

Kühn, Maximilian

Article

Are Firms Paying for the Minimum Wage? Evidence from Germany

Junior Management Science (JUMS)

Provided in Cooperation with:

Junior Management Science e. V.

Suggested Citation: Kühn, Maximilian (2021) : Are Firms Paying for the Minimum Wage? Evidence from Germany, Junior Management Science (JUMS), ISSN 2942-1861, Junior Management Science e. V., Planegg, Vol. 6, Iss. 1, pp. 25-38,
<https://doi.org/10.5282/jums/v6i1pp25-38>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/294944>

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.



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



Online-Appendix zu

„Are Firms Paying for the Minimum Wage? Evidence from Germany“

Maximilian Kühn

University of Mannheim

Junior Management Science 6(1) (2021) 25-38

Appendices

Table A1: Profit Margin – Continuous Log–Model

	(1) FE	(2) RE	(3) FE with TFE	(4) RE with TFE
Bite	0 (.)	-0.833 (0.752)	0 (.)	-0.806 (0.651)
Dummy 2015	0.0197 (0.0499)	0.0237 (0.0503)	0.0119 (0.0774)	0.0148 (0.0805)
DiD	0.305 (0.348)	0.321 (0.350)	0.350 (0.348)	0.370 (0.362)
Observations	419	419	419	419

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.010$

Table A2: Profit Margin – Binary Log–Model

	(1) FE	(2) RE	(3) FE with TFE	(4) RE with TFE
Bite	0 (.)	-0.0498 (0.188)	0 (.)	-0.0432 (0.161)
Dummy 2015	0.0522 (0.0434)	0.0588 (0.0438)	0.0458 (0.0740)	0.0521 (0.0772)
DiD	-0.00875 (0.0796)	-0.0101 (0.0803)	-0.00409 (0.0796)	-0.00657 (0.0829)
Observations	419	419	419	419

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.010$

Table A3: Profit Margin – Continuous Growth Rate–Model

	(1) FE	(2) RE	(3) FE with TFE	(4) RE with TFE
Bite	0 (.)	0.247 (0.248)	0 (.)	0.243 (0.247)
Dummy 2015	0.0349 (0.0694)	0.0605 (0.0645)	0.0741 (0.110)	0.0956 (0.104)
DiD	0.0154 (0.480)	-0.135 (0.448)	0.0768 (0.482)	-0.0857 (0.449)
Observations	402	402	402	402

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.010$

Table A4: Profit Margin – Binary Growth Rate–Model

	(1) FE	(2) RE	(3) FE with TFE	(4) RE with TFE
Bite	0 (.)	0.0461 (0.0610)	0 (.)	0.0451 (0.0610)
Dummy 2015	0.0410 (0.0603)	0.0601 (0.0561)	0.0833 (0.105)	0.0977 (0.0995)
DiD	-0.0152 (0.110)	-0.0486 (0.104)	-0.00737 (0.110)	-0.0421 (0.104)
Observations	402	402	402	402

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.010$ **Table A5: Placebo Regression – Continuous Model**

	(1) FE	(2) RE	(3) FE with TFE	(4) RE with TFE
Dummy 2014	-0.273 (0.400)	-0.00927 (0.471)	-0.138 (0.462)	0.128 (0.545)
Bite	0 (.)	-5.771 (4.573)	0 (.)	-5.765 (4.579)
DiD	3.103 (2.502)	2.392 (2.949)	3.103 (2.516)	2.385 (2.969)
Observations	281	281	281	281

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.010$ **Table A6: Placebo Regression – Binary Model**

	(1) FE	(2) RE	(3) FE with TFE	(4) RE with TFE
Dummy 2014	-0.311 (0.353)	-0.0407 (0.415)	-0.176 (0.421)	0.0965 (0.496)
Bite	0 (.)	-0.902 (1.149)	0 (.)	-0.900 (1.150)
DiD	1.176* (0.622)	0.906 (0.734)	1.176* (0.626)	0.904 (0.739)
Observations	281	281	281	281

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.010$

Table A7: Placebo Regression – Continuous Log–Model

	(1) FE	(2) RE	(3) FE with TFE	(4) RE with TFE
Dummy 2014	-0.0607 (0.0746)	-0.0410 (0.0762)	-0.125 (0.0859)	-0.105 (0.0899)
Bite	0 (.)	-0.879 (0.738)	0 (.)	-0.851 (0.689)
DiD	0.489 (0.468)	0.390 (0.478)	0.478 (0.467)	0.362 (0.489)
Observations	273	273	273	273

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.010$ **Table A8: Placebo Regression – Binary Log–Model**

	(1) FE	(2) RE	(3) FE with TFE	(4) RE with TFE
Dummy 2014	-0.0464 (0.0664)	-0.0248 (0.0690)	-0.111 (0.0791)	-0.0910 (0.0832)
Bite	0 (.)	-0.0522 (0.176)	0 (.)	-0.0469 (0.170)
DiD	0.119 (0.117)	0.0829 (0.121)	0.117 (0.117)	0.0773 (0.123)
Observations	273	273	273	273

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.010$ **Table A9: Placebo Regression – Continuous Growth Rate–Model**

	(1) FE	(2) RE	(3) FE with TFE	(4) RE with TFE
Dummy 2014	0.0184 (0.114)	0.0107 (0.107)	0.0452 (0.136)	0.0315 (0.127)
Bite	0 (.)	0.217 (0.314)	0 (.)	0.213 (0.314)
DiD	0.117 (0.730)	0.139 (0.685)	0.123 (0.731)	0.143 (0.686)
Observations	258	258	258	258

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.010$

Table A10: Placebo Regression – Binary Growth Rate–Model

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	FE	RE	FE with TFE	RE with TFE
Dummy 2014	-0.00355 (0.102)	-0.0134 (0.0952)	0.0236 (0.126)	0.00822 (0.117)
Bite	0 (.)	0.0204 (0.0772)	0 (.)	0.0193 (0.0773)
DiD	0.108 (0.180)	0.122 (0.169)	0.110 (0.180)	0.123 (0.169)
Observations	258	258	258	258

Standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.010$