

Fitzenberger, Bernd; Kohn, Karsten; Lembcke, Alexander C.

Working Paper

Union density and varieties of coverage: the anatomy of union wage effects in Germany

IZA Discussion Papers, No. 3356

Provided in Cooperation with:

IZA – Institute of Labor Economics

Suggested Citation: Fitzenberger, Bernd; Kohn, Karsten; Lembcke, Alexander C. (2008) : Union density and varieties of coverage: the anatomy of union wage effects in Germany, IZA Discussion Papers, No. 3356, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA), Bonn

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/35062>

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.

IZA DP No. 3356

**Union Density and Varieties of Coverage:
The Anatomy of Union Wage Effects in Germany**

Bernd Fitzenberger
Karsten Kohn
Alexander C. Lembcke

February 2008

Union Density and Varieties of Coverage: The Anatomy of Union Wage Effects in Germany

Bernd Fitzenberger

*University of Freiburg,
IFS, ZEW and IZA*

Karsten Kohn

KfW Bankengruppe and IZA

Alexander C. Lembcke

CEP, London School of Economics

Discussion Paper No. 3356
February 2008

IZA

P.O. Box 7240
53072 Bonn
Germany

Phone: +49-228-3894-0
Fax: +49-228-3894-180
E-mail: iza@iza.org

Any opinions expressed here are those of the author(s) and not those of IZA. Research published in this series may include views on policy, but the institute itself takes no institutional policy positions.

The Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) in Bonn is a local and virtual international research center and a place of communication between science, politics and business. IZA is an independent nonprofit organization supported by Deutsche Post World Net. The center is associated with the University of Bonn and offers a stimulating research environment through its international network, workshops and conferences, data service, project support, research visits and doctoral program. IZA engages in (i) original and internationally competitive research in all fields of labor economics, (ii) development of policy concepts, and (iii) dissemination of research results and concepts to the interested public.

IZA Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

ABSTRACT

Union Density and Varieties of Coverage: The Anatomy of Union Wage Effects in Germany*

Collective bargaining in Germany takes place either at the industry level or at the firm level; collective bargaining coverage is much higher than union density; and not all employees in a covered firm are necessarily covered. This institutional setup suggests to explicitly distinguish union power as measured by net union density (NUD) in a labor market segment, coverage at the firm level, and coverage at the individual level. Using linked employer-employee data and applying quantile regressions, this is the first empirical paper which simultaneously analyzes these three dimensions of union influence on the structure of wages. *Ceteris paribus*, a higher share of employees in a firm covered by industry-wide or firm-level contracts is associated with higher wages. Yet, individual bargaining coverage in a covered firm shows a negative impact both on the wage level and on wage dispersion. A higher union density reinforces the effects of coverage, but the effect of union density is negative at all points in the wage distribution for uncovered employees. In line with an insurance motive, higher union density compresses the wage structure and, at the same time, it is associated with a uniform leftward movement of the distribution for uncovered employees.

JEL Classification: J31, J51, J52

Keywords: union density, collective bargaining coverage, wage structure, quantile regression, linked employer-employee data, Structure of Earnings Survey 2001, Germany

Corresponding author:

Bernd Fitzenberger
Institute for Economic Research
Department of Applied Econometrics
Albert-Ludwigs-University
79085 Freiburg
Germany
E-mail: bernd.fitzenberger@vwl.uni-freiburg.de

* This paper was written as part of the research project "Collective Bargaining and the Distribution of Wages: Theory and Empirical Evidence" within the DFG research program "Flexibility in Heterogenous Labor Markets" (FSP 1169). Financial support from the German Science Foundation (DFG) is gratefully acknowledged. We thank, without implicating, Nicole Gürtzgen and participants of the following seminars for constructive comments on earlier drafts: DFG research workshop in Tübingen (October 2006), "Institutions and the Labour Market" (Mannheim, March 2007), EALE 2007 conference (Oslo), *Verein für Socialpolitik* 2007 meeting (Munich). We also thank the Research Data Center (FDZ) at the Statistical Office of Hesse, and in particular Hans-Peter Hafner for support with the data. The opinions expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors' employers.

Contents

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 2 | Collective Wage Bargaining in Germany | 2 |
| 2.1 | Union Membership and Union Density | 3 |
| 2.2 | Collective Bargaining Coverage | 5 |
| 3 | Union Wage Effects in the Literature | 6 |
| 3.1 | Effects of Membership or Coverage? | 7 |
| 3.2 | Union Density and the German Wage Structure | 9 |
| 3.3 | Bargaining Coverage and the German Wage Structure | 10 |
| 4 | Econometric Investigation | 12 |
| 4.1 | Data | 12 |
| 4.2 | Descriptive Evidence | 14 |
| 4.3 | OLS Wage Regressions | 15 |
| 4.4 | Quantile Regression Results | 19 |
| 5 | Conclusions | 20 |
| | References | 22 |
| A | German Structure of Earnings Survey 2001 | 30 |
| B | Standard Errors for Quantile Regression with Sampling Weights and Clustering | 31 |
| C | Tables and Figures | 33 |

1 Introduction

The impact of institutions on economic performance in general, and on wage setting in the labor market in particular, has been under debate for a while (OECD 2006). In times of increasingly heterogeneous economic conditions, it is often argued that institutional rigidities restrain labor market performance and the dynamics of economic development. The discussion often refers to the impact of trade unions, see e. g. the handbook Addison and Schnabel (2003).

The main channel for unions to influence the wage structure is through collective bargaining. In Germany, this influence goes beyond mere negotiation of wage premia for union members since collective agreements on individual membership premia are forbidden by constitutional law. Given the high rate of collective bargaining coverage in the German labor market, union-bargained wages apply to the larger part of all employees and unions influence the wage structure of members as well as of non-members. The design of the German wage-setting system thus offers the possibility to explicitly distinguish the effects of union density and those of collective bargaining coverage. We argue that, on the one hand, net union density as a proxy for union power influences the union's threat point in the collective bargaining process and therefore influences the bargaining outcome. Collective bargaining coverage, on the other hand, captures the actual application of bargained agreements. So density and coverage offer a pre-bargaining and a post-bargaining indicator for unions' influence in the labor market.

The empirical literature on the impact of unions on the German wage structure has so far been confined to using *either* collective bargaining coverage (e.g. Stephan and Gerlach (2003, 2005)) *or* union membership (Fitzenberger and Kohn (2005)). The studies on coverage distinguish between firm-level and industry-wide collective agreements but do not distinguish between firm-level and individual-level coverage by these agreements. Our study extends upon this literature in several dimensions. First, we use a newly available linked employer-employee data set, the German Structure of Earnings Survey (GSES, *Gehalts- und Lohnstrukturerhebung*) 2001, which is unique in the sense that it provides not only firm-level information on collective wage bargaining, but also the coverage status of the individual employees. So not only can we distinguish between different levels of collective bargaining, but also between firm-level and individual-level effects. Second, as there is no information on union membership in the GSES, we impute net union densities for homogeneously defined labor market segments from GSOEP-based estimations of Fitzenberger, Kohn, and Wang (2006). This enables us to simultaneously analyze the effects of union density and collective bargaining coverage. Third, we employ OLS as well

as quantile regressions in order to estimate impacts on wage levels and on wage dispersion.

From a methodological point of view the analysis involves the estimation of the asymptotic distribution of a weighted quantile regression estimator accounting for clustering, as the estimations contain regressors from different levels of aggregation (Angrist, Chernozhukov, and Fernández-Val 2006).

While confirming the need to employ firm-level as well as individual-level data, our results show a positive effect of a firm's decision to apply industry-wide or firm-level contracts on the level of wages. Given the share of covered employees in a firm, however, uncovered employees with individual contracts *ceteris paribus* earn higher wages. Collective bargaining coverage is found to reduce wage inequality. A higher union density reinforces the positive wage effects of coverage. A surprising result is that given coverage status, the effects of net union density on the wage level and on wage dispersion are negative. While striving for more wage equality along the entire wage distribution, powerful unions may even make concessions regarding the average wage level. Furthermore, an increase in wages for covered employees due to union influence may result in a larger labor supply in the uncovered sector, thus resulting in downward wage pressure there. This effect seems to dominate a possible positive union threat effect which may have caused firms in the uncovered sector to also pay higher wages in order to prevent coverage. Overall, our findings on the impact of union density on wage dispersion are in line with an insurance motive of union representation (Agell and Lommerud 1992, Burda 1995). However, the uniform decline of wages in the uncovered sector across the entire wage distribution in response to an increase in union density requires a further explanation. This finding may be due to a decline of investment when union density increases (Vogel 2007) or to downward pressure on wages because of the increase in labor supply in the uncovered sector brought about by higher wages—and thus lower employment—in the covered sector.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 sketches constituent elements of the German system of collective wage bargaining. Section 3 briefly reviews the related literature on the nature of union wage effects and summarizes existing evidence on the effects of union density and collective bargaining coverage on the German wage structure. Our econometric investigation is presented in section 4. Section 5 concludes.

2 Collective Wage Bargaining in Germany

In Germany, there exist three fundamental regimes of wage bargaining. First, collective bargaining takes place at the industry level between a union and an employers' association. Second, a union can negotiate with single firms to sign firm-level collective contracts.

Third, employers and employees may also negotiate individual contracts. According to the German Collective Bargaining Act (*Tarifvertragsgesetz*), collectively negotiated agreements are necessarily binding for individual job matches only if the firm is a member of an employer association and, in addition, the worker is a union member.

In fact, the scope of collective agreements goes beyond the organized parties. Wages set at the firm level as well as individually bargained wages are adapted towards collective bargaining agreements, be it in order to reduce transaction costs or not to create incentives for employees to join a union. Collective agreements can also be declared generally binding by the Minister for Labor and Social Affairs.¹ In light of the traditionally high coverage, researchers in the past (e.g. Fitzenberger (1999, chapter 6)) often assumed that collective bargaining agreements apply to all employees.

Collective agreements constituting discriminatory wage policies with disadvantages for non-union members are forbidden by constitutional law (negative freedom of association, *negative Koalitionsfreiheit*, *Grundgesetz Art. 9*). As wage gains from union membership are not internalized, there exists a free-rider problem of missing individual incentives to join a union.² As a result, union density is considerably smaller than collective bargaining coverage. The design of the German wage-setting system thus suggests to distinguish explicitly between the effects (i) of different bargaining regimes, (ii) of bargaining coverage both at the individual and at the firm level, and (iii) of union density in a labor market segment. However, in light of the free-rider problem and of the fact that collective agreements can not discriminate between members and nonmembers, it is not meaningful to estimate a wage premium for individual membership, as done in most studies for the UK or the US (Lewis 1986, Card, Lemieux, and Riddell 2003).

2.1 Union Membership and Union Density

Union membership, which had merely shown some variation with the business cycle in former decades, has been declining steadily during more recent decades (Ebbinghaus (2003); Fitzenberger, Kohn, and Wang (2006)). The early 1980's mark the beginning of a pronounced trend towards deunionization: having started out at a gross union density (GUD, defined as the ratio of union members to the number of employees in the labor

¹The direct impact of this provision used to be of minor relevance—in the year 2003, only 0.8% of all employees subject to social security contributions were covered by agreements which were binding by declaration (BMWA 2004). Yet, the mere possibility of such a declaration constitutes incentives per se; see OECD (1994).

²However, there are additional motives for union membership. The literature discusses selective incentives provided in addition to public goods (Olson 1965), collective-voice mechanisms (Hirschmann 1970), or the existence of social norms (Akerlof 1980, Booth 1985).

market) of about 40%, GUD was down to a historically low level of 27% by the year 2004. Deunionization was interrupted by a unification effect in 1990, when West German unions were very successful in recruiting members in unified Germany. However, the upsurge in aggregate GUD was not sustainable, and deunionization continued even more rapidly in the 1990's and 2000's. Some trade unions have responded to the decline in size by merging (Keller (2005)). However, unions have not been able to reverse the trend (Ebbinghaus (2003); Fichter (1997)).

Union density governs a union's threat point in the collective bargaining process and is therefore pivotal to the bargaining outcome. Fitzenberger and Kohn (2005) argue that net union density, i. e., the share of employed union members among the number of employees, is an appropriate measure for union power. The higher the number of union members paying membership fees, the higher is the union's funding. In case of industrial conflicts, higher financial power enables the union to pay strike benefits for a longer period of time. Financial power and union representation at the shop floor increase individual support for union action, the probability and the length of a strike, and therefore the expected damage inflicted upon employers. Furthermore, financially powerful unions can invest more in public relations in order to sanitize their public image. Yet, financial obligations also increase with the size of the union. Relative financial power is thus mirrored best by the share of contributors among potentially represented workers. Moreover, as union growth comes along with increased heterogeneity within the union, conflicting interests and contradictory statements increasingly undermine the union's representative role; see also Ebbinghaus (2003) and Keller (2005). Thus net union density is preferable as compared to both gross union density and the absolute number of union members.

Net union density (NUD) for homogeneously defined labor market segments can not be inferred from union records and thus has to be estimated. A number of studies estimates individual determinants of union membership based on survey data.³ Estimated membership propensities can then be used to project NUD. Aggregate NUD usually falls short of GUD by about 10 percentage points. Fitzenberger, Kohn, and Wang (2006) report that after German unification, membership in East Germany started out at a higher level than in West Germany but exhibited a stronger decline afterwards. Aggregate NUD for the years 1993 and 2003 were 38% and 19% in East Germany, and 27% and 21% in West Germany.

³Lorenz and Wagner (1991), Fitzenberger, Haggenev, and Ernst (1999), Schnabel and Wagner (2003, 2005, 2007), Beck and Fitzenberger (2004), Goerke and Pannenberg (2004), Fitzenberger, Kohn, and Wang (2006).

2.2 Collective Bargaining Coverage

Employees are paid according to individual contracts between the employee and the firm or according to a collective agreement. A collective agreement can be negotiated between a union and an employers' association, a union and a firm, or a works council and a firm. Arrangements between firm and works council are only allowed to govern wages or salaries if the firm is not subject to a collective contract or if the collective contract explicitly allows for this type of arrangement. Firm-level agreements involving a union are allowed to set wages even if a collective agreement exists, as long as the firm-level agreement is more specific than the collective agreement. Collective contracts may also contain opening clauses explicitly allowing deviations from the terms of the contract under particular circumstances.

Collectively negotiated agreements are compulsory only for a minority of job matches. In all other cases, the adoption of a collective contract is the result of two voluntary decisions. First, the firm decides whether to subject itself to collective agreements at all. In the interpretation of Dustmann and Schönberg (2004), firms use collective contracts as a commitment device. At a second stage, the firm and each individual employee agree on whether a collective agreement be applied for individual matches. At this latter stage, different groups of employees are expected to be selected out of collective coverage. On the one hand, high-skilled employees in upper professional status categories such as managers are paid highest wages without reference to a collective agreement. On the other hand, workers with marginal employment contracts and low-skilled employees may not be covered by collective agreements and be paid below the collective level applying for core-group coworkers. As a result, the share of covered workers within a firm is usually below one.

Collective bargaining coverage, as measured by the share of employment contracts following collective agreements, was relatively stable in West Germany until the end of the 1990's but has been declining since. By the year 2003, 45% (70%) of West German firms (employees) were covered by a collective agreement (Schnabel 2005). With 26% (47%) the corresponding coverage in East Germany was considerably lower. The 'erosion' towards more decentralized wage setting is examined by a group of studies using firm-level data,⁴ and it is reconfirmed by survey evidence from works councils discussed in Bispinck and Schulten (2003).

⁴Kohaut and Bellmann (1997), Bellmann, Kohaut, and Schnabel (1999), Kohaut and Schnabel (2003b, 2003a).

3 Union Wage Effects in the Literature

Bargaining models treat the negotiation of wages as a rent-sharing problem, the solution to which depends upon the bargaining power of the negotiating parties. In classical models unions enforce a high wage level for the represented work force. Models such as monopoly unions, right-to-manage models, or efficient bargaining predict a monotonic positive relationship between union power and the level of bargained wages (Farber (1986); Oswald (1985); Naylor (2003)).

Some more recent studies also incorporate effects on higher moments of the wage distribution. Agell and Lommerud (1992) and Burda (1995) focus on wage dispersion and discuss an insurance motive for union membership. Faced with uncertainty of future productivity or wages, risk averse employees a priori have a taste for wage compression. If the income of employees depends upon different states of nature such as demand shocks on the firm's product market (Guiso, Pistaferri, and Schivardi 2005), a union acts as agent of the work force and bargains for a compression of the wage distribution relative to the productivity distribution.⁵ The compression effect is also consistent with search and matching theories (Mortensen and Pissarides 1999). By enforcing 'equal pay for equal work' a union additionally seeks to limit favoritism and discrimination by superiors and colleagues, and to encourage solidarity among the work force; see Freeman (1982).⁶ Ceteris paribus, the degree of wage compression is the higher, the higher the bargaining power of the union.

Yet, risk-reducing insurance or equity considerations come at the price of an insurance premium or discount. If a union has a strong preference for wage equality and also wants to prevent negative employment effects, this effect can overcompensate the union's strive for a higher wage level such that a higher net union density is accompanied by a lower wage level. A priori, the sign of the overall level effect is ambiguous as there is a trade-off between reduced inequality and a higher wage level (Calmfors 1993).

Collective agreements do not constrain a firm's right to pay premia above the wage set in the collective contract. So actual wages may differ substantially from the contractual wage. This aspect is examined by the wage-drift literature and studies related to nominal, notional, or real wage rigidity; see, e.g., Bauer, Bonin, and Sunde (2003) and Pfeiffer (2003). Cardoso and Portugal (2005) analyze the gap between contractual and actual

⁵The reallocation implied by a compressed wage structure can be understood as a substitute for explicit means of redistribution such as taxation; see Agell (1999, 2002).

⁶Though the 'equal pay for equal work' campaign originally focused on equal pay for female employees, it has become a commonplace for all anti-discriminatory policies.

wages for employees covered by different types of collective agreements in Portugal.⁷ They find that the positive effect of union strength—as measured by the share of covered employees—on the level of contractual wages is partly offset by a smaller wage cushion. So higher contractual wages in sectors with a high share of covered employees do not lead to higher actual wages. Besides, firms covered by (multi- or single-) firm-level agreements pay higher wages than firms covered by industry-wide agreements.

At any rate, the impact of unions on the wage structure likely varies across the wage distribution. If collectively bargained wages serve as wage floors, the (conditional) wage distribution is compressed from below. In the wage bargaining model of Büttner and Fitzenberger (2003), for example, efficiency wages are paid in the upper part of a productivity distribution, whereas union-bargained wages above marginal productivity are binding for less productive matches. This is in line with the perception of a union representing mainly less productive employees and striving for higher wages particularly at the lower end of the distribution. Then compression of the wage distribution from below is the higher, the stronger the influence of the union.

3.1 Effects of Membership or Coverage?

The question whether union effects should be attributed to union membership or union recognition, has been discussed in the international literature for some time. Traditionally, union membership on the one hand and union recognition or collective bargaining coverage on the other hand were essentially taken as mere alternative measures; see Lewis' (1986) survey for the US. Differences were regarded as relatively unimportant, in particular for States without right-to-work law. Some more recent studies focus on the question whether coverage and membership have conceptually different impacts, such that there may be a coverage premium as well as a membership premium. Blakemore, Hunt, and Kiker (1986) and Hunt, Kiker, and Williams (1987) argue that a coverage effect at the firm level reflects monopoly power of the negotiating union, whereas individual membership effects stem from socialization in unions as institutions.

Andrews, Stewart, Swaffield, and Upward (1998) review and replicate different approaches to disentangle union wage differentials in the British context, where union members as well as non-members can work in establishments with union recognition. Studies for the UK thus distinguish between three main groups of individual statuses: covered members, covered non-members, and non-covered non-members. Andrews, Stewart, Swaffield, and Upward (1998) conclude that the estimates of membership and coverage

⁷Cardoso and Portugal (2005) refer to this gap as “wage cushion” (p. 877) in order to distinguish it from the notion of wage drift, which traditionally focusses on the change of the gap.

premia are rather sensitive with respect to the chosen specification. By and large, the membership differential should dominate the effects of coverage. However, using a similar modeling framework, but applying panel data estimation technique in order to account for possible endogeneity of union status, Koevoets (2007) finds no evidence for a membership premium nor for a coverage premium in individual wages.

A few studies stress the importance of aggregate union power. Freeman and Medoff (1981) find that the share of organized employees at the industry or State level positively influences individual wages. The share is implemented as either the percentage covered by collective bargaining (in manufacturing) or net union density (in construction). The difference is basically driven by data availability and there is no discussion of conceptual differences. In Schumacher's (1999) analysis the share of free-riders erodes union power and results in lower wages.

Stewart (1987) reckons that wage premia for closed shop regulations as extreme cases of union membership premia may differ depending on the institutional settings in which the bargaining takes place. More generally, the effects of different bargaining regimes are likely to interfere with other country-specific institutions and social norms (Flanagan 1999). For example, Card and de la Rica (2006) find that firm-level contracting in Spain results in higher wages as compared to regional and national contracts, while Hartog, Leuven, and Teulings (2002) report only minor differences between bargaining regimes in the Netherlands as a corporatist country. Analyzing union effects in Italy, Dell'Aringa and Lucifora (1994) find a positive effect of recognition in particular for local bargaining coverage, but also a negative *ceteris paribus* effect for plant-level union density.

Based on our reading of the international empirical literature, three important aspects concerning a differential impact of coverage and membership are ignored. First, the recent literature focuses on union membership and ignores union density in relevant labor market segments. Most papers estimating a differential effect of coverage and membership (Andrews, Stewart, Swaffield, and Upward (1998); Koevoets (2007)) do not allow for a wage effect of membership for uncovered workers. Second, the traditional notion of the 'union threat effect' suggests spillover effects from union activity to non-unionized workers. Firms may pay higher wages to non-unionized workers in order to prevent unionization. In the German context, this suggests that wages should increase with union density also for uncovered workers because the threat of unionization for uncovered firms increases with union density. Third, traditional labor supply spillover effects from the covered to the uncovered sector suggest an opposite spillover effect on wages. If the positive wage effect of coverage increases with union density because higher union density reflects higher bargaining power of the union, then the resulting higher wage will cause lower

employment of certain-type workers in the covered sector of a labor market segment and a higher supply of such workers in the uncovered sector. This higher labor supply may cause a downward pressure of wages in the uncovered sector, thus resulting in a negative relationship between union density and wages in the uncovered sector. Along a similar line, a negative effect of union density on wages in the uncovered sector may result from firms' investment behavior. In segments with strong unions, both covered and uncovered firms may *ceteris paribus* invest less into capital, which in turn would reduce workers' productivity and thus wages in covered as well as in uncovered firms (Vogel 2007).

Concluding, the available studies in the international empirical literature are intrinsically linked to the institutional settings for the country analyzed and rely heavily on the availability of adequate data on union status. Due to institutional differences, results from studies for the US or the UK on the differential effects of coverage and membership are unlikely to be of relevance for the German case. We argue in particular that for Germany one should investigate the effect of union density in the market for a specific type of labor as a proxy for union power, that it is meaningless to investigate wage effects of individual membership,⁸ and that it is useful to analyze also the effect of union density in the uncovered sector. The following paragraphs survey the existing literature for Germany which either studies the effects of union density or the effects of bargaining coverage separately. No paper exists so far which analyzes the wage effects of union density and coverage simultaneously.

3.2 Union Density and the German Wage Structure

There exists only a sparse literature estimating the effects of union density on wages in Germany. Using the union membership projections from Beck and Fitzenberger (2004), which are averaged within labor market cells, Fitzenberger and Kohn (2005) estimate the link between union power—as measured by net union density—and measures of the wage structure within and between labor market cells spanned by the dimensions year of observation, industry, skill-level, and age of the employees. A higher union density is *ceteris paribus* associated with lower within and between-cell wage dispersion as well as with a lower wage level. The results thus corroborate the insurance argument. In line with a minimum wage interpretation of union-bargained wages, the wage distribution is compressed disproportionately from below.

Using similar measures for union density, Büttner and Fitzenberger (1998) analyze the impact of union density on wages when estimating quantile regressions for a regional

⁸This point is also supported by individual-level regressions in Goerke and Pannenberg (2004), who find no significant effect of individual union membership on wages.

wage curve. The study uses local unemployment rates and aggregate unemployment rates in order to distinguish the impact of centralized bargaining and local influences on wages. The results show that a higher union density reduces the wage dispersion. Fitzenberger (1999, chapter 6) estimates a structural model of industry-wide wage bargaining based on a union maximizing a Stone-Geary utility function. The study distinguishes two skill-types of labor and union density is allowed to affect the parameters of the utility function. The results show that, in manufacturing, an increase in union density is associated with a significantly stronger preference for high employment relative to wage levels and relative to a reduction of wage dispersion.

3.3 Bargaining Coverage and the German Wage Structure

If wage policies set in collective agreements reflect unions' objectives, the decisions of firms and individuals to adopt a collective agreement have two effects. First, differences between covered and non-covered segments would increase as the result of the unions' strive for higher wages. Second, wage compression induced through the collective contract would reduce within-segment inequality. The question which effect would prevail has been discussed for some time in the Anglo-Saxon context; see Card, Lemieux, and Riddell (2003). Related literature for Germany again is still sparse.

Dustmann and Schönberg's (2004) analysis reveals that firms applying collective contracts as a commitment device *ceteris paribus* employ a higher share of workers with an apprenticeship degree. Moreover, the employed linked data of the IAB employment statistics and the IAB establishment panel suggest that under collective coverage, employee turnover is higher, wage cuts occur more often, and (conditional) wages have a lower variance.

A couple of studies analyze subsamples of the German Structure of Earnings Survey (GSES, *Gehalts- und Lohnstrukturerhebung*). Using different cross sections (1990, 1995, 2001) of the subsample for Lower-Saxony, Gerlach and Stephan (2002, 2006a, 2006c) report Kernel density estimates of log wage distributions for labor market regimes with and without collective and firm-level wage agreements and estimate firm-level wage regressions. In the manufacturing sector, average hourly wages paid in accordance with a collective or a firm-level agreement are higher than the average of individually negotiated wages. Yet, unconditional as well as conditional wage dispersion is highest among individual contracts. Differences between regimes increased between the years 1990 and 2001. Similar results are obtained by Bechtel, Mödinger, and Strotmann (2004) based on the GSES subsample for Baden-Württemberg. Multi-level regression models in Stephan and Gerlach (2003, 2005) reveal that differences in individual wages are consistent with a higher

base wage in case of collective coverage. Returns to human capital—skill, experience, and tenure—as well as residual wage dispersion are lower under collective coverage. Gerlach and Stephan (2006b) note that collective agreements compress within-firm compensation schemes across occupations. As Heinbach and Spindler’s (2007) analysis of the GSES waves 1995 and 2001 for West Germany shows, wage premia in firms applying collective contracts are the smaller the higher the position in the (unconditional) wage distribution. Their quantile decomposition analysis in the tradition of Machado and Mata (2005) and Melly (2006) reveals that observed differences across the distribution are mainly due to different bargaining (coefficient) effects as opposed to selection effects (differences in characteristics).

In a companion paper also using the GSES 2001, Kohn and Lembcke (2007) analyze wage distributions for various labor market subgroups by means of kernel density estimation, variance decompositions, and individual and firm-level wage regressions. The thrust of findings confirms a priori expectations. Union impact through collective bargaining results in a higher wage level as well as reduced overall and residual wage dispersion. Yet, there is no clear evidence for disproportionate wage compression from below or a wage floor formed by collectively bargained low wage brackets. Moreover, the impacts are considerably heterogeneous across different labor market groups.

Heinbach (2006) merges the GSES subsample for Baden-Württemberg with information on the existence of an opening clause in collective agreements. When distinguishing between collective agreements with and those without opening clauses in firm-level regressions, he finds that mean wages for blue-collar workers in manufacturing are lower under opening clauses, but no significant wage differences exist for white-collar workers. Moreover, no significant differences exist regarding wage dispersion as measured by the standard deviation of wages.

Gürtzgen (2006) uses a longitudinal data set linking the IAB employment statistics and the IAB establishment panel (LIAB), which provides firm-level information on coverage. She concludes that selection effects are responsible for larger parts of observed premia associated with industry and firm-level contracting. Yet, once selection is accounted for, positive premia for industry-wide contracts in West Germany and for firm-level contracts in East Germany remain. The effect of collective bargaining coverage on the returns to observable attributes turns out negligible in her study.

4 Econometric Investigation

The evidence surveyed in the previous section suggests that both coverage by collective bargaining and a higher union density are associated with lower wage dispersion. Coverage is also associated with higher wage levels while the link between union density and the wage level is ambiguous. The effects of sector-wide collective agreements on wage dispersion seems to be stronger than the effect of firm-level agreements. The literature so far does not distinguish between individual coverage and firm-level coverage and results in the literature on coverage are based on firm-level coverage only. Also, there are no results in the literature regarding the joint impact of coverage and union density on wages.

Our paper is the first analysis which distinguishes between the following types of union wage effects in Germany: (i) union density, (ii) coverage by a firm-level collective agreement versus coverage by sector-wide collective agreements, and (iii) firm-level coverage versus individual coverage. We use a unique data set which allows to distinguish both (ii) and (iii), and we use membership projections from Fitzenberger, Kohn, and Wang (2006) to impute union density to our data set. We carefully analyze the interaction effects between the different measures.

We restrict our analysis to West Germany for two reasons. First, union policy in East Germany is strongly aligned to an adaption of West German standards. So wage policies are not set independently but with regard to West German wages. Second, in case of industrial conflicts, union action in East Germany relies on solidarity from West German unions. It is therefore not reasonable to assume that East German unions set their objectives independently.⁹

4.1 Data

Our study is based on the German Structure of Earnings Survey (GSES, *Gehalts- und Lohnstrukturerhebung*) 2001, a cross-sectional linked employer-employee data set containing about 850,000 employees in some 22,000 firms. While missing essentially the public sector, the GSES covers the major part of industry and private services. There are several advantages to using the GSES 2001. It is one of the largest mandatory surveys available for Germany. The sample not only includes workers in regular employment, but also

⁹When the metal working union *IG Metall* went on strike for the equalization of West and East German hours of work in the year 2003, the union had to rely on “strike tourists” from West Germany to fill their ranks. This was deemed “common practice” by union representatives (DIE WELT, 06/23/2003). However, by the time the strike affected West German firms, the solidarity of West German employee representatives declined rapidly, and the strike was finally broken off.

employees in vocational training, marginal employment, or partial retirement schemes. In contrast to earlier GSES waves and to the IAB linked employer-employee data set (LIAB), wages are neither truncated nor censored so that lower and upper parts of the wage distribution can be analyzed precisely. The data are gathered from firms' official reporting obligations. Therefore, they are more reliable than information from individual-level surveys or data not covered by duties of disclosure (Jacobebbinghaus 2002). Most importantly for our investigation, the GSES provides not only firm-level information on bargaining coverage, but the coverage status for each individual worker.

The GSES 2001 has only recently been made available for research. So far, analyses with GSES data have been restricted to administrative use or to regional subsamples (cf. Fitzenberger and Reize (2002, 2003) and the studies cited in section 3.3). For descriptions of the data set see Hafner (2005) and Statistisches Bundesamt (2000, 2004). We use the on-site-use version of the GSES available in the Research Data Center of the Federal Statistical Office in Wiesbaden. Details on the selection of the data employed in this study are provided in appendix A. We focus on prime-age male employees working full-time and analyze hourly wages for both blue-collar and white-collar workers.¹⁰ Definitions of variables used and summary statistics are displayed in table 1.

Since the GSES does not provide information on union membership, we extend the GSES by imputing individual propensities for union membership from Fitzenberger, Kohn, and Wang (2006), who estimate determinants of union membership using survey data from the German Socio-Economic Panel (GSOEP) for East and West Germany. Net union density (NUD), our measure for union power, is then obtained by means of aggregation at a cell level spanned by the dimensions region (7 states) \times industry (30 sectors) \times skill (4 groups defined by educational attainment) \times age (7 five-year brackets¹¹), yielding a total of 5,841 nonempty cells.

The cell definition is advantageous because it reflects the structure of the German wage bargaining system. The regional dimension and the sector classification account for the fact that collective negotiations take place at the industry level in different bargaining regions (*Tarifbezirke*). The observation that collective agreements further differentiate between various wage groups is captured by the dimensions skill and age. The cell-level aggregation enables us to analyze the effect of union power independent of individual membership. As pointed out above, it would make no sense to estimate individual membership premia.

¹⁰Our analysis combines blue-collar and white-collar workers as unions are assumed to follow one cohesive policy for all represented workers.

¹¹The last age bracket consists only of 55-year-old employees.

4.2 Descriptive Evidence

We focus on the core labor market group of male employees (both blue and white-collar) in West Germany (excluding Berlin) and distinguish the following three regimes of bargaining coverage:

(CC) collective contract negotiated between an employers' association and a union.

(FC) firm-level agreement negotiated between a firm and a union or a works council.

(IC) individual contract negotiated between employee and employer.

The first column of table 2 displays the size of the respective regimes in our GSES sample. The numbers are broadly in line with those in the literature cited above. 57% of West German employees are paid according to a collective contract. With another 8% covered by a firm-level agreement, this leaves about a third of the work force with individual contracts.

Turning to the share of covered employees within firms, figure 1 reveals a bimodal distribution. About 40% of all employees work in firms which do not apply any collective or firm-level agreements at all. Another 7% of employees work in firms with full coverage. This leaves more than one half of all employees in firms with partial coverage which enable us to distinguish between individual and firm-level effects. Among the latter group, firms with relatively high coverage rates dominate.¹²

Table 3 reports summary statistics for cell-level net union density NUD. Whereas the first row reports raw numbers for the cells, the second row provides an employment-weighted measure by summarizing at the individual level.¹³ With respective average NUD of 19 and 23%, net union density is markedly lower than collective bargaining coverage. Again, the numbers match those in the literature.

Columns two to five in table 2 summarize log hourly wages by wage-setting regimes. On average, employees with individual contracts earn the lowest wages (2.786). Wages paid according to a collective agreement are markedly higher (2.810), and the highest wages are paid by firms subject to a firm-level agreement (2.833). Wage dispersion as measured by the standard deviation of log hourly wages is lowest among employees under collective

¹²Note that our analysis does exclude white-collar workers in the highest professional status category who would reasonably be expected to pursue management objectives and who would be paid without reference to collective wage setting.

¹³Note first that the cell dimensions define NUD at a relatively aggregate level. However, NUD is not identical for all employees in a firm. Note second that the statistics at the individual level in table 3 do not summarize imputed individual propensities for union membership, but the assigned cell-level union density.

coverage (0.286) and only slightly higher in case of firm-level contracts (0.314). Employees with individually negotiated wages face a remarkably higher variation (0.420).¹⁴

The descriptive evidence is thus consistent with the considerations in the literature outlined above. Yet, the observed differences in wage levels and wage dispersion are not necessarily caused by the different bargaining regimes. First, they may conceal differences in union power between different labor market segments. Second, they may result from underlying heterogeneity in employee or firm characteristics. Both of these issues are investigated by means of OLS and quantile wage regressions.

4.3 OLS Wage Regressions

We analyze the different channels of union impact on the wage level by means of wage regressions with individual and firm-level controls. Log hourly wage Y are regressed on the set of covariates $X \equiv [Z, F, V]$ including individual worker characteristics Z , firm characteristics F , and a vector of union variables V . The estimates are based on a sample of individuals $i = 1, \dots, N$ in firms $c = 1, \dots, C$. Sampling weights account for different sampling probabilities. Moreover, since our data are sampled with clustering at the firm level and X contains information from different levels of aggregation, the estimated covariance of the estimator $\hat{\beta}$ has to account for clustering (Froot 1989, Moulton 1990, Williams 2000), i.e. standard errors should be consistent with respect to correlation within firms.

The set of possible union variables V contains individual dummy variables for collective contracts (CC) and firm-level contracts (FC), leaving individual contracts as the base category; the shares of employees in each firm covered by a collective contract (SHARECC) or a firm-level contract (SHAREFC); and net union density (NUD) at the cell level. Allowing also for interaction effects between the variables from different levels, a benchmark specification writes

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{ic} = & \beta_0 + Z_{ic}\beta_Z + F_c\beta_F + CC_{ic}\beta_{V1} + FC_{ic}\beta_{V2} \\
& + SHARECC_c\beta_{V3} + SHAREFC_c\beta_{V4} + NUD_{ic}\beta_{V5} \\
& + CC_{ic} \cdot SHARECC_c\beta_{V6} + FC_{ic} \cdot SHAREFC_c\beta_{V7} \\
& + CC_{ic} \cdot NUD_{ic}\beta_{V8} + FC_{ic} \cdot NUD_{ic}\beta_{V9} \\
& + SHARECC_c \cdot NUD_{ic}\beta_{V10} + SHAREFC_c \cdot NUD_{ic}\beta_{V11} + u_{ic},
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

¹⁴More detailed evidence for wage distributions of different groups of employees (men, women working full-time, and women working part-time, separate for blue-collar and white-collar workers in East and West German firms) is provided in the companion paper Kohn and Lembcke (2007).

where β_{V1} to β_{V5} measure base effects, β_{V6} and β_{V7} capture a different nature of individual coverage in high-coverage firms as compared to low-coverage firms, and β_{V8} and β_{V9} allow for the fact that union power may be targeted toward covered employees only. Positive parameters β_{V10} and β_{V11} would indicate that strong unions achieve their wage objective most successfully in high-coverage firms.

Table 4 displays results for different subsets of union variables, using our preferred set of all individual and firm-level covariates.¹⁵ Specification (i), including only dummy variables for individual coverage, yields significant but rather small effects with different signs for collective and firm-level contracts. While employees subject to a collective contract earn 0.9% less than employees with individual contracts, employees with a firm-level contract earn 1.9% more. Results for the shares of covered employees in specification (ii) are different, though. Here, both collective and firm-level contracts show a positive and significant effect, which is in line with comparable firm-level studies reviewed in section 3.3. An increase in the share of employees in a firm covered by a collective (firm-level) contract by 10 percentage points (pp) is associated with a 0.34% (0.67%) increase in wages. Individual coverage and firm-level shares are combined in specification (iii). While the share variables have a pronounced positive effect, individual coverage by firm-level or collective agreement shows negative *ceteris paribus* effects. It therefore proves important to distinguish the effects of individual coverage and firm-level shares of covered employees. The net effects for a covered individual in a firm with full coverage are negative.

Specification (iv) additionally allows for interaction effects, which turn out negative. So individual coverage is particularly detrimental to the individual wage level in firms with a high share of workers covered by a collective agreement. However, this does not hold for firm-level agreements, as the effect of $FC \times SHARE_{FC}$ is small and insignificant. Average partial effects for individual coverage remain negative. For example, the marginal effect for individual coverage by a collective contract, evaluated at the average coverage rate of 0.565, is -10.1% .¹⁶ So an employee in a firm with an average rate of collective coverage *ceteris paribus* earns about 10% less than an uncovered employee in the same firm. In turn, the marginal effect of an increase in the share of covered employees differs between covered and uncovered employees. While both effects are positive, the effect for covered employees is reduced by the interaction term. In combination, the marginal effect for covered employees is a 0.8% wage increase for a 10 pp increase in the share of employees covered by a collective contract, while the wage increase is 1.8% for uncovered employees.

¹⁵For a sensitivity analysis regarding the covariates see table 5 below.

¹⁶ $-0.048 - 0.094 \cdot 0.565 = -0.101$. If not indicated otherwise, illustrative numbers for marginal effects in the following are evaluated at the respective average coverage shares. When interpreting the results of our preferred specification below we explicitly turn to average partial effects.

Specifications (v) to (viii) introduce net union density into the regressions. In all specifications the base effect of net union density has a negative sign and is significant at the 1% level. Moreover, the inclusion of NUD does basically not alter the effects of bargaining coverage. Only the coefficients of CC and FC become slightly more pronounced. Again, we generally find a positive effect of collective coverage at the firm level, but negative ceteris paribus effects of collective bargaining coverage for the individual. In specification (v) the NUD effect takes up the effects of the omitted coverage variables. When coverage effects are included in specification (vi), an increase in NUD of 10 pp is ceteris paribus associated with a decline in wages by about 1%. So either unions put only a small weight on their wage-level objective, or they are not very effective in transforming their power into a wage pay-off. Specification (vii), which additionally allows for interaction of union density and individual coverage, indicates a corresponding decline of about 3% for employees with individual contracts. The positive interaction effects then imply a reduction of only 1% for employees covered by a collective contract, and even a slightly wage-increasing effect of NUD in case of firm-level contracts. So stronger unions achieve higher wages for covered employees only if the bargaining takes place at the firm level. Unions are least effective with respect to—or put least emphasis on—the interests of uncovered employees.

The inclusion of interaction terms between NUD and the coverage shares in specification (viii) does not have additional explanatory power. It neither yields significant coefficients, nor does it raise the R^2 . So we resort to specification (vii) as our preferred specification for further analysis.

Column (c) of table 5 reproduces the results of the preferred specification. In the lower panel of this table we further report average partial effects (APE).¹⁷ The numbers corroborate the above findings. On average, the partial effect of individual coverage is negative, while the firm-level shares of covered employees have a positive effect. This finding would be in line with a risk premium paid to individuals who do not subject themselves to collective bargaining coverage.¹⁸ The APE of net union density is also negative. This result is consistent with an insurance premium in accordance with the insurance motive for union representation as discussed in the literature (Agell and Lommerud 1992, Burda 1995, Fitzenberger and Kohn 2005). Alternatively, it would also

¹⁷The APE of, say, CC is calculated as $\widehat{APE} = \hat{\beta}_{CC} + \hat{\beta}_{CC \times SHARECC} \cdot \overline{SHARECC} + \hat{\beta}_{NUD \times CC} \cdot \overline{NUD}$. With demeaned variables, coefficients could directly be interpreted as average partial effects. However, given our focus to disentangle the different impacts of, say, NUD for covered and for uncovered employees, it is not reasonable to rely on APEs exclusively.

¹⁸Note that our estimations control for a large set of individual and firm characteristics, including, i. a., firm-size and professional status (see table 1). Of course, we can not fully exclude the possibility of selection effects based on unobserved differences within the categories of worker and firm characteristics.

be consistent with the argument that firms in segments with strong unions *ceteris paribus* invest less into capital—which in turn would reduce workers’ productivity and thus their wages (Vogel 2007)—or with the notion that workers who are unemployed because of higher wages in the covered sector put downward pressure on wages in the uncovered sector.

In order to test the sensitivity of our preferred specification with respect to the set of included covariates, table 5 uses our preferred set of union variables and displays the results of specifications including

- (a) no covariates.
- (b) only worker characteristics such as human capital variables (educational attainment, age, tenure) and workplace-related characteristics (region, indicators for shift-work or work on Sundays, etc.).
- (c) worker (see above) and firm characteristics such as size and industry of the firm or average characteristics of the firm’s workforce.¹⁹

Controlling for individual-level and firm-level characteristics notably reduces the partial effects of both collective coverage and net union density, and controls (in cross-sectional wage regressions at least partially) for likely endogeneity issues in union density and coverage. For example, the average partial effect of CC is -9% in specification (c), while it would be -20% in specification (a). For covered employees, the partial effect of SHARECC even changes sign—whereas a higher share of covered employees is associated with a higher wage in specification (c), the effect would be negative in specification (a). The effect of NUD also changes sign between specifications (b) and (c). The latter suggests that the type of endogeneity of NUD differs regarding individual-level and firm-level characteristics. Controlling for individual characteristics increases the estimated NUD coefficients. This result is consistent with NUD being negatively correlated with individual characteristics that tend to be associated with higher wages. Unions tend to represent workers with lower wages. In contrast, controlling for firm-level characteristics reduces the estimated NUD coefficients. This result is consistent with NUD being positively correlated with firm characteristics that tend to be associated with higher wages. The motivation to unionize is larger when there exist rents which could be appropriated from successful firms which tend to pay higher wages.

¹⁹This specification is the same as specification (vii) in table 4. Note that estimating the model with firm-fixed effects is not feasible because the share variables, and in particular the coverage shares, do not vary within a firm.

The findings of the sensitivity analysis highlight the importance of controlling for individual as well as firm-level characteristics to account for these endogeneity issues. The effects of both NUD and bargaining coverage on the level of wages are substantially reduced if the full set of employer-employee information is controlled for. Therefore, for the subsequent quantile regressions, we only report results controlling for both individual and firm-level characteristics.

4.4 Quantile Regression Results

Least squares regressions focus on the wage level (average wage) only. Yet, union effects may be expected to differ across the distribution, reflecting, e. g., union policies targeted specifically towards low-wage earners. This would imply effects on wage dispersion. We analyze differences across the conditional wage distribution by means of quantile regressions, which were introduced by Koenker and Bassett (1978). Analogously to the OLS regressions in the preceding section, sampling weights are employed and inference has to account for clustering. We show in appendix B how to estimate the asymptotic variance $VAR(\hat{\beta}(\tau))$ accounting for weights and cluster effects.²⁰

Table 6 reports quantile regression results for our preferred specification. Again, the upper panel reports regression coefficients and the lower panel the corresponding average partial effects. In general, effects at the median are close to those obtained from least squares estimation, and the estimated coefficients are significant.²¹

The effects of coverage shares at the firm level (both SHARECC and SHAREFC) do not change much across the distribution. So a firm’s decision to apply a collective or a firm-level contract increases wages across the entire distribution in a similar way. However, the negative impact of collective bargaining coverage for the individual is stronger in upper parts of the conditional distribution. While the APE of a collective agreement is -6% at the 10th percentile, it increases up to -12% at the 90th percentile. Therefore, collective coverage at the individual level reduces wage inequality. The adoption of a collective contract is in fact a means to reduce unjustified (as judged on the basis of observable characteristics) pay gaps between employees, thereby encouraging solidarity among the workforce. Since the coverage effect is also negative in the lower part of the wage distribution, there is no evidence for a negative selection out of collective coverage in this part of the distribution. The effect of firm-level agreements on individual wage

²⁰So far, the approach is not standard in econometric software packages such as STATA, the package employed in this paper. Bootstrapping as an alternative way to estimate $VAR(\hat{\beta}(\tau))$ is not feasible due to computational constraints at the Research Data Center.

²¹Only the interaction of FC and SHAREFC is insignificant at all quantiles, as in the OLS regression.

dispersion is also negative, but not as pronounced as that of collective contracts.

The impact of union density also varies markedly across the wage distribution. The negative base effect is strongest at the upper end of the distribution. Yet, the positive interaction effects of NUD and the coverage regimes CC and FC also increase throughout the distribution. Consequently, the differences in the impact of union power on covered and uncovered employees are most severe at the upper end of the distribution. The APE of NUD indicates that, on average, a 10 pp increase in union density comes along with no significant effect at the 10th percentile, and with a significant reduction of 2.4% at the 90th percentile. So in fact, union power reduces wage inequality, which is in line with the insurance motive of union representation discussed in the related literature. However, our findings can not be solely attributed to the insurance motive because then one should find positive wage effects in the lower part of the wage distribution even if the effect on the mean is negative. The uniformly negative effect on wage levels at all quantiles first suggests that negative spillover effects from wage increases and lower employment in the covered sector to the non-covered sector dominate. The hypothesis of a union threat effect is rejected on this ground. Second, firms in labor market segments with strong unions *ceteris paribus* invest less into capital—which reduces labor productivity and wages across the entire distribution (Vogel 2007). We can not discriminate between these two possible explanations.

5 Conclusions

The design of the German wage-setting system suggests to distinguish explicitly between union power as measured by union density and actual bargaining outcomes measured by different regimes of collective bargaining coverage. Using data from the German Structure of Earnings Survey (GSES) 2001, a newly available linked employer-employee data set, we simultaneously analyze both channels of union impact on the structure of wages.

Employing OLS and quantile wage regressions, we find that the firm-level share of employees subject to collective bargaining or firm-level agreements has a positive impact on the average wage—firms which employ a collective contract on average pay higher wages. As Card and de la Rica (2006) reckon, higher wages in firm-level contracts are at least partially a non-competitive phenomenon. Yet, individual bargaining coverage in a covered firm *ceteris paribus* shows a negative impact both on the wage level and on wage dispersion. The negative impact of individual coverage is stronger at higher quantiles of the conditional wage distribution. Collective bargaining coverage thus reduces wage inequality. The findings are in line with the hypothesis that firms apply collective agree-

ments in order to follow a transparent wage policy. However, a risk premium is paid to workers in a covered firm who are not paid according to a collective contract, i. e., to those who are not covered individually. These workers tend to be the more successful workers in the firm and tend not to be unionized. Their wages are determined by negotiations of the individual worker with the firm. Wages of these workers are particularly high in successful firms for which the coverage effect is also high since collective agreements can extract higher rents from the firms.

Having controlled for the varieties of coverage considered, we also find significant effects of net union density on the wage level and on wage dispersion. A higher share of union members in a relevant labor market segment is *ceteris paribus* associated with lower wages, and the effect is strongest among uncovered individuals and at the upper end of the wage distribution. At the same time, a higher union density reinforces the positive wage effects of coverage at the firm level. A higher union density also reduces wage dispersion. This is in line with an insurance motive of union representation. However, the uniform decline of wages in the uncovered sector across the entire wage distribution in response to an increase in union density requires a further explanation. This finding may be due to a decline of firms' capital investment when union density increases (Vogel 2007) or to downward pressure on wages because of an increase in labor supply in the uncovered sector brought about by higher wages—and thus lower employment—in the covered sector. Our analysis does not allow us to distinguish between these two hypotheses, which should be explored in future research.

Our results highlight the importance of using linked employer-employee data in order to control for worker as well as firm characteristics when evaluating union effects. Unfortunately, our estimations can not take account of the apparent endogeneity of union density and collective coverage, and so the results should not be interpreted as causal effects. The cross-sectional data do not provide adequate instruments for exclusion restrictions. Empirical evidence in the literature regarding the endogeneity of union status variables is ambiguous; see Robinson (1989), Card (1996), and DiNardo and Lee (2004). However, the endogeneity problem in our study is reduced by controlling for both individual and firm characteristics. Future research might explore further the interaction of unions and collective bargaining with country-specific institutions (Addison, Teixeira, and Zwick (2006), Hübler and Jirjahn (2003), and Klikauer (2004)).

References

- ADDISON, J. T., AND C. SCHNABEL (eds.) (2003): *International Handbook of Trade Unions*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- ADDISON, J. T., P. TEIXEIRA, AND T. ZWICK (2006): “Works Councils and the Anatomy of Wages,” Discussion Paper 2474, IZA.
- AGELL, J. (1999): “On the Benefits from Rigid Labour Markets: Norms, Market Failures, and Social Insurance,” *Economic Journal*, 109(453), F143–F164.
- (2002): “On the Determinants of Labour Market Institutions: Rent-Seeking vs. Social Insurance,” *German Economic Review*, 3(2), 107–135.
- AGELL, J., AND K. E. LOMMERUD (1992): “Union Egalitarianism as Income Insurance,” *Economica*, 59(235), 295–310.
- AKERLOF, G. A. (1980): “A Theory of Social Custom, of Which Unemployment May be One Consequence,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 94(4), 749–775.
- ANDREWS, M. J., M. B. STEWART, J. K. SWAFFIELD, AND R. UPWARD (1998): “The estimation of union wage differentials and the impact of methodological choices,” *Labour Economics*, 5(4), 449–474.
- ANGRIST, J., V. CHERNOZHUKOV, AND I. FERNÁNDEZ-VAL (2004): “Quantile Regression under Misspecification, with an Application to the U.S. Wage Structure,” Working Paper 10428, NBER.
- (2006): “Quantile Regression under Misspecification, with an Application to the U.S. Wage Structure,” *Econometrica*, 74(2), 539–563.
- BAUER, T., H. BONIN, AND U. SUNDE (2003): “Real and Nominal Wage Rigidities and the Rate of Inflation: Evidence from German Micro Data,” Discussion Paper 959, IZA.
- BECHTEL, S., P. MÖDINGER, AND H. STROTMANN (2004): “Tarif- und Lohnstrukturen in Baden-Württemberg: Entwicklung und Einfluss der Tarifbindung auf Verdiensthöhe und -streuung,” *Statistische Analysen*, 7/2004, 1–44.
- BECK, M., AND B. FITZENBERGER (2004): “Changes in Union Membership Over Time: A Panel Analysis for West Germany,” *Labour*, 18(3), 329–362.

- BELLMANN, L., S. KOHAUT, AND C. SCHNABEL (1999): “Flächentarifverträge im Zeichen von Abwanderung und Widerspruch: Geltungsbereich, Einflußfaktoren und Öffnungstendenzen,” in *Panelanalysen zu Lohnstruktur, Qualifikation und Beschäftigungsdynamik*, ed. by L. Bellmann, and V. Steiner, Beiträge zur Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung 229, pp. 11–40. Institut für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung, Nürnberg.
- BISPINCK, R., AND T. SCHULTEN (2003): “Verbetrieblichung der Tarifpolitik? Aktuelle Tendenzen und Einschätzungen aus Sicht von Betriebs- und Personalräten,” *WSI Mitteilungen*, 3/2003, 157–166.
- BLAKEMORE, A. E., J. C. HUNT, AND B. F. KIKER (1986): “Collective Bargaining and Union Membership Effects on the Wages of Male Youths,” *Journal of Labor Economics*, 4(2), 193–211.
- BMWA (2004): *Tarifvertragliche Arbeitsbedingungen im Jahr 2003*. Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Arbeit, <http://www.bmwa.bund.de/Navigation/Arbeit/arbeitsrecht.html>, Feb. 2004.
- BOOTH, A. L. (1985): “The Free Rider Problem and a Social Custom Model of Trade Union Membership,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 100(1), 253–261.
- BÜTTNER, T., AND B. FITZENBERGER (1998): “Central Wage Bargaining and Local Wage Flexibility: Evidence from the Entire Wage Distribution,” Discussion Paper 98-39, ZEW Mannheim.
- (2003): “Integrating wage bargaining into an efficiency wage model: The relationship between wages and unemployment revisited,” unpublished manuscript, University of Mannheim.
- BURDA, M. C. (1995): “Unions and Wage Insurance,” Discussion Paper 1232, CEPR.
- CALMFORS, L. (1993): “Centralisation of Wage Bargaining and Macroeconomic Performance: A Survey,” Economics Department Working Papers 131, OECD, Paris.
- CARD, D. (1996): “The Effect of Unions on the Structure of Wages: A Longitudinal Analysis,” *Econometrica*, 64(4), 957–979.
- CARD, D., AND S. DE LA RICA (2006): “Firm-level contracting and the structure of wages in Spain,” *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 59(4), 573–592.

- CARD, D., T. LEMIEUX, AND W. C. RIDDELL (2003): “Unions and the wage structure,” in *International Handbook of Trade Unions*, ed. by J. T. Addison, and C. Schnabel, chap. 8, pp. 246–292. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- CARDOSO, A. R., AND P. PORTUGAL (2005): “Contractual Wages and the Wage Cushion under Different Bargaining Settings,” *Journal of Labor Economics*, 23(4), 875–902.
- DELL’ARINGA, C., AND C. LUCIFORA (1994): “Collective bargaining and relative earnings in Italy,” *European Journal of Political Economy*, 10, 727–747.
- DiNARDO, J., AND D. S. LEE (2004): “Economic Impacts of New Unionization on Private Sector Employers: 1984–2001,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 119(4), 1383–1441.
- DUSTMANN, C., AND U. SCHÖNBERG (2004): “Training and Union Wages,” Discussion Paper 1435, IZA.
- EBBINGHAUS, B. (2003): “Die Mitgliederentwicklung deutscher Gewerkschaften im historischen und internationalen Vergleich,” in *Die Gewerkschaften in Politik und Gesellschaft der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*, ed. by W. Schroeder, and B. Weßels, pp. 174–203. Westdeutscher Verlag.
- FARBER, H. S. (1986): “The Analysis of Union Behavior,” in *Handbook of Labor Economics*, ed. by O. Ashenfelter, and R. Layard, vol. 2, chap. 18, pp. 1039–1089. Elsevier Science, Amsterdam.
- FICHTER, M. (1997): “Trade Union Members: A Vanishing Species in Post-Unification Germany?,” *German Studies Review*, 20(1), 83–104.
- FITZENBERGER, B. (1999): *Wages and Employment Across Skill Groups: An Analysis for West Germany*. Physica, Heidelberg.
- FITZENBERGER, B., I. HAGGENEY, AND M. ERNST (1999): “Wer ist noch Mitglied in Gewerkschaften? Eine Panelanalyse für Westdeutschland,” *Zeitschrift für Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften*, 119, 223–263.
- FITZENBERGER, B., AND K. KOHN (2005): “Gleicher Lohn für gleiche Arbeit? – Zum Zusammenhang zwischen Gewerkschaftsmitgliedschaft und Lohnstruktur in Westdeutschland 1985–1997,” *Zeitschrift für ArbeitsmarktForschung*, 38(2/3), 125–146.

- FITZENBERGER, B., K. KOHN, AND Q. WANG (2006): “The Erosion of Union Membership in Germany: Determinants, Densities, Decompositions,” Discussion Paper 2193, IZA.
- FITZENBERGER, B., AND F. REIZE (2002): “Verdienstanalyse für das frühere Bundesgebiet – Verteilung, Differenziale und Wachstum auf Basis der Gehalts- und Lohnstrukturerhebung,” *Wirtschaft und Statistik*, 12/2002, 1106–1114.
- (2003): “Quantilsregressionen der westdeutschen Verdienste: Ein Vergleich zwischen Gehalts- und Lohnstrukturerhebung und der IAB-Beschäftigtenstichprobe,” in *Empirische Wirtschaftsforschung: Methoden und Anwendungen*, ed. by W. Franz, H. J. Ramser, and M. Stadler, pp. 255–282. Mohr Siebeck, Wirtschaftswissenschaftliches Seminar Ottobeuren 32.
- FLANAGAN, R. J. (1999): “Macroeconomic Performance and Collective Bargaining: An International Perspective,” *Journal of Economic Literature*, 37(3), 1150–1175.
- FREEMAN, R. B. (1982): “Union Wage Practices and Wage Dispersion Within Establishments,” *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 36(1), 3–21.
- FREEMAN, R. B., AND J. L. MEDOFF (1981): “The Impact of the Percentage Organized on Union and Nonunion Wages,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 63(4), 561–572.
- FROOT, K. A. (1989): “Consistent Covariance Matrix Estimation with Cross-Sectional Dependence and Heteroskedasticity in Financial Data,” *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 24(3), 333–355.
- GERLACH, K., AND G. STEPHAN (2002): “Tarifverträge und Lohnstruktur in Niedersachsen,” *Statistische Monatshefte Niedersachsen*, 56(10), 543–552.
- (2006a): “Bargaining regimes and wage dispersion,” *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik*, 126(6), 629–649.
- (2006b): “Pay Policies of Firms and Collective Wage Contracts – An Uneasy Partnership?,” *Industrial Relations*, 45(1), 47–67.
- (2006c): “Tarifverträge und betriebliche Entlohnungsstrukturen,” in *Auf allen Märkten zu Hause: Gedenkschrift für Franz Haslinger*, ed. by C. Clemens, M. Heineemann, and S. Soretz, pp. 123–143. Metropolis, Marburg.
- GOERKE, L., AND M. PANNENBERG (2004): “Norm-Based Trade Union Membership: Evidence for Germany,” *German Economic Review*, 5(4), 481–504.

- GÜRTZGEN, N. (2006): “The Effect of Firm- and Industry-Level Contracts on Wages – Evidence from Longitudinal Linked Employer-Employee Data,” Discussion Paper 06-82, ZEW Mannheim.
- GUIISO, L., L. PISTAFERRI, AND F. SCHIVARDI (2005): “Insurance within the Firm,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 113(5), 1054–1087.
- HAFNER, H.-P. (2005): “Gehalts- und Lohnstrukturerhebung im Produzierenden Gewerbe und im Dienstleistungsbereich 2001,” Dokumentation, Statistische Ämter des Bundes und der Länder – Forschungsdatenzentrum.
- HALL, P., AND S. J. SHEATHER (1988): “On the Distribution of a Studentized Quantile,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 50(3), 381–391.
- HARTOG, J., E. LEUVEN, AND C. TEULINGS (2002): “Wages and the bargaining regime in a corporatist setting: the Netherlands,” *European Journal of Political Economy*, 18, 317–331.
- HÜBLER, O., AND U. JIRJAHN (2003): “Works Councils and Collective Bargaining in Germany: The Impact on Productivity and Wages,” *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 50(4), 471–491.
- HEINBACH, W. D. (2006): “Bargained Wages in Decentralized Bargaining Regimes,” Discussion Paper 26, IAW Tübingen.
- HEINBACH, W. D., AND M. SPINDLER (2007): “To Bind or Not to Bind Collectively? – Decomposition of Bargained Wage Differences Using Counterfactual Distributions,” unpublished manuscript, IAW Tübingen.
- HENDRICKS, W., AND R. KOENKER (1992): “Hierarchical Spline Models for Conditional Quantiles and the Demand for Electricity,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 87(417), 58–68.
- HIRSCHMANN, A. O. (1970): *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty – Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- HUNT, J. C., B. F. KIKER, AND C. G. WILLIAMS (1987): “The Effect of Type of Union on Member-Nonmember Wage Differentials,” *Journal of Labor Research*, 8(1), 59–65.
- JACOBEBBINGHAUS, P. (2002): “Die Lohnverteilung in Haushaltsdatensätzen und in amtlich erhobenen Firmendaten,” *Wirtschaft und Statistik*, 3/2002, 209–221.

- KELLER, B. (2005): “Union Formation through Merger: The Case of Ver.di in Germany,” *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 43(2), 209–232.
- KLIKAUER, T. (2004): “Trade union shopfloor representation in Germany,” *Industrial Relations Journal*, 35(1), 2–18.
- KOENKER, R. (1994): “Confidence Intervals for Regression Quantiles,” in *Asymptotic Statistics: Proceeding of the 5th Prague Symposium on Asymptotic Statistics*, ed. by P. Mandl, and M. Hušková, pp. 349–354. Physica, Heidelberg.
- (2005): *Quantile Regression*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- KOENKER, R., AND G. BASSETT, JR. (1978): “Regression Quantiles,” *Econometrica*, 46(1), 33–50.
- KOEVOETS, W. (2007): “Union wage premiums in Great Britain: Coverage or membership?,” *Labour Economics*, 14(1), 53–71.
- KOHAUT, S., AND L. BELLMANN (1997): “Betriebliche Determinanten der Tarifbindung: Eine empirische Analyse auf der Basis des IAB-Betriebspanels 1995,” *Industrielle Beziehungen*, 4, 317–334.
- KOHAUT, S., AND C. SCHNABEL (2003a): “Tarifverträge – nein danke!? Ausmaß und Einflussfaktoren der Tarifbindung west- und ostdeutscher Betriebe,” *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik*, 223(3), 312–331.
- (2003b): “Zur Erosion des Flächentarifvertrags: Ausmaß, Einflussfaktoren und Gegenmaßnahmen,” *Industrielle Beziehungen*, 10(2), 193–219.
- KOHN, K., AND A. C. LEMBCKE (2007): “Wage Distributions by Bargaining Regime – Linked Employer-Employee Data Evidence from Germany,” *ASTA Wirtschafts- und Sozialstatistisches Archiv*, 1, 247–261.
- LEWIS, H. G. (1986): *Union Relative Wage Effects: A Survey*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- LORENZ, W., AND J. WAGNER (1991): “Bestimmungsgründe von Gewerkschaftsmitgliedschaft und Organisationsgrad – eine ökonometrische Analyse auf Mikrodatenbasis für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland,” *Zeitschrift für Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften*, 111, 65–82.

- MACHADO, J. A. F., AND J. MATA (2005): “Counterfactual Decomposition of Changes in Wage Distributions using Quantile Regression,” *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 20(4), 445–465.
- MELLY, B. (2006): “Estimation of counterfactual distributions using quantile regression,” unpublished manuscript, University of St. Gallen.
- MORTENSEN, D. T., AND C. A. PISSARIDES (1999): “New Developments in Models of Search in the Labor Market,” in *Handbook of Labor Economics*, ed. by O. Ashenfelter, and D. Card, vol. 3, chap. 39, pp. 2567–2627. Elsevier Science, Amsterdam, London, New York.
- MOULTON, B. R. (1990): “An Illustration of a Pitfall in Estimating the Effects of Aggregate Variables on Micro Units,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 72(2), 334–338.
- NAYLOR, R. (2003): “Economic models of union behaviour,” in *International Handbook of Trade Unions*, ed. by J. T. Addison, and C. Schnabel, chap. 3, pp. 44–85. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- OECD (ed.) (1994): *OECD Employment Outlook*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris.
- (ed.) (2006): *OECD Employment Outlook – Boosting Jobs and Incomes*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris.
- OLSON, M. (1965): *The Logic of Collective Action*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- OSWALD, A. J. (1985): “The Economic Theory of Trade Unions: An Introductory Survey,” *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 87(2), 160–193.
- PFEIFFER, F. (2003): *Lohnrigiditäten im gemischten Lohnbildungssystem*, vol. 65 of *ZEW Wirtschaftsanalysen*. Nomos, Baden-Baden.
- ROBINSON, C. (1989): “The Joint Determination of Union Status and Union Wage Effects: Some Tests of Alternative Models,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 97(3), 639–667.
- SCHNABEL, C. (2005): “Gewerkschaften und Arbeitgeberverbände: Organisationsgrade, Tarifbindung und Einflüsse auf Löhne und Beschäftigung,” *Zeitschrift für ArbeitsmarktForschung*, 38(2/3), 181–196.

- SCHNABEL, C., AND J. WAGNER (2003): "Trade Union Membership in Eastern and Western Germany: Convergence or Divergence?," *Applied Economics Quarterly*, 49, 213–232.
- (2005): "Determinants of Trade Union Membership in Western Germany: Evidence from Micro Data, 1980–2000," *Socio-Economic Review*, 3, 1–24.
- (2007): "The Persistent Decline in Unionization in Western and Eastern Germany, 1980–2004: What Can We Learn from a Decomposition Analysis?," *Industrielle Beziehungen*, 14(2), 118–132.
- SCHUMACHER, E. J. (1999): "What Explains Wage Differences Between Union Members and Covered Nonmembers?," *Southern Economic Journal*, 65(3), 493–512.
- STATISTISCHES BUNDESAMT (2000): "Gehalts- und Lohnstrukturerhebung 2001 – Methodische Grundlagen der Erstellung des Auswahlplanes," Dokumentation, Wiesbaden.
- (2004): "Gehalts- und Lohnstrukturerhebung 2001," Fachserie Löhne und Gehälter 16, 1.
- STEPHAN, G., AND K. GERLACH (2003): "Firmenlohndifferenziale und Tarifverträge: Eine Mehrebenenanalyse," *Mitteilungen aus der Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung*, 36(4), 525–538.
- (2005): "Wage settlements and wage setting: results from a multi-level model," *Applied Economics*, 37, 2297–2306.
- STEWART, M. B. (1987): "Collective Bargaining Arrangements, Closed Shops and Relative Pay," *Economic Journal*, 97, 140–156.
- VOGEL, T. (2007): "Wage Compression in Collectively Bargained Labour Contracts," unpublished manuscript, Humboldt University Berlin.
- WILLIAMS, R. L. (2000): "A Note on Robust Variance Estimation for Cluster-Correlated Data," *Biometrics*, 56, 645–646.

A German Structure of Earnings Survey 2001

The German Structure of Earnings Survey (GSES, *Gehalts- und Lohnstrukturerhebung*) 2001 is a linked employer-employee data set administered by the German Statistical Office in accordance with European and German law (European Council Regulation (EC) No 530/1999, amended by EC 1916/2000; German Law on Wage Statistics, *LohnStatG*). It is a sample of all firms in manufacturing and private service sectors with at least ten employees. Sampling takes place at the firm or establishment level. At a first stage, firms are randomly drawn from every Federal State, where the sampling probability varies between 5.3% for the largest state (North Rhine-Westphalia) and 19.4% for the smallest (Bremen). At the second stage, employees are randomly chosen from the firms sampled at the first stage. The share of employees sampled depends upon the firm size and ranges between 6.25% for the largest firms and 100% for firms with less than 20 employees. The data set provides sampling weights.

The GSES 2001 is available for on-site use at Research Centers of the Federal States' Statistical Offices (FDZ) since the year 2005. This study uses an anonymized use-file which includes all firms and employees from the original data except for one firm in Berlin (the only firm in Berlin falling into NACE section C). Regional information is condensed to 12 "states", and some industries have been aggregated at the two-digit level. Overall, the use-file consists of 22,040 sites with 846,156 sampled employees.

We focus on prime-age (25–55-year-old) male full-time employees in West Germany (without Berlin), including both blue and white-collar workers. Employees in vocational training, interns, and employees subject to partial retirement schemes are left out because compensation for these groups does not follow the regular compensation schedule, but special regulations or even special collective bargaining agreements do apply. We also exclude white-collar workers in the highest professional status category (category 1) who can reasonably be expected to pursue management objectives and whose wages are hardly in the focus of collective wage setting. Individuals who worked less than 90% of their contractual working hours in October 2001 and individuals paid subject to a collective contract with a missing identification number for the agreement are dropped.

Part-time and full-time employees are distinguished based on the employer's assessment recorded in the GSES. For blue-collar workers, actual working time and not contractual working time is relevant for monthly payments. We exclude individuals with an actual working time of more than 390 hours in October 2001.

We analyze gross hourly wages including premia. This measure is more appropriate than wages without premia if premia are paid on a regular basis. We impose a lower

bound of one euro for hourly wages.

B Standard Errors for Quantile Regression with Sampling Weights and Clustering

The asymptotic distribution of $\beta(\tau)$ for a given quantile τ in a non-iid setting is

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{\beta}(\tau) - \beta(\tau)) \sim N(0, J(\tau)^{-1}\Sigma(\tau)J(\tau)^{-1}) \quad (2)$$

with

$$\Sigma(\tau) \equiv E[(\tau - \mathbf{1}\{Y < X'\beta(\tau)\})^2 XX'] \quad (3)$$

and

$$J(\tau) \equiv E[f_y(X'\beta(\tau)|X)XX'] = E[f_u(0|X)XX'], \quad (4)$$

assuming a correctly specified model (Angrist, Chernozhukov, and Fernández-Val 2006). f_u denotes the density of the error term; compare Hendricks and Koenker (1992), Koenker (2005), and Melly (2006).

We estimate $VAR(\hat{\beta}(\tau))$ by

$$\widehat{VAR}(\hat{\beta}(\tau)) = \frac{1}{N}\hat{J}(\tau)^{-1}\hat{\Sigma}(\tau)\hat{J}(\tau)^{-1} \quad (5)$$

with

$$\hat{\Sigma}(\tau) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N(\tau - \mathbf{1}\{Y_i < X_i'\hat{\beta}(\tau)\})^2 X_i X_i' \quad (6)$$

and

$$\hat{J}(\tau) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \hat{f}_i X_i X_i' \quad (7)$$

for the case without weights and without clustering. We use the ‘‘Hendricks-Koenker sandwich’’

$$\hat{f}_i = 2h_N / (X_i'(\hat{\beta}(\tau + h_N) - \hat{\beta}(\tau - h_N))) \quad (8)$$

and employ Hall and Sheater’s (1988) rule for the bandwidth h_N :

$$h_N = \frac{1}{N^{1/3}} z_\alpha^{2/3} [1.5s(\tau)/s''(\tau)]^{1/3}, \quad (9)$$

where z_α satisfies $\Phi(z_\alpha) = 1 - \alpha/2$ for the construction of $1 - \alpha$ confidence intervals and $s(\tau)$ denotes the sparsity function.²² As in Koenker (1994), we use the normal distribution to estimate

$$s(\tau)/s''(\tau) = \frac{f^2}{2(f'/f)^2 + [(f'/f)^2 - f''/f]} = \frac{\phi(\Phi(\tau)^{-1})^2}{2(\Phi(\tau)^{-1})^2 + 1}. \quad (10)$$

In analogy to Angrist, Chernozhukov, and Fernández-Val (2004), we take account of sampling weights by replacing (6) with

$$\hat{\Sigma}(\tau) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i^2 (\tau - \mathbf{1}\{Y_i < X_i' \hat{\beta}(\tau)\})^2 X_i X_i' \quad (11)$$

and (7) with

$$\hat{J}(\tau) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \hat{f}_i X_i X_i'. \quad (12)$$

Clustering allows for dependence of observations within clusters (see Froot (1989), Moulton (1990), or Williams (2000) for the case of OLS). We take account of clustering at the firm level and acknowledge that the sampling weights in the GSES are equal for all individuals $i = 1, \dots, N_c$ within a cluster c . With sampling weights w_c normalized to sum to one, $\sum_{c=1}^C w_c = 1$, (11) and (12) generalize to

$$\hat{\Sigma}(\tau) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{c=1}^C w_c^2 \sum_{i=1}^{N_c} \sum_{j=1}^{N_c} X_{ic} (\tau - \mathbf{1}\{Y_{ic} < X_{ic}' \hat{\beta}(\tau)\}) (\tau - \mathbf{1}\{Y_{jc} < X_{jc}' \hat{\beta}(\tau)\}) X_{jc}' \quad (13)$$

and

$$\hat{J}(\tau) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{c=1}^C w_c \sum_{i=1}^{N_c} \hat{f}_{ic} X_{ic} X_{ic}'. \quad (14)$$

²²The sandwich formula is extensively described in Koenker (2005, pp. 79–80). Koenker also mentions the “Powell sandwich”, which is employed by, e. g., Angrist, Chernozhukov, and Fernández-Val (2006).

C Tables and Figures

Table 1: Definition of Variables

| Label | Description | mean | std. dev. |
|------------------|--|-------|-----------|
| Individual Level | | | |
| AGE | Age in years/10. | 3.963 | 0.799 |
| AGESQ | AGE squared. | 16.34 | 6.441 |
| TENURE | Tenure in years/10. | 0.924 | 0.923 |
| TENURESQ | TENURE squared. | 1.705 | 2.716 |
| LOW_EDUC | Low level of education: no training beyond a school degree (or no school degree at all). | 0.144 | 0.351 |
| MED_EDUC | Intermediate level of education: vocational training. | 0.679 | 0.467 |
| HIGH_EDUC | High level of education: university or technical college degree. | 0.108 | 0.311 |
| NA_EDUC | Missing information on the level of education. | 0.069 | 0.253 |
| BC_STAT1 | Blue-collar worker, professional status category 1: vocationally trained or comparably experienced worker with special skills and highly involved tasks. | 0.119 | 0.323 |
| BC_STAT2 | Blue-collar worker, professional status category 2: vocationally trained or comparably experienced worker. | 0.225 | 0.418 |
| BC_STAT3 | Blue-collar worker, professional status category 3: worker trained on-the-job. | 0.156 | 0.363 |
| BC_STAT4 | Blue-collar worker, professional status category 4: laborer. | 0.084 | 0.277 |
| WC_STAT2 | White-collar worker, professional status category 2: executive employee with limited procuration. | 0.162 | 0.369 |
| WC_STAT3 | White-collar worker, professional status category 3: employee with special skills or experience who works on his own responsibility on highly involved or complex tasks. | 0.103 | 0.303 |
| WC_STAT4 | White-collar worker, professional status category 4: vocationally trained or comparably experienced employee who works autonomously on involved tasks. | 0.104 | 0.305 |
| WC_STAT5 | White-collar worker, professional status category 5: vocationally trained or comparably experienced employee working autonomously. | 0.040 | 0.196 |
| WC_STAT6 | White-collar worker, professional status category 6: employee working on simple tasks. | 0.008 | 0.087 |
| NIGHT | Individual worked night shifts. | 0.228 | 0.436 |
| SUNDAY | Individual worked on Sundays or on holidays. | 0.153 | 0.391 |
| SHIFT | Individual worked shift. | 0.147 | 0.354 |
| OVERTIME | Individual worked overtime. | 0.264 | 0.441 |
| Firm Level | | | |
| S_FEM | Share of female employees. | 0.325 | 0.241 |
| S_AGE1 | Share of employees of age 20 or younger. | 0.041 | 0.067 |
| S_AGE2 | Share of employees of age 21–25. | 0.078 | 0.075 |
| S_AGE3 | Share of employees of age 26–30. | 0.096 | 0.074 |
| S_AGE4 | Share of employees of age 31–35. | 0.145 | 0.082 |
| S_AGE5 | Share of employees of age 36–40. | 0.174 | 0.069 |
| S_AGE6 | Share of employees of age 41–45. | 0.143 | 0.076 |
| S_AGE7 | Share of employees of age 46–50. | 0.121 | 0.075 |

Continued on next page...

... table 1 continued

| Label | Description | mean | std. dev. |
|-------------|---|-------|-----------|
| S_AGE8 | Share of employees of age 51–55. | 0.103 | 0.073 |
| S_AGE9 | Share of employees of age 56–60. | 0.068 | 0.063 |
| S_AGE10 | Share of employees of age 61 or older. | 0.042 | 0.056 |
| S_TENURE1 | Share of employees with less than 1 year of tenure. | 0.162 | 0.157 |
| S_TENURE2 | Share of employees with 1–2 years of tenure. | 0.205 | 0.150 |
| S_TENURE3 | Share of employees with 3–5 years of tenure. | 0.150 | 0.125 |
| S_TENURE4 | Share of employees with 6–10 years of tenure. | 0.168 | 0.120 |
| S_TENURE5 | Share of employees with 11–15 years of tenure. | 0.117 | 0.097 |
| S_TENURE6 | Share of employees with 16–20 years of tenure. | 0.064 | 0.072 |
| S_TENURE7 | Share of employees with 21–25 years of tenure. | 0.055 | 0.068 |
| S_TENURE8 | Share of employees with 26–30 years of tenure. | 0.039 | 0.059 |
| S_TENURE9 | Share of employees with 31 or more years of tenure. | 0.038 | 0.062 |
| S_LOW_EDUC | Share of employees with LOW_EDUC. | 0.198 | 0.194 |
| S_MED_EDUC | Share of employees with MED_EDUC. | 0.639 | 0.227 |
| S_HIGH_EDUC | Share of employees with HIGH_EDUC. | 0.072 | 0.136 |
| S_NA_EDUC | Share of employees with NA_EDUC. | 0.113 | 0.229 |
| HOURSWORKED | Average hours worked in the firm. | 154.2 | 23.7 |
| S_IRREG | Share of employees for whom any of NIGHT, SUNDAY, or SHIFT applies. | 0.178 | 0.232 |
| S_OVERTIME | Share of employees working overtime. | 0.178 | 0.260 |
| S_BC | Share of blue collar workers. | 0.478 | 0.327 |
| S_NOT_FT | Share of employees who do not work full-time. | 0.224 | 0.212 |
| FIRMSIZE1 | Firm has between 10 and 49 employees. | 0.416 | 0.493 |
| FIRMSIZE2 | Firm has between 50 and 249 employees. | 0.350 | 0.477 |
| FIRMSIZE3 | Firm has between 250 and 499 employees. | 0.109 | 0.312 |
| FIRMSIZE4 | Firm has between 500 and 999 employees. | 0.073 | 0.260 |
| FIRMSIZE5 | Firm has between 1000 and 1999 employees. | 0.040 | 0.195 |
| FIRMSIZE6 | Firm has 2000 or more employees. | 0.020 | 0.140 |
| SECTOR1 | Mining and quarrying (NACE: 10–14) | 0.011 | 0.105 |
| SECTOR2 | Manufacture of food products, beverages and tobacco (NACE: 15–16) | 0.034 | 0.181 |
| SECTOR3 | Manufacture of textiles and textile products; leather and leather products (NACE: 17–19) | 0.019 | 0.138 |
| SECTOR4 | Manufacture of wood and wood products; pulp, paper and paper products (NACE: 20–21) | 0.033 | 0.179 |
| SECTOR5 | Publishing, printing and reproduction of recorded media (NACE: 22) | 0.036 | 0.186 |
| SECTOR6 | Manufacture of coke, refined petroleum products and nuclear fuel; chemicals and chemical products (NACE: 23–24) | 0.027 | 0.162 |
| SECTOR7 | Manufacture of rubber and plastic products (NACE: 25) | 0.033 | 0.178 |
| SECTOR8 | Manufacture of other non-metallic mineral products (NACE: 26) | 0.028 | 0.164 |
| SECTOR9 | Manufacture of basic metals; fabricated metal products, except from machinery and equipment (NACE: 27–28) | 0.055 | 0.229 |
| SECTOR10 | Manufacture of machinery and equipment n.e.c. (NACE: 29) | 0.045 | 0.207 |
| SECTOR11 | Manufacture of electrical machinery and apparatus n.e.c. (NACE: 31) | 0.025 | 0.157 |
| SECTOR12 | Manufacture of electrical and optical equipment; radio, television, and communication equipment and apparatus (NACE: 30 + 32) | 0.021 | 0.144 |

Continued on next page...

... table 1 continued

| Label | Description | mean | std. dev. |
|----------|--|-------|-----------|
| SECTOR13 | Manufacture of medical, precision and optical instruments, watches and clocks (NACE: 33) | 0.023 | 0.149 |
| SECTOR14 | Manufacture of transport equipment (NACE: 34-35) | 0.032 | 0.176 |
| SECTOR15 | Manufacture n.e.c. (NACE: 36-37) | 0.024 | 0.154 |
| SECTOR16 | Electricity, gas and water supply (NACE: 40-41) | 0.025 | 0.155 |
| SECTOR17 | Construction (NACE: 45) | 0.082 | 0.274 |
| SECTOR18 | Sale, maintenance and repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles; retail sale of automotive fuel (NACE: 50) | 0.031 | 0.173 |
| SECTOR19 | Wholesale trade and commission trade except of motor vehicles and motorcycles (NACE: 51) | 0.056 | 0.231 |
| SECTOR20 | Retail trade, except from motor vehicles and motorcycles; repair of personal and household goods (NACE: 52) | 0.050 | 0.219 |
| SECTOR21 | Hotels and restaurants (NACE: 55) | 0.027 | 0.161 |
| SECTOR22 | Land transport; transport via pipelines; air transport (NACE: 60 + 62) | 0.028 | 0.165 |
| SECTOR23 | Water transport (NACE: 61) | 0.008 | 0.088 |
| SECTOR24 | Supporting and auxiliary transport activities; activities of travel agencies (NACE: 63) | 0.044 | 0.204 |
| SECTOR25 | Post and telecommunications (NACE: 64) | 0.023 | 0.150 |
| SECTOR26 | Financial intermediation, except from insurance and pension funding; activities auxiliary to financial intermediation, except from insurance and pension funding (NACE: 65 + 67.1) | 0.022 | 0.148 |
| SECTOR27 | Insurance and pension funding, except compulsory social security; activities auxiliary to insurance and pension funding (NACE: 66 + 67.2) | 0.016 | 0.126 |
| SECTOR28 | Real estate activities; renting of machinery and equipment without operator and of personal and household goods (NACE: 70-71) | 0.015 | 0.123 |
| SECTOR29 | Computer and related activities (NACE: 72) | 0.022 | 0.146 |
| SECTOR30 | Research and development; other business activities (NACE: 73-74) | 0.075 | 0.264 |
| PUBLIC1 | Firm is privately owned. | 0.923 | 0.267 |
| PUBLIC2 | Firm is partly public-owned (<50%). | 0.021 | 0.144 |
| PUBLIC3 | Firm is mainly public-owned (>50%). | 0.056 | 0.230 |
| REGION1 | Firm is located in Schleswig-Holstein or Hamburg. | 0.106 | 0.308 |
| REGION2 | Firm is located in Lower Saxony or Bremen. | 0.158 | 0.365 |
| REGION3 | Firm is located in North Rhine-Westphalia. | 0.203 | 0.402 |
| REGION4 | Firm is located in Hesse. | 0.105 | 0.306 |
| REGION5 | Firm is located in Rhineland-Palatinate or Saarland. | 0.104 | 0.305 |
| REGION6 | Firm is located in Baden-Württemberg. | 0.158 | 0.365 |
| REGION7 | Firm is located in Bavaria. | 0.166 | 0.372 |


Data source: Extended GSES 2001.

Table 2: Wage Setting Regimes and Wages

| regime | coverage share | log hourly wages | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------|-------|-----------|
| | | mean | min | max | std. dev. |
| collective coverage (CC) | 0.565 | 2.810 | 0.056 | 4.700 | 0.286 |
| firm-level coverage (FC) | 0.075 | 2.833 | 1.434 | 4.754 | 0.314 |
| individual contract (IC) | 0.360 | 2.786 | 0.046 | 5.097 | 0.420 |
| total | | 2.804 | 0.046 | 5.097 | 0.343 |
| N | 316,805 | | | | |

Log hourly wages (in Euros). Data source: Extended GSES 2001.

Figure 1: Bargaining Coverage Within Firms



Histogram: Share of employees covered by collective or firm-level contracts as fraction of firm's total employment. Data source: Extended GSES 2001.

Table 3: Net Union Density

| | mean | min | max | std. dev. | # |
|-----------|-------|-----|-------|-----------|---------|
| Cells | 0.188 | 0 | 0.500 | 0.101 | 5,841 |
| Employees | 0.228 | 0 | 0.500 | 0.102 | 316,805 |

Data source: Extended GSES 2001.

Table 4: Wage Regressions I: Different Measures of the Wage Setting System

| | (i) | | (ii) | | (iii) | | (iv) | | (v) | | (vi) | | (vii) | | (viii) | |
|----------------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
| variable | coef. | std. dev. | coef. | std. dev. | coef. | std. dev. | coef. | std. dev. | coef. | std. dev. | coef. | std. dev. | coef. | std. dev. | coef. | std. dev. |
| CC | -0.009* | (0.004) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FC | 0.019* | (0.010) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SHARECC | | | 0.034** | (0.005) | -0.107** | (0.006) | -0.048** | (0.011) | -0.107** | (0.006) | -0.082** | (0.012) | -0.085** | (0.005) | -0.070** | (0.026) |
| SHAREFC | | | 0.067** | (0.011) | -0.095** | (0.013) | -0.081** | (0.031) | -0.094** | (0.013) | -0.149** | (0.033) | -0.070** | (0.008) | 0.172** | (0.018) |
| SHARECC×CC | | | | | 0.148** | (0.008) | 0.176** | (0.009) | 0.147** | (0.008) | 0.171** | (0.008) | 0.159** | (0.015) | 0.159** | (0.018) |
| SHAREFC×FC | | | | | 0.169** | (0.017) | 0.165** | (0.018) | 0.168** | (0.016) | 0.165** | (0.015) | -0.097** | (0.041) | -0.097** | (0.015) |
| NUD | | | | | -0.094** | (0.015) | -0.094** | (0.015) | | | -0.031 | (0.043) | -0.021 | (0.041) | -0.021 | (0.041) |
| NUD×CC | | | | | -0.012 | (0.044) | | | -0.458** | (0.142) | -0.296** | (0.055) | -0.304** | (0.051) | -0.304** | (0.051) |
| NUD×FC | | | | | | | | | | | 0.203** | (0.032) | 0.193** | (0.045) | 0.193** | (0.045) |
| NUD×SHARECC | | | | | | | | | | | 0.367** | (0.068) | 0.496** | (0.100) | 0.496** | (0.100) |
| NUD×SHAREFC | | | | | | | | | | | | | -0.135 | (0.062) | -0.135 | (0.119) |
| R ² | 0.703 | | 0.705 | | 0.709 | | 0.709 | | 0.703 | | 0.709 | | 0.710 | | 0.710 | |
| N | 316,805 | | 316,805 | | 316,805 | | 316,805 | | 316,805 | | 316,805 | | 316,805 | | 316,805 | |

Regressions include a full set of worker and firm characteristics. Estimation by OLS, observations weighted by inverse sampling probabilities. Clustered standard errors in parentheses. * / **: significance at the 5% / 1% level. Data source: Extended GSES 2001.

Table 5: Wage Regressions II: Different Sets of Covariates

| | (a) | | (b) | | (c)≡(vii) | |
|----------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | coef. | std. dev. | coef. | std. dev. | coef. | std. dev. |
| CC | 0.030 | (0.033) | -0.057** | (0.018) | -0.082** | (0.012) |
| FC | -0.169* | (0.074) | -0.121** | (0.045) | -0.149** | (0.033) |
| SHARECC | 0.708** | (0.015) | 0.227** | (0.009) | 0.171** | (0.008) |
| SHAREFC | 0.644** | (0.033) | 0.185** | (0.020) | 0.165** | (0.018) |
| SHARECC×CC | -0.781** | (0.043) | -0.160** | (0.018) | -0.096** | (0.015) |
| SHAREFC×FC | -0.454** | (0.073) | -0.075 | (0.047) | -0.031 | (0.043) |
| NUD | -0.783** | (0.057) | 0.213** | (0.040) | -0.296** | (0.055) |
| NUD×CC | 0.812** | (0.071) | 0.296** | (0.059) | 0.203** | (0.032) |
| NUD×FC | 0.783** | (0.171) | 0.453** | (0.118) | 0.367** | (0.068) |
| Controls | | | | | | |
| individual characteristics | no | | yes | | yes | |
| firm-level characteristics | no | | no | | yes | |
| R ² | 0.143 | | 0.660 | | 0.710 | |
| N | 316,805 | | 316,805 | | 316,805 | |
| Average Partial Effects | | | | | | |
| CC | -0.200** | (0.009) | -0.075** | (0.006) | -0.087** | (0.005) |
| FC | -0.025 | (0.052) | -0.025 | (0.030) | -0.068* | (0.028) |
| SHARECC | 0.266** | (0.018) | 0.137** | (0.009) | 0.117** | (0.009) |
| SHAREFC | 0.610** | (0.033) | 0.179** | (0.019) | 0.162** | (0.016) |
| NUD | -0.265** | (0.038) | 0.414** | (0.045) | -0.154** | (0.048) |

Regressions by OLS, observations weighted by inverse sampling probabilities. Upper panel: regression coefficients. Lower panel: corresponding average partial effects. Clustered standard errors in parentheses. * / **: significance at the 5% / 1% level. Data source: Extended GSES 2001.

Table 6: Wage Regressions III: Quantile Regressions

| Percentile | (10) | (25) | (50) | (75) | (90) | | | | | |
|-------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|---------|----------|---------|
| | coef. | std. dev. | coef. | std. dev. | coef. | std. dev. | | | | |
| CC | -0.035* | (0.016) | -0.049** | (0.011) | -0.071** | (0.012) | -0.105** | (0.013) | -0.124** | (0.018) |
| FC | -0.104** | (0.033) | -0.135** | (0.029) | -0.157** | (0.031) | -0.169** | (0.034) | -0.183** | (0.047) |
| SHARECC | 0.168** | (0.009) | 0.184** | (0.009) | 0.188** | (0.008) | 0.176** | (0.009) | 0.158** | (0.013) |
| SHAREFC | 0.129** | (0.027) | 0.170** | (0.018) | 0.173** | (0.015) | 0.159** | (0.014) | 0.131** | (0.035) |
| SHARECC×CC | -0.104** | (0.019) | -0.117** | (0.014) | -0.109** | (0.014) | -0.094** | (0.016) | -0.074** | (0.022) |
| SHAREFC×FC | 0.002 | (0.050) | -0.035 | (0.036) | -0.030 | (0.036) | -0.025 | (0.037) | -0.010 | (0.065) |
| NUD | -0.173** | (0.057) | -0.223** | (0.039) | -0.256** | (0.045) | -0.315** | (0.056) | -0.391** | (0.086) |
| NUD×CC | 0.149** | (0.040) | 0.151** | (0.028) | 0.155** | (0.029) | 0.210** | (0.035) | 0.209** | (0.051) |
| NUD×FC | 0.199** | (0.061) | 0.278** | (0.065) | 0.349** | (0.075) | 0.417** | (0.084) | 0.489** | (0.074) |
| N | 316,805 | | 316,805 | | 316,805 | | 316,805 | | 316,805 | |
| Average Partial Effects | | | | | | | | | | |
| CC | -0.056** | (0.007) | -0.077** | (0.006) | -0.094** | (0.006) | -0.107** | (0.006) | -0.116** | (0.008) |
| FC | -0.059* | (0.029) | -0.076** | (0.023) | -0.081** | (0.024) | -0.078** | (0.024) | -0.074 | (0.042) |
| SHARECC | 0.109** | (0.011) | 0.117** | (0.008) | 0.126** | (0.008) | 0.123** | (0.009) | 0.117** | (0.012) |
| SHAREFC | 0.129** | (0.025) | 0.168** | (0.016) | 0.171** | (0.014) | 0.157** | (0.013) | 0.131** | (0.033) |
| NUD | -0.074 | (0.044) | -0.117** | (0.032) | -0.142** | (0.040) | -0.165** | (0.049) | -0.237** | (0.074) |

Regressions include a full set of worker and firm characteristics. Quantile regression, observations weighted by inverse sampling probabilities. Upper panel: regression coefficients. Lower panel: corresponding average partial effects. Clustered standard errors in parentheses; see appendix B for details of the implementation. * / **: significance at the 5% / 1% level. Data source: Extended GSES 2001.