

What Causes Industry Agglomeration? Evidence from Coagglomeration Patterns

By GLENN ELLISON, EDWARD L. GLAESER, AND WILLIAM R. KERR*

Why do firms cluster near one another? We test Marshall's theories of industrial agglomeration by examining which industries locate near one another, or coagglomerate. We construct pairwise coagglomeration indices for US manufacturing industries from the Economic Census. We then relate coagglomeration levels to the degree to which industry pairs share goods, labor, or ideas. To reduce reverse causality, where collocation drives input-output linkages or hiring patterns, we use data from UK industries and from US areas where the two industries are not collocated. All three of Marshall's theories of agglomeration are supported, with input-output linkages particularly important. (JEL L14, L60, O33, R23, R32)

Industries are geographically concentrated.¹ This concentration is too great to be explained by exogenous spatial differences in natural advantage.² Why does this concentration occur? There is no shortage of theories that can explain the agglomeration of industries.³ But we have very little empirical work assessing the relative importance, or even general correctness, of these theories. This paper exploits patterns of industry coagglomeration to measure the relative importance of different theories of industry agglomeration.

The benefits of agglomeration ultimately reflect gains that occur when proximity reduces transport costs. Marshall (1920) emphasized three different types of transport costs—the costs of moving goods, people, and ideas—that can be reduced by industrial agglomeration. First, he argued that firms will locate near suppliers or customers to save shipping costs. Second, he developed a theory of labor market pooling to explain clustering. Finally, he began the theory of intellectual spillovers by arguing that in agglomerations, “the mysteries of the trade become no mystery, but are, as it were, in the air.” Firms, such as those described by AnnaLee Saxenian (1996) in Silicon Valley, locate near one another to learn and to speed their rate of innovation.

There are certainly anecdotal examples of individual industries that have agglomerated to reduce one or more these transport costs. It is challenging, however, to assess their relative

* Ellison: Department of Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, E52-380A, Cambridge, MA 02142, National Bureau of Economic Research (e-mail: gellison@mit.edu); Glaeser: Department of Economics, Harvard University, Littauer Center 315A, Cambridge, MA 02138, and NBER (e-mail: glaeser@fas.harvard.edu); Kerr: Entrepreneurial Management Unit, Harvard Business School, Rock Center 212, Boston MA 02163, and NBER (e-mail: wkerr@hbs.edu). We are grateful to Mohammad Arzaghi, Alex Bryson, Jim Davis, Keith Maskus, Pete Schott, Debbie Smeaton, and three anonymous referees for assistance. We thank Gilles Duranton for assistance in calculating our approximation of the Duranton and Overman (2005) metric. The research in this paper was conducted while the authors were Special Sworn Status researchers of the US Census Bureau at the Boston Census Research Data Center (BRDC). Support for this research from National Science Foundation grants ITR-0427889 and SES-0550897 is gratefully acknowledged. Research results and conclusions expressed are our own and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Census Bureau or the National Science Foundation. This paper has been screened to insure that no confidential data are revealed.

¹ See P. Sargant Florence (1948), E. M. Hoover (1948), Victor R. Fuchs (1962), Paul R. Krugman (1991a), Ellison and Glaeser (1997), and Gilles Duranton and Henry G. Overman (2005, 2008).

² See Ellison and Glaeser (1999).

³ See Johann Heinrich von Thünen (1826), Alfred Marshall (1920), Krugman (1991b), Thomas J. Holmes (1998), and Mohammad Arzaghi and J. Vernon Henderson (2008).

importance to agglomeration across industries as a whole. Each Marshallian theory predicts that the same thing will happen for similar reasons: plants will locate near other plants in the same industry because there is a benefit to locating near plants that share some characteristic. Our empirical approach exploits the information that can be found in coagglomeration patterns. Plants are similar to the other plants in their industry along many dimensions. But across industries, plants are similar in some dimensions and not in others. For example, some industry pairs exchange goods but employ very different workers. Other industries hire similar workers but never trade with each other. Hence, one can gain insight into which theories are more important by looking at which cross-industry similarities best predict which industries coagglomerate.⁴

Section I describes the data used to generate our coagglomeration indices. We use establishment level data from the Census of Manufacturing to calculate the discrete index of Ellison and Glaeser (1997) and an approximation of the continuous metric of Duranton and Overman (2005).

Section II reviews Marshall's three theories and discusses our empirical measure of the importance of each theory for each industry pair. For example, input-output linkages enable us to test whether different industries collocate to reduce the costs of shipping between customers and suppliers. Metrics for the extent to which industries share workers and ideas are similarly constructed. We also describe our calculations of the expected coagglomeration of each industry pair that would be expected to arise from the uneven spatial distribution of natural advantages, following Ellison and Glaeser (1999).

Section III presents our main empirical results. The ordinary least squares relationships support the importance of all three Marshallian theories and the importance of shared natural advantages. We estimate that shared natural advantages are more important than any single Marshallian factor, but not as important as the cumulative effect of the three Marshallian factors. Among the Marshallian factors, customer-supplier relationships have the strongest effect. These input-output linkages are closely followed by similar labor needs. Our proxies for intellectual spillovers are weaker than the other factors but still economically and statistically important. These relative rankings are subject to the caveat that we have imperfect proxies for the variables of interest and a finite number of measured natural advantages. Overall, each of the agglomeration theories plays a measurable role in agglomeration within manufacturing.

One concern with these results is that industrial relationships may be the result of collocation instead of the cause of collocation. Some industries may be flexible enough in their production processes that they adjust to nearby resources of labor and material inputs. If two industries locate near one another for random reasons, then those industries might both start using the same labor and raw materials that are readily available in their shared location. Section IV addresses this concern by developing two sets of instrumental variables. First, we use characteristics of UK industries. Coagglomeration patterns due to unobserved, shared natural advantages or purely random events may differ in the United Kingdom, in which case UK industry characteristics can help identify effects that are due to innate similarities between industry pairs.

Second, we measure the similarities of industries using only data from plants located in different parts of the United States. Even in highly coagglomerated industry pairs, there will typically be some plants in each industry that are not located near plants in the other industry. We can use these isolated plants to estimate input-output matrices and labor usage. Since these plants are not near the other industry, their inputs, outputs, and labor decisions are less likely to be driven by

⁴ In a similar vein, Henderson (2003) examines how plant level productivity is related to the set of plants in the area. A second approach to this problem pioneered by David B. Audretsch and Maryann P. Feldman (1996) and Stuart S. Rosenthal and William C. Strange (2001) is to examine cross-industry variation in the degree of agglomeration, such as regressing the degree to which an industry is agglomerated on the importance of R&D to the industry. Michael Greenstone, Richard Hornbeck, and Enrico Moretti (2008), Carlo Menon (2008), and Mercedes Delgado, Michael E. Porter, and Scott Stern (2008) address related empirical issues.

common omitted factors or by the influence of proximity to the other industry. We use plant level detail from the Census of Manufacturing and individual level data from the Census Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS) to develop measures of industry pair similarity based upon characteristics of the noncoagglomerated plants. Our IV regressions provide additional support for the view that input-output relationships and labor market pooling benefits are both significant drivers of industry agglomeration.

I. US Manufacturing Coagglomeration

We compute pairwise coagglomeration measures for manufacturing industries using the confidential plant level data from the US Census Bureau's Census of Manufacturing.⁵ Each Census documents the operations of approximately 300,000 establishments employing about 17 million workers. We focus on the three-digit level of the 1987 Standard Industrial Classification (SIC3). The sample contains 7,381 industry pair observations per year: all distinct coagglomeration pairs from 122 industries.⁶

We quantify industry pair coagglomeration in two ways. First, we use the Ellison and Glaeser (1997, hereafter EG) metric of coagglomeration. We do this at the state, Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PMSA), and county levels. We also use the longitudinal nature of the Census Bureau data to analyze coagglomeration of startup firms.⁷ The EG coagglomeration index takes a simple form when applied to industry pairs (as opposed to larger groups). The index for the coagglomeration of industries i and j is

$$\gamma_{ij}^c = \frac{\sum_{m=1}^M (s_{mi} - x_m)(s_{mj} - x_m)}{1 - \sum_{m=1}^M x_m^2},$$

where m indexes geographic areas. s_{mi} is the share of industry i 's employment contained in area m . x_m measures the aggregate size of area m , which we model as the mean employment share in the region across manufacturing industries. The Mathematical Appendix demonstrates that this index can be regarded as a measure of the strength of agglomerative forces in a particular model of firm location.

Our second coagglomeration metric is a "lumpy" approximation to the continuous index developed by Duranton and Overman (2005, hereafter DO). DO criticize indices like EG that employ discrete spatial units. This discreteness in effect makes the distance from Detroit to Chicago equivalent to that of Detroit to Miami. DO instead propose analyzing coagglomeration through a continuous index

$$\hat{K}_{ij}^{Emp}(d) = \frac{1}{h \sum_{r=1}^{n_i} \sum_{s=1}^{n_j} e(r)e(s)} \sum_{r=1}^{n_i} \sum_{s=1}^{n_j} e(r)e(s) f\left(\frac{d - d_{r,s}}{h}\right),$$

⁵ See Timothy Dunne, Mark J. Roberts, and Larry Samuelson (1989a, 1989b) and Steven J. Davis, John C. Haltiwanger, and Scott Schuh (1996).

⁶ We exclude Tobacco (210s), Apparel (230s), portions of Printing and Publishing (277–279), Secondary Nonferrous Metals (334), and Search and Navigation Equipment (381). These exclusions are primarily due to data constraints and are documented in the online Appendix.

⁷ Relevant employments for each geographic unit are calculated by aggregating employments from individual establishments. Related work on entrepreneurship patterns includes Guy Dumais, Ellison, and Glaeser (2002), David H. Autor, William R. Kerr, and Adriana D. Kugler (2007), Glaeser and Kerr (2009), and Kerr and Ramana Nanda (2009).

TABLE 1—DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR PAIRWISE COAGGLOMERATION REGRESSIONS

	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
<i>Panel A. Pairwise EG coagglomeration measures</i>				
EG state total employment coagglomeration	0.000	0.013	-0.065	0.207
EG PMSA total employment coagglomeration	0.000	0.006	-0.025	0.119
EG county total employment coagglomeration	0.000	0.003	-0.018	0.080
EG state firm birth employment coagglomeration	0.000	0.015	-0.082	0.259
EG expected coagglomeration due to natural advantages	0.000	0.001	-0.008	0.022
	Industry count	Mean	SD	Maximum
<i>Panel B. Pairwise DO coagglomeration measures</i>				
DO global localization coagglomeration, 1,000 mi.	7,371	0.133	0.073	0.454
DO global dispersion coagglomeration, 1,000 mi.	10	0.592	0.078	0.746
DO expected global localization coagglomeration, 1,000 mi.	7,381	0.181	0.027	0.256
DO global localization coagglomeration, 250 mi.	6,429	0.017	0.019	0.283
DO global dispersion coagglomeration, 250 mi.	952	0.042	0.029	0.307
DO expected global localization coagglomeration, 250 mi.	7,381	0.029	0.010	0.077
	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
<i>Panel C. Marshallian factors</i>				
Labor correlation	0.470	0.226	-0.046	1.000
Input-output maximum	0.007	0.029	0.000	0.823
Input maximum	0.005	0.019	0.000	0.392
Output maximum	0.005	0.026	0.000	0.823
Scherer R&D technical maximum	0.005	0.026	0.000	0.625
Patent citation technical maximum	0.015	0.025	0.000	0.400

Notes: Descriptive statistics for coagglomeration estimations. All pairwise combinations of manufacturing SIC3 industries are included, except those listed in the text, for 7,381 observations. EG and DO coagglomeration metrics are calculated from the 1987 and 1997 Census of Manufacturers, respectively. The distance threshold for determining global localization or dispersion is adjusted across DO row groupings. Natural advantages coagglomeration is estimated through predicted state-industry shares developed from exogenous local cost variables (e.g., coastal access, energy prices) and industry cost dependencies. Labor correlation indices are calculated from the BLS National Industry-Occupation Employment Matrix for 1987. Input-output relationships are calculated from the BEA Benchmark Input-Output Matrix for 1987. Technology flows are calculated from the Scherer (1984) R&D tables for the 1970s and from the NBER Patent Citation Database for 1975–1997. Online Appendix Tables 1–5 provide additional descriptive statistics.

where $d_{r,s}$ is the Euclidean distance between plants r and s , f is a Gaussian kernel density function with bandwidth h , and n_i and n_j are the number of plants in industries i and j , respectively. The summations are over every bilateral distance between plants of industry i and industry j (i.e., $n_i n_j$ distances).

This observed coagglomeration density is then compared to an underlying distribution of manufacturing activity akin to the x_m of EG. An industry pair is said to exhibit global localization (dispersion) if the observed coagglomeration density is substantially higher (lower) than the underlying distribution of manufacturing activity. This comparison is done over a specified distance horizon. We vary this distance threshold below from 100 to 1,000 miles, with our primary results taken from a 250-mile distance horizon.⁸

Panel A of Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for the EG metric. The mean EG pairwise coagglomeration is approximately zero. This is largely by definition: our benchmark measure of

⁸ Specified distance thresholds are required as densities sum to one over the support. Thus, industry pairs that are more localized at shorter distances will be more dispersed than aggregate manufacturing activity at longer distances. DO consider a threshold of 180 kilometers for the United Kingdom, which is motivated by the median plant to plant distance in their sample. This distance is equivalent to 112 miles. The median plant distance is much larger for the United States, falling between 900 and 1,000 miles depending upon the weighting. We chose our four thresholds to span the actual physical distance studied by DO and the median plant concept.

TABLE 2—HIGHEST PAIRWISE COAGGLOMERATIONS

Rank	Industry 1	Industry 2	Coagglomeration
<i>Panel A. EG index using 1987 state total employments</i>			
1	Broadwoven mills, cotton (221)	Yarn and thread mills (228)	0.207
2	Knitting mills (225)	Yarn and thread mills (228)	0.187
3	Broadwoven mills, fiber (222)	Textile finishing (226)	0.178
4	Broadwoven mills, cotton (221)	Broadwoven mills, fiber (222)	0.171
5	Broadwoven mills, fiber (222)	Yarn and thread mills (228)	0.164
6	Handbags (317)	Photographic equipment (386)	0.155
7	Broadwoven mills, wool (223)	Carpets and rugs (227)	0.149
8	Carpets and rugs (227)	Yarn and thread mills (228)	0.142
9	Photographic equipment (386)	Jewelry, silverware, plated ware (391)	0.139
10	Textile finishing (226)	Yarn and thread mills (228)	0.138
11	Broadwoven mills, cotton (221)	Textile finishing (226)	0.137
12	Broadwoven mills, cotton (221)	Carpets and rugs (227)	0.137
13	Broadwoven mills, cotton (221)	Knitting mills (225)	0.136
14	Carpets and rugs (227)	Pulp mills (261)	0.110
15	Jewelry, silverware, plated ware (391)	Costume jewelry and notions (396)	0.107
<i>Panel B. DO index using 1997 firm employments, 250 mi. threshold</i>			
1	Broadwoven mills, fiber (222)	Yarn and thread mills (228)	0.283
2	Carpets and rugs (227)	Yarn and thread mills (228)	0.262
3	Broadwoven mills, fiber (222)	Carpets and rugs (227)	0.226
4	Broadwoven mills, cotton (221)	Yarn and thread mills (228)	0.219
5	Broadwoven mills, cotton (221)	Carpets and rugs (227)	0.218
6	Footwear cut stock (313)	Costume jewelry and notions (396)	0.217
7	Jewelry, silverware, plated ware (391)	Costume jewelry and notions (396)	0.208
8	Knitting mills (225)	Yarn and thread mills (228)	0.200
9	Broadwoven mills, fiber (222)	Knitting mills (225)	0.190
10	Broadwoven mills, cotton (221)	Broadwoven mills, fiber (222)	0.175
11	Textile finishing (226)	Yarn and thread mills (228)	0.163
12	Footwear cut stock (313)	Jewelry, silverware, plated ware (391)	0.157
13	Handbags (317)	Costume jewelry and notions (396)	0.151
14	Broadwoven mills, cotton (221)	Knitting mills (225)	0.149
15	Women's and misses' outerwear (233)	Costume jewelry and notions (396)	0.149

Notes: See Table 1.

an area's "size" is its share of manufacturing employment, so each industry's deviations from the benchmark will be approximately uncorrelated with the average of the deviations of all other industries. The standard deviation of the coagglomeration index is more interesting because it reflects the extent to which industry pairs are positively and negatively coagglomerated. The standard deviation is 0.013 at the state level. This can be compared with the mean within industry agglomeration level of 0.051 in Ellison and Glaeser (1997). Panel B presents descriptive statistics for the DO metric. Eighty-seven percent of industry pairs exhibit some degree of global localization to the 250-mile threshold.

Table 2 lists the 15 most coagglomerated industry pairs for the EG and DO metrics. Textile and apparel industries rank very high on both scales. These industries are heavily concentrated in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. Despite this clustering, these coagglomerations are not as strong as the largest within industry agglomerations. Many industry pairs have approximately zero coagglomeration. Negative values of the EG index arise when pairs of industries are agglomerated in different areas. The lowest EG value of -0.065 obtains for Guided Missiles and Space Vehicles (376) and Railroad Equipment (374) industries. The most dispersed industry pair using the DO metric at 250 miles is Guided Missiles and Space Vehicles (376) and Pulp Mills (261). The correlation of EG and DO metrics across all industry pairs is 0.4.

The Data and Empirical Appendix provides additional information regarding the Census Bureau data, the construction of these two metrics, and their descriptive statistics. The

continuous DO methodology is computationally demanding, and the Appendix fully documents the approximate DO index that we computed to make using the index more tractable on 7,381 industry pairs. These approximations also respond to data limitations of the Census of Manufacturing.⁹

II. Why Do Firms Agglomerate? Empirical Methodology

The gains from concentration, whether in cities or geographic clusters, come from reducing some form of transport costs. Marshall emphasized that these transport costs could be for goods, people, or ideas. Our primary goal is to assess the relative importance of these Marshallian forces. We do so via cross-sectional regressions of pairwise coagglomeration on proxies for the importance of Marshall's agglomerative forces.

Agglomeration and coagglomeration can also appear empirically even if there are no gains from locational proximity. Natural advantages, such as the presence of natural inputs, differ spatially, and firms may choose locations to gain access to those inputs. We therefore also control for expected coagglomeration of industry pairs arising from common dependencies on certain natural advantages (e.g., coastal access, energy prices). Beyond just controlling for important omitted variables, we also view natural advantages as a benchmark for assessing the relative importance of goods, people, and ideas in the location decisions of manufacturing firms.

In the following subsections, we briefly discuss the Marshallian forces and the metrics we use to capture their relevance to each industry pair. We then describe how we model coagglomeration due to natural advantages and some of the limits of our approach. Our initial analysis will consist of OLS regressions of our concentration indices on these measures. Where possible, we focus our estimation and data construction on the 1987 cross section.¹⁰ The online Appendix provides additional details and descriptive statistics.

A. Proximity to Customers and Suppliers: Goods

Firms locate near one another to reduce the costs of obtaining inputs or shipping goods to downstream customers. When inputs are far away from the eventual market, Marshall (1920) argued that firms will trade off the distance between customers and suppliers based on the costs of moving raw inputs and finished goods. For example, sugar refining was one of New York City's largest industries in the nineteenth century because of transport costs. Sugar was refined in New York, rather than on tropical plantations, because refined sugar crystals coalesce during a long sea voyage in a hot ship's hull. Sugar refining took place in New York, rather than in eventual small town markets, to exploit scale economies. Once Armour's refrigerated rail cars made it possible to ship cold beef, cattle were slaughtered in Chicago's vast stockyards to save the costs of shipping live beef east. The "new economic geography" of Masahisa Fujita, Krugman, and Anthony J. Venables (1999) views reducing the costs of transporting goods as the central driver behind agglomeration.

To assess the importance of this factor, we use the 1987 Benchmark Input-Output Accounts published by the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA) to measure the extent that industries buy

⁹ Our main estimations employ random draws of plants from each industry. Distances between these plants are measured through county-to-county spatial distances, and the densities are weighted by plant employments, $e(r)$ and $e(s)$. The online Appendix reports similar results when using plant counts, $e = 1$, or when using aggregated firm counts and employment by county-industry. We discuss how the confidence intervals are adjusted under the approximations.

¹⁰ Panel estimation techniques are limited in this setting due to the high persistence in pairwise coagglomeration (see online Appendix Table 2B). We also believe that industry pair connections do not change greatly over time, and data limitations prevent calculating several of our explanatory measures at higher frequency.

and sell from one another. The input-output tables provide commodity level flows which we aggregate to SIC3 industries. We define $Input_{i \leftarrow j}$ as the share of industry i 's inputs that come from industry j . We also define $Output_{i \rightarrow j}$ as the share of industry i 's outputs that are sold to industry j . These shares are calculated relative to all suppliers and customers, some of which may be non-manufacturing industries or final consumers, and range from zero to one.

The highest observed value of $Input_{i \leftarrow j}$ is 0.39, which represents the share of inputs that come to Leather Tanning and Finishing (SIC 311) from Meat Products (SIC 201). The highest relative value of $Output_{i \rightarrow j}$ is 0.82, which represents the importance of output sales from Public Building and Related Furniture (SIC 253) to Motor Vehicles and Equipment (SIC 371). For most industry pairs, of course, $Input_{i \leftarrow j}$ and $Output_{i \rightarrow j}$ are approximately zero—in fact, 70 percent are less than 0.0001. To construct a single proxy for the connection in goods between a pair of industries, we define unidirectional versions of the input and output variables by $Input_{ij} = \max\{Input_{i \leftarrow j}, Input_{j \leftarrow i}\}$ and $Output_{ij} = \max\{Output_{i \rightarrow j}, Output_{j \rightarrow i}\}$. We also define a combined $InputOutput_{ij} = \max\{Input_{ij}, Output_{ij}\}$.

B. Labor Market Pooling: People

A second reason to agglomerate is to take advantage of scale economies associated with a large labor pool. Multiple theories have been proposed about the underlying benefits of these labor pools. Marshall emphasizes the risk sharing properties of a large labor market. As individual firms become more or less productive, workers can shift across employers, thereby maximizing productivity and reducing the variance of worker wages (e.g., Charles A. Diamond and Curtis J. Simon 1990; Krugman 1991a). A variant on this theory is that agglomerations facilitate better worker-firm matches (e.g., Robert W. Helsley and Strange 1990). Julio J. Rotemberg and Garth Saloner (2000) further model how workers are more likely to invest in human capital in clusters, knowing that they do not face ex post appropriation. Entrepreneurs may also locate in existing agglomerations due to the suitable labor force (e.g., Pierre-Philippe Combes and Duranton 2006; Michael S. Dahl and Steven Klepper 2007).

All of these models suggest that agglomeration occurs because workers are able to move across firms and industries. Labor movements across firms and industries, however, can occur only if the industries use the same type of workers. We will assess the importance of labor market pooling by looking at the extent to which industries that use the same type of workers coagglomerate with one another. We measure the extent to which industries use similar types of labor through the occupational employment patterns across industries catalogued in the 1987 National Industrial-Occupation Employment Matrix (NIOEM) published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). The NIOEM matrix provides industry level employment in 277 occupations, and we define $Share_{io}$ as the fraction of industry i 's employment in occupation o .

We measure the similarity of employments in industries i and j through the correlation of $Share_{io}$ and $Share_{jo}$ across occupations. Table 1 contains summary statistics for this $LaborCorrelation_{ij}$ variable. The mean value is 0.470. The measured correlations of one arise because the industry-occupation matrix reports data for NIOEM industries, which is a coarser division than SIC3 industries. Motor Vehicles (371) and Motorcycles, Bicycles and Parts (375) have the most similar employment patterns among industries with different NIOEM data at 0.984. Logging (241) and Aircrafts and Parts (372) have the least correlated labor needs at -0.046 .

C. Intellectual or Technology Spillovers: Ideas

A final reason that firms collocate is to speed the flow of ideas. Marshall emphasizes that workers learn skills quickly from each other in an industrial cluster. Saxenian (1996) and others

focus on information exchanges among business leaders in industrial concentrations like Silicon Valley. Glaeser and Matthew E. Kahn (2001) argue that the urbanization of high human-capital industries, like finance, is evidence for the role that density plays in speeding the flow of ideas. Arzaghi and Henderson (2008) emphasize networking benefits among marketing firms in Manhattan. Unfortunately, our ability to capture the full range of these models is quite limited. We base our metrics of information flows on patents and research and development (R&D), which reflect only the highest level of information flows, rather than worker level spillovers.

Our first source of data on knowledge spillovers is Frederic M. Scherer's (1984) technology matrix that captures how R&D activity in one industry flows out to benefit another industry. This technology transfer occurs either through supplier-customer relationships between these two industries or through the likelihood that patented inventions obtained in one industry will find applications in the other industry. We develop two metrics, $TechIn_{i \rightarrow j}$ and $TechOut_{i \rightarrow j}$, for these technology flows that mirror $Input_{i \rightarrow j}$ and $Output_{i \rightarrow j}$ described above. The strongest relative technology flows are associated with Plastic Materials and Synthetics (282) and its relationships to Misc. Plastics Products (308), Tires and Inner Tubes (301), and Industrial Organic Chemicals (286).

Our second data source on information exchange is the NBER Patent Database. We measure the extent to which technologies associated with industry i cite technologies associated with industry j , and vice versa. The measures $PatentIn_{i \rightarrow j}$ and $PatentOut_{i \rightarrow j}$ are normalized by total citations for the industries.¹¹ For our regression analysis, we construct unidirectional measures of the intellectual spillovers across an industry pair, $Tech_{ij}$ and $Patent_{ij}$, in a manner analogous to our construction of $InputOutput_{ij}$.

Intellectual spillovers are harder to identify than trade in goods and labor pooling. Many authors employ patent citations to assess intellectual spillovers, but they are only an imperfect measure of intellectual spillovers.¹² As Porter (1990) emphasizes, much knowledge sharing occurs between customers and suppliers, which may be captured more by input-output relationships than by these citations. Idea sharing through the exchange of workers may likewise be better captured by our occupation correlations. Our patent citation measure is a proxy for the importance of exchanging technology rather than a proxy for all forms of intellectual spillovers. Since our measures of idea sharing are weaker than our measures of input-output linkages, we anticipate their connection with coagglomeration to be weaker.

D. Natural Advantages

Some regions simply possess better natural environments for certain industries, and agglomeration can follow from these natural cost advantages. Desert areas are inadequate hosts to the logging industry. Areas with exogenously cheap electricity, due perhaps to hydroelectric power, attract aluminum producers. Coagglomeration may be observed if two industries are attracted to the same natural advantages, even if the industries would not otherwise have interacted through Marshallian forces. For example, the ship building and oil refining industries might be coagglomerated simply because both prefer coastal locations.

¹¹ The NBER Patent Data File was originally compiled by Bronwyn H. Hall, Adam B. Jaffe, and Manuel Trajtenberg (2001). It contains records for all patents granted by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) from January 1975 to December 1999. The USPTO issues patents by technology categories rather than by industries. Combining the work of Daniel K.N. Johnson (1999), Brian S. Silverman (1999), and Kerr (2008), concordances are developed between the USPTO classification scheme and SIC3 industries (a probabilistic mapping).

¹² See Zvi Griliches (1990), Jaffe, Trajtenberg, and Rebecca M. Henderson (1993), Jaffe, Trajtenberg, and Michael S. Fogarty (2000), and Peter Thompson and Melanie Fox-Kean (2005).

To control for natural advantages based coagglomeration, we develop a predicted spatial distribution for each manufacturing industry based upon local cost advantages and industry traits. The core idea is to interact industry characteristics with costs that are relevant to those traits. This methodology follows Ellison and Glaeser (1999), who model 16 state level characteristics that afford natural advantages in terms of natural resources, transportation costs, and labor inputs. Combining these cost differences with each industry's intensity of factor use, Ellison and Glaeser (1999) estimate a spatial distribution of manufacturing activity by industry that would be expected due to cost differences alone. They find that 20 percent of the observed agglomeration of US manufacturing industries can be explained through these mostly exogenous local factors.¹³

We employ these expected spatial distributions of industries across states to calculate expected coagglomeration levels $Coagg_{ij}^{NA}$ for industry pairs. Separate expected coagglomerations due to natural advantages are constructed for the EG and DO metrics. These measures simply substitute the predicted spatial employments by industry into the EG and DO formulas outlined in Section I. Essentially, this approach measures how coagglomerated the two industries would be if their locations were determined entirely by the interactions of industry characteristics and local characteristics. The DO metric again requires some slight modifications, which we document in the online Appendix. The pairwise correlation between expected and actual coagglomeration using this technique is 0.2 and 0.4 for the EG and DO techniques, respectively.

While $Coagg_{ij}^{NA}$ offers an important control for our estimations, the metric is cruder than those possible in a more focused study of natural advantages (e.g., Holmes and Sanghoon Lee 2008) in a couple of ways. First, our 16 natural advantages will omit many traits that may be important in a subset of industries. Second, we constrain the effects of each natural advantage to be proportional to some factor, e.g., the industry's use of electricity, rather than estimating each effect freely. As with our Marshallian regressors, the resulting measurement error may downward bias our estimate of the importance of these natural conditions. It is also possible that some of the omitted natural advantages may be correlated, positively or negatively, with our Marshallian proxies. While mostly fixed, some of our natural advantages may be themselves endogenous, and that endogeneity could lead us to either over- or understate the importance of natural advantage. For example, if energy prices rise in areas where energy intensive firms locate for other reasons, then this will bias the coefficient on energy prices, complicating the interpretation of our results.

Recognizing these limitations, we believe that our measure of expected coagglomeration is both an important control variable and a natural baseline for comparing Marshallian agglomeration economies. As the imperfections in our natural advantages metric have the potential for biasing our Marshallian parameter estimates, we will test the sensitivity of our Marshallian findings to including or excluding expected coagglomeration measures.

III. Empirical Results: OLS Estimates

We now present our main empirical results of the forces contributing to manufacturing coagglomeration. Our core empirical specification is a simple OLS regression:

$$Coagg_{ij} = \alpha + \beta_{NA}Coagg_{ij}^{NA} + \beta_L LaborCorrelation_{ij} + \beta_{IO}InputOutput_{ij} + \beta_T Tech_{ij} + \varepsilon_{ij},$$

where $Coagg_{ij}$ is a measure of the pairwise coagglomeration between industries i and j . We separately test four variants of both the EG and DO metrics. We modify $Coagg_{ij}^{NA}$ to mirror the

¹³ Ellison and Glaeser (1999) suggest that this 20 percent share likely underestimates the true portion of spatial agglomeration that can be explained through mostly fixed characteristics. Sukkoo Kim (1999) estimates natural regional advantages over a 100-year period.

TABLE 3—OLS UNIVARIATE SPECIFICATIONS FOR PAIRWISE COAGGLOMERATION

Each entry reports separate estimation with single regressor	EG coagglomeration index, 1987				DO coagglomeration index, 1997			
	State total empl.	PMSA total empl.	County total empl.	State entry empl.	Bilateral firm employments with localization threshold			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	1,000 mi.	500 mi.	250 mi.	100 mi.
Natural advantages [DV Specific]	0.210 (0.020)	0.188 (0.017)	0.222 (0.014)	0.120 (0.016)	0.442 (0.013)	0.406 (0.012)	0.253 (0.013)	0.531 (0.019)
R^2	0.044	0.036	0.049	0.014	0.200	0.165	0.064	0.282
Labor correlation	0.180 (0.014)	0.106 (0.016)	0.082 (0.013)	0.077 (0.015)	-0.155 (0.012)	0.008 (0.012)	0.127 (0.015)	0.103 (0.013)
R^2	0.032	0.011	0.007	0.006	0.024	0.000	0.016	0.011
Input-output	0.205 (0.037)	0.167 (0.028)	0.130 (0.022)	0.112 (0.022)	0.100 (0.019)	0.162 (0.029)	0.188 (0.036)	0.112 (0.029)
R^2	0.042	0.028	0.017	0.012	0.010	0.026	0.035	0.013
Technology flows Scherer R&D	0.180 (0.037)	0.148 (0.031)	0.107 (0.019)	0.089 (0.024)	0.046 (0.019)	0.107 (0.029)	0.136 (0.038)	0.094 (0.029)
R^2	0.032	0.022	0.012	0.008	0.002	0.011	0.019	0.009
Technology flows patent citations	0.081 (0.012)	0.100 (0.016)	0.085 (0.013)	0.068 (0.013)	-0.001 (0.012)	0.056 (0.012)	0.103 (0.012)	0.092 (0.013)
R^2	0.007	0.010	0.007	0.005	0.000	0.031	0.011	0.008

Notes: Each cell reports a separate regression of pairwise coagglomeration on a determinant of industrial co-location. Coagglomeration measures are calculated from the 1987 and 1997 Census of Manufacturers as listed in the column headers. All pairwise combinations of manufacturing SIC3 industries are included, except those listed in the text, for 7,381 observations. Natural advantages coagglomeration is estimated through predicted state-industry shares developed from exogenous local cost variables (e.g., coastal access, energy prices) and industry cost dependencies. Labor correlation indices are calculated from the BLS National Industry-Occupation Employment Matrix for 1987. Input-output relationships are calculated from the BEA Benchmark Input-Output Matrix for 1987. Technology flows are calculated from the Scherer (1984) R&D tables for the 1970s and from the NBER Patent Citation Database for 1975–1997. Maximum values for the pairwise combination are employed. Variables are transformed to have unit standard deviation for interpretation. Regressions are unweighted. Bootstrapped standard errors are reported in parentheses.

design of the dependent variable (EG or DO), while the Marshallian metrics remain the same. As $Coagg_{ij}^{NA}$ is a generated regressor (e.g., Adrian R. Pagan 1984), we report bootstrapped standard errors.

We normalize all variables to have a standard deviation of one. This normalization makes it easier to compare the coefficient estimates for the different variables and to assess the importance of each factor in explaining overall coagglomeration patterns. We will compare the individual contributions of the Marshallian factors, both amongst themselves and relative to natural advantages. We are also interested in comparing the total contribution of Marshallian agglomeration economies to the contribution of natural advantages. We evaluate this through a one standard deviation increase in all three Marshallian factors.

A. Univariate Regressions

Table 3 presents univariate regressions for each of our variables. Entries in the table are from 40 separate specifications, with columns reporting the coagglomeration index and rows reporting

explanatory variables. Column 1 finds fairly uniform coefficient magnitudes for the EG metric of state total employments. A one standard deviation increase in expected coagglomeration due to shared natural advantages is associated with a 0.21 standard deviation increase in actual coagglomeration. Input-output relationships also exhibit a 0.21 correlation. The other Marshallian factors are slightly weaker. The estimated coefficients are 0.18 for labor pooling and 0.08 to 0.18 for technology sharing. Columns 2 through 4 find comparable orderings when employing other variants of the EG metric, with some overall decline in the strength of all correlations also evident. On their own, each of the three variables can explain about the same share of the variation in coagglomeration across industry pairs.

Columns 5 through 8 consider four variants of the continuous DO metric where we adjust the threshold for identifying localization. Shared natural advantages are found to have greater explanatory power when using the continuous DO index than with the discrete EG metric, regardless of the distance threshold specified.¹⁴ The Marshallian factors generally have similar coefficients in the EG and DO regressions. The EG state level results are particularly similar to the 250 mile DO results. These two measures are designed to reflect coagglomeration at similar scales, so this result provides added confidence that the effects we identify are robust to how coagglomeration is being measured.

The DO results do change substantially when we move to a 1,000-mile threshold: the patent citation measure appears to be uncorrelated with coagglomeration, and the labor pooling measure is negatively correlated with coagglomeration. We find these results to be reassuring. The 1,000-mile threshold is far beyond the distance at which one would expect labor to be highly mobile and ideas to be “in the air.” Hence, we would not expect these regressions to identify strong effects of labor pooling and technological spillovers on coagglomeration.¹⁵

B. Multivariate Regressions

Table 4 presents our full multivariate specification. Each column reports coefficients from a single regression with a pairwise coagglomeration metric as the dependent variable. We concentrate on the EG metric that uses state employments and the DO metric with a 250-mile threshold, reporting four specifications for each.

The first column presents our base EG specification. The estimates show that each of our variables continues to be significant in multivariate frameworks. Natural advantages remains the strongest explanatory variable with a coefficient estimate of 0.16. The point estimates are largest for input-outputs (0.15), followed by labor pooling (0.12) and technology spillovers (0.10). But the differences between the coefficient estimates are not significant, which suggests that all three Marshallian forces are important and that their effects appear to be comparable in magnitude. Together these three variables explain more of the variation in coagglomeration than does natural advantage, which supports the view that agglomeration economies is a more important determinant of geographic location (as in Ellison and Glaeser 1999).

The second column excludes the natural advantages measure from the regression. While we believe that it makes sense generally to control for this measure, the potential endogeneity of the elements that drive the natural agglomeration measure make it reasonable to wonder whether our

¹⁴ The higher correlations when we use the DO natural advantages measure extend from two sources. First, the more continuous horizon helps identify clustering along natural advantages across state borders (e.g., neighboring coastal states in New England). The online Appendix discusses a second, mechanical reason due to limitations in our procedure for constructing the DO natural advantages.

¹⁵ Rosenthal and Strange (2003) and Arzaghi and Henderson (2008) emphasize even further the small spatial distances over which knowledge spillovers occur. The online Appendix further discusses the negative labor correlation with the 1,000-mile DO metric.

TABLE 4—OLS MULTIVARIATE SPECIFICATIONS FOR PAIRWISE COAGGLOMERATION

	EG coaggl. index with state total emp.				DO coaggl. index, 250 mi.			
	Base	Exclude	Separate	Exclude	Base	Exclude	Separate	Exclude
	estimation	natural	input &	pairs in	estimation	natural	input &	pairs in
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Natural advantages [DV specific]	0.163 (0.017)		0.162 (0.017)	0.172 (0.016)	0.251 (0.012)		0.252 (0.012)	0.253 (0.013)
Labor correlation	0.118 (0.011)	0.146 (0.012)	0.114 (0.011)	0.085 (0.012)	0.069 (0.012)	0.098 (0.013)	0.066 (0.012)	0.029 (0.012)
Input-output	0.146 (0.032)	0.149 (0.032)		0.110 (0.022)	0.162 (0.035)	0.150 (0.035)		0.177 (0.032)
Input			0.106 (0.029)				0.097 (0.029)	
Output			0.093 (0.039)				0.107 (0.038)	
Technology flows Scherer R&D	0.096 (0.035)	0.112 (0.035)	0.079 (0.035)	0.046 (0.019)	0.076 (0.033)	0.075 (0.034)	0.065 (0.032)	0.033 (0.020)
R^2	0.103	0.077	0.110	0.059	0.113	0.051	0.117	0.102
Observations	7,381	7,381	7,381	7,000	7,381	7,381	7,381	7,000

Notes: See Table 3. Regressions of pairwise coagglomeration on determinants of industrial co-location. Columns 4 and 8 exclude SIC3 pairwise combinations within the same SIC2. Online Appendix Table 6 provides additional robustness checks. Variables are transformed to have unit standard deviation for interpretation. Bootstrapped standard errors are reported in parentheses.

results change much when that measure is excluded. We find that Marshallian forces become slightly stronger when natural advantages are excluded. However, the coefficients in the two columns are sufficiently similar that it seems that the natural advantages and Marshallian factors are mostly orthogonal to one another. The third column disaggregates the input-output effect into separate input and output effects. The two effects are comparable in magnitude and both are quite significant.

The fourth column excludes all industry pairs in the same two-digit SIC industry (SIC2). There are both conceptual and methodological reasons for this exclusion. Conceptually, industries within the same SIC2 may be more likely to coagglomerate due to unobserved factors or due to geographic features that we have measured with error. Methodologically, some of our measures, like the technology flow measure, have variation that straddles the SIC2 and SIC3 divisions. The coefficient estimates in this regression are slightly lower, but similar in magnitude to the base regression in the first column. We will use this restricted sample in our instrumental variables analysis below.

Columns 5 through 8 present equivalent results for the DO index calculated with a distance threshold of 250 miles. The results are similar to those obtained with the state level EG index. All three Marshallian factors are important. Natural advantages are more important than any single Marshallian factor, but the three factors together are more important than natural advantage. The differences shown in Table 3 persist: natural advantages appear more important when we use the DO metrics for coagglomeration; and labor market pooling appears somewhat less important. Again, the broad similarity provides confidence that the coagglomeration metric design is not driving the basic conclusions of this paper.

Three general conclusions emerge from these regressions. First, all three of Marshall's (1920) theories regarding agglomeration find support in coagglomeration patterns. Second, the Marshallian factors appear to be relatively important in the sense that taken together they are more important than the natural advantages we have identified. Third, the input-output factor

comes through most consistently. Labor pooling follows closely on smaller spatial distances, but it has much less of an effect when we look at coagglomeration at a broader geographic scale.

The online Appendix documents the full set of outcomes for each variant of the coagglomeration metric. We also present robustness checks: using pairwise means rather than maximums for explanatory variables, including industry effects, weighting by the relative size of the industry pair, and substituting the patent-based technology measure for the Scherer metric. We further consider several variants on the EG and DO metrics. While minor differences emerge, the overall patterns presented in Tables 3 and 4 are quite stable.

IV. Instrumental Variables Analysis

A potential concern with the analysis presented above is that our measures of the potential for Marshallian spillovers between industries might endogenously reflect coagglomeration patterns. For example, the volume of trade between the shoemaking and leather industries may not only reflect inherent features of shoemaking technology. It could be that there would be less leather and more plastic in shoes if random events had led to the coagglomeration of the shoemaking and plastics industries. Similarly, the employment mix of an industry could be affected by where plants are located. Firms in some industries may be able to choose between a low tech production process that requires many unskilled laborers and a more automated process with a very different occupational mix. These choices could then be influenced by local labor market conditions.

To help with these concerns, our OLS regressions include controls for expected coagglomeration due to shared interests in natural advantages. Variance in coagglomeration due to unmodeled natural advantages, of course, will still bias our parameter estimates. Moreover, it will not help with the reverse causation problem noted above. In this section we present two sets of IV estimates designed to address these concerns.

A. UK Instruments

Our first set of instruments are constructed from data on characteristics of UK industries. If two industries are coagglomerated in the United States for purely random reasons or because they value different, unobserved natural advantages that are randomly correlated in the United States (e.g., if states with bauxite deposits are also close to sources of sugar cane), then one would expect that the industry pair would not be coagglomerated for these reasons in the United Kingdom. In this case, characteristics of UK industries provide measures of the Marshallian factors for the industry pair that are orthogonal to the endogenous variation in the United States.

Of course, this technique will work in only some situations. If two industries are coagglomerated in the United States because they have a greater need for a coastal location, then they will likely be coagglomerated in the United Kingdom as well. In this case, the UK characteristics of the industry pair could be affected by a correlated endogeneity. Our natural advantages metric should theoretically capture such situations, but unmodeled natural advantages that are not randomly distributed may again be present.

Our UK based instrument for input-output relationships builds from the 1989 Input-Output Balance for the United Kingdom published by the Central Statistical Office in 1992. The original table contained 102 sectors, and Keith E. Maskus, C. Sveikauskas, and Allan Webster (1994) aggregated those original categories into 80 sectors that can be matched with US industries. The construction of the UK instruments is otherwise comparable to that undertaken with BEA data. We will use these UK input-output measures as instruments for the US input-output relationships

under the identifying assumption that UK material flows are correlated with true Marshallian dependencies among US industries but uncorrelated with the reverse causation that may have arisen within the United States after industrial locations are determined.

Our UK based instrument for labor market similarities was constructed using data from the UK Labour Force Survey, which is roughly akin to the US Current Population Survey. The United Kingdom does not publish a detailed equivalent of the BLS NIOEM matrix, so we constructed our own matrix by pooling six years (2001–2006) of the UK Labour Force Survey. We mapped the British industry codes to the SIC3 system, but we did not map the British occupations to NIOEM equivalents. We instead calculated pairwise industry correlations on the British occupation vectors.

There is also a concern of endogeneity of intellectual exchanges, as industries may share technologies because of locational proximity. The online Appendix describes instruments developed through patent citations using instances where both the citing and cited USPTO patent were filed from the United Kingdom, but in practice we found it very difficult to instrument simultaneously for all three of Marshall's forces. We therefore focus on our IV specifications on the customer-supplier and labor pooling rationales, which are also more distinguishable intellectually and empirically.

B. *US Spatial Instruments*

Our second set of instruments are constructed using disaggregated data that allow us to examine industry characteristics in different parts of the United States. This approach measures input-output and labor patterns in one industry in places where the other industry is quite rare. By focusing on areas where the other industry is absent, we can ideally estimate input-output and hiring patterns that are correlated with innate industrial needs but not biased by geographic proximity to the other industry. Most industry pair coagglomerations are sufficiently weak so that one can find parts of the United States where industry i is present and industry j is not overrepresented. We measure the relatedness of each industry pair using data on the characteristics of industry i in areas where industry j is least present and data on the characteristics of industry j in areas where industry i is least present.

Measures of this form will be useful instruments if the endogenous variation in our Marshallian factors is due to a plant's input/labor choices being affected by the proximity of plants in the other industry. For example, they will be helpful if shoemaking plants choose to make leather shoes when located near leather manufacturers and choose to make plastic shoes otherwise. In such a situation, OLS estimates would overstate the importance of input/output relationships as an agglomeration force. By looking at the inputs used by shoemakers who are located far from leather makers, we may derive industry characteristics that are useful instruments.

There are other situations, of course, in which the spatial instruments will not help. One example is where there are economies of scale in the development of production technologies and technologies develop in light of the average distance between plants in industries i and j . In this scenario, firms in industry i still need to buy inputs from industry j even if no plants in industry j are nearby. Measuring characteristics from plants that are not collocated will not correct this situation.

Our spatial input-output instruments are developed using "material inputs trailers" of the 1987 Census of Manufacturing. This form asks plants to list their material inputs and associated expenditures. Our spatial instrument employs the microrecords to calculate industry i 's input dependence on industry j in regions where industry j is least present. We specifically choose the 25 PMSAs where industry j is least present relative to all manufacturing to calculate industry i 's dependency for j . The dependencies are relative to all plant inputs, including nonmanufacturing.

TABLE 5—IV MULTIVARIATE SPECIFICATIONS FOR PAIRWISE COAGGLOMERATION

	EG coaggl. index with state total emp.			DO coaggl. index, 250 mi.		
	Base OLS	UK IV	US spatial IV	Base OLS	UK IV	US spatial IV
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Natural advantages	0.173	0.173	0.171	0.254	0.210	0.233
[DV specific]	(0.016)	(0.019)	(0.016)	(0.013)	(0.016)	(0.012)
Labor correlation	0.083	0.079	0.091	0.027	0.501	0.248
	(0.012)	(0.060)	(0.023)	(0.012)	(0.060)	(0.023)
Input-output	0.122	0.191	0.185	0.186	0.164	0.213
	(0.023)	(0.048)	(0.036)	(0.031)	(0.054)	(0.049)
Observations	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000

Notes: See Table 3. OLS and IV regressions of pairwise coagglomeration on determinants of industrial co-location. All estimations exclude SIC3 pairwise combinations within the same SIC2. Online Appendix Tables 7 and 8 report first stages and additional robustness checks. Variables are transformed to have unit standard deviation for interpretation. Bootstrapped standard errors are reported in parentheses.

The Appendix describes the materials trailers data in greater detail and the variants of this instrument that we tested.¹⁶

Our spatial instruments for labor similarity are developed using the 1990 Census IPUMS. We again ordered PMSAs by the relative presence of each industry compared to all manufacturing activity. We chose the 25 PMSAs where industry i was least present to measure industry j 's occupation needs, and vice versa. We then constructed the labor similarity correlation between industries i and j as described above. The online Appendix again describes these data in greater detail and the variants of this instrument that we tested.

We conduct our IV analysis on the restricted sample of 7,000 pairwise industry combinations that exclude SIC3 pairs within the same SIC2 sector. This restriction is for two reasons. First, some of the data for the instruments have limited variation across SIC3 pairs within an SIC2 sector. Second, our discussion of the instruments' conceptual liabilities has often centered on unobserved natural advantages missed by our expected coagglomeration metric. These confounding issues are most likely to exist among SIC3 industries within the same SIC2 category. As we saw in Table 4, the OLS relationships are stable including or excluding these closely-related industry pairs.

The Appendix documents the first-stage regression estimates for both sets of instruments. The t -statistics are over ten for the relevant instruments, and we satisfy relevant tests regarding weak instruments. The strength of these first-stage relationships does not change substantially when simultaneously instrumenting for both labor and input-output factors. Likewise, the inclusion or exclusion of our metric of expected coagglomeration due to natural advantages does not influence substantially the first-stage relationships for the Marshallian factors.

C. IV Regression Results

Table 5 presents our core instrumental variables results using UK and US spatial instruments. We instrument for the input-output and labor pooling factors using the instruments described

¹⁶ For example, we have confirmed that using absolute thresholds of the bottom 25 cities delivers similar results to techniques using relative shares (e.g., the group of cities accounting for a small share of activity in an industry). We have also implemented a regional approach that includes rural areas.

above. The control of expected coagglomeration due to shared natural advantages is included and treated as exogenous. We do not include a technological spillover variable.¹⁷ Columns 1 and 4 report OLS estimates of these specifications.

Columns 2 and 3 report IV regressions using the EG state level coagglomeration as the dependent variable and employing the UK instruments and US spatial instruments, respectively. Both instruments, despite their quite different construction and data sources, yield similar results. The role of labor is confirmed, and the instrumented elasticity is very similar to the OLS results. On the other hand, the input-output elasticity strengthens. Hausman tests do not reject the hypothesis that the OLS estimates are exogenous at the ten percent level.¹⁸

Our instrumental variables estimates employing the 250-mile DO metric also support the importance of both Marshallian factors. The input-output variable has a larger coefficient in the DO OLS regression than in the EG OLS regression, and the estimate remains significant and retains its magnitude in both IV estimates. The labor pooling variable had a much smaller effect in the OLS regression, but the estimate is much larger in the IV regressions. Hausman tests of equality for the OLS and IV specifications are rejected for the DO specifications with both instrument pairs. The online Appendix extends these IV estimations to other variants of EG and DO metrics.

V. Conclusions

At the broadest level, our paper provides strong support for Marshallian theories of agglomeration. We find consistent evidence for each of the three mechanisms—proximity to reduce the costs of moving goods, people, and ideas—in the US manufacturing sector. Taken together, the Marshallian factors appear to have a stronger effect on coagglomeration patterns than shared natural advantages, which Ellison and Glaeser (1999) found to drive a nontrivial fraction of within-industry agglomeration in the United States. We recognize, however, that we have modeled only a finite number of measured natural advantages and that our proxies are imperfect. This measurement error may lead us to understate the relative contribution of natural advantages versus Marshallian forces.

Which of Marshall's theories regarding industrial agglomeration are more important? Our basic conclusion from examining coagglomeration patterns is that all three forces are similar in magnitude, with input-output flows being the greater among equals. A one standard deviation growth in labor or input-output dependencies increases coagglomeration by around one seventh of a standard deviation. The importance of technology flows is weaker in some specifications, but of comparable magnitude in other estimations.

We do not know how our manufacturing results would generalize to other industries. Many services are more costly to transport since they involve face to face interaction, and therefore we might think that input-output relationships are particularly important in that sector (e.g., Jed Kolko 1997). The current excitement over service offshoring suggests, however, that segments within services like call centers may have rather low transport costs. Ideas and knowledge spillovers may be more important in very innovative sectors. We hope that future research defines Marshallian interactions in ways appropriate for industries outside of manufacturing.

It would likewise be interesting to understand better how these forces have changed over time. Transportation costs for physical goods have declined remarkably over the twentieth century (Glaeser and Janet E. Kohlhase 2004). These shipment costs have likely declined relative to the

¹⁷ In general, our instruments for technology sharing do not adequately distinguish themselves from the input-output and labor pooling relationships. Results for the triple IV are reported in the online Appendix.

¹⁸ The probability of rejecting the Chi-Squared test is 0.13 and 0.16 using the UK and US spatial IVs.

costs of moving labor, but it is not clear whether relative declines for physical goods are more or less than declines in transportation costs for ideas. Some types of information appear to flow very well over long distances, while others still require very close proximity. The impact of these relative changes in transportation costs are worthy of additional study. It would also be interesting to model the interaction between sunk investments in firm locations, made decades ago due to coagglomeration factors that are no longer as relevant, with changing relative transportation costs.

Although this paper is primarily about agglomeration and not about methodology, we hope that the approach it takes will be useful in future explorations of agglomerative forces. The coagglomeration patterns we explore could be examined in many different ways. And the UK and US spatial instruments we develop could be applied in many other areas in which the endogeneity of industry characteristics is a concern as well as in future studies of agglomeration and coagglomeration.

REFERENCES

- Arzagli, Mohammad, and J. Vernon Henderson.** 2008. "Networking Off Madison Avenue." *Review of Economic Studies*, 75(4): 1011–38.
- Audretsch, David B., and Maryann P. Feldman.** 1996. "R&D Spillovers and the Geography of Innovation and Production." *American Economic Review*, 86(3): 630–40.
- Autor, David H., William R. Kerr, and Adriana D. Kugler.** 2007. "Does Employment Protection Reduce Productivity? Evidence from US States." *Economic Journal*, 117(521): F189–217.
- Combes, Pierre-Philippe, and Gilles Duranton.** 2006. "Labour Pooling, Labour Poaching, and Spatial Clustering." *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 36(1): 1–28.
- Dahl, Michael S., and Steven Klepper.** 2007. "Who Do New Firms Hire?" Unpublished.
- Davis, Steven J., John C. Haltiwanger, and Scott Schuh.** 1996. *Job Creation and Destruction*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Delgado, Mercedes, Michael E. Porter, and Scott Stern.** 2008. "Convergence, Clusters and Economic Performance." Unpublished.
- Diamond, Charles A., and Curtis J. Simon.** 1990. "Industrial Specialization and the Returns to Labor." *Journal of Labor Economics*, 8(2): 175–201.
- Dumais, Guy, Glenn Ellison, and Edward L. Glaeser.** 2002. "Geographic Concentration as a Dynamic Process." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 84(2): 193–204.
- Dunne, Timothy, Mark J. Roberts, and Larry Samuelson.** 1989a. "Plant Turnover and Gross Employment Flows in the U.S. Manufacturing Sector." *Journal of Labor Economics*, 7(1): 48–71.
- Dunne, Timothy, Mark J. Roberts, and Larry Samuelson.** 1989b. "The Growth and Failure of U.S. Manufacturing Plants." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 104(4): 671–98.
- Duranton, Gilles, and Henry G. Overman.** 2005. "Testing for Localization Using Micro-Geographic Data." *Review of Economic Studies*, 72(4): 1077–106.
- Duranton, Gilles, and Henry G. Overman.** 2008. "Exploring the Detailed Location Patterns of U.K. Manufacturing Industries Using Microgeographic Data." *Journal of Regional Science*, 48(1): 213–43.
- Ellison, Glenn, and Edward L. Glaeser.** 1997. "Geographic Concentration in U.S. Manufacturing Industries: A Dartboard Approach." *Journal of Political Economy*, 105(5): 889–927.
- Ellison, Glenn, and Edward L. Glaeser.** 1999. "The Geographic Concentration of Industry: Does Natural Advantage Explain Agglomeration?" *American Economic Review*, 89(2): 311–16.
- Florence, P. Sargant.** 1948. *Investment, Location and Size of Plant*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Fuchs, Victor R.** 1962. *Changes in the Location of Manufacturing in the United States Since 1929*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Fujita, Masahisa, Paul Krugman, and Anthony J. Venables.** 1999. *The Spatial Economy: Cities, Regions, and International Trade*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Glaeser, Edward L., and Matthew E. Kahn.** 2001. "Decentralized Employment and the Transformation of the American City." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 8117.

- Glaeser, Edward L., and William R. Kerr.** 2009. "Local Industrial Conditions and Entrepreneurship: How Much of the Spatial Distribution Can We Explain?" *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, 18(3): 623–63.
- Glaeser, Edward L., and Janet E. Kohlhase.** 2004. "Cities, Regions and the Decline of Transport Costs." *Papers in Regional Science*, 83(1): 197–228.
- Greenstone, Michael, Richard Hornbeck, and Enrico Moretti.** 2008. "Identifying Agglomeration Spillovers: Evidence from Million Dollar Plants." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 13833.
- Griliches, Zvi.** 1990. "Patent Statistics as Economic Indicators: A Survey." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 28(4): 1661–707.
- Hall, Bronwyn H., Adam B. Jaffe, and Manuel Trajtenberg.** 2001. "The NBER Patent Citation Data File: Lessons, Insights and Methodological Tools." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 8498.
- Helsley, Robert W., and William C. Strange.** 1990. "Matching and Agglomeration Economies in a System of Cities." *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 20(2): 189–212.
- Henderson, J. Vernon.** 2003. "Marshall's Scale Economies." *Journal of Urban Economics*, 53(1): 1–28.
- Holmes, Thomas J.** 1998. "The Effect of State Policies on the Location of Manufacturing: Evidence from State Borders." *Journal of Political Economy*, 106(4): 667–705.
- Holmes, Thomas J., and Sanghoon Lee.** 2008. "Economies of Density Versus Natural Advantage: Crop Choice on the Back Forty." Unpublished.
- Hoover, Edgar Malone.** 1948. *The Location of Economic Activity*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Jaffe, Adam B., Manuel Trajtenberg, and Michael S. Fogarty.** 2000. "Knowledge Spillovers and Patent Citations: Evidence from a Survey of Inventors." *American Economic Review*, 90(2): 215–18.
- Jaffe, Adam B., Manuel Trajtenberg, and Rebecca Henderson.** 1993. "Geographic Localization of Knowledge Spillovers as Evidenced by Patent Citations." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 108(3): 577–98.
- Johnson, Daniel K. N.** 1999. "150 Years of American Invention: Methodology and a First Geographic Application." Wellesley College Department of Economics Working Paper 99-01.
- Kerr, William R.** 2008. "Ethnic Scientific Communities and International Technology Diffusion." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 90(3): 518–37.
- Kerr, William R., and Ramana Nanda.** 2009. "Democratizing Entry: Banking Deregulations, Financing Constraints, and Entrepreneurship." *Journal of Financial Economics*, 94(1): 124–49.
- Kim, Sukkoo.** 1999. "Regions, Resources, and Economic Geography: Sources of U.S. Regional Comparative Advantage, 1880–1987." *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 29(1): 1–32.
- Kolko, Jed.** 1999. "Can I Get Some Service Here? Information Technology, Service Industries, and the Future of Cities." Unpublished.
- Krugman, Paul.** 1991a. *Geography and Trade*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Krugman, Paul.** 1991b. "Increasing Returns and Economic Geography." *Journal of Political Economy*, 99(3): 483–99.
- Marshall, Alfred.** 1920. *Principles of Economics*. London: MacMillan.
- Maskus, Keith E., Catherine D. Sveikauskas, and Allan Webster.** 1994. "The Composition of the Human Capital Stock and Its Relation to International Trade: Evidence from the U.S. And Britain." *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, 130(1): 50–76.
- Menon, Carlo.** 2008. "The Bright Side of Gerrymandering: An Enquiry on the Determinants of Industrial Agglomeration in the United States." Unpublished.
- Pagan, Adrian.** 1984. "Econometric Issues in the Analysis of Regressions with Generated Regressors." *International Economic Review*, 25(1): 221–47.
- Porter, Michael E.** 1990. *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Rosenthal, Stuart S., and William C. Strange.** 2001. "The Determinants of Agglomeration." *Journal of Urban Economics*, 50(2): 191–229.
- Rosenthal, Stuart S., and William C. Strange.** 2003. "Geography, Industrial Organization, and Agglomeration." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 85(2): 377–93.
- Rotemberg, Julio J., and Garth Saloner.** 2000. "Competition and Human Capital Accumulation: A Theory of Interregional Specialization and Trade." *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 30(4): 373–404.
- Saxenian, AnnaLee.** 1996. *Regional Advantage: Culture and Competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Scherer, Frederic M.** 1984. "Using Linked Patent and R&D Data to Measure Interindustry Technology Flows." In *R&D, Patents, and Productivity*, ed. Zvi Griliches, 417–61. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Silverman, Brian S.** 1999. "Technological Resources and the Direction of Corporate Diversification: Toward an Integration of the Resource-Based View and Transaction Cost Economics." *Management Science*, 45(8): 1109–24.
- Thompson, Peter, and Melanie Fox-Kean.** 2005. "Patent Citations and the Geography of Knowledge Spillovers: A Reassessment." *American Economic Review*, 95(1): 450–60.
- von Thünen, Johann Heinrich.** 1826. *Der Isolierte Staat in Beziehung auf Landwirthschaft und Nationalökonomie, oder Untersuchungen über den Einfluss, den die Getreidepreise, der Reichtum des Bodens und die Abgaben auf den Ackerbau Ausüben*. Reprinted in English as *Von Thünen's Isolated State*, Pergamon Press, 1966.

This article has been cited by:

1. Neave O'Clery, Muhammed Ali Yildirim, Ricardo Hausmann. 2021. Productive Ecosystems and the arrow of development. *Nature Communications* **12**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
2. Oriol Anguera-Torrell, Aurélie Cerdan. 2021. Which commercial sectors coagglomerate with the accommodation industry? Evidence from Barcelona. *Cities* **112**, 103112. [[Crossref](#)]
3. Yuchen Gao, Yimei Hu, Xielin Liu, Huanren Zhang. 2021. Can Public R&D Subsidy Facilitate Firms' Exploratory Innovation? The Heterogeneous Effects between Central and Local Subsidy Programs. *Research Policy* **50**:4, 104221. [[Crossref](#)]
4. Patrick A. Testa. 2021. Shocks and the spatial distribution of economic activity: The role of institutions. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **183**, 791-810. [[Crossref](#)]
5. Mingshu Wang. 2021. Polycentric urban development and urban amenities: Evidence from Chinese cities. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science* **48**:3, 400-416. [[Crossref](#)]
6. Lin Zhou, Li Tian, Yandong Cao, Linchuan Yang. 2021. Industrial land supply at different technological intensities and its contribution to economic growth in China: A case study of the Beijing-Tianjin-Hebei region. *Land Use Policy* **101**, 105087. [[Crossref](#)]
7. Valerien O. Pede, Raymond J. G. M. Florax, Henri L. F. Groot, Gustavo Barboza. 2021. Technological leadership and sectorial employment growth: A spatial econometric analysis for U.S. counties. *Economic Notes* **50**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
8. Matthew E. Kahn, Nancy Lozano-Gracia, Maria Edisa Soppelsa. 2021. POLLUTION'S ROLE IN REDUCING URBAN QUALITY OF LIFE IN THE DEVELOPING WORLD. *Journal of Economic Surveys* **35**:1, 330-347. [[Crossref](#)]
9. Sándor Juhász, Tom Broekel, Ron Boschma. 2021. Explaining the dynamics of relatedness: The role of co-location and complexity. *Papers in Regional Science* **100**:1, 3-21. [[Crossref](#)]
10. César A. Hidalgo. 2021. Economic complexity theory and applications. *Nature Reviews Physics* **3**:2, 92-113. [[Crossref](#)]
11. Rupika Khanna, Chandan Sharma. 2021. Does infrastructure stimulate total factor productivity? A dynamic heterogeneous panel analysis for Indian manufacturing industries. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance* **79**, 59-73. [[Crossref](#)]
12. Shulin Wan, Weixin Luan, Qiaoqiao Lin. 2021. Industry linkage, spatial correlation, and city exports: case study of the textile and clothing export industry in China. *The Annals of Regional Science* **66**:1, 91-112. [[Crossref](#)]
13. David B. Audretsch, Erik E. Lehmann, Matthias Menter, Katharine Wirsching. 2021. Intrapreneurship and absorptive capacities: The dynamic effect of labor mobility. *Technovation* **99**, 102129. [[Crossref](#)]
14. Katuscia Lavoratori, Lucia Piscitello. Geographical Boundaries of External and Internal Agglomeration Economies 221-250. [[Crossref](#)]
15. Francisco J. Beltrán Tapia, Alfonso Díez-Minguela, Julio Martínez-Galarraga. 2021. The shadow of cities: size, location and the spatial distribution of population. *The Annals of Regional Science* **95**. . [[Crossref](#)]
16. Philip McCann. Schools of Thought on Economic Geography, Institutions, and Development 1165-1177. [[Crossref](#)]
17. Gilles Duranton. Agglomeration and Jobs 1289-1306. [[Crossref](#)]
18. Ricardo Hausmann, Daniel P. Stock, Muhammed A. Yildirim. 2021. Implied comparative advantage. *Research Policy* **92**, 104143. [[Crossref](#)]

19. Véronique Flambard, Nicolas Gouvy, J. Jacques, Elisabetta Magnaghi, D. Mancini. Organizational and Environmental Framework of Smart Cities, Universities and Buildings 1-12. [[Crossref](#)]
20. Xiuzhen Pan, Zixiang Wei, Botang Han, Muhammad Shahbaz. 2021. The heterogeneous impacts of interregional green technology spillover on energy intensity in China. *Energy Economics* **83**, 105133. [[Crossref](#)]
21. 2021. OUP accepted manuscript. *The World Bank Economic Review* . [[Crossref](#)]
22. Gordon Hanson. 2020. Who Will Fill China's Shoes? The Global Evolution of Labor-Intensive Manufacturing. *East Asian Economic Review* **24**:4, 313-336. [[Crossref](#)]
23. Maria Bernedo Del Carpio, Carlianne Patrick. 2020. Agglomeration and informality: Evidence from Peruvian establishments. *Journal of Regional Science* **32** . . [[Crossref](#)]
24. Joseph S Shapiro. 2020. The Environmental Bias of Trade Policy*. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* . [[Crossref](#)]
25. Rawaa Laajimi, Julie Le Gallo, Saloua Benammou. 2020. What Geographical Concentration of Industries in the Tunisian Sahel? Empirical Evidence Using Distance-Based Measures. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie* **111**:5, 738-757. [[Crossref](#)]
26. Deng-Kui Si, Yanan Wang, Dongmin Kong. 2020. Employee incentives and energy firms' innovation: Evidence from China. *Energy* **212**, 118673. [[Crossref](#)]
27. Nathaniel Baum-Snow. 2020. Urban Transport Expansions and Changes in the Spatial Structure of U.S. Cities: Implications for Productivity and Welfare. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* **102**:5, 929-945. [[Crossref](#)]
28. Yilin Dong. 2020. Determinants of entry: Evidence from new manufacturing firms in the U.S. *Growth and Change* **51**:4, 1542-1561. [[Crossref](#)]
29. Som Sekhar Bhattacharyya. 2020. Integrated Perspective for Entrepreneurs: The Dos and Don'ts in Strategic Management of New Business Ventures. *Journal of Operations and Strategic Planning* **3**:2, 159-193. [[Crossref](#)]
30. Dongmin Kong, Yanan Wang, Jian Zhang. 2020. Efficiency wages as gift exchange: Evidence from corporate innovation in China. *Journal of Corporate Finance* **65**, 101725. [[Crossref](#)]
31. Yin Huang, Tao Hong, Tao Ma. 2020. Urban network externalities, agglomeration economies and urban economic growth. *Cities* **107**, 102882. [[Crossref](#)]
32. Muhammad Imran, An HuSen, Muhammad Kaleem, Arshad Khan Bangash, Nizam Ud Din, Sobia. 2020. Effect of regional factor productivity on manufacturing sector: The case of Sino-Pak economic ties. *Financial Innovation* **6**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
33. Shimeng Liu, Xi Yang. 2020. Human Capital Externalities or Consumption Spillovers? The Effect of High-Skill Human Capital across Low-Skill Labor Markets. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 103620. [[Crossref](#)]
34. Wenwen Wang. 2020. The heterogeneity of agglomeration effect: Evidence from Chinese cities. *Growth and Change* **51** . . [[Crossref](#)]
35. Nana Yang, Jin Hong, Hongying Wang, Qiming Liu. 2020. Global value chain, industrial agglomeration and innovation performance in developing countries: insights from China's manufacturing industries. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management* **32**:11, 1307-1321. [[Crossref](#)]
36. Zhigang Cai, Ying Li, Yu Yvette Zhang. 2020. A network-based approach to examine the impact of within-city industry agglomeration on total factor productivity. *Quality Technology & Quantitative Management* **17**:6, 738-746. [[Crossref](#)]
37. Shaojian Chen, Hui Mao, Zongxian Feng. 2020. Political uncertainty and firm entry: Evidence from Chinese manufacturing industries. *Journal of Business Research* **120**, 16-30. [[Crossref](#)]

38. Gustavo Barboza, Alessandro Capocchi. 2020. Innovative startups in Italy. Managerial challenges of knowledge spillovers effects on employment generation. *Journal of Knowledge Management* 24:10, 2573-2596. [[Crossref](#)]
39. M. Cecilia Bustamante, Laurent Frésard. 2020. Does Firm Investment Respond to Peers' Investment?. *Management Science* . [[Crossref](#)]
40. Katuscia Lavoratori, Sergio Mariotti, Lucia Piscitello. 2020. The role of geographical and temporary proximity in MNEs' location and intra-firm co-location choices. *Regional Studies* 54:10, 1442-1456. [[Crossref](#)]
41. Jianqiang Li, Yaowen Shan, Gary Tian, Xiangchao Hao. 2020. Labor cost, government intervention, and corporate innovation: Evidence from China. *Journal of Corporate Finance* 64, 101668. [[Crossref](#)]
42. Hyunseob Kim. 2020. How does labor market size affect firm capital structure? Evidence from large plant openings. *Journal of Financial Economics* 138:1, 277-294. [[Crossref](#)]
43. S. Stavropoulos, F. G. van Oort, M. J. Burger. 2020. Heterogeneous relatedness and firm productivity. *The Annals of Regional Science* 65:2, 403-437. [[Crossref](#)]
44. Jing Li, Jialong Xing. 2020. Why Is Collaborative Agglomeration of Innovation so Important for Improving Regional Innovation Capabilities? A Perspective Based on Collaborative Agglomeration of Industry-University-Research Institution. *Complexity* 2020, 1-21. [[Crossref](#)]
45. Christopher C. Liu, Matt Marx. 2020. Micro-geography: a fundamental organizing attribute. *Industry and Innovation* 27:8, 837-841. [[Crossref](#)]
46. Wei Wei, Wan-Li Zhang, Jun Wen, Jun-Sheng Wang. 2020. TFP growth in Chinese cities: The role of factor-intensity and industrial agglomeration. *Economic Modelling* 91, 534-549. [[Crossref](#)]
47. Guangliang Yang, Lixing Li, Shihe Fu. 2020. Do rural migrants benefit from labor market agglomeration economies? Evidence from Chinese cities. *Growth and Change* 51:3, 910-931. [[Crossref](#)]
48. César A Hidalgo. 2020. Trillion dollar streets. *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science* 47:7, 1133-1135. [[Crossref](#)]
49. Giulia Faggio, Olmo Silva, William C Strange. 2020. Tales of the city: what do agglomeration cases tell us about agglomeration in general?. *Journal of Economic Geography* 20:5, 1117-1143. [[Crossref](#)]
50. Ze Han, Wei Song. 2020. Identification and Geographic Distribution of Accommodation and Catering Centers. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information* 9:9, 546. [[Crossref](#)]
51. Mariko I. Ito, Takaaki Ohnishi. 2020. Evaluation of the Heterogeneous Spatial Distribution of Population and Stores/Facilities by Multifractal Analysis. *Frontiers in Physics* 8. . [[Crossref](#)]
52. Fulvio Castellacci, Davide Consoli, Artur Santoalha. 2020. The role of e-skills in technological diversification in European regions. *Regional Studies* 54:8, 1123-1135. [[Crossref](#)]
53. Anthony Howell. 2020. Agglomeration, absorptive capacity and knowledge governance: implications for public-private firm innovation in China. *Regional Studies* 54:8, 1069-1083. [[Crossref](#)]
54. Gharad Bryan, Edward Glaeser, Nick Tsivanidis. 2020. Cities in the Developing World. *Annual Review of Economics* 12:1, 273-297. [[Crossref](#)]
55. Claudia Capozza, Sergio Salomone, Ernesto Somma. 2020. Micro-econometric analysis of innovative start-ups: the role of firm-specific factors and industry context in innovation propensity. *Industrial and Corporate Change* 29:4, 935-957. [[Crossref](#)]
56. Tania Paola Torres-Gutiérrez, Ronny Correa-Quezada, María de la Cruz del Río-Rama, José Álvarez-García. 2020. Location Decisions of New Manufacturing Firms in Ecuador. Agglomeration Mechanisms. *Mathematics* 8:8, 1309. [[Crossref](#)]
57. Jun Oshiro, Yasuhiro Sato. 2020. Industrial structure in urban accounting. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 103576. [[Crossref](#)]

58. Huaxi Yuan, Yidai Feng, Jay Lee, Haimeng Liu. 2020. The Spatio-Temporal Heterogeneity of Financial Agglomeration on Green Development in China Cities Using GTWR Model. *Sustainability* 12:16, 6660. [[Crossref](#)]
59. André Luiz Ferreira e Silva, Marcelo Bentes Diniz. 2020. Padrões de concentração regional da indústria de transformação brasileira. *Nova Economia* 30:2, 407-454. [[Crossref](#)]
60. Hyuk-Soo Kwon, Jihong Lee, Sokbae Lee, Ryungha Oh. 2020. Knowledge spillovers and patent citations: trends in geographic localization, 1976–2015. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology* 94, 1-25. [[Crossref](#)]
61. Taner Osman. 2020. Restrictive Land Use Regulations and Economic Performance. *International Regional Science Review* 43:4, 291-315. [[Crossref](#)]
62. Alejandro Amezcua, Tiago Ratinho, Lawrence A. Plummer, Parvathi Jayamohan. 2020. Organizational sponsorship and the economics of place: How regional urbanization and localization shape incubator outcomes. *Journal of Business Venturing* 35:4, 105967. [[Crossref](#)]
63. Elvira Cerver-Romero, João J. Ferreira, Cristina Fernandes. 2020. A scientometric analysis of knowledge spillover research. *The Journal of Technology Transfer* 45:3, 780-805. [[Crossref](#)]
64. Ilaria Mariotti, Mariachiara Barzotto, Giancarlo Corò, Stefano Saloriani. 2020. Industrial districts, urban areas or both? The location behaviour of foreign and domestic firms in an Italian manufacturing region. *The Annals of Regional Science* 64:3, 523-546. [[Crossref](#)]
65. Sasan Bakhtiari. 2020. Do manufacturing entrepreneurs in Australia have (or develop) a productivity advantage?. *Journal of Productivity Analysis* 53:3, 321-338. [[Crossref](#)]
66. Nathan Yang. 2020. Learning in retail entry. *International Journal of Research in Marketing* 37:2, 336-355. [[Crossref](#)]
67. Bing Xue, Xiao Xiao, Jingzhong Li. 2020. Identification method and empirical study of urban industrial spatial relationship based on POI big data: a case of Shenyang City, China. *Geography and Sustainability* 1:2, 152-162. [[Crossref](#)]
68. Darko B. Vukovic, Moinak Maiti, Dmitry Kochetkov, Alexander Bystryakov. 2020. How attractive are municipal bonds for the passive competitiveness: the case of immunization of municipal bonds. *Competitiveness Review: An International Business Journal* ahead-of-print:ahead-of-print. . [[Crossref](#)]
69. Xinyu Wang, Yu Lin, Yingjie Shi. 2020. Linking industrial agglomeration and manufacturers inventory performance: the moderating role of firm size and enterprise status in the supply chain. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management* ahead-of-print:ahead-of-print. . [[Crossref](#)]
70. Georges Harb, Charbel Bassil. 2020. Terrorism and inbound tourism: Does immigration have a moderating effect?. *Tourism Economics* 26:3, 500-518. [[Crossref](#)]
71. Crocker H. Liu, Stuart S. Rosenthal, William C. Strange. 2020. Employment density and agglomeration economies in tall buildings. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 103555. [[Crossref](#)]
72. Joern H. Block, Alexander Groh, Lars Hornuf, Tom Vanacker, Silvio Vismara. 2020. The entrepreneurial finance markets of the future: a comparison of crowdfunding and initial coin offerings. *Small Business Economics* 78. . [[Crossref](#)]
73. Vicki M. Bier, Yuqun Zhou, Hongru Du. 2020. Game-theoretic modeling of pre-disaster relocation. *The Engineering Economist* 65:2, 89-113. [[Crossref](#)]
74. Gabriel Lang, Eric Marcon, Florence Puech. 2020. Distance-based measures of spatial concentration: introducing a relative density function. *The Annals of Regional Science* 64:2, 243-265. [[Crossref](#)]
75. Jason Barr. 2020. Introduction to the Symposium on Urban Economics. *Eastern Economic Journal* 46:2, 219-223. [[Crossref](#)]
76. Marco Gazel, Armin Schwiendbacher. 2020. Entrepreneurial fintech clusters. *Small Business Economics* 49. . [[Crossref](#)]

77. Donald R. Davis, Jonathan I. Dingel. 2020. The comparative advantage of cities. *Journal of International Economics* **123**, 103291. [[Crossref](#)]
78. Stefano De Falco. 2020. Un'analisi geografica delle ricadute territoriali dell'Università mediante l'individuazione di cluster spaziali. Il caso dell'area di Napoli. *RIVISTA GEOGRAFICA ITALIANA* :1, 85-107. [[Crossref](#)]
79. Li Fang. 2020. Agglomeration and innovation: Selection or true effect?. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* **52**:2, 423-448. [[Crossref](#)]
80. Abhinav Alakshendra, Ziming Li. 2020. Local Governments' Impact on Market Accessibility of Enterprises: Understanding the Location Choices of Enterprises in Hajipur, India. *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics* **63**:1, 119-142. [[Crossref](#)]
81. Chengwei Wang, Qingchun Meng. 2020. Research on the Sustainable Synergetic Development of Chinese Urban Economies in the Context of a Study of Industrial Agglomeration. *Sustainability* **12**:3, 1122. [[Crossref](#)]
82. W Walker Hanlon. 2020. Coal Smoke, City Growth, and the Costs of the Industrial Revolution. *The Economic Journal* **130**:626, 462-488. [[Crossref](#)]
83. Juho Jokinen. 2020. The wage curve and local monopsony power. *The Annals of Regional Science* **64**:1, 159-183. [[Crossref](#)]
84. Zheng Tian, Paul D. Gottlieb, Stephan J. Goetz. 2020. Measuring industry co-location across county borders. *Spatial Economic Analysis* **15**:1, 92-113. [[Crossref](#)]
85. Ghulam Samad, Gregory D. Graff. The Urban Concentration of Innovation and Entrepreneurship in Agricultural and Natural Resource Industries 91-116. [[Crossref](#)]
86. Philip McCann. Schools of Thought on Economic Geography, Institutions, and Development 1-13. [[Crossref](#)]
87. Melissa Dell, Benjamin A Olken. 2020. The Development Effects of the Extractive Colonial Economy: The Dutch Cultivation System in Java. *The Review of Economic Studies* **87**:1, 164-203. [[Crossref](#)]
88. Rune D. Fitjar, Andrés Rodríguez-Pose. 2020. Where cities fail to triumph: The impact of urban location and local collaboration on innovation in Norway. *Journal of Regional Science* **60**:1, 5-32. [[Crossref](#)]
89. Ekaterina Aleksandrova, Kristian Behrens, Maria Kuznetsova. 2020. Manufacturing (co)agglomeration in a transition country: Evidence from Russia. *Journal of Regional Science* **60**:1, 88-128. [[Crossref](#)]
90. Simon Rudkin, Ming He, Yang Chen. 2020. Attraction or Repulsion?: Testing Coagglomeration of Innovation between Firm and University. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
91. Kyle Myers, Lauren Lanahan. 2020. Research Subsidy Spillovers, Two Ways. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
92. Rahul Gupta. 2020. Does Goliath Help David? Anchor Firms and Startup Clusters. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
93. William Grieser, James P. LeSage, Morad Zekhnini. 2020. Industry Networks and the Geography of Firm Behavior. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
94. Dimas Fazio, Thiago Silva, Janis Skrastins. 2020. Economic Resilience: Spillovers, Courts, and Vertical Integration. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
95. Jose Brache, Christian Felzensztein. 2019. Geographical co-location on Chilean SME's export performance. *Journal of Business Research* **105**, 310-321. [[Crossref](#)]
96. Chaoran Hu, Yi Zhou, Canfei He. 2019. Regional industrial development in a dual-core industry space in China: The role of the missing service. *Habitat International* **94**, 102072. [[Crossref](#)]

97. Ioannis Baraklianos, Louafi Bouzouina, Patrick Bonnel, Ouassim Manout. 2019. Do new and relocating firms have different preferences for accessibility?. *Papers in Regional Science* **98**:6, 2315-2341. [[Crossref](#)]
98. Katarzyna Kopczewska, Paweł Churski, Artur Ochojski, Adam Polko. 2019. SPAG: Index of spatial agglomeration. *Papers in Regional Science* **98**:6, 2391-2424. [[Crossref](#)]
99. Seungil Yum. 2019. Empirical Analysis of Relationship between High-Tech Industries and US Metropolitan Statistical Areas. *Journal of Urban Planning and Development* **145**:4, 04019019. [[Crossref](#)]
100. Genevieve Giuliano, Sanggyun Kang, Quan Yuan. 2019. Agglomeration economies and evolving urban form. *The Annals of Regional Science* **63**:3, 377-398. [[Crossref](#)]
101. Andres Dominguez. 2019. Agglomeration effects and informal firms in the internal structure of cities. *Applied Economic Analysis* **27**:80, 93-107. [[Crossref](#)]
102. Levent Kutlu, Usha Nair-Reichert. 2019. Agglomeration effects and spatial spillovers in efficiency analysis: a distribution-free methodology. *Regional Studies* **53**:11, 1565-1574. [[Crossref](#)]
103. Esteban Jaimovich. 2019. Roadways, input sourcing, and patterns of specialization. *European Economic Review* **120**, 103319. [[Crossref](#)]
104. Benjamin Goldman, Thomas Klier, Thomas Walstrum. 2019. Within-industry agglomeration of occupations: Evidence from census microdata. *Journal of Regional Science* **59**:5, 910-930. [[Crossref](#)]
105. Anthony Howell. 2019. Heterogeneous impacts of China's economic and development zone program. *Journal of Regional Science* **59**:5, 797-818. [[Crossref](#)]
106. Richard Harris, John Moffat, Emil Evenhuis, Ron Martin, Andy Pike, Peter Sunley. 2019. Does spatial proximity raise firm productivity? Evidence from British manufacturing. *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society* **3**. . [[Crossref](#)]
107. Anthony Howell. 2019. Relatedness economies, absorptive capacity, and economic catch-up: firm-level evidence from China. *Industrial and Corporate Change* **6**. . [[Crossref](#)]
108. JunJie Wu. 2019. Agglomeration: Economic and Environmental Impacts. *Annual Review of Resource Economics* **11**:1, 419-438. [[Crossref](#)]
109. Ken Ueda. 2019. How Do Local Labor Markets and Human Capital Affect Employment Outcomes after Job Loss?. *Southern Economic Journal* **86**:2, 548-572. [[Crossref](#)]
110. George Deltas, Dakshina G. De Silva, Robert P. McComb. 2019. Spatial persistence of agglomeration in software publishing. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* **166**, 544-565. [[Crossref](#)]
111. Qianqian Wu, Chen Zhang, Hui Wang, Jingjing Hao. 2019. Study on the relationship between agglomeration of service industry and economic growth in Yangtze River Delta based on spatial econometric models. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* **1324**, 012089. [[Crossref](#)]
112. Sotiris Kampanelis. 2019. It's time for Westernization: the advantages of the early start for long-term economic development at the local level. *Oxford Economic Papers* **71**:4, 996-1025. [[Crossref](#)]
113. Keith Head, Yao Amber Li, Asier Minondo. 2019. Geography, Ties, and Knowledge Flows: Evidence from Citations in Mathematics. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* **101**:4, 713-727. [[Crossref](#)]
114. Liang Wang, Justin Tan. 2019. Social Structure of Regional Entrepreneurship: The Impacts of Collective Action of Incumbents on De Novo Entrants. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice* **43**:5, 855-879. [[Crossref](#)]
115. Yi Feng, Keke Song, Yisong S. Tian. 2019. Director networks and initial public offerings. *Journal of Banking & Finance* **106**, 246-264. [[Crossref](#)]
116. Lars Mewes. 2019. Scaling of Atypical Knowledge Combinations in American Metropolitan Areas from 1836 to 2010. *Economic Geography* **95**:4, 341-361. [[Crossref](#)]

117. Susana Garcia, Alfonso Mejia. 2019. Characterizing and modeling subnational virtual water networks of US agricultural and industrial commodity flows. *Advances in Water Resources* **130**, 314-324. [[Crossref](#)]
118. Michel Serafinelli. 2019. "Good" Firms, Worker Flows, and Local Productivity. *Journal of Labor Economics* **37**:3, 747-792. [[Crossref](#)]
119. Martin Andersson, Johan P Larsson, Joakim Wernberg. 2019. The economic microgeography of diversity and specialization externalities – firm-level evidence from Swedish cities. *Research Policy* **48**:6, 1385-1398. [[Crossref](#)]
120. Efraim Benmelech, Nittai Bergman, Anna Milanez, Vladimir Mukharlyamov. 2019. The Agglomeration of Bankruptcy. *The Review of Financial Studies* **32**:7, 2541-2586. [[Crossref](#)]
121. Cathy Ge Bao. 2019. Entry decisions of multinational firms: The role of competition threats. *The World Economy* **42**:7, 2144-2171. [[Crossref](#)]
122. Chenlu Tao, Jinzhu Zhang, Baodong Cheng, Yu Liu. 2019. An Assessment of the Impact of Spatial Agglomeration on the Quality of China's Wood Processing Industry Products. *Sustainability* **11**:14, 3961. [[Crossref](#)]
123. Grigorios Spanos. 2019. Firm organization and productivity across locations. *Journal of Urban Economics* **112**, 152-168. [[Crossref](#)]
124. Sai Ding, Puyang Sun, Wei Jiang. 2019. The Effect of Foreign Entry Regulation on Downstream Productivity: Microeconomic Evidence from China*. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* **121**:3, 925-959. [[Crossref](#)]
125. Toshitaka Gokan, Ikuo Kuroiwa, Kentaro Nakajima. 2019. Agglomeration economies in Vietnam: A firm-level analysis. *Journal of Asian Economics* **62**, 52-64. [[Crossref](#)]
126. Xin Pan, Lutao Ning, Lifang Shi. 2019. Visualisation and determinations of hub locations: Evidence from China's interregional trade network. *Research in Transportation Economics* **75**, 36-44. [[Crossref](#)]
127. Thomas Hellmann, Veikko Thiele. 2019. Fostering Entrepreneurship: Promoting Founding or Funding?. *Management Science* **65**:6, 2502-2521. [[Crossref](#)]
128. Riccardo Cappelli, Ron Boschma, Anet Weterings. 2019. Labour mobility, skill-relatedness and new plant survival across different development stages of an industry. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space* **51**:4, 869-890. [[Crossref](#)]
129. Chuantao Cui, Leona Shao-Zhi Li. 2019. High-speed rail and inventory reduction: firm-level evidence from China. *Applied Economics* **51**:25, 2715-2730. [[Crossref](#)]
130. Dany Bahar, Samuel Rosenow, Ernesto Stein, Rodrigo Wagner. 2019. Export take-offs and acceleration: Unpacking cross-sector linkages in the evolution of comparative advantage. *World Development* **117**, 48-60. [[Crossref](#)]
131. Chung-Yueh Chiu, Chang-Ching Lin, Chih-Hai Yang. 2019. Technological catching-up between two ASEAN members and China: A metafrontier approach. *China Economic Review* **54**, 12-25. [[Crossref](#)]
132. Trey Malone, Antonios M. Koumpias, Per L. Bylund. 2019. Entrepreneurial response to interstate regulatory competition: evidence from a behavioral discrete choice experiment. *Journal of Regulatory Economics* **55**:2, 172-192. [[Crossref](#)]
133. Daniel Montolio, Simón Planells-Struse. 2019. Measuring the negative externalities of a private leisure activity: hooligans and pickpockets around the stadium. *Journal of Economic Geography* **19**:2, 465-504. [[Crossref](#)]
134. Sam McLeod, Jake H.M. Schapper, Carey Curtis, Giles Graham. 2019. Conceptualizing freight generation for transport and land use planning: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Transport Policy* **74**, 24-34. [[Crossref](#)]

135. Caio Peixoto Chain, Antônio Carlos dos Santos, Luiz Gonzaga de Castro, José Willer do Prado. 2019. BIBLIOMETRIC ANALYSIS OF THE QUANTITATIVE METHODS APPLIED TO THE MEASUREMENT OF INDUSTRIAL CLUSTERS. *Journal of Economic Surveys* **33**:1, 60-84. [[Crossref](#)]
136. SHAI BERNSTEIN, EMANUELE COLONNELLI, BENJAMIN IVERSON. 2019. Asset Allocation in Bankruptcy. *The Journal of Finance* **74**:1, 5-53. [[Crossref](#)]
137. Francesco Quatraro, Alessandra Scandura. 2019. Academic Inventors and the Antecedents of Green Technologies. A Regional Analysis of Italian Patent Data. *Ecological Economics* **156**, 247-263. [[Crossref](#)]
138. Shengjun Zhu, Canfei He, Xinming Xia. 2019. Geography of productivity: evidence from China's manufacturing industries. *The Annals of Regional Science* **62**:1, 141-168. [[Crossref](#)]
139. Hiroyasu Inoue, Kentaro Nakajima, Yukiko Umeno Saito. 2019. Localization of collaborations in knowledge creation. *The Annals of Regional Science* **62**:1, 119-140. [[Crossref](#)]
140. Li Fang. 2019. Manufacturing Clusters and Firm Innovation. *Economic Development Quarterly* **33**:1, 6-18. [[Crossref](#)]
141. Kristian Behrens, Brahim Boualam, Julien Martin. 2019. Are clusters resilient? Evidence from Canadian textile industries. *Journal of Economic Geography* **10**. . [[Crossref](#)]
142. Florian Ploeckl. Spatial Modeling 1639-1672. [[Crossref](#)]
143. Jacek Zaucha, Tomasz Komornicki. Territorial Cohesion: The Economy and Welfare of Cities 39-66. [[Crossref](#)]
144. Prateek Goorha, Jason Potts. Core Rules, Contracts, and Commons 95-125. [[Crossref](#)]
145. Gilles Duranton. Agglomeration and Jobs 1-19. [[Crossref](#)]
146. Florian Ploeckl. Spatial Modeling 1-34. [[Crossref](#)]
147. Banji Oyelaran-Oyeyinka, Gora Mboup. Smart Urban Economy in Africa 423-445. [[Crossref](#)]
148. Mitt Nowshade Kabir. Knowledge Society 59-89. [[Crossref](#)]
149. Rikard H. Eriksson, Balázs Lengyel. 2019. Co-worker Networks and Agglomeration Externalities. *Economic Geography* **95**:1, 65-89. [[Crossref](#)]
150. Paul Verstraten, Gerard Verweij, Peter J. Zwaneveld. 2019. Complexities in the spatial scope of agglomeration economies. *Journal of Regional Science* **59**:1, 29-55. [[Crossref](#)]
151. Christos Makridis. 2019. (Why) Are Housing Costs Rising?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
152. Karol Borowiecki, Kathryn Graddy. 2019. Immigrant Artists: Enrichment or Displacement?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
153. Xiao Wang, Yiqing Xie. 2019. The Gravity of Intermediate Inputs in Productivity Spillovers: Evidence from Foreign Direct Investment in China. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
154. Jihong Lee, Yunmi Nam. 2019. ##### ### ##### ##### ### ## (Patent Citations and Localization of Knowledge Spillovers: Evidence from Korea). *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
155. Sergio Mayordomo, Omar Rachedi. 2019. The China Syndrome Affects Banks: The Credit Supply Channel of Foreign Import Competition. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
156. Wen-Tai Hsu, Yi Lu, Xuan Luo, Lianming Zhu. 2019. Does Foreign Direct Investment Lead to Industrial Agglomeration?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
157. Xiaodong Gong, Jiti Gao, Xuan Liang. 2019. Inter-City Spillover and Intra-City Agglomeration Effects Among Local Labour Markets in China. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
158. Federico Belotti, Giuseppe Ilardi, Andrea Piano Mortari. 2019. Estimation of Stochastic Frontier Panel Data Models with Spatial Inefficiency. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

159. William R. Kerr, Frédéric Robert-Nicoud. 2019. Tech Clusters. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
160. JOHN JIANQIU BAI, DANIEL CARVALHO, GORDON M. PHILLIPS. 2018. The Impact of Bank Credit on Labor Reallocation and Aggregate Industry Productivity. *The Journal of Finance* **73**:6, 2787-2836. [[Crossref](#)]
161. Shivaram V. Devarakonda, Brian T. McCann, Jeffrey J. Reuer. 2018. Marshallian Forces and Governance Externalities: Location Effects on Contractual Safeguards in Research and Development Alliances. *Organization Science* **29**:6, 1112-1129. [[Crossref](#)]
162. Peter Gordon, John Cho. 2018. Agglomeration near and far, the case of Southern California: supply chains for goods and ideas. *The Annals of Regional Science* **61**:3, 517-552. [[Crossref](#)]
163. Angel Alañon-Pardo, Patrick J. Walsh, Rafael Myro. 2018. Do neighboring municipalities matter in industrial location decisions? Empirical evidence from Spain. *Empirical Economics* **55**:3, 1145-1179. [[Crossref](#)]
164. Frank M.H. Neffke, Anne Otto, César Hidalgo. 2018. The mobility of displaced workers: How the local industry mix affects job search. *Journal of Urban Economics* **108**, 124-140. [[Crossref](#)]
165. Elizabeth Ananat, Fu Shihe, Stephen L. Ross. 2018. Race-specific urban wage premia and the black-white wage gap. *Journal of Urban Economics* **108**, 141-153. [[Crossref](#)]
166. Luís Cabral, Zhu Wang, Daniel Yi Xu. 2018. Competitors, complementors, parents and places: Explaining regional agglomeration in the U.S. auto industry. *Review of Economic Dynamics* **30**, 1-29. [[Crossref](#)]
167. Joseph Engelberg, Arzu Ozoguz, Sean Wang. 2018. Know Thy Neighbor: Industry Clusters, Information Spillovers, and Market Efficiency. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* **53**:5, 1937-1961. [[Crossref](#)]
168. Bruno Brandão Fischer, Paola Rucker Schaeffer, Julia Phaiffer Silveira. 2018. Universities' gravitational effects on the location of knowledge-intensive investments in Brazil. *Science and Public Policy* **45**:5, 692-707. [[Crossref](#)]
169. Anna M. Ferragina, Giulia Nunziante. 2018. Are Italian firms performances influenced by innovation of domestic and foreign firms nearby in space and sectors?. *Economia e Politica Industriale* **45**:3, 335-360. [[Crossref](#)]
170. Patrik Gustavsson Tingvall, Josefin Videnord. 2018. Regional differences in effects of publicly sponsored R&D grants on SME performance. *Small Business Economics* **78** . [[Crossref](#)]
171. Claudia Capozza, Sergio Salomone, Ernesto Somma. 2018. Local industrial structure, agglomeration economies and the creation of innovative start-ups: evidence from the Italian case. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* **30**:7-8, 749-775. [[Crossref](#)]
172. . Innovation Systems, Policy and Management **82**, . [[Crossref](#)]
173. Russell Golman, Steven Klepper. Spinoffs and Clustering 359-393. [[Crossref](#)]
174. Chris Forman, Avi Goldfarb, Shane Greenstein. Agglomeration of Invention in the Bay Area 418-430. [[Crossref](#)]
175. Emilia Garcia-Appendini. 2018. Financial distress and competitors' investment. *Journal of Corporate Finance* **51**, 182-209. [[Crossref](#)]
176. Oneil Harris. 2018. The impact of industrial districts on the pricing of IPOs. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance* **69**, 274-285. [[Crossref](#)]
177. Özge Öner. 2018. Retail productivity: The effects of market size and regional hierarchy. *Papers in Regional Science* **97**:3, 711-736. [[Crossref](#)]

178. Wolfgang Dauth, Michaela Fuchs, Anne Otto. 2018. Long-run processes of geographical concentration and dispersion: Evidence from Germany. *Papers in Regional Science* **97**:3, 569-593. [[Crossref](#)]
179. Li Fang. 2018. The Dual Effects of Information Technology Clusters: Learning and Selection. *Economic Development Quarterly* **32**:3, 195-209. [[Crossref](#)]
180. Ming He, Yang Chen, Ron Schramm. 2018. Technological spillovers in space and firm productivity: Evidence from China's electric apparatus industry. *Urban Studies* **55**:11, 2522-2541. [[Crossref](#)]
181. Angela Xia Liu, Jan-Benedict E.M. Steenkamp, Jurui Zhang. 2018. Agglomeration as a Driver of the Volume of Electronic Word of Mouth in the Restaurant Industry. *Journal of Marketing Research* **55**:4, 507-523. [[Crossref](#)]
182. Dario Diodato, Frank Neffke, Neave O'Clery. 2018. Why do industries coagglomerate? How Marshallian externalities differ by industry and have evolved over time. *Journal of Urban Economics* **106**, 1-26. [[Crossref](#)]
183. T. Kirk White, Jerome P. Reiter, Amil Petrin. 2018. Imputation in U.S. Manufacturing Data and Its Implications for Productivity Dispersion. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* **100**:3, 502-509. [[Crossref](#)]
184. Chih-Hai Yang, Chia-Hui Huang. 2018. Agglomeration, ownership, and R&D activity: firm-level evidence from China's electronics industry. *Empirical Economics* **54**:4, 1673-1696. [[Crossref](#)]
185. Buhui Qiu, Teng Wang. 2018. Does Knowledge Protection Benefit Shareholders? Evidence from Stock Market Reaction and Firm Investment in Knowledge Assets. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* **53**:3, 1341-1370. [[Crossref](#)]
186. Jan Ruffner, Andrin Spescha. 2018. The Impact of Clustering on Firm Innovation. *CESifo Economic Studies* **64**:2, 176-215. [[Crossref](#)]
187. Liang Wang, Justin Tan, Wan Li. 2018. The impacts of spatial positioning on regional new venture creation and firm mortality over the industry life cycle. *Journal of Business Research* **86**, 41-52. [[Crossref](#)]
188. Roberto Ramos, Enrique Moral-Benito. 2018. Agglomeration by export destination: evidence from Spain. *Journal of Economic Geography* **18**:3, 599-625. [[Crossref](#)]
189. Mohamed Hilal, Sophie Legras, Jean Cavailhès. 2018. Peri-Urbanisation: Between Residential Preferences and Job Opportunities. *Raumforschung und Raumordnung* **76**:2, 133-147. [[Crossref](#)]
190. Qi Guo, Shengjun Zhu, Canfei He. 2018. Industry relatedness and new firm survival in China: do regional institutions and firm heterogeneity matter?. *Post-Communist Economies* **91**, 1-20. [[Crossref](#)]
191. Hunt Allcott, Daniel Keniston. 2018. Dutch Disease or Agglomeration? The Local Economic Effects of Natural Resource Booms in Modern America. *The Review of Economic Studies* **85**:2, 695-731. [[Crossref](#)]
192. Kilian Huber. 2018. Disentangling the Effects of a Banking Crisis: Evidence from German Firms and Counties. *American Economic Review* **108**:3, 868-898. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
193. Arthur O'Sullivan, William C Strange. 2018. The Emergence of Coagglomeration. *Journal of Economic Geography* **18**:2, 293-317. [[Crossref](#)]
194. Haroldo V. Ribeiro, Quentin S. Hanley, Dan Lewis. 2018. Unveiling relationships between crime and property in England and Wales via density scale-adjusted metrics and network tools. *PLOS ONE* **13**:2, e0192931. [[Crossref](#)]
195. Matthias Tomenendal, Christian Raffer, Stephanie Stockklauser, Johannes Kirch. 2018. Introducing the T-shaped model of cluster competence – an integrative framework and first empirical evidence from the German craftsmen sector. *Industry and Innovation* **25**:2, 144-166. [[Crossref](#)]

196. Fikanti Zuliastri, Wiwiek Rindayati, Alla Asmara. 2018. ANALISIS FAKTOR YANG MEMENGARUHI AGLOMERASI INDUSTRI UNGGULAN DAERAH DAN HUBUNGANNYA DENGAN DAYA SAING INDUSTRI DAERAH. *JURNAL EKONOMI DAN KEBIJAKAN PEMBANGUNAN* 2:2, 113-134. [[Crossref](#)]
197. Haitao Yu, Junfeng Jiao, Eric Houston, Zhong-Ren Peng. 2018. Evaluating the relationship between rail transit and industrial agglomeration: An observation from the Dallas-fort worth region, TX. *Journal of Transport Geography* 67, 33-52. [[Crossref](#)]
198. Sasan Bakhtiari, Robert Breunig. 2018. The role of spillovers in research and development expenditure in Australian industries. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology* 27:1, 14-38. [[Crossref](#)]
199. Smriti Anand, Iftekhar Hasan, Priyanka Sharma, Haizhi Wang. 2018. State enforceability of noncompete agreements: Regulations that stifle productivity!. *Human Resource Management* 57:1, 341-354. [[Crossref](#)]
200. Paula Puskarova. Methodological Dichotomy in the Studies of Knowledge Spillovers: CEE Region Under Focus 253-286. [[Crossref](#)]
201. S.-J. Hwang, X. Li. A Measure of the Spillover Effects Among Companies of Same Nationality in the Location Choice of FDI 113-129. [[Crossref](#)]
202. Sampsa Samila. Regional Development 1408-1411. [[Crossref](#)]
203. Frank Neffke, Matté Hartog, Ron Boschma, Martin Henning. 2018. Agents of Structural Change: The Role of Firms and Entrepreneurs in Regional Diversification. *Economic Geography* 94:1, 23-48. [[Crossref](#)]
204. Dariusz Wójcik, Eric Knight, Vladimír Pažitka. 2018. What turns cities into international financial centres? Analysis of cross-border investment banking 2000–2014. *Journal of Economic Geography* 18:1, 1-33. [[Crossref](#)]
205. N. K. Kurichev, E. K. Kuricheva. 2018. Relationship of Housing Construction in the Moscow Urban Agglomeration and Migration to the Metropolitan Area. *Regional Research of Russia* 8:1, 1-15. [[Crossref](#)]
206. Brad R. Humphreys, Josh Matti. 2018. The Spatial Distribution of Urban Consumer Service Firms: Evidence from Yelp Reviews. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
207. Sotiris Kampanelis. 2018. It's Time for Westernization: The Advantages of the Early Start for Long-Term Economic Development at the Local Level. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
208. Oscar-Javier Quiroz P. 2018. Aglomeraciin Empresarial Y Eficiencia TTcnica: Un Enfoque De Frontera Estocstica En La Producciin Para Bogott D.C. (Enterprise Agglomeration and Technical Efficiency: A Stochastic Production Frontier Approach in Bogott-Colombia). *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
209. Ekaterina Aleksandrova, Kristian Behrens, Maria Kuznetsova. 2018. Manufacturing (Co)agglomeration in a Transition Country: Evidence from Russia. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
210. Keith Charles Head, Yao Amber Li, Asier Minondo. 2018. Geography, Ties, and Knowledge Flows: Evidence From Citations in Mathematics. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
211. Helena Schweiger, Alexander Stepanov, Paolo Zacchia. 2018. The Long-Run Effects of R&D Place-Based Policies: Evidence from Russian Science Cities. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
212. EBRD Submitter. 2018. The Long-Run Effects of R&D Place-Based Policies: Evidence from Russian Science Cities. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
213. Daniel Ershov. 2018. Competing with Superstars in the Mobile App Market. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

214. Marco Gazel, Armin Schwiendbacher. 2018. Entrepreneurial Fintech Clusters. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
215. Efraim Benmelech, Nittai Bergman, Hyunseob Kim. 2018. Strong Employers and Weak Employees: How Does Employer Concentration Affect Wages?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
216. Tania Babina, Sabrina Howell. 2018. Entrepreneurial Spillovers from Corporate R&D. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
217. Yichen Su. 2018. The Rising Value of Time and the Origin of Urban Gentrification. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
218. Jiaochen Liang. 2017. Trade shocks, new industry entry and industry relatedness. *Regional Studies* **51**:12, 1749-1760. [[Crossref](#)]
219. Liang Zheng, Zhong Zhao. 2017. What drives spatial clusters of entrepreneurship in China? Evidence from economic census data. *China Economic Review* **46**, 229-248. [[Crossref](#)]
220. Mikaela Backman, Charlie Karlsson. 2017. Location of New Firms: Influence of Commuting Behaviour. *Growth and Change* **48**:4, 682-699. [[Crossref](#)]
221. Muhammad Imran, Gu Zhang, HuSen An. 2017. Impact of market access and comparative advantage on regional distribution of manufacturing sector. *China Finance and Economic Review* **5**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
222. Matthew Freedman. 2017. Persistence in industrial policy impacts: Evidence from Depression-era Mississippi. *Journal of Urban Economics* **102**, 34-51. [[Crossref](#)]
223. Masaki Nakabayashi. 2017. Honesty, Diligence and Skill: Risk Sharing and Specialization in the Kiryu Silk Weaving Cluster, Japan. *Review of Development Economics* **21**:4, 1401-1424. [[Crossref](#)]
224. Mengdi Liu, Ronald Shadbegian, Bing Zhang. 2017. Does environmental regulation affect labor demand in China? Evidence from the textile printing and dyeing industry. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* **86**, 277-294. [[Crossref](#)]
225. Daniel Lederman, Justin T. Lesniak. In Search of Scale Economies with International Data 19-42. [[Crossref](#)]
226. Ikechukwu C. Ahams, Willa Paterson, Susana Garcia, Richard Rushforth, Benjamin L. Ruddell, Alfonso Mejia. 2017. Water Footprint of 65 Mid- to Large-Sized U.S. Cities and Their Metropolitan Areas. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Resources Association* **53**:5, 1147-1163. [[Crossref](#)]
227. . Bibliography 129-139. [[Crossref](#)]
228. Malik Curuk, Gonzague Vannoorenberghe. 2017. Inter-sectoral labor reallocation in the short run: The role of occupational similarity. *Journal of International Economics* **108**, 20-36. [[Crossref](#)]
229. Kristy Buzard, Gerald A. Carlino, Robert M. Hunt, Jake K. Carr, Tony E. Smith. 2017. The agglomeration of American R&D labs. *Journal of Urban Economics* **101**, 14-26. [[Crossref](#)]
230. Thor Berger, Carl Benedikt Frey. 2017. REGIONAL TECHNOLOGICAL DYNAMISM AND NONCOMPETE CLAUSES: EVIDENCE FROM A NATURAL EXPERIMENT. *Journal of Regional Science* **57**:4, 655-668. [[Crossref](#)]
231. Anthony G.O. Yeh, Fiona F. Yang, Zhihua Xu. 2017. Will rural urbanization produce a new producer service space in China?. *Habitat International* **67**, 105-117. [[Crossref](#)]
232. Ronald E. Miller, Umed Temurshoev. 2017. Output Upstreamness and Input Downstreamness of Industries/Countries in World Production. *International Regional Science Review* **40**:5, 443-475. [[Crossref](#)]
233. Siping Luo, Mary E. Lovely, David Popp. 2017. Intellectual returnees as drivers of indigenous innovation: Evidence from the Chinese photovoltaic industry. *The World Economy* **32**. . [[Crossref](#)]
234. Anthony Howell. 2017. Marshallian Sources of Relatedness and Their Effects on Firm Survival and Subsequent Success in China. *Economic Geography* **93**:4, 346-366. [[Crossref](#)]

235. Justyna Majewska. 2017. GPS-based measurement of geographic spillovers in tourism – example of Polish districts. *Tourism Geographies* **19**:4, 612-643. [[Crossref](#)]
236. Stephen J. Redding, Esteban Rossi-Hansberg. 2017. Quantitative Spatial Economics. *Annual Review of Economics* **9**:1, 21-58. [[Crossref](#)]
237. Vicki Marion Bier. 2017. Understanding and Mitigating the Impacts of Massive Relocations Due to Disasters. *Economics of Disasters and Climate Change* **1**:2, 179-202. [[Crossref](#)]
238. Siqi Zheng, Weizeng Sun, Jianfeng Wu, Matthew E. Kahn. 2017. The birth of edge cities in China: Measuring the effects of industrial parks policy. *Journal of Urban Economics* **100**, 80-103. [[Crossref](#)]
239. Oscarina Conceição, Ana Paula Faria, Margarida Fontes. 2017. Regional variation of academic spinoffs formation. *The Journal of Technology Transfer* **42**:3, 654-675. [[Crossref](#)]
240. W. Walker Hanlon, Antonio Miscio. 2017. Agglomeration: A long-run panel data approach. *Journal of Urban Economics* **99**, 1-14. [[Crossref](#)]
241. Laurent Frésard, Ulrich Hege, Gordon Phillips. 2017. Extending Industry Specialization through Cross-Border Acquisitions. *The Review of Financial Studies* **30**:5, 1539-1582. [[Crossref](#)]
242. Manjeet Kharub, Rajiv Sharma. 2017. Comparative analyses of competitive advantage using Porter diamond model (the case of MSMEs in Himachal Pradesh). *Competitiveness Review: An International Business Journal* **27**:2, 132-160. [[Crossref](#)]
243. Chih-Hai Yang, Chung-Yueh Chiu, Meng-Wen Tsou. 2017. Location Choice of Multinational and Local Firms in Vietnam: Birds of a Feather Flock Together?. *The Japanese Economic Review* **68**:1, 95-114. [[Crossref](#)]
244. Yong ZHAO, Ouge QI. 2017. Would Functional Specialization of Space Narrow Down Regional Disparities? — An Empirical Analysis Based on Panel Data of Chinese Urban Agglomerations 2003–2011. *Chinese Journal of Urban and Environmental Studies* **05**:01, 1750003. [[Crossref](#)]
245. Giulia Faggio, Olmo Silva, William C. Strange. 2017. Heterogeneous Agglomeration. *Review of Economics and Statistics* **99**:1, 80-94. [[Crossref](#)]
246. Jianhong Chen, Sucheta Nadkarni. 2017. It's about Time! CEOs' Temporal Dispositions, Temporal Leadership, and Corporate Entrepreneurship. *Administrative Science Quarterly* **62**:1, 31-66. [[Crossref](#)]
247. SELALE TUZEL, MIAO BEN ZHANG. 2017. Local Risk, Local Factors, and Asset Prices. *The Journal of Finance* **72**:1, 325-370. [[Crossref](#)]
248. Zafer Sonmez. 2017. Inventor mobility and the geography of knowledge flows: evidence from the US biopharmaceutical industry. *Science and Public Policy* **95**, scx001. [[Crossref](#)]
249. Nicole Palan. 2017. Konzentrations- und Ungleichheitsindizes: ein methodischer Überblick sowie ein empirischer Vergleich anhand der Textilindustrie. *Zeitschrift für Wirtschaftsgeographie* **61**:3-4. . [[Crossref](#)]
250. Stefano Breschi, Francesco Lissoni, Ernest Miguelez. 2017. Foreign-origin inventors in the USA: testing for diaspora and brain gain effects. *Journal of Economic Geography* **106**, lbw044. [[Crossref](#)]
251. Katarzyna Kopczewska. Cluster-Based Measurement of Agglomeration, Concentration and Specialisation 69-171. [[Crossref](#)]
252. Todd M. Gabe. Winning Industries and the Growth of Good US Jobs 55-89. [[Crossref](#)]
253. Marta R. Casanova, Vicente Orts, José M. Albert. 2017. Sectoral scope and colocalisation of Spanish manufacturing industries. *Journal of Geographical Systems* **19**:1, 65-92. [[Crossref](#)]
254. Kristian Behrens, Giordano Mion, Yasusada Murata, Jens Suedekum. 2017. Spatial frictions. *Journal of Urban Economics* **97**, 40-70. [[Crossref](#)]
255. Eric Marcon, Florence Puech. 2017. A typology of distance-based measures of spatial concentration. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **62**, 56-67. [[Crossref](#)]

256. Thomas F. Hellmann, Veikko Thiele. 2017. Fostering Entrepreneurship: Promoting Founding or Funding?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
257. Thomas McGregor, Samuel Wills. 2017. Surfing a Wave of Economic Growth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
258. Diego Puga. 2017. The Changing Distribution of Firms and Workers Across Cities. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
259. Guangliang Yang, Lixing Li, Shihe Fu. 2017. Do Rural Migrants Benefit from Labor Market Agglomeration Economies? Evidence from Chinese Cities. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
260. Dany Bahar, Ernesto Stein, Rodrigo Andres Wagner, Samuel Rosenow. 2017. The Birth and Growth of New Export Clusters: Which Mechanisms Drive Diversification?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
261. Jess Cornaggia, Matthew Gustafson, Kevin J Pisciotta. 2017. IPOs and the Local Economy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
262. David S. Blakeslee, Ritam Chaurey, Samreen Malik. 2017. Structural Transformation and Spillovers from Industrial Areas. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
263. Maria Bernedo, Carlianne Patrick. 2017. Agglomeration and Informality: Evidence from Peruvian Firms. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
264. Anthony Howell. 2017. Identifying the Sources of Agglomeration Benefits within China's Economic and Development Zones. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
265. Anthony Howell. 2017. Inter-Industry Relatedness, Absorptive Capacity and Firm Productivity in a Transitioning Chinese Economy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
266. Sasan Bakhtiari. 2017. Do Manufacturing Entrepreneurs in Australia Have (or Develop) a Productivity Advantage?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
267. Joseph Kuehn. 2017. The Effect of Competition on the Demand for Skilled Labor: Matching with Externalities in the NBA. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
268. Mariassunta Giannetti, Nicolas Andre Benigno Serrano-Velarde, Emanuele Tarantino. 2017. Cheap Trade Credit and Competition in Downstream Markets. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
269. Giovanni Peri. 2016. Immigrants, Productivity, and Labor Markets. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 30:4, 3-30. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
270. Sergey Lychagin. 2016. Spillovers, absorptive capacity and agglomeration. *Journal of Urban Economics* 96, 17-35. [[Crossref](#)]
271. Kristian Behrens. 2016. Agglomeration and clusters: Tools and insights from coagglomeration patterns. *Canadian Journal of Economics/Revue canadienne d'économique* 49:4, 1293-1339. [[Crossref](#)]
272. Wenchao WU, Shaosheng JIN, Suminori TOKUNAGA. 2016. TESTING LOCALIZATION OF CHINESE FOOD INDUSTRIES: EVIDENCE FROM MICROGEOGRAPHIC DATA. *Review of Urban & Regional Development Studies* 28:3, 202-217. [[Crossref](#)]
273. Eri Yamada, Tetsu Kawakami. 2016. Distribution of Industrial Growth in Nagoya Metropolitan Area, Japan: An Exploratory Analysis Using Geographical and Technological Proximities. *Regional Studies* 50:11, 1876-1888. [[Crossref](#)]
274. David H. Autor, David Dorn, Gordon H. Hanson. 2016. The China Shock: Learning from Labor-Market Adjustment to Large Changes in Trade. *Annual Review of Economics* 8:1, 205-240. [[Crossref](#)]
275. Luisa Gagliardi, Giovanni Marin, Caterina Miriello. 2016. The greener the better? Job creation effects of environmentally-friendly technological change. *Industrial and Corporate Change* 25:5, 779-807. [[Crossref](#)]

276. George Avelino, Ciro Biderman, Glauco Peres da Silva. 2016. A Concentração Eleitoral no Brasil (1994-2014). *Dados* 59:4, 1091-1125. [[Crossref](#)]
277. Miriam Zschoche. 2016. The Effects of Foreign Direct Investment Colocation: Differences Between Manufacturing and Service Firms. *Managerial and Decision Economics* 37:7, 447-460. [[Crossref](#)]
278. Carlianne Patrick. 2016. Jobless capital? The role of capital subsidies. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 60, 169-179. [[Crossref](#)]
279. Wolfgang Dauth, Jens Suedekum. 2016. Globalization and local profiles of economic growth and industrial change. *Journal of Economic Geography* 16:5, 1007-1034. [[Crossref](#)]
280. Marco Percoco. 2016. Highways, local economic structure and urban development. *Journal of Economic Geography* 16:5, 1035-1054. [[Crossref](#)]
281. Emma Howard, Carol Newman, Finn Tarp. 2016. Measuring industry coagglomeration and identifying the driving forces. *Journal of Economic Geography* 16:5, 1055-1078. [[Crossref](#)]
282. Tom Kemeny, Maryann Feldman, Frank Ethridge, Ted Zoller. 2016. The economic value of local social networks. *Journal of Economic Geography* 16:5, 1101-1122. [[Crossref](#)]
283. Holger Görg, Liza Jabbour. 2016. Availability of Business Services and Outward Investment: Evidence from French Firms. *Review of International Economics* 24:4, 797-819. [[Crossref](#)]
284. Ana Isabel Moreno-Monroy, Gustavo Adolfo García Cruz. 2016. Intra-Metropolitan Agglomeration of Formal and Informal Manufacturing Activity: Evidence from Cali, Colombia. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie* 107:4, 389-406. [[Crossref](#)]
285. Todd M. Gabe, Jaison R. Abel. 2016. Shared Knowledge and the Coagglomeration of Occupations. *Regional Studies* 50:8, 1360-1373. [[Crossref](#)]
286. George Clarke, Yue Li, Lixin Colin Xu. 2016. Business environment, economic agglomeration and job creation around the world. *Applied Economics* 48:33, 3088-3103. [[Crossref](#)]
287. Justin R. Pierce, Peter K. Schott. 2016. The Surprisingly Swift Decline of US Manufacturing Employment. *American Economic Review* 106:7, 1632-1662. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
288. Philippe Aghion, Ufuk Akcigit, Julia Cagé, William R. Kerr. 2016. Taxation, corruption, and growth. *European Economic Review* 86, 24-51. [[Crossref](#)]
289. Tobias Scholl, Thomas Brenner. 2016. Detecting Spatial Clustering Using a Firm-Level Cluster Index. *Regional Studies* 50:6, 1054-1068. [[Crossref](#)]
290. Martin Andersson, Johan Klaesson, Johan P. Larsson. 2016. How Local are Spatial Density Externalities? Neighbourhood Effects in Agglomeration Economies. *Regional Studies* 50:6, 1082-1095. [[Crossref](#)]
291. Glenn Ellison, Ashley Swanson. 2016. Do Schools Matter for High Math Achievement? Evidence from the American Mathematics Competitions. *American Economic Review* 106:6, 1244-1277. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
292. Trond Nilsen. 2016. Why Arctic policies matter: The role of exogenous actions in oil and gas industry development in the Norwegian High North. *Energy Research & Social Science* 16, 45-53. [[Crossref](#)]
293. Chris Cunningham, Michaela C. Patton, Robert R. Reed. 2016. Heterogeneous returns to knowledge exchange: Evidence from the urban wage premium. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 126, 120-139. [[Crossref](#)]
294. Marisa Cesário. 2016. Coagglomeration Patterns in Portuguese Labour-intensive Industries: Complementarity and Specialisation Dynamics. *Journal of General Management* 41:4, 35-50. [[Crossref](#)]

295. Alina Igorevna Kosacheva. 2016. Impact of the non-market advantage on equilibrium in A Hotelling model. *Computer Research and Modeling* **8**:3, 573-581. [[Crossref](#)]
296. Chris Forman, Avi Goldfarb, Shane Greenstein. 2016. Agglomeration of Invention in the Bay Area: Not Just ICT. *American Economic Review* **106**:5, 146-151. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
297. Mi Lin, Yum K. Kwan. 2016. FDI technology spillovers, geography, and spatial diffusion. *International Review of Economics & Finance* **43**, 257-274. [[Crossref](#)]
298. Lutao Ning, Fan Wang, Jian Li. 2016. Urban innovation, regional externalities of foreign direct investment and industrial agglomeration: Evidence from Chinese cities. *Research Policy* **45**:4, 830-843. [[Crossref](#)]
299. Russell Golman, Steven Klepper. 2016. Spinoffs and clustering. *The RAND Journal of Economics* **47**:2, 341-365. [[Crossref](#)]
300. Karyn Morrissey, Valerie Cummins. 2016. Measuring relatedness in a multisectoral cluster: an input-output approach. *European Planning Studies* **24**:4, 629-644. [[Crossref](#)]
301. Aviad Pe'er, Ilan Vertinsky, Thomas Keil. 2016. Growth and survival: The moderating effects of local agglomeration and local market structure. *Strategic Management Journal* **37**:3, 541-564. [[Crossref](#)]
302. Thor Berger, Carl Benedikt Frey. 2016. Did the Computer Revolution shift the fortunes of U.S. cities? Technology shocks and the geography of new jobs. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **57**, 38-45. [[Crossref](#)]
303. Ejaz Ghani, Arti Grover Goswami, William R. Kerr. 2016. Highway to Success: The Impact of the Golden Quadrilateral Project for the Location and Performance of Indian Manufacturing. *The Economic Journal* **126**:591, 317-357. [[Crossref](#)]
304. Alyson C. Ma, Ari Van Assche. 2016. Spatial Linkages and Export Processing Location in China. *The World Economy* **39**:3, 316-338. [[Crossref](#)]
305. Stuart Sweeney, Miguel Gómez-Antonio. 2016. LOCALIZATION AND INDUSTRY CLUSTERING ECONOMETRICS: AN ASSESSMENT OF GIBBS MODELS FOR SPATIAL POINT PROCESSES. *Journal of Regional Science* **56**:2, 257-287. [[Crossref](#)]
306. Marco Sanfilippo, Adnan Seric. 2016. Spillovers from agglomerations and inward FDI: a multilevel analysis on sub-Saharan African firms. *Review of World Economics* **152**:1, 147-176. [[Crossref](#)]
307. Juan Alcácer, Minyuan Zhao. 2016. Zooming in: A practical manual for identifying geographic clusters. *Strategic Management Journal* **37**:1, 10-21. [[Crossref](#)]
308. Stephen B. Billings, Erik B. Johnson. 2016. Agglomeration within an urban area. *Journal of Urban Economics* **91**, 13-25. [[Crossref](#)]
309. Jonathan Jones, Colin Wren. Non-Intermediate Markets and FDI Location: A New Approach with an Application to British Regions 97-126. [[Crossref](#)]
310. Sampsa Samila. Regional Development 1-4. [[Crossref](#)]
311. Sveinung Eikeland, Trond Nilsen. 2016. Local content in emerging growth poles: Local effects of multinational corporations' use of contract strategies. *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift - Norwegian Journal of Geography* **70**:1, 13-23. [[Crossref](#)]
312. Daron Acemoglu, David Autor, David Dorn, Gordon H. Hanson, Brendan Price. 2016. Import Competition and the Great US Employment Sag of the 2000s. *Journal of Labor Economics* **34**:S1, S141-S198. [[Crossref](#)]
313. Rajeev Dehejia, Arvind Panagariya. 2016. The Link between Manufacturing Growth and Accelerated Services Growth in India. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* **64**:2, 221-264. [[Crossref](#)]

314. Daron Acemoglu, Ufuk Akcigit, William Kerr. 2016. Networks and the Macroeconomy: An Empirical Exploration. *NBER Macroeconomics Annual* **30**:1, 273-335. [[Crossref](#)]
315. Mercedes Delgado, Michael E. Porter, Scott Stern. 2016. Defining clusters of related industries. *Journal of Economic Geography* **16**:1, 1-38. [[Crossref](#)]
316. E. K. Kuricheva, A. A. Popov. 2016. Housing construction dynamics in the 2010s as a factor of transformation of the Moscow agglomeration. *Regional Research of Russia* **6**:1, 9-20. [[Crossref](#)]
317. Sasan Bakhtiari, Robert V. Breunig. 2016. Identifying R&D Spillovers in Australian Industries. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
318. Sang Hoon Jee, Ju-Ho Lee, Ho-Young Oh. 2016. An Empirical Analysis on the Geography of Korea's High-Tech Jobs and Start-Ups. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
319. Anthony Howell. 2016. Do Marshallian Sources Drive Technological Relatedness? Implications for Firm Survival And Subsequent Success in China. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
320. Anthony Howell. 2016. A Structural Model of Indigenous Innovation and Catch-Up for Developing Economies. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
321. Anthony Howell. 2016. Marshallian Sources of Relatedness, Technological Capabilities and Firm Productivity in China. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
322. Simon JJger. 2016. How Substitutable Are Workers? Evidence from Worker Deaths. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
323. Akihito UJIE, Junya FUKUMOTO. 2016. DETECTION OF INDUSTRIAL AGGLOMERATIONS THROUGH A PROBABILISTIC MODEL RELAXING CONSTRAINTS ON ADJACENCY. *Journal of Japan Society of Civil Engineers, Ser. D3 (Infrastructure Planning and Management)* **72**:5, I_317-I_329. [[Crossref](#)]
324. Maria Cecilia Bustamante. 2016. What Explains the Product Market Component of Corporate Investment?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
325. William David Grieser, Gonzalo Maturana, Santiago Truffa. 2016. Clustering to Coordinate: Who Benefits from Knowledge Spillovers?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
326. Steven G. Craig, Janet E. Kohlhase, Adam W. Perdue. 2016. EMPIRICAL POLYCENTRICITY: THE COMPLEX RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EMPLOYMENT CENTERS. *Journal of Regional Science* **56**:1, 25-52. [[Crossref](#)]
327. Georgeanne M. Artz, Younjun Kim, Peter F. Orazem. 2016. DOES AGGLOMERATION MATTER EVERYWHERE?: NEW FIRM LOCATION DECISIONS IN RURAL AND URBAN MARKETS*. *Journal of Regional Science* **56**:1, 72-95. [[Crossref](#)]
328. Elena Simintzi. 2016. Restructuring Announcements and Rivals' Investment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* **64** . [[Crossref](#)]
329. Jiaming Li, Wenzhong Zhang, Jianhui Yu, Hongxia Chen. 2015. Industrial spatial agglomeration using distance-based approach in Beijing, China. *Chinese Geographical Science* **25**:6, 698-712. [[Crossref](#)]
330. Thomas Klier, Daniel McMillen. 2015. Plant Location Patterns in the European Automobile Supplier Industry. *Growth and Change* **46**:4, 558-573. [[Crossref](#)]
331. Andrew I. Friedson, Jing Li. 2015. The impact of agglomeration economies on hospital input prices. *Health Economics Review* **5**:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
332. Antonio Falato, Dan Li, Todd Milbourn. 2015. Which Skills Matter in the Market for CEOs? Evidence from Pay for CEO Credentials. *Management Science* **61**:12, 2845-2869. [[Crossref](#)]
333. Yoshihiro Hashiguchi, Kiyoyasu Tanaka. 2015. Agglomeration and firm-level productivity: A Bayesian spatial approach. *Papers in Regional Science* **94**, S95-S114. [[Crossref](#)]

334. Tobias Scholl, Thomas Brenner. 2015. Optimizing distance-based methods for large data sets. *Journal of Geographical Systems* 17:4, 333-351. [[Crossref](#)]
335. Nazmiye Balta-Ozkan, Tom Watson, Elisabetta Mocca. 2015. Spatially uneven development and low carbon transitions: Insights from urban and regional planning. *Energy Policy* 85, 500-510. [[Crossref](#)]
336. William R. Kerr, Scott Duke Kominers. 2015. Agglomerative Forces and Cluster Shapes. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 97:4, 877-899. [[Crossref](#)]
337. Krister Salamonsen. 2015. The Effects of Exogenous Shocks on the Development of Regional Innovation Systems. *European Planning Studies* 23:9, 1770-1795. [[Crossref](#)]
338. Tomoya Mori, Tony E. Smith. 2015. On the spatial scale of industrial agglomerations. *Journal of Urban Economics* 89, 1-20. [[Crossref](#)]
339. P.M. Picard. 2015. Trade, economic geography and the choice of product quality. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 54, 18-27. [[Crossref](#)]
340. 2015. Cluster-Based Industrial Development: KAIZEN Management for MSE Growth in Developing Countries. *Competitiveness Review* 25:4, 448-450. [[Crossref](#)]
341. Stefano Breschi, Camilla Lenzi. 2015. The Role of External Linkages and Gatekeepers for the Renewal and Expansion of US Cities' Knowledge Base, 1990-2004. *Regional Studies* 49:5, 782-797. [[Crossref](#)]
342. Richard Hornbeck, Pinar Keskin. 2015. Does Agriculture Generate Local Economic Spillovers? Short-Run and Long-Run Evidence from the Ogallala Aquifer. *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 7:2, 192-213. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
343. Victor Couture. 2015. Knowledge spillovers in cities: An auction approach. *Journal of Economic Theory* 157, 668-698. [[Crossref](#)]
344. Edward L. Glaeser, Sari Pekkala Kerr, William R. Kerr. 2015. Entrepreneurship and Urban Growth: An Empirical Assessment with Historical Mines. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 97:2, 498-520. [[Crossref](#)]
345. Lucas Figal Garone, Alessandro Maffioli, Joao Alberto de Negri, Cesar M. Rodriguez, Gonzalo Vázquez-Baré. 2015. Cluster development policy, SME's performance, and spillovers: evidence from Brazil. *Small Business Economics* 44:4, 925-948. [[Crossref](#)]
346. Marcelo Resende. 2015. Industrial Coagglomeration: Some State-Level Evidence for Brazil. *Nova Economia* 25:1, 181-194. [[Crossref](#)]
347. Krister Salamonsen, Jan Terje Henriksen. 2015. Small Businesses Need Strong Mediators: Mitigating the Disadvantages of Peripheral Localization Through Alliance Formation. *European Planning Studies* 23:3, 529-549. [[Crossref](#)]
348. Kristian Behrens, Théophile Bougna. 2015. An anatomy of the geographical concentration of Canadian manufacturing industries. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 51, 47-69. [[Crossref](#)]
349. Matt Marx, Jasjit Singh, Lee Fleming. 2015. Regional disadvantage? Employee non-compete agreements and brain drain. *Research Policy* 44:2, 394-404. [[Crossref](#)]
350. Megha Mukim. 2015. Coagglomeration of formal and informal industry: evidence from India. *Journal of Economic Geography* 15:2, 329-351. [[Crossref](#)]
351. G. Duranton. 2015. Growing through Cities in Developing Countries. *The World Bank Research Observer* 30:1, 39-73. [[Crossref](#)]
352. Robert Schweizog, Alan Collins. 2015. A Simple Location Index Plus Some Maps and no Apologies: Back to Basics on the Development of Links Between Economic Integration and Spatial Concentration of Industries. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie* 106:1, 17-35. [[Crossref](#)]
353. Murat Ali Dulupçu, Murat Karaöz, Onur Sungur, Hidayet Ünlü. Cluster(ing) Policies in Turkey: The Impact of Internationalization or the Imitation of Internationals 239-262. [[Crossref](#)]

354. Andrea Sujová, Iveta Hajdúchová. Cluster Mapping: A Basis for the Creation of Network Cooperation 85-103. [[Crossref](#)]
355. Yukiko Umeno Saito. Geographical Spread of Interfirm Transaction Networks and the Great East Japan Earthquake 157-173. [[Crossref](#)]
356. Franz-Josef Bade, Eckhardt Bode, Eleonora Cutrini. 2015. Spatial fragmentation of industries by functions. *The Annals of Regional Science* 54:1, 215-250. [[Crossref](#)]
357. Steve Gibbons, Henry G. Overman, Eleonora Patacchini. Spatial Methods 115-168. [[Crossref](#)]
358. Kristian Behrens, Frédéric Robert-Nicoud. Agglomeration Theory with Heterogeneous Agents 171-245. [[Crossref](#)]
359. Pierre-Philippe Combes, Laurent Gobillon. The Empirics of Agglomeration Economies 247-348. [[Crossref](#)]
360. Gerald Carlino, William R. Kerr. Agglomeration and Innovation 349-404. [[Crossref](#)]
361. Matthew E. Kahn, Randall Walsh. Cities and the Environment 405-465. [[Crossref](#)]
362. Maximilian von Ehrlich, Tobias Seidel. 2015. Regional implications of financial market development: Industry location and income inequality. *European Economic Review* 73, 85-102. [[Crossref](#)]
363. Xin Chang, Kangkang Fu, Angie Low, Wenrui Zhang. 2015. Non-executive employee stock options and corporate innovation. *Journal of Financial Economics* 115:1, 168-188. [[Crossref](#)]
364. Ufuk Akcigit, William R. Kerr. 2015. Growth Through Heterogeneous Innovations. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
365. Daron Acemoglu, Ufuk Akcigit, William R. Kerr. 2015. Networks and the Macroeconomy: An Empirical Exploration. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
366. Mi Lin, Yum K Kwan. 2015. FDI Technology Spillovers, Geography, and Spatial Diffusion. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
367. Gilles Duranton, William R. Kerr. 2015. The Logic of Agglomeration. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
368. Hyunseob Kim. 2015. How Does Labor Market Size Affect Firm Capital Structure? Evidence from Large Plant Openings. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
369. Hunt Allcott, Daniel Keniston. 2015. Dutch Disease or Agglomeration? The Local Economic Effects of Natural Resource Booms in Modern America. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
370. Stephen B. Billings, Erik Barry Johnson. 2015. Measuring Agglomeration: Which Estimator Should We Use?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
371. Dariusz Wojcik, eric knight, Vladimir Pazitka. 2015. What Turns Cities into International Financial Centres?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
372. Hans Wolfgang Friederiszick, Massimo Merola. 2015. Regional State Aid Control in Europe: A Legal and Economic Assessment. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
373. Andrew Friedson, Jing Li. 2015. The Impact of Agglomeration Economies on Hospital Input Prices. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
374. Abel Brodeur. 2015. Essays in Applied Economics. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
375. Jin Chen, Jing (Elaine) Chen, Khim-Yong Goh, Yunjie (Calvin) Xu, Bernard C.Y. Tan. 2014. When do sellers bifurcate from Electronic Multisided Platforms? The effects of customer demand, competitive intensity, and service differentiation. *Information & Management* 51:8, 972-983. [[Crossref](#)]
376. Nobuaki Yamashita, Toshiyuki Matsuura, Kentaro Nakajima. 2014. Agglomeration effects of inter-firm backward and forward linkages: Evidence from Japanese manufacturing investment in China. *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* 34, 24-41. [[Crossref](#)]

377. Mercedes Delgado, Michael E. Porter, Scott Stern. 2014. Clusters, convergence, and economic performance. *Research Policy* 43:10, 1785-1799. [[Crossref](#)]
378. Yasusada Murata, Ryo Nakajima, Ryosuke Okamoto, Ryuichi Tamura. 2014. Localized Knowledge Spillovers and Patent Citations: A Distance-Based Approach. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 96:5, 967-985. [[Crossref](#)]
379. Shanzi Ke, Ming He, Chenhua Yuan. 2014. Synergy and Co-agglomeration of Producer Services and Manufacturing: A Panel Data Analysis of Chinese Cities. *Regional Studies* 48:11, 1829-1841. [[Crossref](#)]
380. Laura Alfaro, Maggie Xiaoyang Chen. 2014. The global agglomeration of multinational firms. *Journal of International Economics* 94:2, 263-276. [[Crossref](#)]
381. Giulia Faggio, Olmo Silva. 2014. Self-employment and entrepreneurship in urban and rural labour markets. *Journal of Urban Economics* 84, 67-85. [[Crossref](#)]
382. Anjun Hu, Jiuwen Sun. 2014. Agglomeration economies and the match between manufacturing industries and cities in China. *Regional Science Policy & Practice* 6:4, 315-327. [[Crossref](#)]
383. Suzanne Kok, Bas ter Weel. 2014. CITIES, TASKS, AND SKILLS. *Journal of Regional Science* 54:5, 856-892. [[Crossref](#)]
384. Ron Boschma, Rikard H. Eriksson, Urban Lindgren. 2014. Labour Market Externalities and Regional Growth in Sweden: The Importance of Labour Mobility between Skill-Related Industries. *Regional Studies* 48:10, 1669-1690. [[Crossref](#)]
385. José A. Camacho-Ballesta, Yulia Melikhova, Manuel Hernández-Peinado. 2014. Localization of Business Services in European Regions: Large Urban Areas Stand Out. *European Planning Studies* 22:10, 2094-2115. [[Crossref](#)]
386. Ejaz Ghani, William R. Kerr, Stephen O'Connell. 2014. Spatial Determinants of Entrepreneurship in India. *Regional Studies* 48:6, 1071-1089. [[Crossref](#)]
387. Graciela Kuechle. 2014. Regional concentration of entrepreneurial activities. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 102, 59-73. [[Crossref](#)]
388. Miwa Matsuo. 2014. Competition over High-income Workers: Job Growth and Access to Labour in Atlanta. *Urban Studies* 51:8, 1634-1652. [[Crossref](#)]
389. Kyoji Fukao, Victoria Kravtsova, Kentaro Nakajima. 2014. How important is geographical agglomeration to factory efficiency in Japan's manufacturing sector?. *The Annals of Regional Science* 52:3, 659-696. [[Crossref](#)]
390. Ajay Agrawal, Iain Cockburn, Alberto Galasso, Alexander Oettl. 2014. Why are some regions more innovative than others? The role of small firms in the presence of large labs. *Journal of Urban Economics* 81, 149-165. [[Crossref](#)]
391. Theresa Gutberlet. 2014. Mechanization and the spatial distribution of industries in the German Empire, 1875 to 1907. *The Economic History Review* 67:2, 463-491. [[Crossref](#)]
392. Matthias Kiese, Christian Hundt. 2014. Cluster Policies, Organising Capacity and Regional Resilience: Evidence from German Case Studies. *Raumforschung und Raumordnung* 72:2, 117-131. [[Crossref](#)]
393. Klaus Desmet, Esteban Rossi-Hansberg. 2014. Spatial Development. *American Economic Review* 104:4, 1211-1243. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
394. Elizabeth A. Mack, Yifan Zhang, Sergio Rey, Ross Maciejewski. 2014. Spatio-temporal analysis of industrial composition with IVIID: an interactive visual analytics interface for industrial diversity. *Journal of Geographical Systems* 16:2, 183-209. [[Crossref](#)]
395. Jing Li. 2014. The influence of state policy and proximity to medical services on health outcomes. *Journal of Urban Economics* 80, 97-109. [[Crossref](#)]

396. W. Jacobs, H. R. A. Koster, F. van Oort. 2014. Co-agglomeration of knowledge-intensive business services and multinational enterprises. *Journal of Economic Geography* 14:2, 443-475. [[Crossref](#)]
397. Patricia C. Melo, Daniel J. Graham. 2014. Testing for labour pooling as a source of agglomeration economies: Evidence for labour markets in England and Wales. *Papers in Regional Science* 93:1, 31-52. [[Crossref](#)]
398. Suminori Tokunaga, Masahiro Kageyama, Yuko Akune, Ryohei Nakamura. 2014. EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF AGGLOMERATION ECONOMIES IN THE JAPANESE ASSEMBLY-TYPE MANUFACTURING INDUSTRY FOR 1985-2000: USING AGGLOMERATION AND COAGGLOMERATION INDICES. *Review of Urban & Regional Development Studies* 26:1, 57-79. [[Crossref](#)]
399. Shawn Kantor, Alexander Whalley. 2014. Knowledge Spillovers from Research Universities: Evidence from Endowment Value Shocks. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 96:1, 171-188. [[Crossref](#)]
400. Jordi Jofre-Monseny, Raquel Marín-López, Elisabet Viladecans-Marsal. 2014. THE DETERMINANTS OF LOCALIZATION AND URBANIZATION ECONOMIES: EVIDENCE FROM THE LOCATION OF NEW FIRMS IN SPAIN. *Journal of Regional Science* 54:2, 313-337. [[Crossref](#)]
401. Oliver Falck, Michael Fritsch, Stephan Heblich. 2014. Is industry location persistent over time? Evidence from coagglomeration patterns between new and incumbent firms in Germany. *Review of Regional Research* 34:1, 1-21. [[Crossref](#)]
402. Victoria Kravtsova. 2014. Productivity change and externalities: empirical evidence from Hungary. *International Review of Applied Economics* 28:1, 102-125. [[Crossref](#)]
403. Gilles Duranton. Agglomeration and Jobs 631-648. [[Crossref](#)]
404. Philip McCann. Schools of Thought on Economic Geography, Institutions, and Development 527-538. [[Crossref](#)]
405. Oliver Farhauer, Alexandra Kröll. Indizes räumlicher Konzentration und regionaler Spezialisierung 299-370. [[Crossref](#)]
406. Oliver Farhauer, Alexandra Kröll. Agglomerationskräfte 55-123. [[Crossref](#)]
407. S.N. Rajesh Raj, Kunal Sen, Vinish Kathuria. 2014. Does banking development matter for new firm creation in the informal sector? Evidence from India. *Review of Development Finance* 4:1, 38-49. [[Crossref](#)]
408. Hans R.A. Koster, Jos van Ommeren, Piet Rietveld. 2014. Estimation of semiparametric sorting models: Explaining geographical concentration of business services. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 44, 14-28. [[Crossref](#)]
409. Liliana Rivera, Yossi Sheffi, Roy Welsch. 2014. Logistics agglomeration in the US. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 59, 222-238. [[Crossref](#)]
410. Aaron Chatterji, Edward Glaeser, William Kerr. 2014. Clusters of Entrepreneurship and Innovation. *Innovation Policy and the Economy* 14, 129-166. [[Crossref](#)]
411. Luisa Gagliardi, Giovanni Marin, Caterina Miriello. 2014. The Greener the Better: Job Creation and Environmentally Friendly Technological Change. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
412. Ejaz Ghani, William R. Kerr, Stephen D. O'Connell. 2014. Political Reservations and Women's Entrepreneurship in India. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
413. Marco Sanfilippo, Adnan Seric. 2014. Spillovers from Agglomerations and Inward FDI. A Multilevel Analysis on SSA Domestic Firms. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
414. Gerald A. Carlino, William R. Kerr. 2014. Agglomeration and Innovation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

415. George Deltas, Dakshina G. De Silva, Robert P. McComb. 2014. Industrial Agglomeration and Spatial Persistence: Entry, Growth, and Exit of Software Publishers. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
416. Uwe Neumann, Rüdiger Budde, Christoph Ehlert. 2014. Economic Growth in European City Regions. *Eastern European Economics* **52**:1, 79-108. [[Crossref](#)]
417. Glen Weisbrod, Chandler Duncan, Susan Jones Moses. 2014. Evolving Connection of Transit, Agglomeration, and Growth of High-Technology Business Clusters. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board* **2452**:1, 11-18. [[Crossref](#)]
418. Mei-Hor Lo, Dechang Han. 2014. Exploring Competitive Strategies of China Ceramic Tile Industrial Cluster in Global Economy. *Open Journal of Social Sciences* **02**:03, 11-18. [[Crossref](#)]
419. Mark J. Purdy, Xiao Chang. 2014. Do Clusters Influence Productivity in China's Software Industry?. *Theoretical Economics Letters* **04**:01, 26-33. [[Crossref](#)]
420. Chih-Hai Yang, Hui-Lin Lin, Hsiao-Yun Li. 2013. Influences of production and R&D agglomeration on productivity: Evidence from Chinese electronics firms. *China Economic Review* **27**, 162-178. [[Crossref](#)]
421. Yu Chen, Bernard Fingleton, Gwilym Pryce, Albert S. Chen, Slobodan Djordjević. 2013. Implications of rising flood-risk for employment location: a GMM spatial model with agglomeration and endogenous house price effects. *Journal of Property Research* **30**:4, 298-323. [[Crossref](#)]
422. Monica Andini, Guido de Blasio, Gilles Duranton, William C. Strange. 2013. Marshallian labour market pooling: Evidence from Italy. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **43**:6, 1008-1022. [[Crossref](#)]
423. Jing Li. 2013. Intermediate input sharing in the hospital service industry. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **43**:6, 888-902. [[Crossref](#)]
424. Ejaz Ghani, William R. Kerr, Stephen D. O'Connell. 2013. Local industrial structures and female entrepreneurship in India. *Journal of Economic Geography* **13**:6, 929-964. [[Crossref](#)]
425. Edward Glaeser. 2013. A Review of Enrico Moretti's The New Geography of Jobs. *Journal of Economic Literature* **51**:3, 825-837. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
426. Philipp Ehrl. 2013. Agglomeration economies with consistent productivity estimates. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **43**:5, 751-763. [[Crossref](#)]
427. Matthias Wrede. 2013. Heterogeneous skills and homogeneous land: segmentation and agglomeration. *Journal of Economic Geography* **13**:5, 767-798. [[Crossref](#)]
428. Jasjit Singh, Matt Marx. 2013. Geographic Constraints on Knowledge Spillovers: Political Borders vs. Spatial Proximity. *Management Science* **59**:9, 2056-2078. [[Crossref](#)]
429. Wan-Hsin Liu. 2013. The role of proximity to universities for corporate patenting: provincial evidence from China. *The Annals of Regional Science* **51**:1, 273-308. [[Crossref](#)]
430. Frank Bickenbach, Eckhardt Bode, Christiane Krieger-Boden. 2013. Closing the gap between absolute and relative measures of localization, concentration or specialization. *Papers in Regional Science* **92**:3, 465-479. [[Crossref](#)]
431. Emanuela Marrocu, Raffaele Paci, Stefano Usai. 2013. PRODUCTIVITY GROWTH IN THE OLD AND NEW EUROPE: THE ROLE OF AGGLOMERATION EXTERNALITIES. *Journal of Regional Science* **53**:3, 418-442. [[Crossref](#)]
432. Rui J. P. De Figueiredo, Philipp Meyer-Doyle, Evan Rawley. 2013. Inherited agglomeration effects in hedge fund spawns. *Strategic Management Journal* **34**:7, 843-862. [[Crossref](#)]
433. Todd M. Schmit, Jeffrey S. Hall. 2013. Implications of Agglomeration Economies and Market Access for Firm Growth in Food Manufacturing. *Agribusiness* **29**:3, 306-324. [[Crossref](#)]

434. Valeria Gattai. 2013. International outsourcing versus FDI under contractual incompleteness. *International Review of Economics* 60:2, 157-186. [[Crossref](#)]
435. Ling Peng, Yongmiao Hong. 2013. Productivity spillovers among linked sectors. *China Economic Review* 25, 44-61. [[Crossref](#)]
436. Frank Bickenbach, Eckhardt Bode. 2013. New Economic Geography and Reunified Germany at Twenty: A Fruitful Match?. *Spatial Economic Analysis* 8:2, 120-153. [[Crossref](#)]
437. M. Nathan, H. Overman. 2013. Agglomeration, clusters, and industrial policy. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* 29:2, 383-404. [[Crossref](#)]
438. Gao Guohui, Zheng Zhigang, Zhang Jian Hua, Su Jing. Research on FDI Impact on Economic Growth of Hebei Province Since Joining the WTO 1051-1053. [[Crossref](#)]
439. Markus Kohlbacher, Doris Weitlaner, Arno Hollosi, Stefan Grünwald, Hans-Peter Grahsl. 2013. Innovation in clusters: effects of absorptive capacity and environmental moderators. *Competitiveness Review* 23:3, 199-217. [[Crossref](#)]
440. Michael A. Clemens. 2013. Why Do Programmers Earn More in Houston than Hyderabad? Evidence from Randomized Processing of US Visas. *American Economic Review* 103:3, 198-202. [[Abstract](#)] [[View PDF article](#)] [[PDF with links](#)]
441. David C. Maré, Daniel J. Graham. 2013. Agglomeration elasticities and firm heterogeneity. *Journal of Urban Economics* 75, 44-56. [[Crossref](#)]
442. Oliver Falck, Christina Guenther, Stephan Heblich, William R. Kerr. 2013. From Russia with love: the impact of relocated firms on incumbent survival. *Journal of Economic Geography* 13:3, 419-449. [[Crossref](#)]
443. Ryan M. Gallagher. 2013. SHIPPING COSTS, INFORMATION COSTS, AND THE SOURCES OF INDUSTRIAL COAGGLOMERATION*. *Journal of Regional Science* 53:2, 304-331. [[Crossref](#)]
444. Shihe Fu, Stephen L. Ross. 2013. Wage Premia in Employment Clusters: How Important Is Worker Heterogeneity?. *Journal of Labor Economics* 31:2, 271-304. [[Crossref](#)]
445. Andrés Artal-Tur, José Miguel Navarro-Azorín, María Luisa Alamá-Sabater, Antonio Juan Briones-Peñalver. 2013. Spatial Effects in Industrial Location Choices: Industry Characteristics and Urban Accessibility. *Tijdschrift voor economische en sociale geografie* 104:2, 159-174. [[Crossref](#)]
446. Raja Kali, Javier Reyes, Joshua McGee, Stuart Shirrell. 2013. Growth networks. *Journal of Development Economics* 101, 216-227. [[Crossref](#)]
447. M. Barlet, A. Briant, L. Crusson. 2013. Location patterns of service industries in France: A distance-based approach. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 43:2, 338-351. [[Crossref](#)]
448. Laura De Dominicis, Giuseppe Arbia, Henri L.F. De Groot. 2013. Concentration of Manufacturing and Service Sector Activities in Italy: Accounting for Spatial Dependence and Firm Size Distribution. *Regional Studies* 47:3, 405-418. [[Crossref](#)]
449. Joshua Drucker. 2013. Industrial Structure and the Sources of Agglomeration Economies: Evidence from Manufacturing Plant Production. *Growth and Change* 44:1, 54-91. [[Crossref](#)]
450. Henry Renski. 2013. Using matched employee-employer data to measure labour mobility and knowledge flows in supply-chain and labour-based industry clusters. *Regional Science Policy & Practice* 5:1, 25-43. [[Crossref](#)]
451. Oliver Farhauer, Alexandra Kröll. Indizes räumlicher Konzentration und regionaler Spezialisierung 299-369. [[Crossref](#)]
452. Oliver Farhauer, Alexandra Kröll. Agglomerationskräfte 55-123. [[Crossref](#)]
453. Christian Ketels. Cluster Policy: A Guide to the State of the Debate 249-269. [[Crossref](#)]

454. Karol Jan Borowiecki. 2013. Geographic clustering and productivity: An instrumental variable approach for classical composers. *Journal of Urban Economics* 73:1, 94-110. [[Crossref](#)]
455. Stuart A. Gabriel, Stuart S. Rosenthal. 2013. Urbanization, agglomeration economies, and access to mortgage credit. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 43:1, 42-50. [[Crossref](#)]
456. J. Jofre-Monseny. 2013. Is agglomeration taxable?. *Journal of Economic Geography* 13:1, 177-201. [[Crossref](#)]
457. Michael Pflüger, Uwe Blien, Joachim Möller, Michael Moritz. 2013. Labor Market Effects of Trade and FDI – Recent Advances and Research Gaps. *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik* 233:1. . [[Crossref](#)]
458. Edward L. Glaeser, Sari Pekkala Kerr, William R. Kerr. 2013. Entrepreneurship and Urban Growth: An Empirical Assessment with Historical Mines. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
459. Luis M. B. Cabral, Zhu Wang, Daniel Yi Xu. 2013. Competitors, Complementors, Parents and Places: Explaining Regional Agglomeration in the U.S. Auto Industry. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
460. Todd M. Gabe, Jaison R. Abel. 2013. Shared Knowledge and the Coagglomeration of Occupations. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
461. Astrid Krenz. 2013. Services Sectors' Concentration: The European Union, Greece, and the New Economic Geography. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
462. Selale Tuzel, Miao (Ben) Zhang. 2013. Local Risk, Local Factors, and Asset Prices. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
463. Monica Andini, Guido de Blasio, Gilles Duranton, William C. Strange. 2013. Marshallian Labor Market Pooling: Evidence from Italy. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
464. Valeria Gattai. 2013. International Outsourcing Versus FDI Under Contractual Incompleteness. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
465. Ufuk Akcigit, William R. Kerr. 2013. Growth Through Heterogeneous Innovations. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
466. Juan Alcacer, Minyuan Zhao. 2013. Zooming In: A Practical Manual for Identifying Geographic Clusters. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
467. Jing Li. 2013. Intermediate Input Sharing in the Hospital Service Industry. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
468. Richard Harris, John Moffat. 2012. IS PRODUCTIVITY HIGHER IN BRITISH CITIES?*. *Journal of Regional Science* 52:5, 762-786. [[Crossref](#)]
469. Mauro L. Ghinamo. 2012. EXPLAINING THE VARIATION IN THE EMPIRICAL ESTIMATES OF ACADEMIC KNOWLEDGE SPILLOVERS*. *Journal of Regional Science* 52:4, 606-634. [[Crossref](#)]
470. Saioa Arando, Monica Gago, Jan M. Podivinsky, Geoff Stewart. 2012. Do labour-managed firms benefit from agglomeration?. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 84:1, 193-200. [[Crossref](#)]
471. Xiang-hui Tian, Xiao-liang Xu. Ownership structure adjustment and labor concentration 957-961. [[Crossref](#)]
472. Ana Moreno-Monroy. 2012. Critical Commentary . Informality in Space: Understanding Agglomeration Economies during Economic Development. *Urban Studies* 49:10, 2019-2030. [[Crossref](#)]
473. Wen-Chi Liao. 2012. Inshoring: The geographic fragmentation of production and inequality. *Journal of Urban Economics* 72:1, 1-16. [[Crossref](#)]
474. Marian Rizov, Arie Oskam, Paul Walsh. 2012. Is there a limit to agglomeration? Evidence from productivity of Dutch firms. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 42:4, 595-606. [[Crossref](#)]

475. Alexander Klein, Nicholas Crafts. 2012. Making sense of the manufacturing belt: determinants of U.S. industrial location, 1880–1920. *Journal of Economic Geography* 12:4, 775–807. [[Crossref](#)]
476. Randall G. Holcombe. The Rise and Fall of Agglomeration Economies 211–232. [[Crossref](#)]
477. Kentaro Nakajima, Yukiko Umeno Saito, Ichiro Uesugi. 2012. Measuring economic localization: Evidence from Japanese firm-level data. *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* 26:2, 201–220. [[Crossref](#)]
478. Stephen B. Billings, Erik B. Johnson. 2012. A non-parametric test for industrial specialization. *Journal of Urban Economics* 71:3, 312–331. [[Crossref](#)]
479. Matthew L. Freedman, Renáta Kosová. 2012. Agglomeration, product heterogeneity and firm entry. *Journal of Economic Geography* 12:3, 601–626. [[Crossref](#)]
480. Hoyt Bleakley, Jeffrey Lin. 2012. Portage and Path Dependence *. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 127:2, 587–644. [[Crossref](#)]
481. T. M. Gabe, J. R. Abel. 2012. Specialized knowledge and the geographic concentration of occupations. *Journal of Economic Geography* 12:2, 435–453. [[Crossref](#)]
482. Carlo Menon. 2012. The bright side of MAUP: Defining new measures of industrial agglomeration*. *Papers in Regional Science* 91:1, 3–28. [[Crossref](#)]
483. Joshua Drucker, Edward Feser. 2012. Regional industrial structure and agglomeration economies: An analysis of productivity in three manufacturing industries. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 42:1–2, 1–14. [[Crossref](#)]
484. Nathan Yang. 2012. An Empirical Model of Industry Dynamics with Common Uncertainty and Learning from the Actions of Competitors. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
485. Xin Chang, Kangkang Fu, Angie Low, Wenrui Zhang. 2012. Employee Stock Options and Corporate Innovation. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
486. Casey Dougal, Christopher A. Parsons, Sheridan Titman. 2012. Urban Vibrancy and Corporate Growth. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
487. Samuli Leppälä. 2012. Economic Analysis of Knowledge: The History of Thought and the Central Themes. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
488. Ufuk Akcigit, William R. Kerr. 2012. Growth Through Heterogeneous Innovations. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
489. William R. Kerr, Scott Duke Kominers. 2012. Agglomerative Forces and Cluster Shapes. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
490. Laura Alfaro, Maggie Xiaoyang Chen. 2012. Selection, Reallocation, and Spillover: Identifying the Sources of Gains from Multinational Production. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
491. Edward L. Glaeser, Sari Pekkala Kerr, William R. Kerr. 2012. Entrepreneurship and Urban Growth: An Empirical Assessment with Historical Mines. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
492. William Walker Hanlon. 2012. Dissertation Summary: Innovation and Industry Development: Lessons from the British Cotton Textile Industry During the U.S. Civil War. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
493. William Walker Hanlon. 2012. Industry Connections and the Geographic Location of Economic Activity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
494. Peter B. Doeringer, Pacey Foster, Stephan Manning, David Terkla. 2012. Project-Based Industries and Craft-Like Production: Structure, Location, and Performance. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
495. Hyunseob Kim. 2012. Labor Market Size and Employer Capital Structure: Evidence from Large Plant Openings. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

496. Ejaz Ghani, Arti Grover Goswami, William R. Kerr. 2012. Highway to Success: The Impact of the Golden Quadrilateral Project for the Location and Performance of Indian Manufacturing. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
497. Stuart A. Gabriel, Stuart S. Rosenthal. 2012. Urbanization, Agglomeration Economies, and Access to Mortgage Credit. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
498. Olena Senyuta, Kresimir Zigic. 2012. Managing Spillovers: An Endogenous Sunk Cost Approach. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
499. Antonio Falato, Todd T. Milbourn, Dan Li. 2012. CEO Pay and the Market for CEOs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
500. Gonchar Ksenia, Tatyana Ratnikova. 2012. Explaining the Productivity Advantages of Manufacturing Firms in Russian Urban Agglomerations. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
501. İ. Semih Akçomak, Lex Borghans, Bas ter Weel. 2011. Measuring and Interpreting Trends in the Division of Labour in the Netherlands. *De Economist* **159**:4, 435-482. [[Crossref](#)]
502. KENG-HSIANG CHENG, YU-CHING CHIAO, HSIN-YU SHIH, TAI-YU LEE, TA-SHUN CHO. 2011. Agglomeration and Competition among Chinese Cities: An Investigation of Taiwanese High-Tech Foreign Direct Investment. *Growth and Change* **42**:4, 517-548. [[Crossref](#)]
503. Jeffrey H. Dorfman, Mark D. Partridge, Hamilton Galloway. 2011. Do Natural Amenities Attract High-tech Jobs? Evidence From a Smoothed Bayesian Spatial Model. *Spatial Economic Analysis* **6**:4, 397-422. [[Crossref](#)]
504. Robert W. Helsley, William C. Strange. 2011. Entrepreneurs and cities: Complexity, thickness and balance. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **41**:6, 550-559. [[Crossref](#)]
505. DALIDA KADYRZHANOVA, MATTHEW RHODES-KROPF. 2011. Concentrating on Governance. *The Journal of Finance* **66**:5, 1649-1685. [[Crossref](#)]
506. Frédéric Delmar, Karl Wennberg, Karin Hellerstedt. 2011. Endogenous growth through knowledge spillovers in entrepreneurship: an empirical test. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* **5**:3, 199-226. [[Crossref](#)]
507. Steven Klepper. 2011. Nano-economics, spinoffs, and the wealth of regions. *Small Business Economics* **37**:2, 141-154. [[Crossref](#)]
508. Giovanni Facchini, Anna Maria Mayda, Prachi Mishra. 2011. Do interest groups affect US immigration policy?. *Journal of International Economics* **85**:1, 114-128. [[Crossref](#)]
509. Jordi Jofre-Monseny, Raquel Marín-López, Elisabet Viladecans-Marsal. 2011. The mechanisms of agglomeration: Evidence from the effect of inter-industry relations on the location of new firms. *Journal of Urban Economics* **70**:2-3, 61-74. [[Crossref](#)]
510. E. Glaeser. 2011. Cities, Productivity, and Quality of Life. *Science* **333**:6042, 592-594. [[Crossref](#)]
511. Pierre M. Picard, David E. Wildasin. 2011. Outsourcing, labor market pooling, and labor contracts. *Journal of Urban Economics* **70**:1, 47-60. [[Crossref](#)]
512. Lorenzo Casaburi, G. Alfredo Minerva. 2011. Production in advance versus production to order: The role of downstream spatial clustering and product differentiation. *Journal of Urban Economics* **70**:1, 32-46. [[Crossref](#)]
513. Valter Di Giacinto, Marcello Pagnini. 2011. Local and global agglomeration patterns: Two econometrics-based indicators. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* **41**:3, 266-280. [[Crossref](#)]
514. Michael Brady, Elena Irwin. 2011. Accounting for Spatial Effects in Economic Models of Land Use: Recent Developments and Challenges Ahead. *Environmental and Resource Economics* **48**:3, 487-509. [[Crossref](#)]

515. K. Behrens, F. Robert-Nicoud. 2011. Tempora mutantur: in search of a new testament for NEG. *Journal of Economic Geography* 11:2, 215-230. [[Crossref](#)]
516. J. Barkley Rosser. The New Economic Geography Approach and Other Views 23-42. [[Crossref](#)]
517. J. Barkley Rosser. Complex Dynamics in Spatial Systems 85-105. [[Crossref](#)]
518. Moretti Enrico. Local Labor Markets 1237-1313. [[Crossref](#)]
519. William R Kerr. Breakthrough Inventions and the Growth of Innovation Clusters 103-107. [[Crossref](#)]
520. George Avelino, Ciro Biderman, Glauco Peres da Silva. 2011. A Concentração eleitoral nas eleições paulistas: medidas e aplicações. *Dados* 54:2, 319-347. [[Crossref](#)]
521. Rui J.P. de Figueiredo, Philipp Meyer-Doyle, Evan Rawley. 2011. Inherited Agglomeration Effects in Hedge Funds. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
522. Antonio Falato, Dan Li, Todd T. Milbourn. 2011. To Each According to His Ability? CEO Pay and the Market for CEOs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
523. Yu-Chin Chen, Noah Weisberger, Edwin Wong. 2011. Labor Market Density and Increasing Returns to Scale: How Strong is the Evidence?. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
524. Joshua M. Drucker. 2011. How Does Size Matter? Investigating the Relationship Among Plant Size, Industrial Structure, and Manufacturing Productivity. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
525. Abdullah M. Khan, Mark Rider. 2011. The Impact of Globalization on Agglomeration: The Case of U.S. Manufacturing Employment from 1988 to 2003. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
526. Wen-Chi Liao. 2011. Inshoring: The Geographic Fragmentation of Production and Inequality. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
527. Ejaz Ghani, William R. Kerr, Stephen D. O'Connell. 2011. Spatial Determinants of Entrepreneurship in India. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
528. Ejaz Ghani, William R. Kerr, Stephen D. O'Connell. 2011. Local Industrial Structures and Female Entrepreneurship in India. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
529. Roberto Dopeso-Fernández. 2011. Marshallian Agglomeration Economies and Entrepreneurship: The Spanish Case. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
530. Rodrigo Andres Wagner. 2011. The Collective Action of Global Entrepreneurs. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
531. Stef Proost, Kurt Van Dender. 2011. What Long-Term Road Transport Future? Trends and Policy Options. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy* 5:1, 44-65. [[Crossref](#)]
532. Alfonso Gambardella, Marco S. Giarratana. 2010. Localized knowledge spillovers and skill-biased performance. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal* 4:4, 323-339. [[Crossref](#)]
533. Diego Puga. 2010. THE MAGNITUDE AND CAUSES OF AGGLOMERATION ECONOMIES. *Journal of Regional Science* 50:1, 203-219. [[Crossref](#)]
534. Laura Alfaro, Maggie Xiaoyang Chen. 2010. The Global Agglomeration of Multinational Firms. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
535. Oliver Falck, Christina Guenther, Stephan Heblich, William R. Kerr. 2010. From Russia with Love: The Impact of Relocated Firms on Incumbent Survival. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
536. Mark Rider, Abdullah M. Khan. 2010. The Impact of Globalization on Agglomeration: The Case of U.S. Manufacturing Employment from 1988 to 2003. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
537. Ufuk Akcigit, William R. Kerr. 2010. Growth Through Heterogeneous Innovations. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]
538. William R. Kerr, Scott Duke Kominers. 2010. Agglomerative Forces and Cluster Shapes. *SSRN Electronic Journal* . [[Crossref](#)]

539. Sergey Lychagin. 2010. Spillovers, Absorptive Capacity and Agglomeration. *SSRN Electronic Journal*
. [[Crossref](#)]