Research Progress and Trends in Learning-by-Exporting and Self-Selection Hypotheses of Heterogeneous Firms

Lei He[1,a], Xiaoyu Zhen[1,b,*]

[1]School of Economics and Management, Shaanxi University of Science and Technology, Xi'an, China
[a] helei@sust.edu.cn, [b]15877413138@163.com
*Corresponding author

Abstract: Since the emergence of the heterogeneous firm trade theory pioneered by Melitz, which emphasizes the performance advantages of exporting firms, scholars have increasingly utilized firm-level microdata to investigate the drivers and consequences of international trade. This line of research has given rise to two central hypotheses: learning-by-exporting and self-selection. This paper synthesizes theoretical and empirical studies on these hypotheses, examining their research progress and trends within the framework of firm heterogeneity. By reviewing the evolution of trade theories, consolidating empirical methodologies and findings on learning-by-exporting and self-selection, and analyzing the determinants of learning-by-exporting, we identify key gaps in the literature and outline future research directions. To date, the self-selection hypothesis has garnered broad empirical support, whereas the existence of learning-by-exporting effects remains inconclusive. This study contributes a comprehensive literature review on the trade behavior of heterogeneous firms.

Keywords: Heterogeneous Firms, Trade Theory, Learning-by-Exporting, Self-Selection

1. Introduction

One of the most recent advancements in international trade theory is the "new new trade theory", epitomized by the heterogeneous firm trade theory. This theoretical framework shifts the analytical focus from the macroeconomic country level to the microeconomic firm level, examining firm-level behaviors, objectives, and trade patterns in international markets. Since its inception, empirical studies using cross-country (regional) data to validate the applicability of heterogeneous firm trade theory have become a prominent research focus. A key area of investigation involves the relationship between firm heterogeneity and export behavior, particularly the performance advantages of exporting firms, most notably, productivity differentials.

A central debate persists: Does exporting enhance firm performance ("learning-by-exporting"), or do only high-productivity firms self-select into export markets ("self-selection")? This discussion has crystallized into two complementary yet distinct hypotheses: the learning-by-exporting hypothesis and the self-selection hypothesis[1,2]. Extensive empirical research has been conducted to test these hypotheses, contributing significantly to the evolution of international trade theory. This paper provides a systematic review and critical analysis of the literature on learning-by-exporting and self-selection, elucidating theoretical and empirical progress while identifying emerging trends.

2. The Development of Trade Theory and the Proposal of Heterogeneous Firm Trade Theory

International trade theory has evolved through three distinct developmental phases: traditional trade theory (focused on inter-industry trade), new trade theory (centered on intra-industry trade), and new new trade theory (based on firm heterogeneity). The classical trade theory primarily comprises two foundational pillars: Smith's (1776) theory of absolute advantage and Ricardo's (1817) theory of comparative advantage. Under the premise assumptions of homogeneous products, homogeneous enterprises, a perfectly competitive market, the absence of trade barriers, and constant returns to scale, it explores how countries participate in the international division of labor based on the principle of comparative advantage, which stems primarily from cross-country differentials in factor endowments. The neoclassical trade theory, represented by the factor endowment theory (H-O theory), extends and

develops classical trade theory by explaining the basis of international trade from the perspective of differences in factor endowments and factor intensities of products among countries. However, traditional trade theory focuses on inter-industry trade and struggles to explain the increasingly prevalent phenomenon of intra-industry trade, which precipitated the development of new trade theory. The Dixit-Stiglitz (D-S) monopolistic competition model provides a rigorous theoretical framework for analyzing the fundamental trade-off between consumer preferences for product variety and production-side economies of scale under conditions of increasing returns[3] and imperfect competition. Krugman applied the D-S model to international trade analysis, establishing the theory of scale economies[4]. His model demonstrated that even in the absence of comparative advantage, imperfect competition coupled with increasing returns to scale could generate endogenous specialization and bilateral trade flows between identical economies, thereby providing the first theoretically robust explanation for the prevalence of intra-industry trade among developed nations with similar factor endowments.

Both traditional and new trade theories share the critical limitation of assuming firm homogeneity, thereby neglecting the empirically observed heterogeneity in firm-level characteristics. This fundamental assumption renders these frameworks inadequate for explaining: (1) the substantial variation in firms' export participation decisions, (2) the diversity of organizational forms in international trade, and (3) the systematic differences in export performance across firms. The emergence of new trade theory has successfully overcome these theoretical shortcomings and has opened up a new perspective for the development of international trade theory. The new trade theory has been bifurcated into two principal research strands: One is the endogenous boundary theory of firms, which examines firms' global production organization decisions. The seminal contribution is Antras' endogenous boundary model. The other is heterogeneous firm trade theory, which analyzes internationalization path selection among productivity-heterogeneous firms[5]. The cornerstone contribution is Melitz's Heterogeneous Firms Trade Model (HFTM), which integrates firm productivity differences into Krugman's monopolistic competition framework while incorporating dynamics from Hopenhayn's industry model. The HFTM establishes that export market participation requires overcoming substantial sunk costs, creating a self-selection mechanism where only the most productive firms can profitably export. Less productive firms either serve domestic markets or exit, leading to productivity-enhancing resource reallocation at the industry level. Subsequent refinements by Helpman et al.[6] and Yeaple extended this framework[7]. Complementarily, Clerides et al. (1998) proposed the learning-by-exporting hypothesis, positing that export participation may enhance firm performance through knowledge spillovers and competitive pressures.

3. Empirical Research on Learning-by-Exporting vs. Self-Selection Hypotheses

3.1. Empirical research on the learning-by-exporting hypothesis

The learning-by-exporting hypothesis originates from Arrow's seminal work on learning-by-doing theory in The Economic Implications of Learning by Doing, which posits that technological progress and efficiency gains arise from cumulative experiential knowledge during production processes[8]. The theory extends this logic to international trade, arguing that firms entering global markets gain exposure to advanced foreign technologies and management practices. Through such exposure, exporters accumulate knowledge capital that enhances product quality, managerial expertise, and ultimately production efficiency. Export participation also generates scale economies via market expansion, thereby lowering marginal production costs. Intensified global competition compels exporters to allocate resources toward R&D and quality improvements to meet international standards—a process referred to as export-induced innovation. Additionally, adapting to heterogeneous foreign market preferences necessitates structural optimization of production systems and quality control protocols, yielding additional efficiency gains.

Empirically, the existence of learning-by-exporting has been a central focus in international economics, with foundational contributions dating to Bernard and Jensen's analysis of U.S. firms[9]. A growing body of research supports this hypothesis. Graf and Mohamed examined 14 manufacturing sectors across 27 German trading partners from 2004-2016, using patent citation data to proxy knowledge transfer. Their findings revealed a positive association between patent citations and Germany's R&D-weighted intermediate goods exports, confirming the existence of learning-by-exporting[10]. Debbarma et al. employed the Directional Distance Function (DDF) and the Malmquist-Luenberger productivity index to estimate green total factor productivity (GTFP) in 52 Indian manufacturing firms (2012–2020). They found that the average growth rate of GTFP for exporting enterprises was approximately 7.9%, which was 8.6% higher than that of non-exporting enterprises, indicating a significant existence of the

learning-by-exporting. The learning-by-exporting could serve as an effective mechanism for Indian firms to enhance sustainability and address climate challenges[11]. Atkin et al. conducted a randomized controlled trial (RCT) with Egyptian carpet manufacturers, finding export participation improved technical efficiency and increased profits by 16–26%[12]. Cross-country studies further validate these effects: Haq et al. linked exporting and diversification to performance improvements in Pakistani firms[13]. Zhao and Wen estimated that each additional year of export experience increases productivity by 14%, with capital/technology-intensive firms achieving greater gains than labor-intensive, high-export-intensity counterparts[14].

However, a growing body of empirical evidence challenges the existence of learning-by-exporting. Some studies even suggest that exporting may hinder productivity growth, creating a "productivity paradox". Vu et al. tested the validity of learning-by-exporting and self-selection hypotheses in Vietnamese manufacturing firms (2005–2009), finding that exporters' productivity advantage arose from self-selection, whereby high-productivity firms pre-select into export markets, rather than post-entry learning[15]. Similarly, Ciarli et al. reached comparable conclusions in their analysis of Chilean firms. Using data from Vietnamese manufacturing SMEs (2007–2013), Vo et al. (2020) found no productivity improvements associated with exporting[16]. Conversely, some studies report adverse outcomes: Hu and Ye found that exporting not only failed to improve total factor productivity (TFP) but also exerted adverse spillover effects on pure technical efficiency[17]. Other research has documented the absence of both self-selection and learning-by-exporting mechanisms among exporters[18].

Empirical evidence reveals mixed findings regarding learning-by-exporting outcomes. The impact of learning-by-exporting varies across firms due to heterogeneity in innovation behavior, firm lifecycle stages, and other firm-specific characteristics. Consequently, the presence and magnitude of learning-by-exporting differ significantly among enterprises. Studies showed that export-driven productivity improvements depended crucially on firms' innovation capabilities. Only sufficiently innovative firms achieved accelerated growth through exporting and innovation synergies, whereas less innovative firms may experience productivity declines from exporting[19]. Learning-by-exporting was more pronounced in mature firms—especially those engaged in R&D, large-scale production, and private ownership—whereas younger enterprises demonstrated limited or insignificant learning-by-exporting regardless of R&D investment or firm size[20]. Exporting also facilitated firms' outward foreign direct investment (OFDI), with stronger effects observed in private and domestic firms compared to state-owned or foreign-funded entities[21].

Overall, research on learning-by-exporting has yielded substantial findings. While no universal consensus exists and many findings remain contentious, a general pattern emerges: exporters in developed countries—already positioned at the value chain apex with advanced capabilities—exhibit limited learning-by-exporting effects. Conversely, developing-country exporters, facing substantial productivity gaps relative to exporting nations, demonstrate significant learning potential, making learning-by-exporting a critical productivity-enhancement mechanism. Recent scholarship has expanded this framework by incorporating learning-by-exporting as a mediating variable to examine its role in export-driven improvements in firm risk-taking, social security investments, and export technological sophistication[22,23].

3.2. Empirical research on the self-selection hypothesis

Melitz's (2003) heterogeneous firm trade theory theoretically formalized the self-selection hypothesis in enterprise exports, arguing that only firms with competitive advantages in productivity, scale, or technological innovation can overcome sunk costs to enter export markets. Subsequently, empirical literature extensively tested this theory's cross-country applicability. While these studies employed divergent methodologies and datasets, yielding somewhat inconsistent findings, the majority confirmed the self-selection hypothesis.

Empirical evidence overwhelmingly supports the self-selection hypothesis, though it increasingly suggests it does not operate in isolation. Higher-performing firms that self-select into export markets simultaneously exhibit learning-by-exporting. Kiendrebeogo, using firm-level data from Egypt (2003–2008), found a significant productivity premium among exporters compared to non-exporters—a gap explained by combined self-selection and learning-by-exporting[24]. Similarly, Cisse analyzed Senegalese manufacturing firms (1998–2011) and reported that the most efficient firms self-selected to export and then achieved further productivity gains through learning-by-exporting[25]. Using 2011 data from China's listed service-sector firms, Yang empirically verified the coexistence of both hypotheses (self-selection and learning-by-exporting) in the export-productivity relationship[26]. Tandrayen-Ragoobur extended this

analysis to African manufacturing and services[27], while Rehman explored bidirectional relationships between innovation, productivity, and exports across 29 Eurasian and Central/Eastern European countries—both studies aligning with prior conclusions[28].

However, it is noteworthy that some empirical studies have found exporters performing worse than domestic firms, revealing a self-selection paradox (also termed the "productivity paradox"). This contradicts Melitz's heterogeneous firm trade theory, which posits the self-selection of high-productivity firms into exporting. Sahoo et al. provided empirical support for learning-by-exporting in Indian manufacturing firms (1994–2017), yet found no evidence of the self-selection hypothesis[29]. Conversely, Egyptian firms showed clear self-selection effects. Zhang et al. analyzed Chinese industrial enterprises (2005–2007) and found significant post-entry productivity gains for exporters, yet no self-selection effects for exports or outward FDI[30]. The authors attributed this to China's unique institutional context—processing trade dominance, domestic market fragmentation, and rent-seeking behavior—that collectively lower productivity thresholds for export participation.

4. Determinants of Learning-by-Exporting

Scholars have investigated determinants of learning-by-exporting from multiple dimensions, examining why effects vary across firms and what factors influence their persistence. Key determinants include:

Export Duration: The role of export duration remains contentious. Zhu found that long-term exporters exhibit diminishing learning-by-exporting effects due to the complete absorption of foreign technologies, resulting in "learning exhaustion"[31]. Conversely, Xu argued that extended duration strengthens learning-by-exporting, as early-stage fixed costs and delayed technology spillovers require cumulative experience to generate net benefits[32].

Export Destination: Ito demonstrated that productivity gains from learning-by-exporting occur only when exporting to higher-income countries, which provided advanced technology access and compelled R&D investment to meet stringent standards[33].

Export Intensity: Studies consistently showed heterogeneous effects: low-intensity exporters benefited significantly from learning-by-exporting, while high-intensity exporters not only failed to demonstrate such effects but experienced productivity suppression from exporting[34]. Exceptions exist: Andersson & Lööf found that continuous high-intensity exporters outperformed temporary/low-intensity exporters[35].

Firm Size: Large firms typically exhibited stronger learning-by-exporting due to superior absorptive capacity and resource endowments[36]. Small firms faced constraints like limited market reach, managerial inefficiencies, financing difficulties, and talent shortages that hindered knowledge absorption.

Geographic Location: Eastern coastal regions in China demonstrated weaker learning-by-exporting due to processing trade prevalence, prosperous economic development, fast information flow, and obvious technological spillovers. However, restricted by geographical conditions such as transportation and climate, the western region had slow economic development and limited information access. Enterprises in this region benefited more from export-induced knowledge inflows[37,38].

Ownership Structure: State-owned enterprises and collective enterprises had relatively low productivity but greater potential for improvement, so learning-by-exporting was more pronounced. Private and domestic firms, being smaller in scale and more flexible, demonstrated stronger absorptive capacity, leading to significant learning-by-exporting. However, firms from Hong Kong, Macao, Taiwan, and foreign-owned enterprises exhibited higher baseline productivity and were often engaged in processing trade, which weakened the learning-by-exporting[39,40].

Export Mode: Ordinary trade firms exhibited significant learning-by-exporting, while processing trade firms did not. Compared to ordinary trade, processing trade firms relied primarily on low-cost labor for production at the lower end of the global value chain, earning minimal processing profits. Their capacity to learn and absorb advanced technologies was weaker, and their productivity remained generally low. Thus, the prevalence of processing trade firms was a major contributor to the "productivity paradox"[41,42].

Industry Characteristics: Capital-intensive firms outperform labor-intensive counterparts in learning-by-exporting. Labor-intensive firms faced multiple constraints, including weaker learning capacity, intense market competition, and low technology intensity, which collectively hindered their ability to

improve performance through exporting[43]. However, Tong et al. found that resource-intensive and technology-intensive enterprises exhibited significantly positive learning-by-exporting, while neither capital-intensive nor labor-intensive firms showed such effects[44].

Additional determinants include policy interventions[45], government subsidies, and factor market distortions[46].

5. Research Progress on Empirical Methods for Studying Learning-by-Exporting and Self-Selection

Early empirical investigations into learning-by-exporting and self-selection primarily utilized conventional parametric approaches, including linear models and linear probability models. The seminal methodology developed by Bernard and Jensen established the standard empirical framework[47]. To identify self-selection, their approach compared pre-entry productivity differentials (typically three years before export entry) between exporters and non-exporters. Conversely, learning-by-exporting was measured by analyzing post-entry productivity growth disparities between exporting and non-exporting firms. Qian et al. applied the linear probability model and found a significant productivity premium among exporters, indicating that high-productivity firms both self-selected into exporting and experienced post-entry productivity improvements through learning-by-exporting[48]. However, this method struggles to overcome the endogeneity among variables and cannot eliminate the biases in the estimation results caused by unobservable influencing factors, thereby compromising the robustness of the findings.

With the continuous advancement of econometric techniques, researchers have increasingly employed advanced matching methods to address endogenous concerns in recent studies of learning-by-exporting and self-selection. Among these, Propensity Score Matching (PSM) is the most widely used, whereas the Difference-in-Differences (DID) approach is particularly effective in mitigating estimation bias arising from unobservable confounding factors. A growing number of studies have integrated these two approaches into a PSM-DID framework to investigate the causal effects of exporting on firm performance. Camino-Mogro et al. employed PSM-DID methodology on Ecuadorian manufacturing firm data (2007-2018), demonstrating that exporters' productivity premium arises from the interplay between self-selection and learning-by-exporting[49]. Xing utilized generalized propensity score matching (GPSM) to analyze Chinese firm data and found a positive effect of export volume on total factor productivity (TFP), corroborating the presence of learning-by-exporting. Notably, this study also uncovered an inverse relationship between export intensity and TFP growth[50].

Beyond conventional methodologies, scholars have increasingly employed alternative approaches such as stochastic dominance analysis and quantile regression to investigate learning-by-exporting and self-selection. Stochastic dominance analysis, a nonparametric technique, evaluates learning-by-exporting by testing whether exporters' productivity distributions systematically outperform non-exporters' over time. This method differentiates between one-sided and two-sided tests, which can be implemented through the K-S test method proposed by Kolmogorov-Smirno. Delgado et al. applied this method to Spanish manufacturing firms and found robust evidence of self-selection, with more productive firms entering export markets. However, learning-by-exporting effects were limited to younger exporting firms[51]. Girma et al. conducted an empirical analysis using stochastic dominance tests on UK firm-level data, providing statistically significant evidence for the existence of learning-by-exporting[52]. Quantile regression, pioneered by Koenker and Bassett, provides a statistical methodology to examine how independent variables affect the dependent variable across different distributional quantiles. As an extension of mean regression, this approach yields robust coefficient estimates by leveraging full distributional information. Trinh and Doan utilized panel quantile regression on Vietnamese manufacturing SMEs, demonstrating that exporting positively influenced employment, output, and labor productivity growth, with sustained export participation yielding amplified effects[53]. Other studies have similarly applied panel quantile regression models alongside panel threshold models in related research[54].

6. Research Gaps and Future Directions in Learning-by-Exporting and Self-Selection Studies

The empirical literature demonstrates significant inconsistencies in findings on learning-by-exporting effects, which may stem from several critical yet understudied factors. First, most studies overlook firm heterogeneity in learning and absorptive capacities. Firms with stronger capabilities in these areas are

more likely to convert export exposure into knowledge acquisition and efficiency gains. Second, empirical models often neglect the confounding role of import activities. Given that prior research has identified both self-selection and learning effects in import behavior, accurately estimating the impact of exports on firm performance requires rigorous control for concurrent import influences. Third, financial constraints critically mediate the export-performance relationship. While exporting exposes firms to advanced foreign technologies—a potential platform for improvement, actual productivity gains depend on their ability to finance equipment upgrades and R&D investments, exhibiting a threshold effect. Using a general linear model may obscure the true effects of learning-by-exporting. Finally, conventional empirical frameworks assume a strict temporal sequence where self-selection precedes export entry and learning occurs post-entry. This assumption conflicts with real-world trade dynamics, as learning effects can emerge before formal export participation. Consequently, time-based distinctions between self-selection and learning hypotheses may introduce systematic biases.

Several methodological limitations persist in current research. First, in sample selection, existing studies often rely on outdated or small datasets restricted to specific regions or industries. Methodological limitations frequently cause substantial data attrition, reducing the representativeness of findings and their relevance to contemporary economic shifts. Second, in research object selection, research predominantly focuses on manufacturing firms, overlooking service and agricultural enterprises whose distinct characteristics may critically shape export behaviors. Furthermore, there is little literature conducting research from the perspective of subdivided industries (such as the food processing industry). Third, in research content, while existing work centers on binary export participation, it neglects nuanced dimensions like export scale, duration, or volume—factors that may differentially affect performance outcomes. Additionally, most studies analyze firms at aggregate levels, ignoring micro-level variations in export destinations and product portfolios that substantially influence performance. Finally, the widespread reliance on productivity metrics as proxies for learning-by-exporting is methodologically problematic, as these indirect measures fail to capture actual knowledge transfers between exporters and foreign partners. Direct indicators tracking technology adoption, knowledge absorption, and learning mechanisms in global value chains are urgently needed.

While existing research on learning-by-exporting and self-selection has extensively investigated multiple dimensions of exporter performance, including productivity, scale, and wage dynamics, many issues remain to be further explored. First, the overwhelming focus on productivity impacts leaves profitability outcomes underexplored; whether productivity gains translate to improved profit margins remains unresolved. Second, empirical analyses predominantly utilize national manufacturing data, with scant attention to subnational contexts. Examining export-performance linkages within specific industries at provincial levels could yield context-specific policy guidance for regional trade and industrial development. Third, although studies acknowledge dual contributions from learning-by-exporting and self-selection, their relative contributions remain ambiguous and require rigorous quantification. Fourth, while prior work prioritizes causal identification and factor analysis, it insufficiently examines the operational mechanisms driving self-selection and learning processes. A deeper exploration of these mechanisms is essential for theory refinement. Finally, given China's unique economic context and trade structure, adapting classical theories and models to its contextual realities is essential to derive context-specific conclusions and policy recommendations.

References

[1] Clerides, S. K., Lach, S., and Tybout, J. R. (1998). Is learning by exporting important? Micro-dynamic evidence from Colombia, Mexico, and Morocco. The quarterly journal of economics, 113(3), 903-947.

[2] Melitz, M. J. (2003). The impact of trade on intra-industry reallocations and aggregate industry productivity. econometrica, 71(6), 1695-1725.

[3] Dixit, A. K., and Stiglitz, J. E. (1977). Monopolistic competition and optimum product diversity. The American economic review, 67(3), 297-308.

[4] Krugman, P. R. (1979). Increasing returns, monopolistic competition, and international trade. Journal of international Economics, 9(4), 469-479.

[5] Antràs, P. (2003). Firms, contracts, and trade structure. The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 118(4), 1375-1418.

[6] Helpman, E., Melitz, M. J., and Yeaple, S. R. (2004). Export versus FDI with heterogeneous firms. American economic review, 94(1), 300-316.

[7] Yeaple, S. R. (2005). A simple model of firm heterogeneity, international trade, and wages. Journal of international Economics, 65(1), 1-20.

[8] Arrow, K. J. (1962). The economic implications of learning by doing. The review of economic studies, 29(3), 155-173.

[9] Bernard, A. B., Jensen, J. B., and Lawrence, R. Z. (1995). Exporters, jobs, and wages in US manufacturing: 1976-1987. Brookings papers on economic activity. Microeconomics, 1995, 67-119.

[10] Graf, H., and Mohamed, H. (2025). Beyond trading: knowledge spillovers and learning-by-exporting in global value chains. Industrial and Corporate Change, 34(1), 144-170.

[11] Debbarma, J., Choi, Y., Yang, F., and Lee, H. (2022). Exports as a new paradigm to connect business and information technology for sustainable development. Journal of Innovation and Knowledge, 7(4), 100233.

[12] Atkin, D., Khandelwal, A. K., and Osman, A. (2017). Exporting and firm performance: Evidence from a randomized experiment. The quarterly journal of economics, 132(2), 551-615.

[13] Haq, K. A., Munir, S., and Raza, S. (2022). The impact of export and diversification on firm performance: evidence from pakistan. Am. J. Econ. Bus. Innov, 1(3), 36-46.

[14] Zhao, C.M., and Wen, L. (2016). Export duration, foreign trade competition and productivity advantage of china's enterprises. Reform, (07), 115-128.

[15] Vu, H. V., Holmes, M., Tran, T. Q., and Lim, S. (2016). Firm exporting and productivity: what if productivity is no longer a black box. Baltic Journal of Economics, 16(2), 95-113.

[16] Ciarli, T., Coad, A., and Moneta, A. (2023). Does exporting cause productivity growth? Evidence from Chilean firms. Structural Change and Economic Dynamics, 66, 228-239.

[17] Vo, D. T. H., Sun, S., and Phan, C. T. (2020). Does export destination affect firm productivity? Evidence from small-and medium-sized enterprises in the Vietnamese manufacturing sector. Global Economic Review, 49(1), 23-42.

[18] Yuan, L., and Zou, Z. S. (2017). Do export firms outperform non-export ones? an empirical study on different classification of manufacturing industries in china. Finance and Trade Economics, 38(05), 96-111.

[19] Wu, R., and Chiou, J. R. (2021). Retesting the learning-by-exporting theory: An investigation of Chinese manufacturers' productivity under globalization. Atlantic Economic Journal, 49(1), 71-85.

[20] Liu, B. J. (2017). Do bigger and older firms learn more from exporting? — Evidence from China. China Economic Review, 45, 89-102.

[21] Zhang, X. F., Zhang, J., and Liu, X. P. (2016). The Promotion of the Learning-by-Exporting Effect on OFDI: Theory and Evidence. Journal of International Trade, (04), 155-165.

[22] Xu, H. L. and Zhang, Y. Z. (2021). Does Export Raise Firms' Social Security Contributions. Journal of International Trade, (04), 17-31.

[23] Yu, P., Lv, M. J. and Luo, Y. E. (2023). A study on the impact of opening of China railway express on the export technological sophistication: evidence from Chinese a-share listed companies. Scientific Decision Making, (11), 106-126.

[24] Kiendrebeogo, Y. (2020). Learning by exporting or self-selection into exporting?. Middle East Development Journal, 12(2), 304-325.

[25] Cisse, F. (2017). Do firms learn by exporting or learn to export? Evidence from Senegalese manufacturing firms. Journal of African Development, 19(1), 133-160.

[26] Yang, C. (2014). The export and productivity of Chinese service enterprises: Self-selection effect or learning by exporting effect? International Business Research,35(01), 51-64.

[27] Tandrayen-Ragoobur, V. (2022). The innovation and exports interplay across Africa: Does business environment matter? The Journal of International Trade and Economic Development, 31(7), 1041-1071.

[28] Rehman, N. U. (2017). Self-selection and learning-by-exporting hypotheses: micro-level evidence. Eurasian Economic Review, 7(1), 133-160.

[29] Sahoo, P. K., Rath, B. N., and Le, V. (2022). Nexus between export, productivity, and competitiveness in the Indian manufacturing sector. Journal of Asian Economics, 79, 101454.

[30] Zhang, R. Q., Su, R. andZhang, E. Z. (2016). Relationship between economic openness and enterprise productivity: "learning effect" or "self-selection effect". World Economy Studies, (04),119-133+136.

[31] Zhu, Y. R. (2017). Financial development and export enterprise learning: Empirical analyse from Chinese manufacturing enterprises. Future and Development,41(12), 55-59+73.

[32] Xu, C. P. (2014). A study on the influence of export experience on learning-by-exporting effects——From the perspective of heterogeneous ownership of enterprises. Collected Essays on Finance and Economics, (09), 3-8.

[33] Ito, K. (2011). Sources of learning-by-exporting effects: Does exporting promote innovation. ERIA Discussion Paper Series ERIA-DP-2012-06.

[34] Liu, X. N. and Liu, L. (2016). Interaction between export intensity and product quality: quality promoting effect or learning by exporting effect. Finance and Trade Research, 27(06), 60-69.

[35] Andersson, M., and Lööf, H. (2009). Learning-by-exporting revisited: The role of intensity and persistence. The Scandinavian Journal of Economics, 111(4), 893-916.

[36] Zhang, L., Liu, T. B. and Liu, Y. H. (2021). Productivity advantages and sources identification of the export firms in China. Research on Economics and Management, 42(05), 68-84.

[37] Yu, M. C. and Liu, Y. (2016). A test of the "export learning" effect based on the endogenous production function of exports. Journal of Nanjing University (Philosophy, Humanities and Social Sciences) ,53(05), 38-48.

[38] Zhang, H. and Zhang, M. Q. (2018). Analysis on the learning by exporting effects of firms with excess capacity. Journal of Beijing Jiaotong University (Social Sciences Edition), 17(04), 88-95+122.

[39] Newman, C., Rand, J., Tarp, F., and Thi Tue Anh, N. (2016). Exporting and productivity: Learning from Vietnam. Journal of African Economies, 1-25.

[40] Jing, F. C., Tao, P. and Gao, Y. (2013). Do Chinese firms learn from exporting?: An empirical study from ownership structure. World Economy Studies, (03), 41-47+88.

[41] Zhang, J., Zhang, F. and Chen, Z. Y. (2016). A re-examination of the relationship between export and productivity: new micro evidence from China. The Journal of World Economy, 39(06), 54-76.

[42] Xiang, S. L. and Ma, W. H. (2013). Whether the export enterprises have learning-by-exporting effect: an empirical analysis based on China's microfirms data. World Economy Studies, (10), 37-42+88.

[43] Huang, X. H., Yu, Z. C. and Yu, L. H. (2018). Exports, innovation and markup ratio: an analysis from the perspective of factor intensity. The Journal of World Economy, 41(05), 125-146.

[44] Tong, J. D., Liu, Z. Q. and Huang, P. C. (2014). Learning-by-export effects at different development stages: evidence from China's manufacturing firms. Economic Review, (03), 75-86.

[45] Li, L. X., Li, P. X. and Zhang, X. L. (2020). The effect of special economic zones on the productivity paradox of Chinese exporters. Economic Perspectives, (07), 65-83.

[46] Liu, Z. Q. and Tong, J. D. (2017). Factor market distortion, heterogeneous factors and the relationship between export and the productivity of Chinese firms. The Journal of World Economy, 40(12), 76-97.

[47] Bernard, A. B., and Jensen, J. B. (1999). Exceptional exporter performance: cause, effect, or both? Journal of international economics, 47(1), 1-25.

[48] Qian, X. F., Wang, J. R., Huang, Y. H. and Wang, S. (2011). Exports and the productivity of Chinese industrial enterprises: Self-selection effect or learning by exporting effect? Journal of Quantitative and Technological Economics, 28(02), 37-51.

[49] Camino-Mogro, S., Ordeñana-Rodríguez, X., and Vera-Gilces, P. (2023). Learning-by-exporting vs. self-selection in Ecuadorian manufacturing firms: Evidence from different industry classifications. The Journal of International Trade and Economic Development, 32(2), 281-312.

[50] Xing, Z. P. (2018). Does larger export scale generate higher productivity? ——an empirical research based on Chinese export enterprises. Journal of Dalian University of Technology (Social Sciences), 39(04), 21-28.

[51] Delgado, M. A., Farinas, J. C., and Ruano, S. (2002). Firm productivity and export markets: a non-parametric approach. Journal of international Economics, 57(2), 397-422.

[52] Girma, S., Kneller, R., and Pisu, M. (2005). Exports versus FDI: an empirical test. Review of World Economics, 141, 193-218.

[53] Trinh, L. Q., and Doan, H. T. T. (2018). Internationalization and the growth of Vietnamese micro, small, and medium sized enterprises: Evidence from panel quantile regressions. Journal of Asian Economics, 55, 71-83.

[54] Li, C. Q., Li, X. and Lu, J.(2018). Threshold effect of export on enterprises' green productivity. Science Research Management, 39(03), 59-68.