

Grosfeld, Irena; Hashi, Iraj

Working Paper

The Emergence of Large Shareholders in Mass Privatized Firms: Evidence from Poland and the Czech Republic

Nota di Lavoro, No. 126.2004

Provided in Cooperation with:

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM)

Suggested Citation: Grosfeld, Irena; Hashi, Iraj (2004) : The Emergence of Large Shareholders in Mass Privatized Firms: Evidence from Poland and the Czech Republic, Nota di Lavoro, No. 126.2004, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM), Milano

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/118000>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

**The Emergence of Large
Shareholders in Mass Privatized
Firms: Evidence from
Poland and the Czech Republic**

Irena Grosfeld and Iraj Hashi

NOTA DI LAVORO 126.2004

OCTOBER 2004

PRA – Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust

Irena Grosfeld, *Delta-Fédération Jourdan, CNRS*
Iraj Hashi, *Faculty of Law and Business, Staffordshire University*

This paper can be downloaded without charge at:

The Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Note di Lavoro Series Index:
<http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/WPapers/default.htm>

Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection:
<http://ssrn.com/abstract=609741>

The opinions expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect the position of
Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei
Corso Magenta, 63, 20123 Milano (I), web site: www.feem.it, e-mail: working.papers@feem.it

The Emergence of Large Shareholders in Mass Privatized Firms: Evidence from Poland and the Czech Republic

Summary

Mass privatization offers a particularly suitable framework to study the change in ownership concentration as the extent of change is unusual for a stable market economy. Focusing on two different mass privatization schemes in two transition economies, Poland and the Czech Republic, we find that despite important differences in the design of the two programmes and despite different quality of legal and regulatory framework, ownership structure in the two countries has rapidly evolved and the emerging ownership patterns are remarkably similar. This suggests that private benefits of control are large and the quality of investor protection regime is low in both countries. However, looking at the relationship between the change in ownership concentration and firm performance, we find an interesting difference between the two countries: in the Czech Republic the increase in ownership concentration seems to be less likely in poorly performing firms while in Poland the quality of past performance does not affect investors' willingness to increase their holdings. This effect may be interpreted in the light of the theory stressing the importance of the quality of investors' protection. It could be argued that if Czech investors are more risk averse and more concerned with diversification this is largely due to the weakness of the legal protection they face.

Keywords: Ownership concentration, Mass privatisation, Corporate governance, Transition

JEL Classification: G3, L2, P3, P5

We are grateful to Jean-Francois Nivet for helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper and to Erjon Luci and Bartlomiej Paczoski for invaluable help with the data.

Address for correspondence:

Irena Grosfeld
Delta-Fédération Jourdan, CNRS
48, Boulevard Jourdan
75014 Paris
France
Phone: +331 4313 6328
Fax: +331 4313 6310
E-mail: grosfeld@delta.ens.fr

1. Introduction

Privatisation in Central and Eastern Europe strongly relied on 'wholesale' methods to transfer assets from the state to the private sector. These strategies, often qualified as 'mass privatization', consisted of a free transfer of equity of a large number of firms to large segments of the population. Since the beginning of transition, mass privatization has been strongly criticised as being 'artificial' and unable to provide firms with 'real owners' or to improve firm performance. One of the main criticisms concerned the dispersed ownership structure that mass privatisation was expected to generate. Some countries, e.g. Poland, sensitive to this argument, chose to impose a concentrated ownership structure on privatized firms. The main concern was avoiding excessive dispersion of ownership and providing companies with 'effective owners', capable and willing to enforce control over management and undertake profound firm restructuring. In other countries, such as the Czech Republic, where privatization was understood as the key element of the process of radical institutional change and was expected to create important synergies, the main concern was the speed of the process and less attention was paid to the emergence of a specific ownership structure.

Several years after the initial distribution of firms' equity, it is still largely believed that mass privatization schemes were plagued with inefficiencies mostly due to rigid and/or inefficient ownership structure. However, if we look at the actual change at firm level it turns out that the effective reallocation of property rights has been quite extensive and that the ownership concentration has significantly increased.¹ Therefore, it becomes interesting to describe this evolution in detail and to explore if and how ownership structure adjusted to firm specific characteristics and to factors characterizing the firm's environment.

It should be stressed that the objective of this paper is quite modest. We do not try to assess whether and how ownership structure affects performance. Neither have we distinguished the managerial ownership dimension of ownership structure. These are important questions that have been studied by a number of authors and also need to be investigated further.² In focusing on the determinants of ownership concentration we follow the literature initiated by Demsetz (1983) and Demsetz and Lehn (1985) who argued that ownership structure should be viewed as the result of shareholders' optimizing decisions.³ Considering the determinants of ownership concentration may be viewed as a first step. The next and an important extension of this paper would be to consider the relationship between ownership and firm performance in a simultaneous equation framework: in such framework with firm performance and ownership concentration being the two dependent variables, we could consider potential causality running from ownership to performance.

¹ Berglöf and Pajuste (2003) document high ownership concentration in a number of transition economies.

² For important theoretical contributions see Jensen and Meckling (1976), Shleifer and Vishny (1986), Bolton and von Tadden (1998), Burkart et al. (1997). Some of recent empirical papers include McConnell and Servaes (1990), Himmelberg, et al. (1999), Miguel, et al. (2001). Works on transition economies include Claessens and Djankov (1999), Kocenda and Svejnar (2003), and Simoneti, et al. (2003).

³ For recent contributions, see Bebchuk (1999), Demsetz and Villalonga (2001), Lamba and Stapledon (2002). Jones and Mygind (1999) and Jones, et al. (2003) deal with the determinants of ownership structure in a transition economy.

We focus on firms privatized through two different mass privatization schemes in two transition economies, Poland and the Czech Republic. Mass privatization offers a particularly suitable framework to study the change in ownership concentration as the extent of change is unusual for a stable market economy. We find that despite important differences in the design of the two programmes and despite different quality of legal and regulatory framework, ownership structure in the two countries has rapidly evolved and the emerging ownership patterns are remarkably similar. Ownership concentration has significantly increased and we can observe an important reallocation of ownership claims between different groups of shareholders. In the Czech Republic, starting from a highly dispersed ownership structure, in almost half of companies a majority of shares is held by a single block holder. Similarly in Poland, starting from a particular ownership structure imposed by the National Investment Funds (NIF) programme, the majority of companies involved in the scheme have been freed of NIFs' control and almost half of them have found a single block holding entity with a majority of shares. Ownership concentration, defined as the presence of a majority shareholder or the increase in the share of the largest owner, seems to be mainly determined by firms' past performance and by the identity of the largest owner.

The difference between the two countries appears when we consider how past performance affects the increase in ownership concentration: it turns out that the impact of past performance is positive in the Czech Republic and insignificant or even negative in Poland. This suggests that in Poland shareholders believe they can obtain some benefits of control and do not fear increasing their holdings in less profitable firms while in the Czech Republic less profitable firms are considered as too risky and shareholders prefer increasing their equity holdings in better performing firms. Such result may be interpreted in the light of "law matters" theory due to La Porta, et al. (1998).⁴ The difference in the shareholders' attitude towards risk in the two countries may indeed be due to the differences in the quality of the legal framework. Poland is usually praised for high standards of its regulation while the Czech Republic, especially in the early and mid-1990s, has been blamed for its weaknesses (see Glaeser, et al., 2001)

The evidence of a dynamic adjustment of the ownership structure provided in this paper suggests that, contrary to the concern of the critics of mass privatisation programmes, they were not the most inefficient way of transferring assets from the state to the public sector. The initial ownership structure they created was transitory and rapidly gave way to new configurations. This evidence may help to explain the apparently surprising result of Bennett, et al. (2004). Analyzing the impact of various privatization methods on economic growth in a cross-country setting, they find that mass privatization was the only method with a significantly positive effect. Although we do not consider here the relationship between privatization and performance, the fact that ownership structure in our firms has become highly concentrated may provide an element of explanation.

The plan of the paper is as follows. In section 2 we present the two mass privatization schemes in Poland and in the Czech Republic and show how ownership concentration and the type of the controlling shareholders have changed since the beginning of the process. In

⁴ Looking at cross-country variations, La Porta, et al. (1998) find that concentration of ownership (measured by the stake of the three largest shareholders) is negatively correlated with the quality of investors' legal protection. In other words ownership concentration becomes a substitute for legal protection of investors.

section 3 we consider the potential determinants of ownership concentration. Empirical model is presented in section 4, the results in section 5 and we conclude in section 6.

2. Mass Privatisation and after: reallocation of equity stakes in the Czech Republic and Poland.

Despite broad similarity of their reform programme, Poland and the Czech Republic embarked on two different variants of mass privatisation (briefly described in Appendix 1). Various political and social considerations played a role. Most importantly, the choice was determined by the policy makers' understanding of the role of privatisation in market processes. In Poland privatisation was seen as a means of improving firm incentives and its real objective was firm restructuring. More orthodox methods of privatisation (IPOs, negotiated sales, auctions, etc.) were seen as more efficient from that point of view, but it soon became clear that privatisation would be too slow if it were to rely exclusively on such methods. Therefore, the National Investment Funds (NIF) programme was initiated to supplement other methods and speed up the process. The design of this programme was dominated by the concern about corporate governance arrangements favouring enterprise restructuring. In particular, a concentrated ownership structure was imposed on firms and the funds were to be managed by highly experienced Western specialists.

In the Czech Republic (and before that in Czechoslovakia) privatisation was understood as the precondition for the emergence of a market environment. Voucher privatisation was seen as the most rapid and the least unfair way of transferring assets from the State sector. It was expected that under competitive pressure the initial ownership structure would gradually evolve towards a more effective structure.

The two different philosophies underlying the two mass privatisation programmes are reflected in the design of the regulations of securities markets in the two countries. Poland is usually given as an example of a good regulatory strategy while the Czech Republic is blamed for the weakness of its regulatory framework (Glaeser, et al., 2001). Indeed, the Polish authorities were concerned with the proper development of financial markets in general, and the stock exchange in particular, and focused on the creation of a well established legal system and enforceable laws. In the NIF programme, the remuneration scheme for NIF managers and the stock exchange listing requirements were carefully designed to ensure the transparency of the process and to avoid expropriation of minority investors. The main concern was to avoid excessive dispersion of ownership and to provide companies with 'effective owners'. But the authors of the programme were also concerned with the potential danger of private benefits of control and therefore imposed the limit of 33 percent on the lead fund's holdings in each company.

Such guarantees were deemed unnecessary in the Czech Republic: there was a fear that state intervention would create impediments to a rapid development of market institutions. The Company law and the laws governing the operation of securities markets were very lax and the supervision of securities trading and the associated agents were, until 1998, left to a Securities Office in the Ministry of Finance. Privatised companies were listed on the stock exchange without having to publish a prospectus and to obtain the approval of the securities regulator. The increasing number of financial scandals and opportunistic behaviour involving funds and enterprise managers (later called 'tunnelling') reflected the weakness of the regulatory

framework.⁵ The pressure from the opposition parties and the press eventually forced the government to establish the Securities Commission.

The Data

The data for Czech companies is provided by a Czech commercial company, Aspekt (www.aspekt.cz) who use official company accounts filed by joint stock companies (for financial information), Prague Securities Centre (for ownership information), and company reports for employment and other information. The financial data covers the period of 1993-1999 while the ownership data covers the period 1996 to 1999. The data-set was purchased in early 2000 and consequently the information for 1999 is not complete for all companies. The ownership data includes the identity and the equity holdings of up to seven largest shareholders of each company since 1996. There are five types of owners: industrial and commercial companies (corporations), investment funds, financial institutions,⁶ individuals and the state. The database does not identify foreign ownership.

The data set contains financial information on the bulk of mass privatised companies but the ownership information is limited to a smaller number of companies because many mass privatised companies have left the stock exchange, changed their legal status or have been taken over by other companies. After careful cleaning of the data base (involving the deletion of observations containing obvious errors) we established a balanced panel of 652 companies for which full ownership information is available for the 1996-1999 period.⁷ The sample is well distributed across 12 sectors of economic activity.⁸

The Polish data set, containing all 512 mass privatised companies and covering the 1995-2000 period, was collected from several sources. The Ministry of State Treasury (Department of Privatisation) keeps some basic data on the 512 companies in the National Investment Fund Programme, largely for the period before their privatisation. The Department keeps a record of major changes in the status of these companies. Additional information was collected from the annual reports of NIFs and their portfolio companies through the publication *Monitor Polski*, NIFs' annual reports and the reports of the Association of National Investment Funds. For companies that have been floated on the stock exchange, further information was obtained from the Warsaw Stock Exchange. In the final sample analyzed in this paper we do not include firms that went bankrupt or for some reasons were deleted from the registry kept in the Ministry of State Treasury. We also exclude observations with missing data. The number of firms in the sample was therefore reduced to 439.

⁵ For examples of opportunistic behaviour by managers and large shareholders, see Hashi (1998); Johnson, et al. (2000) and Glaeser, et al. (2001).

⁶ The data set contained two sub-groups of financial institutions: portfolio companies (which are engaged primarily in buying and selling of shares) and banks. However, as the number of firms in these two sub-groups was small, they were combined together under 'financial institutions' in order to make the empirical work more meaningful.

⁷ There are occasionally missing observations for individual variables which lowers the number of observations to 610 in the regressions presented in Section 5.

⁸ Originally firms were grouped into 19 activities based on Prague Stock Exchange classification of sectoral activity (which closely resembles NACE classification) but as the number of firms in some sectors was very small, for reasons of empirical feasibility, we grouped firms in similar activities and formed 12 industrial sectors.

Unlike in the Czech Republic, the initial ownership structure of the companies in the mass privatisation scheme was uniform and fixed by the scheme (the lead fund had 33 percent of shares; other 14 funds 27 percent; employees 15 percent and the state 25 percent). The information on ownership change throughout the period 1995-2000, collected from the variety of sources described above, allows identifying the largest owners of the companies. It shows the extent of the divestiture by NIFs. The distinction is made between foreign and domestic shareholders; among the latter there are companies, NIFs, employees, individuals and the state.

Changes in the ownership structure

We focus on two dimensions of the change in the ownership structure. First, we look at ownership concentration, measured by the share of the largest owner. Second, we consider the reallocation of block holdings between different types of owners. The evidence from both Poland and the Czech Republic points to an unambiguous increase in concentration of ownership in both countries. Table 1 highlights the broad picture of this evolution.

The average holdings of the largest shareholder in the Czech sample increased rapidly from 38.8 percent in 1996 to 51.9 percent in 1999 and in the Polish sample from 33.9 percent in 1996 to 50.3 percent in 2000. In the Czech Republic the median figure indicates that by 1999 in half of the sample firms the largest owner held almost 50 percent of the firm's equity. The number of firms in which the largest shareholder controls more than 50 percent of shares increased indeed from 189 in 1996 to 289 in 1999.

The Polish scheme, due to its cautious design, had a degree of inertia built into it. Dominant owners, i.e., the 'lead funds' holding 33 percent of company shares initially, could not increase their share in portfolio companies until they were floated on the stock market or their capital was increased. At the same time, companies could not be floated on the stock market until they could meet (as any listed company) the stringent listing criteria set by the regulatory agency. Despite these restrictions, a significant reallocation of equity holdings, triggered by a combination of the NIFs' incentive system and the competitive pressure from the product and factor markets, occurred quite rapidly. NIFs have withdrawn from managing a large number of portfolio companies. Some firms were floated on the stock exchange, others were sold to strategic (domestic or foreign) investors, and some were put into liquidation. NIFs proved to be the agents of privatisation rather than agents of restructuring. The net results, as panel (b) of Table 1 shows, were that by the year 2000, the largest shareholders were, on average, in absolute control of their companies. The differences in the initial ownership structure notwithstanding, the process was very similar to that in the Czech Republic.

The second dimension of the change in the ownership structure is the reallocation of ownership rights between different types of largest shareholders. This process was different in the two samples because of the particularities of the privatization process in the two countries and the initially uniform ownership structure of the Polish firm. In Poland, the reallocation of ownership was first dominated by the transfer from the state to NIFs and then from NIFs to other types of owners. While in 1994 all firms were state-owned, by 2000 the state had reduced its holdings to zero in 99 firms and to about 20 percent (on average) in the remaining firms. About 15 percent of the companies in the scheme went bankrupt or entered the bankruptcy or liquidation processes. 36 companies (about 7 percent of the companies in the

scheme, 25 of them with strategic investors) have satisfied the listing conditions set by the Warsaw Stock Exchange and were quoted on the WSE in 2000.

Tables 2 and 3 show how equity held by different types of the largest owner has evolved in Poland between 1998 and 2000 and in the Czech Republic between 1996 and 1999.

In Poland NIFs have withdrawn from 240 firms leaving the companies to the new owner, with over 20 percent of them (52 companies) having been sold to foreign investors. Concerning the concentration of ownership stakes, it is striking that, on average, most strategic investors have gained majority control of the firms' equity. Only NIFs, on average, hold 37 percent of shares of their portfolio companies. The employees, who were given special privileges in the Polish mass privatization, have acquired control of 13 companies. The highest ownership concentration (75 percent) can be observed in firms bought by foreign investors.

Similarly, in the Czech Republic we can observe a gradual process of reallocation of large block holdings between different types of owners. In the immediate post-privatization period, the state, financial institutions and investment funds were the most important large shareholders. A couple of years later we can observe the emergence of individual entrepreneurs and industrial and commercial companies as the largest shareholders. All categories of largest owners have increased their equity stakes. Industrial and commercial companies and financial institutions have increased their average holding to over 56 percent while individuals and investment funds have increased their average holding to around 45-46 percent.

The unusually rapid changes in ownership structure in firms included in the mass privatisation programmes in the Czech Republic and Poland give us the opportunity to empirically investigate the determinants of these changes. The owners' desire to change the initially imposed (Poland) or inefficient (the Czech Republic) ownership structure reflected, and certainly responded to, a variety of firm specific characteristics and factors representing the environment in which firms operate. In what follows we try to identify the determinants of the increase in ownership concentration in the group of Czech and Polish firms.

3. What makes ownership more or less concentrated?

We look at within country variations in ownership structure which means that we do not consider here the important issue on which the work by La Porta, et al. (1998) focused:⁹ legal and regulatory constraints are held constant. We try to identify the determinants of ownership concentration at the level of the firm. We use two dummy variables for ownership concentration: 1) the increase/decrease of the share of the largest owner since the initial allocation of property rights, and 2) the presence/absence of a majority shareholder (holding more than 50 percent of shares).

In line with several previous studies investigating the determinants of ownership concentration, we expect the following factors to influence our two dependent variables:

⁹ Looking at cross-country variations, La Porta, et al. (1998) find that concentration of ownership (measured by the stake of the three largest shareholders) is negatively correlated with the quality of investors' legal protection. In other words, ownership concentration becomes a substitute for legal protection of investors.

Performance

Owners' decision to increase their holding may depend on firm performance. It is possible that in less profitable firms shareholders want to increase their holdings in order to better control the management and obtain some of the benefits of control. On the other hand, such firms may be less attractive for risk-averse shareholders looking for risk diversification. The impact of performance on owners' decision to concentrate their holdings is therefore ambiguous.¹⁰

It is difficult to choose an ideal performance indicator for non-listed firms in transition economies. We use profit before taxes and depreciation which is the commonly used measure. Alternatively, we use the growth of sales as a measure of performance: it is sometimes argued that it is less subject to accounting manipulations. Additionally, we include investment which may be considered as a proxy for the future prospects of the firm. We expect that higher investment activity leads current and potential shareholders to increase their holdings in the firm.

Size

It is usually expected that ownership in larger firms is less likely to be highly concentrated. Purchasing large equity shares in a large company is more expensive than doing the same in a smaller company. Moreover, the concern for diversification also suggests that owners will be careful and refrain from committing a larger fraction of their wealth to one firm. In some previous studies (e.g. Demsetz and Lehn, 1985) firm size was inversely related to ownership concentration. On the other hand, in the highly uncertain conditions of transition economies, larger, older and better known firms may be perceived by some shareholders as less likely to go bankrupt. In this case, such shareholders would increase their shareholding in larger firms. The overall impact of size on ownership structure may thus be ambiguous.

Leverage

Also the effect of leverage on ownership concentration may be ambiguous. Highly leveraged firms are more risky and risk averse owners may prefer avoiding excessive concentration in such firms (Stulz 1988, Demsetz and Lehn, 1985). Similarly, if leverage is seen as a control instrument used to reduce agency costs and creditors substitute owners in their monitoring activities, we would expect ownership concentration to be lower in more leveraged firms. But debt may also be viewed as complementary monitoring device: in that case higher ownership concentration may appear in more indebted companies.

Identity of the dominant shareholder

¹⁰ This ambiguity appears in the previous works. For instance, Demsetz and Villalonga (2001) find that performance has a significant and negative effect on ownership concentration while in Jones, et al. (2003) previous profitability does not affect ownership structure in a significant way.

The degree of ownership concentration may strongly depend on who the largest shareholder is. It is therefore important to distinguish between different types of block holders. For example, a corporation may have stronger motivation than a financial institution to acquire large stakes in a firm. The state and the National Investment Funds in Poland are supposed to wither away as owners and we expect that their equity will progressively diminish. The nationality of the dominant owners may also affect ownership concentration: foreign owners may be more willing and capable of acquiring larger stakes in order to control the company. In Poland we can distinguish between foreign and domestic investors; and among the latter between corporations, individuals, employees, NIFs and the state. In the Czech Republic we can distinguish between corporations, individuals, investment funds, financial institutions, and the state.

Industry

Ownership concentration may vary across industries. Some industries are more likely to have dispersed ownership than others. One of the possible explanations of these differences would be that different types of activities require different level of monitoring.¹¹ In some industries closer monitoring may bring about gains to shareholders¹² while in others, especially those regulated by the state, additional monitoring by large shareholders may not yield any benefits.¹³ Hence, we have to control for the type of the industry in order to take this effect into account.

4. The model

We analyse the determinants of ownership concentration using two dependent variables. First, we estimate the probability that the share of the largest owner has increased since the initial allocation of equity stakes (Y_1). This was the case in 491 firms in the Czech Republic and in 219 firms in Poland. Secondly, we estimate the probability that a company has a majority shareholder at the end of the considered period (Y_2). In our samples, 44 percent of firms in Poland in 2000 and 49 percent in the Czech Republic in 1999 have a shareholder with more than 50 percent of shares.

We use the following general model to identify the factors that affect our dependent variables:

$$P(Y_j=1/X) = \frac{\exp(X\beta)}{1 + \exp(X\beta)}$$

Where $j=1, 2$.

¹¹ See Carlin and Mayer (1999) and Allen (1993).

¹² Demsetz and Lehn (1985) call it 'control potential' and Bebchuk (1999) speaks about private benefits of control.

¹³ Demsetz and Lehn (1985) and Demsetz and Villalonga (2001, e.g., control for regulated industries (financial and utilities).

$P(Y_1 = 1/X)$ is the probability that the share of the largest owner has increased since the beginning of the process and

$P(Y_2 = 1/X)$ is the probability that the largest owner holds more than 50 percent of shares, both conditioned on the realization of X , which represents the vector of explanatory variables and β is the corresponding vector of coefficients.

The vector of explanatory variables X includes the following variables: performance, size, leverage, investment, type of the largest owner, industry, and a set of variables representing specific features of mass privatisation in the two countries.

Performance is defined as ratio of earnings before taxes and depreciation to total assets (the growth of sales is used as another proxy for performance); size is measured by natural logarithm of sales in constant prices; leverage is defined as total liabilities over total assets; investment is the ratio of net investment in fixed assets to total assets. In order to alleviate the problem of potential endogeneity of ownership concentration, the four variables (performance, size, leverage and investment) are averaged over the period ending one year earlier than the year for which ownership is considered. (i.e., 1996-1998 for the Czech sample and 1995-1999 for the Polish sample). Type of owner is a set of dummies representing different types of the largest shareholder. Industry represents a set of dummies for industries to which the firm belongs (12 for Czech firms and 20 in Poland).

In the case of the Czech Republic we want to distinguish between firms that were privatised in the first and in the second wave of the voucher scheme. We also include the initial level of ownership concentration (in 1996).¹⁴ We obviously expect that the increase in ownership concentration will be less likely in firms that were initially already highly concentrated. Such firms are also more likely to have at the end of the process a majority investor. In Poland, the initial level of ownership concentration was by design the same for all firms so we do not include this variable in the regressions. In the case of Polish mass privatised firms we distinguish between listed and non-listed firms by using a dummy variable for firms that are listed on the Warsaw Stock Exchange (WSE). It may be expected that firms listed on the stock exchange are more likely to have widely held share ownership structure. We also want to distinguish between various National Investment Funds and we include a set of dummies representing the lead National Investment Fund of each company (15 NIFs altogether). We know that these funds differed in their strategies towards firms in their portfolios: some funds behaved more like venture capital funds while others chose strategies of purely financial intermediaries. Firms' ownership concentration might have been influenced by these strategies. The full list of variables is presented in Table 4.

5. The results

Tables 5 and 6 show respectively the results for Poland and for the Czech Republic. For each of the two dependent variables we present two sets of regressions: with and without dummies representing the type of the largest shareholder. For Poland additionally, before adding all types of domestic owners, we show, in columns 2 and 5 the results of the regression in which only foreign versus domestic owner is considered.

¹⁴ Ownership concentration is measured by the share of the largest shareholder. In the regression analysis, we use a logistic transformation of this measure. See table 4 for the exact definition.

The inclusion of the type of the largest owner significantly improves the explanatory power of the regressions, particularly in Poland. In both countries most of the coefficients of the dummies representing the type of the largest owner are significant.¹⁵ In particular, in Poland the firm is significantly more likely to be majority controlled if it has a foreign largest shareholder. The presence of a foreign dominant shareholder also significantly influences the probability of an increase in its equity holdings. Interpreting the coefficients of various dummies representing the types of owners we should remember that the reference group is the state in the Czech Republic and the state together with NIFs in Poland. These types of owners are supposed to wither away and therefore it is not surprising that other categories are more likely to increase their equity holdings and to take majority control.

We do not observe a significant relationship between ownership concentration and either leverage or investment. But some of the privatisation-related variables turn out to be quite important. Firms listed on the Warsaw Stock Exchange are less likely to experience increasing concentration and are less likely to have a majority owner. It could be argued that ownership dispersion is safer in listed firms as investors have access to a much greater amount of information and also a certain amount of monitoring is undertaken by the financial market itself. So the opportunities for reaping the benefits of control by increasing ownership concentration and monitoring are more limited. Moreover, according to the regulation of the WSE, beyond a certain level of ownership concentration, the dominant shareholders have to make compulsory purchase offers to other shareholders, which may require a prohibitively large amount of resources. In the Czech Republic, as expected, the higher the initial level of ownership concentration, the lower the probability that the share of the largest shareholder has increased and the higher the probability that the firm has found a majority owner.

The evidence about the importance of firm size is mixed: it becomes insignificant in Poland when all types of largest owners are included and only slightly positive in the Czech Republic. This result suggests that the desire of diversification and the search for a safe investment (which large firms may offer in an uncertain environment) counteract each other. More importantly, we get a contrasting result comparing the correlation between firms' past performance and ownership concentration in the two countries. In Poland firm's past performance does not seem to affect the probability of the increase in the share of the largest owner (it is even slightly negative if we do not control for the type of the largest owner). Also, the presence of a majority shareholder is more likely in firms characterized by poor past profitability. In contrast, in the Czech Republic the coefficient of past profitability is positive and affects very strongly the probability that the share of the largest owner has increased. This result may reflect the owners' willingness to avoid increasing their equity holdings in the Czech poorly performing firms. In Poland, investors appear more likely trying to reap some benefits of control.¹⁶

¹⁵ Only in the Czech Republic the presence/absence of a majority shareholder is not affected by the largest shareholder being an individual or an investment fund. These two categories of owners were the main players in the auctions of the voucher scheme and their behaviour might not differ significantly from the state, which is here the base group.

¹⁶ Grosfeld and Tressel (2002) show that the performance of Polish listed firms improves when the largest owner has a majority stake in the company.

The results are robust to the use of an alternative measure of firm performance: the growth of sales, and an alternative measure of firm size: the natural logarithm of the value of assets.¹⁷

6. Conclusions

In firms privatized in the framework of mass privatization programmes in Poland and the Czech Republic we observe a significant increase in ownership concentration measured by the share of the largest owner. This evidence goes against the main argument of the critics of mass privatization programmes who were convinced that these programmes would bring about dispersed ownership structure at firm level. The fact that the evolution of ownership concentration is similar in Poland and in the Czech Republic suggests that private benefits of control are large in both countries (see Bebchuk, 1999). If we refer to 'law matters' theory, this suggests that the quality of investor protection regime is rather low in both countries. So we do not get a confirmation of the usual view that the Polish legal and regulatory framework is much better than the one in the Czech Republic. However, although the direct comparison of ownership concentration in the two countries does not provide a confirmation of the main prediction of 'law matters' theory, we find indirect evidence in its favour.

Looking at the relationship between the change in ownership concentration and firm performance, we find an interesting result: in the Czech Republic the increase in ownership concentration seems to be less likely in poorly performing firms while in Poland the quality of past performance does not affect investors' willingness to increase their holdings. This contrasting effect may be interpreted in the light of the theory stressing the importance of the quality of investors' protection. It could be argued indeed that if Czech investors seem to be more risk averse and more concerned with diversification this is largely due to the weakness of the legal protection they face.

¹⁷ The results are available on request.

APPENDIX

Mass Privatisation in the Czech Republic

The main method of privatisation in the Czech Republic was ‘voucher privatisation’ through which some 1700 companies were privatised in two ‘waves’ in 1991–92 and 1992–94.¹⁸ The shares of these companies were transferred to either individuals or privatisation investment funds (PIFs) in exchange for vouchers. PIFs set up by manufacturing companies, private individuals and institutions as well as state-owned banks and insurance companies, actively participated in the process as financial intermediaries. Adult citizens received vouchers which they could exchange for the shares of companies in the scheme either directly or indirectly through privatisation investment funds. In the latter case, they could entrust their vouchers to investment funds and become shareholders of these funds (which were joint stock companies) or unit holders in unit trusts. The funds, in turn, could use vouchers collected from their members to bid for shares of their preferred companies. Understandably, given the prevailing information asymmetry and risk aversion, the majority of citizens opted for the second alternative and entrusted their vouchers to investment funds. In the first wave, 72 percent of investment points available were used by funds and 28 percent by individuals directly. In the second wave, the percentages were 64 percent and 36 percent respectively. The bulk of investment points controlled by funds were concentrated in the hands of a small number of funds set up by banks and financial institutions (Hashi 1998). In the first wave, these funds were all close-end funds but in the second wave many of them took the form of unit trusts. Later on, as part of the reform of the financial system, close-end funds were required to convert themselves to open funds by 2002. Initially, the funds were allowed to hold up to 20 percent of the shares of each company in the scheme, though they quickly found ways of bypassing this constraint. The funds’ maximum holding in each company was later reduced to 11 percent.

The shares of mass privatised companies and privatisation investment funds were immediately listed on the stock market without the requirement of prior approval and the publication of a prospectus. The process of buying and selling of shares, and the reorganisation of funds’ portfolios, quickly followed the two waves – a process generally referred to as the ‘third wave’ of privatisation. Investment funds, despite their large overall stakes, were generally not in a controlling position in their portfolio companies. Many funds had ended up with shares of too many companies and wanted to reduce the size of their portfolios. Many individual shareholders, preferring cash to risky shares, also entered the secondary market, selling their shares, thus further pushing down share prices.¹⁹ A major feature of the so-called third wave of privatisation was the take-over of investment funds. Given that PIFs (especially those set up in the first wave) were joint stock companies with a large number of shareholders, they were easy targets for aggressive bidders.

¹⁸ For details of the Czech privatization see Mejstrik (1997).

¹⁹ It was estimated that in the early post-privatization period up to one-third of individuals who had obtained shares in the voucher scheme sold their shares. See The Economist Intelligence Unit, *Country Report*, 2nd Quarter 1995, p. 15.

Mass Privatisation in Poland

The scale of the Polish mass privatisation was less spectacular than the Czech scheme. It included 512 companies and 15 National Investment Funds (NIF), which were set up by the Government.²⁰ The management of these funds was initially entrusted to special consortia of Western and Polish partners (commercial banks, investment banks, consulting firms) selected through an international tender offer. The implementation of the programme was delayed by at least four years (1991-95) for political reasons, mainly the absence of a consensus in the government and the parliament about the final list of companies in the scheme, the precise share of different beneficiaries and the specific arrangements concerning corporate governance of the NIFs. The equity of 512 companies was transferred from the state to new owners according to a common scheme: the majority of shares of each company (60 percent) were given to the 15 National Investment Funds, with the remaining 40 percent going to employees (15 percent) and the Treasury (25 percent). For each company, one of the 15 NIFs received 33 percent of shares and thus became the 'lead fund' for that company. The remaining 27 percent were divided between the other 14 funds (each holding just under 2 percent of shares). This uniform scheme sharply contrasted with the Czech programme where the outcome of the bidding process was completely unforeseeable and any number of funds, individuals and other beneficiaries could end up as new owners of the companies.

Foreign financial institutions were invited to participate in the programme and, together with Polish institutions, bid for the management of NIFs under lucrative remuneration arrangements. The aim was to bring in the fund management know-how and expertise and ensure that Polish institutions learn from their foreign partners. At the same time, foreign institutions with international reputation were expected to follow the same practice as in their own countries, and not to engage in opportunistic behavior, insider dealing and shareholder expropriation which their inexperienced Polish counterparts may have been tempted to embark on. Many foreign institutions did take part in the programme and most NIFs started to be managed by consortia of foreign and Polish institutions.

The citizens did not become direct shareholders of companies in the scheme but received vouchers (or certificates) which entitled them to one share in each of the 15 Funds, thus becoming indirect shareholders of privatised companies. The stated aim of the programme was for NIFs to restructure their portfolio companies, turn them into market oriented firms and sell them to either strategic owners or on the stock exchange. The Funds themselves were floated on the Warsaw Stock Exchange in June 1997 and the citizens' certificates had to be converted to Funds' shares by the end of 1998. Following a buoyant initial market, and the large-scale sale and purchase of shares, the role of the government began to decline and private owners began to dominate the NIFs. After the first general meetings of shareholders, members of the supervisory boards initially appointed by the government were replaced by members elected by new private shareholders. The direct role of the state in the funds came to an end.

²⁰ For details of the Polish mass privatisation, see Hashi (2000) and Mickiewicz and Baltowski (2003).

REFERENCES

- Allen, F. (1993), Stock market and resource allocation, in C. Mayer and X. Vives (eds.) *Capital Markets and Financial Intermediation*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Bebchuk, L. A. (1999), A rent-protection theory of corporate ownership and control, NBER Working Paper n° 7203.
- Bennett, J., S. Estrin, J. W. Maw and G. Urga (2004), Privatization Methods and Economic Growth in Transition Economies, CEPR Discussion Paper n° 4291
- Berglof, E and A. Pajuste (2003), Emerging Owners, Eclipsing Markets? Corporate Governance in Central and Eastern Europe, in Cornelius, P.K. and B. Kogut (eds) *Corporate Governance and Capital Flows in a Global Economy*, OUP: Oxford.
- Bolton, P. and E.L. Von Tadden (1998), Blocks, liquidity and corporate control. *Journal of Finance*, February.
- Burkart, M., D. Gromb and F. Panunzi, (1997), Large shareholders, monitoring and the value of the firm. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112: 693-728.
- Carlin, W. and C. Mayer (1999), Finance, Investment and growth, CEPR Discussion Paper n° 2233.
- Claessens, S. and S. Djankov (1999), Ownership Concentration and Corporate Performance in the Czech Republic, CEPR Discussion Paper 2145.
- Cho, M. (1998), Ownership Structure, Investment and the Corporate Value: an Empirical Analysis, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 47: 103-121.
- Demsetz, H (1983), The structure of ownership and the theory of the firm. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 26: 375-390.
- Demsetz, H. and K. Lehn (1985), The structure of ownership: Causes and consequences. *Journal of Political Economy*, 93 (6): 1155-1177.
- Demsetz, H., B. Villalonga (2001), Ownership structure and corporate performance. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 7 (3): 209-233.
- Djankov, S. and P. Murrell (2002). Enterprise restructuring in transition: A Quantitative Survey. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 40 (4): 1202-1214.
- Glaeser, E., S. Johnson and A. Shleifer (2001), Coase versus the Coasians. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116 (3): 853-899.

Grosfeld, I. and T. Tressel (2002), Competition and ownership structure: substitutes or complements? Evidence from the Warsaw Stock Exchange. *Economics of Transition*, 10 (3): 525-551.

Hashi, I. (1998), Mass privatisation and corporate governance in the Czech Republic. *Economic Analysis*, 1(2): 163-187.

Hashi, I. (2000), The Polish National Investment Fund programme: Mass privatization with a difference? *Comparative Economic Studies*, 42 (1): 87-134.

Himmelberg, C.P., R.G. Hubbard and D. Palia (1999), Understanding the determinants of managerial ownership and the link between ownership and performance. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 53 (3): 353-384.

Jensen, M. and W. Meckling (1976), Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3: 305-360.

Johnson, S., R. La Porta, F. Lopez-de-Silanes and A. Shleifer (2000), Tunnelling, NBER Working Paper 7523.

Jones, D.C., P. Kalmi and N. Mygind (2003), Choice of ownership structure and firm performance: Evidence from Estonia, William Davidson Institute Working Paper n° 560.

Jones, D.C. and N. Mygind (1999), The Nature and Determinants of Ownership Changes after Privatisation: Evidence from Estonia, *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 27: 422-441.

Kocenda, E. and J. Svejnar (2003), Ownership and Firm Performance after Large-Scale Privatization, William Davidson Institute Working Paper n° 471a .

Lamba, A.S. and G. Stapledon (2002), The determinants of corporate ownership structure: Australian evidence", mimeo.

La Porta, R., F. Lopez-de-Silanes and A. Shleifer (1998), Law and finance, *Journal of Political Economy*, 106: 1113-55.

McConnell, J. and H. Servaes (1990), Additional evidence on equity ownership and corporate value. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 2: 119-149.

Mejstrik, M. (1997), *The Privatisation Process in East-Central Europe: Evolutionary Process of Czech Privatization*, Kluwer Academic Publishers: Dordrecht.

Mickiewicz, T., and M. Baltowski (2003), All Roads Lead to Outside Ownership: Polish Piecemeal Privatisation, Chapter 19 in Parker, D. and D. Saal (eds), *International Handbook on Privatisation*, Edward Elgar: Cheltenham.

Miguel A., J. Pindado and Ch. de la Torre (2001), Ownership structure and firm value: new evidence from the Spanish corporate governance system, SSRN Working Paper n° 292282.

Shleifer, A. and R. Vishny (1986), Large shareholders and corporate control. *Journal of Political Economy*, 94: 461-488.

Simoneti, M., A. Bohm, M. Rems, M. Rojec, J. P. Damijan, B. Majecen (2003), Slovenia: Ownership and Performance of Mass Privatised Firms, Chapter 2 in Blaszczyk, B., I. Hoshi and R. Woodward (eds.), *Secondary Privatisation in Transition Economies*, Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstoke.

Stulz, R. (1988), Managerial control of voting rights: financing policies and the market for corporate control, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 20: 25-54.

Table 1: Average shareholdings of the largest owner in mass privatised firms***(a) Czech Republic***

	1996	1997	1998	1999
Mean	38.8	42.8	48.6	51.9
Median	36.3	42.0	47.5	49.7
Std. Dev.	19.3	20.4	21.5	21.8
Number of firms	652	652	652	652

(b) Poland

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Mean	33.9	36.7	42.1	47.7	50.3
Median	33	33	33	33	33
Std. Dev.	5.5	10.1	15.8	20.6	22.6
Number of firms	441	440	439	439	439

Source: Own calculation

Table 2: Poland: The largest shareholder in mass privatized firms, 1998-2000

For each type of the largest shareholder the first row shows the number of firms, the second the average equity holdings and the third its standard deviation

	1998	1999	2000
Foreign investor			
Average equity in percent			
Standard Deviation			
Domestic investors			
Average equity in percent			
Standard Deviation			
Of which:			
			employees
Average equity in percent			
Standard Deviation			
			individual
Average equity in percent			
Standard Deviation			
			corporation
Average equity in percent			
Standard Deviation			
			National Investment Fund
Average equity in percent			
Standard Deviation			
			State
Average equity in percent			
Standard Deviation			
Total			

33
61.27
27.40

406
49.46
21.95

9
43.29
16.01

15
63.01
17.61

75
58.09
22.63

298
46.56
21.28

9
57.00
24.26

439

44
64.87
26.61

395
48.73
21.53

13
65.81
22.16

29
54.20

23.80

100
56.07
22.85

243
44.65
19.29

10
36.29
19.74

439

52
75.11
22.14

387
47.02
20.5

13
55.3
17.36

39
57.52
21.89

124
61.25
20.30

199
37.25
12.38

12
18.7
7.54

439

Table 3: Czech Republic: the largest shareholder in mass privatised firms, 1996-1999

For each type of the largest shareholder the first row shows the number of firms, the second the average equity holdings and the third its standard deviation

		1996	1997	1998	1999
	Individual	89	92	104	108
Average equity in percent		35.12	36.40	39.39	44.77
Standard Deviation		15.18	16.70	18.56	22.74
	Industrial or commercial company	295	371	372	404
Average equity in percent		46.60	47.95	53.90	55.62
Standard Deviation		19.15	20.48	21.05	20.93
	Investment fund	148	127	116	96
Average equity in percent		27.97	32.73	42.03	46.27
Standard Deviation		15.41	18.25	20.92	21.16
	Financial institution	58	33	41	27
Average equity in percent		38.03	42.44	47.70	51.27
Standard Deviation		18.51	17.16	20.16	22.61
	State	62	29	19	17
Average equity in percent		33.05	40.64	37.07	42.99
Standard Deviation		18.26	20.47	20.32	20.43
	Total	652	652	652	652
Average equity in percent		38.75	42.75	48.59	51.94
Standard Deviation		19.26	20.38	21.49	21.82

Table 4: Definition of variables

Variable	Definition
Return on assets	Ratio of earnings before taxes and depreciation to total assets.
Size	Natural logarithm of sales (in constant prices)
Leverage	Ratio of total liabilities to total assets
Investment	Ratio of net investment in fixed assets to total assets
Type of the largest owner	Dummies for different types of the largest shareholder in 1999 in the Czech Republic and in 2000 in Poland. In Poland we have foreign versus domestic investors, among which we distinguish between corporations, individuals, employees, the state and National Investment Funds. In the Czech Republic, there are five types of the largest owners: corporations, individuals, investment funds, financial institutions, and the state.
First wave of voucher privatisation in the Czech Republic	Dummy variable taking the value of 1 for companies included in the first wave of voucher privatisation, and 0 otherwise
Share of the largest owner in 1996	Logistic transformation of the percentage share of the largest shareholder (C1) of a company: $\ln [C1/(100-C1)]$
National Investment Fund dummies	Dummies for each of the 15 lead NIFs
Industry dummies	Dummies for industries to which firms belong. There are 12 industries in the Czech Republic and 20 in Poland

Table 5: Determinants of ownership concentration in Poland (probit regressions)

In columns (1), (2) and (3) the dependent variable is equal to one if in 2000 the firm has an owner with at least 50% of shares and zero otherwise. In columns (4), (5) and (6) the dependent variable is equal to one if the share of the largest owner has increased between 1995 and 2000 and zero otherwise. All independent variables, except dummies, are averaged over 1995-1999. The type of the largest owner refers to 2000. Standard errors are in parentheses; * significant at the 10 percent level; ** significant at the 5 percent level; and *** significant at the 1 percent level. All regressions include a constant term; the reference group for the 'type of the largest owner' is the combined category of State and National Investment Fund.

See Table 4 for detailed definitions of variables.

	<i>Increase in the share of the largest owner 1995 - 2000</i>			<i>Presence of a majority shareholder in 2000</i>		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Return on assets	-0.731* (0.428)	-0.685 (0.436)	-0.369 (0.427)	-1.078** (0.481)	-1.048** (0.495)	-0.685 (0.467)
Size	-0.056 (0.081)	-0.160 (0.088)	0.119 (0.102)	-0.162** (0.083)	-0.295*** (0.092)	-0.166 (0.109)
Leverage	-0.017 (0.020)	-0.019 (0.019)	-0.014 (0.047)	-0.016 (0.017)	-0.019 (0.016)	-0.008 (0.023)
Investment	0.054 (0.188)	0.084 (0.196)	0.021 (0.229)	0.088 (0.190)	0.123 (0.198)	0.063 (0.234)
Firms listed on the WSE	-0.487* (0.263)	-0.610** (0.280)	-0.730** (0.306)	-0.599** (0.281)	-0.798** (0.314)	-0.970*** (0.367)
Type of the largest owner						
Foreign investor		1.722*** (0.285)	2.353*** (0.290)		1.834*** (0.279)	2.681*** (0.300)
Domestic investor , of which:						
Corporation			1.850*** (0.200)			1.994*** (0.210)
Individual			1.455*** (0.281)			1.772*** (0.294)
Employees			1.351*** (0.437)			1.590*** (0.445)
NIF dummies	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Industry dummies	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Number of observations	434	434	434	434	434	434
Pseudo R ²	0.160	0.237	0.415	0.183	0.274	0.475

Table 6: Determinants of ownership concentration in the Czech Republic (probit regressions)

In columns (1) and (2) the dependent variable is equal to one if in 1999 the firm has an owner with at least 50% of shares and zero otherwise. In columns (3) and (4) the dependent variable is equal to one if the share of the largest owner has increased between 1996 and 1999. All independent variables, except dummies, are averaged over 1995-1999. The type of largest owner refers to 1999. Standard errors are in parentheses; * significant at the 10 percent level; ** significant at the 5 percent level; and *** significant at the 1 percent level. All regressions include a constant term; the reference group for the 'type of the largest owner' is 'State'. See Table 4 for detailed definitions of variables.

	Increase in the share of the largest owner 1996 – 1999		Presence of a majority owner in 1999	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Return on assets	1.875*** (0.652)	1.819*** (0.663)	0.870 (0.584)	0.754 (0.597)
Size	-0.001 (0.038)	0.013 (0.040)	0.067 (0.037)	0.073* (0.039)
Share of the largest owner in 1996	-0.383*** (0.063)	-0.394*** (0.065)	0.649*** (0.068)	0.647*** (0.070)
Leverage	-0.089 (0.250)	-0.065 (0.253)	0.000 (0.240)	-0.035 (0.241)
Investment	0.493 (0.383)	0.502 (0.387)	-0.045 (0.346)	-0.055 (0.344)
Firms privatised in the first wave of voucher privatisation	0.104 (0.179)	0.079 (0.181)	-0.234 (0.176)	-0.256 (0.180)
Type of the largest owner				
Corporation		1.034*** (0.367)		0.921** (0.381)
Individual		0.826** (0.395)		0.526 (0.408)
Investment fund		1.033*** (0.390)		0.652 (0.402)
Financial institution		1.207** (0.488)		0.981** (0.464)
Industry dummies	yes	yes	yes	yes
Number of observations	610	610	610	610
Pseudo R ²	0.092	0.107	0.158	0.174

NOTE DI LAVORO DELLA FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Paper Series

Our Note di Lavoro are available on the Internet at the following addresses:

<http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/WPapers/default.html>

<http://www.ssrn.com/link/feem.html>

NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2003

PRIV	1.2003	<i>Gabriella CHIESA and Giovanna NICODANO: <u>Privatization and Financial Market Development: Theoretical Issues</u></i>
PRIV	2.2003	<i>Ibolya SCHINDELE: <u>Theory of Privatization in Eastern Europe: Literature Review</u></i>
PRIV	3.2003	<i>Wietze LISE, Claudia KEMFERT and Richard S.J. TOL: <u>Strategic Action in the Liberalised German Electricity Market</u></i>
CLIM	4.2003	<i>Laura MARSILIANI and Thomas I. RENSTRÖM: <u>Environmental Policy and Capital Movements: The Role of Government Commitment</u></i>
KNOW	5.2003	<i>Reyer GERLAGH: <u>Induced Technological Change under Technological Competition</u></i>
ETA	6.2003	<i>Efrem CASTELNUOVO: <u>Squeezing the Interest Rate Smoothing Weight with a Hybrid Expectations Model</u></i>
SIEV	7.2003	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Alberto LONGO, Stefania TONIN, Francesco TROMBETTA and Margherita TURVANI: <u>The Role of Liability, Regulation and Economic Incentives in Brownfield Remediation and Redevelopment: Evidence from Surveys of Developers</u></i>
NRM	8.2003	<i>Elissaios PAPYRAKIS and Reyner GERLAGH: <u>Natural Resources: A Blessing or a Curse?</u></i>
CLIM	9.2003	<i>A. CAPARRÓS, J.-C. PEREAU and T. TAZDAÏT: <u>North-South Climate Change Negotiations: a Sequential Game with Asymmetric Information</u></i>
KNOW	10.2003	<i>Giorgio BRUNELLO and Daniele CHECCHI: <u>School Quality and Family Background in Italy</u></i>
CLIM	11.2003	<i>Efrem CASTELNUOVO and Marzio GALEOTTI: <u>Learning By Doing vs Learning By Researching in a Model of Climate Change Policy Analysis</u></i>
KNOW	12.2003	<i>Carole MAIGNAN, Gianmarco OTTAVIANO and Dino PINELLI (eds.): <u>Economic Growth, Innovation, Cultural Diversity: What are we all talking about? A critical survey of the state-of-the-art</u></i>
KNOW	13.2003	<i>Carole MAIGNAN, Gianmarco OTTAVIANO, Dino PINELLI and Francesco RULLANI (lix): <u>Bio-Ecological Diversity vs. Socio-Economic Diversity. A Comparison of Existing Measures</u></i>
KNOW	14.2003	<i>Maddy JANSSENS and Chris STEYAERT (lix): <u>Theories of Diversity within Organisation Studies: Debates and Future Trajectories</u></i>
KNOW	15.2003	<i>Tuzin BAYCAN LEVENT, Enno MASUREL and Peter NIJKAMP (lix): <u>Diversity in Entrepreneurship: Ethnic and Female Roles in Urban Economic Life</u></i>
KNOW	16.2003	<i>Alexandra BITUSIKOVA (lix): <u>Post-Communist City on its Way from Grey to Colourful: The Case Study from Slovakia</u></i>
KNOW	17.2003	<i>Billy E. VAUGHN and Katarina MLEKOV (lix): <u>A Stage Model of Developing an Inclusive Community</u></i>
KNOW	18.2003	<i>Selma van LONDEN and Arie de RUIJTER (lix): <u>Managing Diversity in a Globalizing World</u></i>
Coalition	19.2003	<i>Sergio CURRARINI: <u>On the Stability of Hierarchies in Games with Externalities</u></i>
Theory	20.2003	<i>Giacomo CALZOLARI and Alessandro PAVAN (lx): <u>Monopoly with Resale</u></i>
Network	21.2003	<i>Claudio MEZZETTI (lx): <u>Auction Design with Interdependent Valuations: The Generalized Revelation Principle, Efficiency, Full Surplus Extraction and Information Acquisition</u></i>
PRIV	22.2003	<i>Marco LiCalzi and Alessandro PAVAN (lx): <u>Tilting the Supply Schedule to Enhance Competition in Uniform-Price Auctions</u></i>
PRIV	23.2003	<i>David ETTINGER (lx): <u>Bidding among Friends and Enemies</u></i>
PRIV	24.2003	<i>Hannu VARTIAINEN (lx): <u>Auction Design without Commitment</u></i>
PRIV	25.2003	<i>Matti KELOHARJU, Kjell G. NYBORG and Kristian RYDQVIST (lx): <u>Strategic Behavior and Underpricing in Uniform Price Auctions: Evidence from Finnish Treasury Auctions</u></i>
PRIV	26.2003	<i>Christine A. PARLOUR and Uday RAJAN (lx): <u>Rationing in IPOs</u></i>
PRIV	27.2003	<i>Kjell G. NYBORG and Ilya A. STREBULAIEV (lx): <u>Multiple Unit Auctions and Short Squeezes</u></i>
PRIV	28.2003	<i>Anders LUNANDER and Jan-Eric NILSSON (lx): <u>Taking the Lab to the Field: Experimental Tests of Alternative Mechanisms to Procure Multiple Contracts</u></i>
PRIV	29.2003	<i>TangaMcDANIEL and Karsten NEUHOFF (lx): <u>Use of Long-term Auctions for Network Investment</u></i>
PRIV	30.2003	<i>Emiel MAASLAND and Sander ONDERSTAL (lx): <u>Auctions with Financial Externalities</u></i>
ETA	31.2003	<i>Michael FINUS and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN: <u>A Non-cooperative Foundation of Core-Stability in Positive Externality NTU-Coalition Games</u></i>
KNOW	32.2003	<i>Michele MORETTO: <u>Competition and Irreversible Investments under Uncertainty</u></i>
PRIV	33.2003	<i>Philippe QUIRION: <u>Relative Quotas: Correct Answer to Uncertainty or Case of Regulatory Capture?</u></i>
KNOW	34.2003	<i>Giuseppe MEDA, Claudio PIGA and Donald SIEGEL: <u>On the Relationship between R&D and Productivity: A Treatment Effect Analysis</u></i>
ETA	35.2003	<i>Alessandra DEL BOCA, Marzio GALEOTTI and Paola ROTA: <u>Non-convexities in the Adjustment of Different Capital Inputs: A Firm-level Investigation</u></i>

GG	36.2003	<i>Matthieu GLACHANT</i> : <u>Voluntary Agreements under Endogenous Legislative Threats</u>
PRIV	37.2003	<i>Narjess BOUBAKRI, Jean-Claude COSSET and Omrane GUEDHAMI</i> : <u>Postprivatization Corporate Governance: the Role of Ownership Structure and Investor Protection</u>
CLIM	38.2003	<i>Rolf GOLOMBEK and Michael HOEL</i> : <u>Climate Policy under Technology Spillovers</u>
KNOW	39.2003	<i>Slim BEN YOUSSEF</i> : <u>Transboundary Pollution, R&D Spillovers and International Trade</u>
CTN	40.2003	<i>Carlo CARRARO and Carmen MARCHIORI</i> : <u>Endogenous Strategic Issue Linkage in International Negotiations</u>
KNOW	41.2003	<i>Sonia OREFFICE</i> : <u>Abortion and Female Power in the Household: Evidence from Labor Supply</u>
KNOW	42.2003	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Timothy SWANSON</i> : <u>On Biology and Technology: The Economics of Managing Biotechnologies</u>
ETA	43.2003	<i>Giorgio Busetti and Matteo MANERA</i> : <u>STAR-GARCH Models for Stock Market Interactions in the Pacific Basin Region, Japan and US</u>
CLIM	44.2003	<i>Katrin MILLOCK and Céline NAUGES</i> : <u>The French Tax on Air Pollution: Some Preliminary Results on its Effectiveness</u>
PRIV	45.2003	<i>Bernardo BORTOLOTTI and Paolo PINOTTI</i> : <u>The Political Economy of Privatization</u>
SIEV	46.2003	<i>Elbert DIJKGRAAF and Herman R.J. VOLLEBERGH</i> : <u>Burn or Bury? A Social Cost Comparison of Final Waste Disposal Methods</u>
ETA	47.2003	<i>Jens HORBACH</i> : <u>Employment and Innovations in the Environmental Sector: Determinants and Econometrical Results for Germany</u>
CLIM	48.2003	<i>Lori SNYDER, Nolan MILLER and Robert STAVINS</i> : <u>The Effects of Environmental Regulation on Technology Diffusion: The Case of Chlorine Manufacturing</u>
CLIM	49.2003	<i>Lori SNYDER, Robert STAVINS and Alexander F. WAGNER</i> : <u>Private Options to Use Public Goods. Exploiting Revealed Preferences to Estimate Environmental Benefits</u>
CTN	50.2003	<i>László Á. KÓCZY and Luc LAUWERS (Ixi)</i> : <u>The Minimal Dominant Set is a Non-Empty Core-Extension</u>
CTN	51.2003	<i>Matthew O. JACKSON (Ixi)</i> : <u>Allocation Rules for Network Games</u>
CTN	52.2003	<i>Ana MAULEON and Vincent VANNETELBOSCH (Ixi)</i> : <u>Farsightedness and Cautiousness in Coalition Formation</u>
CTN	53.2003	<i>Fernando VEGA-REDONDO (Ixi)</i> : <u>Building Up Social Capital in a Changing World: a network approach</u>
CTN	54.2003	<i>Matthew HAAG and Roger LAGUNOFF (Ixi)</i> : <u>On the Size and Structure of Group Cooperation</u>
CTN	55.2003	<i>Taiji FURUSAWA and Hideo KONISHI (Ixi)</i> : <u>Free Trade Networks</u>
CTN	56.2003	<i>Halis Murat YILDIZ (Ixi)</i> : <u>National Versus International Mergers and Trade Liberalization</u>
CTN	57.2003	<i>Santiago RUBIO and Alistair ULPH (Ixi)</i> : <u>An Infinite-Horizon Model of Dynamic Membership of International Environmental Agreements</u>
KNOW	58.2003	<i>Carole MAIGNAN, Dino PINELLI and Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO</i> : <u>ICT, Clusters and Regional Cohesion: A Summary of Theoretical and Empirical Research</u>
KNOW	59.2003	<i>Giorgio BELLETTINI and Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO</i> : <u>Special Interests and Technological Change</u>
ETA	60.2003	<i>Ronnie SCHÖB</i> : <u>The Double Dividend Hypothesis of Environmental Taxes: A Survey</u>
CLIM	61.2003	<i>Michael FINUS, Ekko van IERLAND and Robert DELLINK</i> : <u>Stability of Climate Coalitions in a Cartel Formation Game</u>
GG	62.2003	<i>Michael FINUS and Bianca RUNDSHAGEN</i> : <u>How the Rules of Coalition Formation Affect Stability of International Environmental Agreements</u>
SIEV	63.2003	<i>Alberto PETRUCCI</i> : <u>Taxing Land Rent in an Open Economy</u>
CLIM	64.2003	<i>Joseph E. ALDY, Scott BARRETT and Robert N. STAVINS</i> : <u>Thirteen Plus One: A Comparison of Global Climate Policy Architectures</u>
SIEV	65.2003	<i>Edi DEFRANCESCO</i> : <u>The Beginning of Organic Fish Farming in Italy</u>
SIEV	66.2003	<i>Klaus CONRAD</i> : <u>Price Competition and Product Differentiation when Consumers Care for the Environment</u>
SIEV	67.2003	<i>Paulo A.L.D. NUNES, Luca ROSSETTO, Arianne DE BLAEIJ</i> : <u>Monetary Value Assessment of Clam Fishing Management Practices in the Venice Lagoon: Results from a Stated Choice Exercise</u>
CLIM	68.2003	<i>ZhongXiang ZHANG</i> : <u>Open Trade with the U.S. Without Compromising Canada's Ability to Comply with its Kyoto Target</u>
KNOW	69.2003	<i>David FRANTZ (Ixi)</i> : <u>Lorenzo Market between Diversity and Mutation</u>
KNOW	70.2003	<i>Ercole SORI (Ixi)</i> : <u>Mapping Diversity in Social History</u>
KNOW	71.2003	<i>Ljiljana DERU SIMIC (Ixi)</i> : <u>What is Specific about Art/Cultural Projects?</u>
KNOW	72.2003	<i>Natalya V. TARANOVA (Ixi)</i> : <u>The Role of the City in Fostering Intergroup Communication in a Multicultural Environment: Saint-Petersburg's Case</u>
KNOW	73.2003	<i>Kristine CRANE (Ixi)</i> : <u>The City as an Arena for the Expression of Multiple Identities in the Age of Globalisation and Migration</u>
KNOW	74.2003	<i>Kazuma MATOBA (Ixi)</i> : <u>Glocal Dialogue- Transformation through Transcultural Communication</u>
KNOW	75.2003	<i>Catarina REIS OLIVEIRA (Ixi)</i> : <u>Immigrants' Entrepreneurial Opportunities: The Case of the Chinese in Portugal</u>
KNOW	76.2003	<i>Sandra WALLMAN (Ixi)</i> : <u>The Diversity of Diversity - towards a typology of urban systems</u>
KNOW	77.2003	<i>Richard PEARCE (Ixi)</i> : <u>A Biologist's View of Individual Cultural Identity for the Study of Cities</u>
KNOW	78.2003	<i>Vincent MERK (Ixi)</i> : <u>Communication Across Cultures: from Cultural Awareness to Reconciliation of the Dilemmas</u>
KNOW	79.2003	<i>Giorgio BELLETTINI, Carlotta BERTI CERONI and Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO</i> : <u>Child Labor and Resistance to Change</u>
ETA	80.2003	<i>Michele MORETTO, Paolo M. PANTEGHINI and Carlo SCARPA</i> : <u>Investment Size and Firm's Value under Profit Sharing Regulation</u>

ITEM	81.2003	<i>Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA and Massimo GIOVANNINI: <u>Oil and Product Dynamics in International Petroleum Markets</u></i>
CLIM	82.2003	<i>Y. Hossein FARZIN and Jinhua ZHAO: <u>Pollution Abatement Investment When Firms Lobby Against Environmental Regulation</u></i>
CLIM	83.2003	<i>Giuseppe DI VITA: <u>Is the Discount Rate Relevant in Explaining the Environmental Kuznets Curve?</u></i>
CLIM	84.2003	<i>Reyer GERLAGH and Wietze LISE: <u>Induced Technological Change Under Carbon Taxes</u></i>
NRM	85.2003	<i>Rinaldo BRAU, Alessandro LANZA and Francesco PIGLIARU: <u>How Fast are the Tourism Countries Growing? The cross-country evidence</u></i>
KNOW	86.2003	<i>Elena BELLINI, Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Dino PINELLI: <u>The ICT Revolution: opportunities and risks for the Mezzogiorno</u></i>
SIEV	87.2003	<i>Lucas BRETSCGHER and Sjak SMULDERS: <u>Sustainability and Substitution of Exhaustible Natural Resources. How resource prices affect long-term R&D investments</u></i>
CLIM	88.2003	<i>Johan EYCKMANS and Michael FINUS: <u>New Roads to International Environmental Agreements: The Case of Global Warming</u></i>
CLIM	89.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI: <u>Economic Development and Environmental Protection</u></i>
CLIM	90.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI: <u>Environment and Economic Growth: Is Technical Change the Key to Decoupling?</u></i>
CLIM	91.2003	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI and Barbara BUCHNER: <u>Climate Policy and Economic Growth in Developing Countries</u></i>
ITEM	92.2003	<i>A. MARKANDYA, A. GOLUB and E. STRUKOVA: <u>The Influence of Climate Change Considerations on Energy Policy: The Case of Russia</u></i>
ETA	93.2003	<i>Andrea BELTRATTI: <u>Socially Responsible Investment in General Equilibrium</u></i>
CTN	94.2003	<i>Parkash CHANDER: <u>The γ-Core and Coalition Formation</u></i>
ITEM	95.2003	<i>Matteo MANERA and Angelo MARZULLO: <u>Modelling the Load Curve of Aggregate Electricity Consumption Using Principal Components</u></i>
ITEM	96.2003	<i>Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA, Margherita GRASSO and Massimo GIOVANNINI: <u>Long-run Models of Oil Stock Prices</u></i>
CTN	97.2003	<i>Steven J. BRAMS, Michael A. JONES, and D. Marc KILGOUR: <u>Forming Stable Coalitions: The Process Matters</u></i>
KNOW	98.2003	<i>John CROWLEY, Marie-Cecile NAVES (Ixi): <u>Anti-Racist Policies in France. From Ideological and Historical Schemes to Socio-Political Realities</u></i>
KNOW	99.2003	<i>Richard THOMPSON FORD (Ixi): <u>Cultural Rights and Civic Virtue</u></i>
KNOW	100.2003	<i>Alaknanda PATEL (Ixi): <u>Cultural Diversity and Conflict in Multicultural Cities</u></i>
KNOW	101.2003	<i>David MAY (Ixi): <u>The Struggle of Becoming Established in a Deprived Inner-City Neighbourhood</u></i>
KNOW	102.2003	<i>Sébastien ARCAND, Danielle JUTEAU, Sirma BILGE, and Francine LEMIRE (Ixi) : <u>Municipal Reform on the Island of Montreal: Tensions Between Two Majority Groups in a Multicultural City</u></i>
CLIM	103.2003	<i>Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO: <u>China and the Evolution of the Present Climate Regime</u></i>
CLIM	104.2003	<i>Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO: <u>Emissions Trading Regimes and Incentives to Participate in International Climate Agreements</u></i>
CLIM	105.2003	<i>Anil MARKANDYA and Dirk T.G. RÜBBELKE: <u>Ancillary Benefits of Climate Policy</u></i>
NRM	106.2003	<i>Anne Sophie CRÉPIN (Ixiv): <u>Management Challenges for Multiple-Species Boreal Forests</u></i>
NRM	107.2003	<i>Anne Sophie CRÉPIN (Ixiv): <u>Threshold Effects in Coral Reef Fisheries</u></i>
SIEV	108.2003	<i>Sara ANIYAR (Ixiv): <u>Estimating the Value of Oil Capital in a Small Open Economy: The Venezuela's Example</u></i>
SIEV	109.2003	<i>Kenneth ARROW, Partha DASGUPTA and Karl-Göran MÄLER(Ixiv): <u>Evaluating Projects and Assessing Sustainable Development in Imperfect Economies</u></i>
NRM	110.2003	<i>Anastasios XEPAPADEAS and Catarina ROSETA-PALMA(Ixiv): <u>Instabilities and Robust Control in Fisheries</u></i>
NRM	111.2003	<i>Charles PERRINGS and Brian WALKER (Ixiv): <u>Conservation and Optimal Use of Rangelands</u></i>
ETA	112.2003	<i>Jack GOODY (Ixiv): <u>Globalisation, Population and Ecology</u></i>
CTN	113.2003	<i>Carlo CARRARO, Carmen MARCHIORI and Sonia OREFFICE: <u>Endogenous Minimum Participation in International Environmental Treaties</u></i>
CTN	114.2003	<i>Guillaume HAERINGER and Myrna WOODERS: <u>Decentralized Job Matching</u></i>
CTN	115.2003	<i>Hideo KONISHI and M. Utku UNVER: <u>Credible Group Stability in Multi-Partner Matching Problems</u></i>
CTN	116.2003	<i>Somdeb LAHIRI: <u>Stable Matchings for the Room-Mates Problem</u></i>
CTN	117.2003	<i>Somdeb LAHIRI: <u>Stable Matchings for a Generalized Marriage Problem</u></i>
CTN	118.2003	<i>Marita LAUKKANEN: <u>Transboundary Fisheries Management under Implementation Uncertainty</u></i>
CTN	119.2003	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT and Myrna WOODERS: <u>Social Conformity and Bounded Rationality in Arbitrary Games with Incomplete Information: Some First Results</u></i>
CTN	120.2003	<i>Gianluigi VERNASCA: <u>Dynamic Price Competition with Price Adjustment Costs and Product Differentiation</u></i>
CTN	121.2003	<i>Myrna WOODERS, Edward CARTWRIGHT and Reinhard SELTEN: <u>Social Conformity in Games with Many Players</u></i>
CTN	122.2003	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT and Myrna WOODERS: <u>On Equilibrium in Pure Strategies in Games with Many Players</u></i>
CTN	123.2003	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT and Myrna WOODERS: <u>Conformity and Bounded Rationality in Games with Many Players</u></i>
1000		Carlo CARRARO, Alessandro LANZA and Valeria PAPPONETTI: <u>One Thousand Working Papers</u>

NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2004

IEM	1.2004	Anil MARKANDYA, Suzette PEDROSO and Alexander GOLUB: <u>Empirical Analysis of National Income and So2 Emissions in Selected European Countries</u>
ETA	2.2004	Masahisa FUJITA and Shlomo WEBER: <u>Strategic Immigration Policies and Welfare in Heterogeneous Countries</u>
PRA	3.2004	Adolfo DI CARLUCCIO, Giovanni FERRI, Cecilia FRALE and Ottavio RICCHI: <u>Do Privatizations Boost Household Shareholding? Evidence from Italy</u>
ETA	4.2004	Victor GINSBURGH and Shlomo WEBER: <u>Languages Disenfranchisement in the European Union</u>
ETA	5.2004	Romano PIRAS: <u>Growth, Congestion of Public Goods, and Second-Best Optimal Policy</u>
CCMP	6.2004	Herman R.J. VOLLEBERGH: <u>Lessons from the Polder: Is Dutch CO2-Taxation Optimal</u>
PRA	7.2004	Sandro BRUSCO, Giuseppe LOPOMO and S. VISWANATHAN (lxv): <u>Merger Mechanisms</u>
PRA	8.2004	Wolfgang AUSSENEGG, Pegaret PICHLER and Alex STOMPER (lxv): <u>IPO Pricing with Bookbuilding, and a When-Issued Market</u>
PRA	9.2004	Pegaret PICHLER and Alex STOMPER (lxv): <u>Primary Market Design: Direct Mechanisms and Markets</u>
PRA	10.2004	Florian ENGLMAIER, Pablo GUILLEN, Loreto LLORENTE, Sander ONDERSTAL and Rupert SAUSGRUBER (lxv): <u>The Chopstick Auction: A Study of the Exposure Problem in Multi-Unit Auctions</u>
PRA	11.2004	Bjarne BRENDSTRUP and Harry J. PAARSCH (lxv): <u>Nonparametric Identification and Estimation of Multi-Unit, Sequential, Oral, Ascending-Price Auctions With Asymmetric Bidders</u>
PRA	12.2004	Ohad KADAN (lxv): <u>Equilibrium in the Two Player, k-Double Auction with Affiliated Private Values</u>
PRA	13.2004	Maarten C.W. JANSSEN (lxv): <u>Auctions as Coordination Devices</u>
PRA	14.2004	Gadi FIBICH, Arie GAVIOUS and Aner SELA (lxv): <u>All-Pay Auctions with Weakly Risk-Averse Buyers</u>
PRA	15.2004	Orly SADE, Charles SCHNITZLEIN and Jaime F. ZENDER (lxv): <u>Competition and Cooperation in Divisible Good Auctions: An Experimental Examination</u>
PRA	16.2004	Marta STRYSZOWSKA (lxv): <u>Late and Multiple Bidding in Competing Second Price Internet Auctions</u>
CCMP	17.2004	Slim Ben YOUSSEF: <u>R&D in Cleaner Technology and International Trade</u>
NRM	18.2004	Angelo ANTOCI, Simone BORGHESI and Paolo RUSSU (lxvi): <u>Biodiversity and Economic Growth: Stabilization Versus Preservation of the Ecological Dynamics</u>
SIEV	19.2004	Anna ALBERINI, Paolo ROSATO, Alberto LONGO and Valentina ZANATTA: <u>Information and Willingness to Pay in a Contingent Valuation Study: The Value of S. Erasmo in the Lagoon of Venice</u>
NRM	20.2004	Guido CANDELA and Roberto CELLINI (lxvii): <u>Investment in Tourism Market: A Dynamic Model of Differentiated Oligopoly</u>
NRM	21.2004	Jacqueline M. HAMILTON (lxvii): <u>Climate and the Destination Choice of German Tourists</u>
NRM	22.2004	Javier Rey-MAQUIEIRA PALMER, Javier LOZANO IBÁÑEZ and Carlos Mario GÓMEZ GÓMEZ (lxvii): <u>Land, Environmental Externalities and Tourism Development</u>
NRM	23.2004	Pius ODUNGA and Henk FOLMER (lxvii): <u>Profiling Tourists for Balanced Utilization of Tourism-Based Resources in Kenya</u>
NRM	24.2004	Jean-Jacques NOWAK, Mondher SAHLI and Pasquale M. SGRO (lxvii): <u>Tourism, Trade and Domestic Welfare</u>
NRM	25.2004	Riaz SHAREEF (lxvii): <u>Country Risk Ratings of Small Island Tourism Economies</u>
NRM	26.2004	Juan Luis EUGENIO-MARTÍN, Noelia MARTÍN MORALES and Riccardo SCARPA (lxvii): <u>Tourism and Economic Growth in Latin American Countries: A Panel Data Approach</u>
NRM	27.2004	Raúl Hernández MARTÍN (lxvii): <u>Impact of Tourism Consumption on GDP. The Role of Imports</u>
CSRM	28.2004	Nicoletta FERRO: <u>Cross-Country Ethical Dilemmas in Business: A Descriptive Framework</u>
NRM	29.2004	Marian WEBER (lxvi): <u>Assessing the Effectiveness of Tradable Landuse Rights for Biodiversity Conservation: an Application to Canada's Boreal Mixedwood Forest</u>
NRM	30.2004	Trond BJORN DAL, Phoebe KOUNDOURI and Sean PASCOE (lxvi): <u>Output Substitution in Multi-Species Trawl Fisheries: Implications for Quota Setting</u>
CCMP	31.2004	Marzio GALEOTTI, Alessandra GORIA, Paolo MOMBRINI and Evi SPANTIDAKI: <u>Weather Impacts on Natural, Social and Economic Systems (WISE) Part I: Sectoral Analysis of Climate Impacts in Italy</u>
CCMP	32.2004	Marzio GALEOTTI, Alessandra GORIA, Paolo MOMBRINI and Evi SPANTIDAKI: <u>Weather Impacts on Natural, Social and Economic Systems (WISE) Part II: Individual Perception of Climate Extremes in Italy</u>
CTN	33.2004	Wilson PEREZ: <u>Divide and Conquer: Noisy Communication in Networks, Power, and Wealth Distribution</u>
KTHC	34.2004	Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Giovanni PERI (lxviii): <u>The Economic Value of Cultural Diversity: Evidence from US Cities</u>
KTHC	35.2004	Linda CHAIB (lxviii): <u>Immigration and Local Urban Participatory Democracy: A Boston-Paris Comparison</u>
KTHC	36.2004	Franca ECKERT COEN and Claudio ROSSI (lxviii): <u>Foreigners, Immigrants, Host Cities: The Policies of Multi-Ethnicity in Rome. Reading Governance in a Local Context</u>
KTHC	37.2004	Kristine CRANE (lxviii): <u>Governing Migration: Immigrant Groups' Strategies in Three Italian Cities – Rome, Naples and Bari</u>
KTHC	38.2004	Kiflemariam HAMDE (lxviii): <u>Mind in Africa, Body in Europe: The Struggle for Maintaining and Transforming Cultural Identity - A Note from the Experience of Eritrean Immigrants in Stockholm</u>
ETA	39.2004	Alberto CAVALIERE: <u>Price Competition with Information Disparities in a Vertically Differentiated Duopoly</u>
PRA	40.2004	Andrea BIGANO and Stef PROOST: <u>The Opening of the European Electricity Market and Environmental Policy: Does the Degree of Competition Matter?</u>
CCMP	41.2004	Micheal FINUS (lxix): <u>International Cooperation to Resolve International Pollution Problems</u>
KTHC	42.2004	Francesco CRESPI: <u>Notes on the Determinants of Innovation: A Multi-Perspective Analysis</u>

CTN	43.2004	<i>Sergio CURRARINI and Marco MARINI: <u>Coalition Formation in Games without Synergies</u></i>
CTN	44.2004	<i>Marc ESCRIHUELA-VILLAR: <u>Cartel Sustainability and Cartel Stability</u></i>
NRM	45.2004	<i>Sebastian BERVOETS and Nicolas GRAVEL (lxvi): <u>Appraising Diversity with an Ordinal Notion of Similarity: An Axiomatic Approach</u></i>
NRM	46.2004	<i>Signe ANTHON and Bo JELLES MARK THORSEN (lxvi): <u>Optimal Afforestation Contracts with Asymmetric Information on Private Environmental Benefits</u></i>
NRM	47.2004	<i>John MBURU (lxvi): <u>Wildlife Conservation and Management in Kenya: Towards a Co-management Approach</u></i>
NRM	48.2004	<i>Ekin BIROL, Ágnes GYOVAI and Melinda SMALE (lxvi): <u>Using a Choice Experiment to Value Agricultural Biodiversity on Hungarian Small Farms: Agri-Environmental Policies in a Transitional Economy</u></i>
CCMP	49.2004	<i>Gernot KLEPPER and Sonja PETERSON: <u>The EU Emissions Trading Scheme. Allowance Prices, Trade Flows, Competitiveness Effects</u></i>
GG	50.2004	<i>Scott BARRETT and Michael HOEL: <u>Optimal Disease Eradication</u></i>
CTN	51.2004	<i>Dinko DIMITROV, Peter BORM, Ruud HENDRICKX and Shao CHIN SUNG: <u>Simple Priorities and Core Stability in Hedonic Games</u></i>
SIEV	52.2004	<i>Francesco RICCI: <u>Channels of Transmission of Environmental Policy to Economic Growth: A Survey of the Theory</u></i>
SIEV	53.2004	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Maureen CROPPER, Alan KRUPNICK and Nathalie B. SIMON: <u>Willingness to Pay for Mortality Risk Reductions: Does Latency Matter?</u></i>
NRM	54.2004	<i>Ingo BRÄUER and Rainer MARGGRAF (lxvi): <u>Valuation of Ecosystem Services Provided by Biodiversity Conservation: An Integrated Hydrological and Economic Model to Value the Enhanced Nitrogen Retention in Renaturated Streams</u></i>
NRM	55.2004	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Tun LIN (lxvi): <u>Biodiversity Conservation on Private Lands: Information Problems and Regulatory Choices</u></i>
NRM	56.2004	<i>Tom DEDEURWAERDERE (lxvi): <u>Bioprospection: From the Economics of Contracts to Reflexive Governance</u></i>
CCMP	57.2004	<i>Katrin REHDANZ and David MADDISON: <u>The Amenity Value of Climate to German Households</u></i>
CCMP	58.2004	<i>Koen SMEKENS and Bob VAN DER ZWAAN: <u>Environmental Externalities of Geological Carbon Sequestration Effects on Energy Scenarios</u></i>
NRM	59.2004	<i>Valentina BOSETTI, Mariaester CASSINELLI and Alessandro LANZA (lxvii): <u>Using Data Envelopment Analysis to Evaluate Environmentally Conscious Tourism Management</u></i>
NRM	60.2004	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Danilo CAMARGO IGLIORI (lxvi): <u>Property Rights Conservation and Development: An Analysis of Extractive Reserves in the Brazilian Amazon</u></i>
CCMP	61.2004	<i>Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO: <u>Economic and Environmental Effectiveness of a Technology-based Climate Protocol</u></i>
NRM	62.2004	<i>Elissaios PAPYRAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH: <u>Resource-Abundance and Economic Growth in the U.S.</u></i>
NRM	63.2004	<i>Györgyi BELA, György PATAKI, Melinda SMALE and Mariann HAJDÚ (lxvi): <u>Conserving Crop Genetic Resources on Smallholder Farms in Hungary: Institutional Analysis</u></i>
NRM	64.2004	<i>E.C.M. RUIJGROK and E.E.M. NILLESEN (lxvi): <u>The Socio-Economic Value of Natural Riverbanks in the Netherlands</u></i>
NRM	65.2004	<i>E.C.M. RUIJGROK (lxvi): <u>Reducing Acidification: The Benefits of Increased Nature Quality. Investigating the Possibilities of the Contingent Valuation Method</u></i>
ETA	66.2004	<i>Giannis VARDAS and Anastasios XEPAPADEAS: <u>Uncertainty Aversion, Robust Control and Asset Holdings</u></i>
GG	67.2004	<i>Anastasios XEPAPADEAS and Constadina PASSA: <u>Participation in and Compliance with Public Voluntary Environmental Programs: An Evolutionary Approach</u></i>
GG	68.2004	<i>Michael FINUS: <u>Modesty Pays: Sometimes!</u></i>
NRM	69.2004	<i>Trond BJØRNDAL and Ana BRASÃO: <u>The Northern Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries: Management and Policy Implications</u></i>
CTN	70.2004	<i>Alejandro CAPARRÓS, Abdelhakim HAMMOUDI and Tarik TAZDAÏT: <u>On Coalition Formation with Heterogeneous Agents</u></i>
IEM	71.2004	<i>Massimo GIOVANNINI, Margherita GRASSO, Alessandro LANZA and Matteo MANERA: <u>Conditional Correlations in the Returns on Oil Companies Stock Prices and Their Determinants</u></i>
IEM	72.2004	<i>Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA and Michael MCALEER: <u>Modelling Dynamic Conditional Correlations in WTI Oil Forward and Futures Returns</u></i>
SIEV	73.2004	<i>Margarita GENIUS and Elisabetta STRAZZERA: <u>The Copula Approach to Sample Selection Modelling: An Application to the Recreational Value of Forests</u></i>
CCMP	74.2004	<i>Rob DELLINK and Ekko van IERLAND: <u>Pollution Abatement in the Netherlands: A Dynamic Applied General Equilibrium Assessment</u></i>
ETA	75.2004	<i>Rosella LEVAGGI and Michele MORETTO: <u>Investment in Hospital Care Technology under Different Purchasing Rules: A Real Option Approach</u></i>
CTN	76.2004	<i>Salvador BARBERÀ and Matthew O. JACKSON (lxx): <u>On the Weights of Nations: Assigning Voting Weights in a Heterogeneous Union</u></i>
CTN	77.2004	<i>Àlex ARENAS, Antonio CABRALES, Albert DÍAZ-GUILERA, Roger GUIMERA and Fernando VEGA-REDONDO (lxx): <u>Optimal Information Transmission in Organizations: Search and Congestion</u></i>
CTN	78.2004	<i>Francis BLOCH and Armando GOMES (lxx): <u>Contracting with Externalities and Outside Options</u></i>
CTN	79.2004	<i>Rabah AMIR, Effrosyni DIAMANTOUDI and Licun XUE (lxx): <u>Merger Performance under Uncertain Efficiency Gains</u></i>
CTN	80.2004	<i>Francis BLOCH and Matthew O. JACKSON (lxx): <u>The Formation of Networks with Transfers among Players</u></i>
CTN	81.2004	<i>Daniel DIERMEIER, Hülya ERASLAN and Antonio MERLO (lxx): <u>Bicameralism and Government Formation</u></i>

CTN	82.2004	<i>Rod GARRATT, James E. PARCO, Cheng-ZHONG QIN and Amnon RAPOPORT (lxx): <u>Potential Maximization and Coalition Government Formation</u></i>
CTN	83.2004	<i>Kfir ELIAZ, Debraj RAY and Ronny RAZIN (lxx): <u>Group Decision-Making in the Shadow of Disagreement</u></i>
CTN	84.2004	<i>Sanjeev GOYAL, Marco van der LEIJ and José Luis MORAGA-GONZÁLEZ (lxx): <u>Economics: An Emerging Small World?</u></i>
CTN	85.2004	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT (lxx): <u>Learning to Play Approximate Nash Equilibria in Games with Many Players</u></i>
IEM	86.2004	<i>Finn R. FØRSUND and Michael HOEL: <u>Properties of a Non-Competitive Electricity Market Dominated by Hydroelectric Power</u></i>
KTHC	87.2004	<i>Elissaios PAPYRAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH: <u>Natural Resources, Investment and Long-Term Income</u></i>
CCMP	88.2004	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI and Claudia KEMFERT: <u>Interactions between Climate and Trade Policies: A Survey</u></i>
IEM	89.2004	<i>A. MARKANDYA, S. PEDROSO and D. STREIMIKIENE: <u>Energy Efficiency in Transition Economies: Is There Convergence Towards the EU Average?</u></i>
GG	90.2004	<i>Rolf GOLOMBEK and Michael HOEL: <u>Climate Agreements and Technology Policy</u></i>
PRA	91.2004	<i>Sergei IZMALKOV (lxy): <u>Multi-Unit Open Ascending Price Efficient Auction</u></i>
KTHC	92.2004	<i>Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Giovanni PERI: <u>Cities and Cultures</u></i>
KTHC	93.2004	<i>Massimo DEL GATTO: <u>Agglomeration, Integration, and Territorial Authority Scale in a System of Trading Cities. Centralisation versus devolution</u></i>
CCMP	94.2004	<i>Pierre-André JOUVET, Philippe MICHEL and Gilles ROTILLON: <u>Equilibrium with a Market of Permits</u></i>
CCMP	95.2004	<i>Bob van der ZWAAN and Reyer GERLAGH: <u>Climate Uncertainty and the Necessity to Transform Global Energy Supply</u></i>
CCMP	96.2004	<i>Francesco BOSELLO, Marco LAZZARIN, Roberto ROSON and Richard S.J. TOL: <u>Economy-Wide Estimates of the Implications of Climate Change: Sea Level Rise</u></i>
CTN	97.2004	<i>Gustavo BERGANTIÑOS and Juan J. VIDAL-PUGA: <u>Defining Rules in Cost Spanning Tree Problems Through the Canonical Form</u></i>
CTN	98.2004	<i>Siddhartha BANDYOPADHYAY and Mandar OAK: <u>Party Formation and Coalitional Bargaining in a Model of Proportional Representation</u></i>
GG	99.2004	<i>Hans-Peter WEIKARD, Michael FINUS and Juan-Carlos ALTAMIRANO-CABRERA: <u>The Impact of Surplus Sharing on the Stability of International Climate Agreements</u></i>
SIEV	100.2004	<i>Chiara M. TRAVISI and Peter NIJKAMP: <u>Willingness to Pay for Agricultural Environmental Safety: Evidence from a Survey of Milan, Italy, Residents</u></i>
SIEV	101.2004	<i>Chiara M. TRAVISI, Raymond J. G. M. FLORAX and Peter NIJKAMP: <u>A Meta-Analysis of the Willingness to Pay for Reductions in Pesticide Risk Exposure</u></i>
NRM	102.2004	<i>Valentina BOSETTI and David TOMBERLIN: <u>Real Options Analysis of Fishing Fleet Dynamics: A Test</u></i>
CCMP	103.2004	<i>Alessandra GORIA e Gretel GAMBARELLI: <u>Economic Evaluation of Climate Change Impacts and Adaptability in Italy</u></i>
PRA	104.2004	<i>Massimo FLORIO and Mara GRASSENTI: <u>The Missing Shock: The Macroeconomic Impact of British Privatisation</u></i>
PRA	105.2004	<i>John BENNETT, Saul ESTRIN, James MAW and Giovanni URGÀ: <u>Privatisation Methods and Economic Growth in Transition Economies</u></i>
PRA	106.2004	<i>Kira BÖRNER: <u>The Political Economy of Privatization: Why Do Governments Want Reforms?</u></i>
PRA	107.2004	<i>Pehr-Johan NORBÄCK and Lars PERSSON: <u>Privatization and Restructuring in Concentrated Markets</u></i>
SIEV	108.2004	<i>Angela GRANZOTTO, Fabio PRANOVI, Simone LIBRALATO, Patrizia TORRICELLI and Danilo MAINARDI: <u>Comparison between Artisanal Fishery and Manila Clam Harvesting in the Venice Lagoon by Using Ecosystem Indicators: An Ecological Economics Perspective</u></i>
CTN	109.2004	<i>Somdeb LAHIRI: <u>The Cooperative Theory of Two Sided Matching Problems: A Re-examination of Some Results</u></i>
NRM	110.2004	<i>Giuseppe DI VITA: <u>Natural Resources Dynamics: Another Look</u></i>
SIEV	111.2004	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Alistair HUNT and Anil MARKANDYA: <u>Willingness to Pay to Reduce Mortality Risks: Evidence from a Three-Country Contingent Valuation Study</u></i>
KTHC	112.2004	<i>Valeria PAPPONETTI and Dino PINELLI: <u>Scientific Advice to Public Policy-Making</u></i>
SIEV	113.2004	<i>Paulo A.L.D. NUNES and Laura ONOFRI: <u>The Economics of Warm Glow: A Note on Consumer's Behavior and Public Policy Implications</u></i>
IEM	114.2004	<i>Patrick CAYRADE: <u>Investments in Gas Pipelines and Liquefied Natural Gas Infrastructure What is the Impact on the Security of Supply?</u></i>
IEM	115.2004	<i>Valeria COSTANTINI and Francesco GRACCEVA: <u>Oil Security. Short- and Long-Term Policies</u></i>
IEM	116.2004	<i>Valeria COSTANTINI and Francesco GRACCEVA: <u>Social Costs of Energy Disruptions</u></i>
IEM	117.2004	<i>Christian EGENHOFER, Kyriakos GIALOGLOU, Giacomo LUCIANI, Maroeska BOOTS, Martin SCHEEPERS, Valeria COSTANTINI, Francesco GRACCEVA, Anil MARKANDYA and Giorgio VICINI: <u>Market-Based Options for Security of Energy Supply</u></i>
IEM	118.2004	<i>David FISK: <u>Transport Energy Security. The Unseen Risk?</u></i>
IEM	119.2004	<i>Giacomo LUCIANI: <u>Security of Supply for Natural Gas Markets. What is it and What is it not?</u></i>
IEM	120.2004	<i>L.J. de VRIES and R.A. HAKVOORT: <u>The Question of Generation Adequacy in Liberalised Electricity Markets</u></i>
KTHC	121.2004	<i>Alberto PETRUCCI: <u>Asset Accumulation, Fertility Choice and Nondegenerate Dynamics in a Small Open Economy</u></i>
NRM	122.2004	<i>Carlo GIUPPONI, Jaroslaw MYSIK and Anita FASSIO: <u>An Integrated Assessment Framework for Water Resources Management: A DSS Tool and a Pilot Study Application</u></i>
NRM	123.2004	<i>Margaretha BREIL, Anita FASSIO, Carlo GIUPPONI and Paolo ROSATO: <u>Evaluation of Urban Improvement on the Islands of the Venice Lagoon: A Spatially-Distributed Hedonic-Hierarchical Approach</u></i>

ETA	124.2004	<i>Paul MENSINK: <u>Instant Efficient Pollution Abatement Under Non-Linear Taxation and Asymmetric Information: The Differential Tax Revisited</u></i>
NRM	125.2004	<i>Mauro FABIANO, Gabriella CAMARSA, Rosanna DURSI, Roberta IVALDI, Valentina MARIN and Francesca PALMISANI: <u>Integrated Environmental Study for Beach Management: A Methodological Approach</u></i>
PRA	126.2004	<i>Irena GROSFELD and Iraj HASHI: <u>The Emergence of Large Shareholders in Mass Privatized Firms: Evidence from Poland and the Czech Republic</u></i>

- (lix) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Mapping Diversity”, Leuven, May 16-17, 2002
- (lx) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on “Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications”, organised by the Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Milan, September 26-28, 2002
- (lxi) This paper was presented at the Eighth Meeting of the Coalition Theory Network organised by the GREQAM, Aix-en-Provence, France, January 24-25, 2003
- (lxii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Communication across Cultures in Multicultural Cities”, The Hague, November 7-8, 2002
- (lxiii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Social dynamics and conflicts in multicultural cities”, Milan, March 20-21, 2003
- (lxiv) This paper was presented at the International Conference on “Theoretical Topics in Ecological Economics”, organised by the Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics - ICTP, the Beijer International Institute of Ecological Economics, and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei – FEEM Trieste, February 10-21, 2003
- (lxv) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on “Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications” organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and sponsored by the EU, Milan, September 25-27, 2003
- (lxvi) This paper has been presented at the 4th BioEcon Workshop on “Economic Analysis of Policies for Biodiversity Conservation” organised on behalf of the BIOECON Network by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice International University (VIU) and University College London (UCL), Venice, August 28-29, 2003
- (lxvii) This paper has been presented at the international conference on “Tourism and Sustainable Economic Development – Macro and Micro Economic Issues” jointly organised by CRENoS (Università di Cagliari e Sassari, Italy) and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, and supported by the World Bank, Sardinia, September 19-20, 2003
- (lxviii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Governance and Policies in Multicultural Cities”, Rome, June 5-6, 2003
- (lxix) This paper was presented at the Fourth EEP Plenary Workshop and EEP Conference “The Future of Climate Policy”, Cagliari, Italy, 27-28 March 2003
- (lxx) This paper was presented at the 9th Coalition Theory Workshop on "Collective Decisions and Institutional Design" organised by the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona and held in Barcelona, Spain, January 30-31, 2004

2003 SERIES

CLIM	<i>Climate Change Modelling and Policy</i> (Editor: Marzio Galeotti)
GG	<i>Global Governance</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
SIEV	<i>Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation</i> (Editor: Anna Alberini)
NRM	<i>Natural Resources Management</i> (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)
KNOW	<i>Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital</i> (Editor: Gianmarco Ottaviano)
IEM	<i>International Energy Markets</i> (Editor: Anil Markandya)
CSRM	<i>Corporate Social Responsibility and Management</i> (Editor: Sabina Ratti)
PRIV	<i>Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust</i> (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)
ETA	<i>Economic Theory and Applications</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
CTN	<i>Coalition Theory Network</i>

2004 SERIES

CCMP	<i>Climate Change Modelling and Policy</i> (Editor: Marzio Galeotti)
GG	<i>Global Governance</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
SIEV	<i>Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation</i> (Editor: Anna Alberini)
NRM	<i>Natural Resources Management</i> (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)
KTHC	<i>Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital</i> (Editor: Gianmarco Ottaviano)
IEM	<i>International Energy Markets</i> (Editor: Anil Markandya)
CSRM	<i>Corporate Social Responsibility and Management</i> (Editor: Sabina Ratti)
PRA	<i>Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust</i> (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)
ETA	<i>Economic Theory and Applications</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
CTN	<i>Coalition Theory Network</i>