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ABSTRACT

Is the Event Study Methodology Useful for Merger Analysis? A Comparison of Stock Market and Accounting Data

by Tomaso Duso, Klaus Gugler, and Burçin Yurtoglu

We use a sample of 167 mergers during the period 1990-2002 involving 544 firms either as merging firms or competitors. We contrast a measure of the merger’s profitability based on event studies with one based on accounting data. We find positive and significant correlations between them when using a long window around the announcement date.
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JEL Classification: L4, K21, G34

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Ist die "event study" Methodologie nützlich für die Analyse von Fusionen? Ein Vergleich von Aktienmärkte und Bilanzdaten

Wir analysieren eine Stichprobe von 167 Fusionen, die zwischen 1990 und 2002 stattgefunden haben und welche 544 Unternehmen –entweder als fusionierende Parteien oder als Wettbewerber– involviert haben. Wir vergleichen eine auf "event studies" basierende Rentabilitätsmaß der Fusion zu einer alternativen Maß, die durch Bilanzdaten konstruiert wurde. Wir finden, dass diese zwei maße positiv und signifikant korrelieren besonders wenn wir ein langes Fenster um die Fusionsankündigung in dem "event study" benutzen.
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1. Introduction
The assessment of the competitive effects of large mergers is one of the most important tasks for antitrust authorities worldwide. Unfortunately, these effects are not observed at the time when the authority must make its decision to allow or block the merger or let the merger through with remedies. In principle, stock markets could help predicting the future profitability, since they are forward looking. However, many economists, in particular industrial organization economists, are skeptical about the markets’ ability to correctly anticipate mergers’ competitive effects. Thus, the pioneering efforts of Eckbo (1983) have not been widely applied in merger analysis.

This paper tries to close the gap between the finance and industrial organization literatures by estimating (1) (ex ante) announcement effects of mergers on both merging and rival firms, (2) (ex post) balance sheet profit effects of these mergers on merging and rival firms up to five years post-mergers, and (3) comparing these estimates by correlation analysis.

2. Measuring Profitability
2.1. Event Studies
Under the assumptions of efficient markets and rational expectations, the market model predicts that firm $i$’s stock return at time $t$ ($R_{it}$) is proportional to a market return ($\alpha + \beta R_{mt} + \epsilon_{it}$). We estimate the market model over 240 trading days, starting 50 days prior to the announcement day. We use the estimated values for the model’s parameters to predict what firm $i$’s stock price would have been, had the merger not been announced ($\hat{R}_{it}$). For firm $i$, we then calculate the abnormal return around the mergers’ announcement day $t$ ($AR_{it}$) as: $AR_{it} = R_{it} - \hat{R}_{it} = R_{it} - (\hat{\alpha} + \hat{\beta} R_{mt})$. The cumulative abnormal return (CAR) over an event window $(m,n)$ is then defined to be: $CAR_{i,m,n} = \sum_{t=m}^{n} AR_{it}$. We calculate these measures for each of the merging rival firms.\(^1\)

2.2. Ex-post Profitability
We use the methodology of Gugler et al. (2003) to predict the merger’s ex post profit effects. The method compares reported profit levels post merger with predicted profit levels in the absence of the merger. Our counterfactual is the development of profits and total assets of the median firm (in terms of profitability) in the same 3-digit industry as the merging firms or their rivals operate. We used a number of other counterfactuals, such as similar size or geographical regions but none changed our results significantly.

\(^1\) See Duso, Gugler, and Yurtoglu (2006) for a description of the literature, the data, and a more complete description of the methodology.
The projected change in the returns on the acquirer’s assets from year \( t-1 \) to \( t+n \) are defined as:

\[
\Delta_{IG(t-1,t+n)} = \frac{\Pi_{IGn} - \Pi_{IG(t-1)}}{K_{IG(t-1)}}
\]

where \( \Pi_{IGn} \) are the median firm’s (income statement) profits and \( K_{ID(t+n)} \) are the median firm’s assets both in the same 3-digit industry of the acquired company in year \( t+n \). We define \( \Delta_{ID(t,t+n)} \) for the acquired firm’s industry analogously to \( \Delta_{IG(t-1,t+n)} \). The predicted profits of the combined company \( M \) in year \( t+n \) is then:

\[
\Pi_{predicted_{M(t+n)}} = \Pi_{G(t-1)} + \frac{K_{IG(t+n)}}{K_{IG(t)}} \Delta_{IG(t-1,t+n)} + \Pi_{D(t)} + \frac{K_{ID(t+n)}}{K_{ID(t)}} \Delta_{ID(t,t+n)},
\]

where \( \Pi_{G(t+n)} (\Pi_{D(t)}) \) are the profits and \( K_{G(t+n)} (K_{D(t)}) \) are the assets of the acquiring (acquired) company in year \( t+n \) (\( t \)).

The same logic can be applied to the rivals. In fact, antitrust markets are different than industries based on the SIC classification. The advantage of our database is that we have information on the merging firms’ effective rivals in the involved product markets. These firms are not a good counterfactual, since they are influenced by the merger just as much as the merging firms are. However, the merger should not strongly affect the rest of the industry, which makes the 3-digit SIC classification a good counterfactual for the merger, once we exclude the merging and rivals firms. We can, hence, get a measure of the projected change in the returns and of the predicted profit for the rivals in absence of the merger, which is something novel in the literature.

Our measure of firm \( i \)'s merger effect (\( i= \)merging entity or rivals) is then the difference between actual (observed) profits in year \( t+n \) and the predicted profits:

\[
\Delta \Pi_{effect_{i(t+n)}} = \Delta \Pi_{actual_{i(t+n)}} - \Delta \Pi_{predicted_{i(t+n)}}
\]

3. The Data and Correlations

Our sample consists of 167 concentrations that were analyzed by the European Commission (EC) during the period 1990-2002.\(^2\) We identify 544 different firms either as merging or as rival firms. The relevant markets and, thus, rivals are defined in the EC reports.

Table 1 reports the median values for the CARs based on different event windows and the profitability effects (\( \Delta \Pi_{effect_{i(t+n)}} \)) for merging firms and rivals up to five years after the merger. In the full sample, all median values (with the possible exception for CAR (2,2) for rivals, which is close to zero) have the same sign.

Table 2 reports pairwise correlations among CARs and profitability effects. For merging firms, the correlation coefficients between CAR (50, 5) and firms’ profit are always positive and mostly significant. The profit effects four years after the merger seem to be very well captured by all

\(^2\) Our sample includes almost all phase II mergers completed by the EU by the end of 2001, and a randomly matched sample of phase I cases, which run up to June 2002. See Duso, Neven, and Röller (2006).
measures of abnormal returns. However, CARs based on long windows seem to perform better. The picture is different for rivals: CARs based on short windows produce very misleading results, since they are negatively and significantly correlated to the real profit effects. However, for rivals the CARs based on long windows (30 or 55 days) also seem to capture very well the long term merger’s profit effects.

Table 3 splits the sample into pro and anticompetitive mergers. Interestingly, the market correctly anticipates anti-competitive mergers when using long pre-announcement periods (25 to 50 days), as witnessed by the large and significant correlation coefficients for rivals up to five years post merger. Also, the market predicts merging firms’ rents stemming from increased efficiencies (procompetitive mergers) more precisely than those stemming from an increase in market power (anticompetitive mergers).

4. Conclusions
This paper establishes empirical evidence that the event study methodology is useful for the competitive analysis of mergers. In particular, for a large sample of EU mergers during the period 1990-2002, we show that abnormal returns and post profitability of mergers are positively and significantly correlated. This is particularly true when using long event windows and, for rivals, in anti-competitive mergers.
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3 The argument follows Eckbo (1983). We define a merger to be anticompetitive if the aggregated CAR of rivals (i.e. the weighted sum of the CARs of all rivals for each merger) in the (25,5) window is positive. See Duso, Neven, and Röller (2006) for a formal derivation of the correspondence between increase in rivals’ profit and decrease in consumers’ surplus.
Table 1: Preliminary Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MERGING FIRMS</th>
<th>RIVALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAR(2,2)</td>
<td>CAR(25,5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs.</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- All values are expressed in Million US$. The CAR(m,n) variables represent the cumulative abnormal returns over the window spanning from m days before the event to n days after the event. The \( \Delta \Pi_{i,t+n} \) variables represent the aggregated profit change from one year before the merger to n years after the merger if compared to the median firm in the same SIC3 industry.

Table 2: Pairwise Correlations: all mergers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MERGING FIRMS</th>
<th>RIVALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAR(1,1)</td>
<td>CAR(2,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \Pi_{i,t+1} )</td>
<td>-0.1069</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1870</td>
<td>0.8598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \Pi_{i,t+2} )</td>
<td>-0.0314</td>
<td>0.1281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.7284</td>
<td>0.1546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \Pi_{i,t+3} )</td>
<td>-0.0196</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.8479</td>
<td>0.9900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \Pi_{i,t+4} )</td>
<td>0.3443</td>
<td>0.5408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0013***</td>
<td>0.0000***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta \Pi_{i,t+5} )</td>
<td>0.1947</td>
<td>0.2882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1201</td>
<td>0.0199**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- We report pairwise correlation coefficients (first row) as well as p-values (second row). ***, **, * represent significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level respectively.
Table 3: Pairwise Correlations: Mergers split into pro- and anti-competitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MERGING FIRMS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>RIVALS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROCOMPETITIVE</td>
<td>ANTICOMPETITIVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>PROCOMPETITIVE</td>
<td>ANTICOMPETITIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAR(1,1)</td>
<td>CAR(2,2)</td>
<td>CAR(5,5)</td>
<td>CAR(25,5)</td>
<td>CAR(50,5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔΠ\text{effect}</td>
<td>-0.1711</td>
<td>0.0434</td>
<td>0.0355</td>
<td>0.1252</td>
<td>0.1732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1451</td>
<td>0.7135</td>
<td>0.7639</td>
<td>0.2810</td>
<td>0.1401</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0608</td>
<td>0.2716</td>
<td>0.0655</td>
<td>0.1669</td>
<td>0.3442</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6304</td>
<td>0.0286**</td>
<td>0.6040</td>
<td>0.1771</td>
<td>0.0050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.0845</td>
<td>-0.0331</td>
<td>-0.0486</td>
<td>0.2177</td>
<td>0.1635</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5556</td>
<td>0.8175</td>
<td>0.7350</td>
<td>0.1211</td>
<td>0.2517</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔΠ\text{effect}</td>
<td>0.5701</td>
<td>0.8112</td>
<td>0.2547</td>
<td>0.2667</td>
<td>0.8304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0000***</td>
<td>0.0000***</td>
<td>0.0840*</td>
<td>0.0669*</td>
<td>0.0000***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.3888</td>
<td>0.3361</td>
<td>0.2278</td>
<td>-0.0360</td>
<td>-0.0512</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0210**</td>
<td>0.0484**</td>
<td>0.1882</td>
<td>0.8374</td>
<td>0.7702</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAR(1,1)</td>
<td>CAR(2,2)</td>
<td>CAR(5,5)</td>
<td>CAR(25,5)</td>
<td>CAR(50,5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔΠ\text{effect}</td>
<td>-0.2169</td>
<td>0.3314</td>
<td>0.0204</td>
<td>0.0085</td>
<td>0.1264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0032***</td>
<td>0.0000***</td>
<td>0.7842</td>
<td>0.0990</td>
<td>0.0899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.1605</td>
<td>-0.1222</td>
<td>0.0271</td>
<td>-0.2188</td>
<td>-0.0413</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0447**</td>
<td>0.1262</td>
<td>0.7365</td>
<td>0.0059*</td>
<td>0.6077</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.2773</td>
<td>0.1216</td>
<td>-0.1338</td>
<td>0.0062</td>
<td>0.0402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0027***</td>
<td>0.1953</td>
<td>0.1541</td>
<td>0.9478</td>
<td>0.6724</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.2204</td>
<td>-0.2841</td>
<td>-0.2379</td>
<td>-0.0742</td>
<td>-0.0837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0328**</td>
<td>0.0055*</td>
<td>0.0210**</td>
<td>0.4770</td>
<td>0.4227</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1696</td>
<td>-0.0355</td>
<td>0.3037</td>
<td>0.1482</td>
<td>-0.0266</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1514</td>
<td>-0.7656</td>
<td>0.0090***</td>
<td>0.2108</td>
<td>0.8234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: We report pairwise correlation coefficients (first row) as well as p-values (second row).***, **, * represent significance at the 1%, 5%, and 10% level respectively. A merger is defined to be anticompetitive (procompetitive) if the aggregated cumulative abnormal returns of the rivals - CAR(25,5) - are positive (negative). The sample includes all observations for which the variable ΔΠ\text{effect}_{i,t+2} was not missing.
Kai A. Konrad, Beate Jochimsen (Eds.)

Finanzkrise im Bundesstaat
2006, Peter Lang Verlag

Robert Nuscheler
On Competition and Regulation in Health Care Systems
2005, Peter Lang Verlag

Pablo Beramendi
Decentralization and Income Inequality
2003, Madrid: Juan March Institute

Thomas Cusack
A National Challenge at the Local Level: Citizens, Elites and Institutions in Reunified Germany
2003, Ashgate

Sebastian Kessing
Essays on Employment Protection
2003, Freie Universität Berlin

Daniel Krähmer
On Learning and Information in Markets and Organizations
2003, Shaker Verlag

Tomaso Duso
Humboldt-University Dissertation, 2002, Berlin,

Bob Hancké
Large Firms and Institutional Change. Industrial Renewal and Economic Restructuring in France
2002, Oxford University Press

Andreas Stephan
Essays on the Contribution of Public Infrastructure to Private: Production and its Political Economy
2002, dissertation.de

Peter A. Hall, David Soskice (Eds.)
Varieties of Capitalism
2001, Oxford University Press

Hans Mewis
Essays on Herd Behavior and Strategic Delegation
2001, Shaker Verlag

Andreas Moerke
Organisationslernen über Netzwerke – Die personenVerflechtungen von Führungsgremien japanischer Aktiengesellschaften
2001, Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag

Silke Neubauer
Multimarket Contact and Organizational Design
2001, Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag

Lars-Hendrik Röller, Christian Wey (Eds.)
Die Soziale Marktwirtschaft in der neuen Weltwirtschaft, WZB Jahrbuch 2001
2001, edition sigma

Michael Tröge
Competition in Credit Markets: A Theoretic Analysis
2001, Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag

Torben Iversen, Jonas Pontusson, David Soskice (Eds.)
Unions, Employers, and Central Banks
2000, Cambridge University Press

Tobias Miarka
2000, Physica-Verlag

Rita Zobel
Beschäftigungsveränderungen und organisationales Lernen in japanischen Industriengesellschaften
2000, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

Jos Jansen
Essays on Incentives in Regulation and Innovation
2000, Tilburg University

Ralph Siebert
Innovation, Research Joint Ventures, and Multiproduct Competition
2000, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
http://dochost.rz.hu-berlin.de/dissertationen/siebert-ralph-2000-03-23/

Damien J. Neven, Lars-Hendrik Röller (Eds.)
The Political Economy of Industrial Policy in Europe and the Member States
2000, edition sigma

Jianping Yang
Bankbeziehungen deutscher Unternehmen: Investitionsverhalten und Risikoanalyse
2000, Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag

Christoph Schenk
Cooperation between Competitors – Subcontracting and the Influence of Information, Production and Capacity on Market Structure and Competition
1999, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
http://dochost.rz.hu-berlin.de/dissertationen/schenk-christoph-1999-11-16
Horst Albach, Ulrike Görtzen, Rita Zobel (Eds.)
Information Processing as a Competitive Advantage of Japanese Firms
1999, edition sigma

Dieter Köster
Wettbewerb in Netzproduktmärkten
1999, Deutscher Universitäts-Verlag
DISCUSSION PAPERS 2005


Philipp Rehm: Citizen Support for the Welfare State: Determinants of Preferences for Income Redistribution

Sigurt Vitols: National Institutions and High Tech Industries: A Varieties of Capitalism Perspective on the Failure of Germany’s “Neuer Markt”

Sebastian G. Kessing, Kai A. Konrad: Union Strategy and Optimal Income Taxation

Kai A. Konrad, Amedeo Spadaro: Education, Redistributive Taxation, and Confidence

Joseph A. Clougherty: The International Drivers of Domestic Airline Mergers in Twenty Nations: Integrating Industrial Organization and International Business

Talat Mahmood, Sara Geerdes, Klaus Schömann: Unmet Labour Demand In Europe – Chances for Immigrants?

Johannes Münster: Simultaneous Inter- and Intra-Group Conflicts

Albert Banal-Estañol, Jo Seldeslachts: Merger Failures

Kai A. Konrad: Silent Interests and All-Pay Auctions

Johannes Münster: Lobbying Contests with Endogenous Policy Proposals

Oz Shy: Dynamic Models of Religious Conformity and Conversion: Theory and Calibration

Kai A. Konrad, Stergios Skaperdas: Succession Rules and Leadership Rents

Kai A. Konrad, Dan Kovenock: Equilibrium and Efficiency in the Tug-of-War

Thomas Cusack, Torben Iversen, Philipp Rehm: Risks at Work: The Demand and Supply Sides of Government Redistribution

Tomaso Duso, Klaus Gugler, Burcin Yurtoglu: EU Merger Remedies: A Preliminary Empirical Assessment

Dan Kovenock, Brian Roberson: Electoral Poaching and Party Identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page Numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Richard Deeg</td>
<td>Complementarity and Institutional Change: How Useful a Concept?</td>
<td>SP II 2005 – 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>SP II 2006 –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klaus Gugler, Dennis C. Müller, B. Burçin Yurtoglu</td>
<td>The Determinants of Merger Waves</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusto R. Micola, Albert Banal Estañol, Derek W. Bunn</td>
<td>Incentives and Cooperation in Vertically Related Energy Markets</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benny Geys</td>
<td>Looking across Borders: A Test of Spatial Policy Interdependence using Local Government Efficiency Ratings</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas R. Cusack</td>
<td>Sinking Budgets and Ballooning Prices: Recent Developments Connected to Military Spending</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ela Glowick</td>
<td>Effectiveness of Bailouts in the EU</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benny Geys</td>
<td>Government Weakness and Electoral Cycles in Local Public Debt: Evidence from Flemish Municipalities</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benny Geys, Bruno Heyndels</td>
<td>Disentangling the Effects of Political Fragmentation on Voter Turnout: The Flemish Municipal Elections</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes Münster</td>
<td>Selection Tournaments, Sabotage, and Participation</td>
<td>08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes Münster</td>
<td>Contests with Investment</td>
<td>09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kjell Erik Lommerud, Steinar Vagstad</td>
<td>Mommy Tracks and Public Policy: On Self-Fulfilling Prophecies and Gender Gaps in Promotion</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilde Coffé, Benny Geys</td>
<td>Towards an Empirical Characterization of Bridging and Bonding Social Capital</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomaso Duso, Klaus Gugler, Burçin Yurtoglu</td>
<td>How Effective is European Merger Control?</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erkki Koskela, Ronnie Schöb</td>
<td>Tax Progression under Collective Wage Bargaining and Individual Effort Determination</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derek Clark, Kai A. Konrad</td>
<td>Contests with Multi-Tasking</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Roberson</td>
<td>Pork-Barrel Politics, Discriminatory Policies, and Fiscal Federalism</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Beck</td>
<td>The Sales Effect of Word of Mouth: A Model for Creative Goods and Estimates for Novels</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albert Banal-Estañol, Paul Heidhues, Rainer Nitsche, Jo Seldeslachts</td>
<td>Merger Clusters during Economic Booms</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanne Prantl</td>
<td>The Role of Policies Supporting New Firms: An Evaluation for Germany after Reunification</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is the Event Study Methodology Useful for Merger Analysis? A Comparison of Stock Market and Accounting Data
Please send a self addressed label and postage stamps in the amount of 0.51 Euro or a “Coupon Reponse International” (if you are ordering from outside Germany) for each WZB-paper requested.

**Absender / Return Address:**

Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung
Presse- und Informationsreferat
Reichpietschufer 50

D-10785 Berlin-Tiergarten

**Hiermit bestelle ich folgende(s) Discussion paper(s):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bestell-Nr. / Order no.</th>
<th>Autor/in, Kurztitel /Author(s) / Title(s) in brief</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>