This PDF is a selection from a published volume from the National Bureau of Economic Research

Volume Title: Challenges of Globalization in the Measurement of National Accounts

Volume Authors/Editors: Nadim Ahmad, Brent Moulton, J. David Richardson, and Peter van de Ven, editors

Volume Publisher: University of Chicago Press

Volume ISBNs: 9780226825892 (cloth), 9780226825908 (electronic)

Volume URL: https://www.nber.org/books-and-chapters/challenges-globalizationmeasurement-national-accounts

Conference Date: March 9-10, 2018

Publication Date: May 2023

Chapter Title: Comment on "A Portrait of US Factoryless Goods Producers"

Chapter Author(s): Teresa C. Fort

Chapter URL: https://www.nber.org/books-and-chapters/challenges-globalizationmeasurement-national-accounts/comment-portrait-us-factoryless-g oods-producers-fort

Chapter pages in book: p. 447 – 450

UNCTAD. 2013. World Investment Report. Accessed December 15, 2016. http:// unctad.org/en/pages/PressRelease.aspx?OriginalVersionID=113. Accessed December 15, 2016. http://unctad.org/en/PublicationChapters/wir2013ch4_en .pdf.

Comment Teresa C. Fort

Overview and Contribution

"A Portrait of US Factoryless Goods Producers" by Fariha Kamal makes an interesting contribution to the growing body of evidence on firms that do not perform physical transformation activities but are nevertheless broadly involved in the manufacturing of goods. These firms are important to understand because they show how traditional measures of manufacturing activity based on production workers may miss important parts of the overall production process. Moreover, factoryless goods producers (FGPs) seem to be innovation intensive when compared to other firms, which suggests that their activities are likely to have important implications for growth and productivity.

Kamal (forthcoming) adds to existing work on FGPs by combining a number of micro-level data sets on employment, R&D, patenting, and trademarking with new data sources for identifying FGPs. This work leads to two significant contributions. First, she assesses the extent of FGP firms outside manufacturing and wholesale. Second, she can measure the extent to which FGP activity is tied to standard measures of innovation, such as patenting and R&D expenditure.

There are two particularly interesting results in Kamal (forthcoming). First, Kamal finds that FGPs' workforce composition is skewed toward workers in headquarter establishments. This is similar to Bernard and Fort (2015), who find that FGP wholesale firms have an average of three times as much management and professional and technical services employment as non-FGP wholesale firms. Finding these results outside the wholesale sector is suggestive of an important role for FGPs in the growth of pro-

Teresa C. Fort is an associate professor of business administration at Tuck School of Business, Dartmouth College, and a faculty research fellow of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

The research in this paper was conducted while the author was a Special Sworn Status researcher of the US Census Bureau at the Boston Research Data Center and the Center for Economic Studies. Any opinions and conclusions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Census Bureau, the NBER, or any other institution to which the authors are affiliated. All results have been reviewed to ensure that no confidential information is disclosed. For acknowledgments, sources of research support, and disclosure of the author's material financial relationships, if any, please see https://www.nber.org/books -and-chapters/challenges-globalization-measurement-national-accounts/comment-portrait -us-factoryless-goods-producers-fort.



Figure 12C.1 2007 share of wholesales establishments that design their products, by contract manufacturing purchase status. Source: 2007 Census of Wholesale trade.

fessional and technical services employment in the United States. It also raises a number of potentially interesting venues for future work. Do FGP firms have foreign production facilities with which these professional and technical services employees interact? Are FGPs associated with growth of outsourcing of manufacturing as firms specialize in the innovation part of the production process?

Second, Kamal finds that FGPs perform considerably more innovation than non-FGP firms. For instance, her results show that FGP firms spend four to seven times more on R&D expenditures compared to non-FGP firms. FGPs also patent and trademark more than non-FGP firms. Given the importance of innovation for long-term growth, these results are particularly interesting. They resonate with findings in Bernard and Fort (2013), where we find that wholesale firms that purchase contract manufacturing services (CMS) are more likely to design the goods they sell. Figure 12C.1 shows that while less than 10 percent of wholesale plants that do not purchase CMS design their products, about 40 percent of plants that purchase domestic CMS design their own products, and over 50 percent of plants that purchase CMS from foreign countries design their goods. An interesting and related question for future work is to assess the extent to which the ability to leverage low-cost production opportunities in foreign countries has increased US innovation. Kamal's work on FGPs provides strong evidence that any answer to this question must examine the innovative decisions of not only US manufacturers but also non-manufacturing FGP firms.

Comments

In this section, I describe two important considerations for interpreting the results of the chapter. First, I discuss the likely role of industry compo-

	Participation Shares			Means		
	Plants	Sales	Emp	Sales (000s)	Emp	ln(VAP)
In CMS Sample	0.54	0.75	0.71	36,778	86	4.56
Out of CMS Sample Not Answered	0.21	0.23	0.24	29,548	77	4.61
Not Asked	0.25	0.02	0.05	2,314	13	4.25
No Info	0.00	0.00	0.00	21,147	61	4.75
All Manufactures	1.00	1.00	1.00	26,638	66	4.50

Table 12C.1 Plant shares and characteristics by response status

Note: 2007 Special inquiries data for the Census of Manufactures. Excludes administrative records. CMS questions only asked on CMF long form.

sitional differences. Second, I describe the role of sample selection. Finally, I conclude by discussing interesting potential avenues for future work raised by this chapter.

Industry compositional differences may drive the results. For instance, if FGPs are concentrated in semiconductor manufacturing-related activities, as studied by Bayard, Byrne, and Smith (2015), then it is likely not meaning-ful to compare them to firms in other sectors, such as Walmart.

These compositional differences are likely quite important. For example, Bernard and Fort (2015) find that wholesale FGP firms' imports are highly concentrated in two sectors: electrical machinery and equipment and machinery (HS2 product codes 84 and 85). These two sectors comprise 40 percent of wholesale FGP firms imports but only 30 percent of non-FGP wholesale firms' imports. While this comparison is limited to wholesale, the possibility of compositional factors driving results becomes more severe when comparing wholesale FGP firms to retail or other sector non-FGP firms. This is highlighted by the fact that Kamal finds that the share of imports over sales is three times higher at FGP firms compared to non-FGPs. In contrast, Bernard and Fort (2015) find that within the wholesale sector, FGP firms import just 38 percent of sales compared to non-FGPs that import 86 percent. Kamal's finding that FGP firms are smaller than non-FGPs is also reversed when comparing FGP wholesale firms to non-FGP wholesale firms. Bernard and Fort (2015) find that FGPs are about twice the size of non-FGPs. In additional results, we found these differences persisted when controlling for industry differences.

Another important consideration when analyzing the results from this chapter is the role of selection into the sample. In Fort (2017), I show that there is considerable selection into the special inquiries data, both in terms of which establishments were asked the question, and conditional on being asked, which establishments responded to the question. Table 12C.1 shows that establishments in the 2007 Census of Manufactures (CM) that

responded to the special inquiry question had an average of 86 employees and \$37 million in sales, while plants that were asked but did not answer the question had 77 employees and only \$30 million in sales. A further 25 percent of plants were not asked the question at all, and these plants are considerably different. The non-asked establishments had just 13 employees and \$2 million in sales.

The role of selection will be even more severe when analyzing the Company Organization Survey, as that survey is geared toward large, multiestablishment firms. Specifically, it covers all large firms (multi-establishment firms with 250 or more employees) and smaller companies that appear to be expanding to multiple establishments. Assessments about the relative size or other activities of FGP versus non-FGP firms may thus be different when considering the universe of US firms instead of the selected sample of large firms for which CMS data are available. It is also possible that the share of aggregate FGP activity will be overstated if larger firms are more likely to be FGPs and those are disproportionately represented in the samples.

Overall, this is an interesting new chapter on factoryless goods producers that takes a first stab at expanding the analysis beyond the manufacturing and wholesale sectors. By exploiting the new data constructed by Kamal, we can hope to learn more about the sectoral composition of FGP firms, and about how FGPs differ from other firms in their industry.

References

- Bayard, Kimberly, David Byrne, and Dominic Smith. 2015. "The Scope of US Factoryless Manufacturing." In *Measuring Globalization: Better Trade Statistics for Better Trade Policy*, Volume 2, edited by Susan Houseman and Michael Mandel, 81–120. Upjohn Institute.
- Bernard, Andrew B., and Teresa C. Fort. 2013. "Factorlyess Goods Producers in the US." NBER Working Paper No. 19396. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

———. 2015. "Factoryless Goods Producing Firms." *American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings* 105 (5): 518–23.

- Fort, Teresa C. 2017. "Technology and Production Fragmentation: Domestic versus Foreign Sourcing." *Review of Economic Studies* 84 (2): 650–87.
- Kamal, Fariha. 2018. "A Portrait of US Factoryless Goods Producers." In *Challenges of Globalization in the Measurement of National Accounts*, edited by Nadim Ahmad, Brent Moulton, J. David Richardson, and Peter van de Ven. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press. This volume.