

STRATEGIC TRADE POLICY AND THE HOME BIAS IN FIRM OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE

STEFFEN HUCK
KAI A. KONRAD

CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 892
CATEGORY 9: INDUSTRIAL ORGANISATION
MARCH 2003

An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded

- *from the SSRN website:* www.SSRN.com
- *from the CESifo website:* www.CESifo.de

STRATEGIC TRADE POLICY AND THE HOME BIAS IN FIRM OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE

Abstract

In this note we consider the preferences of a profit maximizing firm for international ownership in a world in which firms compete in an international Cournot oligopoly, and in which countries use strategic trade policy. We find that firms prefer national ownership and show that full indigenisation occurs in the equilibrium.

JEL Code: D43, D44, F12, L11, L13.

Keywords: strategic trade, international ownership, Cournot oligopoly, home bias.

Steffen Huck
Department of Economics & ELSE
University College London
Gower Street
London WC1E 6BT
United Kingdom
s.huck@ucl.ac.uk

Kai A. Konrad
Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für
Sozialforschung (WZB)
Reichpietschufer 50
10785 Berlin
Germany
kkonrad@wz-berlin.de

The first author acknowledges financial support from the Economic and Social Research Council (UK) via the Centre for Economic Learning and Social Evolution (ELSE).

1 Introduction

In this note we consider the preferences of a profit maximizing firm for international ownership in a world in which firms compete in an international Cournot oligopoly, and in which countries use strategic trade policy. We find that firms prefer national ownership and show that full indigenisation occurs in equilibrium.

It has been noted earlier that internationally dispersed firm ownership matters for countries' incentives vis-a-vis firms in their own country. Barros and Cabral (1994) study merger in an international framework showing that foreign ownership should change a regulator's decisions if the regulator cares about national welfare.¹ In the context of strategic trade policy, Dick (1993) and Welzel (1995) study two-firm-two-country models and show that countries' incentives to subsidize home firms may decrease in the presence of international ownership. Dick supports this theoretical result also by data from US industries.²

We endogenize the ownership structure of firms if this structure is chosen with the aim of maximizing the firm's profit and allow for the general case of n firms in n countries. Firms maximize profits and choose the international composition of their shareholders. Our main result is that fully national ownership is an equilibrium phenomenon. This finding may con-

¹Similarly, Konrad and Lommerud (2001) show that a foreign investor may protect a larger share of the returns of foreign direct investment from confiscation by an indigenisation strategy. Indigenisation changes the host country's weights regarding the redistribution benefits and the production efficiency cost of extortionary taxation.

²Further related work includes Feeney and Hillman (2001) who study how strategic trade policy can change as a result of privatization of firms when equity is internationally tradeable.

tribute to explaining the puzzle of strong and robust home country biases as documented, for example, in Adler and Dumas (1983), French and Poterba (1991) and Tesar and Werner (1995).

Our result does not follow trivially since an increase in the share of international owners has countervailing effects. It is not clear which effect dominates. Let us assume that all firms are fully nationally owned and that one firm, say firm A in country A deviates from that by raising some capital in country B. This will have the following effects.

- The incentives for country B to subsidize their own firms are reduced due to cannibalization. *C.p.*, this is of benefit for firm A.
- The incentives for country A to subsidize firm A are reduced because some of firm A's profits now flow into country B. *C.p.*, this harms firm A.

We are not able to determine which effects are dominating in general, but we show that starting from full indigenization, the negative effect of going international overpowers the advantage that is caused by the first effect. Hence, full national ownership is an equilibrium phenomenon. This, however, does not rule out that there are (potentially fully mixed) equilibria where firms become multinationals.

The assumption that firms can influence the international composition of their shareholders may need some justification. For private firms this is a natural assumption. Here existing (domestic) owners as well as the management do have control over the choice of new investors. Moreover, as it will turn out that foreign ownership reduces equilibrium profits, new investors' willingness to pay for a share of the company falls short of the value this share has if the firm continues to be owned by domestic investors. For public

firms the assumption is harder to justify. Particularly, portfolio investors from abroad cannot be assumed to internalize the reduction of the firm's profits that results from international ownership, if their investment share is small. However, if the firm is controlled by a group of large shareholders, given the results developed here, these may have a common interest that none of them sells a block of shares to a foreign investor. More precisely, domestic shareholders and investors should be willing to pay a premium above the willingness-to-pay of a foreign investor because foreign ownership will reduce the market value of the firm. Also, it seems reasonable to assume that management have some sort of control when new capital is raised, for example, by the type of investor relations policy chosen, or the choice of accounting standards (national norms or US norms), and related to this, by the choice of the stock exchange at which the firm is listed.

Finally, in some cases our results might also give reason for public firms to go private again, a move that has gained some popularity in Europe.³

2 International ownership and strategic trade

We consider a symmetric situation using the standard strategic trade policy framework by Brander and Spencer (1985) but with n firms in n countries, firm i being located in country i . Up to the point where we depart, the framework is well known and can be reviewed briefly. Firms produce quantities x^i of a homogenous good which is exported to some other country that behaves passively with respect to its imports. For ease of notation, we assume linear demand and cost, the benchmark case for most oligopoly models. Without loss of generality we normalize marginal costs to zero and inverse demand to

³See, for example, *Time Magazine* from October 23, 2000 (Vol. 156).

$p(X) = 1 - X$ with $X = \sum_i x^i$. Accordingly, firm i 's profit is

$$\pi^i = x^i(1 - X + s_i) \quad (1)$$

where s_i is the subsidy paid to firm i and chosen by government i in order to maximize national welfare. The countries first choose their subsidies simultaneously, and once these are given and observed by everyone, the firms choose their quantities. For given subsidies we obtain

$$x^{i*} = \frac{1 - S}{n + 1} + s_i \quad (2)$$

with $S = \sum_j s_j$. Hence,

$$\pi^{i*} = \left(\frac{1 - S}{n + 1} + s_i\right)^2. \quad (3)$$

Anticipating (2), countries choose subsidies. Country j 's welfare is given by a weighted sum of the profits of those firms that are at least partly owned by citizens in country j minus the subsidies paid to firm j . Using (2) we can write welfare as

$$W_j = \sum_i \alpha_j^i \left(\frac{1 - S}{n + 1} + s_i\right)^2 - s_j \left(\frac{1 - S}{n + 1} + s_j\right) \quad (4)$$

where α_j^i is the share of firm i owned by citizens of country j . Differentiating (4) with respect to s_j we derive country j 's first-order condition as

$$\sum_i \frac{2\alpha_j^i}{n + 1} \left(\frac{1 - S}{n + 1} + s_i\right) + (1 - 2\alpha_j^j) \frac{1 - S}{n + 1} = \left(2\alpha_j^j - \frac{2n + 1}{n + 1}\right) s_j \quad (5)$$

For the case of pure national ownership everywhere, i.e. if all $\alpha_j^j = 1$, we get $\tilde{s}_j = \frac{n-1}{1+n^2}$, the generalized version of the well-known Brander and Spencer result. In that case, firm i 's profits are given by $\tilde{\pi}_i = \frac{n^2}{(1+n^2)^2}$.

The question arises whether national ownership is an equilibrium in a larger game where firms can first choose the international composition of

equity holders before governments choose their subsidies, i.e., where a firm's strategy is the vector $\alpha^i = (\alpha_1^i, \dots, \alpha_n^i)$ with $\sum_j \alpha_j^i = 1$. To answer this question we first analyse the subsidy-setting subgame that countries play when all firms but one are fully indigenised, i.e., when $\alpha_h^i = 1$ for all h except i . In that case, the first order condition (5) for a country $h \neq i$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{2\alpha_h^i}{n+1} \left(\frac{1-S}{n+1} + s_i \right) + \frac{2}{n+1} \left(\frac{1-S}{n+1} + s_h \right) + (1-2) \frac{1-S}{n+1} \quad (6) \\ & = \left(2 - \frac{2n+1}{n+1} \right) s_h \end{aligned}$$

while the first-order condition for country i which hosts and subsidizes the internationally owned firm i becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{2(1 - \sum_{h \neq i} \alpha_h^i)}{n+1} \left(\frac{1-S}{n+1} + s_i \right) + (1 - 2(1 - \sum_{h \neq i} \alpha_h^i)) \frac{1-S}{n+1} \quad (7) \\ & = \left(2(1 - \sum_{h \neq i} \alpha_h^i) - \frac{2n+1}{n+1} \right) s_i \end{aligned}$$

Solving the simultaneous equations (see the appendix) shows that the equilibrium subsidies depend only the total amount of capital firm i seeks abroad. So, let $\varepsilon = \sum_{h \neq i} \alpha_h^i$. With this we get

$$s_i^* = \frac{n-1-2\varepsilon n}{2\varepsilon n^3 - 2\varepsilon n^2 + n^2 + 1} \quad (8)$$

and

$$S^* = n \frac{2\varepsilon n^2 + n - 4\varepsilon n - 1 - 2\varepsilon}{2\varepsilon n^3 - 2\varepsilon n^2 + n^2 + 1}. \quad (9)$$

Substituting into (3) we can now write firm i 's profit as a function of ε , namely as $\pi^i(\varepsilon) = \left(\frac{n}{2\varepsilon n^3 - 2\varepsilon n^2 + n^2 + 1} \right)^2$. Taking the first derivative of this expression we find that

$$\frac{d\pi^i(\varepsilon)}{d\varepsilon} = \frac{-4n^4(n-1)}{(2\varepsilon n^3 - 2\varepsilon n^2 + n^2 + 1)^3} < 0.$$

Hence, it does *not* pay for firm i to deviate from pure national ownership.

Proposition 1 *Pure national ownership (full indigenisation) is an equilibrium.*

3 Discussion

In this paper we analyzed the relationship between international ownership and equilibrium profits for firms which compete in an international oligopoly in which countries use strategic trade policy. We show for the linear benchmark case that firms maximize their profits if they preserve national ownership.

Intuitively, internationally dispersed ownership reduces the subsidy a firm receives from its home country. This lowers the firm's profits. However, this effect is counteracted as international diversification of equity also reduces the other countries' subsidies to their own firms. We show that the direct effects of reduced subsidies in the home country dominates the beneficial effects of reduced subsidies to the firms in all other countries. Hence, fully domestic ownership of all firms occurs in the equilibrium.

The analysis highlights a strategic reason why firms prefer national ownership. Several simplifying restrictions have been made to make the analysis tractable, e.g., linear demand, constant marginal cost, complete and perfect information etc. Deviations from these assumptions may in some cases generate effects that add or subtract to the benefit of national ownership but will typically not make the effect disappear. Two of these assumptions are particularly worthwhile to be discussed briefly.

One potentially restrictive assumption in our analysis is the symmetry of firms. This assumption reduces the analysis of n players essentially to the two-players case, as each player cares only about the aggregate behavior of

all other players. To check robustness, we therefore analysed the case of two countries with two firms and cost asymmetries, where cost asymmetries map firm size in a Cournot framework. Let the two firms differ in their constant marginal cost. Let firm 2 be the big firm, that is, $c_1 \geq c_2$. Further, let $c_2 = 0$ by appropriate normalization. Straightforward but somewhat tedious calculations show that full indigenisation of firms is still an equilibrium provided that $c_1 \in [0, 1/3]$. This shows that even major cost differences do not change the main result in this paper. Note also that a cost difference that is even bigger typically leads to corner solutions. For instance, if $c_1 > 1/3$ and both firms are indigenised, the small firm 1 produces zero output and makes zero profit in the continuation game with strategic trade policies.

Another assumption that deserves some discussion is that of Cournot competition for which the firms' choice variables are strategic substitutes. As is known from Eaton and Grossman (1986), Bertrand competition, where actions are strategic complements, can lead to strategic trade taxes. Firms may then want to reduce their governments' incentives to use such taxes against them, and international portfolio diversification could be a means for achieving this goal. The crucial question therefore is whether firms' choice variables are indeed strategic substitutes as assumed here. As has been argued by Kreps and Scheinkman (1983), this can be the case even if firms compete in prices at some later stage of the game, if they first make capacity choices. Similarly, strategic substitutability can be caused if firms compete in R&D contests prior to a price or quantity game. A more general set-up that also lends some support to the case of strategic substitutability and strategic trade subsidies for a wide parameter range is provided by Maggi (1996).

As mentioned in the introduction our results may contribute to explaining

the well-documented home-country bias for public firms⁴ and, as private firms might have better control over the international composition of equity why public firms decide to go private again. A few hypotheses that could be tested are as follows:

- As private firms and public firms with large shareholders can more easily control the international composition of ownership of the firm, private firms should be owned domestically to a larger extent than public firms, and the share of international ownership in domestic firms should be larger if the domestic ownership is more dispersed.
- We considered Cournot competition in which a country's strategic trade policy benefits the firms that are located in this country. This reverses with Bertrand competition, and, therefore, the predictions this paper makes on the home bias in international portfolio composition hold for the case of Cournot markets.
- Considering the general equilibrium aspects of strategic trade policy, strategic trade policy focusses on markets with much market power. Hence, the home bias in international portfolio composition should be particularly strong in firms with few Cournot competitors.
- Improved international arrangements to detect and ban strategic trade policy also remove the indigenization incentives that may be caused by

⁴Gordon and Bovenberg (1996) survey and disqualify some of the competing explanations, such as high transaction cost of trading foreign securities, exchange rate risks, specific risk correlations between non-traded and traded assets, and contribute an adverse selection explanation, according to which foreigners' lack of knowledge can result also in a less efficient use of real resources. Their explanation and the explanation given here are, of course, not mutually exclusive.

strategic trade policy. Accordingly, trade liberalization should go along with a reduction in the home bias in international firm ownership.

4 Appendix

In this appendix we derive equations (8) and (9). Using $\varepsilon = \sum_{h \neq i} \alpha_h^i$ and $\varepsilon^h = \alpha_h^i$ we can rewrite (6) as

$$S = -\frac{2\varepsilon^h + 2\varepsilon^h s_i n + 2\varepsilon^h s_i + 1 + s_h n + s_h - n}{-2\varepsilon^h - 1 + n}$$

and (7) as

$$S = \frac{1 + s_i n + s_i + 2\varepsilon s_i n - n + 2\varepsilon n + 2s_i \varepsilon n^2}{1 - n + 2\varepsilon n}$$

Equating the two right-hand sides and solving for s^h we get

$$s_h = -\left(2\varepsilon n^2 - 2\varepsilon^h n + n - 2\varepsilon n - 1\right) \frac{s_i}{1 - n + 2\varepsilon n}$$

Using the definition of S we can write

$$\begin{aligned} S &= s_i - \sum_{h \neq j} \left(2\varepsilon n^2 - 2\varepsilon^h n + n - 2\varepsilon n - 1\right) \frac{s_i}{1 - n + 2\varepsilon n} \\ &= s_i - (n-1) \left(2\varepsilon n^2 + n - 2\varepsilon n - 1\right) \frac{s_i}{1 - n + 2\varepsilon n} + \frac{2ns_i}{1 - n + 2\varepsilon n} \sum_{h \neq j} \varepsilon^h \\ &= s_i - (n-1) \left(2\varepsilon n^2 + n - 2\varepsilon n - 1\right) \frac{s_i}{1 - n + 2\varepsilon n} + \frac{2ns_i}{1 - n + 2\varepsilon n} \varepsilon \\ &= -s_i n \frac{-1 - 2\varepsilon + 2\varepsilon n^2 + n - 4\varepsilon n}{1 - n + 2\varepsilon n} \end{aligned}$$

Substituting back into the first-order condition (7) we get

$$s_i = \frac{n - 1 - 2\varepsilon n}{2\varepsilon n^3 - 2\varepsilon n^2 + n^2 + 1}$$

and

$$S = n \frac{2\varepsilon n^2 + n - 4\varepsilon n - 1 - 2\varepsilon}{2\varepsilon n^3 - 2\varepsilon n^2 + n^2 + 1}.$$

References

- [1] Adler, M., Dumas B., 1983, International portfolio choice and corporation finance, a synthesis. *Journal of Finance* 38, 925-984.
- [2] Barros, P.P., Cabral L., 1994, Merger policy in open economies. *European Economic Review*, 38, 1041-1055.
- [3] Brander, J.A., Spencer B.J., 1985, Export subsidies and international market share rivalry. *Journal of International Economics* 18, 83-91.
- [4] Dick, A.R., 1993, Strategic trade policy and welfare: The empirical consequences of cross-ownership. *Journal of International Economics* 35, 227-249.
- [5] Eaton, J., Grossman G.M., 1986, Optimal trade and industrial policy under oligopoly. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 51(2), 383-406.
- [6] Feeney, J., Hillman A.L., 2001, Privatization and the political economy of strategic trade. *International Economic Review* 42, 535-556.
- [7] French, K.R., Poterba J.M., 1991, Investor diversification and international equity markets. *NBER Working Paper* no. 3609.
- [8] Gordon, R.H., Bovenberg L., 1996, Why is capital so immobile internationally? Possible explanations and implications for capital income taxation. *American Economic Review* 86, 1057-1075.
- [9] Konrad, K.A., Lommerud K.E., 2001, Foreign direct investment, intra-firm trade and ownership structure. *European Economic Review* 45, 475-494.

- [10] Kreps, D., Scheinkman J.A., 1983, Quantity precommitment and Bertrand competition yield Cournot outcomes. *Bell Journal of Economics* 14(2), 326-337.
- [11] Maggi, G., 1996, Strategic trade policies with endogenous mode of competition. *American Economic Review* 86, 237-258.
- [12] Tesar, L.L., Werner I.M., 1995, Home bias and high turnover. *Journal of International Money and Finance* 14, 467-92.
- [13] Welzel, P., 1995, Strategic trade policy with internationally owned firms. *Bulletin of Economic Research* 47, 221-232.

CESifo Working Paper Series

(for full list see www.cesifo.de)

- 824 Syed M. Ahsan and Panagiotis Tsigaris, Measuring the Social Discount Rate under Uncertainty: A Methodology and Application, December 2002
- 825 Kai A. Konrad, Altruism and Envy in Contests: An Evolutionarily Stable Symbiosis, December 2002
- 826 Robert S. Chirinko and Huntley Schaller, A Revealed Preference Approach to Understanding Corporate Governance Problems: Evidence from Canada, December 2002
- 827 Geir B. Asheim, Green National Accounting for Welfare and Sustainability: A Taxonomy of Assumptions and Results, December 2002
- 828 Andrea Gebauer, Chang Woon Nam, and Rüdiger Parsche, Lessons of the 1999 Abolition of Intra-EU Duty Free Sales for Eastern European EU Candidates, December 2002
- 829 Giacomo Corneo, Work and Television, December 2002
- 830 Vivek H. Dehejia and Yiagadeesen Samy, Trade and Labour Standards – Theory, New Empirical Evidence, and Policy Implications, December 2002
- 831 Geir B. Asheim and Wolfgang Buchholz, A General Approach to Welfare Measurement through National Income Accounting, December 2002
- 832 Aaron Tornell and Frank Westermann, The Credit Channel in Middle Income Countries, January 2003
- 833 Gebhard Flaig, Time Series Properties of the German Monthly Production Index, January 2003
- 834 Campbell Leith and Jim Malley, Estimated Open Economy New Keynesian Phillips Curves for the G7, January 2003
- 835 Burkhard Heer and Bernd Süßmuth, Inflation and Wealth Distribution, January 2003
- 836 Erkki Koskela and Leopold von Thadden, Optimal Factor Taxation under Wage Bargaining – A Dynamic Perspective, January 2003
- 837 Carola Grün and Stephan Klasen, Growth, Income Distribution, and Well-Being: Comparisons across Space and Time, January 2003
- 838 Robert S. Chirinko and Ulf von Kalckreuth, On the German Monetary Transmission Mechanism: Interest Rate and Credit Channels for Investment Spending, January 2003

- 839 Sascha O. Becker, Andrea Ichino, and Giovanni Peri, How Large is the “Brain Drain” from Italy?”, January 2003
- 840 Albert Berry and John Serieux, All About the Giants: Probing the Influences on Growth and Income Inequality at the End of the 20th Century, January 2003
- 841 Robert Fenge and Martin Werding, Ageing and the Tax Implied in Public Pension Schemes: Simulations for Selected OECD Countries, January 2003
- 842 Robert Fenge and Martin Werding, Ageing and Fiscal Imbalances Across Generations: Concepts of Measurement, January 2003
- 843 Giovanni Andrea Cornia, The Impact of Liberalisation and Globalisation on Income Inequality in Developing and Transitional Economies, January 2003
- 844 Peter Fredriksson and Per Johansson, Program Evaluation and Random Program Starts, January 2003
- 845 Bernd Hayo and Matthias Wrede, Fiscal Equalisation: Principles and an Application to the European Union, January 2003
- 846 Syed M. Ahsan and Jaideep Oberoi, Inequality, Well-being and Institutions in Latin America and the Caribbean, January 2003
- 847 Chang Woon Nam and Doina Maria Radulescu, The Role of Tax Depreciation for Investment Decisions: A Comparison of European Transition Countries, January 2003
- 848 V. Bhaskar and Steinar Holden, Wage Differentiation via Subsidised General Training, January 2003
- 849 Paloma Lopez-Garcia, Labour Market Performance and Start-up Costs: OECD Evidence, January 2003
- 850 Christian Keuschnigg and Soren Bo Nielsen, Public Policy for Start-up Entrepreneurship with Venture Capital and Bank Finance, January 2003
- 851 Yin-Wong Cheung, Menzie D. Chinn, and Eiji Fujii, China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan: A Quantitative Assessment of Real and Financial Integration, January 2003
- 852 Gregory D. Hess, The Economic Welfare Cost of Conflict: An Empirical Assessment, February 2003
- 853 Douglas J. Cumming and Jeffrey G. MacIntosh, Comparative Venture Capital Governance. Private versus Labour Sponsored Venture Capital Funds, February 2003
- 854 Eckhard Janeba and John Douglas Wilson, Decentralization and International Tax Competition, February 2003
- 855 Tapio Palokangas, Capital Accumulation and Employment Cycles in a Model of Creative Destruction, February 2003

- 856 Brendan Walsh, When Unemployment Disappears: Ireland in the 1990s, February 2003
- 857 Luis H. R. Alvarez and Erkki Koskela, A General Approach to the Stochastic Rotation Problem with Amenity Valuation, February 2003
- 858 Christian Schultz, Strategic Campaigns and Redistributive Politics, February 2003
- 859 Ernst Fehr and Joseph Henrich, Is Strong Reciprocity a Maladaptation? On the Evolutionary Foundations of Human Altruism, February 2003
- 860 Haizhou Huang, Dalia Marin, and Chenggang Xu, Financial Crisis, Economic Recovery and Banking Development in Former Soviet Union Economies, February 2003
- 861 Pedro Cardoso and Bernard M.S. van Praag, How Sustainable Are Old-age Pensions in a Shrinking Population with Endogenous Labour Supply?, February 2003
- 862 Volker Meier, Efficient Transfer of Aging Provisions in Private Health Insurance, February 2003
- 863 Edward Castronova, Theory of the Avatar, February 2003
- 864 Robert S. Chirinko, Hans van Ees, Harry Garretsen, and Elmer Sterken, Investor Protections and Concentrated Ownership: Assessing Corporate Control Mechanisms in the Netherlands, February 2003
- 865 Bernard M.S. van Praag and Pedro Cardoso, The Mix Between Pay-as-you-go and Funded Pensions and what Demography has to do with it, February 2003
- 866 Ernst Fehr, Urs Fischbacher, Bernhard von Rosenblatt, Jürgen Schupp, and Gert G. Wagner, A Nation-Wide Laboratory. Examining Trust and Trustworthiness by Integrating Behavioral Experiments into Representative Survey, February 2003
- 867 Frank Heinemann, The Inflationary Impact of Wage Indexation, February 2003
- 868 Eytan Sheshinski, Bounded Rationality and Socially Optimal Limits on Choice in a Self-Selection Model, February 2003
- 869 M. Hashem Pesaran, Estimation and Inference in Large Heterogenous Panels with Cross Section Dependence, February 2003
- 870 Luis H. R. Alvarez and Erkki Koskela, On the Tree-Cutting Problem under Interest Rate and Forest Value Uncertainty, February 2003
- 871 Norbert Berthold and Rainer Fehn, Unemployment in Germany: Reasons and Remedies, February 2003
- 872 Clemens Fuest, Bernd Huber, and Philipp Tilleßen, Tax Policy and Entrepreneurship in the Presence of Asymmetric Information in Capital Markets, February 2003
- 873 Eytan Sheshinski, Optimum and Risk-Class Pricing of Annuities, February 2003

- 874 Willi Leibfritz, Paul O'Brien and Jean-Christophe Dumont, Effects of Immigration on Labour Markets and Government Budgets – An Overview, February 2003
- 875 M. Hashem Pesaran and Allan Timmermann, How Costly is it to Ignore Breaks when Forecasting the Direction of a Time Series?, February 2003
- 876 Thorvaldur Gylfason and Gylfi Zoega, Education, Social Equality and Economic Growth: A View of the Landscape, February 2003
- 877 Robin Boadway and Jean-François Tremblay, Public Economics and Startup Entrepreneurs, February 2003
- 878 Erkki Koskela and Roope Uusitalo, The Un-Intended Convergence: How the Finnish Unemployment Reached the European Level, February 2003
- 879 Robert Fenge and Volker Meier, Pensions and Fertility Incentives, February 2003
- 880 Eytan Sheshinski, Note on Income Taxation and Occupational Choice, February 2003
- 881 A B Atkinson, Income Inequality in OECD Countries: Data and Explanations, February 2003
- 882 Thomas Gehrig and Rune Stenbacka, Venture Cycles: Theory and Evidence, February 2003
- 883 Ralf Becker and Thomas Hellmann, The Genesis of Venture Capital - Lessons from the German Experience, March 2003
- 884 Eytan Sheshinski, Note on the Optimum Pricing of Annuities, March 2003
- 885 Paul De Grauwe and Magdalena Polan, Globalisation and Social Spending, March 2003
- 886 F. van der Ploeg, Do Social Policies Harm Employment and Growth?, March 2003
- 887 Mirjam van Praag, Initial Capital Constraints Hinder Entrepreneurial Venture Performance: An empirical analysis, March 2003
- 888 Bernard Steunenberg, Coordinating Sectoral Policymaking: Searching for Countervailing Mechanisms in the EU Legislative Process, March 2003
- 889 Eytan Sheshinski, Optimum Delayed Retirement Credit, March 2003
- 890 Frederick van der Ploeg, Rolling Back the Public Sector – Differential effects on employment, investment and growth, March 2003
- 891 Paul De Grauwe and Marc-Alexandre SÉNÉGAS, Monetary Policy in EMU when the Transmission is Asymmetric and Uncertain, March 2003
- 892 Steffen Huck and Kai A. Konrad, Strategic Trade Policy and the Home Bias in Firm Ownership Structure, March 2003