

Inter-firm Heterogeneity in Production

Michele Battisti Valentino Dardanoni Stefano Demichelis*

November 26, 2024

Abstract

This paper studies inter-firm heterogeneity in production. Unlike much of the existing research, which primarily addresses heterogeneous production through unobserved fixed effects, our approach also focuses on differences in factors' output elasticities. Using manufacturing data from Chile, Colombia, and Japan, we apply an innovative Empirical Bayes methodology to estimate heterogeneous Cobb-Douglas production functions. We uncover substantial heterogeneity in both factor neutral productivity and factor elasticities, with a strong negative correlation between them. These findings are consistently observed across datasets and remain robust when using CES and intensive Cobb-Douglas specifications. We show that accounting for these features has significant implications for issues such as markup estimation, firms' technology adoption, and productivity measurement.

J.E.L. classification codes: D24, E23, L00, C11.

Keywords: Production function, Empirical Bayes, Productivity.

arXiv:2411.15980v1 [econ.GN] 24 Nov 2024

*Battisti: University of Palermo, e-mail: michele.battisti@unipa.it. Dardanoni: University of Palermo, email: valentino.dardanoni@unipa.it. Demichelis: University of Pavia, e-mail: stefano.demichelis@unipv.it.

1 Introduction

Eighty years ago, Marschak and Andrews (1944) addressed the issue of interfirm heterogeneity in production techniques, suggesting that production function parameters should be treated as random, due to factors like "*..different technical efficiency, differences in the prices paid or received by various firms (by dropping the assumption of perfect competition); differences in the ability or willingness to choose, or luck in choosing the most profitable combination of resources..*".¹

Despite Marschak's insight, much research has concentrated on unobserved fixed effects, such as managerial quality, with less attention given to heterogeneity in factor elasticities. However, if firms differ solely in factor-neutral productivity (as is common in production studies), a strict dominance order in adopted technologies emerges, which makes it difficult to justify the existence of many competitive firms within the same sector. In contrast, when both factor-neutral productivity and factor returns vary, firms develop distinct strengths and comparative advantages, selecting technologies from an available range of technological options.

This paper introduces a novel Empirical Bayes (EB) approach to estimate the joint distribution of production function parameters.² EB estimation is particularly effective for capturing firm-level heterogeneity in production, allowing us to flexibly model the parameters' marginal and joint distributions, which allows an unrestricted pattern of association among parameters, firm characteristics, and heteroscedastic errors. Using data from Chilean, Colombian, and Japanese manufacturing firms, we estimate Cobb-Douglas production functions with heterogeneous factor elasticities. Across all samples, we observe substantial interfirm heterogeneity not only in factor-neutral productivity but also in factor returns, with a substantial negative correlation between these two forms of productivity.

Our estimates of the joint distribution of technology parameters significantly affect productivity measurements. We observe considerable dispersion in both factor-neutral productivity and returns to scale in each sample, with most technological differences occurring within, rather than across, firm size or industry categories. Using Bernard and Jones (1996)'s Total Technology Productivity (TTP) measure, which considers both productivity types, we find that TTP dispersion is dramatically lower than factor-neutral productivity dispersion: the 90/10 TTP

¹ Marschak and Andrews (1944) contributed many seminal insights, including: i) introducing transmission bias in production function estimation—a topic that has since inspired a significant literature (Olley and Pakes, 1996, Levinsohn and Petrin, 2003, Akerberg, Caves and Frazer, 2015, among others); ii) highlighting identifying challenges of production function estimation under flexible inputs; iii) advancing joint estimation of production functions with profit-maximizing first-order conditions.

² EB techniques are becoming popular in economics for addressing parameter heterogeneity. Chen (2024) cites over 30 studies in economics employing EB methods in the last five years, and Gu and Walters (2022) provides a comprehensive introduction to EB methods in the field.

ratios are an order of magnitude smaller than those for TFP, which ignores heterogeneity in factor returns.

Understanding the joint distribution of technology parameters is also crucial for examining issues like market power, markups, and misallocation. Heterogeneity in factors' parameters affects markup estimates; our findings indicate that our markup estimates show far greater dispersion than Translog estimates due to greater observed heterogeneity.³ Moreover, heterogeneity in production techniques can impact interpretations of market structure. For instance, variations in capital-labor ratios might be attributed to misallocation, although they could result from firms employing different production technologies (Restuccia and Rogerson (2017)).

Though parameter heterogeneity in production function estimation has long been recognized (at least since Kuh (1963)) as a source of bias in linear panel models, there have been few direct estimates of heterogeneous production functions. An early approach was proposed by Zellner *et al.* (1966), who suggested estimating Cobb-Douglas parameters as random coefficients. Mairesse and Griliches (1988) applied this approach to Japanese, French, and U.S. firms, finding notable heterogeneity (see Li, 2021 for recent work). Other studies have indirectly addressed heterogeneity by, for example, interacting firm-specific productivity shocks with factor parameters or using polynomial approximations (e.g., Doraszelski and Jaumandreu, 2018; Oberfield and Raval, 2021; Akerberg, Hahn and Pan, 2022; Demirer, 2022; Li and Sasaki, 2024). A smaller body of work has explored discrete production technologies through switching or finite mixture regressions (e.g., Van Biesebroeck, 2003; Battisti, Belloc and Del Gatto, 2020; Kasahara, Schrimpf and Suzuki, 2023).⁴

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 details our EB approach. Section 3 introduces the data on Colombian, Chilean, and Japanese manufacturing firms used for estimation. In Section 4, we estimate a heterogeneous Cobb-Douglas production function and highlight substantial heterogeneity in technology parameters. Section 5 presents robustness checks, including CES and intensive Cobb-Douglas estimations. Section 6 discusses the economic significance of our findings, and Section 7 gives concluding remarks.

2 Empirical Bayes Estimation

We propose a novel nonparametric EB methodology to estimate the joint distribution of production function parameters. Suppose we have a sample (Y_{it}, X_{it}) where Y_{it} is a measure of output and X_{it} a vector of inputs, $i=1, \dots, I$ denotes the firm and $t=1, \dots, T$ time. In typical

³ See De Loecker and Warzynski, 2012, Oberfield and Raval, 2021, Raval, 2023 for recent studies on markup estimation.

⁴ These studies generally find that a limited number of techniques (often between two and four) effectively represent firms' technological range.

panel data applications, I is large, but usually firms are observed for a short period of time. The production function for Y_{it} can be written as

$$Y_{it} = h(X_{it}; \psi_i) + \epsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

where ψ_i , $i = 1, \dots, I$, is a vector of heterogeneous firm specific technology parameters, and ϵ_{it} is an idiosyncratic normally distributed i.i.d. error with zero mean and (heteroschedastic) standard deviation s_i . Notice that while we are assuming normality of ϵ , we are not making any specific distribution assumption on the distribution of the technology parameter ψ and its joint distribution with ϵ .

The set of parameters is defined by a vector $\theta = (\psi, s)$, with individual firm parameters $\theta_i = (\psi_i, s_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, I$. To guarantee identification of the heterogeneous parameter ψ_i , we assume that the function $h(X_{it}; \psi_i)$ in (1) is injective for all X . Notice that a necessary condition for identifiability is that the number T of observations for each firm is greater than the size of ψ , a significant constraint to the application of these methods with short panels.

We define a finite number of unobserved firm *types* by discretizing θ into finite grids of sizes M^1, M^2, \dots, M^J , arranged lexicographically, where J denotes size of θ . There are $\prod_{j=1}^J M^j = Q$ types: an (unknown) firm type q ($q = 1, \dots, Q$) is a tuple of discretized parameters θ . The discretized joint distribution of the parameters is a $Q \times 1$ vector, described by a probability vector π . Notice that the joint distribution of θ is unrestricted (a discrete nonparametric approximation of the true distribution).⁵ For any firm i , conditional on being of type q , having inputs X_{it} , and error variance s_i^2 , the conditional density of Y_i is

$$f_{iq} = f(Y_i | q, X_{it}, s_i) = \prod_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{s_i} \varphi \left(\frac{Y_{it} - h(X_{it}; q)}{s_i} \right). \quad (2)$$

We collect f_{iq} into the $I \times Q$ matrix F .

Given a prior distribution, say, π^0 , by Bayes Theorem we find the posterior probability that firm i is of type q

$$h_{iq} = \frac{f_{iq} \times \pi_q^0}{\sum_v f_{iv} \times \pi_v^0}.$$

Repeating for all firms and all types, we collect h_{iq} in the $I \times Q$ matrix H . H is a function of F and π^0 , and the i th row of H gives the posterior probability of firm i being a given unobserved type. If we take the mean of each column of H , we get an estimate of the posterior distribution, say $\hat{\pi}$, of the discretized joint distribution of the parameters θ .

Any Bayesian method requires the choice of an appropriate prior distribution (π^0 in our

⁵ Typically grids are built with equally spaced points in intervals which contain most of the parameters' density.

setting). EB estimation typically uses the available data to specify a (parametric or non-parametric) prior. It is straightforward to see that, in this setting, the prior and posterior distributions are multinomial, with a common support on a fixed set of states. Using an approach suggested by Dardanoni and Demichelis (2024), we propose that the choice of the prior is guided by two rational expectations conditions: (1) the choice of the prior is *coherent* with the posterior (that is $\pi^0 = \hat{\pi}$), which conveys the idea that, if given the evidence brought by the data, the posterior distribution agrees with the prior, there is no reason to change the prior; (2) the prior is *stable*, in the sense that if it puts zero weight on a parameter configuration, Bayesian updating of nearby priors decreases its weight.

Formally, coherence and stability imply that estimating the posterior distribution $\hat{\pi}$ is equivalent to finding a stable fixed point in a nonlinear system of equations from a probability simplex into itself. Dardanoni and Demichelis (2024) show that a coherent and stable fixed point (say π^*) exists and is unique.⁶ Furthermore, they show that the number of strictly positive points in π^* is less or equal than the number of firms I , and π^* is the unique Maximum Likelihood estimate of π .⁷

The unique fixed point π^* can be found by an iterative procedure,⁸ which is guaranteed to converge to the unique global maximum of the Log Likelihood. From the estimated π^* , by appropriate marginalization, we can directly derive statistics such as means, standard deviations, and correlations of the joint distribution of the production function parameters. Furthermore, given π^* , using the rows of the matrix of posterior probabilities $H(F, \pi^*)$, we immediately get an estimate of the production function parameters for each individual firm $i = 1, \dots, I$ by taking their expected values.

3 Data

In this study, we use three datasets: plant censuses for Chilean and Colombian firms (popular choices in this field, see e.g. Levinsohn and Petrin, 2003, Gandhi *et al.*, 2020 Raval, 2023, among others) and Orbis Bureau Van Dijk database for Japan, which offers the highest Orbis coverage among OECD countries. The Japanese data was extracted in July 2022.

Our analysis covers countries with different development levels, different periods of time, and varying numbers of firms per country. For output (Y), we use value added, for labor (L),

⁶ While existence follows immediately from Brouwer Theorem, the fixed point may not be necessarily unique: any degenerate probability vector is a fixed point in this context. Requiring that π^0 has full support would be inappropriate since, when there are few observations compared with the size of π^0 , we would expect many zeros. The stability property allows us to sort actual zeros from artifacts.

⁷ Notice the relationship with Nonparametric Maximum Likelihood Estimation by Kiefer and Wolfowitz (1956) and Koenker and Mizera (2014).

⁸ Formally this is equivalent to using the E step in the EM algorithm.

the number of workers, for capital (K), fixed assets. For ease of notation, we denote the natural logs of Y , K , and L as y , k , and l , respectively.

Since attrition may introduce additional heterogeneity, we include only firms operating throughout the entire period, always in the same sector, without addressing the selection issue highlighted by Olley and Pakes, 1996. In addition to this, we need data on intermediates to estimate the Translog production function for comparison, and data on wage share to compute labor markups, so we exclude missing data also on these two variables.

The final balanced samples for the entire period, include 1,535 Colombian firms between 1978 and 1989 (18,420 observations) and 1,096 Chilean firms between 1986 and 1996 (12,056 observations). For Japan, we adopt a conservative approach to reduce outlier heterogeneity. We apply the Billor, Hadi and Velleman (2000) algorithm to exclude 10% of univariate outliers from the marginal distributions of (Y, K, L) and multivariate outliers from their joint distribution⁹. The final sample consists of 39,116 observations from 5,588 firms between 2013 and 2019 (we stop at 2019 to avoid using budget data may be influenced by the Covid period). Table 11 below reports the sample statistics for the three working samples with variables in logs.

Table 1: Working sample statistics

	Chile			Colombia			Japan		
	y	k	l	y	k	l	y	k	l
Median	10.96	8.81	3.79	9.63	7.83	3.93	7.75	8.36	3.74
Mean	11.16	9.00	4.02	9.88	8.01	4.09	7.85	8.36	3.84
Standard deviation	1.86	2.02	1.10	1.77	1.82	1.16	1.14	1.36	1.00
Obs	12056			18420			39116		
Firms	1096			1535			5588		

4 Heterogeneous Cobb-Douglas production function

The Cobb-Douglas (hereon CD) production function (Cobb and Douglas, 1928) may be defined as

$$y_{it} = \alpha_{it} + \beta_i k_{it} + \gamma_i l_{it} + \xi_{it} \quad (3)$$

⁹ For example, Raval (2023) excludes 2% of observations to avoid extreme values. Removing outliers can be particularly important in the presence of noisy capital measurements, which is a known issue in the Orbis dataset, as discussed by Gopinath *et al.* (2017).

where α is a factor neutral technology term (such as TFP, Hicksian-neutral productivity, and managerial ability), β and γ output elasticities, and ξ_{it} a zero mean error.

Notice that we are assuming time and firm heterogeneity in α but firm heterogeneity alone in β and γ , since some components of α , as for instance managerial quality, may change even when factor endowments remain unchanged. Our modeling strategy recognizes that intercepts may be correlated with inputs changes, possibly inducing endogeneity bias (Olley and Pakes, 1996), but time invariance in output elasticities implies that, after a firm has determined its factor endowments, in the short run the embodied technology (Hulten, 1992) may only change minimally over time.¹⁰ We capture the time-varying heterogeneity in α_{it} through individual coefficients $(\alpha_i^0, \alpha_i^1, \alpha_i^2)$

$$\alpha_{it} = \alpha_i^0 + \alpha_i^1 t + \alpha_i^2 t^2 + \eta_{it} \quad (4)$$

with η_{it} as a zero mean error. Our modeling of the productivity term α_{it} is similar to that of Akerberg, Hahn and Pan (2022), with a key difference. In our case, time-varying heterogeneity is captured through heterogeneous (α^1, α^2) coefficients, whereas in their setting, α_{it} is split into a homogeneous process linked to time and an idiosyncratic third order Markov process, capturing individual heterogeneity.¹¹

The final estimating equation is

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i^0 + \alpha_i^1 t + \alpha_i^2 t^2 + \beta_i k_{it} + \gamma_i l_{it} + \phi_{it} \quad (5)$$

with $\phi_{it} \sim N(0, s_i)$, thus allowing for heteroschedasticity. Comparing equations 3 and 5, notice that ϕ_{it} plays the role of an independent and idiosyncratic normal error as in equation 1, while these restrictions do not hold for ξ_{it} in equation 3.

Henceforth we will denote the firm specific time averaged idiosyncratic factor neutral productivity, which sometimes will be referred as the “intercept”, as $\bar{\alpha}_i = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\alpha_i^0 + \alpha_i^1 t + \alpha_i^2 t^2)$, where $T = 11, 12, 7$ respectively for Chile, Colombia and Japan.

¹⁰ The flexibility of our approach allows for the incorporation of time-varying effects also in factor elasticities if sufficient data were available. Increasing the number of estimated parameters may require longer panels and a very large number of firms for accurate estimation.

¹¹ The setting in (4) is thought to deal with the transmission bias issue of Marschak and Andrews (1944), pioneered in the last three decades by Olley and Pakes (1996), under the assumption that the firm specific second order polynomial fully captures heterogeneous productivity dynamics. Note that this implies the manager is aware of the firm’s productivity evolution over time (as estimated by our quadratic trend setting) and chooses inputs accordingly. In other words, we assume that residual innovations to productivity are observed after input decisions are made. As noted earlier, this approach may be more reasonable over shorter time spans.

4.1 Results

Before illustrating our EB estimation results, we exploit our panel data structure to estimate firms' parameters individually for each firm i by OLS, (as in Mairesse and Griliches (1988)), after checking that each firm's regression matrix is full rank. Clearly with short panels this may be *very* inefficient. In all the samples, not only the means of the estimated factor elasticities may be unrealistic, but as shown in Figure 12 in the Appendix, there is an enormous dispersion in estimated parameters, suggesting a need for some form of regularization. The EB approach, by "borrowing strength" from the whole sample of firms, improves the efficiency of the compound estimation of the parameters' joint distribution.

Turning to our EB approach, to estimate the rational expectation prior π^* we need to find an appropriate discretization of the estimating parameters $(\alpha^0, \alpha^1, \alpha^2, \beta, \gamma, s)$. We discretize α^0 , β , and γ with 15 and α^1 , α^2 and s in 6 equally spaced points, using non negative grids for β , and γ . We end up with $15^3 6^3 = 729,000$ parameters' configurations which nonparametrically approximate the true joint distribution.

We combine equations (2) and (5) to find the density matrix F which collects the conditional densities for all firms. Having obtained F for the three samples, we apply an iterative algorithm (starting with a uniform distribution) to find the fixed point π^* . As expected, in each sample the number of non zero points in the support is lower than the number of firms.

From π^* , we directly get the parameters' means, which are shown in Table 2 below. Chile has an average scale elasticity greater than one, Colombia's is approximately one, and Japan's is less than one. The labor output elasticities vary significantly across the three samples, while the capital output elasticities show more similarity.

We compare our estimates of the mean factor elasticities' parameters with standard estimators. Table 11 in the Appendix shows that empirical Bayes (EB) estimates are largely consistent with those obtained using the Akerberg, Caves, and Frazer (ACF) Translog production function approach (Akerberg *et al.*, 2015) and are slightly smaller than the OLS estimates across all samples. The ACF Translog production function addresses endogeneity in productivity shocks, as described by Akerberg *et al.* (2015). For our estimation, we use the ACF Stata `prodest` routine developed by Rovigatti and Mollisi (2018).

4.2 Parameters heterogeneity

Table 3 shows some dispersion metrics for our EB estimates and for the ACF Translog. The standard deviation of the intercept is approximately six times greater, that of the capital-output elasticity about twice as large, and that of the labor-output elasticity between two and three times larger in the EB estimates compared to the Translog estimates. Similarly, differences

Table 2: Average value of EB CD parameters

	α^0	β	γ	α^1	α^2	s
Chile	4.035 (0.084)	0.425 (0.009)	0.789 (0.016)	0.025 (0.005)	-0.002 (0.000)	0.408 (0.005)
Colombia	3.996 (0.065)	0.407 (0.007)	0.668 (0.011)	-0.055 (0.003)	0.004 (0.000)	0.373 (0.004)
Japan	3.491 (0.023)	0.329 (0.003)	0.387 (0.003)	0.022 (0.002)	-0.001 (0.000)	0.184 (0.001)

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses.

between the 90th and 10th percentiles also indicate substantial heterogeneity, and more so for the EB estimates compared to the Translog ones. Looking at Figures 1, 2, 3, the EB estimates generally show a more dispersed and asymmetric distribution with pronounced long tails.

Table 3: Comparison of elasticities: EB and Translog

Chile						
	Intercept		Capital-output elasticity		Labor-output elasticity	
	Translog	EB	Translog	EB	Translog	EB
Median	4.270	4.356	0.333	0.396	0.836	0.684
Std dev	0.375	2.765	0.107	0.289	0.245	0.525
P90/P10	1.213	5.024	2.264	8.123	2.345	5.408
Colombia						
	Intercept		Capital-output elasticity		Labor-output elasticity	
	Translog	EB	Translog	EB	Translog	EB
Median	4.704	3.993	0.264	0.354	0.726	0.621
Std dev	0.470	2.555	0.080	0.279	0.115	0.415
P90/P10	1.278	3.832	2.203	6.206	1.489	5.357
Japan						
	Intercept		Capital-output elasticity		Labor-output elasticity	
	Translog	EB	Translog	EB	Translog	EB
Median	6.681	3.701	0.245	0.290	0.540	0.358
Std dev	0.265	1.700	0.119	0.203	0.149	0.213
P90/P10	1.096	4.011	4.541	5.607	2.024	4.654

Notice also that while EB estimates capture the heterogeneity in structural technological parameters, the Translog production function, as remarked by Raval (2023), "*..allows the output elasticities to vary based upon inputs, but they remain a deterministic function of production parameters and inputs with no error term. Thus, the Translog estimated output elasticities cannot capture the full degree of heterogeneity in input shares..*". In other words, the Translog production function assumes uniform technological parameters, and differences in factor elasticities arise because firms use varying levels of inputs.




Figure 1: Distributions EB vs Translog Chile




Figure 2: Distributions EB vs Translog Colombia




Figure 3: Distributions EB vs Translog Japan

Table 4: CD: firm specific parameters correlation

Chile			
	β	γ	$\beta + \gamma$
α^0	-0.661	-0.456	-0.828
β		-0.292	0.262
γ			0.847
Colombia			
	β	γ	$\beta + \gamma$
α^0	-0.703	-0.488	-0.887
β		-0.207	0.430
γ			0.795
Japan			
	β	γ	$\beta + \gamma$
α^0	-0.831	-0.130	-0.819
β		-0.337	0.548
γ			0.604

Finally, we consistently find very strong negative correlations between the intercepts and the factors' output elasticities in Table 4 in all samples.¹² We discuss possible interpretations

¹² A similar apparent puzzle was found and discussed in Mairesse and Griliches (1988) and Li (2021). Li (2021) suggests the possibility that this is due to latent omitted factors affecting production.

for this rather surprising result in Subsection 6.1 below.

5 Robustness and further analysis

5.1 Simulation

To check the validity of our EB procedure, we perform a simulation using a CD production function

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta_i k_{it} + \gamma_i l_{it} + \epsilon_{it}, \quad \epsilon_{it} \sim N(0, \sigma_i) \quad (6)$$

where, for simplicity, we set the dynamic coefficients α_1 and α_2 to zero. We use the same structure as our Japanese dataset, using the sample values of (k_{it}, l_{it}) with $N = 5588$ and $T = 7$. To generate the heterogeneous coefficients $(\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i, \sigma_i)_{i=1, \dots, N}$, we draw from a multivariate normal distribution reflecting the joint distribution of $(\hat{\alpha}_i, \hat{\beta}_i, \hat{\gamma}_i, \hat{\sigma}_i, k_i, l_i)$ (the estimated individual coefficients and the mean values of capital and labor for the N firms). Overall, this procedure generates realistic heterogeneous parameters with plausible correlations to the firms' input values, providing a non-discretionary structure to the simulation.

We generate $b = 1, \dots, 100$ samples of firm-specific parameters $(\alpha_i^b, \beta_i^b, \gamma_i^b, \sigma_i^b)$, and for each sample b , we generate firms' output as:

$$y_{it}^b = \alpha_i^b + \beta_i^b k_{it} + \gamma_i^b l_{it} + e_{it}^b$$

where e_{it}^b is a draw from $N(0, \sigma_i^b)$. For each sample b , we estimate $(\hat{\alpha}_i^b, \hat{\beta}_i^b, \hat{\gamma}_i^b, \hat{\sigma}_i^b)$ using our EB method, and compare the estimated parameters with the "true" values used in the DGP.

Table 5 shows the Bias and MSE of the mean and standard deviation of the estimated parameters. We observe that the means of all individual parameters are estimated quite precisely, but their dispersion is underestimated. This is expected, as it is well known in the EB literature that the variance of the expected value of the estimated individual parameters tends to underestimate the true variance. (Kass and Steffey, 1989).

Table 5: EB Simulation

BIAS			
	α	β	γ
mean	0.031	-0.002	-0.004
std	0.488	0.062	0.059
MSE			
	α	β	γ
mean	0.002	$< 10^{-4}$	$< 10^{-4}$
std	0.237	0.004	0.004

5.2 CES

The CD production function implicitly assumes that the elasticity of substitution between capital and labor is unitary. As a further robustness check, and to show the general applicability of our EB approach, we estimate a well known generalization of the CD, the CES production function proposed by Arrow *et al.* (1961). Details of the EB estimation CES are in section A in the Appendix. We see that even in presence of large and heterogenous elasticity of substitution among inputs, in all three samples there is substantial consistency between CD and CES estimation with respect to comparable estimates: we see a remarkably similar distributions of both factor neutral productivity and returns to scale, and a similar strong negative correlation.

5.3 Intensive CD production function

For robustness we also estimate a simple heterogeneous CD intensive production function

$$\ln Y_{it} = a_i + b_i \ln X_{it} + \epsilon_{it}$$

in our three samples, with Y being output for worker, X capital for worker, and $\epsilon_{it} \sim N(0, \sigma_i)$. The EB estimates are reported in Table 6 below:

Table 6: EB estimates of intensive CD

	Chile	Colombia	Japan
Mean of a	5.02	4.21	2.28
Std of a	1.22	1.16	1.25
Mean of b	0.40	0.39	0.38
Std of b	0.23	0.27	0.20
Corr of a,b	-0.86	-0.87	-0.87

which shows a large heterogeneity in the production parameters in all three samples, and again a consistently large negative correlation between the factor neutral parameter and the factor output elasticity.

5.4 Unexplained heterogeneity

We have consistently found a large inter-firm heterogeneity in estimated technology parameters. This naturally raises the question: what proportion of this heterogeneity is linked to observable firm characteristics such as firm size or production sector?

The first row in Table 7 shows that in a simple variance decomposition (ANOVA with 33, 43, 39 degrees of freedom for the three countries), the share of the variance explained by size (10 groups for the deciles of Y , K , L , and respectively 8, 17, 13 industry 2-digit level industries for

Chile, Colombia and Japan) is less than 10% for the α, β, γ CD parameters, with the exception of intercept in Japan (around 13%). The share of the variance explained by industry sectors alone is very small, with a peak of 2% for the intercept in Colombia.

Table 7: Fraction of variance explained by size and industry


	CHILE		
	α^0	β	γ
Explained by sectors and size	8.9%	6.4%	6.0%
Explained by sectors	0.5%	0.9%	1.0%
	COLOMBIA		
	α^0	β	γ
Explained by sectors and size	7.3%	7.2%	5.3%
Explained by sectors	2.1%	1.5%	1.1%
	JAPAN		
	α^0	β	γ
Explained by sectors and size	7.3%	4.7%	5.2%
Explained by sectors	1.9%	0.9%	0.6%

We also look at the heterogeneity of estimated parameters at the industry sector levels. We see similar patterns both for the CD and CES estimated parameters (figures 13 and 14 in the Appendix). The general message is that most inter-firm technological differences are within, not across, size or sectors. Attempting to fully address heterogeneity by assuming sector or size homogeneity appears to be rather unhelpful.

6 Implications of technological heterogeneity

6.1 The puzzle of negative correlation between factor neutral productivity and returns to scale

As we stressed in the previous sections, we found in all of our estimations (under CD, CES and Intensive CD production functions) a rather striking negative correlation between the intercept and returns to scale. Figure 4 below shows the scatterplot in the CD case.



CD

Figure 4: Returns of scale vs Intercepts

We propose an explanation for this apparently puzzling result in terms of dominated production techniques. Consider a simple one-factor production function $\ln Y = a + b \ln X$. In Figure 5 below we plot the production function for three firms with heterogeneous parameters (a_i, b_i) for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Since firm 1 has both a higher intercept *and* slope than firms 2 and 3, its production technology dominates those of the other two firms. Generally, given a set of firms $\{a_n, b_n\}_{n=1:N}$, absence of dominance implies the condition $(a_i - a_j)(b_i - b_j) \leq 0$ for all i, j (i.e. a negative correlation between a and b).

On the other hand, assuming heterogeneity in factor neutral productivity a but homogeneity in factor output elasticity b implies a strict order of dominance in production technologies for all firms in the market, which is not compatible with any reasonable concept of firms' equilibrium. On the contrary, absence of dominance implies that some firms employ better factor neutral technologies, and others have better returns from the inputs. This is reflected in the large negative correlation between a and b found in our estimation of the intensive production functions in section 5.3 above.

In the presence of more than one input, one possible way to address production dominance is to define for each firm $i = 1 \dots N$ a 'composite input', say $\bar{X}_{it} = g(K_{it}, L_{it})$ for an appropriate homogeneous function $g : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+$, and then follow the same reasoning as in the single input




Figure 5: Dominated production functions

case. Hardy, Littlewood and Pólya (1952) famously discuss a family of homogeneous functions for aggregating sets of numbers called the *generalized means of order p* , $(\sum_k a_k \theta_k^p)^{1/p}$, which encompasses most usual definitions of means.

Defining the ‘composite input’ \bar{X} as a generalized mean of order p , we may rewrite both the CD and CES estimating equations (5) and (7) as

$$\ln Y_{it} = \bar{\alpha}_i + \nu_i \ln(\bar{X}_{it}) + v_{it},$$

with $\bar{X}_{it} = \left(\omega_i K_{it}^{\frac{\sigma_i-1}{\sigma_i}} + (1 - \omega_i) L_{it}^{\frac{\sigma_i-1}{\sigma_i}} \right)^{\frac{\sigma_i}{\sigma_i-1}}$ in the CES case, and $\bar{X}_{it} = K_{it}^{\frac{\beta_i}{\nu_i}} L_{it}^{\frac{\gamma_i}{\nu_i}}$ in the CD case (the limiting case of the generalized mean of order p for $p \rightarrow 0$). The non dominance condition $(\bar{\alpha}_i - \bar{\alpha}_j)(\nu_i - \nu_j) \leq 0$ induces a negative correlation between the factor neutral parameter $\bar{\alpha}$ and the returns to parameter scale ν , which we consistently find in both our CD and CES estimations and in all three samples.

We notice the link to the theoretical literature on technological menu choice (Jones, 2005, León-Ledesma and Satchi, 2019). In this literature firms choose an appropriate technology (the local production function) from an available technological bundle (the global production function) in the technology parameter space. When the isoquant in this space has a well behaved concave shape, if firms do not choose dominated technologies, a negative correlation would appear.¹³

¹³ As argued above, the standard strategy of allowing heterogeneity in the intercept but assuming homogeneity in the output elasticities implies a strict order of dominance of local production functions which appears to be in contrast with the technology menu literature.

6.2 Productivity measurement

In a well-known survey on productivity measurement, Syverson (2011) describes large and persistent measured productivity differences across firms as a stylized fact. In the standard estimating equation $y_{it} = a_i + bk_{it} + cl_{it} + \epsilon_{it}$, a_i is used as the (logged) productivity estimate for firm i , typically referred by a variety of names such as “Total Factor”, “Factor Neutral”, or “Hick-sian” productivity. Reviewing studies over the past couple of decades, Syverson (2011) argues that “*researchers in many fields [...] have documented, virtually without exception, enormous and persistent measured productivity differences across producers, even within narrowly defined industries*”.

In our three datasets a measure of the dispersion of factor neutral productivity may be obtained, following Syverson (2011), by comparing the values of e^a at the 90th and 10th percentile. Using the values of the estimated \hat{a}_i from our estimation, using the two digits industry level we find average 90/10 differences within each sector equal to 188.8, 94.3 and 53.7 in Chile, Columbia and Japan. respectively


Even taking into account the fact that at two digit industry level we may expect significant differences in firms TFPs, these numbers are indeed enormous. As argued above, if we were appraising firms’ productivity simply by using \hat{a}_i without taking into account factors’ output elasticities heterogeneity, we would implicitly assume a strict order of dominance in firms’ adopted technologies. Clearly these numbers are hardly compatible with any reasonable concept of industry equilibrium.

The standard practice in the literature of using factor neutral productivity to appraise firms’ heterogeneity in technological productivity does not account for heterogeneity in the factors’ elasticities of output. A proposal for considering *both* factors output elasticities and factor neutral productivity for productivity comparisons is discussed in Bernard and Jones (1996), who propose a measure of productivity called Total Technology Productivity (TTP). Given the estimating equation $y_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta_i k_{it} + \gamma_i l_{it} + \epsilon_{it}$, we follow Bernard and Jones (1996) and define


$$\ln(TTP_i) = \alpha_i + \beta_i \ln(K_0) + \gamma_i \ln(L_0)$$

for an appropriate choice of reference levels of capital and labor K_0 and L_0 . In words, TTP captures how much any given firm would produce if all firms employed exactly the same amount of K_0 and L_0 of capital and labor. We calculate $\ln(TTP)$ for each sector, using the median values in each sector of capital and labor for K_0 and L_0 , as recommended by Bernard and Jones (1996). The results are illustrated in figure 6 below, where the yellow histograms refer to the distribution of (logged) factor neutral productivity, the blue ones the distribution of returns to scale, and the red ones $\ln(TTP)$.


Looking at the histograms, it appears that both (logged) factor neutral productivity and returns to scale have roughly comparable dispersion.



Chile



Colombia



Japan

Figure 6: TTP distributions

The mean of $\ln(TTP)$ equals the sum of the means of the two types of productivity; however, given the strong negative correlation between α and $\beta + \gamma$, the histograms of $\ln(TTP)$ show a dramatic reduction in total productivity dispersion: the 90/10 ratios of $\ln(TTP)$ are equal to 3.92, 3.16 and 3.88 respectively for Chile, Columbia and Japan, which, even at the rather coarse sector level, seem much more reasonable estimates of productivity dispersion than those

calculated without considering factors' productivity.¹⁴

Finally, notice that the $\ln(TTP)$ decomposition is not directly applicable to the Translog production function, since heterogeneity in individual firms output elasticities is induced by different factors' levels, so that for any fixed level of K_0 and L_0 there is no production heterogeneity. However, it is interesting to notice, from Table 9 above, that the 90/10 ratio in TFP ($\exp \alpha_i$) is equal to 3.94, 3.60 and 3.01 in Chile, Columbia and Japan, which are quite comparable to our estimates of the 90/10 ratios for TTP. Of course, the key difference is that Translog productivity dispersion estimates attribute these productivity differences solely to the factor neutral components.

6.3 Markup Estimation

In the production approach, the markup for any input is given by the ratio of its output elasticity to its share of revenue (Hall, 1988, De Loecker, 2011). Different ways to account for technological parameter heterogeneity may result in different markups: Raval (2023) observes that, "*...in order to use the production approach, economists will have to allow more heterogeneity in technology*" as ignoring such heterogeneity can result in systematically biased markups estimation. For instance, under a homogeneous CD production function, all firms have the same output elasticities, so differences in markups will only arise from differences in inputs' share of output. Conversely, as discussed in the previous subsection 4.2, the Translog production function underestimates the extent of heterogeneity, which will affect markups estimation.

We compute labor markups using under two methods: i) using our EB estimated firm specific labor elasticity coefficients, and ii) using the estimated firm specific labor elasticity coefficients from the ACF Translog. Results are presented in Figure 7 and Table 8. The EB measures are much more dispersed (for Chile and Colombia the standard deviation and the 90/10 percentile ratios are both around double in EB case and slightly less for Japan) due to the detection of higher levels of heterogeneity.

¹⁴ As for intercountry differences, notice that there are 7, 17 and 13 two-digit sectors in Chile, Columbia and Japan. The standard deviation of $\ln(TTP)$ is respectively 38%, 35% and 34% smaller than the logged factor neutral productivity $\ln(\alpha)$. For robustness, we repeat these productivity calculations using the CES production function, and in the Appendix we show that results are comparable to those obtained using the Cobb Douglas.

		Mean	St.Dev.	90/50 perc.	90/10 perc.	Firms
Chile	Translog	2.13	1.00	1.71	3.16	1207
	EB	2.18	1.88	2.52	7.64	1096
Colombia	Translog	1.70	1.37	1.44	2.27	1760
	EB	1.64	2.42	2.24	8.31	1535
Japan	Translog	1.72	2.41	2.66	6.89	5588
	EB	1.25	2.50	2.96	10.95	5588

Table 8: Labor markups for Chile, Colombia and Japan




Figure 7: Markups comparison

7 Conclusions

The paper shows that the Empirical Bayes (EB) approach effectively addresses heterogeneity in estimating production functions, thereby revealing key characteristics of production technology. By employing a nonparametric EB estimation method, we identified substantial inter-firm heterogeneity in factor-neutral productivity and output elasticities of inputs, as well as a large negative correlation between these two aspects. These findings are consistent across datasets from Chilean, Colombian, and Japanese firms and remain robust when applying CD, CES, and

intensive CD production function specifications.

We show that taking into account inter-firm technological heterogeneity is beneficial for addressing empirical issues such as productivity, misallocation and markup measurements. It also enables a more direct and empirically grounded connection with related theoretical concepts such as local technology suitability (discusses at least since Atkinson and Stiglitz, 1969) and technology menu choice (Jones, 2005; León-Ledesma and Satchi, 2019).

However, it is important to note some limitations of our EB method. A key requirement for identifiability is that each firm must have more observations than the number of parameters being estimated. This implies that more complex models require longer panel data. Nonetheless, even with extended panels, the curse of dimensionality quickly constrains the feasible size of the discrete grid.

Acknowledgements.

We thank the participants of the Productivity and Growth Workshop in Palermo, and in particular to Daniel Akerberg, Mert Demirer, Miguel Leon-Ledesma and Devesh Raval for valuable discussions and suggestions. We are also grateful to Christopher Parmeter, Nicola Persico, David Rivers, and Chad Syverson for their comments, and to Cinzia Di Novi for kind hospitality.

References

- Akerberg, D. A., Caves, K. and Frazer, G. (2015) Identification properties of recent production function estimators, *Econometrica*, **83**, 2411–2451.
- Akerberg, D. A., Hahn, J. and Pan, Q. (2022) Nonparametric identification using timing and information set assumptions with an application to non-hicks neutral productivity shocks.
- Arrow, K. J., Chenery, H. B., Minhas, B. S. and Solow, R. M. (1961) Capital-labor substitution and economic efficiency, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, **43**, 225–250.
- Battisti, M., Belloc, F. and Del Gatto, M. (2020) Labor productivity and firm-level tfp with technology-specific production functions, *Review of Economic Dynamics*, **35**, 283–300.
- Bernard, A. B. and Jones, C. I. (1996) Comparing apples to oranges: productivity convergence and measurement across industries and countries, *American Economic Review*, **86**, 1216–1238.
- Billor, N., Hadi, A. S. and Velleman, P. F. (2000) Bacon: blocked adaptive computationally efficient outlier nominators, *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, **34**, 279–298.
- Chen, J. (2024) Empirical bayes when estimation precision predicts parameters, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.14444v4*.
- Cobb, C. W. and Douglas, P. H. (1928) A theory of production (1928), *American Economic Review*, **18**, 139–152.
- Dardanoni, V. and Demichelis, S. (2024) Rational expectations nonparametric empirical bayes estimation, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.06129*.
- David, P. A. and Van de Klundert, T. (1965) Biased efficiency growth and capital-labor substitution in the us, 1899-1960, *The American Economic Review*, pp. 357–394.
- De Loecker, J. (2011) Product differentiation, multiproduct firms, and estimating the impact of trade liberalization on productivity, *Econometrica*, **79**, 1407–1451.
- De Loecker, J. and Warzynski, F. (2012) Markups and firm-level export status, *American Economic Review*, **102**, 2437–2471.
- Demirer, M. (2022) Production function estimation with factor-augmenting technology: An application to markups, *Job Market Paper*.
- Doraszelski, U. and Jaumandreu, J. (2018) Measuring the bias of technological change, *Journal of Political Economy*, **126**, 1027–1084.
- Gandhi, A., Navarro, S. and Rivers, D. A. (2020) On the identification of gross output production functions, *Journal of Political Economy*, **128**, 2973–3016.
- Gopinath, G., Kalemli-Özcan, Ş., Karabarbounis, L. and Villegas-Sanchez, C. (2017) Capital allocation and productivity in south europe, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **132**, 1915–1967.

- Gu, J. and Walters, C. (2022) Nber si 2022 methods lectures - empirical bayes methods, theory and application.
- Hall, R. E. (1988) The relation between price and marginal cost in us industry, *Journal of political Economy*, **96**, 921–947.
- Hardy, G. H., Littlewood, J. E. and Pólya, G. (1952) *Inequalities*, CUP.
- Hulten, C. R. (1992) Growth accounting when technical change is embodied in capital, *American Economic Review*, **82**, 964–980.
- Jones, C. I. (2005) The shape of production functions and the direction of technical change, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, **120**, 517–549.
- Kasahara, H., Schrimpf, P. and Suzuki, M. (2023) Identification and estimation of production function with unobserved heterogeneity, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.12067*.
- Kass, R. E. and Steffey, D. (1989) Approximate bayesian inference in conditionally independent hierarchical models (parametric empirical bayes models), *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **84**, 717–726.
- Kiefer, J. and Wolfowitz, J. (1956) Consistency of the maximum likelihood estimator in the presence of infinitely many incidental parameters, *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, pp. 887–906.
- Kmenta, J. (1967) On estimation of the ces production function, *International Economic Review*, **8**, 180–189.
- Koenker, R. and Mizera, I. (2014) Convex optimization, shape constraints, compound decisions, and empirical bayes rules, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **109**, 674–685.
- Kuh, E. (1963) *Capital stock growth: A micro-econometric approach*, North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- León-Ledesma, M. A. and Satchi, M. (2019) Appropriate technology and balanced growth, *Review of Economic Studies*, **86**, 807–835.
- Levinsohn, J. and Petrin, A. (2003) Estimating production functions using inputs to control for unobservables, *Review of Economic Studies*, **70**, 317–341.
- Li, M. (2021) A time-varying endogenous random coefficient model with an application to production functions, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.00982*.
- Li, T. and Sasaki, Y. (2024) Identification of heterogeneous elasticities in gross-output production functions, *Journal of Econometrics*, **238**, 105637.
- Maddala, G. and Kadane, J. B. (1967) Estimation of returns to scale and the elasticity of substitution, *Econometrica*, **35**, 419–423.
- Mairesse, J. and Griliches, Z. (1988) Heterogeneity in panel data: are there stable production functions?, *NBER Working Paper no. 2619*.

- Marschak, J. and Andrews, W. H. (1944) Random simultaneous equations and the theory of production, *Econometrica*, **12**, 143–205.
- Oberfield, E. and Raval, D. (2021) Micro data and macro technology, *Econometrica*, **89**, 703–732.
- Olley, G. S. and Pakes, A. (1996) The dynamics of productivity in the telecommunications equipment industry, *Econometrica*, **64**, 1263–1297.
- Raval, D. (2023) Testing the production approach to markup estimation, *Review of Economic Studies*, **90**, 2592–2611.
- Restuccia, D. and Rogerson, R. (2017) The causes and costs of misallocation, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, **31**, 151–174.
- Rovigatti, G. and Mollisi, V. (2018) Theory and practice of total-factor productivity estimation: The control function approach using stata, *The Stata Journal*, **18**, 618–662.
- Syverson, C. (2011) What determines productivity?, *Journal of Economic Literature*, **49**, 326–365.
- Van Biesebroeck, J. (2003) Productivity dynamics with technology choice: An application to automobile assembly, *Review of Economic Studies*, **70**, 167–198.
- Zellner, A., Kmenta, J. and Dreze, J. (1966) Specification and estimation of cobb-douglas production function models, *Econometrica*, **34**, 784–795.

A Heterogeneous CES production function

The CD production function implicitly assumes that the elasticity of substitution between capital and labor is unitary. For completeness, and to show the general applicability of our EB approach, we also estimate a well known generalization of the CD, the CES production function proposed by Arrow *et al.* (1961), hereon ACMS.

Briefly after ACMS, several authors proposed a generalization of the CES function accounting for the degree of homogeneity. Taking logs and assuming a heterogeneous dynamic structure for intercepts as in equation (4), with individual terms $\alpha^0, \alpha^1, \alpha^2$ the estimating equation is

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i^0 + \alpha_i^1 t + \alpha_i^2 t^2 + \nu_i \left(\frac{\sigma_i}{\sigma_i - 1} \right) \ln \left(\omega_i K_{it}^{\frac{\sigma_i - 1}{\sigma_i}} + (1 - \omega_i) L_{it}^{\frac{\sigma_i - 1}{\sigma_i}} \right) + v_{it} \quad (7)$$

where σ is the elasticity of substitution between capital and labor, ω is a distribution parameter, ν is the return to scale parameter and with $v_{it} \sim N(0, s_i)$. Similarly to the CD case, the firm specific factor-neutral productivity $\bar{\alpha}_i = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \alpha_i^0 + \alpha_i^1 t + \alpha_i^2 t^2$.

This function, which is usually called the generalized CES production function, is homogeneous of degree ν . Maddala and Kadane (1967) showed that, using the Kmenta (1967) approximation, omitting ν may imply a substantial estimation bias in σ .¹⁵ This CES function has seven parameters ($\alpha^0, \sigma, \nu, \omega, \alpha^1, \alpha^2, s$). We discretize α^0 with 9 equally spaced points in $[-5, 10]$, σ with 9 points, ν with 9 points and ω with 9 points. For s we use 6 points and we use a setting equal to the CD case for the α^1, α^2 terms. This results in $9^4 * 6^3 = 1,417,176$ parameters' configurations which nonparametrically approximate the true joint parameter distribution. We combine equations (2) and (7) to find the matrix F which collects the conditional densities for all firms, and apply an iterative algorithm (starting with an uniform distribution) to find the fixed point π^* . Table 9 below reports the means of the estimated coefficients.

The table shows that the mean elasticity of substitution σ is much bigger than one for all the countries; the mean of the distribution parameter ω is close to one third, unless than for Colombia, and the mean of the homogeneity parameters ν are close to the CD estimates. The dynamic parameters α^1, α^2 suggest again an average U-shape distribution for the intercept.

From π^* we get the posterior types joint distribution of the firm specific parameters. In Table 10 we show the correlations of the parameters of major interest, and in Figures 8, 9, 10 we present their histograms and (sorted) individual estimates which show again large heterogeneity in all technology parameters, similarly to the CD case. A large mass of the distributions of the elasticities of substitution are between 0 and 4, so that capital and labor may be seen more as substitutes than complements (but notice there are small proportion of firms in each countries that have complementary factors). As in the CD case, notice the very strong negative correlation between the intercept and returns to scale.

¹⁵ The original ACMS formulation implicitly assumes constant returns to scale, and is the most popular version in applications. An alternative generalization focuses on introducing factor augmenting technological parameters, without the unitary sum constraint (introduced by David and Van de Klundert, 1965). We also estimated this second specification, obtaining quite similar results for the common parameters.

Table 9: Average value of CES parameters

	α^0	ω	ν	σ	α^1	α^1	s
Chile	4.590 (0.085)	0.360 (0.007)	1.166 (0.016)	2.605 (0.078)	0.041 (0.005)	-0.002 (0.000)	392 (0.005)
Observations				12056			
Firms				1096			
Colombia	4.562 (0.053)	0.200 (0.004)	1.047 (0.009)	2.759 (0.051)	-0.058 (0.003)	0.005 (0.000)	0.370 (0.004)
Observations				18420			
Firms				1535			
Japan	4.013 (0.017)	0.342 (0.002)	0.691 (0.003)	1.736 (0.008)	0.013 (0.001)	-0.0001 (0.000)	0.192 (0.001)
Observations				39116			
Firms				5588			

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses.

Table 10: CES: firm specific parameters correlation

Chile			
	ω	ν	σ
α^0	-0.195	-0.822	-0.024
ω		0.071	-0.202
ν			-0.106
Colombia			
	ω	ν	σ
α^0	-0.068	-0.866	0.006
ω		-0.245	-0.281
ν			0.077
Japan			
	ω	ν	σ
α^0	0.006	-0.748	-0.107
ω		-0.145	-0.404
ν			-0.145




Figure 8: CES coefficients distributions Chile




Figure 9: CES coefficients distributions Colombia





Figure 10: CES coefficients distributions Japan



Returns to Scale


Figure 11: CD-CES comparison

B Other results


Table 11: Comparison among estimates' elasticities

		<i>EB</i>	<i>ACF Translog</i>	<i>Pooled</i>
Chile	Capital-Output elasticity	0.425 (0.009)	0.336 (0.003)	0.476 (0.019)
	Labor-Output elasticity	0.789 (0.016)	0.816 (0.007)	0.713 (0.033)
	RTS	1.214	1.149	1.189
Colombia	Capital-Output elasticity	0.407 (0.007)	0.262 (0.002)	0.473 (0.015)
	Labor-Output elasticity	0.668 (0.011)	0.728 (0.003)	0.718 (0.022)
	RTS	1.074	0.990	1.191
Japan	Capital-Output elasticity	0.329 (0.003)	0.237 (0.002)	0.264 (0.010)
	Labor-Output elasticity	0.387 (0.003)	0.543 (0.003)	0.600 (0.014)
	RTS	0.720	0.780	0.864


Standard errors among parenthesis. Pooled contains year dummies.



Chile




Colombia




Japan


Figure 12: OLS CD coefficients distributions



Chile




Colombia




Japan


Figure 13: CD coefficients distributions by sectors



Chile



Colombia



Japan

Figure 14: CES coefficients distributions by sectors