

Wagner, Joachim

Working Paper

Improvements and future challenges for the research infrastructure in the field firm level data

Working Paper Series in Economics, No. 88

Provided in Cooperation with:

Institute of Economics, Leuphana Universität Lüneburg

Suggested Citation: Wagner, Joachim (2008) : Improvements and future challenges for the research infrastructure in the field firm level data, Working Paper Series in Economics, No. 88, Leuphana Universität Lüneburg, Institut für Volkswirtschaftslehre, Lüneburg

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/28208>

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.

**Improvements and Future Challenges for the
Research Infrastructure in the Field
*Firm Level Data***

by
Joachim Wagner

University of Lüneburg
Working Paper Series in Economics

No. 88

June 2008

www.leuphana.de/vwl/papers

ISSN 1860 - 5508

Improvements and Future Challenges for the Research Infrastructure in the Field
Firm Level Data *

Joachim Wagner

[Version: June 24, 2008]

Abstract:

This paper discusses issues related to the use of confidential firm level data in Germany. It starts by defining firm level data (in section 1) and reminding us what they are good for (in section 2), who produces firm level data in Germany, and how researchers can access these data today (in section 3). In section 4, new and ongoing developments are discussed that are leading to new products – new types of firm level data that will enhance the research potential available to researchers considerably in the near future. Section 5 concludes with a wish-list.

* This paper is part of the project “Developing the Research Infrastructure for the Social and Behavioral Sciences in Germany and Beyond: Progress since 2001, Current Situation, and Future Demands”, coordinated by the German Council for Social and Economic Data (RatSWD). I thank Nils Braakmann and Alexander Vogel for helpful remarks on an earlier draft version.

Address of the author:

Prof. Dr. Joachim Wagner
Leuphana University Lüneburg, Institute of Economics
P.O. Box 2440, D-21314 Lüneburg, Germany
Phone: +49-4131-677-2330
Fax: +49-4131-677-2026
e-mail: wagner@uni-lueneburg.de
homepage : www.leuphana.de/wifo

Improvements and Future Challenges for the Research Infrastructure in the Field

Firm Level Data

Joachim Wagner

1. What are firm level data?

Firm level data are data collected at, or related to, local production units (establishments) or legal units (enterprises). The technical term used to describe this kind of data in official statistics is *wirtschaftsstatistische Einzeldaten*, or micro data for production units. This kind of data can either be collected in a survey (administered by a statistical office, or by other institutions like an opinion research institute, or a researcher at a university), or produced during a process that is related to administrative issues (for example, collection of taxes on sales, or reporting to the social security system), resulting in what is named process-produced data.

Usually, firm level data are confidential – either by law (if they are collected in surveys from official statistics, or if they are the outcome of administrative processes), or by an agreement between the (private, non-governmental) collector of the data and the firms that delivered the data. The reasons for confidentiality are manifold, including the fact that information delivered by firms that have to report to surveys administered by a statistical office has to be protected against competitors, and that firms usually are only willing to respond to a survey voluntarily if they can be sure that any information considered to be “sensitive” will not be disseminated.

Confidentiality of firm level data is a crucial issue for researchers who want to use micro data for production units in scientific studies. Although researchers are not at all interested in any of the establishments or enterprises per se, they need to access the data at the micro level to perform their statistical analyses and econometric estimations to uncover patterns of firm behaviour and to test theoretical hypotheses. This paper discusses issues related to the use of confidential firm level data by independent researchers (who are not working for the data producers). It starts by reminding us what firm level data are good for (in section 2), who produces firm level data in Germany, and how researchers can access these data today (in section 3). In section 4, new and ongoing developments are discussed that are leading to new products – new types of firm level data that will enhance the research potential available to researchers considerably in the near future. Section 5 concludes with a wish-list.

2. What are firm level data good for?

Researchers use firm level data in a wide range of areas in economics for four (not mutually exclusive) tasks, namely

- to document stylized facts that can not be uncovered by looking at aggregate data for industries or regions,
- to motivate assumptions used in formal theoretical models,
- to test hypotheses derived from theoretical models, and
- to evaluate policy measures.

The following three examples from different areas of economics - firm demography, job creation and destruction, and international firm activities - illustrate the need for, and the research potential of, the use of firm level data:

1. Hopenhayn (1992) considers a long-run equilibrium in an industry with many price-taking firms producing a homogeneous good. Output is a function of inputs and a random variable that models a firm specific productivity shock. These shocks are independent between firms, and are the reason for the heterogeneity of firms. There are sunk costs to be paid at entry, and entrants do not know their specific shock in advance. Incumbents can choose between exiting or staying in the market. The model leads to three testable hypotheses, namely that firms that exit in year t were in $t-1$ less productive than firms that continue to produce in t , that firms that enter in year t are less productive than incumbent firms in year t , and that surviving firms from an entry cohort were more productive than non-surviving firms from this cohort in the start year. Wagner (2007a) uses a panel data set for all manufacturing plants from Germany (1995 – 2002) to test these hypotheses econometrically, and finds that all three hypotheses are supported empirically.

2. It is often argued that in Germany jobs are mostly created in small and medium sized firms, while large firms generally tend to destroy jobs. The so-called *Mittelstand* is considered as the engine of job creation. Using panel data for manufacturing firms Wagner (2007b) demonstrates that this simple view is wrong. Growing and shrinking firms, entries and exits can be found in a substantial amount in all size classes in each time period considered. Economic policy measures with a special focus on firms from different size classes, therefore, can not be justified by pointing to an extraordinary large contribution of these firms to job creation.

3. A large number of empirical studies for many countries (surveyed in Wagner 2007c) demonstrate that exporting firms are more productive than non-exporting firms of the same size from the same narrowly defined industry. This stylized fact motivated Melitz

(2003) to put aside the standard assumption of homogeneous firms and to develop a model with heterogeneous firms where only the more productive firms in an industry export. This model has become the workhorse of a flourishing literature dealing with international firm activities. Using unique recently released nationally representative high-quality longitudinal data at the plant level, Wagner (2007d) presents the first comprehensive evidence on the relationship between exports and productivity for Germany, a leading actor on the world market for manufactured goods. He documents that the positive productivity differential of exporters compared to non-exporters is statistically significant, and substantial, even when observed firm characteristics and unobserved firm specific effects are controlled for.

All three examples demonstrate that using firm level data is not only useful but indispensable for both sound empirical research (including the evaluation of policy measures and the derivation of policy recommendations) and crafting theoretical models that are relevant outside academic journals. In his Nobel lecture James Heckman (2001, p. 674) named “the evidence on the pervasiveness of heterogeneity and diversity in economic life“ the most important empirical discovery from econometric analyses using micro data. Everybody who ever worked with plant or enterprise level data will agree – there is no such thing as a representative firm, not even in 4-digit industries. We would not know this, and were unable to base our theoretical models, and the policy implications derived from these models, on this knowledge if firm level data could not be used by researchers. Fortunately, access is possible, and the next section will review how.

3. Who produces firm level data, and how can they be accessed by researchers today?

In Germany, data for establishments and enterprises are collected or constructed by a number of institutions. Most importantly,

- the Federal Statistical Office (*Statistisches Bundesamt*, or *Destatis*) and the Statistical Offices of the Federal States (*Statistische Ämter der Länder*) administer a large number of surveys as well as secondary statistics;
- the Federal Employment Agency (*Bundesagentur für Arbeit*, or *BA*) and its research institute, the *IAB (Institut für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung)*, uses information on employees covered by social security to construct establishment level information on the number of employees and their average characteristics, and it collects information on a wide range of issues for a panel of establishments in annual surveys for the IAB establishment panel;

- the German Central Bank (*Deutsche Bundesbank*) has a data base with information from balance sheets, and data for foreign direct investments of German firms.

Furthermore, firm level data are collected at a large scale by research institutes (including the Ifo Institute for Economic Research in Munich and the Centre for European Economic Research in Mannheim), and by the KfW (*Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau*), a bank that is closely related to the German state.

It should be noted that some of these firm level data include information on the employees working in the firms, leading to what is named linked employer-employee (LEE) data. LEE data for Germany are the salary and wage structure surveys (*Gehalts- und Lohnstrukturerhebungen*) from official statistics, and the LIAB that combines information from the IAB establishment panel with employee information from social insurance records.

More information on the firm level data for Germany, and references to papers describing their information content, are given in Kaiser and Wagner (2008).

In the past, some of the data producers provided access to confidential firm level data for researchers on the basis of individual contracts and contacts. For example, various statistical offices of the *Länder* allowed researchers to work with firm level data either via remote data access (i.e., by sending programs to the office the output of which was checked for violation of data protection rules and then sent to the researchers) or by giving them a special status as an unpaid employee that makes it feasible for researchers to work with the micro data inside the office, strictly following all relevant data protection rules. Projects that pursued this way formed the network FiDAS_t – an acronym for firm level data from official statistics (*FirmenDaten aus der Amtlichen Statistik*). Results from these projects are documented in various contributions to professional journals, and in three workshop volumes (see Schasse and Wagner 1999, 2001; Pohl et al. 2003). Furthermore, the IAB offered researchers to use the data from the IAB establishment panel via remote data access and the so-called *Schalterstelle*, a contact person in charge of running the programs and checking the output afterwards (see Kölling 2000).

In recent years, following the suggestions of the KVI (Kommission zur Verbesserung der informationellen Infrastruktur zwischen Wissenschaft und Statistik 2001) most of the important producers of firm level data – including the federal statistical office and the statistical offices of the *Länder*, the IAB, and the Deutsche Bundesbank – installed research data centres (or *Forschungsdatenzentren*) that offer researchers convenient ways to work with confidential data via remote data access or working in-house (see Zühlke et al. 2004, Kohlmann 2005, Lipponer 2003). Furthermore, for several data sets scientific use files (SUF)

that can be used by researchers on their own PCs in the office, and public use files (PUF) that can be used by anybody including students during courses were produced (see Zwick 2007). Other data producers (like the KfW) offer researchers the opportunity to use the confidential firm level data in joint projects with employees of the producers, including the access to the data while working in-house. A survey of who offers what to whom and how is given in Kaiser and Wagner (2008).

Most recently, further progress on the way to a less restrictive access to confidential data was made by locating a research data centre outside the data producing institution and inside the institution where the researchers are. The statistical office of Berlin and Brandenburg opened a research data centre in the building of the German Institute for Economic Research (*Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung, DIW*), making the work with the micro data from German official statistics much more convenient for DIW researchers (and for researchers working in one of the universities near by).

Compared to twenty, ten, or even five years ago, for researchers things improved a lot with regard to access to confidential micro data for establishments and enterprises. As the next section will demonstrate, there is more to come.

4. What will the near future bring? New products in the pipeline

Compared to firm level data collected by research institutes data from official surveys have several advantages – they often cover the whole population of targeted firms (and not a small sample only), the firms have to answer, and they have to answer correctly (there are no missing cases, no missing values, and - it is to be hoped - no wrong answers). Furthermore, the surveys are usually repeated periodically, and the data from various waves can be combined to build panel data sets. The extra costs of preparing data from official surveys for scientific research are not zero, but they are only a tiny fraction of the costs of collecting data in a new survey. That said, there is one disadvantage of these data from official statistics. Usually, they cover only a small number of items, often fixed in a law. This leads to severe limitations with regard to the potential of these data for scientific analyses.

A promising way to increase the research potential of data from official statistics' surveys is the combination of the information collected for a unit (enterprise, or establishment) in different surveys. This is technically feasible if each unit has a unique identifier (a unit number) that is used in different surveys. Fortunately, this is the case with firms surveyed by the Federal Statistical Office and the Statistical Offices of the Federal States. Given that it is in accordance with the law to match data from various surveys

administered by the statistical offices, combined information from these surveys can be used in a single empirical investigation. An example might help to see how this increases the research potential of firm level data from official statistics.

The cost structure surveys collect information on, among others, turnover and various categories of costs. From these data a rate of return can be computed to proxy the profit situation of the firm. How is this rate of return related to export activities of the firm? This question can not be answered using these data alone, because in the cost structure surveys no information on exports is collected. Information on exports, however, is available in another survey, a report covering the activities of manufacturing firms, that does itself not contain any information about the profit situation of the firm. Combining data from these two different surveys leads to a data set that makes it possible to investigate the role of exports for profitability (see Fryges and Wagner 2008).

Matched data from surveys collected by the statistical offices have been used in a number of studies recently. The data sets for these studies have been tailor-made by the research data centres for the respective purpose. This is both expensive and time consuming. In the AFiD project (where AFiD is an acronym for *Amtliche Firmendaten für Deutschland*, or official firm level data for Germany) several standardized data sets are prepared that are combinations of data from various surveys (for details see Pohl 2008). These combined data are available to researchers via the research data centres of the statistical offices.

Data sets from the AFiD project will offer a convenient way for researchers to investigate questions that could not be answered using data from only one survey. Furthermore, the content of data sets prepared in the AFiD project can be enhanced by adding information from other sources. On the one hand, it is both technically feasible and legal to add data collected in special purpose surveys that are administered by the statistical offices only once. A case in point is the survey on international outsourcing activities of firms recently performed by the German Federal Statistical Office (Statistisches Bundesamt 2008). The data from this survey have a limited amount of information only – combined with all the other data for firms from the AFiD project, these data offer the opportunity for exciting empirical research on various topics related to the determinants and consequences of international outsourcing. Note that the extra costs of adding these data to the data sets already available are negligible. On the other hand, in accordance with the law, and given that it is technically feasible, data from publicly available sources can be matched with the AFiD data to further enhance the information content of these data sets. To give an example, information about patents granted to the firms can be added. Augmented data sets of this type

– or what might be labelled *AFiDplus* data – will offer attractive opportunities for empirical investigations in innovative fields.

While combining information available for a single firm from various surveys done by official statistics (plus publicly available information from other sources) in the AFiD project is an attractive way to build new rich data sets that are worth much more than the sum of their parts to a researcher, even more attractive data sets can be constructed when confidential firm level micro data from the vaults of different data producers are matched on top of that. To give an example, information on foreign direct investments of firms is not available from any survey done by the statistical offices, but from balance sheet data processed by the German Central Bank (*Deutsche Bundesbank*). Combining AFiD data with the data for foreign direct investments leads to a data set that makes it possible to investigate problems highly relevant for both scientific analysis and policy debates, including the consequences of foreign direct investments for jobs and wages in Germany.

Due to sometimes tricky problems related to the definition of economic units, and the different identifiers used for firms by different data producers, this matching can be technically demanding. Furthermore, legally this is only allowed (in Germany, in 2008) if each firm explicitly states in a written statement which of the data it delivered to the different data producers can be used for the matching. This leads to a fairly high bar set for any project trying to do right this. Recently, the German Federal Ministry for Education and Research (*Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, BMBF*) funded the research project KombiFiD (an acronym for *Kombinierte Firmendaten für Deutschland*, or combined firm level data for Germany) that is a feasibility study in which a large number of firms is asked to agree to match their data, and in which the technical problems of matching data across the boundaries of data producers are looked at. The data from this feasibility study will be available in the research data centres of the data producers involved in KombiFiD – hopefully starting in the summer of 2009. For more information and up-to-date news on the projects go to www.kombifid.de.

5. A Firmpanelholic's Wish-list

Even given all the progress that has been made in the way firm level data are prepared, and offered for use by independent researchers, during the recent past, and with all the data sets under construction in the projects described in section 4 above, there are still wishes that remain unfulfilled. If a fairy offers me three wishes related to firm level data, this is what I would ask for:

1. Change the German law so that it is possible to match micro data for firms across the boundaries of data producers without a written agreement to this matching by the firms. The reason for this wish is obvious from what is said in section 4 above.

2. Find ways to combine firm panel data across national borders, and to give researchers access to these data (see the International Public Use Microdata Series project <www.ipums.org/international> that collects census data for persons and households from all over the world for a role model dealing with individual level data). The main reason for this wish is that we live in times of increasing globalization. If the objects of our analysis – the firms – become more and more international, often controlling or being controlled by firms in other countries, the data we use should enable us to learn about the causes and consequences of their behaviour by allowing the access to micro level data for all units connected to a firm, legally or otherwise, irrespective of the country these units are located in.

3. Find ways to enable researchers in Germany to work with firm level micro by using remote access 24 hours a day and 365 days per year instead of sending programs to the research data centres or going there personally (see Hundepool and de Wolf (2005) for a description of a pilot project at Statistics Netherlands). The reason for this wish is obvious to any researcher using the now conventional ways to work with confidential firm level data: It is possible to do it this way, and it is infinitely better to have this opportunity than not to have any opportunity at all – but it is a second best solution. Time for research is the ultimate constraint faced by researchers, and today's way is extremely time-consuming. (As an aside, I would like to add that scientific use files that can be used on the researchers' own PC are in my view no solution if it comes to firm level data; see Wagner 2005.) Limitations of space for this contribution make it impossible to go into details here, but the example of Denmark (described in some detail in Kaiser and Wagner 2008) clearly demonstrates how such an "easy access"-policy can be implemented. Based on an approved research proposal researchers in Denmark can access the data on the main-frame computers in Statistics Denmark from their office PCs, with penalties for any misuse being extremely high. Not that long ago, the kingdom of Denmark began in what is today the northern part of Hamburg, some 40 kilometers north from my office at the Leuphana. Given the high price of beer in Denmark I am not sure that I wish this should still be the case – but when I look at the easiness of access to all kinds of confidential micro data that my colleagues at Danish universities enjoy, I do. So at the end of the day I wish that we start learning from the Danish experience.

References

- Fryges, Helmut and Joachim Wagner (2008), Exports and profitability – First evidence for German manufacturing firms, unpublished manuscript.
- Heckman, James J. (2001), Micro Data, heterogeneity, and the evaluation of public policy: Nobel lecture. *Journal of Political Economy* 109(4), 673-748.
- Hopenhayn, Hugo (1992), Entry, exit, and firm dynamics in long run equilibrium. *Econometrica* 60(5), 1127-1150.
- Hundepool, Anco and Petr-Paul de Wolf (2005), OnSite@Home: Remote Access at Statistics Netherlands, <http://unece.org/stats/documents/ece/ces/ge.46/2005/wp.6.e.pdf>.
- Kaiser, Ulrich and Joachim Wagner (2008), Neue Möglichkeiten zur Nutzung vertraulicher amtlicher Personen- und Firmendaten, *Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik* 9 (in press).
- Kölling, Arnd (2000), The IAB-Establishment Panel, *Schmollers Jahrbuch / Journal of Applied Social Science Studies* 120(2), 291-300.
- Kohlmann, Annette. (2005), The Research Data Centre of the Federal Employment Service in the Institute for Employment Research, *Schmollers Jahrbuch / Journal of Applied Social Science Studies* 125(3), 437-447.
- Kommission zur Verbesserung der informationellen Infrastruktur zwischen Wissenschaft und Statistik (2001), Wege zu einer besseren informationellen Infrastruktur. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Lipponer, Alexander (2003), Deutsche Bundesbank's FDI micro database, *Schmollers Jahrbuch / Journal of Applied Social Science Studies* 123(4), 593-600.
- Melitz, Marc J. (2003), The impact of trade on intra-industry reallocations and aggregate industry productivity. *Econometrica* 71(6), 1695-1725.
- Pohl, Ramona (2008), AFID data, *Schmollers Jahrbuch / Journal of Applied Social Science Studies* (forthcoming).
- Pohl, Ramona, Joachim Fischer, Ulrike Rockmann, and Klaus Semlinger (Ed.) (2003), Analysen zur regionalen Industrieentwicklung. Sonderauswertungen einzelbetrieblicher Daten der Amtlichen Statistik. Berlin: Statistisches Landesamt Berlin.
- Schasse, Ulrich and Joachim Wagner (Ed.) (1999), Entwicklung von Arbeitsplätzen, Exporten und Produktivität im interregionalen Vergleich – Empirische Untersuchungen mit Betriebspaneldaten. Hannover: Niedersächsisches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung.

- Schasse, Ulrich and Joachim Wagner (Ed.) (2001), Regionale Wirtschaftsanalysen mit Betriebspaneldaten – Ansätze und Ergebnisse. Hannover: Niedersächsisches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung.
- Statistisches Bundesamt (2008), Verlagerung wirtschaftlicher Aktivitäten. Erste Ergebnisse. Wiesbaden.
- Wagner, Joachim (2005), Anonymized firm data under test: Evidence from a replication study, *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik* 225(5), 584-591.
- Wagner, Joachim (2007a), Entry, exit and productivity. Empirical results for German manufacturing industries. University of Lüneburg Working Paper Series in Economics 44, March.
- Wagner, Joachim (2007b), Jobmotor Mittelstand? Arbeitsplatzdynamik und Betriebsgröße in der westdeutschen Industrie. *Vierteljahrshefte zur Wirtschaftsforschung* 76(3), 76-87.
- Wagner, Joachim (2007c), Exports and productivity: A survey of the evidence from firm-level data. *The World Economy* 30(1), 60-82.
- Wagner, Joachim (2007d), Exports and productivity in Germany. *Applied Economics Quarterly* 53(4), 353-373.
- Zühlke, Sylvia, Markus Zwick, Sebastian Scharnhorst and Thomas Wende (2004), The research data centres of the Federal Statistical Office and the statistical offices of the Länder, *Schmollers Jahrbuch / Journal of Applied Social Science Studies* 124(4), 567-578.
- Zwick, Markus (2007), CAMPUS files – Free public use files for teaching purposes, *Schmollers Jahrbuch / Journal of Applied Social Science Studies* 127(4), 655-668.

Working Paper Series in Economics

(see www.leuphana.de/vwl/papers for a complete list)

- No.87: *Markus Groth*: A review of the German mandatory deposit for one-way drinks packaging and drinks packaging taxes in Europe
- No.86: *Heike Wetzel*: European railway deregulation. The influence of regulatory and environmental conditions on efficiency, May 2008
- No.85: *Nils Braakmann*: Non scholae, sed vitae discimus! - The importance of fields of study for the gender wage gap among German university graduates during market entry and the first years of their careers, May 2008
- No.84: *Markus Groth*: Private ex-ante transaction costs for repeated biodiversity conservation auctions: A case study, May 2008
- No.83: *Jan Kranich*: R&D and the agglomeration of industries, April 2008
- No.82: *Alexander Vogel*: Zur Exporttätigkeit unternehmensnaher Dienstleister in Niedersachsen - Erste Ergebnisse zu Export und Produktivität auf Basis des Umsatzsteuerstatistikpanels, April 2008
- No.81: *Joachim Wagner*: Exporte und Firmenerfolg: Welche Firmen profitieren wie vom internationalen Handel?, März 2008
- No.80: *Stefan Baumgärtner*: Managing increasing environmental risks through agro-biodiversity and agri-environmental policies, March 2008
- No.79: *Thomas Huth*: Die Quantitätstheorie des Geldes – Eine keynesianische Reformulierung, März 2008
- No.78: *Markus Groth*: An empirical examination of repeated auctions for biodiversity conservation contracts, March 2008
- No.77: *Nils Braakmann*: Intra-firm wage inequality and firm performance – First evidence from German linked employer-employee-data, February 2008
- No.76: *Markus Groth*: Perspektiven der Nutzung von Methanhydraten als Energieträger – Eine Bestandsaufnahme, Februar 2008
- No.75: *Stefan Baumgärtner, Christian Becker, Karin Frank, Birgit Müller & Christian Quaas*: Relating the philosophy and practice of ecological economics. The role of concepts, models, and case studies in inter- and transdisciplinary sustainability research, January 2008
- No.74: *Thorsten Schank, Claus Schnabel & Joachim Wagner*: Higher wages in exporting firms: Self-selection, export effect, or both? First evidence from German linked employer-employee data, January 2008
- No.73: *Institut für Volkswirtschaftslehre*: Forschungsbericht 2007, Januar 2008
- No.72: *Christian Growitsch and Heike Wetzel*: Testing for economies of scope in European railways: An efficiency analysis, December 2007
[revised version of Working Paper No. 29,
forthcoming in: Journal of Transport Economics and Policy]
- No.71: *Joachim Wagner, Lena Koller and Claus Schnabel*: Sind mittelständische Betriebe der Jobmotor der deutschen Wirtschaft?, Dezember 2007
[publiziert in: Wirtschaftsdienst 88 (2008), 2, 130-135]

- No.70: *Nils Braakmann*: Islamic terror, the war on Iraq and the job prospects of Arab men in Britain: Does a country's direct involvement matter?, December 2007
- No.69: *Maik Heinemann*: E-stability and stability learning in models with asymmetric information, December 2007
- No.68: *Joachim Wagner*: Exporte und Produktivität in Industriebetrieben – Niedersachsen im interregionalen und internationalen Vergleich, Dezember 2007
- No.67: *Stefan Baumgärtner and Martin F. Quaas*: Ecological-economic viability as a criterion of strong sustainability under uncertainty, November 2007
- No.66: *Kathrin Michael*: Überbrückungsgeld und Existenzgründungszuschuss – Ergebnisse einer schriftlichen Befragung drei Jahre nach Gründungsbeginn, November 2007
- No.65: *The International Study Group on Export and Productivity*: Exports and Productivity – Comparable Evidence for 14 Countries, November 2007
- No.64: *Lena Koller, Claus Schnabel und Joachim Wagner*: Freistellung von Betriebsräten – Eine Beschäftigungsbremse?, November 2007
[erscheint in: Zeitschrift für Arbeitsmarktforschung, Heft 2/3 2008]
- No.63: *Anne-Kathrin Last*: The Monetary Value of Cultural Goods: A Contingent Valuation Study of the Municipal Supply of Cultural Goods in Lüneburg, Germany, October 2007
- No.62: *Thomas Wein und Heike Wetzel*: The Difficulty to Behave as a (regulated) Natural Monopolist – The Dynamics of Electricity Network Access Charges in Germany 2002 to 2005, September 2007
- No.61: *Stefan Baumgärtner und Martin F. Quaas*: Agro-biodiversity as natural insurance and the development of financial insurance markets, September 2007
- No.60: *Stefan Bender, Joachim Wagner, Markus Zwick*: KombiFiD - Kombinierte Firmendaten für Deutschland, September 2007
- No.59: *Jan Kranich*: Too much R&D? - Vertical differentiation in a model of monopolistic competition, August 2007
- No.58: *Christian Papilloud und Ingrid Ott*: Convergence or mediation? Experts of vulnerability and the vulnerability of experts' discourses on nanotechnologies – a case study, July 2007
[published in: European Journal of Social Science Research 21 (2008), 1, 41-64]
- No.57: *Ingrid Ott und Susanne Soretz*: Governmental activity, integration and agglomeration, July 2007
[published in: ICFAI Journal of Managerial Economics 5 (2008), 2, 28-47]
- No.56: *Nils Braakmann*: Struktur und Erfolg von Ich-AG-Gründungen: Ergebnisse einer Umfrage im Arbeitsagenturbezirk Lüneburg, Juli 2007
[revidierte Fassung erscheint in: Richter, J., Schöning, S. & Wetzel, H., Mittelstand 2008. Aktuelle Forschungsbeiträge zu gesellschaftlichen und finanzwirtschaftlichen Herausforderungen, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 2008]
- No.55: *Nils Braakmann*: Differences in the earnings distribution of self- and dependent employed German men – evidence from a quantile regression decomposition analysis, July 2007
- No.54: *Joachim Waagner*: Export entry, export exit, and productivity in German Manufacturing Industries, June 2007
[published in: International Journal of the Economics of Business 15 (2008), 2, 169-180]

- No.53: *Nils Braakmann*: Wirkungen der Beschäftigungspflicht schwerbehinderter Arbeitnehmer – Erkenntnisse aus der Einführung des „Gesetzes zur Bekämpfung der Arbeitslosigkeit Schwerbehinderter“, Juni 2007
[revidierte Fassung erscheint in: Zeitschrift für Arbeitsmarktforschung/ Journal for Labour Market Research 41 (2008), 1]
- No.52: *Jan Kranich und Ingrid Ott*: Regionale Spitzentechnologie auf internationalen Märkten, Juni 2007
[erscheint in: Merz, J. und Schulte, R. (Hrsg.): Neue Ansätze der MittelstandsForschung, Münster, 2007]
- No.51: *Joachim Wagner*: Die Forschungspotenziale der Betriebspaneldaten des Monatsberichts im Verarbeitenden Gewerbe, Mai 2007
[erscheint in: AStA – Wirtschafts- und Sozialwirtschaftliches Archiv]
- No.50: *Stefan Baumgärtner, Frank Jöst und Ralph Winkler*: Optimal dynamic scale and structure of a multi-pollution economy, May 2007
- No.49: *Helmut Fryges und Joachim Wagner*: Exports and productivity growth – First evidence from a continuous treatment approach, May 2007
[forthcoming in: Review of World Economics]
- No.48: *Ulrich Kaiser und Joachim Wagner*: Neue Möglichkeiten zur Nutzung vertraulicher amtlicher Personen- und Firmendaten, April 2007
[erscheint in: Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik]
- No.47: *Joachim Wagner*: Jobmotor Mittelstand? Arbeitsplatzdynamik und Betriebsgröße in der westdeutschen Industrie, April 2007
[publiziert in: Vierteljahrshefte zur Wirtschaftsforschung, 76 (2007), 3, 76-87]
- No.46: *Christiane Clemens und Maik Heinemann*: Credit Constraints, Idiosyncratic Risks, and the Wealth Distribution in a Heterogenous Agent Model, March 2007
- No.45: *Jan Kranich*: Biotechnologie und Internationalisierung. Ergebnisse der Online-Befragung, März 2007
- No.44: *Joachim Wagner*: Entry, exit and productivity. Empirical results for German manufacturing industries, March 2007
- No.43: *Joachim Wagner*: Productivity and Size of the Export Market Evidence for West and East German Plants, 2004, March 2007
[publiziert in: Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik, 227 (2007), 4, 403-408]
- No.42: *Joachim Wagner*: Why more West than East German firms export, March 2007
- No.41: *Joachim Wagner*: Exports and Productivity in Germany, March 2007
[publiziert in: Applied Economics Quarterly 53 (2007), 4, 353-373]
- No.40: *Lena Koller, Klaus Schnabel und Joachim Wagner*: Schwellenwerte im Arbeitsrecht. Höhere Transparenz und Effizienz durch Vereinheitlichung, Februar 2007
[publiziert in: Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik, 8 (2007), 3, 242-255]
- No.39: *Thomas Wein und Wiebke B. Röber*: Sind ausbildende Handwerksbetriebe erfolgreicher?, Januar 2007
- No.38: *Institut für Volkswirtschaft*: Forschungsbericht 2006, Januar 2007
- No.37: *Nils Braakmann*: The impact of September 11th, 2001 on the job prospects of foreigners with Arab background – Evidence from German labor market data, January 2007

- No.36: *Jens Korunig*: Regulierung des Netzmonopolisten durch Peak-load Pricing?, Dezember 2006
- No.35: *Nils Braakmann*: Die Einführung der fachkundigen Stellungnahme bei der Ich-AG, November 2006
[erscheint in: Schulte, Reinhard: Neue Ansätze der MittelstandsForschung, Münster etc.: Lit, 2008]
- No.34: *Martin F. Quaas and Stefan Baumgärtner*: Natural vs. financial insurance in the management of public-good ecosystems, October 2006
[forthcoming in: Ecological Economics]
- No.33: *Stefan Baumgärtner and Martin F. Quaas*: The Private and Public Insurance Value of Conservative Biodiversity Management, October 2006
- No.32: *Ingrid Ott and Christian Papilloud*: Converging institutions. Shaping the relationships between nanotechnologies, economy and society, October 2006
[published in: Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society 2007 (27), 4, 455-466]
- No.31: *Claus Schnabel and Joachim Wagner*: The persistent decline in unionization in western and eastern Germany, 1980-2004: What can we learn from a decomposition analysis?, October 2006
[published in: Industrielle Beziehungen/The German Journal of Industrial Relations 14 (2007), 118-132]
- No.30: *Ingrid Ott and Susanne Soretz*: Regional growth strategies: fiscal versus institutional governmental policies, September 2006
[published in: Economic Modelling 25 (1008), 605-622]
- No.29: *Christian Growitsch and Heike Wetzel*: Economies of Scope in European Railways: An Efficiency Analysis, July 2006
- No.28: *Thorsten Schank, Claus Schnabel and Joachim Wagner*: Do exporters really pay higher wages? First evidence from German linked employer-employee data, June 2006
[published in in: Journal of International Economics 72 (2007), 1, 52-74]
- No.27: *Joachim Wagner*: Markteintritte, Marktaustritte und Produktivität
Empirische Befunde zur Dynamik in der Industrie, März 2006
[publiziert in: AStA – Wirtschafts- und Sozialwirtschaftliches Archiv 1 (2007), 3, 193-203]
- No.26: *Ingrid Ott and Susanne Soretz*: Governmental activity and private capital adjustment, March 2006
[forthcoming in: Icfai Journal of Managerial Economics]
- No.25: *Joachim Wagner*: International Firm Activities and Innovation: Evidence from Knowledge Production Functions for German Firms, March 2006
[published in: The Icfai Journal of Knowledge Management VI (2008), 2, 47-62]
- No.24: *Ingrid Ott und Susanne Soretz*: Nachhaltige Entwicklung durch endogene Umweltwahrnehmung, März 2006
publiziert in: Clemens, C., Heinemann, M. & Soretz, S., Auf allen Märkten zu Hause (Gedenkschrift für Franz Haslinger), Marburg: Metropolis, 2006, 233-256
- No.23: *John T. Addison, Claus Schnabel, and Joachim Wagner*: The (Parlous) State of German Unions, February 2006
[published in: Journal of Labor Research 28 (2007), 3-18]

- No.22: *Joachim Wagner, Thorsten Schank, Claus Schnabel, and John T. Addison: Works Councils, Labor Productivity and Plant Heterogeneity: First Evidence from Quantile Regressions*, February 2006
[published in: *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik* 226 (2006), 505 - 518]
- No.21: *Corinna Bunk: Betriebliche Mitbestimmung vier Jahre nach der Reform des BetrVG: Ergebnisse der 2. Befragung der Mitglieder des Arbeitgeberverbandes Lüneburg Nordostniedersachsen*, Februar 2006
- No.20: *Jan Kranich: The Strength of Vertical Linkages*, July 2006
- No.19: *Jan Kranich und Ingrid Ott: Geographische Restrukturierung internationaler Wertschöpfungsketten – Standortentscheidungen von KMU aus regionalökonomischer Perspektive*, Februar 2006
[publiziert in: Merz, J. und Schulte, R. (Hrsg.): *Fortschritte in der MittelstandsForschung*, Münster, 2006, 113-129]
- No.18: *Thomas Wein und Wiebke B. Röber: Handwerksreform 2004 – Rückwirkungen auf das Ausbildungsverhalten Lüneburger Handwerksbetriebe?*, Februar 2006
- No.17: *Wiebke B. Röber und Thomas Wein: Mehr Wettbewerb im Handwerk durch die Handwerksreform?*, Februar 2006
- No.16: *Joachim Wagner: Politikrelevante Folgerungen aus Analysen mit wirtschaftsstatistischen Einzeldaten der Amtlichen Statistik*, Februar 2006
[publiziert in: *Schmollers Jahrbuch* 126 (2006) 359-374]
- No.15: *Joachim Wagner: Firmenalter und Firmenperformance*
Empirische Befunde zu Unterschieden zwischen jungen und alten Firmen in Deutschland, September 2005
[publiziert in: Lutz Bellmann und Joachim Wagner (Hrsg.), *Betriebsdemographie (Beiträge zur Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung, Band 305)*, Nürnberg: IAB der BA, 83-111]
- No.14: *Joachim Wagner: German Works Councils and Productivity: First Evidence from a Nonparametric Test*, September 2005
[forthcoming in: *Applied Economics Letters*]
- No.13: *Lena Koller, Claus Schnabel und Joachim Wagner: Arbeitsrechtliche Schwellenwerte und betriebliche Arbeitsplatzdynamik: Eine empirische Untersuchung am Beispiel des Schwerbehindertengesetzes*, August 2005
[publiziert in: *Zeitschrift für ArbeitsmarktForschung/ Journal for Labour Market Research* 39 (2006), 181-199]
- No.12: *Claus Schnabel and Joachim Wagner: Who are the workers who never joined a union? Empirical evidence from Germany*, July 2005
[published in: *Industrielle Beziehungen/ The German Journal of Industrial Relations* 13 (2006), 118-131]
- No.11: *Joachim Wagner: Exporte und Produktivität in mittelständischen Betrieben*
Befunde aus der niedersächsischen Industrie (1995 – 2004), June 2005
[publiziert in: *Niedersächsisches Landesamt für Statistik, Statistische Berichte Niedersachsen, Sonderausgabe: Tagung der NLS am 9. März 2006, Globalisierung und regionale Wirtschaftsentwicklung - Datenlage und Datenbedarf in Niedersachsen*. Hannover, Niedersächsisches Landesamt für Statistik, Juli 2006, 18 – 29]

- No.10: *Joachim Wagner*: Der Noth gehorchend, nicht dem eignen Trieb.
Nascent Necessity and Opportunity Entrepreneurs in Germany.
Evidence from the Regional Entrepreneurship Monitor (REM), May 2005
[published in: RWI: Mitteilungen. Quarterly 54/ 55 (2003/04), 287-303
{published June 2006}]
- No. 9: *Gabriel Desgranges and Maik Heinemann*: Strongly Rational Expectations Equilibria with
Endogenous Acquisition of Information, March 2005
- No. 8: *Joachim Wagner*: Exports, Foreign Direct Investment, and Productivity: Evidence from
German Firm Level Data, March 2005
[published in: Applied Economics Letters 13 (2006), 347-349]
- No. 7: *Thomas Wein*: Associations' Agreement and the Interest of the Network Suppliers – The
Strategic Use of Structural Features, March 2005
- No. 6: *Christiane Clemens and Maik Heinemann*: On the Effects of Redistribution on Growth
and Entrepreneurial Risk-Taking, March 2005
- No. 5: *Christiane Clemens and Maik Heinemann*: Endogenous Redistributive Cycles – An
overlapping Generations Approach to Social Conflict and Cyclical Growth, March 2005
- No. 4: *Joachim Wagner*: *Exports and Productivity*: A Survey of the Evidence from Firm Level
Data, March 2005
[published in: The World Economy 30 (2007), 1, 60-82]
- No. 3: *Thomas Wein and Reimund Schwarze*: Is the Market Classification of Risk Always
Efficient? - Evidence from German Third Party Motor Insurance, March 2005
- No. 2: *Ingrid Ott and Stephen J. Turnovsky*: Excludable and Non-Excludable Public Inputs:
Consequences for Economic Growth, June 2005 (Revised version)
[published in: Economica 73 (2006), 292, 725-742
also published as CESifo Working Paper 1423]
- No. 1: *Joachim Wagner*: Nascent and Infant Entrepreneurs in Germany.
Evidence from the Regional Entrepreneurship Monitor (REM), March 2005
[erschienen in: Joachim Merz, Reinhard Schulte (Hrsg.), Neue Ansätze der
MittelstandsForschung, Berlin: Lit Verlag 2008, S.395-411]

Leuphana Universität Lüneburg
Institut für Volkswirtschaftslehre
Postfach 2440
D-21314 Lüneburg
Tel.: ++49 4131 677 2321
email: brodt@leuphana.de
www.leuphana.de/vwl/papers