CESifo WORKING PAPERS

11155
2024

May 2024

Multiproduct Firms, Import Competition and Productivity

Emmanuel Dhyne, Amil Petrin, Valerie Smeets, Frederic Warzynski

Impressum:

CESifo Working Papers
ISSN 2364-1428 (electronic version)
Publisher and distributor: Munich Society for the Promotion of Economic Research - CESifo GmbH
The international platform of Ludwigs-Maximilians University's Center for Economic Studies and the ifo Institute
Poschingerstr. 5, 81679 Munich, Germany
Telephone +49 (0)89 2180-2740, Telefax +49 (0)89 2180-17845, email office@cesifo.de
Editor: Clemens Fuest
https://www.cesifo.org/en/wp
An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded
· from the SSRN website: www.SSRN.com
· from the RePEc website: www.RePEc.org
· from the CESifo website: https://www.cesifo.org/en/wp

CESifo *Working Paper No. 11155*

Multiproduct Firms, Import Competition and Productivity

Abstract

We study how increased import competition affects the evolution of productivity in a small open economy. We use a production survey of Belgian firms where we observe quarterly firm-product data at the 8-digit level on value and quantities sold together with firm-level labor, capital, and intermediate inputs from 1997 to 2007, a period marked by a stark decline in tariffs applied to Chinese goods. We extend the methodology developed in Dhyne et al. (2022) to estimate firm-product measures of productivity. We find that a 1% increase in the import share leads to a 1.05% gain in productivity. This elasticity translates into gains from competition over the sample period exceeding 1.2 billion euros, which is over 2.5% of the average annual value of manufacturing output in Belgium. We show firms appear to be less productive the further away from their ”core” competency product. We also find that firms respond to competition by focusing more on their core products. Instrumenting import share with changes in Chinese tariffs magnifies the effect of competition as the coefficient increases tenfold moving from OLS to IV.

JEL-Codes: F100.

Emmanuel Dhyne
National Bank of Belgium
Brussels / Belgium
Emmanuel.Dhyne@nbb.be

Amil Petrin
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis / MN / USA
petrin@umn.edu

Valerie Smeets
Aarhus University / Denmark
vas@econ.au.dk

Frederic Warzynski
LMU Munich / Germany
frederic.warzynski@lmu.de

May 23, 2024
We thank Andrew Bernard, Jan De Loecker, Swati Dhingra, Penni Goldberg, John Haltiwanger, Marc-Andreas Muendler, Peter Schott, Chad Syverson, Dan Trefler, Eric Verhoogen and participants at numerous conferences and seminars. Petrin, Smeets and Warzynski thank the National Bank of Belgium for its financial support. This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement no. 822390. All presented results respect the all confidentiality restrictions associated with the data sources. The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NBB. All errors are ours.

1 Introduction

Economists have shown in a variety of theoretical settings that product-market competition can provide firms with strong incentives to adopt cost-lowering production processes in order to remain profitable (see e.g. Aghion and Howitt, 1996 and Holmes and Schmitz, 2010 for discussion). Several important contributions in the empirical productivity literature have established a strong positive relationship between firm-level total factor productivity growth and increased competition, where the former is given by total firm-level deflated revenue less its predicted value given input use (see e.g. Olley and Pakes, 1996; Pavcnik, 2002; Bloom, Draca and Van Reenen, 2016).

A well-known feature of micro-level production data is that most firms produce multiple products, which suggests the possibility that within-a-firm different products may be produced with different levels of technical efficiency.[1] In this paper, we adapt the framework developed in Dhyne et al. (2022) to estimate firm-product measures of productivity for all firms in Belgian manufacturing. The paper extends the seminal contributions of Diewert (1973) and Lau (1974) and implements it in the modern control function approach first introduced by Olley and Pakes (1996) and later extended by e.g. Levinsohn and Petrin (2003), Ackerberg, Caves and Frazer (2015) and Wooldridge (2009). The intuition is the following. A multiproduct production function extends the single product setting by giving the maximal amount of output achievable of one of the goods the firm produces holding inputs *and* the levels of other goods produced constant. A major strength of the theory is that it neither requires us to assume that multiproduct production is a collection of single product production functions nor does it require us allocate aggregate firm-level input measures across them.

The practical problem that researchers face when considering such an estimation is that very few firms will produce the same subset of products, especially in a small open economy like Belgium. We therefore generalize the method suggested by Dhyne et al. (2022) by aggregating the vector of "all other goods produced" aside from the referenced product, as first suggested by Roberts and Supina (2000). This aggregation approach relies on the strong assumption that all firms producing a specific product within a given economic environment face the same coefficient for this aggregate. The approach further generalizes what researchers have been doing with inputs for decades. We discuss alternative modeling strategies that relax this assumption, and this is also discussed in more details in our companion paper.

The measurement of firm-product productivity allows for more direct identification of

[1] See e.g. Eckel and Neary (2010), Bernard, Redding and Schott (2010, 2011) and Mayer, Melitz and Ottaviano (2014).

the impact of competition as changes in efficiency can directly be related to changes in competitive conditions for that particular 8-digit product category. They also allow us to explore implications of various theoretical models of multiproduct firms, in particular Eckel and Neary (2010), Bernard, Redding and Schott (2010, 2011), and Mayer, Melitz and Ottaviano (2014). All of these models have - in equilibrium - higher revenue "core" products being produced more efficiently within multiproduct firms.[2]

We explore all of these margins using our Belgian dataset from 1997 to 2007, a period of increased competition with China's 2001 entry into the World Trade Organization (WTO). We estimate multiproduct production function for 12 industries separately. Consistent with the production theory of Diewert (1973), the estimated coefficient on the "other-goods-produced" quantity index is the correct sign - negative - and significant for all 12 industries, implying that, holding all input levels constant, an increase in the firm's output index of other-goods-produced leads to a fall in the output of the good under consideration.

We calculate the implied estimates of quarterly firm-product productivity and regress them on last period's import share while controlling for last period's productivity, the product's "rank" in terms of revenue generated at the firm, interactions between the lagged import shares and product rankings, and 8-digit product- and quarter-specific fixed effects. We instrument for the import share using European tariffs on Chinese imports and an estimate of world export supply (excluding Belgium), as suggested by Hummels et al. (2014). Consistent with the theory models, we find that product rankings on average lines up one-to-one with the level of productivity with which a good is produced, with the highest revenue good (core product) being produced most efficiently. We find that a 1% increase in the lagged import share is associated with a 1.05% percent increase in technical efficiency in the current period for the first and second ranked products, and a 0.65% increase in technical efficiency of all other products produced by the firm. Across 10 robustness checks our estimate of 1.05% ranges between 0.84% up to 1.17%. Without instruments we find only one-tenth the effect, which is consistent with lagged import penetration being higher in product markets where domestic innovations in technical efficiency are lower (and vice versa).

As an additional exercise, we calculate the long-run changes in the value of produced output due to a change in the previous period's input share by multiplying the log change in productivity by the product's current revenue, and then scaling it up to account for future output gains arising due to the high persistence of the productivity process as the

[2]Dhingra (2013) and Eckel et al. (2015) show that firms respond to trade liberalization by undertaking R&D activities that lead to greater increases in technical efficiencies or improved quality depending on the nature of the good and the initial level of firm efficiency.

AR(1) coefficient is estimated to be 0.9 across almost all specifications instrumented or not. Of the 65,242 positive and negative changes the average change is a little over 22 thousand euros, and while most changes are positive almost 35% of the realized changes are negative because import shares decrease in many cases. There is a tremendous amount of variation across industries in these changes with some of the biggest negative changes ranging from -1.8 to -2.5 million euros and the some of the biggest positive changes ranges between 2.2 and 2.5 million euros. Aggregating over the entire sample period the overall gain in the value of output due to increased import competition is on the order of 1.4 billion euros, almost 2.5% of average annual value of manufacturing output in Belgium over this period.

The closest empirical findings to ours are from De Loecker, Goldberg, Khandelwal, and Pavcnik (2016)[3] (DLGKP henceforth), who use manufacturing data on multiproduct production from India to estimate the effect of trade liberalization on firm-product marginal costs. They assume multiproduct firms have the same production function coefficients than single-product firms, and then allocate inputs based on input optimization theory. Their setup generates a firm-level technical efficiency but their model implies separate marginal costs for each firm-product.[4] Similar to our findings, they find that marginal costs are on average declining as the within-firm product revenue share increases and that increases in trade liberalization are associated with reductions in product-specific marginal costs. They also provide a solution to the input pricing heterogeneity bias by including output price and market share in their control function approach.

Our approach is complementary to theirs but rests on different assumptions. The main difference between our approach and DLGKP is that we include multiproduct firms in our estimation of production functions. DLGKP estimate the parameters of the production function for single product firms only within a 2-digit industry and assume that multiproduct firms face the same technology and share the same parameters than single product firms for the product that they make. The second difference is that we do not need to retrieve the input allocation shares, as the theory behind Diewert-Lau allows for a flexible functional form that conditions the production of a specific product to aggregate input use and the production of other goods. Third, as a consequence of our methodology,

[3]Garcia Marin and Voigtländer (2019) follow a similar strategy to properly measure learning-by-exporting effect. They are also interested in the pass-through: they find that marginal costs declined substantially after export entry for new entrants, while markups remained stable – so that falling prices explain why revenue-based productivity measures typically found no improvement after export entry. For incumbent exporters however, the pass through was not complete, so that prices declined less than marginal costs and markups increased on average.

[4]Several follow-up papers using multiproduct data extend the De Loecker et al (2016) methodology on important economic dimensions. See e.g. Valmari (2016), Gong and Sickles (2018), Orr (2019), Itoga (2019) and the discussion in Dhyne et al. (2022).

we obtain a firm-product measure of productivity. DLGKP have a firm-level measure, but also derive a firm-product level measure of efficiency, marginal cost.

Our paper is also closely linked and complementary to recent theoretical and empirical developments regarding how multiproduct firms react to trade liberalization or demand shocks and how it affects aggregate productivity. Mayer, Melitz and Ottaviano (2016) analyze how demand shocks in export markets affect French multiproduct exporters to reallocate the mix of products sold in those destinations and show that positive shocks are associated with skewing export sales towards their best performing products. The aggregate implications are quite large, as they estimate that this within firm adjustment of product portfolios is associated with a 12% productivity gain over their period of analysis. While their focus is on export markets, we look at firms' reaction to increased competition on their domestic market. We also suggest a new metric for productivity that varies at the firm-product level.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces the detailed quarterly firm-product dataset that we build. In Section 3, we explain the methodology that we use to estimate the multiproduct production functions and the econometric framework. Section 4 describes the specification we use to relate our measure of productivity to the evolution of import competition and the relevant instruments for our analysis. Section 5 presents our results, and Section 6 concludes.

2 Product Quantities, Prices, and Import Shares

We construct quarterly 8-digit firm-product observations on quantities sold, unit prices, and import shares from 1997–2007 using the Belgian PRODCOM survey and the Belgian data on international trade transactions. We construct quarterly measures of inputs used in production using the Value Added Tax (VAT) declarations, the National Social Security database, and data from the Belgian Central Balance Sheet Office.

2.1 The Belgian PRODCOM survey

The first data set is firm-product level production data (PRODCOM) collected by Statistics Belgium.[5] It has been used in recent papers like Bernard et al. (forthcoming) and Amiti, Konings and Itskhoki (2018). The survey is designed to cover at least 90% of production value in each NACE 4-digit industry by including all Belgium firms with a

[5]See http://statbel.fgov.be/fr/statistiques/collecte_donnees/enquetes/prodcom/ and http://statbel.fgov.be/nl/statistieken/gegevensinzameling/enquetes/prodcom/ for more details in French and Dutch, or Eurostat in English (http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/prodcom).

minimum of 10 employees or total revenue above 2.5 million Euros.[6] The sampled firms are required to disclose monthly product-specific revenues and quantities sold of all products at the PRODCOM 8 digit level (e.g. 15.96.10.00 for "Beer made from malt", 26.51.11.00 for "Cement clinker"). We keep only firms that are classified by NACE as have their principal business activities in manufacturing. We aggregate revenues and quantities to the quarterly level and calculate the associated quarterly unit price. We restrict our analysis to the period from 1995-2007 because it is the main period of trade liberalization and because in 2008 PRODCOM both significantly reduced its sample size and changed its classification system. For each firm within each 4-digit industry we compute the median ratios of total revenue over employment, capital over employment, total revenue over materials and wage bill over labor (average wage), and we exclude those observations more than five times the interquartile range below or above the median. Finally, we keep only firm-product observations where the share of the product's revenue in the firm's total revenue is at least 5%.

The Value Added Tax revenue data provides us with a separate check against the revenue numbers firms report to PRODCOM. Comparing the tax administrative data revenue numbers with the revenue numbers reported in the PRODCOM data, we find that between 85% and 90% of firms report similar values for both. We exclude firms if they do not report a total value of production to PRODCOM that is at least 90% of the revenue they report to the tax authorities.

Table 1 shows the average revenue share of products in firms' portfolios when they are producing a different number of products at two levels of aggregation (8-digit and 2-digit PRODCOM). We observe 137,453 firm-product observations between 1997-2007. As has been noted in other product-level data sets the majority of firms produce multiple products.[7] At the 8-digit level of disaggregation multiproduct firms are responsible for 73% of total value of manufacturing output. Most firms produce between one and five products and these firms account for 75% of the value of manufacturing output. For firms producing two goods the core good accounts for 77.5% of revenue. Similarly for firms producing three goods 69.5% of revenue comes from the core product. Even for firms producing six or more goods the core good is responsible for 49.4% of revenue. At the 2-digit level of aggregation the fraction of manufacturing revenue coming from single product firms jumps to 78% and the fraction of manufacturing revenue from firms producing three or more goods falls to 3%, suggesting firms specialize by typically producing goods within the same 2-digit category.

[6] NACE is a French acronym for the European Statistical Classification of Economic Activities.

[7] See e.g. Bernard et. al (2010) or Goldberg et. al (2010).

2.2 Firm Input Measurements

For tax liability purposes, Belgian firms have to report every quarter in their VAT fiscal declarations both their sales revenues and their input purchases. Using this information, we construct quarterly measures for intermediate input use and investment in capital (purchases of durable goods). For measures of firm employment, we use data from the National Social Security declarations where firms report on a quarterly basis their level of employment and their total wage bill. We construct a quarterly measure of capital using as initial value the total fixed assets data from the Central Balance Sheet Office, which records annual measures of firm assets for all Belgian firms. We then use standard perpetual inventory methods to build out a capital stock for each firm-quarter.[8]

2.3 The Increase in Import Shares: 1997-2007

The competitive environment in Europe changed significantly over the 1997-2007 period with the implementation of the Single Market Plan within the European Union in 1993 and with the entry in 2001 of China into the World Trade Organization. We construct two separate measures of import shares by combining information from the PRODCOM database with the Belgian international trade data, which contains the quarterly values and quantities of all imports and exports by Belgium firms at the 8-digit level.[9]

Let M_{ijt} denote the quantity of imports of firm i of good j at time t and let $M_{jt} = \sum_{i \in \text{Importers}} M_{ijt}$ be the total quantity of imports of product j at the 8-digit level. Let Q_{jt} denote the total domestic quantity sold of product j. Our first measure of import

[8]In order to build the capital stock, we assume a constant depreciation rate of 8% per year for all firms. Real capital stock is computed using the quarterly deflator of fixed capital gross accumulation. The initial capital stock in $t = t_0$, where period t_0 represents the 4th quarter of the first year of observation of the firm, is given by

$$K_{t_0} = \frac{Total\ fixed\ assets_{first\ year\ of\ observation}}{P_{K;t_0}}$$

The capital stock in the subsequent periods is given by

$$K_t = (1 - 0.0194)\, K_{t-1} + \frac{I_t}{P_{K;t}}$$

We assume that the new investment is not readily available for production and that it takes one year from the time of investment for a new unit of capital to be fully operational.

[9]International trade data are recorded at the CN8 level, while PRODCOM is recorded at the PRODCOM level. We use the concordance tables by Eurostat between nomenclatures and over time. We also follow Bernard et al. (forthcoming) to use a classification consistent over time.

penetration is given as[10]:

$$IS_{1jt} = \frac{M_{jt}}{Q_{jt} + M_{jt}}.$$

Belgium is a small open economy with a relatively large harbor and a significant fraction of the products entering Belgium are subsequently re-exported to other countries.[11] To account for re-exporting we develop a second measure based on net imports. Continuing to work in quantity units we define net imports at the firm level as $Max\{M_{ijt} - E_{ijt}, 0\}$ where E_{ijt} is the physical quantity of exports of good j from firm i at time t. Our second import share measure is then given as

$$IS_{2jt} = \frac{\sum_{i \,\in\, \text{Importers}} Max\{M_{ijt} - E_{ijt}, 0\}}{Q_{jt} + \sum_{i \,\in\, \text{Importers}} Max\{M_{ijt} - E_{ijt}, 0\}}.$$

Table 2 shows the changes in import shares at the 8-digit product level between 1997 and 2007 using IS_{2jt}, the "export-corrected" measure of imports, which is our preferred measure. The table shows the percentiles for all 8 digit-products pooled together and by 2-digit industries. The mean change across all products is an increase of 0.043. This mean hides the tremendous heterogeneity in the underlying changes with most changes positive but many changes negative. The 10th percentile change is -0.21 and the 90th percentile is 0.368. The 25th percentile is -0.04 and the 75th percentiles is 0.136. This pattern is reasonably robust across all of the 2-digit industries and across our two measures of import competition and it suggests that there is a role for increases *and decreases* in competition to both increase and decrease technical efficiencies.

3 Empirical framework and estimation of the multi-product transformation function

As discussed previously, our empirical framework extends Dhyne et al. (2022). The methodology is based on Diewert (1973) and Lau (1976) and uses the concept of multi-product transformation function. Diewert shows that "under mild regularity conditions", there will exist a multiproduct transformation function that relates the output of any

[10]We also compute a similar measures is given in value instead of quantity:

$$IS_{3jt} = \frac{MV_{jt}}{Y_{jt} + MV_{jt}}$$

where Y_{jt} represents the value of production of good j in quarter t as measured in PRODCOM and MV_{jt} represents the value of imports of good j in quarter t as measured in the trade dataset.

[11]Duprez (2014) shows that 30% of Belgian exports in 2010 are re-exports of imported goods not processed in Belgium.

product p to the output of all the other goods $((-p))$ a firm produces and to aggregate input use. This functional form significantly simplifies the empirical analysis, as it does not require product-level use of inputs. It is also conditional on the firm's product portfolio choice. The multi-product transformation function for product p (conditional on producing a subset of other products $(-p)$) can be written as:

$$q_{ipt} = \beta_l l_{it} + \beta_k k_{it} + \beta_m m_{it} + \boldsymbol{\gamma q_{i(-p)t}} + \epsilon_{ipt} \tag{1}$$

where i is a firm index, t is a time index, q_{ipt} is the log of quantity of product p, l_{it}, k_{it}, m_{it} are the firm's aggregate input use (labor, capital and material) in logs, $\boldsymbol{q_{i(-p)t}}$ is a **vector** of the log of physical quantity of all the other goods produced by the firm and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is a vector of parameter to be estimated. ϵ_{ipt} is the error term of product p, often referred as unobserved productivity.

We do not estimate the full vector of parameters $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and instead follow Roberts and Supina (2000) and replace the quantity vector with a quantity index and a scalor parameter γ. The output index is the analog to the universally used input aggregators for material, labor and capital in standard estimation of production function. These indices take the form

$$q^*_{i(-p)}t = log(\frac{\sum_{g \neq p} P_{igt} Q_{igt}}{P_{i(-p)t}}).$$

where $P_{i(-p)t}$ is a firm-level price deflator constructed by using the observed prices of all the other goods produced by the firm, as in Eslava et al. (2004) and Smeets and Warzynski (2013).

Our goal is therefore to estimate a version of equation (1) with only one parameter for the other goods produced by the firm, γ and to recover a firm-specific residual varying over time for the next stage of the empirical analysis. This does imply that we have a system of M_t output equations:

$$q_{ipt} = \beta_0 + \beta_l l_t + \beta_k k_t + \beta_m m_t + \gamma q^*_{i(-p)t} + \varepsilon_{ipt} \quad j = 1 \cdots M \tag{2}$$

When estimating this function, the use of the other-output index adds an additional term to the residual that reflects the difference between q_{ipt} and what one would predict for q_{ipt} given the index $q_{i(-p)t}$ and inputs.

To address the issue of simultaneity (Marschak and Andrews, 1944), we extend the Wooldridge (2009) formulation of Olley and Pakes (1995) (OP) and Levinsohn and Petrin (2003) to the multiproduct production setting by allowing for one shock for each product made by the firm.[12]

[12] For more details about the estimation, see Dhyne et al., 2022

When we estimate our multiproduct transformation function, we use quantity at the 8-digit product leveland pool observations in the same 2 digit industry, as commonly done (see e.g. De Loecker et al., 2016). Our coefficients will therefore be the same for all observations within an industry. We refer to this approach as the "generalized Diewert-Lau method".

4 The link between productivity growth, import competition, and changes in gross output

We estimate three different specifications to investigate the relationship between productivity and import shares. We use the import share net of re-exporting for our preferred results and show robustness of our results to our second import share index. We also discuss the mapping of changes in import shares into the implied long-term changes in the value of output due to these changes in competition.

In our first specification, we regress current firm-product productivity on lagged productivity and import share, including an 8-digit product indicator variables (ν_p), and year-quarter indicator variables (δ_t),

$$\epsilon_{ipt} = \rho\, \epsilon_{ip(t-1)} + \alpha_1 IS_{p(t-1)} + \nu_p + \delta_t + \xi_{ipt} \tag{3}$$

where ξ_{ipt} denotes the innovation shock unobserved to both the manager and the econometrician.

We map changes in import shares into changes in output as follows. Letting Δ denote the one period change operator. The units of the productivity term are in the units of output, so the immediate short term impact on the growth rate of output induced by $\Delta IS_{p(t-1)} = IS_{p(t-1)} - IS_{p(t-2)}$ is given by $\Delta\epsilon_{ijt} = \alpha_1\, \Delta IS_{j(t-1)}$. An approximation to the short-term value of this change is then given by

$$PQ_{ipt} * \alpha_1\, \Delta\epsilon_{ipt},$$

where PQ_{ipt} denotes our approximation to the average revenue from period $t-1$ to t generated by the particular product. Alternative approximations might use last periods revenue or the simple average of this period's revenue and last period's revenue. Finally, if the AR(1) term ρ is greater than zero but less than one then this suggests approximating the long-term change in the value of output - denoted $\Delta Value_{ipt}$ - as

$$\Delta Value_{ipt} = \frac{PQ_{ipt} * \alpha_1\, \Delta IS_{p(t-1)}}{(1-\rho)}. \tag{4}$$

Once we have estimates of α_1 and ρ, we can compute this quantity for every firm-product in every time period.

In our second specification, we include indicator variables that denote the revenue rank of the product in the firm's portfolio to investigate whether within-a-firm product rank and productivity are correlated. The omitted variable is the core (highest revenue) product, $Rank^2_{ijt}$ is an indicator for the second product, $Rank^3_{ijt}$ is an indicator for the third product, and $Rank^4_{ijt}$ is an indicator that is equal to one for any product ranked lower than third. The estimation equation is

$$\epsilon_{ijt} = \rho\, \epsilon_{ij(t-1)} + \alpha_1 IS_{j(t-1)} + \sum_{k=2}^{4} \alpha_k Rank^k_{ijt} + \nu_j + \delta_t + \eta_{ijt} \tag{5}$$

In our third specification we interact these rank indicators with the lagged product-level import shares in order to investigate whether the competitive effects vary by product rank. This will also allow for the $\Delta Value_{ijt}$ to vary by product rank holding the change in import share constant. The estimation equation is given as

$$\epsilon_{ijt} = \rho\, \epsilon_{ij(t-1)} + \alpha_1 IS_{j(t-1)} + \sum_{k=2}^{4} (\alpha_k + \alpha_{3+k} IS_{j(t-1)})\, Rank^k_{ijt} + \nu_j + \delta_t + \eta_{ijt}. \tag{6}$$

For a product that ranks first, the formulation for $\Delta Value_{ijt}$ remains as above but for a product that ranked (e.g.) second in revenues in a firm's portfolio the new expression for $\Delta Value_{ijt}$ is given as

$$\Delta Value_{ijt} = \frac{PQ_{ijt} * (\alpha_1 + \alpha_5)\, \Delta IS_{j(t-1)}}{(1-\rho)}, \tag{7}$$

and similarly for other lower ranking products.

We estimate these equations using ordinary least squares and using instrumental variables for the import share for a total of six primary specifications.[13] The import shares that enter into equations (4) to (6) are functions of the quantities of imports at the 8-digit level. These quantities are potentially correlated with the *innovation* term in firm-product productivity after controlling for last period's productivity and time and 8-digit product-level fixed effects. We therefore need instruments that are correlated with the shares but uncorrelated with the innovation shock. For example, if imports shares are increasing in 8-digit product categories in which domestic producers are becoming less productive,

[13] As noted in De Loecker (2013), we could have estimated all of these parameters in one step along with the production function parameters to achieve possible efficiency gains. We did not do so because the one-step approach does not make apparent the quality of the instruments for the import share and we want the first stage F-statistic test for weak instruments to be very transparent. Also, in our results, most of our production function estimates and our estimates from the equations above are fairly precise.

then import shares will be negatively correlated with the productivity shock, leading to a downward bias in the effect of import competition on productivity.

We use two different instruments. Our first instrument for the import share makes use of tariffs obtained from the World Bank WITS website.[14] Over our sample time period, the "effectively applied tariffs" on Chinese goods applied by the European Union are significantly reduced for many goods as a result of China's entry into the World Trade Organization.[15] The World Bank aggregates tariffs to the HS6 level and we use this same HS6-level tariff for all 8-digit level goods in that category.[16] In the spirit of Hummels et. al. (2014), we focus more on HS6-level product categories where China has a significant pre-sample presence by weighting the HS6-level tariffs by the import share of China at the HS6 level in 1995. Our second instrument is also based on Hummels et. al (2014). For each good j at time t, we calculate the total world exports net of those coming from Belgium using the BACI database from CEPII.[17] This variable includes world-wide shocks to export supply for good j that vary over time and products. Positive shocks to world export supply for good j - like decreases in transportation costs for the good - should be positively correlated with the total import share of good j in Belgium. World export supply net of Belgium exports is a valid instrument for the import share if the world-wide supply shocks are uncorrelated with the *innovation* in productivity. This condition is a slightly weaker condition than required by Hummels et al (2014) where the *levels* of productivity must be uncorrelated with the world-wide shock holding other controls constant.

5 Results

We report multiproduct production function estimates and then relate the implied firm-product productivity to changes in import penetration. We then map realized changes in import shares to changes in aggregate manufacturing output. to multiproduct setting.

[14]See *http://wits.worldbank.org/wits/wits/witshelp/Welcome.htm.*

[15]From the WITS website "WITS uses the concept of effectively applied tariff which is defined as the lowest available tariff. If a preferential tariff exists, it will be used as the effectively applied tariff. Otherwise, the MFN applied tariff will be used."

[16]We use conversion tables from Eurostat to identify the HS6-level product category to which each of our 8-digit level PRODCOM goods' belongs.

[17]BACI is the World trade database developed by the Centre d'Etudes Prospectives et d'Informations Internationales (CEPII). The original data is provided by the United Nations Statistical Division (COMTRADE database). BACI is constructed using a harmonization procedure that enables researchers to link import shares directly to HS 6-digit product disaggregation level.

5.1 Estimation at the firm-product level

We first start by estimating firm-product productivity using our Diewert-Lau hybrid method. Our left hand side variable is the physical quantity of a given good produced by a given firm. Goods are defined at the 8-digit product level or PRODCOM8. Our right hand side variables consist of firm-level inputs plus a quantity aggregate reflecting the physical production of all the other goods produced by the firm. The firm-level inputs are expressed in quantity for labor (as the number of workers) and in monetary values for capital and materials.

As suggested by DLGKP, we are concerned that using inputs (deflated by an industry-wide price index) measured in monetary terms will introduce a bias in our estimation. This is especially relevant in our case as we use quantity on the left hand side but values on the right hand side for some of the inputs. We therefore add a linear function of firm-product output prices in our control function.[18]

Our baseline specification relies on a Cobb-Douglas production function and uses a modified version of Wooldridge. While our unit of analysis is an 8-digit product (PRODCOM8), we pool our estimations at the 2-digit product level (PRODCOM2). We therefore assume parameters to be constant within the subset, which is a common practice in the literature.[19] Belgium is a small country and there are few disaggregated products made by many firms. Our method is also data demanding. Pooling products together allows us to reach a reasonable number of data points that we need for our estimations. All of our specifications include both 8-digit product indicator variables and year-quarter indicator variables. Finally, we should note that the use of quarterly data allows us to beef up the number of product-level observations. However, our results are robust if we run the analysis with yearly data.

The quantity aggregate used in our baseline for the output of the other goods produced by the firm is the log of the revenues of all the other goods deflated by the quarterly producer price index. Other alternatives are investigated in the robustness section, as explained in subsection 4.3.

Table 3 reports the results of our production function estimates for the 12 largest 2-digit product groups, which represents 1,655 different 8-digit products or 70% of all products made in Belgium. Our largest product group is food and beverages with 52,573 firm-product-quarter observations while our smallest product group is electrical machinery

[18] Experimenting by adding market share, or using a non linear function of output prices did not affect our results.

[19] In previous versions, we pooled products belonging to the same 4-digit level (see Dhyne et al., 2014) and for a very limited set of products for which we had enough observations. Our results were robust to the pooling specification.

with 4,437 firm-product-quarter observations.[20] The quantity aggregate coefficient is the correct sign (negative) and significant for all 12 industries and ranges between -0.082 for paper and -0.145 for apparel. The interpretation for apparel is that - holding all input levels constant at their current levels - an increase in the firm's apparel output index of one percent comes at the expense on average of 0.14 percent of the good under consideration. On the input side 29 out of 36 coefficients are statistically significant, 35 of the 36 coefficients have the correct (non-negative) sign, and in the one case where capital is negative it is not significant.

In the multi-product setting, returns to scale can be defined in a variety of ways depending upon what feature of production is of interest. If we hold the other outputs constant and increase all inputs by one percent, we get a range for most industries of an increase in output of the good under consideration between 0.8 and 1, which is the sum of the coefficients on all three inputs. Above, we report that "returns" to output of a good If we hold inputs constant and increase the other-output index by one percent ranges from -0.08 to -0.14. If we increase all inputs and the output index by one percent - the sum of all coefficients - then we get a range of increases that principally lie between 0.7 and 0.9. In the single-product case researchers frequently report returns to scale close to one but comparisons to the multi-product case are frustrated by the fact that they are estimating different function, the latter of which holds other outputs constant and the former of which does not.

5.2 The link between import competition and productivity

Table 4 presents results from the OLS and IV regressions of productivity on import shares. All specifications include 8-digit product indicators and quarterly-time indicator variables. Our ten alternative estimates for α_1 range from 0.84 to 1.17 and are all statistically significant.

5.2.1 Non-instrumented Results

In column 1, we regress firm-product productivity on lagged productivity and product-level import share. Changes in import share are positively correlated with productivity but the magnitude is small; the estimated value of α_1 from equation (12) is estimated to be 0.10, implying an increase of 10% in the import share with a 1.0% increase in firm-product productivity. Since the average change in shares is 4.7%, this OLS estimate suggests import competition has played a relatively minor role in promoting economic growth.

[20]The 2-digit PRODCOM product categories are the same as the European industry codes (NACE).

We find a high persistence in firm-product productivity over time with a coefficient of 0.91 for lagged productivity that is statistically significant at 1%. This estimated value for ρ is approximately the same for all of the OLS and IV specifications we have estimated and it suggests changes in productivity are long-lived.

In column 2, we investigate whether productivity is related to the share of revenue that the product generates for the firm by including share-rank indicators. The left out good is the firm's "core" product, that is, the product that generates the most revenue for the firm. Products that generate less revenue are not produced as productively, with the second ranking product's productivity being 9.3% lower than the core product, the third ranking product 20.9% less, and the fourth and above ranked products 32.3% less. All rank indicator variables are statistically significant at 1%. While the exact magnitudes of these differences do vary across our OLS and IV specifications the finding of this ordering of productivity by share-rank is very robust.

Column 3 adds interactions between import share and the rank of the product to test whether the magnitude of the change in productivity due to a change in import shares varies by share-rank. The lead coefficient α_1 is still small at 0.12 and significant at 1% and slightly higher than in the previous specifications, where it represented the average effect across all products. The interactions between import share and product rank are all negative, with -0.01 for the second product (but not statistically significant), -0.03 for the third product (significant at 1%) and -0.12 for products ranked more than 3 (significant at 1%). Thus the OLS results suggest changes in import shares impact the first, second, and third products similarly but do not affect products ranked higher than three.

5.2.2 Instrumented Results

Columns 4, 5, and 6 are the IV analogs to columns 1-3. They use the same price-weighted quantity index in the W-OPLP production function estimation. Our first-stage F-statistics from the regressions of import shares on our two instruments reject the hypothesis of weak instruments at the 1% level in all three IV regressions.

Column 4 shows estimates from the regression of productivity on lagged productivity and the lagged instrumented import share. Relative to column 1 the estimate of α_1 increases almost *ninefold* from 0.10 to 0.87 and is significant at the 10% level. When we add the share-rank indicators in column 5, the estimate of α_1 goes up to 0.99 and is significant at the 5% level. When we add the interactions of the share-rank indicators with the instrumented lagged import share in column 6 the estimate of α_1 climbs to 1.05 and remains significant at 5%. The increase from 0.12 to 1.05 when we move from OLS to IV is consistent with lagged import penetration being higher in product markets where domestic innovations in productivity are lower (and vice versa).

In column 6, the coefficients on the share-rank indicators decrease only a bit relative to OLS. However, the coefficients on the interactions tell a different story relative to the OLS results: all products - regardless of the product revenue ranking - exhibit increasing productivity in response to increases in import competition. A 1% increase in the lagged import share is associated with a 1% percent increase in productivity in the current period of both the first and second ranked products, and a 0.65% increase in productivity of all other products produced by the firm. All three coefficients are statistically significant at 1%. Recall that this impact is only the short-term effect because the estimated AR(1) coefficient is 0.89 and strongly significant.

Column 7 presents the first of ten robustness checks. We estimate the production function parameters with the modified Wooldridge estimator (W-OPLP) but using the unweighted quantity index instead of the price-weighted quantity index. The estimated coefficient on α_1 drops slightly to 1.01 and remains significant at the 5% level. The remaining point estimates are very similar to those from column 6. Table 5 and table A1 contain the other nine robustness checks. The estimates for α_1 range from 0.84 to 1.17 and seven of the nine are significant at the 5% level (the other two are significant at the 10% level). For the most part the other coefficients are very similar across these specifications. Readers not interested in these details can skip directly to Section 7.3.

For comparison, Column 1 of table 5 reprints the results from our preferred specification (column 6 of table 4). All nine specifications use the price-weighted quantity index, and except for columns 2 and 3, all of these specifications estimate the production function parameters with the W-OPLP estimator. In column 2, we estimate the production function but address simultaneity using just materials as the proxy (the Wooldridge-LP estimator). We find an estimate of α_1 of 1.06. In column 3 we ignore simultaneity and use OLS to estimate the production function parameters. We find the estimated coefficient is 0.84, the lowest of all of our alternative estimates. Column 4 uses our alternative measure of the import share that does not adjust for re-export. For this specification we estimate a value of α_1 of 0.93.[21] Column 5 does not include the product's output price in the estimation of the production functions and we find an estimate of 0.89 for α_1. Column 6 allows the price-weighted quantity index and its squared value to enter the production function during estimation, as argued by Diewert (1973), and the coefficient increases to 1.17, the largest estimate of α_1 across all eleven specifications.

We currently pool single and multiproduct firms. Column 1 of table A1 reports results for only multiproduct firms and Column 2 uses both single- and multiproduct firms - the

[21] In previous versions, we also experimented with measures of import shares in value instead of quantity, and found similar results. Results are available from the authors.

full sample - but includes an indicator variable for multiproduct firms in the import share regression. The respective α_1's are 1.08 and 1.11 and both are significant at the 5% level.

Firms that are active in international markets may respond differently to increases in import competition relative to those that only sell in the domestic market. Column 3 of table A1 includes two indicator variables, one for whether the firm producing the product imports and one for whether they export. The estimate of α_1 is 1.02 and significant at the 5% level. Column 4 of table A1 includes two indicator variables, one for whether the firm imports goods in the same 8-digit category as the good it is producing and one for whether it exports that particular good. Both variables are lagged by one quarter. The estimate is 1.01 and again significant.

We also find two additional side results in line with previous papers in the literature. Firms that import appear to be slightly more efficient at making their goods (column 3), and exported goods appear to be produced slightly more efficiently as well (column 4).

5.3 Changes in the Value of Output due to Changes in Import Competition

Equation (7) shows how we translate changes in import shares into changes in the value of manufacturing output for any product j. The expected percentage change in productivity in the current period due to a change in the lagged import share is given by multiplying our preferred estimate of α_1 of 1.05 by the change in the lagged import share for that 8-digit product category. We multiply this expected change in productivity in the current period by the current revenue of the product to estimate the total expected change in product revenue this period. The AR(1) coefficient of 0.89 implies these changes are highly persistent, and we account for future gains in productivity by scaling up this estimated change in current revenue by $\frac{1}{1-0.89}$. By design, the total lifetime change in revenues will be positive in years when the lagged import share increases and negative when the import share decreases.[22]

Table 6 reports the entire distribution of 65,242 changes in the long-run value of produced output due to changes in the previous period's input share from 1997-2007. There is a tremendous amount of dispersion in the changes in the value of output due to changes in import shares. Almost 35% of the realized changes are negative because import shares decrease in many cases (see Table 2). On average changes in prior year's input share leads to an increase in the long-run value of output of over 22,000 euros. Across industries the largest average change is 96,000 euros in Electrical Machinery followed by

[22]We did not have enough variation to allow for precise estimation of different coefficients on increases and decreases in import shares but we could not reject that they were significantly different from one another.

Apparel (75,000) and Basic Metals (71,000). The median changes in import shares are close to zero and this leads to the median changes in the value of output to be close to zero across all 11 2-digit industries. Both the positive and negative changes can be very large for products with the biggest revenues, as in industries like Machinery and Equipment, Basic Metals, and Electrical Machinery. Across these industries the 10th percentile of the distribution in these industries ranges between -1.8 to -2.5 million euros and the 90th percentile changes ranges between 2.2 and 2.5 million euros.

In table 7, we aggregate the positive and negative changes separately across industries in each year from 1997 to 2007. On average, the value of increased output due to increases in import shares ranges from 1.1 to 1.4 billion euros in any given year and the decreases range from -1.1 to -1.4 billion euros. These numbers are not small relative to the overall average annual total value of real output in Belgian manufacturing of 55 billion euros. The net changes in every year are positive except for 1997 and most years range from between 100 and 300 million euros. Aggregating over the entire sample period the overall gain in the value of output due to increased import competition is on the order of 1.4 billion euros, almost 2.5% of average annual output.

6 Conclusion

We develop a new approach to estimate firm-product productivity for multiproduct firms using detailed quarterly data on inputs and on the physical quantities of goods produced by firms. We use our estimates of 8-digit firm-product level productivity to study the link between productivity and import competition. Our results show a strong positive relationship between productivity and import competition, pointing towards the disciplinary effect of competition on efficiency. Over the sample period, we find an aggregate effect on Belgian manufacturing of over 1.2 billion euros. Consistent with several theoretical papers in international trade, we find that firms are more productive at their core products. We also find that, while the productivity of all products benefit from increased competition, the "core" products experience the biggest increases.

While our main finding is that increased import competition leads to higher productivity, we do not analyze in this paper the channels through which firms generate these productivity gains. Therefore, our results as such provide indirect evidence in favor of recent extensions of multi product firms models that suggest that firms adapt their innovation strategy when facing trade liberalization (see e.g. Dhingra, 2013; Eckel et al., 2015). We leave this line of investigation for future research.

References

[1] Ackerberg, D., Benkard, L., Berry, S., and Pakes, A. Econometric Tools for Analyzing Market Outcomes. Chapter 63 in Handbook of Econometrics: Volume 6A, Edited by J. Heckman and E. Leamer, North Holland 2007.

[2] Ackerberg, D., K. Caves, and G. Frazer, 2015. Identification Properties of Recent Production Function Estimators. Econometrica 83, 2411-2451.

[3] Aghion, P., and P. Howitt, 1996. *Endogenous Growth Theory.* MIT Press.

[4] Amiti, M., Konings, J. and Itskhoki, O., 2018. International Shocks, Variable Markups and Domestic Prices. Working Paper.

[5] Bernard, A., E. Blanchard, I. Van Beveren, and H. Vandenbussche, 2012. Multi-Product Exporters, Carry-Along Trade and the Margins of Trade. NBER Working Paper #18246.

[6] Bernard, A., S. Redding, and P. Schott, 2010. Multiple-Product Firms and Product Switching. American Economic Review 100, 70-97.

[7] Bernard, A., S. Redding, and P. Schott, 2011. Multi-product Firms and Trade Liberalization. Quarterly Journal of Economics 126, 1271-1318.

[8] Bloom, N., M. Draca, and J. Van Reenen, 2016. Trade Induced Technical Change? The Impact of Chinese Imports on Innovation, IT and Productivity. Review of Economic Studies 83, 87-117.

[9] De Loecker, J., 2011. Product Differentiation, Multi-Product Firms and Estimating the Impact of Trade Liberalization on Productivity. Econometrica 79, 1407-1451.

[10] De Loecker, J., 2013. Detecting Learning by Exporting. American Economic Journal: Microeconomics 5, 1-21.

[11] De Loecker, J., P. Goldberg, A. Khandelwal, and N. Pavcnik, 2016. Prices, markups and Trade Reform. Econometrica 84, 445-510.

[12] de Roux, N., Eslava, M., Franco, S. and Verhoogen, E., 2020. Estimating Production Functions in Differentiated-Product Industries with Quantity Information and External Instruments. Mimeo, Columbia University.

[13] Dhingra, S., 2013. Trading away wide brands for cheap brands. American Economic Review 103, 2554–84.

[14] Dhyne, E., A. Petrin, and F. Warzynski, 2014. Deregulation and Spillovers in Multi-Product Production Settings. Mimeo, Aarhus University.

[15] Dhyne, E., A. Petrin, V. Smeets and F. Warzynski, 2022. Theory for Extending Single-Product Production Function Estimation to Multi-Product Settings. NBER Working Paper # 30784.

[16] Diewert, W. 1973. Functional Forms for Profit and Transformation Functions. Journal of Economic Theory 6, pp. 284-316.

[17] Duprez, C. 2014. Value Creation in Exports: A Diagnostic for Belgium. NBB Economic Review, September 2014, pp. 25-39.

[18] Eckel, C., Iacovone, L., Javorcik, B., and Neary, J. P., 2015. Multi-product firms at home and away: Cost- versus quality-based competence. Journal of International Economics 95, 216–232.

[19] Eckel, C. and Neary, P. J., 2010. Multi-Product Firms and Flexible Manufacturing in the Global Economy. Review of Economic Studies 77, 188–217.

[20] Eslava, M., Haltiwanger, J., Kugler, A. and Kugler, M., 2004. The effects of structural reforms on productivity and profitability enhancing reallocation: evidence from Colombia. Journal of Development Economics 75, 333–371.

[21] Foster, L., J. Haltiwanger, and C. Syverson, 2008. Reallocation, Firm Turnover, and Efficiency: Selection on Productivity or Profitability? American Economic Review 98, 394-425.

[22] Garcia Marin, A. and Voigtländer, N., (2019). Exporting and plant-level efficiency gains: It's in the measure. Journal of Political Economy 127, 1777-1825.

[23] Goldberg, P., A. Khandelwal, N. Pavcnik, and P. Topalova, 2010a. Imported Intermediate Input and Domestic Product Growth: Evidence from India. Quarterly Journal of Economics 126, 1727-1767.

[24] Goldberg, P., A. Khandelwal, N. Pavcnik, and P. Topalova, 2010b. Multiproduct Firms and Product Turnover in the Developing World: Evidence from India. Review of Economics and Statistics 92, 1042-1049.

[25] Gong and Sickles, 2018. Resource Allocation in the Multi-divisional Multi-product Firms. Rice University Working Paper.

[26] Itoga, 2019. Within-Firm Reallocation and the Impacts of Trade under Factor Market Imperfection. Working Paper.

[27] Holmes, T. and T. Schmitz, 2010. Competition and Productivity: A Review of Evidence. Annual Review of Economics 2, 619â€“42.

[28] Hummels, D., R. JÃ¸rgensen, J. Munch, and C. Xiang, 2014. The Wage Effects of Offshoring: Evidence from Danish Matched Worker-firm Data. American Economic Review 104, 1597â€“1629.

[29] Klette, T. J. and Z. Griliches, 1996. The Inconsistency of Common Scale Estimators When Output Prices Are Unobserved and Endogenous. Journal of Applied Econometrics 11, 343-361.

[30] Lau, L., 1976. A Characterization of the Normalized Restricted Profit Function. Journal of Economic Theory 12, 131-163.

[31] Levinsohn, J., and A. Petrin, 2003. Estimating Production Functions Using Inputs to Control for Unobservables. Review of Economic Studies 70, 317-341.

[32] Lileeva, A. and D. Trefler, 2010. Improved Access to Foreign Markets Raises Plant-Level Productivity... for Some Plants. Quarterly Journal of Economics 125, 1051-1099.

[33] Mayer, T., M. Melitz, and G. Ottaviano, 2014. Market Size, Competition, and the Product Mix of Exporters. American Economic Review 104, 495-536.

[34] Mayer, T., M. Melitz, and G. Ottaviano, 2016. Product Mix and Firm Productivity Responses to Trade Competition. Work in progress.

[35] Olley, S., and A. Pakes, 1996. The Dynamics of Productivity in the Telecommunications Industry. Econometrica 64, 1263-1297.

[36] Orr, S., 2019. Within-Firm Productivity Dispersion: Estimates and Implications. University of British Columbia Working Paper.

[37] Pavcnik, N., 2002. Trade Liberalization, Exit, and Productivity Improvements: Evidence from Chilean Plants. Review of Economic Studies 69, 245–276.

[38] Petropoulos, W, 2000. Industry Productivity Dynamics with Capacity Utilization and Differentiated Products, University of Michigan Ph.D.

[39] Roberts, M. and D. Supina, 2000. Output price and markup dispersion in micro data: the roles of producer heterogeneity and noise. Industrial Organization 9, 1-36.

[40] Smeets, V. and Warzynski, F., 2013. Estimating productivity with multi-product firms, pricing heterogeneity and the role of international trade. Journal of International Economics 90, 237-244.

[41] Valmari, N., 2016. Estimating Production Functions of Multi-product Firms. ETLA Working Paper No. 37, March, 2016.

[42] Wooldridge, J. M., 2009. On estimating firm-level production functions using proxy variables to control for unobservables. Economics Letters 104, 112-114.

Table 1: Average share of a firm's revenue derived by its individual products, 1997 to 2007

Product ranking within a firm determined by its share of the firm's total revenue.

Number of products produced by the firm at the Prodcom 8-digit level

	1	2	3	4	5	More than 5	N
Product rank							
1	100	77.5	69.5	64.2	57.8	49.4	
2		22.5	23.0	23.5	23.6	22.4	
3			7.5	9.1	11.1	11.8	
4				3.2	5.3	6.7	
5					2.2	3.9	
6+						5.8	
Share of manufacturing output	26.4	19.0	12.8	11.7	4.1	26.0	100
# observations	59,510	33,955	15,078	9,246	4,906	12,119	134,814

Number of products produced by the firm at the Prodcom 2-digit level

	1	2	3	4	5	More than 5	N
Product rank							
1	100	82.1	74.4	74.1	63.8	65.4	
2		17.9	20.2	19.2	22.8	17.5	
3			5.4	5.1	7.9	9.3	
4				1.6	3.8	4.5	
5					1.6	3.1	
6+						0.2	
Share of manufacturing output	78.4	16.3	3.4	1.4	0.3	0.2	100
# observations	117,598	14,669	1,884	481	129	53	134,814

Note: For any product rank i each column j reports the average share (in %) of the i-th product in total output for firms producing j products.

Table 2: Changes in import share defined in terms of "re-export" corrected quantities (I_{2jt}) from 1997 to 2007 at the 8-digit product level

Distribution of changes reported for each 2-digit product category

Code	Product category	Mean	Mean (weighted)	10th	25th	Median	75th	90th	# products
24	Chemicals	0.027	0.073	-0.297	-0.098	0.002	0.140	0.381	240
15	Food and beverages	0.008	-0.015	-0.202	-0.096	0.004	0.098	0.228	215
28	Fabricated metal products	0.172	0.196	-0.176	0.001	0.122	0.389	0.575	103
29	Machinery and equipment	0.062	0.070	-0.290	-0.034	0.019	0.185	0.493	93
25	Rubber and plastic products	0.028	0.058	-0.284	-0.116	0.020	0.164	0.322	81
18	Apparel	0.114	0.194	-0.008	0.006	0.060	0.177	0.323	68
27	Basic metals	0.002	0.014	-0.303	-0.036	0.020	0.104	0.269	62
26	Non metallic mineral	0.090	0.038	-0.112	-0.007	0.047	0.193	0.347	49
21	Paper	0.047	-0.004	-0.270	-0.037	0.040	0.181	0.443	47
17	Textile	0.003	-0.030	-0.318	-0.186	0.002	0.112	0.372	45
31	Electrical machinery	0.064	0.022	-0.347	-0.062	0.028	0.193	0.478	29
	All products	0.051	0.043	-0.216	-0.040	0.020	0.164	0.409	1075

Note: The weighted means weight by the product's 8-digit revenue share of the total 2-digit industry revenue.

Table 3: Multi-product production function estimates at 2-digit Prodcom level

Dependent variable q_{ijt} is log of the quantity sold in physical units at the 8-digit product level of good j by firm i at time t
All specifications include quarter-year and product dummies and a constant term

	(1) Food & beverages 15	(2) Fab. metal 28	(3) Other manuf. 36	(4) Chemicals 24	(5) Non metallic mineral 26	(6) Rubber & plastic 25	(7) Machinery & equip. 29	(8) Textile 17	(9) Apparel 18	(10) Paper 21	(11) Basic metals 27	(12) Electrical machinery 31
$q_{(-j)}$	-0.107***	-0.097***	-0.110***	-0.100***	-0.086***	-0.096***	-0.107***	-0.097***	-0.145***	-0.082***	-0.113***	-0.085***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.005)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.003)
l	0.148***	0.388***	0.346***	0.037*	0.320***	0.043*	0.390***	0.179***	0.257***	0.305***	0.169***	0.475***
	(0.010)	(0.016)	(0.022)	(0.021)	(0.016)	(0.025)	(0.030)	(0.022)	(0.023)	(0.031)	(0.027)	(0.045)
m	0.443***	0.379***	0.658***	0.634***	0.439***	0.761***	0.178*	0.698***	0.507***	0.535***	0.629***	0.474***
	(0.049)	(0.062)	(0.077)	(0.071)	(0.074)	(0.098)	(0.102)	(0.105)	(0.059)	(0.116)	(0.114)	(0.128)
k	0.089**	0.115*	0.152*	0.085	0.109	0.132*	0.067	0.166*	-0.131	0.161	0.060	0.000
	(0.039)	(0.059)	(0.080)	(0.091)	(0.075)	(0.078)	(0.104)	(0.100)	(0.146)	(0.102)	(0.116)	(0.123)
# obs.	47,125	17,309	12,673	13,742	11,036	11,106	11,138	9,512	6,008	5,465	5,551	3,984

Note: Each column reports the estimated coefficients using a modified variant of the Wooldrige-Mixed OP-LP estimator. Explanatory variables are in logs and include firm-level labor, the standard real indices for materials and for capital - i.e. the dollar value of each - and a firm level index of the output of its other goods $q_{i(-j)t}$ given by the revenue of all other products produced by the firm. We include the product's price as an additional control (see Estimation section and see Appendix for results that do not include price). Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Table 4: The link between firm-product technical efficiency, import competition and product rank
Dependent variable is the estimated firm-product technical efficiency residual
Product ranking within a firm determined by its share of the firm's total revenue

	using price weighted quantity index						using unweighted quantity index
	OLS			IV			IV
Dep. var.: technical efficiency	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Lagged import share	0.108***	0.101***	0.123***	0.878*	0.996**	1.055**	1.012**
	(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.014)	(0.501)	(0.494)	(0.460)	(0.474)
Second product		-0.093***	-0.090***		-0.094***	-0.089***	-0.110***
		(0.003)	(0.004)		(0.004)	(0.020)	(0.020)
Third product		-0.209***	-0.200***		-0.211***	-0.094***	-0.096***
		(0.004)	(0.005)		(0.005)	(0.025)	(0.026)
Product above rank 3		-0.323***	-0.287***		-0.325***	-0.195***	-0.194***
		(0.005)	(0.007)		(0.007)	(0.025)	(0.026)
Lagged import share x 2nd prod.			-0.014			-0.034	0.015
			(0.011)			(0.075)	(0.076)
Lagged import share x 3rd prod.			-0.039***			-0.398***	-0.384***
			(0.014)			(0.086)	(0.088)
Lagged import share x higher rank prod.			-0.122***			-0.422***	-0.410***
			(0.016)			(0.080)	(0.082)
Lagged technical efficiency	0.913***	0.889***	0.889***	0.915***	0.893***	0.894***	0.900***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
First stage F-statistic				55.36***	55.73***	16.09***	15.89***
# obs.	165,800	165,800	165,800	106,243	106,243	106,243	106,243

Note: Import shares are computed controlling for re-export. The first three columns report OLS estimates. The next three columns show the estimates where import share is instrumented by Chinese tariffs weighted by the share of China in the pre-sample period and world export supply. Column (7) is similar to column (6) but uses the TFP estimates from a specification with an alternative unweighted quantity index. All specifications include quarter-year and product dummies and a constant term (not reported). Robust standard errors are in parentheses. *** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.1$.

Table 5: The link between firm-product technical efficiency, import competition and product rank
Robustness to production function estimators

Dep. var.: technical efficiency	(1) Wooldridge-OPLP	(2) Wooldridge-LP	(3) OLS	(4) Import share in quantity unadjusted for re-export	(5) without price control	(6) with quadratic term for $q_{(-j)}$
Lagged import share	1.055**	1.069**	0.849*	0.936**	0.894*	1.171**
	(0.460)	(0.459)	(0.472)	(0.420)	(0.477)	(0.547)
Second product	-0.089***	-0.088***	-0.096***	-0.091***	-0.090***	-0.074***
	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.021)	(0.020)	(0.023)
Third product	-0.094***	-0.091***	-0.127***	-0.083***	-0.123***	-0.067**
	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.029)	(0.026)	(0.030)
Product above rank 3	-0.195***	-0.197***	-0.235***	-0.177***	-0.216***	-0.182***
	(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.026)	(0.029)	(0.026)	(0.030)
Lagged import share x 2nd prod.	-0.034	-0.042	-0.069	-0.022	-0.070	0.071
	(0.075)	(0.075)	(0.075)	(0.070)	(0.076)	(0.089)
Lagged import share x 3rd prod.	-0.398***	-0.417***	-0.405***	-0.385***	-0.389***	-0.327***
	(0.086)	(0.086)	(0.087)	(0.085)	(0.088)	(0.103)
Lagged import share x higher rank prod.	-0.422***	-0.430***	-0.452***	-0.424***	-0.456***	-0.296***
	(0.080)	(0.080)	(0.081)	(0.080)	(0.082)	(0.095)
Lagged technical efficiency	0.894***	0.892***	0.870***	0.893***	0.878***	0.876***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
# obs.	106,243	106,243	106,243	106,243	106,243	106,243

Note: This table reports results for the estimates in column 6 of table 4 using four alternative methods of estimating the production function estimates and the implied technical efficiency residuals. As before all production function specifications include quarter-year and product dummies and a constant term (not reported). Column (1) uses the same specification as column 6 in table 4. Column (2) uses the TFP measure from the Wooldridge-Levinsohn&Petrin estimator with price control. Column (3) uses ordinary least squares estimates of TFP. The next four columns use the Wooldridge OPLP estimator used in table 4. Column (4) uses an import share measure in quantity and that does not control for reexport. Column (5) uses the TFP estimates from the Wooldridge-OPLP estimator that does *not* include the product's output price as an control. Column (6) includes a quadratic term for the revenues of the other goods produced by the firm when estimating the production function parameters. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 6: The distribution of estimated annual changes in the value of 8-digit firm-product output attributable to changes in import shares, 1997-2007
Thousands of Euros

Code	Product category	10th	25th	Median	75th	90th	# obs	Mean
24	Chemicals	-971.6	-53.3	0.0	55.2	936.4	10005.0	10.8
15	Food and beverages	-281.1	-30.5	-0.1	21.4	250.7	22186.0	-5.9
28	Fabricated metal products	-517.7	-100.6	0.1	137.1	691.2	6063.0	53.8
29	Machinery and equipment	-2536.6	-185.4	0.1	277.1	2241.2	2180.0	17.7
25	Rubber and plastic products	-953.8	-105.5	0.7	158.1	1070.3	4820.0	28.0
18	Apparel	-71.9	-3.1	1.4	52.1	308.7	4708.0	75.7
27	Basic metals	-1924.4	-154.0	0.2	282.2	2509.1	2113.0	71.2
26	Non metallic mineral	-343.7	-41.8	0.8	78.9	431.9	4091.0	23.6
21	Paper	-1165.2	-99.9	0.2	141.6	1156.4	2799.0	20.1
17	Textile	-879.0	-106.9	0.5	121.3	826.3	2741.0	9.8
31	Electrical machinery	-1878.8	-208.9	0.1	344.0	2589.4	656.0	96.5
	All products	-538.3	-46.7	0.1	63.6	625.9	65242.0	22.6

Note: The table uses the estimates in column 6 in table 4 along with the realized changes in import shares to calculate the estimated change in output value. The change in output value is calculated by first multiplying the change in firm-product technical efficiency by the coefficient on import share to get the change in the growth rate in output due to the change in the import share. In order to account for the time series persistence in technical efficiency implied by the AR(1) term we scale additional value in output by $\frac{1}{1-\hat{\rho}}$, where $\hat{\rho}$ is the estimated value of the AR(1) coefficient from column 6 of table 4.

Table 7: Aggregate manufacturing gains and losses from increases and decreases in import competition, 1997-2007
Millions of Euros

	Firm-product gains with increases in import share (1)	Frm-product losses with decreases in import share (2)	Total Change (1)+(2)
1997	1,122	-1,473	-351
1998	1,246	-1,105	141
1999	1,376	-1,237	138
2000	1,317	-1,245	72
2001	1,407	-1,369	38
2002	1,369	-1,095	273
2003	1,407	-1,191	216
2004	1,372	-1,002	370
2005	1,278	-1,033	245
2006	1,357	-1,140	217
2007	1,263	-1,147	116
Total	14,514	-13,038	1,476

Note: The table reports the sum of all estimated productivity gains, losses and net gains at the annual level across all 2-digit manufacturing industries reported in Table 5.

Table A1: The link between firm-product technical efficiency, import competition and product rank
Other checks on robustness to production function estimation and importing/exporting

Dep. var.: technical efficiency	(1) Only multi-product firms	(2) All firms pooled with multi-product indicator in production estimation	(3) Does the firm import or export ?	(4) Is the product imported or exported by the firm ?
Lagged import share	1.086**	1.114**	1.020**	1.012**
	(0.439)	(0.459)	(0.469)	(0.468)
Second product	-0.136***	-0.159***	-0.090***	-0.090***
	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.020)
Third product	-0.140***	-0.170***	-0.095***	-0.094***
	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.025)	(0.025)
Product above rank 3	-0.242***	-0.267***	-0.197***	-0.197***
	(0.027)	(0.026)	(0.025)	(0.025)
Lagged import share x 2nd prod.	-0.116	0.023	-0.030	-0.029
	(0.077)	(0.075)	(0.074)	(0.074)
Lagged import share x 3rd prod.	-0.512***	-0.332***	-0.397***	-0.398***
	(0.092)	(0.086)	(0.086)	(0.086)
Lagged import share x higher rank prod.	-0.565***	-0.376***	-0.419***	-0.419***
	(0.087)	(0.080)	(0.080)	(0.080)
Multi-product indicator		0.149***		
		(0.005)		
Lagged Importer indicator			0.017**	-0.004
			(0.007)	(0.005)
Lagged exporter indicator			0.006	0.025***
			(0.007)	(0.006)
Lagged technical efficiency	0.873***	0.885***	0.892***	0.892***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
# obs.	84,493	106,243	106,243	106,243

Note: Column (1) considers only multi-product firms. Column (2) considers all firms but adds an indicator variable for multi-product firms when estimating the production function parameters. Column (3) includes two indicator variables, one for whether the firm is an importer, the other for whether the firm is an exporter. In column (4), the import and export indicators are on if the firm is exporting or importing that specific product. All specifications include quarter-year and product dummies and a constant term (not reported). Robust standard errors are in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table A2: Productivity Estimates - by prodcom2, splitting logO - WOPLP

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
VARIABLES	10	25	31	20	23	22	28	13	14	17	24	26	27
lnsame4d	-0.033***	-0.048***	-0.036***	-0.025***	-0.022***	-0.035***	-0.045***	-0.055***	-0.043***	-0.044***	-0.030***	-0.005	-0.039***
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.016)	(0.003)
lno4	-0.045***	-0.067***	-0.063***	-0.045***	-0.033***	-0.047***	-0.049***	-0.044***	-0.061***	-0.056***	-0.044***	0.011	-0.033***
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.021)	(0.004)
lnl	0.134***	0.462***	0.223***	-0.076***	0.238***	-0.041**	0.539***	0.289***	0.296***	0.039	-0.035	-0.210*	0.317***
	(0.008)	(0.017)	(0.020)	(0.017)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.032)	(0.019)	(0.020)	(0.030)	(0.029)	(0.118)	(0.038)
lnm1	0.238***	0.244***	0.535***	0.479***	0.299***	0.661***	0.014	0.203***	0.337***	0.236***	0.541***	0.968***	0.434***
	(0.038)	(0.055)	(0.067)	(0.061)	(0.067)	(0.068)	(0.118)	(0.074)	(0.035)	(0.083)	(0.082)	(0.251)	(0.109)
lnm2	0.178***	0.076*	0.179***	0.240***	0.184***	0.272***	0.224***	0.213***	0.393***	0.323***	0.135	0.453**	0.160
	(0.027)	(0.045)	(0.052)	(0.045)	(0.057)	(0.059)	(0.074)	(0.049)	(0.044)	(0.084)	(0.084)	(0.200)	(0.106)
lnk	0.053	0.104	-0.004	0.117	0.451***	0.232***	-0.288**	0.137**	0.037	0.231**	0.362***	-0.364	0.372**
	(0.043)	(0.070)	(0.084)	(0.080)	(0.106)	(0.081)	(0.121)	(0.067)	(0.100)	(0.108)	(0.140)	(0.277)	(0.156)
lnp	-1.035***	-1.021***	-1.018***	-1.030***	-1.137***	-1.039***	-0.921***	-1.079***	-1.058***	-0.956***	-1.214***	-0.965***	-1.012***
	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.008)	(0.010)	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.011)	(0.016)	(0.013)	(0.017)	(0.018)	(0.012)
Observations	72033	22227	17423	24768	15425	18395	11494	15766	11062	7544	8427	1797	6135

Robust standard errors in parentheses

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Columns labeled by two-digit product ISIC