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Motivation

Firms increasingly adopt hybrid business models, whereby they sell bundles of product and services (Cusumano et al., 2015).

- **Servitization.** Manufacturers set out to grow their revenues and profits around services rather than products alone (Vandermerwe and Rada, 1988; Baines and Lightfoot, 2013).
  - French train manufacturer Alstom has introduced *train life services*, offering maintenance and parts supply services to transport companies.

- **Productization.** Service firms add tangible components to their offering. (Harkonen et al., 2015).
  - Embed sensors or other forms of hardware.
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Facts 1&2: B2B; sector heterogeneity

Fact 1: 87% of the firms which bundle sell to other firms (B2B).

Fact 2: On average only 22% of firms sell bundles of products and services. Their presence vary considerably across sectors.

### Bundling across sectors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Share of firms</th>
<th>Share of sales</th>
<th>Observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58-63</td>
<td>Information and communication</td>
<td>39.24</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Electricity, gas, steam, etc...</td>
<td>26.48</td>
<td>12.37</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-33</td>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>8.85</td>
<td>1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-47</td>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade, repair</td>
<td>22.16</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69-75</td>
<td>Professional, scientific and technical</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64-66</td>
<td>Financial and insurance activities</td>
<td>16.08</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-82</td>
<td>Administrative and support service</td>
<td>14.13</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-39</td>
<td>Water supply, sewerage, waste</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Real estate activities</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-43</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49-53</td>
<td>Transportation and storage</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.81</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>4,566</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Fact 3&4: Bundling; productivity; exporting.**

**Fact 3:** Firms that sell integrated solutions are more productive.  
**Fact 4:** Firms that sell integrated solutions export more.
Regression Results
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Bundling and Exporting: Regression Results

\[ e_{kjt}^f = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 s_{kst}^f + \Omega_{kjt}^f + \vartheta_f + \vartheta_k + \vartheta_j + \vartheta_m + \vartheta_t + \varepsilon_{kjt}^f \] (1)

1. \( e_{kjt}^f \) is the export intensity of firm \( f \) in sector \( k \) and state \( j \), at time \( t \), computed as the ratio between sales in foreign markets over total turnover.

2. \( s_{ijt}^f \) is the variable of interest, i.e. the share of firm turnover generated by selling integrated solutions: we expect \( \alpha_1 \) to be positive and significant.

3. \( \Omega_{kjt}^f \) is a vector of time-varying firm characteristics.

4. \( \vartheta_f \) are firm fixed-effects (FEs). \( \vartheta_k \) indicates sector dummies/FEs. \( \vartheta_j \) refers to state dummies/FEs. \( \vartheta_m \) are size dummies/FEs. \( \vartheta_t \) are time dummies/FEs.

5. \( \varepsilon_{kjt}^f \) is the error term.
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Bundling and Exporting: Regression Results

\[ e_{kjt}^f = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 s_{kjt}^f - \]
\[ + \Omega_{kjt}^f + \vartheta_f + \vartheta_k + \vartheta_j + \vartheta_m + \vartheta_t + \varepsilon_{kjt}^f \]  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>OLS (Full sample)</th>
<th>OLS (Fixed-effects)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( e_{kjt}^f )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( s_{kjt}^f )</td>
<td>0.087***</td>
<td>0.092***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( lp_{kjt}^f )</td>
<td>1.677**</td>
<td>1.341**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.627)</td>
<td>(0.518)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( inv_{kjt}^f )</td>
<td>21.329***</td>
<td>20.746***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.562)</td>
<td>(2.473)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( rd_{kjt}^f )</td>
<td>0.205***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.050)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>4,094</td>
<td>3,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \vartheta_k, \vartheta_j, \vartheta_m, \vartheta_t )</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \vartheta_f, \vartheta_kxt, \vartheta_mxt )</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \vartheta_f, \vartheta_kxt, \vartheta_mxt, \vartheta_jxt )</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A 1% increase in \( e_{kjt}^f \) is associated to a 7-9 pps increase in export intensity.
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**Bundling and Exporting: Manufacturers vs. ICT**

\[
e_{kjt}^f = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 s_{kjt}^f + \alpha_2 \mu_{kjt}^f + \alpha_3 \mu_{kjt}^f \times s_{kjt}^f - \\
+ \Omega_{kjt}^f + \vartheta_f + \vartheta_k + \vartheta_j + \vartheta_m + \vartheta_t + \varepsilon_{kjt}^f
\]  

(3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(e_{kjt}^f)</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(s_{kjt}^f)</td>
<td>0.092***</td>
<td>0.087***</td>
<td>0.086***</td>
<td>0.059**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\mu_{kjt}^f)</td>
<td>5.438***</td>
<td>5.571***</td>
<td>4.289**</td>
<td>5.722**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.585)</td>
<td>(0.626)</td>
<td>(1.365)</td>
<td>(1.618)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\mu_{kjt}^f \times s_{kjt}^f)</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.029**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(lp_{kjt}^f)</td>
<td>-0.010***</td>
<td>-0.011**</td>
<td>-0.012*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(inv_{kjt}^f)</td>
<td>21.706***</td>
<td>21.698***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.593)</td>
<td>(3.870)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(rd_{kjt}^f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.201**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>2,061</td>
<td>2,019</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>1,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\vartheta_k, \vartheta_j, \vartheta_m, \vartheta_t)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Bundling and Exporting: Manufacturers vs. ICT

\[
e^f_{kJt} = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 s^f_{kJt} + \alpha_2 \mu^f_{kJt} + \alpha_3 \mu^f_{kJt} \times s^f_{kJt} - \\
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<td>(0.626)</td>
<td>(1.365)</td>
<td>(1.618)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\mu^f_{kJt} \times s^f_{kJt})</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.015</td>
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</tr>
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<td>-0.011**</td>
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</tr>
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<td>(0.004)</td>
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<td>(inv^f_{kJt})</td>
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<td></td>
<td>21.706***</td>
<td>21.698***</td>
</tr>
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<td>(3.870)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(rd^f_{kJt})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.201**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.049)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>2,061</td>
<td>2,019</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>1,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>0.177</td>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Bundling and Exporting: Drivers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of new customers</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in sales per customer</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in earnings per customer</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in customer loyalty</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bundling is likely to increase firms’ competitive advantage either through product differentiation or by locking in customers in long-term agreements, or through a combination of the two.

Our data allow us to look closer into what leads firms to bundle.

- **Demand motives.** 91% of firms sell integrated solutions to increase customer loyalty and 78% to acquire new customers (in line with (Ariu et al., 2018).
- **Supply motives.** 70% (67%) of firms declare that bundling is implemented to increase sales (earnings) per customer.
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DR-PSM Results
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Bundling and Exporting: DR-PSM

The effect of bundling on exporting can be verified by looking at the following difference:

$$[\eta_{kjt}^1 - \eta_{kjt}^0]$$

where $\eta_{kjt}^1$ ($\eta_{kjt}^0$) is the outcome (exporting) for firm $f$ in sector $k$ and state $j$, at time $t$ that sells (does not sell) product-service bundles.

$$E[\eta_{kjt}^1 - \eta_{kjt}^0] = E[\eta_{kjt}^1] - E[\eta_{kjt}^0]$$ (4)

the probability model of bundling (the propensity score) can be written as

$$Pr[\eta_{kjt}^0 = 1] = \Phi[g(\Omega^*)]$$ (5)

where $\Omega^*$ is a vector of firm, sector and state characteristics covariates.
Bundling and Exporting: DR-PSM

Bundling is not a characteristic that is randomly assigned to firms but a strategy they choose to increase their competitiveness.

- The matching procedure relies on conditional independence: the treatment (bundling product and services) is as good as randomly assigned after conditioning on a set of covariates.

Imposing common support, if balancing property holds, in each block the average propensity score is not different for treated and untreated. Within each sub-sample, we can then analyze the data as if they came from a completely randomized experiment.

- We have to show that after conditioning on a set of covariates, the treatment does not affect the means of the potential outcomes.
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Bundling and Exporting: DR-PSM

Pearl’s back-door criterion: two chances to get things right:

- either block the back-door path by matching and eliminating any association between covariates and treatment assignment
- or block the back-door path with regression by controlling for other causes of the outcome that are correlated with treatment.

As long as one of the two models are correctly specified, the effect of the treatment on the outcome will be correctly estimated.
Bundling and exporting: DR-PSM Results

Defining $\eta^{1,f,DR}_{kjt}$ and $\eta^{0,f,DR}_{kjt}$ as the counterfactual responses ($DR$ stands for Doubly Robust), we can then evaluate:

$$\zeta_{DR} = E[\eta^{1,f,DR}_{kjt}] - E[\eta^{0,f,DR}_{kjt}] =$$

$$= \frac{1}{f} \sum_{f} \left( \frac{s^{f,DR}_{kjt} \eta^{f}_{kjt}}{\lambda(\Omega^*; \hat{\beta})} - \frac{s^{f,DR}_{kjt} - \lambda(\Omega^*; \hat{\beta})}{\lambda(\Omega^*; \hat{\beta})} \times \chi_{1}(\Omega^*; \hat{\gamma}_{1}) \right) +$$

$$- \frac{1}{f} \sum_{f} \left( \frac{(1 - s^{f,DR}_{kjt}) \eta^{f}_{kjt}}{1 - \lambda(\Omega^*; \hat{\beta})} - \frac{s^{f,DR}_{kjt} - \lambda(\Omega^*; \hat{\beta})}{1 - \lambda(\Omega^*; \hat{\beta})} \times \chi_{0}(\Omega^*; \hat{\gamma}_{0}) \right)$$

(6)

where $f$ indexes firms as before; $\lambda(\Omega^*; \hat{\beta})$ is a postulated model for the true propensity score; $\chi_{0}(\Omega^*; \hat{\gamma}_{0})$ and $\chi_{1}(\Omega^*; \hat{\gamma}_{1})$ are postulated regression models for the true relationship between the vector of covariates ($\Omega^*$) and the outcome within each stratum of treatment.
DR-PSM: Balancing the Sample ($s_{kjt}^f$ dummy)
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### Bundling and exporting: DR-PSM Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$e^f_{kjt}$</th>
<th>$ATE^{s,f}_{kjt}$</th>
<th>$\zeta_{DR}$</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Sample trimmed at the $5^{th}$ centile</th>
<th>$ATE^{s,f,5}_{kjt}$</th>
<th>$\zeta_{DR,5}$</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Sample trimmed at the $10^{th}$ centile</th>
<th>$ATE^{s,f,10}_{kjt}$</th>
<th>$\zeta_{DR,10}$</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1:1 Radius Kernel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$ATE^{s,f}_{kjt}$</td>
<td>4.49***</td>
<td>5.59***</td>
<td>5.16***</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.21**</td>
<td>3.23***</td>
<td>2.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.42***</td>
<td>3.96***</td>
<td>3.42***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\zeta_{DR}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>3,984</td>
<td>3,984</td>
<td>3,984</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,889</td>
<td>3,863</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,889</td>
<td>3,692</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lp$_{kjt}$</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inv$_{kjt}$</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rd$_{kjt}$</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\vartheta_k$, $\vartheta_m$</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\vartheta_j$, $\vartheta_t$</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Discussion

The good as a firm’s core competence, and the service as a peripheral product.

- One-way complementarity between goods and services (Ariu et al., 2018)

Goods and services as (two-way) complements (e.g., Cusumano et al., 2015).

In our case bundling seems to be driven by a mix of demand and supply motives.
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- Better data.
- IM and EM of trade.
- Buyer-seller repeated interaction setting.
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Thank you!
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Weights

Stratification by:

- size;
- sectors;

For each wave, the relative ($rw$) and absolute ($aw$) weights for firms in sector $j$ and size class $m$ is built as follows:

$$rw^{km} = \frac{\varphi^{km}}{\varphi^{km}_o} \quad aw^{km} = \left( \frac{\varphi^{km}}{\varphi^{km}_o} \right) \left( \frac{\varphi}{\varphi_o} \right)$$

Where $\varphi^{km}$ is the number of firms in industry $k$ and size class $m$ for the population of German firms in a given wave and $\varphi^{km}_o$ is the number of firms in industry $k$ and size class $m$ in our sample. $\varphi$ and $\varphi_o$ are the number of firms in the population and our sample respectively.
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