

Table 1. Structured Management Score by Kind of Business

NAICS ¹ code	Kind of Business	Structured Management Score ²	Standard Error
31-33	Manufacturing	0.549	0.002
311	Food Manufacturing	0.568	0.008
312	Beverage and Tobacco Product Manufacturing	0.604	0.010
313	Textile Mills	0.557	0.013
314	Textile Product Mills	0.475	0.022
315	Apparel Manufacturing	0.420	0.017
316	Leather and Allied Product Manufacturing	0.557	0.016
321	Wood Product Manufacturing	0.537	0.008
322	Paper Manufacturing	0.654	0.007
323	Printing and Related Support Activities	0.469	0.009
324	Petroleum and Coal Products Manufacturing	0.569	0.016
325	Chemical Manufacturing	0.652	0.006
326	Plastics and Rubber Products Manufacturing	0.643	0.005
327	Nonmetallic Mineral Product Manufacturing	0.516	0.006
331	Primary Metal Manufacturing	0.646	0.007
332	Fabricated Metal Product Manufacturing	0.514	0.003
333	Machinery Manufacturing	0.557	0.005
334	Computer and Electronic Product Manufacturing	0.598	0.007
335	Electrical Equipment, Appliance, and Component Manufacturing	0.627	0.006
336	Transportation Equipment Manufacturing	0.645	0.008
337	Furniture and Related Product Manufacturing	0.474	0.010
339	Miscellaneous Manufacturing	0.487	0.009

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, National Bureau of Economic Research, and Stanford University; 2015 Management and Organizational Practices Survey. Information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, sample design, and definitions can be found on the Internet at https://www.census.gov/mcd/mops/how_the_data_are_collected/index.html

(1) For a full description of the NAICS codes used in this table, see <http://www.census.gov/eos/www/naics>

(2) The structured management practice score for each establishment is generated in two steps. First, the responses for each of the 16 management questions, responses are normalized on a 0-1 scale. The response which is associated with the most structured management practice is normalized to 1, and the one associated with the least structured practices is normalized to zero. If a question has three categories, the "in between" category is assigned the value 0.5. Similarly for four categories, the "in between" categories are assigned 1/3 and 2/3, and so on. Then, the management score for the establishment is calculated as the unweighted average of the normalized responses for the 16 management questions. The scores presented in the table are the weighted averages of the scores for all establishments in the estimation domain. For more information, see https://www.census.gov/mcd/mops/how_the_data_are_collected/index.html

Table 2. Structured Management Score by State

State	Structured Management Score ¹	Standard Error
All	0.549	0.002
Alabama	0.586	0.011
Alaska	0.548	0.009
Arizona	0.563	0.015
Arkansas	0.558	0.017
California	0.513	0.006
Colorado	0.590	0.015
Connecticut	0.530	0.021
Delaware	0.595	0.052
District of Columbia	D	D
Florida	0.558	0.011
Georgia	0.590	0.010
Hawaii	0.503	0.059
Idaho	0.576	0.013
Illinois	0.533	0.009
Indiana	0.581	0.009
Iowa	0.569	0.015
Kansas	0.589	0.013
Kentucky	0.561	0.015
Louisiana	0.563	0.016
Maine	0.515	0.041
Maryland	0.516	0.022
Massachusetts	0.524	0.014
Michigan	0.566	0.009
Minnesota	0.544	0.012
Mississippi	0.596	0.018
Missouri	0.552	0.014
Montana	0.566	0.021
Nebraska	0.556	0.020
Nevada	0.549	0.015
New Hampshire	0.532	0.040
New Jersey	0.480	0.014
New Mexico	0.539	0.019
New York	0.510	0.011
North Carolina	0.583	0.010
North Dakota	0.549	0.026
Ohio	0.556	0.007
Oklahoma	0.551	0.015
Oregon	0.563	0.014
Pennsylvania	0.528	0.008
Rhode Island	0.523	0.019
South Carolina	0.590	0.018
South Dakota	0.566	0.027

Table 2. Structured Management Score by State

State	Structured Management Score ¹	Standard Error
Tennessee	0.570	0.013
Texas	0.554	0.007
Utah	0.556	0.018
Vermont	0.538	0.043
Virginia	0.567	0.013
Washington	0.524	0.014
West Virginia	0.577	0.020
Wisconsin	0.550	0.010
Wyoming	0.582	0.013

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, National Bureau of Economic Research, and Stanford University; 2015 Management and Organizational Practices Survey. Information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, sample design, and definitions can be found on the Internet at https://www.census.gov/mcd/mops/how_the_data_are_collected/index.html

(1) The structured management practice score for each establishment is generated in two steps. First, the responses for each of the 16 management questions, responses are normalized on a 0-1 scale. The response which is associated with the most structured management practice is normalized to 1, and the one associated with the least structured practices is normalized to zero. If a question has three categories, the "in between" category is assigned the value 0.5. Similarly for four categories, the "in between" categories are assigned 1/3 and 2/3, and so on. Then, the management score for the establishment is calculated as the unweighted average of the normalized responses for the 16 management questions. The scores presented in the table are the weighted averages of the scores for all establishments in the estimation domain. For more information, see

https://www.census.gov/mcd/mops/how_the_data_are_collected/index.html

(D) Withheld to avoid disclosing data of individual companies

Table 3. Structured Management Score by Employment Size

Number of Employees	Structured Management Score ¹	Standard Error
All	0.549	0.002
1-4	0.454	0.015
5-9	0.410	0.010
10-19	0.442	0.006
20-49	0.508	0.003
50-99	0.599	0.002
100-249	0.663	0.001
250-499	0.708	0.001
500-999	0.734	0.001
1000-2499	0.754	Z
2500+	0.764	0.000

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, National Bureau of Economic Research, and Stanford University; 2015 Management and Organizational Practices Survey. Information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, sample design, and definitions can be found on the Internet at https://www.census.gov/mcd/mops/how_the_data_are_collected/index.html

(1) The structured management practice score for each establishment is generated in two steps. First, the responses for each of the 16 management questions, responses are normalized on a 0-1 scale. The response which is associated with the most structured management practice is normalized to 1, and the one associated with the least structured practices is normalized to zero. If a question has three categories, the "in between" category is assigned the value 0.5. Similarly for four categories, the "in between" categories are assigned 1/3 and 2/3, and so on. Then, the management score for the establishment is calculated as the unweighted average of the normalized responses for the 16 management questions. The scores presented in the table are the weighted averages of the scores for all establishments in the estimation domain. For more information, see

https://www.census.gov/mcd/mops/how_the_data_are_collected/index.html

(Z) Estimate is greater than zero but less than 0.0005

Table 4. Structured Management Score by Establishment Age

Age of Establishment, in Years¹	Structured Management Score²	Standard Error
All	0.549	0.002
0-5	0.561	0.005
6-15	0.544	0.005
16-25	0.536	0.004
26+	0.555	0.003

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, National Bureau of Economic Research, and Stanford University; 2015 Management and Organizational Practices Survey and Longitudinal Business Database. Information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, sample design, and definitions can be found on the Internet at https://www.census.gov/mcd/mops/how_the_data_are_collected/index.html

(1) Establishment age is based on the first year that the establishment was in business in the Longitudinal Business Database. Information on the Longitudinal Business Database can be found on the internet at: <https://www.census.gov/ces/dataproducts/datasets/lbd.html>

(2) The structured management practice score for each establishment is generated in two steps. First, the responses for each of the 16 management questions, responses are normalized on a 0-1 scale. The response which is associated with the most structured management practice is normalized to 1, and the one associated with the least structured practices is normalized to zero. If a question has three categories, the "in between" category is assigned the value 0.5. Similarly for four categories, the "in between" categories are assigned 1/3 and 2/3, and so on. Then, the management score for the establishment is calculated as the unweighted average of the normalized responses for the 16 management questions. The scores presented in the table are the weighted averages of the scores for all establishments in the estimation domain. For more information, see https://www.census.gov/mcd/mops/how_the_data_are_collected/index.html

Table 5. Structured Management Score by Census Region

Census Region ¹	Structured Management Score ²	Standard Error
All	0.549	0.002
Midwest	0.556	0.003
Northeast	0.517	0.005
South	0.568	0.003
West	0.533	0.004

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, National Bureau of Economic Research, and Stanford University; 2015 Management and Organizational Practices Survey. Information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, sample design, and definitions can be found on the Internet at https://www.census.gov/mcd/mops/how_the_data_are_collected/index.html

(1) For more information on Census Regions, see https://www.census.gov/geo/reference/gtc/gtc_census_divreg.html

(2) The structured management practice score for each establishment is generated in two steps. First, the responses for each of the 16 management questions, responses are normalized on a 0-1 scale. The response which is associated with the most structured management practice is normalized to 1, and the one associated with the least structured practices is normalized to zero. If a question has three categories, the "in between" category is assigned the value 0.5. Similarly for four categories, the "in between" categories are assigned 1/3 and 2/3, and so on. Then, the management score for the establishment is calculated as the unweighted average of the normalized responses for the 16 management questions. The scores presented in the table are the weighted averages of the scores for all establishments in the estimation domain. For more information, see https://www.census.gov/mcd/mops/how_the_data_are_collected/index.html

Table 6. Share of Respondents Providing Responses by Question

Question	Response	Percent of Respondents (%)	Standard Error (%)
Managing production problems	We fixed it but did not take further action	4.61	0.20
	We fixed it and took action to make sure that it did not happen again	33.19	0.38
	We fixed it and took action to make sure that it did not happen again, and had a continuous improvement process to anticipate problems like these in advance	60.67	0.39
	No action was taken	1.53	0.13
	No response ¹	0.00	0.00
Number of key performance indicators ²	1-2 key performance indicators	7.95	0.26
	3-9 key performance indicators	47.97	0.39
	10 or more key performance indicators	34.65	0.32
	No key performance indicators	9.43	0.29
	No response ¹	0.00	0.00
Frequency of review of key performance indicators by managers ³	Yearly	18.74	0.28
	Quarterly	22.19	0.31
	Monthly	39.97	0.36
	Weekly	27.99	0.31
	Daily	25.65	0.30
	Hourly or more frequently	3.51	0.11
	Never	9.43	0.29
	No Response	0.21	0.04

Question	Response	Percent of Respondents (%)	Standard Error (%)
Frequency of review of key performance indicators by non-managers ³	Yearly	14.31	0.25
	Quarterly	18.97	0.26
	Monthly	27.74	0.30
	Weekly	17.27	0.25
	Daily	17.74	0.26
	Hourly or more frequently	4.08	0.12
	Never	26.51	0.38
	No response	0.23	0.04
Location of display boards	All display boards were located in one place	20.72	0.30
	Display boards were located in multiple places	32.72	0.31
	We did not have any display boards	46.41	0.39
	No response	0.16	0.03
Production targets timeframe	Main focus was on short-term (less than one year) production targets	34.29	0.37
	Main focus was on long-term (more than one year) production targets	2.92	0.13
	Combination of short-term and long-term production targets	50.85	0.38
	No production targets	11.94	0.31
	No response ¹	0.00	0.00
Effort needed to achieve production targets	Possible to achieve without much effort	4.19	0.18
	Possible to achieve with some effort	11.82	0.26
	Possible to achieve with normal amount of effort	40.26	0.37
	Possible to achieve with more than normal effort	27.76	0.31
	Only possible to achieve with extraordinary effort	4.91	0.16
	No response	11.05	0.30

Question	Response	Percent of Respondents (%)	Standard Error (%)
Aware of production targets	Only senior managers	7.81	0.23
	Most managers and some production workers	20.96	0.32
	Most managers and most production workers	14.63	0.24
	All managers and most production workers	45.61	0.38
	No response	11.00	0.30
Basis for non-manager performance bonuses ³	Their own performance	13.16	0.25
	Their team or shift performance	6.84	0.17
	Their establishment's performance	13.12	0.20
	Their company's performance	25.87	0.30
	No performance bonuses	53.53	0.38
	No response	0.87	0.07
Share of non-managers receiving performance bonuses	0%	6.70	0.18
	1-33%	8.23	0.21
	34-66%	2.52	0.10
	67-99%	7.87	0.16
	100%	23.36	0.29
	Production targets not met	13.14	0.31
	No response	38.18	0.38
Basis for manager performance bonuses ³	Their own performance	17.64	0.26
	Their team or shift performance	8.48	0.18
	Their establishment's performance	18.60	0.24
	Their company's performance	41.04	0.35
	No performance bonuses	40.26	0.39
	No response	0.80	0.07

Question	Response	Percent of Respondents (%)	Standard Error (%)
Share of managers receiving performance bonuses	0%	5.01	0.18
	1-33%	10.75	0.21
	34-66%	3.12	0.11
	67-99%	9.03	0.16
	100%	32.84	0.33
	Production targets not met	13.55	0.31
	No response	25.71	0.36
Non-manager promotions	Promotions were based solely on performance and ability	68.33	0.38
	Promotions were based partly on performance and ability, and partly on other factors	13.50	0.25
	Promotions were based mainly on factors other than performance and ability	1.86	0.10
	Non-managers are normally not promoted	16.31	0.35
	No response ¹	0.00	0.00
Manager promotions	Promotions were based solely on performance and ability	65.64	0.39
	Promotions were based partly on performance and ability, and partly on other factors	10.66	0.22
	Promotions were based mainly on factors other than performance and ability	1.44	0.09
	Managers are normally not promoted	22.25	0.37
	No response ¹	0.00	0.00

Question	Response	Percent of Respondents (%)	Standard Error (%)
Reassignment or dismissal of under-performing non-managers	Within 6 months of identifying non-manager under-performance	46.62	0.38
	After 6 months of identifying non-manager under-performance	20.15	0.26
	Rarely or never	33.23	0.40
	No response ¹	0.00	0.00

Reassignment or dismissal of under-performing managers	Within 6 months of identifying manager under-performance	33.01	0.34
	After 6 months of identifying manager under-performance	24.19	0.28
	Rarely or never	42.80	0.39
	No response ¹	0.00	0.00

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, National Bureau of Economic Research, and Stanford University; 2015 Management and Organizational Practices Survey. Information on confidentiality protection, sampling error, nonsampling error, sample design, and definitions can be found on the Internet at https://www.census.gov/mcd/mops/how_the_data_are_collected/index.html

- (1) Response required for inclusion in tabulation sample.
- (2) Examples of key performance indicators include metrics on production, cost, waste, quality, inventory, energy, absenteeism, and deliveries on time.
- (3) Respondents instructed to "select all that apply." Response shares sum to greater than 100%.