

ANALES DE  
ECONOMÍA  
APLICADA

ANAIS DE  
ECONOMIA  
APLICADA

2009

José Pires Manso  
João Dionísio Monteiro  
(Directores)

# ANALES DE ECONOMÍA APLICADA

---

# ANAIS DE ECONOMIA APLICADA 2009

Número XXIII

José R. Pires Manso  
João Dionísio Monteiro  
(Directores)



ASEPELT son las siglas de la Asociación Científica Internacional de Economía Aplicada. El objetivo de la Asociación, recogido en sus estatutos y que inspira su actividad, es organizar, promover y favorecer trabajos originales de carácter científico en el dominio de la Economía Aplicada.

Para ello, desde la Asociación se definen las siguientes líneas de actuación:

1. El intercambio de información, entre sus miembros, de sus trabajos de investigación.
2. La publicación de una Revista Científica: "Estudios de Economía Aplicada".
3. La publicación de selecciones de artículos o de obras colectivas.
4. La organización de seminarios, coloquios o congresos.

La Asociación se convierte, de esta manera, en un foro abierto al intercambio y debate de las distintas ideas y aportaciones científicas, que se desarrollan tanto en el ámbito universitario como en el empresarial, dentro del campo de la Economía Aplicada.

Las Reuniones Anuales de la Asociación, punto de encuentro de un elevado número de investigadores involucrados en estas cuestiones, proporcionan un medio excepcional para el mejor conocimiento mutuo, embrión de futuras colaboraciones.

Esta publicación ANALES DE ECONOMÍA APLICADA es la expresión del camino que están tomando las nuevas iniciativas en el ámbito de la investigación y de la innovación en Economía Aplicada.

ASEPELT são as siglas da Associação Científica Internacional de Economia Aplicada. O objectivo da Associação, transcrito nos seus estatutos, e que inspira a sua actividade, é organizar, promover e favorecer trabalhos originais de carácter científico no domínio da Economia Aplicada.

Para isso, a Associação define as seguintes linhas de acção:

1. O intercâmbio de informação, entre seus membros, de seus trabalhos de investigação.
2. A publicação de uma Revista Científica: "Estudios de Economía Aplicada".
3. A publicação de selecções de artigos ou de obras colectivas.
4. A organização de seminários, colóquios ou congressos.

A Associação converte-se, desta forma, num fórum aberto ao intercâmbio e debate de distintas ideias e contributos científicos, que se desenvolvem tanto no âmbito universitário como no empresarial, dentro do campo da Economia Aplicada.

As Reuniões Anuais da Associação, ponto de encontro de um elevado número de investigadores envolvidos na discussão destas questões, proporcionam um meio excepcional para o melhor conhecimento mútuo, embrião de futuras colaborações.

Esta publicação ANAIS DE ECONOMIA APLICADA é a expressão do caminho que estão a tomar as novas iniciativas no âmbito da investigação e da inovação na Economia Aplicada.

## **ANALES DE ECONOMÍA APLICADA** **ANAIS DE ECONOMIA APLICADA**

Año/Ano 2009 - Número XXIII

© 2009 ASEPELT

© 2009 Delta Publicaciones Universitarias

Reservados todos los derechos. El contenido de esta publicación, tanto de la obra escrita como electrónica, puede ser utilizado, de común acuerdo con ASEPELT y DELTA PUBLICACIONES, para usos exclusivamente particulares y/o profesionales y, en ningún caso, comerciales.

Reservados todos os direitos. O conteúdo desta publicação tanto da obra escrita como eletrónica, pode ser utilizado, de comum acordo com ASEPELT e DELTA PUBLICACIONES, para usos exclusivamente particulares e/ou profissionais e, em nenhum caso, comerciais.

ISBN: 978-84-92453-69-6

Depósito Legal:

**Preimpresión/Preimpressão:** Delta Publicaciones  
**Impresión/Impressão:** FER Impresores

## Comité Académico de ASEPELT

Presidente JESÚS BERNARDO PENA TRAPERO  
Universidad de Alcalá

Vocal: **ANTONIO GARCÍA LIZANA**  
Universidad de Málaga

Vocal: **ANTONIO PULIDO SANROMÁN**  
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

Vocal: **ESTELA BEE DAGUM**  
Universidad de Bolonia

Vocal: **JOAQUÍN ARANDA GALLEGO**  
Universidad de Murcia

Vocal: **JOSÉ GARCÍA PÉREZ**  
Universidad de Almería

Vocal: **JOSEFA E. FERNÁNDEZ ARUFE**  
Universidad de Valladolid

Vocal: **LAWRENCE R. KLEIN**  
Pennsylvania University

Vocal: **RAFAEL HERRERÍAS PLEGUEZUELO**  
Universidad de Granada

## Comité Científico

**Adolfo Rodero Franganillo**  
Universidad ETEA Córdoba-ESPAÑA

**Agustín Hernández Bastida**  
Universidad de Granada-ESPAÑA

**Alcino F.P. Couto**  
FCSH/UBI-PORTUGAL

**Alfredo Iglesias Suárez**  
Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha-ESPAÑA

**Álvaro Martins Monteiro**  
ISEG-UTL-PORTUGAL

**Amelia Pérez Zabaleta**  
UNED-ESPAÑA

**Ana Paula Matias Gama**  
FCSH/UBI-PORTUGAL

**Anabela Almeida**  
FSCG/UBI-PORTUGAL

**Anabela Dinis**  
FSCG/UBI-PORTUGAL

**António F. de Matos**  
FSCG/UBI-PORTUGAL

**Antonio García Lizana**  
Universidad de Málaga-ESPAÑA

**António L. Silvestre**  
ISEG/UTL-PORTUGAL

**Antonio Macías Hernández**  
Universidad de La Laguna-ESPAÑA

**António Marques**  
FSCG/UBI-PORTUGAL

**Antonio Pulido San Román**  
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid-MADRID

**Bala Veeramacheni**  
State University of New York-USA

**Beatriz González López-Valcárcel**  
Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria-ESPAÑA

**Carlos Murillo Fort**  
Universidad Pompeu Fabra-ESPAÑA

**Carlos Barros**  
ISEG/UTL-PORTUGAL

**Carlos Braumann**  
U. Evora-PORTUGAL

**Carlos Legna Verna**  
Universidad de La Laguna-ESPAÑA

**Carlos Moslares García**  
IQS. Universitat Ramon Llull-ESPAÑA

**Carmen Delia Dávila Quintana**  
Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria-ESPAÑA

**Christopher Gerry**  
UTAD-PORTUGAL

**Diego Martínez Perán**  
Intereconomía-ESPAÑA

**Estela Bee Dagum**  
Universidad de Bolonia-ITALIA

**Eugení Aguiló Pérez**  
Universidad de las Islas Baleares-ESPAÑA

**Fco. Javier Callealta Barroso**  
Universidad de Alcalá de Henares-ESPAÑA

**Fernanda Nogueira**  
UTAD-PORTUGAL

**Fernando Cortina García**  
Instituto Nacional de Estadística-ESPAÑA

**Flor María Guerrero Casas**  
Universidad Pablo Olavide-ESPAÑA

**Francisco Diniz**  
UTAD-PORTUGAL

**Francisco José Vázquez Polo**  
Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria-ESPAÑA

**Ginés Guirao Pérez**  
Universidad de La Laguna-ESPAÑA

**Helena Corrales Herrero**  
Universidad de Valladolid-ESPAÑA

**Isabel Soares**  
FE/UP-PORTUGAL

**Jacques Soichot**  
UB-Dijón

**Jesús Bernardo Pena Trapero**  
Universidad de Alcalá de Henares-ESPAÑA

**Jesús Cavero Álvarez**  
Universidad de Valladolid

**Jesús Esteban García**  
Universidad de Valencia-ESPAÑA

**João Albino M. Silva**  
FE/Ualg-PORTUGAL

**João C. C. Leitão**  
IST/UTL-PORTUGAL

**João Carlos Matias**  
FE/UBI-Portugal

**João D. Monteiro**  
FCSH/UBI-PORTUGAL

**João José M Ferreira**  
FCSH/UBI-Portugal

**João Rebelo**  
UTAD-PORTUGAL

**João Sousa Andrade**  
FE/UC-PORTUGAL

**Joaquim Ramos Silva**  
ISEG/UTL-Portugal

**Joaquín Aranda Gallego**  
Universidad de Murcia-ESPAÑA

**Joaquín Turmo Garuz**  
Universidad de Barcelona-ESPAÑA

**Jorge Miguel Silva**  
FCE/UBI-PORTUGAL

**José A. Cadima Ribeiro**  
EEG/UM-PORTUGAL

**José A. S. Rodrigues Fuinhas**  
FCSH/UBI-PORTUGAL

**José Alberto Soares da Fonseca**  
FE/UC-Portugal

**José Boza Chirino**  
Universidad de Las Palmas-ESPAÑA

**José Callejon Cespedes**  
Universidad de Granada-España

**José García Pérez**  
Universidad de Almería-ESPAÑA

**José L Miralles Quirós**  
Universidad de Extremadura-ESPAÑA

**José Luis Rojo García**  
Universidad de Valladolid-ESPAÑA

**José Manuel Díez Modino**  
Universidad de León-ESPAÑA

**José María Gil Roig**  
Universidad de Politécnica de Cataluña-ESPAÑA

**José María Moreno Jiménez**  
Universidad de Zaragoza-ESPAÑA

**José María Sarabia**  
Universidad de Cantabria-ESPAÑA

**Jose Miguel Casas Sánchez**  
Universidad de Alcalá de Henares-ESPAÑA

**José R. Pires Manso**  
FCSH/UBI-PORTUGAL

**Josefa E. Fernández Arufe**  
Universidad de Valladolid-ESPAÑA

**Josefina Martínez Barbeito**  
Universidad de La Coruña-ESPAÑA

**Josep García Blandón**  
Universidad Ramon Llull-ESPAÑA

**Josep Lladós Masllorenc**  
UOC-ESPAÑA

**Josep Maria Argilés Bosch**  
Universidad de Barcelona-ESPAÑA

**Juan José Cáceres Hernández**  
Universidad de La Laguna-ESPAÑA

**Juan Manuel Rey Julia**  
Universidad de Cádiz-ESPAÑA

**Julián Ramajo Hernandez**  
Universidad de Extremadura-ESPAÑA

**Justo Sotelo Navalpotro**  
Universidad de San Pablo CEU-ESPAÑA

**Lawrence R. Klein**  
Pennsylvania University-USA

**Lluís Jovell I Turró**  
Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona-ESPAÑA

**Lucía Navarro Gómez**  
Universidad de Málaga-ESPAÑA

**Lucinio González Sabaté**  
Universidad de Ramon Llull-ESPAÑA

**Luis Lourenço**  
FCSH/UBI-PORTUGAL

**Luis Mendes**  
FCSH/UBI-Portugal

**M<sup>a</sup> Isabel Sánchez y Sánchez Amaya**  
Universidad del País Vasco-ESPAÑA

**Manuel A. Ferreira**  
ISCTE-PORTUGAL

**Manuel Antonio Muñoz Pérez**  
Universidad de Oviedo-ESPAÑA

**Manuel Coelho**  
ISEG/UTL-Portugal

**Manuel Diez Modino**  
Universidad de León-ESPAÑA

**Manuel Navarro Ibáñez**  
Universidad de La Laguna-ESPAÑA

**Manuela Hill**  
ISCTE-PORTUGAL

**Mar Guitert Catasús**  
Universidad de Ramon Llull-ESPAÑA

**Margarida Proença**  
EEG/UM-PORTUGAL

**Margarida Vaz**  
FCSH/UBI-PORTUGAL

**María del Carmen Guisán Seijas**  
Universidad de Santiago de Compostela-ESPAÑA

**Maria do Céu Alves**  
FCSH/UBI-Portugal

**Maria Fátima David**  
ESTG/PG-Portugal

**Maria José Silva**  
FCSH/UBI-PORTUGAL

**Maria Teresa Noronha**  
FE/Ualg-PORTUGAL

**Mariana Bosch Casabó**  
Universidad de Ramon Llull-ESPAÑA

**Mário B. Raposo**  
FCSH/UBI-PORTUGAL

**Mário J. B. Franco**  
FCSH/UBI-Portugal

**Miguel Anjel Fajardo Caldera**  
Universidad de Extremadura-ESPAÑA

**Milagros Dones Tacero**  
Universidad de Autónoma de Madrid-ESPAÑA

**Mónica Martínez Blasco**  
Universidad de Ramon Llull-ESPAÑA

**Nuno Valério**  
ISEG/UTL-PORTUGAL

**Paulo Duarte**  
FCSH/UBI-PORTUGAL

**Paulo G. Pinheiro**  
FCSH/UBI-PORTUGAL

**Paulo M. Nunes**  
FCSH/UBI-PORTUGAL

**Pedro Guedes de Carvalho**  
FCSH/UBI-Portugal

**Pedro P. Barros**  
FE/UNL-PORTUGAL

**Rafael Amiel Sánchez**  
Global Insight-ESPAÑA

**Rafael Caballero**  
Universidad de Málaga-ESPAÑA

**Rafael Herrerías Pleguezuelo**  
Universidad de Granada-ESPAÑA

**Ricardo Alves**  
FCSH/UBI-PORTUGAL

**Ricardo G. Rodrigues**  
FCSH/UBI-Portugal

**Ricardo Ubeda Sales**  
Universidad de Ramón Llull-ESPAÑA

**Rigoberto Pérez Suárez**  
Universidad de Oviedo-ESPAÑA

**Rui Junqueira Lopes**  
UE-PORTUGAL

**Santiago Rodríguez Feijoo**  
Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria-ESPAÑA

**Susana C. Gabriel**  
FCSH/UBI-PORTUGAL

**Susana P. Garrido**  
FCSH/UBI-Portugal

**Tiago N. Sequeira**  
FCSH/UBI-PORTUGAL

**Victor Cano Fernández**  
Universidad de La Laguna-ESPAÑA

**Vitor Cavaleiro**  
FE/UBI-Portugal

**Xavier Tomàs Morer**  
Universidad de Ramon Llull-ESPAÑA

**Zélia Serrasqueiro**  
FCSH/UBI-PORTUGAL

## Comité de Honor/Comité de Honra

- D. **Victor Constâncio**  
Governador do Banco de Portugal
- D. **Castro Guerra**  
Secretário de Estado da Indústria e Energia
- D. **Emílio Rui Vilar**  
Presidente da Fundação C. Gulbenkian
- D. **João Senteiro**  
Presidente da FCT
- D. **Manuel J. Santos Silva**  
Reitor da Universidade da Beira Interior
- D. **Luis Lourenço**  
Presidente da Faculdade das Ciências Sociais e Humanas
- D. **Ginés Guirao Pérez**  
Presidente de ASEPELT
- D. **Murteira Nabo**  
Bastónario da Ordem dos Economistas
- D. **Victor Santos**  
ISEG/UTL e Presidente da ERSE
- D. **Simões Lopes**  
Ex-bastónario da Ordem dos Economistas e ex-Reitor da Universidade Técnica de Lisboa
- D. **Carlos Pinto**  
Presidente da Câmara da Covilhã
- D.<sup>a</sup>. **Alzira Serrasqueiro**  
Governadora Civil do Distrito de Castelo Branco
- D. **Artur Santos Silva**  
Presidente do Conselho de Administração do Banco Português de Investimento (BPI)
- D. **Júlio Fermoso**  
Presidente do Conselho de Administração da Caja Duero

## Comité de Organizador

José R. Pires Manso (Chairman)  
Alcino P. Couto  
António F. de Matos  
António Marques  
João D. Monteiro

José A. S. Rodrigues Fuinhas  
Margarida M. Vaz  
Paulo M. Nunes  
Susana C. Gabriel  
Tiago N. Sequeira

## Comité Ejecutivo/Comité Executivo de ASEPELT

### Presidente

Ginés Guirao Pérez

### Vicepresidente

Adolfo Rodero Franganillo

### Secretario general

Carlos Moslares García

### Vocales

Justo Sotelo Navalpotro  
José Manuel Diez Modino  
José María Moreno Jiménez  
Flor M<sup>a</sup> Guerrero Casas  
Miguel Ángel Fajardo Caldera  
José Boza Chirino  
Fernando Cortina García  
José María Sarabia Alegría

## Reuniones Anuales celebradas por la Asociación ASEPELT-España

Reunión I	1987	Barcelona	Reunión XIII	1999	Burgos
Reunión II	1988	Valladolid	Reunión XIV	2000	Oviedo
Reunión III	1989	Sevilla	Reunión XV	2001	La Coruña
Reunión IV	1990	Murcia	Reunión XVI	2002	Madrid
Reunión V	1991	Las Palmas de Gran Canaria	Reunión XVII	2003	Almería
Reunión VI	1992	Granada	Reunión XVIII	2004	León
Reunión VII	1993	Cádiz	Reunión XIX	2005	Badajoz
Reunión VIII	1994	Mallorca	Reunión XX	2006	Tenerife
Reunión IX	1995	Santiago de Compostela	Reunión XXI	2007	Valladolid
Reunión X	1996	Albacete	Reunión XXII	2008	Barcelona
Reunión XI	1997	Bilbao	<b>Reunión XXIII</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>Covilhã (Portugal)</b>
Reunión XII	1998	Córdoba			



# APRESENTAÇÃO

A ciência económica evolui muito rapidamente e cada vez mais para áreas interdisciplinares; e essa evolução tem tido reconhecimento público como é o caso da recente atribuição do prémio Nobel da Economia a um investigador da área da psicologia económica; mas outras áreas há que se têm vindo a afirmar progressivamente como é o caso da economia da energia e do ambiente, da economia da saúde, da economia experimental, da economia da estratégia, ou da economia da inovação, entre outras.

Neste XXIII Congresso Internacional de Economia Aplicada, o XXIII Encontro Anual e primeiro da ASEPELT Internacional, dada a sua recente mudança de nome, a par das tradicionais áreas da economia, abriu-se o leque a algumas destas novas áreas científicas e a verdade é que os investigadores corresponderam totalmente à nossa expectativa apresentando trabalho de indubitável interesse e em quantidades dignas de registo, como o prova o resultado da dupla revisão a que os mesmos artigos foram sujeitos e que aprovou a apresentação de um razoável número desses artigos. Esperemos que seja também essa a opinião dos investigadores que se dignarem assistir ao XXIII congresso na Covilhã.

Ao todo as áreas científicas a concurso foram dezasseis, das mais tradicionais a outras mais recentes como as já referidas áreas da economia da energia e do ambiente, da estratégia económica, da economia da inovação, da economia do conhecimento. O número de artigos recebidos foi de várias centenas, dos quais se seleccionaram, após a referida dupla revisão por avaliadores anónimos e independentes, cerca de duas centenas que estão englobados no CD dos Anais de Economia Aplicada que a Delta Publicaciones acaba de editar. Alguns desses artigos, distinguidos pelos próprios avaliadores, merecem um destaque especial e por isso se publicam como ‘ponencias’ na versão em livro dos mesmos Anais, a par dos resumos de todas as comunicações seleccionadas para apresentação no congresso; quer um quer o outro desses documentos apresenta ISBN.

No âmbito desta nota introdutória cabe um agradecimento especial ao imenso trabalho desenvolvido pelos inúmeros revisores anónimos e independentes, espanhóis e portugueses, de todos os artigos recebidos, alguns deles em áreas bem densas e complexas.

Também queremos destacar o trabalho do Comité Organizador constituído por colegas da Universidade da Beira Interior, realçando apenas o nome do colega João Dionísio Monteiro pela sua total disponibilidade e empenho desde o início deste processo, e o trabalho do secretariado com destaque para a técnica superior Elisabete



Ramos, e ainda a Delta Publicaciones que pacientemente foi aguardando o envio dos nossos trabalhos, apesar do extremamente curto espaço de tempo de que dispunha.

Uma palavra breve para agradecer ao Presidente da ASEPELT Internacional, Prof. Ginés Guirao, pelo apoio sempre disponibilizado e por ter confiado nas nossas mãos a organização deste congresso, o congresso da internacionalização da ASEPELT.

Como é evidente o maior realce vai para as centenas de autores dos artigos seleccionados; são eles os verdadeiros responsáveis por esta obra e pelo seu mérito científico.

Um obrigado a todos pela colaboração dispensada.

Covilhã, Junho de 2009

**José Ramos Pires Manso**  
**João Dionísio Monteiro**  
(directores)

# PRESENTACIÓN

La ciencia económica evoluciona muy rápidamente y cada vez más para áreas interdisciplinarias; y esa evolución ha tenido reconocimiento público como es el caso de la reciente atribución del Premio Nobel de Economía a un investigador del área de la Psicología Económica; pero hay otras áreas que se están afirmando progresivamente como es el caso de la Economía de la energía y del medioambiente, Economía de la Salud, Economía experimental, Economía de la estrategia o la Economía de la innovación, entre otras.

En este XXIII Congreso Internacional de Economía Aplicada, o XXIII Encuentro Anual y primero de ASEPELT Internacional, dado su reciente cambio de nombre, junto a las áreas tradicionales de la Economía, se abre el abanico a algunas de estas nuevas áreas científicas y la verdad es que los investigadores correspondieron totalmente a nuestra expectativa, presentando trabajos de indudable interés y en cantidades dignas de mención, como prueba el resultado de la doble revisión a la que los mismos artículos fueron sujetos y que aprobó un razonable número de ellos. Esperemos también que esta sea también la opinión de los investigadores que se dignaron a asistir al XXIII Congreso en Covilhã.

Finalmente las áreas científicas a concurso fueron dieciséis, desde las más tradicionales a otras más recientes como las ya referidas áreas de Economía de la energía y del medioambiente, Economía de la estrategia económica, Economía de la innovación y Economía del conocimiento. Fueron cientos los artículos recibidos, de los cuales se seleccionaron tras la referida revisión doble por evaluadores anónimos e independientes, cerca de dos centenares que están recogidos en el CD de los Anales de Economía Aplicada que Delta Publicaciones acaba de editar. Algunos de estos artículos, distinguidos por los propios evaluadores, merecen una relevancia especial y por ello se publican como “ponencias” en la versión en libro de los mismos Anales, así como los resúmenes de todas las comunicaciones seleccionadas para su presentación en el Congreso; en todo caso, cualesquiera de esos documentos presenta ISBN.

En el ámbito de esta nota introductoria, cabe un agradecimiento especial al inmenso trabajo desarrollado por los innumerables revisores anónimos e independientes, españoles y portugueses, de todos los artículos recibidos, algunos de ellos en áreas muy densas y complejas.

También queremos agradecer el trabajo del Comité Organizador constituido por colegas de la Universidade da Beira Interior, destacando apenas el nombre del colega João Dionísio Monteiro por su total disponibilidad y empeño desde el inicio de este proceso, y el trabajo de secretariado, con especial mención a la labor técnica superior

de Elisabete Ramos, e incluso a Delta Publicaciones que pacientemente aguardó el envío de nuestros trabajos, a pesar del extremadamente corto espacio de tiempo del que disponía.

Unas breves palabras también para agradecer al Presidente de ASEPELT Internacional, Prof. Ginés Guirao, por el apoyo siempre dispuesto y por haber confiado a nuestras manos la organización de este congreso, el congreso de la internacionalización de ASEPELT.

Como es evidente, el mayor realce va para los centenares de autores de los artículos seleccionados; son ellos los verdaderos responsables de esta obra y por su mérito científico.

Agradecemos a todos la colaboración dispensada

Covilhã, Junho de 2009

**José Ramos Pires Manso**  
**João Dionísio Monteiro**  
(directores)

# DETERMINANTS AND EFFECTS OF INCREASING DIVERSIFICATION: NEW EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE FOR THE SPANISH ECONOMY

ALMUDENA MARTÍNEZ CAMPILLO

E-mail: amarc@unileon.es

M<sup>a</sup> DEL PILAR SIERRA FERNÁNDEZ

E-mail: pilar.sierra@unileon.es

Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Empresariales  
Universidad de León

## Abstract

Previous works that examine the effects of corporate diversification in the Spanish economy are scarce and contradictory, which impedes the generation of widely accepted conclusions. This paper aims to provide new empirical evidence on the nature of the diversification-performance relationship in Spain during a period characterized by important transformations in the competitive environment (1997-2001) and hence in the strategic tendency of firms. After using Heckman's two-stage method on a sample of 236 large Spanish firms, results indicate that increasing diversification positively and significantly influenced firm profitability over this period. By comparing these results with those previously obtained for the Spanish economy, it may be concluded that the level of diversification and their consequences vary with time and contextual changes.

*Key-Words:* Corporate diversification, determinants, effects, environmental transformations.

*Área Temática:* Economía Europea.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The diversification strategy is defined as “*the entry of a firm into new lines of activity, either by processes of internal business development or acquisition, which entails changes in its administrative structure, systems, and other management processes*” (Ramanujan and Varadarajan, 1989: 525). Researchers from different areas have sought to explain the antecedents of this strategy and its relationship with firm performance. In particular, this last question is the topic of extensive studies for leading developed countries<sup>1</sup> (Denis *et al.*, 1997, 1999; Campa and Kedia, 2002; Kim *et al.*, 2004; Desai *et al.*, 2005; Miller, 2004, 2006), but evidence hardly exists for other more recently developed countries. Thus, considering the importance that researchers from other nations (such as USA, Canada, UK, France, Germany or Japan) are giving to the study of the performance effects of diversification, and given that previous research analyzing the diversification-performance relationship in the Spanish economy is scarce, contradictory and not too recent (Suárez-González, 1994; Menéndez and Gómez, 2000; Ramírez and Espitia, 2002), it may be interesting to provide new empirical evidence on this issue in Spain, whose business environment is different from the one examined in most early works.

Although Spanish firms have traditionally shown a low level of diversification (Ramírez and Espitia, 2002; Sánchez-Bueno *et al.*, 2006), contextual changes that have taken place in recent

---

<sup>1</sup> Despite that an extensive research examines the diversification-performance relationship in leading developed countries, the empirical evidence remains inconclusive.

years have led to an extremely competitive environment, in which diversification constitutes one of the strategies that firms may choose to adapt and survive (Simanavičienė and Dagilienė, 2003; Cottrel and Nault, 2004; Colpan and Hikino, 2005). As a result, Spanish firms have indeed increased their levels of diversification in the last decade<sup>2</sup>, which in turn may have had varying effects on firm performance. Also, the fact that Spanish companies are smaller in size and less diversified than those in most leading developed countries may lead to insights different from the ones found in previous research in other countries.

For these reasons, the main goal of this study is to examine the nature of the diversification-performance relationship in the Spanish economy in a new context, characterized by important transformations in business environment and the strategic tendency of firms. To that end, since researchers have raised serious questions about the methodology of preceding studies linking diversification strategy to firm performance (Palich *et al.*, 2000; Miller, 2006), this study uses Heckman's (1979) two-stage method<sup>3</sup>. This statistical technique allows the proper correction of some econometric problems traditionally associated with the estimation of diversification effects, such as sample selection bias and endogeneity.

This work contributes to the existing literature in three important ways: *First*, the study seeks to advance the state of the art on the diversification-performance relationship in Spain by adding to the limited and contradictory empirical research existing to date (Ramírez and Espitia, 2002). Moreover, it provides additional information on this topic by analyzing for the first time the performance effects of the initial decision to diversify; that is, when firms increase their number of business segments from one to two or more. *Second*, the study considers that the nature of the diversification-performance relationship may vary with contextual changes within a country across time (Mayer and Whittington, 2003; Chakrabarti *et al.*, 2007; Singh *et al.*, 2007). For this reason, it attempts to predict the performance effects of diversification over the last years based on the new strategic tendency of Spanish firms derived from changes in business environment. Given that the relationship between diversification and performance seems to be influenced by contextual changes, it may be interesting to provide new empirical evidence for Spain in a different business context. *Third*, the study also contributes from a methodological perspective by applying Heckman's two-stage method to control for possible endogeneity and sample selection biases in the diversification-performance relationship (Miller, 2006).

The structure of the article is as follows. Section 2 introduces and justifies the hypothesis proposed as regards the impact of diversification on firm performance in Spanish firms. Section 3 contains the data and empirical methodology. Section 4 reports the results. The final section offers some concluding remarks.

## 2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

### 2.1 Antecedents about the diversification-performance relationship:

The analysis of diversification effects on firm performance is one of the most widely studied and debated topics in the academic and business world. However, the nature of the diversification-performance relationship remains largely unsolved to date insofar as it depends on the benefits and costs associated with this strategy. It is argued that diversification can be driven by a range of perceived benefits associated with market power advantages (Scherer, 1980), greater efficiency of internal capital markets (Williamson, 1985; Stein, 1997), scope and scale economies from sharing resources and capabilities across different businesses (Fraquelli *et al.*, 2004; Tanriverdi and Venkatraman, 2005), increased debt capacity (Lewellen, 1971), tax

---

<sup>2</sup> Despite this tendency, Spanish firms still show a significantly lower level of diversification than those from the rest of the European developed countries (Sánchez-Bueno *et al.*, 2006).

<sup>3</sup> To our knowledge, there is not any published study applying Heckman's method to estimate the nature of the diversification-performance relationship in Spain. However, recent works have used it to analyze such a relationship in the context of the American economy (Campa and Kedia, 2002; Villalonga, 2004; Miller, 2006).

and other financial advantages (Majd and Myers 1987; Berger and Ofek, 1995), and risk reduction (Lubatkin and Chatterjee, 1994). In contrast to diversification, single-business strategy does not provide these benefits.

Nonetheless, as the diversification degree increases the associated costs also escalate. The main potential cost linked with a higher level of diversification is the exacerbated managerial agency problem. Indeed, diversification may allow managers to increase their compensation and status in the business community, to reduce their personal employment risk and to become entrenched by managing this strategy in a way consistent with their own skills (Denis *et al.*, 1997, 1999). In particular, these costs may be described in terms of misallocation of funds due to cross-subsidization of failing businesses (Meyer *et al.*, 1992), internal power struggles generated by the allocation of resources between different divisions (Rajan *et al.*, 2000), inefficient investments in businesses with poor opportunities (Stulz, 1990) and information and incentive problems between corporate headquarters and division managers (Harris *et al.*, 1982), or between managers and external investors (Hadlock *et al.*, 2001). Additional costs may also arise due to the increase in coordination and control problems across businesses (Hoskisson and Hitt, 1988).

Because of these myriad benefits and costs, it is difficult to predict the net impact of diversification strategy on firm performance. This may explain why early research on the diversification-performance relationship does not show a consistent pattern in results. A review of the literature indicates four sets of findings to be prevalent. The first set of studies reports a positive effect of this strategy on firm performance (Rhoades, 1973; Campa and Kedia, 2002; Villalonga, 2004). The second set of findings concludes a negative relationship between diversification and performance (Berger and Ofek, 1995; Lamont and Polk, 2002; Singh *et al.*, 2007). A third set of studies finds no significant relationship between both variables (Gort, 1962; Palepu, 1985; Menéndez and Gómez, 2000). Finally, the fourth set of findings reports that the diversification-performance relationship is not linear, but curvilinear (Grant *et al.*, 1988; Ramírez and Espitia, 2002; Mayer and Whittington, 2003).

In this clearly contradictory analysis framework, a study by Palich *et al.* (2000) brings a degree of clarity by using meta-analytic data drawn from 55 previously published works. This study revises and synthesizes mayor theoretical perspectives and empirical studies on the subject and proposes three theoretical models to explain the nature of the diversification-performance relationship: the linear model and two curvilinear models; the inverted-U model and the intermediate model.

The *linear model* is based on the premise that diversification and performance are linearly and positively related (Arnould, 1969; Markham, 1973; Rhoades, 1973). Thus, under this model it is considered that unrelated diversification outperforms related diversification, while this last strategy performs better than single-business strategy. This position rests mainly upon the assumptions derived from the perspectives of market power and internal market efficiency (Scherer, 1980).

The *inverted-U model* posits that related diversification is better than unrelated diversification and single-business strategies in terms of firm performance (Grant *et al.*, 1988; Palich *et al.*, 2000; Ramírez and Espitia, 2002; Mayer and Whittington, 2003). The main theoretical argument suggesting the superiority of a moderate level of diversification focuses on advantages derived from scope and scale economies, since the firm is able to distribute the cost of an asset already capitalized by spreading its use across multiple linked businesses (Markides and Williamson, 1994; Fraquelli *et al.*, 2004; Tanriverdi and Venkatraman, 2005). However, this model argues that the marginal costs of diversification increase rapidly as the diversification hits high levels because of problems derived from managing an increasingly disparate portfolio of businesses, as well as control and effort losses due to increased shirking, coordination and administrative costs, and internal capital market inefficiencies (Grant *et al.*, 1988). Thus, this model posits that firms experience some optimal level of diversification, with performance decrements to either side of that point of maximization.

Finally, the *intermediate model* notions that diversification yields positive but diminishing returns beyond some point of optimization (Markides, 1992). A diversifying firm will first apply its excess assets in the closest market it can enter. If excess capacity remains, the firm will enter

markets even further afield. But as assets are applied in more and more distant fields, they lose their competitive advantage and thus earn lower profits (Wernerfelt and Montgomery, 1988). This implies that the relation between diversification and its marginal benefits is a decreasing function (Grant and Jammine, 1988). Therefore, under this model it is assumed that diversification performs better than single-business strategy, although both related and unrelated diversification may have a similar impact on firm performance, due to the costs of exploiting relatedness between businesses and the unique benefits derived from unrelated strategy (Nayyar, 1992).

## 2.2 The diversification-performance relationship in the Spanish Economy

The diversification-performance relationship is one of the issues that is arousing most interest in economic research. Despite this fact, empirical studies in the Spanish economy are limited and their findings are clearly contradictory. Firstly, the study by Suárez-González (1994) examines the impact of diversification on firm performance in a sample of 4,548 firms and concludes that single-business firms outperformed diversified firms over the period 1987-1990. Secondly, Menéndez and Gómez (2000), by using a panel data of 64 non-financial firms quoted on the Madrid Stock Exchange during the period 1990-1994, show that diversification strategy does not seem to significantly influence firm value. Finally, Ramírez and Espitia (2002) demonstrate using a sample of 103 large, non-financial Spanish companies, that the firms with moderate levels of diversification had the best performance, while the firms with low and high levels of diversification showed significantly lower performance over the period 1992 to 1995.

Spanish firms have traditionally been characterized by a low level of diversification (Ramírez and Espitia, 2002; Sánchez-Bueno *et al.*, 2006). However, during the last decade the entry into new lines of activity has become a common practice in business reality, as well as being one of the most important alternatives for corporate growth, along with internationalization and innovation. The main reasons behind this change in the strategic tendency of firms seem to be the following: the significant growth potential of the Spanish economy over this period (Ramírez and Espitia, 2002), and the fact that the competitive environment in which Spanish firms operate has changed dramatically over the last ten years. Indeed, they have been immersed in an extremely fierce world, determined basically by the globalization of markets and a growing emphasis on knowledge and innovation (Sánchez-Bueno *et al.*, 2006). In this new business context, it is of paramount importance that companies understand and adapt to these environmental transformations if they want to survive. In this regard, diversification is a central phenomenon for the adaptation, survival, and growth of firms in a highly competitive environment; that is, it is a critical strategy for continued existence of firms (Simanavičienė and Dagilienė, 2003; Cottrel and Nault, 2004; Colpan and Hikino, 2005).

A recent study by Sánchez-Bueno *et al.* (2006) notes that during the period 1993-2003, in order to adapt to the new business context, large Spanish firms have shown a marked decrease in the single-business strategy (-15 percent), the predominance and stability of the dominant-business strategy (44 percent of them), and a substantial increase in related diversification (+14 percent). Indeed, “*in this period of profound changes in the competitive environment, the most frequent moves are those from single-business strategy to dominant-business strategy and from these two strategies to related diversification*” (Sánchez-Bueno *et al.*, 2006: 28), while unrelated diversification hardly has representation in the whole decade<sup>4</sup>. Thus, the panorama

---

<sup>4</sup> The study by Sánchez-Bueno *et al.* (2006) uses Rumelt's (1974) classification of diversification strategies, based on the specialization and related ratios: *Single-business strategy* implies that the proportion of a firm's revenue attributable to its largest single business is 95% or more in a given year. *Dominant-business strategy* implies that the proportion of a firm's revenue attributable to its largest single business is 70% or more but less than 95%. *Related diversification* implies that the proportion of a firm's revenue attributable to its largest single business is less than 70% and majority of businesses are related to each other (the proportion of a firm's revenue attributable to its largest group of related businesses is 70% or more). *Unrelated diversification* implies that the proportion of a firm's revenue attributable to its largest single business is less than 70% and majority of businesses are not related to each other (the proportion of a firm's revenue attributable to its largest group of related businesses is less than 70%).

described reveals that in recent years large Spanish firms have shown a clear tendency towards greater diversification, especially towards moderate levels of diversification<sup>5</sup>.

Given that the nature of the diversification-performance relationship varies widely with changes in context over time (Geringer *et al.*, 2000; Mayer and Whittington, 2003; Chakrabarti *et al.*, 2007; Singh *et al.*, 2007), such variation in the strategic tendency of Spanish firms derived from environmental transformations may have had an impact on subsequent performance. In particular, Palich *et al.* (2000: 164) conclude that “*positive effects (on firm performance) occur as firms shift from a single-business strategy to a related diversification strategy*”. Indeed, whichever of the three theoretical models proposed by these researchers - linear, inverted-U and intermediate- allow us to deduce that diversification is positively related to performance across the low to moderate range of diversification. Firms with low level of diversification do not have multiple businesses, so they may not enjoy economies of scope and other important advantages that may accompany diversification, with the consequent negative implications for performance. However, firms with moderate levels of diversification may generate cost advantages derived from sharing resources and activities between businesses. Moreover, these firms may also benefit from learning curve efficiencies, intra-firm product/process technology diffusion, and restricted access to factors of production that are necessary for operations stemming from a specific industry (Markides and Williamson, 1994; Tanriverdi and Venkatraman, 2005).

In addition, the study by Palich *et al.* (2000: 164) adds that these positive effects of moderate levels of diversification on firm performance “*are detectable as a linear effect in samples restricted away from the high end of diversification*” –that is, in samples that hardly include firms with high levels of diversification<sup>6</sup>. With these arguments in mind, considering the strategic tendency shown by large Spanish firms during the last decade, the study presents the following hypothesis in order to test the linear model over the period analyzed<sup>7</sup>:

**H<sub>1</sub>:** *Diversification strategy has a positive linear effect on firm performance.*

### 3. METHODS

#### 3.1 Population

The population for this study comprises a set of large firms operating in Spain over the period from 1997 to 2001<sup>8</sup>. Specifically, those Spanish public companies with total sales greater than three million euros per annum and more than 100 employees during this time period were chosen. The Dun&Bradstreet Directory yields a total of 3,655 firms fulfilling these criteria. However, the question of evaluating diversification effects is best broached by focusing on firms when they decide to diversify for the first time; that is, when they increase their number of business segments from one to two or more (Miller, 2004; Villalonga, 2004). For this reason, we restrict the research to firms reporting only one business segment at the four-digit SIC level in 1997, excluding all companies specializing in financial services, regulated utilities,

<sup>5</sup> As Palich *et al.* (2000: 158) note “*level and type of diversification are conceptually distinct, but we do not differentiate them here... In support to our approach, empirical research consistently indicates that type of diversification is strongly associated with continuous data representing level of diversification*”. For the purpose of maintaining homogeneity and allowing comparisons, in this paper is also considered that single-business strategy is equivalent to low diversification, the range from dominant-business strategy to related strategy is equivalent to moderate diversification, and unrelated strategy is equivalent to high diversification.

<sup>6</sup> The findings of the study by Palich *et al.* (2000: 164) expressly state that “*Diversification appears to have an inverted-U curvilinear relationship with performance: positive effects occur as firms move from a single-business strategy to a related diversification strategy (detectable as a linear effect in samples restricted away from the high end of diversification), but negative effects occur as firms move from a related strategy to an unrelated strategy (detectable as a linear effect in samples restricted away from the low end of diversification)*”

<sup>7</sup> The other relations that emerge from the review of the literature are considered in the alternative hypothesis.

<sup>8</sup> The analysis of the period between 1997 and 2001 is justified by three main reasons: (1) the lack of studies that examine the impact of diversification on Spanish firm performance since 1996; (2) the public availability, when the population was selected, of data on the number of businesses in which large Spanish firms operate until the year 2001; (3) the fact that important contextual changes with potential to affect the diversification-performance relationship have taken place during such period.



government and non-classifiable establishments. After applying these restrictions, the final population consists of 1,256 single-business firms in 1997. Once the different annual editions of the Dun&Bradstreet Directory were consulted, it was possible to observe that 520 companies made the decision to diversify during the 1998-2001 period and 736 remained specialized<sup>9</sup>.

### 3.2 Sample selection

The measurement of the level of diversification the year in which firms diversify for the first time between 1998 and 2001 takes into account both the number of business segments at the four-digit SIC level in which they operate, which is taken from the Dun&Bradstreet Directory, and the relative importance of each business segment to the firm's sales, which is not publicly available to Spanish firms. Thus, it was necessary to carry out a survey to collect this information about the year of diversification. Specifically, a questionnaire was sent to the CEOs of the 520 diversifying firms in the population, which was completed between May and July 2003<sup>10</sup>. A valid response rate of 22.7 percent provides a sample of 118 diversifying companies (sampling error was 8.1 percent with a 95 percent confidence level).

The distribution of these 118 firms as regards the diversification strategy followed (dominant-business, related diversification and unrelated diversification) is as follows<sup>11</sup>: Starting from all firms pursue a single-business strategy in 1997, 50.8 percent of them shift to a dominant-business strategy (60 firms), 40.6 percent to related diversification (48 firms), and only 8.4 percent to unrelated diversification (10 firms)<sup>12</sup>. Moreover, it is possible to arrive at the same conclusion as Sánchez-Bueno *et al.* (2006) regarding the strategic changes of specialized firms: the most frequent moves are those from single-business strategy to dominant-business strategy and related diversification; that is, towards moderate levels of diversification. As a result, it is possible to conclude that the sample of diversifying firms used in this study does not present a high level of diversification; that is, it is a sample restricted away from the high end of diversification.

Recent literature indicates that “*the confidence with which one can draw conclusions from empirical studies of strategic phenomena is significantly limited if the sample is constructed of firms that have experienced the phenomenon under study*” (Jensen and Zajac, 2004: 512). For this reason, each diversifying firm from the sample was paired with one of the 736 specialized firms from the population to avoid sample selection bias. Matching criteria were proposed by Miller (2004) for a similar purpose: sharing the same principal business at the two-digit SIC code level and having a similar size (within 70-130 percent of sales and/or employees) in the year prior to the diversification event. After applying these criteria, the final sample consists of 236 firms, distributed equally between diversifying and specialized companies.

### 3.3 Independent variable

The entropy index (Jacquemin and Berry, 1979; Palepu, 1985) was used to measure the level of diversification the year  $t$  in which firms diversify for the first time between 1998 and 2001. This index is defined as follows:

---

<sup>9</sup> Dun&Bradstreet Directories annually offer the four-digit SIC codes for the 50,000 largest Spanish firms.

<sup>10</sup> These 520 firms were specialized in 1997 and they moved from a single-business strategy to a multi-business strategy during the period 1998-2001. Given that in this study the level of diversification is measured the year  $t$  in which the firm diversifies for the first time over this period, four different versions of the questionnaire were mailed: The *version 1* was sent to the firms that diversified for the first time in 1998 and their CEOs had to specify the proportion of sales in each business segment at the four-digit SIC level with respect to total sales in 1998; *versions 2, 3 and 4* were sent to the firms that diversified for the first time in 1999, 2000 and 2001, respectively, and their CEOs had to specify the proportion of sales in each business segment at the four-digit SIC level with respect to total sales in 1999, 2000 and 2001, respectively. As well as inquiring about this question, the questionnaire also asked for information required in the framework of other research.

<sup>11</sup> The diversification strategy followed by each firm in the sample have been identified through Rumelt's classification (see footnote 4), as in the works by Palich *et al.* (2000), Suárez-González (1994) and Sánchez-Bueno *et al.* (2006), for the purpose of maintaining homogeneity. As in these previous studies, the largest group of related businesses has been also determined within a two-digit SIC industry.

<sup>12</sup> As regards unrelated diversifiers, although Rumelt's related ratios are less than 70%, they are not too distant from this threshold that allows differentiating between related and unrelated diversification (see footnote 4).

where  $n$  is number of the firm's business segments at the four-digit SIC level and  $P_i$  is  $i$ th business segment's sales divided by the firm's total sales. The entropy measure is zero for single-business firms and it increases with greater diversification.

$$DIV = - \sum_{i=1}^n P_i \ln (1/P_i) \quad (1)$$

The choice of this index is justified because previous research concludes that “*the high degree of correspondence between the continuous (level of diversification) and categorical (type of diversification) measures can be interpreted as a “plus” for SIC-based diversification measures*” (Montgomery, 1982:305). As a result, on the base of the entropy index it is possible to consider that a low level of diversification is equivalent to a single-business strategy, a moderate level of diversification is equivalent to the range from dominant-business strategy to related diversification, and a high level of diversification is equivalent to unrelated diversification. Also, the entropy index has been reported as superior basically because it combines objectivity, content and construct validity, and simplicity (Kim *et al.*, 2004).

### 3.4 Dependent variable

The effects of diversification on firm performance were measured in terms of profitability. Specifically, *firm profitability* was measured by the variation in return on assets -ROA- (Jensen and Zajac, 2004; Desai *et al.*, 2005); that is, a measure of accounting performance<sup>13</sup>. This variable was quantified as percentage change in average ROA between the three-year pre- and post-diversification periods. The averages for the three years prior and following to the diversification event were used to control for any seasonality in firms' ROA figures. Performance data were taken from the SABI database.

### 3.5 Control variables

The analysis included the following control variables that have demonstrated significant effects on firm performance independent of diversification: (a) two variables to identify the corporate governance characteristics of companies the year of diversification (Mayer and Whittington, 2003): first, one to account for the *corporate control*, that takes a value of 1 if firms are owner-controlled (external owners have 5 percent or more of the outstanding shares) or owner-manager controlled (CEOs have 2 percent or more of the outstanding shares), and a value of 2 if firms are manager-controlled (external ownership is diffused -less than 5 percent- and CEO ownership is limited -less than 2 percent-)<sup>14</sup>; and, second, another one to control the *proportion of insiders on the board of directors*; (b) two firm-level economical variables, such as *size* (log of total assets) and *investment* (capital expenditures/sales), to abstract from any performance differences due to these internal factors (Palich *et al.*, 2000; Campa and Kedia, 2002; Villalonga, 2004). We calculate 3-year pre-diversification averages for these variables; (c) a dummy variable that indicates whether firms develop *export activity* the year of diversification, since firms that operate in more than one country are able to reap benefits that are not available to purely domestic firms (Palich *et al.*, 2000); and (d) one industry-level variable such as *profitability* (industry ROA at the four digit SIC level), since prior research has shown industry effects to have an important impact on variation of firm performance (Campa

<sup>13</sup> ROA was chosen as an accounting-based measure of firm profitability because this indicator remains the most widely used performance measure in the strategy literature (Kim *et al.*, 2004). Although market value-based measures may be considered more complete indicators of the effects of corporate strategies, their use in this study would have restricted the population to firms that were quoted on the Spanish Stock Market. The limited nature and uneven distribution across industries of our national Stock Market advised against this approach.

<sup>14</sup> This criterion is also followed by Desai *et al.* (2005) to account for the corporate control when analyzing the performance effects of diversification.

and Kedia, 2002; Villalonga, 2004). We calculate 3-year pre-diversification average for this variable. All necessary data to construct control variables were taken from the SABI database.

### 3.6 Model specification

Standard regression techniques are not able to control for endogeneity bias from self-selection associated with studying the diversification-performance relationship. One solution is to apply Heckman's (1979) two-stage method. In the first stage, the procedure estimates the selection equation as a maximum-likelihood probit model to analyze the propensity to diversify and calculate the *Inverse Mills Ratio* ( $\lambda_i$ ). In the second stage, the corrected regression equation is estimated by OLS regression to examine the effects of diversification on performance.

Heckman's method eliminates the endogeneity bias from self-selection in the following way (Wooldridge, 2002): (1) it requires identifying at least one variable that may be a significant regressor in the selection equation but not in the regression equation. While other variables may be available, *the fraction of firms in the main industry that are diversified* (Villalonga, 2004) resulted to be appropriate for such a purpose. Due to data limitations, this variable had to be calculated from our population; and (2) it requires most regressors in the regression equation may be included in the selection equation.

In this case, the study considered the following regression and selection equations:

$$Y_i = \alpha + \beta_1 D_i + \beta_2 X_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (\text{regression equation}) \quad (2)$$

where  $Y_i$  is the diversifying firm's performance;  $D_i$  a diversification index<sup>15</sup>;  $X_i$  a vector of control variables and  $\varepsilon_i$  a normal error term. This equation uses data from diversifying firms.

$$DIV_i^* = \gamma Z_i + \mu_i \quad (\text{selection equation}) \quad (3)$$

where the latent variable  $DIV_i^*$  is observed as:

-  $DIV_i = 1$  (the firm  $i$  decides to diversify) if  $DIV_i^* > 0$ ,

or as

-  $DIV_i = 0$  (the firm  $i$  decides not to diversify) if  $DIV_i^* \leq 0$ ;

$Z_i$  is a vector of variables that affect a firm's propensity to diversify (all control variables from the regression equation since they also relate to the choice to diversify, as well as the fraction of diversified firms in the main industry) and  $\mu_i$  is a normal error term. This equation uses data from both diversifying firms and matching specialized firms.

The fact that the diversification performance,  $Y_i$ , is only observed if  $DIV_i = 1$  may lead to endogeneity bias from self-selection. Heckman's method controls for this bias by meeting the two previously cited identification conditions, as well as including the *Inverse Mills Ratio* ( $\lambda_i$ ) as an additional regressor in the regression equation. The *Inverse Mills Ratio* approximates the likelihood of diversification in each firm and is calculated by diverse statistical programmes using estimates obtained from the selection equation. After incorporating this correction, the final regression equation is:

$$Y_i = \alpha + \beta_1 D_i + \beta_2 X_i + \theta \lambda_i + \eta_i \quad (\text{corrected regression equation}) \quad (4)$$

## 4. RESULTS

Table 1 presents means, standard deviations and correlation coefficients for all variables used in this study. As shown, the estimated correlation between diversification and change in ROA is equal to 0.25. Thus, it is possible to conclude that the association between diversification and firm performance is not too strong. Although some variables in regression equations show a high correlation, the examination of variance inflation factors (VIFs) indicates no evidence of multicollineality.

<sup>15</sup> This study also tests for potential curvilinearity in the diversification-performance relationship by including a measure of *Diversification Squared* ( $D_i^2$ ) in the regression equation.

**Table 1**  
Means, standard deviations and pairwise correlations

<b>Selection equation</b>										
(N = 236)	Mean	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1.Diversification (dummy)	0.50	0.50	1.00							
2.Corporate control	1.21	0.41	0.04	1.00						
3.Insiders proportion	13.5	26.6	0.22***	0.49***	1.00					
4.Log of total assets	17.04	1.23	-0.24***	-0.08	-0.05	1.00				
5.CAPEX/Sales	0.45	0.70	-0.06	0.11	0.05	0.02	1.00			
6.Export activity	0.57	0.49	0.18**	-0.10	0.17**	-0.02	0.05	1.00		
7.Industry ROA	-1.84	22.85	-0.16**	-0.09	-0.07	0.19**	-0.07	-0.05	1.00	
8.Fraction diversified firms	6.27	3.19	0.15*	0.03	0.01	0.02	-0.11†	0.02	-0.03	

  

<b>Regression equation</b>										
(N = 118)	Mean	S.D.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.Sales Growth	0.68	0.99	1.00							
2.Change in ROA	0.17	1.46	0.05	1.00						
3.Diversification	0.75	0.41	0.33***	0.25**	1.00					
4.Corporate control	1.23	0.42	-0.06	-0.20**	-0.14	1.00				
5.Insiders proportion	19.39	31.28	-0.11	0.45***	0.08	0.35***	1.00			
6.Log of total assets	16.74	1.16	-0.29**	-0.05	-0.13	-0.01	0.04	1.00		
7.CAPEX/Sales	0.41	0.57	-0.05	-0.04	-0.03	0.03	-0.07	0.05	1.00	
8.Export activity	0.67	0.41	0.05	0.34***	0.05	-0.09	0.27**	0.09	-0.01	1.00
9.Industry ROA	-5.60	20.94	0.07	0.02	0.01	-0.11	-0.01	0.06	-0.12	-0.03

†p < 0.10; \* p < 0.05; \*\* p < 0.01; \*\*\* p < 0.001

This study applies a hierarchical regression analysis in order to test the performance effects of diversification in the second stage of Heckman's method<sup>16</sup>. Table 2 summarizes regression results on the relationship between diversification and firm profitability. All models indicate that the coefficient of the  $\lambda_i$  variable is not significant, indicating the absence of sample selection bias.

Results for control variables are reported in Model 1. As shown, the coefficients for corporate control, the proportion of insiders on the board of directors, and export activity are significantly associated with change in ROA. Specifically, these variables explain 39.3 percent of the variance ( $p > 0.001$ ). Model 2 reflects the linear effect of diversification. As predicted, this strategy by itself appears to have a substantial positive impact on firm profitability ( $p > 0.05$ ). In particular, the addition of the diversification variable in Model 2 contributes significantly to the prediction of change in ROA, producing a significant  $\Delta F$  equal to 3.476 and explaining an additional 1.9 percent of the variance ( $p > 0.05$ ). Model 3 includes the quadratic term of diversification as well. As shown, its coefficient is not statistically significant. This means that the diversification-profitability relationship is not curvilinear, but linear. Therefore, although the effect size is not quite as strong as expected, the results obtained offer support for Hypothesis 1 when performance is measured in terms of firm profitability.

<sup>16</sup> Results of first-stage probit regression predicting propensity to diversify are reported in the Appendix I, which reveals significant relationships for several variables with the choice to diversify. The *Inverse Mills Ratio* ( $\lambda_i$ ) calculated using estimates obtained from this selection equation is introduced as a control variable in regression equations.

**Table 2**  
Second-stage regression predicting the effect of diversification on firm profitability  
(Dependent variable: Change in ROA)

Variables	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3 <sup>a</sup>
Constant	2.29 (2.07)	1.29 (2.10)	1.68 (2.06)
Corporate control	-1.25*** (0.30)	-1.14*** (0.30)	-1.14*** (0.31)
Insiders proportion	0.02*** (0.01)	0.02*** (0.01)	0.02*** (0.01)
Log of total assets	-0.07 (0.14)	-0.04 (0.14)	-0.04 (0.14)
CAPEX/Sales	0.06 (0.20)	0.07 (0.20)	0.07 (0.20)
Export activity	0.45† (0.30)	0.44† (0.29)	0.45† (0.30)
Industry ROA	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
Diversification ( $D_i$ )		0.52* (0.26)	0.51† (0.28)
Diversification Squared ( $D_i^2$ )			0.04 (0.44)
Inverse Mills Ratio ( $\lambda_i$ )	-0.29 (0.72)	-0.34 (0.71)	-0.33 (0.72)
Wald <sup>a</sup>	$\chi^2(12) = 70.40^{***}$	$\chi^2(13) = 75.31^{***}$	$\chi^2(14) = 75.43^{***}$
R <sup>2</sup>	0.393	0.412	0.412
$\Delta R^2$	0.393	0.019	0.000
$\Delta F$	10.166***	3.476*	0.015

<sup>a</sup> The diversification variable ( $D_i$ ) used in the quadratic term ( $D_i^2$ ) is centered to avoid multicollinearity problems. Results are similar if uncentered.

<sup>b</sup> Wald test is a  $\chi^2$  test of all coefficients in the regression model, except the constant, are equal to 0 (Heckman, 1979).

Values are unstandardized coefficients, with standard errors in parentheses

†  $p < 0.10$ ; \*  $p < 0.05$ ; \*\*  $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

The main purpose of this study is to provide new empirical evidence on the impact of diversification on firm performance by using a sample of 236 large Spanish firms over the 1997 to 2001 period. The choice of this time period is interesting in that it allows us to consider the new conditions of the environment in which firms have operated over the last decade and, hence, the strategic changes that they have made with the aim of adapting to such conditions. To that end, the study justifies and tests one hypothesis that proposes that the diversification strategy has a positive linear effect on firm profitability during the period of study. This hypothesis is tested by using Heckman's two-stage method.

Our hypothesis receives total support when performance is measured in terms of change in ROA. On the one hand, results have demonstrated that the impact of diversification on this profitability measure has been positive and significant. Over the period analyzed, in order to adapt to the new business environment, large Spanish firms showed a clear tendency towards greater diversification, especially towards moderate levels of diversification (Sánchez-Bueno *et al.*, 2006). Results indicate that, as a consequence of this change in the strategic tendency, Spanish firms were able to improve firm profitability. Previous studies such as Grant *et al.*, (1988), Tallman and Li (1996), and Geringer *et al.* (2000), by using SIC code-based measures

of level of diversification on British, American, and Japanese samples respectively, also find that an intermediate level of diversification is positively related to profitability<sup>17</sup>. The main explanations for our result could be the access to additional profits by exploiting multiple advantages across different businesses, without having to bear the costs of maintaining high levels of diversification (Palich *et al.*, 2000), and the fact that in more recently developed economies, such as the Spanish economy, diversifiers may create more value and be more successful because of the presence of greater market inefficiencies (Chakrabarti *et al.*, 2007). On the other hand, results have also shown that, according to the study by Palich *et al.* (2000), increasing diversification is associated with proportional increases in firm ROA, when using a sample that hardly includes firms with high levels of diversification.

Overall, it is possible to conclude that the tendency towards greater diversification shown by large Spanish firms during the last decade seems to have favourably affected firm performance. Indeed, results indicate that the strategic change from low to moderate levels of diversification has been translated into profitability benefits over recent years; that is, as long as diversification stays within the scope of the resources and capabilities, it will provide increased benefits for firms in terms of ROA.

This study also shows that the Spanish context has changed over recent years in a way that has positively influenced the diversification-performance relationship. Historically Spanish firms have shown a low level of diversification and previous empirical evidence has hardly been able to demonstrate the positive effects of this strategy. During the period studied, the strategic changes from low to moderate levels of diversification have mainly been a defensive reaction to a perceived threat in a highly competitive environment; that is, the outcome of a rational benefits-seeking behaviour for the adaptation and survival in a new business context. For this reason, benefits derived from this strategy by Spanish firms seem to have been greater than costs associated with its implementation, with the consequent improvement in firm profitability. The results obtained support the notion that as environmental conditions fluctuate, the level of diversification also seems both to vary and to have varying effects on performance<sup>18</sup> (Geringer *et al.*, 2000; Mayer and Whittington, 2003; Singh *et al.*, 2007; Chakrabarti *et al.*, 2007).

The findings of this study may have implications for research. First of all, our results, combined with the results of previous works for an earlier period (Suárez-González, 1994; Menéndez and Gómez, 2000; Ramírez and Espitia, 2002), suggest that the performance effects of diversification in the Spanish economy varies over time as a consequence of possible strategic changes in response to changing environment. Thus, it is possible to deduce that contextual variations within countries may help explain the pattern of inconsistent results in this research stream. Second, our findings suggest that it may have substantial benefits for research on the diversification-performance link in a particular country from systematic replication studies across different periods characterized by different business contexts.

From a practical perspective, the results of this study constitute a new contribution to the debate regarding the effects of diversification on firm performance. When in international economic and business forums, in the presence of an extremely fierce and competitive environment, it is common to hear about the urgent need for firms to engage in strategies to improve their competitiveness, the findings of this study demonstrate that the change from the low to moderate range of diversification may be an appropriate option for attaining such a goal via an increase in firm profitability.

<sup>17</sup> These studies did not directly test for the linear model. In particular, they tested for the curvilinear effect of diversification on firm performance from samples that included firms with different levels of diversification (low, moderate and high), and all of them found that moderate degrees of diversification often predict higher performance in terms of ROA.

<sup>18</sup> As well as the analysis of a different period and business context, other reasons for further explaining the discrepancies in results between this study and previous empirical research in Spain may be the focus on the initial decision to diversify, the employment of different measures of diversification and performance, the use of different sources of data, the application of different methods, or the unequal distribution of the sample by industries.

## REFERENCES

- ARNOULD, R. J. (1969) Conglomerate growth and profitability, in *Economics of Conglomerate Growth* (Ed.) L. Garoian, Oregon State University, Corvallis, pp. 72-80.
- BERGER, P. AND OFEK, E. (1995) Diversification effect on firm's value, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 37, 39-65.
- CAMPA, J. M. AND KEDIA, S. (2002) Explaining the diversification discount, *Journal of Finance*, 57, 1731-1762.
- CHAKRABARTI, A., SINGH, K. AND MAHMOOD, I. (2007) Diversification and performance: Evidence from East Asian firms, *Strategic Management Journal*, 28, 101-120.
- COLPAN, A. M. AND HIKINO, T. (2005) Changing economic environments, evolving diversification strategies, and differing financial performance: Japan's largest textile firms, 1970-2001, *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 14, 897-940.
- COTTRELL, T. AND NAULT, B. (2004) Product variety and firm survival in the microcomputer software industry, *Strategic Management Journal*, 25, 1005-1025.
- DENIS, D. J., DENIS, D. K. AND SARIN, A. (1997) Agency problems, equity ownership and corporate diversification, *Journal of Finance*, 52, 135-160.
- DENIS, D. J., DENIS, D. K. AND SARIN, A. (1999) Agency theory and the influence of equity ownership structure on corporate diversification strategies, *Strategic Management Journal*, 20, 1071-1076.
- DESAI, A.; KROLL, M. AND WRIGHT, P. (2005) Outside board monitoring and the economic outcomes of acquisitions: a test of the substitution hypothesis, *Journal of Business Research*, 58, 926-934.
- FRAQUELLI, G., PIACENZA, M. AND VANNONI, D. (2004) Scope and scale economies in multi-utilities: Evidence from gas, water and electricity combinations, *Applied Economics*, 36, 2045-2057.
- GERINGER, M., TALLMAN, S. AND OLSEN, D. (2000) Product and international diversification among Japanese multinational firms, *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 51-80.
- GORT, M. (1962) *Diversification and Integration in American Industry*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- GRANT, R. M. AND JAMMINE, A. P. (1988) Performance differences between Wrigley/Rumelt strategic categories, *Strategic Management Journal*, 9, 333-346.
- GRANT, R. M., JAMMINE, A. P. AND THOMAS, H. (1988) Diversity, diversification, and profitability among British manufacturing companies, 1972-1984, *Academy of Management Journal*, 31, 771-801.
- HADLOCK, C., RYNGAERT, M. AND THOMAS, S. (2001) Corporate structure and equity offerings: Are there benefits to diversification?, *Journal of Business*, 74, 613-635.
- HARRIS, M., KRIEBEL, C. AND RAVIV, A. (1982) Asymmetric information, incentives and intrafirm resource allocation, *Management Science*, 28, 604-620.
- HECKMAN, J. J. (1979) Sample selection bias as a specification error, *Econometrica*, 47, 153-161.
- HOSKISSON, R. E. AND HITT, M. A. (1988) Strategic control systems and relative R&D Investment in large multiproduct firms, *Strategic Management Journal*, 9, 605-621.
- JACQUEMIN, A. AND BERRY, C. (1979) Entropy measure of diversification and corporate growth, *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 27, 359-370.
- JENSEN, M. C. AND ZAJAC, E. J. (2004) Corporate elites and corporate strategy, *Strategic Management Journal*, 25, 507-524.
- KIM, H., HOSKISSON, R. E. AND WAN, W. P. (2004) Power dependence, diversification and performance in keiretsu member firms, *Strategic Management Journal*, 25, 613-636.
- LAMONT, O. AND POLK, C. (2002) Does Diversification Destroy Value? Evidence from the Industry Shocks, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 63, 51-77.
- LEWELLEN, W. (1971) A pure financial rationale for the conglomerate merger, *Journal of Finance*, 26, 521-545.
- LUBATKIN, M. AND CHATTERJEE, S. (1994) Extending modern portfolio theory into the domain of corporate diversification: Does it apply?, *Academy of Management Journal*, 37, 109-136.
- MAJD, S. AND MYERS, S. (1987) Tax asymmetries and corporate income tax reform, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 12, 147-175.
- MARKHAM, J. W. (1973) *Conglomerate enterprise and economic performance*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- MARKIDES, C. C. (1992) Consequences of corporate refocusing: Ex ante evidence, *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, 398-412.
- MARKIDES, C. C. AND WILLIAMSON, P. J. (1994) Related diversification, core competences and corporate performance, *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, 149-165.

- MAYER, M. AND WHITTINGTON, R. (2003) Diversification en context: A cross-national and cross-temporal extension, *Strategic Management Journal*, 24, 773-781.
- MENÉNDEZ, E. AND GÓMEZ, S. (2000) La estrategia de diversificación: creación o destrucción de riqueza, *Cuadernos de Economía y Dirección de la Empresa*, 7, 383-400.
- MEYER, M., MILGROM, P. AND ROBERTS, J. (1992) Organizational prospects, influence costs, and ownership changes, *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, 1, 9-35.
- MILLER, D. J. (2004) Firms' technological resources and the performance effects of diversification: A longitudinal study, *Strategic Management Journal*, 25, 1097-1119.
- MILLER, D. J. (2006) Technological diversity, related diversification and firm performance, *Strategic Management Journal*, 27, 601-619.
- MONTGOMERY, C. A. (1982) The measure of firm diversification: some new empirical evidence, *Academy of Management Journal*, 25, 299-307.
- NAYYAR, P. (1992) On the measurement of corporate diversification strategy: Evidence from large U.S. service firms, *Strategic Management Journal*, 13, 219-235.
- PALEPU, K. (1985) Diversification strategy, profit performance and the entropy measure, *Strategic Management Journal*, 6, 239-255.
- PALICH, L. E., CARDINAL, L. B. AND MILLER, C. C. (2000) Curvilinearity in the diversification-performance linkage: An examination of over three decades of research, *Strategic Management Journal*, 21, 155-174.
- RAJAN, R., SERVAES, H. AND ZINGALES, L. (2000) The cost of diversity: The diversification discount and inefficient investment, *Journal of Finance*, 55, 35-80.
- RAMANUJAN, V. AND VARADARAJAN, P. (1989) Research on corporate diversification: A synthesis, *Strategic Management Journal*, 10, 523-551.
- RAMÍREZ, M. L. AND ESPITIA, M. A. (2002) The impact of product diversification strategy on the corporate performance of large Spanish firms, *Spanish Economic Review*, 4, 119-137.
- RHOADES, S. A. (1973) The effect of diversification on industry profit performance in 241 manufacturing industries: 1963, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 55, 9-24.
- RUMELT, R. P. (1974) *Strategy, structure, and economic performance*, Harvard Business School Press, Boston.
- SANCHEZ-BUENO, M. J., GALÁN, J. I. AND SUAREZ-GONZÁLEZ, I. (2006) Evolución de la estrategia corporativa y la estructura organizativa en los grandes grupos españoles, *Universia Business Review*, 11, 22-35.
- SCHERER, F. M. (1980) *Industrial Market Structure and Economic Performance*. Rand McNally, Chicago.
- SIMANAVIČIENĖ, Z. AND DAGILIENĖ, L. (2003) The benefits of business combinations, *Transformations in Business and Economics*, 2, 105-120.
- SINGH, M., NEJADMALAYERI, A. AND MATHUR, I. (2007) Performance impact of business group affiliation: An analysis of the diversification-performance link in a developing economy, *Journal of Business Research*, 60, 339-347.
- STEIN, J. (1997) Internal capital markets and the competition for corporate resources, *Journal of Finance*, 52, 111-134.
- STULZ, R. (1990) Managerial discretion and optimal financing policies, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 26, 3-27.
- SUÁREZ-GONZÁLEZ, I. (1994) Estrategia de diversificación y resultados de la empresa española, *Revista de Economía Aplicada*, 2, 103-128.
- TALLMAN, S. AND LI, J.T. (1996) The effects of international diversity and product diversity on the performance of multinational firms, *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 179-196.
- TANRIVERDI, H. AND VENKATRAMAN, N. (2005) Knowledge relatedness and the performance of multi-business firms, *Strategic Management Journal*, 26, 97-119.
- VILLALONGA, B. (2004) Does Diversification Cause the 'Diversification Discount'?, *Financial Management*, 33, 5-32.
- WERNERFELT, B. AND MONTGOMERY, C. A. (1988) Tobin's  $q$  and the importance of focus in firm performance, *American Economic Review*, 78, 246-250.
- WILHELMSSON, L. AND MCQUEEN, D. (1999) Product diversity and performance: a macro study of 20 large Swedish industrial corporations, *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 15, 43-64.
- WILLIAMSON, O. E. (1985): *The economic institutions of capitalism*, Free Press, New York.
- WOOLDRIDGE, J. (2002): *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*, MIT Press, Cambridge.



## APPENDIX I

First-stage probit regression predicting propensity to diversify

Variables	Coefficients	S.E.	z-Statistic
Constant	4.35**	1.38	3.15
Corporate control	-0.37	0.27	-1.39
Insiders proportion	0.01**	0.01	2.99
Log of total assets	-0.28***	0.08	-3.56
CAPEX/Sales	-0.12	0.12	-0.97
Export activity	0.40*	0.18	2.20
Industry ROA	-0.02*	0.01	-2.06
Fraction diversified firms	0.07**	0.03	2.54
Number of total observations			236
Number of censored observations			118
Log-likelihood test statistic			-139.46***
Pseudo-R <sup>2</sup>			0.15

† p &lt; 0.10; \* p &lt; 0.05; \*\* p &lt; 0.01; \*\*\* p &lt; 0.001