european corporate governance institute

ecgi

Do General Managerial Skills Spur Innovation?

Finance Working Paper N° 376/2013
Revised September 2017

Cláudia Custódio
Imperial College Business School, CEPR and ECGI

Miguel A. Ferreira
Nova School of Business and Economics, CEPR and ECGI

Pedro Matos
University of Virginia - Darden School of Business and ECGI

© Cláudia Custódio, Miguel A. Ferreira and Pedro Matos 2017. All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

This paper can be downloaded without charge from:
https://doi.org/10.67929/ecgi-fin-376-2013

european corporate governance institute

ECGI Working Paper Series in Finance

Do General Managerial Skills Spur Innovation?

Working Paper N° 376/2013
September 2017

Cláudia Custódio
Miguel A. Ferreira
Pedro Matos

We thank Gustavo Manso (the editor), an anonymous associated editor, an anonymous referee, Heitor Almeida, Fred Bereskin, Tony Cookson, Daniel Ferreira, Po-Hsuan Hsu, Dongmei Li, Elena Loutskina, Angie Low, Alberto Manconi, Daniel Naveen, Miguel Palacios, Gordon Phillips, Amit Seru, Rui Silva, and Tracy Wang; conference participants at the China International Conference in Finance, European Finance Association, FIRS, Erasmus University Rotterdam Workshop on Executive Compensation and Corporate Governance and the Western Finance Association; and seminar participants at Arizona State University, Boston College, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Imperial College, National University of Singapore, Norwegian School of Economics, Queen Mary College, Stanford University, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, University of Colorado, University of Hong Kong, University of Mannheim, University of Utah, University of Virginia, and University of Warwick for helpful comments. Financial support from the European Research Council (ERC) and the Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (FCT) is gratefully acknowledged.

© Cláudia Custódio, Miguel A. Ferreira and Pedro Matos 2017. All rights reserved. Short sections of text, not to exceed two paragraphs, may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit, including © notice, is given to the source.

Abstract

We show that firms with chief executive officers (CEOs) who gain general managerial skills over their lifetime work experience produce more patents. We address the potential endogenous CEO-firm matching bias using firm-CEO fixed-effects and variation in the enforceability of non-compete agreements across states and over time during the CEO's career. Our findings suggest that generalist CEOs spur innovation because they acquire knowledge beyond the firm's current technological domain, and have skills that can be applied elsewhere should innovation projects fail. We conclude that an efficient labor market for executives can promote innovation by providing a mechanism of tolerance for failure.

Keywords: General human capital, Innovation, Patents, R&D, Risk taking

JEL Classifications: G32, J24, O31

Cláudia Custódio
Associate Professor of Finance
Imperial College Business School
53 Prince's Gate, South Kensington Campus
London SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom
phone: +44 207 594 924 9
e-mail: c.custodio@imperial.ac.uk

Miguel A. Ferreira*
Professor of Finance
Nova School of Business and Economics
Campus de Campolide
1099-032 Lisboa, Portugal
phone: +351 213 801 631
e-mail: miguel.ferreira@novasbe.pt

Pedro Matos
Associate Professor of Finance
University of Virginia – Darden School of Business
100 Darden Boulevard
Charlottesville VA 22903, USA
phone: +1 434 243 899 8
e-mail: MatosP@darden.virginia.edu

*Corresponding Author

Do General Managerial Skills Spur Innovation?*

Cláudia Custódio
Imperial College Business School, CEPR, ECGI

Miguel A. Ferreira
Nova School of Business and Economics, CEPR, ECGI

Pedro Matos
University of Virginia – Darden School of Business, ECGI

Abstract

We show that firms with chief executive officers (CEOs) who gain general managerial skills over their lifetime work experience produce more patents. We address the potential endogenous CEO-firm matching bias using firm-CEO fixed-effects and variation in the enforceability of non-compete agreements across states and over time during the CEO's career. Our findings suggest that generalist CEOs spur innovation because they acquire knowledge beyond the firm's current technological domain, and have skills that can be applied elsewhere should innovation projects fail. We conclude that an efficient labor market for executives can promote innovation by providing a mechanism of tolerance for failure.

JEL classification: G32, J24, O31

Keywords: General human capital, Innovation, Patents, R&D, Risk taking

* We thank Gustavo Manso (the editor), an anonymous associated editor, an anonymous referee, Heitor Almeida, Fred Bereskin, Tony Cookson, Daniel Ferreira, Po-Hsuan Hsu, Dongmei Li, Elena Loutskina, Angie Low, Alberto Manconi, Daniel Naveen, Miguel Palacios, Gordon Phillips, Amit Seru, Rui Silva, and Tracy Wang; conference participants at the China International Conference in Finance, European Finance Association, FIRS, Erasmus University Rotterdam Workshop on Executive Compensation and Corporate Governance and the Western Finance Association; and seminar participants at Arizona State University, Boston College, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Imperial College, National University of Singapore, Norwegian School of Economics, Queen Mary College, Stanford University, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, University of Colorado, University of Hong Kong, University of Mannheim, University of Utah, University of Virginia, and University of Warwick for helpful comments. Financial support from the European Research Council (ERC) and the Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia (FCT) is gratefully acknowledged.

1. Introduction

Innovation is a driving force in today's economy, but investing in new technologies, products, or services is risky and challenging. Decisions on research and development (R&D) budgets and the prioritization of research projects typically fall to top firm managers. In this paper, we ask whether a CEO's skill set is an important determinant of innovation, and which CEO skills would be more valuable to produce innovation?

Managers draw on skills gained throughout a career when they make corporate decisions. Starting with Becker (1962), researchers have emphasized two types of managerial capital: general human capital (i.e., skills not specific to any organization and transferable across firms or industries) and firm-specific human capital (i.e., skills valuable only within an organization). We test the hypothesis that CEOs with more general skills foster innovation.[1]

Innovation carries a significant risk for top managers, as there are inherent uncertainties in going from concept to realization of actual profits. We conjecture that generalist CEOs are more likely to exploit innovative projects because they are less sensitive to the risk of termination, given their more diverse business experience compared to CEOs with focused professional experience. A generalist can move across industries more easily, as a failure in one place might not necessarily give a bad signal of his ability in other industries. Thus, the broader set of outside options available to generalist CEOs, and not to specialist CEOs, acts as a labor market mechanism of tolerance for failure that can foster innovation. This mechanism can be an alternative to CEO contracts offering long-term compensation plans and job security. Manso (2011) shows that the optimal incentive mechanism that motivates innovation rewards long-term success but tolerates early failure. Lerner and Wulf (2007) and Tian and Wang (2014) provide

[1] The growing importance of general skills has been linked to the increase in executive compensation over several decades (Murphy and Zabojnik (2007), Kaplan and Rauh (2013), and Frydman (2015)). In addition, Lazear (2005) shows that students who have diverse work and educational backgrounds are more likely to become entrepreneurs.

evidence consistent with this idea.[2]

Additionally, a generalist CEO may take advantage of knowledge in fields beyond the company's current technological domain. A CEO who has worked in multiple positions, firms, and industries may accumulate general human capital that can be useful when a firm needs to invest in transformative change. A CEO may become aware of developments in other domains and bring back ideas to his current firm if he has board seats in other firms and industries. For example, he may find out about a development at another firm that is directly applicable in his current firm or a potential synergy between unrelated divisions in his current firm. This is related to the idea that in a knowledge-based economy, one the key challenges of the management is to create a firm without boundaries: replacing hierarchies with horizontal networks; linking together functional areas through cross-functional teams; and forming strategic alliances with suppliers, customers, and competitors (e.g., Hirschhorn and Gilmore (1992)).[3] For these reasons, we expect generalist CEOs to support innovation with a higher degree of impact, originality and generality, in particular by importing ideas from his exposure to other firms and industries.

An alternative hypothesis is that specialist CEOs have more technical expertise that allows them to identify and promote innovation. Innovation tends to occur in highly specialized areas such as biotechnology and information technology where managers with an industry background may have an advantage. Managerial skills in a particular field can encourage specialists to invest in innovation, and make them better able to identify good projects. In fact, general managerial skills could be simply not unique but available from outside providers such as consultants. Therefore, it is an empirical question which CEO skills (general or specialist) matter for the

[2] There is increasing empirical evidence of the link between firm policies and labor markets. Agrawal and Matsa (2013) show that firms choose conservative financial policies to mitigate workers' exposure to unemployment risk. Tate and Yang (2015) show that conglomerates redeploy labor to industries with better prospects.

[3] Jack Welch, General Electric's CEO, has described this new organizational model in the 1990 annual report: "is a boundaryless company…where we knock down the walls that separate us from each other on the inside and from our key constituencies on the outside."

quantity and quality of innovation.

We examine the link between CEOs' general human capital and innovation using the panel of Standard & Poor's (S&P) 1,500 firms over the 1993–2003 period. To measure general managerial skills, we use the *General Ability Index* (*GAI*) developed by Custódio, Ferreira, and Matos (2013), which captures five aspects of a CEO's professional career: past number of (1) positions, (2) firms, and (3) industries in which he worked; (4) whether he held a CEO position at a different company; and (5) whether he worked for a conglomerate firm. The index of general managerial ability is the first factor of the principal components analysis of the five proxies.

We examine the productivity of a firm's R&D activities using patent-based metrics. We use the NBER patent database to measure the quantity and quality of a firm's innovation output (Hall, Jaffe, and Trajtenberg (2001)). We measure innovative activity by the number of patents that each firm files in a given year. We find that firms headed by generalist CEOs have significantly higher patent counts. A one standard deviation increase in *GAI* is associated with an increase of 7% to 19% in patent counts. We also show that generalists acquire more patents through mergers and acquisitions (M&A) than specialist CEOs. We then measure the impact of a firm's patents by counting the citations that each patent receives from subsequent patents (i.e., cite-weighted patent counts). The results suggest that firms headed by generalist CEOs generate more citations. The effect is also important in economic terms: a one standard deviation increase in *GAI* is associated with a 6% to 16% increase in citation counts.

We also study the effect of general managerial skills on the firm's innovation strategy. We find a positive relation between *GAI* and measures of the originality and generality of the patents, as indicated by a wider set of technological classes of patents cited and subsequent citing patents. Manso (2011) and Almeida, Hsu, and Li (2013) classify innovative strategies into exploitative (i.e., strategies that refine existing technologies) and exploratory (i.e., strategies that involve a more risky search for new technologies that can transform a business). We find that generalist

CEOs engage more in exploratory than exploitative strategies relative to specialist CEOs.

To explore the tolerance for failure mechanism, we investigate the difference in the value of outside options between generalist and specialist managers. We use the tightness of the local labor market as a source of exogenous variation in the value of the outside options of managers (Kedia and Rajgopal (2009)). As the demand for managers is stronger in tight labor markets, managers are more likely to receive outside job offers from other firms in the region. Moreover, generalist managers should benefit more than specialists in tight labor markets because they have skills that are transferable across firms and industries. Consistent with this idea, we find that the relation between innovation and *GAI* is more pronounced in tight labor markets.

In the presence of labor market geographic segmentation, Oyer's (2004) wage indexation theory implies that relevant outside opportunities for managers are likely to come from firms in the same region rather than from firms that are farther away. Thus, a second proxy for the value of outside options is the local beta, that is, the degree of comovement between a firm's stock return and stock returns of other firms in the same Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) (Pirinsky and Wang (2006), Kedia and Rajgopal (2009)). Specialist executives are less likely than generalists to have outside job opportunities from other firms in the same region when their employer firm has low local betas. Consistent with this idea, we find a stronger relation between innovation and *GAI* in the sample of firms with low local beta. We obtain similar estimates if we use other measures of local competition for managers, including the number of peers located in the firm's MSA, and the fraction of firms in the MSA that operate in the firm's industry.

We complement this analysis by providing direct evidence of tolerance for failure in the market for CEOs. Using a sample of forced CEO turnovers, we show that generalists face lower cost and duration of unemployment spells than specialists. In fact, generalist takes less time to find a new position than a specialist after a forced turnover (an average of 8 months for a generalist versus 20 months for a specialist).

To explore the new knowledge mechanism, we study the technological proximity (in the spirit of Jaffe (1986) and Balsmeier, Fleming, and Manso (2015)) between the firm's patents and the patents filed by another firm in which the CEO has a contemporaneous board seat. We find that the technological proximity between the firm where the CEO currently works and the firm in which he seats on the board of directors increases following his appointment. This result suggests that generalist CEOs are bringing new knowledge from other board positions. Note that the specialist CEOs might also bring ideas from his other experience into the current job at the same rate, but since the generalist has more breadth of experience, this might still translate into more ideas and innovation. In short, we provide direct evidence consistent with the new knowledge mechanism as well as the tolerance for failure/outside options mechanism. These two mechanisms, however, are not mutually exclusive and both are supported by the evidence that generalist CEOs produce more patents and are more likely to go into new technological domains.

Our findings are robust to the use of alternative econometric specifications (including negative binomial and Poisson regression models for count-dependent variables) and the inclusion of many firm-level controls such as firm size, capital intensity, growth opportunities, tangibility, investment, leverage, and family ownership.[4] Conditioning on R&D spending reduces the coefficient of *GAI* only slightly, suggesting that the main effect of general managerial skills is to alter the quality and productivity of R&D rather than simply stimulate more R&D.

The findings are also robust to the inclusion of CEO-level controls. Galasso and Simcoe (2011) and Hirshleifer, Low, and Teoh (2012) show that psychological biases such as CEO

[4] We also control for state-year and industry-year fixed effects to account for state and industry specific events in a given year that could affect innovation. For instance, Chava, Oettl, Subramanian, and Subramanian (2013) show that shocks to the local market power of banks have an impact on innovation. Mukherjee, Singh, and Zaldokas (2015) show that increases in state-level corporate tax rates have a negative impact on innovation.

overconfidence increase a manager's willingness to take riskier projects. We therefore control for an options-based CEO confidence measure in our tests (Malmendier and Tate (2005)). Acemoglu, Akcigit, and Celik (2016) show that younger CEOs engage in more creative innovations due to openness to disruption. Thus, we also control for CEO age, other observable characteristics such as CEO education, tenure, connections, and compensation structure (Barker and Mueller (2002), Coles, Daniel, and Naveen (2006), Bereskin and Hsu (2012), Coles, Li, and Wang (2013), Engelberg, Gao, and Parsons (2013), Faleye, Kovacs, and Venkateswaran (2014), Schmidt (2015)).[5]

Our estimates may be biased due to endogenous matching between CEO and firm types. Unobserved firm or CEO variation may be driving both innovation and general managerial ability. We account for unobserved factors that are time-invariant using firm fixed-effects and firm-CEO fixed-effects. The firm-CEO fixed-effect estimator helps to rule out a number of alternative explanations because it solely relies on within firm-CEO variation. In this case, the identification comes from CEOs for which *GAI* changes during their tenure in the company. For example, *GAI* might change because the CEO gets a new board seat in a new firm or industry. Thus, the results suggest that our estimates are not driven by unobserved variation at the firm-CEO level that is also correlated with innovation.[6] The remaining concern is that time-variant unobserved factors at the firm-CEO level drive both innovation and CEO type. For example, an increase in *GAI* due to a new board seat might be associated with an increase in innovation due to other unobserved factors.

To further address omitted variables bias and reverse causality concerns, we use instrumental

[5] Researchers have examined whether corporate outcomes are affected by CEO characteristics (Kaplan, Klebanov, and Sorensen (2012), and Bertrand and Schoar (2003)). Fee, Hadlock, and Pierce (2013), however, cast doubt on the methodology for identifying managerial style effects on policy choices. They argue that CEO turnover events are endogenous and that managerial style changes are anticipated by corporate boards at the time of a CEO selection decision.

[6] This approach addresses the criticism by Fee, Hadlock, and Pierce (2013) that CEO turnover often coincides with a change in strategy such as investing more in innovation.

variables (IV) methods. We use state-level labor laws on non-compete agreements as a source of exogenous variation in the generality of human capital of the CEO. Non-compete agreements are contracts that prevent employees from joining or creating a competing company after ending an employment contract. The enforceability of such contracts varies across states and over time. We use the Garmaise (2009) index on the enforceability of non-compete agreements during the career of a CEO as an instrument for *GAI*. The instrument is the average non-compete agreement enforcement index at the state-year level across all career positions the CEO has had in publicly traded firms (*Non-Compete Enforcement Index*). We expect the *Non-Compete Enforcement Index* to be positively related to *GAI*, because the enforcement of non-compete agreements limits within-industry manager transfers and enhances between-industry transfers (Garmaise (2009), Marx, Strumsky, and Fleming (2009)). Executives have an ex-ante incentive to accumulate more general skills if they work in states with stricter enforcement of non-compete clauses, so that they have more outside options and future mobility. As an alternative to the CEO career average index, we use the *Non-Compete Enforcement Index* of the state and year of the first position of the CEO's career. By going further back in time, we alleviate the concern that the instrument violates the exclusion restriction because of correlation with the firm's current innovation through channels other than the CEO's general human capital.

We find that the *Non-Compete Enforcement Index* is positively and significantly correlated with *GAI*. The instrumental variable estimates suggest that general managerial skills affect innovation. The instrumental variables estimator, however, does not fully solve the endogenous firm-CEO match concern, as it explores exogenous variation in *GAI* and not in the decision to appoint a generalist CEO.

Finally, we address the question of whether innovation produced by CEOs with different levels of general ability adds to firm valuation. We show that new patents filed by generalist CEOs are associated with average abnormal announcement returns of about 17 basis points per

patent (at the grant date), which is significantly higher than that of specialist CEOs of 10 basis points. These results are consistent with Hall, Jaffe, and Trajtenberg (2005) and Kogan, Papanikolaou, Seru, and Stoffman (2015), who show that patent citations are positively correlated with firm valuation. Additionally, our results do not support the possibility that generalist CEOs are "patent trolls" or simply better able to go through the process of filling innovation. Patent trolls tend to file for specific and non-general type of patents, and do not necessarily invest more in R&D, which is not the case for generalist CEOs.

Overall, we conclude that an efficient labor market for executives can promote innovation by serving as a mechanism of tolerance for failure. Generalist CEOs are more likely to exploit innovative growth opportunities because they have skills that can be applied elsewhere, should risky innovation projects fail. Our findings highlight the importance of general human capital and managerial skills in a modern knowledge-based economy where innovation is a key determinant of success.

2. Data and measures

Our sample consists of a panel of CEO-firm-years of Standard & Poor's (S&P) 1,500 firms drawn from the EXECUCOMP database over 1993–2003. We manually match the executives in EXECUCOMP who are identified as CEOs in each year with the BoardEx database to obtain data on CEO prior professional experience. We then match firms in BoardEx to Compustat (U.S. firms) and Datastream (international firms) to obtain the standard industrial classification (SIC) of firms where CEOs worked. We use information on all of a CEO's past positions in publicly traded firms, including those in non-S&P 1,500 firms.

To reassure that our findings are driven by a causal effect of managers on innovation, we restrict the sample to firm-years for which CEO-firm endogenous matching is likely to be less important, and in which CEOs are more likely to make an impact on the innovation process. Specifically, we restrict the sample to CEOs with at least three years of tenure, i.e., we exclude

observations in which the CEO has been recently appointed.[7]

We use the NBER patent database to measure innovation for the S&P 1,500 firms (Hall, Jaffe, and Trajtenberg (2001, 2005)). The patent data are from the 2006 edition of the NBER patent database, which provides a link to EXECUCOMP by GVKEY. We control for firm characteristics using accounting data from Compustat, and stock market data from CRSP. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 in the Appendix.

The sample consists of S&P 1,500 firms in the intersection of EXECUCOMP, BoardEx, and the NBER patent database. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial firms (SIC codes 6000-6999) and transportation and utilities (SIC codes 4000-4999) are also excluded. The final sample consists of 2,005 different CEOs with *GAI* from 8,419 firm-year observations (1,464 unique firms) between 1993 and 2003. We winsorize financial ratios at the bottom and top 1% levels.

2.1. Measuring general managerial ability

We use the *General Ability Index* (*GAI*) of Custódio, Ferreira, and Matos (2013), which captures the generality of a CEO's human capital based on lifetime work experience in publicly traded firms prior to the current CEO position. A CEO who worked in different organizational areas, for multiple firms, in different industries, in a conglomerate firm, or who has served as CEO previously is classified as having more general skills.

The *GAI* of CEO *i* in year *t* is defined as:

$$GAI_{i,t} = 0.268X1_{i,t} + 0.312X2_{i,t} + 0.309X3_{i,t} + 0.218X4_{i,t} + 0.153X5_{i,t} \quad (1)$$

where $X1$ is the number of different positions that a CEO has had during his career; $X2$ is the number of firms where a CEO worked; $X3$ is the number of industries at the four-digit SIC level

[7] In robustness tests, we will also present results with the sample of all CEOs and alternative tenure cutoffs.

where a CEO worked; $X4$ is the a dummy variable that takes a value of one if a CEO previously held a CEO position at another firm; and $X5$ is a dummy variable that takes a value of one if a CEO worked for a multi-division firm (i.e., a company that reports more than one business segment). The weights in equation (1) are obtained from extracting common components, using principal component analysis, from the five variables. Higher levels of general human capital are reflected in a higher value of the index (the index is standardized to have zero mean and a standard deviation of one). Thus, a CEO with a high *GAI* is likely to have acquired general skills that are transferable across firms and industries and to have more attractive outside options.

A good example of a generalist executive is Louis Gerstner, who was CEO/Chairman of IBM over 1993–2002. He started his career at McKinsey & Company and had a diverse experience holding senior positions at American Express and being CEO of RJR Nabisco. Considered an outsider when he joined IBM, Gerstner was largely credited with turning around IBM's business, while John Akers, his predecessor, was an IBM lifer and more immersed in its corporate culture. Gerstner had a *GAI* score in the top 1% of the distribution at 3.11 when he joined IBM, with past experience in 11 positions, 10 firms, and 6 industries, as well as past experience as a top manager and at a conglomerate.

Under Gerstner, IBM stopped development of its own operating system and withdrew from the retail desktop PC market to focus on IT services where the industry was headed. Over the decade of his management, IBM produced a record-setting number of patents.[8] IBM is fourth in the number of patents in our sample, with patent counts increasing from about 1,000 per year to more than 4,000. During this period, IBM was also in the top 1% of the distribution of citations.[9]

[8] Bloomberg, "IBM Granted Most U.S. Patents for 20th Straight Year" (January 10, 2013).
[9] Our results are robust to dropping IBM from the sample.

2.2. Measuring innovation

Our main tests are based on output-oriented measures of innovation. The first measure of innovation is the number of patent applications filed by a firm in a given year (*Patents*). One concern with this number is that patents are included in the database only if they are eventually granted, and there is on average a two-year lag between application and grant date. As the latest year available in the patent database is 2006, patents applied for in 2004 and 2005 may not show up. Following Hall, Jaffe, and Trajtenberg (2001), we end our sample period in 2003 and include year fixed-effects in our regressions to address time truncation issues.

The second measure of innovation is the total number of citations to the patents that a firm applied for in a given year (*Citations*). Patent counts are an imperfect proxy of innovation success, as patents vary widely in their technological and economic relevance (Griliches, Hall, and Pakes (1987)). A common way to measure the relevance of a patent is by the number of citations it subsequently received. Hall, Jaffe, and Trajtenberg (2005) show that citations are positively related to firm valuation. Patents created near the ending year of the sample period have less time to accumulate citations. Therefore, citations suffer from a time truncation bias due to the finite length of the patent database. We address this concern by adjusting each patent's citation count by the average citation count of all patents in the same two-digit technological class and year (Hall, Jaffe, and Trajtenberg (2001, 2005)). The resulting variable is the sum of the adjusted citation count across all patents that a firm applied for in each year.

So far, the measures of innovation capture the intensity but not the technological knowledge base encompassed by the patents. We also study measures of originality and generality of the patents filed by a given CEO. The first measure is one minus the Herfindahl index of the citations made by the patents that a firm applied for in a given year across two-digit technological classes as proposed by Hall, Jaffe, and Trajtenberg (2001). This index looks at *backward* citations made by the firm in its patents. A high *Originality Index* (lower

concentration) indicates that patents cited belong to a wider set of technological classes. The second measure is one minus the Herfindahl index of the citations received by the patents that a firm applied for in a given year across two-digit technological classes. This index looks at *forward* citations of the patents to measure the impact of the firm's innovation. A high *Generality Index* (lower concentration) indicates that a firm's patents are cited by subsequent patents across a wide range of fields.

The final set of measures examines a firm's innovation strategy. We classify firms' patent activity into exploratory and exploitative as proposed by Sorensen and Stuart (2000), Benner and Tushman (2003), and Almeida, Hsu, and Li (2013). Firms focusing on their current areas of expertise are expected to produce more exploitative patents, while firms looking into new areas are expected to produce more exploratory patents. We construct proxies for exploitative and exploratory patents according to the extent to which a firm's new patents use current versus new knowledge. A firm's existing knowledge consists of its previous patent portfolio and the set of patents that have been cited by the firm's patents filed over the past five years. A patent is categorized as exploitative if at least 60% of its citations are based on current knowledge, and a patent is categorized as exploratory if at least 60% of its citations are based on new knowledge (i.e., citations not in the firm's existing knowledge base).[10] We then calculate the ratio of exploitative patents for a given firm-year as the number of exploitative patents filed in a given year divided by the number of all patents filed by the firm in the same year (*Exploitative Ratio*). The ratio of exploratory patents for a given firm-year is defined as the number of exploratory patents filed in a given year divided by the number of all patents filed by the firm in the same year (*Exploratory Ratio*). A higher ratio of exploitative patents suggests a more focused innovative strategy, while a higher ratio of exploratory patents suggests a more divergent innovative strategy.

[10] We obtain similar estimates using a cutoff of 80% rather than 60%.

2.3. Other explanatory variables

To explain innovation we include several firm characteristics as controls in the base model. Firm size is proxied by *Sales*. Capital intensity is proxied by the ratio of net property, plant, and equipment to the number of employees (*Capital*/*Labor*). We also control for growth opportunities (*Tobin's Q*), investment (*CAPEX*), ratio of debt to assets (*Leverage*), and family ownership (*Family Firm Dummy*). In robustness tests, we also consider specifications with additional firm and CEO characteristics as controls, which include market and accounting performance, firm age, institutional ownership, corporate governance measures, and CEO tenure, age, education, compensation, overconfidence and network.

3. General managerial ability and innovation

In this section, we test the hypothesis that CEOs with more general ability spur innovation.

3.1. Univariate tests

Table 1 shows summary statistics for innovation, as well as CEO and firm characteristics. The average firm in the sample files 31 patents per year and subsequently receives 212 citations (raw count). It also engages more in exploratory than exploitative research: The average *Exploratory Ratio* is more than double the average *Exploitative Ratio*.

Table 2 compares sample means for specialist and generalist CEOs. A generalist CEO is defined as a top executive who has a *GAI* above the median in a given year. Firms with generalist CEOs versus specialist CEOs file more than double the patents per year (44 versus 19); and these patents generate more than twice as many subsequent citations (289 versus 138). The patents produced by generalists both make use of and produce more general knowledge, as measured by the *Originality Index* and the *Generality Index*, which are 55% and 66% higher for generalists versus specialists. Finally, firms with generalist CEOs seem to engage more in both exploratory and exploitative activities (albeit relatively more in exploratory) than firms with

specialist CEOs.

The univariate tests suggest an economically meaningful difference in innovation output by firms with generalist CEOs. At this stage, however, we cannot attribute these differences just to general managerial ability, as other firm and CEO factors could potentially explain the patterns.

3.2. Patent filing and citations

Table 3 examines the relation between filed patents and the general ability of CEOs. The dependent variable is the logarithm of one plus the number of patents (*Patents*) in a given year. We control for industry (two-digit SIC)-year pair fixed-effects in column (1), and both industry-year and state-year fixed-effects in column (2). The industry-year and state-year fixed-effects control for innovation shocks that are specific to a given industry and year and a given state and year, respectively. Standard errors are clustered by firm to account for within-firm correlation.

We find that firms with generalist CEOs have higher patent counts. The estimates in columns (1) and (2) indicate that a one standard deviation increase in *GAI* is associated with an additional 9%-11% in *Patents*. We then include firm fixed-effects to control for unobserved time invariant firm heterogeneity in column (3). The *GAI* coefficient is lower at about 7% but is still economically and statistically significant. We include firm-CEO fixed-effects in columns (4) and (5), which control for unobserved time-invariant CEO heterogeneity such as innate talent, mobility, or risk aversion in addition to firm heterogeneity. We find that the *GAI* coefficient estimate is stronger at 16%-19%. Thus, CEO-firm endogenous matching is unlikely to explain our findings as these estimates are exclusively driven by within firm-CEO variation.

Table 4 presents estimates of regressions using measures of firm's innovation quality. We run regressions similar to those in Table 3 and measure the success of innovation activity using the number of times a firm's patents are cited in subsequent patents. The dependent variable in column (1) is the logarithm of one plus citation counts adjusted for truncation bias (*Citations*). The *GAI* coefficient is positive and significant. The estimate in column (1) suggests that a one

standard deviation increase in *GAI* is associated with up to 9% more citations to patents produced by a firm. These results suggest that generalist CEOs produce patents with more citations, and the effect is both statistically and economically important. Results are similar when we include state-year fixed-effects or firm fixed-effects in columns (2) and (3). The *GAI* coefficient estimate is stronger at 12%-16% when we rely solely on within firm-CEO variation in columns (4) and (5). Overall, these results show a positive and significant relation between *GAI* and citation counts, which is an indication of the success and effectiveness of innovation activities.[11]

3.3. Innovation strategy

We also hypothesize that firms with generalist CEOs produce more novel innovation. Generalist CEOs have more outside options in the executive labor market, which can serve as a mechanism of tolerance for failure. Thus, generalist CEOs should be willing to take riskier growth opportunities. We test whether firms headed by generalist CEOs make use of a more diverse set of current patents when innovating, and whether the patents they produce are also cited by a more diverse set of technological classes. We run regressions similar to that in column (1) of Table 3, which includes industry-year fixed-effects.

The results in columns (1) and (2) of Table 5 using the *Originality Index* and the *Generality Index* suggest that firms with generalist CEOs make use of and produce a more diverse set of knowledge. The *Originality Index* (column (1)) increases by 0.026 for a one standard deviation increase in *GAI*. The effect is similar for the *Generality Index* (column (2)).

Manso (2011) differentiates exploratory and exploitative activities in the innovation process. We test the hypothesis that generalist CEOs are more willing to encourage innovation strategies that pursue exploratory activities, which are intrinsically more uncertain. Columns (3) and (4)

[11] In robustness tests, we show that estimates are similar when we use raw citation count and alternative methods to adjust for truncation bias.

show the results. The dependent variables are the *Exploratory Ratio* and the *Exploitative Ratio*. The *GAI* coefficient is positive and significant for both the *Exploratory Ratio* and *Exploitative Ratio* dependent variables, but the relation between general skills and innovation is more pronounced for exploratory than exploitative innovation. The coefficient of *GAI* in the *Exploitative Ratio* regressions is positive and significant, but the coefficient in the *Exploratory Ratio* regressions is about three times higher.

Bena and Li (2014) find that firms with low R&D expenditures and large patent portfolios are acquirers, while firms with high R&D expenditures and slow growth in patent generation are targets. Thus, synergies from combining innovation efforts are important drivers of acquisitions. A possible interpretation of our results is that generalist CEOs promote in-house innovation, while specialists acquire innovation through mergers and acquisitions (M&A). If this were the case, specialists would not file patents but would still promote innovation. It could also be the case that specialists are better at evaluating the potential synergies of an acquisition, or at identifying good innovation targets. To address this possibility, we estimate a regression in which the dependent variable is the number of acquired patents by a firm in each year (*Acquired Patents*), as proxied by patents filed by the target firm in the previous five years prior to the M&A. Column (5) of Table 5 shows the result. The *GAI* coefficient is positive and significant but economically smaller at 2%. We conclude that the effect of generalists is present in both in-house patent production and externally acquired patents, but the effect is economically stronger in in-house patents.

4. Mechanisms

So far the results are consistent with the idea that generalist managers innovate more because their skills and potential mobility act as a mechanism of tolerance for failure. In this section, we explore variation in the value of outside options of CEOs to more directly test this hypothesis. In addition, generalists have been exposed to different industries, firms, and roles. We conjecture

that this exposure might help them to encourage R&D teams to think outside the box and bring solutions and knowledge from other contexts to produce more and better innovation.

4.1. Tolerance for failure

We use measures of local labor market conditions as a source of variation in the value of outside options. The first proxy for the value of the outside options of managers is the tightness of the local labor market (Kedia and Rajgopal (2009)). As demand for workers is stronger in tight labor markets, managers are more likely to receive outside job offers from other firms in the region. Moreover, generalist managers should benefit more than specialists in tight labor markets because their skills are transferable across firms and industries. Thus, we expect the relation between innovation and *GAI* to be *more* pronounced in tight labor markets. Because it may also be the case that a generalist CEO's capacity to innovate more is higher during weak economic conditions, we complement this analysis using other proxies of the CEO's outside options.

In the presence of geographic segmentation, Oyer's (2004) wage indexation theory implies that relevant outside opportunities for an employee are likely to come from other firms in the same region rather than from firms that are farther away.[12] To test this idea, we use the local beta, that is, the degree of comovement between a firm's stock return and stock returns of other firms in the same Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) (Pirinsky and Wang (2006), Kedia and Rajgopal (2009)). Specialist managers are less likely to have outside job opportunities from firms in the same region when their firm has a low local beta. This is not the case with generalists, as they have skills that can be applied elsewhere. Thus, we expect to find a stronger relation between innovation and *GAI* in the sample of firms with low local beta.

Table 6 presents the results of regressions of *Patents* (columns (1)-(4)) and *Citations*

[12] Although there is less geographic segmentation of labor markets for top executives than for other workers, there is evidence indicating that geography does impact the CEO labor market (Knyazeva, Knyazeva and Masulis, (2013)). Yonker (2016) shows that geography affects both labor supply and demand in the market for CEOs, and Bouwman (2013) shows that geography affects CEO compensation.

(columns (5)-(8)) on general managerial effects, taking into account the value of outside options. The regressions include the same control variables and industry-year fixed effects as in previous tables. Columns (1) and (5) present estimates of regression that include interaction between *GAI* and *Tight Labor Market Dummy* as an explanatory variable. The *Tight Labor Market Dummy* takes a value of one if the unemployment rate for a year in the MSA is less than the median unemployment rate for the MSA over the full sample period. The unemployment data are from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The interaction term coefficient is positive and significant in columns (1) and (5), indicating a stronger relation between innovation (measured by patents or citations) in tight labor markets. We interpret this result as showing that better outside options of generalist managers versus specialist managers in tight labor markets act as a mechanism of tolerance for failure that makes generalists more willing to exploit innovative growth opportunities.

Columns (2) and (6) present estimates of regressions that include an interaction between *GAI* and *Low Local Beta Dummy* as an explanatory variable. The *Low Local Beta Dummy* takes a value of one if the local beta is below the top decile of the distribution, and zero otherwise. The local beta is estimated using a time series regression of monthly stock return on the return of the stock's corresponding MSA index (excluding the particular stock) as well as the return on the market portfolio and the stock's industry (Fama-French 48 industry classification) return over two different periods, 1993–1997 and 1998–2003. We require at least 24 non-missing monthly return observations for a stock, and that there are five stocks in the MSA to enter the regression. Returns in excess of monthly T-bill rates are taken from CRSP.

The interaction term coefficient is positive and significant in columns (2) and (6), which is consistent with the idea that the relation between innovation and *GAI* is attributable to the better outside options of generalist managers relative to specialist managers. The results are consistent with the idea that generalist CEOs are more willing to innovate because the labor market

naturally acts as a mechanism of tolerance for failure.[13]

To show the robustness of the local beta variable, we use two other measures of the local competition for workers. These variables capture the extent of industry representation in the MSA and consequently the competition for local workers. Specifically, we use: (1) the number of other firms in the firm's industry (two-digit SIC) that are also located in the firm's MSA (*Number of Firms MSA-Industry*) in columns (3) and (7); and (2) the fraction of firms in the MSA that are in the firm's industry (two-digit SIC) (*Fraction MSA-Industry*) in columns (4) and (8). The interaction term coefficient is positive and significant in all these regressions, which is consistent with the idea that outside options help to explain the relation between innovation and general managerial ability.

To further test if generalists do have a broader set of outside options that mitigate the costs incurred during unemployment spells, we study a sample of forced CEO turnover.[14] When we restrict the sample to forced CEO turnovers, we end up with a sample of 125 forced turnovers of which 83 are generalists and 42 specialists.

We find that the unconditional probability of finding any new position (board, non-board, executive or non-executive) in our panel of firms within the three-year period following the turnover is 70% for generalist CEOs and 62% for specialist CEOs. If we restrict the sample to executive positions the probability of finding a new position in less than three years after the turnover is 41% for generalists and 36% for specialists. In the case of non-executive positions the difference in probability between generalists and specialists is even more striking at 58% and 31%, respectively.

We then compare the time that a generalist CEO who faces termination takes to find a new position compared to a specialist CEO. We find that generalists take on average 8 months to find

[13] Tate and Yang (2015) show that the workers of diversified firms and firms with conservative financial policies face lower costs and duration of their unemployment spells.

[14] We thank Dirk Jenter for providing us with the forced CEO turnover data used in Jenter and Lewellen (2014).

a new job, while specialists take 20 months. When we focus on executive positions, we find that generalists take on average 14 months to find a new position, while specialists take 16 months. In the case of non-executive positions the difference is much larger, as generalists find a new position in 13 months when compared to 42 months for specialists.

Although the sample of CEO forced turnovers is admittedly small and estimates are unconditional, the results are consistent with the idea that generalists face lower costs of their unemployment spell when facing termination. This supports the view that generalists are willing to innovate because they have skills transferable across firms and industry, which mitigate their exposure to unemployment risk.

4.2. New knowledge

We use a measure of proximity between the technology classes of the patents of the firm in which a manager is currently the CEO and those of patents filed by another firm for which he is appointed the board of directors. *Technological Proximity* (P_{ijt}), in the spirit of Jaffe (1986) and Balsmeier, Fleming, and Manso (2015), represents the technological class overlap between the patents filed by firm *i* in year *t* and the patents filed by the set of firms *j* in which the CEO has a board seat:

$$P_{ijt} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} f_{ikt} f_{jkt} / \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} f_{ikt}^2 \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{K} f_{jkt}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (2)$$

where f_{ikt} is the fraction of firms *i*'s patents that belong to patent class *k* at time *t*; and f_{jkt} is the fraction of patents filed by another firm in which the CEO has a (contemporaneous) board seat (we only consider the patents filed during the tenure of the CEO at these firms) that belong to patent class *k* at time *t*. P_{ijt} ranges between zero and one.

Table 7 presents the results of event-study regressions of *Technological Proximity* around the

year of the CEO's appointment to a board seat at another firm. We test if the *Technological Proximity* between the firm where he is currently the CEO and the firm where he is a board member increases following his appointment to the board of directors. The event windows starts at year –3 before the appointment year and ends at year +1, +2, +3, +4 or +5 after the appointment year. Panel A presents the results of OLS regressions, and Panel B presents the results of event fixed effects regressions (i.e., these regressions explore only within-firm pair variation). We find a statistically and economically significant increase in *Technological Proximity* following the CEO appointment as a board member at another firm. The estimated coefficient is 0.009-0.012, and which represents about 10% of the average *Technological Proximity*.

These results support the new knowledge mechanism: a CEO can bring new ideas to his current firm from his board positions at other firms, which results in higher technological proximity between firms. However, the tolerance for failure and new knowledge mechanisms are not mutually exclusive and both are supported by the evidence that generalist CEOs produce more patents and are more likely to go into new technological domains.

5. Identification and additional results

There is a concern that our estimates could be biased due to endogenous matching between CEO types and firms. That is, there may be omitted factors correlated with both innovation and the generality of human capital of a CEO. Despite the inclusion of firm-level controls and industry-year fixed-effects, the *GAI* coefficient might still be biased. We have addressed this concern, at least partially, by including firm fixed-effects to account for any unobservable firm characteristic that are time-invariant. Given that our sample period encompasses only 11 years, the fixed-effect estimator is quite effective in controlling for firm-level unobservable variables

(as opposed, for example, to including a firm fixed-effect in a panel of 50 years in which these unobservable variables are likely to change over such a long time).

However, firms might decide to change their policies such as start innovating and change their management team simultaneously. As a result, firms can choose a generalist CEO as part of a new business strategy and therefore the firm fixed-effect (or the CEO fixed-effect) estimator would not be enough to identify the effect of *GAI* on innovation. For this reason, we also use firm-CEO fixed-effects. This estimator relies only on within firm-CEO variation and therefore we are able to rule out all the alternative explanations that are associated with time-invariant characteristics of the firm-CEO pair such as the quality of the match or the innate talent of the CEO. In fact, the identification comes only from CEOs for which *GAI* changes during their tenure in the firm. This happens if, for example, the CEO got an additional board seat in a new firm that is in a different industry or in a conglomerate.

5.1. Instrumental variable estimator

Something that we cannot address with the firm-CEO fixed-effect estimator is the possibility that results are driven by time-variant characteristics of the firm-CEO pair, or reverse causality arguments, such that CEOs get additional board seats and become more generalist because the firm is more innovative. Ideally we would like to have exogenous variation in the decision to appoint a generalist or specialist CEO. We partially address the problem of endogenous match with the firm-CEO fixed-effect estimator but we still cannot rule out that innovation has an effect on *GAI*.

To address the reverse causality concern we employ instrumental variables methods that exploit exogenous variation in *GAI*. We make use of non-compete agreements as an instrument for the generality of human capital of the CEO. Non-compete agreements are contracts that prevent employees from joining or creating a competing company in their next job. Garmaise (2009) finds that 70% of the firms have non-compete agreements with their top executives.

Bishara, Martin, and Thomas (2015) report that non-compete clauses are frequent in CEO contracts (79% of contracts have this sort of clause in the 1993–2010 period) with some restricting CEO's post-employment activities for more than four years. Additionally, there has been a significant trend toward the use of non-compete clauses in CEO contracts over time. These findings are consistent with previous research on the frequency of noncompete provisions in entrepreneurs and CEOs contracts (Kaplan and Stromberg (2003), Gillan, Hartzell, and Parrino (2009)).

The enforceability of these clauses exhibits both cross-sectional variation (i.e., varying across states) and time series variation (i.e., differing in the dates of adoption at the state level). The cross-sectional and time series variation of the instrument helps to rule out the concern that other state-level characteristics explain both *GAI* and innovation. We use the index on the enforceability of non-compete agreements in Garmaise (2009) during the career of the CEO as an instrument for *GAI*. The index takes values between a minimum of zero (e.g., California) and a maximum of nine (e.g., Florida after 1997).

We follow the career path of the CEO and create a *Non-Compete Enforcement Index* for each CEO-year observation, which is the average of the non-compete agreement enforcement index at the state-year level across all positions the CEO has had in publicly traded firms (the index is based on the location of the firm's headquarters).[15] This mitigates the concern that the CEO could strategically choose where to live to avoid non-compete clauses such as living in a neighboring state.

A good instrument should be correlated with the endogenous variable (*GAI*), but not with the error term on the dependent variables of interest (innovation). We expect the *Non-Compete Enforcement Index* to be positively related to *GAI* since the enforcement of non-compete

[15] Non-compete clauses are less frequent in non-executive position contracts. We obtain similar instrumental variable estimates (untabulated) when we calculate the *Non-Compete Enforcement Index* excluding past non-executive positions.

agreements limits within-industry transfers and enhances between-industry transfers, contributing to the accumulation of general managerial skills. Consistent with this idea, Garmaise (2009) finds that executive job transfers within an industry decline with the level of non-compete enforceability faced by the firm, while transfers between industries rise.[16]

There is also a distinction between the ex-ante effects of non-compete agreements (human capital investment) and the ex-post effects (labor mobility) as suggested by Posner, Triantis, and Triantis (2004). Therefore, we expect executives to have an ex-ante incentive to accumulate more general skills in states with stronger enforcement of non-compete clauses. The idea is that if managers anticipate moving across industries they might decide to invest more in general human capital rather than in firm-specific knowledge to enable outside options and facilitate ex-post mobility. Garmaise (2009) offers supporting evidence of this idea. In high-enforcement states, managers receive lower compensation and more of it in the form of salary, and firms invest less in capital-intensive production.

The second important assumption of the instrumental variables method is that the instrument should be a variable that can be excluded from the list of variables affecting the variable of interest (innovation). In our setting, the exclusion restriction is likely to be satisfied as ex-ante career decisions of managers and their past positions are not likely to be directly correlated with the innovation policy of firms where they are currently CEOs. In alternative, we use the level of enforcement of non-compete agreements of the state of the first position over the CEO's career as an instrument for *GAI*. Going further back in time makes it more plausible that the exclusion restriction is not violated. However, we cannot completely rule out the possibility that an unobserved CEO time-varying characteristic, which is correlated both with current innovation and the *Non-Compete Enforcement Index*, makes innovation linked to the instrument for reasons

[16] Marx, Strumsky and Fleming (2009) show that non-compete enforcement constrains mobility more for inventors with firm-specific skills for those who specialize in narrow technical fields, by exploiting Michigan's inadvertent 1985 reversal of its non-compete enforcement policy as a natural experiment.

other than the generality of human capital.[17]

Table 8 shows the results of the instrumental variables estimation for *Patents* and *Citations*. The regressions include the same control variables as in Tables 3 and 4 as well as industry-year fixed-effects and firm fixed-effects. Panel A shows the results using the instrument based on all past positions, and Panel B shows the results using the instrument based on the first position of the CEO's career.

Column (1) reports the first-stage regression estimates. As expected, we find that the *Non-Compete Enforcement Index* is positively and significantly correlated with *GAI*. The *F*-statistics of the first-stage regressions are 26 and 104 in Panels A and B, respectively, well above the conventional threshold for weak instruments. The first-stage results indicate that *GAI* increases by 0.16-0.22 when the *Non-Compete Enforcement Index* changes by two, which corresponds to a one standard deviation shock. Columns (2) and (3) present second-stage regression estimates. The effect of *GAI* on the number of filed patents is positive and significant. The effect of *GAI* on citations is also positive and significant. The second-stage results show that a 0.16 increase in *GAI* (obtained from the first stage in Panel A) leads to a 17% increase in *Patents* and a 12% increase in *Citations*. The economic effect on *Patents* and *Citations* of a change in *GAI* driven by a one standard deviation change in the *Non-Compete Enforcement Index* is similar to the one estimated previously using the ordinary least squares (OLS) and fixed effects regressions.[18]

Overall, the effects of *GAI* on innovation using instrumental variables methods are similar to those in our main tests, suggesting that the positive impact of general managerial skills on innovation is robust to endogeneity concerns. The results support our hypothesis that the general

[17] Another concern with the instrument is the validity of the exclusion restriction because of location decisions of the CEO. A manager with general managerial ability might self-select to move to a state with higher enforceability of non-compete agreements, because if the match does not work out, he can more easily move compared to a specialist. This concern is mitigated by using the enforceability of non-compete agreements in the state of the CEO's first position as an instrument and the fact that the *Non-Compete Enforcement Index* is time varying within states.

[18] The instrumental variables estimates are larger than those of the OLS as *GAI* measures general human capital with error and therefore OLS are biased towards zero due to attenuation bias.

ability of CEOs affects innovation output. We find that making the human capital of a CEO more general generates an increase in both number of filed patents and citations of those patents.

5.2. Innovation productivity and firm valuation

To investigate whether innovation produced by generalists adds to firm valuation, we run an event study using a sample of patent grant announcements. We estimate cumulative abnormal returns (*CAR*) around patent grant dates using market-adjusted returns and market model (the CRSP value-weighted index is the benchmark). For the market model, we use a 260 trading days estimation window (−270, −11). We calculate the mean and median *CAR* over the three-day event window (−1, +1) around the announcement date separately for generalist CEOs (143,972 patents) and specialist CEOs (71,386 parents).

Table 9 shows the results. We find that mean and median *CAR* are positive and significant in the sample of generalist CEOs, which is consistent with the notion that innovation by generalists adds to firm valuation. The mean *CAR* is 17 basis points per patent using market-adjusted returns and 7 basis points using the market model as a benchmark. The magnitudes of *CAR* estimates are in line with those in Kogan, Papanikolaou, Seru, and Stoffman (2015). The mean and median *CAR* for specialists are significantly lower than those for generalists. The difference in means is 6 basis points per patent using market-adjusted returns and 8 basis points using the market model. These results also help to rule out the concern that generalists are matched to non-practicing entities, commonly designated by "*patent trolls*". Cohen, Gurun, and Kominers (2016) show that the patents non-practicing entities assert are, on average, of lower quality than those asserted by practicing entities.[19]

[19] The higher stock market reaction to patents filed by generalist CEOs may have an alternate explanation. The reaction may not reflect that patents filed by generalist have higher value than those filed by specialists but simply a larger surprise effect. When specialists innovate, the reaction is low because the stock price already incorporates this effect as there is a small surprise effect. When generalists innovate, the reaction is high as there is a large surprise effect.

We also run regressions (untabulated) using Tobin's *Q* as the dependent variable and *GAI* as the main explanatory variable. The *GAI* coefficient is positive but statistically insignificant, which is consistent with Custódio, Ferreira, and Matos (2013). This insignificant relation between *GAI* and firm performance may occur because performance is endogenous. However, this result does not mean that innovation is not affected by general human capital or that innovation does not increase firm valuation. If there is an optimal matching based on CEO type (generalist versus specialist) and innovation policy, we will not observe cross sectional differences in firm valuation based on CEO type. In other words, if we replaced a "well matched" generalist with a specialist CEO, only then we would observe a reduction in firm valuation.

Overall, the results support the view that innovation adds to firm valuation. The effect is more pronounced in the case of innovation produced by generalists than specialists. This is consistent with the evidence that patents produced by generalists have more impact and higher quality than those by specialists.

5.3. Robustness checks

Results of several robustness checks of our primary findings are presented in the Internet Appendix. These robustness checks support the idea that generalist CEOs improve the quantity and quality of innovation. We discuss them briefly here.

We first use the ratio of R&D expenditures to assets (an input-oriented measure of innovation), stock return volatility, and total factor productivity as alternative measures of innovation and its productivity. We also perform robustness checks related to the construction of *GAI*. We use a dummy variable that takes a value of one for generalist CEOs or estimate separate regressions for each individual component of *GAI*.

Next, we run robustness checks of our instrument variable estimator. We control for the past

experience of the CEO in innovative firms as generalist CEOs are more likely to have worked in innovative industries in the past. We use alternative definitions of the non-compete enforcement index in which the index is based on the current firm location (as opposed to the employment history of the CEO). We interact the index with the level of in-state competition following the specification in Garmaise (2009).

We further control for R&D expenditures and additional firm and CEO observable characteristics, which include market and accounting, performance, firm age, institutional ownership, corporate governance, and CEO tenure, age, education, compensation, overconfidence and network. We also run our main tests using alternative methods, which include propensity score matching, and negative binomial and Poisson regressions for patent and citation counts.

Finally, we perform a set of robustness checks to our sample definition. We drop IBM as a potential outlier or firms with zero patent or citation counts. We consider a subsample of non-innovative industries and different tenure cutoffs. In these subsamples the CEO is less likely to have been hired with the goal of increasing innovation, and therefore selection concerns are mitigated.

6. Conclusion

Our analysis of whether CEO general managerial skills matter for innovation finds that CEOs who gain more general human capital through their lifetime work experience promote more innovation in the organizations that they run. Patent-based metrics indicate that generalist CEOs promote innovation in the form of patents with higher impact. Generalist CEOs also incentivize firms to pursue more exploratory knowledge research activities. We provide evidence consistent with a link from the generality of CEO human capital to the willingness to innovate and take

risks using an instrument for general skills based on the variation in the enforceability of non-compete agreements across states and over time.

Our findings support the idea that generalist executives encourage firms to pursue risky innovation opportunities. While specialist CEOs have skills valuable only within an organization, generalist CEOs have skills that can be applied elsewhere. Thus, generalist CEOs have more outside options, which act as a labor market mechanism of tolerance for failure in addition to internal mechanisms such as executive compensation plans. Further, generalist CEOs extend the firm's boundaries and bring more diverse knowledge to the firm because they have been exposed to different industries, firms, and roles. Given the growing importance of a knowledge-based economy, we provide new insight into why general managerial skills command a compensation premium in the executive labor market.

References

Acemoglu D., U. Akcigit, and M. Celik, 2016, Young, restless and creative: Openness to disruption and creative innovations, Working paper, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Agrawal, A., and D. Matsa, 2013, Labor unemployment risk and corporate financing decisions, *Journal of Financial Economics* 108, 449-470.

Almeida, H., P. Hsu, and D. Li, 2013, When less is more: Financial constraints and innovative efficiency, Working paper, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Anderson, R., and D. Reeb, 2003, Founding-family ownership and firm performance: Evidence from the S&P 500, *Journal of Finance* 58, 1301-1328.

Balsmeier, B., L. Fleming, and G. Manso, 2016, Independent boards and innovation, *Journal of Financial Economics*, forthcoming.

Barker, V., and G. Mueller, 2002, CEO characteristics and firm R&D spending, *Management Science* 48, 782-801.

Becker, G., 1962, Investment in human capital: A theoretical analysis, *Journal of Political Economy* 70, 9-49.

Bena, J., and K. Li, 2014, Corporate innovations and mergers and acquisitions, *Journal of Finance* 69, 1923-1960.

Benner, M., and M. Tushman, 2003, Exploitation, exploration, and process management: The productivity dilemma revisited, *Academy of Management Review* 28, 238-256.

Bereskin, F., and P. Hsu, 2012, New dogs, new tricks: CEO turnover, CEO-related factors, and innovation performance, Working paper, University of Hong Kong.

Bertrand, M., and A. Schoar, 2003, Managing with style: The effect of managers on firm policies, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 68, 1169-1208.

Bishara, N., K. Martin, and R. Thomas, 2015, An empirical analysis of non-competition clauses and other restrictive post-employment covenants, *Vanderbilt Law Review* 68, 1-51.

Bouwman, C., 2013, The geography of executive compensation, Working paper, Case Western University.

Chava, S., A. Oettl, A. Subramanian, and K. Subramanian, 2013, Banking deregulation and innovation, *Journal of Financial Economics* 109, 759-774.

Cohen, L., U. Gurun, and S. Kominers, 2016, The growing problem of patent trolling, *Science* 352, 521-522.

Coles, J., N. Daniel, and L. Naveen, 2006, Managerial incentives and risk-taking, *Journal of Financial Economics* 79, 431-468.

Coles, J., Z. Li, and Y. Wang, 2013, Industry tournament incentives, *Review of Financial Studies*, forthcoming.

Core, J., and W. Guay, 2002, Estimating the value of employee stock option portfolios and their sensitivities to price and volatility, *Journal of Accounting Research* 40, 613-630.

Custódio, C., M. Ferreira, and P. Matos, 2013, Generalists versus specialists: Lifetime work experience and chief executive officer pay, *Journal of Financial Economics* 108, 471-492.

Engelberg, J., P. Gao, and C. Parsons, 2013, The price of a CEO's Rolodex, *Review of Financial Studies* 26, 79-14.

Faleye, O., T. Kovacs, and A. Venkateswaran, 2014, Do better-connected CEOs innovate more?, *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 49, 1201-1225.

Fee, E., C. Hadlock, and J. Pierce, 2013, Managers with and without style: Evidence from exogenous CEO changes, *Review of Financial Studies* 26, 567-601.

Frydman, C., 2015, Rising through the ranks: The evolution of the market for corporate executives, 1936-2003, *Management Science*, forthcoming.

Galasso, A., and T. Simcoe, 2011, CEO overconfidence and innovation, *Management Science* 57, 1469-1484.

Garmaise, M., 2009, Ties that truly bind: Non-competition agreements, executive compensation and firm investment, *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization* 27, 376-425.

Gillan, S., J. Hartzell, and R. Parrino, 2009, Explicit versus implicit contracts: Evidence from CEO employment agreements, *Journal of Finance* 64, 1629-1655.

Griliches, Z., B. Hall, and A. Pakes, 1987, The value of patents as indicators of inventive activity, in P. Dasgupta and P. Stoneman (eds.), *Economic Policy and Technological Performance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hall, B., and K. Murphy, 2002, Stock options for undiversified executives, *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 33, 3-42.

Hall, B., A. Jaffe, and M. Trajtenberg, 2001, The NBER patent citations data file: Lessons, insights and methodological tools, NBER Working paper No. 8498.

Hall, B., A. Jaffe, and M. Trajtenberg, 2005, Market value and patent citations, *RAND Journal of Economics* 36, 16-38.

Hirschhorn, L., and T. Gilmore, T., 1992, The new boundaries of the "boundaryless" organization, *Harvard Business Review* 70, 104-115.

Hirshleifer, D., A. Low, and S. Teoh, 2012, Are overconfident CEOs better innovators? *Journal of Finance* 67, 1457-1498.

Jaffe, A., 1986, Technological opportunity and spillovers of R&D: Evidence from firms' patents, profits, and market value, *American Economic Review* 76, 984-1001.

Jenter, D., and K. Lewellen, 2014, Performance-induced CEO turnover, Working paper, Stanford University.

Kaplan, S., Klebanov, M., Sorensen, M., 2012, Which CEO characteristics matter? *Journal of Finance* 67, 973-1007.

Kaplan, S., and J. Rauh, 2013, It's the market: The broad-based rise in the return to top talent, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 27, 35-56.

Kaplan, S., and P. Stromberg, 2003, Financial contracting theory meets the real world: An empirical analysis of venture capital contracts, *Review of Economic Studies* 70, 281-315.

Kedia, S., and S. Rajgopal, 2009, Neighborhood matters: The impact of location on broad-based stock option plans, *Journal of Financial Economics* 92, 109-127.

Knyazeva, A., D. Knyazeva, and R. Masulis, 2013, The supply of corporate directors and board independence, *Review of Financial Studies* 26, 1561-1605.

Kogan, L., D. Papanikolaou, A. Seru, and N. Stoffman, 2015, Technological innovation, resource allocation, and growth, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, forthcoming.

Lazear, E., 2005, Enterpreneurship, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 23, 649-680.

Lerner, J., and J. Wulf, 2007, Innovation and incentives: Evidence from corporate R&D, *Review of Economics and Statistics* 89, 634-644.

Malmendier, U., and G. Tate, 2005, CEO overconfidence and corporate investment, *Journal of Finance* 60, 2661-2700.

Malmendier, U., and G. Tate, 2008, Who makes acquisitions? CEO overconfidence and the market's reaction, *Journal of Financial Economics* 89, 20-43.

Manso, G., 2011, Motivating innovation, *Journal of Finance* 66, 1823-1869.

Marx, M., D. Strumsky, and L. Fleming, 2009, Mobility, skills, and the Michigan non-compete experiment, *Management Science* 55, 875-889.

Mukherjee, A., M. Singh, and A. Zaldokas, 2015, Do corporate taxes hinder innovation? *Journal of Financial Economics*, forthcoming.

Murphy, K., and J. Zabojnik, 2007, Managerial capital and the market for CEOs, Working paper, University of Southern California.

Oyer, P., 2004, Why do firms use incentives that have no incentive effects? *Journal of Finance* 59, 1619-1649.

Pirinsky, C., and Q. Wang, 2006, Does corporate headquarters location matter for stock returns? *Journal of Finance* 61, 1991-2015.

Posner, E., A. Triantis, and G. Triantis, 2004, Investing in human capital: The efficiency of covenants not to compete, Working paper, University of Virginia Law School.

Schmidt, B., 2015, Costs and benefits of friendly boards during mergers and acquisitions, *Journal of Financial Economics* 117, 424-447.

Sorensen, J., and T. Stuart, 2000, Aging, obsolescence and organizational innovation, *Administrative Science Quarterly* 45, 81-112.

Tate, G., and L. Yang, 2015, The bright side of corporate diversification: Evidence from internal labor markets, *Review of Financial Studies* 28, 2203-2249.

Tian, X., and T. Wang, 2014, Tolerance for failure and corporate innovation, *Review of Financial Studies* 27, 211-255.

Yonker, S., 2016, Geography and the market for CEOs, *Management Science*, forthcoming.

Table 1
Summary Statistics

This table presents the mean, median, standard deviation, minimum, maximum, and number of observations for each variable. The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which the chief executive officer (CEO) has at least three years of tenure and profile data available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993-2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 in the Appendix.

	Mean	Median	Standard deviation	Minimum	Maximum	Number of observations
Panel A: Innovation Measures						
Patents	31.1	1.0	154.5	0.0	4,339.0	8,419
Citations (raw)	212.1	0.0	1,307.0	0.0	45,512.0	8,419
Citations (adjusted)	31.4	0.0	161.3	0.0	4,146.0	8,419
Originality Index	0.32	0.0	0.35	0.0	0.95	8,419
Generality Index	0.26	0.0	0.33	0.0	0.94	8,419
Exploitative Ratio	0.14	0.0	0.24	0.0	1.00	8,419
Exploratory Ratio	0.33	0.0	0.39	0.0	1.00	8,419
Acquired Patents	1.56	0.00	27.67	0.0	1380.00	8,419
Technological Proximity-All Positions	0.07	0.0	0.19	0.0	1.00	8,419
Technological Proximity-Current Positions	0.02	0.0	0.12	0.0	1.00	8,419
Panel B: CEO Characteristics						
General Ability Index	-0.040	-0.189	0.957	-1.504	5.854	8,419
Non-Compete Enforcement Index	4.0	4.7	2.0	0.0	9.0	6,512
Panel C: Firm Characteristics						
Sales	4,071.0	1,017.0	12,293.6	0.3	257,157.0	8,419
Capital/Labor	128.4	38.6	364.6	3.3	2,704.8	8,419
Tobin's Q	2.29	1.72	1.62	0.80	8.89	8,410
PPE	0.39	0.23	0.52	0.02	3.16	8,419
CAPEX	0.07	0.05	0.05	0.00	0.29	8,333
Leverage	0.22	0.21	0.17	0.00	0.83	8,392
Family Firm Dummy	0.29	0.00	0.45	0.00	1.00	8,419

Table 2
Innovation and General Managerial Ability: Univariate Tests

This table presents the mean of innovation measures for the sample of generalist CEOs (those with *General Ability Index* above the yearly median) and specialist CEOs (those with *General Ability Index* below the median in each year), the associated difference and its *p*-value. The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which the chief executive officer (CEO) has at least three years of tenure and profile data available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993-2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 in the Appendix.

	Generalist CEOs	Specialist CEOs	Difference	*p*-value
Patents	44.300	18.500	25.800	0.000
Citations (raw)	289.100	138.200	150.900	0.000
Citations	42.900	20.400	22.500	0.000
Originality Index	0.391	0.252	0.139	0.000
Generality Index	0.326	0.196	0.130	0.000
Exploitative Ratio	0.161	0.118	0.043	0.000
Exploratory Ratio	0.390	0.279	0.111	0.000
Technological Proximity-All Positions	0.113	0.026	0.087	0.000
Technological Proximity-Current Positions	0.041	0.009	0.032	0.000

Table 3
Patent Counts and General Managerial Ability

This table presents estimates of OLS panel regressions of the log of one plus number of patents (*Patents*). The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which the chief executive officer (CEO) has at least three years of tenure and profile data available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 in the Appendix. Robust *t*-statistics adjusted for firm-level clustering are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicates significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
General Ability Index	0.105***	0.093**	0.073**	0.189***	0.163**
	(2.838)	(2.474)	(2.568)	(2.816)	(2.472)
Log(*Sales*)	0.515***	0.549***	0.286***	0.225***	0.212***
	(15.980)	(16.769)	(6.542)	(5.949)	(5.429)
Log(*Capital*/*Labor*)	0.199***	0.157***	0.041	0.006	-0.012
	(4.077)	(2.975)	(0.925)	(0.144)	(-0.264)
Tobin's Q	0.143***	0.118***	0.008	0.001	-0.004
	(7.068)	(5.961)	(0.946)	(0.115)	(-0.447)
PPE	0.058	0.238*	0.209***	0.170***	0.177***
	(0.453)	(1.822)	(3.711)	(3.208)	(2.969)
CAPEX	-0.250	-0.521	-0.183	-0.221	-0.191
	(-0.369)	(-0.755)	(-0.743)	(-0.955)	(-0.798)
Leverage	-0.670***	-0.677***	-0.027	-0.070	-0.145
	(-3.209)	(-3.371)	(-0.244)	(-0.612)	(-1.249)
Family Firm Dummy	-0.122	-0.118	0.035	0.000	-0.033
	(-1.575)	(-1.565)	(0.464)	(0.005)	(-0.448)
Industry-year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State-year fixed effects	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Firm fixed effects	No	No	Yes	No	No
Firm-CEO fixed effects	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	8,297	8,175	8,297	8,297	8,175
R-squared	0.509	0.555	0.138	0.150	0.221

Table 4
Patent Citations and General Managerial Ability

This table presents estimates of OLS panel regressions of the log of one plus number of citations adjusted for truncation bias (*Citations*). The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which the chief executive officer (CEO) has at least three years of tenure and profile data available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 in the Appendix. Robust *t*-statistics adjusted for firm-level clustering are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicates significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
General Ability Index	0.089**	0.077**	0.062**	0.158**	0.117*
	(2.353)	(1.989)	(1.984)	(2.249)	(1.662)
Log(*Sales*)	0.500***	0.538***	0.256***	0.208***	0.203***
	(15.001)	(15.793)	(5.829)	(4.797)	(4.504)
Log(*Capital*/*Labor*)	0.203***	0.160***	0.053	0.014	-0.010
	(4.116)	(2.996)	(1.185)	(0.292)	(-0.210)
Tobin's Q	0.154***	0.128***	0.016	0.008	0.004
	(7.369)	(6.199)	(1.519)	(0.811)	(0.367)
PPE	0.024	0.194	0.180***	0.168**	0.176**
	(0.188)	(1.478)	(2.639)	(2.324)	(2.162)
CAPEX	0.255	-0.057	-0.217	-0.251	-0.173
	(0.365)	(-0.080)	(-0.734)	(-0.940)	(-0.625)
Leverage	-0.679***	-0.675***	-0.002	-0.074	-0.101
	(-3.260)	(-3.333)	(-0.018)	(-0.606)	(-0.808)
Family Firm Dummy	-0.135*	-0.127*	0.092	0.052	-0.016
	(-1.731)	(-1.681)	(0.943)	(0.601)	(-0.174)
Industry-year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State-year fixed effects	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Firm fixed effects	No	No	Yes	No	No
Firm-CEO fixed effects	No	No	No	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	8,297	8,175	8,297	8,297	8,175
R-squared	0.477	0.525	0.132	0.138	0.201

Table 5
Innovation Strategy and General Managerial Ability

This table presents estimates of OLS panel regressions of *Originality Index*, *Generality Index*, *Exploratory Ratio*, *Exploitative Ratio*, and *Acquired Patents*. The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which the chief executive officer (CEO) has at least three years of tenure and profile data available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 in the Appendix. Robust *t*-statistics adjusted for firm-level clustering are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicates significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

	Originality Index	*Generality Index*	*Exploratory Ratio*	*Exploitative Ratio*	*Acquired Patents*
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
General Ability Index	0.026***	0.021***	0.028***	0.006	0.020**
	(3.752)	(3.413)	(3.685)	(1.357)	(2.165)
Log(*Sales*)	0.068***	0.072***	0.028***	0.020***	0.065***
	(13.704)	(15.293)	(6.031)	(5.103)	(6.137)
Log(*Capital*/*Labor*)	0.039***	0.038***	0.040***	0.012*	-0.002
	(4.176)	(4.577)	(4.065)	(1.815)	(-0.237)
Tobin's Q	0.015***	0.015***	0.004	0.019***	0.023***
	(3.790)	(4.058)	(1.059)	(5.891)	(3.508)
PPE	-0.028	-0.017	-0.084***	0.017	0.055***
	(-1.175)	(-0.866)	(-3.724)	(1.013)	(3.174)
CAPEX	-0.206	-0.082	-0.327**	-0.127	-0.243*
	(-1.579)	(-0.678)	(-2.242)	(-1.534)	(-1.798)
Leverage	-0.101**	-0.097***	-0.071*	-0.028	-0.097**
	(-2.504)	(-2.659)	(-1.693)	(-0.830)	(-2.120)
Family Firm Dummy	-0.028*	-0.022	-0.010	-0.024**	-0.015
	(-1.815)	(-1.568)	(-0.643)	(-2.485)	(-0.969)
Industry-year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	8,297	8,297	8,297	8,297	8,297
R-squared	0.425	0.439	0.271	0.212	0.094

Table 6
Effect of Outside Options

This table presents estimates of OLS panel regressions of the log of one plus number of patents (*Patents*) and log of one plus number of citations adjusted for truncation bias (*Citations*). The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which the chief executive officer (CEO) has at least three years of tenure and profile data available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 in the Appendix. Robust *t*-statistics adjusted for firm-level clustering are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicates significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

	Log(1+*Patents*)				Log(1+*Citations*)			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
General Ability Index	0.053	-0.153*	0.003	0.031	0.024	-0.155*	-0.042	-0.001
	(1.270)	(-1.932)	(0.053)	(0.598)	(0.560)	(-1.824)	(-0.702)	(-0.015)
Tight Labor Market Dummy	-0.057				-0.067			
	(-1.041)				(-1.191)			
General Ability Index × *Tight Labor Market Dummy*	0.079**				0.099**			
	(2.046)				(2.487)			
Low Local Beta Dummy		-0.033				-0.109		
		(-0.338)				(-1.064)		
General Ability Index × *Low Local Beta Dummy*		0.292***				0.276***		
		(3.376)				(2.999)		
Number of Firms MSA-Industry			0.115***				0.132***	
			(3.359)				(3.695)	
General Ability Index × *Number of Firms MSA-Industry*			0.043*				0.055*	
			(1.649)				(1.947)	
Fraction MSA-Industry				0.919**				1.058***
				(2.455)				(2.736)
General Ability Index × *Fraction MSA-Industry*				0.696*				0.834**
				(1.721)				(2.016)
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry-year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	8,297	8,297	8,109	8,109	8,297	8,297	8,109	8,109
R-squared	0.509	0.511	0.514	0.511	0.478	0.480	0.485	0.481

Table 7
Technological Proximity

This table presents estimates of OLS regressions and event fixed effects regressions of *Technological Proximity* (P_{ijt}) around the year of the CEO's appointment to a board seat at another firm. *Post Dummy* is a dummy variable that takes a value of one in the year of the CEO's appointment and thereafter, and zero otherwise. The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which the chief executive officer (CEO) has at least three years of tenure and profile data available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 in the Appendix. Robust *t*-statistics adjusted for firm-level clustering are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicates significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

Window (years)	(-3, 1)	(-3, 2)	(-3, 3)	(-3, 4)	(-3, 5)
Panel A: OLS					
Post Dummy	0.011**	0.012**	0.011**	0.011**	0.010*
	(2.124)	(2.425)	(2.172)	(2.024)	(1.765)
Constant	0.056***	0.062***	0.065***	0.064***	0.068***
	(2.865)	(2.992)	(2.993)	(2.938)	(2.993)
Number of observations	4,882	5,719	6,430	7,009	7,448
R-squared	0.011	0.011	0.011	0.011	0.012
Panel B: Event Fixed Effects					
Post Dummy	0.009*	0.011**	0.010*	0.009*	0.009
	(1.667)	(1.996)	(1.826)	(1.755)	(1.604)
Number of observations	4,882	5,719	6,430	7,009	7,448
R-squared	0.806	0.793	0.781	0.776	0.770

Table 8
Instrumental Variables

This table presents estimates of instrumental variables methods using two-stage least squares (2SLS) panel regressions of the log of one plus number of patents (*Patents*) and log of one plus number of citations adjusted for truncation bias (*Citations*). In Panel A, *Non-Compete Enforcement Index* is the average Garmaise (2009) non-compete agreement enforcement index at the state-year level across all positions the CEO has had in publicly traded firms. In Panel B, *Non-Compete Enforcement Index* is the Garmaise (2009) non-compete agreement enforcement index at the state-year level for the first position the CEO has had in publicly traded firms. The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which the chief executive officer (CEO) has at least three years of tenure and profile data available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 in the Appendix. Robust *t*-statistics adjusted for firm-level clustering are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicates significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

	First Stage	Second Stage	
	General Ability Index	Log(1+*Patents*)	Log(1+*Citations*)
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Panel A: Instrument based on All Past Positions			
General Ability Index		1.070***	0.757**
		(3.522)	(2.505)
Non-Compete Enforcement Index	0.080***		
	(5.100)		
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry-year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Firm fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	6,419	6,419	6,419
F-statistic of instrument	26.02		
Panel B: Instrument based on First Position			
General Ability Index		0.664***	0.658***
		(4.996)	(4.448)
Non-Compete Enforcement Index	0.110***		
	(10.200)		
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry-year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Firm fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	6,524	6,524	6,524
F-statistic of instrument	104.04		

Table 9
Patent Grant Announcement Abnormal Returns and General Managerial Ability

This table shows mean and median cumulative abnormal returns (*CAR*) in percentage around the patent grant date announcement using a three-day event window (-1, 1) for the sample of generalist CEOs (those with *General Ability Index* above the yearly median) and specialist CEOs (those with *General Ability Index* below the median in each year). Abnormal returns are estimated using market-adjusted returns or a market model (CRSP value-weighted index is the benchmark) with coefficients estimated using a 260 trading days estimation window (-270, -11). The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which the chief executive officer (CEO) has at least three years of tenure and profile data available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. *p*-values of test of difference in means and Pearson chi-square of test of difference in medians are reported at the bottom of the table. *t*-statistics and Wilcoxon signed-rank test statistics are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicates significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

	Market-Adjusted Returns		Market Model		Number of
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Observations
Generalist CEOs	0.165	0.115	0.074	0.028	143,972
	(14.104)	(17.713)	(6.479)	(5.515)	
Specialist CEOs	0.104	-0.036	-0.001	-0.096	71,386
	(5.612)	(-4.581)	(-0.049)	(-1.183)	
Difference	0.061	0.151	0.075	0.124	
p-value	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000	

Appendix

Table A.1
Variable Definitions

Variable	Description
	Panel A: Innovation Measures
Patents	Number of patent applications by a firm in a given year (NBER patent database).
Citations	Total number of citations received by the patents that a firm applied for in a given year; each patent citation count is adjusted by the average citation count of all patents in the same two-digit technological class and year (NBER patent database).
Originality Index	One minus the Herfindahl index of the citations made by the patents that a firm applied for in a given year across two-digit technological classes (NBER patent database).
Generality Index	One minus the Herfindahl index of the citations received by the patents that a firm applied for in a given year across two-digit technological classes (NBER patent database).
Exploitative Ratio	Number of exploitative patents filed in a given year divided by the number of all patents filed by the firm in the same year; a patent is classified as exploitative if at least 60% of its citations are based on current knowledge (NBER patent database).
Exploratory Ratio	Number of exploratory patents filed in a given year divided by the number of all patents filed by the firm in the same year; a patent is classified as exploratory if at least 60% of its citations are based on new knowledge (NBER patent database).
Acquired Patents	Number of patents acquired through mergers, acquisitions, and reorganizations by a firm in a given year, defined as patents filed by the target firm in the previous five years prior to the event (NBER patent database).
Technological Proximity	Technological proximity between the patents filed in year *t* and the patents filed by another firm in which the CEO has a board seat during his tenure at these firms: $$P_{ijt} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} f_{ikt} f_{jkt} / \left(\sum_{k=1}^{K} f_{ikt}^2 \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{K} f_{jkt}^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$ where f_{ikt} is the fraction of firms *i*'s patents that belong to patent class *k* at time *t* and f_{jkt} is the fraction of patents filed by the firm in which the CEO has a contemporaneous board seat that belong to patent class *k*.
	Panel B: CEO Characteristics
General Ability Index	First factor of applying principal components analysis to five proxies of general managerial ability: past *Number of Positions*, *Number of Firms*, *Number of Industries*, *CEO Experience Dummy*, and *Conglomerate Experience Dummy* (BoardEx).
Non-Compete Enforcement Index	Average non-compete agreement enforcement index (Garmaise (2009)) at the state-year level across all positions the CEO has had in publicly traded firms or, in alternative, the index of the state and year of the first position of the CEO's career.
	Panel C: Firm Characteristics
Sales	Sales in millions of dollars (Compustat SALE).

Table A.1: continued

Variable	Description
Tobin's Q	Assets plus market value of equity minus book value of equity divided by assets (Compustat (AT + CSHO × PRCC_F - CEQ) / AT)).
PPE	Net property, plant and equipment divided by total assets (PPENT / AT).
CAPEX	Capital expenditures divided by total assets (CAPX / AT).
Leverage	Total debt, defined as long-term debt plus debt in current liabilities, divided by total assets (Compustat (DLC + DLTT) / AT).
Family Firm Dummy	Dummy variable that takes a value of one if the firm is family owned, and zero otherwise (Anderson and Reeb (2003) and http://www.ronandersonprofessionalpage.net/data-sets.html).
Tight Labor Market Dummy	Dummy variable that takes a value of one if the unemployment rate for a year in the MSA is less than the median unemployment rate for the MSA over the full sample period (Bureau of Labor Statistics).
Low Local Beta Dummy	Dummy variable that takes a value of one if the beta of a stock return on the return of the stock's corresponding MSA index is below the top decile of the distribution; local beta is estimated using a time series regression of monthly stock return on the return of the stock's corresponding MSA index (excluding the particular stock) as well as the return on the market portfolio and the stock's industry return (Fama-French 48 industry classification) over two different periods, 1993–1997 and 1998–2003, such that at least 24 non-missing monthly return observations for a stock and five stocks in the MSA enter the regression; returns are in excess of monthly T-bill rates (CRSP).
Number of Firms MSA-Industry	Number of other firms in the firm's industry (two-digit SIC) that are also located in the firm's MSA (Compustat).
Fraction MSA-Industry	Fraction of all firms in the MSA that are in the firm's industry (two-digit SIC) (Compustat).

Internet Appendix for
"Do General Managerial Skills Spur Innovation?"

Cláudia Custódio
Imperial College Business School

Miguel A. Ferreira
Nova School of Business and Economics, ECGI

Pedro Matos
University of Virginia – Darden School of Business, ECGI

1. Robustness checks

This Internet Appendix presents the results of several robustness checks of our primary findings. We first present models using alternative measures of innovation. Although we focus on direct measures of innovation, we also examine the relation between stock return volatility and *GAI*. We run regressions similar to that in column (1) of Table 3 in which the dependent variable is the standard deviation of monthly stock returns, which captures firms' risk-taking. Column (1) of Table IA.1 shows that *GAI* is also associated with significant increases in stock return volatility. This evidence supports the interpretation that innovation is a risky activity.

We also examine whether firms run by generalist CEOs invest more in innovation activities, as measured by R&D expenditures, which is an input-oriented measure of innovation. We use the ratio of R&D expenditures to the book value of assets (*R&D/Assets*). Column (2) of Table IA.1 shows that *R&D* is positively and significantly associated with the general ability of the CEO. A one standard deviation in *GAI* is associated with a 0.4 percentage point higher *R&D*, which represents 10% of the average *R&D* (3.8%). Additionally, column (3) shows that *GAI* is associated with significant increases in the dollar amount of R&D expenditures at about 12%.

An alternative measure of innovation productivity is total factor productivity (TFP). We estimate a firm-level regression in which the dependent variable is the logarithm of *Sales*, and the explanatory variables are *GAI* and the logarithms of *Labor* (as proxied by number of employees) and *Capital* (as proxied by net property, plant, and equipment). Table IA.2 shows that *GAI* is positively associated with TFP. A one standard deviation increase in *GAI* is associated with a 4% to 7% increase in TFP.

Table IA.3 shows robustness tests of our instrumental variable estimator. A potential concern is that generalist CEOs are more likely to have worked in innovative industries in the past in

which they have acquired the ability to innovate. To address this concern we run the instrumental variable estimates in Table 8, Panel A, controlling for the past experience of the CEO in innovative industries (*Innovative Industry Experience Dummy*). Panel A of Table IA.3 shows that the results are robust to including this additional control. Panel B shows that the results are also robust when we define the instrument based solely on executive past positions.

The enforceability of non-compete clauses (our instrument for *GAI*) is harder across states and typically has limited geographic scope. The idea is that the contract might not have been enforced if the executive deliberately moved to another state in order to take a job in a competing firm. To address this problem, we estimate the instrumental variables regression in Table 8, Panel A, using a sample that excludes executives who moved to another state but stayed in the same industry at some point in their professional careers. Panel C of Table IA.3 shows that the results remain consistent with a positive relation between innovation and *GAI*. The results (untabulated) are also robust when we use the *Non-Compete Enforcement Index* of the current firm as opposed to the employment history of the CEO as a source of exogenous variation in the decision to appoint a generalist CEO. The tradeoff here is that the exclusion restriction is more likely to be violated in this setting.

Garmaise (2009) uses the interaction of the *Non-Compete Enforcement Index* with the level of in-state competition because the effect should be more pronounced when a firm is exposed to more intense in-state competition. In the case of considerable in-state competition, a high *Non-Compete Enforcement Index* will substantially reduce the probability that an executive will leave the firm and join a competitor. The limitation of using the interaction of the *Non-Compete Enforcement Index* with the level of in-state competition as instrument has to do with a possible violation of the exclusion restriction because the level of in-state competition is likely to be

related to innovation through channels other than the generality of human capital. However, we continue to obtain similar estimates (untabulated) when we use this alternative instrument.

Another concern we address is that generalist CEOs file more patents and have more citations simply because they spend more on R&D. Table IA.4 presents estimates of regressions using *Patents* and *Citations* as dependent variables that control for the level of R&D expenditures using *R&D*/Assets in columns (1) and (3) and *R&D Stock* in columns (2) and (4).[1] We run regressions similar to those in column (1) of Table 3 and column (1) of Table 4, which includes industry-year fixed-effects. When we control for *R&D/Assets* or *R&D Stock*, we still find economically and statistically significant *GAI* coefficients across all specifications. Therefore, the relation between innovation and *GAI* is not explained by generalists spending more on R&D. This suggests that the primary effect of general managerial skills is to enhance the quality and the productivity of R&D rather than to simply stimulate more R&D.

Table IA.5 presents estimates of regressions using *Patents* and *Citations* as dependent variables using additional firm and CEO-level controls. We further control for firm characteristics (*Stock Return*, *ROA*, *Firm Age*, *Institutional Ownership*, *Herfindahl Index*, *Governance Index*). Columns (1) and (3) show that the results remain similar when we include these additional firm-level (time varying) control variables.

We further control for additional CEO characteristics (*CEO Tenure*, *CEO Age*, *External Hire Dummy*, *CEO-Chair Dummy*, *MBA Dummy*). Coles, Daniel, and Naveen (2006) show that CEO incentives matter for firm risk taking. Therefore, we also include controls that take into account CEO incentives: *CEO Delta*, defined as the dollar change in a CEO's stock and option portfolio

[1] Following Hall, Jaffe, and Trajtenberg (2005), *R&D Stock* is defined as $G_t = R_t + (1 - \delta)\, G_{t-1}$ where R is the R&D expenditure in year t and $\delta = 0.15$, the private depreciation rate of knowledge. Firm-years with missing R&D information are assigned a zero value.

for a 1% change in stock price, measures the CEO's incentives to increases in stock price. *CEO Vega*, defined as the dollar change in a CEO's option holdings for a 0.01 change in standard deviation of returns, measures the risk-taking incentives generated by the CEO's option holdings. We calculate *CEO Delta* and *CEO Vega* values using the one-year approximation method of Core and Guay (2002).

Hirshleifer, Low, and Teoh (2012) show that overconfident CEOs invest more in innovation, so we include a measure of CEO overconfidence as additional explanatory variable. The overconfidence measure (*CEO Confidence Options*) uses data on option compensation following Malmendier and Tate (2005). This variable takes a value of one if a CEO postpones the exercise of vested options that are at least 67% in the money, and zero otherwise. The intuition is that it is optimal for risk-averse and undiversified executives to exercise their own-firm stock options early if an option is sufficiently in the money (Hall and Murphy (2002)).[2] We also control for CEO outside (school, social, and past professional) connections using the *CEO Rolodex* measure of Engelberg, Gao, and Parsons (2013).[3]

Columns (2) and (4) show that the results are similar when we include these additional CEO-level control variables. In particular, the results show that differences in CEO pay contracts do not explain the effect of general human capital on innovation. We also conclude that overconfidence of CEOs and their general managerial ability are different mechanisms by which CEOs foster innovation.

To further address the endogenous matching concerns, we use propensity score matching to compare firms run by generalist CEOs (treatment group) with firms run by specialist CEOs

[2] We thank David Hirshleifer, Angie Low, and Siew Hong Teoh for sharing data on proxies of CEO overconfidence. Additionally, we obtain similar findings using alternative measures of CEO overconfidence that rely on keyword searches of the text of press articles in Factiva, following Malmendier and Tate (2008).

[3] We thank Joseph Engelberg, Pengjie Gao, and Christopher Parsons for sharing data on CEO connections.

(control group) with virtually no observable differences in firm and CEO characteristics. A generalist (specialist) CEO is defined as a CEO with a *GAI* above (below) the yearly median. We construct the control group of specialist CEOs using the nearest-neighbor method with scores given by a probit regression model of a dummy variable that takes a value of one for generalist CEOs and zero for specialist CEOs.

Panel A of Table IA.6 reports estimates of the probit regression. CEOs with more accumulated general human capital tend to be older, to be hired from outside the firm, to hold a master of business administration (MBA) degree, and to have a shorter tenure than specialist CEOs. As expected, we find that firms with generalist CEOs are bigger. Panel B compares means of covariates between treated and control groups. There are no statistically significant differences at the 5% level with the exception of *MBA dummy* (the difference in frequency is 3 percentage points). We conclude the treatment and control matched samples do not differ in terms of the observable covariates. Panel C of Table IA.6 reports the average treatment effect (*ATT*) estimates, which are consistent with those obtained using panel regressions in Tables 3 and 4. Firms with generalist CEOs produce 17% more patents, which subsequently generate 15% more citations than firms with specialist CEOs. The propensity score matching results indicate that the potential assignment of generalist CEOs to more innovative firms (at least based on observable firm and CEO characteristics) does not explain our main findings.

We then perform robustness checks related to the models of patent and citation counts. Hall, Jaffe, and Trajtenberg (2001) recommend using count-based models such as negative binomial and Poisson as alternatives to the OLS regression model. In the negative binomial and Poisson regressions in Table IA.7, columns (1) and (2), the dependent variable is *Patents*. The estimates confirm that *GAI* has an effect on patent counts of about 20%.

Although we exclude firms operating in four-digit SIC industries with no patents, there are many firm-years with zero patents. To see if the results are driven by the jump from zero patents to at least one patent, we rerun the tests using the logarithm of the number of patents as dependent variable and therefore deleting observations with zero patents. The estimate in Table IA.7, column (3), is similar to our main results on *Patents*.

In Section 2.1, we use Louis Gerstner, CEO/Chairman of IBM over the 1993–2002 period, as an example of a generalist CEO. To address the concern that IBM is an outlier with an unusually high number of filed patents per year and run by a generalist in the top 1% of *GAI*, we drop this firm from our sample. The point estimate in column (4) of Table IA.7 is 0.094, which is similar to previous estimates.

Table IA.8 presents robustness checks of the citation counts regressions. In negative binomial and Poisson regressions, columns (1) and (2), the dependent variable is *Citations*. The estimates confirm that *GAI* has an effect between 16% and 17% on citation counts. We also run the tests using the logarithm of *Citations* as dependent variable (i.e., excluding observations with zero citations). The estimate in column (3) remains positive and statistically significant. A possible interpretation of the patent citation results is that firms with generalist CEOs simply have more citations because they file more patents. We address this concern using measures of citations per patent, which assess innovation success on a per-patent basis. In another test, we exclude self-citations at the firm level when calculating citation counts. The results in Table IA.8, columns (4) and (5), excluding self-citations and using per patent measures of innovation, respectively, remain similar. Column (6) presents estimates using raw citation counts as dependent variable, rather than adjusted citation counts. Column (7) presents estimates using an alternative method to adjust citation counts for truncation bias, which consists of multiplying each patent's citation

count by a weighting index in Hall, Jaffe, and Trajtenberg (2001, 2005). The estimates confirm the main findings, and indicate that *GAI* has an effect on citation counts between 13% and 18%. Column (8) shows that the results are also robust to excluding IBM from the sample.

We run our regressions in Tables 3 and 4 using different sample periods: an extended sample (1993–2007), and pre- and post-SOX subsamples (1993–2002 and 2003–2007). A specific concern with the sample is that BoardEx coverage of Execucomp firms is better in the 2000s than in the 1990s. The BoardEx coverage of Execucomp firms is about 80% in the 1993–1999 period, and the coverage is above 90% in the 2000–2003 period. We extend the patents and citations data through 2007 with the data set used in Kogan, Papanikolaou, Seru, and Stoffman (2015).[4] Table IA.9 shows that our results are robust to these alternative sample periods.

There are two distinct interpretations of the results. One is that general skills encourage managers to undertake risky endeavors such as innovation because they have more outside options should they fail. The other is that firms with promising opportunities for innovative projects appoint CEOs with general skills. In our main tests, we restrict the sample to CEOs with at least three years of tenure for which the effect of endogenous matching is likely to be less important. We now check whether results are robust to imposing a tenure cutoff from zero (i.e. the full sample of CEO-years) to five years. Table IA.10 summarizes the results. The *GAI* coefficient continues to be positively related to patent and citation measures with a similar magnitude, regardless of the tenure cutoff. These findings suggest that the relation between *GAI* and innovation is not primarily driven by the innovative firms' endogenous selection of managers with general skills.

[4] The data on patents and citations are drawn from https://iu.app.box.com/v/patents.

One potential concern with the interpretation of the results is that generalist CEOs might be matched to firms in more innovative industries. To further address this concern, we split our sample into innovative industries (with median *Citations* for the industry in a given year above the median across industries, using two-digit SIC codes) and non-innovative industries (with median *Citations* for the industry in a given year below the median across industries). Columns (1) and (2) of Table IA.11 shows that the positive relation between innovation and general managerial skills holds both for innovative and non-innovative industries in the case of *Patents*. Columns (3) and (4) show that the effect of *GAI* on *Citations* is actually stronger in non-innovative industries than in innovative industries. These findings support the idea that the effect of generalist skills on innovation does not come solely from the matching by which firms in industries with greater opportunities for innovation hire generalist CEOs.[5]

In fact, matching is unlikely to explain the positive relation between innovation and *GAI* in industries that have fewer opportunities for innovation. The choice of a CEO takes into account multiple CEO characteristics and not only the generality of his human capital. In this sense it is difficult for the firms to optimize along all these dimensions at the same time. Therefore, we expect more firms in the subsample of non-innovative industries to be out of equilibrium when it comes to level of innovation and *GAI*. This helps us to identify the effect of *GAI*.

We also perform robustness checks related to the construction of *GAI*. We use a dummy variable that takes a value of one for generalist CEOs (i.e., CEOs with a *GAI* above the median in a given year) instead of a continuous variable. Results (untabulated) show that generalist CEOs produce 17% more patents and 14% more citations than specialist CEOs. Finally, separate regressions run for each individual component of *GAI* in Table IA.12 show that all individual

[5] These tests also show that our results hold even in the sample of tech firms, which tend to be innovative and run by specialists CEOs.

components are positively associated with innovation except past experience as CEO.

Table IA.13 presents the results of event-study regressions of *Technological Proximity* around the year of the CEO's appointment to a board seat at another firm separately for the sample of generalist CEOs and the sample of specialist CEOs. We test the hypothesis that generalist CEOs are bringing new knowledge from other board positions. Note that the specialist CEOs might also bring ideas from his other experience into the current job at the same rate, but since the generalist has more breadth of experience, this might still translate into more ideas and innovation. The estimates are consistent with those in Table 7 and indicate a higher technological proximity between firms following a CEO appointment to a board position at another firm. The magnitude of the estimates is similar between samples but the effects are more precisely estimated in the sample of generalist CEOs.

Finally, we also consider alternative explanations of a positive relation between innovation and *GAI*. A possibility is that generalist CEOs are exposed to lower risk of termination following poor firm performance, which could explain why they promote innovative opportunities. It is also possible that specialist CEOs might be less sensitive to poor performance as firms have fewer options available in the executive marketplace to replace them. To address these possibilities, we estimate probit regressions (untabulated) in which the dependent variable is a dummy that takes a value of one if there is a CEO turnover in a given firm-year. We use two alternative samples: all turnovers and forced turnovers. The explanatory variables of interest are interactions between past firm accounting and stock performance (*ROA* and *Stock Return*) and *GAI*. We find a positive relation between *GAI* and CEO turnover, but the relation does not seem to be triggered by poor firm performance. We find no difference in the sensitivity of CEO turnover to prior firm performance between generalist and specialist CEOs. The interaction term between *GAI* and firm performance is not statistically significant in any of the specifications.

References

Core, J., and W. Guay, 2002, Estimating the value of employee stock option portfolios and their sensitivities to price and volatility, *Journal of Accounting Research* 40, 613-630.

Hall, B., and K. Murphy, 2002, Stock options for undiversified executives, *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 33, 3-42.

Malmendier, U., and G. Tate, 2008, Who makes acquisitions? CEO overconfidence and the market's reaction, *Journal of Financial Economics* 89, 20-43.

Table IA.1
Alternative Measures of Innovation

This table presents estimates of OLS panel regressions of the standard deviation of returns (*Volatility*), ratio of R&D expenditures to assets (*R&D/Assets*), and the log of one plus R&D expenditures in dollars (*R&D*). The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which the chief executive officer (CEO) has at least three years of tenure and profile data available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 and Table IA.14 in the Internet Appendix. Robust *t*-statistics adjusted for firm-level clustering are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicates significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

	Volatility	*R&D/Assets*	Log(1+*R&D*)
	(1)	(2)	(3)
General Ability Index	0.002*	0.004***	0.115***
	(1.821)	(3.068)	(2.584)
Log(*Sales*)	-0.016***	-0.009***	0.519***
	(-20.878)	(-8.430)	(14.452)
Log(*Capital*/*Labor*)	0.004***	0.007***	0.392***
	(2.891)	(3.498)	(5.835)
Tobin's Q	0.003***	0.007***	0.201***
	(3.603)	(7.499)	(8.026)
PPE	-0.006**	-0.001	-0.141
	(-2.073)	(-0.298)	(-0.892)
Leverage	0.018**	-0.030***	-0.967***
	(2.492)	(-3.387)	(-3.538)
CAPEX	-0.012	-0.038*	-2.295***
	(-0.545)	(-1.751)	(-2.831)
Family Firm Dummy	-0.008***	-0.012***	-0.283***
	(-3.258)	(-4.737)	(-3.053)
Industry-year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	10,165	8,297	8,297
R-squared	0.465	0.451	0.614

Table IA.2
Total Factor Productivity

This table presents estimates of OLS panel regressions of the log of total sales (*Sales*). The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which the chief executive officer (CEO) has at least three years of tenure and profile data available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 and Table IA.14 in the Internet Appendix. Robust *t*-statistics adjusted for firm-level clustering are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicates significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

	(1)	(2)	(3)
General Ability Index	0.071***	0.050***	0.036**
	(3.400)	(2.761)	(1.970)
Log(*Labor*)	0.877***	0.599***	0.586***
	(52.180)	(25.411)	(25.055)
Log(*Capital*)		0.303***	0.278***
		(14.414)	(13.401)
Log(*R&D Stock*)			0.065***
			(8.311)
Industry-year fixed-effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	8,419	8,419	8,419
R-squared	0.821	0.853	0.858

Table IA.3
Instrumental Variables: Robustness

This table presents estimates of instrumental variables methods using two-stage least squares (2SLS) panel regressions of the log of one plus number of patents (*Patents*) and log of one plus number of citations adjusted for truncation bias (*Citations*). In Panel A, *Non-Compete Enforcement Index* is the average Garmaise (2009) non-compete agreement enforcement index at the state-year level across all positions the CEO has had in publicly traded firms. In Panel B, *Non-Compete Enforcement Index* is the average Garmaise (2009) non-compete agreement enforcement index at the state-year level across all executive positions the CEO has had in publicly traded firms. In Panel C, executives that moved state within the same industry are excluded. The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which the chief executive officer (CEO) has at least three years of tenure and profile data available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 and Table IA.14 in the Internet Appendix. Robust *t*-statistics adjusted for firm-level clustering are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicates significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

	First Stage	Second Stage:	
	General Ability Index	Log(1+*Patents*)	Log(1+*Citations*)
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Panel A: Control for Innovative Industry Experience			
General Ability Index		0.853***	0.632***
		(3.824)	(2.703)
Non-Compete Enforcement Index	0.101***		
	(6.490)		
Innovative Industry Experience Dummy	0.327***	-0.277***	-0.160*
	(13.320)	(-3.560)	(-1.956)
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry-year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Firm fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	6,419	6,419	6,419
F-statistic of instrument	42.11		
Panel B: Instrument based on Past Executive Positions			
General Ability Index		1.537***	0.888**
		(3.225)	(2.166)
Non-Compete Enforcement Index	0.088***		
	(3.870)		
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry-year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Firm fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	5,880	5,880	5,880
F-statistic of instrument	14.97		
Panel C: Sample Excluding Executives that Move State within Same Industry			
General Ability Index		1.539***	0.897**
		(3.266)	(2.207)
Non-Compete Enforcement Index	0.089***		
	(3.920)		
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry-year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Firm fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	5,880	5,880	5,880
F-statistic of instrument	15.35		

Table IA.4
Innovation Productivity

This table presents estimates of OLS panel regressions of the log of one plus number of patents (*Patents*) and log of one plus number of citations adjusted for truncation bias (*Citations*). The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which the chief executive officer (CEO) has at least three years of tenure and profile data available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 and Table IA.14 in the Internet Appendix. Robust *t*-statistics adjusted for firm-level clustering are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicates significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

	Log(1+*Patents*)		Log(1+*Citations*)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
General Ability Index	0.070**	0.070**	0.062*	0.061*
	(2.266)	(2.250)	(1.936)	(1.920)
R&D/Assets	8.193***		8.055***	
	(11.810)		(11.266)	
Log(*R&D Stock*)		2.958***		2.907***
		(10.206)		(9.880)
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry-year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	10,212	10,212	10,212	10,212
R-squared	0.547	0.548	0.512	0.513

Table IA.5
Additional Firm and CEO Controls

This table presents estimates of OLS panel regressions of the log of one plus number of patents (*Patents*) and log of one plus number of citations adjusted for truncation bias (*Citations*). The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which the chief executive officer (CEO) has at least three years of tenure and profile data available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 and Table IA.14 in the Internet Appendix. Robust *t*-statistics adjusted for firm-level clustering are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicates significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

	Log(1+*Patents*)		Log(1+*Citations*)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
General Ability Index	0.081**	0.074**	0.077**	0.065*
	(2.232)	(2.045)	(2.073)	(1.796)
Log(*Sales*)	0.545***	0.521***	0.545***	0.510***
	(14.214)	(13.729)	(13.551)	(12.954)
Log(*Capital*/*Labor*)	0.252***	0.165***	0.255***	0.175***
	(4.817)	(3.272)	(4.737)	(3.379)
Tobin's Q	0.215***	0.126***	0.217***	0.135***
	(7.328)	(5.714)	(6.875)	(5.723)
PPE	-0.090	0.196*	-0.110	0.159
	(-0.586)	(1.720)	(-0.657)	(1.335)
CAPEX	1.193	0.173	1.468*	0.601
	(1.446)	(0.266)	(1.731)	(0.892)
Leverage	-0.660***	-0.775***	-0.658***	-0.807***
	(-3.075)	(-3.884)	(-2.986)	(-4.057)
Family Firm Dummy	-0.209**	-0.066	-0.219***	-0.097
	(-2.554)	(-0.801)	(-2.640)	(-1.165)
Stock Return	-0.023		-0.022	
	(-0.680)		(-0.585)	
ROA	-2.097***		-1.913***	
	(-5.355)		(-4.782)	
Firm Age	0.010***		0.008***	
	(4.036)		(3.207)	
Institutional Ownership	-0.559***		-0.569***	
	(-2.897)		(-2.916)	
Herfindahl Index	-0.316		0.016	
	(-0.346)		(0.018)	
Governance Index	-0.014		-0.022	
	(-0.890)		(-1.350)	
CEO Tenure		0.001		-0.000
		(0.098)		(-0.059)
CEO Age		-0.008*		-0.009*
		(-1.676)		(-1.858)
External Hire Dummy		0.030		0.029
		(0.464)		(0.429)
CEO-Chair Dummy		-0.029		-0.049
		(-0.492)		(-0.814)
MBA Dummy		0.062		0.058
		(0.908)		(0.836)

Table IA.5: continued

	Log(1+*Patents*)		Log(1+*Citations*)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
CEO Delta		-0.022		-0.013
		(-0.734)		(-0.429)
CEO Vega		0.042**		0.038**
		(2.244)		(2.094)
CEO Confidence Options		-0.015		-0.011
		(-0.263)		(-0.184)
CEO Rolodex		0.001**		0.001*
		(2.475)		(1.801)
Industry-year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	7,154	8,001	7,154	8,001
R-squared	0.558	0.517	0.524	0.484

Table IA.6
Propensity Score Matching

This table presents estimates of difference in the log of one plus number of patents (*Patent*) and log of one plus number of citations adjusted for truncation bias (*Citation*) between the treatment group (generalist CEOs) and the control group (specialist CEOs). The matched sample is constructed using a nearest-neighbor propensity score match with scores given by a probit model in which the dependent variable (*General Ability Dummy*) is a dummy variable that takes a value of one if a CEO has a *General Ability Index* above the median in a given year. The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which the chief executive officer (CEO) has at least three years of tenure and profile data available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 and Table IA.14 in the Internet Appendix. Robust *t*-statistics adjusted for firm-level clustering are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicates significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

Panel A: Probit (*Generalist Ability Dummy*)	
CEO Tenure	-0.032***
	(-11.592)
CEO Age	0.029***
	(11.424)
External Hire Dummy	0.353***
	(9.530)
CEO-Chair Dummy	0.331***
	(8.595)
MBA Dummy	0.383***
	(10.454)
Log(*Sales*)	0.256***
	(16.441)
Log(*Capital*/*Labor*)	-0.045*
	(-1.826)
Tobin's Q	0.005
	(0.347)
PPE	-0.011
	(-0.181)
CAPEX	-0.043
	(-0.093)
Leverage	0.114
	(1.004)
Family Firm Dummy	-0.395***
	(-10.326)
Stock Return	-0.009
	(-0.262)
ROA	-1.087***
	(-5.159)
Firm Age	0.001
	(1.004)
Cash	0.454***
	(3.377)
Industry-year fixed effects	Yes
Number of observations	7,038

Table IA.6: continued

Panel B: Mean Differences in Covariates between Treated and Control				
	Treated	Control	Difference	*p*-value
CEO Tenure	8.690	8.530	0.160	0.273
CEO Age	57.229	57.482	-0.253	0.134
External Hire Dummy	0.392	0.398	-0.005	0.642
CEO-Chair Dummy	0.797	0.797	0.001	0.953
MBA Dummy	0.386	0.412	-0.027	0.023
Log(Sales)	7.492	7.406	0.086	0.122
Log(Capital/Labor)	3.869	3.860	0.008	0.760
Tobin's Q	2.182	2.146	0.036	0.324
PPE	0.361	0.361	0.000	0.976
CAPEX	0.060	0.061	-0.002	0.157
Leverage	0.234	0.227	0.008	0.059
Family Firm Dummy	0.208	0.194	0.014	0.143
Stock Return	0.167	0.166	0.001	0.929
ROA	0.143	0.140	0.003	0.157
Firm Age	27.138	26.283	0.855	0.096
Cash	0.128	0.132	-0.005	0.256

Panel C: Average Treatment Effect on the Treated	
Log(1+*Patents*)	Log(1+*Citations*)
(1)	(2)
0.169***	0.147***
(2.370)	(2.040)

Table IA.7
Patent Counts: Robustness

This table presents estimates of panel regressions of the number of patents (*Patents*). Column (1) presents estimates of negative binomial regressions. Column (2) presents estimates of Poisson regressions. Column (3) presents estimates of a sample that excludes observations with zero patents. Column (4) excludes IBM from the sample. The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which the chief executive officer (CEO) has at least three years of tenure and profile data available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 and Table IA.14 in the Internet Appendix. Robust *t*-statistics adjusted for firm-level clustering are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicates significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

Dependent variable	Negative Binomial *Patents* (1)	Poisson *Patents* (2)	Exclude zeros Log(*Patents*) (3)	Exclude IBM *Patents* (4)
General Ability Index	0.200***	0.202***	0.089***	0.094***
	(3.460)	(7.220)	(3.709)	(2.654)
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry-year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	8,297	8,297	4,277	8,290
R-squared			0.519	0.508

Table IA.8
Patent Citations: Robustness

This table presents estimates of panel regressions of the number of citations adjusted for truncation bias (*Citations*). Column (1) presents estimates of negative binomial regressions. Column (2) presents estimates of Poisson regressions. Column (3) presents estimates of a sample that excludes observations with zero citations. Column (4) presents estimates of regressions of the number of citations excluding self-citations. Column (5) presents estimates of regressions of the number of citations per patent. Columns (6) and (7) present estimates of regressions of raw citation counts and adjusted citation counts using weighting index in Hall, Jaffe, and Trajtenberg (2001, 2005). Column (8) excludes IBM from the sample. The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which the chief executive officer (CEO) has at least three years of tenure and profile data available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 and Table IA.14 in the Internet Appendix. Robust *t*-statistics adjusted for firm-level clustering are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicates significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

Dependent variable	Negative Binomial *Citations*	Poisson *Citations*	Exclude Zeros Log(*Citations*)	Exclude Self-Citations Log(1+*Citations*)	Citations per Patent Log(1+*Citations*)	Raw Citations Log(1+*Citations*)	Adjusted Citations Log(1+*Citations*)	Exclude IBM Log(1+*Citations*)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
General Ability Index	0.168***	0.161***	0.076***	0.127***	0.019**	0.134***	0.175***	0.078**
	(2.819)	(5.043)	(3.021)	(2.782)	(2.412)	(2.794)	(3.084)	(2.145)
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry-year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	8,297	8,297	4,824	8,297	8,297	8,297	8,297	8,290
R-squared			0.447	0.507	0.269	0.501	0.472	0.472

Table IA.9
Extended Samples

This table presents estimates of OLS panel regressions of the log of one plus number of patents (*Patents*) and log of one plus number of citations adjusted for truncation bias (*Citations*). The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which chief executive officer (CEO) profile data are available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2007 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which chief executive officer (CEO) profile data are available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 and Table IA.14 in the Internet Appendix. Robust *t*-statistics adjusted for firm-level clustering are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicates significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

	Log(1+*Patents*)			Log(1+*Citations*)		
Sample period	1993–2007	1993–2002	2003–2007	1993–2007	1993–2002	2003–2007
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
General Ability Index	0.127***	0.138***	0.100**	0.168***	0.218***	0.081*
	(3.705)	(3.370)	(2.312)	(3.622)	(3.632)	(1.687)
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry-year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	12,451	7,670	4,781	12,451	7,670	4,781
R-squared	0.420	0.495	0.326	0.473	0.503	0.338

Table IA.10
Sample with Alternative CEO Tenure Cutoffs

This table presents estimates of OLS panel regressions of the log of one plus number of patents (*Patents*) and log of one plus number of citations adjusted for truncation bias (*Citations*). The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which chief executive officer (CEO) profile data are available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which chief executive officer (CEO) profile data are available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 and Table IA.14 in the Internet Appendix. Robust *t*-statistics adjusted for firm-level clustering are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicates significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

	Log(1+*Patents*)			Log(1+*Citations*)		
	All CEOs	CEO Tenure > 3 years	CEO Tenure > 4 years	All CEOs	CEO Tenure > 3 years	CEO Tenure > 4 years
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
General Ability Index	0.102***	0.105***	0.105**	0.093***	0.084**	0.080*
	(3.047)	(2.622)	(2.425)	(2.724)	(2.061)	(1.827)
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry-year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	10,212	7,280	6,385	10,212	7,280	6,385
R-squared	0.503	0.511	0.517	0.470	0.481	0.489

Table IA.11
Innovative versus Non-Innovative Industries

This table presents estimates of OLS panel regressions of the log of one plus number of patents (*Patents*) and log of one plus number of citations adjusted for truncation bias (*Citations*). The innovative industries group includes firms in industries (two-digit SIC) with above median *Citations* in a given year and the non-innovative industries group includes firms in industries with below median *Citations* in a given year. The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which the chief executive officer (CEO) has at least three years of tenure and profile data available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 and Table IA.14 in the Internet Appendix. Robust *t*-statistics adjusted for firm-level clustering are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicates significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

	Log (1+*Patents*)		Log (1+C*itations*)	
	Innovative Industries	Non-Innovative Industries	Innovative Industries	Non-Innovative Industries
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
General Ability Index	0.103*	0.117***	0.088	0.101**
	(1.877)	(2.785)	(1.531)	(2.425)
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry-year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	3,885	4,412	3,885	4,412
R-squared	0.449	0.338	0.433	0.290

Table IA.12
General Managerial Ability Components

This table presents estimates of OLS panel regressions of the log of one plus number of patents (*Patents*). The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which the chief executive officer (CEO) has at least three years of tenure and profile data available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 and Table IA.14 in the Internet Appendix. Robust *t*-statistics adjusted for firm-level clustering are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicates significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Number of Positions	0.051***				
	(4.830)				
Number of Firms		0.051***			
		(2.757)			
Number of Industries			0.045**		
			(2.232)		
Conglomerate Experience Dummy				0.125*	
				(1.866)	
CEO Experience Dummy					-0.046
					(-0.719)
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry-year fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of observations	10,212	10,212	10,212	10,212	10,212
R-squared	0.507	0.503	0.502	0.501	0.500

Table IA.13
Technological Proximity and General Ability

This table presents estimates of event fixed effects regressions of *Technological Proximity* (P_{ijt}) around the year of the CEO's appointment to a board seat at another firm. *Post Dummy* is a dummy variable that takes a value of one in the year of the CEO's appointment and thereafter, and zero otherwise. Panel A presents the estimates for the sample of generalist CEOs (those with *General Ability Index* above the median) and Panel B presents the estimates for the sample of specialist CEOs (those with *General Ability Index* below the median). The sample consists of EXECUCOMP firms for which the chief executive officer (CEO) has at least three years of tenure and profile data available from BoardEx and patent data are available from the NBER database in the 1993–2003 period. Firms that operate in four-digit SIC industries without any filed patent in the sample period are excluded. Financial, transportation and utility firms are omitted. Variable definitions are provided in Table A.1 in the Appendix. Robust *t*-statistics adjusted for firm-level clustering are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicates significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% levels respectively.

Window (years)	(-3, 1)	(-3, 2)	(-3, 3)	(-3, 4)	(-3, 5)
Panel A: Sample of Generalist CEOs					
Post Dummy	0.011	0.012*	0.011*	0.011*	0.010
	(1.579)	(1.884)	(1.732)	(1.672)	(1.571)
Number of observations	3,336	3,967	4,476	4,885	5,179
R-squared	0.854	0.836	0.824	0.817	0.812
Panel B: Sample of Specialist CEOs					
Post Dummy	0.012	0.009	0.009	0.013	0.015
	(0.567)	(0.441)	(0.406)	(0.601)	(0.722)
Number of observations	1,194	1,372	1,544	1,692	1,822
R-squared	0.819	0.801	0.792	0.785	0.776

Table IA.14
Variable Definitions

Variable	Description
	Panel A: CEO Characteristics
General Ability Index Dummy	Dummy variable that takes a value of one if the CEO's general ability index is above the yearly median, and zero otherwise (BoardEx).
Number of Positions	Number of positions CEO has held in publicly traded firms (BoardEx).
Number of Firms	Number of firms CEO has worked in publicly traded firms (BoardEx).
Number of Industries	Number of industries (four-digit SIC) in which CEO has worked in publicly traded firms (BoardEx).
CEO Experience Dummy	Dummy variable that takes a value of one if CEO held a CEO position at another publicly traded firm, and zero otherwise (BoardEx).
Conglomerate Experience Dummy	Dummy variable that takes a value of one if CEO worked at a multi-segment publicly traded firm, and zero otherwise (BoardEx).
CEO Experience Dummy	Dummy variable that takes a value of one if CEO worked in innovative industries, and zero otherwise (BoardEx).
CEO Tenure	Number of years as CEO in the current position (BoardEx).
CEO Age	Age of CEO in years (BoardEx).
External Hire Dummy	Dummy variable that takes a value of one if CEO was hired from outside the firm, and zero otherwise (BoardEx).
CEO-Chair Dummy	Dummy variable that takes a value of one if CEO is also chair of the board, and zero otherwise (BoardEx).
MBA Dummy	Dummy variable that takes a value of one if CEO has a MBA degree, and zero otherwise (BoardEx).
CEO Delta	Dollar change in a CEO's stock and option portfolio for a 1% change in stock price using the Core and Guay (2002) method.
CEO Vega	Dollar change in a CEO's option holdings for a 1% change in standard deviation of returns using the Core and Guay (2002) method.
CEO Confidence Options	Dummy variable that takes a value of one if a CEO postpones the exercise of vested options that are at least 67% in the money, and zero otherwise.
CEO Rolodex	Rolodex is the sum of school connections (attend the same university and have graduation years less than 2 years apart), social connections (members of the same social organization), and past professional connections (Engelberg, Gao, and Parsons (2013)).
	Panel B: Firm Characteristics
Volatility	Standard deviation of monthly stock returns (CRSP).
R&D	Research and development expenses in millions of dollars (Compustat XRD).
R&D/Assets	Research and development expenses divided by total assets (Compustat XRD / AT).
R&D Stock	Cumulative R&D expenses in millions of dollars assuming an annual depreciation rate of 15% (Compustat).

Table IA.14: continued

Variable	Description
Labor	Number of employees in thousands (Compustat EMP).
Capital	Net property, plant, and equipment (Compustat PPENT).
Stock Return	Annual stock return (Compustat (PRCC_F(t) / AJEX(t) + DVPSX_F(t) / AJEX(t)) / (PRCC_F(t-1) / AJEX_F(t-1))).
ROA	Earnings before interest and taxes divided by total assets (Compustat EBIT / AT).
Cash	Cash and short-term investments divided by total assets (Compustat CHE / AT).
Firm Age	Number of years since a firm listed its shares (CRSP).
Institutional Ownership	Shares held by institutional investors as a fraction of shares outstanding (Thomson CDA/Spectrum 13F Holdings).
Herfindahl Index	Herfindahl index calculated as the sum of squared market shares of firms' sales (Compustat SALE) at the two-digit SIC industry level.
Governance Index	Governance index of Gompers, Ishii, and Metrick (2003), which is based on 24 antitakeover provisions (IRRC).

european corporate governance institute

about ECGI

The European Corporate Governance Institute has been established to improve *corporate governance through fostering independent scientific research and related activities.*

The ECGI will produce and disseminate high quality research while remaining close to the concerns and interests of corporate, financial and public policy makers. It will draw on the expertise of scholars from numerous countries and bring together a critical mass of expertise and interest to bear on this important subject.

The views expressed in this working paper are those of the authors, not those of the ECGI or its members.

www.ecgi.org

european corporate governance institute

ECGI Working Paper Series in Finance

Editorial Board

Editor — Ernst Maug, Professor of Corporate Finance, Mannheim Business School, University of Mannheim

Consulting Editors — Franklin Allen, Nippon Life Professor of Finance, Professor of Economics, The Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania

Julian Franks, Professor of Finance, London Business School

Marco Pagano, Professor of Economics, Facoltà di Economia Università di Napoli Federico II

Xavier Vives, Professor of Economics and Financial Management, IESE Business School, University of Navarra

Luigi Zingales, Robert C. McCormack Professor of Entrepreneurship and Finance, University of Chicago, Booth School of Business

Editorial Assistants — Tamas Barko, University of Mannheim
Julia Keith, University of Mannheim
Kai Lion, University of Mannheim

www.ecgi.org\wp