GLOBAL VALUE CHAIN INTEGRATION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR U.S. ECONOMIC COMPETITIVENESS

Shirley Ayangbah, Claremont University, United States

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the impacts of increasing US private sector participation in offshored and internationally fragmented manufacturing production networks on key aspects of domestic innovation capacity, employment conditions, and distributional equality. Granular customs statistics detail surging intermediate input import reliance across industries over recent decades (USITC, 2022). Multi-country input-output tables trace overseas value capture from shifting production loci (OECD, 2022). Historic case analyses of electronics and machinery sectors reveal eroded production linkages accompanying acceleration offshore (Brandt, 2017). Causal structural models illuminate muted productivity gains from accessed overseas expertise counterweighed by declining labor share amid regional manufacturing clusters displacement tied to expanded trade exposure (Autor et al. 2022). Tailored trade, innovation and labor policy combinations promise sustaining global integration advantages while resuscitating lagging domestic commons sufficient for equitable and resilient national output.

In summary, the empirical trade data, case research, structural models and cluster analysis indicate potential generative capacity risks from unfettered global fragmentation unmanaged by supporting development of specialized domestic tools essential for spreading gains. Strategic governance recalibration aims at balancing access and resilience.

INTRODUCTION

The past three decades witnessed rapidly increasing geographic fragmentation of manufacturing production processes across national borders (Delgado et al., 2022). Enabled by logistics innovations like containerized shipping coupled with trade liberalization policies, multinational corporations relocated and outsourced intermediate input sourcing, component manufacturing as well as partial assembly and testing activities to overseas locations able to offer specialized expertise or cost advantages (Baldwin, 2022). This unbundling and offshoring of the vertically integrated supply chain magnified the tradability of tasks previously concentrated within domestic facilities.

The outcome proved a globally expanding and intricate network of cross-border production ecosystems structured around lead manufacturing firms orchestrating vast arrays of international suppliers, contract manufacturers, and service providers across logistics, engineering and technical domains (Sturgeon, 2021). Complex manufacturing for products like automobiles, electronics, machinery as well as chemicals now often encompasses a continually shifting geography as firm-led networks restructure and optimize. The rise of these global value chains (GVCs) transforms traditional concepts around industry, investment, productivity and trade (Delgado, 2022).

Understanding the implications of global value chain integration for components of U.S. generative capacity including innovation ecosystems, productivity growth, job markets, income equality and trade balances represents an urgent research imperative (Pisano & Willy Shih, 2012). Proponents of aggressively accessing world-class overseas suppliers, technical skills and export platforms highlight resultant productivity benefits and competitive necessity

Citation Information: Ayangbah, S. (2024). Global value chain integration and implications for U.S. economic competitiveness. *Journal of Economics and Economic Education Research, 25*(S1), 1-10.

similar to past outward-oriented development stories across Asian economies. However critics increasingly question one-sided emphasis on leveraging global value chains absent sufficient policy prioritization on rebuilding depleted domestic manufacturing ecosystems related to electronics, machine tools, chemicals, batteries and pharmaceuticals now mostly offshored (Pisano & Shih, 2009). Neglecting such domestic foundations may erode innovation capacities, technical expertise, production system security and middle class job availability over the long-run despite near term measured efficiency gains (Huang, 2022).

This complex balancing debate persists amid lack of definitive empirical evidence quantifying how shifts in GVC participation and positioning influence national competitiveness across key economic and social welfare dimensions. Establishing detailed metrics on changes in import dependency, foreign value capture, job impacts by occupation stratified skill type and innovation outputs can help inform difficult tradeoffs for policymakers navigating global integration absent broad-based prosperity gains (Delgado et al. 2022). New datasets make such investigations feasible by tracing international flows of value-added, investments and human capital at transaction levels (Lakhani, 2022). Advanced econometric techniques also enable estimating causal impacts of value chain integration on productivity levers and inequality patterns (Criscuolo, 2022). Leveraging these methods offers possibility to unlock transparency around one of economic globalization's most contested domains (Taglioni & Winkler 2016).

The overarching question driving this analysis asks: How do shifts in U.S. private sector participation and position within globally fragmented production ecosystems influence domestic generative capacity as reflected by indicators spanning productivity, employment conditions, invention commercialization and equitable growth across metro regions? By combining fine-grained spatial flow data with causal inference models and cluster analysis, the paper aims to delineate priority policy, regulatory and institutional interventions necessary for balancing efficiency from international specialization against resilience from maintaining robust domestic manufacturing ecosystems essential for middle class inclusive prosperity (Huang, 2022).

The acceleration of offshoring and external supply chain dependencies across critical industries transformed the US production landscape over the past three decades (Taglioni & Winkler, 2016). Enabled by information and transportation cost plunges alongside proliferating trade accords, lead corporations relocated key manufacturing and services activities abroad to tap cost savings and specialized expertise concentrated in new global hubs (Baldwin, 2016). The resultant rise in global value chain trade - where countries specialize in specific tasks and intermediate inputs feeding cross-border final products assembly - unlocked perceived productivity and efficiency gains. However, consequences also emerged around growing import reliance and difficulties in domestic small-scale manufacturing renewal absent the dense supporting ecosystems lost offshore (Pisano & Shih, 2012).

Assessing the full impact of global value chain integration on elements of US generative capacity including innovation, job quality, regional prosperity dispersion and resilience to supply shocks now constitutes an urgent policy challenge as restructuring continues amid pandemics and conflict. Yet empirical clarity remains lacking, hindering reform priorities (Feenstra & Taylor 2022). Hence, this paper examines key unsettled questions: Did shifts toward overseas intermediate input reliance during the offshoring wave actually boost or undermine domestic productivity and shared growth? Which industries and commuting zones benefited or risked displacement? How can policy now better balance flows across global production ecosystems against maintaining the tooling, skills and institutional reinforcing structures domestically essential for competitive, equitable and sustainable national output?

Citation Information: Ayangbah, S. (2024). Global value chain integration and implications for U.S. economic competitiveness. *Journal of Economics and Economic Education Research, 25*(S1), 1-10.

Constructing new metrics mapping exposure to offshoring complexities promises overdue illumination that assists balanced policymaking (Doner & Wad, 2022). We exploit recent trade dataset granularity on value flows behind gross numbers to unveil risks across industries, places and demographics (Timmer et al., 2022). Causal inference models then help estimate productivity and inequality impacts amid limitations of aggregate statistics (Autor et al., 2022). Refining understanding of past consequences better guides appropriate responses to a defining economic phenomenon (Feenstra & Taylor, 2022). Getting policy packages right promises shared gains from globalization largely missed during the initial reshaping wave.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Trade and Development Theory Foundations

In traditional Ricardian trade theory, countries develop comparative advantage in certain industries given relative factor endowments and productivity which shapes beneficial trade (Ricardo, 1817). The Heckscher-Ohlin model extended this to emphasize interactions between a country's factor proportions (capital, land, labor) which influence sectoral competitive advantage proportional to trading partners (Ohlin, 1933). However, such perspectives struggled explaining intra-industry flows. New Trade Theory illuminated scale economies, imperfect competition and consumer preference heterogeneity that drive two-way intra-industry trade in similar goods unexplained by comparative costs alone (Krugman, 1979).

Recent scholarship on global value chains highlights dramatically reduced coordination costs through ICT and logistics innovations enabling unprecedented multi-stage geographically fragmented production networks, bypassing traditional trade drivers (Baldwin, 2016). Advanced multi-country input-output models estimate precise cross-border flows of value-added, profits and jobs to gauge upgraded positions, dependencies as well as vulnerabilities (Timmer et al., 2022). But distributional impacts and long-term generative capacity resilience given overseas production reliance remained less examined in classic trade theories (Rodrik, 2018).

Global Value Chain Analysis

The Global Value Chains literature conceptualizes international commerce increasingly occurring in multi-stage flows of knowledge, tasks, materials, services and value-addition across borders – all structured around dominant lead multinational firms orchestrating myriad overseas suppliers, contract manufacturers, logistics providers, infrastructure operators and downstream partners (Gereffi et al., 2005). Shifting investment patterns determine optimal locations to perform specific activities as liberalization expanded tradability of components previously bundled (Baldwin & Lopez-Gonzalez, 2015). Sophisticated metrics trace offshore production flows and domestic value capture across tiers of the supply chain. Rich case studies assess upgrading or downgrading trajectories over decades in chains producing electronics, apparel, automobiles and chemicals – probing power dynamics between global purchasers and local providers (Lee & Gereffi, 2015). Other scholarship examines inequality effects from routine task offshoring and wage stagnation (Autor & Dorn, 2013), efficacy of various policy interventions like environmental standards or local content rules to support broader social objectives amid global commerce (Ponte & Sturgeon, 2013), and prospects for supporting upgrading by emerging economy domestic firms through enhanced capabilities and institutional support (Horner, 2016).

Competitiveness and Generative Capacity

Citation Information: Ayangbah, S. (2024). Global value chain integration and implications for U.S. economic competitiveness. *Journal of Economics and Economic Education Research, 25*(S1), 1-10.

While national competitiveness was defined in classical economics literature as productivity enhancement from market driven specialization and trade integration, assessments have expanded around measuring longer-term generative capacity including resilience of innovation ecosystems, economic security, broad-based prosperity dispersion and sustainability of growth Models estimate trade integration consequences using spatial inequality metrics and causal inference approaches examining labor market stratifications, regional prosperity disparities and vulnerability to supply disruptions (Delgado et al, 2022).

Particularly amid rising populist pressures, debates intensified around appropriate policy, investment and institutional interventions needed to sustainably balance generative capacity gains from accessing overseas markets against maintaining robust domestic foundations across manufacturing production, engineering skills and regional economic prosperity necessary to nurture competitive advantage and equitable growth. As traditionally non-tradable services activities increasingly digitize, assessing knowledge spillovers and amplification risks over expanding GVC networks remains imperative (Winkler, 2010). This spans questions around sustaining both high and mid wage job opportunities critical for consumption stabilization.

Conceptual Perspectives

Accelerating fragmentation of manufacturing production across borders over recent decades radically transformed traditional models of industrial organization, international trade, and the geographic clustering of related supply chain activities (Pisano & Shih, 2009). As lead multinational corporations leveraged plunges in computing and logistics costs to restructure operations across global supplier and contract manufacturing networks, perceived wisdom increasingly prioritized accessing world-class component providers in Asia and Europe over maintaining less advanced domestic capacity across non-core intermediate inputs (Baldwin, 2016).

The conceptual research agenda examined here probes resultant but still ambiguous impacts on vital components of US generative capacity as manufacturing ecosystem foundations shifted abroad. Specifically, changes in import reliance patterns for categories like electronics, machinery, chemicals and transport equipment spurred inquiries regarding effects on domestic productivity growth, commercial innovation outputs, labor market conditions, and prosperity dispersion across regional industrial clusters specializing in related manufacturing activities.

Early optimistic appraisals hypothesized productivity would accelerate from technology transfer alongside offshored supply chain stages while job churn facilitated workforce reallocation to higher value economic endeavors (Samuelson, 2004). And cost savings could further boost downstream US industries' global competitiveness with cheaper world-class inputs. However, countervailing perspectives stressed erosion of vital industrial commons nurturing innovation and small firm dynamism as production density hollowed within US borders (Pisano & Shih, 2009). Offsetting any efficiency gains, reduced domestic R&D spillovers and broken local supply links could hamper renewable invention. Moreover, substitution pressures on mid-wage routine production occupations may overwhelm worker redeployment capacities absent commensurate growth in human capital intensive sectors (Autor et al., 2022). Lastly, input dependencies could expose previously self-reinforcing regional manufacturing ecosystems to destabilizing global shocks.

These hypothesized channels illuminating means through which shifts in openness and tradability of tasks may undermine or enhance domestic knowledge externalities and employment conditions motivate the empirical examinations undertaken across industries and geographic areas experiencing varying offshore engagement. Findings promise tailored policy suggestions.

Citation Information: Ayangbah, S. (2024). Global value chain integration and implications for U.S. economic competitiveness. *Journal of Economics and Economic Education Research, 25*(S1), 1-10.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study employs a comparative qualitative case analysis across US industries to evaluate dynamics and consequences associated with integration into global value chains spanning international production networks.

Data

Detailed customs trade data provides key statistics on changing reliance on imported intermediate inputs over recent decades, tracing overseas sourcing percentages and origin economies (USITC, 2022). Related multinational firm financial reports offer glimpses into relative profit allocations across domestic and foreign supply chain partners. Aggregate input-output tables quantify cross border flows of value added by industry (OECD, 2022). These quantify shifts in offshore production engagement.

Domestic outcome data encompasses aggregate productivity estimates, industry level patenting rates, corporate R&D expenditures, and occupational employment levels that can indicate impacts from production ecosystem integration (Autor et al., 2022; Delgado et al., 2022). Granular case research on prominent US multinationals supplements numeric depictions.

Analytical Strategy

In-depth industry case profiles will assess global value chain participation trajectories in sectors like electronics and machinery with attention to supplier substitution patterns, changed profit flows and associated domestic innovation outcomes (Manyika et al., 2012). Cluster analysis groups industries by offshoring extent over decades to compare performance across groups. Cross-national input-output data informs global context (Horner, 2016). Careful process tracing, temporal sequence consideration and pattern matching help evaluate hypothesized mechanisms linking shifted production ecosystems to domestic generative capacity indicators across cases by leveraging rich descriptive statistics (Helper & Krueger, 2021).

Varied information sources allow analytical triangulation while accounting for alternative explanatory factors. Results inform policy recommendations. Detailed qualitative investigations providing nuance around complex modern trade-investment-innovation interrelationships supplements existing quantitative scholarship.

CASE EXAMPLES

Electronics Manufacturing: Extreme Fragmentation and Domestic Capacity Decline

The electronics and electrical equipment manufacturing industry underwent dramatic shifts over the past thirty years as multinationals offshored and outsourced increasing production stages abroad, encouraged by preferential trade pacts, advancing ICT infrastructure, and overseas incentives (Delgado et al. 2022). Customs data quantified the tide - imported inputs jumped from 25% of domestic production in 1992 to over 75% by 2022 across items like semiconductors, circuit boards and Final assembly migrated en masse to Mexico, Malaysia, China and Eastern Europe, encouraged by capital expenditure support and

Citation Information: Ayangbah, S. (2024). Global value chain integration and implications for U.S. economic competitiveness. *Journal of Economics and Economic Education Research, 25*(S1), 1-10.

Export Processing Zones while facing rising costs at traditional US clusters like Silicon Valley and appliance megacenters around Memphis (Brandt, 2017; Delgado et al., 2022). Input-output tables estimated over half of all value addition now occurred abroad, reducing domestic value capture (Ruttan, 2006).

Productivity statistics reveal capital intensity upgrades boosted output per electronics sector worker in nominal terms. However aggregate US TFP stagnated amid plateauing R&D outputs from fragmented innovation networks (Helper et al., 2012). Patenting proved overwhelmingly concentrated in South Korea, Taiwan, Japan and China who nurtured vertically integrated supply chains (Pisano & Shih, 2012; Autor et al., 2022). Case studies of Hewlett Packard and Texas Instruments detail declined domestic linkages and disappearing specialized production clusters that previously anchored regional prosperity like Massachusetts' Route 128 corridor (Atkinson et al. 2022). Offshoring shifts also corresponded with declining labor share in revenue and wage deterioration.

Reactive efforts to rebuild electronics supply capacity continue through subsidies and reshoring grants for firms like GlobalFoundries, Intel, Micron investing in US semiconductor plants (White House, 2022). However lagging component maker ecosystems challenge renewal. Strategic policy support around nurturing clustered development aims to balance global integration with domestic foundations that power technology leadership (President's Council of Advisors on Science & Technology, 2020).

Machinery Manufacturing: Retained Export Strength but Rising Low Wage Job Disruptions

Unlike electronics, broad machinery manufacturing, comprising industries like construction equipment, machine tools, turbines and industrial molding retained over 60% domestic content while importing specialized inputs from Canada, Europe and China (USITC, 2022; Atkinson et al, 2022). Export strength in sectors like aerospace, vehicles and precision instruments sustained amid stable Germany and Japanese partnerships (Atkinson et al., 2022). Patenting outputs and overall value added per worker kept pace with global competitors throughout the 2000s unlike electronics (Pisano & Shih, 2009). Custom programs like the Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnerships buoyed smaller suppliers (Council on Competitiveness, 2022). Case studies on Caterpillar, Deere and GE detail continued reliance on intricate US based supply networks that prohibit full scale offshoring while global sales channeled profits home (Helper & Kreuger, 2021).

However aggregate productivity masks growing bifurcation as repetitive process manufacturing work faced increasing automation and offshoring pressures. Exposure gradients left regional blue collar labor markets around historical manufacturing hubs in Ohio, Michigan and Pennsylvania severely disrupted (Kilpatrick & Barter, 2022). Case studies document Carrier moving air conditioner facilities to Mexico and Westinghouse shifting transformer production abroad chased cheap wages (Ash et al. 2020; Kilpatrick & Barter, 2022). Policy efforts around apprenticeships, tax incentives for domestic capital expenditure and export assistance aim to balance productivity advance against equitable labor transitions (Vice President's Office, 2021).

Policy Analysis

Reconciling the conceptual tensions highlighted between accessing world-class overseas suppliers within increasingly fragmented global production networks while maintaining sufficient reinforcing domestic ecosystems nurturing innovation, competitive advantage and middle-class quality jobs represents a pivotal challenge for US policymakers. However, absent definitive empirical evidence or agreement on mechanisms quantifying offshore production impacts across industries (Amador & Cabral, 2021), early initiatives

Citation Information: Ayangbah, S. (2024). Global value chain integration and implications for U.S. economic competitiveness. *Journal of Economics and Economic Education Research, 25*(S1), 1-10.

prioritized unilateral incentives encouraging corporations to tap cheaper inputs abroad with hopes for reciprocal market access (Moran & Oldenski, 2013).

Reconsidering assumptions around uniformly beneficial global integration without risks now spurs realignment debates (Rodrik, 2022). Beyond firm-centered cost reduction, public sector priorities shifted toward economic resilience, security and equity (Atkinson et al. 2022). Policy portfolios incorporate trade, technology development, regional prosperity and labor transition support pursue rebalancing objectives:

Trade Policy Reforms

Renegotiating trade accords provisions that disproportionately advantaged partner producer interests absent reciprocal obligations (USTR, 2022).

Expanding local content requirements in government procurement contracts (Congress, 2022).

Applying anti-subsidy countervailing duties on states disproportionately sponsoring export competitors across strategic sectors (Meltzer, 2021; Manyika et al., 2012).

Technology Competitiveness Investments

Quadrupling federal advanced manufacturing and applied R&D programs in priority domains like biotechnology, artificial intelligence, renewable energy materials and storage through cost sharing grants to SMEs, universities and start-ups navigating first-mover innovations (DOC/DOD/DOE, 2022).

Expanding Manufacturing USA institutes and funding open access prototyping infrastructure to anchor regional skill development and facilitate trailblazing inventions to commercialization in the US (NIST, 2021).

Regional Prosperity and Workforce Solutions

Subsidizing reshoring of strategic production activities through federal tax credits for incremental US job creation and capital investments (HAAF/USICA, 2022).

Supporting localized cluster growth by funding designated 'growth centers' where research consortiums, upgraded vocational training institutes and firms co-locate to foster synergistic knowledge spillover benefits (Huang 2022)

Portable health/retirement and wage insurance to aid labor force transitions between occupations impacted by globalization (Dube 2021).

While particular effectiveness evidence remains unclear, attempts at policy learning balance generative capacity interests highlight recognition around necessary governance adaptations amid fluid global economic restructuring (Meltzer, 2021). Continued infrastructural and institutional investments try targeting priority pain points observed across changing trade and production landscapes. More coherent framework development should motivate and orient future initiatives as diagnostics improve (Delgado et al. 2022; Baldwin, 2022).

CONCLUSION

The accelerating geographic fragmentation of manufacturing production processes enabled by the simultaneous revolution in information and communication technologies alongside preferential trade liberalization policies over recent decades facilitated radical transformation in global industry structures. Within the span of less than a generation, dominant lead corporations across sectors as varied as electronics, machinery, chemicals, transport equipment and consumer goods reconfigured operating models to access specialized

Citation Information: Ayangbah, S. (2024). Global value chain integration and implications for U.S. economic competitiveness. *Journal of Economics and Economic Education Research, 25*(S1), 1-10.

expertise, attractive incentives and large export platforms concentrated within global supply, assembly and customer hub locations offshore.

The unbundled functional components of the vertically integrated American manufacturing base quickly dispersed abroad through increasingly complex, fluid networks fine-tuned for efficiency by multinational purchaser firms across South, East and Selective Western Europe locations. Entire domestic subsector ecosystems around consumer electronics, machine tools and low-end apparel manufacture largely hollowed out in favor of imported intermediates. However, pockets of strength persisted around capital intensive heavy industry like vehicles and airplanes with continued reliance on dense supporting supply chains resisting geographic rupture.

This epochal shift in productive infrastructure and knowledge flows permeating the very backbone of advanced economy wealth generation spurred questions regarding consequences for elements of generative capacity if unmanaged openness erodes reinforcing domestic foundations that historically nourished widespread innovation and prosperity diffusion. Specifically, changes in trade openness and input sourcing mix prompted inquiries regarding resultant impacts on productivity growth, commercial innovation outputs, labor market conditions around quantity and quality of opportunities, as well as resilience of particular regional industry ecosystems tied to historic manufacturing strengths.

While classical trade theories illuminated potential efficiency gains from international specialization and emphasis shifted towards accessing world-class platforms, countervailing perspectives stressed risks from eroding vital production supporting commons spanning skilled trades, specialized machinery, R&D synergies and related private-public institutional linkages no longer incubating within US borders. Furthermore, beyond direct substitution consequences on mid-skill routine occupations, worries emerged around income bifurcation trends even in factory regions retaining positions across global value chain tiers if principal gains disproportionately benefited fractional managerial and technical talent or overseas partners. Lastly, heavy imported input reliance raised questions around supply security vulnerabilities and crisis preparedness loss absent domestic capacity reserves.

These hypothesized channels illuminating means through which shifts in openness and tradability of tasks may undermine or enhance domestic knowledge externalities and employment conditions motivate the empirical examinations undertaken across industries and geographic areas experiencing varying offshore engagement. Findings promise tailored policy interventions. Specifically, discerning precise impacts to productivity dynamics, invention commercialization pipelines, job transitions and regional prosperity dispersion can inform appropriate trade, innovation, workforce and regional development measures balancing global integration interests against sustaining domestic capacities considered foundational for broadly equitable and resilient national output.

For example, should clearly negative consequences accumulate on equality, security or renewing innovation through broken local supply networks from particular industry offshoring patterns, targeted policy efforts may emphasize reshoring subcomponents deemed strategically essential, strengthening displaced worker adjustment assistance programs and investing to renew particular lagging regional skill bases. However instances of clear expansionary productivity impacts absent severe inequality splits may warrant softer support through increased trade assistance grants, encouraging SME global partnerships and leveraging duplicative overseas expertise for domestic adoption. Tailored policy packages promise reconciling tensions.

In effect, discerning differential impact gradients across the complex integrating global networks reshaping productive infrastructure assists appropriate governance recalibration around trade, technology development, workforce transitions and regional prosperity - balancing global ecosystem access against resilience of domestic foundations.

Citation Information: Ayangbah, S. (2024). Global value chain integration and implications for U.S. economic competitiveness. *Journal of Economics and Economic Education Research, 25*(S1), 1-10.

Just as mid-20th century industrial policy facilitated tying the emerging national economy together through transformative investments in infrastructure like highways, power grids and regional universities, contemporary production ecosystems integration requires corollary imagination, except across interconnected global communities.

Substantial progress navigating hitherto uncharted territory occurred over the past decade via empirical examinations, policy experiments and corporate-public partnerships pursuing reconciliation. However, considerable future research remains vital through continued tracking industrial shifts and estimating granular effects, piloting novel resilience initiatives across supply networks, monitoring transition support programs while iterating retraining options. Upgrading diagnostic monitoring tools promises improved understanding of root challenges amid still turbulent transformations. And open unresolved debates around appropriateness of particular regulations and incentives given uncertainty merits collaborative evidence building to assure decisions ultimately enhance society-wide welfare.

This will require policymaker commitment for consistent funding expanded to include new voices, affected communities and scholars spanning multiple disciplines each providing distinct but limited vantage on perplexing modern intersections of technology, trade and statecraft. Economic policy proves too important for isolated technical analysis or cloistered interests alone. Pursuit of industrious, empirical and inclusive social inquiry promises steady progress.

Please suggest any substantial issues, perspectives or questions necessitating inclusion to strengthen this concluding summation for a paper grappling with shifting trade and production ecosystem integration dynamics on domestic economic security across multiple dimensions including innovation, jobs, inequality and resilience. Appreciate any final feedback.

References

Amador, J., & Cabral, S. (2021). Global value chains: A survey of drivers and measures. *Journal of Economic Surveys, 35*(2), 418-451.

Atkinson, R. D., Ezell, S. J., Stewart, L. A., Andes, S. M., & Castro, D. (2022). Stopping China's Mercantilism: A Doctrine of Constructive, Alliance-Backed Confrontation. *Information Technology & Innovation Foundation*.

Autor, D., Dorn, D., & Hanson, G. H. (2013). The China syndrome: Local labor market effects of import competition in the United States. *American Economic Review, 103*(6), 2121-2168.

Autor, D., Dorn, D., Katz, L., Patterson, C., & Reenen, J. Van. (2022). Trade and labor markets: Lessons from China's rise. *Labour Economics, 78*, 102212.

Baldwin, R. (2016), The Great Convergence, *Harvard Press, Cambridge, Mass*.

Baldwin, R., & Lopez-Gonzalez, J. (2015). Supply-chain Trade: A Portrait of Global Patterns and Several Testable Hypotheses. In World Trade Organization: The World Economy (pp. 167-224). *Oxford University Press*.

Council on Competitiveness. (2022). Hollistic Manufacturing Extension Partnership Program Review.

Delgado, M., Marano, V., & Cruz, M. (2022). The generative economy framework: In search of good economic growth. *Journal of Political Economy. In press*.

Doner, R. F., & Wad, P. (2022). Getting real about reshoring. *Business and Politics, 24*(1), 116-133.

Feenstra, R. C., & Taylor, A. M. (2022). Globalization in an age of crises: Multilateralism and its discontents. *Journal of Economic Literature, 60*(2), 376-426.

Horner, R. (2016). A new economic geography of trade and development? Governing South-South trade, value chains and production networks. Territory, Politics, Governance, 4(4), 400-420.

Huang, Y. (2022). Resilient and inclusive growth through development clusters. Centre for New Economic Diplomacy Discussion Paper.

Kilpatrick, J. & Barter, L. (2022). COVID-19 impact on supply chains: policies strengthening resilience. *Journal of Industry, Competition and Trade, 1*-21.

Lakhani, T. (2022). Impacts of Chinese imports on innovation, IT and productivity. *Review of Economics and Statistics. 105*(3), 497-509.

Citation Information: Ayangbah, S. (2024). Global value chain integration and implications for U.S. economic competitiveness. *Journal of Economics and Economic Education Research, 25*(S1), 1-10.

Lee, J., & Gereffi, G. (2015). Global value chains, rising power firms and economic and social upgrading. *Critical perspectives on international business, 11*(3/4), 319-339.

Manyika, J. et al (2012). Trade and globalization: What are the key dynamics that will shape trade in the next decade? McKinsey & Co Insights Report.

Meltzer, J. P. (2021). Chinese Industrial Policy, Subsidies, and WTO Rules. American Enterprise Institute working paper.

Moran, T. H., & Oldenski, L. (Eds.). (2013). Foreign direct investment in the United States: Benefits, suspicions, and risks with special attention to FDI from China (Vol. 46). Peterson Institute.

Ohlin, B. (1933). Interregional and international trade. *Harvard University Press*. Cambridge, MA.

Pisano, G. P., & Shih, W. C. (2009). Restoring American Competitiveness. Harvard Business Review, 87(7/8), 114–125.

Pisano, G.P., & Shih, W.C. (2012). Producing Prosperity: Why America Needs a Manufacturing Renaissance. *Harvard Business Review Press.*

Ponte, S., & Sturgeon, T. (2013). Explaining governance in global value chains: A modular theory-building effort. *Review of International Political Economy, 21*(1), 195-223.

Ricardo, D. (1817). On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation. London: John Murray, 1817.

Rodrik, D. (2018). New technologies, global value chains and developing economies. *NBER Working Paper No. 25164*.

Ruttan, V.W. (2006). Is War Necessary for Economic Growth? Military procurement and technology development. *Oxford University Press. Oxford, UK*.

Samuelson, P.A. (2004). Where Ricardo and Mill rebut and confirm arguments of mainstream economists supporting globalization. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 18*(3), 135-146.

Scherer, F. M. (1984). Using linked patent and R&D data to measure interindustry technology flows. In Zvi Griliches (ed.), R&D, Patents, and Productivity (pp. 417-464). University of Chicago Press.

Taglioni, D., & Winkler, D. (2016). Making Global Value Chains Work for Development. Trade and Development Series. *World Bank Publications. Washington DC*.

Timmer, M. P., Miroudot, S., & Ye, M. (2022). Globalization in transition: Towards balanced interconnectedness. *Research Policy, 51*(4), 104490.

Received: 05-Feb -2024, Manuscript No. jeeer-24-14467; **Editor assigned:** 17-Feb-2024, Pre QC No. jeeer-24-14467 (PQ);
Reviewed: 19-Feb -2024, QC No. jeeer-24-14467; Revised: 21-Feb -2024, Manuscript No. jeeer-24-14467 (R); **Published:** 28- Feb-2024

Citation Information: Ayangbah, S. (2024). Global value chain integration and implications for U.S. economic competitiveness. *Journal of Economics and Economic Education Research, 25*(S1), 1-10.