

Koskela, Erkki

Working Paper

Outsourcing cost and tax progression under Nash wage bargaining with flexible outsourcing

CESifo Working Paper, No. 3142

Provided in Cooperation with:

Ifo Institute – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research at the University of Munich

Suggested Citation: Koskela, Erkki (2010) : Outsourcing cost and tax progression under Nash wage bargaining with flexible outsourcing, CESifo Working Paper, No. 3142, Center for Economic Studies and ifo Institute (CESifo), Munich

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/39056>

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.

Outsourcing Cost and Tax Progression under Nash Wage Bargaining with Flexible Outsourcing

Erkki Koskela

CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 3142

CATEGORY 4: LABOUR MARKETS

JULY 2010

An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded

- *from the SSRN website:* www.SSRN.com
- *from the RePEc website:* www.RePEc.org
- *from the CESifo website:* www.CESifo-group.org/wp

Outsourcing Cost and Tax Progression under Nash Wage Bargaining with Flexible Outsourcing

Abstract

It is analyzed the impacts of outsourcing cost and wage tax progression under labor market imperfections with Nash wage bargaining and flexible outsourcing. With sufficiently strong (weak) labor market imperfection, lower outsourcing cost has a wage-moderating (wage-increasing) effect so that there is a negative (positive) effect on equilibrium unemployment. Higher tax progression, to keep the relative tax burden per worker constant, has a wage moderating and a positive effect on employment and negative effect on outsourcing.

JEL-Code: H22, J41, J51.

Keywords: Nash wage bargaining, outsourcing, labor tax reform.

Erkki Koskela
Department of Economics
University of Helsinki
P.O. Box 17 (Arkadiankatu 7)
00014 Helsinki
Finland
erkki.koskela@helsinki.fi

I thank the Academy of Finland (grant No. 1217622) for financial support.

I. Introduction

Wage differences across countries constitute an important explanation for the currently significant business practice of international outsourcing.¹ Outsourcing can take two alternative forms. Firms may write long-term contracts that fix the amount of outsourcing before the trade union sets the wage, or alternatively firms may be flexible enough later on to decide upon the amount of outsourcing activity after the domestic wage is set by the trade union.

In the presence of flexible outsourcing it is analyzed the following questions:² What are the effects of the outsourcing costs and the wage tax rate and the tax exemption on the Nash wage formation under labor market imperfections with substitutability between outsourcing and domestic labor? What are the effects of the labor tax reform, to keep the relative tax burden per worker constant, on domestic wage setting, employment and outsourcing?³ With flexible outsourcing the wage elasticity of domestic labor demand is an increasing function of the lower outsourcing cost and of higher wage rate of domestic labor. With sufficiently strong (weak) labor market imperfections a lower outsourcing cost has a wage-moderating (wage-increasing) effect so that there is a negative (positive) effect on equilibrium unemployment. The wage tax rate has a positive effect and the tax exemption a negative effect on the wage negotiation. Higher tax progression under Nash wage bargaining, to keep the relative tax burden per worker constant, has a wage-moderating effect and a positive effect on domestic employment and a negative effect on outsourcing.

Section II presents the basic structure of theoretical framework and domestic labor demand and outsourcing are studied in section III. Wage determination and equilibrium unemployment are presented in section IV under linearly progressive wage

¹ Amiti and Wei (2005) emphasize the big difference on labor costs as the main explanation for the strong increase in outsourcing of both manufacturing and services to countries with low labor costs.

² Skaksen (2004) has analyzed in the absence of taxation the implications of outsourcing for wage setting and employment under imperfectly competitive labor markets in terms of both potential (non-realized) and realized international outsourcing for wage setting and employment by assuming that the firms do not commit themselves to outsourcing prior wage negotiation.

³ This has been analyzed in the absence of outsourcing, see e.g. Koskela and Vilmunen (1996).

tax. The effects of labor tax progression on wage setting, employment and outsourcing are analyzed in section V and conclusions in section VI.

II. Basic Framework

At stage 1 the government as a Stackelberg leader fixes labor tax parameters. The government employs a wage tax rate t , which is levied on the wage w , minus a tax exemption a . The tax base per worker for t equals $(w-a)$ and the marginal tax rate t exceeds the average tax rate $t(1-a/w)$ so that the tax system is linearly progressive.⁴ The net-of-tax wage, the worker receives, is given by $w^n = w(1-t) + ta$. At stage 2 the labor union and the firm negotiate wage formation by taking tax parameters as given and anticipating the domestic labor demand and outsourcing. At stage 3 both the domestic labor demand and the outsourcing is decided by the firm by taking tax parameters and wage setting as given.

To derive an explicit solution a decreasing returns to scale production function is presented as

$$R(L, M) = \frac{\delta}{\delta-1} (L + \gamma M)^{\frac{\delta-1}{\delta}}, \quad \delta > 1, \gamma > 0 \quad (1)$$

where L is the amount of domestic labor and M denotes the firm's labor input acquired from external suppliers through outsourcing. The parameter $\delta > 1$ means that the production function is a concave function of domestic labor and outsourcing inputs.⁵ According to (1) domestic labor and outsourcing are substitutes and the parameter $\gamma > 0$ captures the productivity of outsourcing relative to labor.

⁴ For about tax progression, see e.g. Lambert (2001, chapters 7-8).

⁵ Lommerud et al. (2006) in the absence of taxation have demonstrated how international mergers might curb the market power of unions giving socially excessive incentive for international mergers, unless products are close substitutes. This paper does not focus on the simultaneous presence of imperfections in labor and product markets.

III. Domestic Labor Demand and Outsourcing

Under flexible outsourcing the firm decides simultaneously on domestic employment L and outsourcing M so as to maximize the profit function the output price is normalized to unity

$$\underset{L,M}{\text{Max}} \pi = \frac{\delta}{\delta-1} (L + \gamma M)^{\frac{\delta-1}{\delta}} - wL - C(M), \quad (2)$$

by taking the negotiated wage and the cost of outsourcing as given, where $C(M) = 0,5cM^2$ is a convex cost of establishing capacity M for foreign outsourced. This outsourcing labor input captures the idea that exploitation of the marginal cost advantages associated with production in low-wage countries typically requires that the firm makes irreversible investment into the establishment of network of supplies in the relevant low-wage countries. The first-order conditions are $\pi_L = (L + \gamma M)^{-\frac{1}{\delta}} - w = 0$, and $\pi_M = (L + \gamma M)^{-\frac{1}{\delta}} \gamma - cM = 0$, which give the labor demand and outsourcing

$$L = w^{-\delta} - \gamma M = w^{-\delta} - \gamma^2 \frac{w}{c}, \quad (3a)$$

$$M = \gamma \frac{w}{c}. \quad (3b)$$

Domestic labor demand is a negative function of wage rate and productivity of outsourcing, and a positive function of cost of outsourcing, while outsourcing is a positive function of wage rate and productivity of outsourcing and a negative function of cost of outsourcing. In this model the outsourcing elasticities are constant, while the wage elasticity of labor demand is not constant

$$\eta(w, c, \gamma) \equiv -\frac{L_w w}{L} = \frac{\delta w^{-\delta} + \gamma^2 \frac{w}{c}}{L} = \delta \left(1 + \gamma \frac{M^*}{L^*}\right) + \gamma \frac{M^*}{L^*} = \delta + (1 + \delta) \gamma \frac{M^*}{L^*}. \quad (4)$$

The relationship between the wage rate (the outsourcing cost) and the wage elasticity of domestic labor demand is positive (negative), i.e. $\eta_w = (1 + \eta)(1 + \delta) \gamma \frac{M^*}{wL^*} > 0$ and

$\eta_c = -(1 + \delta) \gamma \frac{M^*}{cL^*} \left(1 + \gamma \frac{M^*}{L^*}\right) < 0$. Higher wage rate and lower outsourcing cost

increasing the wage elasticity of domestic labor demand lies in conformity with empirical evidence.⁶ Also the productivity of outsourcing will have a positive effect on the wage elasticity of domestic labor demand, i.e. $\eta_\gamma > 0$.

IV. Wage Determination via Nash Bargaining under Linearly Progressive Wage Tax

This section investigates wage determination by applying the Nash bargaining following the right-to-manage approach. The labor union's objective function in the presence of linearly progressive wage taxation is assumed to be $\hat{U} = (w(1-t) + ta)L^* + b(N - L^*)$ under the wage tax rate t and the tax exemption a and L^* denotes the total domestic employment. b is the outside option available to union members and N is the number of union members ($N \geq L^*$) and the threat point is $U^o = Nb$ so that the relevant target function of the labor union is $U = \hat{U} - Nb = L^*(w(1-t) + ta - b)$. The firm and the labor union negotiate wage rate to solve the following optimization problem

$$\underset{w}{\text{Max}} \Omega = \left[L^*(w(1-t) + ta - b) \right]^\beta \left[R(L^*, M^*) - wL^* - 0,5M^{*2} \right]^{1-\beta} \quad (5)$$

$$\text{s.t. } L^* = w^{-\delta} - \gamma^2 \frac{w}{c},$$

where the relative bargaining power of the labor union (the firm) is β ($1-\beta$). The first-order condition for the negotiated wage rate can be written as

$$\Omega_w = 0 \Leftrightarrow \beta \frac{U_w}{U} + (1-\beta) \frac{\pi_w^*}{\pi^*} = 0, \quad (6)$$

where

$$\frac{U_w}{U} = \frac{1}{w} \left[\frac{w(1-\eta(w, c, \gamma))(1-t) + \eta(w, c, \gamma)(b-ta)}{w(1-t) - (b-ta)} \right] > 0, \quad (7a)$$

and

⁶ See e.g. Slaughter (2001) and Hasan et al. (2007).

$$\frac{\pi_w^*}{\pi^*} = -\frac{1}{w} \frac{wL}{\pi} = -\frac{1}{w} \frac{R_L L}{\left[R - R_L L - \frac{1}{2} R_M M \right]} = -\frac{1}{w} \frac{2(\delta-1)}{[2-\delta+\eta]} < 0. \quad (7b)$$

Substituting (7a) and (7b) into the first-order condition (6) gives the following Nash bargaining solution for the negotiated wage

$$w^N = \frac{\beta\eta(2-\delta+\eta) + (1-\beta)2(\delta-1)}{\beta(\eta-1)(2-\delta+\eta) + (1-\beta)2(\delta-1)} \hat{b} = A\hat{b} \quad (8)$$

where $\eta(w, c, \gamma)$, the outside option is $\hat{b} = \frac{b-ta}{1-t}$ and the mark-up $A > 1$ as $1 \geq \beta > 0$.

Equation (8) is not an explicit form for the wage rate under outsourcing because the mark-up depends in a non-linear way on the wage ratio via the ratio between outsourcing and domestic labor demand. Before initiating a detailed analysis of the relationship we report the negotiated wage for the two special cases with all the bargaining power concentrated into the hands of the labor union or the firm, respectively. In the case of a monopoly labor union ($\beta = 1$) the wage is also determined in implicit form according to

$$w^N \Big|_{\beta=1} = \frac{\eta(2-\delta+\eta)}{(\eta-1)(2-\delta+\eta)} \hat{b} = \frac{\eta(w, c, \gamma)}{\eta(w, c, \gamma) - 1} \hat{b}. \quad (8')$$

If the firm has all the bargaining power the mark-up factor is reduced to one according to

$$w^N \Big|_{\beta=0} = \hat{b}. \quad (8'')$$

By differentiating the negotiated wage (8) with respect to the outsourcing cost c gives (see Appendix A)

$$\frac{dw^N}{dc} = \frac{\frac{A_c w}{A}}{1 - \frac{A_w w}{A}} \quad (9)$$

where $1 - \frac{A_w w}{A} > 0$ and $\frac{A_c w}{A} \begin{cases} > \\ = \\ < \end{cases} 0$ if $\beta \begin{cases} > \\ = \\ < \end{cases} \frac{2(\delta - 1)}{(2 + (1 + \delta)\gamma \frac{M^*}{L^*})^2 + 2(\delta - 1)}$. According

to (9) the lower outsourcing cost can decrease wage setting if the relative bargaining power of labor union is higher than the low threshold. This threshold is inversely related to the wage elasticity. Lower outsourcing cost increases the wage elasticity of domestic labor demand by decreasing the mark-up. This is the dominant effect as long as the labor union has a sufficiently strong bargaining power. Also wage is affected by the negative effect on profit according to (7b) and when the labor union has a sufficiently low bargaining power, higher outsourcing due to lower outsourcing cost moderates the profit reducing effect of a higher wage. In this case more outsourcing induces an increase in the wage when the bargaining power lies with the firm to a sufficient degree.⁷

In terms of the wage tax rate and the tax exemption differentiating (8) gives

$$\frac{dw^N}{dt} = \frac{A}{\left(1 - \frac{A_w w}{A}\right)} \frac{b - a}{(1 - t)^2} > 0 \text{ as } b - a > 0 \text{ and } \frac{dw^N}{da} = -\frac{A}{\left(1 - \frac{A_w w}{A}\right)} \frac{t}{(1 - t)} < 0 \quad (10)$$

These results can be summarized in

Proposition 1: *In the presence of flexible outsourcing with sufficiently strong (weak) labor market imperfections a lower outsourcing cost has a wage-moderating (wage-increasing) effect so that with a monopoly labor union, a lower outsourcing cost moderates wages. The wage tax rate (tax exemption) has a positive (negative) effect on wage negotiation.*

We now analyze the effect of outsourcing cost given labor tax parameters on equilibrium unemployment. According to (8) the wage formation for workers is of the form $w^N = A \hat{b}$, where $\hat{b} = \frac{b - ta}{1 - t}$ contains the outside option and the linearly

⁷ This has been analyzed in Koskela and Stenbacka (2009) in the presence of strategic outsourcing without labor taxation.

progressive wage taxation parameters and the mark-up factor is $A > 1$. In a general equilibrium the term b should be re-interpreted as the endogenous outside option. By assuming that the taxation is linearly progressive both in the presence of getting employment and in the case of not getting employment but unemployment benefit, which we specify as

$$b = (1 - u)(w^N(1 - t) + ta) + u(\bar{b}(1 - t) + ta) \quad (11)$$

where u is the unemployment rate, \bar{b} captures the unemployment benefit and w denotes the wage formation in identical industries (see, e.g. Nickell and Layard (1999), p. 3048-3049 for a further discussion). Assuming a constant benefit-replacement ratio $0 < q = \bar{b}/w^N < 1$ equation (11) can be expressed as

$$b = (1 - u)(w^N(1 - t) + ta) + u(qw^N(1 - t) + ta) = w^N(1 - t) + ta + u(q - 1)w^N(1 - t) \quad (12)$$

Under this assumption we have $\hat{b} = \frac{b - ta}{1 - t} = w^N + u(q - 1)w^N$ and $w^N = A\hat{b}$ can be written in terms of endogenous outside option as $w^N = A[w^N + u(q - 1)w^N]$ so that the equilibrium unskilled unemployment can be presented

$$u = \frac{1}{(1 - q)} \left(1 - \frac{1}{A} \right) \quad (13)$$

In terms of outsourcing cost we have as for the impact of outsourcing cost on equilibrium unemployment we initially observe from (13) that $\frac{du}{dc} = \frac{1}{1 - q} \frac{A_c}{A^2}$.

Combining this observation with (9) we can draw the conclusion that

$$\frac{du}{dc} \begin{cases} > \\ = \\ < \end{cases} 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \beta \begin{cases} > \\ = \\ < \end{cases} \frac{2(\delta - 1)}{(2 + (1 + \delta)\gamma \frac{M^*}{L})^2 + 2(\delta - 1)}. \quad (14)$$

This result can be summarized in

Proposition 2: *In the presence of flexible outsourcing with sufficiently strong (weak) labor market imperfections a lower outsourcing cost has a negative (positive) effect on equilibrium unemployment so that with a monopoly labor union, a lower outsourcing cost moderates wages and equilibrium unemployment.*

V. Effects of Labor Tax Progression Policy on Wage Negotiation, Employment and Outsourcing

Now the analysis concentrates on the effects of tax progression for wage formation and employment by looking at the tax reform that increases tax progression while keeping the average tax burden per worker constant so that

$$t - \frac{ta}{w} = t^a \quad (15)$$

is constant. The average tax rate progression (ARP) is given by the difference between the marginal tax rate t and the average tax rate t^a , $ARP \equiv t - t^a$. The tax system is progressive if ARP is positive and progression is increased if ARP increases. Government raises the degree of tax progression by increasing t and adjusts a upwards such that t^a remains constant. In this analysis the fully-balanced public sector budget aspect is not considered, because only some sectors may engage outsourcing, but not the whole economy.

First the analysis focuses the wage effect of this tax reform under Nash domestic wage bargaining. Differentiating (15) with respect to t , a and w to keep it constant gives $da = \frac{(w-a)}{t} dt + \frac{a}{w} dw$ and the total wage effect is $dw = w_t dt + w_a da$.

Substituting the RHS of $da = \frac{(w-a)}{t} dt + \frac{a}{w} dw$ for da in $dw = w_t dt + w_a da$ gives

$$\left. \frac{dw^N}{dt} \right|_{dt^a=0} = \frac{\left(w_t + \frac{(w-a)}{t} w_a \right)}{\left(1 - \frac{w_a a}{w} \right)} < 0 \quad (16)$$

where $\left(1 - \frac{w_a a}{w}\right) > 0$ and $\left(w_t + \frac{(w-a)}{t} w_a\right) = -\frac{A}{\left(1 - \frac{A_w w}{A}\right)} \frac{[w(1-t) + ta - b]}{(1-t)^2} < 0$.

A higher degree of tax progression, keeping the relative tax burden per worker constant, will decrease the wage rate in the presence of flexible outsourcing. The employment and outsourcing effects of this labor tax reform by using equations (3a), (3b), (16) are

$$\left. \frac{dL^*}{dt} \right|_{dt^a=0} = L_w^* \left. \frac{dw^N}{dt} \right|_{dt^a=0} > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \left. \frac{dM^*}{dt} \right|_{dt^a=0} = M_w^* \left. \frac{dw^N}{dt} \right|_{dt^a=0} < 0 \quad (17)$$

The wage moderating effect of tax progression, to keep the relative tax burden per worker constant, increases domestic labor demand and decreases outsourcing in the presence of flexible outsourcing.⁸ These results can be summarized in

Proposition 3: *In the presence of flexible outsourcing increasing the degree of tax progression under Nash wage bargaining, to keep the relative tax burden per worker constant, has a wage-moderating effect, a positive effect on domestic employment and a negative effect on outsourcing.*

VI. Conclusions

This paper has presented the following things in the case of homogenous domestic labor demand with the presence of flexible outsourcing: What are the effects of outsourcing costs on wage formation in an imperfectly competitive labor market under Nash wage bargaining? What are the effects of one labor tax reform on domestic wage setting and domestic employment as well as on outsourcing under flexible outsourcing? It has been shown that with sufficiently strong (weak) labor market imperfections a lower outsourcing cost has a wage-moderating (wage-increasing) effect so that there is a negative (positive) effect on equilibrium unemployment. Increasing

⁸ Under the monopoly labor union $A|_{\beta=1} = \frac{\eta}{\eta-1}$ the qualitative results (16), (17) are similar (see e.g. Koskela and Schöb (2008)).

the degree of tax progression under Nash wage bargaining, to keep the relative tax burden per worker constant, has a wage-moderating effect and a positive effect of domestic employment and a negative effect on outsourcing.

References:

- Amiti, M. and S.-J. Wei (2005): Fear of Service Outsourcing: Is It Justified?, *Economic Policy*, April, 307-347.
- Hasan, R., D. Mitra and R.V. Ramaswamy (2007): Trade Reforms, Labor Regulations, and Labor Demand Elasticities: Empirical Evidence from India, *the Review of Economics and Statistics*, 89, 466-481.
- Koskela, E. and J. Vilmunen (1996): Tax Progression is Good for Employment in Popular Models of Trade Union Behaviour, *Labour Economics*, 3, 65-80.
- Koskela, E. and R. Schöb (2008): Outsourcing of Unionized Firms and the Impact of Labour Market Policy Reforms, CESifo Working Paper No. 2360, Forthcoming in: *Review of International Economics*.
- Koskela, E. and R. Stenbacka (2009): Equilibrium Unemployment with Outsourcing under Labour Market Imperfections, *Labour Economics*, 16, 284-290.
- Lambert, P.J. (2001): *The Distribution and Redistribution of Income*, 3rd edition, Manchester University Press.
- Lommerud, K.E., F. Meland and L. Sorgard (2006): National versus International Mergers in Unionized Oligopoly, *the Rand Journal of Economics*, 37, 212-233.
- Nickell, S. and R. Layard (1999): Labor Market Institutions and Economic Performance, in Ashelfelter, O., Card, D. (eds): *Handbook of Labor Economics*, Volume 3C, 3029-3084.
- Skaksen, J.R. (2004): International Outsourcing When Labour Markets are Unionized, *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 37(1), 78-94.
- Slaughter, M. (2001): International Trade and Labor Demand Elasticities, *Journal of International Economics*, 54, 27-56.

Appendix A: Nash wage bargaining and outsourcing cost

Differentiation of (8) with respect to w and c and substituting $\hat{b} = w/A$ for \hat{b} gives

$$\frac{dw^N}{dc} = \frac{A_c w}{A} / \left(1 - \frac{A_w w}{A}\right) \quad (\text{A1})$$

Using $X = \beta(\eta - 1)Z + (1 - \beta)2(\delta - 1)$, $Z = 2 + (1 + \delta)\gamma \frac{M^*}{L^*}$, and differentiating

$A = \frac{X + \beta Z}{X}$ with respect to c ($Z_c = \eta_c < 0$) gives

$$A_c = \frac{-\beta\eta_c(\beta[Z^2 + 2(\delta - 1)] - 2(\delta - 1))}{X^2} \quad \text{so that} \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$A_c \begin{cases} > \\ = \\ < \end{cases} 0 \text{ as } \beta \begin{cases} > \\ = \\ < \end{cases} \frac{2(\delta - 1)}{(2 + (1 + \delta)\gamma \frac{M^*}{L^*})^2 + 2(\delta - 1)} \quad (\text{A3})$$

Differentiating the mark-up with respect to the wage ($Z_w = \eta_w > 0$) gives

$$A_w = \frac{-\beta\eta_w(\beta[Z^2 + 2(\delta - 1)] - 2(\delta - 1))}{X^2} \quad (\text{A4})$$

By using (A3) and (A4) equation (A1) can be expressed as

$$\frac{dw^N}{dc} = \frac{\frac{A_c w}{A}}{1 - \frac{A_w w}{A}} = \frac{-\beta\eta_c w(\beta[Z^2 + 2(\delta - 1)] - 2(\delta - 1))}{X(X + \beta Z) + \beta\eta_w w(\beta[Z^2 + 2(\delta - 1)] - 2(\delta - 1))} \quad (\text{A5})$$

where the denominator is positive so that we have

$$\frac{dw^N}{dc} \begin{cases} > \\ = \\ < \end{cases} 0 \text{ as } \beta \begin{cases} > \\ = \\ < \end{cases} \frac{2(\delta - 1)}{(2 + (1 + \delta)\gamma \frac{M^*}{L^*})^2 + 2(\delta - 1)}. \text{ QED} \quad (\text{A6})$$

CESifo Working Paper Series

for full list see www.cesifo-group.org/wp

(address: Poschingerstr. 5, 81679 Munich, Germany, office@cesifo.de)

- 3081 Stephane Dees, M. Hashem Pesaran, L. Vanessa Smith and Ron P. Smith, Supply, Demand and Monetary Policy Shocks in a Multi-Country New Keynesian Model, June 2010
- 3082 Sara Amoroso, Peter Kort, Bertrand Melenberg, Joseph Plasmans and Mark Vancauteran, Firm Level Productivity under Imperfect Competition in Output and Labor Markets, June 2010
- 3083 Thomas Eichner and Rüdiger Pethig, International Carbon Emissions Trading and Strategic Incentives to Subsidize Green Energy, June 2010
- 3084 Henri Fraisse, Labour Disputes and the Game of Legal Representation, June 2010
- 3085 Andrzej Baniak and Peter Grajzl, Interjurisdictional Linkages and the Scope for Interventionist Legal Harmonization, June 2010
- 3086 Oliver Falck and Ludger Woessmann, School Competition and Students' Entrepreneurial Intentions: International Evidence Using Historical Catholic Roots of Private Schooling, June 2010
- 3087 Bernd Hayo and Stefan Voigt, Determinants of Constitutional Change: Why do Countries Change their Form of Government?, June 2010
- 3088 Momi Dahan and Michel Strawczynski, Fiscal Rules and Composition Bias in OECD Countries, June 2010
- 3089 Marcel Fratzscher and Julien Reynaud, IMF Surveillance and Financial Markets – A Political Economy Analysis, June 2010
- 3090 Michel Beine, Elisabetta Lodigiani and Robert Vermeulen, Remittances and Financial Openness, June 2010
- 3091 Sebastian Kube and Christian Traxler, The Interaction of Legal and Social Norm Enforcement, June 2010
- 3092 Volker Grossmann, Thomas M. Steger and Timo Trimborn, Quantifying Optimal Growth Policy, June 2010
- 3093 Huw David Dixon, A Unified Framework for Using Micro-Data to Compare Dynamic Wage and Price Setting Models, June 2010
- 3094 Helmuth Cremer, Firouz Gahvari and Pierre Pestieau, Accidental Bequests: A Curse for the Rich and a Boon for the Poor, June 2010

- 3095 Frank Lichtenberg, The Contribution of Pharmaceutical Innovation to Longevity Growth in Germany and France, June 2010
- 3096 Simon P. Anderson, Øystein Foros and Hans Jarle Kind, Hotelling Competition with Multi-Purchasing: Time Magazine, Newsweek, or both?, June 2010
- 3097 Assar Lindbeck and Mats Persson, A Continuous Theory of Income Insurance, June 2010
- 3098 Thomas Moutos and Christos Tsitsikas, Whither Public Interest: The Case of Greece's Public Finance, June 2010
- 3099 Thomas Eichner and Thorsten Upmann, Labor Markets and Capital Tax Competition, June 2010
- 3100 Massimo Bordignon and Santino Piazza, Who do you Blame in Local Finance? An Analysis of Municipal Financing in Italy, June 2010
- 3101 Kyriakos C. Neanidis, Financial Dollarization and European Union Membership, June 2010
- 3102 Maela Giofré, Investor Protection and Foreign Stakeholders, June 2010
- 3103 Andrea F. Presbitero and Alberto Zazzaro, Competition and Relationship Lending: Friends or Foes?, June 2010
- 3104 Dan Anderberg and Yu Zhu, The Effect of Education on Marital Status and Partner Characteristics: Evidence from the UK, June 2010
- 3105 Hendrik Jürges, Eberhard Kruk and Steffen Reinhold, The Effect of Compulsory Schooling on Health – Evidence from Biomarkers, June 2010
- 3106 Alessandro Gambini and Alberto Zazzaro, Long-Lasting Bank Relationships and Growth of Firms, June 2010
- 3107 Jenny E. Ligthart and Gerard C. van der Meijden, Coordinated Tax-Tariff Reforms, Informality, and Welfare Distribution, June 2010
- 3108 Vilen Lipatov and Alfons Weichenrieder, Optimal Income Taxation with Tax Competition, June 2010
- 3109 Malte Mosel, Competition, Imitation, and R&D Productivity in a Growth Model with Sector-Specific Patent Protection, June 2010
- 3110 Balázs Égert, Catching-up and Inflation in Europe: Balassa-Samuelson, Engel's Law and other Culprits, June 2010
- 3111 Johannes Metzler and Ludger Woessmann, The Impact of Teacher Subject Knowledge on Student Achievement: Evidence from Within-Teacher Within-Student Variation, June 2010

- 3112 Leif Danziger, Uniform and Nonuniform Staggering of Wage Contracts, July 2010
- 3113 Wolfgang Buchholz and Wolfgang Peters, Equity as a Prerequisite for Stable Cooperation in a Public-Good Economy – The Core Revisited, July 2010
- 3114 Panu Poutvaara and Olli Ropponen, School Shootings and Student Performance, July 2010
- 3115 John Beirne, Guglielmo Maria Caporale and Nicola Spagnolo, Liquidity Risk, Credit Risk and the Overnight Interest Rate Spread: A Stochastic Volatility Modelling Approach, July 2010
- 3116 M. Hashem Pesaran, Predictability of Asset Returns and the Efficient Market Hypothesis, July 2010
- 3117 Dorothee Crayen, Christa Hainz and Christiane Ströh de Martínez, Remittances, Banking Status and the Usage of Insurance Schemes, July 2010
- 3118 Eric O’N. Fisher, Heckscher-Ohlin Theory when Countries have Different Technologies, July 2010
- 3119 Huw Dixon and Hervé Le Bihan, Generalized Taylor and Generalized Calvo Price and Wage-Setting: Micro Evidence with Macro Implications, July 2010
- 3120 Laszlo Goerke and Markus Pannenberg, ‘Take it or Go to Court’ – The Impact of Sec. 1a of the German Protection against Dismissal Act on Severance Payments -, July 2010
- 3121 Robert S. Chirinko and Daniel J. Wilson, Can Lower Tax Rates be Bought? Business Rent-Seeking and Tax Competition among U.S. States, July 2010
- 3122 Douglas Gollin and Christian Zimmermann, Global Climate Change and the Resurgence of Tropical Disease: An Economic Approach, July 2010
- 3123 Francesco Daveri and Maria Laura Parisi, Experience, Innovation and Productivity – Empirical Evidence from Italy’s Slowdown, July 2010
- 3124 Carlo V. Fiorio and Massimo Florio, A Fair Price for Energy? Ownership versus Market Opening in the EU15, July 2010
- 3125 Frederick van der Ploeg, Natural Resources: Curse or Blessing?, July 2010
- 3126 Kaisa Kotakorpi and Panu Poutvaara, Pay for Politicians and Candidate Selection: An Empirical Analysis, July 2010
- 3127 Jun-ichi Itaya, Makoto Okamura and Chikara Yamaguchi, Partial Tax Coordination in a Repeated Game Setting, July 2010
- 3128 Volker Meier and Helmut Rainer, On the Optimality of Joint Taxation for Non-Cooperative Couples, July 2010

- 3129 Ryan Oprea, Keith Henwood and Daniel Friedman, Separating the Hawks from the Doves: Evidence from Continuous Time Laboratory Games, July 2010
- 3130 Mari Rege and Ingeborg F. Solli, The Impact of Paternity Leave on Long-term Father Involvement, July 2010
- 3131 Olaf Posch, Risk Premia in General Equilibrium, July 2010
- 3132 John Komlos and Marek Brabec, The Trend of BMI Values by Centiles of US Adults, Birth Cohorts 1882-1986, July 2010
- 3133 Emin Karagözoğlu and Arno Riedl, Information, Uncertainty, and Subjective Entitlements in Bargaining, July 2010
- 3134 John Boyd, Gianni De Nicolò and Elena Loukoianova, Banking Crises and Crisis Dating: Theory and Evidence, July 2010
- 3135 Michael R. Baye, Dan Kovenock and Casper G. de Vries, The Herodotus Paradox, July 2010
- 3136 Martin Kolmar and Hendrik Rommeswinkel, Group Contests with Complementarities in Efforts, July 2010
- 3137 Carolina Manzano and Xavier Vives, Public and Private Learning from Prices, Strategic Substitutability and Complementarity, and Equilibrium Multiplicity, July 2010
- 3138 Axel Löffler, Gunther Schnabl and Franziska Schobert, Inflation Targeting by Debtor Central Banks in Emerging Market Economies, July 2010
- 3139 Yu-Fu Chen and Michael Funke, Global Warming and Extreme Events: Rethinking the Timing and Intensity of Environmental Policy, July 2010
- 3140 Lawrence M. Kahn, Labor Market Policy: A Comparative View on the Costs and Benefits of Labor Market Flexibility, July 2010
- 3141 Ben J. Heijdra, Jochen O. Mierau and Laurie S.M. Reijnders, The Tragedy of Annuity, July 2010
- 3142 Erkki Koskela, Outsourcing Cost and Tax Progression under Nash Wage Bargaining with Flexible Outsourcing, July 2010