

Addison, John T.; Schnabel, Claus; Wagner, Joachim

Working Paper

The course of research into the economic consequences of German works councils

Diskussionspapiere, No. 22

Provided in Cooperation with:

Friedrich-Alexander-University Erlangen-Nuremberg, Chair of Labour and Regional Economics

Suggested Citation: Addison, John T.; Schnabel, Claus; Wagner, Joachim (2003) : The course of research into the economic consequences of German works councils, Diskussionspapiere, No. 22, Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Lehrstuhl für Arbeitsmarkt- und Regionalpolitik, Nürnberg

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/28305>

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.

**FRIEDRICH-ALEXANDER-UNIVERSITÄT
ERLANGEN-NÜRNBERG**

Lehrstuhl für VWL, insbes. Arbeitsmarkt- und Regionalpolitik
Professor Dr. Claus Schnabel

**Diskussionspapiere
Discussion Papers**

No. 22

**The Course of Research into the Economic
Consequences of German Works Councils**

JOHN T. ADDISON, CLAUS SCHNABEL,
AND JOACHIM WAGNER

NOVEMBER 2003

ISSN 1615-5831

Editor: Prof. Dr. Claus Schnabel, Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg
© John T. Addison, Claus Schnabel, and Joachim Wagner

The Course of Research into the Economic Consequences of German Works Councils

John T. Addison^a, Claus Schnabel^b, and Joachim Wagner^c

ABSTRACT: In a recent survey, Frege (2002) concludes that economic analysis of the works council has reached a 'dead end'. The present treatment offers a different conclusion based on a more encompassing review of the evidence. It will identify three distinct phases in the economic analysis of codetermination at the workplace. While Frege just considered studies from the first two phases, it is the third phase of research that contains some of the most positive evaluations to date of works council impact. Even if such estimates appear much exaggerated and the effect of works councils is likely to be small on average, the new literature redirects our research effort towards the factors that produce swings around this average, including differences in works council types and their workplace environments.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG: In einem jüngst veröffentlichten Überblicksartikel kommt Frege (2002) zu dem Schluss, die ökonomische Analyse des Betriebsrats sei in eine Sackgasse geraten. Die vorliegende Arbeit zieht ein anderes Fazit, das auf einer umfassenderen Betrachtung der empirischen Evidenz beruht. Dabei werden drei Phasen der ökonomischen Analyse der betrieblichen Mitbestimmung unterschieden. Während Frege nur Studien aus den ersten beiden Phasen berücksichtigte, ist es gerade die dritte Forschungsphase, die einige der positivsten Bewertungen von Betriebsräten enthält. Selbst wenn derartige Einschätzungen stark übertrieben erscheinen und der Betriebsratseffekt im Durchschnitt relativ gering sein dürfte, weist die neuere Literatur darauf hin, dass unsere Forschungsbemühungen sich stärker auf Faktoren konzentrieren sollten, die Schwankungen um diesen Durchschnitt hervorrufen (wie z.B. unterschiedliche Typen von Betriebsräten und deren Arbeitsplatzumgebung).

KEYWORDS: Works council, codetermination, Germany

JEL-CLASSIFICATION: J50

^a Prof. Dr. John T. Addison, Department of Economics, Moore School of Business, University of South Carolina (U.S.A.), Columbia SC 29208, USA, ecceaddi@moore.sc.edu.

^b Prof. Dr. Claus Schnabel, Friedrich-Alexander-Universität Erlangen-Nürnberg, Lehrstuhl für Arbeitsmarkt- und Regionalpolitik, Lange Gasse 20, D-90403 Nürnberg, claus.schnabel@wiso.uni-erlangen.de.

^c Prof. Dr. Joachim Wagner, Universität Lüneburg, Institut für Volkswirtschaftslehre, D-21332 Lüneburg, wagner@uni-lueneburg.de.

1. INTRODUCTION

Research into the impact of works councils on firm performance dates from the mid- to late-1980s, with a series of articles by FitzRoy and Kraft (1985, 1987, 1990) that strongly rejected any positive general association between works councils and firm performance. Until then it had largely been taken for granted that what was good for workplace relations necessarily benefited firm performance. FitzRoy and Kraft's altogether more pessimistic evaluation served to stimulate the economic analysis of works councils, even if progress was to be fitful because of data limitations.

Almost from the outset, analysis of the likely economic consequences of works councils attracted considerable interest outside of Germany. This was primarily due to the points of contact between this work and two important strands of (Anglo-Saxon) industrial relations and labour economics research, namely, the literature concerning the economic consequences of unions on the one hand and that dealing with the performance effects of employee involvement on the other. These links were reinforced by Freeman and Medoff's (1984) application to the labour market of Hirschman's (1970) exit-voice paradigm (see also Addison and Belfield, 2003), as these authors' ideas gradually took root.

The survey article by Frege (2002) is indicative of the sustained interest in the institution of the *Betriebsrat* outside of Germany. In her review, Frege offers an assessment of research on works councils from the perspective of several disciplines. And in addressing the ontology, practice, and transformation of works councils, she usefully locates the economics component into wider research relief. Nonetheless, we contend that her summary of the labour economics research is seriously incomplete. In the first place, there are a number of factual errors in her treatment.¹ Second, she provides only a partial view of the developing

¹ First, Frege (2002, p. 236) incorrectly attributes the *management pressure/competence* argument (see below) to Addison, Kraft, and Wagner (1993) rather than to FitzRoy and Kraft (1985, 1987, 1990). Second, she argues that the study by Addison, Kraft, and Wagner (1993) does not have a sufficiently large control group of firms without works councils, gives no information on the size of firms in the sample, and indeed fails to indicate whether size is controlled for (Frege, 2002: 237). In fact, Addison, Kraft, and Wagner state that codetermination-free establishments make up 40 per cent of this particular sample, provide descriptive statistics on firm size (measured by employment) in an appendix table, and in each of their regressions provide the coefficient estimates for this size variable. Third, in addressing the findings of Addison, Schnabel, and Wagner (1997), Frege (2002: 237) is in fact referring to findings from Addison, Siebert, Wagner, and Wei (2000). We do not further address either of these studies here, other than to note that the former estimates a linear probability model of works council presence for Germany while the latter offers a *cross-country* test of the Freeman-Lazear (1995) model discussed by Frege (2002: 234-35).

economic literature up to 2000, discussing just four of the mainstream economic studies, while citing eight. In contrast, our review of the earlier literature will discuss (cite) seventeen (twenty-two) empirical studies, as well as a wider range of performance outcomes. Third, in discussing this research she compounds two distinct phases of the literature, delineated by pronounced differences in sample size, findings, and methodology. Finally, she omits the very latest research based on the nationally representative Establishment Panel of the Institute for Labour Market Research (of the Federal Labour Office). Interestingly, this third phase of research contains some of the most optimistic evaluations of works council impact on firm performance.

Ultimately, Frege (2002: 239) concludes that the economic analysis of the works council is at a 'dead end'. In the light of the preceding criticisms, we think it necessary to offer both a restatement and update of the economic effects of the German works council. In this endeavour, the three phases of research that we identify provide an indispensable guide to the developing economic literature. Contrary to Frege, we will conclude that continued disputation in the literature is a sign of vitality rather than indicative of its having reached a dead end, although a new research agenda is now necessary.

2. THE THREE PHASES OF ECONOMICS RESEARCH

Research into the association between works councils and firm performance conforms to three distinct phases, defined by differences in the type of datasets investigated, explanatory variables used, and econometric methods deployed. The first phase is marked by the investigation of small samples of firms in cross section. The second phase largely corresponds to the analysis of much larger data sets of a regional or industry-specific nature (with one exception noted below). The third phase is characterised by the use of truly nationally representative data. The second and third phases are based on panel data, although it has proved difficult to fully exploit the longitudinal nature of the new datasets because very few plants introduce or abandon works councils over the life of the panel. Also, as we shall see, the findings of works council effect differ between and within phases.

PHASE I: SMALL SAMPLE STUDIES.

Results of what we have termed the first phase of research are contained in Table 1. Apart from their being based on small samples of firms, the hallmark of these Phase I studies is the often unfavourable association between works council presence and the particular economic outcome investigated. This is most obviously the case in the key studies by FitzRoy and Kraft (rows 1 through 3), which are also notable for their technical sophistication (namely, use of systems of equations).

(Table 1 near here)

As can be seen from the table, FitzRoy and Kraft exploit a common data set to investigate three outcome indicators: profitability (row 1), total factor productivity (row 2), and innovation (row 3). The unifying theme of all three studies is a *managerial pressure/managerial competence* model. Hard-driving managers are said to elicit greater effort from their workers and are rewarded with higher salaries and profits. This pressure exerted by management causes workers to join unions, and unionised workers get higher wages even if this is only partial compensation for their greater effort. Workers are also more likely to form a works council to protect themselves from 'adverse' management actions, which will include the pressure on required levels of effort. Yet efficient managers, so the argument runs, can institute adequate systems of communication and decision-making without the impediment of autonomous works councils (i.e. works councils are viewed as a constraint, not a potential source of efficiency gain). Managerial competence is thus expressed in a reduced probability of works council presence, partly because efficient managers pay higher wages.

In testing this managerial pressure/managerial competence model, FitzRoy and Kraft seek to explain and model the existence of workplace 'representation'. In their profitability study (row 1), the authors are concerned to explain the association between workplace union density and profitability, and in particular the line of causation running from performance to workplace density as workers react to the higher demands made of them by managers in a defensive fashion. In their productivity study (row 2), it is now works council presence that is simultaneously estimated with total factor productivity, with the expectation that causation will run in two directions: partly from higher performance to workplace representation (the defensive mechanism) as in the case of union membership/density, but also from works council presence to output as this form of workplace representation is held to adversely impact performance by limiting management prerogative. Finally, in their study of firm

innovation (row 3), FitzRoy and Kraft argue that the impact of union density may be direct after all and serve to reinforce the negative effect of the works council; that is, a works council is supposed to carry more weight in negotiations where workplace union density is high and will be more likely to take a hard line in conflict situations. (In addition, FitzRoy and Kraft posit that a more highly unionised workforce is more likely to elect a council.) Accordingly, in this study they combine works council presence with union density to form an 'organised labour' variable which is then jointly estimated with the level of innovative activity.

What do FitzRoy and Kraft find from endogenising workplace representation in this manner? In their study of financial performance, works councils are associated with sharply reduced profitability (row 1). In this case, however, observe that works council presence is taken to be exogenous, so that it is only the nonrandom distribution of union density which is being modeled. In their productivity analysis (row 2), works council presence leads to lower total factor productivity. That is to say, purged of any (positive) feedback effect from productivity to works council presence, works councils are associated with lower productivity.

To repeat, in both these studies the effect of unions is positive but indirect. However, in the case of the row 3 study, the role of the union is direct and is argued to operate in tandem with works council presence to impede efficiency. FitzRoy and Kraft's simultaneous equation estimates of innovation (as proxied by the proportion of sales consisting of new products introduced over a five-year interval) and the organized labour variable point to a strongly negative effect running from organization to innovation, and with no reverse causality operating.

Most of the other studies of Phase I provide single-equation estimates. The major exception is the study by Kraft (1986) in row 7 (see below). Together they fail to tell as consistent a story of works council impact as do the analyses of FitzRoy and Kraft. But of all the studies only Schnabel and Wagner (1994) report a favourable impact of the works council (row 4). In an analysis of innovative activity, this time measured by R&D intensity, these authors find a marginally significant positive relation between works council presence and innovation among their sample of 31 establishments in a 1990 cross section. Any such favourable impact is sensitive to workplace union density. The tipping point here is 51 per cent unionization. Once this threshold is breached, the positive impact of the works council is reversed and the association becomes increasingly negative.

Only one of the Phase I studies looks at investment in physical capital. In an analysis of investment – as measured by the ratio of gross capital formation to the capital stock – for a sample of a little over 50 manufacturing establishments in two German Länder in 1990/91, Addison, Kraft, and Wagner (1993) report that plants with works councils undertake significantly less investment than their codetermination-free counterparts (row 5). But if works council presence yields less favourable investment, this negative result does not apparently carry over to value added or to pretax profits also examined in the same study.

Works council effects on a subjective measure(s) of profitability, as well as a measure of product innovation, are also found to be generally statistically insignificant in a study of industrial firms in Lower Saxony by Addison and Wagner (1997), based on a telephone interview of an initial sample of 175 establishments in 1993 (row 6 of the table). This study is notable for its being the first attempt to gauge the degree of influence of the works council. The authors derive an index of works council voice according to its reported involvement in four areas of decision making. A marginally significant negative association is found between the extent of works council voice and the achievement of high profitability, again as assessed by the manager respondent. By contrast, the coefficient estimates for a conventional works council measure are statistically significant throughout, whether works council presence is endogenised or not.

The last study in row 7 of Table 1 is noteworthy for its attempt to inquire into the black box of mechanisms through which works councils are supposed to achieve the benefits attributed to them. Pooling two years of data on metalworking firms (i.e. the same sample as subsequently used by FitzRoy and Kraft in the studies summarized in rows 1 and 2 of Table 1), Kraft (1986) regresses a dummy variable capturing low/high turnover among unskilled workers – manager respondents to the study questionnaire were asked whether the quit rates of unskilled workers were ‘high’ or ‘low’ – on an index of individual voice, works council presence (i.e. collective voice), a measure of training opportunities, firm size, and variables capturing production techniques and organisation structure. The novel individual voice argument is constructed on the basis of replies to questions as to the decision possibilities open to blue-collar workers in the areas of investment and rationalization, coordination of work groups, and the determination of job design. Kraft finds that turnover is materially reduced, the greater the opportunities for the exercise of individual voice. The coefficient estimate for collective voice/works council presence is positive but not statistically significant, while all the other covariates are shown to have their expected effect on turnover.

One obvious cause for concern with the Phase I studies is the issue of sample size. The use of small samples should reduce the precision of the works council coefficient estimate and thus predispose any test against finding a works council effect. At the same time, problems of omitted variables bias are elevated by the limited number of control variables and cloud even 'well-determined' (i.e. statistically significant) associations in the data. In any event, we see that there is little overt support for the institution of the works council and some seemingly strong adverse effects.

Another issue is the works council variable. As we have seen, the above studies typically recoup the works council effect from the coefficient estimate for a variable indicating actual or, less commonly, predicted works council presence. An immediate concern is that most establishments over a certain size have works councils, while most plants under a certain size do not. In 2000, for example, just 9.1 per cent of German establishments employing between 5 and 20 employees had works councils whereas in plants with between 201 and 500 (over 500) employees the corresponding incidence was 80.6 (91.7) per cent. In other words, over certain ranges of employment one cannot hope to identify a works council effect using a measure based on presence of the entity alone. Therefore one should use samples containing a good number of establishments with and without works councils. In this regard, there is no obvious indication of 'imbalance' in the Phase I studies. Moreover, whatever the general disadvantage of small samples of firms from the perspective of statistical inference, also observe that some of the Phase I datasets have been rich enough to allow the researcher to fashion measures of the degree of involvement of the works council in decision-making (the row 6 study) or to examine the relationship between the works council and workplace union density (rows 3 and 4). As we shall see, the parsimony of larger data sets in this regard has required alternative solutions to works council 'definition', such as prior structuring by sample size (i.e. examining size ranges within which the power of the works council is a datum), as well as reformulation of the 'collective bargaining' variable.

Finally, observe that not all performance outcomes have received equal treatment in Phase I. In particular, there is a seeming neglect of employment indicators. That being said, employment is a more ambiguous performance measure than outcomes such as productivity or investment. Take the case of employment change. Reduced employment growth might well indicate inferior performance. On the other hand, successful attempts to recast outmoded workplace organization into a form more adaptable to technical change, or the abandonment of restrictive work practices, might also be reflected in slowed employment growth. In any event, just one of the Phase I studies examines employment (row 7) and is

unconventional in focusing on a subjective measure of quits rather than an objective, continuous measure of turnover. However, the use of a subjective indicator can be informative. For example, objective data may not be available for individual skill categories. More important, absent formalisation of what constitutes an optimal quit rate, a manager's identification of 'excessive' quits – or lack thereof – might usefully supplement objective data; in particular, indications of higher quit rates in plants without works councils may have no implications for efficiency when subjective data fail to identify turnover as problematic or 'high'.

Despite some real data strengths – including information on establishment variables – the fact remains that the findings of the early research literature may not be representative by reason of sample size, and sector and region covered. As a result, the associations revealed in Phase I studies cannot be generalised beyond the samples investigated, and do not offer a solid basis for making inferences about the efficacy of works councils for the firm or the economy.

PHASE II: SOME NEW LARGE-SCALE DATA SETS

Studies of the next phase are able to exploit large-scale data sets, principally the Hannover Firm Panel and the NIFA-Panel. The population of the first data set is all manufacturing establishments with at least five employees in the state of Lower Saxony. The actual sample of plants is stratified according to firm size and industry. It comprises around 1,000 establishments in 1994, declining to a little over 700 establishments by the time of the fourth wave in 1997 because of sample attrition (for a description of this data set, see Brand, Carstensen, Gerlach, and Klodt, 1996; Gerlach, Hübler, and Meyer, 2003). The second survey is of all establishments in the German machine-tool industry and covers the period 1989-1999. This panel has eight waves, the data for which were collected via a mail questionnaire. The sample base is approximately 6,000 companies, and the realised sample approximates 1,500 per wave (see Schmidt and Widmaier, 1992; Widmaier, 2001).

There is also a third data set in the form of a nationally representative but older and employment-based survey of 2,392 private-sector firms, conducted in 1987 (see Büchtemann and Höland, 1989). Reflecting its narrower focus on employment issues, use of this data set has been restricted to the analysis of labour fluctuations.

A summary of results from selected Phase II studies is provided in Table 2. The overall picture is that works councils now appear in rather more favourable light. The jury is still out today on whether this difference reflects the unrepresentativeness of the Phase I studies, or is instead a practical manifestation of the improvement in, or maturation of, the relationship between firms and their works councils flagged in the German industrial relations literature (in particular, see Kotthoff, 1994).

Four distinguishing characteristics of the Phase II studies can usefully be identified. First, there is a tendency to look for differences in works council impact by establishment size. There are several reasons for this. One is the point made earlier that very large plants almost always have works councils and small plants seldom do. Another reason is that works council authority (number of councilors, number of paid councilors, entitlements to information, and input in matters of personnel selection, etc.) is as a matter of law increasing in establishment size. When a dummy variable indicating the presence or otherwise of a works council at the establishment is used in a regression model, that variable can only be expected to pick up the effect of a works council if two conditions are met: first, establishments with and without works councils need to be present in reasonable numbers; second, the rights of the works council must be the same in all establishments. If only a tiny number of firms in a sample have (do not have) a council, we cannot expect to be able to estimate the effect of the entity with any precision. And if the legal rights of a council are not held constant over the establishments in the sample, a simple dummy variable cannot, as a matter of construction, take care of this variation and any related variation in the economic impact of works councils in firms of different size. Therefore, some of the Phase II studies seek *ab initio* to estimate the association between works councils and various performance outcomes by looking at firms with between 21 and 100 employees, within which employment range the legal rights of the works council are a datum and the number of plants with and without a council is roughly equal. A separate and more general size-related issue is that there are practical grounds for believing that the costs of the codetermination apparatus may be greater and the benefits smaller for specific categories of plant. In this latter context, using data from the first wave of the Hannover Firm Panel, Addison, Schnabel and Wagner (2001), caution that where beneficial outcomes are observed these tend to be confined to establishments with more than 100 employees (row 2 of Table 2).

(Table 2 near here)

Second, more attention is paid in the Phase II literature to labour turnover. Here the findings are seemingly at odds with the evidence from the single Phase I turnover study reviewed earlier. In her review, Frege (2002: 237-38) chooses to emphasise the turnover issue, focusing on a Phase II study by Backes-Gellner, Frick, and Sadowski (1997) that uses data from the Büchtemann and Höland (1989) data set. Backes-Gellner *et al.* argue that skills formation and acquisition are a precondition for the success of the German model and that the works council promotes reliance investments (termed effective skill utilisation) by fostering cooperation between the two sides and safeguarding employment security. Their evidence is indirect, however, reflecting the lack of data on training in this data set. That is to say, rather than examining training investments directly, these authors mainly look to evidence on quit rates and dismissals, both of which are found to be materially reduced in the presence of works councils. Since the facts on these associations were first reported by Frick and Sadowski (1995), the details given in row 1 of Table 2 pertain to this study.

Although data from the much richer Hannover Firm Panel do not always point to reduced quits in works council regimes – while also indicating that management in works council plants is more prone to complain that employment levels are excessive – they do nonetheless tell much the same employment story. Thus, for example, Addison, Schnabel, and Wagner (2001) find that hires, quits, and dismissals are all reduced in works council settings (row 2). The same tendency is evident in Dilger's (2002) analysis of personnel fluctuation using the NIFA Panel (row 6).

Since lower quit rates increase the time horizon over which training investments may be recouped they imply greater training, so that Frege is quite correct to rehearse the training argument. Indeed, in a recent study using the Hannover Firm Panel not summarised in Table 2, Gerlach and Jirjahn (2001) report that works council establishments provide more further training than their codetermination-free counterparts. But real progress in identifying the work council role in this area optimally requires matched employee and employer data. Such information would assist in identifying the effect of works councils on quit rates over and above the contribution of wages. Also, to recall our earlier observation that the reduction in quits/increase in training investments under works councils might be excessive, it would also be useful as a first step to include either quits or training intensity in production function test. Pending such analyses, the role of this key collective voice route to improved performance remains opaque.

Third, a rather interesting development in this stage of the developing literature is the inclusion of a collective bargaining variable proper. Unlike their Phase I precursors, the large-scale data sets of Phase II either fail to contain information on union density or that information is unreliable. The new studies instead use the presence or otherwise of a collective bargaining agreement at regional or industry level, namely, a 'union coverage' variable that reflects the dual system of industrial relations in Germany. In its fullest application, the new variable is interacted with works council presence, so that works council impact (*inter al.*) is examined separately by collective bargaining regime. In particular, the study by Hübler and Jirjahn (2003) in row 3 of the table offers a formal test of Freeman and Lazear's (1995) argument that where a works council is embedded in an external collective bargaining framework this will serve to dissipate distributional squabbles at the workplace, thereby enhancing any pro-productive effect of the works council. Hübler and Jirjahn test the model using pooled data from two waves of the Hannover Firm Panel. Both works council presence and collective bargaining coverage are treated as endogenous and modeled in separate productivity and wage equations. The productivity results in particular offer support for the model: labour productivity is higher in works council regimes but only where the establishment is covered by a collective agreement. The wage results are less compelling. That is to say, the idea that collective agreements can police rent-seeking behavior is undercut by the finding of higher wages in all works council establishments irrespective their collective bargaining coverage.²

The notion that strong collective bargaining can be beneficial is also encountered in Britain, where it has been argued that unions need to be strong if they are to be effective agents of collective voice (see Bryson, 2001). In the German case, as we have seen, the argument is particularly interesting because of the intriguing prospect of a decoupling of distribution from production issues, even if only partial. Since this application seems to hinge on bargaining external to the firm, a real issue is raised by the growing tendency towards company-level collective agreements. The number of German firms bargaining at the company-level has tripled since 1990. We are unaware of any analysis of this development on performance outcomes, but as part of a future research agenda it would certainly be interesting to see – in the manner of the Phase I literature – whether the effects on workplace economic

² An earlier version of this paper also inquired into the works council-profitability nexus. Anomalously, the authors reported a positive albeit statistically insignificant association between their profit measure and works council presence irrespective of collective bargaining regime.

performance are differentiated when both the union and the works council are active at the company level.

The fourth theme of the Phase II literature is the inclusion of employee involvement mechanisms and so-called 'high performance work practices'. As can be seen from the entry in row 5 of Table 2, the latter include elements of the former such as teamwork. In one sense, research on the role of such personnel practices provides a link between Phase I and Phase II studies. In particular, in a follow-up of their earlier study (see row 2 of Table 1), FitzRoy and Kraft (1995) qualify their harsh interpretation of works council impact on establishment performance. They report evidence of a well-determined positive association between works councils and productivity in profit sharing regimes. Among firms that do not practice profit sharing, however, the works council effect on productivity is still negative and statistically significant.

The main Phase II studies covering employee involvement/high performance work practices are reported in rows 5 and 6 of Table 2. But we should preface our review of this material with some remarks on the study in row 4 of the table that focuses on the interaction between works councils and profit-sharing schemes for managers. In his analysis of data from the Hannover Firm Panel, Jirjahn (2002) finds that works councils are generally associated with higher labour productivity and that this effect is strengthened after allowing for management incentive schemes which are themselves pro-productive. However, as can be seen from the table, the coefficient estimate for the interaction term is negative, which the author interprets as consistent with two hypotheses: either profit-sharing management reduces the commitment value of agency in circumstances where the works council cannot foster trust and loyalty absent the cooperation of management, or management rent seeking is curbed by profit sharing and the works council is not so important for building cooperation in situations of reduced opportunism on the part of management. Although ultimately empirically inconclusive, conceptually this study represents a further development of the underlying collective voice model in which improvements in firm performance are potential rather than guaranteed (see Addison and Belfield, 2003).

The last two studies in Table 2 return us to the issue of non-executive employee involvement mechanisms/high performance workplace practices. Each exploits the NIFA-Panel for the machine-tools industry. This data set is of interest for three main reasons. First, it identifies a set of five such practices. Second, it contains management's assessment of the working relationship with the works council, albeit only for the sixth wave in 1996. Specifically, the

NIFA survey asks the management respondent to rate the works council entity as (a) 'mostly antagonistic', (b) 'sometimes difficult', (c) 'unreservedly cooperative', (d) 'passive', and (e) 'excluded by management'. Third, the data set also records additional information on the degree of involvement of the works council. It can be seen from the table that the results of using this additional material are mixed. Thus, from the row 5 study it is the case that firms with works councils tend to use more high performance workplace practices than their works council-free counterparts but that the number of such practices is highest where the institution is described by management as 'antagonistic'. More positively, from the more extensive study in the last row of the table, it can be seen that although the general tendency is for works council plants to record lower profitability this effect can apparently be negated by greater works council involvement. In addition, some beneficial effect of the works council on product innovation is detected in circumstances where its degree of involvement is above normal.

Even if they contain few if any technical innovations, the studies of Phase II are noteworthy for their creative use of both existing and new variables such as establishment size, collective bargaining, and employee involvement. The use of these variables in performance equations has revealed the works council in more favourable light than the Phase I studies. As cases in point, recall the findings that works councils may be associated with higher productivity in larger plants; that the dual industrial relations system may allow the productive potential of works councils to be realised; and that works council effects may be positive when taken in conjunction with other forms of employee involvement. To be sure, there remain a number of inconsistencies and ambiguities in the literature. One example is provided by establishment profitability. Nearly all studies point to poorer financial performance in works council regimes, but what is the source of this deficit if – as is seemingly the case – (higher) wages and (lower) productivity do not emerge as consistent culprits? Another is the issue of whether employee involvement and other workplace practices complement or substitute for works councils. The literature tilts towards acceptance of complementarity, but this issue is also not settled.³

Almost all the research summarised in Table 2 is cross sectional. Problems of statistical inference may arise if the determinants of the key independent variable – works council

³ It was an alleged shortfall of worker representation on the basis of statistics on works council incidence and coverage that prompted the recent reform of the Works Constitution Act; see Addison, Bellmann, Schnabel, and Wagner (2002).

presence (or type, or intensity) – are not accounted for. For example, works councils may be introduced in circumstances of economic difficulty or advantage. Also, their introduction may reflect unobserved differences in the costs and benefits of the institution at plant level which may in turn be linked to the outcomes in which we are interested. As in the Phase I literature, there have been some attempts to endogenise works councils presence, although identification is particularly difficult in this case. Further, if some permanent unobserved plant characteristic is associated with works council presence (*inter al.*) and the outcome indicator, accounting for the nonrandom distribution of the works council in cross section will not suffice. In short, biases may attach to these Phase II estimates, and causality continues to be an issue. A final question is whether the above findings are representative given the regional and industrial composition of the two main data sets – or still representative given their vintage. This is the issue of external validity. Fortunately, in each of the above respects this is not the end of the story, as economists have most recently been able to use an unambiguously nationally representative data set with greater longitudinal capacity.

PHASE III: THE IAB ESTABLISHMENT PANEL

The latest data set to be used by researchers is the Establishment Panel of the Institute for Labour Market Research (Institut für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung/IAB) of the Federal Labour Office (Bundesanstalt für Arbeit). Beginning in 1993 the IAB Establishment Panel surveyed several thousand establishments from all sectors of the economy in the former West Germany and, since 1996, for the unified Germany. The Establishment Panel is based on a stratified random sample – the strata are for 16 industries and 10 employment size classes – from the population of all establishments with at least one employee covered by social insurance. To correct for panel mortality, exits and newly-founded units, the data are augmented regularly. Familiarly, the data are collected in personal interviews with the owners or senior management of the establishment. The purpose of the panel is to serve the needs of the Federal Labour Office, and so its focus is employment-related matters such as labour turnover, level and composition of employment, apprenticeship training, investments, and subsidies (see Kölling, 2000).

Although information on most variables is collected for each wave of the panel, the works council question was asked of all establishments only in 1993, 1996, 1998, and 2000, and in the ‘missing’ years only of panel accessions. A few other questions have been asked on a less regular basis. Examples include questions on employee share ownership and profit

sharing, teamworking, devolved decision-making, as well as additional information on training and the goals of training programmes (all of which arguments have variously been used to identify employee involvement /high performance work practices).

(Table 3 near here)

Table 3 provides a snapshot of some of the most recent research using the Establishment Panel. The information in the first two rows of the table indicates a strongly positive general association between works council presence and economic performance. This is particularly true of the studies by Frick (2002a, 2002b), summarised in row 1 of the table. Prior to Frick's estimates, there were just two formal production function studies for Germany, namely, the Phase I studies by FitzRoy and Kraft (1987) and Addison, Kraft and Wagner (1993) – see rows 2 and 5 of Table 1, respectively – and none for a large data base. Frick uses the question in the Establishment Panel asking for information on 'replacement investment' (i.e. depreciation) as a rough proxy for the value of the capital stock. He estimates production functions for two cross sections of data (1998 and 2000), and reports that labour productivity is as much as 25 to 30 per cent higher in works council regimes.

The production function study by Wolf and Zwick (2002) in row 2 of Table 3 also offers a very positive view of works council impact. Thus, for the 1999 cross section of the Establishment Panel, the authors obtain positive and statistically significant coefficient estimates for the works council dummy variable, albeit of somewhat smaller magnitude than reported by Frick. However, Wolf and Zwick are more concerned with the consequences of high performance workplace practices for output than with the effects of codetermination on performance. The authors identify two bundles of workplace practices, namely, 'organisational changes', comprising the delegation of responsibility and decisions to lower levels of the hierarchy, teamwork, and workgroups with an independent budget, and 'incentives' which include employee share ownership and profit sharing.

Wolf and Zwick are especially concerned with the methodological problems that arise from the endogeneity of the decision to introduce these practices and from unobserved establishment characteristics. In recognition of these potential selection biases, Wolf and Zwick use a two-step panel estimation procedure, after Black and Lynch (2001). In the first step, a Cobb-Douglas production function is estimated for 1996-99 to calculate an unobserved time invariant fixed effect for each establishment in the sample, where the equation includes just the time-varying input factors as regressors. In the second step, these

fixed effects are regressed on the high performance workplace practices and other (nearly) time-invariant determinants including the presence or otherwise of a works council, with and without controlling for the endogeneity of the workplace practices. For its part, the coefficient estimate for the works council dummy variable is reported to be strongly positive and statistically significant.⁴ But this result is based on a cross-section test, and to the extent that the fixed component of the unobserved heterogeneity in the second stage is correlated with the observed firm-level characteristics, the finding of a positive works council effect may have no causal interpretation.

In contrast to the above, each of the two other Phase III studies summarised in Table 3 suggests that establishments with and without a works council do not exhibit statistically significant differences in efficiency. In the row 3 study, Schank, Schnabel, and Wagner (2002) estimate a fixed effects frontier production function separately for each of the two workplace regimes and then compare technical efficiencies of median plants in the two regimes. Only plants with between 21 and 100 employees (throughout the 1993-2000 sample period) are included on the grounds that over this size interval the powers of the works council are a datum and to avoid any potential bias in the estimated impact of a works council due to size effects, reflecting the point that very large plants almost always have a works council whereas small plants seldom do. The confidence intervals of the reported technical efficiency estimates for the two types of plants overlap, leading the authors to conclude that there is no evidence that works council plants are any more efficient than their works council-free counterparts.

In the row 4 study, Addison, Bellmann, Schnabel, and Wagner (2002) formally exploit changes in works council status through time. Since this study focuses on recent changes in the law facilitating works council formation – namely, the 2001 Works Constitution Reform Act – its concern is with the introduction of works councils rather than with their introduction *and* dissolution. The authors' empirical strategy reflects their concern with the selection problem. They use a formal matching model to compare establishments that subsequently experienced the election of a works council with their closest counterparts from among the

⁴ Interestingly, the effects on productivity of the two sets of high performance workplace practices identified in the study are reversed once unobserved plant heterogeneity and selection are accounted for. Specifically, those practices fostering employee involvement (e.g. teamworking) now have a significantly positive impact on productivity whereas the incentive bundles (e.g. profit sharing) turn statistically insignificant. The former measures appear to be introduced when firms confront structural problems, whereas the latter emerge as more a feature of good times.

firmament of (1,513) plants that remained continuously free of works councils over the sample period. Unlike the other studies in Table 3 that focus exclusively on productivity, this study also considers changes in the quit rate, in employment, and in the profit situation between 1996 and 2000. Note that the change in productivity is proxied by the change in sales per employee rather than the more familiar value added per head measures as the Establishment Panel set has an unusually large number of missing values for purchases of intermediate products – a crucially important consideration given the small number of plants with new councils – although the two measures are highly correlated over the sample period. No statistically significant differences between the treatment group and the controls are reported for any of the four performance outcomes. In short, the establishment of a work council does not appear to have a causal effect on mainstream economic performance outcomes.

Two other studies take their cue from the above analyses, and are referred to but not summarized in the table. Thus, Zwick (2003) re-examines one of the two bundles of high performance workplace practices identified in Wolf and Zwick (2002) – namely, ‘organizational changes’ – and investigates whether its effects on establishment productivity differ as between plants with and without works councils since he finds that the production functions differ in the two settings. In addition to modeling the endogeneity of this bundle of workplace practices, as in the row 2 study, he also allows for the endogeneity of works council presence using an endogenous switching regression model. Zwick reports that the pro-productive effects of such organizational changes are confined to workplaces with works councils. His estimates of the independent influence of works councils on productivity closely correspond to those reported in the row 2 study.

A final exercise by Addison, Schank, Schnabel, and Wagner (2003) provides a sensitivity analysis of the works council effect in production function estimates. It is shown that the large positive coefficient estimates for the works council variable reported in some of the literature are not only sensitive to sector and region (as suggested in the row 1 studies) but also and especially to establishment size. In establishments with 21-100 employees – where, to repeat, works council powers are a datum and where there is a balanced representation of both types of workplace regime – the coefficient estimates for the works council dummy plummet and are typically statistically insignificant. The suggestion that there are likely to be few *cet. par.* differences on average between plants with works councils and plants without them is consistent with the findings of the studies in rows 3 and 4 of Table 3.

In outlining some key Phase III results, we have evidently traveled a long way from our starting point. The Phase I literature pointed to some really rather alarming adverse consequences of works council presence. Phase II studies for their part, while by no means uniformly supportive of works councils, nonetheless identify a number of circumstances in which beneficial net works council effects might obtain. And, initially at least, the Phase III research using nationally representative data seemed unreservedly favourable to works councils. Although we have argued that the latter estimates are inflated and that the effects of works councils on productivity are likely to be small on average, even this attenuated conclusion is of course a far cry from the tenor of Phases I studies.

3. CONCLUSION

In this restatement and update of a burgeoning body of empirical research into the economic consequences of works councils, we have characterised the developments as conforming to three distinct stages. Although the empirical findings are not tidy, it would be a mistake to conclude that research into the economic consequences of works councils has stalled or otherwise reached a dead end. The following itemisation might help clarify what we have learned and what we need to know more about. First, it would appear to be the case that the early literature *either* encouraged an overly negative view of the impact of works councils on net, *or* that the functioning of works councils has improved since then. Second, from the subsequent literature, the average works council 'effect' would appear to obscure some systematic differences by establishment size, collective bargaining coverage, and employee involvement mechanism. Thus, even if smaller establishments may be hampered by, say, slowed decision making under works councils it might also be true that large plants would have had to invent something akin to the entity in the absence of their being mandated under law. For its part, collective bargaining coverage may assist in decoupling distribution from production issues, and help focus the works council on the latter. And some forms of employee involvement/high performance workplace practices may be highly productive in works council regimes. Third, excessive admiration of the institution is as misplaced as excessive revulsion towards it. Some of the latest, Phase III estimates of the effect of works councils on labour productivity are likely to seduce. But we have argued that they need to be taken with more than a pinch of statistical salt, and have countered with evidence suggesting that the works council effect may be zero on average.

Enough has been said to indicate that we do not intend this attenuated but important conclusion to be read as establishing a (German) case for works councils, although we recognize that those who have always viewed the economic case for works councils as secondary to the requirements of equity (i.e. industrial democracy) may well regard it as decisive. Rather, our conclusion would be that research should now focus on the factors that produce shifts around this average relation.

As a next step, research into the effects of works councils should perhaps concentrate on firms with newly established councils, with a view to determining why they were introduced and identifying their effects on firm performance. Here a matching approach comparing quasi-identical firms with and without a new council might usefully be applied. This procedure can be accomplished with longitudinal data sets such as the IAB Establishment Panel used in the Phase III studies, provided the number of plants in which a works council is introduced is large enough. In this latter context, recent changes in the Works Constitution Act may be helpful in that they portend an increase in the formation of new works councils. A more ambitious and necessarily longer-term research goal would require that we go beyond 'the dummy variable approach' and use in-depth case studies to examine different types of works councils operating in different environments. Ideally, these case studies should be informed by the first procedure, that is, seek to compare firms in which works councils were elected with otherwise identical firms in which they were not.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

An earlier draft of this paper was presented at the Banco de Portugal conference on Labor Market Reforms, Santa Maria do Bouro, Portugal, June 1, 2003. The authors are indebted to conference participants for their helpful comments. We also benefited from the comments of two anonymous referees and Stephen Wood, the editor of the BJIR.

Table 1: The Economic Impact of the Works Council – Phase I Studies

Study	Data	Dependent variable(s)	Methodology	Findings
1. FitzRoy and Kraft (1985)	Pooled data for 1977 and 1979 on 61/62 firms in the metal-working industry.	Profitability, union density, wages, and salaries.	Four-equation system estimated by 3SLS. Detailed firm controls. Work council presence not endogenised.	Union density has a positive and statistically significant effect on profitability (and on wages and salaries). Coefficient estimate for works council dummy is negative and statistically significant in the profit equation.
2. FitzRoy and Kraft (1987)	As above.	Total factor productivity and works council presence.	Two-equation system.	Work council presence associated with a significant reduction in productivity. Union density effects positive and statistically significant throughout.
3. FitzRoy and Kraft (1990)	57 metal-working firms, 1979.	Innovation, as proxied by the proportion of sales consisting of new products introduced in the preceding five years, and an 'organised labour' measure derived from the interaction of the works council dummy and union density.	Two-equation system.	Organised labour covariate is associated with a statistically significant reduction in innovative activity.
4. Schnabel and Wagner (1994)	31 manufacturing establishments in two German states, 1990.	Proportion of revenues spent on R&D in 1979.	Single-equation Tobit model. Parsimonious specification.	Coefficient estimate for works council dummy is positive and marginally statistically significant. Union density has strongly negative effect on R&D intensity.
5. Addison, Kraft, and Wagner (1993)	c. 50 establishment sample from same data as in row 4 study above.	Profitability, value added, and investment.	Single-equation specifications estimated by least median of squares/reweighted least squares.	Mixed pattern of generally statistically insignificant coefficient estimates for the works council dummy variable. But the works council effect is negative and statistically significant in the case of investment in physical capital.
6. Addison and Wagner (1997)	74 manufacturing establishments in one German state, 1993.	Subjective measure of 'high profitability' and an innovation measure (introduction of a new product in 1992).	Probit models. Three works council indicators: works council presence, degree of participation or voice of the works council, and an instrument for the presence of a works council.	Mixed pattern of generally statistically insignificant coefficient estimates for all three works council variables. The exception is the degree of works council involvement measure which is negatively associated with high profitability, albeit only at the 10% level.
7. Kraft (1986)	As for the studies in rows 1 and 2.	Subjective measure of 'high quits' and a synthetic measure of 'individual voice', in each case for unskilled workers.	Simultaneous system of probit equations.	Individual voice, but not collective voice (as proxied by works council presence), serves to significantly reduce high turnover.

Table 2: The Economic Impact of the Works Council – Phase II Studies

Study	Data	Dependent variable(s)	Methodology	Findings
1. Frick and Sadowski (1995) ^a	1,616 firms taken from a nationally representative survey of 2,392 for-profit enterprises in the manufacturing and service sectors. Data cover the interval May 1985-April 1987.	Quit and dismissal rates.	Single-equation log-odds model estimated by OLS.	Works council presence associated with statistically significant reductions in quits and dismissals (2.4 and 2.9 percentage points, respectively).
2. Addison, Schnabel, and Wagner (2001) ^b	c. 900 establishments from the 1994 wave of the Hannover Firm Panel (see text). Detailed establishment and industry controls.	Value-added per worker; subjective measure(s) of financial performance; wages and salaries per employee (and the percentage 'wage gap'); three labour turnover measures (hires, separations, and gross turnover); and two measures of innovation (introduction of new processes/products).	Single-equation estimates. Separate results for all establishments and a subset of plants with 21-100 employees	Works council presence associated with higher labour productivity overall, but not for establishments with 21-100 employees. Profitability systematically lower in the presence of works councils. Wages are higher when there are works councils but the sources of these higher earnings are not transparent. All labour turnover measures are reduced in the presence of works councils other than for the subset of smaller establishments. Neither process nor product innovation is materially influenced by works council presence.
3. Hübler and Jirjahn (2003)	Pooled data from the 1994 and 1996 waves of the Hannover Firm Panel (see text). Detailed establishment and industry controls, including whether or not the plant is covered by an (external) collective agreement.	Value added per worker, and wages and salaries per employee.	Bivariate probit maximum likelihood estimates of works council presence and coverage by a collective agreement to form selection arguments in the outcome equations	Positive effect of works council on productivity measure is statistically significant only where the plant is covered by a collective agreement. But wages are higher in works council regimes irrespective of collective agreement coverage.
4. Jirjahn (2002)	As above. Detailed establishment and industry controls, including whether or not plant management covered by a profit sharing arrangement.	Value added per employee.	Single-equation OLS model (auxiliary probit model of works council presence provided, but not used to provide selectivity-adjusted estimates). Separate estimates for all establishments and a subset of plants with 21-100 employees.	Across all establishments and the subset of smaller plants, the effect of works council presence is positive and statistically significant (in all but one specification). Executive profit sharing schemes are also pro-productive throughout, although the interaction effect is negative and significant for the all-establishment case

5. Frick (2001)	c. 1,700 establishments from the 6th (1996) wave of the NIFA-Panel. This data set identifies five high performance work practices (HPWP). It also distinguishes five types of works council as assessed by management (ranging from 'antagonistic' to 'excluded') and a variable identifying greater involvement of the works council in processes of technological and/or organizational change than laid down under the law or collective agreements.	Number of HPWP practices.	<p>Descriptive analysis: gives number of HPWP used in plants by works council presence, involvement, and type. The five HPWP are reductions in hierarchies, delegation of decision-making, work groups with independent budgets, group- or team-work, and flexible working time.</p> <p>Multiple classification analysis: uses same categories as for descriptive treatment and five covariates (viz. log number of employees, log sales per employee, stock of orders, and the degrees of capacity and manpower utilisation).</p>	<p>Establishments with works councils use more HPWP than plants without works councils, although this difference is not statistically significant in the multivariate analysis. Establishments with works council involvement in technological and organisational change exceeding that set down by law or collective agreement also have more HPWP than do plants with less involved councils. But the number of HPWP is highest in establishments where the works council is rated 'antagonistic'.</p> <p>HPWP are reported to have a positive effect on establishment performance but a negative influence on labour demand.</p>
6. Dilger (2002)	NIFA-Panel, as above, but supplemented with information on works council presence from the 4th (1994) wave. Three works council measures identified: a simple dummy variable indicating presence or otherwise of the entity, a set of dummy variables for the various types of works councils (see row 5 above), and the change in works council status, 1994-96. Detailed establishment-level controls.	Quit, hire, and labour fluctuation rates; flexible working time; product innovation; and financial performance (a dummy variable indicating the achievement of at least a 'sufficient' rate of return).	Single-equation cross-section OLS regressions for quit, hire, and labour fluctuation rates. Single equation, cross-section Logit models for flexible working time, product innovation, and financial performance. Models for flexible working time, product innovation, and profitability are also estimated separately for plants with 21-100 employees. Multinomial Logit models for the determinants of flexible working time use the three works council measures and detailed plant-level controls.	Works councils consistently reduce all measures of personnel fluctuation, but the coefficient estimates for some types of works councils are not statistically significant at conventional levels. Works councils promote the use of flexible working time (in both the all-establishment sample and the subset of plants with 21-100 employees), but the effects by type of council are not always well determined. Although works councils do not in general influence product innovation, where their involvement in technological and organisational changes exceeds that laid down by law or collective agreement the effect is positive and weakly statistically significant. The impact of works councils on financial performance is negative for all establishments and smaller establishments, but is not statistically significant where the degree of engagement of the council in technological /organisational change exceeds benchmark levels.

Notes: ^a See also Backes-Gellner, Frick, and Sadowski (1997); Frick (1997); and Gerlach and Jirjahn (2001).

^b See also Addison, Schnabel, and Wagner (1996, 1998); Addison, Siebert, Wagner, and Wei (2001).

Table 3: The Economic Impact of the Works Council – Phase III Studies^a

Study	Data	Dependent variable(s)	Methodology	Findings
1. Frick (2002a, 2002b)	IAB Establishment Panel, using data on 2,640 western German and 2,119 eastern German establishments.	Log value added.	A works-council-in-the-production-function test (Cobb-Douglas, CES, and translog specifications). Separate results given for eastern and western Germany in two cross sections (1998 and 2000). Establishment controls include capital, as proxied by replacement investment.	Works council presence is associated with sharply higher labour productivity of 25% (30%) for western (eastern) Germany. Disaggregations by broad sector (i.e. manufacturing and services) confirm this basic result for eastern Germany, and for services (although not manufacturing) in western Germany.
2. Wolf and Zwick (2002) ^b	As above, 1999 and 1996-99. Gross sample contains 6,397 establishments.	Log value added.	Production function test. Main focus of study is on the output effects of (six) high performance workplace practices (HPWP) rather than codetermination per se. Cross section estimates – with and without correction for selection into (grouped) HPWP arrangement – are provided for the 1999 wave. Panel estimates, again controlling for the endogeneity of the broad HPWP arrangement, follow a two-stage procedure, and use data from the 1996-99 waves. Detailed plant controls.	The coefficient estimate for works council presence is positive and highly statistically significant in the basic cross-section model. But the point estimate is not robust with correction for selection on the personnel measures in one specification. In the panel estimates, works council presence has a strongly positive impact on the establishment-specific fixed effect.
3. Schank, Schnabel, and Wagner (2002) ^c	As above, 1993-2000. Unbalanced (n=2,301) and balanced (n=592) sample of west German establishments with 21-100 employees.	Log total sales.	Fixed effects estimation of a stochastic frontier production function. The comparison is between the technical efficiency estimates – and their 95% confidence intervals – of the median works council plant and its works council free counterpart.	There are no statistically significant differences in efficiency between establishments with and without work councils. Results are robust to outliers.
4. Addison, Bellmann, Schnabel, and Wagner (2002)	As above, 1996-2000. Initial sample of 1,544 establishments, all without works councils in 1996.	Changes in quits, sales per employee, employment, and profitability.	Nonparametric propensity score matching model. 'Treated' group comprises all plants in which a works council was set up between 1996 and 1998. Matched plants derived from the 1,513 controls.	Mean values for the performance indicators in establishments that introduced works councils are not statistically different from those of comparator plants that remained works council free. Results are robust to outliers.

Notes: ^a See also Addison, Bellmann, and Kölling (2002).

^b See also Zwick (2003).

^c See also Addison, Schank, Schnabel, and Wagner (2003).

REFERENCES

- Addison, J. T. and Belfield, C. (2003). 'Union voice'. Discussion Paper No. 862, Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor/IZA, August (forthcoming in *Journal of Labor Research*, 2004).
- Addison, J. T., Bellmann, L. and Kölling, A. (2002). 'Unions, works councils and plant closings in Germany'. Discussion paper No. 474, Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor/IZA, April (forthcoming in *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, March 2004).
- Addison, J. T., Bellmann, L., Schnabel, C. and Wagner, J. (2002). 'The long-awaited reform of the German Works Constitution Act'. Discussion paper No. 422, Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor/IZA, February 2002 (forthcoming in *Industrial Relations*, April 2004).
- Addison, J. T., Kraft, K. and Wagner, J. (1993). 'German works councils and firm performance'. In B. E. Kaufman and M. M. Kleiner (eds.), *Employee Representation: Alternatives and Future Directions*. Madison, WI: Industrial Relations Research Association.
- Addison, J. T., Schnabel, C. and Wagner, J. (1996). 'German works councils, profits and innovation'. *Kyklos*, 49: 555-82.
- Addison, J. T., Schnabel, C. and Wagner, J. (1997). 'On the determinants of mandatory works councils in Germany'. *Industrial Relations*, 36: 419-45.
- Addison, J. T., Schnabel, C. and Wagner, J. (1998). 'Betriebsräte in der deutschen Industrie: Verbreitung, Bestimmungsgründe und Effekte'. In K. Gerlach, O. Hübler, and W. Meyer (eds.), *Ökonomische Analysen betrieblicher Strukturen und Entwicklungen – Das Hannoveraner Firmenpanel*. Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.
- Addison, J. T., Schnabel, C. and Wagner, J. (2001). 'Works councils in Germany: their effects on establishment performance'. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 53: 659-94.
- Addison, J. T., Schank, T., Schnabel, C. and Wagner, J. (2003). 'German works councils in the production process'. Discussion Paper No. 812, Bonn: Institute for the Study of Labor/IZA, June.
- Addison, J. T., Siebert, W.S., Wagner, J. and Wei X. (2000). 'Worker participation and firm performance'. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 38: 7-48.
- Addison, J. T. and Wagner, J. (1997). 'The impact of German works councils on profitability and innovation: new evidence from micro data'. *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik*, 216: 1-20.
- Backes-Gellner, U., Frick, B. and Sadowski, D. (1997). 'Codetermination and personnel policies of German firms: the influence of works councils on turnover and further training'. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 8: 328-47.

- Black, S.E. and Lynch, L.M. ((2001). 'How to compete: the impact of workplace practices and information technology on productivity'. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 83: 434-45.
- Brand, R., Carstensen, V., Gerlach, K. and Klodt, T. (1996). 'The Hannover Panel'. Discussion Paper No. 2, University of Hannover, May.
- Brown, C. and Medoff, J. (1978). 'Trade unions in the production process'. *Journal of Political Economy*, 86: 355-78.
- Büchtemann, C. F. and Höland, A. (1989). 'Befristete Arbeitsverträge nach dem Beschäftigungsförderungsgesetz'. Bonn: Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Sozialordnung.
- Bryson, A. (2001). 'Unionism and workplace closure in Britain, 1900-1998'. Unpublished paper. London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Dilger, A. (2002). *Ökonomik betrieblicher Mitbestimmung*. München and Mering: Rainer Hampp Verlag.
- FitzRoy, F. and Kraft, K. (1985). 'Unionization, wages, and efficiency: theories and evidence from the U.S. and West Germany.' *Kyklos*, 38 (4): 537-54.
- FitzRoy, F. and Kraft, K. (1987). 'Efficiency and internal organization: works councils in West German firms'. *Economica*, 54: 493-504.
- FitzRoy, F. and Kraft, K. (1990). 'Innovation, rent-sharing and the organization of labor in the Federal Republic of Germany'. *Small Business Economics*, 2: 95-103.
- FitzRoy, F. and Kraft, K. (1995). 'On the choice of incentives in firms'. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 26: 145-60.
- Freeman, R. B. and James L. Medoff, J. L. (1984). *What Do Unions Do?* New York: Basic Books.
- Freeman, R. B. and Lazear, E. P. (1995). 'An economic analysis of works councils'. In J. Rogers and W. Streeck (eds.), *Works Councils: Consultation, Representation, and Cooperation in Industrial Relations*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
- Frege, C. (2002). 'A critical assessment of the theoretical and empirical research on German works councils'. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 40: 221-48.
- Frick, B. (1997). *Mitbestimmung und Personalfuktuation*. München and Mering: Rainer Hampp Verlag.
- Frick, B. (2001). 'High performance practices und betriebliche Mitbestimmung: Komplementär oder substitutiv? – Empirische Befunde für den deutschen Maschinenbau.' Wittener Diskussionspapiere, Heft Nr. 88, University of Witten-Herdecke, December.
- Frick, B. (2002a). 'Ökonomische Analyse der deutschen Betriebsverfassung'. In D. Sadowski and U. Walwei (eds.), *Die ökonomische Analyse des Arbeitsrechts*. Nürnberg: Bundesanstalt für Arbeit.
- Frick, B. (2002b). 'Mandated codetermination, voluntary profit sharing and firm performance.' Mimeographed, University of Witten-Herdecke.

- Frick, B. and Sadowski, D. (1995). 'Works councils, unions, and firm performance'. In F. Buttler, W. Franz, R. Schettkat, and D. Soskice (eds.), *Institutional Frameworks and Labor Market Performance*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Gerlach, K., Hübler, O. and Meyer, W. (2003). 'The Hannover Firm Panel (HFP)'. *Schmollers Jahrbuch*, 123 [in press].
- Gerlach, K. and Jirjahn, U. (2001). 'Employer provided further training: evidence from German establishment data'. *Schmollers Jahrbuch*, 121: 139-64.
- Hirschman, A.O. (1970) *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Hübler, O. and Jirjahn, U. (2003). 'Works councils and collective bargaining in Germany: the impact on productivity and wages'. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 50: 471-91.
- Jirjahn, U. (2002). 'Executive incentives, works councils and firm performance'. Unpublished paper. University of Hannover.
- Kölling, A. (2000). 'The IAB establishment panel'. *Schmollers Jahrbuch*, 120: 291-300.
- Kommission Mitbestimmung (1998). *Mitbestimmung und neue Unternehmenskulturen – Bilanz und Perspektiven*. Gütersloh: Verlag Bertelsmann Stiftung.
- Kotthoff, H. (1994). *Betriebsräte und Bürgerstatus: Wandel und Kontinuität betrieblicher Interessenvertretung*. Munich and Mering: Rainer Hampp Verlag.
- Kraft, K. (1985). 'Exit and voice in the labour market: an empirical study of quits'. *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics*, 142: 697-715.
- Schank, T., Schnabel, C. and Wagner, J. (2002). 'Works councils – sand or grease in the operation of German firms?' Working Paper 281. Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, University of Lüneburg, November (forthcoming in *Applied Economics Letters*, 2004).
- Schnabel, C. and Wagner, J. (1994). 'Industrial relations and trade union effects on innovation in Germany'. *Labour*, 8: 489-503.
- Schmidt, U. and Widmaier, U. (1992). *Flexible Arbeitssysteme in Maschinenbau: Ergebnisse aus dem Betriebspanel des Sonderforschungsbereichs 187*. Opladen: Leske & Budrich.
- Widmaier, U. (2001). 'The German mechanical engineering industry and the NIFA-panel'. *Schmollers Jahrbuch*, 121: 275-84.
- Wolf, E. and Zwick, T. (2002). 'Reassessing the impact of high performance workplaces'. Discussion Paper No. 02-07, Mannheim: Centre for European Economic Research/ZEW.
- Zwick, T. (2003). 'Works councils and the productivity impact of direct employee participation'. Discussion Paper No. 03-47, Mannheim: Centre for European Economic Research/ZEW.

In der Diskussionspapierreihe sind bisher erschienen:

Previously published Discussion Papers:

1	Addison J.T., Schnabel C., Wagner J.	Die <i>mitbestimmungsfreie Zone</i> aus ökonomischer Sicht	05/2000
2	Jahn E.J., Wagner T.	Substitution and Crowding-Out Effects of Active Labour Market Policy	06/2000
3	Wegener T.	Institutionelle Aspekte der Regionalisierung von Wirtschafts- und Strukturpolitik	09/2000
4	Kölling, A., Schnabel, C., Wagner, J.	Bremst das Schwerbehindertengesetz die Arbeitsplatzdynamik in Kleinbetrieben?	01/2001
5	Schnabel, C., Wagner, J.	Verbreitung und Bestimmungsgründe verschiedener Formen der Arbeitnehmerpartizipation in Industriebetrieben	06/2001
6	Jahn E.J., Wagner T.	Labour's Law?	06/2001
7	Niederalt, M., Schnabel, C. Kaiser, Chr.	Betriebliches Ausbildungsverhalten zwischen Kosten-Nutzen-Kalkül und gesellschaftlicher Verantwortung – Einflussfaktoren der Ausbildungsintensität von deutschen Betrieben	11/2001
8	Kohaut, S. Schnabel, C.	Tarifverträge – nein danke!? Einflussfaktoren der Tarifbindung west- und ostdeutscher Betriebe	12/2001
9	Jahn, E.J.	Brauchen wir einen allgemeinen Kündigungsschutz?	02/2002
10	Addison, J.T., Bellmann, L., Schnabel, C., Wagner, J.	German Works Councils Old and New: Incidence, Coverage and Determinants	05/2002
11	Jahn, E.J. Wagner, T.	A Hiring Subsidy for Long-Term Unemployment in a Search Model with PES and Random Search	05/2002
12	Goerke, L. Schnabel, C.	On Strike Insurance	06/2002
13	Kölling, A. Schnabel, C. Wagner, J	Establishment Age and Wages: Evidence from German Linked Employer-Employee Data	06/2002

14	Kölling, A. Schank, T.	Skill-Biased Technological Change, International Trade and the Wage Structure	09/2002
15	Schnabel, C.	Determinants of trade union membership	10/2002
16	Addison, J.T., Bellmann, L., Schnabel, C., Wagner, J.	The Reform of the German Works Constitution Act: A Critical Assessment	12/2002
17	Zagelmeyer, S.	Die Entwicklung kollektiver Verhandlungen in Großbritannien: Ein historischer Überblick	01/2003
18	Schnabel, C., Wagner, J.	Trade Union Membership in Eastern and Western Germany: Convergence or Divergence?	01/2003
19	Haltiwanger, J., Jarmin, R., Schank, T.	Productivity, Investment in ICT and Market Experimentation: Micro Evidence from Germany and the U.S.	03/2003
20	Niederalt, M.	Betriebliche Ausbildung als kollektives Phänomen	05/2003
21	Addison, J.T., Schank, T., Schnabel, C., Wagner, J.	German Works Councils in the Production Process	07/2003
22	Addison, J.T., Schnabel, C., Wagner, J.	The Course of Research into the Economic Consequences of German Works Councils	11/2003

Eine aktualisierte Liste der Diskussionspapiere findet sich auf der Homepage:
<http://www.arbeitsmarkt.wiso.uni-erlangen.de/>

An updated list of discussion papers can be found at the homepage:
<http://www.arbeitsmarkt.wiso.uni-erlangen.de/>