

# Employee Satisfaction, Labor Market Flexibility, and Stock Returns Around the World

Finance Working Paper N° 433/2014

February 2017

Alex Edmans

London Business School, CEPR and ECGI

Lucius Li

London School of Economics

Chendi Zhang

University of Warwick

© Alex Edmans, Lucius Li and Chendi Zhang 2018.  
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:  
[http://ssrn.com/abstract\\_id=2461003](http://ssrn.com/abstract_id=2461003)

[www.ecgi.org/wp](http://www.ecgi.org/wp)

ECGI Working Paper Series in Finance

# Employee Satisfaction, Labor Market Flexibility, and Stock Returns Around the World

Working Paper N° 433/2014

February 2017

Alex Edmans  
Lucius Li  
Chendi Zhang

We thank Seong Byun, Dan Cable, Paul Edwards, Norbert Häring, Ioannis Ioannou, Nigel Nicholson, Jong Min Oh, Andrew Oswald, Marco Pagano, Michael Parke, Madan Pillutla, Elena Simintzi, Jan Starmans, Pin Sun, Vikrant Vig, Paolo Volpin, and Bin Wang, and conference/seminar participants at LBS, LSE, Piraeus, and the Surrey-IFABS Conference for helpful comments.

© Alex Edmans, Lucius Li and Chendi Zhang 2018. 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 study the relationship between employee satisfaction and firm performance around the world, using lists of the “Best Companies to Work For” in 14 countries. Employee satisfaction is associated with superior long-run returns, current valuation ratios, future profitability, and earnings surprises in flexible labor markets, such as the US and UK, but not rigid labor markets, such as Germany. These results are consistent with employee satisfaction improving recruitment, retention, and motivation in flexible labor markets, where firms face fewer constraints on hiring and firing and employees have greater ability to respond to higher satisfaction. In rigid labor markets, legislation already provides minimum standards for worker welfare and so additional expenditure may exhibit diminishing returns. The findings have implications for the differential profitability of socially responsible investing strategies around the world – in particular, the importance of considering institutional factors when forming such strategies.

---

Keywords: Employee Satisfaction, Labor Market Flexibility, Socially Responsible Investing, Corporate Social Responsibility

JEL Classifications: G12, G23, G38, J53, J81, J83, J88, K31

### Alex Edmans\*

Professor of Finance  
London Business School, Institute of Finance and Accounting  
Regent's Park  
London, NW1 4SA, United Kingdom  
phone: +44 20 700 082 58  
e-mail: aedmans@london.edu

### Lucius Li

Fellow in Finance  
London School of Economics, Department of Finance  
Houghton Street  
London, WC2A 2AE, United Kingdom  
phone: +44 20 7955 6857  
e-mail: L.Li25@lse.ac.uk

### Chendi Zhang

Associate Professor of Finance  
University of Warwick, Warwick Business School  
Gibbet Hill Rd  
Coventry, CV4 7AL, United Kingdom  
e-mail: Chendi.Zhang@wbs.ac.uk

\*Corresponding Author

# Employee Satisfaction, Labor Market Flexibility, and Stock Returns Around The World \*

Alex Edmans<sup>a</sup>

*London Business School, CEPR, and ECGI*

Lucius Li<sup>b</sup>

*London School of Economics*

Chendi Zhang<sup>c</sup>

*Warwick Business School*

This draft: February 21, 2017

## Abstract

We study the relationship between employee satisfaction and firm performance around the world, using lists of the “Best Companies to Work For” in 14 countries. Employee satisfaction is associated with superior long-run returns, current valuation ratios, future profitability, and earnings surprises in flexible labor markets, such as the US and UK, but not rigid labor markets, such as Germany. These results are consistent with employee satisfaction improving recruitment, retention, and motivation in flexible labor markets, where firms face fewer constraints on hiring and firing and employees have greater ability to respond to higher satisfaction. In rigid labor markets, legislation already provides minimum standards for worker welfare and so additional expenditure may exhibit diminishing returns. The findings have implications for the differential profitability of socially responsible investing strategies around the world – in particular, the importance of considering institutional factors when forming such strategies.

**JEL classifications:** G12, G23, G38, J53, J81, J83, J88, K31

**Keywords:** Employee Satisfaction, Labor Market Flexibility, Socially Responsible Investing, Corporate Social Responsibility

---

\* We thank Seong Byun, Dan Cable, Paul Edwards, Norbert Häring, Ioannis Ioannou, Nigel Nicholson, Jong Min Oh, Andrew Oswald, Marco Pagano, Michael Parke, Madan Pillutla, Elena Simintzi, Jan Starmans, Pin Sun, Vikrant Vig, Paolo Volpin, and Bin Wang, and conference/seminar participants at LBS, LSE, Piraeus, and the Surrey-IFABS Conference for helpful comments.

<sup>a</sup> Email: [aedmans@london.edu](mailto:aedmans@london.edu), London Business School, Regent’s Park, London NW1 4SA, UK

<sup>b</sup> Email: [L.Li25@lse.ac.uk](mailto:L.Li25@lse.ac.uk), London School of Economics, Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE, UK

<sup>c</sup> Email: [Chendi.Zhang@wbs.ac.uk](mailto:Chendi.Zhang@wbs.ac.uk), Warwick Business School, University of Warwick, Gibbet Hill Rd, Coventry CV4 7AL, UK

This paper studies the relationship between employee satisfaction and stock returns around the world. Theory provides conflicting predictions as to whether employee satisfaction is beneficial or harmful to firm value. On the one hand, it can be a valuable tool for recruitment, retention, and motivation. For the typical 20<sup>th</sup>-century firm, the bulk of its value stemmed from its physical capital. In contrast, most modern firms' key assets are their workers – not only senior management, but also rank-and-file employees. For example, in knowledge-based industries such as software, pharmaceuticals, and financial services, non-managerial employees engage in product innovation, build customer and supplier relationships, and mentor subordinates. Employee-friendly policies can attract and retain high-quality workers skilled at these tasks.

Employee satisfaction can also be a valuable motivational tool. The above tasks are difficult to measure and thus motivate with the monetary “piece rates” often used in 20<sup>th</sup>-century manufacturing firms. This reduced effectiveness of extrinsic motivators increases the role for intrinsic motivators such as satisfaction. The efficiency wage hypothesis highlights numerous channels through which satisfaction may increase motivation. For example, Akerlof (1982) posits that employees view a positive working environment as a “gift” from the firm and respond with a “gift” of increased effort.<sup>1</sup> Separately, employees are more likely to be innovative if companies have a culture that tolerates failure and a reputation for providing job security. These motivational benefits may be particularly important for rank-and-file employees, who are harder to incentivize with equity than executives, due to their small individual effect on firm value.

On the other hand, employee satisfaction can represent wasteful expenditure by management. Taylor (1911) argues that workers should be treated like any input – management's goal is to

---

<sup>1</sup> These theories imply a high *level* of compensation, but do not suggest that the *form* of compensation should be in satisfaction compared to cash, which is believed to be fungible. However, Maslow (1943) and Herzberg (1959) stress that cash is only effective up to a point: once workers' physical needs are met, they are motivated by non-pecuniary factors such as job satisfaction, which cannot be purchased with cash and can only be provided by the firm.

extract maximum output from them while minimizing their cost. Under this view, satisfaction is an indicator that employees are overpaid or underworked, both of which reduce firm value.

The relative importance of the above costs and benefits depends on the institutional context. In flexible labor markets, the recruitment benefits of satisfaction are more important since firms engage in more hiring – both because hiring is easier (due to fewer restrictions on the contracts firms can offer) and because firing underperformers is easier, creating more vacancies. The retention benefits are also more important because the rate of departures is higher. Rivals face fewer constraints on hiring away workers; in addition, the greater firing risk encourages employees to invest in general rather than firm-specific skills (Thelen (2001)), which increases their ability to be recruited elsewhere.

The motivational benefits of employee satisfaction are also likely higher in flexible labor markets. First, the motivational benefits from communicating with workers, providing a positive working environment, and not engaging in discrimination are stronger if these are not mandated by law and thus more likely to be seen as a “gift”. Second, the motivation to work hard to avoid being fired from a satisfying job (Shapiro and Stiglitz (1984)) is stronger if firing is more likely. Third, a cost of greater autonomy – a key element of employee satisfaction – is that workers may abuse it by slacking, which is alleviated by the firm’s ability to fire shirkers. Fourth, where dismissal laws are weak, employees may be less willing to innovate, because the firm may punish short-run failures or hold up workers in the case of successful innovations (Acharya, Baghai, and Subrahmanian (2013)). Thus, a reputation for treating workers fairly and tolerating failure is particularly likely to spur innovation. Finally, in flexible labor markets, firm-worker matches are typically superior (Acemoglu and Pischke (1998)). Increased motivation has a greater effect when employees are in jobs for which their skill set is best suited.

In contrast, in rigid labor markets, hiring and firing are harder, and thus the recruitment, retention, and motivational benefits of employee satisfaction are likely lower. In addition, expenditure on employee satisfaction likely exhibits diminishing marginal returns. When regulations already ensure a minimum level of worker welfare, companies with high satisfaction relative to their peers may be exceeding the optimal level.

Testing the link between employee satisfaction and firm performance is challenging, because causality may run from the latter to the former. Edmans (2011, 2012) addresses this challenge by using stock returns (rather than, say, accounting profits) as the dependent variable. If satisfaction were the result, rather than cause, of high profits, these profits should already be incorporated into the stock price at the start of the return compounding window, since they are tangible.<sup>2</sup> Thus, firms with high employee satisfaction should not outperform going forwards. In contrast, he finds that the “100 Best Companies to Work For in America” subsequently beat their peers by 2-3% per year over a 26-year period. These results suggest that employee satisfaction has value but is not immediately capitalized by the market, consistent with prior evidence on the mispricing of intangibles discussed in Section 1. However, these papers only study the US – a country with particularly flexible labor markets – and so their external validity is limited. It is unclear whether these results are generalizable to other countries, especially those with less flexible labor markets.

This paper addresses this open question. We study the link between employee satisfaction and stock returns in 14 countries, and investigate how this relationship depends on the country’s level of labor market flexibility. The US Best Companies (“BC”) list is produced by the Great Place to Work<sup>®</sup> Institute. The Institute produces similar lists in 44 other countries, of which 15 have at least 10 BCs publicly traded in the domestic market. We use two measures of country-level labor market flexibility, which are available for 14 of these 15 countries. The first measure is the OECD

---

<sup>2</sup> We control for momentum to address any slowness in the market incorporating tangible information into stock prices.

Employment Protection Legislation (“EPL”) index, also used in Blanchard and Portugal (2000), Messina and Vallanti (2007), Pagano and Volpin (2005b), and Simintzi, Vig, and Volpin (2015). The second is the labor market flexibility categories of the Fraser Institute’s Economic Freedom of the World (“EFW”) index, also used by Bernal-Verdugo, Furceri, and Guillaume (2012a, 2012b), Freeman, Kruse, and Blasi (2008), and Haltiwanger, Scarpetta, and Schweiger (2008).

We find that the alphas previously documented for the US are not anomalous in a global context. An equal-weighted BC portfolio generates a significant Carhart (1997) 4-factor monthly alpha of 34 basis points in the US. This alpha is only the 10<sup>th</sup> highest out of the 14 countries. For example, it is 0.77% in Japan and (an insignificant) 0.81% in the UK. However, we also document sizable heterogeneity across countries. For example, Germany exhibits an insignificantly negative alpha of -0.45%. Thus, while prior results generally hold out of sample, they do not extend to every country.

We next show that the abnormal returns to the BCs are higher in flexible labor markets, using both measures. We conduct a pooled panel regression of firm-level stock returns on BC status interacted with labor market flexibility, controlling for the firm-level determinants of stock returns identified by Brennan, Chordia, and Subrahmanyam (1998), such as size, book-to-market, dividend yield, past returns, trading volume, and the stock price. To ensure that labor market flexibility is not simply proxying for other differences between countries, we use other country-level variables such as the rule of law (La Porta, Lopez-de-Silanes, Shleifer, and Vishny (1997)), the anti-director rights index (Spamann (2010)), Hofstede’s (1980) measure of cultural individualism, and GDP growth, both independently and interacted with BC status, and country fixed effects. Since abnormal returns to the BCs depend not only on the value (if any) of satisfaction but also the extent to which it is not priced by the market, we also control for the country-level price efficiency measure of Fernandes and Ferreira (2009). We use GDP per capita and the ratio of stock market



capitalization to GDP to proxy for a country's economic development, which may also be related to market efficiency.

We find that a one standard deviation increase in EPL (EFW) is associated with a 0.64% (0.54%) higher industry-adjusted monthly return to being a BC, significant at the 1% level. The result suggests that the link between employee satisfaction and stock returns depends critically on the institutional context. This has important implications for both managers and investors. Starting with the former, even if the Edmans (2011, 2012) results can be interpreted as causal, they do not suggest that managers should necessarily increase expenditure on employee satisfaction in countries with low labor market flexibility. Moving to the latter, investors can only expect to earn alpha from investing in firms with high employee satisfaction in countries with high labor market flexibility.

However, our stock return results admit alternative explanations. First, the high stock returns of BCs in flexible labor markets could represent compensation for risk, perhaps because employee satisfaction is worth little upon bankruptcy. This explanation is difficult to reconcile with the sheer magnitude of the excess returns in certain countries, as well as their negativity in others, but further analyses can be conducted. Second, it could be that employee satisfaction has zero value, but the market erroneously believes that it represents wasteful expenditure and thus discounts BCs upon list inclusion; the positive future returns represent an unwinding of this undervaluation.

We conduct additional tests to address these alternative explanations. If the superior returns to BCs in flexible labor markets stem from an initial discount – either due to risk or a misperception that employee satisfaction is value-destructive – then the BCs should initially trade at low valuation ratios. In contrast, we show that, at the start of the return compounding window, they enjoy superior industry-adjusted Tobin's Qs, and this premium is significantly increasing in labor market flexibility. These results are consistent with Edmans (2011) who finds that the US BCs trade at an

initial premium, and also with the market at least partially impounding the (positive or negative) value of employee satisfaction upon list publication.

To further distinguish between whether the returns to BCs arise from risk or employee satisfaction having (positive or negative) value that the market misprices, we study future accounting performance. We find that the BCs higher future profitability than their peers, particularly in flexible labor markets. A one standard deviation increase in EPL (EFW) is associated with BCs having a next-year return on assets that is 1.23 (1.20) percentage points higher. We find similar results for return on assets two years out, and the net profit margin over both a one- and two-year horizon.

Finally, superior future accounting performance should only manifest in higher stock returns if it was unanticipated by the market. We find that the BCs exhibit significantly higher earnings surprises than peer firms in flexible but not rigid labor markets. A one standard deviation increase in EPL is associated the BCs enjoying a 0.16% (0.50%) higher earnings surprise one year (two years) ahead, significant at the 5% level. However, the results are not significant for EFW.

This paper contributes to a number of literatures. The first is the link between employee satisfaction and firm performance, e.g. Abowd (1989), Diltz (1995), Dhrymes (1998), and Edmans (2011, 2012). These studies only analyze the US. Given the importance of labor market institutions, it is unclear whether their results generalize more widely. Second, since employee satisfaction is a common socially responsible investing (“SRI”) screen, this paper contributes to research on the link between SRI and investor returns. This literature has mixed results.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Hamilton, Jo and Statman (1993), Kurtz and DiBartolomeo (1996), Guerard (1997), Bauer, Koedijk, and Otten (2005), Schröder (2007), and Statman and Glushkov (2009) find no or a mixed effect of SRI screens on investment returns; Brammer, Brooks, and Pavelin (2006), Renneboog, Ter Horst, and Zhang (2008), and Hong and Kacperczyk (2009) find a negative effect; and Derwall et al. (2005), Fornell et al. (2006), Edmans (2011, 2012), and Eccles, Ioannou, and Serafeim (2014) find a positive one. Relatedly, Servaes and Tamayo (2013), Dimson, Karakas, and Li (2015), Flammer (2015), and Krüger (2015) find evidence that corporate social responsibility positively impacts shareholder value.

Moreover, nearly all studies use US data and their generalizability is again unclear. The value of various social screens – employee satisfaction, gender diversity, animal rights, environmental protection, and whether the firm is in a “sin” industry (such as tobacco, alcohol, and gambling) – likely depends on the institutional context and cultural norms. To our knowledge, this is the first paper to study the investment performance of a SRI screen in a global context. Finally, this paper adds to the literature comparing the performance of investment strategies across countries. Asness, Moskowitz, and Pedersen (2013) find that value strategies are profitable not only in the US, but also in the UK, Europe, and Japan. Momentum strategies are profitable in the first three regions, but not Japan. Chui, Titman, and Wei (2010) find that momentum profits within a country are increasing in the individualism of its national culture.

## **1. Hypothesis development**

We first discuss whether we should expect any long-run returns to the Best Companies lists at all, in either direction. Our return compounding window starts at the beginning of the month after list publication. Thus, since these lists are public, we should find no abnormal returns in a semi-strong efficient market. Regardless of the institutional context, and thus regardless of whether employee satisfaction has positive or negative value, this value should be capitalized by the market before the start of the return compounding window.

However, there is significant prior evidence that intangible assets are not fully priced by the stock market. Firms with superior governance (Gompers, Ishii, and Metrick (2003), Giroud and Mueller (2011)), customer satisfaction (Fornell et al. (2006)), environmental efficiency (Derwall et al. (2005)), and high R&D and advertising expenditure (Chan, Lakonishok, and Sougiannis (2001)) all earn higher long-run returns. Edmans (2011) documents that the value of BC list inclusion is not fully capitalized by the market until 4-5 years later in the US, which is arguably the most efficient

stock market. Thus, it is reasonable to hypothesize that the value of employee satisfaction will not be immediately capitalized by non-US stock markets.

As explained in the introduction, the use of future stock returns as the dependent variable alleviates concerns that employee satisfaction is correlated with an omitted variable that also drives firm value, or that there is reverse causality from firm value to satisfaction. However, reverse causality can still arise if employees have superior information about their firm's future stock returns and those with positive information report higher satisfaction today. This explanation is unlikely for a number of reasons. Existing studies suggest that employees do not have private information: Benartzi (2001) shows that employees make incorrect decisions when allocating their 401(k) accounts to company stock, and Bergman and Jenter (2007) find that firms are able to lower total compensation by granting their workers overvalued options in lieu of salary. Even if employees do have superior information, it is likely to be about near-term returns, given that executives are unable to forecast returns past 100 days (Jenter, Lewellen, and Warner (2011)). There is a significant time lag between the survey completion deadline and the start of the return compounding window – for example, this lag is seven months in the United States. It is also plausible that employees who predict higher future returns will perceive the stock as undervalued today, potentially reducing satisfaction.

We now discuss why the value of employee satisfaction might depend on a country's labor market flexibility. A major branch of the human resource management literature, known as contingency theory, emphasizes that the value of investing in employee satisfaction is highly contingent on the setting (e.g. Huselid (1995), Macduffie (1995)); this view is also shared by the organizational economics literature (e.g. Milgrom and Roberts (1995)). Specifically, the introduction discussed three potential benefits of employee satisfaction: improved recruitment, retention, and motivation. The first two benefits are likely stronger in flexible labor markets, in

which hiring and firing are easier. Turning to the motivational benefits, a key element of employee satisfaction is worker autonomy whose value is reduced by collective bargaining (a feature of rigid labor markets) for two reasons. First, collective bargaining contributes to a rules-based working environment, and so any increase in discretion resulting from a particular HR practice is piecemeal rather than holistic. Second, collective bargaining means that workers' tasks are decided centrally, giving less freedom for a satisfied worker to voluntarily take value-creating actions.<sup>4</sup>

As with any investment, the returns to employee satisfaction are likely decreasing. In rigid labor markets, regulations already impose a floor on worker welfare, leading to a downward movement along the marginal benefit curve. For example, if the minimum wage is already high, the firm is already some way along its marginal benefit curve; moving further along it by paying a premium may lead to the benefits being below the costs.<sup>5</sup> Separately, Germany mandates worker representation on boards, which means that communication with employees provides less of a competitive advantage. As discussed above, the recruitment, retention, and motivation benefits of employee satisfaction are likely lower in rigid labor markets, causing a downward shift in the marginal benefit curve.

Indeed, a manager may spend excessively on employee satisfaction due to an agency problem. He may enjoy more pleasant relationships with his subordinates by overpaying them (Jensen and Meckling (1976)), or use employee benefits as a takeover defense (Pagano and Volpin (2005a)). Indeed, Simintzi, Vig, and Volpin (2015) find that employment protection increases labor costs and

---

<sup>4</sup> Hypothetically, a satisfied employee could choose to exert effort in excess of the centrally bargained standard. However, a large literature on alienation of "rate-busters" highlights the social costs of doing so (e.g. Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939), Mayo (1949), Lam et al. (2011)).

<sup>5</sup> For many years, US supermarket Costco famously paid its rank-and-file employees nearly double that of its close competitor Walmart, contributing to its high level of employee satisfaction. (In 2015, Walmart voluntarily announced a significant increase in worker pay, largely driven by the perceived benefits of employee satisfaction, so the difference with Costco is much smaller.) Due to the US's flexible labor markets and thus relatively low minimum wage, many Walmart employees were low-paid and. Thus, Costco was able to offer a wage premium without paying exceeding employees' marginal product; indeed, its profit per employee was over 40% higher than Walmart's. Source: "Why Wal-Mart Will Never Pay Like Costco", *Bloomberg*, August 27, 2013.

reduces profitability. Cronqvist et al. (2009) show that high worker pay is correlated with managerial entrenchment. Excessive expenditure on employee satisfaction may also result from labor control. In countries where employees have more bargaining power (e.g. there is centralized collective bargaining), it could be workers who are determining human resource policies, and so satisfaction could be excessive from shareholders' perspective. Indeed, Gorton and Schmid (2004) find that German firms where one-half of the supervisory board consists of employees trade at a 31% discount to firms with one-third worker representation. Faleye, Mehrotra, and Morck (2006) find that labor-controlled U.S. firms deviate more from value maximization and exhibit lower labor and total factor productivity. Chen, Kacperczyk, and Ortiz-Molina (2011) hypothesize that labor unions protect wages in a downturn, and find that they increase a firm's operating leverage and cost of equity. Unions also protect underperforming managers and reduce firm value (Atanassov and Kim (2009), Lee and Mas (2012)).

As a result, we predict that the BCs generate positive abnormal returns in countries with high labor market flexibility, and that the returns to list inclusion decrease with labor market rigidity. Note that this hypothesis does not require all of the channels through which employee satisfaction affects firm value to depend on labor market flexibility, only that a sufficient proportion do.

## **2. Data and summary statistics**

### *2.1. Measures of employee satisfaction*

Our main data source is the Best Companies lists compiled by the Great Place to Work<sup>®</sup> Institute. The first list focused on US companies and was published in a 1984 book entitled the "The 100 Best Companies to Work for in America", later updated in 1993; from 1998 onwards it has been published every January in *Fortune* magazine. Two-thirds of the score comes from a 58-question survey that the Institute administers to 250 employees randomly selected in each firm. The

remaining one-third comes from the Institute's evaluation of factors such as a company's demographic makeup, pay and benefits programs, and culture. The companies are scored in four areas: Credibility (communication to employees), Respect (opportunities and benefits), Fairness (compensation and diversity), and Pride/Camaraderie (teamwork, philanthropy, and celebrations), and the top firms are publicly announced in a list. The list is highly regarded as a thorough measure of employee satisfaction, receiving significant attention from shareholders, management, employees, and the media, and has since been extended to 44 other countries around the world.

Some of the channels through which the effect of employee satisfaction depends on labor market flexibility, as described in the introduction, apply to employee satisfaction in general. For example, recruitment and retention benefits depend on aggregate employee satisfaction. Other channels depend on specific dimensions of employee satisfaction that are captured in the survey – in other words, the survey questions reflect the dimensions of satisfaction that are relevant for our hypothesized mechanisms. One such channel is that certain dimensions of employee satisfaction may already be mandated by law, and thus would not be seen as a “gift” under Akerlof's (1982) model. For example, the Credibility area contains questions on informative communication (“management keeps me informed about important issues and changes”, “management makes its expectations clear”) and accessible communication (“I can ask management any reasonable question and get a straight answer”, “management is approachable, easy to talk with”); the Respect area contains questions on collaboration (“management genuinely seeks and responds to suggestions and ideas”, “management involves people in decisions that affect their jobs or work environment”). These dimensions would likely be satisfied for the average firm in Germany, where worker representation on the board is mandatory. Thus, a firm that is well above-average may be excessively collaborative and allowing workers to take decisions at the expense of firm value. The

Respect area also contains questions on work environment, and the Fairness area contains questions on discrimination, all of which may also be mandated by law.

A second dimension of employee satisfaction discussed in our hypothesis development is autonomy, which is captured by many areas. For example, the Respect area contains questions such as “management genuinely seeks and responds to suggestions and ideas”, “management involves people in decisions that affect their jobs or work environment”, “I am able to take time off from work when I think it’s necessary”, and “people are encouraged to balance their work life and their personal life.” A third channel discussed earlier is that, where firing is easier, employees may innovate less due to fear of firing either if the innovation fails or if it succeeds (due to expropriation). Indeed, the Credibility area contains questions on reliability (“I believe management would lay people off only as a last resort”) and honesty (“Management is honest and ethical in its business practices”); the Respect area contains a question on tolerance for failure (“Management recognizes honest mistakes as part of doing business”).

Firms apply to be considered for the list. Such selection issues either have no effect or likely bias the results downwards. For it to affect the results, the selection decision must be correlated with either the independent variable (satisfaction) or outcome variable (future returns). If firms with low satisfaction choose not to apply because they expect not to make the list, this simply increases its accuracy. If a firm with high satisfaction chooses not to apply because it believes this quality is already publicly known, this reduces the satisfaction level of the firms in the list and attenuates the results. Turning to the outcome variable, even if the decision to apply were correlated with current profitability or past stock returns, both of these variables should be incorporated into the stock price at the start of the return compounding window and thus not affect future stock returns (controlling for momentum). Even if management has temporary private information on future returns, this likely has little effect since list applications must be made by



several months before the return window (e.g. 8 months<sup>6</sup> for the US). As discussed previously, Jenter, Lewellen, and Warner (2011) show that managers' private information is confined to the next 100 days; managers have little predictive ability for returns over days 100–150.

We include countries with more than five years' history of BC listings. For each country, we only include BCs that are both headquartered and primarily listed in that country, to prevent the results being driven by a small number of multinational firms that are on the BC list of several countries. Table 1 describes the 14 countries that have data on labor market flexibility (which we will describe in Section 2.2) and where at least 10 BCs are headquartered and listed. Column (1) shows the start year of BC listings for each country. Since the earliest start year for a non-US country is 1997 (for Brazil), our sample period is from September 1997 to December 2013. As a result, we start the US data from 1998 when the lists were first published in *Fortune*.

To form BC portfolios, we use the beginning of the month after the list publication date for each country as our portfolio formation date. For example, the US list is typically published in mid-January, and so we use February 1 as the portfolio formation date. Thus, our analyses are joint tests of the value of employee satisfaction and the extent to which this value is immediately capitalized by the market. The constituents of BC portfolios are rebalanced once a year on the same day. Column (2) reports the portfolio formation dates for each country.

For the UK and US, the number of firms in the list has remained constant over time. For the other countries, it has increased over time – for example, the first list in Germany (in 2003) contains 50 firms, while in 2013 it contains 100. Column (6) of Table 1 indicates the number of BCs selected in the initial list and the 2013 list for each country.

---

<sup>6</sup> This contrasts with the 7-month window between employee survey responses and the return window since employees have one month to fill in the survey.

Just as the US list has been published in *Fortune* every year since 1998, the BC lists in other countries have similarly been widely publicized, and so an efficient market should rapidly incorporate them into the stock price. Column (7) lists the current publisher for the list in each country; each is a major newspaper or magazine.<sup>7</sup>

## 2.2. Measures of labor market flexibility

We use two measures of labor market flexibility. The first is the OECD's Employment Protection Legislation ("EPL") index. The index measures the procedures involved in hiring workers on either fixed-term or temporary contracts, and in dismissing individuals and groups of workers. It is based on statutory laws, collective bargaining agreements, case law, contributions from OECD member countries, and experts' advice from each country. It has three components:

*Individual dismissal of workers with regular contracts* (category EPR) measures three aspects of dismissal protection: (i) procedural inconveniences of the dismissal process faced by employers, such as notification and consultation requirements; (ii) length of notice periods and conditions of severance pay; and (iii) difficulty of dismissal, such as the circumstances under which a dismissal is possible, and repercussions for the employer if an unfair dismissal is discovered.

*Additional costs for collective dismissals* (category EPC) measures the extra costs faced by employers when they dismiss several workers simultaneously, over and above the costs applicable for individual dismissals.

*Regulation of temporary contracts* (category EPT) measures regulations for fixed-term and temporary work contracts in terms of job type and duration, requirements for such workers to

---

<sup>7</sup> In some cases, the publisher has changed over time, or there is more than one outlet; we report the current publisher, and the main outlet in the case of multiple ones.

receive equal pay and working conditions as permanent employees, and regulations for the setup and operations of work agencies.

The first two measures capture the ease of dismissal. As mentioned in the introduction, fewer firing constraints increase the motivational benefits of employee satisfaction (as workers will exert greater effort to avoid being fired from a satisfying job), and its recruitment benefits (since the ease of firing raises the number of vacancies). The third measure captures constraints on hiring, which reduce the recruitment and retention benefits of satisfaction. Separately, regulations on hiring and firing impose a minimum level of satisfaction, leading to a downward movement along the marginal benefit curve.

We calculate *EPL* as the 10 minus the average of the three sub-indicators' scores,<sup>8</sup> so that a high *EPL* score implies high labor market flexibility. Columns (1)-(4) of Table 1, Panel B reports the time series mean of *EPL* and each sub-index for each country from 1997-2013. As a rough check that *EPL* is linked to labor mobility, we were able to collect data on labor turnover rates for seven countries in our sample from OECD (1996). Their correlation with the time series mean of *EPL* in our sample period is 0.73. Similarly, Messina and Vallanti (2007) and the OECD (2013) show that *EPL* is negatively associated with labor turnover. This is consistent with our motivation, that the recruitment and retention benefits of employee satisfaction are higher in flexible labor markets.

Our second measure of labor market flexibility uses indices from the Fraser Institute's Economic Freedom of the World ("EFW") database. Feldmann (2009) refers to these indices as a comprehensive measure of the "de facto strictness of labor regulations". We use the EFW indices across six policy categories. All indices are standardized on a 0-10 scale, with higher values indicating greater flexibility.

---

<sup>8</sup> The OECD reports *EPL* as a weighted average of the three broad categories, where the weights depend on the number of sub-indicators in each group. Our results are robust to this weighted measure of *EPL*.

*Hiring regulations and minimum wage* (category 5Bi) is based on the World Bank's Doing Business Difficulty of Hiring Index. The index measures: (i) whether fixed-term contracts are prohibited for permanent tasks; (ii) the maximum cumulative duration of fixed-term contracts; and (iii) the ratio of the minimum wage for a first-time employee to the average value added per worker.

*Hiring and firing regulations* (category 5Bii) is derived from the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Report's survey question "How would you characterize the hiring and firing of workers in your country?" Respondents assign a score from 1 ("impeded by regulations") to 7 ("flexibly determined by employers") which are then standardized onto a 0-10 scale.

*Centralized collective bargaining* (category 5Biii) is based on the World Economic Forum's Global Competitiveness Report's survey question "How are wages generally set in your country?" Respondents assign a score from 1 ("by a centralized bargaining process by regulations") to 7 ("up to each individual company") which are then standardized onto a 0-10 scale.

*Hours regulations* (category 5Biv, previously called "mandated cost of hiring a worker") is based on the World Bank's Doing Business Rigidity of Hours Index, which measures (i) whether there are restrictions on night work; (ii) whether there are restrictions on weekly holiday work; (iii) whether the work-week can consist of 5.5 days; (iv) whether the work-week can extend to 50 hours or more (including overtime) for 2 months a year to respond to a seasonal increase in production; and (v) whether paid annual vacation is 21 working days or fewer.

*Mandated cost of worker dismissal* (category 5Bv) is based on the World Bank's Doing Business data. It includes the cost of the advance notice requirements, severance payments, and penalties due when dismissing a redundant worker.

*Conscription* (category 5Bvi) is based on the use and duration of military conscription. Lower ratings of labor market flexibility are assigned to countries with longer conscription periods.

Categories 5Bi, 5Bii and 5Biv capture the ease of hiring (similar to EPL’s category EPT, although the latter focuses on temporary contracts), and category 5Bv captures the ease of firing (similar to EPL’s categories EPR and EPC). Category 5Biii measures the power of labor unions. Labor unions impose restrictions on contracts which hinder both hiring and firing, and may press for higher employee satisfaction even if not in shareholders’ interest. Category 5Bvi captures a regulatory intervention to the supply-side. Where conscription is greater, the recruitment benefits of employee satisfaction are smaller since individuals have less freedom to join firms.

The current form of the EFW data is available annually from 2002 to 2013.<sup>9</sup> We construct a composite measure (*EFW*) that equals the average of the six indices in each country-year. Column (5)-(11) of Table 1, Panel B reports the time-series mean of *EFW* and each sub-index for each country. The correlation of country-year *EFW* and *EPL* is 0.62, which shows that these measures capture different dimensions of labor market flexibility.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Country-level alphas

We first calculate the Carhart (1997) four-factor alphas to the BC portfolios in each country:

$$R_{ct} = \alpha + \beta_{MKT}MKT_{ct} + \beta_{HML}HML_{ct} + \beta_{SMB}SMB_{ct} + \beta_{MOM}MOM_{ct} + \varepsilon_{ct}, \quad (1)$$

where  $R_{ct}$  is the US dollar returns to a BC portfolio (either equal-weighted or value-weighted) in month  $t$  for country  $c$  in excess of the US one-month treasury rate (as in Fama and French (2012)).

We use dollar returns, consistent with the literature on international asset pricing (e.g. Fama and

---

<sup>9</sup> The EFW also provided labor market flexibility data in 2000 and 2001 but on different components, which are not comparable to the data from 2002 onwards.

French (2015), Griffin (2002), and Hou, Karolyi, and Kho (2011)) and also because the Fama and French (2012) factors, described shortly, are in dollars. Stock returns are taken from the Center for Research in Security Prices (“CRSP”) for US firms and Datastream for other firms. Both active and inactive firms are included to avoid survivorship bias. We winsorize stock returns at the 0.5% and 99.5% level in each country; results are very similar without winsorization.

$\alpha$  is an intercept that captures the abnormal risk-adjusted return. *MKT*, *HML*, *SMB*, and *MOM* are, respectively, the Fama and French (2012) regional factors on market, value, size, and momentum, collected from Kenneth French’s website. We use the Europe factors for all European countries, the North American factors for Brazil, Chile, Canada and the US, the Japan factors for Japan, and the Asia-Pacific Excluding Japan factors for Korea and India.

$\varepsilon$  is an error term. Standard errors are corrected for heteroscedasticity and autocorrelation using Newey-West’s (1987) estimator with four lags.

Panel A of Table 2 reports results for equal-weighted portfolios. Three of the 14 countries (Denmark, Germany, and Greece) have insignificantly negative alphas. The remaining 11 countries have positive alphas, which are significant at the 10% level or better for Chile, Japan, Sweden, and the US. In terms of economic significance, the US has the 10<sup>th</sup> highest alpha out of the 14 countries, suggesting that it is not an outlier. Panel B of Table 2 reports results for value-weighted portfolios. Denmark, France, Germany, and Greece have negative alphas, with Denmark’s being significant at the 10% level. The alphas for Chile and the UK are significantly positive at the 10% level or better.

### 3.2. *Characteristics controls*

While Section 3.1 controls for the BCs' covariance with risk factors, this section controls for firm characteristics that may also affect stock returns. We first run the following pooled panel regression across all firms (both BCs and non-BCs) within a country, at the firm-month level:

$$R_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 BC_{it} + \beta_2 FirmControls_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}. \quad (2)$$

$R_{it}$  is the return on stock  $i$  in month  $t$ . We use three different variables for the stock return. The first is the raw return. The second is the market-adjusted return, i.e. in excess of the local country market return.<sup>10</sup> The local market return is the MSCI stock market index for each country, from Datastream. The third is the industry-adjusted return, where the industry return is the median return among non-BC firms in the same industry and same country as firm  $i$  in month  $t$ , using the Fama and French (1997) 48-industry classifications.  $BC_{it}$  is a dummy variable that equals one if firm  $i$  was included in the most recent BC list prior to month  $t$ , and zero otherwise.  $FirmControls_{it}$  are the control variables used in Brennan, Chordia, and Subrahmanyam (1998), calculated using CRSP and Compustat for US firms and Datastream and Worldscope for non-US firms.  $SIZE$  is the log of firm  $i$ 's market capitalization at the end of month  $t-2$ .  $BM$  is the log of firm  $i$ 's book-to-market ratio at the end of month  $t-2$ .  $YLD$  is firm  $i$ 's dividend yield: the total dividend paid over the 12 months prior to month  $t$ , divided by the share price at the end of month  $t-2$ .  $RET2-3$  is the log of one plus firm  $i$ 's cumulative return over months  $t-3$  through  $t-2$ .  $RET4-6$  and  $RET7-12$  are defined similarly.  $VOL$  is the log of firm  $i$ 's dollar trading volume in month  $t-2$ .  $PRC$  is the log of firm  $i$ 's price at the end of month  $t-2$ . We also include year-month fixed effects to control for macroeconomic conditions that may affect stock returns in a given month. Standard errors are clustered by year-month (clustering by firm does not change the results).

---

<sup>10</sup> Results are similar using the CAPM-adjusted abnormal return ( $AR_{cit}$ ) with either a 5- or 3-year rolling-window beta.

The results are presented in Table 3; we only present the coefficient on the *BC* dummy for brevity. For raw returns, it is significantly positive for Canada, Chile, India, Japan, Korea, and the US.<sup>11</sup> For example, in the US, being a BC is associated with an additional monthly return of 36 basis points. Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, and Sweden have negative coefficients on the *BC* dummy; the coefficient is only significant in Denmark.

#### 4. The role of labor market flexibility

This section examines how the relationship between employee satisfaction and stock returns depends on the degree of labor market flexibility. Specifically, we enhance the pooled panel regression in equation (2) with measures of labor market flexibility and country-level controls, and estimate it across the full sample of all countries<sup>12</sup>:

$$R_{cit} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 BC_{cit} + \beta_2 BC_{cit} \times LMF_{ct} + \beta_3 BC_{cit} \times CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_1 LMF_{ct} + \delta_2 CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_3 FirmControls_{cit} + \varepsilon_{cit}. \quad (3)$$

where  $R_{cit}$  is either the raw, market-adjusted, or industry-adjusted return.  $LMF$  refers to our two labor market flexibility measures: *EPL* and *EFW*. To ensure that our  $LMF$  variables are not simply proxying for other country-level differences, we include *CountryControls<sub>ct</sub>*, a vector of other country-level control variables. *RuleofLaw<sub>c</sub>* measures the rule of law from La Porta, Lopez-de-Silanes, Shleifer, and Vishny (1997). *GDPg<sub>ct</sub>* measures GDP growth taken from the World Bank, and *ADRI<sub>c</sub>* measures the anti-director rights index corrected by Spamann (2010). *IDV<sub>c</sub>* is

---

<sup>11</sup> The coefficient on the *BC* dummy in Canada is very high (e.g. 210 basis points for raw returns). We have re-run the cross-country analyses that follow excluding Canada for robustness. The results are very similar, since the Canada data is only available for a short time period.

<sup>12</sup> Holderness (2016) argues that international empirical analyses should be conducted at the firm level, rather than at the country level, as the latter approach ignores between-firm, within-country variation. Our equation (3) controls for firm characteristics.



Hofstede’s (1980) measure of a country’s cultural individualism, which we include because Chui, Titman, and Wei (2010) find that profits to another trading strategy (momentum) depend on individualism.  $PriceInf_{ct}$  is a measure of price informativeness based on Fernandes and Ferreira (2009): one minus the R-squared of a regression of monthly equity excess returns on value-weighted local market excess returns and US market excess returns each year. We take the median value over all firms for a particular country-year.<sup>13</sup> Since the returns to BCs capture not only the value of employee satisfaction, but the extent to which this value is not immediately capitalized by the market, we include price informativeness as a proxy for market efficiency. (Note that the control for firm size may also proxy for arbitrage costs and investor sophistication (Lakonishok, Shleifer, and Vishny (1994)). We also include  $GDP_{ct}$  (GDP per capita) and  $MktCapGDP_{ct}$  (stock market capitalization over GDP), both taken from the World Bank, which proxy for the development of a country’s economy and stock market, and thus may also be related to market efficiency.

We include the country-level controls both independently (except for the time-invariant country-level variables  $RuleofLaw$ ,  $ADRI$  and  $IDV$  due to the presence of country fixed effects) and also interacted with  $BC$ , to ensure that any significance of the  $BC*LMF$  interaction does not simply arise because  $LMF$  proxies for another country-level variable that is causing cross-country differences in the returns to the BCs. We include year-month fixed effects as in equation (2), and country fixed effects to capture country-level variation in average stock market returns. Following Petersen (2009), we double-cluster standard errors. We do so at the country and year-month levels as it is the most conservative specification; the results remain robust to double-clustering at the firm and year-month levels.

---

<sup>13</sup> Following Fernandes and Ferreira (2009), our sample screening criteria in the calculation are: 1) excluding firms with negative sales in a particular year; 2) excluding firms with total assets of under \$100 million; and 3) requiring stock returns data in Datastream in every month of a given year.

While we include country fixed effects and time-varying country controls (both independently and interacted with *BC*), it may be that *LMF* is correlated with time-varying unobservable country-level factors that are captured by neither our observable controls nor time-invariant fixed effects. To explain our results, not only would the unobservable factors have to be associated with future stock returns, but also the association would have to depend on a firm's *BC* status. While not impossible, this narrows the range of admissible alternative explanations for our findings.<sup>14</sup>

Panel A of Table 4 presents the results using *EPL* as the measure of labor market flexibility. Columns (1)-(3) use raw returns as the dependent variable. In column (1), which contains no measures of labor market flexibility or country controls, *BC* has a positive coefficient of 0.74, which is significant at the 1% level. However, in column (3) when interactions with *EPL* and the country controls are added, the coefficient on *BC* becomes significantly negative, but the coefficient on *BC\*EPL* is significantly positive at the 1% level. Thus, *BCs* are not associated with higher returns on average, but only in countries with flexible labor markets. Columns (4)-(6) ((7)-(9)) use the market-adjusted (industry-adjusted) return as the dependent variable. The results are equally strong, with the coefficient on *BC\*EPL* being 0.94 (1.09) for market-adjusted (industry-adjusted) returns. A one standard deviation increase in *EPL* is associated with a 0.55% (0.64%) increase in the monthly market-adjusted (industry-adjusted) return to being a *BC*.

Panel B presents the results using *EFW* as the measure of labor market flexibility, which are similar to Panel A. For raw, market-adjusted, and industry-adjusted returns in columns (3), (6), and (9) respectively, the coefficient on *BC\*EFW* is positive and significant at the 1% level. For

---

<sup>14</sup> Unfortunately, we were unable to find (either in prior literature or institutional study) any exogenous shocks to labor laws during our sample period that we could exploit for identification. OECD (2013, Figure 2.1) documents changes in *EPL*, but only Greece and Brazil experience large changes in our sample period. In addition, such changes are themselves likely to be endogenous, since countries choose when to enforce labor laws.

example, the coefficient of 0.31 in column (9) indicates that a one standard deviation increase in *EFW* is associated with a 0.54% increase in the monthly industry-adjusted return to being a BC.

## 5. Potential mechanisms

The results of Section 4 are consistent with a number of potential mechanisms. Our hypothesis is that employee satisfaction has particularly high value in flexible labor markets, but the market does not fully incorporate this value immediately upon list publication. However, there are a number of alternative explanations. First, the abnormal returns stem from risk rather than mispricing – since employee satisfaction is an intangible asset worth little in bankruptcy, the BCs may be particularly vulnerable to changes in economic conditions. The sheer magnitude of the positive excess returns in some countries, documented in Table 2, seems difficult to fully explain by risk, as do the negative returns in others, but additional analyses can be conducted to assess this hypothesis. Second, employee satisfaction creates neither positive nor negative value, but the market erroneously thinks that it represents wasteful expenditure, and so reacts negatively to list inclusion; the subsequent superior returns reflect the correction of this mispricing. This explanation would require the negative returns to employee satisfaction in other countries to result from the market erroneously thinking that it is value-creating and incorrectly reacting positively to list inclusion.<sup>15</sup>

Both of these alternative hypotheses would imply that the BCs in flexible (rigid) labor markets trade at a valuation discount (premium) at the beginning of the return compounding window, i.e. at the start of the month following list publication. We thus study the effect of being a Best Company on industry-adjusted Tobin's Q by running the following regression:

---

<sup>15</sup> A third channel is that list inclusion attracts demand from socially responsible investors, leading to price pressure. Edmans (2011) estimates this effect for the US and found it to be very small compared to the magnitude of the abnormal returns.

$$Q_{cit} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 BC_{cit} + \beta_2 BC_{cit} \times LMF_{ct} + \beta_3 BC_{cit} \times CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_1 LMF_{ct} + \delta_2 CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_3 FirmControls2_{cit} + \varepsilon_{cit}. \quad (4)$$

$Q_{cit}$  is industry-adjusted Tobin's Q for firm  $i$  in country  $c$  in year  $t$  at the start of the return compounding window, i.e. at the start of the month following list publication, where Tobin's Q is calculated as the sum of book assets plus market equity, minus the sum of book equity plus balance sheet deferred taxes, all divided by book assets, and winsorized at the 0.5% and 99.5% level in each country. The industry adjustment is conducted by subtracting the median Q across all non-BC firms in the same industry in country  $c$  and year  $t$ .  $FirmControls2$  is a vector of firm controls:  $BM$  is the log of firm  $i$ 's book-to-market ratio,  $LBVA$  is the log of book assets,  $ROE$  is firm  $i$ 's return on equity as measured by income divided by book equity, and  $FROE$ ,  $F2ROE$ , and  $F3ROE$  represent the return on equity for the next three years. The choice of these variables follows Gompers, Ishii, and Metrick (2003) and Edmans (2011). The country-level controls are defined as in Table 4. We include country and year-month fixed effects, and double-cluster standard errors at the country and year-month level.<sup>16</sup>

The results in Table 5 show that, without country controls or  $LMF$ , the BCs enjoy Tobin's Qs that are 0.84 units higher at the start of the return compounding window; the magnitude is consistent with Edmans (2011). Moreover, this premium is particularly high in flexible labor markets. When the  $BC*LMF$  interactions are included, they are significant at the 5% level or better (both with and without country controls), but the coefficient on  $BC$  as a standalone becomes either insignificant or significantly negative, suggesting that the BCs are *only* associated with higher Q in

---

<sup>16</sup> The fixed effects and clustering are at the year-month (rather than year) level, because the month following list publication differs across countries.

flexible labor markets. With country fixed effects and country controls, a one standard deviation increase in *EPL (EFW)* is associated with BCs having a 0.09 (0.19) unit higher Q. These results are inconsistent with the alternative explanation that the superior returns to the BCs in flexible labor markets result from them initially trading at a discount. In contrast, they are consistent with the hypothesis that employee satisfaction is valuable, particularly in flexible labor markets, and the market partially incorporates its value upon list publication.

We now study the future accounting performance of the BCs, to investigate whether their excess returns result from the (positive or negative) value of employee satisfaction rather than risk. We run the following regression:

$$Perf_{cit+j} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 BC_{cit} + \beta_2 BC_{cit} \times LMF_{ct} + \beta_3 BC_{cit} \times CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_1 LMF_{ct} + \delta_2 CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_3 BM_{cit} + \varepsilon_{cit}. \quad (5)$$

$Perf_{cit+j}$  is industry-adjusted accounting performance for firm  $i$  in country  $c$  in year  $t+j$  (for  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ ), measured in two ways.  $ROA_{cit+j}$  is the industry-adjusted return on assets, calculated as operating income before depreciation divided by book value of assets following Chan and Chen (1991).<sup>17</sup>  $NPM_{cit+j}$  is the industry-adjusted net profit margin, calculated as operating income before depreciation divided by sales following Jacobson (1987). Following Gompers, Ishii, and Metrick (2003), we include  $BM_{cit}$  as a firm-level control. The country-level controls are defined as in Section 4. We winsorize operating performance at the 0.5% and 99.5% level in each country and include country and year fixed effects. Also as in Gompers, Ishii, and Metrick (2003), we run least absolute deviation (“LAD”) regressions to mitigate the effect of large outliers. Standard errors are

---

<sup>17</sup> The results remain significant when replacing operating income before depreciation by net income.

robust to heteroscedasticity and misspecification (Angrist, Chernozhukov, and Fernández-Val (2006)), and clustered at the country level.<sup>18</sup>

The results are shown in Table 6. The BCs enjoy return on asset ratios that are 3.7 (2.8) percentage points higher than their peers one year (two years) after list inclusion.<sup>19</sup> When the  $BC*LMF$  interactions are added, they are significant at the 1% level, both with and without country controls; the coefficient on  $BC$  alone either becomes insignificant or significantly negative. A one standard deviation increase in  $EPL$  ( $EFW$ ) is associated with BCs having a next-year return on assets that is 1.23 (1.20) percentage points higher. We find similar results using net profit margin as the dependent variable. Out of the 16 specifications (with and without controls, using  $EPL$  or  $EFW$ , for  $ROA$  and  $NPM$  as the performance measure, and studying performance one or two years ahead), 13 of the  $BC*LMF$  interaction terms are significant at least at the 5% level, and two at the 10% level.

The superior operating performance of the BCs in flexible labor markets can only account for their superior stock returns to the extent that they are unanticipated by the market. Thus, Table 7 follows Core, Guay, and Rusticus (2006), Giroud and Mueller (2011), and Edmans (2011) by studying the earnings surprises of the BCs. We run the following pooled panel regression across countries:

$$\begin{aligned}
 Surprise_{cit} = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 BC_{cit} + \beta_2 BC_{cit} \times LMF_{ct} + \beta_3 BC_{cit} \times CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_1 LMF_{ct} + \\
 & \delta_2 CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_3 FirmControls_{cit} + \varepsilon_{cit}, \quad (6)
 \end{aligned}$$

---

<sup>18</sup> We use the Stata “qreg2” command which only allows clustering of standard errors along one dimension. To our knowledge, the econometrics literature has not proposed an estimator for two-way clustering in a quantile regression and no such code is available.

<sup>19</sup> As benchmarks against which to evaluate the economic significance of this result, if we take the inter-quartile range (standard deviation) of  $ROA$  for each country and calculate the median across the 14 countries, we obtain 7.0% (10.3%). Thus, the 3.7% or 2.8% higher return on assets of the BCs appear plausible.

where *Surprise* is the one or two-year earnings surprise. The one-year earnings surprise is the actual earnings per share for the fiscal year ending in year  $t$  minus the median I/B/E/S analyst forecast, deflated by the stock price two months prior. The I/B/E/S consensus forecast is taken eight months prior to the end of the forecast period, i.e. four months after the previous fiscal year-end. Since most annual reports are filed within three months of the fiscal year-end, this ensures that analysts know prior earnings when making their forecasts. The two-year earnings surprise is calculated in a similar fashion, with the consensus forecast taken 20 months before the year-end. As in Easterwood and Nutt (1999), Lim (2001), Teoh and Wong (2002), Giroud and Mueller (2011), and Edmans (2011), we remove observations for which the forecast error is larger than 10% of the price. *FirmControls*<sup>3</sup> is a vector of control variables. Columns (1) and (4) include no firm controls; (2) and (5) include *BM* one and two years prior, and (3) and (6) also include *SIZE* one and two years prior. All specifications include country and year-month fixed effects.

Our hypothesis is not only that the BCs exhibit superior earnings surprises, but also that this superiority is increasing in labor market flexibility. This is a difficult test to pass: Core, Guay, and Rusticus (2006) show that, even though well-governed firms deliver higher stock returns than poorly-governed firms (Gompers, Ishii, and Metrick (2003)), they do not deliver superior earnings surprises – even in unconditional regressions that do not interact the variable of interest (governance) with a country-level variable.

Panel A of Table 7 illustrates the results using *EPL* as the measure of labor market flexibility. Columns (1)-(3) show that the BCs enjoy significantly higher one-year earnings surprises in flexible labor markets: the coefficient on *BC\*EPL* is significant at the 1% level in columns (1), and at the 5% level in column (2) and (3) which include either one or both firm controls. Columns (4)-(6) study two-year earnings surprises and show that the interaction is significant at at least the 5% level

in all columns. In terms of economic significance, a one standard deviation increase in the *EPL* measure is associated with a 0.16% (0.50%) increase in the one-year (two-year) earnings surprise. However, Panel B shows positive but insignificant results using *EFW*. Thus, overall, the earnings surprise results are more mixed.

Overall, our results suggest that companies with high employee satisfaction exhibit higher future stock returns, current valuation ratios, future operating performance, particularly in countries with high labor market flexibility. We also find higher earnings surprises in flexible labor markets under the *EPL* measure, but not the *EFW* measure. These findings are consistent with employee satisfaction being a valuable intangible asset that is not fully priced by the market in countries with flexible labor markets, but reflecting wasteful expenditure in countries with rigid labor markets.

## **6. Conclusions**

This paper studies how the relationship between employee satisfaction and stock returns depends critically on a country's labor market flexibility. The alphas documented by Edmans (2011, 2012) for the US are not anomalous in a global context, in terms of economic significance. However, they do not automatically generalize to every country – being listed as a Best Company to Work For is associated with superior returns only in countries with high labor market flexibility. We find similar results for current valuation ratios, operating performance, and (under the *EPL* measure) future earnings surprises – these are higher for the Best Companies, but only in countries with flexible labor markets.

Our findings are consistent with the recruitment, retention, and motivational benefits of employee satisfaction being most valuable in flexible labor markets. The results emphasize the importance of the institutional context for both managers and investors. Even if prior results using US data can be interpreted as causal, it is not the case that managers can hope to increase stock



returns by investing in employee satisfaction, because a positive link only exists in countries with high labor market flexibility. Turning to investors, a strategy of investing in firms with high employee satisfaction will only generate superior returns in countries with high labor market flexibility. Given that the vast majority of empirical asset pricing studies that uncover alpha are based on US data, the results emphasize caution in applying these strategies overseas. This caution is especially warranted for strategies that are likely to be dependent on the institutional or cultural environment, such as socially responsible investing. Just as the value of employee satisfaction depends on the flexibility of labor markets and existing regulations on worker welfare, the value of other SRI screens, such as gender diversity, animal rights, environmental protection, and operating in an ethical industry, also likely depend on the context.

## References

- Abowd, John M. (1989): “The Effect of Wage Bargains on the Stock Market Value of the Firm.” *American Economic Review* 79, 774–800.
- Acemoglu, Daron and Jörn-Steffen Pischke: (1998) “Why do Firms Train? Theory and Evidence.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 63, 79–119.
- Acharya, Viral V., Ramin P. Baghai, and Krishnamurthy V. Subrahmanian (2013): “Labor Laws and Innovation.” *Journal of Law and Economics* 56, 997–1037.
- Akerlof, George A. (1982): “Labor Contracts as Partial Gift Exchange.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 97, 543–569.
- Agrawal, Anup, Jeffrey Jaffe, and Gerson Mandelker (1992): “The Post-Merger Performance of Acquiring Firms: A Re-Examination of an Anomaly.” *Journal of Finance* 47, 1605–1621.
- Angrist, Joshua D., Victor Chernozhukov, and Iván Fernández-Val (2006): “Quantile Regression Under Misspecification, with an Application to the US Wage Structure.” *Econometrica* 74, 539–563.
- Asness, Clifford S., Tobias J. Moskowitz, and Lasse Heje Pedersen (2013): “Value and Momentum Everywhere.” *Journal of Finance* 68, 929–985.
- Atanassov, Julian and E. Han Kim (2009): “Labor and corporate governance: International evidence from restructuring decisions.” *Journal of Finance* 64, 341–374.
- Bauer, Rob, Kees Koedijk, and Roger Otten (2005): “International Evidence on Ethical Mutual Fund Performance and Investment Style.” *Journal of Banking and Finance* 29, 1751–1767.
- Benartzi, Shlomo (2001): “Excessive extrapolation and the allocation of 401(k) accounts to company stock.” *Journal of Finance* 56, 1747–1764.
- Bergman, Nittai and Dirk Jenter (2007): “Employee sentiment and stock option compensation.” *Journal of Financial Economics* 84, 667–712.
- Bernal-Verdugo, Lorenzo E., David Furceri, and Dominique Guillaume (2012a): “Labor Market Flexibility and Unemployment: New Empirical Evidence of Static and Dynamic Effects.” *Comparative Economic Studies* 54, 251–273.
- Bernal-Verdugo, Lorenzo E., David Furceri, and Dominique Guillaume (2012b): “Crises, Labor Market Policy, and Unemployment.” Working Paper, International Monetary Fund.
- Blanchard, Olivier and Pedro Portugal (2001): “What Hides Behind an Unemployment Rate: Comparing Portuguese and US Labor Markets.” *American Economic Review* 91, 187–207.

- Brammer, Stephen, Chris Brooks, and Stephen Pavelin (2006): “Corporate Social Performance and Stock Returns: UK Evidence from Disaggregate Measures.” *Financial Management* 35, 97–116.
- Brennan, Michael J., Tarun Chordia, and Avanidhar Subrahmanyam (1998): “Alternative Factor Specifications, Security Characteristics, and the Cross-Section of Expected Returns.” *Journal of Financial Economics* 49, 345–373.
- Carhart, Mark M. (1997): “On Persistence in Mutual Fund Performance.” *Journal of Finance* 52, 57–82.
- Chan, K. C. and Nai-Fu Chen (1991): “Structural and Return Characteristics of Small and Large Firms.” *Journal of Finance* 46, 1467–1484.
- Chan, Louis K. C., Josef Lakonishok, and Theodore Sougiannis (2001): “The Stock Market Valuation of Research and Development Expenditures.” *Journal of Finance* 56, 2431–2456.
- Chen, Huafeng Jason, Marcin Kacperczyk, and Hernan Ortiz-Molina (2011): “Labor Unions, Operating Flexibility, and the Cost of Equity.” *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 46, 25–58.
- Cheng, Beiting, Ioannis Ioannou, and George Serafeim (2014): “Corporate Sustainability and Access to Finance.” *Strategic Management Journal* 35, 1–23.
- Chui, Andy C.W., Sheridan Titman, and K.C. John Wei (2010): “Individualism and Momentum around the World.” *Journal of Finance* 65, 361–392.
- Core, John E., Wayne R. Guay, and Tjomme O. Rusticus (2006): “Does Weak Governance Cause Weak Stock Returns? An Examination of Firm Operating Performance and Investors’ Expectations.” *Journal of Finance* 61, 655–687.
- Cronqvist, Henrik, Fredrik Heyman, Mattias Nilsson, Helena Svaleryd, and Jonas Vlachos (2009): “Do Entrenched Managers Pay Their Workers More?” *Journal of Finance* 64, 309–339.
- Derwall, Jeroen, Nadja Guenster, Rob Bauer, and Kees Koedijk (2005): “The Eco-Efficiency Premium Puzzle.” *Financial Analysts Journal* 61, 51–63.
- Dhrymes, Phoebus J. (1998): “Socially Responsible Investment: Is It Profitable?” In: Bruce, B. (Ed.), *The Investment Research Guide to Socially Responsible Investing*. The Colloquium on Socially Responsible Investing, Plano, TX, 264–284.
- Diltz, J. David (1995): “Does Social Screening Affect Portfolio Performance?” *Journal of Investing* 4, 64–69.
- Dimson, Elroy, Oguzhan Karakas, and Xi Li (2015): “Active Ownership.” *Review of Financial Studies* 28, 3225–3268.

- Eccles, Robert, Ioannis Ioannou, and George Serafeim (2014) “The Impact of Corporate Sustainability on Organizational Processes and Performance.” *Management Science* 60, 2835–2857.
- Easterwood, John C. and Stacey R. Nutt (1999): “Inefficiency in Analysts’ Earnings Forecasts: Systematic Misreaction or Systematic Optimism?” *Journal of Finance* 43, 153–193.
- Edmans, Alex (2011): “Does the Stock Market Fully Value Intangibles? Employee Satisfaction and Equity Prices.” *Journal of Financial Economics* 101, 621–640.
- Edmans, Alex (2012): “The Link between Job Satisfaction and Firm Value, with Implications for Corporate Social Responsibility.” *Academy of Management Perspectives* 26, 1–19.
- Faleye, Olubunmi, Vikas Mehrotra, and Randall Morck (2006): “When Labor Has a Voice in Corporate Governance.” *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis* 41, 489–510.
- Fama, Eugene F. and Kenneth R. French (1997): “Industry Costs of Equity.” *Journal of Financial Economics* 43, 153–193.
- Fama, Eugene F. and Kenneth R. French (2012): “Size, Value, and Momentum in International Stock Returns.” *Journal of Financial Economics* 105, 457–472.
- Fama, Eugene F. and Kenneth R. French (2015): “International Tests of a Five-Factor Asset Pricing Model.” Working Paper, University of Chicago.
- Fama, Eugene F. and James D. MacBeth (1973): “Risk, Return, and Equilibrium: Empirical Tests.” *Journal of Political Economy* 81, 607–636.
- Feldmann, Horst (2009): “The Unemployment Effects of Labor Regulation around the World.” *Journal of Comparative Economics* 37, 76–90.
- Fernandes, Nuno and Miguel A. Ferreira (2009): “Insider Trading Laws and Stock Price Informativeness.” *Review of Financial Studies* 22, 1845–1887.
- Flammer, Caroline (2015): “Does Corporate Social Responsibility Lead to Superior Financial Performance? A Regression Discontinuity Approach.” *Management Science* 61, 2549–2568.
- Fornell, Claes, Sunil Mithas, Forrest V. Morgeson III, and M.S. Krishnan (2006): “Customer Satisfaction and Stock Prices: High Returns, Low Risk.” *Journal of Marketing* 70, 3–14.
- Freeman, Richard B., Douglas Kruse, and Joseph Blasi (2008): “The Same Yet Different: Worker Reports on Labor Practices and Outcomes in a Single Firm across Countries.” *Labor Economics* 15, 750–771.
- Giroud, Xavier and Holger M. Mueller (2011): “Corporate Governance, Product Market Competition, and Equity Prices.” *Journal of Finance* 66, 563–600.

- Gompers, Paul, Joy Ishii, and Andrew Metrick (2003): "Corporate Governance and Equity Prices." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 118, 107–156.
- Gorton, Gary and Frank A. Schmid (2004): "Capital, Labor, and the Firm: A Study of German Codetermination." *Journal of the European Economic Association* 2, 863–905.
- Griffin, John M. (2009): "Are the Fama and French Factors Global or Country Specific?" *Review of Financial Studies* 15, 783–803.
- Haltiwanger, John, Stefano Scarpetta, and Helena Schweiger (2008): "Assessing Job Flows across Countries: The Role of Industry, Firm Size and Regulations." *NBER Working Paper Series*.
- Guerard, Jr., John B. (1997): "Is there a Cost to Being Socially Responsible in Investing?" *Journal of Investing* 6, 11–18.
- Hamilton, Sally, Hoje Jo, and Meir Statman (1993): "Doing Well while Doing Good: the Investment Performance of Socially Responsible Mutual Funds." *Financial Analysts Journal* 49, 62–66.
- Hertzberg, Frederick (1959): *The Motivation to Work*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hofstede, Geert (1980): *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills CA: Sage Publications.
- Holderness, Clifford G. (2016): "Problems with using Aggregate Data to Infer Individual Behavior: Evidence from Law, Finance, and Ownership." *Critical Finance Review* 5, 1–40.
- Hong, Harrison and Marcin Kacperczyk (2009): "The Price of Sin: the Effect of Social Norms on Markets." *Journal of Financial Economics* 93, 15–36.
- Hou, Kewei, G. Andrew Karolyi, and Bong-Chan Kho (2009): "What Factors Drive Global Stock Returns?" *Review of Financial Studies* 24, 2527–2574.
- Huselid, Mark A. (1995): "The Impact of Human Resource Practices on Turnover, Productivity, and Corporate Financial Performance." *Journal of Financial Economics* 38, 635–672.
- Ioannou, Ioannis and George Serafeim (2012): "What Drives Corporate Social Performance? The Role of Nation-Level Institutions." *Journal of International Business Studies* 43, 834–864.
- Jacobson, Robert (1987): "The Validity of ROI as a Measure of Business Performance." *American Economic Review* 77, 470–478.
- Jensen, Michael C. and William H. Meckling (1976): "Theory of the Firm: Managerial Behavior, Agency Costs, and Capital Structure." *Journal of Financial Economics* 3, 305–360.
- Jenter, Dirk, Katharina A. Lewellen, and Jerold B. Warner (2011): "Security Issue Timing: What Do Managers Know, and When Do They Know It?" *Journal of Finance* 66, 413–443.

- Krüger, Philipp (2015): “Corporate Goodness and Shareholder Wealth.” *Journal of Financial Economics* 115, 304–329.
- Kurtz, Lloyd and Dan DiBartolomeo (1996): “Socially Screened Portfolios: An Attribution Analysis of Relative Performance.” *Journal of Investing* 5, 35–41.
- La Porta, Rafael, Florencio López-de-Silanes, Andrei Shleifer, and Robert W. Vishny (1997): “Legal Determinants of External Finance.” *Journal of Finance* 52, 1131–1150.
- Lakonishok, Josef, Andrei Shleifer, and Robert W. Vishny (1994): “Contrarian Investment, Extrapolation, and Risk.” *Journal of Finance* 49, 1541–1578.
- Lam, Catherine K., Gerben S. Van der Vegt, Frank Walter, and Xin Huang (2011): “Harming High Performers: A Social Comparison Perspective on Interpersonal Harming in Work Teams.” *Journal of Applied Psychology* 96, 588–601.
- Lee, David. S. and Alexandre Mas (2012): “Long-run Impacts of Unions on Firms: New Evidence from Financial Markets, 1961–1999.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 127, 333–378.
- Macduffie, John Paul (1995): “Human Resource Bundles and Manufacturing Performance: Organizational Logic and Flexible Production Systems in the World Auto Industry.” *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 48, 179–221.
- Maslow, Abraham H. (1943): “A Theory of Human Motivation.” *Psychological Review* 50, 370–396.
- Mayo, Edwin (1949): *Hawthorne and the Western Electric Company: The Social Problems of an Industrial Civilisation*. London: Routledge.
- Messina, Julian and Giovanna Vallanti (2007): “Job Flow Dynamics and Firing Restrictions: Evidence from Europe.” *Economic Journal* 117, F279–F301.
- Milgrom, Paul and John Roberts (1995): “Complementarities and Fit: Strategy, Structure, and Organizational Design in Manufacturing.” *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 19, 179–208.
- Newey, Whitney K. and Kenneth West (1987): “A Simple, Positive Semidefinite, Heteroskedasticity and Autocorrelation Consistent Covariance Matrix.” *Econometrica* 55, 703–708.
- OECD (1996): “Employment Adjustment, Workers and Unemployment.” *OECD Employment Outlook*, Chapter 5.
- OECD (2013): “Protecting Jobs, Enhancing Flexibility: A New Look at Employment Protection Legislation.” *OECD Employment Outlook*, Chapter 2.

- Pagano, Marco and Paolo F. Volpin (2005a): “Managers, Workers, and Corporate Control.” *Journal of Finance* 60, 843–870.
- Pagano, Marco and Paolo F. Volpin (2005b): “The Political Economy of Corporate Governance.” *American Economic Review* 95, 1005–1030.
- Petersen, Mitchell A. (2009): “Estimating Standard Errors in Finance Panel Data Sets: Comparing Approaches.” *Review of Financial Studies* 22, 435–480.
- Renneboog, Luc, Jenke Ter Horst, and Chendi Zhang (2008): “The Price of Ethics and Stakeholder Governance: The Performance of Socially Responsible Mutual Funds.” *Journal of Corporate Finance* 14, 302–328.
- Roethlisberger, F. J. and William J. Dickson (1939). *Management and the Worker*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Schröder, Michael (2007): “Is there a Difference? The Performance Characteristics of SRI Equity Indices.” *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting* 34, 331–348.
- Servaes, Henri and Ane Tamayo (2013): “The Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Firm Value: The Role of Customer Awareness.” *Management Science* 59, 1045–1061.
- Shapiro, Carl and Joseph E. Stiglitz (1984): “Equilibrium Unemployment as a Worker Discipline Device.” *American Economic Review* 74, 433–444.
- Simintzi, Elena, Vikrant Vig, and Paolo Volpin (2015): “Labor Protection and Leverage.” *Review of Financial Studies* 28, 561–591.
- Spamann, Holger (2010): “The Antidirector Rights Index Revisited.” *Review of Financial Studies* 23, 467–486.
- Statman, Meir and Denys Glushkov (2008): “The Wages of Social Responsibility.” *Financial Analysts Journal* 65, 33–46.
- Taylor, Frederick Winslow (1911): *The Principles of Scientific Management*. Harper Brothers, New York.
- Thelen, Kathleen (2001): “Varieties of Labor Politics in the Developed Democracies.” In Hall, P. A. and Soskice, D. (eds) (2001) *Varieties of Capitalism: the Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 71–103.
- Wasmer, Etienne (2006): “General versus Specific Skills in Labor Markets with Search Frictions and Firing Costs.” *American Economic Review* 96, 811–831.

**Table 1**  
**Summary statistics**

**Panel A: Publicly-listed Best Companies to Work For**

Panel A reports the list of countries in which at least ten publicly-listed Best Companies (BCs) are headquartered and publicly listed. Column (1) presents the years of BC lists that we use for each country. Column (2) reports our portfolio formation date for each country. Column (3) gives the number of listed BC per country. Column (4) presents the total number of listed firms in each country including BCs. Column (5) records the total number of firm-month observations for each country. Column (6) indicates for each country the number of BCs in the year the list was initiated and also in 2013. The last row shows the current publication outlet for each country. The sample period is September 1997 to December 2013.

Country	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)		(7)
	Listing years	Formation date	Total no. of public BCs	Total no. of firms	Total no. of obs.	Size of BC lists Initial	2013	Current Publication Outlet
<i>Brazil</i>	1997-2013	01-Sep	70	652	30,883	50	100	Época
<i>Canada</i>	2006-2013	01-May	15	4,405	172,724	30	50	The Globe and Mail
<i>Chile</i>	2001-2013	01-Dec	11	304	22,050	25	50	El Mercurio
<i>Denmark</i>	2001-2013	01-Dec	23	461	26,960	50	75	GPTW Europe
<i>Finland</i>	2003-2013	01-Mar	14	241	19,448	20	50	Talouselämä
<i>France</i>	2002-2013	01-Apr	18	1,765	92,813	25	49	Le Figaro
<i>Germany</i>	2003-2013	01-Mar	24	1,646	84,252	50	100	Handelsblatt
<i>Greece</i>	2003-2013	01-May	12	443	39,570	10	25	To Vima
<i>India</i>	2003-2013	01-Jun	46	2,578	131,432	25	100	The Economic Times
<i>Japan</i>	2007-2013	01-Apr	38	4,981	510,977	20	40	Nikkei Business
<i>Korea</i>	2002-2013	01-Nov	49	2,019	128,687	20	100	The Korea Economic Daily
<i>Sweden</i>	2003-2013	01-Apr	11	823	44,418	25	38	GPTW Sweden
<i>UK</i>	2001-2013	01-May	33	4,943	199,276	50	50	The Guardian
<i>US</i>	1998-2013	01-Feb	188	11,478	1,209,671	100	100	Fortune
All	–	–	552	39,239	2,713,161	500	927	–



**Table 1 (Cont'd)****Panel B: Employment protection legislation and labor market flexibility**

Panel B summarizes the employment protection legislation (*EPL*) indicators from OECD and the labor market flexibility index (*EFW*) based on the Fraser Institute's Economic Freedom of the World database. Column (1) presents the time-series average of *EPL* for each country. *EPL*, for a given country-year, is 10 minus the average of three components: individual dismissal of workers with regular contracts (*EPR*), additional costs for collective dismissals (*EPC*), and regulation of temporary contracts (*EPT*). Columns (2)-(4) gives the time-series average of these individual components. Column (5) presents the time-series average of *EFW* for each country. *EFW* for a given country-year is the average of six components: hiring regulations and minimum wage per country (*5Bi*), hiring and firing regulations (*5Bii*), centralized collective bargaining (*5Biii*), hours regulations (*5Biv*), mandated cost of worker dismissal (*5Bv*), and military conscription (*5Bvi*). Columns (6)-(11) gives the time-series average of these individual components. The sample period is 1997-2013 for *EPL* and 2002-2013 for *EFW*.

Country	(1) EPL	(2) Individual dismissals (regular contracts) EPR	(3) Collective dismissals (additional costs) EPC	(4) Temporary contracts EPT	(5) EFW	(6) Hiring regulations and min. wage 5Bi	(7) Hiring and firing regulations 5Bii	(8) Centralized collective bargaining 5Biii	(9) Hours regulations 5Biv	(10) Mandated cost of worker dismissal 5Bv	(11) Conscription 5Bvi
<i>Brazil</i>	7.841	1.452	0.900	4.125	4.643	3.620	4.410	5.335	5.175	6.315	3.000
<i>Canada</i>	8.620	0.921	2.969	0.250	7.916	7.740	6.055	7.485	8.430	7.785	10.00
<i>Chile</i>	8.124	2.627	0.000	3.000	5.766	6.120	4.900	7.965	8.625	6.215	0.769
<i>Denmark</i>	7.743	2.147	3.250	1.375	6.753	7.795	7.580	5.490	6.650	10.00	3.000
<i>Finland</i>	8.151	2.203	1.781	1.563	4.931	4.625	4.335	3.635	5.280	8.708	3.000
<i>France</i>	6.866	2.402	3.375	3.625	5.528	3.245	2.885	5.870	3.570	7.600	10.00
<i>Germany</i>	7.409	2.798	3.625	1.352	4.515	5.500	2.870	3.410	5.045	4.800	5.462
<i>Greece</i>	6.883	2.680	3.250	3.422	4.472	5.405	3.655	4.010	4.360	7.015	2.385
<i>India</i>	8.154	3.286	0.438	1.813	6.990	8.370	3.335	6.940	7.850	5.446	10.00
<i>Japan</i>	8.080	1.556	3.250	0.953	8.085	8.250	3.785	8.005	8.685	9.785	10.00
<i>Korea</i>	7.856	2.369	1.875	2.188	4.376	6.600	4.110	7.135	6.475	1.938	0.000
<i>Sweden</i>	7.891	2.333	2.500	2.945	5.285	5.535	3.080	3.975	4.725	8.708	5.692
<i>UK</i>	8.541	1.159	2.860	0.338	7.968	7.920	6.045	7.555	7.825	8.462	10.00
<i>US</i>	8.873	0.257	2.875	0.250	8.673	8.355	7.015	7.790	8.875	10.00	10.00
Average	7.931	1.937	2.852	1.681	6.396	6.363	4.576	6.043	6.541	7.341	5.951
Std. Dev.	0.585	0.767	1.016	1.201	1.711	2.459	1.754	1.763	2.479	1.891	3.993

**Table 2**  
**Country-level alphas**

**Panel A: Risk-adjusted returns of equal-weighted BC portfolios**

This table reports regression results of monthly returns of equal-weighted portfolios of Best Companies using Carhart's (1997) four-factor model:

$$R_{ct} = \alpha + \beta_{MKT}MKT_{ct} + \beta_{HML}HML_{ct} + \beta_{SMB}SMB_{ct} + \beta_{MOM}MOM_{ct} + \varepsilon_{ct},$$

where  $R_{ct}$  is the return on an equal-weighted portfolio of listed BCs in month  $t$  for country  $c$  in excess of the risk-free rate.  $\alpha$  is the intercept that captures the abnormal risk-adjusted return.  $MKT_{ct}$ ,  $HML_{ct}$ ,  $SMB_{ct}$ , and  $MOM_{ct}$ , are, respectively, the Fama and French (2012) regional factors on market, value, size, and momentum. Standard errors, given in parentheses, are adjusted for heteroscedasticity and four lags of autocorrelation. \*\*\*, \*\*, and \* indicate significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level, respectively. The sample period is September 1997 to December 2013.

Country	$\alpha$	$\beta_{MKT}$	$\beta_{HML}$	$\beta_{SMB}$	$\beta_{MOM}$	Adj.R <sup>2</sup>	Obs. No.
<i>Brazil</i>	<b>0.942</b> (0.606)	<b>0.969</b> *** (0.135)	<b>0.349</b> ** (0.147)	<b>0.535</b> ** (0.211)	<b>-0.057</b> (0.142)	0.312	183
<i>Canada</i>	<b>0.091</b> (0.485)	<b>1.280</b> *** (0.113)	<b>-0.209</b> (0.217)	<b>-0.320</b> (0.277)	<b>-0.113</b> (0.142)	0.648	90
<i>Chile</i>	<b>0.971</b> * (0.503)	<b>0.716</b> *** (0.146)	<b>-0.264</b> (0.211)	<b>0.464</b> ** (0.216)	<b>0.003</b> (0.109)	0.280	143
<i>Denmark</i>	<b>-0.629</b> (0.403)	<b>0.934</b> *** (0.076)	<b>0.074</b> (0.160)	<b>0.788</b> *** (0.154)	<b>0.095</b> (0.077)	0.685	143
<i>Finland</i>	<b>0.957</b> (0.715)	<b>0.947</b> *** (0.165)	<b>0.295</b> (0.390)	<b>0.501</b> (0.359)	<b>-0.232</b> (0.156)	0.471	92
<i>France</i>	<b>0.346</b> (0.453)	<b>0.891</b> *** (0.093)	<b>-0.415</b> * (0.242)	<b>-0.366</b> (0.252)	<b>-0.240</b> (0.101)	0.592	127
<i>Germany</i>	<b>-0.445</b> (0.437)	<b>1.028</b> ** (0.092)	<b>0.310</b> (0.301)	<b>-0.167</b> (0.189)	<b>-0.193</b> ** (0.096)	0.642	128
<i>Greece</i>	<b>-0.584</b> (0.791)	<b>1.143</b> *** (0.227)	<b>-0.275</b> (0.630)	<b>0.282</b> (0.461)	<b>-0.462</b> (0.180)	0.488	96
<i>India</i>	<b>1.076</b> (0.670)	<b>1.029</b> *** (0.099)	<b>0.274</b> (0.269)	<b>0.089</b> (0.224)	<b>-0.413</b> *** (0.141)	0.533	113
<i>Japan</i>	<b>0.768</b> * (0.332)	<b>0.985</b> *** (0.076)	<b>-0.083</b> (0.156)	<b>0.623</b> *** (0.156)	<b>0.008</b> (0.096)	0.701	79
<i>Korea</i>	<b>0.602</b> (0.570)	<b>1.037</b> *** (0.082)	<b>-0.000</b> (0.209)	<b>-0.194</b> (0.229)	<b>-0.159</b> (0.200)	0.552	132
<i>Sweden</i>	<b>0.870</b> * (0.497)	<b>1.136</b> *** (0.106)	<b>-0.623</b> ** (0.262)	<b>0.377</b> (0.328)	<b>0.129</b> (0.159)	0.497	127
<i>UK</i>	<b>0.812</b> (0.569)	<b>0.835</b> *** (0.081)	<b>-0.617</b> *** (0.195)	<b>0.405</b> * (0.216)	<b>-0.279</b> ** (0.126)	0.446	150
<i>US</i>	<b>0.341</b> *** (0.112)	<b>1.036</b> *** (0.025)	<b>0.041</b> *** (0.033)	<b>0.201</b> *** (0.038)	<b>-0.125</b> (0.008)	0.926	190

**Table 2 (Cont'd)****Panel B: Risk-adjusted returns of value-weighted BC portfolios**

This table reports regression results of monthly returns of value-weighted portfolios of Best Companies using Carhart's (1997) four-factor model:

$$R_{ct} = \alpha + \beta_{MKT}MKT_{ct} + \beta_{HML}HML_{ct} + \beta_{SMB}SMB_{ct} + \beta_{MOM}MOM_{ct} + \varepsilon_{ct},$$

where  $R_{ct}$  is the return on a value-weighted portfolio of listed BCs in month  $t$  for country  $c$  in excess of the risk-free rate.  $\alpha$  is the intercept that captures the abnormal risk-adjusted return.  $MKT_{ct}$ ,  $HML_{ct}$ ,  $SMB_{ct}$ , and  $MOM_{ct}$ , are, respectively, the Fama and French (2012) regional factors on market, value, size, and momentum. Standard errors, given in parentheses, are adjusted for heteroscedasticity and four lags of autocorrelation. \*\*\*, \*\*, and \* indicate significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level, respectively. The sample period is September 1997 to December 2013.

Country	$\alpha$	$\beta_{MKT}$	$\beta_{HML}$	$\beta_{SMB}$	$\beta_{MOM}$	Adj.R <sup>2</sup>	Obs. No.
<i>Brazil</i>	<b>0.591</b> (0.580)	<b>0.944</b> *** (0.134)	<b>0.228</b> (0.168)	<b>0.420</b> ** (0.204)	<b>-0.119</b> (0.123)	0.306	183
<i>Canada</i>	<b>0.203</b> (0.326)	<b>1.148</b> *** (0.089)	<b>0.093</b> (0.197)	<b>-0.227</b> (0.162)	<b>-0.137</b> (0.092)	0.757	90
<i>Chile</i>	<b>1.039</b> * (0.563)	<b>0.762</b> *** (0.144)	<b>-0.288</b> (0.230)	<b>0.580</b> * (0.337)	<b>0.070</b> (0.148)	0.240	143
<i>Denmark</i>	<b>-1.020</b> * (0.572)	<b>1.045</b> *** (0.105)	<b>-0.220</b> (0.288)	<b>0.442</b> * (0.230)	<b>0.151</b> (0.136)	0.490	143
<i>Finland</i>	<b>0.739</b> (0.717)	<b>0.960</b> *** (0.169)	<b>0.135</b> (0.395)	<b>0.325</b> (0.374)	<b>-0.298</b> ** (0.149)	0.455	92
<i>France</i>	<b>-0.200</b> (0.424)	<b>0.891</b> *** (0.081)	<b>-0.129</b> (0.257)	<b>0.161</b> (0.212)	<b>0.083</b> (0.100)	0.478	127
<i>Germany</i>	<b>-0.453</b> (0.549)	<b>0.957</b> *** (0.092)	<b>0.338</b> (0.289)	<b>-0.285</b> (0.205)	<b>-0.106</b> (0.101)	0.509	128
<i>Greece</i>	<b>-0.582</b> (0.843)	<b>1.216</b> *** (0.229)	<b>-0.050</b> (0.685)	<b>-0.219</b> (0.503)	<b>-0.734</b> ** (0.243)	0.542	96
<i>India</i>	<b>0.861</b> (0.608)	<b>1.022</b> *** (0.097)	<b>-0.085</b> (0.222)	<b>0.172</b> (0.200)	<b>-0.264</b> * (0.149)	0.559	113
<i>Japan</i>	<b>0.365</b> (0.308)	<b>0.938</b> *** (0.074)	<b>-0.276</b> ** (0.130)	<b>-0.011</b> (0.155)	<b>-0.015</b> (0.103)	0.721	79
<i>Korea</i>	<b>0.135</b> (0.623)	<b>1.121</b> *** (0.092)	<b>0.107</b> (0.262)	<b>-0.384</b> (0.284)	<b>-0.158</b> (0.247)	0.527	132
<i>Sweden</i>	<b>0.212</b> (0.517)	<b>1.165</b> *** (0.127)	<b>-0.761</b> *** (0.280)	<b>0.313</b> (0.358)	<b>0.140</b> (0.138)	0.475	127
<i>UK</i>	<b>0.988</b> ** (0.475)	<b>0.727</b> *** (0.081)	<b>-0.400</b> ** (0.156)	<b>-0.243</b> (0.202)	<b>-0.010</b> (0.096)	0.360	150
<i>US</i>	<b>0.182</b> (0.160)	<b>1.069</b> *** (0.036)	<b>-0.410</b> *** (0.047)	<b>-0.193</b> *** (0.055)	<b>-0.006</b> (0.030)	0.864	190

**Table 3**  
**Stock returns by country, controlling for firm characteristics**

This table reports results of monthly firm-level pooled panel regressions:

$$R_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 BC_{it} + \beta_2 FirmControls_{it} + \varepsilon_{it},$$

where  $R_{it}$  is the return for firm  $i$  in month  $t$ , either raw, market-adjusted, or industry-adjusted using the Fama and French (1997) 48-industry classification.  $BC_{it}$  is a dummy variable that equals one if firm  $i$  has been included in the most recent BC list prior to month  $t$ , and zero otherwise.  $FirmControls_{it}$  include the following firm-level controls:  $SIZE$  is the log of firm  $i$ 's market capitalization at the end of month  $t-2$ ;  $BM$  is the log of firm  $i$ 's book-to-market ratio at the end of month  $t-2$ ;  $YLD$  is firm  $i$ 's dividend yield as measured by the total dividends paid over the 12 months prior to month  $t$ , divided by the share price at the end of month  $t-2$ ;  $RET2-3$  is the log of one plus firm  $i$ 's cumulative return over months  $t-3$  through  $t-2$ ;  $RET4-6$  and  $RET7-12$  are defined similarly;  $VOL$  is the log of firm  $i$ 's dollar trading volume in month  $t-2$ ;  $PRC$  is the log of firm  $i$ 's price at the end of month  $t-2$ . We include year-month fixed effects and winsorize stock returns at 0.5% in each tail. We report only the coefficient on  $BC$  for brevity. Standard errors, given in parentheses, are clustered by year-month. \*\*\*, \*\*, and \* indicate significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level, respectively. The sample period is September 1997 to December 2013.

Country	Dependent Variable		
	Raw returns	Market-adjusted returns	Industry-adjusted returns
<i>Brazil</i>	<b>0.090</b> (0.520)	<b>0.095</b> (0.512)	<b>-0.405</b> (0.495)
<i>Canada</i>	<b>2.017***</b> (0.569)	<b>2.031***</b> (0.569)	<b>1.499***</b> (0.526)
<i>Chile</i>	<b>0.325</b> (0.402)	<b>0.326</b> (0.401)	<b>0.557</b> (0.408)
<i>Denmark</i>	<b>-0.588</b> (0.382)	<b>-0.592</b> (0.381)	<b>-0.295</b> (0.409)
<i>Finland</i>	<b>-0.613</b> (0.715)	<b>-0.627</b> (0.710)	<b>-0.541</b> (0.854)
<i>France</i>	<b>-0.334</b> (0.754)	<b>-0.262</b> (0.783)	<b>-0.510</b> (0.758)
<i>Germany</i>	<b>-0.541</b> (0.458)	<b>-0.453</b> (0.466)	<b>-0.425</b> (0.443)
<i>Greece</i>	<b>0.493</b> (0.786)	<b>0.600</b> (0.831)	<b>0.633</b> (0.785)
<i>India</i>	<b>1.265***</b> (0.451)	<b>1.317***</b> (0.464)	<b>1.317***</b> (0.420)
<i>Japan</i>	<b>1.081***</b> (0.320)	<b>1.089***</b> (0.321)	<b>0.973***</b> (0.308)
<i>Korea</i>	<b>1.396***</b> (0.391)	<b>1.392***</b> (0.392)	<b>1.132***</b> (0.387)
<i>Sweden</i>	<b>-0.044</b> (0.511)	<b>-0.040</b> (0.513)	<b>-0.007</b> (0.527)
<i>UK</i>	<b>0.382</b> (0.444)	<b>0.397</b> (0.444)	<b>0.240</b> (0.444)
<i>US</i>	<b>0.362**</b> (0.160)	<b>0.409**</b> (0.162)	<b>0.424***</b> (0.162)

**Table 4**  
**Stock returns across countries**

**Panel A: Measuring labor market flexibility with EPL**

This table reports the results of pooled panel regressions across countries:

$$R_{cit} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 BC_{cit} + \beta_2 BC_{cit} \times EPL_{ct} + \beta_3 BC_{cit} \times CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_1 EPL_{ct} + \delta_2 CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_3 FirmControls_{cit} + \varepsilon_{cit},$$

where  $R_{cit}$  is the return for firm  $i$  in month  $t$ , either raw, market-adjusted, or industry-adjusted using the Fama and French (1997) 48-industry classification.  $BC_{cit}$  is a dummy variable that equals one if firm  $i$  has been included in the most recent BC list in country  $c$  prior to month  $t$ , and zero otherwise.  $EPL_{ct}$  is the employment protection legislation described in Table 1, Panel B for country  $c$  at month  $t$ .  $CountryControls_{ct}$  include the following country-level controls: *RuleofLaw* measures the rule of law from La Porta, Lopez-de-Silanes, Shleifer, and Vishny (1997); *GDPg* measures GDP growth taken from the World Bank; *GDPpc* measures GDP per capita taken from the World Bank; *ADRI* measures the anti-director rights index corrected by Spamann (2010); *IDV* is Hofstede measure of cultural individualism; *PriceInf* measures the efficiency of a firm's stock markets constructed following Fernandes and Ferreira (2009); *MktCapGDP* is the stock market capitalization over GDP taken from the World Bank.  $FirmControls_{cit}$  include the firm-level controls described in Table 3. We include country and year-month fixed effects, and winsorize stock returns at 0.5% in each tail. The regression constant is not reported for brevity. Standard errors, given in parentheses, are double clustered by country and year-month. \*\*\*, \*\*, and \* indicate significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level, respectively. The sample period is September 1997 to December 2013.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Dependent variables	Raw returns			Market-adjusted returns			Industry-adjusted returns		
$BC_{cit}$	<b>0.743***</b> (0.188)	<b>-4.059**</b> (1.931)	<b>-4.888***</b> (0.712)	<b>0.770***</b> (0.182)	<b>-4.332**</b> (1.830)	<b>-5.243***</b> (0.593)	<b>0.734***</b> (0.155)	<b>-4.358**</b> (1.903)	<b>-4.960***</b> (1.268)
$BC_{cit} * EPL_{ct}$		<b>0.569**</b> (0.246)	<b>0.941***</b> (0.130)		<b>0.596**</b> (0.234)	<b>0.938***</b> (0.121)		<b>0.600**</b> (0.236)	<b>1.094***</b> (0.161)
$BC_{cit} * RuleofLaw_c$			<b>0.040</b> (0.149)			<b>0.021</b> (0.128)			<b>-0.046</b> (0.167)
$BC_{cit} * GDPg_{ct}$			<b>0.089</b> (0.096)			<b>0.101</b> (0.095)			<b>0.129</b> (0.103)
$BC_{cit} * GDPpc_{ct}$			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)			<b>0.000</b> (0.000)
$BC_{cit} * ADRI_c$			<b>-0.275**</b> (0.116)			<b>-0.247**</b> (0.113)			<b>-0.504***</b> (0.134)
$BC_{cit} * IDV_c$			<b>-0.007</b> (0.010)			<b>-0.005</b> (0.010)			<b>-0.010</b> (0.013)
$BC_{cit} * PriceInf_{ct}$			<b>-0.561</b> (0.596)			<b>-0.603</b> (0.531)			<b>-0.873*</b> (0.499)

<i>BC<sub>cit</sub>*MktCapGDP<sub>ct</sub></i>			<b>0.004</b> (0.007)			<b>0.004</b> (0.007)			<b>0.003</b> (0.007)
<i>EPL<sub>ct</sub></i>		<b>0.570</b> (1.266)	<b>-1.101</b> (1.756)		<b>2.209</b> (1.883)	<b>1.646</b> (1.754)		<b>0.768</b> (1.176)	<b>-0.925</b> (1.302)
<i>GDPg<sub>ct</sub></i>			<b>0.152</b> (0.144)			<b>-0.096</b> (0.111)			<b>-0.153</b> (0.115)
<i>GDPpc<sub>ct</sub></i>			<b>-0.001***</b> (0.000)			<b>-0.000**</b> (0.000)			<b>-0.000***</b> (0.000)
<i>PriceInf<sub>ct</sub></i>			<b>-1.200*</b> (0.648)			<b>0.229</b> (0.353)			<b>-0.671</b> (0.482)
<i>MktCapGDP<sub>ct</sub></i>			<b>0.107***</b> (0.025)			<b>0.047**</b> (0.019)			<b>0.035**</b> (0.017)
<i>SIZE</i>	<b>-0.298***</b> (0.112)	<b>-0.272**</b> (0.117)	<b>-0.246*</b> (0.126)	<b>-0.272**</b> (0.112)	<b>-0.246**</b> (0.120)	<b>-0.241*</b> (0.125)	<b>-0.325***</b> (0.102)	<b>-0.325***</b> (0.103)	<b>-0.323***</b> (0.109)
<i>BM</i>	<b>0.244</b> (0.262)	<b>0.223</b> (0.255)	<b>0.209</b> (0.254)	<b>0.223</b> (0.258)	<b>0.197</b> (0.245)	<b>0.179</b> (0.240)	<b>0.126</b> (0.245)	<b>0.105</b> (0.240)	<b>0.083</b> (0.232)
<i>YIELD</i>	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.001***</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.001***</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000*</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000*</b> (0.000)	<b>0.001***</b> (0.000)
<i>RET2-3</i>	<b>-0.398</b> (0.434)	<b>-0.447</b> (0.486)	<b>-0.744</b> (0.601)	<b>-0.517</b> (0.440)	<b>-0.497</b> (0.474)	<b>-0.622</b> (0.538)	<b>-0.457</b> (0.376)	<b>-0.482</b> (0.412)	<b>-0.616</b> (0.443)
<i>RET4-6</i>	<b>-0.045</b> (0.554)	<b>-0.326</b> (0.561)	<b>-0.473</b> (0.586)	<b>-0.066</b> (0.469)	<b>-0.231</b> (0.463)	<b>-0.302</b> (0.491)	<b>-0.072</b> (0.408)	<b>-0.213</b> (0.420)	<b>-0.257</b> (0.427)
<i>RET7-12</i>	<b>0.167</b> (0.451)	<b>0.126</b> (0.523)	<b>0.197</b> (0.487)	<b>0.326</b> (0.343)	<b>0.370</b> (0.364)	<b>0.358</b> (0.370)	<b>0.065</b> (0.334)	<b>0.065</b> (0.343)	<b>0.102</b> (0.341)
<i>VOL</i>	<b>0.158**</b> (0.077)	<b>0.148*</b> (0.085)	<b>0.123</b> (0.086)	<b>0.137*</b> (0.078)	<b>0.127</b> (0.087)	<b>0.118</b> (0.086)	<b>0.181***</b> (0.061)	<b>0.192***</b> (0.066)	<b>0.186***</b> (0.068)
<i>PRC</i>	<b>0.149**</b> (0.069)	<b>0.146*</b> (0.079)	<b>0.151*</b> (0.092)	<b>0.161*</b> (0.086)	<b>0.147*</b> (0.088)	<b>0.154</b> (0.095)	<b>0.210**</b> (0.097)	<b>0.212**</b> (0.103)	<b>0.219**</b> (0.109)
Year-month fixed effects	included	included	included	included	included	included	included	included	included
Country fixed effects	included	included	included	included	included	included	included	included	included
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.13	0.13	0.13	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Number of obs.	2,608,146	2,400,861	2,283,051	2,551,638	2,400,734	2,283,051	2,607,984	2,400,749	2,282,962

**Table 4 (Cont'd)**

**Panel B: Measuring labor market flexibility with EFW**

This table reports the results of pooled panel regressions across countries:

$$R_{cit} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 BC_{cit} + \beta_2 BC_{cit} \times EFW_{ct} + \beta_3 BC_{cit} \times CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_1 EFW_{ct} + \delta_2 CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_3 FirmControls_{cit} + \varepsilon_{cit},$$

where  $R_{cit}$  is the return for firm  $i$  in month  $t$ , either raw, market-adjusted, or industry-adjusted using the Fama and French (1997) 48-industry classification.  $BC_{cit}$  is a dummy variable that equals one if firm  $i$  has been included in the most recent BC list in country  $c$  prior to month  $t$ , and zero otherwise.  $EFW_{ct}$  is the labor market flexibility index based on the Fraser Institute's Economic Freedom of the World database described in Table 1, Panel B for country  $c$  at month  $t$ .  $CountryControls_{ct}$  include the following country-level controls: *RuleofLaw* measures the rule of law from La Porta, Lopez-de-Silanes, Shleifer, and Vishny (1997); *GDPg* measures GDP growth taken from the World Bank; *GDPpc* measures GDP per capita taken from the World Bank; *ADRI* measures the anti-director rights index corrected by Spamann (2010); *IDV* is Hofstede measure of cultural individualism; *PriceInf* measures the efficiency of a firm's stock markets constructed following Fernandes and Ferreira (2009); *MktCapGDP* is the stock market capitalization over GDP taken from the World Bank.  $FirmControls_{cit}$  include the firm-level controls described in Table 3. We include country and year-month fixed effects, and winsorize stock returns at 0.5% in each tail. The regression constant is not reported for brevity. Standard errors, given in parentheses, are double clustered by country and year-month. \*\*\*, \*\*, and \* indicate significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level, respectively. The sample period is September 1997 to December 2013.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Dependent variables	Raw returns			Market-adjusted returns			Industry-adjusted returns		
$BC_{cit}$	<b>0.608**</b> (0.264)	<b>-0.516*</b> (0.263)	<b>1.478</b> (1.004)	<b>0.636**</b> (0.248)	<b>-0.571</b> (0.366)	<b>1.855</b> (1.333)	<b>0.600***</b> (0.223)	<b>-0.361</b> (0.377)	<b>3.015</b> (2.032)
$BC_{cit} * EFW_{ct}$		<b>0.145**</b> (0.057)	<b>0.309***</b> (0.081)		<b>0.155**</b> (0.063)	<b>0.330***</b> (0.076)		<b>0.123**</b> (0.062)	<b>0.313***</b> (0.111)
$BC_{cit} * RuleofLaw_c$			<b>-0.281***</b> (0.096)			<b>-0.276***</b> (0.083)			<b>-0.312**</b> (0.139)
$BC_{cit} * GDPg_{ct}$			<b>-0.004</b> (0.066)			<b>0.001</b> (0.063)			<b>0.017</b> (0.050)
$BC_{cit} * GDPpc_{ct}$			<b>0.000</b> (0.000)			<b>0.000</b> (0.000)			<b>0.000</b> (0.000)
$BC_{cit} * ADRI_c$			<b>-0.050</b> (0.116)			<b>-0.201</b> (0.113)			<b>-0.400</b> (0.134)
$BC_{cit} * IDV_c$			<b>0.002</b> (0.007)			<b>0.001</b> (0.006)			<b>-0.004</b> (0.010)
$BC_{cit} * PriceInf_{ct}$			<b>0.061</b> (0.357)			<b>-0.296</b> (0.294)			<b>-0.457*</b> (0.258)

<i>BC<sub>cit</sub>*MktCapGDP<sub>ct</sub></i>			<b>-0.009</b> (0.009)			<b>-0.005</b> (0.008)			<b>-0.006</b> (0.007)
<i>EFW<sub>ct</sub></i>		<b>-0.816</b> (0.664)	<b>-0.879</b> (1.194)		<b>-0.159</b> (0.276)	<b>0.071</b> (0.503)		<b>-0.148</b> (0.346)	<b>-0.112</b> (0.505)
<i>GDPg<sub>ct</sub></i>			<b>0.206*</b> (0.119)			<b>-0.082</b> (0.107)			<b>-0.089</b> (0.106)
<i>GDPpc<sub>ct</sub></i>			<b>-0.001</b> (0.000)			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)			<b>-0.000**</b> (0.000)
<i>PriceInf<sub>ct</sub></i>			<b>-0.611</b> (0.652)			<b>0.363</b> (0.398)			<b>-0.303</b> (0.544)
<i>MktCapGDP<sub>ct</sub></i>			<b>0.076***</b> (0.019)			<b>0.039***</b> (0.012)			<b>0.026**</b> (0.011)
<i>SIZE</i>	<b>-0.311**</b> (0.123)	<b>-0.300**</b> (0.126)	<b>-0.309***</b> (0.120)	<b>-0.274**</b> (0.124)	<b>-0.272**</b> (0.123)	<b>-0.276**</b> (0.127)	<b>-0.316**</b> (0.126)	<b>-0.315**</b> (0.125)	<b>-0.341***</b> (0.121)
<i>BM</i>	<b>0.334</b> (0.280)	<b>0.331</b> (0.280)	<b>0.355</b> (0.302)	<b>0.310</b> (0.272)	<b>0.310</b> (0.272)	<b>0.303</b> (0.277)	<b>0.230</b> (0.256)	<b>0.229</b> (0.256)	<b>0.228</b> (0.264)
<i>YIELD</i>	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.001***</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.001***</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.001***</b> (0.000)
<i>RET2-3</i>	<b>-0.279</b> (0.541)	<b>-0.289</b> (0.543)	<b>-0.622</b> (0.605)	<b>-0.473</b> (0.532)	<b>-0.475</b> (0.533)	<b>-0.621</b> (0.587)	<b>-0.329</b> (0.484)	<b>-0.330</b> (0.484)	<b>-0.484</b> (0.509)
<i>RET4-6</i>	<b>-0.443</b> (0.719)	<b>-0.464</b> (0.713)	<b>-0.680</b> (0.691)	<b>-0.472</b> (0.642)	<b>-0.476</b> (0.641)	<b>-0.588</b> (0.653)	<b>-0.320</b> (0.536)	<b>-0.324</b> (0.533)	<b>-0.406</b> (0.543)
<i>RET7-12</i>	<b>0.220</b> (0.498)	<b>0.189</b> (0.501)	<b>0.301</b> (0.486)	<b>0.380</b> (0.370)	<b>0.374</b> (0.369)	<b>0.389</b> (0.379)	<b>0.096</b> (0.370)	<b>0.091</b> (0.365)	<b>0.131</b> (0.368)
<i>VOL</i>	<b>0.166*</b> (0.086)	<b>0.158*</b> (0.088)	<b>0.160**</b> (0.081)	<b>0.136</b> (0.088)	<b>0.134</b> (0.088)	<b>0.133</b> (0.087)	<b>0.169**</b> (0.079)	<b>0.167**</b> (0.079)	<b>0.179**</b> (0.076)
<i>PRC</i>	<b>0.128**</b> (0.062)	<b>0.129**</b> (0.063)	<b>0.144*</b> (0.074)	<b>0.138*</b> (0.076)	<b>0.138*</b> (0.077)	<b>0.140*</b> (0.080)	<b>0.183**</b> (0.087)	<b>0.183**</b> (0.087)	<b>0.195**</b> (0.095)
Year-month fixed effects	included	included	included	included	included	included	included	included	included
Country fixed effects	included	included	included	included	included	included	included	included	included
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.09	0.09	0.10	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02
Number of obs.	2,251,334	2,251,334	2,058,667	2,195,782	2,195,782	2,058,667	2,251,209	2,251,209	2,058,565



**Table 5**  
**Tobin's Q across countries**

This table reports results of pooled panel regressions across countries:

$$Q_{cit} \text{ or } Q_{cit+1} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 BC_{cit} + \beta_2 BC_{cit} \times LMF_{ct} + \beta_3 BC_{cit} \times CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_1 LMF_{ct} + \delta_2 CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_3 FirmControls_{2cit} + \varepsilon_{cit},$$

where  $Q_{cit}$  or  $Q_{cit+1}$  is industry-adjusted Tobin's Q for firm  $i$  in country  $c$  in year  $t$  or  $t+1$  at the start of the return compounding window, i.e. at the start of the month following list publication. Tobin's Q is calculated as the sum of book assets plus market equity, minus the sum of book equity plus balance sheet deferred taxes, all divided by book assets. Industry Tobin's Q is the median among non-BC firms.  $BC_{cit}$  is a dummy variable that equals one if firm  $i$  has been included in the most recent BC list in country  $c$  prior to month  $t$ , and zero otherwise.  $LMF_{ct}$  refers to our the labor market flexibility measures,  $EPL$  or  $EFW$ , as described in Table 1, Panel B.  $CountryControls_{ct}$  include the country-level controls described in Table 4.  $FirmControls_{2cit}$  include the following firm-level controls:  $ROE$  is the return on equity as measured by income divided by book equity.  $LBVA$  is the log of book value of assets.  $FROE$ ,  $F2ROE$ , and  $F3ROE$  are the return on equity for the next three years. We include country and year-month fixed effects, and winsorize Tobin's Q at 0.5% in each tail. The regression constant is not reported for brevity. Standard errors, given in parentheses, are double clustered by country and year-month. \*\*\*, \*\*, and \* indicate significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level, respectively. The sample period is September 1997 to December 2013.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Dependent variables	Contemporaneous Industry-adjusted Tobin's Q					
	EPL			EFW		
$BC_{cit}$	<b>0.839***</b> (0.148)	<b>-3.356***</b> (0.810)	<b>-0.993</b> (1.176)	<b>0.684***</b> (0.110)	<b>-0.063</b> (0.217)	<b>0.080</b> (0.750)
$BC_{cit} * LMF_{ct}$		<b>0.490***</b> (0.094)	<b>0.157**</b> (0.072)		<b>0.095***</b> (0.020)	<b>0.113**</b> (0.052)
$BC_{cit} * RuleofLaw_c$			<b>0.085</b> (0.192)			<b>-0.057</b> (0.120)
$BC_{cit} * GDPg_{ct}$			<b>0.043***</b> (0.015)			<b>0.069*</b> (0.035)
$BC_{cit} * GDPpc_{ct}$			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)
$BC_{cit} * ADRI_c$			<b>-0.105</b> (0.082)			<b>-0.002</b> (0.052)
$BC_{cit} * IDV_c$			<b>0.008</b> (0.006)			<b>0.011**</b> (0.005)
$BC_{cit} * PriceInf_{ct}$			<b>0.032</b> (0.051)			<b>0.154***</b> (0.058)
$BC_{cit} * MktCapGDP_{ct}$			<b>0.002*</b> (0.001)			<b>-0.004*</b> (0.002)
$LMF_{ct}$		<b>-0.080</b> (0.134)	<b>-0.134***</b> (0.037)		<b>-0.048</b> (0.048)	<b>-0.083*</b> (0.043)
$GDPg_{ct}$			<b>0.008</b> (0.007)			<b>0.009*</b> (0.006)
$GDPpc_{ct}$			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)
$PriceInf_{ct}$			<b>0.010</b>			<b>0.008</b>

			(0.027)			(0.024)
<i>MktCapGDP<sub>ct</sub></i>			<b>-0.002*</b>			<b>-0.001</b>
			(0.001)			(0.001)
<i>LBVA</i>	<b>-0.001</b>	<b>-0.001</b>	<b>-0.000</b>	<b>-0.001</b>	<b>-0.001</b>	<b>-0.001</b>
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
<i>ROE</i>	<b>-0.000</b>	<b>-0.000</b>	<b>-0.000</b>	<b>-0.000</b>	<b>-0.000</b>	<b>-0.000</b>
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
<i>FROE</i>	<b>0.000***</b>	<b>0.000***</b>	<b>0.000***</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.000</b>	<b>0.001</b>
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
<i>F2ROE</i>	<b>0.002</b>	<b>0.002</b>	<b>0.002</b>	<b>0.002</b>	<b>0.002</b>	<b>0.002</b>
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.003)
<i>F3ROE</i>	<b>0.001</b>	<b>0.001</b>	<b>0.002</b>	<b>0.001</b>	<b>0.001</b>	<b>0.001</b>
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Year-month fixed effects	included	included	included	included	included	included
Country fixed effects	included	included	included	included	included	included
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01
Number of obs.	109,032	102,057	97,884	94,144	94,144	89,383

**Table 6**  
**Operating performance across countries**

**Panel A: Measuring labor market flexibility with EPL: Industry-adjusted return on assets**

This table reports results of the least absolute deviation regressions across countries:

$$ROA_{cit+j} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 BC_{cit} + \beta_2 BC_{cit} \times EPL_{ct} + \beta_3 BC_{cit} \times CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_1 EPL_{ct} + \delta_2 CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_3 BM_{cit} + \varepsilon_{cit},$$

where  $ROA_{cit+j}$  is the return on assets calculated as operating income before depreciation divided by book value of assets for firm  $i$  in country  $c$  in year  $t+j$  (for  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ ), and then industry adjusted.  $BC_{cit}$  is a dummy variable that equals one if firm  $i$  has been included in the most recent BC list in country  $c$  prior to month  $t$ , and zero otherwise.  $EPL_{ct}$  is the employment protection legislation described in Table 1, Panel B.  $CountryControls_{ct}$  include the country-level controls described in Table 4.  $BM$  is firm  $i$ 's log book-to-market ratio at the previous year end. We include country and year fixed effects. The regression constant is not reported for brevity. Standard errors, given in parentheses, are robust to heteroscedasticity and misspecification, and clustered by country. \*\*\*, \*\*, and \* indicate significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level, respectively. The sample period is September 1997 to December 2013.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Dependent variables	One year ahead			Two years ahead		
$BC_{cit}$	<b>0.037***</b> (0.007)	<b>-0.121***</b> (0.037)	<b>-0.048</b> (0.069)	<b>0.028***</b> (0.004)	<b>-0.093***</b> (0.026)	<b>0.011</b> (0.071)
$BC_{cit} * EPL_{ct}$		<b>0.019***</b> (0.005)	<b>0.021***</b> (0.004)		<b>0.015***</b> (0.003)	<b>0.016***</b> (0.004)
$BC_{cit} * RuleofLaw_c$			<b>-0.012**</b> (0.006)			<b>-0.018***</b> (0.005)
$BC_{cit} * GDPg_{ct}$			<b>0.001</b> (0.001)			<b>-0.000</b> (0.001)
$BC_{cit} * GDPp_{ct}$			<b>0.000***</b> (0.000)			<b>0.000***</b> (0.000)
$BC_{cit} * ADRI_c$			<b>-0.009</b> (0.007)			<b>-0.009</b> (0.008)
$BC_{cit} * IDV_c$			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)
$BC_{cit} * PriceInf_{ct}$			<b>0.003</b> (0.003)			<b>-0.003</b> (0.004)
$BC_{cit} * MktCapGDP_{ct}$			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)
$EPL_{ct}$		<b>0.008</b> (0.005)	<b>0.011***</b> (0.003)		<b>0.011*</b> (0.006)	<b>0.016***</b> (0.005)
$GDPg_{ct}$			<b>0.000</b> (0.000)			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)
$GDPp_{ct}$			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)			<b>0.000</b> (0.000)
$PriceInf_{ct}$			<b>0.002*</b> (0.001)			<b>0.002</b> (0.002)
$MktCapGDP_{ct}$			<b>-0.000***</b> (0.000)			<b>-0.000**</b> (0.000)
$BM$	<b>-0.011***</b> (0.001)	<b>-0.011***</b> (0.001)	<b>-0.011***</b> (0.001)	<b>-0.014***</b> (0.002)	<b>-0.014***</b> (0.003)	<b>-0.015***</b> (0.003)
Year fixed effects	included	included	included	included	included	included
Country fixed effects	included	included	included	included	included	included
Number of obs.	135,541	127,760	119,504	94,274	86,818	80,767

**Table 6 (Cont'd)**

**Panel B: Measuring labor market flexibility with EFW: Industry-adjusted return on assets**

This table reports results of the least absolute deviation regression across countries:

$$ROA_{cit+j} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 BC_{cit} + \beta_2 BC_{cit} \times EFW_{ct} + \beta_3 BC_{cit} \times CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_1 EFW_{ct} + \delta_2 CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_3 BM_{cit} + \varepsilon_{cit},$$

where  $ROA_{cit+j}$  is the return on assets calculated as operating income before depreciation divided by book value of assets for firm  $i$  in country  $c$  in year  $t+j$  (for  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ ), and then industry adjusted.  $BC_{cit}$  is a dummy variable that equals one if firm  $i$  has been included in the most recent BC list in country  $c$  prior to month  $t$ , and zero otherwise.  $EFW_{ct}$  is the labor market flexibility index based on the Fraser Institute's Economic Freedom of the World database described in Table 1, Panel B.  $CountryControls_{ct}$  include the country-level controls described in Table 4.  $BM$  is firm  $i$ 's log book-to-market ratio at the previous year end. We include country and year fixed effects. The regression constant is not reported for brevity. Standard errors, given in parentheses, are robust to heteroscedasticity and misspecification, and clustered by country. \*\*\*, \*\*, and \* indicate significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level, respectively. The sample period is September 1997 to December 2013.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Dependent variables	One year ahead			Two years ahead		
$BC_{cit}$	<b>0.034***</b> (0.006)	<b>-0.009</b> (0.013)	<b>0.085***</b> (0.026)	<b>0.027***</b> (0.004)	<b>-0.012</b> (0.022)	<b>0.106</b> (0.087)
$BC_{cit} * EFW_{ct}$		<b>0.005***</b> (0.002)	<b>0.007**</b> (0.003)		<b>0.005**</b> (0.002)	<b>0.006***</b> (0.002)
$BC_{cit} * RuleofLaw_c$			<b>-0.016***</b> (0.004)			<b>-0.019***</b> (0.007)
$BC_{cit} * GDPg_{ct}$			<b>0.001</b> (0.002)			<b>-0.000</b> (0.001)
$BC_{cit} * GDPp_{ct}$			<b>0.000**</b> (0.000)			<b>0.000***</b> (0.000)
$BC_{cit} * ADRI_c$			<b>-0.006</b> (0.004)			<b>-0.007</b> (0.009)
$BC_{cit} * IDV_c$			<b>0.000</b> (0.000)			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)
$BC_{cit} * PriceInf_{ct}$			<b>0.017**</b> (0.008)			<b>0.006</b> (0.007)
$BC_{cit} * MktCapGDP_{ct}$			<b>-0.000**</b> (0.000)			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)
$EFW_{ct}$		<b>-0.001</b> (0.001)	<b>-0.001*</b> (0.000)		<b>-0.001</b> (0.001)	<b>-0.000</b> (0.001)
$GDPg_{ct}$			<b>0.000</b> (0.000)			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)
$GDPp_{ct}$			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)			<b>0.000</b> (0.000)
$PriceInf_{ct}$			<b>0.002</b> (0.001)			<b>0.002</b> (0.002)
$MktCapGDP_{ct}$			<b>-0.000***</b> (0.000)			<b>-0.000***</b> (0.000)
$BM$	<b>-0.012***</b> (0.001)	<b>-0.012***</b> (0.001)	<b>-0.012***</b> (0.002)	<b>-0.014***</b> (0.002)	<b>-0.014***</b> (0.002)	<b>-0.014***</b> (0.003)
Year fixed effects	included	included	included	included	included	included
Country fixed effects	included	included	included	included	included	included
Number of obs.	121,800	121,800	112,746	87,706	87,706	80,926

**Table 6 (Cont'd)**

**Panel C: Measuring labor market flexibility with EPL: Industry-adjusted net profit margin**

This table reports results of the least absolute deviation regression across countries:

$$NPM_{cit+j} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 BC_{cit} + \beta_2 BC_{cit} \times EPL_{ct} + \beta_3 BC_{cit} \times CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_1 EPL_{ct} + \delta_2 CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_3 BM_{cit} + \varepsilon_{cit},$$

where  $NPM_{cit+j}$  is the net profit margin calculated as operating income before depreciation divided by sales for firm  $i$  in country  $c$  in year  $t+j$  (for  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ ), and then industry adjusted.  $BC_{cit}$  is a dummy variable that equals one if firm  $i$  has been included in the most recent BC list in country  $c$  prior to month  $t$ , and zero otherwise.  $EPL_{ct}$  is the employment protection legislation described in Table 1, Panel B.  $CountryControls_{ct}$  include the country-level controls described in Table 4.  $BM$  is firm  $i$ 's log book-to-market ratio at the previous year end. We include country and year fixed effects. The regression constant is not reported for brevity. Standard errors, given in parentheses, are robust to heteroscedasticity and misspecification, and clustered by country. \*\*\*, \*\*, and \* indicate significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level, respectively. The sample period is September 1997 to December 2013.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Dependent variables	One year ahead			Two years ahead		
$BC_{cit}$	<b>0.036***</b> (0.011)	<b>-0.147**</b> (0.064)	<b>-0.006</b> (0.048)	<b>0.031***</b> (0.007)	<b>-0.165***</b> (0.057)	<b>-0.040</b> (0.055)
$BC_{cit} * EPL_{ct}$		<b>0.022***</b> (0.008)	<b>0.014*</b> (0.008)		<b>0.024***</b> (0.007)	<b>0.026***</b> (0.006)
$BC_{cit} * RuleofLaw_c$			<b>-0.018***</b> (0.004)			<b>-0.035***</b> (0.004)
$BC_{cit} * GDPg_{ct}$			<b>0.002</b> (0.001)			<b>-0.001</b> (0.002)
$BC_{cit} * GDPpc_{ct}$			<b>0.000***</b> (0.000)			<b>0.000***</b> (0.000)
$BC_{cit} * ADRI_c$			<b>-0.007</b> (0.005)			<b>-0.006</b> (0.005)
$BC_{cit} * IDV_c$			<b>0.000**</b> (0.000)			<b>0.001***</b> (0.000)
$BC_{cit} * PriceInf_{ct}$			<b>0.007</b> (0.008)			<b>-0.005</b> (0.006)
$BC_{cit} * MktCapGDP_{ct}$			<b>-0.000***</b> (0.000)			<b>-0.000***</b> (0.000)
$EPL_{ct}$		<b>0.011</b> (0.009)	<b>0.012</b> (0.008)		<b>0.012**</b> (0.005)	<b>0.014***</b> (0.005)
$GDPg_{ct}$			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)
$GDPpc_{ct}$			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)			<b>0.000</b> (0.000)
$PriceInf_{ct}$			<b>0.001</b> (0.001)			<b>0.001</b> (0.003)
$MktCapGDP_{ct}$			<b>-0.000***</b> (0.000)			<b>-0.000**</b> (0.000)
$BM$	<b>-0.011***</b> (0.002)	<b>-0.011***</b> (0.002)	<b>-0.012***</b> (0.002)	<b>-0.012***</b> (0.003)	<b>-0.012***</b> (0.003)	<b>-0.013***</b> (0.004)
Year fixed effects	included	included	included	included	included	included
Country fixed effects	included	included	included	included	included	included
Number of obs.	130,948	123,240	115,291	90,836	83,453	77,588

**Table 6 (Cont'd)**

**Panel D: Measuring labor market flexibility with EFW: Industry-adjusted net profit margin**

This table reports results of the least absolute deviation regression across countries:

$$NPM_{cit+j} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 BC_{cit} + \beta_2 BC_{cit} \times EFW_{ct} + \beta_3 BC_{cit} \times CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_1 EFW_{ct} + \delta_2 CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_3 BM_{cit} + \varepsilon_{cit},$$

where  $NPM_{cit+j}$  is the net profit margin calculated as operating income before depreciation divided by sales for firm  $i$  in country  $c$  in year  $t+j$  (for  $j \in \{1, 2\}$ ), and then industry adjusted.  $BC_{cit}$  is a dummy variable that equals one if firm  $i$  has been included in the most recent BC list in country  $c$  prior to month  $t$ , and zero otherwise.  $EFW_{ct}$  is the labor market flexibility index based on the Fraser Institute's Economic Freedom of the World database described in Table 1, Panel B.  $CountryControls_{ct}$  include the country-level controls described in Table 4.  $BM$  is the log of firm  $i$ 's book-to-market ratio at the previous year end. We include country and year fixed effects. The regression constant is not reported for brevity. Standard errors, given in parentheses, are robust to heteroscedasticity and misspecification, and clustered by country. \*\*\*, \*\*, and \* indicate significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level, respectively. The sample period is September 1997 to December 2013.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Dependent variables	One year ahead			Two years ahead		
$BC_{cit}$	<b>0.036***</b> (0.013)	<b>-0.019</b> (0.016)	<b>0.040</b> (0.030)	<b>0.035***</b> (0.013)	<b>-0.040</b> (0.026)	<b>0.085***</b> (0.032)
$BC_{cit} * EFW_{ct}$		<b>0.008***</b> (0.003)	<b>0.002</b> (0.003)		<b>0.010**</b> (0.005)	<b>0.003*</b> (0.002)
$BC_{cit} * RuleofLaw_c$			<b>-0.010</b> (0.007)			<b>-0.027***</b> (0.005)
$BC_{cit} * GDPg_{ct}$			<b>0.002</b> (0.001)			<b>-0.001</b> (0.002)
$BC_{cit} * GDPpc_{ct}$			<b>0.000**</b> (0.000)			<b>0.000***</b> (0.000)
$BC_{cit} * ADRI_c$			<b>-0.005</b> (0.003)			<b>-0.004</b> (0.003)
$BC_{cit} * IDV_c$			<b>0.000*</b> (0.000)			<b>0.001***</b> (0.000)
$BC_{cit} * PriceInf_{ct}$			<b>0.013</b> (0.010)			<b>0.008</b> (0.008)
$BC_{cit} * MktCapGDP_{ct}$			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)			<b>0.000</b> (0.000)
$EFW_{ct}$		<b>-0.001</b> (0.001)	<b>-0.001*</b> (0.001)		<b>-0.001</b> (0.001)	<b>0.000</b> (0.001)
$GDPg_{ct}$			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)			<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)
$GDPpc_{ct}$			<b>-0.000*</b> (0.000)			<b>0.000</b> (0.000)
$PriceInf_{ct}$			<b>0.001</b> (0.002)			<b>0.000</b> (0.002)
$MktCapGDP_{ct}$			<b>-0.000**</b> (0.000)			<b>-0.000*</b> (0.000)
$BM$	<b>-0.012***</b> (0.002)	<b>-0.012***</b> (0.002)	<b>-0.012***</b> (0.002)	<b>-0.012***</b> (0.003)	<b>-0.012***</b> (0.003)	<b>-0.013***</b> (0.003)
Year fixed effects	included	included	included	included	included	included
Country fixed effects	included	included	included	included	included	included
Number of obs.	130,948	123,240	115,291	84,319	84,319	77,741

**Table 7**  
**Earnings surprises across countries**

**Panel A: Measuring labor market flexibility with EPL**

This table reports the results of pooled panel regressions across countries:

$$Surprise_{cit} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 BC_{cit} + \beta_2 BC_{cit} \times EPL_{ct} + \beta_3 BC_{cit} \times CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_1 EPL_{ct} + \delta_2 CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_3 FirmControls_{cit} + \varepsilon_{cit},$$

where  $Surprise_{cit}$  is the one- or two-year earnings surprise for firm  $i$  in country  $c$  in year  $t$ . The one- (two)-year earnings surprise is the actual earnings per share for the fiscal year ending in year  $t$  minus the median I/B/E/S analyst forecast, deflated by the stock price two months prior. The I/B/E/S consensus forecast is taken 8 (20) months prior to the end of the forecast period.  $BC_{cit}$  is a dummy variable that equals one if firm  $i$  has been included in the most recent BC list in country  $c$  prior to month  $t$ , and zero otherwise.  $EPL_{ct}$  is the employment protection legislation described in Table 1, Panel B for country  $c$  at month  $t$ .  $CountryControls_{ct}$  include the country-level controls described in Table 4.  $FirmControls_{cit}$  include  $BM$  which is firm  $i$ 's log book-to-market ratio and  $SIZE$  which is firm  $i$ 's log market capitalization, both calculated one-year (two-year) prior for one-year (two-year) earnings surprises. We include country and year-month fixed effects. The regression constant is not reported for brevity. Standard errors, given in parentheses, are robust to heteroscedasticity and misspecification, and double clustered by country and year-month. \*\*\*, \*\*, and \* indicate significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level, respectively. The sample period is September 1997 to December 2013.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Dependent variables	One-year earnings surprises			Two-year earnings surprises		
$BC_{cit}$	<b>1.016</b> (1.241)	<b>1.147</b> (1.300)	<b>0.871</b> (1.264)	<b>4.320</b> (3.064)	<b>3.823</b> (3.303)	<b>3.482</b> (3.294)
$BC_{cit} * EPL_{ct}$	<b>0.218***</b> (0.080)	<b>0.225**</b> (0.109)	<b>0.273**</b> (0.108)	<b>0.632**</b> (0.251)	<b>0.791***</b> (0.276)	<b>0.848***</b> (0.275)
$BC_{cit} * RuleofLaw_c$	<b>-0.012</b> (0.199)	<b>-0.064</b> (0.201)	<b>-0.090</b> (0.203)	<b>-0.558***</b> (0.177)	<b>-0.598**</b> (0.242)	<b>-0.630***</b> (0.243)
$BC_{cit} * GDPg_{ct}$	<b>0.080***</b> (0.014)	<b>0.068***</b> (0.016)	<b>0.073***</b> (0.018)	<b>0.054</b> (0.096)	<b>0.046</b> (0.110)	<b>0.049</b> (0.110)
$BC_{cit} * GDPpc_{ct}$	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000**</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000*</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000**</b> (0.000)
$BC_{cit} * ADRI_c$	<b>-0.404***</b> (0.081)	<b>-0.406***</b> (0.077)	<b>-0.387***</b> (0.074)	<b>-0.844***</b> (0.230)	<b>-0.886***</b> (0.283)	<b>-0.867***</b> (0.274)
$BC_{cit} * IDV_c$	<b>-0.019</b> (0.014)	<b>-0.019</b> (0.013)	<b>-0.023*</b> (0.013)	<b>-0.043**</b> (0.017)	<b>-0.047**</b> (0.019)	<b>-0.051***</b> (0.019)
$BC_{cit} * PriceInf_{ct}$	<b>-0.204</b> (0.143)	<b>-0.264*</b> (0.143)	<b>-0.257*</b> (0.139)	<b>-0.290*</b> (0.164)	<b>-0.223</b> (0.210)	<b>-0.231</b> (0.210)
$BC_{cit} * MktCapGDP_{ct}$	<b>0.003</b> (0.003)	<b>0.004</b> (0.003)	<b>0.004</b> (0.003)	<b>0.006</b> (0.005)	<b>0.006</b> (0.006)	<b>0.006</b> (0.006)
$EPL_{ct}$	<b>1.035</b> (0.755)	<b>1.314</b> (1.008)	<b>1.344</b> (1.026)	<b>0.682*</b> (0.403)	<b>0.636</b> (0.477)	<b>0.630</b> (0.478)
$GDPg_{ct}$	<b>0.095***</b> (0.023)	<b>0.105***</b> (0.025)	<b>0.101***</b> (0.025)	<b>0.193***</b> (0.044)	<b>0.193***</b> (0.045)	<b>0.194***</b> (0.046)
$GDPpc_{ct}$	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)
$PriceInf_{ct}$	<b>0.201**</b> (0.085)	<b>0.188**</b> (0.076)	<b>0.178**</b> (0.079)	<b>0.168*</b> (0.087)	<b>0.145</b> (0.093)	<b>0.150</b> (0.095)

<i>MktCapGDP<sub>ct</sub></i>	<b>-0.009</b> (0.007)	<b>-0.008</b> (0.007)	<b>-0.008</b> (0.007)	<b>-0.011*</b> (0.006)	<b>-0.012*</b> (0.006)	<b>-0.012*</b> (0.006)
<i>BM</i>		<b>-0.046***</b> (0.008)	<b>-0.018</b> (0.013)		<b>0.054***</b> (0.011)	<b>0.078***</b> (0.013)
<i>SIZE</i>			<b>0.093***</b> (0.017)			<b>0.081***</b> (0.019)
Year-month fixed effects	included	included	included	included	included	included
Country fixed effects	included	included	included	included	included	included
Number of obs.	62,571	58,307	58,307	54,423	46,626	46,626



**Table 7 (Cont'd)**

**Panel B: Measuring labor market flexibility with EFW**

This table reports the results of pooled panel regressions across countries:

$$Surprise_{cit} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 BC_{cit} + \beta_2 BC_{cit} \times EFW_{ct} + \beta_3 BC_{cit} \times CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_1 EFW_{ct} + \delta_2 CountryControls_{ct} + \delta_3 FirmControls_{cit} + \varepsilon_{cit},$$

where  $Surprise_{cit}$  is the one- or two-year earnings surprise for firm  $i$  in country  $c$  in year  $t$ . The one- (two)-year earnings surprise is the actual earnings per share for the fiscal year ending in year  $t$  minus the median I/B/E/S analyst forecast, deflated by the stock price two months prior. The I/B/E/S consensus forecast is taken 8 (20) months prior to the end of the forecast period.  $BC_{cit}$  is a dummy variable that equals one if firm  $i$  has been included in the most recent BC list in country  $c$  prior to month  $t$ , and zero otherwise.  $EFW_{ct}$  is the labor market flexibility index based on the Fraser Institute's Economic Freedom of the World database described in Table 1, Panel B for country  $c$  at month  $t$ .  $CountryControls_{ct}$  include the country-level controls described in Table 4.  $FirmControls_{cit}$  include  $BM$  which is firm  $i$ 's log book-to-market ratio and  $SIZE$  which is firm  $i$ 's log market capitalization, both calculated one-year (two-year) prior for one-year (two-year) earnings surprises. We include country and year-month fixed effects. The regression constant is not reported for brevity. Standard errors, given in parentheses, are robust to heteroscedasticity and misspecification, and double clustered by country and year-month. \*\*\*, \*\*, and \* indicate significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level, respectively. The sample period is September 1997 to December 2013.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Dependent variables	One-year earnings surprises			Two-year earnings surprises		
$BC_{cit}$	<b>1.942***</b> (0.559)	<b>2.236***</b> (0.583)	<b>2.171***</b> (0.580)	<b>6.925***</b> (1.624)	<b>6.966***</b> (1.739)	<b>6.884***</b> (1.675)
$BC_{cit} * EFW_{ct}$	<b>0.017</b> (0.064)	<b>0.059</b> (0.078)	<b>0.081</b> (0.069)	<b>0.151</b> (0.158)	<b>0.220</b> (0.172)	<b>0.240</b> (0.167)
$BC_{cit} * RuleofLaw_c$	<b>-0.020</b> (0.142)	<b>-0.183</b> (0.176)	<b>-0.194</b> (0.173)	<b>-0.389**</b> (0.162)	<b>-0.288</b> (0.200)	<b>-0.301*</b> (0.182)
$BC_{cit} * GDPg_{ct}$	<b>0.093**</b> (0.045)	<b>0.090*</b> (0.050)	<b>0.095*</b> (0.052)	<b>-0.003</b> (0.091)	<b>-0.003</b> (0.101)	<b>-0.001</b> (0.102)
$BC_{cit} * GDPp_{ct}$	<b>-0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)
$BC_{cit} * ADRI_c$	<b>-0.260</b> (0.175)	<b>-0.261</b> (0.178)	<b>-0.243</b> (0.177)	<b>-0.770***</b> (0.249)	<b>-0.906***</b> (0.320)	<b>-0.888***</b> (0.314)
$BC_{cit} * IDV_c$	<b>-0.008</b> (0.010)	<b>-0.007</b> (0.009)	<b>-0.012</b> (0.009)	<b>-0.044***</b> (0.017)	<b>-0.052***</b> (0.019)	<b>-0.056***</b> (0.019)
$BC_{cit} * PriceInf_{ct}$	<b>-0.064</b> (0.141)	<b>-0.216</b> (0.182)	<b>-0.194</b> (0.170)	<b>-0.172</b> (0.221)	<b>-0.145</b> (0.239)	<b>-0.136</b> (0.236)
$BC_{cit} * MktCapGDP_{ct}$	<b>0.003</b> (0.005)	<b>0.004</b> (0.005)	<b>0.004</b> (0.005)	<b>0.009</b> (0.008)	<b>0.011</b> (0.009)	<b>0.011</b> (0.009)
$EFW_{ct}$	<b>-0.149</b> (0.113)	<b>-0.191*</b> (0.110)	<b>-0.193*</b> (0.108)	<b>-0.184**</b> (0.078)	<b>-0.214***</b> (0.073)	<b>-0.214***</b> (0.074)
$GDPg_{ct}$	<b>0.083***</b> (0.024)	<b>0.092***</b> (0.026)	<b>0.088***</b> (0.025)	<b>0.185***</b> (0.036)	<b>0.186***</b> (0.037)	<b>0.187***</b> (0.038)
$GDPp_{ct}$	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)	<b>0.000</b> (0.000)
$PriceInf_{ct}$	<b>0.090</b> (0.077)	<b>0.054</b> (0.072)	<b>0.045</b> (0.073)	<b>0.113*</b> (0.059)	<b>0.082*</b> (0.047)	<b>0.088*</b> (0.051)
$MktCapGDP_{ct}$	<b>-0.004</b>	<b>-0.003</b>	<b>-0.003</b>	<b>-0.007</b>	<b>-0.008</b>	<b>-0.008</b>

	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.007)
<i>BM</i>		<b>-0.034***</b>	<b>-0.007</b>		<b>0.042***</b>	<b>0.066***</b>
		(0.010)	(0.015)		(0.014)	(0.016)
<i>SIZE</i>			<b>0.099***</b>			<b>0.084***</b>
			(0.018)			(0.023)
Year-month fixed effects	included	included	included	included	included	included
Country fixed effects	included	included	included	included	included	included
Number of obs.	49,420	47,401	47,401	43,500	40,657	40,657

## 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.

## 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 Vanessa Wang, University of Mannheim

## **Electronic Access to the Working Paper Series**

The full set of ECGI working papers can be accessed through the Institute's Web-site ([www.ecgi.org/wp](http://www.ecgi.org/wp)) or SSRN:

<b>Finance Paper Series</b>	<a href="http://www.ssrn.com/link/ECGI-Fin.html">http://www.ssrn.com/link/ECGI-Fin.html</a>
-----------------------------	---

<b>Law Paper Series</b>	<a href="http://www.ssrn.com/link/ECGI-Law.html">http://www.ssrn.com/link/ECGI-Law.html</a>
-------------------------	---