to the number of eco-strategies implemented by each firm. Then, to identify any nonlinear relationship, if any, we also introduce the quadratic form of breadth.

$$Growth_{i,c} = breadth_{i,c}\beta_1 + CL_{i,c}\beta_2 + \delta sector_{i,c} + \rho country_i + \varepsilon_i \qquad \text{Eq.[5]}$$

$$Growth_{i,c} = breadth_{i,c}\beta_1 + breadth_{i,c}^2\beta_2 + CL_{i,c}\beta_3 + \delta sector_{i,c} + \rho country_i + \varepsilon_i \qquad \text{Eq.[6]}$$

To minimise any estimation bias due to an omitted variable, we have included in all the equations a series of control variables in line with previous work on the determinants of

---

[13] Unfortunately, we do not have continuous data for investment intensity. These data are collected through categorical values that are self-reported by firms on an interval scale. The questionnaire asks firms how much they invested to become more resource efficient in general, and so, the intensity is not available for each separate eco-strategy.

firm growth (see Coad (2009) for a survey), as well as being restricted by the variables available to us in our dataset. As regards the set of control variables, to take into account relevant observable firm-level characteristics, we introduce the following variables: firm size –micro (*1-9 employees*), small (*10–49 employees*) and medium sized (*50–249 employees*) – age (*young*), the role of technological and management capabilities within the firm (*own technical expertise*) and, the importance of internal and external financial support respectively in implementing resource efficiency activities *(own finance and external resources).*

Then, as the different eco-strategy variables can be correlated with unobserved firm specific heterogeneity, we also control for firms' attitudes towards the environment. For instance, positive performance effects due to higher resource efficiency strategies could be a result of better management, especially eco-management. To prevent any potential omitted variable bias, we include two dummy variables that take into account the influence of firm eco-orientation by considering whether the environment is one of the top priorities *(greenness)* and whether the firm is aiming to create a competitive advantage or business opportunity by taking actions to be more resource efficient *(business opportunities).* Finally, we include sector dummies (manufacturing, retail, services and industry), and country dummies.[14]

Due to the non-linear form of the ordered logit estimation the size of the coefficients should not be directly interpreted. The focus should be on the sign and significance of the estimates. Clustered standard errors by country are reported to avoid an underestimation of standard errors due to intra-group error correlation.

Before turning to the regression results, we first address potential concerns about the presence of multicollinearity. Table A.2 shows the correlations between the independent and control variables. The correlation coefficients and variance inflation factors raise no concerns regarding multicollinearity. The results of a collinearity diagnostic test on the regression models show that the mean variance inflation factor (VIF) values range between 2.41 and 3.10 (well below 10), thus, confirming the absence of multicollinearity problems in the dataset. The only noteworthy correlation is between the eight eco-strategies and breadth (from 0.37 to 0.70), which will be included in separate model specifications later on.

4. RESULTS

The results of the ordered logit model for the whole database and for both country groups considered in this paper are displayed in Tables 4-6.[15] Five specifications have been

---

[14] Appendix 1 summarizes the list of variables and their definition, Appendix 2 shows the correlation matrix.

[15] We must stress that the cross-sectional nature of the dataset we are using constitutes a limitation to the scope of the present analysis and only allows us to comment on correlations between variables rather than

estimated. Specification I shows the results when the eco-strategy variable makes no distinction between the nature of the eco-strategies. Specification II decomposes the eco-strategy into eight different resource-efficiency practices according to the Flash Eurobarometer Survey 426. Specification III considers the intensity of those eco-strategies. Finally, specifications IV and V incorporate the breadth of the eco-strategies and the quadratic form of breadth respectively to test whether firms with a greater breadth of eco-strategies experience better firm performance.

We find for all the countries involved that undertaking of an eco-strategy in general to be more resource efficient is associated with reduced growth in terms of turnover. When we split the sample by clusters, the eco-strategy coefficient remains negative, but is non-significant. In general, these results suggest that there is a need to consider the relationships of different eco-strategies in detail, since their effects on firm performance and especially firm growth are heterogeneous. At first sight our main finding would be the negative relationship between eco-innovation strategies and firm growth, meaning that it does not pay to be green. However, going a step further and distinguishing between different types of eco-strategy, we instead find clear confirmation that not all measures to improve resource efficiency have the same effect on growth, and therefore it would be best to decompose them.

Of the eight forms of eco-strategy considered, only three have a significantly positive effect on firm performance. Using predominantly renewable energy (e.g. including own production through solar panels, etc.), recycling by reusing material or waste within the company, and designing products that are easier to maintain, repair or reuse are eco-strategies that relate to positive firms' growth. However, firms that aim to reduce water or energy experience a negative and strongly significant effect on firms' growth. The other eco-strategies under consideration show no significant effect on firm growth. In line with previous literature, this suggests that the effect of eco-strategies on firm performance varies depending on the specific sub-type of resource efficient strategy considered (Doran and Ryan, 2016; Ghisetti and Rennings, 2014).

Regarding the two country groups, the results for former countries show that firms that undertake an energy reduction eco-strategy see a decrease in firm performance, whereas two resource efficiency practices – the use of renewable energies and the design of products that are easier to maintain, repair or reuse – seem to play a more important role in firm growth. As for the new member group, only one of the eight eco-strategies – the predominant use of renewable energy– exerts a positive and strongly significant effect on firms' growth. In addition, firms in these countries that implement water and energy reduction activities show the worst performance.

---

proper causations. In addition, the formulation of some questions does not allow an exact time structure to be identified.

Table 4
Ordered logit regression: whole sample

	(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)	(V)
Eco-strategy	-0.171*				
	(0.0803)				
Types					
Water reduction		-0.171**			
		(0.0545)			
Energy reduction		-0.198***			
		(0.0484)			
Predominant use of renewable energy		0.221***			
		(0.0440)			
Material reduction		0.0155			
		(0.0468)			
Waste reduction		0.0228			
		(0.0410)			
Sale of scrap to other firms		-0.0108			
		(0.0525)			
Recycling		0.0810*			
		(0.0321)			
Design products easier to maintain, repair, use		0.148***			
		(0.0334)			
High investment			0.194**		
			(0.0680)		
Breadth				-0.0133	-0.116*
				(0.0150)	(0.0480)
Breadth^2					0.0143*
					(0.0057)
Control variables					
Size: ref. size 1_9					
size_10_49	0.525***	0.532***	0.522***	0.524***	0.525***
	(0.0444)	(0.0416)	(0.0440)	(0.0445)	(0.0440)
size_50_249	0.872***	0.887***	0.872***	0.874***	0.870***
	(0.0594)	(0.0574)	(0.0587)	(0.0601)	(0.0590)
Young	0.965***	0.962***	0.967***	0.965***	0.964***
	(0.0658)	(0.0673)	(0.0654)	(0.0662)	(0.0662)
Own technical expertise	0.0866*	0.0717*	0.0464	0.0645	0.0899*
	(0.0361)	(0.0320)	(0.0326)	(0.0333)	(0.0355)
Own finance	0.139**	0.135***	0.0824*	0.104**	0.146***
	(0.0439)	(0.0366)	(0.0375)	(0.0366)	(0.0429)
External finance	0.205***	0.198***	0.171**	0.192***	0.207***
	(0.0556)	(0.0574)	(0.0537)	(0.0582)	(0.0591)
Greenness priority	0.148***	0.146***	0.126***	0.141***	0.156***
	(0.0337)	(0.0354)	(0.0323)	(0.0362)	(0.0371)
Business opportunity	0.218***	0.199***	0.199***	0.213***	0.223***
	(0.0432)	(0.0468)	(0.0420)	(0.0453)	(0.0470)
Sector: ref. Industry					
Manufacturing	0.161*	0.178**	0.161*	0.163*	0.163*
	(0.0679)	(0.0686)	(0.0675)	(0.0683)	(0.0684)
Retail	0.192**	0.236***	0.202***	0.192**	0.194**
	(0.0605)	(0.0609)	(0.0605)	(0.0608)	(0.0603)
Services	0.300***	0.343***	0.308***	0.303***	0.304***
	(0.0651)	(0.0645)	(0.0652)	(0.0654)	(0.0655)
Constant cut1	-0.0982	-0.0524	-0.00637	-0.0301	-0.105
	(0.0845)	(0.0804)	(0.0799)	(0.0813)	(0.0861)
Constant cut2	1.355***	1.408***	1.447***	1.423***	1.349***
	(0.0801)	(0.0795)	(0.0813)	(0.0819)	(0.0829)

Country dummies	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Wald test country dummies	10478***	20840***	8894***	9222***	9454***
Pseudo R^2	0.0447	0.0475	0.0449	0.0446	0.0445
Observations	11,336	11,336	11,336	11,336	11,336

Clustered standard errors by country (28 clusters). *, ** and *** correspond to significance levels of 1, 5 and 10 %. Dependent variable: annual turnover growth (1) Decreased; (2) Remained unchanged, (3) Increased.

Other reasons for the negative relationship between eco-strategy in general and firm performance may be that firms might find it difficult to reap the returns on these resource-efficiency practices since they need time before they exert their full effects, or that the intensity of the strategies (which we do not observe in specifications I and II) is not sufficiently high to modify the production process or stimulate the demand through environmental innovation dynamics. Regarding the latter, when we include the investment in eco-strategy (specification III), it seems that greater investment in resource efficiency strategies triggers an improvement in overall firm performance. However, only a few firms in the sample invest intensely in eco-strategies and turn them out to be profitable in terms of firm growth. In contrast, when we split the analysis into former and new members, the large amounts of money spent on resource efficiency strategies are only positive and significant for countries that have recently been incorporated into the EU project.

Regarding our third hypothesis, specifications IV and V examine the link between breadth of eco-strategies and firm performance. When breadth is introduced in specification IV a negative relationship is found, although this relationship is not significant. In specification V, however, when we also incorporate the quadratic term, the breadth variable becomes negative and significant and the quadratic term positive and significant, which suggests that the wider array of eco-strategies influences firm performance more than proportionality. The relationship between firm growth and eco-strategy is U-shaped, in line with the findings of Soltmann et al., (2015) using industry-level data. This implies that when the number of eco-strategies undertaken is low, this has a negative impact on firm performance. Conversely, when the number of eco-strategies is high, this triggers firm growth. However, again only a few firms in the sample undertake a large number of eco-strategies. These results are still robust when we split the sample into our two clusters of countries – the breadth variables and their quadratic forms have the same sign but are not significant.

As for the effect of the control the variables employed in our econometric specification, the results reveal that firms that value either the environment as a core priority activity or resource efficient practices as the means to create competitive advantage show better firm performance. In particular we note that SMEs in former countries rely more heavily on better eco-management than countries that have more recently joined the EU.

In addition, having good own technical capabilities and expertise and good access to financial resources (both internal and external) significantly helps European SMEs to improve their firm performance. Our result clearly confirms the conjecture that firm growth is different across country groups. External finance significantly increases firm

growth in new member states, although, this variable seems not to be relevant for long-standing members of the EU. Own technical expertise and own financial resources also show a significant positive influence on growth in the EU15 countries. These results are in line with Hölzl (2009), finding that technological capabilities seem to be more important in high-growth SMEs in countries that are closer to the technological frontier.

As far as firm characteristics are concerned, age and size are found to be important determinants of a firm's growth, with a large body of evidence showing that younger and smaller firms are more dynamic and thus more effective in spurring growth (Barba Navaretti et al., 2014; Coad, 2009). As regards age, our results are in line with the previous literature, with young firms seeming to perform better. Firm size, meanwhile, is positively correlated to firm performance in both country groups in our sample.

Finally, the explanatory variables used in the ordered logit estimation confirm that sector and country factors have an impact on firm growth. Using a Wald test, we also examined the joint significance of the country dummies for the whole sample. The p-value of this test, which is equal to 0.000, allows us to reject the null hypothesis that the coefficients are jointly equal to 0. Indeed, this test shows the relevance of country specificities. Moreover, we obtain this result for all the specifications adopted in the paper.

Table 5
Ordered logit regression: Former EU members

	(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)	(V)
Eco-strategy	-0.158				
	(0.110)				
Types					
Water reduction		-0.0968			
		(0.0737)			
Energy reduction		-0.152**			
		(0.0537)			
Predominant use of renewable energy		0.166**			
		(0.0520)			
Material reduction		0.0177			
		(0.0583)			
Waste reduction		0.0349			
		(0.0529)			
Sale of scrap to other firms		-0.0162			
		(0.0734)			
Recycling		0.0908			
		(0.0500)			
Design products easier to maintain, repair, use		0.170***			
		(0.0341)	0.100		
High investment			(0.0956)		
Breadth				0.0095	-0.0905
				(0.0121)	(0.0611)
Breadth^2				0.0137	
				(0.0078)	
					(0.0057)
Control variables					
Size: ref. size 1_9					

18

size_10_49	0.546***	0.549***	0.546***	0.542***	0.543***
	(0.0655)	(0.0612)	(0.0654)	(0.0653)	(0.0649)
size_50_249	0.774***	0.783***	0.774***	0.770***	0.765***
	(0.0899)	(0.0824)	(0.0900)	(0.0900)	(0.0883)
Young	1.032***	1.037***	1.032***	1.033***	1.034***
	(0.0910)	(0.0921)	(0.0906)	(0.0901)	(0.0909)
Own technical expertise	0.134*	0.0960*	0.104*	0.0989	0.121*
	(0.0549)	(0.0478)	(0.0463)	(0.0506)	(0.0547)
Own finance	0.149*	0.124*	0.113*	0.107	0.137*
	(0.0624)	(0.0573)	(0.0543)	(0.0567)	(0.0648)
External finance	0.129	0.106	0.104	0.100	0.114
	(0.0690)	(0.0662)	(0.0682)	(0.0680)	(0.0688)
Greenness priority	0.184***	0.159***	0.166***	0.158***	0.168***
	(0.0336)	(0.0324)	(0.0342)	(0.0327)	(0.0327)
Business opportunity	0.207***	0.174**	0.192**	0.188**	0.198**
	(0.0602)	(0.0635)	(0.0588)	(0.0608)	(0.0623)
Sector: ref. Industry					
Manufacturing	0.148	0.154	0.149	0.146	0.147
	(0.101)	(0.0991)	(0.101)	(0.101)	(0.102)
Retail	0.240**	0.273***	0.247**	0.244**	0.250**
	(0.0785)	(0.0804)	(0.0792)	(0.0793)	(0.0780)
Services	0.362***	0.397***	0.370***	0.373***	0.376***
	(0.0818)	(0.0821)	(0.0806)	(0.0827)	(0.0817)
Constant cut1	-0.509***	-0.390***	-0.404***	-0.391***	-0.481***
	(0.126)	(0.114)	(0.115)	(0.114)	(0.113)
Constant cut2	0.922***	1.046***	1.027***	1.040***	0.950***
	(0.105)	(0.108)	(0.106)	(0.105)	(0.101)
Country dummies	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Wald test country dummies	41910***	33690***	1.4e+05***	1.0e+05***	24925.20***
Pseudo R^2	0.0486	0.0504	0.0485	0.0484	0.0489
Observations	6,104	6,104	6,104	6,104	6,104

Clustered standard errors by country (15 clusters). *, ** and *** correspond to significance levels of 1, 5 and 10 %. Dependent variable: annual turnover growth (1) Decreased; (2) Remained unchanged, (3) Increased.

Table 6
Ordered logit regression: new EU members

	(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)	(V)
Eco-strategy	-0.170				
	(0.117)				
Types					
Water reduction		-0.271***			
		(0.0744)			
Energy reduction		-0.236**			
		(0.0799)			
Predominant use of renewable energy		0.323***			
		(0.0763)			
Material reduction		0.0111			
		(0.0777)			
Waste reduction		0.00940			
		(0.0614)			
Sale of scrap to other firms		-0.00211			
		(0.0789)			
Recycling		0.0501			
		(0.0378)			
Design products easier to maintain, repair,		0.110			

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
use				(0.0680)	0.305**
High investment					(0.0929)
				-0.0433	-0.140*
Breadth				(0.0292)	(0.0708)
					0.0136
Breadth^2					(0.0079)
Control variables					
Size: ref. size 1_9					
size_10_49	0.499***	0.514***	0.491***	0.507***	0.507***
	(0.0620)	(0.0557)	(0.0598)	(0.0625)	(0.0613)
size_50_249	0.968***	0.997***	0.968***	0.991***	0.986***
	(0.0726)	(0.0752)	(0.0705)	(0.0735)	(0.0718)
Young	0.911***	0.898***	0.916***	0.912***	0.910***
	(0.0860)	(0.0892)	(0.0846)	(0.0884)	(0.0876)
Own technical expertise	0.0307	0.0495	-0.0171	0.0300	0.0566
	(0.0386)	(0.0415)	(0.0416)	(0.0412)	(0.0394)
Own finance	0.125*	0.163***	0.0471	0.117**	0.166***
	(0.0581)	(0.0418)	(0.0488)	(0.0443)	(0.0473)
External finance	0.358***	0.381***	0.314***	0.367***	0.383***
	(0.0827)	(0.0874)	(0.0758)	(0.0901)	(0.0927)
Greenness priority	0.0975	0.124	0.0752	0.116	0.133
	(0.0599)	(0.0678)	(0.0536)	(0.0691)	(0.0726)
Business opportunity	0.232***	0.235**	0.208***	0.250***	0.258***
	(0.0613)	(0.0729)	(0.0597)	(0.0713)	(0.0737)
Sector: ref. Industry					
Manufacturing	0.499***	0.514***	0.491***	0.507***	0.507***
	(0.0620)	(0.0557)	(0.0598)	(0.0625)	(0.0613)
Retail	0.968***	0.997***	0.968***	0.991***	0.986***
	(0.0726)	(0.0752)	(0.0705)	(0.0735)	(0.0718)
Services	0.911***	0.898***	0.916***	0.912***	0.910***
	(0.0860)	(0.0892)	(0.0846)	(0.0884)	(0.0876)
Constant cut1	-0.202	-0.159	-0.125	-0.174	-0.229
	(0.107)	(0.0924)	(0.0958)	(0.0935)	(0.117)
Constant cut2	1.281***	1.335***	1.359***	1.309***	1.255***
	(0.113)	(0.102)	(0.112)	(0.107)	(0.119)
Country dummies	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Wald test country dummies	3656***	35196***	5345***	9303***	9685***
Pseudo R^2	0.0409	0.0457	0.0415	0.0413	0.0417
Observations	5,232	5,232	5,232	5,232	5,232

Clustered standard errors by country (13 clusters). *, ** and *** correspond to significance levels of 1, 5 and 10 %. Dependent variable: annual turnover growth (1) Decreased; (2) Remained unchanged, (3) Increased.

4.1 Additional analyses - robustness check

In this section, the robustness of the ordered logit model (OLM) estimates is tested. A critical assumption of the OLM is that it requires the distance between each category to be equivalent (proportional odds assumption). It also requires the number of categories not be too large and for there to be sufficient variation in each category. Since an ordinal dependent model might violate the proportionality assumption, the estimation requires models that avoid the assumption of equality in the distance between categories (Long and Freese, 2006). To test whether this assumption is violated in our sample we use the Brant test (Brant, 1990) in each model specification. Unsurprisingly, the test shows that our models violate the parallel-lines assumption, partly due to the inclusion of the many country dummy variables. If we focus on our independent and control variables, there are

few occasions when the parallel regression assumption is violated. The test statistics indicate that the assumption is violated for the following variables: business opportunities, size (50-249 employees), and manufacturing and retail sectors. [16]

Therefore, as a robustness check for the ordered logit model and as the literature suggests we provide additional estimates. First we dichotomize the outcome variable (increased v. unchanged or decreased firm growth) and use a binary logistics regression. We, then also report a model that does not assume proportionality (generalized ordered logit model).[17]

In essence the results from both models, the logit and the generalized ordered, convey the same story. Not all eco-strategies have the same impact on firm growth across SMEs in the EU28, and the intensity and breadth of the eco-strategies are relevant as regards firm growth. In short, we can rely on the results from the standard ordered logit model as presented above.[18] In addition, to test the robustness of the estimations we perform two more regressions. First we run an ordered probit only for manufacturing firms given their innovation potential and environmental pressure. Second, because of the heterogeneity of the former country group, we split the cluster into core countries and Mediterranean countries in order to better understand the differences between the two. The results are in accordance with the current results displayed above.[19]

5. CONCLUSIONS

The aim of this paper was to shed light on how eco-innovation strategies impact on SME growth across European countries. Previous empirical studies on the relationship between eco-strategies and firm performance have often been based on relatively small samples and are usually confined to a single country. Our paper expands this stream of research by using an extensive dataset covering a large sample of SMEs in 28 European countries. In addition, we classify the EU28 countries into two clusters. This distinction between EU15 and new EU members (the group of states that joined from 2004 onwards) allows us to better understand the differences between the two groups of countries.

Through the application of an ordered logistic model our empirical results suggest that there is a need to distinguish between different eco-strategies and, in line with previous literature, draw attention to the fact that the correct question is not whether 'it pays to be eco', but rather 'when' and 'for whom' it pays to be eco. Firm growth varies greatly according to eco-strategy, and thus, not all eco-strategies are positively related to better

---

[16] See Appendix 3 for further details.

[17] The generalized ordered logit model is less restrictive than the ordered logit model, which assumes proportional odds among the categories of the dependent variable, but is still more parsimonious and interpretable than non-ordinal methods, such as multinomial logistic regression.

[18] The results are not reported here but are available upon request.

[19] The results are not reported here but are available upon request.

performance, at least not in the short term. It would appear that in a European SME context certain measures in eco-strategies can result in a win-win situation for both the firm and society, while others result in a better environmental situation but at the expense of firm performance in terms of growth. In particular we find that European firms using renewable energies perform better. Undertaking eco-strategies aimed at recycling or designing products that are easier to maintain, repair or reuse also increases firm growth in former members of the EU. However, those firms that aim to reduce water or energy pollution seem to show a negative correlation with firm growth. Consequently, our results also shed light on the idea that the analysis and classification of different types of eco-strategy does matter.

Furthermore, our results indicate that higher investment in eco-strategies improves firm growth, particularly in the new member states that joined the EU from 2004 onwards. In other words, it seems important to be eco-efficient but it must also happen in a big way. Finally, we observe a U-shaped relationship between eco-strategies and firm growth meaning that a greater breadth of eco-strategies is associated with better firm performance. However, few SMEs are able to either invest large amounts or undertake large numbers of eco-strategies.

At the same time, we also observe that the conjecture of firm growth is different across country groups. Valuing the environment as a core activity of the firm is more important for former countries whereas new EU members seems to rely more on external finance for growth.

To sum up, our empirical evidence suggests both a negative and a positive relationship between eco-strategy and firm performance that depends, on the one hand, on the types of eco-strategy, and on the other, on the level and intensity of those eco-strategies. Hence the association between eco-strategies and firm performance may be more complex than simply positive, negative or neutral. This would suggest that the theoretical framework should encompass at the same time both perspectives: a positive and negative relationship between eco-strategy and firm performance.

In terms of implications, we find that most European SMEs do undertake eco-strategies but at a low investment intensity. Since the impact of eco-strategies is negative when investment intensity is not taken into account, this suggests that there is room for policy interventions aimed at raising awareness among SMEs of the advantages of making a minimum level of investment in eco-strategies. The eco-strategies whereby European firms add value vary slightly across different countries. Policy-makers should therefore consider the economic and technological specifications of each group of EU countries so as to choose the best possible instruments for increasing investments in eco-strategies. Furthermore, a greater breadth of eco-strategies is associated with better firm performance, and therefore managers should evaluate not only the benefit of each particular eco-strategy, but also the possible synergies and interactions between different strategies.

6. REFERENCES

Albertini, E., 2013. Does Environmental Management Improve Financial Performance? A Meta-Analytical Review. Organization & Environment 26, 431–457. doi:10.1177/1086026613510301

Ambec, S., Cohen, M.A., Elgie, S., Lanoie, P., 2013. The Porter Hypothesis at 20: Can Environmental Regulation Enhance Innovation and Competitiveness? Review of Environmental Economics and Policy 7, 2–22. doi:10.1093/reep/res016

Ambec, S., Lanoie, P., 2008. Does it pay to be green? A systematic overview. Academy of Management Perspectives 22, 45–62.

Antonioli, D., Borghesi, S., Mazzanti, M., 2016. Are regional systems greening the economy? Local spillovers, green innovations and firms' economic performances. Economics of Innovation and New Technology 25, 692–713. doi:10.1080/10438599.2015.1127557

Aragón-Correa, J.A., Hurtado-Torres, N., Sharma, S., García-Morales, V.J., 2008. Environmental strategy and performance in small firms: A resource-based perspective. Journal of Environmental Management 86, 88–103. doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2006.11.022

Barba Navaretti, G., Castellani, D., Pieri, F., 2014. Age and firm growth: evidence from three European countries. Small Business Economics 43, 823–837. doi:10.1007/s11187-014-9564-6

Barbieri, N., Ghisetti, C., Gilli, M., Marin, G., Nicolli, F., 2016. A Survey of the Literature on Environmental Innovation Based on Main Path Analysis. Journal of Economic Surveys 30, 596–623. doi:10.1111/joes.12149

Beltrán-Esteve, M., Picazo-Tadeo, A.J., 2017. Assessing environmental performance in the European Union: Eco-innovation versus catching-up. Energy Policy 104, 240–252. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2017.01.054

Brant, R., 1990. Assessing Proportionality in the Proportional Odds Model for Ordinal Logistic Regression. Biometrics 46, 1171–1178.

Cainelli, G., De Marchi, V., Grandinetti, R., 2015. Does the development of environmental innovation require different resources? Evidence from Spanish manufacturing firms. Journal of Cleaner Production 94, 211–220. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.02.008

Cainelli, G., Mazzanti, M., Zoboli, R., 2011. Environmentally oriented innovative strategies and firm performance in services. Micro-evidence from Italy. International Review of Applied Economics 25, 61–85. doi:10.1080/02692170903426146

Coad, A., 2009. The Growth of Firms: a Survey of Theories and Empirical Evidence. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.

Colombelli, A., Krafft, J., Quatraro, F., 2015. Eco-innovation and firm growth: Do green gazelles run faster? Microeconometric evidence from a sample of European firms, GREDED Working paper Series.

Cuerva, M.C., Triguero, Á., Córcoles, D., 2014. Drivers of green and non-green innovation: empirical evidence in Low-Tech SMEs. Journal of Cleaner Production 68, 104–113. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.10.049

De Marchi, V., 2012. Environmental innovation and R&D cooperation: Empirical evidence from Spanish manufacturing firms. Research Policy 41, 614–623. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2011.10.002

Dixon-Fowler, H.R., Slater, D.J., Johnson, J.L., Ellstrand, A.E., Romi, A.M., 2013. Beyond "Does it Pay to be Green?" A Meta-Analysis of Moderators of the CEP–CFP Relationship. Journal of Business Ethics 112, 353–366. doi:10.1007/s10551-012-1268-8

Doran, J., Ryan, G., 2016. The Importance of the Diverse Drivers and Types of Environmental Innovation for Firm Performance. Business Strategy and the Environment 25, 102–119. doi:10.1002/bse.1860

Doran, J., Ryan, G., 2012. Regulation and firm perception, eco-innovation and firm performance. European Journal of Innovation Management 15, 421–441. doi:10.1108/14601061211272367

Earnhart, D., Lizal, L., 2007. Effect of Pollution Control on Corporate Financial Performance in a Transition Economy. European Environment Journal 266, 247–266. doi:10.1002/eet

Elsayed, K., Paton, D., 2005. The impact of environmental performance on firm performance: Static and dynamic panel data evidence. Structural Change and Economic Dynamics 16, 395–412. doi:10.1016/j.strueco.2004.04.004

Gagliardi, L., Marin, G., Miriello, C., D., G., H., H.B., D., H., 2016. The greener the better? Job creation effects of environmentally-friendly technological change. Industrial and Corporate Change 25, 779–807. doi:10.1093/icc/dtv054

Ghisetti, C., Mancinelli, S., Mazzanti, M., Zoli, M., 2016. Financial barriers and environmental innovations: evidence from EU manufacturing firms. Climate Policy 3062, 1–17. doi:10.1080/14693062.2016.1242057

Ghisetti, C., Rennings, K., 2014. Environmental innovations and profitability: how does

it pay to be green? An empirical analysis on the German innovation survey. Journal of Cleaner Production 75, 106–117. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.03.097

Hojnik, J., Ruzzier, M., 2016. The driving forces of process eco-innovation and its impact on performance: Insights from Slovenia. Journal of Cleaner Production 133, 812–825. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.06.002

Hölzl, W., 2009. Is the R&D behaviour of fast-growing SMEs different? Evidence from CIS III data for 16 countries. Small Business Economics 33, 59–75. doi:10.1007/s11187-009-9182-x

Hoogendoorn, B., Guerra, D., van der Zwan, P., 2015. What drives environmental practices of SMEs? Small Business Economics 44, 759–781. doi:10.1007/s11187-014-9618-9

Horbach, J., 2016. Empirical determinants of eco-innovation in European countries using the community innovation survey. Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions 19, 1–14. doi:10.1016/j.eist.2015.09.005

Horbach, J., 2008. Determinants of environmental innovation—New evidence from German panel data sources. Research Policy 37, 163–173. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2007.08.006

Horbach, J., Oltra, V., Belin, J., 2013. Determinants and Specificities of Eco-Innovations Compared to Other Innovations—An Econometric Analysis for the French and German Industry Based on the Community Innovation Survey. Industry & Innovation 20, 523–543. doi:10.1080/13662716.2013.833375

Horbach, J., Rennings, K., 2013. Environmental innovation and employment dynamics in different technology fields – an analysis based on the German Community Innovation Survey 2009. Journal of Cleaner Production 57, 158–165. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.05.034

Horváthová, E., 2010. Does environmental performance affect financial performance? A meta-analysis. Ecological Economics 70, 52–59. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2010.04.004

Kunapatarawong, R., Martínez-Ros, E., 2016. Towards green growth: How does green innovation affect employment? Research Policy 45, 1218–1232. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2016.03.013

Lanoie, P., Laurent-Lucchetti, J., Johnstone, N., Ambec, S., 2011. Environmental Policy, Innovation and Performance: New Insights on the Porter Hypothesis. Journal of Economics & Management Strategy 20, 803–842. doi:10.1111/j.1530-

9134.2011.00301.x

Lee, K.-H., Min, B., 2015. Green R&D for eco-innovation and its impact on carbon emissions and firm performance. Journal of Cleaner Production 108, 534–542. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.05.114

Leeuwen, G. van, Mohnen, P., 2017. Revisiting the Porter Hypothesis: an emperical analysis of green innovation for the Netherlands. Economics of Innovation and New Technology 26, 63–77. doi:10.1080/10438599.2016.1202521

Leiponen, A., Helfat, C.E., 2010. Innovation objectives, knowledge sources, and the benefits of breadth. Strategic Management Journal 31, 224–236. doi:10.1002/smj.807

Long, J.S., Freese, J., 2006. Regression models for categorical dependent variables using Stata. StataCorp LP.

Marin, G., Lotti, F., 2017. Productivity effects of eco-innovations using data on eco-patents. Industrial and Corporate Change 26, 125–148. doi:10.1093/icc/dtw014

Marin, G., Marzucchi, A., Zoboli, R., 2015. SMEs and barriers to Eco-innovation in the EU: exploring different firm profiles. Journal of Evolutionary Economics 25, 671–705. doi:10.1007/s00191-015-0407-7

Miroshnychenko, I., Barontini, R., Testa, F., 2017. Green practices and financial performance: A global outlook. Journal of Cleaner Production 147, 340–351. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.01.058

Palmer, K., Oates, W.E., Portney, P.R., 1995. Tightening Environmental Standards: The Benefit-Cost or the No-Cost Paradigm? Journal of Economic Perspectives 9, 119–132. doi:10.1257/jep.9.4.119

Porter, M.E., 1991. American Green Strategy. Scientific American 264, 168.

Porter, M.E., Linde, C. van der, 1995. Toward a New Conception of the Environment-Competitiveness Relationship. Journal of Economic Perspectives 9, 97–118. doi:10.1257/jep.9.4.97

Przychodzen, J., Przychodzen, W., 2015. Relationships between eco-innovation and financial performance - Evidence from publicly traded companies in Poland and Hungary. Journal of Cleaner Production 90, 253–263. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.11.034

Quintana-García, C., Benavides-Velasco, C. a., 2008. Innovative competence, exploration and exploitation: The influence of technological diversification. Research Policy 37, 492–507. doi:10.1016/j.respol.2007.12.002

Rennings, K., 2000. Redefining innovation — eco-innovation research and the contribution from ecological economics. Ecological Economics 32, 319–332. doi:10.1016/S0921-8009(99)00112-3

Rexhäuser, S., Rammer, C., 2014. Environmental Innovations and Firm Profitability: Unmasking the Porter Hypothesis. Environmental and Resource Economics 57, 145–167. doi:10.1007/s10640-013-9671-x

Riillo, C.A.F., 2017. Beyond the question "Does it pay to be green?": How much green? and when? Journal of Cleaner Production 141, 626–640. doi:10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.09.039

Soltmann, C., Stucki, T., Woerter, M., 2015. The Impact of Environmentally Friendly Innovations on Value Added. Environmental and Resource Economics 62, 457–479. doi:10.1007/s10640-014-9824-6

Tavassoli, S., Karlsson, C., 2016. Innovation strategies and firm performance: Simple or complex strategies? Economics of Innovation and New Technology 25, 631–650. doi:10.1080/10438599.2015.1108109

Triguero, Á., Moreno-Mondéjar, L., Davia, M.A., 2013. Drivers of different types of eco-innovation in European SMEs. Ecological Economics 92, 25–33. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2013.04.009

Trumpp, C., Guenther, T., 2017. Too Little or too much? Exploring U-shaped Relationships between Corporate Environmental Performance and Corporate Financial Performance. Business Strategy and the Environment 26, 49–68. doi:10.1002/bse.1900

Wagner, M., Phu, N. Van, Azomahou, T., Wehrmeyer, W., 2002. The relationship between the environmental and economic performance of firms: an empirical analysis of the European paper industry. Corporate social responsibility and Environmental Management 146, 133–146. doi:10.1002/csr.22

Walley, N., Whitehead, B., 1994. It's not easy being green. Harvard Business Review 72, 46–52.

APPENDIX

Appendix 1. Variable definitions

Table A.1

Variable definitions

Dependent variables	
Sales growth rate	Categorical variable which takes the value 1 = firm turnover decreased; 2 = firm turnover unchanged; and 3 = firm turnover increased
Independent variables	

Eco-strategies	8 dummy variables that take the value 1 if the firm states to undertake the following actions to be more resource efficient; 0 if not
	      Water reduction
	      Energy reduction
	      Predominant use of renewable energy
	      Material reduction
	      Waste reduction
	      Sale of scrap to other firms
	      Recycling
	      Design products easier to maintain, repair or reuse
	<u>Breadth</u>: number of eco-strategies undertaken by the firm (range from 0 to 8)
	<u>High investment</u>: Dummy variable that takes the value 1 if the firm investment in eco-strategies is higher than 5% of annual turnover; 0 if not

Control variables	

Size	Categorical variable
	      1–9 employees
	      9–49 employees
	      50–249 employees

Young	Dummy variable that takes a value equal to 1 if firm is less than 6-years-old; 0 if not
Own technical expertise	Dummy variable that takes a value equal to 1 if firm reports internal technical expertise to implement resource efficiency practices; 0 if not
Own finance	Dummy variable that takes a value equal to 1 if firm reports self-financed resource efficiency measures; 0 if not
External finance	Dummy variable that takes a value equal to 1 if firm reports external support to implement resource efficiency practices; 0 if not
Firm's greenness	Dummy variable which takes the value 1 if firm reports that the environment is a core priority for the firm, going beyond regulatory requirements; 0 if not
Profit motivation	Dummy variable that takes a value equal to 1 if firm reports internal technical expertise to implement resource efficiency practices; 0 if not
Sector	Sector-specific dummy variables. This indicates the main activity of the company: manufacturing, retail, services and industry

Appendix 2. Correlation matrix

Table A.2
Correlation matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
1	1.00																						
2	0.48*	1.00																					
3	0.13*	0.17*	1.00																				
4	0.39*	0.42*	0.13*	1.00																			
5	0.39*	0.40*	0.17*	0.42*	1.00																		
6	0.18*	0.19*	0.10*	0.23*	0.26*	1.00																	
7	0.20*	0.20*	0.14*	0.23*	0.29*	0.19*	1.00																
8	0.17*	0.19*	0.14*	0.25*	0.23*	0.18*	0.21*	1.00															
9	0.07*	0.09*	0.09*	0.07*	0.06*	0.05*	0.06*	0.09*	1.00														
10	0.65*	0.67*	0.37*	0.68*	0.70*	0.50*	0.54*	0.49*	0.12*	1.00													
11	-0.06*	-0.13*	-0.06*	-0.08*	-0.09*	-0.20*	-0.06*	-0.05*	-0.02*	-0.16*	1.00												
12	0.01	0.04*	0.01	0.01	0.02*	0.07*	0.02*	0.01	0.012	0.04*	-0.67*	1.00											
13	0.07*	0.10*	0.05*	0.08*	0.09*	0.16*	0.04*	0.04*	0.015	0.14*	-0.44*	-0.37*	1.00										
14	-0.02*	-0.05*	-0.02*	-0.02*	-0.03*	-0.04*	-0.01	-0.02*	-0.01	-0.04*	0.10*	-0.04*	-0.07*	1.00									
15	0.18*	0.27*	0.07*	0.27*	0.26*	0.15*	0.17*	0.19*	0.07*	0.34*	-0.07*	0.01*	0.06*	-0.03*	1.00								
16	0.24*	0.31*	0.07*	0.27*	0.25*	0.17*	0.17*	0.12*	0.08*	0.35*	-0.08*	0.02*	0.07*	-0.02*	0.15*	1.00							
17	0.11*	0.14*	0.11*	0.12*	0.15*	0.13*	0.10*	0.08*	0.07*	0.20*	-0.12*	0.02*	0.11*	-0.01	0.01*	-0.02*	1.00						
18	0.21*	0.24*	0.13*	0.20*	0.25*	0.11*	0.21*	0.11*	0.04*	0.32*	-0.06*	0.01	0.06*	-0.01	0.16*	0.17*	0.06*	1.00					
19	0.10*	0.15*	0.07*	0.18*	0.14*	0.14*	0.10*	0.15*	0.06*	0.22*	-0.10*	0.02*	0.08*	-0.01	0.15*	0.11*	0.09*	-0.02*	1.00				
20	-0.02*	-0.04*	0.03*	0.02*	0.02	0.03*	-0.01	0.02*	0.03*	0.01	-0.02*	0.03*	-0.01	0.03*	0.04*	-0.01	0.01	0.01	0.05	1.00			
21	0.05*	0.06*	0.01	0.11*	0.10*	0.20*	0.06*	0.12*	0.04*	0.15*	-0.15*	0.02*	0.16*	-0.04*	0.10*	0.09*	0.04*	0.08*		-0.21*	1.00		
22	0.05	-0.01	-0.04*	-0.08*	-0.03*	-0.03*	-0.01	-0.06*	-0.07*	-0.05*	0.11*	-0.03*	-0.10*	-0.03	-0.07*	-0.02*	-0.04*	-0.01	-0.04*	-0.27*	-0.37*	1.00	
23	-0.03*	-0.01	-0.01	-0.03*	-0.05*	-0.17*	-0.04*	-0.06*	0.01	-0.09*	0.03*	-0.01	-0.02*	0.01*	-0.04*	-0.05*	0.01	-0.01	-0.03*	-0.27*	-0.37*	-0.46*	1.00

*Significant at 5%.

1. Water reduction; 2. Energy reduction; 3. Predominant use of renewable energy; 4. Material reduction; 5. Waste reduction; 6.Sale of scrap to other firms; 7.Recycling; 8.Design products easier to maintain, repair or use; 9.High investment in eco-strategy; 10. Breadth; 11. Size: 1-9 employees; 12. Size 10-49 employees; 13. Size 50-249 employees; 14. Young; 15. Own technical expertise; 16. Own finance; 17. External finance; 18. Greenness; 19. Business opportunity; 20. Industry; 21. Manufacturing; 22.Retail; 23.Services.

Appendix 3. Robustness checks

Table A.3.1
Brant test of parallel regression assumption

	Chi2	p>chi2	df	Chi2	p>chi2	df	Chi2	p>chi2	df
All	217.72	0.000	42	226.30	0.000	50	218.79	0.000	43
Eco-strategies	0.12	0.724	1						
Water reduction				1.45	0.229	1			
Energy reduction				0.25	0.618	1			
Renewable energy				1.45	0.228	1			
Material reduction				1.07	0.301	1			
Waste reduction				0.64	0.425	1			
Sale scrap				1.32	0.251	1			
Recycling				0.21	0.647	1			
Design products				3.63	0.057	1			
High investment				0.08	0.782	1			
Breadth							0.93	0.334	1
Breadth^2							0.66	0.417	1
Size 10-49 employee	2.30	0.129	1	1.80	0.180	1	2.20	0.138	1
Size 50-249 employee	7.62	0.006	1	6.02	0.014	1	7.39	0.007	1
Young	1.37	0.243	1	1.27	0.259	1	1.34	0.247	1
Own technical	0.12	0.729	1	0.14	0.712	1	0.30	0.584	1
Own finance	0.01	0.904	1	0.00	0.992	1	0.01	0.911	1
Greenness priority	0.42	0.519	1	0.63	0.428	1	0.62	0.429	1
Business opportunity	7.79	0.005	1	7.57	0.006	1	7.25	0.007	1
Manufacturing	5.22	0.022	1	5.10	0.024	1	4.98	0.026	1
Retail	7.72	0.005	1	7.43	0.006	1	7.65	0.006	1
Services	1.29	0.255	1	1.33	0.249	1	1.28	0.257	1
BE	1.09	0.297	1	1.50	0.220	1	1.08	0.300	1
NE	0.13	0.719	1	0.00	0.947	1	0.14	0.711	1
DE	20.62	0.000	1	21.64	0.000	1	20.45	0.000	1
IT	2.74	0.098	1	3.23	0.072	1	2.52	0.112	1
LU	0.58	0.446	1	0.41	0.523	1	0.60	0.439	1
DK	0.60	0.440	1	0.77	0.379	1	0.59	0.444	1
IE	3.30	0.069	1	2.95	0.086	1	3.26	0.071	1
GB	3.33	0.068	1	3.66	0.056	1	3.42	0.064	1
GR	11.78	0.001	1	11.11	0.001	1	12.23	0.000	1
ES	2.43	0.119	1	2.31	0.129	1	2.54	0.111	1
PT	0.81	0.368	1	1.11	0.293	1	0.81	0.368	1
FI	4.21	0.040	1	5.07	0.024	1	4.11	0.043	1
SE	2.33	0.127	1	3.10	0.079	1	2.30	0.129	1
AT	11.31	0.001	1	12.61	0.000	1	11.31	0.001	1
CY	1.17	0.280	1	0.93	0.335	1	1.24	0.265	1
CZ	11.11	0.001	1	11.78	0.001	1	11.04	0.001	1
EE	2.40	0.121	1	2.53	0.112	1	2.06	0.152	1
HU	0.53	0.466	1	0.70	0.404	1	0.49	0.486	1
LV	0.89	0.344	1	0.67	0.414	1	0.95	0.329	1
LT	1.04	0.308	1	0.85	0.356	1	1.15	0.284	1
MT	0.06	0.810	1	0.11	0.743	1	0.06	0.809	1
PL	5.15	0.023	1	5.77	0.016	1	5.02	0.025	1
SK	5.84	0.016	1	6.19	0.013	1	5.87	0.015	1
SI	2.00	0.158	1	2.35	0.126	1	1.82	0.178	1
BG	1.60	0.206	1	1.81	0.178	1	1.45	0.229	1
RO	4.19	0.041	1	4.08	0.043	1	4.43	0.035	1
CR	0.05	0.824	1	0.02	0.893	1	0.06	0.804	1

A significant test statistic provides evidence that the parallel regression assumption has been violated.

2006

CREAP2006-01
Matas, A. (GEAP)**; Raymond, J.Ll.** (GEAP)
"Economic development and changes in car ownership patterns"
(Juny 2006)

CREAP2006-02
Trillas, F. (IEB)**; Montolio, D.** (IEB)**; Duch, N.** (IEB)
"Productive efficiency and regulatory reform: The case of Vehicle Inspection Services"
(Setembre 2006)

CREAP2006-03
Bel, G. (PPRE-IREA)**; Fageda, X.** (PPRE-IREA)
"Factors explaining local privatization: A meta-regression analysis"
(Octubre 2006)

CREAP2006-04
Fernàndez-Villadangos, L. (PPRE-IREA)
"Are two-part tariffs efficient when consumers plan ahead?: An empirical study"
(Octubre 2006)

CREAP2006-05
Artís, M. (AQR-IREA)**; Ramos, R.** (AQR-IREA)**; Suriñach, J.** (AQR-IREA)
"Job losses, outsourcing and relocation: Empirical evidence using microdata"
(Octubre 2006)

CREAP2006-06
Alcañiz, M. (RISC-IREA)**; Costa, A.; Guillén, M.** (RISC-IREA)**; Luna, C.; Rovira, C.**
"Calculation of the variance in surveys of the economic climate"
(Novembre 2006)

CREAP2006-07
Albalate, D. (PPRE-IREA)
"Lowering blood alcohol content levels to save lives: The European Experience"
(Desembre 2006)

CREAP2006-08
Garrido, A. (IEB)**; Arqué, P.** (IEB)
"The choice of banking firm: Are the interest rate a significant criteria?"
(Desembre 2006)

CREAP2006-09
Segarra, A. (GRIT)**; Teruel-Carrizosa, M.** (GRIT)
"Productivity growth and competition in spanish manufacturing firms:
What has happened in recent years?"
(Desembre 2006)

CREAP2006-10
Andonova, V.; Díaz-Serrano, Luis. (CREB)
"Political institutions and the development of telecommunications"
(Desembre 2006)

CREAP2006-11
Raymond, J.L.(GEAP)**; Roig, J.L..** (GEAP)
"Capital humano: un análisis comparativo Catalunya-España"
(Desembre 2006)

CREAP2006-12
Rodríguez, M.(CREB)**; Stoyanova, A.** (CREB)
"Changes in the demand for private medical insurance following a shift in tax incentives"
(Desembre 2006)

CREAP2006-13
Royuela, V. (AQR-IREA)**; Lambiri, D.**; **Biagi**, **B.**
"Economía urbana y calidad de vida. Una revisión del estado del conocimiento en España"
(Desembre 2006)

CREAP2006-14

Camarero, M.; Carrion-i-Silvestre, J.LL. (AQR-IREA)**.;Tamarit**, **C.**
"New evidence of the real interest rate parity for OECD countries using panel unit root tests with breaks"
(Desembre 2006)

CREAP2006-15
Karanassou, M.; Sala, H. (GEAP)**.;Snower** , **D. J.**
"The macroeconomics of the labor market: Three fundamental views"
(Desembre 2006)

2007

XREAP2007-01
Castany, L (AQR-IREA)**; López-Bazo, E.** (AQR-IREA)**.;Moreno** , **R.** (AQR-IREA)
"Decomposing differences in total factor productivity across firm size"
(Març 2007)

XREAP2007-02
Raymond, J. Ll. (GEAP)**; Roig, J. Ll.** (GEAP)
"Una propuesta de evaluación de las externalidades de capital humano en la empresa"
(Abril 2007)

XREAP2007-03
Durán, J. M. (IEB)**; Esteller, A.** (IEB)
"An empirical analysis of wealth taxation: Equity vs. Tax compliance"
(Juny 2007)

XREAP2007-04
Matas, A. (GEAP)**; Raymond, J.Ll.** (GEAP)
"Cross-section data, disequilibrium situations and estimated coefficients: evidence from car ownership demand"
(Juny 2007)

XREAP2007-05
Jofre-Montseny, J. (IEB)**; Solé-Ollé, A.** (IEB)
"Tax differentials and agglomeration economies in intraregional firm location"
(Juny 2007)

XREAP2007-06
Álvarez-Albelo, C. (CREB)**; Hernández-Martín, R.**
"Explaining high economic growth in small tourism countries with a dynamic general equilibrium model"
(Juliol 2007)

XREAP2007-07
Duch, N. (IEB)**; Montolio, D.** (IEB)**; Mediavilla, M.**
"Evaluating the impact of public subsidies on a firm's performance: a quasi-experimental approach"
(Juliol 2007)

XREAP2007-08
Segarra-Blasco, A. (GRIT)
"Innovation sources and productivity: a quantile regression analysis"
(Octubre 2007)

XREAP2007-09
Albalate, D. (PPRE-IREA)
"Shifting death to their Alternatives: The case of Toll Motorways"
(Octubre 2007)

XREAP2007-10
Segarra-Blasco, A. (GRIT); **Garcia-Quevedo, J.** (IEB); **Teruel-Carrizosa, M.** (GRIT)
"Barriers to innovation and public policy in catalonia"
(Novembre 2007)

XREAP2007-11
Bel, G. (PPRE-IREA); **Foote, J.**
"Comparison of recent toll road concession transactions in the United States and France"
(Novembre 2007)

XREAP2007-12
Segarra-Blasco, A. (GRIT);
"Innovation, R&D spillovers and productivity: the role of knowledge-intensive services"
(Novembre 2007)

XREAP2007-13
Bermúdez Morata, Ll. (RFA-IREA); **Guillén Estany, M.** (RFA-IREA), **Solé Auró, A**. (RFA-IREA)
"Impacto de la inmigración sobre la esperanza de vida en salud y en discapacidad de la población española"
 (Novembre 2007)

XREAP2007-14
Calaeys, P. (AQR-IREA); **Ramos, R.** (AQR-IREA), **Suriñach, J**. (AQR-IREA)
"Fiscal sustainability across government tiers"
 (Desembre 2007)

XREAP2007-15
Sánchez Hugalbe, A. (IEB)
"Influencia de la inmigración en la elección escolar"
 (Desembre 2007)

2008

XREAP2008-01
Durán Weitkamp, C. (GRIT)**; Martín Bofarull, M.** (GRIT) ; **Pablo Martí, F.**
"Economic effects of road accessibility in the Pyrenees: User perspective"
(Gener 2008)

XREAP2008-02
Díaz-Serrano, L.; Stoyanova, A. P. (CREB)
"The Causal Relationship between Individual's Choice Behavior and Self-Reported Satisfaction: the Case of Residential Mobility in the EU"
(Març 2008)

XREAP2008-03
Matas, A. (GEAP)**; Raymond, J. L.** (GEAP)**; Roig, J. L.** (GEAP)
"Car ownership and access to jobs in Spain"
(Abril 2008)

XREAP2008-04
Bel, G. (PPRE-IREA) **; Fageda, X.** (PPRE-IREA)
"Privatization and competition in the delivery of local services: An empirical examination of the dual market hypothesis"
(Abril 2008)

XREAP2008-05
Matas, A. (GEAP); **Raymond, J. L.** (GEAP); **Roig, J. L.** (GEAP)
"**Job accessibility and employment probability**"
(Maig 2008)

XREAP2008-06
Basher, S. A.; Carrión, J. Ll. (AQR-IREA)
Deconstructing Shocks and Persistence in OECD Real Exchange Rates
(Juny 2008)

XREAP2008-07
Sanromá, E. (IEB)**; Ramos, R.** (AQR-IREA); Simón, H.
Portabilidad del capital humano y asimilación de los inmigrantes. Evidencia para España
(Juliol 2008)

XREAP2008-08
Basher, S. A.; Carrión, J. Ll. (AQR-IREA)
Price level convergence, purchasing power parity and multiple structural breaks: An application to US cities
(Juliol 2008)

XREAP2008-09
Bermúdez, Ll. (RFA-IREA)
A priori ratemaking using bivariate poisson regression models
(Juliol 2008)

XREAP2008-10
Solé-Ollé, A. (IEB), **Hortas Rico, M.** (IEB)
Does urban sprawl increase the costs of providing local public services? Evidence from Spanish municipalities
(Novembre 2008)

XREAP2008-11
Teruel-Carrizosa, M. (GRIT), **Segarra-Blasco, A.** (GRIT)
Immigration and Firm Growth: Evidence from Spanish cities
(Novembre 2008)

XREAP2008-12
Duch-Brown, N. (IEB), **García-Quevedo, J.** (IEB), **Montolio, D.** (IEB)
Assessing the assignation of public subsidies: Do the experts choose the most efficient R&D projects?
(Novembre 2008)

XREAP2008-13
Bilotkach, V., **Fageda, X.** (PPRE-IREA), **Flores-Fillol, R.**
Scheduled service versus personal transportation: the role of distance
(Desembre 2008)

XREAP2008-14
Albalate, D. (PPRE-IREA), **Gel, G.** (PPRE-IREA)
Tourism and urban transport: Holding demand pressure under supply constraints
 (Desembre 2008)

2009

XREAP2009-01
Calonge, S. (CREB)**; Tejada, O.**
"A theoretical and practical study on linear reforms of dual taxes"
(Febrer 2009)

XREAP2009-02
Albalate, D. (PPRE-IREA)**; Fernández-Villadangos, L.** (PPRE-IREA)
"Exploring Determinants of Urban Motorcycle Accident Severity: The Case of Barcelona"
(Març 2009)

XREAP2009-03
Borrell, J. R. (PPRE-IREA)**; Fernández-Villadangos, L.** (PPRE-IREA)
"Assessing excess profits from different entry regulations"
(Abril 2009)

XREAP2009-04
Sanromá, E. (IEB)**; Ramos, R.** (AQR-IREA), **Simon, H.**
"Los salarios de los inmigrantes en el mercado de trabajo español. ¿Importa el origen del capital humano?"
(Abril 2009)

XREAP2009-05
Jiménez, J. L.; Perdiguero, J. (PPRE-IREA)
"(No)competition in the Spanish retailing gasoline market: a variance filter approach"
(Maig 2009)

XREAP2009-06
Álvarez-Albelo,C. D. (CREB)**, Manresa, A.** (CREB)**, Pigem-Vigo, M.** (CREB)
"International trade as the sole engine of growth for an economy"
(Juny 2009)

XREAP2009-07
Callejón, M. (PPRE-IREA)**, Ortún V, M.**
"The Black Box of Business Dynamics"
(Setembre 2009)

XREAP2009-08
Lucena, A. (CREB)
"The antecedents and innovation consequences of organizational search: empirical evidence for Spain"
(Octubre 2009)

XREAP2009-09
Domènech Campmajó, L. (PPRE-IREA)
"Competition between TV Platforms"
(Octubre 2009)

XREAP2009-10
Solé-Auró, A. (RFA-IREA),**Guillén, M.** (RFA-IREA), **Crimmins, E. M.**
"Health care utilization among immigrants and native-born populations in 11 European countries. Results from the Survey of Health, Ageing and Retirement in Europe"
(Octubre 2009)

XREAP2009-11
Segarra, A. (GRIT)**, Teruel, M.** (GRIT)
"Small firms, growth and financial constraints"
(Octubre 2009)

XREAP2009-12
Matas, A. (GEAP)**, Raymond, J.Ll.** (GEAP), **Ruiz, A.** (GEAP)
"Traffic forecasts under uncertainty and capacity constraints"
(Novembre 2009)

XREAP2009-13
Sole-Ollé, A. (IEB)
"Inter-regional redistribution through infrastructure investment: tactical or programmatic?"
(Novembre 2009)

XREAP2009-14
Del Barrio-Castro, T., **García-Quevedo, J.** (IEB)
"The determinants of university patenting: Do incentives matter?"
(Novembre 2009)

XREAP2009-15
Ramos, R. (AQR-IREA), **Suriñach, J.** (AQR-IREA)**, Artís, M.** (AQR-IREA)
"Human capital spillovers, productivity and regional convergence in Spain"
(Novembre 2009)

XREAP2009-16
Álvarez-Albelo, C. D. (CREB), **Hernández-Martín, R.**
"The commons and anti-commons problems in the tourism economy"
(Desembre 2009)

2010

XREAP2010-01
García-López, M. A. (GEAP)
"The Accessibility City. When Transport Infrastructure Matters in Urban Spatial Structure"
(Febrer 2010)

XREAP2010-02
García-Quevedo, J. (IEB), **Mas-Verdú, F.** (IEB), **Polo-Otero, J.** (IEB)
"Which firms want PhDs? The effect of the university-industry relationship on the PhD labour market"
(Març 2010)

XREAP2010-03
Pitt, D., **Guillén, M.** (RFA-IREA)
"An introduction to parametric and non-parametric models for bivariate positive insurance claim severity distributions"
(Març 2010)

XREAP2010-04
Bermúdez, Ll. (RFA-IREA), **Karlis, D.**
"Modelling dependence in a ratemaking procedure with multivariate Poisson regression models"
(Abril 2010)

XREAP2010-05
Di Paolo, A. (IEB)
"Parental education and family characteristics: educational opportunities across cohorts in Italy and Spain"
(Maig 2010)

XREAP2010-06
Simón, H. (IEB), **Ramos, R.** (AQR-IREA), **Sanromá, E.** (IEB)

"Movilidad ocupacional de los inmigrantes en una economía de bajas cualificaciones. El caso de España"
(Juny 2010)

XREAP2010-07
Di Paolo, A. (GEAP & IEB), **Raymond, J. Ll.** (GEAP & IEB)
"Language knowledge and earnings in Catalonia"
(Juliol 2010)

XREAP2010-08
Bolancé, C. (RFA-IREA), **Alemany, R.** (RFA-IREA), **Guillén, M.** (RFA-IREA)
"Prediction of the economic cost of individual long-term care in the Spanish population"
(Setembre 2010)

XREAP2010-09
Di Paolo, A. (GEAP & IEB)
"Knowledge of catalan, public/private sector choice and earnings: Evidence from a double sample selection model"
(Setembre 2010)

XREAP2010-10
Coad, A., **Segarra, A.** (GRIT), **Teruel, M.** (GRIT)
"Like milk or wine: Does firm performance improve with age?"
(Setembre 2010)

XREAP2010-11
Di Paolo, A. (GEAP & IEB), **Raymond, J. Ll.** (GEAP & IEB), **Calero, J.** (IEB)
"Exploring educational mobility in Europe"
(Octubre 2010)

XREAP2010-12
Borrell, A. (GiM-IREA), **Fernández-Villadangos, L.** (GiM-IREA)
"Clustering or scattering: the underlying reason for regulating distance among retail outlets"
(Desembre 2010)

XREAP2010-13
Di Paolo, A. (GEAP & IEB)
"School composition effects in Spain"
(Desembre 2010)

XREAP2010-14
Fageda, X. (GiM-IREA), **Flores-Fillol, R.**
"Technology, Business Models and Network Structure in the Airline Industry"
(Desembre 2010)

XREAP2010-15
Albalate, D. (GiM-IREA), **Bel, G.** (GiM-IREA), **Fageda, X.** (GiM-IREA)
"Is it Redistribution or Centralization? On the Determinants of Government Investment in Infrastructure"
(Desembre 2010)

XREAP2010-16
Oppedisano, V., **Turati, G.**
"What are the causes of educational inequalities and of their evolution over time in Europe? Evidence from PISA"
(Desembre 2010)

XREAP2010-17
Canova, L., **Vaglio, A.**
"Why do educated mothers matter? A model of parental help"
(Desembre 2010)

2011

XREAP2011-01
Fageda, X. (GiM-IREA), **Perdiguero, J.** (GiM-IREA)
"An empirical analysis of a merger between a network and low-cost airlines"
(Maig 2011)

XREAP2011-02
Moreno-Torres, I. (ACCO, CRES & GiM-IREA)
"What if there was a stronger pharmaceutical price competition in Spain? When regulation has a similar effect to collusion"
(Maig 2011)

XREAP2011-03
Miguélez, E. (AQR-IREA); **Gómez-Miguélez, I.**
"Singling out individual inventors from patent data"
(Maig 2011)

XREAP2011-04
Moreno-Torres, I. (ACCO, CRES & GiM-IREA)
"Generic drugs in Spain: price competition vs. moral hazard"
(Maig 2011)

XREAP2011-05
Nieto, S. (AQR-IREA)**, Ramos, R.** (AQR-IREA)
"¿Afecta la sobreeducación de los padres al rendimiento académico de sus hijos?"
(Maig 2011)

XREAP2011-06
Pitt, D., **Guillén, M.** (RFA-IREA), **Bolancé, C.** (RFA-IREA)
"Estimation of Parametric and Nonparametric Models for Univariate Claim Severity Distributions - an approach using R"
(Juny 2011)

XREAP2011-07
Guillén, M. (RFA-IREA), **Comas-Herrera, A.**
"How much risk is mitigated by LTC Insurance? A case study of the public system in Spain"
(Juny 2011)

XREAP2011-08
Ayuso, M. (RFA-IREA), **Guillén, M.** (RFA-IREA), **Bolancé, C.** (RFA-IREA)
"Loss risk through fraud in car insurance"
(Juny 2011)

XREAP2011-09
Duch-Brown, N. (IEB), **García-Quevedo, J.** (IEB), **Montolio, D.** (IEB)
"The link between public support and private R&D effort: What is the optimal subsidy?"
(Juny 2011)

XREAP2011-10
Bermúdez, Ll. (RFA-IREA), **Karlis, D.**
"Mixture of bivariate Poisson regression models with an application to insurance"
(Juliol 2011)

XREAP2011-11
Varela-Irimia, X-L. (GRIT)
"Age effects, unobserved characteristics and hedonic price indexes: The Spanish car market in the 1990s"
(Agost 2011)

XREAP2011-12
Bermúdez, Ll. (RFA-IREA), **Ferri, A.** (RFA-IREA), **Guillén, M.** (RFA-IREA)
"A correlation sensitivity analysis of non-life underwriting risk in solvency capital requirement estimation"
(Setembre 2011)

XREAP2011-13
Guillén, M. (RFA-IREA), **Pérez-Marín, A.** (RFA-IREA), **Alcañiz, M.** (RFA-IREA)
"A logistic regression approach to estimating customer profit loss due to lapses in insurance"
(Octubre 2011)

XREAP2011-14
Jiménez, J. L., **Perdiguero, J.** (GiM-IREA), **García, C.**
"Evaluation of subsidies programs to sell green cars: Impact on prices, quantities and efficiency"
(Octubre 2011)

XREAP2011-15
Arespa, M. (CREB)
"A New Open Economy Macroeconomic Model with Endogenous Portfolio Diversification and Firms Entry"
(Octubre 2011)

XREAP2011-16
Matas, A. (GEAP), **Raymond, J. L.** (GEAP), **Roig, J.L.** (GEAP)
"The impact of agglomeration effects and accessibility on wages"
(Novembre 2011)

XREAP2011-17
Segarra, A. (GRIT)
"R&D cooperation between Spanish firms and scientific partners: what is the role of tertiary education?"
(Novembre 2011)

XREAP2011-18
García-Pérez, J. I.; **Hidalgo-Hidalgo, M.**; **Robles-Zurita, J. A.**
"Does grade retention affect achievement? Some evidence from PISA"
(Novembre 2011)

XREAP2011-19
Arespa, M. (CREB)
"Macroeconomics of extensive margins: a simple model"
(Novembre 2011)

XREAP2011-20
García-Quevedo, J. (IEB), **Pellegrino, G.** (IEB), **Vivarelli, M.**
"The determinants of YICs' R&D activity"
(Desembre 2011)

XREAP2011-21
González-Val, R. (IEB), **Olmo, J.**
"Growth in a Cross-Section of Cities: Location, Increasing Returns or Random Growth?"
(Desembre 2011)

XREAP2011-22
Gombau, V. (GRIT), **Segarra, A.** (GRIT)
"The Innovation and Imitation Dichotomy in Spanish firms: do absorptive capacity and the technological frontier matter?"
(Desembre 2011)

2012

XREAP2012-01
Borrell, J. R. (GiM-IREA), **Jiménez, J. L.**, **García, C.**
"Evaluating Antitrust Leniency Programs"
(Gener 2012)

XREAP2012-02
Ferri, A. (RFA-IREA), **Guillén, M.** (RFA-IREA), **Bermúdez, Ll.** (RFA-IREA)
"Solvency capital estimation and risk measures"
(Gener 2012)

XREAP2012-03
Ferri, A. (RFA-IREA), **Bermúdez, Ll.** (RFA-IREA), **Guillén, M.** (RFA-IREA)
"How to use the standard model with own data"
(Febrer 2012)

XREAP2012-04
Perdiguero, J. (GiM-IREA), **Borrell, J.R.** (GiM-IREA)
"Driving competition in local gasoline markets"
(Març 2012)

XREAP2012-05
D'Amico, G., **Guillen, M.** (RFA-IREA), Manca, R.
"Discrete time Non-homogeneous Semi-Markov Processes applied to Models for Disability Insurance"
(Març 2012)

XREAP2012-06
Bové-Sans, M. A. (GRIT), Laguado-Ramírez, R.
"Quantitative analysis of image factors in a cultural heritage tourist destination"
(Abril 2012)

XREAP2012-07
Tello, C. (AQR-IREA), **Ramos, R.** (AQR-IREA), **Artís, M.** (AQR-IREA)
"Changes in wage structure in Mexico going beyond the mean: An analysis of differences in distribution, 1987-2008"
(Maig 2012)

XREAP2012-08
Jofre-Monseny, J. (IEB), **Marín-López, R.** (IEB), **Viladecans-Marsal, E.** (IEB)
"What underlies localization and urbanization economies? Evidence from the location of new firms"
(Maig 2012)

XREAP2012-09
Muñiz, I. (GEAP), **Calatayud, D.**, **Dobaño, R.**
"Los límites de la compacidad urbana como instrumento a favor de la sostenibilidad. La hipótesis de la compensación en Barcelona medida a través de la huella ecológica de la movilidad y la vivienda"
(Maig 2012)

XREAP2012-10
Arqué-Castells, P. (GEAP), **Mohnen, P.**
"Sunk costs, extensive R&D subsidies and permanent inducement effects"
(Maig 2012)

XREAP2012-11
Boj, E. (CREB), **Delicado, P.**, **Fortiana, J**., **Esteve, A.**, **Caballé, A.**
"Local Distance-Based Generalized Linear Models using the dbstats package for R"
(Maig 2012)

XREAP2012-12
Royuela, V. (AQR-IREA)
"What about people in European Regional Science?"
(Maig 2012)

XREAP2012-13
Osorio A. M. (RFA-IREA)**, Bolancé, C.** (RFA-IREA), **Madise, N.**
"Intermediary and structural determinants of early childhood health in Colombia: exploring the role of communities"
(Juny 2012)

XREAP2012-14
Miguelez. E. (AQR-IREA)**, Moreno, R.** (AQR-IREA)
"Do labour mobility and networks foster geographical knowledge diffusion? The case of European regions"
(Juliol 2012)

XREAP2012-15
Teixidó-Figueras, J. (GRIT)**, Duró, J. A.** (GRIT)
"Ecological Footprint Inequality: A methodological review and some results"
(Setembre 2012)

XREAP2012-16
Varela-Irimia, X-L. (GRIT)
"Profitability, uncertainty and multi-product firm product proliferation: The Spanish car industry"
(Setembre 2012)

XREAP2012-17
Duró, J. A. (GRIT), **Teixidó-Figueras, J.** (GRIT)
"Ecological Footprint Inequality across countries: the role of environment intensity, income and interaction effects"
(Octubre 2012)

XREAP2012-18
Manresa, A. (CREB), **Sancho, F.**
"Leontief versus Ghosh: two faces of the same coin"
(Octubre 2012)

XREAP2012-19
Alemany, R. (RFA-IREA), **Bolancé, C.** (RFA-IREA), **Guillén, M.** (RFA-IREA)
"Nonparametric estimation of Value-at-Risk"
(Octubre 2012)

XREAP2012-20
Herrera-Idárraga, P. (AQR-IREA), **López-Bazo, E.** (AQR-IREA), **Motellón, E.** (AQR-IREA)
"Informality and overeducation in the labor market of a developing country"
(Novembre 2012)

XREAP2012-21
Di Paolo, A. (AQR-IREA)
"(Endogenous) occupational choices and job satisfaction among recent PhD recipients: evidence from Catalonia"
(Desembre 2012)

2013

XREAP2013-01
Segarra, A. (GRIT), **García-Quevedo, J.** (IEB), **Teruel, M.** (GRIT)
"Financial constraints and the failure of innovation projects"
(Març 2013)

XREAP2013-02
Osorio, A. M. (RFA-IREA), **Bolancé, C.** (RFA-IREA), Madise, N., Rathmann, K.
"Social Determinants of Child Health in Colombia: Can Community Education Moderate the Effect of Family Characteristics?"
(Març 2013)

XREAP2013-03
Teixidó-Figueras, J. (GRIT), **Duró, J. A.** (GRIT)
"The building blocks of international ecological footprint inequality: a regression-based decomposition"
(Abril 2013)

XREAP2013-04
Salcedo-Sanz, S., **Carro-Calvo, L.**, **Claramunt, M.** (CREB), **Castañer, A.** (CREB), **Marmol, M.** (CREB)
"An Analysis of Black-box Optimization Problems in Reinsurance: Evolutionary-based Approaches"
(Maig 2013)

XREAP2013-05
Alcañiz, M. (RFA), **Guillén, M.** (RFA), **Sánchez-Moscona, D.** (RFA), **Santolino, M.** (RFA), **Llatje, O., Ramon, Ll.**
"Prevalence of alcohol-impaired drivers based on random breath tests in a roadside survey"
(Juliol 2013)

XREAP2013-06
Matas, A. (GEAP & IEB), **Raymond, J. Ll.** (GEAP & IEB), **Roig, J. L.** (GEAP)
"How market access shapes human capital investment in a peripheral country"
(Octubre 2013)

XREAP2013-07
Di Paolo, A. (AQR-IREA), **Tansel, A.**
"Returns to Foreign Language Skills in a Developing Country: The Case of Turkey"
(Novembre 2013)

XREAP2013-08
Fernández Gual, V. (GRIT), **Segarra, A.** (GRIT)
"The Impact of Cooperation on R&D, Innovation andProductivity: an Analysis of Spanish Manufacturing and Services Firms"
(Novembre 2013)

XREAP2013-09
Bahraoui, Z. (RFA); **Bolancé, C.** (RFA); **Pérez-Marín. A. M.** (RFA)
"Testing extreme value copulas to estimate the quantile"
(Novembre 2013)

2014

XREAP2014-01
Solé-Auró, A. (RFA), **Alcañiz, M.** (RFA)
"Are we living longer but less healthy? Trends in mortality and morbidity in Catalonia (Spain), 1994-2011"
(Gener 2014)

XREAP2014-02

Teixidó-Figueres, J. (GRIT), **Duro, J. A.** (GRIT)
"Spatial Polarization of the Ecological Footprint distribution"
(Febrer 2014)

XREAP2014-03
Cristobal-Cebolla, A.; Gil Lafuente, A. M. (RFA), **Merigó Lindhal, J. M.** (RFA)
"La importancia del control de los costes de la no-calidad en la empresa"
(Febrer 2014)

XREAP2014-04
Castañer, A. (CREB); **Claramunt, M.M.** (CREB)
"Optimal stop-loss reinsurance: a dependence analysis"
(Abril 2014)

XREAP2014-05
Di Paolo, A. (AQR-IREA); **Matas, A.** (GEAP); **Raymond, J. Ll.** (GEAP)
"Job accessibility, employment and job-education mismatch in the metropolitan area of Barcelona"
(Maig 2014)

XREAP2014-06
Di Paolo, A. (AQR-IREA); **Mañé, F.**
"Are we wasting our talent? Overqualification and overskilling among PhD graduates"
(Juny 2014)

XREAP2014-07
Segarra, A. (GRIT); **Teruel, M.** (GRIT); **Bové, M. A.** (GRIT)
"A territorial approach to R&D subsidies: Empirical evidence for Catalonian firms"
(Setembre 2014)

XREAP2014-08
Ramos, R. (AQR-IREA); **Sanromá, E.** (IEB); **Simón, H.**
"Public-private sector wage differentials by type of contract: evidence from Spain"
(Octubre 2014)

XREAP2014-09
Bel, G. (GiM-IREA); **Bolancé, C.** (Riskcenter-IREA); **Guillén, M.** (Riskcenter-IREA)**; Rosell, J.** (GiM-IREA)
"The environmental effects of changing speed limits: a quantile regression approach"
(Desembre 2014)

2015

XREAP2015-01
Bolance, C. (Riskcenter-IREA); **Bahraoui, Z.** (Riskcenter-IREA), **Alemany, R.** (Risckcenter-IREA)
"Estimating extreme value cumulative distribution functions using bias-corrected kernel approaches"
(Gener 2015)

XREAP2015-02
Ramos, R. (AQR-IREA); **Sanromá, E.** (IEB), **Simón, H.**
"An analysis of wage differentials between full- and part-time workers in Spain"
(Agost 2015)

XREAP2015-03
Cappellari, L.; **Di Paolo, A.** (AQR-IREA)
"Bilingual Schooling and Earnings: Evidence from a Language-in-Education Reform"
(Setembre 2015)

XREAP2015-04
Álvarez-Albelo, C. D., Manresa, A. (CREB), **Pigem-Vigo, M.** (CREB)
 "Growing through trade: The role of foreign growth and domestic tariffs"
(Novembre 2015)

XREAP2015-05
Caminal, R., Di Paolo, A. (AQR-IREA)
Your language or mine?
(Novembre 2015)

XREAP2015-06
Choi, H. (AQR-IREA)**, Choi, A.** (IEB)
When one door closes: the impact of the hagwon curfew on the consumption of private tutoring in the Republic of Korea

(Novembre 2015)

2016

XREAP2016-01
Castañer, A. (CREB, XREAP); **Claramunt, M M.** (CREB, XREAP), **Tadeo, A.**, **Varea, J.** (CREB, XREAP)
Modelización de la dependencia del número de siniestros. Aplicación a Solvencia II
(Setembre 2016)

XREAP2016-02
García-Quevedo, J. (IEB, XREAP); **Segarra-Blasco, A.** (GRIT, XREAP), **Teruel, M.** (GRIT, XREAP)
Financial constraints and the failure of innovation projects
(Setembre 2016)

XREAP2016-03
Jové-Llopis, E. (GRIT, XREAP); **Segarra-Blasco, A.** (GRIT, XREAP)
What is the role of innovation strategies? Evidence from Spanish firms
(Setembre 2016)

XREAP2016-04
Albalate, D. (GiM-IREA, XREAP); **Rosell, J.** (GiM-IREA, XREAP)
Persistent and transient efficiency on the stochastic production and cost frontiers – an application to the motorway sector
(Octubre 2016)

XREAP2016-05
Jofre-Monseny, J. (IEB, XREAP), **Silva, J. I.**, **Vázquez-Grenno, J.** (IEB, XREAP)
Local labor market effects of public employment
(Novembre 2016)

XREAP2016-06
Garcia-López, M. A. (IEB, XREAP), **Hemet, C.**, **Viladecans-Marsal, E.** (IEB, XREAP)
Next train to the polycentric city: The effect of railroads on subcenter formation
(Novembre 2016)

XREAP2016-07
Vayá, E. (AQR-IREA, XREAP)**, García, J. R.** (AQR-IREA, XREAP)**, Murillo, J.** (AQR-IREA, XREAP)**, Romaní, J.** (AQR-IREA, XREAP)**, Suriñach, J.** (AQR-IREA, XREAP)**,**
Economic impact of cruise activity: the port of Barcelona
(Desembre 2016)

XREAP2016-08
Ayuso, M. (Riskcenter, XREAP)**, Guillen, M.** (Riskcenter, XREAP)**, Nielsen, J. P.**
Improving automobile insurance ratemaking using telematics: incorporating mileage and driver behaviour data
(Desembre 2016)

XREAP2016-09
Ruíz, A. (GEAP, XREAP), **Matas, A.** (GEAP, XREAP), **Raymond, J. Ll.**
How do road infrastructure investments affect the regional economy? Evidence from Spain
(Desembre 2016)

2017

XREAP2017-01
Bernardo, V. (GiM-IREA, XREAP); **Fageda, X.** (GiM-IREA, XREAP)
Globalization, long-haul flights and inter-city connections
(Octubre 2017)

XREAP2017-02
Di Paolo, A. (AQR-IREA, XREAP); **Tansel, A.**
Analyzing Wage Differentials by Fields of Study: Evidence from Turkey
(Octubre 2017)

XREAP2017-03
Melguizo, C. (AQR-IREA, XREAP); **Royuela, V.** (AQR-IREA, XREAP)
What drives migration moves across urban areas in Spain? Evidence from the great recession
(Octubre 2017)

XREAP2017-04
Boonen, T.J., Guillén, M. (RISKCENTER, XREAP); **Santolino, M.** (RISKCENTER, XREAP)
Forecasting compositional risk allocations
(Octubre 2017)

XREAP2017-05
Curto-Grau, M. (IEB, XREAP)**, Solé-Ollé, A.** (IEB, XREAP)**, Sorribas-Navarro, P.** (IEB, XREAP)
Does electoral competition curb party favoritism?
(Novembre 2017)

XREAP2017-06
Esteller, A. (IEB, XREAP)**, Piolatto, A.** (IEB, XREAP)**, Rablen, M. D.**
Taxing high-income earners: tax avoidance and mobility
(Novembre 2017)

XREAP2017-07
Bolancé, C. (RISKCENTER, XREAP)**, Vernic, R**
Multivariate count data generalized linear models: Three approaches based on the Sarmanov distribution
(Novembre 2017)

XREAP2017-08
Albalate, D. (GiM-IREA, XREAP)**, Bel-Piñana, P. (**GiM-IREA, XREAP)
Public Private Partnership management effects on road safety outcomes
(Novembre 2017)

XREAP2017-09
Teruel, M. (GRIT, XREAP)**, Segarra, A. (**GRIT, XREAP)
Gender diversity, R&D teams and patents: An application to Spanish firms
(Novembre 2017)

XREAP2017-10
Cuberes, D., **Teignier, M.** (CREB, XREAP)
How Costly Are Labor Gender Gaps? Estimates by Age Group for the Balkans and Turkey
(Novembre 2017)

XREAP2017-11
Murilló, I. P., **Raymond, J. L.** (GEAP, XREAP), **Calero, J.** (IEB, XREAP)
Efficiency in the transformation of schooling into competences: A cross-country analysis using PIAAC data
(Novembre 2017)

XREAP2017-12
Giuntella, O., Mazzonnay, F., Nicodemo, C. (GEAP, XREAP), **Vargas Silva, C**
Immigration and the Reallocation of Work Health Risks
(Desembre 2017)

XREAP2017-13
Giuntella, O., Nicodemo, C. (GEAP, XREAP), **Vargas Silva, C.**
The Effects of Immigration on NHS Waiting Times
(Desembre 2017)

XREAP2017-14
Solé-Ollé, A. (IEB, XREAP), Viladecans-Marsal, E. (IEB, XREAP)
Housing Booms and Busts and Local Fiscal Policy
(Desembre 2017)

XREAP2017-15
Jové-Llopis, E. (GRIT, XREAP), Segarra-Blasco, A. (GRIT, XREAP)
Eco-strategies and firm growth in European SMEs
(Desembre 2017)

xarxa.xreap@gmail.com