

A Search and Learning Model of Export Dynamics*

Jonathan Eaton^{a,e}, Marcela Eslava^b, David Jenkins^c,
C. J. Krizan^d, and James Tybout^{c,e}

June 3, 2020

Abstract

Customs record data reveal a number of patterns in relationships Colombian firms have with their U.S. buyers. We interpret these patterns in terms of a continuous-time model in which heterogeneous sellers search for buyers in a market. Success in selling to a buyer reveals information to the seller about the appeal of her product in the market, affecting her incentive to search for more buyers. Fit using the method of simulated moments, the model replicates key patterns in the customs records and allows us quantify several types of trade costs, including the search costs of identifying potential clients and the costs of maintaining business relationships with existing clients. It also allows us to estimate the effect of previous exporting activity on the costs of meeting new clients, and to characterize the cumulative effects of learning on firms' search intensities. Finally, we use our fitted model to explore the effects of these trade costs and learning effects on aggregate export dynamics.

*We gratefully acknowledge support from the National Science Foundation (Grant SES-0922358), the United States Census Bureau, and Banco de la República de Colombia. We also thank Monica Hernández, Gustavo Caballero and Camilo Acosta for excellent research assistance, as well as Enrique Montes for expert data advice. This paper was written in part by Census Bureau staff. It has undergone a more limited review than official Census Bureau publications. All results were reviewed to ensure confidentiality. Any views, findings and opinions in the paper reflect the views of the authors and do not reflect the views of the U.S. Census Bureau.

1 Introduction

Research on exporting has been digging deeper into microeconomics data to understand the barriers that producers face in entering foreign markets and their implications for export dynamics. Firm-level datasets have provided insights first into the costs of exporting at all, and then, as data became available, to penetrating individual markets (Das et. al, 2007; Arkolakis, 2010; Eaton et al., 2011; Morales et al., 2019). We take this analysis one step forward by examining exporters’ relationships with individual buyers in a market, both descriptively and through the lens of a dynamic model. In doing so we quantify exporting costs, link them to particular types of information frictions, and explore their dynamic implications.

The first type of friction in our model is standard: exporters must engage in costly search to identify potential clients abroad. Since search costs are convex in match rates, this forces firms to gradually build their portfolio of foreign buyers. The second type of friction arises from sellers’ limited knowledge of foreign buyers’ tastes. Potential exporters are unsure about the appeal of their products in foreign markets, but they gradually learn about this as they meet potential customers. Therefore, exporters with appealing products intensify their marketing efforts as they receive positive reinforcement. The final type of friction has to do with buyers learning about sellers. Exporters that have already established a large number of business relationships are relatively visible to other buyers, so for a given level of spending on search, they meet relatively more potential customers. This means that new exporters add clients relatively slowly, and it makes it profitable for exporters with large client bases to replace the many business relationships they lose to attrition.

We base our analysis on the cross-sectional and temporal variation in shipment-level customs records from the United States, which report importer and exporter identifiers. We begin by summarizing the main patterns in these data that we want our model to explain, including the dynamics of seller matching patterns and the life-cycle revenue trajectories generated by individual matches. Then we develop a dynamic search and matching model in which exporters expand by adding to their client base in destination markets. Finally, we fit this model to our customs data and use it to make inferences about the importance of several types of information frictions.

In addition to quantifying the value of information, this last stage involves several counterfactual experiments. These are designed to answer several questions: How much intangible capital is tied to foreign business connections, and how does this capital vary across different types of exports? Controlling for exporters’ productivity and product appeal, how big a role does market visibility play in driving success? And finally, to what extent do information frictions cause aggregate export dynamics to deviate from a sequence of static equilibria?

1.1 Relation to literature

JT: section needs to be updated, including discussion of:

Aeberhardt, R., I. Buono, and H. Fadinger (2014)

Eaton, Jinkins, Tybout and Xu (?)

Monarch and Schmidt-Eisenlohr (2018)

Ruhl and Willis (2017)

Alessandria, Choi and Ruhl (2018)

Foster, Haltiwanger and Syverson (2016)

Nguyen (2012)

Rho, Young-Woo and Joel Rodrigue (2016)

Bernard (2018 & what else?)

Pivetau (forthcoming)

Timoshenko (2015)

Macchiavello (2015)

Li (2018)

Kohn et al. (2016)

Gourio, F. and L. Rudanko (2014)

Dickstein and Morales (2018)

others?

While we look at the evolution of firms' sales in a particular market, our analysis is related to the literature on the dynamics of firm size in general. The model explains the size distribution of firm sales through two interacting mechanisms. One, as in Melitz (2003), Bernard et al. (2003), Luttmer (2007), and Irarrazabal and Opromolla (2006), is firm efficiency: More efficient firms sell more to a given set of buyers by having a lower price or a higher quality product. A second is that some firms have larger networks of buyers than others, as in Jackson and Rogers (2007) or Chaney (2011).

Investments in building a client base constitute a type of sunk cost, so our model also relates to the export hysteresis literature (Dixit, 1989; Baldwin and Krugman, 1989; Das, et al., 2007; Alessandria and Choi, 2007; Alessandria et al., 2010), where firms pay a one-shot start-up cost to break into new markets. But unlike these formulations, our sunk costs are incurred on the client margin rather than the country margin, and they pay off in terms of market knowledge and reputation as well as revenue streams. These features of our model allow us to explain why new exporters who don't exit tend to rapidly expand, and why established exporters' sales are relatively stable. They also explain why many firms export for short periods on a very small scale.

Our formulation is also related to the two-period learning models developed by Rauch and Watson (2003) and Alborno et al (2012). In the former, importers experiment with foreign suppliers by placing trial orders with them, and they gain access to a supplier network if they establish a successful business relationship. In the latter, firms choose to experiment in markets with low entry costs in order to learn about their product’s appeal elsewhere. Like our model, these formulations provide interpretations for the fact that when new exporters survive, their exports tend to grow rapidly.¹

Finally, in allowing firms to attract more buyers by incurring greater costs, our analysis relates to Drozd and Nozal (2012) and Arkolakis (2009, 2010). By positing that firms face marketing costs that are convex in the number of foreign clients they service, Arkolakis also accounts for small-scale exporters and the age-dependence of export growth rates. However, since all exporting relationships last a single period in his models and learning is absent, Arkolakis’s models do not explain the irreversibilities observed in firms’ exporting behavior, nor do they speak to the duration of matches.

2 Firm-Level Trade: Transaction Level Evidence

2.1 Data

The empirical motivation for our model comes from a comprehensive data set that describes all imports by buyers in the United States from Colombian exporters (as well as other origins) during the period 1992-2009. The source is the U.S. Census Bureau’s Longitudinal Foreign Trade Transactions Database (LFTTD). Each record includes a date, the US dollar value of the product shipped, a 6-digit harmonized system product code, a quantity index, and, critically, ID codes for both sellers and buyers. These IDs allow us to identify the formation and dissolution of business relationships between individual buyers in the U.S. and sellers in Colombia, hereafter referred to as “matches.”²

To identify foreign exporters, the U.S. import transactions records include a manufacturer’s identification code.³ This field is an amalgamation of the manufacturer’s country, company name, street address, and city. Anecdotal information from customs brokers in-

¹Ruhl and Willis (2008) also note this pattern in plant-level export data and show that market entry costs are insufficient to explain it.

²There are two ways to track U.S. importers in the LFTTD: Employment Identification Numbers (EINs) and the firm identifiers in the Longitudinal Business Database (“alphas”). Though an EIN does not necessarily identify a complete firm, it is unique to a firm, and there is one associated with every import transaction. Alphas map to entire firms, but the match rate between trade transactions and alphas is only about 80 percent (Bernard, Redding, and Schott, 2009). To maximize the coverage of our sample, we use Employment Identification Numbers (EIN) to identify U.S. buyers.

³This variable is based on Block 13 of CBP form 7501, the import declaration form and customs brokers are required to input the data.

icates that commonly used software constructs it automatically as the name and address information is entered in other fields. So this variable is sensitive to differences in the way exporters’ names and addresses are recorded as they pass through customs, and shipments from the same exporter can appear to originate from distinct Colombian firms. To gauge the importance of this problem, we have conducted various checks on the matches that are based on this variable; these are explained in Appendix B.

We limit our analysis to transactions between non-affiliated trade partners, and we consider only imports of manufactured goods. The latter restriction notably excludes oil and coffee exports, which constitute the bulk of trade between the two countries and are dominated by a few Colombian sellers.⁴ Our final data set of manufacturing transactions spans the years 1992-2009. It contains 26,625 unique Colombian exporters, 12,921 unique U.S. importers, and 42,767 unique trading pairs. Value data have been deflated to 1992 prices using the U.S. CPI. Since we exclude a number of large HS codes from our data, as well as affiliated trade, and because we also lose information due to disclosure restrictions, the total value covered by our data is not comparable to total Colombian exports to the U.S. Table 17 in Appendix B compares patterns in our sample to patterns in official aggregates from both the U.S. and Colombia.

In addition to U.S. customs records, we use establishment level survey data from Colombia’s national statistics agency (Departamento Administrativo Nacional de Estadística, or DANE). These data provide annual information on the sales volumes, exports, and other characteristics of all Colombian manufacturing plants with at least 10 workers. Because they have been widely analyzed, we do not discuss summary statistics for this data set herein. Later, however, when estimating our search and learning model, we use such statistics to characterize the size distribution of Colombian firms, the fraction of Colombian plants that export and, among these firms, the relationship between exports and domestic sales.

2.2 Exporter cohort maturation

Following Brooks (2006) and Eaton et al. (2008), Table 1 summarizes the typical cohort maturation process for Colombian exporters of manufactured goods to the United States. It is based on observed evolution patterns among cohorts of firms that entered the market each year between 1993 and 1999, and it exploits U.S. customs records from 1992 through 2009.

To interpret the figures in this table, imagine for a moment that they describe a particular cohort, say, those firms that first entered the U.S. market in 1993. Then the second row of the Table would imply that only 29 percent of these firms continued exporting through 1994 (column 1), yet these survivors generated 11 percent more export revenue in 1994 than the

⁴Colombian commercialization of coffee is centralized to an important degree by the National Federation of Coffee Growers. A few players also dominate oil exports.

Table 1: Average aggregates by cohort age

| Cohort age | Actual data | | |
|------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|
| | Exporters | Total Exports | Average Exports |
| 1 year | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 years | 0.29 | 1.11 | 3.77 |
| 3 years | 0.18 | 0.93 | 5.03 |
| 4 years | 0.14 | 0.67 | 4.66 |
| 5 years | 0.12 | 0.63 | 5.18 |
| 6 years | 0.10 | 0.51 | 4.99 |
| 7 years | 0.08 | 0.50 | 5.72 |
| 8 years | 0.08 | 0.45 | 5.91 |
| 9 years | 0.07 | 0.39 | 5.58 |
| 10 years | 0.06 | 0.40 | 6.58 |

Notes: Figures for cohorts aged 2-10 are expressed relative to corresponding figures for one-year-old cohorts.

entire cohort did in 1993 (column 2) because sales per surviving cohort member were 3.77 times as large in 1994 as sales per cohort member in 1993 (column 3). Other rows would have analogous interpretations, each normalized relative to the cohort's entry year.

The actual interpretation for Table 1 differs from this one only in that it is an average of all of the cohort-specific tables we can construct using cohorts observed for at least 10 years.⁵ Taking averages saves space but does not affect the basic message, since maturation patterns vary little across cohorts (Appendix tables A.1-A.3).

Column 1 of Table 1 shows the rate of decline in cohort membership is especially high between the first and second year, with more than 70 percent of firms dropping out. But conditional on making it to the second year, the survival probability is much higher, with an attrition rate around 40 percent the second year, and further declines occur thereafter. Thus, in terms of numbers, the most recent cohort is always larger than any previous one, and exporters with more than 15 years of market tenure are rare. For example, firms that were exporting to the United States in 1992 account for less than five percent of the firms exporting to the United States towards the end of the sample.

Column 2 shows that the rapid initial decline in its membership is not accompanied by a similar collapse in total cohort sales. The relative stability of total sales means that sales per firm are growing substantially. Indeed, as can be seen in column 3, sales per surviving exporter more than triple from the first to the second year, increase again in the cohort's third year, and show no strong tendency to grow further or shrink thereafter.

⁵Similar tables for Colombian exports of all goods and to all destinations appear in Eaton, et al (2008).

2.3 Patterns of buyer-seller matches

We next use the data to characterize the buyer-seller matches that took place during 1992-2009.

2.3.1 Monogamous and polygamous matches

The number of Colombian exporters appearing in our sample grew from 2,232 in 1992 to 3,300 in 2009, a growth of 2 percent per annum, while the number of U.S. importing firms grew by 3 percent per annum (Appendix A, Table 16). The number of Colombian exporter-U.S. importer pairs (representing at least one transaction between them in a year) also grew at an annual rate of 2 percent. Roughly 80 percent of matches are monogamous in the sense that the buyer deals with only one Colombian exporter and the exporter ships to only one buyer in the United States. However, since the remainder of the matches are polygamous, the average Colombian exporter was involved in relationships with around 1.3 U.S. firms while the average U.S. buyer was involved with around 2.3 Colombian firms. Both figures declined slightly over the period.

2.3.2 Transition Probabilities

Like firms' exporting stints (Table 1), most of their buyer-seller matches are short-lived. Of the 3,087 matches that existed at the beginning of the period, 70 percent didn't make it to 1993. But, of those that made it into the next year, almost 50 percent made it into the next year. Similarly, of the relationships that existed in 2005, 57 percent started that year but of those that started before, 37 percent had been around at least three years before. Of the 3,210 matches identified in 1992, less than 25 are present every year throughout the period.

Table 2: Transition Probabilities, Number of Clients

| t \ t+1 | Out | Dormant | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6-10 | 11+ |
|---------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Out | . | . | 0.932 | 0.055 | 0.009 | 0.002 | 0.001 | 0.001 | 0.000 |
| Dormant | . | . | 0.876 | 0.100 | 0.015 | 0.008 | . | . | 0.000 |
| 1 | 0.539 | 0.080 | 0.321 | 0.048 | 0.010 | 0.002 | . | 0.001 | . |
| 2 | 0.194 | 0.077 | 0.375 | 0.241 | . | 0.024 | 0.009 | 0.004 | . |
| 3 | 0.090 | 0.042 | 0.220 | 0.271 | 0.210 | 0.092 | . | 0.027 | . |
| 4 | 0.059 | . | 0.129 | 0.216 | 0.215 | 0.184 | 0.083 | 0.095 | . |
| 5 | . | . | 0.095 | 0.184 | 0.181 | 0.181 | 0.126 | 0.178 | . |
| 6-10 | . | . | 0.039 | 0.073 | 0.089 | 0.123 | 0.157 | 0.419 | 0.073 |
| 11+ | . | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | . | . | . | 0.432 | 0.526 |

Table 2 reports the probability with which a Colombian firm participating in certain number of relationships with buyers transits into a different number of relationships the following year. (Confidentiality restrictions prevent us from reporting numbers for cells that are too sparsely populated.) This table reports the annual average for 1992-2009 across all industries. A firm that stops exporting but re-appears as an exporter sometime later in our sample period is considered to have gone "dormant", while those exporters that drop to zero foreign sales for the extent of our sample are considered to have gone "out" of exporting. Those that have never been observed to export constitute the pool of potential entrants.

Among first-time exporters, 93.2 percent sell to only one firm. Of these, 62 percent don't export the next year, and only about six percent go on to establish a larger number of relationships. For firms with three relationships in a year, about twelve percent enter into a larger number of relationships the next year. Hence there is an enormous amount of churning at the lower end. Even for firms with a large number of relationships the most likely outcome is to have fewer the next year.

2.3.3 Ergodic degree distribution

We can ask what this pattern of entry and growth implies about the ergodic distribution of relationships. If we assume that entrants in a year replace exiting firms, the ergodic distribution implied by this transition matrix is given by Table 3.

Table 3: Ergodic Client Distribution Implied by Transitions

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6-10 | 11+ |
|------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Erg Distribution | 0.792 | 0.112 | 0.031 | 0.016 | 0.009 | 0.022 | 0.016 |
| Data | 0.778 | 0.116 | 0.043 | 0.021 | 0.011 | . | . |

For purposes of comparison, the year-specific average share of Colombian firms in each group is reported as well. Note that the ergodic distribution implied by the transition matrix is very close to the cross-sectional distribution in the data, suggesting that over the period we observe the process has been quite stationary. Interestingly, both distributions are very nearly Pareto, reflecting the coexistence of many small scale exporters with a few "super-exporters."

2.3.4 Match maturation

The survival probability of new matches increases with initial sales volume. Table 4 sorts observations on matches according to their size in their first year of existence and reports

year-to-year separation rates. In addition to the very low survival rates, two patterns stand out. First, those matches that begin with sales in the top quartile among all new matches are more likely to survive than matches that begin with smaller sales volumes. Second, survival probabilities improve after the initial year.

Table 4: Separation Rates, by Age of Match and Initial Sales

| | 1 year | 2 years | 3 years | 4 years | 5+ years |
|------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|----------|
| Quartile 1 | 82.9 | 63.2 | 57.3 | 55.0 | 49.7 |
| Quartile 2 | 75.6 | 58.4 | 49.4 | 46.8 | 43.7 |
| Quartile 3 | 67.7 | 52.1 | 44.6 | 40.8 | 37.6 |
| Quartile 4 | 52.1 | 44.5 | 40.3 | 39.2 | 36.7 |

Further features of the match maturation process are evident in Figure 1, which shows average annual sales per match, broken down by initial size quartile. For each size quartile, matches are further distinguished according to their total life span: less than one year (life=0), 1 to 2 years (life=1), and so forth. And for each cluster of bars, the left-most bar corresponds to sales in the initial year of the match’s existence, the next bar corresponds to sales during the second year of the match’s existence, and so forth.

The first message of these graphs is that initial sales are a good predictor of sales in subsequent years, conditioning on survival. Those matches with first-year sales in the smallest quartile systematically generated the lowest annual sales in subsequent years, and more generally, first-year sales are monotonically related to annual sales in subsequent years. (Note the different scales of the vertical axes in different panels of Figure 1.) Second, sales tend to jump from the first to the second year, in large part because observations on a match’s first year correspond to less than a full calendar year. (There is an analogous effect at work in the final year of a match’s life.) Looking at complete-year observations reveals a tendency for annual sales to grow among matches that start small and survive, but no such tendency among matches that start in the largest quartile. Finally, looking across matches with different life spans, those that survive more years tend to have higher sales in all (full) years than matches that fail relatively quickly. This pattern is robust across matches in the different quartiles for initial sales.




Figure 1: Average annual sales per match, by initial size quartile

3 A Model of Exporting at the Transactions Level

We now develop a model of exporter behavior consistent with the patterns reviewed above. Buyer-seller relationships form and disband at irregular intervals. Similarly, export shipments are discrete events distributed unevenly through time. To capture these features of the data, and to allow agents to update their behavior each time their circumstances change, we formulate our model in continuous time, treating all of the exogenous processes in our model as Markov jump processes.

Explaining the evolution of a firm's exports and domestic sales requires modeling both its sales to existing buyers and the evolution of its portfolio of clients. We can treat these two components sequentially. We first consider the relationship between a seller and an individual buyer. Having characterized the seller's profits from a relationship with an individual buyer, we then turn to her learning about the popularity of her product, i.e., the chance that a potential buyers likes her product. Finally, we characterize her search for buyers.

3.1 A Seller-Buyer Relationship

This section characterizes the profit streams that sellers generate from successful business relationships. The expressions we develop here describe relationships between domestic firms

and foreign buyers, but with appropriate relabelling of market-wide variables they apply equally to relationships between domestic firms and domestic buyers.

3.1.1 Profits from a single shipment

Several features of our model are standard. First, at any time t seller j can hire workers at a wage w_t in real local currency units, each of whom can produce $\varphi_j \in \{\varphi^1, \dots, \varphi^{N_\varphi}\}$ units of output.⁶ Hence seller j 's unit cost in local currency is w_t/φ_j . If she sells at price p_{jt} in foreign currency her unit profit in local currency is

$$p_{jt}/e_t - w_t/\varphi_j, \quad (1)$$

where e_t is the exchange rate. Second, goods markets are monopolistically competitive and each producer supplies a unique differentiated product.

Once buyer i has agreed to form a business relationship with seller j , he periodically places sales orders with j . For j , an order from i that arrives at time t generates revenue:

$$X_{ijt} = \left(\frac{p_{jt}}{P_t} \right)^{1-\eta} y_{ijt} \bar{X}_t, \quad (2)$$

where $\eta > 1$ is buyers' elasticity of demand, p_{jt} is the price of seller j 's product, \bar{X}_t is the average spending level among all potential foreign buyers, P_t is the relevant price index for all competing products in the foreign market, and $y_{ijt} \in \{y^1, \dots, y^{N_y}\}$ is a time-varying demand shifter idiosyncratic to the ij relationship.⁷

For simplicity, and to keep the analysis as close as possible to other heterogenous firm models, we assume that the seller posts a non-negotiable price, charging the optimal markup over unit cost:⁸

$$p_{jt} = \frac{\eta}{\eta - 1} \frac{e_t w_t}{\varphi_j} \quad (3)$$

By (1), (2), and (3), an order from buyer i at time t therefore generates the following profits for seller j :

$$\pi_{ijt} = \frac{1}{\eta} \frac{\bar{X}_t}{e_t} \left(\frac{e_t w_t \eta / (\eta - 1)}{\varphi_j P_t} \right)^{1-\eta} y_{ijt}.$$

⁶We treat φ as time-invariant to facilitate model identification. Other sources of idiosyncratic temporal variation in sales will be discussed shortly.

⁷Not all buyers necessarily face the same range of goods and hence the same aggregate price index P . We treat idiosyncratic components of the price index as P as reflected in y_{ijt} .

⁸An alternative specification would introduce bilateral bargaining between buyer and seller.

We can combine all the macroeconomic variables affecting the profit of any seller from this source selling in this destination, along with constants, as:

$$x_t = \frac{1}{\eta} \frac{\bar{X}_t}{e} \left(\frac{e_t w_t \eta / (\eta - 1)}{P_t} \right)^{1-\eta},$$

where $x \in \{x^1, \dots, x^{N_x}\}$ is general to all potential buyers in the foreign market. Suppressing subscripts on state variables, this allows us to write the profits from a sale as:

$$\pi_\varphi(x, y) = x \varphi^{\eta-1} y, \quad (4)$$

In what follows, (4) is all we take from our specification of preferences and pricing behavior into the dynamic analysis. Any set of assumptions that deliver this simple multiplicative expression for a firm's profit from a sale would serve us equally well.

3.1.2 Relationship dynamics

At any point in time, each seller maintains business relationships with an endogenous number of buyers. These relationships form as a consequence of a search process that will be characterized in the following section, and they dissolve for several reasons. First, there is a constant exogenous hazard δ that any particular relationship will terminate, which could be due to the demise of the buyer or the buyer no longer finding the seller's product useful. Second, after each sale to a particular buyer, the seller evaluates whether it is worth sustaining her relationship with him. Doing so keeps the possibility of future sales to him alive, but it also means paying the fixed costs F of maintaining the account, providing technical support, and maintaining client-specific product adjustments.⁹

When deciding whether to maintain a particular business relationship, the seller knows her own type, φ , the macro state, x and profits from the current sale, $\pi_\varphi(x, y)$ to the buyer in question. She can therefore infer this buyer's current y value and calculate the value of her relationship with him to be:

$$\tilde{\pi}_\varphi(x, y) = \pi_\varphi(x, y) + \max\{\hat{\pi}_\varphi(x, y) - F, 0\}.$$

Here $\hat{\pi}_\varphi(x, y)$ is the expected value of continuing a relationship that is currently in state (x, y) . Clearly the seller terminates this relationship if $\hat{\pi}_\varphi(x, y) < F$.

If a seller pays F to keep a relationship active, and if the relationship does not end

⁹For instance, Colombian producers of construction materials interviewed for a related project (Domínguez et al, 2013) referred that it is frequent for foreign buyers to request adjustments in the specifications of products or packages. In turn, these require adjustments in the production process that are costly to maintain.

anyway for exogenous reasons, one of several events will next affect it: with hazard λ^b the buyer will place another order, with hazard $q_{xx'}^X$ x will jump to some new marketwide state $x' \neq x$, or with hazard $q_{yy'}^Y$ y will jump to some new buyer-specific shock $y' \neq y$.¹⁰ Let τ_b be the random time that elapses until one of these events occurs. Given that x and y are Markov jump processes, τ_b is distributed exponentially with parameter $\lambda^b + \lambda_x^X + \lambda_y^Y$, where

$$\lambda_x^X = \sum_{x' \neq x} q_{xx'}^X \quad (5)$$

and

$$\lambda_y^Y = \sum_{y' \neq y} q_{yy'}^Y, \quad (6)$$

are the hazards of transiting from x to any $x' \neq x$, and from y to any $y' \neq y$, respectively. Then assuming the seller has a discount factor ρ , the continuation value $\hat{\pi}_\varphi(x, y)$ solves the Bellman equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\pi}_\varphi(x, y) &= \mathbf{E}_{\tau_b} \left[e^{-(\rho+\delta)\tau_b} \frac{1}{\lambda^b + \lambda_x^X + \lambda_y^Y} \left(\sum_{x' \neq x} q_{xx'}^X \hat{\pi}_\varphi(x', y) + \sum_{y' \neq y} q_{yy'}^Y \hat{\pi}_\varphi(x, y') + \lambda^b \tilde{\pi}_\varphi(x, y) \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\rho + \delta + \lambda^b + \lambda_x^X + \lambda_y^Y} \left(\sum_{x' \neq x} q_{xx'}^X \hat{\pi}_\varphi(x', y) + \sum_{y' \neq y} q_{yy'}^Y \hat{\pi}_\varphi(x, y') + \lambda^b \tilde{\pi}_\varphi(x, y) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Before a seller has met her next buyer, she does not know what state y this buyer will happen to be in. So when choosing her search intensity for new business relationships, she must base her decisions on the ex ante expected pay-off to forming a new business relationship. Given the market state x , a type- φ seller calculates this expected value as:

$$\tilde{\pi}_\varphi(x) = \sum_s \Pr(y^s) \tilde{\pi}_\varphi(x, y).$$

where $\Pr(y^s)$ is the probability that a randomly selected buyer is currently in state $y^s \in \{y^1, \dots, y^{N_y}\}$.¹¹

For the purposes of the search model that follows, all that matters about an individual relationship is $\tilde{\pi}_\varphi(x)$, and this object can be estimated directly from data on the revenue streams generated by matches. Nonetheless, the history of a seller's interactions with a

¹⁰Since sales in the data are discrete events rather than flows, we model the buyer's purchases accordingly. We think of the buyer not as making use of the products continually but in discrete spurts. For example, the buyer might be a producer of a product that it makes in batches. At the completion of each batch it buys inputs for the next batch.

¹¹Here we take the probabilities $\Pr(y^m)$ to be the ergodic distribution of y implied by the transition hazards $q_{yy'}^Y$. We could assume that the distribution at the time of the first purchase is different from the ergodic one.

given buyer affects its overall sales trajectory and hence matters for our characterization of aggregate export dynamics.

Hereafter, we will denote the expected value of a relationship with a foreign buyer by $\tilde{\pi}_\varphi^f(x)$ and the expected value of a relationship with a home market buyer by $\tilde{\pi}_\varphi^h(x)$. These two objects are calculated in the same way, but since expenditure levels (\bar{X}_t) and price indices (P_t) differ across markets, and no exchange rate factor e is necessary for domestic profit calculations, each has its own process for the market-wide state variable, x . These market-wide demand shifters are denoted x^f and x^h below.

3.2 Learning about Product Appeal

In each market, sellers conduct market-specific searches for buyers. When searching in market $m \in \{h, f\}$, each recognizes that some fraction $\theta^m \in [0, 1]$ of the potential buyers she meets there will be willing to do business with her. An encounter with one of these willing buyers generates an expected profit stream worth $\tilde{\pi}_{\varphi, x}^m$, while an encounter with any of the remaining potential buyers does not generate a sale then or subsequently.

Each seller's θ^h and θ^f values are drawn before she has met any clients. These draws remain fixed through time, inducing permanent cross-market differences in her product's popularity. All θ^m draws are independently beta-distributed across sellers and markets:

$$b(\theta^m | \alpha, \beta) = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta)}{\Gamma(\alpha)\Gamma(\beta)} (\theta^m)^{\alpha-1} (1 - \theta^m)^{\beta-1}, \quad m \in \{h, f\},$$

where $\Gamma(\phi) = \int_0^\infty z^{\phi-1} e^{-z} dz$ is the gamma function (needed to ensure that the distribution has the proper limits). However, the independence of θ^h and θ^f does not mean sellers' domestic and foreign sales are likewise independent. Rather, cross-market correlation in sales will be induced by the firm type φ , which can be viewed as capturing aspects of product appeal that are common to both markets.¹²

Benchmark model: Sellers are presumed to have already met many potential customers in the domestic market, and thus to have learned their θ^h draws. But sellers typically have far less experience abroad, so in the benchmark version of our model, we allow them to still be learning about their θ^f draws. Specifically, each seller recognizes that for any given θ^f , the probability a random sample of n potential foreign buyers will yield a customers is

¹²The firm effect is similarly interpreted to reflect both productive efficiency and product appeal in Melitz (2003) and many other papers based on CES demand systems. However in the present context, the global aspects of product appeal captured by φ are qualitatively distinct from the market-specific product appeal effects captured by θ . The former determines the amount of a product each buyer purchases, given that he is interested, while the latter determines what fraction of potential buyers are willing to place orders with the seller, should they happen to meet her.

binomially distributed:

$$q[a|n, \theta^f] = \binom{n}{a} [\theta^f]^a [1 - \theta^f]^{n-a}.$$

So after she has met n^f potential buyers abroad, a^f of whom were willing to buy her product, a seller's posterior beliefs about her θ^f draw are distributed:

$$p(\theta^f|a^f, n^f) \propto q[a^f|n^f, \theta^f] \cdot b(\theta^f|\alpha, \beta)$$

where the factor of proportionality is the inverse of the integral of the right-hand side over the support of θ^f . Since the beta distribution is the conjugate prior for the binomial, a firm's expected success rate after a successes in n trials has a convenient closed-form representation:

$$\bar{\theta}_{a,n}^f = E[\theta^f|a^f, n^f] = \int_0^1 \theta p(\theta|a^f, n^f) d\theta = \frac{a^f + \alpha}{n^f + \alpha + \beta}. \quad (7)$$

This posterior mean converges to $p \lim \left(\frac{a^f}{n^f} \right) = \theta^f$ as n gets large.

No-learning model: As an alternative to our benchmark model, we consider the possibility that sellers already know their product's popularity in *both* markets, so that $p(\theta^f|a^f, n^f)$ is a degenerate distribution and $\bar{\theta}_{a,n}^f = \theta^f$. In this version of the model, sellers' matching histories only affect their search intensities by affecting their visibility in each market, as we will discuss shortly. Our no-learning model is not nested by the benchmark model, it is simply a different characterization of the role of information in driving search policies.

3.3 Searching for Buyers

To complete our characterization of firms' behavior, we now consider sellers' search intensities in each market. Each seller continuously chooses the market-specific hazard s^m , $m \in \{h, f\}$, with which she encounters a potential buyer, recognizing that this involves the instantaneous flow cost $c^m(s^m, a^m)$, where $c^m(s^m, a^m)$ is increasing and convex in s^m .¹³ Whether $c^m(s^m, a^m)$ increases or decreases in the number of successful matches, a^m , depends upon the relative strength of several forces and will be left for the data to determine. Costs might fall with a^m because encounters with interested buyers increase the seller's visibility and enhance her

¹³Interviews conducted with Colombian exporters revealed a variety of activities firms pursue to meet potential buyers abroad (Domínguez, et al, 2013). Ranked roughly in terms of decreasing cost, these included maintaining a foreign sales office; paying the exports promotion office to organize visits with prospective clients abroad, and sending their sales representatives to those visits; sending sales representatives abroad to visit potential clients on their own; attending trade fairs; paying a researcher to search the web for foreign firms that purchase products similar to their own; paying browsers to ensure that their site appear near the top of a search for their product type; maintaining a web site in English. Interviewees also reported that relatively low-cost activities, such as traveling to trade fairs, or translating their websites to English, led to relationships with one or two clients every few years. Establishing a larger network of clients required much more costly activities.

opportunities to meet additional potential buyers. Alternatively, costs might rise if the pool of easy-to-reach buyers becomes "fished out," as in Arkolakis (2007).

We can now describe optimal search behavior, beginning with the foreign market. Recall that when the foreign market state is x^f , a type- φ seller expects the value of a new business relationship will be $\tilde{\pi}_\varphi^f(x^f)$. Further, she believes the next match will yield such a relationship with probability $\bar{\theta}_{a,n}^f$. Combined with search cost function $c^f(s^f, a^f)$ and the jump process for x^f , these objects imply sellers' optimal search policy abroad.

To characterize this policy, let τ_s^f be the random time interval until the next foreign search event, which could be either a change in the marketwide state x^f or an encounter with a potential buyer. Then, suppressing market superscripts, the optimal search intensity s for a type- φ firm with foreign market search history (a, n) solves the following the Bellman equation:

$$V_\varphi(a, n, x) = \max_s \mathbf{E}_{\tau_s} \left[-c(s, a) \int_0^{\tau_s} e^{-\rho t} dt + \frac{e^{-\rho \tau_s}}{s + \lambda_x^X} \cdot \left(\sum_{x' \neq x} q_{xx'}^X V_\varphi(a, n, x') \right) + s \left[\bar{\theta}_{a,n} (\tilde{\pi}_\varphi(x) + V_\varphi(a + 1, n + 1, x) + (1 - \bar{\theta}_{a,n}) V_\varphi(a, n + 1, x)) \right] \right]$$

(Recall that λ_x^X is given by (5).) Taking expectations over τ_s yields:

$$V_\varphi(a, n, x) = \max_s \frac{1}{\rho + s + \lambda_x^X} \left[-c(s, a) + \sum_{x' \neq x} q_{xx'}^X V_\varphi(a, n, x') + s \left\{ \bar{\theta}_{a,n} [\tilde{\pi}_\varphi(x) + V_\varphi(a + 1, n + 1, x)] + (1 - \bar{\theta}_{a,n}) V_\varphi(a, n + 1, x) \right\} \right] \quad (8)$$

Applying the multiplication rule for differentiation and using expression (8) for $V_\varphi(a, n, x)$, the optimal search intensity s^* satisfies:

$$\frac{\partial c(s^*, a)}{\partial s} = \bar{\theta}_{a,n} [\tilde{\pi}_\varphi(x) + V_\varphi(a + 1, n + 1, x)] + (1 - \bar{\theta}_{a,n}) V_\varphi(a, n + 1, x) - V_\varphi(a, n, x) \quad (9)$$

That is, the marginal cost of search must equal the expected marginal benefit of a match, which includes the expected value of the associated profit stream, $\bar{\theta}_{a,n} \tilde{\pi}_\varphi(x)$, and the expected value of the information generated.

Now consider the home market. Since we assume sellers have already learned their true success rates at home, θ_j^h , new encounters do not influence expectations, and we need not condition the value function or the expected success rate on search histories. Again

suppressing market superscripts, the Bellman equation collapses to:

$$V_\varphi(x, a) = \max_s \frac{1}{\rho + \lambda_x^X} \left[-c(s, a) + \sum_{x' \neq x} q_{xx'}^X V_\varphi(x', a) + s \left\{ \theta_j^h [\tilde{\pi}_\varphi(x) + V_\varphi(a+1, x)] + (1 - \theta_j^h) V_\varphi(a, x) \right\} \right] \quad (10)$$

and the first-order condition is simply:

$$\frac{\partial c(s^*, a)}{\partial s} = \theta_j^h [\tilde{\pi}_\varphi(x) + V_\varphi(a+1, x) - V_\varphi(a, x)].$$

The marginal cost of search equals the expected profit from a successful relationship times the probability of success. Of course, this condition also describes foreign market search in the no-learning version of the model.

4 An empirical version of the model

4.1 The search cost function

To implement our model empirically, we impose additional structure in several respects. First, we specify a functional form for our search cost function. Generalizing Arkolakis (2007) to allow for network effects, we write these costs as:

$$c^m(s^m, a^m) = \kappa_0^m \frac{[(1 + s^m)]^{\kappa_1} - 1}{\kappa_1 [1 + \ln(1 + a^m)]^\gamma}. \quad (11)$$

where $m \in \{h, f\}$. Several properties of this function merit note. First, marginal costs fall at a rate determined by γ with the number of successful matches a seller has already made, so $\gamma > 0$ implies “network” effects and $\gamma < 0$ implies “congestion” effects.¹⁴ Second, a seller who is not searching in a particular market incurs no search cost: $c^m(0, a^m) = 0$. Third, given the cumulative number of successful matches, a , the marginal cost of search increases with s at a rate determined by κ_1 : $\frac{\partial c^m(s^m, a^m)}{\partial s^m} = \kappa_0^m (1 + s^m)^{\kappa_1 - 1} / [1 + \ln(1 + a)]^\gamma$. Fourth, we allow the cost function scalar to vary across markets, since the cost of maintaining any given level of visibility is likely to be higher in foreign markets. Finally, since a^m is the cumulative number of successes in market m , network effects endure, even if a firm is not actively searching.

¹⁴To contain the dimensionality of the computational problem we solve, we assume that firms with more than a^* buyers have (i) exhausted their learning effects, and (ii) reap no additional network effects at the margin from further matches. We choose a^* to exceed the observed maximum a for 99 percent of sellers in the foreign (United States) market. Also, we set $a = a^*$ for all sellers in their home (Colombian) market.

4.2 Processes for exogenous state variables

Next we impose more structure on the exogenous state variables, φ , x^h , x^f , y^h and y^f . All are assumed to have zero means in logs, and the net effect of these normalizations is undone by introducing scalars Π^h and Π^f into the home and foreign profit functions, respectively:

$$\pi_\varphi^f(x^f, y^f) = \Pi^f x^f \varphi^{\eta-1} y^f, \quad (12)$$

$$\pi_\varphi^h(x^h, y^h) = \Pi^h x^h \varphi^{\eta-1} y^h \quad (13)$$

More substantively, we impose that the cross-firm distribution of φ is log normal with variance parameter σ_φ , and we treat all of the Markov jump processes (x^h, y^h, x^f, y^f) as independent Ehrenfest diffusion processes. The idiosyncratic match shocks, y^f and y^h , are assumed to share the same distribution, but we allow the x^f and x^h processes to differ. Among other things, the latter accommodates the fact that the exchange rate affects aggregate demand and price indices in the two markets differently.

Any variable z generated by an Ehrenfest process can be discretized into $2g + 1$ possible values, $g \in I^+ : z \in \{-g\Delta, -(g-1)\Delta, \dots, 0, \dots, (g-1)\Delta, g\Delta\}$. Further, it jumps to a new value with hazard λ_z , and given that a jump occurs, it goes to z' according to:

$$z' = \begin{cases} z + \Delta \\ z - \Delta \\ \text{other} \end{cases} \text{ with probability } \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{z}{g\Delta}\right) \\ \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{z}{g\Delta}\right) \\ 0 \end{cases}.$$

Thus, given a grid size g , the intensity matrices $Q^X = \{q_{ij}^X\}_{i,j=1,N^X}$ and $Q^Y = \{q_{ij}^Y\}_{i,j=1,N^Y}$ that were introduced in section 3.1 are each block-diagonal and characterized by a single parameter, Δ .

5 Estimation

5.1 Stage 1: estimating observable jump processes

Shimer (2005) shows that if z follows a continuous time Ehrenfest diffusion process, it asymptotes to an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process with mean zero as the fineness of the grid increases:¹⁵

$$dz = -\mu z dt + \sigma dW.$$

¹⁵Specifically, replacing the parameter vector (λ, g, Δ) with $(\lambda/\epsilon, g/\epsilon, \Delta\sqrt{\epsilon})$, $\epsilon > 0$, leaves the autocorrelation parameter μ and the instantaneous variance parameter σ unchanged. But as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the innovation dW approaches normal.

Table 5: Market-wide Demand Shifters

| | <i>Parameter</i> | <i>value</i> |
|---------------------------------|------------------|--------------|
| home macro state jump hazard | λ^{x_h} | 1.200 |
| foreign macro state jump hazard | λ^{x_f} | 1.215 |
| home macro state jump size | Δ^{x_h} | 0.003 |
| foreign macro state jump size | Δ^{x_f} | 0.053 |

Here $\mu = \lambda_z/g$, $\sigma = \sqrt{\lambda_z}\Delta$, and W follows a Weiner process. Accordingly, since it is possible to observe proxies for x^f and x^h , these can be viewed as discrete time observations on underlying Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes, and the parameters of these processes can be econometrically estimated. Then, given μ and σ , estimates of Δ and λ for these processes can be inferred.

Measuring x^f as real expenditures on manufacturing goods in the U.S., and measuring x^h as real expenditures on manufacturing goods in Colombia, we obtain the results reported in Table 5.¹⁶ They imply that x^f and x^h both jump 1.2 times per year, on average. However, jumps in the U.S. market tend to be much larger, essentially because they reflect movements in the real exchange rate as well as movement in dollar-denominated expenditures.

5.2 Stage 2: Indirect inference

Our data are relatively uninformative about the rate of time discount ρ and the demand elasticity η , so we do not attempt to estimate either one. For the former we follow convention and assume $\rho = 0.05$. For the latter, following many previous trade papers, we fix the demand elasticity at $\eta = 5$. Also, to limit the size of the estimated parameter vector, we take the exogenous match failure rate to be the observed match failure rate among matches at least 3 years old ($\delta = 0.326$), we take the search cost function to be quadratic in search intensity ($\kappa_1 = 2$), and we assume that the hazard rate for the buyer is once per quarter ($\lambda_y = 4$).¹⁷

All of the remaining parameters we estimate jointly using the transactions data summarized in Section 2 above. These parameters include the market size scalars (Π^h, Π^f), the fixed costs of maintaining a match (F^h, F^f), the parameters of the product appeal distributions (α, β), the dispersion of the productivity distribution (σ_φ), the jump size for the idiosyncratic

¹⁶Our foreign market size measure is the OECD time series on American GDP in 'Industry, including energy' adding imports and subtracting net exports of manufactures. Our home market size measure is real Colombian expenditures on manufacturing goods, taken from DANE. We converted all of the data used for the estimation into real 1992 US dollars, deflating nominal US dollars with the consumer price index available on the US Bureau of Labor Statistic website. We used an official Colombian Peso - US Dollar exchange rate time series downloaded from the Central Bank of Colombia to convert Pesos to nominal US Dollars

¹⁷These last three parameters could in principle be estimated, and in earlier drafts we have done so. However, they have not appeared to be well-identified.

buyer shocks (Δ_y) , the hazard rate for shipments (λ_b) , the network/congestion parameter (γ) , and the market-specific cost function scaling parameters (κ_0^h, κ_0^f) . For notational convenience we collect these parameters in the vector Λ :

$$\Lambda = \left(\Pi^h, \Pi^f, F^h, F^f, \alpha, \beta, \sigma_\varphi, \Delta_y, \lambda_b, \gamma, \kappa_0^h, \kappa_0^f \right)$$

We construct our estimator for Λ using the method of indirect inference (Gouriéroux and Monfort, 1996). That is, for each candidate Λ vector, we use the model to simulate the foreign and domestic transactions of an artificial sample of producers. Then, using these simulated data, we estimate a set of reduced-form regressions that summarize the relationships we want our model to capture. Finally, looking across candidate Λ vectors, we choose the one that makes the regression coefficients from simulated data correspond as closely as possible to the corresponding regression coefficients based on sample data. Algebraically, our estimator is

$$\hat{\Lambda} = \min_{\Lambda} [\bar{m} - m(\Lambda)]' W [\bar{m} - m(\Lambda)],$$

where \bar{m} is a column vector of regression coefficients obtained from sample data, $m(\Lambda)$ is the analogous vector of regression coefficients based on data simulated at Λ , and W is a compatible non-singular weighting matrix. Setting $W^{-1} = \text{var}(\bar{m} - m(\Lambda))$ maximizes the efficiency of this estimator, but any non-singular W will yield consistent estimates. We use a block-diagonal version of $\text{var}(\bar{m} - m(\Lambda))$, with each block corresponding to the moments from a particular regression.

The regressions themselves are reported in Tables 6, 7 and 8. In each table, the data-based regression estimates are reported, and their standard errors are reported below them in parentheses. To facilitate comparisons between the sample and the simulated data, and with no loss of information, we have replaced the intercept of each regression with the mean value of the dependent variable in cases where that was possible.¹⁸ We now briefly describe these regressions and our reasoning in choosing them.

Search policy. The first regression in Table 6 summarizes the effects of firms' market experiences on their search intensity (s). Roughly speaking, this equation can be viewed as a second order approximation to the foreign market policy function (9)—a central object in our model. The dependent variable is a proxy for a firm's foreign market search intensity after n successful matches, namely, the inverse of the time interval between firm j 's n^{th} and $n + 1^{st}$ match. And the right-hand side is a second-order translog function of this firm's cumulative number of successes (a) and cumulative success rate ($\frac{a}{n}$). To deal with firms that have had no successes, we add 1 to a and to $\frac{a}{n}$ before taking logs.

¹⁸Several regressions were done in real pesos within the Colombian national statistical agency (DANE). We are not confident that they can be expressed in units that are strictly comparable to the real dollar units in which U.S. customs records were expressed.

The unit of observation here is an exporter-specific new match, and we define a new match to occur whenever an exporter makes a shipment to a buyer it has not dealt with before. We view this first shipment as a sample of the exporter’s merchandise, so we only consider this match to be successful if it results in at least one additional shipment. This interpretation of the data means we can use customs records to directly infer the cumulative number of successes for each firm j (a_{nj}) after each of its $n \in \{1, \dots, N_j\}$ matches, and the associated cumulative success rates $(\frac{a}{n})_{nj}$.

Interpreting the coefficient estimates for this regression is problematic, both because it includes second order terms and because we have not controlled for the highly nonlinear firm effects generated by φ and θ^f . But evaluation of this equation on a grid of success rates and cumulative successes gives us a crude sense for the relationships implied by our estimates. This exercise shows that search intensity shows little sensitivity to success rates, but it strongly increases with cumulative successes.

Separation policy. Equation (ii) captures a second basic feature of firms’ exporting behavior: match termination policies. Here the unit of observation is seller j ’s i^{th} match in year t , and the dependent variable $D^{exit\ match}$ takes a value of unity when this match is in its final year.¹⁹ Our model implies that matches are more likely to terminate when the idiosyncratic demand shock z_{ijt} and/or the firm’s productivity level φ_j is low. Neither variable is directly observable, so we use several of their correlates as explanatory variables: current match sales, X_{ijt}^f , age of the match, A_{ijt} , and export market tenure, Δ_{ijt} . All variables are expressed in logs and, given the patterns revealed by Table 4, we allow firms in their first year of exporting ($D^{new\ to\ mkt} = 1$) to experience particularly high failure rates.²⁰

Equation (ii) helps to identify the fixed costs of maintaining a foreign match, F^f . That is, conditioning on sales, X_{ijt}^f , matches are more likely to survive when fixed costs are low. Failure rates are also affected by the volatility of z_{ijt} , which is governed by the jump size, λ_y .

Not surprisingly, estimates of equation (ii) reflect the same patterns that we noted in connection with Table 7. Matches in their first year are relatively likely to fail, as are matches that start with relatively small sales volumes. The results also show that exporters with more experience in foreign markets tend to have longer-lived relationships, a feature of the data that our model captures with cross-firm variation in productivity levels, φ .

Match success rates The remaining regressions in Table 4 concern the distribution of success rates, θ . Equation (iii) summarizes the average success rate among active exporters and its relation to the cumulative number of meetings an exporter has had (n). Accordingly

¹⁹Only active matches are included in the sample.

²⁰Note, however, that in Table 7, matches that die after a single shipment are treated as having existed for less than one year, while our model-based estimates treat these cases of single shipments as unsuccessful meetings that did not lead to business relationships.

it is informative about $\alpha/(\alpha + \beta)$ and selection due to learning. Equation (iv) describes dispersion in success rates—i.e., the squared residuals from equation (iii)—among exporters with different experience (n) levels. Both regressions suggest that selection takes place as firms acquire market tenure, since success rates are higher among experienced (high- n) firms, and the dispersion in success rates among such firms is lower.

Client distributions and shipment frequencies. The next set of regressions appears in Table 7. Equation (v) summarizes the information on client distributions in Table 3. Specifically, letting $\Phi(\ell)$ be the fraction of exporters with no more than ℓ active clients, column (v) reports the regression of $\ln(1 - \Phi(\ell))$ on $\ln \ell$ and $(\ln \ell)^2$.²¹ We choose this functional form because earlier studies have found that exporters’ foreign client distributions are approximately Pareto, implying that the relationship between $\ln(1 - \Phi(\ell))$ and $\ln \ell$ is approximately linear. Note that our data confirm a nearly-Pareto client distribution, as the coefficient on the quadratic term is quite small (-0.055).

Equation (v) helps to identify the cost function parameters $(\kappa_0^h, \kappa_0^f, \gamma)$ because the client distribution largely reflects firms’ search intensities. In particular, the network effects captured by the parameter γ determine how much of a search cost discount large (big a) firms enjoy, and thus the “fatness” of the right-hand tail of the client distribution $\Phi(\cdot)$.

Equation (vi), the other regression in Table 7, simply establishes the mean log number of shipments per year per continuing match. It serves as a target for the shipment arrival hazard and obviously helps to identify λ_b .

Match- and firm-level sales Regressions that characterize the time series properties of firms’ exports, cross-firm dispersion in exports, and patterns of correlation between exports and domestic sales are collected in Table 8. These equations are particularly informative about the parameters $(\Pi^h, \Pi^f, F^h, F^f, \sigma_\varphi, \Delta_y)$. Equation (vii) is an AR1 in log match revenues, conditioned on match age and a dummy to control for first-year effects. By the logic reviewed in section 5.1 above, the root (0.826) and root mean square error (1.208) in this AR1 identify the jump size, Δ_y and the cross-firm variance in productivity, σ_φ , up to selection effects. Also, together with equation (ii), the mean log annual revenue per match (10.67) essentially pins down the profit function scalar and the fixed cost of maintaining a foreign match (Π_f, F^f) .

The last four equations in Table 8 involve domestic sales. Since we don’t observe firms’ individual matches in the domestic market, these regressions describe establishment-level

²¹By construction, the intercept of the (non-parametric version of) this regression line must be zero.

panel data merged with Colombian customs records.²² Equations (viii) is an AR1 for home sales, and is thus informative about the extent which firms adjust their domestic connections and their associated match specific sales in response to idiosyncratic shocks. Accordingly, the coefficients in this equation are particularly helpful in identifying κ_0^h and F^h , and the mean squared error helps identify σ_φ and $\alpha/(\alpha + \beta)$. Equation (ix) is a simple projection of firm level exports on firm-level domestic sales. It serves to distinguish market-specific variation in revenues from variation in revenues that is common to both markets. Thus the estimated parameters of this equation, including its mean squared error, are informative about the variance of productivity shocks (σ_φ^2), which are common to both markets, relative to the variance of market-specific appeal draws, θ^h and θ^f .²³

²²More precisely, regressions (viii) through (x) in Table 8 are done using a combination of the Colombian Annual Manufacturing Survey (AMS) and Colombian administrative records of exports transactions. The data used cover 1993-2007. Exports are merged into the AMS using firm identifiers. This is done because the AMS has no export information for 1993-1999, and because the dynamics of aggregate exports reported in the EAM starting in 2004 differ substantially from aggregate reports from other sources.

²³Given the average success rate, $\alpha/(\alpha + \beta)$, the variances of θ^h and θ^f depend only on $\alpha + \beta$.

Table 6: Match hazards, success rates, and endurance

| | (i) $\ln(\lambda_{ij})$ | (ii) $D_{ijt}^{exit\ match}$ | (iii) $\frac{a_{ij}}{n_{ij}}$ | (iv) $u_{a_{ij}/n_{ij}}^2$ |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| mean, dep. variable | 1.767 (0.621e-2) | 0.395 (0.319e-2) | 0.413 (0.153e-2) | 0.091 (0.26e-4) |
| $\ln(1 + n_{ij})$ | — | — | 0.093 (0.003) | -0.056 (0.000) |
| $\ln(1 + n_{ij})^2$ | -0.818 (0.113) | — | — | — |
| $[\ln(1 + a_{ij})]^2$ | 0.312 (0.017) | — | — | — |
| $\ln(1 + \frac{a_{ij}}{n_{ij}})$ | -1.132 (0.296) | — | — | — |
| $[\ln(1 + \frac{a}{n})]^2$ | 2.451 (0.396) | — | — | — |
| $\ln(1 + a_{ij}) \cdot \ln(1 + \frac{a_{ij}}{n_{ij}})$ | -0.708 (0.134) | — | — | — |
| $D_{ijt}^{new\ to\ mkt}$ | — | 0.034 (0.011) | — | — |
| $\ln X_{ijt}^f$ | — | -0.031 (0.002) | — | — |
| $\ln A_{ijt}$ | — | -0.054 (0.009) | — | — |
| $\ln \Delta_{jt}$ | — | -0.028 (0.007) | — | — |
| observations (rounded) | 38,500 | 23,500 | 35,800 | 35,800 |

Notes: Unit of observation, columns *i*, *iii* and *iv*: seller *j*'s *i*th match. Unit of observation, column *ii*: seller *j*'s *i*th match in its *t*th year. λ_{ij} = inverse of time interval between commencement of match *i* and commencement of the next one for exporter *j*. $D_{ijt}^{exitmatch} = 1$ if exporter *j*'s *i*th match dies in year *t*. a_{ij} = cumulative number of successes for exporter *j* at time of match *i*. $D_{ijt}^{newtomkt} = 1$ if exporter *j*'s *i*th match is in its first year. $\ln A_{ijt}$ = log age of exporter *j*'s *i*th match. $\ln \Delta_{jt}$ = log age of exporter *j* in year *t*. X_{ijt}^f = foreign sales volume generated by exporter *j*'s *i*th match.

Table 7: Client distribution and shipment frequency

| | (v) $\ln(1 - \Phi(\ell))$ | (vi) $\ln(s_{ijt})$ |
|---------------------|------------------------------|------------------------|
| mean, dep. variable | -5.973 (2.173) | 0.971 (0.004) |
| $\ln(\ell)$ | -1.8813 (0.1123) | - |
| $(\ln \ell)^2$ | -0.0545 (0.0211) | - |
| sample restrictions | $\ell > 0$ | $s_{ijt} > 0$ |

Notes: ℓ : number of active clients; $\Phi()$ = cumulative distribution of exporters in terms of ℓ ; s_{ijt} = number of shipments per year to client i by exporter j in year t

Table 8: Home and foreign sales regressions

| | (vii) $\ln X_{ijt}^f$ | (viii) $\ln X_{jt}^h$ | (ix) $\ln X_{jt}^f$ | (x) D_{jt}^f | (xi) $\frac{X_{jt}^f}{X_{jt}^f + X_{jt}^h}$ |
|---------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|--|
| mean, dep. variable | 10.665 (0.002) | - | - | 0.102 (0.003) | 0.127 (0.002) |
| R_{ijt-1} | 0.328 (0.018) | - | - | - | - |
| $\ln X_{ijt-1}^f$ | 0.826 (0.004) | - | - | - | - |
| $\ln X_{jt-1}^h$ | - | 0.976 (0.029) | - | - | - |
| $\ln X_{jt}^h$ | - | - | 0.323 (0.110) | - | - |
| $\ln \Delta_t$ | 0.063 (0.014) | - | - | - | - |
| root mse | 1.2079 | 0.4621 | 2.1665 | 0.303 | 0.243 |
| sample restrictions | $X_{ijt}^f, X_{ijt-1}^f > 0$ | $X_{jt}^h, X_{jt-1}^h > 0$ | $X_{jt}^f, X_{jt}^h > 0$ | $X_{jt}^h > 0$ | $X_{jt}^f, X_{jt}^h > 0$ |

Notes: $R_{ijt} = 1$ if exporter j 's i^{th} match is in its first year. $\ln \Delta_{jt} = \log$ age of exporter j . X_{ijt}^f = foreign sales volume generated by exporter j 's i^{th} match. X_{jt}^f = total foreign sales volume generated by firm j . X_{jt}^h = total home sales volume generated by firm j . $D_{jt}^f = 1$ if firm j is an exporter.

Finally, equations (x) and (xi) describe the relative importance of home versus foreign sales. The former gives the share of firms that participate in the foreign market and thereby speaks to the relative return to maintaining foreign versus domestic business connections, that is (Π^f, F^f, κ_0^f) versus (Π^h, F^h, κ_0^h) . The latter gives the average share of exports to the U.S. in total sales of exporting firms. Accordingly, it largely reflects the number of clients in each market, and thus responds especially to differences between κ_0^f and κ_0^h .

Sensitivity analysis As suggested by Andrews et al. (2017), we check which moments are important using the sample analog to the matrix $(G'WG)^{-1}G'W$ where $G = \frac{-\partial[m(\Lambda)]}{\partial\Lambda'}$ is the Jacobian for the vector of simulated moments. "Intuitively, this matrix is a local approximation to the mapping from moments to estimated parameters." (Andrews, et al., 2017, p. 1555) Evaluated at our benchmark estimates (to be discussed), we obtain the results reported in detail in Appendix C. Here we summarize the patterns that emerge.

First, most parameters respond to many moments rather than one or several. Limiting our attention to elasticities with absolute value greater than 0.1, most parameters show significant responses to at least 5 moments, and several (F^f, F^h, γ) respond to more than 15. All parameters respond to at least 2. The moments that affect the most parameters are those generated by the match sales autogression (equation *vii*), the shipping rate regression (equation *vi*), the domestic sales autoregression (equation *viii*), the regression explaining the variance in success rates (equation *iv*), and the fraction of firms that export (equation *x*).

5.3 Parameter estimates

Table 9 reports estimates of the structural parameter vector Λ for both the benchmark and the no-learning model. Although our estimator exploits month-to-month transitions in the customs records, all hazards are normalized so that the unit of time is one year. Thus, for example, our estimate of δ implies that on average, matches last roughly 4 months (one-third of a year) before separating for exogenous reasons. Most parameter estimates are similar for both models, though the benchmark model fits the data better. **[Report non-nested test here?]** We therefore focus our discussion on the results for this model, turning later to the main distinguishing features of the no-learning results.

Benchmark parameter estimates Active matches generate an average of $\lambda_b = 15.43$ shipments per year, and the profits associated with these shipments vary widely across firms and macro conditions. Evaluating the gross profit-per-shipment functions (12) and (13) at our estimated values for Π^h, Π^f and the parameters governing realizations for φ, x , and y , we find that gross profits per shipment (before fixed costs) for a firm at the median productivity level matched to a median buyer are essentially zero. Accordingly, these firms are not active.

On the other hand, a firm with productivity 1.9 standard deviations above the mean earns gross profits per shipment ranging from \$US 4 to \$US 42, depending upon what state its buyer is in. In the domestic market, the analogous figures range from \$US 45 to \$US 405. Further, a firm with the highest productivity matched to the best possible buyer in the most favorable macro state earns \$US 31,512 in gross profits per export shipment and \$US 281,570 in profit per domestic shipment. Of course, firms almost never attain these maxima, and when they do they are very unlikely to repeat their performance. This is consequence of the short expected life span of matches, and the fact that buyers' demands change an average of $\lambda_y = 4$ times per year.

These figures may seem small, but they are consistent with the data. First, the productivity distribution for exporting firms come from the right-hand tail of the unconditional productivity distribution. Thus those firms with productivity 1.9 standard deviations above the mean unconditional mean of φ are actually the smaller exporters. Second, since revenues per shipment are $\eta = 5$ times profits per shipment, and since an average of $\lambda_b = 15.43$ shipment occur per year, expected annual revenues from a match that survives the entire year are $\eta \cdot \lambda_b = 77.15$ times as large as profits per shipment for that match.

Turning to the fixed cost estimates, note that both are quite small ($F^f = \$0.30$, $F^h = \$0.03$). These costs thus have no affect on major exporters. Nonetheless, they affect the fraction of exporting firms by keeping fringe players that would otherwise sell tiny amounts out of foreign markets.

The profit and cost function scalars are much more important. The model assigns lower search costs to the home market ($\kappa_0^h = 859.0$ versus $\kappa_0^f = 3,079.7$) and larger profits per sale ($\ln \Pi^h = -3.88$ versus $\ln \Pi^f = -6.16$). Both patterns help explain the small of output exported to the U.S. among these firms (Table 8, regression *xi*). And the two sets of scalars are separately identified by their different effects on match arrival rates (Table 4, regression *i*) and revenues from ongoing matches (Table 8, regressions *vii* and *viii*). The benchmark model also implies that search costs fall significantly as firms acquire market visibility through successful matches ($\gamma = 0.383$). As mentioned earlier, identification of this visibility effect comes largely from the shape of the client distribution (Table 7, regression *v*).

So what are the costs of making new matches? For a firm with no prior successful matches in the foreign market, a search intensity sufficient to yield an average of one new match per year costs $c^f(1, 0) = \$US 1,539$, but an expected yield of four new matches—about one successful match for a firm with average product appeal—costs $c^f(4, 0) = \$US 24,637$. The analogous figures in the home market are $c^h(1, 0) = \$US 428$ and $c^h(4, 0) = \$US 6,848$. But having an established reputation is helpful. A firm that has already made 2 successful foreign matches could expect to pay only $c^f(4, 2) = \$US 20,142$ for the next one—roughly 20 percent less than the cost of the first one. Similarly, a firm that has already made two

Table 9: Structural parameter estimates

| | <i>Parameter</i> | Benchmark model | | No-learning model | |
|--|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| | | <i>value</i> | <i>std. error</i> | <i>value</i> | <i>std. error</i> |
| log domestic profit scalar | $\ln \Pi^h$ | -3.879 | (0.1364) | -3.460 | (0.0725) |
| log foreign profit scalar | $\ln \Pi^f$ | -6.135 | (0.1993) | -6.273 | (0.0759) |
| fixed cost, domestic | F^h | 0.027 | (0.0047) | 0.037 | (0.0064) |
| fixed cost, foreign | F^f | 0.296 | (0.0428) | 0.301 | (0.0359) |
| First θ distribution parameter | α | 0.571 | (0.0454) | 0.581 | (0.0703) |
| Second θ distribution parameter | β | 1.894 | (0.2320) | 4.661 | (0.2107) |
| demand shock jump size | Δ^y | 1.882 | (0.2222) | 1.951 | (0.1810) |
| shipment order arrival hazard | λ_b | 15.426 | (0.1991) | 15.431 | (0.1428) |
| std. deviation, log firm type | σ_φ | 1.386 | (0.0095) | 1.401 | (0.0051) |
| network effect parameter | γ | 0.383 | (0.0485) | 0.508 | (0.0479) |
| home search cost function scalar | $\ln \kappa_0^h$ | 11.722 | (0.1486) | 12.408 | (0.0850) |
| foreign search cost function scalar | $\ln \kappa_0^f$ | 13.002 | (0.0095) | 13.666 | (0.1373) |
| fit metric | | 10.806 | | 11.346 | |

successful home market matches could expect to pay $c^h(4, 2) = \$US\ 5,598$ for the third. These reputation effects are nontrivial, and other things equal, they create a cost advantage for well-established firms.

Given match payoffs and search costs, firms' search intensity is determined by their expected success rates. Their (unobserved) actual rates are drawn from a beta distribution, which we estimate to have mean $\alpha/(\alpha+\beta) = 0.23$ and standard deviation $\sqrt{\alpha\beta/[(\alpha+\beta)^2(\alpha+\beta+1)]} = 0.23$. Hence, before they acquire export market experience, firms expect that roughly 1 in 4 new encounters with potential buyers will lead to business relationships. And since new exporters are uncertain about their θ^f draws, they expect to learn a good deal from the outcomes of their early matches.

No-learning parameter estimates Recall that our no-learning model differs from the benchmark model in that it presumes each firm j already know the fraction of the foreign population of buyers that is willing to do business with it, θ_j^f . This assumption implies that low-appeal firms never bother to invest much in foreign market searches, and firms that do search abroad have less incentive to do so intensively when they are new to the market. That is, the information value of matches is no longer present.

The last two columns of Table 9 present parameter estimates based on this version of the model. Most parameters are similar, but the estimate of the network effect is larger ($\gamma = 0.50$ versus $\gamma = 0.38$) and the estimates of search costs are higher ($\kappa_0^h = 859$ and $\kappa_0^f = 3,079$ versus $\kappa_0^h = 1,826$ and $\kappa_0^f = 5,982$). Higher search costs scalars and larger network effects appear to help the model explain the observed pattern of small, gradual growth and eventual dominance of high- θ entrants without relying on learning effects. However, the no-learning

version of the model does significantly worse than the benchmark version according to Rivers and Vuong’s (2002) test statistic for non-nested comparisons: **XX**.

6 Analysis of results

6.1 Model fit

Appendix D juxtaposes the data-based moments, \bar{m} , with their simulated counterparts, $m(\Lambda)$, from the benchmark model. Generally, the patterns in the data are replicated by our model, though not all of the model-based equation estimates correspond closely to their data-based counterparts. In particular, average exporting rates, match-specific sales dynamics, and the client distribution are well-captured by the model, as are most mean values of dependent variables. However the model fails to generate the association between success rates and firms’ search intensities that we observe in the data. A more detailed summary of the fit can be found in Appendix D.

Since we have not targeted the patterns described in Section 2 when estimating, it is instructive to ask how well they are replicated by our model. Tables 10, 11 and 12 below provide answers. In the top panel of table 10, the information in Tables 1-3 is collapsed by averaging across exporting cohorts for which we observe at least 10 years of data. (These cohorts were born in the years 1997 through 2002.) Values of each aggregate for 2-year olds, 3-year olds, and so on are expressed as fractions of the corresponding values for 1-year olds. For example, the data tell us that, on average, only 29 percent of the exporters who began exporting in year t were still exporting in year $t+1$, and only 5 percent of those that began exporting in year t were present in year $t+9$. Likewise, among Colombian exporters that survive in the U.S. market for 10 years, average exports per firm are 6.58 times as large as they are among exporters that are in their first year of exporting.

The bottom panel of Table 10 shows corresponding figures based on model-simulated data. Qualitatively, the patterns in the actual and the simulated data match up. For both data sets, the largest drops in the number of exporters occur during the first two years, thereafter cohort size drops gradually. Likewise, total exports rise early in cohort’s life, and decline thereafter. Finally, exports per surviving firm grow rapidly over time, reflecting both the exit of small-scale firms and client accumulation among survivors. It should be noted, however, that the ”average exports” and ”total exports” series based on actual data vary less dramatically with cohort age than the simulated data. Also, in the data-based figures, the drop in cohort membership is more dramatic during the first year. In significant part, these discrepancies reflect the fact that the data-based figures were constructed by treating the first shipment between a buyer and a seller as establishing a match, while the model

Table 10: Cohort evolutions: data vs. model

| Actual data | | | |
|--------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------------|
| Cohort age | Exporters | Total Exports | Average Exports |
| 1 year | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 2 years | 0.29 | 1.11 | 3.77 |
| 3 years | 0.18 | 0.93 | 5.03 |
| 4 years | 0.14 | 0.67 | 4.66 |
| 5 years | 0.12 | 0.63 | 5.18 |
| 6 years | 0.10 | 0.51 | 4.99 |
| 7 years | 0.08 | 0.50 | 5.72 |
| 8 years | 0.08 | 0.45 | 5.91 |
| 9 years | 0.07 | 0.39 | 5.58 |
| 10 years | 0.06 | 0.40 | 6.58 |

| Simulated data | | | |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------------|
| Cohort age | Exporters | Total Exports | Average Exports |
| 1 year | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 2 year | 0.61 | 1.73 | 2.84 |
| 3 years | 0.35 | 1.34 | 3.81 |
| 4 years | 0.19 | 1.81 | 9.50 |
| 5 years | 0.10 | 2.29 | 22.74 |
| 6 years | 0.06 | 2.12 | 34.43 |
| 7 years | 0.05 | 1.89 | 39.69 |
| 8 years | 0.04 | 1.69 | 43.23 |
| 9 years | 0.03 | 1.89 | 63.69 |
| 10 years | 0.02 | 1.46 | 65.17 |

Notes: Figures for cohorts aged 2-10 are expressed relative to corresponding figures for one-year-old cohorts.

does not.²⁴

Table 11 compares the match exit rates observed in the actual data with those observed in the simulated data. These are broken down by match age, and by the size of the match's first-year sales. As with the figures in Table 6, this comparison is imperfect because of the differences in the way matches are defined in the two data sets. Nonetheless, the relatively high failure rates among first-year matches are replicated by the model, as is the tendency for matches that begin from the largest sales quartile to fail less frequently than others. However, the high failure rates are concentrated among one-year-old matches in the simulated data, while they decline more more gradually with age in the actual data. Also, unlike the actual data, the exporters that begin in the smallest size quartile exhibit failure rates as low as

²⁴Specifically, since the data-based series count single-shipment buyer-seller encounters as matches, these series inflate the one-year-old firm and total export counts, while depressing mean exports among one-year olds. And the one-year old figures appear in the denominator of the ratios for all other years.

Table 11: Match separation rates

| Match age | Actual data | | | |
|-----------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | Quartile 1 | Quartile 2 | Quartile 3 | Quartile 4 |
| 1 year | 82.9 | 75.6 | 67.7 | 52.1 |
| 2 years | 63.2 | 58.4 | 52.1 | 44.5 |
| 3 years | 57.3 | 49.4 | 44.6 | 40.3 |
| 4 years | 55 | 46.8 | 40.8 | 39.2 |
| 5+ years | 49.7 | 43.7 | 37.6 | 36.7 |

| Match age | Simulated data | | | |
|-----------|----------------|------------|------------|------------|
| | Quartile 1 | Quartile 2 | Quartile 3 | Quartile 4 |
| 1 year | 0.60 | 0.88 | 0.89 | 0.63 |
| 2 years | 0.27 | 0.29 | 0.31 | 0.27 |
| 3 years | 0.30 | 0.32 | 0.33 | 0.30 |
| 4 years | 0.31 | 0.28 | 0.20 | 0.32 |
| 5+ years | 0.28 | 0.30 | 0.36 | 0.36 |

Notes: Figures are percentages of the exporters in each age-initial size category that do not export during the following year.

Table 12: Exporter distribution by number of buyers

| Number of buyers | share of exporters | |
|------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| | actual data | simulated data |
| 1 | 0.79 | 0.77 |
| 2 | 0.11 | 0.10 |
| 3 | 0.03 | 0.05 |
| 4 | 0.02 | 0.03 |
| 5 | 0.01 | 0.02 |
| 6-10 | 0.02 | 0.03 |
| 11+ | 0.02 | 0.01 |

Notes: Blah blah blah




Figure 2: Log continuation value of firms conditional on match history

Notes: Continuation value trajectories for firms with productivity in the 10th, 50th, and 90th percentiles of the simulated productivity distribution of exporters. For each productivity type, we plot values for all successful matches, alternating success and failure, and all failures.

those of the largest exporters.

Finally, Table 12 reports the distribution of client counts across exporters in the actual versus simulated data. Overall the two distributions match up well, though the actual data contain more exporters with two clients (and fewer with more than two clients) than the model predicts.

6.2 The value of relationships

6.2.1 The value of clients

In addition to convex search costs, two forces in our model make exporting decisions forward looking. First, each successful business relationship improves an exporter’s visibility and reduces its cost of finding additional potential clients. We call this the “network effect.” Second, each match—successful or unsuccessful—conveys information about the scope of the market for the exporter’s product. We call this the “learning effect.” With Bayesian updating (equation 7), it means that early matches generate particularly valuable signals and may be worth pursuing even if they are not expected to generate significant earnings. It also means that two firms, *ex ante* identical, may have very different long term experiences in export markets, depending upon whether their early matches happened to yield successful business relationships.

To get some sense for the combined importance of the network effect and the learning effect, Figure 2 shows the perceived change in the firm’s value with each additional meeting.

These changes are exclusive of the profits generated by the new matches, so they describe the impact of each new match on continuation values solely through these two effects. We plot the continuation values for firms of three productivity types, taken from the 10th, 50th, and 90th productivity percentiles among simulated exporters.²⁵ These values depend upon firms' priors concerning their popularity ($\bar{\theta}^f$), which in turn depend upon the number of meetings (n) they have already experienced at the of time each increment to a . (They do not depend upon firms' *true* success rates, θ^f , as these are unobservable.) We demonstrate this dependence of perceived continuation values on match histories by considering several extreme cases: an unbroken string of successful matches ($n = a$) and an unbroken string of failures ($n = 0$). To provide a benchmark, we also graph the evolution of firms' values when they experience a strictly alternating succession of successes and failures ($n \approx 2a$).

Initial continuation values of the three productivity types of exporters vary widely. The foreign operations of the highest productivity type of firm are valued at US\$ 53,800 before its first foreign match, while the median productivity firm's foreign operations are valued at only US\$ 452 before its first match, and the foreign operations of the lowest productivity firm are initially worth only US\$ 5.

The first match has the biggest impact on continuation values, and most of the impact of additional information has dissipated by the twentieth match. For example, if its first match is a success, the highest productivity firm's value jumps to US\$ 165,000. On the other hand, failures quickly erase firm value. The continuation value of the median productivity firm with four successful matches is almost the same as the value of the high productivity firm with four failed matches, at US\$ 5,669.

In addition to continuation values, match histories affect the intensity with which firms search for new clients. We explore this dependence in Figure 3, which plots beliefs regarding θ^f over time for a firm in the 90th percentile of productivity. Here we assume that if a firm is searching with intensity λ , it meets its next match at exactly the mean waiting time $1/\lambda$. There are two lines on the plot, both containing five successes and five failures. The only difference is that in the top line, the successes come first, while in the bottom line the failures come first. Before any meetings, the beliefs are the same, and after all 10 meetings they are the same as well because at this point both histories contain 5 successes.

The key message of Figure 3 is that if the successes come first, it takes 10.5 years to get 10 matches. But if the failures come first, it takes more than 43 years. Thus, simply because of luck, it takes four times longer for the failure-first firm to get to 10 meetings and it searches far less intensively along the way.

²⁵Of course, since low-productivity firms do not export, these are percentiles of a truncated distribution.




Figure 3: Evolution of success probability belief

Notes: Beliefs of a firm with productivity in the 90th percentile of exporters over success probability. Top line is five success followed by five failures. Bottom line is five failures followed by five successes.

6.2.2 Comparison with no-learning

The patterns we have depicted thus far reflect both the network effect and the learning effect. To gauge their relative importance, we now redo Figure 2 under the assumption that firms know their true θ^f realizations from the start. More precisely, using our estimates of the "no learning" policy function (see Table 9), we simulate the continuation values of firms at the 10th, 50th, and 90th productivity percentiles. And as in Figure 2 we consider three alternative match histories: only successes, only failures, and alternating successes and failures. Also, since true success rates now affect behavior, we give all firms a success probability of $\theta^f = 0.43$. This number corresponds to the 65th percentile of success probabilities among active exporters in our simulated data. We chose this particular value because it is close to 50%, and it is one of the discretized points on the grid we use for estimation.

The results appear in Figure 4. Overall, continuation values move much less as firms acquire experience, implying that the new exporter dynamics in Figure 2 were mainly due to firms learning their types. Continue values do still rise a bit when firms make successful matches because these matches make it easier to meet additional buyers (the "network effect"). However, unsuccessful matches now have no effect on these values.

We can also examine how match arrival times depend on successes and failures in the no-learning model. Since firms know their success probabilities in this model, the no-learning version of Figure 3 (not pictured) is simply two horizontal lines with height θ^f . But the lengths of these lines still depends upon match histories because of the network effect. To demonstrate this dependence, Figure 5 plots the expected time to ten meetings, when five




Figure 4: Log continuation value of firms conditional on match history, no learning

Notes: Continuation value trajectories for firms with productivity in the 10th, 50th, and 90th percentiles of the simulated productivity distribution of exporters in the learning version of the model. For each productivity type, we plot values for all successful matches, alternating success and failure, and all failures.




Figure 5: Time to ten meetings by placement of five consecutive successes

consecutive meetings are successful and the others failures. The x -axis is the number of meetings that take place before the first success occurs. If it is one, then the first five meetings are successes, and the next five failures. If it is 6, then the first five meetings are failures, and the last five meetings successes.

To facilitate comparison, Figure 5 presents results for both the baseline model (panel a) and the no learning model (panel b). All plots are for a firm in the 90th percentile of productivity among exporters, and, in the case of the no-learning model, the success probability is set to $\theta^f = 0.43$. As we saw in Figure 3, the time it takes a learning firm to reach ten meetings depends heavily on the placement of the successes (panel a). If the successes come at the beginning of the ten meetings, it takes 12 years for this type of firm to reach ten meetings. If the failures come first, it takes 45 years. But for no-learning firms (panel b), time to ten meetings depends much less on the placement of successes. If the successes come first, it takes 27 years to reach ten meetings. If they come last, it takes 32 years.²⁶ So here again we see that learning effects and network effects both matter, but the former are more important.

6.3 Macroeconomic adjustment dynamics

If there were no sources of friction in our model, and if the effects of idiosyncratic shocks were ignorable by the law of large numbers, aggregate exports would be static functions of the aggregate shocks that affect all firms' export revenues (x^f). We conclude our analysis by asking how much our model's predictions for aggregate export trajectories deviate from this hypothetical norm, and why.²⁷

To do so, we simulate a permanent (but unanticipated) 20 percent Colombian peso devaluation on total export trajectories under two alternative scenarios: our benchmark model, and the no-learning model. For both simulations, we use the same set of market-wide shocks. Specifically, we use a series of randomly-generated aggregate rate shocks to simulate the model, and then simulate the model again with the same shocks, but increasing their values by 20% after a particular date. The shock progression is graphed in Figure 6, with the shock arriving at time zero. As with the rest of the series in this section, in the figure the shocks are normalized to one at the time of impact.

Figure 7 summarizes the results of these experiments, normalizing each export series

²⁶The reason it takes so long is that this type of firm expects that only around half of its meetings will be successes. This corresponds to the ultimate 50% success rate we are simulating, but it also means that the firms are not searching very hard. If we were to make the firm believe that it has a close to 100% success rate, it would only take a few years to reach 10 meetings.

²⁷Since we are using a single-agent model, we caution that these simulations miss interactions between exporters in the foreign market. However, they may be a reasonable approximation to the aggregate exports responses of a small country shipping to a large one, where its products constitute a small fraction of total supply.





Figure 6: Series of Peso to Dollar Exchange Rate Shocks, Baseline and with 20% Peso Devaluation

to unity in the year before the shock hits (year -1). Consider Panel (a) and Panel (b) of Figure 7, which plot total export sales over a 30 year period bisected by the shock. In both versions of the model, the immediate effect of the depreciation is to increase the peso-denominated revenue flow from existing clients by 20 percent. And because other margins of adjustment are sluggish, this valuation effect accounts for almost all of the movement in aggregate exports during the first post-shock year.


The differences in these patterns trace largely to differences in the numbers of matches, which are depicted in Panels (c) and (d) of Figure 7. Here the valuation effect plays no role, so it is easier to see the difference between the baseline series and the two series without learning. We interpret these patterns to mean that firms with high success rates (large θ^f values) jump into the export market aggressively when they know their profit potential, but they go slow if they do not, gaining confidence and intensifying their search efforts as positive signals accrue.

What accounts for the high volatility of the no-learning, no-network series? We have already noted that when firms know their type, the high- θ^f exporters want to expand quickly when markets turn favorable. But if network effects are missing, these same firms have relatively little incentive to maintain a large client base when market conditions turn sour. Negative aggregate shocks therefore trigger relatively rapid retrenchment when both learning and network effects are absent. **[JT: Need to confirm that aggregate worsen after year 8 or so.]**


In sum, learning effects and—to a lesser extent—network effects do appear to lend persistence to aggregate bilateral export flows, adding several years to the transition period in the aftermath of a permanent shock. These results obtain because the relevant extensive margin here is the match, not the firm. This means that adjustment on that margin matters




(a) Total sales




(b) Total sales




(c) Total active matches



(d) Total active matches



(e) Total active firms



(f) Total active firms

Figure 7: Response to a 20% depreciation of Colombian Peso: Market level outcomes

for dominant exporters and fringe players alike.

7 Summary

[JT: section not yet updated] Customs records reveal tremendous turnover among Colombian manufacturers who export to the U.S.. In a typical year, 48 percent of these exporters are new to the U.S. market, and 81 percent of these new exporters will be gone two years hence. New exporters ship small quantities, so despite their numbers they account for only 12 percent of total Colombian exports in value terms. But each new cohort of Colombian exporters contains a small number of firms that survive and rapidly expand, growing many times faster than aggregate Colombian exports. They do so by adding U.S. clients to their customer base at a rapid rate.

After documenting these patterns, we develop a continuous time model that explains them. Firms wishing to export must engage in costly search to identify potential buyers abroad. The buyers they encounter either reject their products or form finite-lived business relationships with them. Buyer who form business relationships with exporters send them favorable signals about the appeal of their products, and in doing so, encourage them to search more intensively for additional buyers. Successful business relationships also reduce search costs by improving sellers' visibility (network effects). Finally, sellers' search intensities depend upon their permanent idiosyncratic characteristics and marketwide conditions.

Fit using the method of simulated moments, the model replicates the patterns in customs records described above and allows us quantify several types of trade costs, including the search costs of identifying potential clients and the costs of maintaining business relationships with existing clients. It also allows us to estimate the network effect of previous exporting successes on the costs of meeting new clients, and to characterize the cumulative effects of learning on firms' search intensities. Both the learning effect and the network effect prove to be quantitatively important. Finally, our model provides a lens through which to view the seemingly unpredictable responses of export flows to exchange rate fluctuations.

References

- Aeberhardt, R., I. Buono, and H. Fadinger (2014): “Learning, incomplete contracts and export dynamics: theory and evidence from French firms,” *European Economic Review*, 68: 219–249
- Albornoz, Facundo, Hector Calvo Pardo, Gregory Corcos, and Emanuel Ornelas (2012) “Sequential Exporting,” *Journal of International Economics* 88: 17-31.
- Alessandria, George and Horag Choi (2007) “Do Sunk Costs of Exporting Matter for Net Export Dynamics?” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, pp. 289-336.
- Alessandria, George, Joseph Kaboski and Virgiliu Midrigan (2010) “Inventories, Lumpy Trade, and Large Devaluations,” *American Economic Review*, 100 (5) pp. 2304-39.
- Arkolakis, Konstantinos (2009) “A Unified Theory of Firm Selection and Growth,” Yale University, Department of Economics, Working Paper.
- Arkolakis, Konstantinos (2010) “Market Access Costs and the New Consumers Margin in International Trade,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 118(6), pp. 1151-1199.
- Baldwin, Richard. E. and Paul Krugman (1989): “Persistent Trade Effects of Large Exchange Rate Changes.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 104, pp. 635-654.
- Bernard, Andrew and J. Bradford Jensen (1999) “Exceptional Exporter Performance: Cause, Effect, or Both?” *Journal of International Economics* , 47, pp. 1-25.
- Bernard, Andrew, J. Bradford Jensen, Samuel Kortum and Jonathan Eaton (2003) “Plants and Productivity in International Trade,” *American Economic Review* 93(4), pp. 1268-1290
- Bernard, Andrew, J. Bradford Jensen, J. Stephen J. Reading, and Peter K. Schott (2007) “Firms in International Trade,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*.
- Besedes, Tibor (2007). “A Search Cost Perspective on Formation and Duration of Trade,” Working Paper, Department of Economics, Georgia Tech University.
- Blum, Bernardo S., Sebastian Claro, and Ignatius Horstmann (2009). “Intermediation and the Nature of Trade Costs: Theory and Evidence.” Working Paper, The University of Toronto.
- Brooks, Eileen (2006) “Why don’t firms export more? Product Quality and Colombian Plants” *Journal of Development Economics*, 80: 160-178.

- Chaney, Thomas (2011) "The Network Structure of International Trade," University of Chicago.
- Clerides, Sofronis, Saul Lach and James Tybout (1998) "Is Learning-by-Exporting Important? Micro-dynamic Evidence from Colombia, Mexico and Morocco," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, pp. 903-947.
- Das, Mita, Mark Roberts and James Tybout (2007) "Market Entry Costs, Producer Heterogeneity and Export Dynamics," *Econometrica* 75(3), pp. 837-874.
- Dickstein, M. J. and E. Morales (2018): "What do exporters know?" *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 133: 1753–1801.
- Domínguez, Juan Camilo, Jonathan Eaton, Marcela Eslava, and James Tybout. (2010) "Search and Learning in Export Markets: Case Studies for Colombia." Pennsylvania State University, Working Paper.
- Drozd, Lukasz A. and Jaromir B. Nosal (2008) "Understanding International Prices: Customers as Capital," Working Paper, The University of Wisconsin.
- Dixit, Avinash (1989), "Hysteresis, Import Penetration, and Exchange Rate Pass-Through," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 104, No. 2 (May), pp. 205-228.
- Eaton, Jonathan, Samuel Kortum, and Francis Kramarz (2004) "Dissecting Trade: Firms, Industries, and Export Destinations," *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings*, 94: 150-154.
- Eaton, Jonathan, Samuel Kortum, and Francis Kramarz (2011) "An Anatomy of International Trade: Evidence from French Firms," *Econometrica* 79(5), pp. 1453-1498.
- Eaton, Jonathan, Marcela Eslava, Maurice Kugler and James Tybout (2008). "Export Dynamics in Colombia: Firm-Level Evidence," in Elhanan Helpman, Dalia Marin and Thierry Verdier, eds., *The Organization of Firms in a Global Economy*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard U. Press.
- Eslava, Marcela, John Haltiwanger, Adriana Kugler, and Maurice Kugler (2004) "The Effects of Structural Reforms on Productivity and Profitability Enhancing Reallocation: Evidence from Colombia," *Journal of Development Economics*, 75: 333-371.
- Foster, Lucia, John Haltiwanger and Chad Syverson (2016) "The Slow Growth of New Plants: Learning about Demand?" *Economica* 83(329): 91-129.

- Gourio, F. and L. Rudanko (2014): “Customer Capital,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 81: 1102–1136.
- Gouriéroux and Monfort, 1996. *Simulation-Based Econometric Methods*. New York: Oxford U. Press.
- Irrarrazabal, Alfonso A. and Luca David Oromolla (2006) “Hysteresis in Export Markets,” New York University, Working Paper.
- Jackson, Matthew and Brian Rogers (2007) “Meeting Strangers and Friends of Friends: How Random are Social Networks?” *American Economic Review*, 97: 890-915.
- Jovanovic, Boyan (1982) “Selection and the Evolution of Industry,” *Econometrica*, 50: 649-670.
- Kugler, Maurice (2006) “Spillovers from foreign direct investment: within or between industries?” *Journal of Development Economics*, 80(2): 444-477.
- Kohn, D., F. Leibovici, and M. Szkup (2016): “Financial frictions and new exporter dynamics,” *International Economic Review* 57: 453–486.
- Li, Shengyu (2018) ”A structural model of productivity, uncertain demand, and export dynamics,” *Journal of International Economics* 115: 1-15.
- Luttmer, Erzo (2007) “Selection, Growth, and the Size Distribution of Firms,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122: 1103-1144.
- The Value of Relationships: Evidence from a Supply Shock to Kenyan Rose Exports
- Rocco Macchiavello and Ameet Morjaria 2015 ”The Value of Relationships: Evidence from a Supply Shock to Kenyan Rose Exports” *American Economic Review*, 105(9): 2911-2945
- McCallum, Andrew (2015) ”The Structure of Export Entry Costs,” FRB working paper.
- Morales, Eduardo, Gloria Sheu, and Andres Zahler (2019) ”Extended Gravity.” *Review of Economic Studies* 86(6): 2668-2712
- Melitz, Marc (2003) “The Impact of Trade on Intra-Industry Reallocations and Aggregate Industry Productivity,” *Econometrica* 71, 1695-1725.
- Nguyen, Daniel (2012) ”Demand Uncertainty, Exporting Delays and Exporting Failures,” *Journal of International Economics* 86: 336-344.

- Rauch, James and Joel Watson (2003) "Starting Small in an Unfamiliar Environment," *International Journal of Industrial Organization* 21: 1021-1042.
- Roberts, Mark and James Tybout (1997a) "The Decision to Export in Colombia: An Empirical Model of Entry with Sunk Costs," *American Economic Review* 87(4), pp. 545-563.
- Roberts, Mark and James Tybout (1997b) *What Makes Exports Boom?* Directions in Development Monograph Series, The World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Roo, Yungwoo and Joel Rodrigue (2016) "Firm-Level Investment and Export Dynamics" *International Economic Review* 57(1): 271-304
- Ruhl, Kim and Jonathan Willis (2017) "New Exporter Dynamics," *International Economic Review* 58(3): 703-725.
- Shimer, Robert (2005) "The Cyclical Behavior of Equilibrium Unemployment and Vacancies," *The American Economic Review*, 95(1), pp. 25-49.
- Tauchen, George (1986) "Finite State Markov-Chain Approximation to Univariate and Vector Autoregressions," *Economics Letters*, 20.2. 177-181.
- Timoshenko, O. A. (2015): "Learning versus sunk costs explanations of export persistence," *European Economic Review*, 79, 113-128

A data tables

| year | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | total |
|------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1992 | 2,232 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2,232 |
| 1993 | 823 | 1,235 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2,058 |
| 1994 | 583 | 330 | 1,160 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2,073 |
| 1995 | 440 | 213 | 339 | 953 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1,945 |
| 1996 | 372 | 163 | 178 | 255 | 899 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1,867 |
| 1997 | 321 | 128 | 133 | 170 | 248 | 877 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1,877 |
| 1998 | 268 | 104 | 124 | 132 | 153 | 256 | 893 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1,930 |
| 1999 | 232 | 85 | 87 | 114 | 117 | 187 | 262 | 1,026 | | | | | | | | | | | 2,110 |
| 2000 | 203 | 85 | 79 | 91 | 103 | 136 | 170 | 344 | 1,372 | | | | | | | | | | 2,583 |
| 2001 | 187 | 70 | 65 | 79 | 85 | 109 | 145 | 229 | 389 | 1,251 | | | | | | | | | 2,609 |
| 2002 | 173 | 64 | 62 | 72 | 68 | 88 | 112 | 171 | 242 | 399 | 1,373 | | | | | | | | 2,824 |
| 2003 | 165 | 51 | 58 | 62 | 62 | 77 | 86 | 140 | 185 | 301 | 440 | 1,719 | | | | | | | 3,346 |
| 2004 | 150 | 52 | 41 | 53 | 63 | 76 | 80 | 132 | 164 | 223 | 327 | 616 | 1,768 | | | | | | 3,745 |
| 2005 | 140 | 52 | 47 | 39 | 54 | 77 | 69 | 115 | 145 | 196 | 235 | 398 | 661 | 1,902 | | | | | 4,130 |
| 2006 | 122 | 46 | 44 | 39 | 44 | 71 | 65 | 110 | 131 | 157 | 168 | 308 | 410 | 564 | 1,896 | | | | 4,175 |
| 2007 | 113 | 37 | 39 | 31 | 42 | 55 | 48 | 91 | 101 | 132 | 156 | 240 | 305 | 365 | 548 | 1,681 | | | 3,984 |
| 2008 | 93 | 29 | 30 | 24 | 38 | 50 | 45 | 74 | 90 | 117 | 130 | 184 | 198 | 230 | 331 | 447 | 1,455 | | 3,565 |
| 2009 | 80 | 25 | 28 | 24 | 28 | 40 | 39 | 60 | 72 | 88 | 97 | 145 | 175 | 157 | 230 | 248 | 386 | 1,378 | 3,300 |

Table 13: Number of Exporting Firms, by Entry Cohort

| year | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | total |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|
| 1992 | 469 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 469 |
| 1993 | 352 | 83 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 435 |
| 1994 | 336 | 83 | 92 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 510 |
| 1995 | 313 | 75 | 102 | 58 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 549 |
| 1996 | 256 | 67 | 62 | 40 | 60 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 484 |
| 1997 | 247 | 84 | 43 | 41 | 48 | 119 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 581 |
| 1998 | 225 | 49 | 42 | 36 | 45 | 131 | 63 | | | | | | | | | | | | 590 |
| 1999 | 207 | 51 | 49 | 41 | 39 | 197 | 74 | 81 | | | | | | | | | | | 739 |
| 2000 | 180 | 53 | 55 | 37 | 51 | 102 | 53 | 158 | 109 | | | | | | | | | | 799 |
| 2001 | 150 | 22 | 51 | 41 | 28 | 57 | 36 | 80 | 101 | 111 | | | | | | | | | 677 |
| 2002 | 124 | 23 | 47 | 34 | 27 | 28 | 23 | 45 | 65 | 83 | 40 | | | | | | | | 538 |
| 2003 | 147 | 42 | 51 | 31 | 42 | 24 | 22 | 37 | 71 | 107 | 50 | 78 | | | | | | | 702 |
| 2004 | 156 | 43 | 53 | 19 | 57 | 21 | 23 | 42 | 78 | 106 | 60 | 107 | 90 | | | | | | 855 |
| 2005 | 150 | 22 | 75 | 17 | 52 | 18 | 23 | 43 | 78 | 80 | 58 | 81 | 75 | 84 | | | | | 855 |
| 2006 | 117 | 31 | 52 | 14 | 64 | 43 | 17 | 38 | 61 | 79 | 32 | 51 | 52 | 112 | 78 | | | | 838 |
| 2007 | 103 | 7 | 18 | 11 | 67 | 58 | 19 | 30 | 28 | 64 | 22 | 35 | 33 | 66 | 67 | 62 | | | 689 |
| 2008 | 95 | 6 | 9 | 8 | 33 | 37 | 17 | 33 | 26 | 34 | 20 | 31 | 37 | 54 | 42 | 53 | 57 | | 591 |
| 2009 | 68 | 22 | 7 | 6 | 13 | 24 | 10 | 23 | 16 | 16 | 14 | 22 | 41 | 25 | 39 | 37 | 36 | 64 | 485 |

Table 14: Value of Exports, by Entry Cohort (millions of \$US)

| year | 1992 | 1993 | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | pooled |
|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--------|
| 1992 | 210 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 210 |
| 1993 | 428 | 67 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 211 |
| 1994 | 576 | 251 | 79 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 246 |
| 1995 | 712 | 353 | 300 | 61 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 282 |
| 1996 | 687 | 411 | 346 | 158 | 67 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 259 |
| 1997 | 771 | 652 | 321 | 241 | 192 | 136 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 310 |
| 1998 | 839 | 468 | 339 | 269 | 297 | 510 | 71 | | | | | | | | | | | | 306 |
| 1999 | 893 | 601 | 561 | 361 | 336 | 1,054 | 281 | 79 | | | | | | | | | | | 350 |
| 2000 | 885 | 623 | 697 | 407 | 496 | 750 | 313 | 460 | 80 | | | | | | | | | | 309 |
| 2001 | 801 | 316 | 783 | 519 | 329 | 521 | 251 | 350 | 259 | 89 | | | | | | | | | 260 |
| 2002 | 716 | 353 | 757 | 473 | 399 | 318 | 207 | 260 | 268 | 207 | 29 | | | | | | | | 191 |
| 2003 | 891 | 827 | 870 | 493 | 677 | 315 | 257 | 260 | 385 | 355 | 114 | 46 | | | | | | | 210 |
| 2004 | 1,039 | 828 | 1,281 | 358 | 900 | 281 | 291 | 318 | 478 | 476 | 183 | 174 | 51 | | | | | | 228 |
| 2005 | 1,071 | 413 | 1,593 | 444 | 967 | 231 | 326 | 375 | 535 | 408 | 248 | 204 | 113 | 44 | | | | | 207 |
| 2006 | 958 | 675 | 1,177 | 356 | 1,448 | 605 | 256 | 341 | 464 | 505 | 188 | 165 | 126 | 198 | 41 | | | | 201 |
| 2007 | 915 | 175 | 466 | 357 | 1,606 | 1,048 | 391 | 327 | 278 | 481 | 140 | 145 | 108 | 181 | 123 | 37 | | | 173 |
| 2008 | 1,023 | 208 | 283 | 341 | 860 | 747 | 379 | 443 | 289 | 287 | 153 | 166 | 186 | 236 | 125 | 120 | 39 | | 166 |
| 2009 | 855 | 864 | 262 | 266 | 478 | 607 | 255 | 389 | 221 | 176 | 143 | 152 | 235 | 162 | 169 | 151 | 93 | 47 | 147 |

Table 15: Exports per Firm, by Entry Cohort (thousands of \$US)

| Year | Colombian Sellers | U.S. Importers | Pairs |
|------|-------------------|----------------|-------|
| 1992 | 2,232 | 1,190 | 3,087 |
| 1993 | 2,058 | 1,183 | 2,824 |
| 1994 | 2,073 | 1,212 | 2,810 |
| 1995 | 1,945 | 1,173 | 2,588 |
| 1996 | 1,867 | 1,191 | 2,490 |
| 1997 | 1,877 | 1,208 | 2,480 |
| 1998 | 1,930 | 1,191 | 2,495 |
| 1999 | 2,110 | 1,386 | 2,793 |
| 2000 | 2,583 | 1,661 | 3,411 |
| 2001 | 2,609 | 1,698 | 3,483 |
| 2002 | 2,824 | 1,826 | 3,733 |
| 2003 | 3,346 | 2,110 | 4,483 |
| 2004 | 3,745 | 2,296 | 5,071 |
| 2005 | 4,130 | 2,457 | 5,552 |
| 2006 | 4,175 | 2,471 | 5,607 |
| 2007 | 3,984 | 2,343 | 5,307 |
| 2008 | 3,565 | 2,221 | 4,751 |
| 2009 | 3,300 | 2,079 | 4,467 |

Table 16: Exporters and importers by year

B Data checks

To investigate the quality of the exporter id (manuf_id) in the U.S. import records, we ran a series of robustness checks. The Colombian and U.S. data overlap for the years 2000-2008 and both contain measures of the value of exports as well as the number of exporting firms. If the manuf_id variable is error-prone and noisy, we would expect the U.S. data to over-report the number of Colombian firms exporting to the U.S. That is, each time a customs broker wrongly enters the data in the field, a new firm would be created. Table 17 below summarizes the total value of exports to the U.S. and the number of Colombian firms, by year, for each data set.

The datasets align much more closely on value than they do on firm counts. The difference in value is never more than 10% while the firm count difference ranges from 18% to 74%. The differences are stable over time.

To look more closely at the cause of the difference in firm counts, we compared the number of firms across sources by HS2 categories. The counts in the LFTTD were higher than the Colombian data in only 28 of the 82 codes and by far the biggest differences are in HS codes 61 and 62: textiles. In these two product classes the U.S. data identifies 4025 more firms than the Colombian data. If we remove these two sectors from the list, the difference in firm counts flips and the Colombian data contain 1001 more firms than the LFTTD.

Interestingly, Title 19 of U.S. code specifically requires that the manuf_id variable for textile products represent the manufacturer of the textile products, not an intermediary. That is, for this sector in particular the manufacturer, not an intermediary must be reported on the CBP 7501 form. By contrast, prior work by several authors of this paper has shown (Marcela’s 8/9/13 e-mail referenced this) that the Colombian data reports the exporter, which may or may not be the manufacturer. Given that previous research (Tybout, 2000 JEL) has shown that developing countries tend to have a disproportionately large share of

| Year | Colombia | | United States | | % difference | |
|------|-------------|-------|---------------|-------|--------------|-------|
| | # exporters | value | # exporters | value | # exporters | value |
| 2000 | 1775 | 1038 | 2721 | 1140 | 53% | 10% |
| 2001 | 2026 | 995 | 2744 | 1019 | 35% | 2% |
| 2002 | 2230 | 870 | 2986 | 855 | 34% | -2% |
| 2003 | 2800 | 1113 | 3579 | 1119 | 28% | 1% |
| 2004 | 3035 | 1379 | 4002 | 1415 | 32% | 3% |
| 2005 | 2861 | 1554 | 4288 | 1438 | 50% | -7% |
| 2006 | 2689 | 1665 | 4361 | 1552 | 62% | -7% |
| 2007 | 2420 | 1540 | 4175 | 1496 | 73% | -3% |
| 2008 | 2161 | 1570 | 3758 | 1474 | 74% | -6% |

Table 17: Colombian versus U.S. Customs Records

small manufacturing firms, it is reasonable to assume that a large part of the reason why the U.S. data report so many more firms in the textile sector is that due to administrative reasons the U.S. data count many small manufacturers and the Colombian data are, in many cases, reporting aggregators and intermediaries.

As a final check of the integrity of the `manuf_id` variable - and the robustness of our main results - we experimented with a “fuzzy” version of the `manuf_id` variable that did not contain any street numbers in the string (a likely source of input errors). The effect of this is to reduce the number of Colombian firms in the data, an approximation of fixing any extraneous noise from data entry errors. Next we re-ran Table 4 with the fuzzy data and compared the results to the original version.

One of the key findings from Table 4 is the high match separation rates ranging from about 40% to 66%. Using the fuzzy version did not reduce the separation rates substantially and left the patterns intact. The fuzzy separation rates ranged from 26% to 62%, a drop of 6% on average. It does not appear that our results are sensitive to a modest reduction in data entry errors.

C Identification

Table 18: Sensitivity matrix

| | $\ln \Pi^h$ | F^h | F^f | $\ln \Pi^f$ | α | β | Δ_y | λ_b | γ | $\ln \kappa_0^h$ | $\ln \kappa_0^f$ | σ_φ |
|---|-------------|--------|--------|-------------|----------|---------|------------|-------------|----------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| avg. mat death | -0.112 | 0.007 | 0.011 | -0.111 | -0.019 | 0.127 | 0.006 | 0.068 | -0.045 | -0.097 | -0.119 | 0.000 |
| new to mkt | -0.841 | -0.034 | 0.420 | -0.656 | -0.283 | 0.772 | 1.199 | -0.325 | -0.482 | 0.329 | 0.131 | 0.040 |
| current sales | -2.164 | 0.294 | 2.080 | 2.905 | 0.003 | 0.454 | 11.016 | 4.386 | -2.072 | -12.437 | -3.520 | -0.326 |
| exporter age | 1.027 | 0.092 | -0.745 | 1.029 | 0.411 | -1.124 | -1.216 | 1.074 | 0.586 | -0.966 | -0.726 | -0.089 |
| match age | -0.876 | 0.117 | -0.216 | -0.557 | 0.068 | 0.868 | -0.389 | 1.422 | -0.136 | -2.108 | -1.579 | -0.045 |
| avg. match sales | 0.190 | -0.012 | -0.042 | 0.075 | 0.040 | -0.045 | -0.228 | -0.176 | 0.072 | 0.256 | 0.214 | 0.011 |
| 1st yr dummy | 1.616 | -0.096 | 0.462 | 5.391 | 0.419 | -4.141 | 6.635 | 1.058 | 0.501 | -2.377 | 2.464 | -0.175 |
| match sales, t-1 | -0.683 | 0.058 | -0.097 | -1.127 | -0.183 | 1.293 | 0.170 | 0.742 | -0.469 | -0.082 | -1.077 | 0.012 |
| exporter age | 0.428 | -0.047 | 0.196 | 1.050 | 0.169 | -1.178 | -0.081 | -0.493 | 0.410 | -0.419 | 0.891 | -0.018 |
| MSE, match AR1 | -0.349 | 0.015 | -0.132 | -0.122 | -0.043 | 0.105 | 0.091 | -0.045 | -0.017 | -0.019 | -0.204 | -0.003 |
| degree dist. slope | 0.033 | -0.002 | 0.001 | 0.136 | 0.071 | 0.757 | -0.020 | -0.502 | -0.038 | 0.237 | -0.142 | -0.016 |
| degree dist. curv. | 0.509 | -0.016 | 0.059 | 0.830 | 0.287 | 1.327 | 0.246 | -0.858 | 0.006 | 0.377 | -0.403 | -0.068 |
| avg. ln #shipments | 0.206 | -0.020 | 0.237 | 0.177 | 0.046 | -0.063 | -0.803 | 10.713 | -0.144 | 0.359 | -0.001 | -0.021 |
| export/dom coef. | -0.442 | 0.021 | 0.069 | 0.714 | 0.009 | -0.302 | 1.730 | 0.672 | -0.067 | -1.311 | -0.135 | -0.045 |
| dom. sales AR1 | 2.835 | 0.051 | -4.213 | -2.908 | -0.602 | 3.213 | 1.311 | -1.069 | -1.155 | 14.694 | -0.998 | 0.174 |
| avg. match hazard | -0.002 | 0.007 | 0.205 | 0.005 | -0.006 | 0.037 | 0.055 | -0.083 | -0.223 | -0.418 | 0.013 | 0.105 |
| $\ln(1+a)$ | -0.040 | 0.002 | 0.004 | -0.071 | -0.003 | 0.093 | -0.044 | 0.003 | -0.016 | -0.033 | -0.037 | 0.002 |
| $\ln(1+a)^2$ | -0.066 | -0.003 | 0.212 | 0.770 | 0.035 | -0.790 | 0.746 | 0.402 | 0.081 | -0.890 | 0.169 | -0.039 |
| $\ln(1+\frac{1}{n})$ | 0.018 | -0.001 | -0.003 | 0.029 | 0.000 | -0.036 | 0.024 | -0.002 | 0.004 | 0.025 | 0.016 | -0.001 |
| $\ln(1+\frac{1}{n})^2$ | -0.027 | 0.001 | 0.008 | -0.027 | -0.001 | 0.037 | -0.013 | 0.011 | -0.007 | -0.043 | -0.020 | 0.000 |
| $\ln(1+\frac{1}{n}) \cdot \ln(1+a)$ | 0.089 | -0.003 | -0.035 | 0.041 | 0.006 | -0.063 | -0.003 | -0.065 | 0.020 | 0.164 | 0.057 | 0.001 |
| avg. succ. rate, $\frac{a}{n}$ | -0.181 | -0.035 | -0.547 | -2.688 | 1.697 | -0.361 | 1.759 | -2.682 | -0.563 | 1.323 | 0.037 | 0.095 |
| coef., $\ln n$ | -1.121 | 0.020 | 2.076 | -3.493 | -0.655 | -2.049 | -7.981 | -0.494 | 0.032 | -0.423 | -2.017 | 0.023 |
| $var(\frac{a}{n} n)$ | 14.085 | -0.180 | 5.673 | 33.822 | 8.725 | -29.932 | -12.829 | -3.497 | -5.688 | -1.592 | 15.193 | -1.119 |
| coef., $\ln n$ | 11.610 | -0.994 | 9.961 | 17.641 | -2.014 | -42.636 | 19.778 | 9.299 | 7.756 | -4.401 | 9.615 | -0.933 |
| $\frac{\text{foreign sales}}{\text{total sales}}$ | -9.785 | -0.068 | 1.997 | 1.591 | 0.443 | -2.183 | -1.189 | 2.443 | 1.057 | -10.317 | 1.247 | -0.052 |
| $\frac{\text{\#exporters}}{\text{\#firms}}$ | -3.256 | 0.110 | -3.178 | -2.103 | -1.139 | 0.187 | 3.049 | 2.308 | -0.959 | 9.688 | -2.247 | 0.034 |

Table 19: Sensitivity matrix, elasticity form

| | $\ln \Pi^h$ | F^h | F^f | $\ln \Pi^f$ | α | β | Δ_y | λ_b | γ | $\ln \kappa_0^h$ | $\ln \kappa_0^f$ | σ_φ |
|---|-------------|--------|---------|-------------|----------|---------|------------|-------------|----------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| avg. mat death | 0.008 | 0.064 | 0.010 | 0.005 | -0.009 | 0.018 | 0.001 | 0.001 | -0.031 | -0.002 | -0.002 | 0.000 |
| new to mkt | -0.029 | 0.167 | -0.189 | -0.014 | 0.066 | -0.054 | -0.085 | 0.003 | 0.168 | -0.004 | -0.001 | -0.004 |
| current sales | -0.019 | -0.360 | -0.234 | 0.016 | 0.000 | -0.008 | -0.195 | -0.009 | 0.180 | 0.035 | 0.009 | 0.008 |
| exporter age | 0.020 | -0.259 | 0.193 | 0.013 | -0.055 | 0.046 | 0.050 | -0.005 | -0.118 | 0.006 | 0.004 | 0.005 |
| match age | 0.005 | 0.086 | -0.015 | 0.002 | 0.002 | 0.009 | -0.004 | 0.002 | -0.007 | -0.004 | -0.002 | -0.001 |
| avg. match sales | -0.536 | -4.896 | -1.569 | -0.134 | 0.762 | -0.259 | -1.329 | -0.125 | 2.067 | 0.239 | 0.181 | 0.084 |
| 1st yr dummy | -0.353 | -2.996 | 1.325 | -0.745 | 0.622 | -1.855 | 2.991 | 0.058 | 1.111 | -0.172 | 0.161 | -0.107 |
| match sales, t-1 | 0.107 | 1.303 | -0.200 | 0.112 | -0.194 | 0.414 | 0.055 | 0.029 | -0.745 | -0.004 | -0.050 | 0.005 |
| exporter age | -0.007 | -0.105 | 0.040 | -0.010 | 0.018 | -0.038 | -0.003 | -0.002 | 0.065 | -0.002 | 0.004 | -0.001 |
| MSE, match AR1 | 0.065 | 0.392 | -0.325 | 0.014 | -0.054 | 0.040 | 0.035 | -0.002 | -0.033 | -0.001 | -0.011 | -0.002 |
| degree dist. slope | 0.010 | 0.091 | -0.004 | 0.027 | -0.150 | -0.479 | 0.013 | 0.039 | 0.120 | -0.024 | 0.013 | 0.014 |
| degree dist. curv. | 0.020 | 0.094 | -0.031 | 0.021 | -0.078 | -0.109 | -0.020 | 0.009 | -0.003 | -0.005 | 0.005 | 0.008 |
| avg. ln #shipments | -0.079 | -1.086 | 1.195 | -0.043 | 0.120 | -0.050 | -0.636 | 1.034 | -0.560 | 0.046 | 0.000 | -0.023 |
| export/dom coef. | 0.079 | 0.546 | 0.163 | -0.081 | 0.011 | -0.111 | 0.639 | 0.030 | -0.122 | -0.078 | -0.007 | -0.023 |
| dom. sales AR1 | -0.705 | 1.813 | -13.736 | 0.457 | -1.018 | 1.636 | 0.672 | -0.067 | -2.912 | 1.209 | -0.074 | 0.121 |
| avg. match hazard | 0.000 | -0.245 | -0.663 | 0.001 | 0.010 | -0.019 | -0.028 | 0.005 | 0.558 | 0.034 | -0.001 | -0.073 |
| $\ln(1+a)$ | -0.004 | -0.025 | -0.005 | -0.004 | 0.002 | -0.018 | 0.009 | 0.000 | 0.015 | 0.001 | 0.001 | -0.001 |
| $\ln(1+a)^2$ | 0.000 | -0.003 | 0.017 | -0.003 | 0.001 | -0.010 | 0.010 | 0.001 | 0.005 | -0.002 | 0.000 | -0.001 |
| $\ln(1+\frac{1}{n})$ | -0.018 | -0.107 | -0.037 | -0.018 | -0.002 | -0.072 | 0.048 | 0.000 | 0.035 | 0.008 | 0.005 | -0.002 |
| $\ln(1+\frac{1}{n})^2$ | -0.039 | -0.216 | -0.149 | -0.024 | 0.009 | -0.108 | 0.039 | -0.004 | 0.097 | 0.020 | 0.009 | -0.002 |
| $\ln(1+\frac{1}{n}) \cdot \ln(1+a)$ | -0.013 | -0.069 | -0.067 | -0.004 | 0.006 | -0.019 | -0.001 | -0.002 | 0.030 | 0.008 | 0.002 | 0.000 |
| avg. $\frac{a}{n}$ | 0.022 | -0.603 | -0.870 | 0.206 | 1.399 | -0.090 | 0.440 | -0.082 | -0.693 | 0.053 | 0.001 | 0.032 |
| coef., $\ln n$ | -0.003 | -0.006 | -0.061 | -0.005 | 0.010 | 0.009 | 0.037 | 0.000 | -0.001 | 0.000 | 0.001 | 0.000 |
| $var(\frac{a}{n} n)$ | -0.238 | -0.435 | 1.257 | -0.361 | 1.001 | -1.035 | -0.447 | -0.015 | -0.974 | -0.009 | 0.077 | -0.053 |
| coef., $\ln n$ | 0.100 | 1.217 | -1.121 | 0.096 | 0.117 | 0.749 | -0.350 | -0.020 | -0.675 | 0.012 | -0.025 | 0.022 |
| $\frac{\text{foreign sales}}{\text{total sales}}$ | 0.157 | -0.155 | 0.419 | -0.016 | 0.048 | -0.072 | -0.039 | 0.010 | 0.172 | -0.055 | 0.006 | -0.002 |
| $\frac{\#exporters}{\#firms}$ | 0.118 | 0.572 | -1.517 | 0.048 | -0.282 | 0.014 | 0.229 | 0.021 | -0.354 | 0.117 | -0.024 | 0.003 |

D Model Fit

Each table in this appendix reports model-based based moments below their data-based counterparts, which are repeated from Tables 6, 7 and 8. Standard errors for the data-based estimates appear in parentheses below each pair of figures; these too are repeated from Tables 6, 7 and 8.

Looking first at table 20, column 1, we see the model understates monthly log match hazards. The quadratic relationship between match hazards and cumulative successes in the data is also present in the model-based simulations, albeit somewhat dampened. And the relation between success rates and match hazards changes curvature. Column 2 shows that the model under-predicts match death rates a bit, though it picks up their negative relationship to match sales and age. (The first year effect seems to be entirely absorbed by this age variable.) As for success rates, the model comes reasonably close to the data. It misses the positive association between this variable and number of matches, but does replicate the reduction in success rate dispersion as the cumulative number of matches grows.

Turning to table 21, we see that model gets the nearly-Pareto distribution of client counts across firms, as the coefficient on $\ln(\ell)^2$ is negative but close to zero, just as in the data. However, the slope of regression v is less negative in the simulated data than in the actual data, implying that the model predicts relative more exporters have high-client counts. As for equation (vi) , the estimated model generates more shipments per month among active matches than we find in the data.

Finally, table 22 shows that the model does a good job of explaining match-level sales dynamics (equation vii), including the dependence of sales on exporters' market tenure, Δ . It also gets the persistence in home market sales almost exactly right (equation $viii$). It is less successful at explaining the weak correlation between domestic and foreign sales, perhaps because the dependent variable is exports destined for the U.S. alone, and exports to other destinations—which are not in our model—are not really independently determined.

Table 20: Match hazards, success rates, and endurance: Model vs. Data

| | (i) $\ln(\lambda_{ij})$ | (ii) $D_{ijt}^{exit\ match}$ | (iii) $\frac{a_{ij}}{n_{ij}}$ | (iv) $u_{a_{ij}/n_{ij}}^2$ |
|---|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | 1.767 | 0.395 | 0.413 | 0.091 |
| mean, dep. variable | 1.527 (0.621 E-2) | 0.267 (0.319 E-2) | 0.470 (0.153 E-2) | 0.066 (0.265 E-3) |
| $\ln(1 + n_{ij})$ | — | — | 0.093 -0.009 (0.003) | -0.060 -0.033 (0.000) |
| $\ln(1 + a_{ij})$ | -0.818 -0.371 (0.113) | — | — | — |
| $[\ln(1 + a_{ij})]^2$ | 0.312 0.024 (0.017) | — | — | — |
| $\ln(1 + \frac{a_{ij}}{n_{ij}})$ | -1.132 3.774 (0.296) | — | — | — |
| $[\ln(1 + \frac{a}{n})]^2$ | 2.451 -5.555 (0.396) | — | — | — |
| $\ln(1 + a) \cdot \ln(1 + \frac{a}{n})$ | -0.708 0.564 (0.134) | — | — | — |
| $D_{ijt}^{new\ to\ mkt}$ | — | 0.034 -0.133 (0.012) | — | — |
| $\ln X_{ijt}^f$ | — | -0.032 -0.033 (0.002) | — | — |
| $\ln A_{ijt}$ | — | -0.054 -0.077 (0.009) | — | — |
| $\ln \Delta_{jt}$ | — | -0.028 0.020 (0.007) | — | — |

Notes: Unit of observation, columns *i*, *iii* and *iv*: seller *j*'s *i*th match. Unit of observation, column *ii*: seller *j*'s *i*th match in its *t*th year. λ_{ij} = inverse of time interval between commencement of match *i* and commencement of the next one for exporter *j* $D_{ijt}^{exitmatch} = 1$ if exporter *j*'s *i*th match dies in year *t*. a_{ij} = cumulative number of successes for exporter *j* at time of match *i*. $D_{ijt}^{newtomkt} = 1$ if exporter *j*'s *i*th match is in its first year. $\ln A_{ijt}$ = log age of exporter *j*'s *i*th match. $\ln \Delta_{jt}$ = log age of exporter *j* in year *t*. X_{ijt}^f = foreign sales volume generated by exporter *j*'s *i*th match.

Table 21: Client distribution and shipment frequency, model vs. data

| | (v) $\ln(1 - \Phi(\ell))$ | (vi) $\ln(\lambda_b)$ |
|---------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | 0.971 |
| mean, dep. variable | - | 1.489 |
| | | () |
| | -1.881 | |
| $\ln(\ell)$ | -1.199 (0.112) | - |
| | -0.056 | |
| $(\ln \ell)^2$ | -0.115 (0.021) | - |
| sample restrictions | $\ell > 0$ | $\lambda_b > 0$ |

Notes: ℓ : number of active clients; $\Phi()$ = cumulative distribution of exporters in terms of ℓ ; s_{ijt} = number of shipments per year to client i by exporter j in year t

Table 22: Home and foreign sales regressions

| | (vii) $\ln X_{ijt}^f$ | (viii) $\ln X_{jt}^h$ | (ix) $\ln X_{jt}^f$ | (x) D_{jt}^f | (xi) $\frac{X_{jt}^f}{X_{jt}^h + X_{jt}^f}$ |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|--|
| | 10.665 | | | 0.102 | 0.127 |
| mean, dep. variable | 10.957 (0.002) | - | - | 0.141 (0.003) | 0.062 (0.002) |
| | 0.328 | | | | |
| R_{ijt-1} | 0.607 (0.018) | - | - | | |
| | 0.826 | | | | |
| $\ln X_{ijt-1}^f$ | 0.848 (0.004) | - | - | | |
| | | 0.976 | | | |
| $\ln X_{jt-1}^h$ | - | 0.964 (0.001) | - | | |
| | | | 0.323 | | |
| $\ln X_{jt}^h$ | - | - | 0.811 (0.012) | | |
| | 0.063 | | | | |
| $\ln \Delta_{jt}$ | 0.060 (0.014) | - | - | | |
| sample restrictions | $X_{ijt}^f > 0$ $X_{ijt-1}^f > 0$ | $X_{jt}^h > 0$ $X_{jt-1}^h > 0$ | $X_{jt}^f > 0$ $X_{jt}^h > 0$ | $X_{jt}^h > 0$ | $X_{jt}^f, X_{jt}^h > 0$ |

Notes: $R_{ijt} = 1$ if exporter j 's i^{th} match is in its first year. $\ln \Delta_{jt} = \log$ age of exporter j . X_{ijt}^f = foreign sales volume generated by exporter j 's i^{th} match. X_{jt}^f = total foreign sales volume generated by firm j . X_{jt}^h = total home sales volume generated by firm j . $D_{jt}^f = 1$ if firm j is an exporter.