Journal of Economic Literature 2011, 49:2, 326–365
http:www.aeaweb.org/articles.php?doi=10.1257/jel.49.2.326

What Determines Productivity?

Chad Syverson*

Economists have shown that large and persistent differences in productivity levels across businesses are ubiquitous. This finding has shaped research agendas in a number of fields, including (but not limited to) macroeconomics, industrial organization, labor, and trade. This paper surveys and evaluates recent empirical work addressing the question of why businesses differ in their measured productivity levels. The causes are manifold, and differ depending on the particular setting. They include elements sourced in production practices—and therefore over which producers have some direct control, at least in theory—as well as from producers' external operating environments. After evaluating the current state of knowledge, I lay out what I see are the major questions that research in the area should address going forward.
(*JEL* D24, G31, L11, M10, O30, O47)

1. *Introduction*

Thanks to the massive infusion of detailed production activity data into economic study over the past couple of decades, researchers in many fields have learned a great deal about how firms turn inputs into outputs. Productivity, the efficiency with which this conversion occurs, has been a topic of particular interest. The particulars of these studies have varied depending on the researchers' specific interests, but there is a common thread. They have documented, virtually without exception, enormous and persistent measured productivity differences across producers, even within narrowly defined industries.

The magnitudes involved are striking. Chad Syverson (2004b) finds that within four-digit SIC industries in the U.S. manufacturing sector, the average difference in logged total factor productivity (TFP) between an industry's 90th and 10th percentile plants is 0.651. This corresponds to a TFP ratio of $e^{0.651} = 1.92$. To emphasize just what this number implies, it says that the plant at the 90th percentile of the productivity distribution makes almost *twice* as much output with the *same measured inputs* as the 10th percentile plant. Note that this is the average 90–10 range. The range's standard deviation across four-digit industries is 0.173, so several industries see much larger productivity differences among their producers. U.S. manufacturing is not exceptional in terms of productivity dispersion. Indeed, if anything,

*University of Chicago and National Bureau of Economic Research. I thank Eric Bartelsman, Nick Bloom, Roger Gordon, John Haltiwanger, Chang-Tai Hsieh, Ariel Pakes, Amil Petrin, John Van Reenen, and anonymous referees for helpful comments. This work is supported by the NSF (SES-0519062 and SES-0820307), and both the Stigler Center and the Centel Foundation/Robert P. Reuss Faculty Research Fund at the University of Chicago Booth School of Business.

it is small relative to the productivity variation observed elsewhere. Chang-Tai Hsieh and Peter J. Klenow (2009), for example, find even larger productivity differences in China and India, with average 90–10 TFP ratios over 5:1.[1]

These productivity differences across producers are not fleeting, either. Regressing a producer's current TFP on its one-year-lagged TFP yields autoregressive coefficients on the order of 0.6 to 0.8 (see, e.g., Árpád Ábrahám and Kirk White 2006 and Foster, Haltiwanger, and Syverson 2008). Put simply, some producers seem to have figured out their business (or at least are on their way), while others are woefully lacking. Far more than bragging rights are at stake here: another robust finding in the literature—virtually invariant to country, time period, or industry—is that higher productivity producers are more likely to survive than their less efficient industry competitors. Productivity is quite literally a matter of survival for businesses.

1.1 *How Micro-Level Productivity Variation and Persistence Has Influenced Research*

The discovery of ubiquitous, large, and persistent productivity differences has shaped research agendas in a number of fields. Here are some examples of this influence, though by no means is it meant to be a comprehensive accounting. They speak to the breadth of the impact that answers to this paper's title question would have.

Macroeconomists are dissecting aggregate productivity growth—the source of almost all per capita income differences across countries—into various micro-components, with the intent of better understanding the sources of such growth. Foster, Haltiwanger, and C. J. Krizan (2001), for example, overview the substantial role of reallocations of economic activity toward higher productivity producers (both among existing plants and through entry and exit) in explaining aggregate productivity growth. Hsieh and Klenow (2009) ask how much larger the Chinese and Indian economies would be if they achieved the same efficiency in allocating inputs across production units as does the United States. Models of economic fluctuations driven by productivity shocks are increasingly being enriched to account for micro-level patterns, and are estimated and tested using plant- or firm-level productivity data rather than aggregates (e.g., Jeffrey R. Campbell and Jonas D. M. Fisher 2004, Eric J. Bartelsman, Haltiwanger, and Stefano Scarpetta 2009, and Marcelo Veracierto 2008). Micro productivity data have also been brought to bear on issues of long-run growth, income convergence, and technology spillovers. They offer a level of resolution unattainable with aggregated data.

In industrial organization, research has linked productivity levels to a number of features of technology, demand, and market structure. Examples include the effect of competition (Syverson 2004a and James A. Schmitz 2005), the size of sunk costs (Allan Collard-Wexler 2010), and the interaction of product market rivalry and technology spillovers (Nicholas Bloom, Mark Schankerman, and John Van Reenen 2007). Another line of study has looked at the interaction of firms' organizational structures with productivity

[1] These figures are for revenue-based productivity measures; i.e., where output is measured using plant revenues (deflated across years using industry-specific price indexes). TFP measures that use physical quantities as output measures rather than revenues actually exhibit even *more* variation than do revenue-based measures as documented in Lucia Foster, John Haltiwanger, and Syverson (2008). Hsieh and Klenow (2009) also find greater productivity dispersion in their TFP measures that use quantity proxies to measure output (actual physical quantities are not available for most producers in their data). Even though it is only a component of revenue-based TFP (the other being the producer's average price), quantity-based TFP can be more dispersed because it tends to be negatively correlated with prices, as more efficient producers sell at lower prices. Thus revenue-based productivity measures, which combine quantity-based productivity and prices, tend to understate the variation in producers' physical efficiencies.

levels (e.g., Vojislav Maksimovic and Gordon Phillips 2002, Antoinette Schoar 2002, and Ali Hortaçsu and Syverson 2007, 2011).

Labor economists have explored the importance of workers' human capital in explaining productivity differences (John M. Abowd et al. 2005 and Jeremy T. Fox and Valérie Smeets 2011), the productivity effects of incentive pay (Edward P. Lazear 2000), other various human resources practices (Casey Ichniowski and Kathryn Shaw 2003), managerial talent and practices (Bloom and Van Reenen 2007), organizational form (Luis Garicano and Paul Heaton 2007), and social connections among coworkers (Oriana Bandiera, Iwan Barankay, and Imran Rasul 2009). There has also been a focus on the role of productivity-driven reallocation on labor market dynamics via job creation and destruction (Haltiwanger, Scarpetta, and Helena Schweiger 2008).

Perhaps in no other field have the productivity dispersion patterns noted above had a greater influence on the trajectory of the research agenda than in the trade literature. Theoretical frameworks using heterogeneous-productivity firms like Jonathan Eaton and Samuel Kortum (2002) and Marc J. Melitz (2003) are now the dominant conceptual lenses through which economists view trade impacts. In these models, the trade impacts vary across producers and depend on their productivity levels in particular. Aggregate productivity gains come from improved selection and heightened competition that trade brings. A multitude of empirical studies have accompanied and been spurred by these theories (e.g., Nina Pavcnik 2002, Andrew B. Bernard, J. Bradford Jensen, and Peter K. Schott 2006, and Eric A. Verhoogen 2008). They have confirmed many of the predicted patterns and raised questions of their own.

1.2 *The Question of "Why?"*

Given the important role that productivity differences play in these disparate literatures, the facts above raise obvious and crucial questions. *Why* do firms (or factories, stores, offices, or even individual production lines, for that matter) differ so much in their abilities to convert inputs into output? Is it dumb luck or instead something—or many things—more systematic? Can producers control the factors that influence productivity or are they purely external products of the operating environment? What supports such large productivity differences in equilibrium?

A decade ago, when Bartelsman and Mark Doms (2000) penned the first survey of the micro-data productivity literature for this journal, researchers were just beginning to ask the "Why?" question. Much of the work to that point had focused on establishing facts like those above—the "What?" of productivity dispersion. Since then, the literature has focused more intensely on the reasons why productivity levels are so different across businesses. There has definitely been progress. But we've also learned more about what we *don't* know, and this is guiding the ways in which the productivity literature will be moving. This article is meant to be a guide to and comment on this research.

I begin by setting some boundaries. I have to. A comprehensive overview of micro-founded productivity research is neither possible in this format nor desirable. There are simply too many studies to allow adequate coverage of each. First, I will focus on empirical work. This is not because I view it as more important than theory. Rather, it affords a deeper coverage of this important facet of a giant literature and it better reflects my expertise. That said, I will sketch out a simple heterogeneous-productivity industry model below to focus the discussion, and I will also occasionally bring up specific theoretical work with particularly close ties to the empirical issues discussed. Furthermore, for obvious reasons, I will focus on research that has been done since Bartelsman and Doms (2000) was written.

Even within these boundaries, there are more studies than can be satisfactorily described individually. I see this article's role as filtering the broader lessons of the literature through the lens of a subset of key studies. The papers I focus on here are not necessarily chosen because they are the first or only good work on their subject matter, but rather because they had an archetypal quality that lets me weave a narrative of the literature. I urge readers whose interests have been piqued to more intensively explore the relevant literatures. There is far more to be learned than I can convey here.

A disclaimer: some of my discussion contains elements of commentary. These opinions are mine alone and may not be the consensus of researchers in the field.

I organize this article as follows. The next section sketches the conceptual background: what productivity is, how it is often measured in practice, and how differences in productivity among producers of similar goods might be sustained in equilibrium. Section 3 looks at influences on productivity that operate primarily within the business. This can be at the firm level, plant level, or even on specific processes within the firm. Many of these influences may potentially be under the control of the economic actors inside the business. In other words, they can be "levers" that management or others have available to impact productivity. Section 4 focuses on the interaction of producers' productivity levels and the markets in which they operate. These are elements of businesses' external environments that can affect productivity levels. This impact might not always be direct, but they can induce producers to pull some of the levers discussed in section 3, indirectly influencing observed productivity levels in the process. They may also be factors that affect the amount of productivity dispersion that can be sustained in equilibrium and influence observed productivity differences through that channel. Section 5 discusses what I see as the big questions about business-level productivity patterns that still need to be answered. A short concluding section follows.

2. *Productivity—What It Is, How It Is Measured, and How Its Dispersion Is Sustained*

This section briefly reviews what productivity is conceptually, how it is measured in practice, and how productivity differences among producers of similar goods might be supported in equilibrium. Deeper discussions on the theory of productivity indexes can be found in Douglas W. Caves, Laurits R. Christensen, and W. Erwin Diewert (1982) and the references therein. More detail on measurement issues can be found in the large literature on the subject; see, for example, G. Steven Olley and Ariel Pakes (1996), Zvi Griliches and Jacques Mairesse (1998), Richard Blundell and Stephen R. Bond (2000), James Levinsohn and Amil Petrin (2003), and Daniel C. Ackerberg et al. (2007). Examples of models that derive industry equilibria with heterogeneous-productivity producers include Boyan Jovanovic (1982), Hugo A. Hopenhayn (1992), Richard Ericson and Pakes (1995), Melitz (2003), Marcus Asplund and Volker Nocke (2006), and Foster, Haltiwanger, and Syverson (2008).

2.1 *Productivity in Concept*

Simply put, productivity is efficiency in production: how much output is obtained from a given set of inputs. As such, it is typically expressed as an output–input ratio. Single-factor productivity measures reflect units of output produced per unit of a particular input. Labor productivity is the most common measure of this type, though occasionally capital or even materials productivity measures are used. Of course, single-factor productivity levels are affected by the

intensity of use of the excluded inputs. Two producers may have quite different labor productivity levels even though they have the same production technology if one happens to use capital much more intensively, say because they face different factor prices.

Because of this, researchers often use a productivity concept that is invariant to the intensity of use of observable factor inputs. This measure is called total factor productivity (TFP) (it is also sometimes called multifactor productivity). Conceptually, TFP differences reflect shifts in the isoquants of a production function: variation in output produced from a fixed set of inputs. Higher-TFP producers will produce greater amounts of output with the same set of observable inputs than lower-TFP businesses and, hence, have isoquants that are shifted up and to the right. Factor price variation that drives factor intensity differences does not affect TFP because it induces shifts *along* isoquants rather than shifts *in* isoquants.

TFP is most easily seen in the often-used formulation of a production function where output is the product of a function of observable inputs and a factor-neutral (alternatively, Hicks-neutral) shifter:

$$Y_t = A_t F(K_t, L_t, M_t),$$

where Y_t is output, $F(\cdot)$ is a function of observable inputs capital K_t, labor L_t, and intermediate materials M_t, and A_t is the factor-neutral shifter. In this type of formulation, TFP is A_t. It captures variations in output not explained by shifts in the observable inputs that act through $F(\cdot)$.[2]

TFP is, at its heart, a residual. As with all residuals, it is in some ways a measure of our ignorance: it is the variation in output that cannot be explained based on observable inputs. So it is fair to interpret the work discussed in this survey as an attempt to "put a face on" that residual—or more accurately, "put faces on," given the multiple sources of productivity variation. The literature has made progress when it can explain systematic influences on output across production units that do not come from changes in observable inputs like standard labor or capital measures.

2.2 *Measuring Productivity*

While productivity is relatively straightforward in concept, a host of measurement issues arise when constructing productivity measures from actual production data. Ironically, while research with micro production data greatly expands the set of answerable questions and moves the level of analysis closer to where economic decisions are made than aggregate data does, it also raises measurement and data quality issues more frequently.

The first set of issues regards the output measure. Many businesses produce more than one output. Should these be aggregated to a single output measure, and how if so? Further, even detailed producer microdata do not typically contain measures of output quantities. Revenues are typically observed instead. Given this limitation of the data, the standard approach has been to use revenues (deflated to a common year's real values using price deflator series) to measure output. While this may be acceptable, and even desirable, if product quality differences are fully reflected in prices, it can be problematic

[2] I use a multiplicatively separable technology shift to make exposition easy, but TFP can be extracted from a general time-varying production function $Y_t = G_t(A_t, K_t, L_t, M_t)$. Totally differentiating this production function gives:

$$dY_t = \frac{\partial G}{\partial A} dA_t + \frac{\partial G}{\partial K} dK_t + \frac{\partial G}{\partial L} dL_t + \frac{\partial G}{\partial M} dM_t.$$

Without loss of generality, we can choose units to normalize $\partial G/\partial A = 1$. Thus when observed inputs are fixed ($dK_t = dL_t = dM_t = 0$), differential shifts in TFP, dA_t, create changes in output dY_t.

whenever price variation instead embodies differences in market power across producers. In that case, producers' measured productivity levels may reflect less about how efficient they are and more about the state of their local output market. Recent work has begun to dig deeper into the consequences of assuming single-product producers and using revenue to measure output. I'll discuss this more below. In the meantime, I will go forward assuming deflated revenues accurately reflect the producer's output.

The second set of measurement issues regards inputs. For labor, there is the choice of whether to use number of employees, employee-hours, or some quality-adjusted labor measure (the wage bill is often used in this last role, based on the notion that wages capture marginal products of heterogeneous labor units). Capital is typically measured using the establishment or firm's book value of its capital stock. This raises several questions. How good of a proxy is capital stock for the flow of capital services? Should the stock be simply the producer's reported book value, and what are the deflators? Or should the stock be constructed using observed investments and the perpetual inventory method—and what to assume about depreciation? When measuring intermediate materials, an issue similar to the revenue-as-output matter above arises, because typically only the producer's total expenditures on inputs are available, not input quantities. More fundamentally, how should intermediate inputs be handled? Should one use a gross output production function and include intermediate inputs directly, or should intermediates simply be subtracted from output so as to deal with a value-added production function? On top of all these considerations, one makes these input measurement choices in the context of knowing that any output driven by unmeasured input variations (due to input quality differences or intangible capital, for example) will show up as productivity.

The third set of measurement concerns involves aggregating multiple inputs in a TFP measure. As described above, TFP differences reflect shifts in output while holding inputs constant. To construct the output–input ratio that measures TFP, a researcher must weight the individual inputs appropriately when constructing a single-dimensional input index. The correct weighting is easiest to see when the production function is Cobb–Douglas:

$$TFP_t = A_t = \frac{Y_t}{K_t^{\alpha_k} L_t^{\alpha_l} M_t^{\alpha_m}}.$$

In this case, the inputs are aggregated by taking the exponent of each factor to its respective output elasticity. It turns out that this holds more generally as a first-order approximation to any production function. The input index in the TFP denominator can be constructed similarly for general production functions.[3]

Even after determining how to construct the input index, one must measure the output elasticities α_j, $j \in \{k,l,m\}$. Several approaches are common in the literature. One builds upon assumptions of cost-minimization to construct the elasticities directly from observed production data. A cost-minimizing producer will equate an input's output elasticity with the product of that input's cost share and the scale elasticity. If cost shares can be measured (obtaining capital costs are usually the practical sticking point here) and the scale elasticity either estimated or assumed, then the output

[3]While Cobb–Douglas-style approaches are probably the most common in the literature, many researchers also use the translog form (see Caves, Christensen, and Diewert 1982), which is a second-order approximation to general production functions and, as such, is more flexible, though more demanding of the data. There is also an entirely nonparametric approach, data envelopment analysis (DEA), that is used in certain, somewhat distinct circles of the literature. See William W. Cooper, Lawrence M. Seiford, and Kaoru Tone (2006) for an overview of DEA methods.

elasticities α_j can be directly constructed. If a researcher is willing to make some additional but not innocuous assumptions—namely, perfect competition and constant returns to scale—then the elasticities equal the share of revenues paid to each input. This makes constructing the α_j simple. Materials' and labor's shares are typically straightforward to collect with the wage bill and materials expenditures data at hand. Capital's share can be constructed as the residual, obviating the need for capital cost measures. (Though there is a conceptual problem since, as the model that follows below points out, it is unclear what makes the producer's size finite in a perfectly competitive, constant returns world.) An important caveat is that the index approach assumes away factor adjustment costs. If they are present, the first-order conditions linking observed factor shares to output elasticities will not hold. This can be mitigated in part (but at cost) by using cost shares that have been averaged over either time or producers in order to smooth out idiosyncratic adjustment-cost-driven misalignments in actual and optimal input levels, but some mismeasurement could remain.

A separate approach is to estimate the elasticities α_j by estimating the production function. In this case, (logged) TFP is simply the estimated sum of the constant and the residual. In the Cobb–Douglas case (which again, recall, is a first-order approximation to more general technologies), the estimated equation is:

$$\ln Y_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_k \ln K_t + \alpha_l \ln L_t + \alpha_m \ln M_t + \omega_t .$$

Hence the TFP estimate would be $\hat{\alpha}_0 + \hat{\omega}_t$, where the first term is common across production units in the sample (typically the technology is estimated at the industry level), and the second is idiosyncratic to a particular producer.

This approach raises econometric issues. As first pointed out by Jacob Marschak and William H. Andrews (1944), input choices are likely to be correlated with the producer's productivity ω_t: more efficient producers are, all else equal, likely to hire more inputs. There is also potential selection bias when a panel is used, since less efficient producers—those with low ω_t—are more likely to exit from the sample. (As will be discussed below, the positive correlation between productivity and survival is one of the most robust findings in the literature.) Then there is the issue of producer-level price variation mentioned above. A substantial literature has arisen to address these issues; see Griliches and Mairesse (1998), Ackerberg et al. (2007), and Johannes Van Biesebroeck (2008) for overviews.

There is debate as to which of the many available methods is best. In the end, as I see it, choosing a method is a matter of asking oneself which assumptions one is comfortable making. Certainly one cannot escape the fact that *some* assumptions must be made when estimating the production function.

Fortunately, despite these many concerns, many of the results described in this paper are likely to be quite robust to measurement peculiarities. When studies have tested robustness directly, they typically find little sensitivity to measurement choices. The inherent variation in establishment- or firm-level microdata is typically so large as to swamp any small measurement-induced differences in productivity metrics. Simply put, high-productivity producers will tend to look efficient regardless of the specific way that their productivity is measured. I usually use cost-share-based TFP index numbers as a first pass in my own work; they are easy to construct and offer the robustness of being a nonparametric first-order approximation to a general production function. That said, it is always wise to check one's results for robustness to specifics of the measurement approach.

2.3 *A Model of Within-Industry Productivity Dispersion*

Given the large differences in productivity within an industry that I discussed above, a natural question is to ask how they could be sustained in equilibrium. The ubiquity of this dispersion suggests there must be some real economic force at work, rather than it simply being an artifact of measurement or odd chance. Here, I sketch out a simple model that shows how that is possible. The model will also prove helpful in facilitating discussion throughout this survey.

Industry producers, indexed by i, earn profits given by

$$\pi_i = R(A_i, L_i, D) - wL_i - f.$$

$R(\cdot)$ is a general revenue function. A_i is the producer's productivity level, and L_i is its labor input. (I assume labor is the firm's only input for the sake of simplicity.) Productivity levels differ across producers. The specific form of $R(\cdot)$ depends on the structure of the output market and the production function. Revenues can also depend on an industry state D. This can be a vector or a scalar and, depending on the structure of output market competition, it may include industrywide demand shocks, the number of industry producers, their productivity levels, and/or moments of the productivity distribution. Both the wage rate w and fixed cost f are common across, and taken as given by, all producers.

I assume $R(\cdot)$ is twice differentiable with $\partial R/\partial L > 0$, $\partial^2 R/\partial L^2 < 0$, $\partial R/\partial A > 0$, and $\partial^2 R/\partial A \partial L > 0$. If the industry is perfectly competitive, these conditions are satisfied given a production function that is similarly differentiable, concave in L, and where productivity and labor are complements. Further, under perfect competition, all information contained in D is reflected in the market price P that equates total demand and supply, which the producers of course take as given. In imperfectly competitive markets, the assumptions about $R(\cdot)$ place restrictions on the form of competitive interaction (be it monopolistically competitive or oligopolistic) and through this the shapes of the residual demand curves. The contents of D will also depend on the particulars of the competitive structure. For example, in a heterogeneous-cost Cournot oligopoly, D will contain the parameters of the industry demand curve and the productivity levels of the industry's producers, as these are sufficient to determine the Nash equilibrium outputs and therefore revenues of each producer i. Despite these restrictions, this setup is reasonably general.

The assumptions on the shape of $R(\cdot)$ imply that, given the industry state D, each producer has a unique optimal employment level L_i^* that is increasing in its productivity level. Intuitively, the producer's optimal employment level (which I refer to from here forward as its size), which is set to equate marginal revenues and marginal costs, is pinned down by increasing marginal costs in perfectly competitive markets and a downward-sloping residual demand curve (and possibly increasing marginal costs as well) in imperfectly competitive markets.

Denote the producer's profits at its optimal size by

$$\pi(A_i, L_i^*, D) = R(A_i, L_i^*, D) - w L_i^* - f.$$

By the envelope theorem and the conditions on the revenue function, profits are increasing in the producer's productivity level A_i. This implies that there will be a critical productivity level $\underline{A}$ such that for $A_i < \underline{A}$, profits will be negative. $\underline{A}$ will depend in general on w, f, and the industry state D. Since D may itself depend on the distribution of productivity levels in the industry, we will need an additional condition to determine

the industry equilibrium. This comes from an entry structure as follows.

A large pool of ex ante identical potential entrants decides whether to enter the industry. They first choose whether to pay a sunk entry cost s in order to receive a productivity draw from a distribution with probability density function $g(A)$ over the interval $[A_l, A_u]$.[4] If a potential entrant chooses to receive a draw, it determines after observing it whether to begin production at its optimal size and earn the corresponding operating profits $\pi(A_i, L_i^*, D)$.

Only potential entrants with productivity draws high enough to make nonnegative operating profits will choose to produce in equilibrium. Hence the expected value of paying s is the expected value of $\pi(A, L^*, D)$ over $g(A)$, conditional on drawing $A_i \geq \underline{A}$. This expected value is obviously affected by the cutoff cost level $\underline{A}$. A free-entry condition pins down this value: $\underline{A}$ must set the net expected value of entry into the industry V^e equal to zero. Thus $\underline{A}$ satisfies

$$V^e = \int_{\underline{A}}^{A_u} \pi(A, L^*, D)\, g(A)\, dA - s = 0.$$

This expression summarizes the industry equilibrium.[5] It combines the two conditions that all producers make nonnegative operating profits and that entry occurs until the expected value of taking a productivity draw is zero. By pinning down the equilibrium distribution of productivity levels in the industry through determining $\underline{A}$, it also determines the equilibrium industry state D. The particular values of $\underline{A}$ and D depend on the exogenous components of the model: $g(A)$, w, f, and s, and the functional form of $R(\cdot)$.

The equilibrium productivity distribution will be a truncation of the underlying productivity distribution $g(A)$. Specifically, the equilibrium distribution (denoted $\gamma(A)$) is:

$$\gamma(A) = \begin{cases} \frac{g(A)}{1 - G(\underline{A})} & \text{if } A \geq \underline{A} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

There are two notable features of this distribution. First, it is not trivially degenerate; the model supports productivity heterogeneity under general conditions. This is because high-productivity producers are limited in their ability to sell to the industry's entire market. This finite optimal producer size is a consequence of the concavity of the revenue function. In perfectly competitive markets, this concavity comes from increasing marginal costs. In industries with imperfectly competitive output markets, the concavity arises from downward-sloping demand curves (due to product differentiation from any source) and, possibly, from increasing marginal costs as well. In either case, one can interpret productivity A as a factor of production that differs in quantity or quality across producers. A higher level of A loosens the size constraint but does not eliminate it.

Second, the average productivity level in the industry will vary as the exogenous parameters change. Increases in the average productivity level across plants (coming from parameter changes that increase $\underline{A}$) will thus expectedly translate into higher

[4] These bounds are essentially arbitrary as long as they span $\underline{A}$ for any possible D. That is, a producer with productivity level A_l is not profitable (i.e., it cannot cover its fixed costs) in any possible industry state, and one with productivity A_u is always profitable.

[5] I've made two implicit assumptions in this equation. First, V^e is exactly zero only in industries with a large number of producers. I will assume there is a continuum of producers for the remainder of the discussion. This is consistent with an assumption of perfect competition or monopolistic competition in the product market, though obviously rules out strategic oligopolistic interactions. The model's logic applies to industries with a discrete number of firms, however. In that case, free entry condition will imply a number of producers N such that the expected value of entry with $N - 1$ firms is positive but is negative with N firms. The other assumption is that the productivity distribution $g(A)$ is continuous, but the model can be modified to accommodate discrete productivity distributions.

aggregate industry productivity—the ratio of total industry output to total industry inputs.[6] Therefore what happens at the micro level feeds upwards into aggregates. This feature reflects a major thrust behind the research agenda of understanding micro productivity: it teaches us more about aggregate productivity movements.

Of course, this model is very simple and leaves out many features observed in empirical work on productivity. I will quickly discuss two such features.

As a two-stage entry and production model, the model abstracts from dynamics. It can therefore be interpreted as characterizing long-run industry equilibria. That said, versions of this model's type with more complex dynamics have been worked out by, among others, Hopenhayn (1992) and Asplund and Nocke (2006). Further, even this simple structure hints at how the dynamics of reallocation—a focus of some of the literature discussed below—might work. Suppose the industry is initially in equilibrium and then each producer is hit with a persistent, independent productivity shock. Those receiving favorable shocks will see an increase in their optimal size, while those hit by negative shocks will want to shrink. Indeed, some may be hit by shocks so adverse that they will no longer be profitable. And if we imagine there are still potential entrants who could pay the sunk cost to take a productivity draw, the environment after the productivity shocks may be favorable enough to induce some of them to want to do so. Any adjustment to a new, postshock equilibrium will therefore require reallocation of inputs from their initial locations. Favorably shocked producers will grow, unfavorably shocked producers will shrink or exit, and new producers may enter the industry at a productivity level above exiters. These patterns of reallocation are robust features of the data.

A greater limitation of the model is that a producer's productivity is exogenous. The equilibrium productivity distribution is endogenized only through a selection effect: the determination of who produces in equilibrium via $\underline{A}$. While I discuss below that selection is an empirically important mechanism, it is abundantly clear that producers often take actions to try to raise their productivity level. In this case, the equilibrium sketched out above will not directly apply, though many of its basic elements will.

Despite the model's simplicity and limited scope, it can form a useful conceptual base upon which to build the discussion below.

3. *Productivity and the Plant or Firm*

This section discusses factors that directly impact productivity at the micro level by operating within the plant or firm. They are "levers" that management or others can potentially use to impact the productivity of their business. They are akin to forces that would allow firms in the model of the previous section to raise their A_i draw, though most likely at a cost. Section 4 below will focus on influences external to the firm: elements of the industry or market environment that can induce productivity changes or support productivity dispersion.

I have broken up the discussion of direct productivity impacts by category for the sake of exposition. However, it's good to keep in mind that some forces can overlap these categories, and multiple mechanisms can act in

[6] For differentiated product industries, relating an industry's aggregate productivity level to the productivity levels of its component firms requires constructing a quantity index that adds up firms' disparate outputs. The proper index depends on how the product varieties enter final demanders' utility functions. Under standard aggregators, increases in the average firm-level productivity translate into increases in aggregate industry productivity (see, e.g., Melitz 2003). However, there are complications involved in empirically mapping back-and-forth between changes in micro-level productivity distributions within an industry and changes in aggregate industry productivity (see, e.g., Paul Schreyer 2001, Petrin and Levinsohn 2005, Susanto Basu et al. 2009, and Charles R. Hulten 2009).

concert. I will point out many of these across-category links as the discussion goes along.

3.1 *Managerial Practice/Talent*

Researchers have long proposed that managers drive productivity differences.[7] Whether sourced in the talents of the managers themselves or the quality of their practices, this is an appealing argument. Managers are conductors of an input orchestra. They coordinate the application of labor, capital, and intermediate inputs. Just as a poor conductor can lead to a cacophony rather than a symphony, one might expect poor management to lead to discordant production operations.

Still, perhaps no potential driver of productivity differences has seen a higher ratio of speculation to actual empirical study. Data limitations have been the stumbling block. The proliferation of production microdata has afforded a great increase in detail, but such data rarely contains detailed information on any aspect of managerial inputs. Sometimes there may be a distinction made between blue- and white-collar or production and nonproduction employees, but that is usually it. The identity, much less the characteristics, practices, or time allocation of individual managers is rarely known. Furthermore, managerial inputs can be very abstract. It's not just time allocation that matters but what the manager does with their time, like how they incentivize workers or deal with suppliers.

A recent set of papers has made considerable efforts to close this measurement gap. Some have focused on single-industry or even single-firm case studies by necessity, given the detail required in the data. More comprehensive efforts that cover a broader cross section of economic activity are underway, however.

Bloom and Van Reenen (2007) offer one of the most comprehensive studies relating management practices (though not managers per se) to productivity. They and their team surveyed managers from over 700 medium-sized firms in the United States, United Kingdom, France, and Germany. They surveyed plant managers, so the measured practices revolve around day-to-day and close-up operations rather than the broader strategic choices made at the executive level.

Surveys were conducted over the phone by a questioner who shared the respondent's native language. Information was probed on eighteen specific management practices in four broad areas: operations, monitoring, targets, and incentives. The interviewers scored the firm on its practices based on these responses. Given the inherently subjective element of this measurement process, Bloom and Van Reenen took several steps to enhance accuracy and consistency. Managers were not told they were being scored. Questions on practices were open-ended (e.g., "Can you tell me how you promote your employees?" rather than "Do you promote your employees based on tenure?"). Financial performance was not discussed.

[7] I mean *long* proposed: Francis A. Walker (1887) posits that managerial ability is the source of differences in surplus across businesses: "The excess of produce which we are contemplating comes from directing force to its proper object by the simplest and shortest ways; from saving all unnecessary waste of materials and machinery; from boldly incurring the expense—the often large expense—of improved processes and appliances, while closely scrutinizing outgo and practising a thousand petty economies in unessential matters; from meeting the demands of the market most aptly and instantly; and, lastly, from exercising a sound judgment as to the time of sale and the terms of payment. It is on account of the wide range among the employers of labor, in the matter of ability to meet these exacting conditions of business success, that we have the phenomenon in every community and in every trade, in whatever state of the market, of some employers realizing no profits at all, while others are making fair profits; others, again, large profits; others, still, colossal profits." It is impressive how Walker's description closely matches (albeit with the flowing prose typical of the time) the viewpoints of researchers over 120 years later. We finally are becoming able, with the growing availability of broad-based production microdata, to test such hypotheses on a comprehensive basis.

The firms were small enough so that the interviewers would not already be aware of the performance of the firms they surveyed. Each interviewer conducted dozens of interviews, allowing Bloom and Van Reenen to control for interviewer fixed effects when relating management scores to outcomes. Further, over sixty firms were surveyed twice, by different interviewers; the correlation between the separate management practice scores for the same firms was 0.73.

Much of what was scored as "best practice" management in the interviews was based on the recommendations of the management consulting industry. This raises concerns about whether these practices are actually related to performance, or just the management fad of the moment. Importantly, therefore, Bloom and Van Reenen document that higher-quality management practices (and higher scores) are correlated with several measures of productivity and firm performance, including labor productivity, TFP, return on capital, Tobin's Q, sales growth, and the probability of survival.[8] The correlation between a firm's management practice score and its total factor productivity is statistically strong and economically nontrivial. Spanning the interquartile range of the management score distribution, for example, corresponds to a productivity change of between 3.2 and 7.5 percent. This is between 10 and 23 percent of TFP's 32 percent interquartile range in their sample.

Bloom and Van Reenen show two factors are important predictors of the quality of management practice in a firm. More intense competition in the firm's market, measured in several ways, is positively correlated with best-practice management. Additionally, management practice scores are lower when the firm is family-owned *and* primogeniture determined the current CEO's succession—i.e., he is the eldest son of the firm's founder. (I will discuss the competition–productivity link more extensively in section 4. Interestingly, primogeniture's tie to productivity is not about family ownership per se—in fact, family ownership in isolation is positively correlated with good management.) These two factors are responsible for explaining most of the difference between the country-level average management scores in the sample. The variation in these averages is largely the result of the United Kingdom and France having a left tail of poorly managed firms. Both countries have traditionally favored primogeniture by tradition and family-firm exemptions in their inheritance tax laws.

Disentangling whether these correlations are causal is more challenging. Perhaps management consultancies base their recommendations on the practices observed at successful firms, but some excluded factor drives both management practice and performance. Bloom and Van Reenen, aware of this issue, estimated a specification in an earlier working paper version of the article that used competition and primogeniture measures to instrument for management scores. The notion is that the competitive and legal environments are orthogonal to other factors that drive management practices, at least in the short run. The estimated effect of management practices on TFP remains statistically significant and is in fact larger than the ordinary least squares case. This may suggest that unobserved third factors have a modest role, if any, and that Bloom and Van Reenen's management practice scores reflect (albeit noisily) true managerial acumen.

Bloom and Van Reenen have since expanded their management practice survey program to gain greater coverage of business practices across economies. Bloom and Van Reenen (2010) and Bloom et al. (2010) review results from an extension of this survey program to nearly 6,000 firms in

[8] The data from this paper is available online at http://cep.lse.ac.uk/_new/publications/abstract.asp?index=2313.

seventeen countries, including fast-growing China, India, and Brazil. The broader results echo those above. A particularly interesting pattern emerging from the early analysis is that the much lower average management practice scores in China, India, and Brazil are driven not so much by lower productivity across the board (though this is present to some extent), but in particular by a large left tail of very poorly managed firms. This has obvious implications for how trade growth and its assorted competitive pressures might impact productivity evolution in these and other countries. (More about Chinese and Indian firms' TFP levels below.) Bloom and Van Reenen are now further expanding the survey program to incorporate a panel element. This will be extremely useful, as it will allow one to control for unobservable fixed heterogeneity across firms as well as to see how firms' management practices change when their external environment does.

Other work in this vein includes James B. Bushnell and Catherine Wolfram (2009), who find that power plant operators have nontrivial impacts on the thermal efficiency of power plants. The best can boost their plant's fuel efficiency by over three percent, saving millions of dollars of fuel costs per year. Unfortunately, the data are less clear about what particular actions or attributes predict good plant management.

These research lines study managerial actions and policies at levels below the executive suite. Other work has focused on how those at the apexes of corporate hierarchies influence performance. Marianne Bertrand and Schoar (2003) study top executives (e.g., CEOs, CFOs, Presidents, etc.) who manage at least two firms for three years each during their 1969–99 sample period. Following managers across multiple firms lets them test if individual executives can explain variation in firms' performance measures. While they don't measure productivity specifically, they do find that the individual manager fixed effects (particularly for CEOs) have significant explanatory power over firms' returns on assets. Adding these fixed effects to a regression of returns on firm and year fixed effects raises the adjusted R^2 from 0.72 to 0.77.

These results reflect performance differences that can be explained by the identity of the managers. This still leaves open the question of what the managers *do* or *know* that affects performance. Bertrand and Schoar don't have the sort of detailed management practice data of Bloom and Van Reenen, but they do regress their estimated manager fixed effects on two variables they observe for the executives in their data: age and MBA attainment. They find that while age is not a significant factor, managers with MBAs have significantly higher return on assets effects (by roughly 1 percent, as compared to a mean of 16 percent). This might be due to their more aggressive behavior as reflected in investment, leverage, and dividend-paying (or lack thereof) choices. More recent work (e.g., Steven N. Kaplan, Mark M. Klebanov, and Morten Sorensen 2008 and Ulrike Malmendier and Geoffrey Tate 2009) has started to dig deeper into how particular CEO practices and philosophies are tied to firm performance.

Other within-firm work has suggested that the human resources components of management, in particular, can affect productivity. This research—see for example Ichniowski, Shaw, and Giovanna Prennushi (1997), Lazear (2000), Barton H. Hamilton, Jack A. Nickerson, and Hideo Owan (2003), the papers cited in Ichniowski and Shaw (2003), Bruce Shearer (2004), and Bandiera, Barankay, and Rasul (2007 and 2009)—uses highly detailed, production-line-specific data to tie nonstandard human resource management practices like pay-for-performance schemes, work teams, cross-training, and routinized labor–management communication to productivity growth. These papers have elucidated some interesting details

about the productivity effects of these practices. For instance, these practices may be complements: while they may have only modest impact on productivity when implemented in isolation, their total impact is larger than the sum of its parts when used in conjunction. Further, these practices are likely to have heterogeneous effects across production lines, even in the same plant, if different lines produce product variants of varying complexity. Brent Boning, Ichniowski, and Shaw (2007), for example, find an interaction between the complexity of the production process and the ability of innovative human resource management in raising productivity.

Alexandre Mas (2008) shows in a vivid case study how poor management–labor relations can have productivity effects. He looks at the resale values of equipment made at plants and times where Caterpillar was experiencing labor strife during the 1990s. Compared to otherwise identical products made at plants or times without unrest, these products had about 5 percent lower resale values. This substantial productivity impact due to the implied reduction in the equipment's quality-adjusted service flows totaled $400 million.

With these and other studies, the evidence that management and productivity are related is starting to pile up. Further, some of this work strongly suggests that this relationship is causal. Still, establishing causality definitively remains a key issue for research. Bloom, Benn Eifert, Aprajit Mahajan, David McKenzie, and John Roberts (2011) are attempting to establish as much by using what many consider to be the gold standard for establishing causality: a randomized field experiment. They are providing management consulting to a random set of Indian firms and will compare productivity growth in this treatment group to that observed in a set of control firms not receiving the intervention. This study could go a long way toward establishing whether or not a causal link exists. Any such link would raise additional questions. First, even if the interventions raised productivity, were they cost effective? That is, would they pay for themselves in a market setting? Second, given what we know about Indian firms in general, particularly for the left tail of the productivity distribution, if management consulting were to be effective anywhere, it would be in India. Should the experiment therefore be thought of as measuring the upper bound of the causal effect of management practices?

3.2 *Higher-Quality General Labor and Capital Inputs*

Management is an unmeasured input in most production functions, and hence is embodied in the productivity measure. Similarly, the productive effects of inputs like (nonmanagement) labor and capital can also enter productivity if there are input quality differences that standard input measures do not capture.[9]

There is of course an enormous literature on human capital, far too large to cover here, that has tied several factors to labor quality, including education, training, overall experience, and tenure at a firm. Much of this work in labor economics has focused on wages as the outcome of interest. A smaller set of work has looked at human capital's impact on productivity.

[9] Attempts to capture labor quality differences in labor measures rather than productivity are the impetus behind using the wage bill to measure labor inputs rather than the number of employees or employee-hours. The notion is that market wages reflect variations in workers' contributions to production; firms with more productive workers will have a higher wage bill per employee. Of course, there are problems with this approach: wage variation might reflect the realities of local labor markets, or causation could be in the other direction, if more productive producers earn rents that are shared with or captured by employees (Van Reenen 1996; Abowd, Francis Kramarz, and David N. Margolis 1999). Hence, more direct labor-quality measures are needed to definitively pin down labor quality's productivity contribution.

Newer work using matched employer-employee datasets, which allow individual workers to be tracked across plants or firms over time, has offered evidence on the importance of labor quality. Abowd et al. (2005) offer a broad survey of the early evidence from these types of datasets, which tend to be newly constructed and therefore still have short panel histories. Their applicability for studying productivity, while limited now, will greatly increase over time. Still, some progress has been made with such data. Pekka Ilmakunnas, Mika Maliranta, and Jari Vainiomäki (2004), for example, use Finnish matched worker–plant data to show that (not surprisingly) productivity is increasing in workers' education as well as age.

As great a potential as such data may hold, the results in Fox and Smeets (2011) suggest that matched employer–employee data will not answer all of the literature's burning questions. They use matched employer–employee records from the Danish economy to control for worker education, gender, experience, and industry tenure in production function estimation. While these labor quality measures have significant coefficients in the production function, accounting for their influence only decreases the average within-industry 90–10 percentile productivity ratio from 3.74 to 3.36. There is plenty of productivity variation left to be explained. In a somewhat encouraging find for researchers using more limited datasets, they find that including the wage bill alone as a measure of labor inputs—data that is almost always available—does almost as well as including the full array of their human capital measures, though they caution that wage bills are subject to endogeneity concerns, as discussed above. This finding of only a modest role for finer labor skills measures in explaining productivity differences is echoed in Fernando Galindo-Rueda and Jonathan E. Haskel's (2005) investigation with similar U.K. data. (Incidentally, using the decline in productivity dispersion as a metric of a newly measured factor's importance in explaining productivity—or an R^2-type measure as Bertrand and Schoar use—is a good idea. Studies seeking to explain productivity dispersion should strive to conduct and report similar exercises.)

Capital can also vary in quality in ways not captured with standard measures. If capital vintages differ from one another in how much technological progress they embody, the common book-value-based capital stock measures will tend to miss variations in average capital vintages across producers. Several studies have tried to measure the rate of capital-embodied technological progress by carefully constructing measures of the distribution of capital vintages within plants or firms. Plutarchos Sakellaris and Daniel J. Wilson (2004) do exactly this using the annual investment histories of plants in the U.S. Annual Survey of Manufactures and industry-year-specific depreciation measures. They estimate a production function that is standard in all respects except that, rather than measuring capital inputs with single dollar-valued stock, they use a weighted sum of the plant's past investments. The weights combine the cumulative depreciation of a particular vintage's investment and a technological progress multiplier that they estimate. They assume that capital efficiency units grow at a constant rate per year, which they estimate to be between 8 to 17 percent per year, depending on the specification. These numbers are striking in their implications about how much productivity growth can come from investment alone. (Note that, unlike the standard capital deepening effects of investment that serve only to shift labor productivity, capital-embodied technological progress also raises TFP.) Other studies using different methodologies (e.g., Jason G. Cummins and Giovanni L. Violante 2002) have found somewhat smaller values, on the order of five percent per year. This seems to

be an area desperate for further evidence, given its potential importance.

Van Biesebroeck (2003) measures the productivity impact of auto assembly plants shifting to "lean" technologies, which in that context involves new capital plus a host of complementary practices (teamwork, just-in-time ordering, etc.). This is also clearly related to the managerial practice discussion earlier. He finds that both the entry of new lean plants and the transformation of earlier vintage plants are responsible for the industry's acceleration of labor productivity growth during the late 1980s and early 1990s. Interestingly, his estimates of each technology's parameters suggest that capital-augmenting productivity is the primary driver of labor productivity growth under lean processes, while Hicks-neutral TFP-type productivity drives growth in the traditional technology plants.

Of course, not just physical capital can have unobservable quality differences. Certain types of capital may be themselves invisible—that is, intangible capital. Such capital can include any of a number of concepts, like a firm's reputation, know-how, or its loyal customer base, just to name a few. Despite the difficulty in quantifying these types of capital, they can have very real output effects that, as such, will result in measured productivity differences. I will discuss some specific cases of intangible capital in operation below, but the full breadth and depth of intangibles' role in explaining productivity differences are still very much open questions.

3.3 *Information Technology and R&D*

While the research described above indicates that input heterogeneity matters, the productivity effects of a particular type of capital—information technology (IT)—have been the subject of intense study. This is rightly so; many have hypothesized that IT was behind the resurgence in U.S. aggregate productivity growth in the mid-1990s after twenty years of sluggish performance, and that IT has more generally influenced productivity patterns across multiple industries and countries. Given the sheer size of GDP per capita variation that can be driven by even a modest change in trend productivity growth over a sustained period, it is not surprising that sources of such changes receive considerable research attention. Because of this attention, I discuss the work done on this particular capital type separately here.

An overview of IT capital's broad productivity impacts, particularly in driving the growth resurgence, can be found in Dale W. Jorgenson, Mun S. Ho, and Kevin J. Stiroh (2005, 2008) and Stephen D. Oliner, Daniel E. Sichel, and Stiroh (2007). These studies document that IT-related productivity gains—both spectacular productivity growth in IT-*producing* industries and more modest changes in IT-*using* industries—play an important role in explaining aggregate U.S. productivity growth over the past couple of decades.

At the same time, Bart van Ark, Mary O'Mahony, and Marcel P. Timmer (2008) show that the European Union's comparably sluggish productivity growth over the same period can be explained in large part by the later emergence and smaller size of IT investment in European economies. Bloom, Sadun, and Van Reenen (forthcoming) suggest that it is not geography per se that matters, but rather the location of the owning firm. They show U.S.-based multinationals operating in the European Union are more productive than their EU counterparts, and this productivity advantage is primarily derived from IT capital. They link their management practices data discussed above to data on IT usage to test for particular mechanisms through which this productivity advantage arises. Their evidence points to a complementarity between IT capital and human resources practices, explaining U.S.

multinationals' productivity advantage in the European Union.

These broad patterns raise the question of which specific micro mechanisms actually underlie the aggregate relationship between IT and productivity growth. Several studies have explored this issue with detailed production data. Thomas N. Hubbard (2003) shows how on-board computers raise average utilization rates of trucks that they are installed in. The computers provide dispatchers real-time information on a truck's locations and load status, allowing them to better match the available cartage capacity to innovations in demand.[10]

Ann Bartel, Ichniowski, and Shaw (2007) show how better computer numerically controlled (CNC) machining centers—automated devices that shape parts from raw material stock—raise productivity in the valve manufacturing industry by shortening setup times, raising speeds of production runs, and even allowing quicker inspections. The appealing element of the study's empirical approach is that both the products and the production process, except for the particular pieces of IT capital whose contribution is of interest, remain constant across observations. The paper also shows that IT-intensive product design tools like computer-aided design packages make it easier to design customized parts, and lower setup times make multiple production runs less costly. Offering a broader array of parts allows the firms to better match their production capabilities to their customers' desires, increasing the surplus of their sales.

Such a gain in surplus from product specialization raises an important broader point about productivity measurement. Better customization from IT can raise firms average product prices. Measures of productivity in physical units of output (e.g., number of valves per unit input) may therefore not fully capture the surplus gained. This is one case where the limit of most producer-level datasets to revenue-based output measures does not pose a measurement problem because this sort of productivity gain would be reflected in revenues but not physical quantities. (That said, the concern about price variations due to local market power or demand shocks creating productivity mismeasurement still applies in differentiated product settings.)

Erik Brynjolfsson et al. (2008), Bartelsman, Pieter A. Gautier, and Joris de Wind (2010), and Giulia Faggio, Kjell G. Salvanes, and Van Reenen (2010) each draw, in related but distinct ways, broader lines connecting IT and productivity. Brynjolfsson et al. document case studies where IT enhances the speed with which firms can replicate practices they find productive in one of their lines of business across the entire organization. This ability to lever-up a productivity advantage means successfully innovating firms displace less productive competitors more quickly. IT thus raises the volatility of firm performance. Brynjolfsson et al. test for and find this heightened volatility in a sample of Compustat firms in sixty-one industries. In the context of the model in section 2, Brynjolfsson et al. essentially argue that IT reduces the concavity of the firm's revenue function, allowing them to better leverage (and in a dynamic world, do so more quickly) any inherent productivity advantages (increases in A_i) that they develop or stumble upon.

[10] Adopting any new technology, IT or otherwise, obviously has its own costs. A new technology's net productivity benefit to the adopter depends on the difference between the increased production the new technology facilitates and its acquisition cost. For the marginal adopting producer, this net gain will be zero. However, inframarginal producers experience positive productivity gains. The aggregate productivity gains that any technology will offer will therefore also depend on the competitiveness of the technology-producing sector. A lower markup and price for the technology raises both the number of inframarginal adopters and the net productivity gain that each experiences.

Bartelsman, Gautier, and de Wind (2010) further develop the notion that IT shifts not just the mean of the distribution of innovation outcomes but its variance as well. Because poor outcomes are truncated by the option to exit—again in the parlance of the model above, firms drawing a productivity level below $\underline{A}$ don't need to produce at a loss—greater variance raises the value of making risky innovations. Bartelsman, Gautier, and de Wind note, however, that exit costs (absent in the model in section 2) will stifle firms' willingness to innovate because they make it harder to dismiss unsuccessful outcomes. They argue that employment-protection legislation like firing costs makes exit more expensive and therefore reduces firms' willingness to adopt IT. They show that IT-intensive sectors are in fact smaller in countries with greater legal restrictions on firms' abilities to close unsuccessful lines of business. They cite employment protection legislation as a major contributor to the IT gap documented by van Ark, O'Mahony, and Timmer (2008). (I will further discuss the role of flexibility in input markets further in section 4 below.)

Faggio, Salvanes, and Van Reenen (2010) document that within-industry productivity dispersion in the United Kingdom has trended upwards over the past couple of decades. They relate this increased dispersion to the growth in wage dispersion that has occurred over the same period in the United Kingdom and almost every other developed economy. It would be interesting to see if similar productivity spreading is occurring in concert with wage dispersion growth in these other economies. More directly applicable to the theme of this section, however, is that Faggio, Salvanes, and Van Reenen show that industries that experienced the greatest growth in productivity dispersion also saw the largest increases in IT capital intensity. This is yet more evidence tying IT to greater productivity variance.

There is a long literature linking R&D and productivity, and recent additions to it have focused on exploring the ties at the micro level. As with many input-based stories of productivity differences, the difficulty is in separating correlation from causation. There are many reasons why more productive firms might do more R&D, suggesting that some of the causation may go the other way.

Ulrich Doraszelski and Jordi Jaumandreu (2009) model firm productivity growth as the consequence of R&D expenditures with uncertain outcomes. Estimating their model using a panel of Spanish firms, they find that R&D does appear to explain a substantial amount of productivity growth. However, and picking up the theme of increased variance tied to IT capital discussed above, they also find that firm-level uncertainty in the outcome of R&D is considerable, much more so than with respect to the return on physical capital investment. In fact, their estimates suggest that engaging in R&D roughly doubles the degree of uncertainty in the evolution of a producer's productivity level.

Bee Yan Aw, Mark J. Roberts, and Daniel Yi Xu (2008) highlight the bidirectional causality between R&D and productivity in their study of Taiwanese electronics exporters. They find that firms that select into exporting tend to already be more productive than their domestic counterparts (more on this in the trade section below), but the decision to export is often accompanied by large R&D investments. These investments raise exporters' productivity levels further in turn, highlighting both selection and causal effects tying productivity to R&D. The timing of this R&D blitz is consistent with a world where the exporters are more willing to innovate on the margin because they can spread the potential gains of productivity growth across a larger market.

Of course, R&D is simply one of the more observable components of firms' overall

innovative efforts. Many firms undertake both process and product innovation without formally reporting R&D spending. (I will discuss product innovation's ties to productivity differences in further detail below.) This limits the literature's ability to give a comprehensive look into the relationships between productivity and innovation. Still, it is a very useful start, and the mechanisms the R&D literature highlights are likely to often overlap with the effects of unmeasured innovative spending.

3.4 *Learning-by-Doing*

The very act of operating can increase productivity. Experience allows producers to identify opportunities for process improvements. This productivity growth, often called learning-by-doing, has a long and rich history of study in the literature but has recently been investigated in more detail given newly available micro-level production data.

C. Lanier Benkard (2000) studies the precipitous drop in the labor hours Lockheed needed to assemble its L-1011 TriStar wide-body aircraft. The first few units off the line required more than one million person hours (equivalent to three shifts a day of 2,500 workers each for fifty work days). This was cut in half by the 30th plane, and halved again by the 100th. Benkard estimates both the learning rate—how fast past production increases productivity (decreases unit labor requirements)—and the "forgetting" rate, which is how fast the knowledge stock built by learning depreciates. Forgetting is quantitatively important in this setting: Benkard estimates that almost 40 percent of the knowledge stock depreciates each year. This may not be literal forgetting but could instead primarily reflect labor turnover. An additional factor in "forgetting" was the shift to a new variant of the plane after about 130 units. This new variant was different enough that the imperfect substitutability of the knowledge stock between the original and new variants led to a temporary but substantial increase in labor requirements.

Rebecca Achee Thornton and Peter Thompson (2001) investigate what *types* of experience matter in productivity growth from learning by doing. Their data includes unit labor requirements for several design variants of 4,000 Liberty ships produced by multiple shipyards during World War II. The multidesign/multiyard nature of the data lets them estimate the relative productivity contributions of four different measures of past production experience: the yard's past production experience with a particular design, the same yard's past production of other designs, other yards' experience with the particular design, and other yards' production of other designs. Not surprisingly, a yard's past production of a particular model matters most for productivity growth in that same model. After that comes the yard's experience with other ship designs, at about 60 percent the size of the own-design effect. Cross-yard spillovers are considerably smaller—only about five to ten percent of the own-yard, own-design learning impact. These cross-plant learning effects, while relatively modest here, do show that producers may become more productive by learning from other businesses. I will discuss cross-business spillovers more below.

Steven D. Levitt, John A. List, and Syverson (2011) find more limited cross-model learning spillovers within an auto assembly plant. Using detailed data on hundreds of individual operations during assembly of thousands of cars, they studied the causes and effects of manufacturing defects. This particular plant began production of three model variants (nameplates) of a common platform at staggered times during a production year. Each time a new model ramped up, the plant began a new learning curve. An interesting contrast was seen when looking at what happened to defect

rates when a new shift started producing a given model. In that case, relearning was not necessary. The new shift began operating at defect rates at about the same level as the previous shift had achieved after it already had run down much of the learning curve.

Ryan Kellogg (2009) looks at oil and gas drilling in Texas to study how learning occurs when an upstream and downstream producer work together over time. He follows the efforts of pairs of producers and drillers. The former are companies actively involved in exploring for, extracting, and selling oil, while the latter firms specialize in boring out the wells that the producers hope will yield oil. Since producers typically work with multiple drillers and vice versa, and work in different fields, Kellogg is able to separately measure the productivity impacts of the experience of producers alone (i.e., regardless of the drilling firms they work with), drillers alone, and the joint experience of producer–driller pairs. He finds that accumulated experience between a producer–driller pair increases productivity above and beyond that of each of the firms' overall experience levels. This relationship-specific experience is a type of capital that is lost if the firms split up, giving them incentives to preserve their contracting environment.

3.5 *Product Innovation*

Innovations in product quality may not necessarily raise the quantity of output (measured in some physical unit) per unit input, but they can increase the product price and, therefore, the firm's revenue per unit input. If one thinks about productivity as units of quality delivered per unit input, product innovation can enhance productivity. This is captured in standard revenue-based productivity measures since they reflect price variations across an industry's plants or firms. (Though as mentioned above and discussed further below, revenue productivity can also be misleading when price variation due to differences in market power across producers exist.) Product innovation can be aimed at entering new markets or at refocusing a firm's efforts toward growing demand segments as documented in Daron Acemoglu and Joshua Linn (2004).

Product innovation's productivity effects have been studied in several recent papers. As touched on above, one of the mechanisms behind IT-based productivity growth that Bartel, Ichniowski, and Shaw (2007) point to is an improved ability to customize products. Other inputs mentioned above, like R&D and higher-quality employees, can also spur innovation.

Rasmus Lentz and Dale T. Mortensen (2008) use Danish firm-level data to estimate a model of firms' product innovation efforts in the vertical-quality-ladder style of Tor Jakob Klette and Kortum (2004). They find that about 75 percent of aggregate productivity growth comes from reallocation of inputs (employment in their setup) to innovating firms. About one-third of this comes from entry and exit channels. The other two-thirds occurs as inputs move toward growing firms (and hence innovating firms as seen through the lens of their model) from firms that lose market share when they fall behind the quality frontier.

Natarajan Balasubramanian and Jagadeesh Sivadasan (2011) link detailed and broad-based data on firms' patenting and production activities (they merge the NBER patent database with the U.S. Census Business Register) to see what happens when a firm patents. They find clear evidence that new patent grants are associated with increases in firm size (by any one of a number of measures), scope (the number of products it makes), and TFP (though the evidence is weaker here). Whether these correlations reflect the causal effects of patents is not clear; patenting activity could be just one part of a firm's coordinated push into new

markets. Nevertheless, given the breadth of the study's coverage and its result that correlations exist, more research in this area would be worthwhile.

Bernard, Stephen J. Redding, and Peter Schott (2010) show that a firm's TFP is positively correlated with the number of products it produces. This holds both in the cross section and within firms over time. At the very least, these results indicate that productivity growth accompanies expansion of the variety of products a firm offers. It is less clear whether innovative activity drives both productivity and product-variety growth or whether firms experiencing general productivity shocks "strike while the iron is hot," expanding their product offerings in response. The role of changes in product scope in firm size and productivity growth is one that is just beginning to get the attention it deserves in research agendas.

3.6 *Firm Structure Decisions*

A lot of the micro productivity literature uses the establishment (e.g., factory, store, or office) as the unit of analysis. This is in part data driven; many surveys are conducted at this level. Plus, plants often embody the smallest indivisible unit of a production process and, as such, are a natural level at which to study technologies. But it is also clear that firm-level factors and, in particular, the organizational structure of the firm's production units—the industries they operate in, their vertical and horizontal linkages, their relative sizes, and so on—will sometimes be related to the productivity levels of the firm's component business units.

Some have suggested there is a link between firm decentralization and how easily productive new technologies are adopted. Bloom, Sadun, and Van Reenen (2009) favor this explanation for European firms' recent laggard productivity growth (as mentioned above). It is also the subject of Acemoglu et al. (2007). The evidence tends to be suggestive but indirect, however, and this is an area where careful work in measuring firm structures (not an easy task) could pay big dividends.

Silke J. Forbes and Mara Lederman (2011) look at how vertical integration affects airline performance. They find that, among flights departing from a given airport on a given day, airlines that own their regional affiliates experience shorter delays and fewer cancellations than those contracting with affiliated regionals at arm's length. This performance advantage appears to come largely from differential performance on adverse weather days. Forbes and Lederman posit that contracts are limited in their ability to fully specify contingent actions necessary to react most effectively to short-horizon logistical problems. Vertical integration, by clearly setting out the decision rights within the organization, allows airlines to more nimbly respond to unexpected scheduling issues. This flexibility comes at a cost, however: primarily in higher wage costs for integrated airlines. This could explain why not every mainline carrier has integrated.

Hortaçsu and Syverson (2011) use the Longitudinal Business Database, which contains most private nonagricultural establishments in the United States, to examine the productivity of plants in vertically structured firms. They find that vertically integrated plants have higher productivity levels than their nonintegrated industry cohorts, but most of this difference reflects selection of high-productivity plants into vertical structures rather than a causal impact of integration on productivity. Surprisingly, these productivity differences—and indeed the firm's choice to have a vertical structure at all—usually are not related to the movements of goods along the production chain. Vertically integrated firms' upstream plants

ship a surprisingly small amount to downstream plants in their firm (small relative to both the firms' total upstream production and their downstream needs). Roughly one-third of upstream plants report no shipments to their firms' downstream units; half ship less than three percent of their output internally. This suggests that rather than moderating goods transfers along production chains, integration instead allows more efficient transfers of intangible inputs (e.g., managerial oversight) within the firm.

Maksimovic and Phillips (2002) and Schoar (2002) both investigate the productivity of plants within conglomerate firms (in their setting, those that operate in multiple two- or three-digit SIC industries). Their work was spurred on in part by the extensive finance literature on the "diversification discount," the term for the oft-measured negative correlation between a firm's financial returns and the number of business lines it operates. Both papers leverage U.S. manufacturer microdata to convincingly argue that the diversification discount is not about low productivity (or even, in one case, any sort of underperformance). They differ, however, in their explanations.

Maksimovic and Phillips (2002) make a selection argument. Firms that choose to specialize are likely to have idiosyncratically high productivity draws in a particular line of business but considerably weaker draws outside this segment. Firms that choose conglomerate structures, on the other hand, are likely to have high draws in several industries but not exceptionally high draws in any particular industry. Thus if one simply compares the performance of a conglomerate's segments to the focused and highly productive segments of a specialist, the latter would expectedly be higher. This result does not rely on the previous literature's favored explanations of management overreach, cross subsidization of weak segments, or other agency problems at conglomerates. It simply reflects the optimal allocation of resources within a business given the firm's inherent abilities. They support their efficient allocation argument by showing that conglomerate firms' most productive plants are in their largest segments, and segments of a given rank are more productive in larger firms. Furthermore, conglomerates expand on their strongest margins: their largest, most productive segments are more sensitive to demand shifts than their smaller, less efficient lines of business.

Schoar (2002) notes that, in her sample, plants in conglomerates have, if anything, higher permanent productivity levels. The observed discount reflects the temporary adjustment costs resulting from the very act of diversifying into new businesses. She shows that when a conglomerate diversifies, the plants it buys actually experience productivity growth, suggesting that they are in fact being reallocated to more capable management (there will be more on the reallocation of productive inputs below). At the same time, however, the conglomerate's existing plants suffer productivity losses. Since conglomerates have on average many more existing plants than acquired ones, average productivity in the firm falls for a period. Schoar attributes these productivity changes to a "new toy" effect: managers (over-) concentrate their efforts on integrating the new plants and business lines at the expense of existing ones. She also finds evidence that the firms' wages absorb any performance rents, also leading to a bifurcation between performance as measured by productivity and by stock market returns.

4. *External Drivers of Productivity Differences*

The previous section discussed factors that operate within the firm to determine productivity levels. Producers have, at least in theory, some degree of control over these

factors. This section focuses instead on how producers' operating environments can influence productivity levels and growth. These environmental factors may not operate directly on productivity, but they can affect producers' incentives to apply the factors discussed in the previous section. They can also influence the extent to which such efforts are successful at moving producers to a higher position within their industry's productivity distribution, and how responsive market share and survival are to productivity differences. That is, these external drivers can impact both the so-called "within" and "between" components of aggregate productivity growth. The within component comes from individual producers becoming more efficient. The between component arises when more efficient producers grow faster than less efficient ones, or when more efficient entrants replace less efficient exiting businesses.[11]

By their nature, these environmental elements are also the most closely tied to government policy. Therefore understanding these drivers merits special attention when considering the productivity implications of market interventions.

Before discussing the specific external drivers, it is worth taking a minute to discuss why the operating environment should affect observed productivity levels. The most basic producer theory, after all, says any profit-minimizing firm minimizes its cost of producing its chosen quantity. This prediction is invariant to the structure of the market in which the firm operates.

The presence of spillovers is one possible channel through which the external environment affects productivity levels. I discuss situations where other firms' production practices influence another business's productivity level first in this section.

A second possibility is that external drivers influence the extent of Darwinian selection in the firm's market. This force is highlighted by the model in section 2. Environmental factors that shift the model's exogenous parameters or the shape of the revenue function will change the minimum productivity level necessary for profitable operation, $\underline{A}$, and the responsiveness of market share to productivity differences. This will shift the observed productivity distribution among the market's producers.

Even in the absence of spillovers or selection, external factors can affect producers' incentives to raise their own productivity level. How can this be if theory says firms minimize costs? Well, the standard, static cost-minimizing firm model is an inadequate description of the technology adoption processes. A richer model like that in Thomas J. Holmes, David K. Levine, and Schmitz (2008)—who build off Kenneth J. Arrow's (1962) seminal work—points out additional channels through which a firm's market environment (and the competitive structure in particular) shifts producers' incentives to raise their productivity level. Holmes, Levine, and Schmitz suppose that adopting a productivity-enhancing practice involves disruption costs: a temporary period where costs are actually *higher* than before any technological change was made. Disruption could be due to installation issues, fine-tuning new technology, retraining workers,

[11] Many studies attempt to quantify the relative contributions of within and between effects by decomposing aggregate productivity growth into terms that reflect the separate effects. Petrin and Levinsohn (2005) have recently raised caveats about the robustness of these commonly used "accounting decompositions." They advocate a method that focuses on measuring the gaps between the estimated social marginal benefits and costs of producers' inputs. Aggregate productivity grows when inputs are reallocated in a way that reduces the average gap. While distinct in theory and empirical implementation from the accounting decompositions, such "gap methods" have the same conceptual goal: to separately measure how much aggregate productivity growth comes from businesses becoming more efficient themselves and how much comes from reallocation of economic activity to more efficient producers.

and so on. With such adoption costs, producers facing less competition have less incentive to adopt the new technology because the higher per-unit profits that monopoly power brings raise the opportunity cost of changing production practices. In the context of the model in section 2, less competition means a more concave revenue function due to steeper residual demand curves. This could arise from, for example, less scope for consumers to substitute across producers in the output market.[12]

The reality of production is also much more complex than even in these augmented models. Most technologies, even if routinized, are intricate, multifaceted processes that require considerable coordination. They are constantly being buffeted by shocks to input costs and demand-driven shifts in capacity requirements. Cost-minimizing production practice is really therefore a moving target, a constantly shifting ideal combination of operations. Elements of a firm's market environment can affect the firm's incentives to chase that moving target.

4.1 *Productivity Spillovers*

Producer practices can have spillover effects on the productivity levels of other firms. These externalities are often discussed in the context of classic agglomeration mechanisms like thick-input-market effects and knowledge transfers. Knowledge transfers in particular need not be tied to any single geographic or input market. Producers are likely to attempt to emulate productivity leaders in their own and closely related industries, regardless of whether they share a common input market.

Any empirical search for spillovers must face the classic "reflection problem" familiar to the peer effects literature: correlated productivity levels among cohorts of producers can be a sign of spillovers, but the correlation might also reflect the impact of common shocks from unobserved third factors. Obviously, if one can observe exogenous productivity shocks for a subset of producers and track how related producers' productivity levels evolve in response, this goes a great way towards identifying causality. Such instances can be difficult to observe generally, however, and such an approach cannot be used in a single cross section. An alternative strategy is to test whether the intensity of the productivity correlation is related to some measure of between-producer distance, be it in geographic, technological, or product-market space. Higher productivity correlations among "nearby" producers are predicted by many theories of spillovers. This approach is still imperfect, however, as the structure of common shocks might also be related to distance.

Enrico Moretti (2004) explores agglomeration-type productivity spillovers by matching the 1980 and 1990 U.S. Population Censuses with the 1982 and 1992 Census of Manufactures by city-industry. He estimates a plant-level production function that includes the share of workers in *other* industries in the metro area who have completed some college. He interprets the estimated marginal product of this outside educated labor as a productivity spillover. Moretti finds that the marginal product of the local human capital measure is in fact positive. Furthermore, the measured spillovers are stronger across plants that are "close" in both the geographic and technological senses. These results are consistent with both the

[12] A second, more roundabout mechanism also relates greater competition to technology innovation and adoption. If heightened competition raises the firm's probability of exit or bankruptcy, the convexity of the firm's payoffs created by limited liability encourages risk-taking (see, for example, Susan Rose-Ackerman 1991). In essence, competition may drive desperate firms to "throw a Hail Mary" by adopting risky but potentially productive new technologies in the hope of staving off collapse. I will discuss another implication of the convexity of firm payoffs and technology adoption below.

thick-input-market and knowledge-transfer stories of productivity spillovers.

Several studies have focused specifically on the role of knowledge transfers. On one level, it seems that they must exist. It is doubtful that productivity-enhancing practices are completely excludable; businesses cannot always keep every facet of their production process secret. On the other hand, the ubiquity of large and persistent productivity differences within industries suggests that any such emulation/spillover process is far from perfect. Frictions clearly exist that prevent less efficient producers from fully replicating industry leaders' best practices. The crucial research questions of these studies, then, are the size of knowledge transfers, what features influence this size, and the channels through which the spillovers operate.

Rachel Griffith, Rupert Harrison, and Van Reenen (2006) show that the geographic location of a firm's R&D activity matters. Using patent data to pin down the historical locations of U.K. firms' R&D operations (they use presample locations to minimize endogeneity of the location of research activity), they find that U.K. firms with a greater R&D presence in the United States have faster overall productivity growth, and that this growth is more highly correlated with the growth of the U.S. R&D stock in the same industry. These patterns are consistent with a U.S. research presence making it easier for firms to tap into the knowledge base of the U.S. economy, which tends to be the technological leader in most industries. The precise mechanism through which this technology tapping occurs is unclear, and would be an interesting area for further exploration.

Bloom, Schankerman, and Van Reenen (2007) point out that spillovers can cut two ways: technological spillovers can benefit everyone, but there can also be market-stealing effects on the product market side.[13] They separately identify these two effects by comparing the impact of firms' R&D (instrumented for using federal- and state-level R&D tax incentives) on other firms at varying technological and product market distances. They measure technological distance using correlations in firms' patenting patterns and product market distance using the correlation in firms' sales across business segments. Because these two distances are not perfectly correlated across firms, they can measure the separate impacts of R&D. They find that both types of spillovers matter but technological spillovers quantitatively dominate, creating a net positive externality.

Bartelsman, Haskel, and Ralf Martin (2008) make an interesting distinction between global and economy-specific technology frontiers. They show using microdata from numerous countries that a plant's productivity converges faster toward the productivity level of the domestic leader in its industry than the global industry leader. A second intriguing result is that if a plant falls sufficiently behind the global frontier, any pull toward convergence disappears, but convergence to the national frontier remains no matter the size of the gap (conditional on survival, of course).

Gustavo Crespi et al. (2008) and Wolfgang Keller and Stephen R. Yeaple (2009) also look at cross-border productivity convergence. Crespi et al. focus on measuring the information flows that could be the source of this convergence. They combine production microdata with survey data on where firms gather information used in their innovative efforts. They find that, not surprisingly, "nearby" firms (e.g., suppliers and competitors, though less so buyers) are primary

[13] Hans Gersbach and Armin Schmutzler (2003) demonstrate how product market competition can endogenously determine the extent of knowledge spillovers via labor mobility.

sources; that much of this information, particularly from competitors, is free (though surely not given *freely*); and that having a multinational presence aids these flows. Keller and Yeaple (2009) tie productivity growth among publicly traded U.S. firms to foreign direct investment in those firms' sectors by foreign-owned multinationals. FDI-driven spillovers account for a substantial portion of productivity growth, especially in high-tech sectors.

These papers and others like them suggest that spillovers exist and operate through various mechanisms, though again the observed productivity dispersion also makes clear that substantial frictions to the diffusion and replication of best practices remain. Policies meant to increase such spillovers must be careful, however, to not destroy firms' incentives to innovate. If spillover-enhancing policies make it too hard for firms to appropriate the benefits of their innovation, the policies could do more damage than good in the long run.

4.2 *Competition*

Pressures from threatened or actual competitors can affect productivity levels within an industry. Competition drives productivity through two key mechanisms; this section discusses examples of research into both.

The first is Darwinian selection among producers with heterogeneous productivity levels. Competition moves market share toward more efficient (i.e., lower-cost and generally therefore lower-price) producers, shrinking relatively high-cost firms/plants, sometimes forcing their exit, and opening up room for more efficient producers. It also raises the productivity bar that any potential entrant must meet to successfully enter. In the static model of section 2, these mechanisms are summarized as an increase in $\underline{A}$. Such selection underlies the "between" component of aggregate productivity growth mentioned earlier.

The second mechanism acts through efficiency increases within plants or firms. As discussed above, heightened competition can induce firms to take costly productivity-raising actions that they may otherwise not. Besides raising producers' own productivity levels, this effect of competition leads to aggregate productivity growth via the "within" component. There is a Schumpeterian caveat to this within-effect of competition, however. As Xavier Vives (2007) points out, under certain conditions, heightened competition (at least for a market of fixed size) can actually diminish a firm's incentives to make productivity-enhancing investments.

Because of the substantial literature built around the productivity impacts of trade competition, I discuss it in a separate subsection below. I first cover general competitive effects.

4.2.1 *Intramarket Competition*

A general indicator that product-market competition is enhancing productivity is a positive correlation between productivity and producer growth and survival. Such correlations have been a robust finding in the literature; Foster, Haltiwanger, and Krizan (2001) offer a broad-based overview, for example.[14] Several recent studies have looked at particular mechanisms through which competition leads to a Darwinian selection process.

Syverson (2004a) investigates the connection between competition and productivity in a case study of the ready-mixed concrete industry, which is well suited for this

[14] Foster, Haltiwanger, and Syverson (2008) point out that these results linking selection to productivity actually reflect selection on *profitability*, since intraindustry price variation caused by idiosyncratic demand differences across plants is buried in standard revenue-based productivity measures. They show that such demand variation is extremely important in explaining plant survival patterns, even in their sample of plants in homogeneous-product industries. This broader interpretation of the evidence to include demand-side factors will be discussed further in the following section.

type of investigation. The industry's physically homogeneous product and very high transport costs make spatial differentiation paramount. Differences in competitiveness across markets should therefore be related to the density of concrete producers in the market. It is harder for inefficient concrete producers to be profitable in dense markets because, if they charge the high prices necessary to cover their costs, customers can easily shift to their more efficient competitors. This implies the productivity distribution of ready-mixed plants will be truncated from below as density rises. This is indeed what holds in the data. Markets with denser construction activity have higher lower-bound productivity levels, higher average productivity, and less productivity dispersion. (Construction density is used as an exogenous shifter of concrete producer density because the construction sector buys almost all of the ready-mixed industry's output, yet concrete accounts for only a small share of construction costs.) Syverson (2007) shows that these patterns of competition-driven selection on costs are also reflected in ready-mixed prices.[15]

Outside of manufacturing, Foster, Haltiwanger, and Krizan (2006) find that aggregate productivity growth in the U.S. retail sector is almost exclusively through the exit of less efficient single-store firms and by their replacement with more efficient national chain store affiliates. This evokes stories surrounding the growth and competitive impacts of discount retailers like Wal-Mart and Target over the past two decades.

These studies focus on the selection effect of competition. Schmitz (2005) offers an example of productivity growth in an industry that is driven almost entirely by within-effect efficiency improvements. He follows U.S. iron ore mining during the period the industry was first facing competition from foreign producers. (Brazilian mines, specifically. I will discuss more examples of trade-induced productivity change in a separate section below.) The case study shows how competition can drive existing firms to improve their productivity.

The U.S. iron ore industry had been protected from foreign competition by the high costs of transporting ore from its other sources on the globe (e.g., Australia and Brazil). By 1980, however, increased production from low-cost Brazilian mines brought delivered prices for Brazilian ore in the Great Lakes region in line with delivered prices from northern Minnesota's Mesabi Range, the major ore-producing area of the United States. Facing competition from abroad for the first time, the U.S. producers attempted to lower costs by making drastic changes in their production operations. Schmitz shows most of these changes centered on loosening the strict work rules in the U.S. mines. For instance, mine managers originally had very little flexibility in their ability to assign different workers to different tasks. The initiation of serious competition allowed the mines to gain back flexibility in new contracts, raising their utilization of available labor and enabling them to shed unneeded overhead workers. The reconfigured contracts were extremely successful at raising productivity. The industry's average labor productivity had been roughly constant at two tons of ore per worker-hour for several decades preceding 1980. By 1985, however, it had doubled to four tons per hour. As a result, the mines were able to remain competitive even in the face of continuously falling Brazilian ore prices.

Other recent studies have shown these detailed case studies appear emblematic of much broader competitive effects that

[15] Such price effects also raise an interesting point given the common use of revenue-based productivity measures. Namely, as competition raises the average physical (i.e., quantity-, not revenue-based) productivity level in the market, it also reduces prices. This means standard revenue-based productivity measures will understate the true impact of competition on average productivity levels.

act across numerous industries and economies. For example, Syverson (2004b) looks at the entire U.S. manufacturing sector. Richard Disney, Haskel, and Ylva Heden (2003a, 2003b) and the studies described in U.K. Office of Fair Trading (2007) show similar results in the United Kingdom. And Giuseppe Nicoletti and Scarpetta (2005) overview evidence across OECD countries.

4.2.2 *Trade Competition*

As seen in Schmitz's results for the iron ore industry, the presence—or even just the threat—of imports from abroad is another form of competitive pressure. This phenomenon is the focus of a burgeoning line of research, driven in part by the recent theoretical trade literature focusing on heterogeneous-productivity producers and their response to trade, especially Eaton and Kortum (2002) and Melitz (2003).

Pavcnik (2002) shows how trade liberalization during the 1970s drove productivity growth among Chilean manufacturers. The paper demonstrates that sectors facing new import competition saw faster productivity growth over her 1979–86 sample period than sectors producing primarily nontradables. Pavcnik goes on to show that these industry-level gains came both from existing producers raising their productivity levels (the within effect) and from the reallocation of activity away from—and sometimes, the exit of—less efficient, formerly protected producers (the selection effect).

Bloom, Mirko Draca, and Van Reenen (2011) look at how Chinese import competition—the proverbial 800-pound gorilla in trade policy discussions—affected productivity and innovation in twelve European countries between 1996 and 2007. To identify competition's effects, they exploit the differential across-product drops in import barriers that occurred when China became part (due to its accession into the WTO) of the now-expired Multi Fibre Agreement in 2001. European firms producing the products that saw the greatest increase in competition responded in one of two ways. Some, particularly those using low-tech production methods, shrank and exited. Others, however, innovated. Their patent rates, R&D, IT adoption, and TFP growth increased concurrently. In aggregate, therefore, Chinese trade competition increased aggregate TFP in these markets through both within- and between-firm (selection) effects.

Multiple studies using producer microdata have found comparable results in other settings. Examples include Marcela Eslava et al. (2004), Marc-Andreas Muendler (2004), Bernard, Jensen, and Schott (2006), Ana M. Fernandes (2007), and Verhoogen (2008). The specific mechanisms through which trade-oriented competition is postulated to increase productivity do vary across the papers, from quality upgrading within plants to heightened selection across plants. Mary Amiti and Jozef Konings (2007) highlight a separate mechanism through which trade can increase productivity: the expansion of the set (or declines in the effective price) of intermediate inputs when imported inputs become more available. I will discuss the input-market channel further below.

Interestingly, despite the strong correlation between the average productivity level of an industry's plants and that industry's trade exposure, there is less evidence of large productivity impacts on the domestic plants when they begin exporting. That is, exporters are almost inevitably more productive than their nonexporting industry counterparts, but most studies have found that this correlation largely reflects selection rather than a causal impact of exporting on productivity. Plants that choose to begin exporting were *already* more productive before trade. This is surprising if only because exporting firms can leverage the benefits of any productivity gains across larger markets, raising their incentive to engage in innovative activities.

That said, Van Biesebroeck (2005) and Jan De Loecker (2007a) document cases where exporters' productivity advantage grows *after* entry into the export market. (This is sometimes referred to as the "learning-by-exporting" hypothesis.) Both are in somewhat special settings, which might explain in part why they find postexport productivity growth while many others have not. The postexport growth of Van Biesebroeck's (2005) sample of sub-Saharan African exporters appears to reduce their credit and contract enforcement constraints, allowing them to undertake what were previously prohibitively costly productivity-raising activities. Such a mechanism raises the question of whether it would apply to any firm that chooses to export (if so, why wouldn't every producer do so?), or whether these effects, while causal, reflect heterogeneous treatment effects, with firms most apt to benefit choosing to export. De Loecker (2007a) finds that Slovenian firms that begin exporting during the posttransition period saw productivity growth after entering foreign markets. Interestingly, firms exporting to higher-income regions saw greater productivity growth. Apparently the export market—not just the exporter itself—matters. This raises interesting selection issues about which markets firms choose to export to, even conditional on the decision to export in the first place.

4.3 *Deregulation or Proper Regulation*

Poorly regulated markets can create perverse incentives that reduce productivity. Deregulating or reformatting to smarter forms of regulation can reverse this.

Benjamin Bridgman, Shi Qi, and Schmitz (2009) show how regulations in place for decades in the U.S. sugar market destroyed incentives to raise productivity. The U.S. Sugar Act, passed in 1934 as part of the Depression-era restructuring of agricultural law, funded a subsidy to sugar beet farmers with a tax on downstream sugar refining. Refiners were compensated for this tax by quota protection from imports and government-imposed limits on domestic competition (antitrust law was often thrown to the wind in the construction of New Deal programs). This transfer scheme led to the standard quantity distortions, but it also distorted incentives for efficient production. Farmers received a flat payment per ton of sugar contained in their beets, so their optimal response was to simply grow the largest beets possible. The problem is that refining larger beets into sugar is less efficient. As beets grow larger, their sugar-to-pulp ratio falls, requiring more time and energy to extract a given amount of sugar from them. At the same time, given the restraints on competition in the refined sugar market, refiners had little incentive to improve sugar extraction on the margin. The combined result of these incentives is readily apparent in the data. When the Sugar Act was passed, a ton of beets yielded an average of 310 pounds of refined sugar, a figure that had been steadily rising from 215 pounds per ton in 1900. But this trend suddenly reversed after 1934. Yields dropped to 280 pounds per ton by 1950 and 240 pounds by 1974, the year the Act was repealed. Not surprisingly, yields began to climb again immediately after repeal, to about 295 pounds per ton by 2004. It is a sad testimony to the Act's productivity distortions that yields seventy years after the act were still lower than when it was passed.

Christopher R. Knittel (2002) and Kira R. Fabrizio, Nancy L. Rose, and Wolfram (2007) examine how power plant operations react to changes in the regulatory structure they operate under. Both studies involve moving plants away from a traditional cost-plus regulated monopoly structure into alternative forms. Knittel (2002) studies the implementation of "incentive regulation" programs, where regulators explicitly tie operators' earnings to the achievement of particular operating efficiencies. Fabrizio, Rose, and

Wolfram look at the effect of electricity market reforms that occurred in many regions in the United States during the 1990s. Both studies find that plants experienced efficiency gains after the shift in the regulatory environment. Fabrizio, Rose, and Wolfram also show that, in line with what one would expect, the productivity gains were largest among investor-owned utilities and smallest in municipally operated utilities.

Beyond these case studies, recent work has also taken a broader look at how product market regulations impact productivity at the micro level. For example, Michael Greenstone, List, and Syverson (2011) show how environmental regulations (the U.S. Clean Air Act Amendments specifically) reduce manufacturing plants' productivity levels. Nicoletti and Scarpetta (2005) and Jens Arnold, Nicoletti, and Scarpetta (2008) discuss the productivity effects of product-market regulations in OECD economies. A related yet distinct relation between legal structure and productivity is how privatization affects formerly state-owned firms. J. David Brown, John S. Earle, and Almos Telegdy's (2006) study of formerly state-owned enterprises in several Eastern European countries is one of the more comprehensive of such studies. They document broad-based productivity growth in plants after privatization but they also find considerable variation in the size of the impacts across countries, with more than 15 percent average TFP growth in Romania but a slightly negative impact in Russia.

4.4 *Flexible Input Markets*

I discussed above how competition increases productivity. If one thinks of competition as flexibility in product markets—in more competitive markets, it's easier for consumers to shift their purchases from one producer to another—it is logical to suppose that flexible *input* markets might also raise productivity levels.

Indeed, there are almost surely complementarities between product market and input market flexibility. If consumers want to reallocate their purchases across producers, firms that experience growth in demand for their products will need to hire additional inputs to meet that demand. The more easily inputs can move toward these firms, which will typically be higher-productivity businesses due to the forces described above, the faster and more smoothly the reallocation mechanism works. In the context of the model in section 2, flexible input markets reduce the concavity of the revenue function, making producer size more responsive to productivity differences. This section discusses recent research tying factor market flexibility to productivity.

The institutional features of input markets, such as the roles of unions and the structure of the financial sector, have an ambiguous theoretical impact on flexibility. If institutions improve match efficiency, solve asymmetric information problems, or otherwise serve efficiency-enhancing roles, they make input markets more flexible. If they facilitate rent-seeking behavior on the other hand, they impede flexibility. In the end, the impact of any particular institution is an empirical question—one which several of the studies in this section investigate.

Maksimovic and Phillips (2001) investigate the market for U.S. manufacturing plants themselves, as productive assets. They measure how a plant's productivity changes when it is sold by one firm to another. They find that, on average, a plant's productivity rises after the sale. That is reassuring: the market tends to allocate inputs in an efficient way, instead of as a response to ambitions of empire-building managers or other inefficient motives. Another of their findings that is consistent with this efficiency-enhancing role is that the plants that are sold tend to come from the selling firm's less productive business lines. In essence, the sellers are

moving away from activities at which they are less proficient.

Petrin and Sivadasan (2010) use a novel approach to look at the productivity effects of labor market flexibility. They measure the difference between Chilean plants' marginal products of labor (as derived from industry-level production functions they estimate) and their average wages. Such gaps can be caused by any one of a number of market distortions, like market power, taxes, or the firing costs that are the object of the study. Allocative efficiency is achieved, at least in the cross section, when this gap is equated across plants. (Though of course overall inefficiencies still exist unless these gaps are all zero.) Efficiency increases if labor inputs are moved from low- to high-gap plants because the net change in marginal product caused by the input shift outstrips the change in wage costs. Petrin and Sivadasan find that a particular legislative change that raised firing costs was associated with an increase in the mean gap, suggesting the legislation reduced allocative efficiency.

Several recent papers have taken these ideas and asked whether, more broadly speaking, economies efficiently allocate inputs across heterogeneous production units. Hsieh and Klenow (2009) use the measured TFP dispersion across Chinese and Indian firms to infer the size of producer-level distortions that jointly depress aggregate productivity in those economies. Their methodology is conceptually similar to Petrin and Sivadasan's gap approach. Their model indicates that in the absence of distortions, plants' revenue-based TFP levels (TFP measured using revenues as an output measure rather than quantities) should be equal. This implies that observed deviations from this equality reflect the presence of distortions. (Note, however, that quantity-based TFP values are not equated even if there are no distortions.) Essentially, their framework implies that plants with relatively high (low) revenue TFP levels are too small (large) relative to an allocatively efficient benchmark.[16] After measuring these implied plant-level distortions, they compare their distribution to the analogous distribution measured in U.S. microdata. (This is used as the comparison rather than the first-best/zero-distortion outcomes because it is a more realistic control group. The U.S. data contain, and hence can be used to control for, gaps that reflect adjustment costs and measurement error that may be immutable to policy action.) Hsieh and Klenow find that Chinese aggregate TFP could increase by 30–50 percent and Indian TFP by 40–60 percent by achieving the U.S. level of allocative efficiency with their existing resources.

Bartelsman, Haltiwanger, and Scarpetta (2009) look at the success of allocation across several countries. Rather than using a gap-type methodology like Hsieh and Klenow, they measure efficiency using the correlation between a plant's share of industry output and its productivity level. The logic of this metric is straightforward and similar to that in the model in section 2 and what was discussed at the beginning of the competition section. Well functioning markets should reallocate output to more productive plants, leading to a positive correlation between output share and productivity. An additional advantage of the metric is that it is easy to compute. Its limitation is that it is an accounting decomposition and, as such, is not directly tied to welfare theory the way gap-type measures are. However, Bartelsman,

[16] Their model's implication of equal revenue TFP across plants stems from the standard efficiency condition that inputs' marginal revenue products are equated across all uses, and the fact that marginal products are proportional to average products for a Cobb–Douglas production function without fixed costs. Since TFP is an average product measure, equal marginal revenue products implies equal average revenue products and therefore equal revenue TFP. Non-Cobb–Douglas technologies and/or fixed costs can also support persistent revenue TFP differences aside from any distortions.

Haltiwanger, and Scarpetta show, in a simple model, how various types of producer-level distortions do in fact lead to reductions in the output–productivity correlation within an industry.

5. *Big Questions*

That is a brief summary of what we know about the causes of productivity differences at the micro level and why we would want to know these causes. I want to emphasize that while the discussion draws out major themes of that body of knowledge, it really only just scratches the surface of the literature.

I think a fair reading of the discussion above would say that we have learned a lot about productivity since the Bartelsman and Doms (2000) survey. At the same time, it is hardly time to declare victory and go home. Many pressing issues and open questions remain. In this section, I will briefly lay out what I see to be the major questions about productivity that the research agenda should address.[17]

5.1 *What Is the Importance of Demand?*

Productivity is typically thought of as a supply-side concept. As discussed in section 2, it is the component of the production function unrelated to observable labor, capital, and intermediate inputs. But productivity as actually measured in producer microdata generally reflects more than just supply-side forces. Because producer-specific prices are unobserved in most business-level microdata, output is typically measured by revenue divided by an industry-level deflator. This means that within-industry price differences are embodied in output and productivity measures. If prices reflect in part idiosyncratic demand shifts or market power variation across producers—a distinct likelihood in many industries—then high "productivity" businesses may not be particularly technologically efficient. Much of the literature described above therefore documents the joint influence of productivity *and* demand factors that show up in within-industry price variation.

A new strand of research has begun to extend the productivity literature to explicitly account for such idiosyncratic demand effects as well. These new frameworks—see Sanghamitra Das, Roberts, and James R. Tybout (2007), Eslava et al. (2008), Foster, Haltiwanger, and Syverson (2008, 2010), and De Loecker (2007b) for example—allow an additional and realistic richness in the market forces that determine producers' fates. The work to this point indicates that demand factors are indeed important. They exert a considerable influence on businesses' growth and survival. And while many of the basic results above that have been checked after adjusting for the supply–demand dichotomy have been robust, the results do suggest some reinterpretations of productivity effects as inferred from standard measures.

The scope of issues that this new line of research has addressed is still small, however. Demand could play an important role in many more settings that have been hidden to this point due to measurement issues. This is likely to be especially true when moving to sectors without well defined outputs (what exactly does Google produce, for example, and how should it be measured?). Unwinding this knot is a top priority.

5.2 *What Is the Role of (or Hope for) Government Policies That Encourage Productivity Growth?*

Clearly, many of the productivity drivers discussed above can be influenced by government policies. This is especially true of the "external" drivers in the previous section—the elements of the market environment that can induce business to take actions to raise their productivity or that affect the

[17] Conversations with Haltiwanger were very helpful in writing this section.

Darwinian selection process that whittles out inefficient producers.

Several policy-related questions are prime targets for research. There have been many policy reforms (particularly in trade policy and market regulation design) that had plausibly productivity-enhancing effects. Many studies have evaluated specific reforms in isolation, taking the policy change as given. But a policy change, even one that moves in the right direction, may not necessarily be optimal. Alternative reforms, either in size or approach, might be more cost effective. Research has typically compared the effects of policy reforms to a null of no reform, but perhaps an equally important comparison is among possible reform alternatives. What type of reform is most effective for a given type of market or friction? What is the optimal size and timing of policy changes? These are the next set of questions the literature should chase in this area.

A related issue is why reforms, even if they are welfare enhancing in their productivity effects, don't always happen. There could be economic reasons for this. Established interests could be earning rents in the unreformed environment. They may be able to stave off reform, especially if its benefits are diffuse while its losses are concentrated. Characterizing the nature of these barriers to aggregate productivity gains—who wins, who loses, and by how much—could be fruitful.

5.3 *Which Productivity Drivers Matter Most?*

The research described above has framed which factors might explain variation in productivity levels. The relative quantitative importance of each, however, is still unclear. Summarized succinctly, if we could easily measure these factors and add them to the production function, which would have the largest R^2?

Of course, it's quite likely that the quantitative impact of factors varies across industries or markets. A concomitant question, then, is which factors matter most in what sectors? Research that ties observable attributes of the industry's technology or demand structure to the quantitative importance of productivity-influencing factors would be an incredible advance in our ability to explain productivity growth.

5.4 *What Factors Determine Whether Selection or Within-Producer Growth Is More Important in a Market/Sector/Industry?*

In many settings above, there was a prominent distinction between aggregate productivity growth coming from "within" (productivity growth at a given plant or firm) and "between" (reallocation-based selection across existing businesses or entry and exit) sources. Just as the literature still needs to characterize the relative quantitative contribution of various influences on producer-level efficiency, so too does it need to measure the relative importance of within and between components in explaining aggregate productivity growth.

We do know some patterns already. For example, aggregate productivity growth in the retail sector seems to be almost exclusively from reallocation, at least in the United States. But of course the literature has covered nowhere near the full span of sectors and economies. More importantly, we do not yet have a good model of what sectoral features (again on either the supply or demand side) might determine the relative importance of each. Why is within-store productivity growth so small on average in retail, but not manufacturing, for example? Answering questions like this would go a long way to developing our understanding of how micro productivity differences drive the aggregate productivity movements.

5.5 *What Is the Role of Misallocation as a Source of Variation in Emerging Economies?*

Productivity differences explain much of the per capita income variation across countries. As seen above, recent research with producer microdata is building the case that a substantial portion of these productivity gaps arise from poor allocation of inputs across production units in developing countries.

In some ways, this is a hopeful finding: these countries could become substantially more productive (and raise their incomes) by simply rearranging the inputs they already have. Not everything hangs on some unattainable technologies that are out of reach.

On the other hand, the result also has discouraging elements. While research has identified misallocation as a source of the problem, it hasn't really pinned down exactly what distortions create gaps between the social marginal benefits and costs of inputs across production units. It is hard to implement policies that close these gaps and the variation between them (i.e., reallocate inputs more efficiently) without knowing the nature of the gaps in the first place.

That said, there has been some early progress on this front. Witness the efforts to tie misallocation to various labor market policies. Much remains to be done, however, and this is an important area for further effort.

5.6 *What Is the Importance of Higher Variance in Productivity Outcomes?*

Some of the work above, particularly that focusing on the role of IT capital, suggests that the variance of productivity outcomes might be increasing at a very broad level. This has several implications. First, the operation of a business is a call option: poor outcomes are truncated because of the possibility of exit. The value of this option increases with a mean-preserving spread in outcomes. As such, higher variance should lead to more firms taking bets on potential productivity-increasing activities like IT investment. There is some evidence that this is happening, but the literature has yet to show this definitively. Second, if there is an upward trend in productivity dispersion, will the forces of selection stem this spread? If so, when? Will a shakeout be strong enough to drive dispersion back to its previous level? Third, is this increase in variance something specific about IT capital, or is it a broader feature of general purpose technologies? Historical evidence would be very informative here. For example, did the diffusion of the electric motor in the early twentieth century also increase in the variance in productivity outcomes across businesses? Or even when a particular industry experiences a revolution in its standard technology, does this lead to temporary increases in productivity dispersion followed by a shakeout?

5.7 *Can We Predict Innovation Based on Market Conditions?*

Here I speak of innovation broadly—product and process innovation, measured or unmeasured by formal R&D numbers. This question is in some ways a corollary to the one above about quantifying and predicting the split between within-producer and between-producer productivity growth. Within-productivity growth is in many cases not simply the passive accumulation of efficiency; it comes in part as a result of the active innovative efforts of producers. What market or technological factors determine how large innovative activity will be? Can we predict whether product or process innovation will dominate, based on market features?

5.8 *The Nature of Intangible Capital*

Many of the primary drivers of productivity naturally create persistence in productivity levels at plants and firms. These include learning-by-doing; innovative efforts; and in many cases investment in higher quality

managerial, labor, or capital inputs. An easy way to explain such persistence is to think of these productivity enhancements as resulting from producers' investments in intangible capital—know-how about their businesses that is embodied in the organization. This conceptual structure also highlights how productivity gains sourced in intangible capital can also be thought of, along with managerial and unobserved factor qualities, as arising from mismeasured inputs. If one really could measure intangible capital (which, alas, is inherently difficult given its nature), the productivity differences arising from such sources could be explained.

Understanding how such intangible capital stocks are built and sustained would shed light on many productivity-related issues for this reason. Such insights would also speak toward active literatures on the subject in macroeconomics and finance. How much uncertainty is inherent in intangible capital investment? What is the distribution of rates of return across producers, and what predicts them? Is intangible capital fully excludable or are there spillovers to other firms? How well do R&D measures capture investment in intangibles? Are there other proxies that could augment such measures?

5.9 *Management Versus Managers*

We know more about the role of management than before, but what about *managers*? Some good work on CEOs aside, we don't really know if good managerial practices matter enough to attain productivity gains or whether they are complementary to the skills of those who implement them. If they are complements, what skills matter? Are they built by experience, tenure in the industry or on the job, education, or something else? Understanding these issues might also help to pin down the causal nature of management practices. If good management practices reflect in large part the fact that they are what good managers do, then the causal impact might be limited. On the other extreme, if managers don't seem to matter at all, then it is quite likely that managerial practices have a strong causal impact on productivity.

5.10 *A Plea for Data*

Data availability is not a research question, but it is crucial for answering the questions posed above. Virtually everything discussed in this survey we now know because detailed data on production practices was available. But many of these datasets were originally collected by statistical agencies for the purpose of constructing aggregates. Their ability to offer insights into what happens at the micro level was in many ways a happy externality. Now that we know the value of the knowledge that such information can generate, economists should push for more directed efforts to measure business-level production practices. This could include, for example, more data on managers and management practices, business-level prices, input quality measures, proxies for intangible capital, non-R&D innovation spending, and so on. Obviously, collecting such data is costly, and this sort of push will involve tradeoffs for statistical agencies or a willingness of researchers to pay private companies for the collection efforts. Nevertheless, it seems clear that there is much to be gained in exchange for those costs.

6. *Conclusion*

The research into the productivity differences across businesses has come a long way since Bartelsman and Doms (2000) surveyed the literature a decade ago. We know more about what causes the measured differences in productivity, and how factors both internal and external to the plant or firm shape the distribution. These insights have been applied to research questions in numerous fields.

That said, there is still plenty to be learned. Fortunately, I see no sign that the rate at which researchers accumulate knowledge in this area is slowing. I am excited to see what the next several years bring in this research agenda, as the content of the next decade's survey unfolds.

References

Abowd, John M., John Haltiwanger, Ron Jarmin, Julia Lane, Paul Lengermann, Kristin McCue, Kevin McKinney, and Kristin Sandusky. 2005. "The Relation among Human Capital, Productivity, and Market Value: Building Up from Micro Evidence." In *Measuring Capital in the New Economy*, ed. Carol Corrado, John Haltiwanger, and Daniel Sichel, 153–98. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Abowd, John M., Francis Kramarz, and David N. Margolis. 1999. "High Wage Workers and High Wage Firms." *Econometrica*, 67(2): 251–333.

Ábrahám, Árpád, and Kirk White. 2006. "The Dynamics of Plant-Level Productivity in U.S. Manufacturing." Center for Economic Studies Working Paper 06-20.

Acemoglu, Daron, Philippe Aghion, Claire Lelarge, John Van Reenen, and Fabrizio Zilibotti. 2007. "Technology, Information, and the Decentralization of the Firm." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(4): 1759–99.

Acemoglu, Daron, and Joshua Linn. 2004. "Market Size in Innovation: Theory and Evidence from the Pharmaceutical Industry." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 119(3): 1049–90.

Ackerberg, Daniel, C. Lanier Benkard, Steven Berry, and Ariel Pakes. 2007. "Econometric Tools for Analyzing Market Outcomes." In *Handbook of Econometrics, Volume 6A*, ed. James J. Heckman and Edward E. Leamer, 4171–276. Amsterdam and Boston: Elsevier, North-Holland.

Amiti, Mary, and Jozef Konings. 2007. "Trade Liberalization, Intermediate Inputs, and Productivity: Evidence from Indonesia." *American Economic Review*, 97(5): 1611–38.

Arnold, Jens, Giuseppe Nicoletti, and Stefano Scarpetta. 2008. "Regulation, Allocative Efficiency and Productivity in OECD Countries: Industry and Firm-Level Evidence." Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Economics Department Working Paper 616.

Arrow, Kenneth J. 1962. "Economic Welfare and the Allocation of Resources for Invention." In *The Rate and Direction of Inventive Activity: Economic and Social Factors*, 609–26. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Asplund, Marcus, and Volker Nocke. 2006. "Firm Turnover in Imperfectly Competitive Markets." *Review of Economic Studies*, 73(2): 295–327.

Aw, Bee Yan, Mark J. Roberts, and Daniel Yi Xu. 2008. "R&D Investments, Exporting, and the Evolution of Firm Productivity." *American Economic Review*, 98(2): 451–56.

Balasubramanian, Natarajan, and Jagadeesh Sivadasan. 2011. "What Happens When Firms Patent? New Evidence from U.S. Economic Census Data." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 93(1): 126–46.

Bandiera, Oriana, Iwan Barankay, and Imran Rasul. 2007. "Incentives for Managers and Inequality among Workers: Evidence from a Firm-Level Experiment." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(2): 729–73.

Bandiera, Oriana, Iwan Barankay, and Imran Rasul. 2009. "Social Connections and Incentives in the Workplace: Evidence from Personnel Data." *Econometrica*, 77(4): 1047–94.

Bartel, Ann, Casey Ichniowski, and Kathryn Shaw. 2007. "How Does Information Technology Affect Productivity? Plant-Level Comparisons of Product Innovation, Process Improvement, and Worker Skills." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(4): 1721–58.

Bartelsman, Eric J., and Mark Doms. 2000. "Understanding Productivity: Lessons from Longitudinal Microdata." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 38(3): 569–94.

Bartelsman, Eric J., Pieter A. Gautier, and Joris de Wind. 2010. "Employment Protection, Technology Choice, and Worker Allocation." Tinbergen Institute Discussion Paper 2010-042/3.

Bartelsman, Eric J., John Haltiwanger, and Stefano Scarpetta. 2009. "Cross-Country Differences in Productivity: The Role of Allocation and Selection." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 15490.

Bartelsman, Eric J., Jonathan E. Haskel, and Ralf Martin. 2008. "Distance to Which Frontier? Evidence on Productivity Convergence from International Firm-Level Data" Centre for Economic Policy Research Discussion Paper 7032.

Basu, Susanto, Luigi Pascali, Fabio Schiantarelli, and Luis Serven. 2009. "Productivity, Welfare and Reallocation: Theory and Firm-Level Evidence." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 15579.

Benkard, C. Lanier. 2000. "Learning and Forgetting: The Dynamics of Aircraft Production." *American Economic Review*, 90(4): 1034–54.

Bernard, Andrew B., J. Bradford Jensen, and Peter K. Schott. 2006. "Trade Costs, Firms and Productivity." *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 53(5): 917–37.

Bernard, Andrew B., Stephen J. Redding, and Peter K. Schott. 2010. "Multiple-Product Firms and Product Switching." *American Economic Review*, 100(1): 70–97.

Bertrand, Marianne, and Antoinette Schoar. 2003. "Managing with Style: The Effect of Managers on Firm Policies." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(4): 1169–1208.

Bloom, Nicholas, Mirko Draca, and John Van Reenen. 2011. "Trade Induced Technical Change? The Impact

of Chinese Imports on Innovation, IT and Productivity." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 16717.

Bloom, Nicholas, Benn Eifert, Aprajit Mahajan, David McKenzie, and John Roberts. 2011. "Does Management Matter? Evidence from India." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 16658.

Bloom, Nicholas, Christos Genakos, Raffaella Sadun, and John Van Reenen. 2010. "Does Management Matter: New Empirics and Old Theories." Unpublished.

Bloom, Nicholas, Raffaella Sadun, and John Van Reenen. 2009. "The Organization of Firms across Countries." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 15129.

Bloom, Nicholas, Raffaella Sadun, and John Van Reenen. Forthcoming. "Americans Do I.T. Better: US Multinationals and the Productivity Miracle." *American Economic Review*.

Bloom, Nicholas, Mark Schankerman, and John Van Reenen. 2007. "Identifying Technology Spillovers and Product Market Rivalry." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 13060.

Bloom, Nicholas, and John Van Reenen. 2007. "Measuring and Explaining Management Practices across Firms and Countries." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122(4): 1351–1408.

Bloom, Nicholas, and John Van Reenen. 2010. "Why Do Management Practices Differ across Firms and Countries?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 24(1): 203–24.

Blundell, Richard, and Stephen R. Bond. 2000. "GMM Estimation with Persistent Panel Data: An Application to Production Functions." *Econometric Reviews*, 19(3): 321–40.

Boning, Brent, Casey Ichniowski, and Kathryn Shaw. 2007. "Opportunity Counts: Teams and the Effectiveness of Production Incentives." *Journal of Labor Economics*, 25(4): 613–50.

Bridgman, Benjamin, Shi Qi, and James A. Schmitz. 2009. "The Economic Performance of Cartels: Evidence from the New Deal U.S. Sugar Manufacturing Cartel, 1934–74." Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis Staff Report 437.

Brown, J. David, John S. Earle, and Almos Telegdy. 2006. "The Productivity Effects of Privatization: Longitudinal Estimates from Hungary, Romania, Russia, and Ukraine." *Journal of Political Economy*, 114(1): 61–99.

Brynjolfsson, Erik, Andrew McAfee, Michael Sorell, and Feng Zhu. 2008. "Scale without Mass: Business Process Replication and Industry Dynamics." Harvard Business School Working Paper 07-016.

Bushnell, James B., and Catherine D. Wolfram. 2009. "The Guy at the Controls: Labor Quality and Power Plant Efficiency." In *International Differences in the Business Practices and Productivity of Firms*, ed. Richard B. Freeman and Kathryn L. Shaw, 79–102. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Campbell, Jeffrey R., and Jonas D. M. Fisher. 2004. "Idiosyncratic Risk and Aggregate Employment Dynamics." *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 7(2): 331–53.

Caves, Douglas W., Laurits R. Christensen, and W. Erwin Diewert. 1982. "The Economic Theory of Index Numbers and the Measurement of Input, Output, and Productivity." *Econometrica*, 50(6): 1393–1414.

Collard-Wexler, Allan. 2010. "Demand Fluctuations in the Ready-Mix Concrete Industry." Unpublished.

Cooper, William W., Lawrence M. Seiford, and Kaoru Tone. 2006. *Introduction to Data Envelopment Analysis and Its Uses: With DEA-Solver Software and References*. New York: Springer.

Crespi, Gustavo, Chiara Criscuolo, Jonathan E. Haskel, and Matthew Slaughter. 2008. "Productivity Growth, Knowledge Flows, and Spillovers." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 13959.

Cummins, Jason G., and Giovanni L. Violante. 2002. "Investment-Specific Technical Change in the United States (1947–2000): Measurement and Macroeconomic Consequences." *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 5(2): 243–84.

Das, Sanghamitra, Mark J. Roberts, and James R. Tybout. 2007. "Market Entry Costs, Producer Heterogeneity, and Export Dynamics." *Econometrica*, 75(3): 837–73.

De Loecker, Jan. 2007a. "Do Exports Generate Higher Productivity? Evidence from Slovenia." *Journal of International Economics*, 73(1): 69–98.

De Loecker, Jan. 2007b. "Product Differentiation, Multi-product Firms and Estimating the Impact of Trade Liberalization on Productivity." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 13155.

Disney, Richard, Jonathan E. Haskel, and Ylva Heden. 2003a. "Entry, Exit and Establishment Survival in UK Manufacturing." *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 51(1): 91–112.

Disney, Richard, Jonathan E. Haskel, and Ylva Heden. 2003b. "Restructuring and Productivity Growth in UK Manufacturing." *Economic Journal*, 113(489): 666–94.

Doraszelski, Ulrich, and Jordi Jaumandreu. 2009. "R&D and Productivity: Estimating Endogenous Productivity." Unpublished.

Eaton, Jonathan, and Samuel Kortum. 2002. "Technology, Geography, and Trade." *Econometrica*, 70(5): 1741–79.

Ericson, Richard, and Ariel Pakes. 1995. "Markov-Perfect Industry Dynamics: A Framework for Empirical Work." *Review of Economic Studies*, 62(1): 53–82.

Eslava, Marcela, John Haltiwanger, Adriana Kugler, and Maurice Kugler. 2004. "The Effects of Structural Reforms on Productivity and Profitability Enhancing Reallocation: Evidence from Colombia." *Journal of Development Economics*, 75(2): 333–71.

Eslava, Marcela, John Haltiwanger, Adriana Kugler, and Maurice Kugler. 2008. "Plant Survival, Market Fundamentals and Trade Liberalization." Unpublished.

Fabrizio, Kira R., Nancy L. Rose, and Catherine D. Wolfram. 2007. "Do Markets Reduce Costs? Assessing the Impact of Regulatory Restructuring on US

Electric Generation Efficiency." *American Economic Review*, 97(4): 1250–77.
Faggio, Giulia, Kjell G. Salvanes, and John Van Reenen. 2010. "The Evolution of Inequality in Productivity and Wages: Panel Data Evidence." *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 19(6): 1919–51.
Fernandes, Ana M. 2007. "Trade Policy, Trade Volumes and Plant-Level Productivity in Colombian Manufacturing Industries." *Journal of International Economics*, 71(1): 52–71.
Forbes, Silke J., and Mara Lederman. 2011. "Does Vertical Integration Affect Firm Performance? Evidence from the Airline Industry." *Rand Journal of Economics*, 41(4): 765–90.
Foster, Lucia, John Haltiwanger, and C. J. Krizan. 2001. "Aggregate Productivity Growth: Lessons from Microeconomic Evidence." In *New Developments in Productivity Analysis*, ed. Charles R. Hulten, Edwin R. Dean, and Michael J. Harper, 303–63. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
Foster, Lucia, John Haltiwanger, and C. J. Krizan. 2006. "Market Selection, Reallocation, and Restructuring in the U.S. Retail Trade Sector in the 1990s." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 88(4): 748–58.
Foster, Lucia, John Haltiwanger, and Chad Syverson. 2008. "Reallocation, Firm Turnover, and Efficiency: Selection on Productivity or Profitability?" *American Economic Review*, 98(1): 394–425.
Foster, Lucia, John Haltiwanger, and Chad Syverson. 2010. "The Slow Growth of New Plants: Learning about Demand?" Unpublished.
Fox, Jeremy T., and Valérie Smeets. 2011. "Does Input Quality Drive Measured Differences in Firm Productivity?" National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 16853.
Galindo-Rueda, Fernando, and Jonathan E. Haskel. 2005. "Skills, Workforce Characteristics and Firm-Level Productivity in England." Report prepared for the Department of Trade and Industry, Department for Education and Skills, Office for National Statistics.
Garicano, Luis, and Paul Heaton. 2007. "Information Technology, Organization, and Productivity in the Public Sector: Evidence from Police Departments." Centre for Economic Performance Discussion Paper 826.
Gersbach, Hans, and Armin Schmutzler. 2003. "Endogenous Technological Spillovers: Causes and Consequences." *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, 12(2): 179–205.
Greenstone, Michael, John A. List, and Chad Syverson. 2011. "The Effects of Environmental Regulation on the Competitiveness of U.S. Manufacturing." Unpublished.
Griffith, Rachel, Rupert Harrison, and John Van Reenen. 2006. "How Special is the Special Relationship? Using the Impact of U.S. R&D Spillovers on U.K. Firms as a Test of Technology Sourcing." *American Economic Review*, 96(5): 1859–75.
Griliches, Zvi, and Jacques Mairesse. 1998. "Production Functions: The Search for Identification." In *Econometrics and Economic Theory in the Twentieth Century: The Ragnar Frisch Centennial Symposium*, ed. Steinar Strøm, 169–203. Cambridge; New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
Haltiwanger, John, Stefano Scarpetta, and Helena Schweiger. 2008. "Assessing Job Flows across Countries: The Role of Industry, Firm Size and Regulations." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 13920.
Hamilton, Barton H., Jack A. Nickerson, and Hideo Owan. 2003. "Team Incentives and Worker Heterogeneity: An Empirical Analysis of the Impact of Teams on Productivity and Participation." *Journal of Political Economy*, 111(3): 465–97.
Holmes, Thomas J., David K. Levine, and James A. Schmitz. 2008. "Monopoly and the Incentive to Innovate When Adoption Involves Switchover Disruptions." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 13864.
Hopenhayn, Hugo A. 1992. "Entry, Exit, and Firm Dynamics in Long Run Equilibrium." *Econometrica*, 60(5): 1127–50.
Hortaçsu, Ali, and Chad Syverson. 2007. "Cementing Relationships: Vertical Integration, Foreclosure, Productivity, and Prices." *Journal of Political Economy*, 115(2): 250–301.
Hortaçsu, Ali, and Chad Syverson. 2011. "Why Do Firms Own Production Chains?" Unpublished.
Hsieh, Chang-Tai, and Peter J. Klenow. 2009. "Misallocation and Manufacturing TFP in China and India." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124(4): 1403–48.
Hubbard, Thomas N. 2003. "Information, Decisions, and Productivity: On-Board Computers and Capacity Utilization in Trucking." *American Economic Review*, 93(4): 1328–53.
Hulten, Charles R. 2009. "Growth Accounting." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 15341.
Ichniowski, Casey, and Kathryn Shaw. 2003. "Beyond Incentive Pay: Insiders' Estimates of the Value of Complementary Human Resource Management Practices." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 17(1): 155–80.
Ichniowski, Casey, Kathryn Shaw, and Giovanna Prennushi. 1997. "The Effects of Human Resource Management Practices on Productivity: A Study of Steel Finishing Lines." *American Economic Review*, 87(3): 291–313.
Ilmakunnas, Pekka, Mika Maliranta, and Jari Vainiomäki. 2004. "The Roles of Employer and Employee Characteristics for Plant Productivity." *Journal of Productivity Analysis*, 21(3): 249–76.
Jorgenson, Dale W., Mun S. Ho, and Kevin J. Stiroh. 2005. *Productivity. Volume 3. Information Technology and the American Growth Resurgence*. Cambridge and London: MIT Press.
Jorgenson, Dale W., Mun S. Ho, and Kevin J. Stiroh. 2008. "A Retrospective Look at the U.S. Productivity Growth Resurgence." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 22(1): 3–24.
Jovanovic, Boyan. 1982. "Selection and the Evolution

of Industry." *Econometrica*, 50(3): 649–70.
Kaplan, Steven N., Mark M. Klebanov, and Morten Sorensen. 2008. "Which CEO Characteristics and Abilities Matter? National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 14195.
Keller, Wolfgang, and Stephen R. Yeaple. 2009. "Multinational Enterprises, International Trade, and Productivity Growth: Firm Level Evidence from the United States." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 91(4): 821–31.
Kellogg, Ryan. 2009. "Learning by Drilling: Inter-firm Learning and Relationship Persistence in the Texas Oilpatch." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 15060.
Klette, Tor Jakob, and Samuel Kortum. 2004. "Innovating Firms and Aggregate Innovation." *Journal of Political Economy*, 112(5): 986–1018.
Knittel, Christopher R. 2002. "Alternative Regulatory Methods and Firm Efficiency: Stochastic Frontier Evidence from the U.S. Electricity Industry." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 84(3): 530–40.
Lazear, Edward P. 2000. "Performance Pay and Productivity." *American Economic Review*, 90(5): 1346–61.
Lentz, Rasmus, and Dale T. Mortensen. 2008. "An Empirical Model of Growth through Product Innovation." *Econometrica*, 76(6): 1317–73.
Levinsohn, James, and Amil Petrin. 2003. "Estimating Production Functions Using Inputs to Control for Unobservables." *Review of Economic Studies*, 70(2): 317–41.
Levitt, Steven D., John A. List, and Chad Syverson. 2011. "How Does Learning By Doing Happen?" Unpublished.
Maksimovic, Vojislav, and Gordon Phillips. 2001. "The Market for Corporate Assets: Who Engages in Mergers and Asset Sales and Are There Efficiency Gains?" *Journal of Finance*, 56(6): 2019–65.
Maksimovic, Vojislav, and Gordon Phillips. 2002. "Do Conglomerate Firms Allocate Resources Inefficiently across Industries? Theory and Evidence." *Journal of Finance*, 57(2): 721–67.
Malmendier, Ulrike, and Geoffrey Tate. 2009. "Superstar CEOs." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124(4): 1593–1638.
Marschak, Jacob, and William H. Andrews. 1944. "Random Simultaneous Equations and the Theory of Production." *Econometrica*, 12(3–4): 143–205.
Mas, Alexandre. 2008. "Labour Unrest and the Quality of Production: Evidence from the Construction Equipment Resale Market." *Review of Economic Studies*, 75(1): 229–58.
Melitz, Marc J. 2003. "The Impact of Trade on Intra-industry Reallocations and Aggregate Industry Productivity." *Econometrica*, 71(6): 1695–1725.
Moretti, Enrico. 2004. "Workers' Education, Spillovers, and Productivity: Evidence from Plant-Level Production Functions." *American Economic Review*, 94(3): 656–90.
Muendler, Marc-Andreas. 2004. "Trade, Technology, and Production: A Study of Brazilian Manufacturers, 1986–1998." CESifo Working Paper 1148.
Nicoletti, Giuseppe, and Stefano Scarpetta. 2005. "Regulation and Economic Performance: Product Market Reforms and Productivity in the OECD." Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Economics Department Working Paper 460.
Oliner, Stephen D., Daniel E. Sichel, and Kevin J. Stiroh. 2007. "Explaining a Productive Decade." *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1: 81–137.
Olley, G. Steven, and Ariel Pakes. 1996. "The Dynamics of Productivity in the Telecommunications Equipment Industry." *Econometrica*, 64(6): 1263–97.
Pavcnik, Nina. 2002. "Trade Liberalization, Exit, and Productivity Improvement: Evidence from Chilean Plants." *Review of Economic Studies*, 69(1): 245–76.
Petrin, Amil, and James Levinsohn. 2005. "Measuring Aggregate Productivity Growth Using Plant-Level Data." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 11887.
Petrin, Amil, and Jagadeesh Sivadasan. 2010. "Estimating Lost Output from Allocative Inefficiency, with Application to Chile and Firing Costs." Unpublished.
Rose-Ackerman, Susan. 1991. "Risk Taking and Ruin: Bankruptcy and Investment Choice." *Journal of Legal Studies*, 20(2): 277–310.
Sakellaris, Plutarchos, and Daniel J. Wilson. 2004. "Quantifying Embodied Technological Change." *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 7(1): 1–26.
Schmitz, James A. 2005. "What Determines Productivity? Lessons from the Dramatic Recovery of the U.S. and Canadian Iron Ore Industries following Their Early 1980s Crisis." *Journal of Political Economy*, 113(3): 582–625.
Schoar, Antoinette. 2002. "Effects of Corporate Diversification on Productivity." *Journal of Finance*, 57(6): 2379–2403.
Schreyer, Paul. 2001. *Measuring Productivity: Measurement of Aggregate and Industry-Level Productivity Growth: OECD Manuel*. Paris and Washington, D.C.: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
Shearer, Bruce. 2004. "Piece Rates, Fixed Wages and Incentives: Evidence from a Field Experiment." *Review of Economic Studies*, 71(2): 513–34.
Syverson, Chad. 2004a. "Market Structure and Productivity: A Concrete Example." *Journal of Political Economy*, 112(6): 1181–1222.
Syverson, Chad. 2004b. "Product Substitutability and Productivity Dispersion." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(2): 534–50.
Syverson, Chad. 2007. "Prices, Spatial Competition and Heterogeneous Producers: An Empirical Test." *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 55(2): 197–222.
Thornton, Rebecca Achee, and Peter Thompson. 2001. "Learning from Experience and Learning from Others: An Exploration of Learning and Spillovers in Wartime Shipbuilding." *American Economic Review*, 91(5): 1350–68.
U.K. Office of Fair Trading. 2007. "Production and Competition: An OFT Perspective on the Productivity Debate." OFT 887.
van Ark, Bart, Mary O'Mahony, and Marcel P. Timmer.

2008. "The Productivity Gap between Europe and the United States: Trends and Causes." *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 22(1): 25–44.

Van Biesebroeck, Johannes. 2003. "Productivity Dynamics with Technology Choice: An Application to Automobile Assembly." *Review of Economic Studies*, 70(1): 167–98.

Van Biesebroeck, Johannes. 2005. "Exporting Raises Productivity in Sub-Saharan African Manufacturing Firms." *Journal of International Economics*, 67(2): 373–91.

Van Biesebroeck, Johannes. 2008. "The Sensitivity of Productivity Estimates: Revisiting Three Important Debates." *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 26(3): 311–28.

Van Reenen, John. 1996. "The Creation and Capture of Rents: Wages and Innovation in a Panel of U.K. Companies." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 111(1): 195–226.

Veracierto, Marcelo. 2008. "Firing Costs and Business Cycle Fluctuations." *International Economic Review*, 49(1): 1–39.

Verhoogen, Eric A. 2008. "Trade, Quality Upgrading, and Wage Inequality in the Mexican Manufacturing Sector." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 123(2): 489–530.

Vives, Xavier. 2007. "Innovation and Competitive Pressure." IESE Business School Working Paper 634.

Walker, Francis A. 1887. "The Source of Business Profits." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1(3): 265–88.

This article has been cited by:

1. Fikru Kefyalew Alemayehu, Subal C. Kumbhakar. 2021. Excess capacity, production technology and technical inefficiency in hospitality sector. *Tourism Management* **82**, 104202. [Crossref]
2. Yoo Ri Kim, Allan M. Williams, Sangwon Park, Jason Li Chen. 2021. Spatial spillovers of agglomeration economies and productivity in the tourism industry: The case of the UK. *Tourism Management* **82**, 104201. [Crossref]
3. Kristina Barauskaite, Anh Dinh Minh Nguyen. 2021. Direct and network effects of idiosyncratic TFP shocks. *Empirical Economics* **80**. . [Crossref]
4. Haisen Wang, Gangqiang Yang, Xiao Ouyang, Jiaying Qin. 2021. Does central environmental inspection improves enterprise total factor productivity? The mediating effect of management efficiency and technological innovation. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* **108**. . [Crossref]
5. Naoki Ando. 2021. Human capital, cultural distance and staffing localization. *Multinational Business Review* **ahead-of-print**:ahead-of-print. . [Crossref]
6. Claire Giordano, Paloma Lopez-Garcia. 2021. Firm heterogeneity and international trade: A cross-country analysis within the EU. *The Journal of International Trade & Economic Development* **30**:1, 68-103. [Crossref]
7. Arilda Teixeira, Silveli Cristo-Andrade, Emerson Wagner Mainardes. Internal Barriers for the Brazilian Economy to Achieve External Competitiveness 119-140. [Crossref]
8. Youssef Abdul Razzak Doughan. Factors of Production, Economic Growth, and Sustainable Development 427-439. [Crossref]
9. José Manuel Montero, Alberto Urtasun. 2021. Markup dynamics and financial frictions: The Spanish case. *International Review of Economics & Finance* **71**, 316-341. [Crossref]
10. Hyungtai Kim, Sanghoon Ahn, Gudmundur F. Ulfarsson. 2021. Impacts of transportation and industrial complexes on establishment-level productivity growth in Korea. *Transport Policy* **100**, 89-97. [Crossref]
11. María Teresa Ballestar, Ángel Díaz-Chao, Jorge Sainz, Joan Torrent-Sellens. 2021. Impact of robotics on manufacturing: A longitudinal machine learning perspective. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* **162**, 120348. [Crossref]
12. Marcello Perez-Alvarez, Holger Strulik. 2021. Nepotism, human capital and economic development. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **181**, 211-240. [Crossref]
13. Thomas Winberry. 2021. Lumpy Investment, Business Cycles, and Stimulus Policy. *American Economic Review* **111**:1, 364-396. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]
14. Jesse Perla, Christopher Tonetti, Michael E. Waugh. 2021. Equilibrium Technology Diffusion, Trade, and Growth. *American Economic Review* **111**:1, 73-128. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]
15. By Chien-Yu Huang, Juin-Jen Chang, Lei Ji. 2020. Inflation, market structure, and innovation-driven growth with distinct cash constraints. *Oxford Economic Papers* **10**. . [Crossref]
16. David Szakonyi. 2020. Private Sector Policy Making: Business Background and Politicians' Behavior in Office. *The Journal of Politics* 000-000. [Crossref]

17. Eleonora Bartoloni, Maurizio Baussola. 2020. Productivity and earnings at the firm-plant level: the case of Lombardy's urban and non-urban agglomerations. *Spatial Economic Analysis* **2**, 1-22. [Crossref]
18. Mitchell Hoffman, Steven Tadelis. 2020. People Management Skills, Employee Attrition, and Manager Rewards: An Empirical Analysis. *Journal of Political Economy* 000-000. [Crossref]
19. Alex Bryson, Lucy Stokes, David Wilkinson. 2020. Can Human Resource Management Improve Schools' Performance?. *LABOUR* **34**:4, 427-440. [Crossref]
20. Ryan A. Decker, John Haltiwanger, Ron S. Jarmin, Javier Miranda. 2020. Changing Business Dynamism and Productivity: Shocks versus Responsiveness. *American Economic Review* **110**:12, 3952-3990. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]
21. Mohd Alsaleh, Azeem Oluwaseyi Zubair, Abdul Samad Abdul-Rahim. 2020. Productivity growth and its determinants of the bioenergy industry in the EU28 region: Empirical evidence using Malmquist productivity index. *BUSINESS STRATEGY & DEVELOPMENT* **3**:4, 531-542. [Crossref]
22. Jianmin Tang, Weimin Wang. 2020. Technological frontier, technical efficiency and the post-2000 productivity slowdown in Canada. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* **55**, 12-25. [Crossref]
23. Abdollah Noorizadeh, Timo Kuosmanen, Antti Peltokorpi. 2020. Effective purchasing reallocation to suppliers: Insights from productivity dynamics and real options theory. *International Journal of Production Economics* 108002. [Crossref]
24. Paolo Castelnovo, Valentina Morretta, Michela Vecchi. 2020. Regional disparities and industrial structure: territorial capital and productivity in Italian firms. *Regional Studies* **54**:12, 1709-1723. [Crossref]
25. Douglas Gollin, Christopher Udry. 2020. Heterogeneity, Measurement Error, and Misallocation: Evidence from African Agriculture. *Journal of Political Economy* 000-000. [Crossref]
26. Godfrey Madigu, Luis A. Gil-Alana. 2020. What do productivity indices tell us? A case study of U.S. industries. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* **14**. . [Crossref]
27. Philipp J. H. Schröder, Allan Sørensen. 2020. Specific taxation, asymmetric costs, and endogenous quality. *Journal of Public Economic Theory* **9**. . [Crossref]
28. Hazhir Rahmandad, Jerker Denrell, Drazen Prelec. 2020. What makes dynamic strategic problems difficult? Evidence from an experimental study. *Strategic Management Journal* **32**. . [Crossref]
29. Martina Novotná, Tomáš Volek, Michael Rost, Jaroslav Vrchota. 2020. IMPACT OF TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENT ON FIRM'S PRODUCTION EFFICIENCY FACTOR IN MANUFACTURING. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, ahead of print1-21. [Crossref]
30. Andrés Salas-Vallina, María Dolores Moreno-Luzón, María Gil-Marqués. 2020. From individual to team ambidexterity: the moderating role of collaborative behavior and international experience. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice* **22**, 1-15. [Crossref]
31. Guojun He, Shaoda Wang, Bing Zhang. 2020. Watering Down Environmental Regulation in China*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **135**:4, 2135-2185. [Crossref]
32. Ingo Weller, Julian Süß, Heiner Evanschitzky, Florian von Wangenheim. 2020. Transformational Leadership, High-Performance Work System Consensus, and Customer Satisfaction. *Journal of Management* **46**:8, 1469-1497. [Crossref]
33. R. Andrew Butters. 2020. Demand Volatility, Adjustment Costs, and Productivity: An Examination of Capacity Utilization in Hotels and Airlines. *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* **12**:4, 1-44. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

34. Stefan Schweikl, Robert Obermaier. 2020. Lessons from three decades of IT productivity research: towards a better understanding of IT-induced productivity effects. *Management Review Quarterly* **70**:4, 461-507. [Crossref]
35. Gaaitzen de Vries, Aobo Jiang, Oscar Lemmers, Shang-Jin Wei. 2020. Firm productivity and functional specialisation. *The World Economy* **69**. . [Crossref]
36. Harald Hau, Yi Huang, Gewei Wang. 2020. Firm Response to Competitive Shocks: Evidence from China's Minimum Wage Policy. *The Review of Economic Studies* **87**:6, 2639-2671. [Crossref]
37. Yadong Luo, Vladislav Maksimov, Juan Bu. 2020. Making Geographic Dispersion Work for Emerging Market MNEs. *Journal of International Management* 100800. [Crossref]
38. Mohammad Amin, Cedric Okou. 2020. Casting a shadow: Productivity of formal firms and informality. *Review of Development Economics* **24**:4, 1610-1630. [Crossref]
39. Rebecca Henderson. 2020. Innovation in the 21st Century: Architectural Change, Purpose, and the Challenges of Our Time. *Management Science* . [Crossref]
40. Renu Agarwal, Paul J. Brown, Christopher Bajada, Philip Stevens, Roy Green. 2020. The effects of competition on management practices in New Zealand – a study of manufacturing firms. *International Journal of Production Research* **58**:20, 6217-6234. [Crossref]
41. Rajiv Banker, Rong Huang, Yinghua Li, Sha Zhao. 2020. Do Accounting Standards Matter for Productivity?. *Production and Operations Management* **68**. . [Crossref]
42. V. G. R. CHANDRAN, RAJAH RASIAH, TIEN HONG LIM. 2020. DRIVING LABOR PRODUCTIVITY: THE ROLE OF CAPABILITY AND HUMAN CAPITAL IN MALAYSIA'S FOOD MANUFACTURING FIRMS. *The Singapore Economic Review* **26**, 1-22. [Crossref]
43. Evan Rawley, Robert Seamans. 2020. Internal agglomeration and productivity: Evidence from microdata. *Strategic Management Journal* **41**:10, 1770-1798. [Crossref]
44. Mari Tanaka, Nicholas Bloom, Joel M. David, Maiko Koga. 2020. Firm performance and macro forecast accuracy. *Journal of Monetary Economics* **114**, 26-41. [Crossref]
45. S. Stavropoulos, F. G. van Oort, M. J. Burger. 2020. Heterogeneous relatedness and firm productivity. *The Annals of Regional Science* **65**:2, 403-437. [Crossref]
46. Feng-Wen Chen, Yu-Lu Tan, Fengzhang Chen, Yong-Qiu Wu. 2020. Enhancing or suppressing: The effect of labor costs on energy intensity in emerging economies. *Energy* 118964. [Crossref]
47. Fabiano Schivardi, Tom Schmitz. 2020. The IT Revolution and Southern Europe's Two Lost Decades. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **18**:5, 2441-2486. [Crossref]
48. Alessandro Bellocchi, Edgar Sanchez Carrera, Giuseppe Travaglini. 2020. Asymmetries in the euro area and TFP growth: evidence from three major European economies. *Journal of Economic Studies* **ahead-of-print**:ahead-of-print. . [Crossref]
49. Roope Ohlsbom, Mika Maliranta. 2020. Management Practices and Allocation of Employment: Evidence from Finnish Manufacturing. *International Journal of the Economics of Business* 1-24. [Crossref]
50. Valeria Cirillo, Andrea Ricci. 2020. Heterogeneity matters: temporary employment, productivity and wages in Italian firms. *Economia Politica* **14**. . [Crossref]

51. Quang Canh Le, Thi Phuong Thu Nguyen, Tuyet Nhung Do. 2020. State ownership, quality of sub-national governance, and total factor productivity of firms in Vietnam. *Post-Communist Economies* **18**, 1-14. [Crossref]
52. Fang-Nan Liao, Feng-Wen Chen. 2020. Independent director interlocks: effects and boundary on the earnings persistence of the firm. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja* **12**, 1-27. [Crossref]
53. Daniel Fackler, Eva Weigt. 2020. Who Buffers Income Losses after Job Displacement? The Role of Alternative Income Sources, the Family, and the State. *LABOUR* **34**:3, 239-276. [Crossref]
54. Mariarosaria Agostino, Marco R. Di Tommaso, Annamaria Nifo, Lauretta Rubini, Francesco Trivieri. 2020. Institutional quality and firms' productivity in European regions. *Regional Studies* **54**:9, 1275-1288. [Crossref]
55. Wagner Piazza Gaglianone, Raffaella Giacomini, João Victor Issler, Vasiliki Skreta. 2020. Incentive-driven inattention. *Journal of Econometrics* . [Crossref]
56. LAY LIAN CHUAH, NORMAN V. LOAYZA, HA NGUYEN. 2020. IS RESOURCE MISALLOCATION LEADING TO PRODUCTIVITY GAPS IN MALAYSIA'S MANUFACTURING SECTOR?. *The Singapore Economic Review* **65**:05, 1213-1235. [Crossref]
57. Eliana Sangreman Lima, Paul McMahon, Ana Paula Cabral Seixas Costa. 2020. Establishing the relationship between asset management and business performance. *International Journal of Production Economics* 107937. [Crossref]
58. Jason W. Miller, William A. Muir. 2020. A New Perspective on Returns to Scale for Truckload Motor Carriers. *Journal of Business Logistics* **41**:3, 236-258. [Crossref]
59. Anna Gumpert, Haishi Li, Andreas Moxnes, Natalia Ramondo, Felix Tintelnot. 2020. The life-cycle dynamics of exporters and multinational firms. *Journal of International Economics* **126**, 103343. [Crossref]
60. Aytekin Ertan, Stefan Lewellen, Jacob K. Thomas. 2020. Do Profit Margins Expand for High Growth Firms?. *Journal of Management Accounting Research* **32**:3, 117-135. [Crossref]
61. Quang-Thanh Ngo, Quang-Van Tran, Tien-Dung Nguyen, Trung-Thanh Nguyen. 2020. How Heterogeneous Are the Determinants of Total Factor Productivity in Manufacturing Sectors? Panel-Data Evidence from Vietnam. *Economies* **8**:3, 57. [Crossref]
62. Ritika Jain, Amit Nandan. 2020. Electricity prices and firms' decisions and outcomes: The case of India after a decade of the Electricity Act. *Energy Economics* **91**, 104915. [Crossref]
63. Johannes Brunzel. 2020. Overconfidence and narcissism among the upper echelons: a systematic literature review. *Management Review Quarterly* **51**. . [Crossref]
64. Kristina Barauskaite, Anh D. M. Nguyen. 2020. Intersectoral network-based channel of aggregate TFP shocks. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* **30**. . [Crossref]
65. Eleonora Bartoloni, Alessandro Arrighetti, Fabio Landini. 2020. Recession and firm survival: is selection based on cleansing or skill accumulation?. *Small Business Economics* **153**. . [Crossref]
66. Jason Miller, Beth Davis-Sramek, Brian S. Fugate, Mark Pagell, Barbara B. Flynn. 2020. Editorial Commentary: Addressing Confusion in the Diffusion of Archival Data Research. *Journal of Supply Chain Management* **16**. . [Crossref]
67. Claudiu Tiberiu Albulescu, Serban Miclea. 2020. How does the national human capital index influence the total factor productivity of the Romanian R&D firms?. *Human Systems Management* **2**, 1-6. [Crossref]

68. Ying Hao, Danni Han, Chong Ning, Jianhui Liao. 2020. Culture from overseas and corporate transparency: Evidence from China. *International Journal of Finance & Economics* . [Crossref]
69. Nebojša Stojčić, Edvard Orlić. 2020. Spatial dependence, foreign investment and productivity spillovers in new EU member states. *Regional Studies* **54**:8, 1057-1068. [Crossref]
70. Junichi Haraguchi, Toshihiro Matsumura. 2020. Implicit protectionism via state enterprises and technology transfer from foreign enterprises. *Review of International Economics* **28**:3, 723-743. [Crossref]
71. Abdilahi Ali, Syed Imran Ali. 2020. Antecedents of the propensity to learn management practices and their impacts on firm outcomes in emerging markets: A Bayesian Model Averaging approach. *International Business Review* **29**:4, 101706. [Crossref]
72. Amit Gandhi, Salvador Navarro, David A. Rivers. 2020. On the Identification of Gross Output Production Functions. *Journal of Political Economy* **128**:8, 2973-3016. [Crossref]
73. Andreas Blume, April Mitchell Franco, Paul Heidhues. 2020. Dynamic coordination via organizational routines. *Economic Theory* **98**. . [Crossref]
74. Eleonora Bartoloni, Maurizio Baussola. 2020. Is there a profit premium for market-oriented firms? A panel data investigation. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology* **29**:5, 501-521. [Crossref]
75. Ibrahim Mike Okumu, Joseph Mawejje. 2020. Labour productivity in African manufacturing: Does the level of skills development matter?. *Development Policy Review* **38**:4, 441-464. [Crossref]
76. Paolo Zacchia. 2020. Knowledge Spillovers through Networks of Scientists. *The Review of Economic Studies* **87**:4, 1989-2018. [Crossref]
77. Eva Hagsten, Martin Thomas Falk. 2020. Use and intensity of electronic invoices in firms: The example of Sweden. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **262**, 121291. [Crossref]
78. Cheng-wei Chang, Ching-chong Lai, Ting-wei Lai. 2020. Fiscal stimulus in a simple macroeconomic model of monopolistic competition with firm heterogeneity. *The Japanese Economic Review* **71**:3, 447-477. [Crossref]
79. Jun Du, Enrico Vanino. 2020. Agglomeration externalities of fast-growth firms. *Regional Studies* **15**, 1-15. [Crossref]
80. Gustavo Canavire-Bacarreza, Luis Castro Peñarrieta. 2020. Can licensing induce productivity? Exploring the IPR effect. *Empirical Economics* **83**. . [Crossref]
81. Oladele Akogun, Andrew Dillon, Jed Friedman, Ashesh Prasann, Pieter Serneels. 2020. Productivity and Health: Physical Activity as a Measure of Effort. *The World Bank Economic Review* **1113**. . [Crossref]
82. Xiaoyong Dai, Yuanyuan Guo, Le Wang. 2020. Composition of R&D expenditures and firm performance. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management* **32**:6, 739-752. [Crossref]
83. Ruben Dewitte, Michel Dumont, Bruno Merlevede, Glenn Rayp, Marijn Verschelde. 2020. Firm-Heterogeneous Biased Technological Change: A nonparametric approach under endogeneity. *European Journal of Operational Research* **283**:3, 1172-1182. [Crossref]
84. Fikru Kefyalew Alemayehu, Sigbjørn Landazuri Tveteraas. 2020. Long-run labour flexibility in hospitality: A dynamic common correlated effects approach. *Tourism Economics* **26**:4, 704-718. [Crossref]

85. Tinh Doan, Lyndall Strazdins, Liana Leach. 2020. Cost of poor health to the labour market returns to education in Australia: another pathway for socio-economic inequality. *The European Journal of Health Economics* **21**:4, 635-648. [Crossref]
86. Wen Wen, Huijie Cui, Yun Ke. 2020. Directors with foreign experience and corporate tax avoidance. *Journal of Corporate Finance* **62**, 101624. [Crossref]
87. GUR AMINADAV, ELIAS PAPAIOANNOU. 2020. Corporate Control around the World. *The Journal of Finance* **75**:3, 1191-1246. [Crossref]
88. Fabio Landini. 2020. Distortions in firm selection during recessions: a comparison across European countries. *Industrial and Corporate Change* **29**:3, 683-712. [Crossref]
89. Roberto Álvarez, Aldo Gonzalez. 2020. Competition, selection, and productivity growth in the Chilean manufacturing industry. *Industrial and Corporate Change* **29**:3, 877-892. [Crossref]
90. Masayuki Morikawa. 2020. Effects of outside directors on firms' investments and performance: Evidence from a quasi-natural experiment in Japan. *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* **56**, 101074. [Crossref]
91. Massimo Tamberi. 2020. Productivity differentials along the development process: A "MESO" approach. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* **53**, 99-107. [Crossref]
92. Lucas Figal Garone, Paula A. López Villalba, Alessandro Maffioli, Christian A. Ruzzier. 2020. Firm-level productivity in Latin America and the Caribbean. *Research in Economics* **74**:2, 186-192. [Crossref]
93. Yoshimichi Murakami, Keijiro Otsuka. 2020. Governance, Information Spillovers, and Productivity of Local Firms: Toward an Integrated Approach to Foreign Direct Investment and Global Value Chains. *The Developing Economies* **58**:2, 134-174. [Crossref]
94. Zach Flynn. 2020. Identifying productivity when it is a factor of production. *The RAND Journal of Economics* **51**:2, 496-530. [Crossref]
95. Desiderio Romero-Jordán, Ismael Sanz-Labrador, José Félix Sanz-Sanz. 2020. Is the corporation tax a barrier to productivity growth?. *Small Business Economics* **55**:1, 23-38. [Crossref]
96. Joseph Junior Aduba, Behrooz Asgari. 2020. Productivity and technological progress of the Japanese manufacturing industries, 2000–2014: estimation with data envelopment analysis and log-linear learning model. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Regional Science* **4**:2, 343-387. [Crossref]
97. Denila Jinny Arulraj, Thillai Rajan Annamalai. 2020. Firms' Financing Choices and Firm Productivity: Evidence from an Emerging Economy. *International Journal of Global Business and Competitiveness* **15**:1, 35-48. [Crossref]
98. Steffen Viete, Daniel Erdsiek. 2020. Mobile Information Technologies and Firm Performance: The Role of Employee Autonomy. *Information Economics and Policy* **51**, 100863. [Crossref]
99. Stefania Cardinaleschi, Mirella Damiani, Fabrizio Pompei. 2020. Knowledge-intensive sectors and the role of collective performance-related pay. *Industry and Innovation* **27**:5, 480-512. [Crossref]
100. Teheni El Ghak, Awatef Gdairia, Boutheina Abassi. 2020. High-tech Entrepreneurship and Total Factor Productivity: the Case of Innovation-Driven Economies. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy* **5**. . [Crossref]
101. Anna Waldman-Brown. 2020. Redeployment or robocalypse? Workers and automation in Ohio manufacturing SMEs. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* **13**:1, 99-115. [Crossref]

102. Fabio Landini, Alessandro Arrighetti, Eleonora Bartoloni. 2020. The sources of heterogeneity in firm performance: lessons from Italy1. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* **44**:3, 527-558. [Crossref]
103. Francesco Decarolis, Leonardo M Giuffrida, Elisabetta Iossa, Vincenzo Mollisi, Giancarlo Spagnolo. 2020. Bureaucratic Competence and Procurement Outcomes. *The Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* **52**. . [Crossref]
104. Steven A. Sharpe, Gustavo A. Suarez. 2020. Why Isn't Business Investment More Sensitive to Interest Rates? Evidence from Surveys. *Management Science* . [Crossref]
105. Stephen F Lin, Catherine Thomas, Arturs Kalnins. 2020. In-House and Arm's Length: Productivity Heterogeneity and Variation in Organizational Form. *The Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* **8**. . [Crossref]
106. Justine Falciola, Marion Jansen, Valentina Rollo. 2020. Defining firm competitiveness: A multidimensional framework. *World Development* **129**, 104857. [Crossref]
107. Amitabh Chandra, Douglas O Staiger. 2020. Identifying Sources of Inefficiency in Healthcare*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **135**:2, 785-843. [Crossref]
108. Joseph A. Clougherty, Tomaso Duso, Jo Seldeslachts, Lorenzo Ciari. 2020. Transformational Strategies and Productivity Growth: A Transformational-Activities Perspective on Stagnation in the New-Normal Business Landscape. *Journal of Management Studies* **57**:3, 537-568. [Crossref]
109. Klaus S. Friesenbichler. 2020. Does EU-accession affect domestic market structures and firm level productivity?. *Empirica* **47**:2, 343-364. [Crossref]
110. Stephen Michael Impink, Andrea Prat, Raffaella Sadun. 2020. Measuring Collaboration in Modern Organizations. *AEA Papers and Proceedings* **110**, 181-186. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]
111. Benjamin Bennett, René Stulz, Zexi Wang. 2020. Does the stock market make firms more productive?. *Journal of Financial Economics* **136**:2, 281-306. [Crossref]
112. Rebecca N. Hann, Heedong Kim, Wenfeng Wang, Yue Zheng. 2020. Information Frictions and Productivity Dispersion: The Role of Accounting Information. *The Accounting Review* **95**:3, 223-250. [Crossref]
113. Paola Profeta. Gender Equality and Public Policy **40**, . [Crossref]
114. Mattia Di Ubaldo, Iulia Siedschlag. 2020. Investment in Knowledge-Based Capital and Productivity: Firm-Level Evidence from a Small Open Economy. *Review of Income and Wealth* **46**. . [Crossref]
115. Trond-Arne Borgersen, Roswitha M. King. 2020. Is the transition process neutral to the employment–output ratio? Or does 'jobless growth' come naturally? The case when allocative and technological effects interact. *Post-Communist Economies* **32**:3, 391-408. [Crossref]
116. Fabian Rocha Aponte. 2020. Firm dispersion and total factor productivity: Are Norwegian salmon producers less efficient over time?. *Aquaculture Economics & Management* **24**:2, 161-180. [Crossref]
117. Tauqir Ahmed, Arshad Ali Bhatti. 2020. MEASUREMENT AND DETERMINANTS OF MULTI-FACTOR PRODUCTIVITY: A SURVEY OF LITERATURE. *Journal of Economic Surveys* **34**:2, 293-319. [Crossref]
118. Greer K. Gosnell, John A. List, Robert D. Metcalfe. 2020. The Impact of Management Practices on Employee Productivity: A Field Experiment with Airline Captains. *Journal of Political Economy* **128**:4, 1195-1233. [Crossref]

119. Oriana Bandiera, Andrea Prat, Stephen Hansen, Raffaella Sadun. 2020. CEO Behavior and Firm Performance. *Journal of Political Economy* **128**:4, 1325-1369. [Crossref]

120. Nicholas Bloom, Aprajit Mahajan, David McKenzie, John Roberts. 2020. Do Management Interventions Last? Evidence from India. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **12**:2, 198-219. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

121. Yan Wu, Nico Heerink, Linhui Yu. 2020. Real estate boom and resource misallocation in manufacturing industries: Evidence from China. *China Economic Review* **60**, 101400. [Crossref]

122. David B. Audretsch, Maksim Belitski. 2020. The role of R&D and knowledge spillovers in innovation and productivity. *European Economic Review* **123**, 103391. [Crossref]

123. Roma C. Paje, Paola Beatriz A. Escobar, Anna Monica R. Ruaya, Paula Andrea F. Sulit. 2020. The Impact of Compressed Workweek Arrangements on Job Stress, Work-Life Balance, and Work Productivity of Rank-and-File Employees from Different Industries in Metro Manila. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **1529**, 032055. [Crossref]

124. Aurélie Corne, Olga Goncalves, Nicolas Peypoch. 2020. Evaluating the performance drivers of French ski resorts: A hierarchical approach. *Managerial and Decision Economics* **41**:3, 389-405. [Crossref]

125. José Luis Preciado Arreola, Daisuke Yagi, Andrew L. Johnson. 2020. Insights from machine learning for evaluating production function estimators on manufacturing survey data. *Journal of Productivity Analysis* **53**:2, 181-225. [Crossref]

126. Bruce E. Kaufman, Michael Barry, Adrian Wilkinson, Rafael Gomez. 2020. Alternative balanced scorecards built from paradigm models in strategic HRM and employment/industrial relations and used to measure the state of employment relations and HR system performance across U.S. workplaces. *Human Resource Management Journal* **19**. . [Crossref]

127. Stephan Kampelmann, Benoît Mahy, François Rycx, Guillaume Vermeylen. 2020. Over-, Required, and Undereducation: Consequences on the Bottom Lines of Firms. *LABOUR* **34**:1, 80-112. [Crossref]

128. Ming He, Yang Chen, Charles van Marrewijk. 2020. The effects of urban transformation on productivity spillovers in China. *Economic Modelling* . [Crossref]

129. Romain Duval, Gee Hee Hong, Yannick Timmer. 2020. Financial Frictions and the Great Productivity Slowdown. *The Review of Financial Studies* **33**:2, 475-503. [Crossref]

130. Amanda G. Gregg. 2020. Factory Productivity and the Concession System of Incorporation in Late Imperial Russia, 1894–1908. *American Economic Review* **110**:2, 401-427. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

131. Eric E. O. Opoku, Isabel K. M. Yan, Kate Hynes. 2020. Reaching up and reaching out: The impact of competition on firms' productivity and export decisions. *Pacific Economic Review* **25**:1, 69-101. [Crossref]

132. Nana Zhang, Liang Mei. 2020. Sustainable Development in the Service Industry: Managerial Learning and Management Improvement of Chinese Retailers. *Sustainability* **12**:4, 1430. [Crossref]

133. Ester Camiña, Ángel Díaz-Chao, Joan Torrent-Sellens. 2020. Automation technologies: Long-term effects for Spanish industrial firms. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* **151**, 119828. [Crossref]

134. Javier Arnaut. 2020. Did structural change account for productivity growth within manufacturing during the import substitution era? A historical appraisal of Mexico, Argentina, and Brazil. *The Journal of International Trade & Economic Development* **29**:1, 1-35. [Crossref]

135. M. V. Simonova, N. V. Kozhuhova. Strategies for Obtaining Added Value in Developing Technological Innovations 128-136. [Crossref]

136. Kevin Layer, Andrew L. Johnson, Robin C. Sickles, Gary D. Ferrier. 2020. Direction selection in stochastic directional distance functions. *European Journal of Operational Research* **280**:1, 351-364. [Crossref]

137. Rok Cresnar. New Generation of Productive Workers 261-275. [Crossref]

138. Hsin-Ning Su, Igam M. Moaniba. 2020. Does geographic distance to partners affect firm R&D spending? The moderating roles of individuals, firms, and countries. *Journal of Business Research* **106**, 12-23. [Crossref]

139. Luke Emeka Okafor, Mita Bhattacharya, Nicholas Apergis. 2020. Bank credit, public financial incentives, tax financial incentives and export performance during the global financial crisis. *The World Economy* **43**:1, 114-145. [Crossref]

140. Jianping Zha, Ying Zhu, Dongqin He, Ting Tan, Xiaojie Yang. 2020. Sources of tourism growth in Mainland China: An extended data envelopment analysis-based decomposition analysis. *International Journal of Tourism Research* **22**:1, 54-70. [Crossref]

141. Minjia Chen, Roman Matousek. 2020. Do productive firms get external finance? Evidence from Chinese listed manufacturing firms. *International Review of Financial Analysis* **67**, 101422. [Crossref]

142. Elena Grinza, François Rycx. 2020. The Impact of Sickness Absenteeism on Firm Productivity: New Evidence from Belgian Matched Employer–Employee Panel Data. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society* **59**:1, 150-194. [Crossref]

143. Charles Henri DiMaria, Chiara Peroni, Francesco Sarracino. 2020. Happiness Matters: Productivity Gains from Subjective Well-Being. *Journal of Happiness Studies* **21**:1, 139-160. [Crossref]

144. María Teresa Ballestar, Ángel Díaz-Chao, Jorge Sainz, Joan Torrent-Sellens. 2020. Knowledge, robots and productivity in SMEs: Explaining the second digital wave. *Journal of Business Research* **108**, 119-131. [Crossref]

145. Lei Si, Mingsheng Chen. Health Economic Evaluation of Workplace Health Promotion 1-16. [Crossref]

146. John Page. Industrial Policy, Firm Capabilities, and Kaizen 29-44. [Crossref]

147. Akio Hosono, John Page, Go Shimada. Overview 1-27. [Crossref]

148. Filipe Lage de Sousa, Mauricio Canêdo-Pinheiro, Bernardo Pereira Cabral, Glaucia Estefânia de Sousa Ferreira. Impact of Kaizen-like Practices in the Brazilian Manufacturing Sector 221-243. [Crossref]

149. Youssef Abdul Razzak Doughan. Factors of Production, Economic Growth, and Sustainable Development 1-14. [Crossref]

150. Trent Krupa, Steven Utke. 2020. The Cost of Misaligned Tax Incentives: Evidence from Tax-Motivated Special Dividends. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

151. Lei Si, Mingsheng Chen. Health Economic Evaluation of Workplace Health Promotion 555-570. [Crossref]

152. Japhet Osazefua Imhanzenobe, David McMillan. 2020. Managers' financial practices and financial sustainability of Nigerian manufacturing companies: Which ratios matter most?. *Cogent Economics & Finance* **8**:1, 1724241. [Crossref]

153. Victor Manuel Bennett. 2020. Automation and Market Dominance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

154. Hiroyuki Kasahara, Yoichi Sugita. 2020. Nonparametric Identification of Production Function, Total Factor Productivity, and Markup from Revenue Data. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

155. WAHIDA AHMAD, DAVID PRENTICE. 2019. HOW LARGE ARE PRODUCTIVITY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ISLAMIC AND CONVENTIONAL BANKS?. *The Singapore Economic Review* 1-20. [Crossref]

156. Giovanni Dosi, Dario Guarascio, Andrea Ricci, Maria Enrica Virgillito. 2019. Neodualism in the Italian business firms: training, organizational capabilities, and productivity distributions. *Small Business Economics* **70**. . [Crossref]

157. Masayuki Morikawa. 2019. Dispersion and volatility of TFPQ and TFPR: findings from three service industries. *Industrial and Corporate Change* **28**:6, 1515-1531. [Crossref]

158. Sanday Amos, Doungahire Abdoul Karim Zanhouo. 2019. Financial constraints, firm productivity and cross-country income differences: Evidence from sub-Sahara Africa. *Borsa Istanbul Review* **19**:4, 357-371. [Crossref]

159. Marie-Noelle Duquenne, Maria Tsiapa, Valantis Tsiakos. 2019. Contribution of the Common Agricultural Policy to agricultural productivity of EU regions during 2004–2012 period. *Review of Agricultural, Food and Environmental Studies* **100**:1-4, 47-68. [Crossref]

160. J David Brown, John S Earle, Mee Jung Kim, Kyung Min Lee. 2019. Start-ups, job creation, and founder characteristics. *Industrial and Corporate Change* **28**:6, 1637-1672. [Crossref]

161. Lassana Cissokho. 2019. The productivity cost of power outages for manufacturing small and medium enterprises in Senegal. *Journal of Industrial and Business Economics* **46**:4, 499-521. [Crossref]

162. Furkan Baser, Soner Gokten. 2019. Paths of economic development: A global evidence for the mediating role of human capital. *The Journal of International Trade & Economic Development* **28**:8, 996-1018. [Crossref]

163. Danny McGowan, Chrysovalantis Vasilakis. 2019. Reap what you sow: Agricultural technology, urbanization and structural change. *Research Policy* **48**:9, 103794. [Crossref]

164. Matthew Smith, Danny Yagan, Owen Zidar, Eric Zwick. 2019. Capitalists in the Twenty-First Century*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **134**:4, 1675-1745. [Crossref]

165. Sunny Li Sun, Bo Zou. 2019. Generative Capability. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management* **66**:4, 636-649. [Crossref]

166. Massimo Filippini, Thomas Geissmann, Valerie J. Karplus, Da Zhang. 2019. The productivity impacts of energy efficiency programs in developing countries: Evidence from iron and steel firms in China. *China Economic Review* 101364. [Crossref]

167. Oliver Levine, Missaka Warusawitharana. 2019. Finance and productivity growth: Firm-level evidence. *Journal of Monetary Economics* . [Crossref]

168. Biswa Swarup Misra. 2019. Determinants of total factor productivity in Indian states. *Indian Growth and Development Review* **13**:1, 259-282. [Crossref]

169. Arta Mulliqi, Nick Adnett, Mehtap Hisarciklilar. 2019. Human capital and exports: A micro-level analysis of transition countries. *The Journal of International Trade & Economic Development* **28**:7, 775-800. [Crossref]

170. Túlio A. Cravo, Caio Piza. 2019. The impact of business-support services on firm performance: a meta-analysis. *Small Business Economics* **53**:3, 753-770. [Crossref]

171. Marc Cowling, George Tanewski. 2019. On the productive efficiency of Australian businesses: firm size and age class effects. *Small Business Economics* **53**:3, 739-752. [Crossref]

172. Tomasz Kijek, Arkadiusz Kijek. 2019. Is innovation the key to solving the productivity paradox?. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge* **4**:4, 219-225. [Crossref]

173. Haris Tabakovic, Thomas G. Wollmann. 2019. The impact of money on science: Evidence from unexpected NCAA football outcomes. *Journal of Public Economics* **178**, 104066. [Crossref]

174. Mary Dixon-Woods. 2019. How to improve healthcare improvement—an essay by Mary Dixon-Woods. *BMJ* **114**, l5514. [Crossref]

175. Lene Kromann, Anders Sørensen. 2019. Automation, performance and international competition: a firm-level comparison of process innovation. *Economic Policy* **34**:100, 691-722. [Crossref]

176. Jaan Masso, Priit Vahter. 2019. Knowledge Transfer from Multinationals through Labour Mobility: Are There Effects on Productivity, Product Sophistication and Exporting?. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade* **55**:12, 2774-2795. [Crossref]

177. Tahir M. Nisar, Niraj Kumar, Guru Prabhakar. 2019. Effect of best management practices on the performance and productivity of small firms. *Production Planning & Control* **30**:10-12, 919-934. [Crossref]

178. Isaac Abekah-Koomson, Pang Wei Loon, Gamini Premaratne, Teo Siew Yean. 2019. Total Factor Productivity Growth: Evidence from West African Economies. *Global Business Review* **76**, 097215091985619. [Crossref]

179. Navaneethakrishnan Kengatharan. 2019. A knowledge-based theory of the firm. *International Journal of Manpower* **40**:6, 1056-1074. [Crossref]

180. Maaja Vadi, Anne Reino, Anne Aidla. 2019. The relationship between intangible assets and firm productivity – still myth or is there new evidence?. *International Journal of Manpower* **40**:6, 1030-1035. [Crossref]

181. Chan Wang, Pu-yan Nie, Ting Cui. 2019. Endogenous product substitutability strategy under duopoly. *Managerial and Decision Economics* **40**:6, 623-632. [Crossref]

182. Mike G. Tsionas, Michael L. Polemis. 2019. On the estimation of total factor productivity: A novel Bayesian non-parametric approach. *European Journal of Operational Research* **277**:3, 886-902. [Crossref]

183. Hien Thu Tran. 2019. Institutional quality and market selection in the transition to market economy. *Journal of Business Venturing* **34**:5, 105890. [Crossref]

184. Hazhir Rahmandad. 2019. Interdependence, Complementarity, and Ruggedness of Performance Landscapes. *Strategy Science* **4**:3, 234-249. [Crossref]

185. Pål Børing. 2019. The relationship between firm productivity, firm size and CSR objectives for innovations. *Eurasian Business Review* **9**:3, 269-297. [Crossref]

186. Si Li, Xintong Zhan. 2019. Product Market Threats and Stock Crash Risk. *Management Science* **65**:9, 4011-4031. [Crossref]

187. Surender Kumar, Madhu Khanna. 2019. Temperature and production efficiency growth: empirical evidence. *Climatic Change* **156**:1-2, 209-229. [Crossref]

188. Bernd Andreas Wiech, Athanassios Kourouklis, James Johnston. 2019. Understanding the components of profitability and productivity change at the micro level. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management* **69**:5, 1061-1079. [Crossref]

189. Danmeng Li, Qiuju Jiang, Yong Mai. 2019. Board interlocks and capital structure dynamics: evidence from China. *Accounting & Finance* **3**. . [Crossref]

190. Thomas L. P. R. Peeters, Brian M. Mills, Enrico Pennings, Hojun Sung. 2019. Manager migration, learning-by-hiring, and cultural distance in international soccer. *Global Strategy Journal* **21**. . [Crossref]

191. Daniel E. Sichel. 2019. Productivity Measurement: Racing to Keep Up. *Annual Review of Economics* **11**:1, 591-614. [Crossref]

192. Carl Shapiro. 2019. Protecting Competition in the American Economy: Merger Control, Tech Titans, Labor Markets. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **33**:3, 69-93. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

193. Alvaro Garcia-Marin, Nico Voigtländer. 2019. Exporting and Plant-Level Efficiency Gains: It's in the Measure. *Journal of Political Economy* **127**:4, 1777-1825. [Crossref]

194. Fredrik Heyman, Pehr-Johan Norbäck, Lars Persson. 2019. The Turnaround of the Swedish Economy: Lessons from Large Business Sector Reforms. *The World Bank Research Observer* **34**:2, 274-308. [Crossref]

195. Daniel Fackler, Jens Stegmaier, Eva Weigt. 2019. Does extended unemployment benefit duration ameliorate the negative employment effects of job loss?. *Labour Economics* **59**, 123-138. [Crossref]

196. Tobias Stucki, Martin Woerter. 2019. The private returns to knowledge: A comparison of ICT, biotechnologies, nanotechnologies, and green technologies. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* **145**, 62-81. [Crossref]

197. Steven Blader, Claudine Gartenberg, Andrea Prat. 2019. The Contingent Effect of Management Practices. *The Review of Economic Studies* **113**. . [Crossref]

198. Juliana Gonçalves Taveira, Eduardo Gonçalves, Ricardo Da Silva Freguglia. 2019. The missing link between innovation and performance in Brazilian firms: a panel data approach. *Applied Economics* **51**:33, 3632-3649. [Crossref]

199. Juan Carlos Salazar-Elena, José Guimón. 2019. Management practices and small firms' productivity in emerging countries. *Competitiveness Review: An International Business Journal* **29**:4, 356-374. [Crossref]

200. Tigabu Degu Getahun, Espen Villanger. 2019. Active Private Sector Development Policies Revisited: Impacts of the Ethiopian Industrial Cluster Policy. *The Journal of Development Studies* **55**:7, 1548-1564. [Crossref]

201. E. Mark Curtis, Jonathan M. Lee. 2019. When do environmental regulations backfire? Onsite industrial electricity generation, energy efficiency and policy instruments. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **96**, 174-194. [Crossref]

202. Bohdan Kukharskyy, Michael Pflüger. 2019. Time is on my side: relational contracts and aggregate welfare. *Oxford Economic Papers* **71**:3, 709-732. [Crossref]

203. Grigorios Spanos. 2019. Firm organization and productivity across locations. *Journal of Urban Economics* **112**, 152-168. [Crossref]

204. Chris Baumann, Michael Cherry, Wujin Chu. 2019. Competitive Productivity (CP) at macro–meso–micro levels. *Cross Cultural & Strategic Management* **26**:2, 118-144. [Crossref]

205. Rafael Gomez, Michael Barry, Alex Bryson, Bruce E. Kaufman, Guenther Lomas, Adrian Wilkinson. 2019. The "good workplace". *Journal of Participation and Employee Ownership* **2**:1, 60-90. [Crossref]

206. YUAN AN, KEBIN DENG, ZHONG DING, FOX GAO. 2019. THE ROLE OF MARKETIZATION ON THE LINKAGE BETWEEN MISALLOCATION AND PRODUCTIVITY DISPERSION: EVIDENCE FROM CHINA. *The Singapore Economic Review* 1950029. [Crossref]

207. Luis Medrano-Adán, Vicente Salas-Fumás, J. Javier Sanchez-Asin. 2019. Firm size and productivity from occupational choices. *Small Business Economics* **53**:1, 243-267. [Crossref]

208. Paolo Castelnovo, Chiara F. Del Bo, Massimo Florio. 2019. Quality of institutions and productivity of State-Invested Enterprises: International evidence from major telecom companies. *European Journal of Political Economy* **58**, 102-117. [Crossref]

209. Livio Romano. 2019. Explaining growth differences across firms: The interplay between innovation and management practices. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* **49**, 130-145. [Crossref]

210. Matthew Thomas Johnson, Elliott Johnson. 2019. Stress, domination and basic income: considering a citizens' entitlement response to a public health crisis. *Social Theory & Health* **17**:2, 253-271. [Crossref]

211. Franco Malerba, Gary P Pisano. 2019. Innovation, competition and sectoral evolution: an introduction to the special section on Industrial Dynamics. *Industrial and Corporate Change* **28**:3, 503-510. [Crossref]

212. Panagiotis Fouskas, Catherine Robinson. 2019. Should I Stay or Should I Go? Firm Heterogeneity in the Post-crisis Period. *The Manchester School* **87**:3, 367-402. [Crossref]

213. Lars Kolvereid, Bjørn Willy Åmo. 2019. Growth Intention and Growth in Small Accounting Firms. *Administrative Sciences* **9**:2, 36. [Crossref]

214. Stefano Costa, Federico Sallusti, Claudio Vicarelli, Davide Zurlo. 2019. Over the ROC methodology: Productivity, economic size and firms' export thresholds. *Review of International Economics* **1**. . [Crossref]

215. Charilaos Mertzanis, Mona Said. 2019. Access to skilled labor, institutions and firm performance in developing countries. *International Journal of Manpower* **40**:2, 328-355. [Crossref]

216. Nicholas Bloom, Erik Brynjolfsson, Lucia Foster, Ron Jarmin, Megha Patnaik, Itay Saporta-Eksten, John Van Reenen. 2019. What Drives Differences in Management Practices?. *American Economic Review* **109**:5, 1648-1683. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

217. David Atkin, Amit K. Khandelwal, Adam Osman. 2019. Measuring Productivity: Lessons from Tailored Surveys and Productivity Benchmarking. *AEA Papers and Proceedings* **109**, 444-449. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

218. Andreas Fuster, Matthew Plosser, Philipp Schnabl, James Vickery. 2019. The Role of Technology in Mortgage Lending. *The Review of Financial Studies* **32**:5, 1854-1899. [Crossref]

219. André Stel, Boris Lokshin, Nardo Vries. 2019. The Effect of SME Productivity Increases on Large Firm Productivity in the EU. *Kyklos* **72**:2, 332-353. [Crossref]

220. Marco Grazzi, Chiara Piccardo, Cecilia Vergari. 2019. Building a firm level dataset for the analysis of industrial dynamics and demography. *Journal of Economic and Social Measurement* **43**:3-4, 169-197. [Crossref]

221. Chong Ning, Ying Hao, Zhibo Liu, Yuting Liu. 2019. Business social norms from overseas and corporate social responsibility performance: evidence from China. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Accounting & Economics* **17**, 1-31. [Crossref]

222. Bertha Viviana Ruales Guzmán, Alessandro Brun, Oscar Fernando Castellanos Domínguez. 2019. Quality management as a determinant factor of productivity. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management* **68**:4, 675-698. [Crossref]

223. John Asker, Allan Collard-Wexler, Jan De Loecker. 2019. (Mis)Allocation, Market Power, and Global Oil Extraction. *American Economic Review* **109**:4, 1568-1615. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

224. Manhal Ali, Reza Salehnejad, Mohaimen Mansur. 2019. Hospital productivity: The role of efficiency drivers. *The International Journal of Health Planning and Management* **34**:2, 806-823. [Crossref]

225. Areti Gkypali, Kostas Kounetas, Kostas Tsekouras. 2019. European countries' competitiveness and productive performance evolution: unraveling the complexity in a heterogeneity context. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* **29**:2, 665-695. [Crossref]

226. Mika Nieminen, Kari Heimonen, Timo Tohmo. 2019. Current Accounts and Coordination of Wage Bargaining. *Open Economies Review* **30**:2, 319-341. [Crossref]

227. Qingshan Chen, Shah Muhammad Kamran, Hongzhong Fan. 2019. Real estate investment and energy efficiency: Evidence from China's policy experiment. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **217**, 440-447. [Crossref]

228. Giovanni Dosi, Andrea Roventini, Emanuele Russo. 2019. Endogenous growth and global divergence in a multi-country agent-based model. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* **101**, 101-129. [Crossref]

229. Garrett T. Senney, Lucia F. Dunn. 2019. The role of work schedules and the macroeconomy on labor effort. *Labour Economics* **57**, 23-34. [Crossref]

230. Florian Kuhn, Chacko George. 2019. Business cycle implications of capacity constraints under demand shocks. *Review of Economic Dynamics* **32**, 94-121. [Crossref]

231. Shawn Kantor, Alexander Whalley. 2019. Research Proximity and Productivity: Long-Term Evidence from Agriculture. *Journal of Political Economy* **127**:2, 819-854. [Crossref]

232. Steven Hutton, Stephen Eldridge. 2019. Improving productivity through strategic alignment of competitive capabilities. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management* **68**:3, 644-668. [Crossref]

233. Jonas Hjort, Jonas Poulsen. 2019. The Arrival of Fast Internet and Employment in Africa. *American Economic Review* **109**:3, 1032-1079. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

234. Ilona Sergant, Patrick Van Cayseele. 2019. Financial Constraints: State Aid to the Rescue? Empirical Evidence from Belgian Firm-Level Data. *Journal of Industry, Competition and Trade* **19**:1, 33-67. [Crossref]

235. Jieun Chang, Youngho Kang. 2019. Instrumental Variable Estimates of the Effect of Management Practices on Firm Performance in Korean Firms. *Journal of Labor Research* **40**:1, 106-125. [Crossref]

236. Fabio Pieri, Riccardo Verruso. 2019. The determinants of corporate profitability in the Italian domestic appliances industry. *Journal of Industrial and Business Economics* **46**:1, 83-115. [Crossref]

237. Eric J. Bartelsman, Martin Falk, Eva Hagsten, Michael Polder. 2019. Productivity, technological innovations and broadband connectivity: firm-level evidence for ten European countries. *Eurasian Business Review* **9**:1, 25-48. [Crossref]

238. Martin C. Byford, Joshua S. Gans. 2019. Strengthening a weak rival for a fight. *International Journal of Industrial Organization* **63**, 1-17. [Crossref]

239. Bishwa S. Koirala, Alok K. Bohara, Satis Devkota, Kamal P. Upadhyaya. 2019. Community managed hydropower, spillover effect and agricultural productivity: The case of rural Nepal. *World Development Perspectives* **13**, 67-74. [Crossref]

240. Quoc Hung Nguyen. 2019. Growth Model with Financial Deepening and Productivity Heterogeneity. *The Japanese Economic Review* **70**:1, 123-140. [Crossref]

241. Petri Böckerman, Seppo Laaksonen, Jari Vainiomäki. 2019. Does ICT Usage Erode Routine Occupations at the Firm Level?. *LABOUR* **33**:1, 26-47. [Crossref]

242. Antti Kauhanen, Mika Maliranta. 2019. The Roles of Job and Worker Restructuring in Aggregate Wage Growth Dynamics 1. *Review of Income and Wealth* **65**:1, 99-118. [Crossref]

243. Frank Nagle. 2019. Open Source Software and Firm Productivity. *Management Science* **65**:3, 1191-1215. [Crossref]

244. Michael Powell. 2019. Productivity and credibility in industry equilibrium. *The RAND Journal of Economics* **50**:1, 121-146. [Crossref]

245. J. David Brown, John S. Earle, Solomiya Shpak, Volodymyr Vakhitov. 2019. Is Privatization Working in Ukraine?. *Comparative Economic Studies* **61**:1, 1-35. [Crossref]

246. Arti Grover Goswami, Denis Medvedev, Ellen Olafsen. What Makes for High Growth? 67-115. [Crossref]

247. Stefanie A. Haller, Sean Lyons. 2019. Effects of broadband availability on total factor productivity in service sector firms: Evidence from Ireland. *Telecommunications Policy* **43**:1, 11-22. [Crossref]

248. Swati Dhingra, John Morrow. 2019. Monopolistic Competition and Optimum Product Diversity under Firm Heterogeneity. *Journal of Political Economy* **127**:1, 196-232. [Crossref]

249. Alessandra Bonfiglioli, Rosario Crinò, Gino Gancia. 2019. Trade, Finance, and Endogenous Firm Heterogeneity. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **17**:1, 79-130. [Crossref]

250. Yoonseok Lee, Andrey Stoyanov, Nikolay Zubanov. 2019. Olley and Pakes-style Production Function Estimators with Firm Fixed Effects. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* **81**:1, 79-97. [Crossref]

251. Fang-Nan Liao, Xiao-Li Ji, Zhi-Ping Wang. 2019. Firms' Sustainability: Does Economic Policy Uncertainty Affect Internal Control?. *Sustainability* **11**:3, 794. [Crossref]

252. Lin Zhou, Jianglong Li, Yangqing Dan, Chunping Xie, Houyin Long, Hongxun Liu. 2019. Entering and Exiting: Productivity Evolution of Energy Supply in China. *Sustainability* **11**:4, 983. [Crossref]

253. Xiao Dai, Jian Wu, Liang Yan, Qian Zhang, Fangli Ruan, Dan Wang. 2019. Industrial Structure Restructuring, Production Factor Allocation Analysis: Based on a Mineral Resource-Intensive City —Jiaozuo City. *Sustainability* **11**:4, 1021. [Crossref]

254. Philip Wales. 2019. The Anatomy of UK Labour Productivity: Lessons from New and Existing Data Sources. *National Institute Economic Review* **247**, R40-R52. [Crossref]

255. Japhet Osazefua Imhanzenobe. 2019. Operational efficiency and financial sustainability of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria. *Journal of Accounting and Taxation* **11**:1, 17-31. [Crossref]

256. Ayodotun S. Ibidunni, Joachim A. Abiodun, Oyebisi M. Ibidunni, Maxwell A. Olokundun. 2019. Using explicit knowledge of groups to enhance firm productivity: A data envelopment analysis application. *South African Journal of Economic and management Sciences* **22**:1. . [Crossref]
257. David J. Teece. 2019. A capability theory of the firm: an economics and (Strategic) management perspective. *New Zealand Economic Papers* **53**:1, 1-43. [Crossref]
258. Hyun Seok Lee, Saravanan Kesavan. Determinants of Excess Inventory Announcement and Stock Market Reaction in the Retail Sector 197-233. [Crossref]
259. Florian Flachenecker, Martin Kornejew. 2019. The causal impact of material productivity on microeconomic competitiveness and environmental performance in the European Union. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* **21**:1, 87-122. [Crossref]
260. Lee G. Branstetter, Britta Glennon, J. Bradford Jensen. 2019. The IT Revolution and the Globalization of R&D. *Innovation Policy and the Economy* **19**, 1-37. [Crossref]
261. Pian Shu, Claudia Steinwender. 2019. The Impact of Trade Liberalization on Firm Productivity and Innovation. *Innovation Policy and the Economy* **19**, 39-68. [Crossref]
262. Lionel Fontagné, Gianluca Santoni. 2019. Agglomeration economies and firm-level labor misallocation. *Journal of Economic Geography* **19**:1, 251-272. [Crossref]
263. Masayuki Morikawa. 2019. Firm heterogeneity and international trade in services. *The World Economy* **42**:1, 268-295. [Crossref]
264. Isabela Manelici, Smaranda Pantea. 2019. Industrial Policy at Work: Evidence from Romania's Income Tax Break for Workers in IT. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
265. Marcela Eslava, John C. Haltiwanger, Alvaro-Jose Pinzon G.. 2019. Job Creation in Colombia vs the U.S.: 'Up or Out Dynamics' Meets 'the Life Cycle of Plants'. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
266. Astrid Krenz. 2019. Firm Heterogeneity, Productivity, and the Extensive Margins of Trade – Differences Between Manufacturing Firms in East and West Germany. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
267. Roberta de Santis, Valeria Ferroni. 2019. On Productivity Measurement and Interpretation: Some Insights on Italy in the European Context. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
268. Zach Flynn. 2019. Identifying the Elasticity of Experience and Its Effect on Market Structure. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
269. Carlo Ciccarelli, Matteo Gomellini, Paolo Sestito. 2019. Demography and Productivity in the Italian Manufacturing Industry: Yesterday and Today. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
270. Manhal Ali, Reza Salehnejad, Peter Kawalek. 2019. Human Resource Management, Complementarity and Organisational Performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
271. Abdul-Nasah Soale, Emmanuel Tsyawo. 2019. Clustered Covariate Regression. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
272. Hans Hvide, Tom Meling. 2019. Do Temporary Demand Shocks Have Long-Term Effects for Startups?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
273. Horng Chern Wong. 2019. Wage Determination Across Firms. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
274. Nicola Bianchi, Michela Giorcelli. 2019. Not All Management Training Is Created Equal: Evidence from the Training Within Industry Program. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

275. Ingo Weller, Christina B. Hymer, Anthony J. Nyberg, Julia Ebert. 2019. How Matching Creates Value: Cogs and Wheels for Human Capital Resources Research. *Academy of Management Annals* **13**:1, 188-214. [Crossref]

276. Mary Dixon-Woods. 2019. Harveian Oration 2018: Improving quality and safety in healthcare . *Clinical Medicine* **19**:1, 47-56. [Crossref]

277. T. K. Kvasha. 2019. The Drivers of the Total Factor Productivity. *Statistics of Ukraine* **85**:2, 12. [Crossref]

278. Thomas Covert, Richard Sweeney. 2019. Relinquishing Riches: Auctions vs Informal Negotiations in Texas Oil and Gas Leasing. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

279. Simone Lenzu, David Rivers, Joris Tielens. 2019. Financial Shocks and Productivity: Pricing Response and the TFPR-TFPQ Bifurcation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

280. Stephen Glaeser, Marcel Olbert, Ann-Catherin Werner. 2019. Tax Competition and Employment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

281. W. Erwin Diewert, Kevin J. Fox. Productivity Indexes and National Statistics: Theory, Methods and Challenges 707-759. [Crossref]

282. Marco Cucculelli, Alessia Lo Turco, Massimo Tamberi. Productivity Differentiation and International Specialization of Firms and Districts 133-146. [Crossref]

283. Irina Bogatyreva, Marina Simonova, Elena Privorotskaya. 2019. Current state of labour productivity in the economy of developed countries. *E3S Web of Conferences* **91**, 08022. [Crossref]

284. Yuri Fridman, Ekaterina Loginova, Galina Rechko. 2019. Mechanisms for Harmonizing the Sustainable Development of Kuzbass as a Resource Region. *E3S Web of Conferences* **134**, 03002. [Crossref]

285. M.V. Simonova, N.N. Gunko, S.A. Kolesnikov, A.N. Parshin. 2019. Structure of the Performance Management at the Regional Level. *SHS Web of Conferences* **71**, 04007. [Crossref]

286. Daniel F. Spulber. 2019. Licensing Standard Essential Patents: Bargaining and Incentives to Invent. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

287. Dimitrios Exadaktylos, Massimo Riccaboni, Armando Rungi. 2019. Talents from Abroad. Foreign Managers and Productivity in the United Kingdom. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

288. Hans Hvide, Tom Meling. 2019. Do Temporary Demand Shocks Have Long-Term Effects for Startups?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

289. Natalie Bau, Adrien Matray. 2019. Misallocation and Capital Market Integration: Evidence from India. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

290. Pooyan Khashabi, Tobias Kretschmer. 2019. Digital Transformation and Organization Design – A Complex Relationship. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

291. Mohamed Fazil Mohamed Firdhous. Cloud Computing for Rural ICT Implementations 1189-1222. [Crossref]

292. Valerie J. Karplus, Thomas Geissmann, Da Zhang. 2019. When Does Management Develop? External Linkages, Structured Practices, and Productivity in Chinese Firms. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

293. Réka Juhász, Mara Squicciarini, Nico Voigtländer. 2019. Technology Adoption and Productivity Growth During the Industrial Revolution: Evidence from France. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

294. Marcel Olbert. 2019. Loss or Lost? Economic Consequences of Internal Capital Markets in Business Groups. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

295. Clement Bellet, Jan-Emmanuel De Neve, George Ward. 2019. Does Employee Happiness Have an Impact on Productivity?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

296. Claudia Custodio, Diogo Mendes, Daniel Metzger. 2019. The Impact of Financial Education of Managers on Medium and Large Enterprises – A Randomized Controlled Trial in Mozambique. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

297. Patricio S. Dalton, Julius Rüschenpöhler, Burak R. Uras, Bilal Zia. 2019. Local Best Practices for Business Growth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

298. Florian Englmaier, Nicolai J. Foss, Thorbjørn Knudsen, Tobias Kretschmer. Organization Design and Firm Heterogeneity: Towards an Integrated Research Agenda for Strategy 229-252. [Crossref]

299. Kadri Männasoo, Heili Hein, Raul Ruubel. 2018. The contributions of human capital, R&D spending and convergence to total factor productivity growth. *Regional Studies* **52**:12, 1598-1611. [Crossref]

300. Robert Jensen, Nolan H. Miller. 2018. Market Integration, Demand, and the Growth of Firms: Evidence From a Natural Experiment in India. *American Economic Review* **108**:12, 3583-3625. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

301. Michael Polder, Hugo de Bondt, George van Leeuwen. 2018. Business dynamics, industry productivity growth, and the distribution of firm-level performance: evidence for the role of ICT using Dutch firm-level data. *The Journal of Technology Transfer* **43**:6, 1522-1541. [Crossref]

302. Diego M. Morris. 2018. Innovation and productivity among heterogeneous firms. *Research Policy* **47**:10, 1918-1932. [Crossref]

303. Hyejin Jung, JungTae Hwang, Byung-Keun Kim. 2018. Does R&D investment increase SME survival during a recession?. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* **137**, 190-198. [Crossref]

304. Wiebke Bartz-Zuccala, Pierre Mohnen, Helena Schweiger. 2018. The Role of Innovation and Management Practices in Determining Firm Productivity. *Comparative Economic Studies* **60**:4, 502-530. [Crossref]

305. Andrew Y Chen. 2018. A General Equilibrium Model of the Value Premium with Time-Varying Risk Premia. *The Review of Asset Pricing Studies* **8**:2, 337-374. [Crossref]

306. António Brandão, Joana Pinho. 2018. Productivity Shocks in a Union-Duopoly Model. *The Manchester School* **86**:6, 722-756. [Crossref]

307. Stephan Kampelmann, François Rycx, Yves Saks, Ilan Tojerow. 2018. Does education raise productivity and wages equally? The moderating role of age and gender. *IZA Journal of Labor Economics* **7**:1. . [Crossref]

308. Mai Giang, Tran Xuan, Bui Trung, Mai Que, Yuichiro Yoshida. 2018. Impact of Investment Climate on Total Factor Productivity of Manufacturing Firms in Vietnam. *Sustainability* **10**:12, 4815. [Crossref]

309. Hisamitsu Saito, João Romão. 2018. Seasonality and regional productivity in the Spanish accommodation sector. *Tourism Management* **69**, 180-188. [Crossref]

310. Manuel Salas-Velasco. 2018. Resource misallocation and production inefficiency. *Journal of Economic Studies* **45**:6, 1272-1287. [Crossref]

311. Daron Acemoglu, Ufuk Akcigit, Harun Alp, Nicholas Bloom, William Kerr. 2018. Innovation, Reallocation, and Growth. *American Economic Review* **108**:11, 3450-3491. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

312. Kengo Kato, Yuya Sasaki. 2018. Uniform confidence bands in deconvolution with unknown error distribution. *Journal of Econometrics* **207**:1, 129-161. [Crossref]

313. Shengyu Li. 2018. A structural model of productivity, uncertain demand, and export dynamics. *Journal of International Economics* **115**, 1-15. [Crossref]

314. Jonas Steel, Lode Godderis, Jeroen Luyten. 2018. Methodological Challenges in the Economic Evaluation of Occupational Health and Safety Programmes. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* **15**:11, 2606. [Crossref]

315. Geoff Mason, Mary O'Mahony, Rebecca Riley. 2018. What is Holding Back UK Productivity? Lessons from Decades of Measurement. *National Institute Economic Review* **246**, R24-R35. [Crossref]

316. Cristian Bartolucci, Francesco Devicienti, Ignacio Monzón. 2018. Identifying Sorting in Practice. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **10**:4, 408-438. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

317. Joaquin Blaum, Claire Lelarge, Michael Peters. 2018. The Gains from Input Trade with Heterogeneous Importers. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* **10**:4, 77-127. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

318. Asif Islam, Silvia Muzi, Jorge Luis Rodriguez Meza. 2018. Does mobile money use increase firms' investment? Evidence from Enterprise Surveys in Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania. *Small Business Economics* **51**:3, 687-708. [Crossref]

319. Sebastian Doerr, Mehdi Raissi, Anke Weber. 2018. Credit-supply shocks and firm productivity in Italy. *Journal of International Money and Finance* **87**, 155-171. [Crossref]

320. Martin Falk, Eva Hagsten. 2018. Influence of local environment on exit of accommodation establishments. *Tourism Management* **68**, 401-411. [Crossref]

321. Yixin Liu, David C. Mauer, Yilei Zhang. 2018. The hedging benefits of industrial and global diversification: Evidence from economic downturns. *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting* **45**:9-10, 1322-1351. [Crossref]

322. Victor Couture, Gilles Duranton, Matthew A. Turner. 2018. Speed. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* **100**:4, 725-739. [Crossref]

323. Victoria Sevcenko, Sendil Ethiraj. 2018. How Do Firms Appropriate Value from Employees with Transferable Skills? A Study of the Appropriation Puzzle in Actively Managed Mutual Funds. *Organization Science* **29**:5, 775-795. [Crossref]

324. Sai Ding, Minjoo Kim, Xiao Zhang. 2018. Do firms care about investment opportunities? Evidence from China. *Journal of Corporate Finance* **52**, 214-237. [Crossref]

325. W. Erwin Diewert, Kevin J. Fox. 2018. A decomposition of US business sector TFP growth into technical progress and cost efficiency components. *Journal of Productivity Analysis* **50**:1-2, 71-84. [Crossref]

326. David B Audretsch. 2018. Entrepreneurship, economic growth, and geography. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* **34**:4, 637-651. [Crossref]

327. Xiaoyong Dai, Liwei Cheng. 2018. The impact of product innovation on firm-level markup and productivity: evidence from China. *Applied Economics* **50**:42, 4570-4581. [Crossref]

328. V. Vandenberghe. 2018. The Contribution of Educated Workers to Firms' Efficiency Gains: The Key Role of Proximity to the 'Local' Frontier. *De Economist* **166**:3, 259-283. [Crossref]

329. Peng Bin, Xiaolan Chen, Andrea Fracasso, Chiara Tomasi. 2018. Resource allocation and productivity across provinces in China. *International Review of Economics & Finance* **57**, 103-113. [Crossref]

330. SYED HASAN. 2018. GREAT ENGINES TURN ON SMALL PIVOTS: A PRODUCTIVITY ANALYSIS OF SMALL-SCALE MANUFACTURING IN PUNJAB, PAKISTAN. *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship* **23**:03, 1850014. [Crossref]

331. Xiqian Cai, Jie Gong, Yi Lu, Songfa Zhong. 2018. Recover Overnight? Work Interruption and Worker Productivity. *Management Science* **64**:8, 3489-3500. [Crossref]

332. Jason R. Blevins, Ahmed Khwaja, Nathan Yang. 2018. Firm Expansion, Size Spillovers, and Market Dominance in Retail Chain Dynamics. *Management Science* **64**:9, 4070-4093. [Crossref]

333. Wonil Lee, Giovanni C. Migliaccio. 2018. Temporal Effect of Construction Workforce Physical Strain on Diminishing Marginal Productivity at the Task Level. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management* **144**:9, 04018083. [Crossref]

334. Caio Piza. 2018. Out of the Shadows? Revisiting the impact of the Brazilian SIMPLES program on firms' formalization rates. *Journal of Development Economics* **134**, 125-132. [Crossref]

335. Bettina Peters, Rebecca Riley, Iulia Siedschlag, Priit Vahter, John McQuinn. 2018. Internationalisation, innovation and productivity in services: evidence from Germany, Ireland and the United Kingdom. *Review of World Economics* **154**:3, 585-615. [Crossref]

336. Xiaoyong Dai, Zao Sun, Hang Liu. 2018. Disentangling the effects of endogenous export and innovation on the performance of Chinese manufacturing firms. *China Economic Review* **50**, 42-58. [Crossref]

337. Edvard Orlic, Iraj Hashi, Mehtap Hisarciklilar. 2018. Cross sectoral FDI spillovers and their impact on manufacturing productivity. *International Business Review* **27**:4, 777-796. [Crossref]

338. Filipe Lage de Sousa, Gianmarco I.P. Ottaviano. 2018. Relaxing credit constraints in emerging economies: The impact of public loans on the productivity of Brazilian manufacturers. *International Economics* **154**, 23-47. [Crossref]

339. Jing Cai, Adam Szeidl. 2018. Interfirm Relationships and Business Performance*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **133**:3, 1229-1282. [Crossref]

340. Ming He, Yang Chen, Ron Schramm. 2018. Technological spillovers in space and firm productivity: Evidence from China's electric apparatus industry. *Urban Studies* **55**:11, 2522-2541. [Crossref]

341. Christos Makridis, Benjamin Dean. 2018. Measuring the economic effects of data breaches on firm outcomes: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Economic and Social Measurement* **43**:1-2, 59-83. [Crossref]

342. Katarina Bačić, Ivana Rašić Bakarić, Sunčana Slijepčević. 2018. Sources of productivity differentials in manufacturing in post-transition urban South-East Europe. *Post-Communist Economies* **30**:4, 526-548. [Crossref]

343. Bing Zuo, Lingdi Li. 2018. Resource Reallocation and Heterogeneous Productivity Growth in the Tourism Industry. *Journal of China Tourism Research* **14**:3, 370-391. [Crossref]

344. Adam Sacarny. 2018. Adoption and learning across hospitals: The case of a revenue-generating practice. *Journal of Health Economics* **60**, 142-164. [Crossref]

345. T. Kirk White, Jerome P. Reiter, Amil Petrin. 2018. Imputation in U.S. Manufacturing Data and Its Implications for Productivity Dispersion. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* **100**:3, 502-509. [Crossref]

346. Inga Bethmann, Martin Jacob, Maximilian A. Müller. 2018. Tax Loss Carrybacks: Investment Stimulus versus Misallocation. *The Accounting Review* **93**:4, 101-125. [Crossref]

347. Mark A. Dutz. Introduction: Brazil's Productivity Imperative 1-13. [Crossref]

348. Jared Rubin, Anya Samek, Roman M. Sheremeta. 2018. Loss aversion and the quantity–quality tradeoff. *Experimental Economics* **21**:2, 292-315. [Crossref]

349. Mario Coccia. 2018. Optimization in R&D intensity and tax on corporate profits for supporting labor productivity of nations. *The Journal of Technology Transfer* **43**:3, 792-814. [Crossref]

350. Jin Lei, Jiaping Qiu, Chi Wan. 2018. Asset tangibility, cash holdings, and financial development. *Journal of Corporate Finance* **50**, 223-242. [Crossref]

351. Klaus Prettner, Holger Strulik. 2018. Trade and productivity: The family connection redux. *Journal of Macroeconomics* **56**, 276-291. [Crossref]

352. Ulrich Doraszelski, Jordi Jaumandreu. 2018. Measuring the Bias of Technological Change. *Journal of Political Economy* **126**:3, 1027-1084. [Crossref]

353. Chad Turner, Robert Tamura, Curtis J. Simon, Sean Mulholland. 2018. Dynastic Human Capital and Black-White Earnings Differentials in the United States, 1940–2000. *Journal of Human Capital* **12**:2, 385-430. [Crossref]

354. Natália P. MONTEIRO, Odd Rune STRAUME. 2018. ARE COOPERATIVES MORE PRODUCTIVE THAN INVESTOR-OWNED FIRMS? CROSS-INDUSTRY EVIDENCE FROM PORTUGAL. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics* **89**:2, 377-414. [Crossref]

355. James Bailey, Douglas Webber. 2018. Health Insurance Benefit Mandates and Firm Size Distribution. *Journal of Risk and Insurance* **85**:2, 577-595. [Crossref]

356. Aloysius Brata, Henri de Groot, Wouter Zant. 2018. Shaking up the Firm Survival: Evidence from Yogyakarta (Indonesia). *Economies* **6**:2, 26. [Crossref]

357. Smriti Sharma, Finn Tarp. 2018. Does managerial personality matter? Evidence from firms in Vietnam. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **150**, 432-445. [Crossref]

358. Javad taherpoor. 2018. The Impact of Economic Resilience and Vulnerability on Labor Productivity. *Journal of Research in Economic Modeling* **8**:31, 197-227. [Crossref]

359. Hannu Piekkola. 2018. Broad-based intangibles as generators of growth in Europe. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology* **27**:4, 377-400. [Crossref]

360. Robert C. Feenstra. 2018. Alternative Sources of the Gains from International Trade: Variety, Creative Destruction, and Markups. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **32**:2, 25-46. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

361. Giuseppe Berlingieri, Sara Calligaris, Chiara Criscuolo. 2018. The Productivity-Wage Premium: Does Size Still Matter in a Service Economy?. *AEA Papers and Proceedings* **108**, 328-333. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

362. Eva Lyubich, Joseph S. Shapiro, Reed Walker. 2018. Regulating Mismeasured Pollution: Implications of Firm Heterogeneity for Environmental Policy. *AEA Papers and Proceedings* **108**, 136-142. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

363. Khaled Elmawazini, Elias G. Saleeby, Ahmed Ibn el Farouk, Bashayer AL-Naser. 2018. Tripartite decomposition of labor productivity growth, FDI and human development: evidence from transition economies. *Economic Change and Restructuring* **51**:2, 153-171. [Crossref]

364. Joel Stiebale, Dev Vencappa. 2018. Acquisitions, markups, efficiency, and product quality: Evidence from India. *Journal of International Economics* **112**, 70-87. [Crossref]

365. Oriana Bandiera, Renata Lemos, Andrea Prat, Raffaella Sadun. 2018. Managing the Family Firm: Evidence from CEOs at Work. *The Review of Financial Studies* **31**:5, 1605-1653. [Crossref]

366. Marijke J. D. Bos, Gonzague Vannoorenberghe. 2018. Total factor productivity spillovers from trade reforms in India. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique* **51**:2, 549-606. [Crossref]

367. Ulf Lewrick, Lukas Mohler, Rolf Weder. 2018. Productivity growth from an international trade perspective. *Review of International Economics* **26**:2, 339-356. [Crossref]

368. Xinshen Diao, Josaphat Kweka, Margaret McMillan. 2018. Small firms, structural change and labor productivity growth in Africa: Evidence from Tanzania. *World Development* **105**, 400-415. [Crossref]

369. Abdoulaye I. Djido, Bekele A. Shiferaw. 2018. Patterns of labor productivity and income diversification – Empirical evidence from Uganda and Nigeria. *World Development* **105**, 416-427. [Crossref]

370. Roberta Pellegrino, Nicola Costantino. 2018. An empirical investigation of the learning effect in concrete operations. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management* **25**:3, 342-357. [Crossref]

371. Jason Hecht. 2018. Research and development and labour productivity: do high-tech firms exhibit labour- or capital-saving technical change?. *Applied Economics* **50**:16, 1790-1811. [Crossref]

372. Guilherme Fowler A. Monteiro, Nicolai Foss. 2018. Resources and market definition: Rethinking the "hypothetical monopolist" from a resource-based perspective. *Managerial and Decision Economics* **39**:3, 346-353. [Crossref]

373. Manhal Ali, Reza Salehnejad, Mohaimen Mansur. 2018. Hospital heterogeneity: what drives the quality of health care. *The European Journal of Health Economics* **19**:3, 385-408. [Crossref]

374. Miriam Bruhn, Dean Karlan, Antoinette Schoar. 2018. The Impact of Consulting Services on Small and Medium Enterprises: Evidence from a Randomized Trial in Mexico. *Journal of Political Economy* **126**:2, 635-687. [Crossref]

375. Ioannis Bournakis, Dimitris Christopoulos, Sushanta Mallick. 2018. KNOWLEDGE SPILLOVERS AND OUTPUT PER WORKER: AN INDUSTRY-LEVEL ANALYSIS FOR OECD COUNTRIES. *Economic Inquiry* **56**:2, 1028-1046. [Crossref]

376. Norman Gemmell, Richard Kneller, Danny McGowan, Ismael Sanz, José F. Sanz-Sanz. 2018. Corporate Taxation and Productivity Catch-Up: Evidence from European Firms. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* **120**:2, 372-399. [Crossref]

377. Massimiliano Agovino, Antonio Garofalo, Katia Marchesano. 2018. Do institutions affect the matching process of disabled people? The Italian case. *Quality & Quantity* **52**:2, 921-943. [Crossref]

378. Enrique Moral-Benito. 2018. Growing by learning: firm-level evidence on the size-productivity nexus. *SERIEs* **9**:1, 65-90. [Crossref]

379. Marcio Cruz, Maurizio Bussolo, Leonardo Iacovone. 2018. Organizing knowledge to compete. *Journal of International Economics* **111**, 1-20. [Crossref]

380. Alessandra Bonfiglioli, Rosario Crinò, Gino Gancia. 2018. Betting On Exports: Trade and Endogenous Heterogeneity. *The Economic Journal* **128**:609, 612-651. [Crossref]

381. Wenya Cheng, John Morrow. 2018. Firm Productivity Differences From Factor Markets. *The Journal of Industrial Economics* **66**:1, 126-171. [Crossref]

382. Roberto Ganau, Andrés Rodríguez-Pose. 2018. Industrial clusters, organized crime, and productivity growth in Italian SMEs. *Journal of Regional Science* **58**:2, 363-385. [Crossref]

383. Ricard Gil, Christian A. Ruzzier. 2018. The Impact of Competition on "Make-or-Buy" Decisions: Evidence from the Spanish Local TV Industry. *Management Science* **64**:3, 1121-1135. [Crossref]

384. Fredrik Heyman, Pehr-Johan Norbäck, Lars Persson. 2018. Who creates jobs and who creates productivity? Small versus large versus young versus old. *Economics Letters* **164**, 50-57. [Crossref]

385. Peng Zhang, Olivier Deschenes, Kyle Meng, Junjie Zhang. 2018. Temperature effects on productivity and factor reallocation: Evidence from a half million chinese manufacturing plants. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **88**, 1-17. [Crossref]

386. Kadri Männasoo, Peeter Maripuu, Aaro Hazak. 2018. Investments, Credit, and Corporate Financial Distress: Evidence from Central and Eastern Europe. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade* **54**:3, 677-689. [Crossref]

387. Tumennasan Bayar, Marcia Millon Cornett, Otgontsetseg Erhemjamts, Ty Leverty, Hassan Tehranian. 2018. An examination of the relation between strategic interaction among industry firms and firm performance. *Journal of Banking & Finance* **87**, 248-263. [Crossref]

388. Tiago Fonseca, Francisco Lima, Sonia C. Pereira. 2018. Understanding productivity dynamics: A task taxonomy approach. *Research Policy* **47**:1, 289-304. [Crossref]

389. Juan Camilo Serpa, Harish Krishnan. 2018. The Impact of Supply Chains on Firm-Level Productivity. *Management Science* **64**:2, 511-532. [Crossref]

390. Alex Bryson, Francis Green. 2018. Do Private Schools Manage Better?. *National Institute Economic Review* **243**, R17-R26. [Crossref]

391. . Building Solid Foundations: How to Promote Potential Growth 157-216. [Crossref]

392. Harry Bloch. 2018. Innovation and the Evolution of Industry Structure. *International Journal of the Economics of Business* **25**:1, 73-83. [Crossref]

393. John Roberts. 2018. Needed: More Economic Analyses of Management. *International Journal of the Economics of Business* **25**:1, 3-10. [Crossref]

394. Stefan Bender, Nicholas Bloom, David Card, John Van Reenen, Stefanie Wolter. 2018. Management Practices, Workforce Selection, and Productivity. *Journal of Labor Economics* **36**:S1, S371-S409. [Crossref]

395. David Card, Ana Rute Cardoso, Joerg Heining, Patrick Kline. 2018. Firms and Labor Market Inequality: Evidence and Some Theory. *Journal of Labor Economics* **36**:S1, S13-S70. [Crossref]

396. John Haltiwanger, Henry Hyatt, Erika McEntarfer. 2018. Who Moves Up the Job Ladder?. *Journal of Labor Economics* **36**:S1, S301-S336. [Crossref]

397. Hang J. Kim, Jerome P. Reiter, Alan F. Karr. 2018. Simultaneous edit-imputation and disclosure limitation for business establishment data. *Journal of Applied Statistics* **45**:1, 63-82. [Crossref]

398. Arturo Realyvásquez-Vargas, Aide Aracely Maldonado-Macías, Jorge Luis García-Alcaraz. Evaluation of Manufacturing Systems 11-19. [Crossref]

399. Murat Akkaya, Deniz Güvercin. The Determinants of Total Factor Productivity in European Union 171-189. [Crossref]

400. Florian Flachenecker, Jun Rentschler, Willem de Kleuver. Monitoring Resource Efficiency Developments: Indicators, Data, and Trends 31-50. [Crossref]

401. Alex Bryson. Mutual Gains? The Role for Employee Engagement in the Modern Workplace 43-62. [Crossref]

402. Florian Flachenecker. 2018. The causal impact of material productivity on macroeconomic competitiveness in the European Union. *Environmental Economics and Policy Studies* **20**:1, 17-46. [Crossref]

403. Kelly Monahan. The Changing Nature of Work 1-33. [Crossref]

404. Paul Heidhues, Botond Kőszegi. Behavioral Industrial Organization 517-612. [Crossref]

405. Mian Yang, Fuxia Yang, Chuanwang Sun. 2018. Factor market distortion correction, resource reallocation and potential productivity gains: An empirical study on China's heavy industry sector. *Energy Economics* **69**, 270-279. [Crossref]

406. André Kurmann, Stanislav Rabinovich. 2018. Dynamic inefficiency in decentralized capital markets. *Journal of Economic Theory* **173**, 231-256. [Crossref]

407. Sharon Belenzon, Andrea Patacconi. Organization of Production, the: An International Perspective 1184-1187. [Crossref]

408. Nathan Goldschlag, Alex Tabarrok. 2018. Is regulation to blame for the decline in American entrepreneurship?. *Economic Policy* **33**:93, 5-44. [Crossref]

409. Carl Friedrich Kreuser, Carol Newman. 2018. Total Factor Productivity in South African Manufacturing Firms. *South African Journal of Economics* **86**, 40-78. [Crossref]

410. Eva Lyubich, Joseph S. Shapiro, Reed Walker. 2018. Regulating Mismeasured Pollution: Implications of Firm Heterogeneity for Environmental Policy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

411. Livio Romano. 2018. Explaining Growth Differences Across Firms: The Interplay between Innovation and Management Practices. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

412. Bettina Peters, Rebecca Riley, Iulia Siedschlag, Priit Vahter, John McQuinn. 2018. Internationalisation, Innovation and Productivity in Services: Evidence from Germany, Ireland and the United Kingdom. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

413. Andreas Fuster, Matthew C. Plosser, Philipp Schnabl, James I. Vickery. 2018. The Role of Technology in Mortgage Lending. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

414. Matteo Bugamelli, Francesca Lotti, Monica Amici, Emanuela Ciapanna, Fabrizio Colonna, Francesco D'Amuri, Silvia Giacomelli, Andrea Linarello, Francesco Manaresi, Giuliana Palumbo, Filippo Scoccianti, Enrico Sette. 2018. Productivity Growth in Italy: A Tale of a Slow-Motion Change. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

415. Aloysius Gunadi Brata, Henri L. F. de Groot, Wouter Zant. 2018. Shaking Up the Firm Survival: Evidence from Yogyakarta (Indonesia). *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

416. Vincenzo Denicolo, Michele Polo. 2018. The Innovation Theory of Harm: An Appraisal. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

417. Fabiano Schivardi, Tom Schmitz. 2018. The IT Revolution and Southern Europe's Two Lost Decades. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

418. Steffen Viete, Daniel Erdsiek. 2018. Trust-Based Work Time and the Productivity Effects of Mobile Information Technologies in the Workplace. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

419. Francesco Manaresi, Nicola Pierri. 2018. Credit Supply and Productivity Growth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

420. Enrique Moral-Benito. 2018. The Microeconomic Origins of the Spanish Boom. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

421. Florian Englmaier, Nicolai J. Foss, Thorbjorn Knudsen, Tobias Kretschmer. 2018. Organization Design and Firm Heterogeneity: Towards an Integrated Research Agenda for Strategy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

422. Nicholas Bloom, Kalina B. Manova, John Van Reenen, Stephen Teng Sun, Zhihong Yu. 2018. Managing Trade: Evidence From China and the US. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

423. Joseph S. Shapiro, Reed Walker. 2018. Why is Pollution from U.S. Manufacturing Declining? The Roles of Environmental Regulation, Productivity, and Trade. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

424. Brandon Schaufele. 2018. Elasticities, Tax Rates and Industry Opposition to Unilateral Carbon Pricing: Evidence from Agriculture. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

425. Helena Schweiger, Alexander Stepanov, Paolo Zacchia. 2018. The Long-Run Effects of R&D Place-Based Policies: Evidence from Russian Science Cities. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

426. J. David Brown, John S. Earle, Mee Jung Kim, Kyung Min Lee. 2018. High-Growth Entrepreneurship. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

427. Patrick Schneider. 2018. Decomposing Differences in Productivity Distributions. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

428. EBRD Submitter. 2018. The Long-Run Effects of R&D Place-Based Policies: Evidence from Russian Science Cities. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

429. Claudio Labanca, Dario Pozzoli. 2018. Coordination of Hours Within the Firm. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

430. Jiaren Pang, Xinyi Zhang, Xi Zhou. 2018. From Classroom to Boardroom: The Value of Academic Independent Directors. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

431. Patricia Angle, Chris Forman. 2018. Does IT Level the Playing Field for Small Establishments? Evidence from Manufacturing. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

432. Bryan T. Kelly, Dimitris Papanikolaou, Amit Seru, Matt Taddy. 2018. Measuring Technological Innovation over the Long Run. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

433. Murray Z. Frank, Keer Yang. 2018. Does Finance Flow to High Productivity Firms?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

434. Berislav Zmuk, Ksenija Dumicic, Irena Palic. 2018. Forecasting Labour Productivity in the European Union Member States: Is Labour Productivity Changing as Expected?. *Interdisciplinary Description of Complex Systems* **16**:3, 504-523. [Crossref]

435. Aytekin Ertan, Stefan M. Lewellen, Jacob Kandathil Thomas. 2018. The Long-Run Average Cost Puzzle. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

436. Laurens Cherchye, Bram De Rock, Annalisa Ferrando, Klaas Mulier, Marijn Verschelde. 2018. Identifying Financial Constraints from Production Data. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

437. Vittorio Bassi, Aisha Nansamba. 2018. Screening and Signaling Non-Cognitive Skills: Experimental Evidence from Uganda. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

438. Jungsik Hyun, Ryan Kim. 2018. Business Cycles with Input Complementarity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

439. Bernard Herskovic, Thilo Kind, Howard Kung. 2018. Size Premium Waves. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

440. Marcel Olbert, Peter Severin. 2018. Private Equity and Taxes. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

441. Sebastian Doerr. 2018. Collateral, Reallocation, and Aggregate Productivity: Evidence from the U.S. Housing Boom. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

442. Holger Görg, Philipp Henze, Viroj Jienwatcharamongkhol, Daniel Kopasker, Hassan Molana, Catia Montagna, Fredrik Sjöholm. 2017. Firm size distribution and employment fluctuations: Theory and evidence. *Research in Economics* **71**:4, 690-703. [Crossref]

443. Yihui Pan, Stephan Siegel, Tracy Yue Wang. 2017. Corporate Risk Culture. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* **52**:6, 2327-2367. [Crossref]

444. John M. de Figueiredo, Brian S. Silverman. 2017. On the Genesis of Interfirm Relational Contracts. *Strategy Science* **2**:4, 234-245. [Crossref]

445. Wanderson Fernandes Modesto de Oliveira, Walid Abbas El-Aouar, Rodrigo José Guerra Leone. 2017. CASO RÁPIDO & BARATO: VAMOS ENTREGAR LOGO A ENCOMENDA?. *REAd. Revista Eletrônica de Administração (Porto Alegre)* **23**:spe, 394-411. [Crossref]

446. Sachiko Kazekami. 2017. Do service sectors need core sectors to improve their productivity?. *Eurasian Economic Review* **7**:3, 389-410. [Crossref]

447. Almukhtar S. Al-Abri. 2017. Improved labour productivity is imperative for Oman's economic diversification. *Local Economy: The Journal of the Local Economy Policy Unit* **32**:8, 867-879. [Crossref]

448. Rosa Capolupo, Vito Amendolagine, Giovanni Ferri. 2017. Offshore-sourcing strategies and the puzzle of productivity: a micro-level analysis. *Journal of Global Operations and Strategic Sourcing* **10**:3, 282-308. [Crossref]

449. Kostas Tsekouras, Nikos Chatzistamoulou, Kostas Kounetas. 2017. Productive performance, technology heterogeneity and hierarchies: Who to compare with whom. *International Journal of Production Economics* **193**, 465-478. [Crossref]

450. Yen-Po Chen, Ting-Wei Lai, Wen-Chieh Lee, Hao-Chung Li. 2017. Trade barrier and misallocations: The case of the photovoltaic manufacturing industry in China. *International Review of Economics & Finance* **52**, 352-367. [Crossref]

451. Isabel Busom, Jorge Andrés Vélez-Ospina. 2017. Innovation, Public Support, and Productivity in Colombia. A Cross-industry Comparison. *World Development* **99**, 75-94. [Crossref]

452. Charles Hsu, Kirill E. Novoselov, Rencheng Wang. 2017. Does Accounting Conservatism Mitigate the Shortcomings of CEO Overconfidence?. *The Accounting Review* **92**:6, 77-101. [Crossref]

453. Martin ANDERSSON, Trudy-Ann STONE. 2017. GLOBAL SOURCING AND TECHNICAL EFFICIENCY – A FIRM-LEVEL STUDY ON THE ICT INDUSTRY IN SWEDEN. *Journal of Business Economics and Management* **18**:5, 877-896. [Crossref]

454. Mary Hallward-Driemeier, Gaurav Nayyar. Why Manufacturing Has Been Important for Development 7-37. [Crossref]

455. Segundo Camino Mogro. 2017. Estimación de una función de producción y análisis de la productividad: el sector de innovación global en mercados locales. *Estudios Gerenciales* **33**:145, 400-411. [Crossref]

456. José Morelos Gómez, Miguel Ángel Nuñez Bottini. 2017. Productividad de las empresas de la zona extractiva minera-energética y su incidencia en el desempeño financiero en Colombia. *Estudios Gerenciales* **33**:145, 330-340. [Crossref]

457. Linjie Li, Xiaming Liu, Dong Yuan, Miaojie Yu. 2017. Does outward FDI generate higher productivity for emerging economy MNEs? – Micro-level evidence from Chinese manufacturing firms. *International Business Review* **26**:5, 839-854. [Crossref]

458. Theodosios Dimopoulos, Stefano Sacchetto. 2017. Merger activity in industry equilibrium. *Journal of Financial Economics* **126**:1, 200-226. [Crossref]

459. Dolores Añón Higón, Jaime Gómez, Pilar Vargas. 2017. Complementarities in innovation strategy: do intangibles play a role in enhancing firm performance?. *Industrial and Corporate Change* **26**:5, 865-886. [Crossref]

460. Daniel Berkowitz, Hong Ma, Shuichiro Nishioka. 2017. Recasting the Iron Rice Bowl: The Reform of China's State-Owned Enterprises. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* **99**:4, 735-747. [Crossref]

461. Maya Cara, Julian Birkinshaw, Suzanne Heywood. Structural Versus Experienced Complexity: A New Perspective on the Relationship between Organizational Complexity and Innovation 115-150. [Crossref]

462. David C. Maré, Dean R. Hyslop, Richard Fabling. 2017. Firm productivity growth and skill. *New Zealand Economic Papers* **51**:3, 302-326. [Crossref]

463. Philipp M. Richter, Alexander Schiersch. 2017. CO 2 emission intensity and exporting: Evidence from firm-level data. *European Economic Review* **98**, 373-391. [Crossref]

464. Paola Cardamone. 2017. A Spatial Analysis of the R&D-Productivity Nexus at Firm Level. *Growth and Change* **48**:3, 313-335. [Crossref]

465. V. Vandenberghe. 2017. The productivity challenge. What to expect from better-quality labour and capital inputs?. *Applied Economics* **49**:40, 4013-4025. [Crossref]

466. Guido Friebel, Matthias Heinz, Miriam Krueger, Nikolay Zubanov. 2017. Team Incentives and Performance: Evidence from a Retail Chain. *American Economic Review* **107**:8, 2168-2203. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

467. Diego Restuccia, Richard Rogerson. 2017. The Causes and Costs of Misallocation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **31**:3, 151-174. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

468. Huong Quynh Nguyen. 2017. Business reforms and total factor productivity in Vietnamese manufacturing. *Journal of Asian Economics* **51**, 33-42. [Crossref]

469. David Atkin, Azam Chaudhry, Shamyla Chaudry, Amit K. Khandelwal, Eric Verhoogen. 2017. Organizational Barriers to Technology Adoption: Evidence from Soccer-Ball Producers in Pakistan*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **132**:3, 1101-1164. [Crossref]

470. Theresa Chaudhry, Muhammad Haseeb, Maryiam Haroon. 2017. Economic geography and misallocation in Pakistan's manufacturing hub. *The Annals of Regional Science* **59**:1, 189-208. [Crossref]

471. Stefano Manzocchi, Beniamino Quintieri, Gianluca Santoni. 2017. Local manufacturing productivity markers: an empirical study of the Italian counties. *The Annals of Regional Science* **59**:1, 255-279. [Crossref]

472. Nathan Wilmers. 2017. Does Consumer Demand Reproduce Inequality? High-Income Consumers, Vertical Differentiation, and the Wage Structure. *American Journal of Sociology* **123**:1, 178-231. [Crossref]

473. Catherine Buffington, Lucia Foster, Ron Jarmin, Scott Ohlmacher. 2017. The management and organizational practices survey (MOPS): An overview1. *Journal of Economic and Social Measurement* **42**:1, 1-26. [Crossref]

474. Eva Hagsten, Anna Sabadash. 2017. A neglected input to production: the role of ICT-schooled employees in firm performance. *International Journal of Manpower* **38**:3, 373-391. [Crossref]

475. Davide Castellani, Sandro Montresor, Torben Schubert, Antonio Vezzani. 2017. Multinationality, R&D and productivity: Evidence from the top R&D investors worldwide. *International Business Review* **26**:3, 405-416. [Crossref]

476. Hao-Chung Li, Wen-Chieh Lee, Bo-Ting Ko. 2017. What determines misallocation in innovation? A study of regional innovation in China. *Journal of Macroeconomics* **52**, 221-237. [Crossref]

477. Xiaodan Yu, Giovanni Dosi, Marco Grazzi, Jiasu Lei. 2017. Inside the virtuous circle between productivity, profitability, investment and corporate growth: An anatomy of Chinese industrialization. *Research Policy* **46**:5, 1020-1038. [Crossref]

478. Sumit Agarwal, Gene Amromin, Itzhak Ben-David, Souphala Chomsisengphet, Tomasz Piskorski, Amit Seru. 2017. Policy Intervention in Debt Renegotiation: Evidence from the Home Affordable Modification Program. *Journal of Political Economy* **125**:3, 654-712. [Crossref]

479. Romina Giuliano, Stephan Kampelmann, Benoît Mahy, François Rycx. 2017. Short Notice, Big Difference? The Effect of Temporary Employment on Firm Competitiveness across Sectors. *British Journal of Industrial Relations* **55**:2, 421-449. [Crossref]

480. Florin Maican, Matilda Orth. 2017. Productivity Dynamics and the Role of 'Big-Box' Entrants in Retailing. *The Journal of Industrial Economics* **65**:2, 397-438. [Crossref]

481. Thorbjørn Knudsen, Daniel A. Levinthal, Sidney G. Winter. 2017. Systematic Differences and Random Rates: Reconciling Gibrat's Law with Firm Differences. *Strategy Science* **2**:2, 111-120. [Crossref]

482. Lee,Jai-Min, Heeho Kim, ###. 2017. #### #### ### ####### ### ##. *Productivity Review* **31**:2, 29-61. [Crossref]

483. Nkechi S. Owoo, Wim Naudé. 2017. Spatial proximity and firm performance: evidence from non-farm rural enterprises in Ethiopia and Nigeria. *Regional Studies* **51**:5, 688-700. [Crossref]

484. Ingo Geishecker, Philipp J. H. Schröder, Allan Sørensen. 2017. Explaining the size differences of exporter premia: theory and evidence. *Review of World Economics* **153**:2, 327-351. [Crossref]

485. Edwin Goñi, William F. Maloney. 2017. Why don't poor countries do R&D? Varying rates of factor returns across the development process. *European Economic Review* **94**, 126-147. [Crossref]

486. Meng-Chi Tang. 2017. Total factor productivity or labor productivity? Firm heterogeneity and location choice of multinationals. *International Review of Economics & Finance* **49**, 499-514. [Crossref]

487. Alessandro Bonatti, Johannes Hörner. 2017. Learning to disagree in a game of experimentation. *Journal of Economic Theory* **169**, 234-269. [Crossref]

488. Weilei Shi, Sunny Li Sun, Daying Yan, Zhu Zhu. 2017. Institutional fragility and outward foreign direct investment from China. *Journal of International Business Studies* **48**:4, 452-476. [Crossref]

489. Jeroen Klijs, Jack Peerlings, Wim Heijman. 2017. Introducing labour productivity changes into models used for economic impact analysis in tourism. *Tourism Economics* **23**:3, 561-576. [Crossref]

490. David Atkin, Amit K. Khandelwal, Adam Osman. 2017. Exporting and Firm Performance: Evidence from a Randomized Experiment*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **132**:2, 551-615. [Crossref]

491. Leonid Kogan, Dimitris Papanikolaou, Amit Seru, Noah Stoffman. 2017. Technological Innovation, Resource Allocation, and Growth*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **132**:2, 665-712. [Crossref]

492. Simon Kirby, Oriol Carreras, Rebecca Piggott, James Warren. 2017. Prospects for the UK Economy. *National Institute Economic Review* **240**, F14-F49. [Crossref]

493. Luqman Oyekunle Oyewobi, Abimbola Olukemi Windapo, James Olabode Bamidele Rotimi. 2017. Determinants of construction organisational performance. *Journal of Financial Management of Property and Construction* **22**:1, 37-61. [Crossref]

494. Alicia Gómez–Tello, Rosella Nicolini. 2017. Immigration and productivity: a Spanish tale. *Journal of Productivity Analysis* **47**:2, 167-183. [Crossref]

495. Robert Inklaar, Addisu A. Lashitew, Marcel P. Timmer. 2017. THE ROLE OF RESOURCE MISALLOCATION IN CROSS-COUNTRY DIFFERENCES IN MANUFACTURING PRODUCTIVITY. *Macroeconomic Dynamics* **21**:3, 733-756. [Crossref]

496. Klaus Friesenbichler, Eva Selenko. 2017. Firm performance in challenging business climates: does managerial work engagement make a difference?. *Asian Business & Management* **16**:1-2, 25-49. [Crossref]

497. Simon Commander. 2017. Accounting for failures to reform in the Arab world. *Economics of Transition* **25**:2, 351-373. [Crossref]

498. Reza Mofidi, Carol Marrow. 2017. The effects of the NHS reforms on quality of care. *British Journal of Healthcare Management* **23**:3, 120-130. [Crossref]

499. Stefano Bianchini, Giulio Bottazzi, Federico Tamagni. 2017. What does (not) characterize persistent corporate high-growth?. *Small Business Economics* **48**:3, 633-656. [Crossref]

500. Yunhao Dai, Dongmin Kong, Jin Xu. 2017. Does fairness breed efficiency? Pay gap and firm productivity in China. *International Review of Economics & Finance* **48**, 406-422. [Crossref]

501. Huju Liu, Jianmin Tang. 2017. Age-productivity profiles of entrants and exits: evidence from Canadian manufacturing. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* **40**, 26-36. [Crossref]

502. Bernabe Lopez-Martin. 2017. From Firm Productivity Dynamics to Aggregate Efficiency. *The World Bank Economic Review* **30**:Supplement_1, S57-S66. [Crossref]

503. Leonardo Iacovone, Mariana Pereira-López, Marc Schiffbauer. 2017. ICT Use, Competitive Pressures, and Firm Performance in Mexico. *The World Bank Economic Review* **30**:Supplement_1, S109-S118. [Crossref]

504. Anders Broström, Staffan Karlsson. 2017. Mapping research on R&D, innovation and productivity: a study of an academic endeavour. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology* **26**:1-2, 6-20. [Crossref]

505. Gale A. Boyd. 2017. Comparing the statistical distributions of energy efficiency in manufacturing: meta-analysis of 24 Case studies to develop industry-specific energy performance indicators (EPI). *Energy Efficiency* **10**:1, 217-238. [Crossref]

506. William F. Maloney, Mauricio Sarrias. 2017. Convergence to the managerial frontier. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **134**, 284-306. [Crossref]

507. R. Giuliano, B. Mahy, F. Rycx, G. Vermeylen. 2017. Does corporate social responsibility make over-educated workers more productive?. *Applied Economics* **49**:6, 587-605. [Crossref]

508. Nádia Campos Pereira Bruhn, Cristina Lelis Leal Calegário, Francisval de Melo Carvalho, Renato Silvério Campos, Antônio Carlos dos Santos. 2017. Mergers and acquisitions in Brazilian industry: a study of spillover effects. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management* **66**:1, 51-77. [Crossref]

509. Yousef Daoud, Khalid Sekkat. 2017. Cross-country comparative analysis of SMEs' TFP in MENA region: A firm-level assessment. *Middle East Development Journal* **9**:1, 55-83. [Crossref]

510. Joshua Gans, Michael D. Ryall. 2017. Value capture theory: A strategic management review. *Strategic Management Journal* **38**:1, 17-41. [Crossref]

511. Harutaka Takahashi. Nonbalanced Growth in a Neoclassical Two-Sector Optimal Growth Model 339-359. [Crossref]

512. P. Alberca, L. Parte. Measuring the Regional Productivity in Spanish Hotel Industry 35-54. [Crossref]

513. Cosimo Beverelli, Matteo Fiorini, Bernard Hoekman. 2017. Services trade policy and manufacturing productivity: The role of institutions. *Journal of International Economics* **104**, 166-182. [Crossref]

514. Carol Newman, John Rand, Finn Tarp, Nguyen Thi Tue Anh. 2017. Exporting and Productivity: Learning from Vietnam. *Journal of African Economies* **26**:1, 67-92. [Crossref]

515. Eyerusalem Siba, Mulu Gebreeyesus. 2017. Learning to export and learning from exporting: The case of Ethiopian manufacturing. *Journal of African Economies* **26**:1, 1-23. [Crossref]

516. Eric A. Posner, E. Glen Weyl. 2017. Property Is Only Another Name for Monopoly. *Journal of Legal Analysis* **9**:1, 51-123. [Crossref]

517. Martin Nordin, Sören Höjgård. 2017. An evaluation of extension services in Sweden. *Agricultural Economics* **48**:1, 51-60. [Crossref]

518. Hans K. Hvide, Yanren Zhang. 2017. Too Big to Succeed? Overstaffing in Firms. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

519. R. Andrew Butters. 2017. Demand Volatility, Adjustment Costs, and Productivity: An Examination of Capacity Utilization in Hotels and Airlines. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

520. Mary Jialin Li. 2017. Industrial Investments in Energy Efficiency: A Good Idea?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

521. Yoonseok Lee, Nick Zubanov. 2017. Olley and Pakes-Style Production Function Estimators with Firm Fixed Effects. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

522. Karthik Balakrishnan. 2017. Localized Competition, Cash Holdings and Innovation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

523. Emanuele Colonnelli, Mounu Prem. 2017. Corruption and Firms. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

524. Klaus Friesenbichler, Agnes Kuegler. 2017. Statistical Benchmarking As a Development Tool: An Introduction for Practitioners. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

525. Eric J. Bartelsman, Zoltan Wolf. 2017. Measuring Productivity Dispersion. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

526. Mark Egan, Stefan Lewellen. 2017. The Cross Section of Bank Value. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
527. Massimo Filippini, Thomas Geissmann, Valerie Karplus. 2017. A Green Bargain? The Impact of an Energy Saving Program on Productivity Growth in China's Iron and Steel Industry. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
528. Michael Mandel. 2017. An Analysis of Job and Wage Growth in the Telecom/Tech Sector. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
529. Shihe Fu, Peng Zhang. 2017. Air Quality and Manufacturing Firm Productivity: Comprehensive Evidence from China. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
530. Mario Coccia. 2017. What Maximizes Labor Productivity? Optimal Levels of R&D Intensity and Tax on Corporate Profits for Nations. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
531. Marco Grazzi, Cecilia Vergari. 2017. Building a Firm Level Dataset for the Analysis of Industrial Dynamics and Demography. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
532. Joseph S. Shapiro, Reed Walker. 2017. Why is Pollution from U.S. Manufacturing Declining? The Roles of Environmental Regulation, Productivity, and Trade. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
533. Wouter Dessein, Andrea Prat. 2017. Organizational Capital, Corporate Leadership, and Firm Dynamics. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
534. Sourav Bhattacharya, Pavel Chakraborty, Chirantan Chatterjee. 2017. Organize to Innovate: Intellectual Property Regimes, Technology Adoption and Firm Structure. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
535. Robert S. Gibbons, Marco LiCalzi, Massimo Warglien. 2017. What Situation Is This? Coarse Cognition and Behavior Over a Space of Games. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
536. Christos Andreas Makridis, Benjamin Dean. 2017. The Economic Effects of Cyber Security Failures on Firms: Evidence from Publicly Reported Data Breaches. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
537. Wolfgang Kerber. 2017. Competition, Innovation, and Competition Law: Dissecting the Interplay. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
538. Maria Bernedo, Carlianne Patrick. 2017. Agglomeration and Informality: Evidence from Peruvian Firms. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
539. Alessandro Arrighetti, Eleonora Bartoloni, Fabio Landini. 2017. The Sources of Heterogeneity in Firm Performance: Lessons from Italy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
540. Joseph Kuehn. 2017. The Effect of Competition on the Demand for Skilled Labor: Matching with Externalities in the NBA. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
541. Tolga Demir. 2017. Utilizing Management Technology Advantages in Cross-Border Acquisitions. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
542. Daron Acemoglu, Ufuk Akcigit, Harun Alp, Nicholas Bloom, William Kerr. 2017. Innovation, Reallocation, and Growth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
543. John M. de Figueiredo, Brian S. Silverman. 2017. On the Genesis of Interfirm Relational Contracts. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
544. Pierre-Philippe Combes, Gilles Duranton, Laurent Gobillon. 2017. The Production Function for Housing: Evidence from France. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

545. Thibault Libert. 2017. Misallocation Before, During and After the Great Recession. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

546. Philippe Aghion, Cagatay Bircan. 2017. The Middle-Income Trap from a Schumpeterian Perspective. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

547. Yordan Georgiev, Piroska Nagy-Mohacsi, Alexander Plekhanov. 2017. Structural Reform and Productivity Growth in Emerging Europe and Central Asia. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

548. Sebastian Dörr, Mehdi Raissi, Anke Weber. 2017. Credit-Supply Shocks and Firm Productivity in Italy. *IMF Working Papers* **17**:67, 1. [Crossref]

549. Romain Duval, Gee Hee Hong, Yannick Timmer. 2017. Financial Frictions and the Great Productivity Slowdown. *IMF Working Papers* **17**:129, 1. [Crossref]

550. Rocco Macchiavello, Ameet Morjaria. 2017. Competition and Relational Contracts: Evidence from Rwanda's Coffee Mills. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

551. Dermot Leahy, Catia Montagna. 2017. Economising, Strategising and the Vertical Boundaries of the firm. *The B.E. Journal of Theoretical Economics* **17**:1. . [Crossref]

552. Jason Chan, Jin-Hyuk Kim, Liad Wagman. 2017. On the Tradeoffs between Privacy and Security: Evidence from Wiretap Orders. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

553. Matthias Breuer. 2017. How Does Financial-Reporting Regulation Affect Market-Wide Resource Allocation?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

554. Giovanni Dosi, Marcelo C. Pereira, Maria Enrica Virgillito. 2016. The footprint of evolutionary processes of learning and selection upon the statistical properties of industrial dynamics. *Industrial and Corporate Change* **355**, dtw044. [Crossref]

555. Masayuki Morikawa. 2016. Factoryless goods producers in Japan. *Japan and the World Economy* **40**, 9-15. [Crossref]

556. Ren Lu, Min Ruan, Torger Reve. 2016. Cluster and co-located cluster effects: An empirical study of six Chinese city regions. *Research Policy* **45**:10, 1984-1995. [Crossref]

557. Giovanni Dosi, Marco Grazzi, Luigi Marengo, Simona Settepanella. 2016. Production Theory: Accounting for Firm Heterogeneity and Technical Change. *The Journal of Industrial Economics* **64**:4, 875-907. [Crossref]

558. Juan J. Dolado, Salvador Ortigueira, Rodolfo Stucchi. 2016. Does dual employment protection affect TFP? Evidence from Spanish manufacturing firms. *SERIEs* **7**:4, 421-459. [Crossref]

559. Anders C. Johansson, Xunan Feng. 2016. The state advances, the private sector retreats? Firm effects of China's great stimulus programme. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* **40**:6, 1635-1668. [Crossref]

560. Daniel Ferreira, Thomas Kittsteiner. 2016. When Does Competition Foster Commitment?. *Management Science* **62**:11, 3199-3212. [Crossref]

561. Roberto Ganau. 2016. Productivity, Credit Constraints and the Role of Short-Run Localization Economies: Micro-Evidence from Italy. *Regional Studies* **50**:11, 1834-1848. [Crossref]

562. Marcel Fafchamps, Simon Quinn. 2016. Networks and Manufacturing Firms in Africa: Results from a Randomized Field Experiment. *The World Bank Economic Review* **3**, lhw057. [Crossref]

563. Nicolas Roys. 2016. Persistence of shocks and the reallocation of labor. *Review of Economic Dynamics* **22**, 109-130. [Crossref]

564. Cliff Waldman. 2016. The Evolving Contours of Productivity Performance and Automation Investment in U.S. Manufacturing. *Business Economics* **51**:4, 213-238. [Crossref]

565. Sai Ding, Wei Jiang, Puyang Sun. 2016. Import competition, dynamic resource allocation and productivity dispersion: micro-level evidence from China. *Oxford Economic Papers* **68**:4, 994-1015. [Crossref]

566. C. A. K. Lovell. 2016. Recent Developments in Productivity Analysis. *Pacific Economic Review* **21**:4, 417-444. [Crossref]

567. Paul L. E. Grieco, Ryan C. McDevitt. 2016. Productivity and Quality in Health Care: Evidence from the Dialysis Industry. *The Review of Economic Studies* **50**, rdw042. [Crossref]

568. Juan Carlos Suárez Serrato, Owen Zidar. 2016. Who Benefits from State Corporate Tax Cuts? A Local Labor Markets Approach with Heterogeneous Firms. *American Economic Review* **106**:9, 2582-2624. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

569. Josh Ederington, Jeremy Sandford. 2016. Employer discrimination and market structure: Does more concentration mean more discrimination?. *International Journal of Industrial Organization* **48**, 1-33. [Crossref]

570. Pierre-Richard Agénor. 2016. Optimal fiscal management of commodity price shocks. *Journal of Development Economics* **122**, 183-196. [Crossref]

571. T. Clay McManus, Georg Schaur. 2016. The effects of import competition on worker health. *Journal of International Economics* **102**, 160-172. [Crossref]

572. Addisu A. Lashitew. 2016. Employment Protection and Misallocation of Resources Across Plants: International Evidence. *CESifo Economic Studies* **62**:3, 453-490. [Crossref]

573. Mikael Carlsson, Julián Messina, Oskar Nordström Skans. 2016. Wage Adjustment and Productivity Shocks. *The Economic Journal* **126**:595, 1739-1773. [Crossref]

574. Doan Thi Thanh Ha, Kozo Kiyota, Kenta Yamanouchi. 2016. Misallocation and Productivity: The Case of Vietnamese Manufacturing. *Asian Development Review* **33**:2, 94-118. [Crossref]

575. Hyunbae Chun, Jung-Wook Kim, Randall Morck. 2016. Productivity growth and stock returns: firm- and aggregate-level analyses. *Applied Economics* **48**:38, 3644-3664. [Crossref]

576. Amitabh Chandra, Amy Finkelstein, Adam Sacarny, Chad Syverson. 2016. Health Care Exceptionalism? Performance and Allocation in the US Health Care Sector. *American Economic Review* **106**:8, 2110-2144. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

577. Donald Lessard, David J. Teece, Sohvi Leih. 2016. The Dynamic Capabilities of Meta-Multinationals. *Global Strategy Journal* **6**:3, 211-224. [Crossref]

578. Marco Grazzi, Nadia Jacoby, Tania Treibich. 2016. Dynamics of investment and firm performance: comparative evidence from manufacturing industries. *Empirical Economics* **51**:1, 125-179. [Crossref]

579. Francesco Bogliacino, Mario Pianta. 2016. The Pavitt Taxonomy, revisited: patterns of innovation in manufacturing and services. *Economia Politica* **33**:2, 153-180. [Crossref]

580. Andrea Pozzi, Fabiano Schivardi. 2016. Demand or productivity: what determines firm growth?. *The RAND Journal of Economics* **47**:3, 608-630. [Crossref]

581. Michael Peneder. 2016. Competitiveness and industrial policy: from rationalities of failure towards the ability to evolve. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* **11**, bew025. [Crossref]

582. Arne Bigsten, Mulu Gebreeyesus, Måns Söderbom. 2016. Tariffs and Firm Performance in Ethiopia. *The Journal of Development Studies* **52**:7, 986-1001. [Crossref]

583. Ryan A. Decker, John Haltiwanger, Ron S. Jarmin, Javier Miranda. 2016. Where has all the skewness gone? The decline in high-growth (young) firms in the U.S. *European Economic Review* **86**, 4-23. [Crossref]

584. Klaus Friesenbichler, Michael Peneder. 2016. Innovation, competition and productivity. *Economics of Transition* **24**:3, 535-580. [Crossref]

585. Alex Coad, Julian S. Frankish, Richard G. Roberts, David J. Storey. 2016. Predicting new venture survival and growth: Does the fog lift?. *Small Business Economics* **47**:1, 217-241. [Crossref]

586. Anton Korinek, Luis Servén. 2016. Undervaluation through foreign reserve accumulation: Static losses, dynamic gains ,. *Journal of International Money and Finance* **64**, 104-136. [Crossref]

587. David C. Chan. 2016. Teamwork and Moral Hazard: Evidence from the Emergency Department. *Journal of Political Economy* **124**:3, 734-770. [Crossref]

588. Giulio Cainelli, Roberto Ganau, Donato Iacobucci. 2016. Do Geographic Concentration and Vertically Related Variety Foster Firm Productivity? Micro-Evidence from Italy. *Growth and Change* **47**:2, 197-217. [Crossref]

589. PAITOON WIBOONCHUTIKULA, CHAYANON PHUCHAROEN, NUCHIT PRUEKTANAKUL. 2016. SPILLOVER EFFECTS OF FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT ON DOMESTIC MANUFACTURING FIRMS IN THAILAND. *The Singapore Economic Review* **61**:02, 1640028. [Crossref]

590. Andrius Tamošiūnas. Managing stakeholders in complex investments projects . [Crossref]

591. Sabien Dobbelaere, Rodolfo Lauterbach, Jacques Mairesse. 2016. Micro-evidence on product and labor market regime differences between Chile and France. *International Journal of Manpower* **37**:2, 229-252. [Crossref]

592. Vincent Vandenberghe. 2016. Is workforce diversity good for efficiency? An approach based on the degree of concavity of the technology. *International Journal of Manpower* **37**:2, 253-267. [Crossref]

593. Erik Brynjolfsson, Kristina McElheran. 2016. The Rapid Adoption of Data-Driven Decision-Making. *American Economic Review* **106**:5, 133-139. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

594. Lucia Foster, Cheryl Grim, John Haltiwanger, Zoltan Wolf. 2016. Firm-Level Dispersion in Productivity: Is the Devil in the Details?. *American Economic Review* **106**:5, 95-98. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

595. Amitabh Chandra, Amy Finkelstein, Adam Sacarny, Chad Syverson. 2016. Productivity Dispersion in Medicine and Manufacturing. *American Economic Review* **106**:5, 99-103. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

596. Balázs Égert. 2016. Regulation, Institutions, and Productivity: New Macroeconomic Evidence from OECD Countries. *American Economic Review* **106**:5, 109-113. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

597. Adelheid Holl. 2016. Highways and productivity in manufacturing firms. *Journal of Urban Economics* **93**, 131-151. [Crossref]

598. Dale W. Jorgenson, Mun S. Ho, Jon D. Samuels. 2016. The impact of information technology on postwar US economic growth. *Telecommunications Policy* **40**:5, 398-411. [Crossref]

599. Paul L. E. Grieco, Shengyu Li, Hongsong Zhang. 2016. PRODUCTION FUNCTION ESTIMATION WITH UNOBSERVED INPUT PRICE DISPERSION. *International Economic Review* **57**:2, 665-690. [Crossref]

600. Nathan E. Wilson. 2016. Market Structure as a Determinant of Patient Care Quality. *American Journal of Health Economics* **2**:2, 241-271. [Crossref]

601. Wim Naudé. 2016. Entrepreneurship and the Reallocation of African Farmers. *Agrekon* **55**:1-2, 1-33. [Crossref]

602. Alex Coad, Gabriele Pellegrino, Maria Savona. 2016. Barriers to innovation and firm productivity. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology* **25**:3, 321-334. [Crossref]

603. Hazhir Rahmandad, Nelson Repenning. 2016. Capability erosion dynamics. *Strategic Management Journal* **37**:4, 649-672. [Crossref]

604. Carlos Carreira, Paulino Teixeira. 2016. Entry and exit in severe recessions: lessons from the 2008–2013 Portuguese economic crisis. *Small Business Economics* **46**:4, 591-617. [Crossref]

605. Sai Ding, Puyang Sun, Wei Jiang. 2016. The Effect of Import Competition on Firm Productivity and Innovation: Does the Distance to Technology Frontier Matter?. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* **78**:2, 197-227. [Crossref]

606. Roland Izuagbe, Saheed Abiola Hamzat, Edith Idowu Joseph. 2016. Electronic Information Resources (EIR) Adoption in Private University Libraries: The Moderating Effect of Productivity and Relative Advantage on Perceived Usefulness. *Journal of Information Science Theory and Practice* **4**:1, 30-48. [Crossref]

607. Jan P.A.M. Jacobs, Simon van Norden. 2016. Why are initial estimates of productivity growth so unreliable?. *Journal of Macroeconomics* **47**, 200-213. [Crossref]

608. John Lyneis, John Sterman. 2016. How to Save a Leaky Ship: Capability Traps and the Failure of Win-Win Investments in Sustainability and Social Responsibility. *Academy of Management Discoveries* **2**:1, 7-32. [Crossref]

609. Gabriel Natividad. 2016. Quotas, Productivity, and Prices: The Case of Anchovy Fishing. *Journal of Economics & Management Strategy* **25**:1, 220-257. [Crossref]

610. Marijn Verschelde, Michel Dumont, Glenn Rayp, Bruno Merlevede. 2016. Semiparametric stochastic metafrontier efficiency of European manufacturing firms. *Journal of Productivity Analysis* **45**:1, 53-69. [Crossref]

611. Jonas Andersson, Jarle Møen. 2016. A Simple Improvement of the IV-estimator for the Classical Errors-in-Variables Problem. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* **78**:1, 113-125. [Crossref]

612. Thomas Sampson. 2016. Dynamic Selection: An Idea Flows Theory of Entry, Trade, and Growth *. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **131**:1, 315-380. [Crossref]

613. Simeon D. Alder. 2016. In the Wrong Hands: Complementarities, Resource Allocation, and TFP. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics* **8**:1, 199-241. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

614. Bert M. Balk. The Dynamics of Productivity Change: A Review of the Bottom-Up Approach 15-49. [Crossref]

615. C.I. Jones. The Facts of Economic Growth 3-69. [Crossref]

616. Kostas Tsekouras, Nikos Chatzistamoulou, Kostas Kounetas, David C. Broadstock. 2016. Spillovers, path dependence and the productive performance of European transportation sectors in the presence of technology heterogeneity. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* **102**, 261-274. [Crossref]

617. Matteo Grazzi, Carlo Pietrobelli, Adam Szirmai. Determinants of Enterprise Performance in Latin America and the Caribbean: What Does the Micro-Evidence Tell Us? 1-36. [Crossref]

618. Alison Cathles, Siobhan Pangerl. Different Obstacles for Different Productivity Levels? An Analysis of Caribbean Firms 207-243. [Crossref]

619. Sharon Belenzon, Andrea Patacconi. Organization of Production, the: An International Perspective 1-4. [Crossref]

620. Chengwei Liu, Mark de Rond. 2016. Good Night, and Good Luck: Perspectives on Luck in Management Scholarship. *The Academy of Management Annals* **10**:1, 409-451. [Crossref]

621. Lucia Foster, Cheryl Grim, John Haltiwanger. 2016. Reallocation in the Great Recession: Cleansing or Not?. *Journal of Labor Economics* **34**:S1, S293-S331. [Crossref]

622. Edward P. Lazear, Kathryn L. Shaw, Christopher Stanton. 2016. Making Do with Less: Working Harder during Recessions. *Journal of Labor Economics* **34**:S1, S333-S360. [Crossref]

623. Flora Bellone, Patrick Musso, Lionel Nesta, Frederic Warzynski. 2016. International trade and firm-level markups when location and quality matter. *Journal of Economic Geography* **16**:1, 67-91. [Crossref]

624. Lucia Foster, John Haltiwanger, Chad Syverson. 2016. The Slow Growth of New Plants: Learning about Demand?. *Economica* **83**:329, 91-129. [Crossref]

625. Luiz Artur Ledur Brito, Patrícia Kawai Sauan. 2016. Management Practices as Capabilities Leading to Superior Performance. *BAR - Brazilian Administration Review* **13**:3. . [Crossref]

626. Theodosios Dimopoulos, Stefano Sacchetto. 2016. Merger Activity in Industry Equilibrium. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

627. Yihui Pan, Stephan Siegel, Tracy Yue Wang. 2016. Corporate Risk Culture. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

628. Michael R. Peneder. 2016. Competitiveness and Industrial Policy: From Rationalities of Failure Towards the Ability to Evolve. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

629. Tigabu Degu Getahun. 2016. The Effect of Industrial Cluster Policy on Firm Performance in Ethiopia: Evidence from the Leather Footware Cluster. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

630. Erik Brynjolfsson, Kristina McElheran. 2016. Data in Action: Data-Driven Decision Making in U.S. Manufacturing. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

631. Wei Gao, Matthias Kehrig. 2016. Returns to Scale, Productivity and Competition: Empirical Evidence from U.S. Manufacturing and Construction Establishments. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

632. Yixin Liu, David C. Mauer, Yilei Zhang. 2016. The Hedging Benefits of Domestic and Global Diversification: Evidence from Economic Downturns. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

633. Andrew Y. Chen. 2016. A General Equilibrium Model of the Value Premium with Time-Varying Risk Premia. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

634. Klaus Sylvester Friesenbichler. 2016. Innovation, Competition and Productivity: Firm Level Evidence for Eastern Europe and Central Asia. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

635. John (Jianqiu) Bai. 2016. The Impact of Bank Credit on Labor Reallocation and Aggregate Industry Productivity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

636. Catherine D. Buffington, Lucia Foster, Ron S. Jarmin, Scott Ohlmacher. 2016. The Management and Organizational Practices Survey (MOPS): An Overview. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

637. Enrique Moral-Benito. 2016. Growing by Learning: Firm-Level Evidence on the Size-Productivity Nexus. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

638. Harald Hau, Yi Huang, Gewei Wang. 2016. Firm Response to Competitive Shocks: Evidence from Chinaas Minimum Wage Policy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

639. Nathan Goldschlag, Stefano Bianchini, Julia Lane, Joseba SanMartin Sola, Bruce A. Weinberg. 2016. Research Funding and Regional Economies. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

640. Eric A. Posner, E. Glen Weyl. 2016. Property Is Another Name for Monopoly Facilitating Efficient Bargaining with Partial Common Ownership of Spectrum, Corporations, and Land. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

641. Holger Herz, Armin Schmutzler. 2016. Cooperation and Mistrust in Relational Contracts. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

642. Daniel Fackler, Eva Hank. 2016. Who Buffers Income Losses after Job Displacement? The Role of Alternative Income Sources, the Family, and the State. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

643. John R. Graham, Campbell R. Harvey, Shivaram Rajgopal. 2016. Corporate Culture: The Interview Evidence. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

644. Joseph S. Shapiro. 2016. Why is Pollution from U.S. Manufacturing Declining? The Roles of Trade, Regulation, Productivity, and Preferences. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

645. Benjamin Johannes Lutz. 2016. Emissions Trading and Productivity: Firm-Level Evidence from German Manufacturing. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

646. Neal Solomon. 2016. Policy Solutions to the Productivity Growth Crisis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

647. Pierre-Philippe Combes, Laurent Gobillon. 2016. The Production Function for Housing: Evidence from France. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

648. Andrea Linarello, Andrea Petrella. 2016. Productivity and Reallocation: Evidence from the Universe of Italian Firms. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

649. Santiago Levy, Luis Felipe LLpez-Calva. 2016. Labor Earnings, Misallocation, and the Returns to Education in Mexico. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

650. Harutaka Takahashi. 2016. Nonbalanced Growth in a Neoclassical Two-Sector Optimal Growth Model. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

651. Wiebke Bartz, Pierre Mohnen, Helena Schweiger. 2016. The Role of Innovation and Management Practices in Determining Firm Productivity in Developing Economies. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

652. Era Dabla-Norris, Giang Ho, Annette Kyobe. 2016. Structural Reforms and Productivity Growth in Emerging Market and Developing Economies. *IMF Working Papers* **16**:15, 1. [Crossref]

653. Chengwei Liu, Mark de Rond. 2016. Good Night, and Good Luck: Perspectives on Luck in Management Scholarship. *Academy of Management Annals* **10**:1, 409-451. [Crossref]

654. Conner Mullally, Alessandro Maffioli. 2016. Extension and Matching Grants for Improved Management: An Evaluation of the Uruguayan Livestock Program. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* **98**:1, 333-350. [Crossref]

655. Mohamed Fazil Mohamed Firdhous. Cloud Computing for Rural ICT Implementations 496-527. [Crossref]

656. Paul Anglin, Yanmin Gao. 2016. The Dynamics of Incentives, Productivity, and Operational Risk. *The B.E. Journal of Theoretical Economics* **16**:1. . [Crossref]

657. N. Zolas, N. Goldschlag, R. Jarmin, P. Stephan, J. O.- Smith, R. F. Rosen, B. M. Allen, B. A. Weinberg, J. I. Lane. 2015. Wrapping it up in a person: Examining employment and earnings outcomes for Ph.D. recipients. *Science* **350**:6266, 1367-1371. [Crossref]

658. Mohammad Amin. 2015. Competition and labor productivity in India's retail stores. *Journal of Asian Economics* **41**, 57-68. [Crossref]

659. Andreas Löschel, Frank Pothen, Michael Schymura. 2015. Peeling the onion: Analyzing aggregate, national and sectoral energy intensity in the European Union. *Energy Economics* **52**, S63-S75. [Crossref]

660. Yuki Higuchi, Vu Hoang Nam, Tetsushi Sonobe. 2015. Sustained impacts of Kaizen training. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **120**, 189-206. [Crossref]

661. Giovanni Dosi, Marco Grazzi, Daniele Moschella. 2015. Technology and costs in international competitiveness: From countries and sectors to firms. *Research Policy* **44**:10, 1795-1814. [Crossref]

662. Peter Scott, Nicolas Ziebarth. 2015. The Determinants of Plant Survival in the U.S. Radio Equipment Industry During the Great Depression. *The Journal of Economic History* **75**:4, 1097-1127. [Crossref]

663. Mika Maliranta, Niku Määttänen. 2015. An Augmented Static Olley-Pakes Productivity Decomposition with Entry and Exit: Measurement and Interpretation. *Economica* **82**, 1372-1416. [Crossref]

664. Young Hoon Lee, Hayley Jang, Sun Ho Hwang. 2015. Market Competition and Threshold Efficiency in the Sports Industry. *Journal of Sports Economics* **16**:8, 853-870. [Crossref]

665. Luís Velez Lapão. 2015. The challenge of benchmarking health systems: is ICT innovation capacity more systemic than organizational dependent?. *Israel Journal of Health Policy Research* **4**:1. . [Crossref]

666. Areti Gkypali, Kostas Tsekouras. 2015. Productive performance based on R&D activities of low-tech firms: an antecedent of the decision to export?. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology* **24**:8, 801-828. [Crossref]

667. Dan Bogart, Latika Chaudhary. 2015. Off the rails: Is state ownership bad for productivity?. *Journal of Comparative Economics* **43**:4, 997-1013. [Crossref]

668. Masayuki Morikawa. 2015. Are large headquarters unproductive?. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **119**, 422-436. [Crossref]

669. David A. Green. 2015. Chasing after “good jobs.” Do they exist and does it matter if they do?. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique* **48**:4, 1215-1265. [Crossref]

670. Pehr-Johan Norbäck, Ayça Tekin-Koru, Andreas Waldkirch. 2015. Multinational Firms and Plant Divestiture. *Review of International Economics* **23**:5, 811-845. [Crossref]

671. Anders Akerman, Ingvil Gaarder, Magne Mogstad. 2015. The Skill Complementarity of Broadband Internet *. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **130**:4, 1781-1824. [Crossref]

672. Andrea Lasagni, Annamaria Nifo, Gaetano Vecchione. 2015. FIRM PRODUCTIVITY AND INSTITUTIONAL QUALITY: EVIDENCE FROM ITALIAN INDUSTRY. *Journal of Regional Science* **55**:5, 774-800. [Crossref]

673. Christopher R. Walters. 2015. Inputs in the Production of Early Childhood Human Capital: Evidence from Head Start. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **7**:4, 76-102. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

674. Giovanni Dosi, Daniele Moschella, Emanuele Pugliese, Federico Tamagni. 2015. Productivity, market selection, and corporate growth: comparative evidence across US and Europe. *Small Business Economics* **45**:3, 643-672. [Crossref]

675. Eric Bartelsman, Sabien Dobbelaere, Bettina Peters. 2015. Allocation of human capital and innovation at the frontier: firm-level evidence on Germany and the Netherlands. *Industrial and Corporate Change* **24**:5, 875-949. [Crossref]

676. Long Gao. 2015. Long-Term Contracting: The Role of Private Information in Dynamic Supply Risk Management. *Production and Operations Management* **24**:10, 1570-1579. [Crossref]

677. Nicola Lacetera, Justin Sydnor. 2015. Would You Buy a Honda Made in the United States? The Impact of Production Location on Manufacturing Quality. *Review of Economics and Statistics* **97**:4, 855-876. [Crossref]

678. Elias Dinopoulos, Bulent Unel. 2015. Entrepreneurs, jobs, and trade. *European Economic Review* **79**, 93-112. [Crossref]

679. John Page, Måns Söderbom. 2015. Is Small Beautiful? Small Enterprise, Aid and Employment in Africa. *African Development Review* **27**:S1, 44-55. [Crossref]

680. Natina Yaduma, Allan Williams, Andrew Lockwood, Sangwon Park. 2015. Performance, labour flexibility and migrant workers in hotels: An establishment and departmental level analysis. *International Journal of Hospitality Management* **50**, 94-104. [Crossref]

681. Christian Pfeifer. 2015. The nexus between top managers' human capital and firm productivity. *Applied Economics Letters* **22**:12, 982-986. [Crossref]

682. Robert Inklaar, Michael Koetter, Felix Noth. 2015. Bank market power, factor reallocation, and aggregate growth. *Journal of Financial Stability* **19**, 31-44. [Crossref]

683. Philippe Aghion, Ufuk Akcigit, Peter Howitt. 2015. The Schumpeterian Growth Paradigm. *Annual Review of Economics* **7**:1, 557-575. [Crossref]

684. John Haltiwanger. 2015. Job Creation, Job Destruction, and Productivity Growth: The Role of Young Businesses. *Annual Review of Economics* **7**:1, 341-358. [Crossref]

685. XAVIER GIROUD, HOLGER M. MUELLER. 2015. Capital and Labor Reallocation within Firms. *The Journal of Finance* **70**:4, 1767-1804. [Crossref]

686. MARIASSUNTA GIANNETTI, GUANMIN LIAO, XIAOYUN YU. 2015. The Brain Gain of Corporate Boards: Evidence from China. *The Journal of Finance* **70**:4, 1629-1682. [Crossref]

687. Serguey Braguinsky, Atsushi Ohyama, Tetsuji Okazaki, Chad Syverson. 2015. Acquisitions, Productivity, and Profitability: Evidence from the Japanese Cotton Spinning Industry. *American Economic Review* **105**:7, 2086-2119. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

688. Ying Ge, Huiwen Lai, Susan Chun Zhu. 2015. Multinational price premium. *Journal of Development Economics* **115**, 181-199. [Crossref]

689. Davide Sala, Erdal Yalcin. 2015. Export Experience of Managers and the Internationalisation of Firms. *The World Economy* **38**:7, 1064-1089. [Crossref]

690. Johannes Koettl, Siddharth Sharma, Olga Kupets, Aaditya Mattoo, Caglar Ozden, Jose Martin Moreno Graz.yna Vigo. The Effects of Aging on Productivity: Diverse, Not Alarming 167-212. [Crossref]
691. Ligita Melece, Agnese Krievina. 2015. Growth of food sector's productivity through innovations. *Management Theory and Studies for Rural Business and Infrastructure Development* **37**:2, 252-263. [Crossref]
692. Cristiano Antonelli, Francesco Crespi, Giuseppe Scellato. 2015. Productivity growth persistence: firm strategies, size and system properties. *Small Business Economics* **45**:1, 129-147. [Crossref]
693. Simona Settepanella, Giovanni Dosi, Marco Grazzi, Luigi Marengo, Federico Ponchio. 2015. A discrete geometric approach to heterogeneity and production theory. *Evolutionary and Institutional Economics Review* **12**:1, 223-234. [Crossref]
694. Hyunbae Chun, Jung-Wook Kim, Jason Lee. 2015. How does information technology improve aggregate productivity? A new channel of productivity dispersion and reallocation. *Research Policy* **44**:5, 999-1016. [Crossref]
695. X. Yu, G. Dosi, J. Lei, A. Nuvolari. 2015. Institutional change and productivity growth in China's manufacturing: the microeconomics of knowledge accumulation and "creative restructuring". *Industrial and Corporate Change* **24**:3, 565-602. [Crossref]
696. Emek Basker. 2015. Change at the Checkout: Tracing the Impact of a Process Innovation. *The Journal of Industrial Economics* **63**:2, 339-370. [Crossref]
697. Robert Gibbons, John Roberts. Organizational Economics 1-15. [Crossref]
698. Olivier Bertrand, Laurence Capron. 2015. Productivity enhancement at home via cross-border acquisitions: The roles of learning and contemporaneous domestic investments. *Strategic Management Journal* **36**:5, 640-658. [Crossref]
699. Florin Maican, Matilda Orth. 2015. A dynamic analysis of entry regulations and productivity in retail trade. *International Journal of Industrial Organization* **40**, 67-80. [Crossref]
700. Sabien Dobbelaere, Kozo Kiyota, Jacques Mairesse. 2015. Product and labor market imperfections and scale economies: Micro-evidence on France, Japan and the Netherlands. *Journal of Comparative Economics* **43**:2, 290-322. [Crossref]
701. Iris Mihai. 2015. Economic Productivity Flip-Flop in the Danube Countries. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* **183**, 11-20. [Crossref]
702. Mario D. Tello. 2015. Firms' Innovation, Public Financial Support, and Total Factor Productivity: The Case of Manufactures in Peru. *Review of Development Economics* **19**:2, 358-374. [Crossref]
703. Eva Yamila Catela, Mario Cimoli, Gabriel Porcile. 2015. Productivity and Structural Heterogeneity in the Brazilian Manufacturing Sector: Trends and Determinants. *Oxford Development Studies* **43**:2, 232-252. [Crossref]
704. Hiroshi Yoshikawa. 2015. Stochastic macro-equilibrium: a microfoundation for the Keynesian economics. *Journal of Economic Interaction and Coordination* **10**:1, 31-55. [Crossref]
705. N. Bloom, C. Propper, S. Seiler, J. Van Reenen. 2015. The Impact of Competition on Management Quality: Evidence from Public Hospitals. *The Review of Economic Studies* **82**:2, 457-489. [Crossref]
706. Barry T. Hirsch, Bruce E. Kaufman, Tetyana Zelenska. 2015. Minimum Wage Channels of Adjustment. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society* **54**:2, 199-239. [Crossref]

707. Hans Lööf, Pardis Nabavi. 2015. The Joint Impact of Innovation and Knowledge Spillovers on Productivity and Growth for Exporting Firms. *The World Economy* **38**:4, 730-750. [Crossref]

708. Chiara Criscuolo, Peter N. Gal, Carlo Menon. 2015. Dynemp: A Routine for Distributed Microdata Analysis of Business Dynamics. *The Stata Journal: Promoting communications on statistics and Stata* **15**:1, 247-274. [Crossref]

709. Limor Golan, Christine A. Parlour, Uday Rajan. 2015. Competition, Managerial Slack, and Corporate Governance. *Review of Corporate Finance Studies* **4**:1, 43-68. [Crossref]

710. Ater, Eugene Orlov. 2015. The Effect of the Internet on Performance and Quality: Evidence from the Airline Industry. *Review of Economics and Statistics* **97**:1, 180-194. [Crossref]

711. Rui Castro, Gian Luca Clementi, Yoonsoo Lee. 2015. Cross Sectoral Variation in the Volatility of Plant Level Idiosyncratic Shocks. *The Journal of Industrial Economics* **63**:1, 1-29. [Crossref]

712. Natalie Chun, Soohyung Lee. 2015. Bonus compensation and productivity: evidence from Indian manufacturing plant-level data. *Journal of Productivity Analysis* **43**:1, 47-58. [Crossref]

713. Pranpreya Sriwannawit, Ulf Sandström. 2015. Large-scale bibliometric review of diffusion research. *Scientometrics* **102**:2, 1615-1645. [Crossref]

714. Y. Li, M. Rama. 2015. Firm Dynamics, Productivity Growth, and Job Creation in Developing Countries: The Role of Micro- and Small Enterprises. *The World Bank Research Observer* **30**:1, 3-38. [Crossref]

715. Bert M. Balk. 2015. Measuring and relating aggregate and subaggregate total factor productivity change without neoclassical assumptions. *Statistica Neerlandica* **69**:1, 21-48. [Crossref]

716. Kevin J. Fox, Amani Elnasri. 2015. R&D, Innovation and Productivity: The Role of Public Support. *KDI Journal of Economic Policy* **37**:1, 73-96. [Crossref]

717. Nicholas Bloom, James Liang, John Roberts, Zhichun Jenny Ying. 2015. Does Working from Home Work? Evidence from a Chinese Experiment *. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **130**:1, 165-218. [Crossref]

718. Allan Collard-Wexler, Jan De Loecker. 2015. Reallocation and Technology: Evidence from the US Steel Industry. *American Economic Review* **105**:1, 131-171. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

719. Esben Sloth Andersen, Jacob Rubæk Holm. The Signs of Change in Economic Evolution 91-117. [Crossref]

720. Paloma Martínez Sánchez, Natalia Rincón Ballesteros, Diana Fuentes Olaya. Impact of 5S on Productivity, Quality, Organizational Climate and IS at Tecniaguas S.A.S 247-255. [Crossref]

721. Massimo Armenise, Giorgia Giovannetti, Gianluca Santoni. Do FDI in Business Services Affect Firms' TFP? Evidence from Italian Provinces 195-217. [Crossref]

722. Jun Du, Yama Temouri. 2015. High-growth firms and productivity: evidence from the United Kingdom. *Small Business Economics* **44**:1, 123-143. [Crossref]

723. Dominika Langenmayr, Andreas Haufler, Christian J. Bauer. 2015. Should tax policy favor high- or low-productivity firms?. *European Economic Review* **73**, 18-34. [Crossref]

724. Aristidis Bitzenis, Vasileios A. Vlachos. The Fight against the Shadow Economy as an Exit from the Greek Sovereign Debt Crisis 275-285. [Crossref]

725. Lawrence D. W. Schmidt, Alexis Akira Toda. 2015. Do You Save More or Less in Response to Bad News? A New Identification of the Elasticity of Intertemporal Substitution. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

726. Joshua S. Gans, Michael D. Ryall. 2015. The Value Capture Model: A Strategic Management Review. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

727. Mariya Molodchik, Carlos M. Fernnndez-Jarddn, ngel Barajas. 2015. The Firm Size Effect on Performance Due to Intangible Resources. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

728. Alessandro Bonatti, Johannes Horner. 2015. Learning to Disagree in a Game of Experimentation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

729. Joseph S. Shapiro, Reed Walker. 2015. Why is Pollution from U.S. Manufacturing Declining? The Roles of Trade, Regulation, Productivity, and Preferences. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

730. Andreas LLschel, Frank Pothen, Michael Schymura. 2015. Peeling the Onion: Analyzing Aggregate, National and Sectoral Energy Intensity in the European Union. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

731. Francesco Bogliacino, Mario Pianta. 2015. The Pavitt Taxonomy, Revisited. Patterns of Innovation in Manufacturing and Services (La Revisiin De La Taxonomma De Pavitt. Patrones De Innovaciin En Manufactura Y Servicios). *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

732. Bert M. Balk. 2015. The Dynamics of Productivity Change: A Review of the Bottom-Up Approach. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

733. Lucia Foster, John Haltiwanger, Shawn D. Klimek, C.J. Krizan, Scott Ohlmacher. 2015. The Evolution of National Retail Chains: How We Got Here. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

734. Ioannis Bournakis, Dimitris Christopoulos, Sushanta Mallick. 2015. Knowledge Spillovers, Absorptive Capacity and Growth: An Industry-Level Analysis for OECD Countries. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

735. Steven Blader, Claudine Madras Gartenberg, Andrea Prat. 2015. The Contingent Effect of Management Practices. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

736. John Haltiwanger, Henry R. Hyatt, Erika McEntarfer. 2015. Cyclical Reallocation of Workers Across Employers by Firm Size and Firm Wage. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

737. Robert B. Kulick. 2015. Horizontal Mergers, Prices, and Productivity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

738. Peng Zhang. 2015. Temperature and Economic Growth: New Evidence from Total Factor Productivity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

739. Peter Howitt. 2015. Mushrooms and Yeast: The Implications of Technological Progress for Canada's Economic Growth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

740. Luis Medrano-Adan, Vicente Salas-Fumms, J. Javier Sanchez-Asin. 2015. The Distribution of Firm Sizes from Occupational Choice: Theory and Empirical Implications. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

741. Hankyul Oh, Andrew L Johnson, Lorenzo Lucianetti, Seokjun Youn. 2015. The Effect of Performance Measurement Systems on Productive Performance: An Empirical Study of Italian Manufacturing Firms. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

742. Kieron Meagher, Rodney W. Strachan. 2015. The Case for Excellence in Management: The Effects of Management Practices on Productivity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

743. David C. Marr, Dean Hyslop, Richard Fabling. 2015. Firm Productivity Growth and Skill. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

744. Amitabh Chandra, Amy Finkelstein, Adam Sacarny, Chad Syverson. 2015. Healthcare Exceptionalism? Performance and Allocation in the U.S. Healthcare Sector. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

745. Giovanni Dosi, Marcelo C Pereira, Maria Enrica Virgillito. 2015. The Footprint of Evolutionary Processes of Learning and Selection Upon the Statistical Properties of Industrial Dynamics. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

746. Vincent Vandenberghe. 2015. Is Workforce Diversity Good for Efficiency? An Approach Based on the Degree of Concavity of the Technology. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

747. Era Dabla-Norris, Si Guo, Vikram Haksar, Minsuk Kim, Kalpana Kochhar, Kevin Wiseman, Aleksandra Zdzienicka. 2015. The New Normal: A Sector-level Perspective on Productivity Trends in Advanced Economies. *Staff Discussion Notes* **15**:3, 1. [Crossref]

748. Roberto Cardarelli, Lusine Lusinyan. 2015. U.S. Total Factor Productivity Slowdown: Evidence from the U.S. States. *IMF Working Papers* **15**:116, 1. [Crossref]

749. Mohamed Fazil Mohamed Firdhous. Cloud Computing for Rural ICT Implementations 166-197. [Crossref]

750. Daniel Ferreira, Radoslawa Nikolowa. 2015. Misallocation of Talent in Competitive Labor Markets. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

751. Alma MAČIULYTĖ-ŠNIUKIENĖ. Darbo produktyvumą lemiančių veiksnių poveikio vertinimas globalizacijos kontekste **59**, . [Crossref]

752. Margo Liik, Jaan Masso, Kadri Ukrainski. 2014. The contribution of R&D to production efficiency in OECD countries: econometric analysis of industry-level panel data. *Baltic Journal of Economics* **14**:1-2, 78-100. [Crossref]

753. Steven J. Davis, John Haltiwanger, Kyle Handley, Ron Jarmin, Josh Lerner, Javier Miranda. 2014. Private Equity, Jobs, and Productivity. *American Economic Review* **104**:12, 3956-3990. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

754. Thomas Strobel. 2014. Directed technological change, skill complementarities and sectoral productivity growth: evidence from industrialized countries during the new economy. *Journal of Productivity Analysis* **42**:3, 255-275. [Crossref]

755. Jun Du, Xiaoxuan Liu, Ying Zhou. 2014. State advances and private retreats? — Evidence of aggregate productivity decomposition in China. *China Economic Review* **31**, 459-474. [Crossref]

756. SIDNEY G. WINTER. 2014. The future of evolutionary economics: can we break out of the beachhead?. *Journal of Institutional Economics* **10**:4, 613-644. [Crossref]

757. S. Schiavo. 2014. Financial constraints and firm behavior in international markets: an introduction to the special section. *Industrial and Corporate Change* **23**:6, 1469-1476. [Crossref]

758. L. Einav, J. Levin. 2014. Economics in the age of big data. *Science* **346**:6210, 1243089-1243089. [Crossref]

759. Jacob Rubæk Holm. 2014. The significance of structural transformation to productivity growth. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* **24**:5, 1009-1036. [Crossref]

760. David Powell, Joachim Wagner. 2014. The exporter productivity premium along the productivity distribution: evidence from quantile regression with nonadditive firm fixed effects. *Review of World Economics* **150**:4, 763-785. [Crossref]

761. Gale A. Boyd, E. Mark Curtis. 2014. Evidence of an "Energy-Management Gap" in U.S. manufacturing: Spillovers from firm management practices to energy efficiency. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **68**:3, 463-479. [Crossref]

762. Lara Lebedinski, Vincent Vandenberghe. 2014. Assessing education's contribution to productivity using firm-level evidence. *International Journal of Manpower* **35**:8, 1116-1139. [Crossref]

763. Carlos Sáenz-Royo, Vicente Salas-Fumás. 2014. Long- and short-term efficiency in an automobile factory: An econometric case study. *International Journal of Production Economics* **156**, 98-107. [Crossref]

764. John Asker, Allan Collard-Wexler, Jan De Loecker. 2014. Dynamic Inputs and Resource (Mis)Allocation. *Journal of Political Economy* **122**:5, 1013-1063. [Crossref]

765. Richard Fabling, Arthur Grimes. 2014. The "Suite" Smell of Success. *ILR Review* **67**:4, 1095-1126. [Crossref]

766. Yukichi Mano, John Akoten, Yutaka Yoshino, Tetsushi Sonobe. 2014. Teaching KAIZEN to small business owners: An experiment in a metalworking cluster in Nairobi. *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* **33**, 25-42. [Crossref]

767. Clive Belfield, Peter Crosta, Davis Jenkins. 2014. Can Community Colleges Afford to Improve Completion? Measuring the Cost and Efficiency Consequences of Reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* **36**:3, 327-345. [Crossref]

768. Ryan Decker, John Haltiwanger, Ron Jarmin, Javier Miranda. 2014. The Role of Entrepreneurship in US Job Creation and Economic Dynamism. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **28**:3, 3-24. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

769. Sea-Jin Chang, Brian Wu. 2014. Institutional barriers and industry dynamics. *Strategic Management Journal* **35**:8, 1103-1123. [Crossref]

770. Kalin Nikolov. 2014. Collateral amplification under complete markets. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* **45**, 80-93. [Crossref]

771. Nicholas Bloom, Renata Lemos, Raffaella Sadun, Daniela Scur, John Van Reenen. 2014. JEEA-FBBVA LECTURE 2013 : THE NEW EMPIRICAL ECONOMICS OF MANAGEMENT. *Journal of the European Economic Association* **12**:4, 835-876. [Crossref]

772. Keith W. Glaister. 2014. The contribution of management to economic growth: a review. *Prometheus* **32**:3, 227-244. [Crossref]

773. Dale W. Jorgenson, Mun S. Ho, Jon D. Samuels. 2014. What will revive U.S. economic growth? Lessons from a prototype industry-level production account for the United States. *Journal of Policy Modeling* **36**:4, 674-691. [Crossref]

774. Byung S. Min, Russell Smyth. 2014. Corporate governance, globalization and firm productivity. *Journal of World Business* **49**:3, 372-385. [Crossref]

775. Gabriel Natividad. 2014. Integration and Productivity: Satellite-Tracked Evidence. *Management Science* **60**:7, 1698-1718. [Crossref]

776. Francesco Lippi, Fabiano Schivardi. 2014. Corporate control and executive selection. *Quantitative Economics* **5**:2, 417-456. [Crossref]

777. Jens J. Krüger. 2014. Intrasectoral structural change and aggregate productivity development: robust stochastic nonparametric frontier function estimates. *Empirical Economics* **46**:4, 1545-1572. [Crossref]

778. Álvaro Escribano, Rodolfo Stucchi. 2014. Does recession drive convergence in firms' productivity? Evidence from Spanish manufacturing firms. *Journal of Productivity Analysis* **41**:3, 339-349. [Crossref]

779. John E. Tilton. 2014. Cyclical and secular determinants of productivity in the copper, aluminum, iron ore, and coal industries. *Mineral Economics* **27**:1, 1-19. [Crossref]

780. Tetsushi Sonobe, Yuki Higuchi, Keijiro Otsuka. 2014. Differences in Management Practices and Productivity in Micro and Small Enterprises in Industrial Clusters. *Journal of International Commerce, Economics and Policy* **05**:02, 1450006. [Crossref]

781. Dietrich Vollrath. 2014. The efficiency of human capital allocations in developing countries. *Journal of Development Economics* **108**, 106-118. [Crossref]

782. Shunsuke Managi, Akira Hibiki, Tetsuya Shimane. 2014. Efficiency or technology adoption: A case study in waste-treatment technology. *Resource and Energy Economics* **36**:2, 586-600. [Crossref]

783. Shane Greenstein, Frank Nagle. 2014. Digital dark matter and the economic contribution of Apache. *Research Policy* **43**:4, 623-631. [Crossref]

784. P. Aghion, N. Bloom, J. Van Reenen. 2014. Incomplete Contracts and the Internal Organization of Firms. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* **30**:suppl 1, i37-i63. [Crossref]

785. P. Legros, A. F. Newman. 2014. Contracts, Ownership, and Industrial Organization: Past and Future. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* **30**:suppl 1, i82-i117. [Crossref]

786. Jianmin Tang. 2014. Are small or large producers driving the Canada-U.S. labour productivity gap? Recent evidence from manufacturing. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique* **47**:2, 517-539. [Crossref]

787. Horst Raff, Joachim Wagner. 2014. Foreign Ownership and the Extensive Margins of Exports: Evidence for Manufacturing Enterprises in Germany. *The World Economy* **37**:5, 579-591. [Crossref]

788. Massimo Gallo, Lorenzo Valmasoni. 2014. Skill upgrading e grande recessione: evidenze dai dati dei centri per l'impiego del veneto. *RIVISTA DI ECONOMIA E STATISTICA DEL TERRITORIO* :1, 25-59. [Crossref]

789. Enghin Atalay, Ali Hortaçsu, Chad Syverson. 2014. Vertical Integration and Input Flows. *American Economic Review* **104**:4, 1120-1148. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

790. Esben Sloth Andersen, Jacob Rubæk Holm. 2014. The signs of change in economic evolution. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* **24**:2, 291-316. [Crossref]

791. Prabal K. De, Priya Nagaraj. 2014. Productivity and firm size in India. *Small Business Economics* **42**:4, 891-907. [Crossref]

792. Sheryl Winston Smith. 2014. Follow me to the innovation frontier? Leaders, laggards, and the differential effects of imports and exports on technological innovation. *Journal of International Business Studies* **45**:3, 248-274. [Crossref]

793. Dan Andrews, Federico Cingano. 2014. Public policy and resource allocation: evidence from firms in OECD countries. *Economic Policy* **29**:78, 253-296. [Crossref]

794. André van Hoorn. 2014. Individualism and the cultural roots of management practices. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **99**, 53-68. [Crossref]

795. Hinh T. Dinh. Strengthening Light Manufacturing 35-52. [Crossref]

796. Joachim Wagner. 2014. Exports, foreign direct investments and productivity: are services firms different?. *The Service Industries Journal* **34**:1, 24-37. [Crossref]

797. Nicolai J. Foss. 2014. Toward an Organizational Economics of Heterogeneous Capabilities. *International Journal of the Economics of Business* **21**:1, 15-19. [Crossref]

798. Igal Hendel, Yossi Spiegel. 2014. Small Steps for Workers, a Giant Leap for Productivity. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **6**:1, 73-90. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

799. Philippe Aghion, Ufuk Akcigit, Peter Howitt. What Do We Learn From Schumpeterian Growth Theory? 515-563. [Crossref]

800. Hans K. Hvide, Georgios A. Panos. 2014. Risk tolerance and entrepreneurship. *Journal of Financial Economics* **111**:1, 200-223. [Crossref]

801. Günther Schuh, Till Potente, Rawina Varandani, Carlo Hausberg, Bastian Fränken. 2014. Collaboration Moves Productivity to the Next Level. *Procedia CIRP* **17**, 3-8. [Crossref]

802. Yoko Asuyama, Seiha Neou. Cambodia: Growth with Better Working Conditions 38-76. [Crossref]

803. Olivier J Blanchard, Florence Jaumotte, Prakash Loungani. 2014. Labor market policies and IMF advice in advanced economies during the Great Recession. *IZA Journal of Labor Policy* **3**:1, 2. [Crossref]

804. Andreas Lichter, Andreas Peichl, Sebastian Siegloch. 2014. Exporting and Labor Demand: Micro-Level Evidence from Germany. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

805. Daron Acemoglu, Ufuk Akcigit, Murat Alp Celik. 2014. Young, Restless and Creative: Openness to Disruption and Creative Innovations. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

806. Olivier Bertrand, Laurence Capron. 2014. Productivity Enhancement at Home via Cross-Border Acquisitions: The Roles of Learning and Contemporaneous Domestic Investments. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

807. Giovanni Dosi, Marco Grazzi, Luigi Marengo, Simona Settepanella. 2014. Production Theory: Accounting for Firm Heterogeneity and Technical Change. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

808. Nathan Wilson. 2014. Market Structure as a Determinant of Patient Care Quality. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

809. Areti Gkypali, Kostas Tsekouras. 2014. Productive Performance Based on R&D Activities: An Antecedent of the Decision to Export?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

810. Richard Kneller, Danny McGowan. 2014. Productivity-Enhancing Demand Shocks: Technology Adoption During the U.S. Ethanol Boom. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

811. Ioannis Ioannou. 2014. Redefining Strategy in the Age of Sustainability and Social Responsibility. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

812. Giovanni Dosi, Marco Grazzi, Daniele Moschella. 2014. Technology and Costs in International Competitiveness: From Countries and Sectors to Firms. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

813. Leif Brandes, Donja Darai. 2014. The Value of Top-Down Communication for Organizational Performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

814. William F. Maloney, Mauricio Sarrias. 2014. Convergence to the Managerial Frontier. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

815. Alan Gelb, Christian Johannes Meyer, Vijaya Ramachandran. 2014. Development as Diffusion: Manufacturing Productivity and Sub-Saharan Africa's Missing Middle. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

816. Alfredo MarttnnOliver, Sonia Ruano, Vicente Salas-Fumms. 2014. Productivity of Banks: Implications for Interest Rates, Economic Profits and Branches. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
817. Michel Dumont, Bruno Merlevede, Glenn Rayp, Marijn Verschelde. 2014. European Competitiveness: A Semi-Parametric Stochastic Metafrontier Analysis at the Firm Level. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
818. Si Li, Xintong Zhan. 2014. Product Market Threats and Stock Crash Risk. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
819. Egor Matveyev. 2014. Assortative Matching in Managerial Labor Markets: Theory and Measurement. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
820. Eric Bartelsman, Sabien Dobbelaere, Bettina Peters. 2014. Allocation of Human Capital and Innovation at the Frontier: Firm-Level Evidence on Germany and the Netherlands. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
821. Martin C. Byford, Joshua S. Gans. 2014. Permission to Exist. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
822. Hans-Peter Brunner, Kislaya Prasad. 2014. Regional Cooperation and Integration (RCI) and Trade-Driven Competitiveness -- Is There a Relation to Inclusive Growth? -- Overview of Economic Literature. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
823. Mitsukuni Nishida, Nathan Yang. 2014. Better Together? Retail Chain Performance Dynamics in Store Expansion Before and after Mergers. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
824. Alfredo MarttnnOliver, Sonia Ruano, Vicente Salas-Fumms. 2014. Productivity and Welfare: An Application to the Spanish Banking Industry. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
825. Andrew Y. Chen. 2014. Habit, Production, and the Cross-Section of Stock Returns. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
826. Ramon Xifre. 2014. The Competitiveness of the Spanish Economy -- A Bird's-Eye View on the Four Largest Euro Area Economies. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
827. Nathan Goldschlag, Alexander T. Tabarrok. 2014. Is Regulation to Blame for the Decline in American Entrepreneurship?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
828. Dirk Crass, Bettina Peters. 2014. Intangible Assets and Firm-Level Productivity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
829. Simeon Alder, David Lagakos, Lee E. Ohanian. 2014. The Decline of the U.S. Rust Belt: A Macroeconomic Analysis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
830. Richard Fabling, Lynda Sanderson. 2014. Productivity Distributions in New Zealand: The Dangers of International Comparison. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
831. Andrr van Hoorn. 2014. Trust, Workplace Organization, and Comparative Economic Development. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
832. Ben Miller, Robert D. Atkinson. 2014. Raising European Productivity Growth Through ICT. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]
833. Shahid Yusuf. 2014. Middle East Transitions: A Long, Hard Road. *IMF Working Papers* **14**:135, 1. [Crossref]
834. Göran Roos. Manufacturing in a High Cost Environment 393-480. [Crossref]

835. Fariha Kamal. 2014. DOES FIRM OWNERSHIP AFFECT SPILLOVER OPPORTUNITIES? EVIDENCE FROM CHINESE MANUFACTURING. *Journal of Regional Science* **54**:1, 137-154. [Crossref]

836. Derek C. Jones, Jeffrey Pliskin. Information Technology and High Performance Workplace Practices: Evidence on Their Incidence from Upstate New York Establishments 61-81. [Crossref]

837. Yunshi Liu, Linda C. Wang, Li Zhao, David Ahlstrom. 2013. Board turnover in Taiwan's public firms: An empirical study. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management* **30**:4, 1059-1086. [Crossref]

838. Fulvio Coltorti. 2013. Italian Industry, Decline or Transformation? A Framework. *European Planning Studies* **21**:12, 2037-2077. [Crossref]

839. Russell Thomson, Elizabeth Webster. 2013. Innovation and Productivity. *Australian Economic Review* **46**:4, 483-488. [Crossref]

840. Masayuki Morikawa. 2013. Productivity and survival of family firms in Japan. *Journal of Economics and Business* **70**, 111-125. [Crossref]

841. Fabio Pieri, Enrico Zaninotto. 2013. Technical efficiency and the vertical boundaries of the firm: theory and evidence. *Applied Economics Letters* **20**:17, 1538-1543. [Crossref]

842. Andrea Caragliu. 2013. Dynamics of knowledge diffusion: the ICT sector in Lombardy. *Regional Science Policy & Practice* **5**:4, 453-473. [Crossref]

843. Amit K. Khandelwal,, Peter K. Schott,, Shang-Jin Wei. 2013. Trade Liberalization and Embedded Institutional Reform: Evidence from Chinese Exporters. *American Economic Review* **103**:6, 2169-2195. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

844. Roberto Camagni, Roberta Capello, Andrea Caragliu. 2013. One or infinite optimal city sizes? In search of an equilibrium size for cities. *The Annals of Regional Science* **51**:2, 309-341. [Crossref]

845. Avner Ben-Ner. 2013. Preferences and organization structure: Toward behavioral economics micro-foundations of organizational analysis. *The Journal of Socio-Economics* **46**, 87-96. [Crossref]

846. Anandasivam Gopal, Manu Goyal, Serguei Netessine, Matthew Reindorp. 2013. The Impact of New Product Introduction on Plant Productivity in the North American Automotive Industry. *Management Science* **59**:10, 2217-2236. [Crossref]

847. Roberto Camagni, Roberta Capello, Andrea Caragliu. 2013. Una o infinite dimensioni urbane ottime? Alla ricerca di una dimensione di equilibrio. *SCIENZE REGIONALI* :3, 53-88. [Crossref]

848. Gabriel Natividad. 2013. Financial Capacity and Discontinuous Investment: Evidence from Emerging Market Multibusiness Firms. *Review of Financial Studies* **26**:9, 2375-2410. [Crossref]

849. V. Vandenberghe, F. Waltenberg, M. Rigo. 2013. Ageing and employability. Evidence from Belgian firm-level data. *Journal of Productivity Analysis* **40**:1, 111-136. [Crossref]

850. Teresa C Fort, John Haltiwanger, Ron S Jarmin, Javier Miranda. 2013. How Firms Respond to Business Cycles: The Role of Firm Age and Firm Size. *IMF Economic Review* **61**:3, 520-559. [Crossref]

851. Steven D. Levitt, John A. List, Chad Syverson. 2013. Toward an Understanding of Learning by Doing: Evidence from an Automobile Assembly Plant. *Journal of Political Economy* **121**:4, 643-681. [Crossref]

852. Robert Elliott, Ying Zhou. 2013. State-owned Enterprises, Exporting and Productivity in China: A Stochastic Dominance Approach. *The World Economy* **36**:8, 1000-1028. [Crossref]

853. Andrius Tamošiūnas. 2013. THE MODEL FOR EVALUATION OF CORPORATE STRATEGIC CHANGES IN THE CONTEXT OF CLIMATE CHANGE: PLYWOOD MANUFACTURE. *Journal of Business Economics and Management* **15**:1, 135-152. [Crossref]

854. Mark Vancauteren. 7 The Role of EU Harmonization in Explaining the Export-Productivity Premium of Food Processing Firms 165-185. [Crossref]

855. V. Vandenberghe. 2013. Are firms willing to employ a greying and feminizing workforce?. *Labour Economics* **22**, 30-46. [Crossref]

856. Ari Hyytinen, Mika Maliranta. 2013. Firm lifecycles and evolution of industry productivity. *Research Policy* **42**:5, 1080-1098. [Crossref]

857. Dan Bogart, Latika Chaudhary. 2013. Engines of Growth: The Productivity Advance of Indian Railways, 1874–1912. *The Journal of Economic History* **73**:2, 339-370. [Crossref]

858. Masato Nishiwaki, Hyoeg Ug Kwon. 2013. Are Losers Picked? An Empirical Analysis of Capacity Divestment and Production Reallocation in the Japanese Cement Industry. *The Journal of Industrial Economics* **61**:2, 430-467. [Crossref]

859. Nigel L. Driffield, Tomasz Mickiewicz, Yama Temouri. 2013. Institutional reforms, productivity and profitability: From rents to competition?. *Journal of Comparative Economics* **41**:2, 583-600. [Crossref]

860. A. Simonazzi, A. Ginzburg, G. Nocella. 2013. Economic relations between Germany and southern Europe. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* **37**:3, 653-675. [Crossref]

861. Xavier Giroud. 2013. Proximity and Investment: Evidence from Plant-Level Data *. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **128**:2, 861-915. [Crossref]

862. Patrick Legros, Andrew F. Newman. 2013. A Price Theory of Vertical and Lateral Integration*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **128**:2, 725-770. [Crossref]

863. Marta Fernández-Olmos, Isabel Díez-Vial. 2013. Effect of firm's resources on international diversification: An application in the Iberian Ham industry. *European Management Journal* **31**:2, 196-208. [Crossref]

864. Carlos Sáenz-Royo, Vicente Salas-Fumás. 2013. Learning to learn and productivity growth: Evidence from a new car-assembly plant. *Omega* **41**:2, 336-344. [Crossref]

865. Saibal Ghosh. 2013. Do economic reforms matter for manufacturing productivity? Evidence from the Indian experience. *Economic Modelling* **31**, 723-733. [Crossref]

866. Chiara F. Del Bo. 2013. Productivity in electricity generation: The role of firm ownership and regional institutional quality. *International Review of Applied Economics* **27**:2, 237-264. [Crossref]

867. Marco Mariani, Elena Pirani, Elena Radicchi. 2013. La sopravvivenza delle imprese negli anni della crisi: prime evidenze empiriche dalla Toscana. *ECONOMIA E POLITICA INDUSTRIALE* :1, 25-52. [Crossref]

868. Fabio Pieri, Enrico Zaninotto. 2013. Vertical integration and efficiency: an application to the Italian machine tool industry. *Small Business Economics* **40**:2, 397-416. [Crossref]

869. Gale Boyd, Gang Zhang. 2013. Measuring improvement in energy efficiency of the US cement industry with the ENERGY STAR Energy Performance Indicator. *Energy Efficiency* **6**:1, 105-116. [Crossref]

870. M. Vancauteren. 2013. EU harmonisation of regulations and mark-ups in the Dutch food industry. *European Review of Agricultural Economics* **40**:1, 163-189. [Crossref]

871. Nicholas Bloom, Benn Eifert, Aprajit Mahajan, David McKenzie, John Roberts. 2013. Does Management Matter? Evidence from India *. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **128**:1, 1-51. [Crossref]

872. Nicola Gennaioli, Rafael La Porta, Florencio Lopez-de-Silanes, Andrei Shleifer. 2013. Human Capital and Regional Development *. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* **128**:1, 105-164. [Crossref]

873. J. David Brown, Julie L. Hotchkiss, Myriam Quispe-Agnoli. 2013. DOES EMPLOYING UNDOCUMENTED WORKERS GIVE FIRMS A COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGE?*. *Journal of Regional Science* **53**:1, 158-170. [Crossref]

874. Enrique Hernández Laos. 2013. Legislación laboral, sector informal y productividad multifactorial en México. *Economía UNAM* **10**:28, 5-52. [Crossref]

875. Alain Gabler, Markus Poschke. 2013. Experimentation by firms, distortions, and aggregate productivity. *Review of Economic Dynamics* **16**:1, 26-38. [Crossref]

876. Carol Newman, John Rand, Finn Tarp. 2013. Industry Switching in Developing Countries. *The World Bank Economic Review* **27**:2, 357-388. [Crossref]

877. Fritz Rahmeyer. 2013. Schumpeter, Marshall, and Neo-Schumpeterian Evolutionary Economics. *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik* **233**:1. . [Crossref]

878. Sascha O. Becker, Hans K. Hvide. 2013. Do Entrepreneurs Matter?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

879. Hans Lööf, Pardis Nabavi Larijani. 2013. Learning and Productivity of Swedish Exporting Firms: The Importance of Innovation Efforts and the Geography of Innovation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

880. Rosella Nicolini, Alicia Gómez-Tello. 2013. Immigration and Productivity: A Spanish tale. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

881. Ricard Gil, Christian A. Ruzzier. 2013. 'Make or Buy' as Competitive Strategy: Evidence from the Spanish Local TV Industry. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

882. Emek Basker. 2013. Change at the Checkout: Price Effects of Barcode Scanners. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

883. Allan Collard-Wexler, Jan De Loecker. 2013. Reallocation and Technology: Evidence from the U.S. Steel Industry. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

884. Sabien Dobbelaere, Kozo Kiyota, Jacques Mairesse. 2013. Product and Labor Market Imperfections and Scale Economies: Micro-Evidence on France, Japan and the Netherlands. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

885. Xavier Giroud, Holger M. Mueller. 2013. Capital and Labor Reallocation Inside Firms. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

886. Norman Gemmell, Richard Kneller, Danny McGowan, Ismael Sanz, José F. Sanz-Sanz. 2013. Corporate Taxation and Productivity Catch-Up: Evidence from European Firms. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

887. Alvaro Garcia Marin, Nico Voigtländer. 2013. Exporting and Plant-Level Efficiency Gains: It's in the Measure. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

888. Philippe Aghion, Ufuk Akcigit, Peter Howitt. 2013. What Do We Learn from Schumpeterian Growth Theory?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

889. Alex Coad, Agusti Segarra Blasco, Mercedes Teruel. 2013. Innovation and Firm Growth: Does Firm Age Play a Role?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

890. Klaus Prettner, Holger Strulik. 2013. Trade and Productivity: The Family Connection Redux. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

891. Nicholas Bloom, Erik Brynjolfsson, Lucia Foster, Ron S. Jarmin, Itay Saporta Eksten, John Michael Van Reenen. 2013. Management in America. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

892. Dan Bogart, Latika Chaudhary. 2013. Off the Rails: Is State Ownership Bad for Productivity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

893. Edward P. Lazear, Kathryn L. Shaw, Christopher Stanton. 2013. Making Do with Less: Working Harder During Recessions. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

894. Godwin Chukwudum Nwaobi. 2013. African Jobless Growth Morphology: Vulnerabilities and Policy Responses. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

895. Lucia Foster, Cheryl Grim, John Haltiwanger. 2013. Reallocation in the Great Recession: Cleansing or Not?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

896. Nicolai J. Foss. 2013. Towards an Organizational Economics of Heterogeneous Capabilities. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

897. Daron Acemoglu, Ufuk Akcigit, Nicholas Bloom, William R. Kerr. 2013. Innovation, Reallocation and Growth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

898. Itai Ater, Eugene Orlov. 2013. The Effect of the Internet on Performance and Quality: Evidence from the Airline Industry. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

899. Olivier J. Blanchard, Florence Jaumotte, Prakash Loungani. 2013. Labor Market Policies and IMF Advice in Advanced Economies During the Great Recession. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

900. Richard Fabling, Norman Gemmell, Richard Kneller, Lynda Sanderson. 2013. Estimating Firm-Level Effective Marginal Tax Rates and the User Cost of Capital in New Zealand. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

901. Oriana Bandiera, Andrea Prat, Raffaella Sadun. 2013. Managing the Family Firm: Evidence from CEOs at Work. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

902. Richard Fabling, Norman Gemmell, Richard Kneller, Lynda Sanderson. 2013. Estimating Firm-Level Effective Tax Rates and the User Cost of Capital in New Zealand. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

903. Bruno Cassiman, Stijn Vanormelingen. 2013. Profiting from Innovation: Firm Level Evidence on Markups. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

904. Diego A. Restrepo-Tobon, Subal C. Kumbhakar, Kai Sun. 2013. Are U.S. Commercial Banks Too Big?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

905. Rui Albuquerque, Luis Brandao-Marques, Miguel A. Ferreira, Pedro Matos. 2013. International Corporate Governance Spillovers: Evidence from Cross-Border Mergers and Acquisitions. *IMF Working Papers* **13**:234, 1. [Crossref]

906. Olivier Blanchard, Florence Jaumotte, Prakash Loungani. 2013. Labor Market Policies and IMF Advice in Advanced Economies during the Great Recession. *Staff Discussion Notes* **13**:02, 1. [Crossref]

907. Konstantinos Serfes. 2013. A Price Theory of Vertical and Lateral Integration Under Productivity Heterogeneity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

908. Maria Guadalupe,, Olga Kuzmina,, Catherine Thomas. 2012. Innovation and Foreign Ownership. *American Economic Review* **102**:7, 3594-3627. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

909. Michael G. Jacobides, Sidney G. Winter, Stefan M. Kassberger. 2012. The dynamics of wealth, profit, and sustainable advantage. *Strategic Management Journal* **33**:12, 1384-1410. [Crossref]

910. Amil Petrin, James Levinsohn. 2012. Measuring aggregate productivity growth using plant-level data. *The RAND Journal of Economics* **43**:4, 705-725. [Crossref]

911. Tanjim Hossain, John A. List. 2012. The Behavioralist Visits the Factory: Increasing Productivity Using Simple Framing Manipulations. *Management Science* **58**:12, 2151-2167. [Crossref]

912. Richard Schmalensee. 2012. "On a Level with Dentists?" Reflections on the Evolution of Industrial Organization. *Review of Industrial Organization* **41**:3, 157-179. [Crossref]

913. Antonio J. Revilla, Zulima Fernández. 2012. The relation between firm size and R&D productivity in different technological regimes. *Technovation* **32**:11, 609-623. [Crossref]

914. A. Holl. 2012. Market potential and firm-level productivity in Spain. *Journal of Economic Geography* **12**:6, 1191-1215. [Crossref]

915. Lucas W. Davis,, Catherine Wolfram. 2012. Deregulation, Consolidation, and Efficiency: Evidence from US Nuclear Power. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* **4**:4, 194-225. [Abstract] [View PDF article] [PDF with links]

916. Nicholas Bloom, Helena Schweiger, John Van Reenen. 2012. The land that lean manufacturing forgot?. *Economics of Transition* **20**:4, 593-635. [Crossref]

917. Robert Gibbons, Rebecca Henderson. 2012. Relational Contracts and Organizational Capabilities. *Organization Science* **23**:5, 1350-1364. [Crossref]

918. Masayuki Morikawa. 2012. Population density and efficiency in energy consumption: An empirical analysis of service establishments. *Energy Economics* **34**:5, 1617-1622. [Crossref]

919. Tomohiko Inui, Atsushi Kawakami, Tsutomu Miyagawa. 2012. Market competition, differences in technology, and productivity improvement: An empirical analysis based on Japanese manufacturing firm data. *Japan and the World Economy* **24**:3, 197-206. [Crossref]

920. Joachim Wagner. 2012. Average wage, qualification of the workforce and export performance in German enterprises: evidence from KombiFiD data. *Journal for Labour Market Research* **45**:2, 161-170. [Crossref]

921. Sasan Bakhtiari. 2012. Offshoring, wages and the growing skill gap: Advocating offshoring without sectoral reallocation. *International Review of Economics & Finance* **23**, 46-58. [Crossref]

922. Jan Hagemejer, Joanna Tyrowicz. 2012. Is the effect really so large? Firm-level evidence on the role of FDI in a transition economy1. *Economics of Transition* **20**:2, 195-233. [Crossref]

923. Stephen Martin. 2012. Market Structure and Market Performance. *Review of Industrial Organization* **40**:2, 87-108. [Crossref]

924. Yukichi Mano, Alhassan Iddrisu, Yutaka Yoshino, Tetsushi Sonobe. 2012. How Can Micro and Small Enterprises in Sub-Saharan Africa Become More Productive? The Impacts of Experimental Basic Managerial Training. *World Development* **40**:3, 458-468. [Crossref]

925. Sasan Bakhtiari. 2012. Markets and the non-monotonic relation between productivity and establishment size. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique* **45**:1, 345-372. [Crossref]

926. Nicholas Bloom, Christos Genakos, Raffaella Sadun, John Van Reenen. 2012. Management Practices Across Firms and Countries. *Academy of Management Perspectives* **26**:1, 12-33. [Crossref]

927. Alan Maynard. 2012. The powers and pitfalls of payment for performance. *Health Economics* **21**:1, 3-12. [Crossref]

928. Tomohiro Machikita, Yasushi Ueki. 2012. Impacts of incoming knowledge on product innovation: technology transfer in auto-related industries in developing economies. *Asian Journal of Technology Innovation* **20**:sup1, 9-27. [Crossref]

929. Tor Eriksson. Progression of HR Practices in Danish Firms During Two Decades 237-266. [Crossref]

930. Drew Creal, Leslie A. Robinson, Jonathan L. Rogers, Sarah L. C. Zechman. 2012. The Multinational Advantage. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

931. Laurent Bouvier, Tahir M. Nisar. 2012. Firm Types and Managerial Capital: Findings from Private Bond Contracts. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

932. Bo H. Eriksen. 2012. Dancing with the Stars: How Talent Shapes Firm Performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

933. Missaka Warusawitharana, Oliver Levine. 2012. Finance and Productivity Growth: Firm-Level Evidence. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

934. Lucia Foster, John C. Haltiwanger, Chad Syverson. 2012. The Slow Growth of New Plants: Learning About Demand?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

935. Hans K. Hvide, Georgios A. Panos. 2012. Do the (More) Risk Tolerant become Entrepreneurs?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

936. David Brown, Julie L. Hotchkiss, Myriam Quispe-Agnoli. 2012. Does Employing Undocumented Workers Give Firms a Competitive Advantage?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

937. Richard Schmalensee. 2012. 'On a Level with Dentists?': Reflections on the Evolution of Industrial Organization. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

938. Enghin Atalay. 2012. Materials Prices and Productivity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

939. Laura Alfaro, Maggie Xiaoyang Chen. 2012. Selection, Reallocation, and Spillover: Identifying the Sources of Gains from Multinational Production. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

940. Florin Maican, Matilda Orth. 2012. Productivity Dynamics and the Role of 'Big-Box' Entrants in Retailing. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

941. Florin Maican. 2012. From Boom to Bust and Back Again: A Dynamic Analysis of IT Services. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

942. Rudy Colacicco. 2012. The 'Average' Within-Sector Firm Heterogeneity in General Oligopolistic Equilibrium. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

943. Sumit Agarwal, Gene Amromin, Itzhak Ben-David, Souphala Chomsisengphet, Tomasz Piskorski, Amit Seru. 2012. Policy Intervention in Debt Renegotiation: Evidence from the Home Affordable Modification Program. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

944. Michael Greenstone, John A. List, Chad Syverson. 2012. The Effects of Environmental Regulation on the Competitiveness of U.S. Manufacturing. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

945. Cristian Bartolucci, Francesco Devicienti. 2012. Better Workers Move to Better Firms: A Simple Test to Identify Sorting. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

946. Daniel Ferreira, Thomas Kittsteiner. 2012. Competition and Organizational Change. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

947. John Robst, Kathryn Rost, Donna Marshall. 2012. Do Employers Know the Quality of Health Care Benefits They Purchase?: Factors Related to Employer Knowledge of HEDIS Depression Scores for Health Plans. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

948. Florin Maican, Matilda Orth. 2012. A Dynamic Analysis of Regulation and Productivity in Retail Trade. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

949. Tomohiro Machikita, Yasushi Ueki. 2012. Impact of Production Linkages on Industrial Upgrading in ASEAN, the People's Republic of China, and India: Organizational Evidence of a Global Supply Chain. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

950. Ezra Oberfield, Devesh Raval. 2012. Micro Data and Macro Technology. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

951. Hanna Hottenrott, Sascha Rexhauser, Reinhilde Veugelers. 2012. Green Innovations and Organizational Change: Making Better Use of Environmental Technology. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

952. Leonid Kogan, Dimitris Papanikolaou, Amit Seru, Noah Stoffman. 2012. Technological Innovation, Resource Allocation, and Growth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

953. Andrea Pozzi, Fabiano Schivardi. 2012. Demand or Productivity: What Determines Firms Growth?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

954. Mi Dai, Madhura Maitra, Miaojie Yu. 2012. Unexceptional Exporter Performance in China? The Role of Processing Trade. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

955. Mariann Rigo, Vincent Vandenberghe, Fábio Waltenberg. 2012. Ageing and Employability. Evidence from Belgian Firm-Level Data. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

956. Tinh Doan, Philip Stevens. 2012. Evolution of Competition in Vietnam Industries over the Recent Economic Transition. *Economics: The Open-Access, Open-Assessment E-Journal* **6**:2012-19, 1. [Crossref]

957. Andrr van Hoorn. 2012. Individualism and the Cultural Roots of Management Practices. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

958. Peter A. G. van Bergeijk, Fabienne Fortanier, Harry Garretsen, Henri L. F. de Groot, Selwyn J. V. Moons. 2011. Productivity and Internationalization: A Micro-Data Approach. *De Economist* **159**:4, 381-388. [Crossref]

959. Joachim Wagner. 2011. Exports and Firm Characteristics in German Manufacturing Industries: New Evidence from Representative Panel Data. *Applied Economics Quarterly* **57**:2, 107-143. [Crossref]

960. Jonathan Skinner. Causes and Consequences of Regional Variations in Health Care11This chapter was written for the Handbook of Health Economics (Vol. 2). My greatest debt is to John E. Wennberg for introducing me to the study of regional variations. I am also grateful to Handbook authors Elliott Fisher, Joseph Newhouse, Douglas Staiger, Amitabh Chandra, and especially Mark Pauly for insightful comments, and to the National Institute on Aging (PO1 AG19783) for financial support 45-93. [Crossref]

961. Sea-Jin Chang, Brian Wu. 2011. Industry Dynamics and Institutional Frictions in Post-liberalization China. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

962. Devesh Raval. 2011. Beyond Cobb-Douglas: Estimation of a CES Production Function with Factor Augmenting Technology. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

963. Limor Golan, Christine A. Parlour, Uday Rajan. 2011. Competition, Quality and Managerial Slack. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

964. Andreas Blume, April Franco, Paul Heidhues. 2011. Dynamic Coordination Via Organizational Routines. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

965. Renáta Kosová, Francine Lafontaine, Bo Zhao. 2011. Scale, Scope, Ownership Changes, and Performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

966. Barry T. Hirsch, Bruce E. Evan Kaufman, Tetyana Zelenska. 2011. Minimum Wage Channels of Adjustment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

967. Jan Bena, Peter Ondko, Evangelia Vourvachaki. 2011. Productivity Gains from Services Liberalization in Europe. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

968. Mitsukuni Nishida, Amil Petrin, Saao Polanec. 2011. Explaining Reallocation's Apparent Negative Contribution to Growth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

969. Masato Nishiwaki. 2010. Are Losers Picked? An Empirical Analysis of Capacity Divestment and Production Reallocation in the Japanese Cement Industry. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

970. Florin Maican, Matilda Orth. 2008. Productivity Dynamics and the Role of Big-Box Entrants in Retailing. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]

971. Dermot Leahy, Catia Montagna. 2005. Economising, Strategising and the Vertical Boundaries of the Firm. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [Crossref]