Düsseldorf Institute
for Competition Economics

DISCUSSION PAPER

No 86

More Bits – More Bucks? Measuring the Impact of Broadband Internet on Firm Performance

Irene Bertschek,
Daniel Cerquera,
Gordon J. Klein

February 2013

HEINRICH HEINE
UNIVERSITÄT DÜSSELDORF

IMPRINT

DICE DISCUSSION PAPER

Published by
Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, Department of Economics, Düsseldorf Institute for Competition Economics (DICE), Universitätsstraße 1, 40225 Düsseldorf, Germany

Editor:

Prof. Dr. Hans-Theo Normann
Düsseldorf Institute for Competition Economics (DICE)
Phone: +49(0) 211-81-15125, e-mail: normann@dice.hhu.de

DICE DISCUSSION PAPER

ISSN 2190-9938 (online) – ISBN 978-3-86304-085-7

More Bits - More Bucks? Measuring the Impact of Broadband Internet on Firm Performance*

Irene Bertschek*

Daniel Cerquera†

Gordon J. Klein‡

Abstract

The paper provides empirical evidence for the causal impact of broadband Internet on firms' labour productivity and realised process and product innovations. The analysis refers to the early phase of DSL expansion in Germany from 2001 to 2003, when roughly 60 percent of the German firms already used broadband Internet. Identification relies on instrumental variable estimation taking advantage of information on the availability of DSL broadband at the postal code level. The results show that broadband Internet has no impact on firms' labour productivity, whereas it exhibits a positive and significant impact on their innovation activity.

JEL-classification: D22, L23, O31

Keywords: labour productivity, product and process innovation, broadband Internet

*The paper is based on the project "The role of broadband internet for corporate success" commissioned by Deutsche Telekom AG. For further information on projects conducted at ZEW see http://www.zew.de/en/forschung/forschung.php3. One earlier version of this paper was part of Gordon J. Klein's Ph.D. thesis submitted to the University of Düsseldorf, another one has been published as a ZEW discussion paper. This version represents the unedited version of October 2012. The final version of this paper containing further corrections and editorial work has been accepted for publication and is in press at the journal *Information Economics and Policy*, 2012, available at: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.infoecopol.2012.11.002. We wish to thank François Laisney, Mark McCabe, Ralf Dewenter, Martin Peitz and Glenn Woroch as well as participants of the EARIE Conference 2011 in Stockholm, the ITS conference 2011 in Budapest and the Scientific Seminar of the Florence School of Regulation, Communications and Media at the European University Institute, Florence, May 2012, for helpful comments. Moreover, we thank the two referees for their constructive questions and comments. The opinions expressed are those of the authors.

*ZEW Mannheim, ICT Research Group, bertschek@zew.de; University of Mannheim.

†ZEW Mannheim, ICT Research Group, cerquera@zew.de.

‡Düsseldorf Institute for Competition Economics (DICE), klein@dice.hhu.de

1 Introduction

Numerous empirical studies at different levels of aggregation demonstrate the important role of information and communication technologies (ICT) for economic performance.[2] As general purpose technologies (Bresnahan and Trajtenberg, 1995), ICT enable firms to reshape their business processes and to improve their products and services (e.g. Brynjolfsson and Saunders, 2010). Firms' innovation activity in turn increases labour productivity, thereby entailing growth and competitiveness.

In order to reap the potential benefits of ICT, policy makers and industry representatives denote the availability of an efficient broadband internet infrastructure as being essential. Broadband Internet is defined as Internet access provided at a certain high level of speed. The particular definitions are heterogeneous and cover a wide range of actual speed.[3] However, in many regions across the U.S. and in European countries Internet access is not available at any speed that can be defined as broadband. Fostering the availability of such infrastructures has therefore been declared a policy objective of European countries and of the U.S.[4]

Even though the benefits of broadband internet seem to be undisputed among policy makers, empirical evidence on the benefits is inconclusive. A causal, positive effect of telecommunication infrastructure on economic performance has already been presented in the literature (Röller and Waverman, 2001). There are some studies (Koutroumpis, 2009; Czernich et al., 2011) showing positive effects of broadband internet on economic growth at the aggregate level. By contrast, empirical evidence on the causal impact of broadband on firm performance is still lacking.

[2]See for instance the recent comprehensive study by Van Reenen et al. (2010) as well as Draca et al. (2007), Van Ark et al. (2008) and Jorgenson et al. (2008).

[3]For instance, the OECD defines the lower bound of broadband internet as Internet access with speeds above 256 kbits per second. However, in their analysis (OECD, 2009) they also distinguish between different speeds that are by far more rapid.

[4]For example, the Federal Communications Commission (2010) has published a detailed broadband strategy, the European Commission (2010) defines broadband deployment as one goal in its Europe 2020 strategy and the German Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology (Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Technologie, 2009) announced broadband deployment as a policy objective, too.

This paper provides empirical evidence on the causal impact of broadband Internet on firm performance using a sample of German manufacturing and services firms. Firm performance is measured in terms of labour productivity and realised product and process innovation. The data base stems from a business survey and was collected by the Centre of European Economic Research in the years 2002 and 2004 (ZEW ICT Survey). This data contains detailed information on the economic characteristics, performance and ICT use of the sampled firms for the years 2001 and 2003, including the use of broadband internet. Given that broadband usage might be influenced by firms' economic performance (i.e. reverse causality), an instrumental variable approach is used to control for potential endogeneity of broadband usage at the firm level. We use DSL availability at the postal code level as instrumental variable for firms' broadband usage. The focus on the early phase of DSL expansion in Germany (from 2001 to 2003) allows us to exploit differences in the rate of broadband usage across German firms.[5]

The paper provides two main results. First, even though the econometric analysis shows a positive correlation between labour productivity and the use of broadband internet, this effect is not robust when controlling for endogeneity and different sources of variation. Using an instrumental variable approach, we show that the impact of broadband internet on firms' labour productivity is highly heterogeneous among German firms and not statistically different from zero. Second, the impact of broadband internet on firms' innovation activity is positive, significant and robust with respect to different specifications. This suggests that broadband internet enabled firms to reorganise and reshape their business processes and to improve their products or services. This innovation activity induced by broadband usage may have been translated into productivity gains in later periods, as suggested by the vast empirical evidence on the productivity effects of innovation.

[5]Due to the rapid diffusion of broadband internet, subsequent surveys do not provide this variation, because DSL diffusion had reached almost 100 percent. DSL was the dominant broadband technology during that period such that the focus is on this technology.

2 Background Discussion

In their seminal paper, Röller and Waverman (2001) show that investment in telecommunication infrastructure has causal positive and significant effects on economic growth. In order to identify causal effects and to take account of endogeneity they estimate a structural multi-equation model. Their data base comprises a time period of 20 years and 21 OECD countries. The results suggest that the positive effect resulting from investment in telecommunication infrastructure is stronger as soon as a critical level of telecommunication penetration is reached.

Previous work shows evidence for the economic impact of telecommunication investment on growth for developing versus developed countries (Hardy, 1980), for the U.S. (Cronin et al., 1991) and for manufacturing versus services sectors (Greenstein and Spiller, 1995). Subsequent studies support the results found by Röller and Waverman (2001) for OECD countries (Datta and Agarwal, 2004) and for Chinese regions (Shiu and Lam, 2008).

A recent study by Czernich et al. (2011) provides empirical evidence for the growth effects of broadband infrastructure at the aggregate level.[6] The authors use a panel data base of OECD countries comprising the years 1996 to 2007. They apply a technology diffusion model explaining the availability of broadband internet. They thereby take account of the fact that investment in infrastructure takes place in prospering regions or countries first, i.e. the investment decision itself depends on the economic potential of a region or country and is thus endogenous. The results show an increase in GDP per capita growth by 0.9 to 1.5 percentage points per year.

Further studies support the important role of broadband internet for the economy, for example Duggal et al. (2007) and Koutroumpis (2009).[7] Gillett et al. (2006) consider different measures of economic performance. They analyse the impact of

[6] In their study, Internet access with at least 256 kbit/s is defined as broadband independent on whether it is DSL, fibre or any other kind of connection.

[7] See also the survey by Holt and Jamison (2009).

broadband internet availability in the U.S. on employment, wages and the number of IT-intensive firms.

Forman et al. (2011) take a regional perspective and analyse the hypothesis that internet lowers the cost for economic engagement also in geographically isolated regions. Their initial hypothesis is that internet lowers the cost for economic engagement also in geographically isolated regions. Thus, internet should have effects on the performance of firms and employees also in regions whose performance was comparably low before the diffusion of the internet. The authors do not look at broadband internet but at business investment in advanced internet technologies.[8] They find that although advanced Internet widely diffused in the U.S. from 1995 to 2000, the economic benefits in terms of wage growth were concentrated in a few well-performing counties only.

Clearly, our study is also related to the wide literature on the role of ICT for firm performance. This literature has shown that ICT has positive and significant effects on firm performance usually measured by labour productivity (see for example the surveys by Kretschmer (2012), Prieger and Heil (2010), Draca et al. (2007), Hagén and Zeed (2005), Hagén et al. (2007), and UNCTAD (2007)).

Polder et al. (2010) take a firm-level perspective to analyse the role of ICT and R&D for innovation success and productivity of Dutch firms. They find that the use of broadband internet is particularly important for services firms where broadband is positively related to product and process innovation as well as to organisational innovation. By contrast, in the manufacturing sector, broadband is significant only for product and organisational innovation. For process innovation it is rather e-commerce that plays a significant role.

Our study also takes a firm-level perspective. It analyses whether broadband usage has affected firms' innovation activity and labour productivity in a time period when DSL started to become available. In contrast to Polder et al. (2010), we attempt to

[8] As advanced Internet technologies Forman et al.(2011, p.562) consider ERP, customer service, education, extranet, publications, purchasing, technical support.

identify causal effects of broadband usage. Therefore, we use DSL availability at the postal code level as an instrumental variable for explaining firms' broadband usage.

3 Econometric Implementation

We consider two measures of firm performance: labour productivity and innovation activity. In order to analyse the impact of broadband Internet on labour productivity we apply a production function framework. Firms are supposed to produce according to a Cobb-Douglas production function with various input factors. Output Y_i is a function of labour L_i, non-ICT capital K_i, ICT capital ICT_i, broadband internet BB_i, and a vector of control variables X_i:

$$Y_i = f(A_i, L_i, K_i, ICT_i, BB_i, \mathbf{X_i}) \tag{1}$$

Parameter A_i measures total factor productivity and reflects differences in production efficiency across firms. In the econometric estimations, labour productivity defined as the logarithm of sales per employee (Y_i/L_i), is used as a dependent variable. The estimation equation can be described as follows:

$$ln\left(\frac{Y_i}{L_i}\right) = lnA_i + (\alpha_L - 1)lnL_i + \alpha_K lnK_i + \beta_{ICT}ICT_i + \beta_{BB}BB_i + \beta_{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{X_i} + u_i \tag{2}$$

where u_i is a normally distributed error term. Firm i's use of broadband internet, BB_i, is assumed to positively affect labour productivity.

Innovation activity is measured by a binary variable taking the value one if an innovation has been realised and the value zero otherwise. The probability of realising a process innovation (or product innovation) is assumed to be related to factor inputs labour L_i, non-ICT capital K_i and ICT capital ICT_i, to the use of broadband internet BB_i and to control variables X_i comprising for instance previous innovation success. The relationship is specified as:

$$\Pr[Y_i^j = 1|x] = \Phi(\alpha_L lnL_i + \alpha_K lnK_i + \beta_{ICT} ICT_i + \beta_{BB} BB_i + \beta_{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{X_i}) \qquad (3)$$

with $j \in \{IC, ID\}$ and IC = process innovation and ID = product innovation, and $\Phi(\cdot)$ representing the cumulative normal distribution function. Broadband Internet is assumed to shift firm i's probability to innovate.

The use of broadband internet might be part of a firm's strategy and therefore possibly endogenous with respect to firm performance.[9] In particular, high performing firms may be more likely to adopt broadband internet than firms with a lower performance, possibly indicating a reverse causality. This issue is tackled by applying an instrumental variable approach for analysing labour productivity and a bivariate recursive probit for analysing innovation activity. For this purpose, broadband internet use is instrumented by DSL availability. The latter is defined as the time lag (in years) between the deployment date for the postal code area where a firm is located and the benchmark date 31st of December, 2001. Due to the fact that DSL is the most widely used broadband technology in Germany. DSL availability is highly correlated with actual broadband Internet use. While DSL availability is related to regional economic performance, i.e. Internet infrastructure providers prefer to invest first in well-performing regions, it can be assumed to be exogenous to a single firm's performance.

We instrument firms' broadband usage by DSL availability at the corresponding postal code level.[10] For the labour productivity estimations, we also instrument production function inputs, capital and labour, with their corresponding lagged values in order to take account of possible endogeneity. The estimations are performed by the general method of moments approach.

[9]Recall that our analysis refers to the period when DSL started to diffuse. Of course, in the meantime almost all firms have obtained broadband internet connection.

[10]See for example Wooldridge (2010, p. 939) for further details on instrumental variable estimation.

For the innovation estimations, we have to take into account that the dependent variables of the two equations that are to be estimated, i.e. the use of broadband internet as well as the realisation of a process or a product innovation, respectively, are binary. Therefore, a recursive bivariate probit approach is applied.[11] DSL availability in years is the exclusion restriction in the broadband usage equation. From the estimations we derive the marginal effects of the probability of introducing an innovation conditional on the use of broadband Internet. Moreover, the average treatment effect, for a given firm, is calculated according to the following equation:

$$ATE = \Phi(\gamma \mathbf{Z} + \beta_{BB} BB) - \Phi(\gamma \mathbf{Z}) \tag{4}$$

where γ is the vector of the coefficients according to equation (3) excluding broadband usage, while β_{BB} refers to broadband usage. In order to calculate the overall impact for the sampled firms, an average is calculated for the ATE at each observation. The standard errors are then calculated using the delta method.

4 Data and Descriptive Analysis

For the empirical analysis three different data sets are used: (i) The ZEW ICT survey which is a firm-level data set comprising information about firms' performance, broadband usage and firm characteristics; (ii) data on DSL availability at the postal code level provided by Deutsche Telekom AG; (iii) the INKAR database with information on regional economic characteristics provided by the German Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development.

[11]See for example Maddala(1983), Angrist and Pischke (2009, pp.197-204) and Greene (2008, pp.823-826) for further details.

4.1 Firm-level Variables

The analysis is based on two waves of a representative business survey carried out by the Centre for European Economic Research (ZEW) in 2002 and 2004 (ZEW ICT Survey). Most of the survey questions refer to the years 2001 and 2003, respectively. The advantage of restricting the analysis to these particular surveys is that with approximately 60 percent of firms using broadband in 2002 there is a significant variation in this variable which is helpful for identifying the impacts of broadband internet on firm performance.

The sample is stratified according to sectors (seven manufacturing sectors and seven business-related service sectors), three size classes and two regions (East and West Germany). Each wave comprises about 4,400 firms located in Germany. The data set contains detailed information on the use of ICT applications, innovation activity, sales, number and qualification structure of employees and various other firm characteristics. The data set is designed as a panel, however not all variables were collected in both years. Considering the two waves has the distinct advantage that we are able to take account of time lags. For instance, the innovation variables collected in the 2004 wave refer to the period 2001 to 2003 whereas the broadband usage is surveyed in the 2002 wave.

Broadband Internet is measured by a dummy variable and is defined as a firm's use of either leased lines or DSL broadband. In particular, the relevant question in the survey is "What kind of Internet connection does your company have?" The list of possible answers is (i) modem, (ii) ISDN, (iii) DSL, (iv) leased line, (v) others. At the time considered here, DSL Internet access provided an access speed of at least 768 kbits per second. This is clearly above the lower bound of the OECD broadband definition of 256 kbits per second (OECD, 2009). Importantly, at this time DSL was, beside leased lines for larger firms, the dominant broadband technology. Alternative broadband technologies such as satellite connection and powerline were not of relevance for firms at that time.

Labour productivity is measured as sales per employee. Realised *process innovation* is measured by a dummy variable, indicating whether a firm has internally introduced new or significantly improved processes between the years 2001 to 2003. Realised *product innovation* accordingly measures whether the firm has introduced new or significantly improved products or services.[12] Moreover, we take account of the persistence of innovation behaviour, the so-called success breeds success hypothesis (see for example Flaig and Stadler, 1994, and Peters, 2009) by including innovation activity from the previous period and thus controlling for firms' previous experience in innovation.

Since *non-ICT capital* is not observed in our data set, it is proxied by *total investment* in million euro. A measure for capital is not available and due to the fact that we have only two waves it is impossible to apply the perpetual inventory method. A couple of papers use investment as a proxy for capital, for example Bertschek and Kaiser (2004) or Griffith et al. (2006). *ICT capital* is proxied by three variables: The ICT survey provides information about firms' *ICT intensity* measured as the percentage share of employees working predominantly at a computer. In addition, two dummy variables capture whether a firm applies Supply Chain Management (*SCM*) or Enterprise Resource Planning (*ERP*).

The *qualification of employees* is captured by the proportion of employees being high-skilled (degree from university, university of applied sciences or university of cooperative education). Medium-skilled (master craftsman or vocational training) and low-skilled (without formal qualification) workers are the reference categories.

Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1. The average value of labour productivity is 0.19 million euro of sales per employee.[13] The firms have on average 166 employees, 21% of the employees are high-skilled. The average investment is 1.95 million euro.

[12] These definitions follow the OSLO manual (OECD and Eurostat, 2005).

[13] Since there are a few very large firms in the sample, we drop 5% of the firms with the largest number of employees, thus firms with more than 1,500 employees. Moreover, we omitted outliers with labour productivity of at least five times larger than the sector mean. These omitted firms are distributed along all economic sectors and not concentrated in specific sectors.

On average, 52% of a firm's employees work mainly with a computer. 22% of the firms use Supply Chain Management (SCM) and 77% apply an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system. Broadband Internet is used by 61% of the firms. Most of the firms without broadband use alternative Internet technologies such as a modem. Only about two percent of the firms do not have an Internet connection.

Concerning innovative activity, 75% of all firms introduced new or significantly improved processes (process innovations) between 2001 and 2003, while 65% of the firms brought new or significantly improved products or services to the market (product innovations) within this period.

Additionally, a set of dummy variables controls for differences across location (East or West Germany), export activity and sector affiliation. On average, 21% of the firms are located in East Germany, 53% export their products or services. In order to take account of regional disparities, we use a set of 10 regional dummies controlling for region-specific differences that might be correlated with firms' performance as well as with DSL availability. Each of these regions comprises between 9 and 12 percent of the observations from the sample.

Table 1 also reveals systematic differences between firms with and firms without broadband internet. Firms with broadband internet are larger with respect to total investment and number of employees. In firms with broadband a larger share of employees works mainly with a computer (59% compared to 40%). Firms with broadband internet have only a slightly higher labour productivity than firms without broadband (20% versus 18%). By contrast, in the group of broadband users there is a considerably higher share of process and product innovators than in the group of non-broadband users (80% compared to 68% in case of process innovation, and 71% compared to 57% in case of product innovation).

Table 2 shows descriptive statistics of the subsample used for the estimations. While firms in the subsample tend to be smaller in terms of employees than in the full sample, all other variables show more or less the same structure, suggesting that firms that have to be left out due to item or unit nonresponse are missing at random.

4.2 DSL Availability at Postal Code Level

We use information on regional DSL availability to instrument firms' actual broadband usage. The data is provided by Deutsche Telekom AG and contains information about the main distribution frames (i.e. central offices) and the dates when these distribution frames were equipped with DSL.

DSL deployment in Germany began for a couple of test regions in 1999, but officially started in 2000. As shown in Table 3, by the end of 2001, DSL was already available in 75.57% of the postal code areas in Germany, meaning that in these postal code areas at least one distribution centre was equipped with DSL.

In our analysis, DSL availability is defined as the time lag (in years) between the deployment date for the postal code where a firm is located and the benchmark date 31st of December, 2001.

Table 4 shows mean and percentiles of days of DSL availability by the 31st of December, 2001, for the estimation sample. This comprises 815 postal code areas. On average, firms are located in postal code areas where DSL is available for 332 days. 25% of the firms are located in areas with DSL availability for 180 days and 75% of the firms in areas with DSL availability for 458 days. Thus, our measure of DSL availability is characterised by large variation.

There are at least three reasons why DSL availability at the regional level can be considered to be an appropriate instrument for a firm's broadband internet use: First, DSL is the dominant broadband technology at this time. Second, from a *single* firm's perspective, the decision of a telecommunication provider to invest in DSL is exogeneous. Third, for the time period considered in this study, DSL availability still shows enough variation for identifying effects of broadband internet use at the firm level.

4.3 Regional Information

Further information on regional economic characteristics stems from the INKAR database provided by the German Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development. GDP per capita at the county level measures regional performance and takes account of the fact that Internet infrastructure providers invest in prospering regions first. The estimation sample comprises 223 counties.

5 Empirical Results

5.1 Labour Productivity

Table 5 shows the results from estimating the production function according to equation (2). Column (1) refers to a simple OLS specification, including broadband usage, labour and investment as well as controls for sectors and location. The estimation shows a positive and significant relationship between the use of broadband internet and labour productivity at the firm level. This result underpins the hypothesis that broadband infrastructure has the potential to increase efficiency of business processes (e.g. via E-commerce and global networking). The coefficient of labour represents the parameter $\alpha_l - 1$ and is therefore negative.

The optimal choice of inputs and strategies, however, might be affected by firm performance rendering the results of an OLS estimation inconsistent. In order to derive consistent estimates we apply an instrumental variable approach, the results of which are presented in columns (2)-(6) of Table 5.[14]

The first stage regressions show positive and significant coefficients of the instrumental variable, i.e., years of DSL availability. The partial F-statistic for broadband

[14]For all specifications, the Wald endogeneity test suggests that there is endogeneity. Therefore, an IV strategy seems to be appropriate for deriving consistent estimates.

at the first stage takes values between around 7 an 10. Moreover, firms that are larger and more IT intensive have a higher probability of using broadband internet. The second stage regressions reveal a positive and significant impact of broadband internet on labour productivity. In all estimations, however, the broadband coefficient is considerably larger than in the OLS regression and it is estimated with less precision, as indicated by the large standard errors.

While specification (2) corresponds to the OLS specification, specifications (3)-(6) extend the analysis by including additional variables that are supposed to be important determinants of labour productivity such as the computerisation of workplaces, the application of ERP and SCM, the share of highly qualified employees, as well as firms' previous experience with innovation.

Specification (3) introduces the percentage of employees working predominantly with computers as a measure of firms' ICT intensity. In accordance with the literature, ICT intensity is positively related to labour productivity. The impact of broadband internet on labour productivity remains positive and weakly significant. When dummies for ERP and SCM are introduced as further measures of ICT (specification 5) only SCM turns out to be positively related to labour productivity while leaving the impact of broadband internet unaffected. The share of highly qualified employees as well as the realisation of product innovation in previous periods do not play any significant role for labour productivity. Although the impact of broadband internet remains weakly significant in columns (3)-(5), this impact is measured with low precision as the standard errors show.

Finally, specification (6) introduces regional variables, i.e., 10 regional dummies and GDP per head at the county level for 223 counties in order to control for regional economic characteristics. As outlined above, telecommunication providers are likely to invest in regions with greater economic potential first. The coefficient of broadband internet in the labour productivity equation is reduced and turns out to be insignificant.

The results suggest that the benefits from using broadband internet are heterogeneous across firms. This is to some extent in line with Forman et al. (2011) who find a positive and significant relationship between investment in advanced Internet technologies and regional wage growth only for 6% of the well-performing U.S. counties. Moreover, as pointed out for instance by Bresnahan et al. (2002) investment in IT needs long-term complementary investment in order to result in positive labour productivity effects. Our study, however, could not take into account a long-term perspective due to data limitations. Finally, some recent empirical evidence for Italian small firms suggests that it is not the broadband connection itself that makes firms more productive but it is the type of application as well as complementary organisational and strategic changes that matter (Colombo et al., 2012).

5.2 Innovation

Table 6 presents the estimation results for process innovations. The first column refers to the probit estimation. As expected, it shows a positive and significant coefficient of broadband use. The recursive bivariate probit estimations are depicted in columns (2) to (5). They take account of the fact that firms' broadband usage might be endogenous to process innovation activity. The regressions with broadband as dependent variable all reveal a positive and highly significant coefficient of the instrumental variable (or exclusion restriction) years of DSL availability. This, together with the likelihood ratio tests, suggests that the application of a bivariate probit is preferable to a simple probit approach and that DSL availability seems to be an appropriate instrument.

In particular, analogously to the previously described productivity estimation, specifications (2) to (5) take into account additional factors relevant for explaining the realisation of process innovations. Investment, the percentage of employees working predominantly with computers as well as the previous realisation of product innovations turn out to be positively related to the probability of realising process innovations.[15] Although the coefficient of broadband use decreases when the number

[15]The 2002 ZEW ICT Survey did not ask for process innovations, such that product innovations

of additional explanatory variables increases, it remains positive and highly significant, suggesting that broadband usage has a positive impact on the probability of realising a process innovation.

Table 7 presents the marginal effects for the probit and the bivariate probit estimations. According to the simple probit estimation, broadband internet use has an impact of 7.96 percentage points on the probability of innovating. The marginal effects resulting from the bivariate probit estimations are much higher varying between 56 and 63 percentage points. The marginal effect is measured at the mean of all variables and conditional on broadband internet being used.

Table 8 presents the average marginal effects of the probit estimations and the average treatment effects derived from the bivariate probit estimations. According to the probit estimation, on average, broadband internet use increases the probability of realising a process innovation by 7.80 percentage points, which is close to the marginal effect at the mean. The average treatment effects resulting from the recursive bivariate probit are much larger, lying between 41 and 45 percentage points.

While the common probit model, not taking into account potential endogeneity of firms' broadband usage, is likely to underestimate the effect of broadband internet use, the bivariate probit seems to overestimate it. One possible reason is that there are unobserved factors driving firms' innovative activity that are negatively correlated with firms' broadband usage. For instance, the adoption of broadband internet might induce a process of internal reorganisation that reduces the contribution of some existing practices to the firms' innovative output. Moreover, the estimations may suffer from a small sample size.

Even though the exact quantification of the impact of broadband usage on process innovations remains difficult due to these potential sources of imprecision, the positive and highly significant effects suggest that, during or right after the phase of

are used as a proxy for previous innovation experience.

DSL expansion, broadband internet boosted the probability of reshaping and reorganising business processes. The large size of the coefficient might reflect that using broadband internet as general purpose technology (GPT) benefits from network externalities and knowledge spillovers as it is diffused throughout the economy. Thus, firms benefit from their suppliers and customers that use broadband internet, too.

Turning to product innovations (Table 9), in the broadband equations of the bivariate model, the instrumental variable years of DSL availability is positive and highly significant in explaining firms' broadband use.[16]

In the product innovation equation the coefficient of broadband use is positive and highly significant with respect to the different specifications (2) to (5). While former product innovations, highly qualified employees and export activity are positively and significantly related to the probability of realising product innovations, all other explanatory variables are insignificant.

According to the marginal effects (Table 10) broadband use increases the probability of successfully realising product innovation by 6.93 percentage points according to the simple probit estimation. The marginal effects resulting from the recursive bivariate probit range from 36 to 49 percentage points.

As Table 11 shows, the average marginal effect of broadband use on the probability of innovation is 6 percentage points according to the simple probit estimate. The average treatment effect stemming from the bivariate probit estimates varies between 28 percentage points in the sparse specification (2) and 35 percentage points in the richest specification (5). While the average treatment effects are quite large and much larger than in the case of simple probit, they are lower than in the case of process innovation. The simple probit model might underestimate the effect of broadband use due to neglecting potential endogeneity between broadband use and firms' innovation activity. By contrast, the average treatment effects estimated by

[16] The likelihood ratio test holds in the two richer specifications (4 and 5), suggesting endogeneity of broadband use. Therefore, the recursive bivariate probit is preferable to the common probit model.

the recursive bivarite probit seem to be quite large. Possible explanations are the same as in the case of process innovation. Applying the recursive bivariate model might lead to less precision of the estimations as reflected by the large increase in standard errors.

As a robustness check, we apply the IV GMM approach suggested by Wooldridge (2010, p. 939) used for estimating the labour productivity equations also to the analysis of innovation (see Tables 12 and 13). In a first step, broadband usage by firms is estimated using a binary response model by maximum likelihood (i.e Probit.) regressed on DSL availability and other variables. Then the fitted values for broadband use at the firm level are taken as instruments in the two-stage procedure.

The results basically remain the same as with the bivariate probit approach. However, in case of product innovation, the broadband coefficient turns insignificant when past product innovation is taken into account (Table 13, specification (3) to (5)). In case of the bivariate probit estimations, the marginal effects of broadband in case of product innovation are significant in all specifications although at a lower significance level than in case of process innovation.

For process innovation, the two-stage linear probability model also shows positive and highly significant coefficients and marginal effects for the broadband variable. Past product innovation is taken into account to control for persistent innovation activity since a variable for past process innovation is not available in the data. However, product and process innovation are often highly correlated and so past product innovation still seems to be a good proxy for the innovation capability of firms, and therefore, not surprisingly, the corresponding coefficient is positive and highly significant.

The positive and mostly significant effects of broadband use being robust across all specifications, suggests that broadband internet in its expansion phase has enabled firms to develop and offer new or considerably improved processes and products. The stimulating effect of broadband internet might have been reinforced via externalities from broadband-using suppliers and customers within the same industry.

6 Conclusions

The purpose of the paper was to provide empirical evidence on the causal impact of broadband internet on firms' performance in terms of labour productivity and innovation activity. Focusing on the early phase of DSL expansion in Germany, we use information on DSL availability at the postal code level as an instrument for firms' broadband usage.

While broadband internet does not have a significant impact on labour productivity, it positively affects firms' probability of realising process or product innovations. Although the coefficients and marginal effects in the case of innovation might be overestimated, they are highly significant and robust with respect to different specifications.

These findings support the hypothesis that broadband internet in its expansion phase enabled firms to reshape and optimise business processes and to develop new or improve existing products and services. The fact that the impact on labour productivity turns out to be insignificant suggests that this process of reorganisation was accompanied by a phase of experimenting and learning, which is typical for the introduction of a general purpose technology. Broadband effects on labour productivity might arise in the long run, a perspective that we could not take into account due to data limitations. Moreover, next to possible effects on 'hard' measures like innovation and productivity, broadband internet may have advantages for employees' well-being, for instance if they have email access or share online platforms with their colleagues. Although these advantages may increase the quality of working they do not necessarily affect quantitative performance measures in a positive way. These issues, however, require different kinds of data in order to be properly analysed and so, they are left for future research.

References

Angrist, J. and Pischke, J. (2009). *Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist's Companion*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey.

Bertschek, I. and Kaiser, U. (2004). Productivity Effects of Organizational Change: Microeconometric Evidence, *Management Science* **50**(3): 394–404.

Bresnahan, T., Brynjolfsson, E. and Hitt, L. (2002). Information Technologies, Workplace Organization and the Demand for Skilled Labor: Firm-Level Evidence, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* **117**(1): 339–376.

Bresnahan, T. and Trajtenberg, M. (1995). General Purpose Technologies:'Engines of Growth'?, *Journal of Econometrics* **65**(1): 83–108.

Brynjolfsson, E. and Saunders, A. (2010). *Wired for Innovation: How IT is Reshaping the Economy*, The MIT Press, Cambridge Massachussetts.

Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Technologie (2009). *Innovationspolitik, Informationsgesellschaft, Telekommunikation. Breitbandstrategie der Bundesregierung*, Berlin.

Colombo, M. G., Croce, A. and Grili, L. (2012). ICT Services and Small Businesses' Productivity Gains: An Analysis of the Use of Broadband Internet Technology, *Working Paper; Milano, Italy* .

Cronin, F., Parker, E., Colleran, E. and Gold, M. (1991). Telecommunications Infrastructure and Economic Growth - An Analysis of Causality, *Telecommunications Policy* **15**(6): 529–535.

Czernich, N., Falck, O., Kretschmer, T. and Woessmann, L. (2011). Broadband Infrastructure and Economic Growth, *Economic Journal* **121**: 505–532.

Datta, A. and Agarwal, S. (2004). Telecomunications and Economic Growth: A Panel Data Approach, *Applied Economics* **36**(15): 1649–1654.

Draca, M., Sadun, R. and Van Reenen, J. (2007). *Productivity and ICTs: A Review of the Evidence*, in Mansell R., C. Avgerau, D. Quah and R. Siverstone (eds). The Oxford Handbook of Information and Communication Technologies. Oxford University Press Inc., New York.

Duggal, V., Saltzman, L. and Klein, L. (2007). Infrastructure and Productivity: An Extension to Private Infrastructure and IT Productivity, *Journal of Econometrics* **17**(2): 485–502.

European Commission (2010). Europe 2020 - a strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth, http://europa.eu/press_room/pdf/complet_en_barroso___007_-_europe_2020_-_en_version.pdf [Downloaded: 20.12.2010].

Federal Communications Commission (2010). Connecting America: The National Broadband Plan, http://download.broadband.gov/plan/national-broadband-plan.pdf [Downloaded: 06.12.2010].

Flaig, G. and Stadler, M. (1994). Success Breeds Success. The Dynamics of the Innovation Process, *Empirical Economics* **19**(1): 55–68.

Forman, C., Goldfarb, A. and Greenstein, S. (2011). The Internet and Local Wages: A Puzzle, *American Economic Review* **102**(1): 556–575.

Gillett, S., Lehr, W. and Osorio, C. (2006). Measuring the Economic Impact of Broadband Deployment, *Final Report National Technical Assistance, Training, Research and Evaluation Project* .

Greene, W. (2008). *Econometric Analysis*, 6th edition edn, Prentice-Hall.

Greenstein, S. and Spiller, P. (1995). Modern Telecommunications Infrastructure and Economic Activity: An Empirical Investigation, *Industrial and Corporate Change* **4**(4): 647–665.

Griffith, R., Huergo, E., Mairesse, J. and Peters, B. (2006). Innovation and Productivity Across Four European Countries, *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* **22**(4): 483–498.

Hagén, H.-O., Ahlstrand, C., Nilsson, E. and Adermon, A. (2007). *Innovation Matters: An Empirical Analysis of Innovation 2002-2004 and its impact on productivity.*, Statistics Sweden.

Hagén, H.-O. and Zeed, J. (2005). *Does ICT Use Matter for Firm Productivity?*, Statistics Sweden.

Hardy, A. (1980). The Role of Telephone in Economic Development, *Telecommunications Policy* **4**(4): 278–286.

Holt, L. and Jamison, M. (2009). Broadband and Contributions to Economic Growth: Lessons from the US Experience, *Telecommunications Policy* **33**(10-11): 575–581.

Jorgenson, D., Ho, M. and Stiroh, K. (2008). A Retrospective Look at the US Productivity Growth Resurgence, *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **22**(1): 3–24.

Koutroumpis, P. (2009). The Economic Impact of Broadband on Growth: A Simultaneous Approach, *Telecommunications Policy* **33**(9): 471–485.

Kretschmer, T. (2012). Information and communication technologies and productivity growth: A survey of the literature, *OECD Digital Economy Papers* (195).

Maddala, G. (1983). *Limited-Dependent and Qualitative Variables in Economics*, Cambridge University Press, New York.

OECD (2009). *OECD Communications Outlook 2009*, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris.

OECD and Eurostat (2005). *Oslo Manual, Guidelines For Collecting and Interpreting Innovation Data, Third edition*, OECD and Eurostat, Paris.

Peters, B. (2009). Persistence of Innovation: Stylised Facts and Panel Data Evidence, *The Journal of Technology Transfer* **34**(2): 226–243.

Polder, M., van Leeuwen, G., Mohnen, P. and Raymond, W. (2010). Product, Process and Organizational Innovation: Drivers, Complementarity and Productivity Effects, *UNU-MERIT Working Paper* (2010-035).

Prieger, J. E. and Heil, D. (2010). *The Microeeocnomic Impact of E-Business*, Encyclopedia of E-Business Development and Management in the Global Economy, I. Lee (ed.), Hershey, PA:IGI Global.

Röller, L. and Waverman, L. (2001). Telecommunications Infrastructure and Economic Development: A Simultaneous Approach, *American Economic Review* **91**(4): 909–923.

Shiu, A. and Lam, P.-L. (2008). Causal Relationship between Telecommunications and Economic Growth in China and its Regions, *Regional Studies* **42**(5): 705–718.

UNCTAD (2007). *Information Economy Report 2007-2008: Science and Technology for Development: The New Paradigm of ICT*, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD); New York and Geneva: United Nations.

Van Ark, B., O'Mahony, M. and Timmer, M. (2008). The Productivity Gap Between Europe and the United States: Trends and Causes, *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **22**(1): 25–44.

Van Reenen, J., Bloom, N., Draca, M., Kretschmer, T., Sadun, R., Overman, H. and Schankerman, M. (2010). *The Economic Impact of ICT*, Final Report to the European Commission. Centre for Economic Performance, London School of Economics.

Wooldridge, J. (2010). *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*, 2nd edn, MIT Press, Cambridge Massachusetts.

A Appendix

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics, Full Sample

Variable	**Mean**	**with broadband**	**without broadband**	**Number of obs.**
Labour Productivity 2003	0.19	0.20	0.18	1437
	(0.24)	(0.26)	(0.21)	
Process Innovation 2001 - 2003	0.75	0.80	0.68	1789
	(0.43)	(0.40)	(0.47)	
Product Innovation 2001 - 2003	0.65	0.71	0.57	1783
	(0.48)	(0.46)	(0.50)	
Broadband Internet Use 2002	0.61			3901
	(0.49)			
Internet Use 2002	0.98	1.0	0.95	4030
	(0.14)	(0.0)	(0.23)	
Total Employees 2001	166.11	205.46	94.90	4037
	(260.80)	(290.45)	(176.29)	
Investment 2001 (in Millions)	1.95	2.48	1.00	2594
	(6.25)	(7.35)	(3.40)	
% of Employees using a Comp.	0.52	0.59	0.40	4030
	(0.34)	(0.33)	(0.32)	
% of High Qualified Employees	0.21	0.25	0.15	3871
	(0.25)	(0.27)	(0.21)	
Product Innovation 1999 - 2001	0.65	0.71	0.55	3997
	(0.48)	(0.46)	(0.50)	
Enterprise Resource Planning	0.77	0.84	0.67	4012
	(0.42)	(0.37)	(0.47)	
Supply Chain Management	0.22	0.26	0.15	3993
	(0.41)	(0.44)	(0.35)	
Export Dummy	0.53	0.56	0.47	4000
	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.50)	
East Dummy	0.21	0.20	0.23	4036
	(0.41)	(0.40)	(0.42)	
GDP	28.38	29.17	26.99	4020
	(13.10)	(13.47)	(12.28)	

Source: ZEW ICT survey 2002 and 2004. Standard errors in brackets.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics, Estimation Sample

Variable	**Mean**	**with broadband**	**without broadband**	**Number of obs.**
Labour Productivity 2003	0.18	0.19	0.18	849
	(0.21)	(0.20)	(0.24)	
Process Innovation 2001 - 2003	0.76	0.80	0.71	985
	(0.43)	(0.40)	(0.45)	
Product Innovation 2001 - 2003	0.65	0.70	0.58	985
	(0.48)	(0.46)	(0.49)	
Broadband Internet Use 2002	0.58			985
	(0.49)			
Internet Use 2002	0.99	1.0	0.97	985
	(0.11)	(0.0)	(0.17)	
Total Employees 2001	136.19	167.71	92.54	985
	(223.37)	(251.46)	(168.04)	
Investment 2001 (in Millions)	1.59	1.96	1.08	985
	(3.94)	(4.60)	(2.72)	
% of Employees using a Comp.	0.51	0.59	0.40	985
	(0.34)	(0.33)	(0.32)	
% of High Qualified Employees	0.21	0.24	0.16	985
	(0.24)	(0.26)	(0.22)	
Product Innovation 1999 - 2001	0.66	0.71	0.58	985
	(0.47)	(0.45)	(0.49)	
Enterprise Resource Planning	0.77	0.84	0.67	980
	(0.42)	(0.37)	(0.47)	
Supply Chain Management	0.23	0.28	0.15	981
	(0.42)	(0.45)	(0.36)	
Export Dummy	0.53	0.57	0.49	985
	(0.50)	(0.50)	(0.50)	
East Dummy	0.22	0.22	0.21	985
	(0.41)	(0.41)	(0.41)	
GDP	27.81	28.66	26.64	985
	(13.39)	(14.03)	12.37	

Source: ZEW ICT survey 2002 and 2004. Standard errors in brackets.

Table 3: Postal Code Regions with DSL Availability

Postal Code Regions with DSL Availability			
Year	Number	Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
2000	1249	21.73	21.73
2001	3094	53.84	75.57
2002	625	10.88	86.45
2003	69	1.2	87.65
2004	277	4.82	92.47
2005	200	3.48	95.95
2006	125	2.18	98.12
2007	80	1.39	99.51
2008 & 2009	28	0.48	100

Mean values. A postal code region has broadband availability if at least one main distribution frame in the area is equipped with DSL. Source: Data from Deutsche Telekom AG.

Table 4: DSL Availability measured in Number of Days

	Mean	25%	50%	75%	90%
Days of DSL Availability	332	180	328	458	607

Reading help: On average, firms are located in postal code areas where DSL is available for 332 days. Source: Data from Deutsche Telekom AG. Estimation Sample.

Table 5: Results for Labour Productivity; OLS and IV

Labour Productivity	***OLS***			***IV GMM***		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Broadband Use in 2002	0.1127**	0.7997*	0.6576	0.7037*	0.6899*	0.3430
	(0.0456)	(0.4360)	(0.4139)	(0.4165)	(0.4122)	(0.3700)
Employees (in logs)	-0.1571***	-0.2854***	-0.2596***	-0.2514***	-0.2623***	-0.2531***
	(0.0279)	(0.0817)	(0.0801)	(0.0801)	(0.0772)	(0.0736)
Investment (in logs)	0.1511***	0.2247***	0.2130***	0.2060***	0.2112***	0.2226***
	(0.0201)	(0.0819)	(0.0757)	(0.0758)	(0.0732)	(0.0706)
% of Employees using a Comp.			0.4902***	0.5398***	0.5258***	0.6091***
			(0.1874)	(0.1889)	(0.1806)	(0.1586)
Enterprise Resource Planning					-0.0497	0.0064
					(0.0886)	(0.0828)
Supply Chain Management					0.1160	0.1383**
					(0.0728)	(0.0680)
% of High Qualified Employees				-0.1660	-0.1745	-0.1139
				(0.1387)	(0.1377)	(0.1329)
Product Innovation (1999-2001)				-0.0843	-0.0870	-0.0908
				(0.0695)	(0.0700)	(0.0656)
GDP per Capita						-0.0012
						(0.0019)
Region Dummies						x
Export Dummy	0.1666***	0.0475	0.0426	0.0603	0.0498	0.0583
	(0.0526)	(0.0815)	(0.0755)	(0.0797)	(0.0800)	(0.0755)
Constant	-1.3465***	-1.0650**	-1.2632***	-1.2852***	-1.1838**	-1.1063**
	(0.1519)	(0.5244)	(0.4702)	(0.4741)	(0.4605)	(0.4654)
Broadband Use, first stage						
Years of DSL availability		1.2436***	1.4512***	1.4479***	1.5004***	1.4799***
		(0.3217)	(0.3771)	(0.3745)	(0.3890)	(0.3671)
Employees (in logs)		-0.0250	-0.0403	-0.0389	-0.0376	-0.0306
		(0.0281)	(0.0325)	(0.0327)	(0.0305)	(0.0283)
Investment (in logs)		0.0003	-0.0019	-0.0011	-0.0010	-0.0026
		(0.0143)	(0.0134)	(0.0136)	(0.0132)	(0.0131)
% of Employees using a Comp.			-0.2082	-0.2055	-0.2164	-0.1949
			(0.1646)	(0.1627)	(0.1586)	(0.1450)
Enterprise Resource Planning					-0.0516	-0.0623
					(0.0602)	(0.0618)
Supply Chain Management					-0.0106	-0.0100
					(0.0463)	(0.0457)
% of High Qualified Employees				0.0053	0.0007	-0.0085
				(0.0861)	(0.0863)	(0.0873)
Product Innovation (1999-2001)				-0.0184	-0.0089	-0.0057
				(0.0399)	(0.0404)	(0.0405)
GDP per Capita						-0.0004
						(0.0012)
Region Dummies						x
Export Dummy		0.0184	0.0131	0.0124	0.0070	0.0189
		(0.0474)	(0.0443)	(0.0458)	(0.0463)	(0.0431)
Constant		0.0009	0.0286	0.0381	0.0581	0.0604
		(0.1222)	(0.1049)	(0.1072)	(0.1069)	(0.1187)
Partial F-Stat. (first stage)		7.85	10.47	9.29	9.25	7.18
Number of Observations	1137	770	770	759	752	751
Wald test		0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
R^2	0.21	0.027	0.12	0.10	0.10	0.24

Robust Standard errors are in brackets. The table only shows the first stage for broadband use and not for the inputs. All estimations include controls for industries and location.
Significant at 1% ***, significant at 5% ** , significant at 10% *

Table 6: Results for Process Innovation, Probit and Bivariate Probit

Process Innovation 2003-2001	***Probit*** (1)	***Recursive Bivariate Probit*** (2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Broadband Use in 2002	0.2599***	1.4082***	1.3985***	1.2976***	1.2878***
	(0.0931)	(0.1792)	(0.1823)	(0.2340)	(0.2389)
Employees (in logs)		-0.0461	-0.0615	-0.0594	-0.0589
		(0.0481)	(0.0482)	(0.0513)	(0.0516)
Investment (in logs)		0.0720**	0.0684**	0.0781**	0.0785**
		(0.0324)	(0.0323)	(0.0330)	(0.0330)
Product Innovation (1999-2001)			0.2541**	0.3053***	0.3022***
			(0.0997)	(0.1006)	(0.1008)
% of Employees using a Comp.				-0.3166	-0.3458*
				(0.1974)	(0.2025)
% of High Qualified Employees					0.1693
					(0.2306)
Exports	0.2700***	0.0363	-0.0103	0.0116	0.0068
	(0.1017)	(0.0995)	(0.1003)	(0.1022)	(0.1025)
GDP per Capita		-0.0039	-0.0030	-0.0021	-0.0022
		(0.0033)	(0.0034)	(0.0034)	(0.0034)
Region Dummies		x	x	x	x
Constant	0.5523***	0.3850	0.2970	0.3875	0.3967
	(0.1689)	(0.3066)	(0.3084)	(0.3143)	(0.3152)
Broadband Use					
Years of DSL Availability		0.2791***	0.2654***	0.2415***	0.2415***
		(0.0727)	(0.0734)	(0.0764)	(0.0766)
Employees (in logs)		0.1796***	0.1732***	0.2026***	0.2025***
		(0.0470)	(0.0473)	(0.0483)	(0.0484)
Investment (in logs)		0.0562*	0.0565*	0.0483	0.0485
		(0.0325)	(0.0324)	(0.0331)	(0.0331)
Product Innovation (1999-2001)			0.0883	-0.0202	-0.0194
			(0.0979)	(0.1012)	(0.1014)
% of Employees using a Comp.				1.0549***	1.0632***
				(0.1643)	(0.1728)
% of High Qualified Employees					-0.0374
					(0.2382)
Exports		0.1804*	0.1610	0.1335	0.1348
		(0.1002)	(0.1021)	(0.1040)	(0.1045)
GDP per Capita		0.0034	0.0037	0.0012	0.0012
		(0.0035)	(0.0035)	(0.0036)	(0.0036)
Region Dummies		x	x	x	x
Constant		-1.1047***	-1.1001***	-0.9558***	-0.9425***
		(0.2935)	(0.2935)	(0.3009)	(0.3020)
ρ		-0.8022***	-0.8005***	-0.7424**	-0.7364**
		(0.1046)	(0.1054)	(0.1350)	(0.1382)
Number of Observations	985	985	985	985	985
Likelihood Ratio Test		0.0033	0.0042	0.0128	0.0145

Standard errors are in brackets. All estimations include controls for industries and location.
Significant at 1% ***, significant at 5% ** , significant at 10% *

Table 7: Marginal Effects Process Innovation

Process Innovation 2003-2001	***Probit*** (1)	***Recursive Bivariate Probit*** (2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Broadband Use in 2002	0.0796***	0.6300***	0.6257***	0.5660***	0.5601***
	(0.0288)	(0.1045)	(0.1066)	(0.1336)	(0.1361)
Employees (in logs)		0.0064	0.0008	0.0039	0.0039
		(0.0134)	(0.0134)	(0.0141)	(0.0142)
Investment (in logs)		0.0291***	0.0279***	0.0295***	0.0296***
		(0.0091)	(0.0090)	(0.0092)	(0.0092)
Product Innovation (1999-2001)			0.0950***	0.0971***	0.0960***
			(0.0303)	(0.0308)	(0.0308)
% of Employees using a Comp.				0.0180	0.0093
				(0.0521)	(0.0532)
% of High Qualified Employees					0.0483
					(0.0663)
GDP per Capita		-0.0008	-0.0005	-0.0005	-0.0006
		(0.0009)	(0.0010)	(0.0010)	(0.0010)
Export Dummy	0.0819***	0.0327	0.0155	0.0184	0.01670
	(0.0309)	(0.0279)	(0.0280)	(0.0289)	(0.0289)
Number of Observations	985	985	985	985	985

Marginal effects at the mean in column (1). Marginal effects at the mean, conditional on broadband being used in columns (2)-(5), except of coefficient for broadband use. Standard errors in brackets. Significant at 1% ***, significant at 5% ** , significant at 10% *

Table 8: Average Marginal Effect (Probit) and Average Treatment Effects (Recursive Probit) Process Innovation

Process Innovation 2003-2001	***Probit*** (1)	***Recursive Bivariate Probit*** (2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Broadband Use in 2002	0.0780***	0.4530***	0.4470***	0.4093***	0.4057***
	(0.0254)	(0.0687)	(0.0688)	(0.0788)	(0.0807)
Number of Observations	985	985	985	985	985

Column (1) provides average marginal effects. Columns (2)-(5) provide average treatment effects. Standard errors in brackets. Significant at 1% ***, significant at 5% ** , significant at 10% *

Table 9: Results for Product Innovation, Probit and Bivariate Probit

Product Innovation 2003-2001	***Probit*** (1)	***Recursive Bivariate Probit*** (2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Broadband Use in 2002	0.1893**	0.8529*	0.9717**	1.0862***	1.1048***
	(0.0891)	(0.4435)	(0.4913)	(0.3867)	(0.3901)
Employees (in logs)		0.1221*	0.0638	0.0500	0.0467
		(0.0671)	(0.0702)	(0.0660)	(0.0670)
Investment (in logs)		0.0175	0.0007	-0.0010	-0.0007
		(0.0332)	(0.0334)	(0.0322)	(0.0324)
Product Innovation (1999-2001)			0.8624***	0.8450***	0.8291***
			(0.1668)	(0.1380)	(0.1392)
% of Employees using a Comp.				-0.1544	-0.2997
				(0.2438)	(0.2416)
% of High Qualified Employees					0.6728***
					(0.2548)
Export Dummy	0.5763***	0.3923***	0.2370*	0.2272**	0.2004*
	(0.0982)	(0.1227)	(0.1233)	(0.1143)	(0.1145)
GDP per Capita		-0.0028	0.0000	0.0003	-0.0001
		(0.0034)	(0.0036)	(0.0035)	(0.0035)
Region Dummies		x	x	x	x
Constant	-0.1097	-1.0635***	-1.4653***	-1.4139***	-1.3794***
	(0.1570)	(0.3095)	(0.3426)	(0.3494)	(0.3532)
Broadband Use					
Years of DSL Availability		0.2426***	0.2249***	0.1987**	0.1954**
		(0.0799)	(0.0796)	(0.0792)	(0.0793)
Employees (in logs)		0.1848***	0.1755***	0.2015***	0.2009***
		(0.0474)	(0.0482)	(0.0489)	(0.0490)
Investment (in logs)		0.0600*	0.0602*	0.0515	0.0525
		(0.0323)	(0.0324)	(0.0330)	(0.0331)
Product Innovation (1999-2001)			0.0979	-0.0019	-0.0022
			(0.0992)	(0.1021)	(0.1023)
% of Employees using a Comp.				1.0950***	1.0910***
				(0.1646)	(0.1726)
% of High Qualified Employees					0.0155
					(0.2348)
Exports		0.1648	0.1438	0.1037	0.1009
		(0.1016)	(0.1037)	(0.1049)	(0.1056)
GDP per Capita		0.0029	0.0031	0.0004	0.0004
		(0.0035)	(0.0035)	(0.0036)	(0.0036)
Region Dummies		x	x	x	x
Constant		-0.5671	-0.6986	-0.8494**	-0.8697**
		(0.3645)	(0.4606)	(0.4254)	(0.4413)
ρ		-0.5132	-0.6035	-0.6907*	-0.7012*
		(0.2684)	(0.2929)	(0.2224)	(0.2243)
Number of Observations	985	985	985	985	985
Likelihood Ratio Test		0.1676	0.1967	0.0871	0.0927

Standard errors in brackets. All estimations include controls for industries and location.
Significant at 1% ***, significant at 5% ** , significant at 10% *

Table 10: Marginal Effects Product Innovation

Product Innovation 2003-2001	***Probit*** (1)	***Recursive Bivariate Probit*** (2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Broadband Use in 2002	0.0693**	0.3571*	0.4168*	0.4776**	0.4873**
	(0.0327)	(0.2074)	(0.2392)	(0.1942)	(0.1977)
Employees (in logs)		0.0668***	0.0476**	0.0505**	0.0492**
		(0.0180)	(0.0194)	(0.0199)	(0.0203)
Investment (in logs)		0.0132	0.0080	0.0073	0.0076
		(0.0115)	(0.0118)	(0.0121)	(0.0119)
Product Innovation (1999-2001)			0.3640***	0.3562***	0.3496***
			(0.0372)	(0.0375)	(0.0379)
% of Employees using a Comp.				0.1018	0.0439
				(0.0662)	(0.0686)
% of High Qualified Employees					0.2741***
					(0.0933)
GDP per Capita		-0.0008	0.0004	0.0002	0.0000
		(0.0013)	(0.0013)	(0.0013)	(0.0013)
Export Dummy	0.2091***	0.1685***	0.1170***	0.1080***	0.0966**
	(0.0350)	(0.0371)	(0.0394)	(0.0397)	(0.0401)
Number of Observations	985	985	985	985	985

Marginal effects at the mean in column (1). Marginal effects at the mean, conditional on broadband being used in columns (2)-(5), except of coefficient for broadband use. Standard errors in brackets. Significant at 1% ***, significant at 5% ** , significant at 10% *

Table 11: Average Marginal Effects (Probit) and Average Treatment Effects (Recursive Probit), Product Innovation

Product Innovation 2003-2001	***Probit*** (1)	***Recursive Bivariate Probit*** (2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Broadband Use in 2002	0.0626***	0.2829***	0.3024**	0.3425***	0.3458***
	(0.0284)	(0.0944)	(0.1220)	(0.1110)	(0.1168)
Number of Observations	985	985	985	985	985

Column (1) provides average marginal effects. Columns (2)-(5) provide average treatment effects. Standard errors in brackets. Significant at 1% ***, significant at 5% ** , significant at 10%*

Table 12: Results for Process Innovations; OLS and IV GMM

Process Innovations 2001-2003	***OLS*** (1)	***IV GMM*** (2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Broadband Use in 2002	0.0376	0.7005**	0.6252**	0.6465**	0.6437**
	(0.0284)	(0.2753)	(0.2697)	(0.2580)	(0.2566)
Employees (in logs)	0.0157	-0.0311	-0.0314	-0.0369	-0.0368
	(0.0151)	(0.0262)	(0.0250)	(0.0263)	(0.0262)
Investment (in logs)	0.0342***	0.0214	0.0212	0.0229*	0.0230*
	(0.0107)	(0.0142)	(0.0136)	(0.0133)	(0.0133)
Product Innovation (1999-2001)			0.0982**	0.1167***	0.1154***
			(0.0393)	(0.0383)	(0.0383)
% of Employees using a Comp.				-0.1838	-0.1955*
				(0.1168)	(0.1182)
% of High Qualified Employees					0.0577
					(0.0866)
Exports	0.0468	0.0024	-0.0104	-0.0061	-0.0081
	(0.0330)	(0.0438)	(0.0420)	(0.0412)	(0.0415)
GDP per Capita	-0.0007	-0.0016	-0.0012	-0.0008	-0.0009
	(0.0010)	(0.0014)	(0.0013)	(0.0013)	(0.0013)
Region Dummies	x	x	x	x	x
Constant	0.7356***	0.6629***	0.6312***	0.6650***	0.6678***
	(0.0962)	(0.1207)	(0.1152)	(0.1137)	(0.1139)
Broadband Use, first stage					
Broadband Use in 2002		1.1944***	1.2035***	1.3900***	1.3950***
		(0.3043)	(0.3119)	(0.3286)	(0.3288)
Employees (in logs)		-0.0119	-0.0121	-0.0270	-0.0274
		(0.0257)	(0.0257)	(0.0290)	(0.0290)
Investment (in logs)		-0.0040	-0.0041	-0.0060	-0.0060
		(0.0125)	(0.0125)	(0.0116)	(0.0116)
Product Innovation (1999-2001)			-0.0072	-0.0005	-0.0006
			(0.0370)	(0.0347)	(0.0348)
% of Employees using a Comp.				-0.1471	-0.1499
				(0.1385)	(0.1383)
% of High Qualified Employees					0.0039
					(0.0756)
Exports		-0.0121	-0.0116	-0.0180	-0.0183
		(0.0402)	(0.0399)	(0.0377)	(0.0378)
GDP per Capita		-0.0003	-0.0003	-0.0002	-0.0002
		(0.0012)	(0.0012)	(0.0011)	(0.0011)
Region Dummies		x	x	x	x
Constant		-0.0304	-0.0284	-0.0205	-0.0206
		(0.1136)	(0.1134)	(0.1058)	(0.1059)
Partial F-Stat. (first stage)		6.8432	6.6270	8.9886	8.6932
R^2	0.0899	.	.	.	.
χ^2		68.96	81.45	82.36	83.66
Number of Observations	985	985	985	985	985

Significant at 1% ***, significant at 5% ** , significant at 10% *
Robust Standard errors are in brackets. All estimations include controls for industries and location.

Table 13: Results for Product Innovations; OLS and IV GMM

Product Innovations 2001-2003	***OLS*** (1)	***IV GMM*** (2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Broadband Use in 2002	0.0091	0.5608**	0.3286	0.3368	0.3429
	(0.0306)	(0.2832)	(0.2485)	(0.2307)	(0.2275)
Employees (in logs)	0.0599***	0.0209	0.0181	0.0165	0.0158
	(0.0159)	(0.0266)	(0.0232)	(0.0237)	(0.0233)
Investment (in logs)	0.0123	0.0016	0.0003	0.0007	0.0006
	(0.0112)	(0.0135)	(0.0119)	(0.0115)	(0.0114)
Product Innovation (1999-2001)			0.3373***	0.3421***	0.3378***
			(0.0366)	(0.0361)	(0.0360)
% of Employees using a Comp.				-0.0485	-0.0923
				(0.1012)	(0.1013)
% of High Qualified Employees					0.1866***
					(0.0662)
Exports	0.1623***	0.1253***	0.0795**	0.0805**	0.0732*
	(0.0351)	(0.0439)	(0.0384)	(0.0372)	(0.0374)
GDP per Capita	-0.0007	-0.0014	-0.0001	0.0000	-0.0001
	(0.0011)	(0.0013)	(0.0011)	(0.0011)	(0.0011)
Region Dummies	x	x	x	x	x
Constant	0.1898*	0.1292	0.0175	0.0262	0.0350
	(0.1052)	(0.1237)	(0.1071)	(0.1054)	(0.1049)
Broadband Use, first stage					
Broadband Use in 2002		1.1944***	1.2035***	1.3900***	1.3950***
		(0.3043)	(0.3119)	(0.3286)	(0.3288)
Employees (in logs)		-0.0119	-0.0121	-0.0270	-0.0274
		(0.0257)	(0.0257)	(0.0290)	(0.0290)
Investment (in logs)		-0.0040	-0.0041	-0.0060	-0.0060
		(0.0125)	(0.0125)	(0.0116)	(0.0116)
Product Innovation (1999-2001)			-0.0072	-0.0005	-0.0006
			(0.0370)	(0.0347)	(0.0348)
% of Employees using a Comp.				-0.1471	-0.1499
				(0.1385)	(0.1383)
% of High Qualified Employees					0.0039
					(0.0756)
Exports		-0.0121	-0.0116	-0.0180	-0.0183
		(0.0402)	(0.0399)	(0.0377)	(0.0378)
GDP per Capita		-0.0003	-0.0003	-0.0002	-0.0002
		(0.0012)	(0.0012)	(0.0011)	(0.0011)
Region Dummies		x	x	x	x
Constant		-0.0304	-0.0284	-0.0205	-0.0206
		(0.1136)	(0.1134)	(0.1058)	(0.1059)
Partial F-Stat. (first stage)		6.8432	6.6270	8.9886	8.6932
R^2	0.1873	.	0.1826	0.1782	0.1797
χ^2		217.08	442.43	450.09	474.39
Number of Observations	985	985	985	985	985

Significant at 1% ***, significant at 5% ** , significant at 10% *
Robust Standard errors are in brackets. All estimations include controls for industries and location.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSION PAPERS

86 Bertschek, Irene, Cerquera, Daniel and Klein, Gordon J., More Bits – More Bucks? Measuring the Impact of Broadband Internet on Firm Performance, February 2013.
Forthcoming in: Information Economics and Policy.

85 Rasch, Alexander and Wenzel, Tobias, Piracy in a Two-Sided Software Market, February 2013.
Forthcoming in: Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization.

84 Bataille, Marc and Steinmetz, Alexander, Intermodal Competition on Some Routes in Transportation Networks: The Case of Inter Urban Buses and Railways, January 2013.

83 Haucap, Justus and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Google, Facebook, Amazon, eBay: Is the Internet Driving Competition or Market Monopolization?, January 2013.

82 Regner, Tobias and Riener, Gerhard, Voluntary Payments, Privacy and Social Pressure on the Internet: A Natural Field Experiment, December 2012.

81 Dertwinkel-Kalt, Markus and Wey, Christian, The Effects of Remedies on Merger Activity in Oligopoly, December 2012.

80 Baumann, Florian and Friehe, Tim, Optimal Damages Multipliers in Oligopolistic Markets, December 2012.

79 Duso, Tomaso, Röller, Lars-Hendrik and Seldeslachts, Jo, Collusion through Joint R&D: An Empirical Assessment, December 2012.
Forthcoming in: The Review of Economics and Statistics.

78 Baumann, Florian and Heine, Klaus, Innovation, Tort Law, and Competition, December 2012.

77 Coenen, Michael and Jovanovic, Dragan, Investment Behavior in a Constrained Dictator Game, November 2012.

76 Gu, Yiquan and Wenzel, Tobias, Strategic Obfuscation and Consumer Protection Policy in Financial Markets: Theory and Experimental Evidence, November 2012.

75 Haucap, Justus, Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Jovanovic, Dragan, Competition in Germany's Minute Reserve Power Market: An Econometric Analysis, November 2012.

74 Normann, Hans-Theo, Rösch, Jürgen and Schultz, Luis Manuel, Do Buyer Groups Facilitate Collusion?, November 2012.

73 Riener, Gerhard and Wiederhold, Simon, Heterogeneous Treatment Effects in Groups, November 2012.

72 Berlemann, Michael and Haucap, Justus, Which Factors Drive the Decision to Boycott and Opt Out of Research Rankings? A Note, November 2012.

71 Muck, Johannes and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, First Mover Advantages in Mobile Telecommunications: Evidence from OECD Countries, October 2012.

70 Karaçuka, Mehmet, Çatik, A. Nazif and Haucap, Justus, Consumer Choice and Local Network Effects in Mobile Telecommunications in Turkey, October 2012.
Forthcoming in: Telecommunications Policy.

69 Clemens, Georg and Rau, Holger A., Rebels without a Clue? Experimental Evidence on Explicit Cartels, October 2012.

68 Regner, Tobias and Riener, Gerhard, Motivational Cherry Picking, September 2012.

67 Fonseca, Miguel A. and Normann, Hans-Theo, Excess Capacity and Pricing in Bertrand-Edgeworth Markets: Experimental Evidence, September 2012.
Forthcoming in: Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics.

66 Riener, Gerhard and Wiederhold, Simon, Team Building and Hidden Costs of Control, September 2012.

65 Fonseca, Miguel A. and Normann, Hans-Theo, Explicit vs. Tacit Collusion – The Impact of Communication in Oligopoly Experiments, August 2012.
Forthcoming in: European Economic Review.

64 Jovanovic, Dragan and Wey, Christian, An Equilibrium Analysis of Efficiency Gains from Mergers, July 2012.

63 Dewenter, Ralf, Jaschinski, Thomas and Kuchinke, Björn A., Hospital Market Concentration and Discrimination of Patients, July 2012.

62 Von Schlippenbach, Vanessa and Teichmann, Isabel, The Strategic Use of Private Quality Standards in Food Supply Chains, May 2012.
Forthcoming in: American Journal of Agricultural Economics.

61 Sapi, Geza, Bargaining, Vertical Mergers and Entry, July 2012.

60 Jentzsch, Nicola, Sapi, Geza and Suleymanova, Irina, Targeted Pricing and Customer Data Sharing Among Rivals, July 2012.
Forthcoming in: International Journal of Industrial Organization.

59 Lambarraa, Fatima and Riener, Gerhard, On the Norms of Charitable Giving in Islam: A Field Experiment, June 2012.

58 Duso, Tomaso, Gugler, Klaus and Szücs, Florian, An Empirical Assessment of the 2004 EU Merger Policy Reform, June 2012.

57 Dewenter, Ralf and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, More Ads, More Revs? Is there a Media Bias in the Likelihood to be Reviewed?, June 2012.

56 Böckers, Veit, Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Müller Andrea, Pull-Forward Effects in the German Car Scrappage Scheme: A Time Series Approach, June 2012.

55 Kellner, Christian and Riener, Gerhard, The Effect of Ambiguity Aversion on Reward Scheme Choice, June 2012.

54 De Silva, Dakshina G., Kosmopoulou, Georgia, Pagel, Beatrice and Peeters, Ronald, The Impact of Timing on Bidding Behavior in Procurement Auctions of Contracts with Private Costs, June 2012.
Forthcoming in: Review of Industrial Organization.

53 Benndorf, Volker and Rau, Holger A., Competition in the Workplace: An Experimental Investigation, May 2012.

52 Haucap, Justus and Klein, Gordon J., How Regulation Affects Network and Service Quality in Related Markets, May 2012.
Published in: Economics Letters 117 (2012), pp. 521-524.

51 Dewenter, Ralf and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Less Pain at the Pump? The Effects of Regulatory Interventions in Retail Gasoline Markets, May 2012.

50 Böckers, Veit and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, The Extent of European Power Markets, April 2012.

49 Barth, Anne-Kathrin and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, How Large is the Magnitude of Fixed-Mobile Call Substitution? - Empirical Evidence from 16 European Countries, April 2012.

48 Herr, Annika and Suppliet, Moritz, Pharmaceutical Prices under Regulation: Tiered Co-payments and Reference Pricing in Germany, April 2012.

47 Haucap, Justus and Müller, Hans Christian, The Effects of Gasoline Price Regulations: Experimental Evidence, April 2012.

46 Stühmeier, Torben, Roaming and Investments in the Mobile Internet Market, March 2012.
Published in: Telecommunications Policy, 36 (2012), pp. 595-607.

45 Graf, Julia, The Effects of Rebate Contracts on the Health Care System, March 2012.

44 Pagel, Beatrice and Wey, Christian, Unionization Structures in International Oligopoly, February 2012.
Forthcoming in: LABOUR: Review of Labour Economics and Industrial Relations.

43 Gu, Yiquan and Wenzel, Tobias, Price-Dependent Demand in Spatial Models, January 2012.
Published in: B. E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy,12 (2012), Article 6.

42 Barth, Anne-Kathrin and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Does the Growth of Mobile Markets Cause the Demise of Fixed Networks? – Evidence from the European Union, January 2012.

41 Stühmeier, Torben and Wenzel, Tobias, Regulating Advertising in the Presence of Public Service Broadcasting, January 2012.
Published in: Review of Network Economics, 11, 2 (2012), Article 1.

40 Müller, Hans Christian, Forecast Errors in Undisclosed Management Sales Forecasts: The Disappearance of the Overoptimism Bias, December 2011.

39 Gu, Yiquan and Wenzel, Tobias, Transparency, Entry, and Productivity, November 2011.
Published in: Economics Letters, 115 (2012), pp. 7-10.

38 Christin, Clémence, Entry Deterrence Through Cooperative R&D Over-Investment, November 2011.
Forthcoming in: Louvain Economic Review.

37 Haucap, Justus, Herr, Annika and Frank, Björn, In Vino Veritas: Theory and Evidence on Social Drinking, November 2011.

36 Barth, Anne-Kathrin and Graf, Julia, Irrationality Rings! – Experimental Evidence on Mobile Tariff Choices, November 2011.

35 Jeitschko, Thomas D. and Normann, Hans-Theo, Signaling in Deterministic and Stochastic Settings, November 2011.
Forthcoming in: Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization.

34 Christin, Cémence, Nicolai, Jean-Philippe and Pouyet, Jerome, The Role of Abatement Technologies for Allocating Free Allowances, October 2011.

33 Keser, Claudia, Suleymanova, Irina and Wey, Christian, Technology Adoption in Markets with Network Effects: Theory and Experimental Evidence, October 2011.
Published in: Information Economics and Policy, 24 (2012), pp. 262-276.

32 Çatik, A. Nazif and Karaçuka, Mehmet, The Bank Lending Channel in Turkey: Has it Changed after the Low Inflation Regime?, September 2011.
Published in: Applied Economics Letters, 19 (2012), pp. 1237-1242.

31 Hauck, Achim, Neyer, Ulrike and Vieten, Thomas, Reestablishing Stability and Avoiding a Credit Crunch: Comparing Different Bad Bank Schemes, August 2011.

30 Suleymanova, Irina and Wey, Christian, Bertrand Competition in Markets with Network Effects and Switching Costs, August 2011.
Published in: B. E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy, 11 (2011), Article 56.

29 Stühmeier, Torben, Access Regulation with Asymmetric Termination Costs, July 2011.
Published in: Journal of Regulatory Economics, 43 (2013), pp. 60-89.

28 Dewenter, Ralf, Haucap, Justus and Wenzel, Tobias, On File Sharing with Indirect Network Effects Between Concert Ticket Sales and Music Recordings, July 2011.
Published in: Journal of Media Economics, 25 (2012), pp. 168-178.

27 Von Schlippenbach, Vanessa and Wey, Christian, One-Stop Shopping Behavior, Buyer Power, and Upstream Merger Incentives, June 2011.

26 Balsmeier, Benjamin, Buchwald, Achim and Peters, Heiko, Outside Board Memberships of CEOs: Expertise or Entrenchment?, June 2011.

25 Clougherty, Joseph A. and Duso, Tomaso, Using Rival Effects to Identify Synergies and Improve Merger Typologies, June 2011.
Published in: Strategic Organization, 9 (2011), pp. 310-335.

24 Heinz, Matthias, Juranek, Steffen and Rau, Holger A., Do Women Behave More Reciprocally than Men? Gender Differences in Real Effort Dictator Games, June 2011.
Published in: Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization, 83 (2012), pp. 105-110.

23 Sapi, Geza and Suleymanova, Irina, Technology Licensing by Advertising Supported Media Platforms: An Application to Internet Search Engines, June 2011.
Published in: B. E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy, 11 (2011), Article 37.

22 Buccirossi, Paolo, Ciari, Lorenzo, Duso, Tomaso, Spagnolo Giancarlo and Vitale, Cristiana, Competition Policy and Productivity Growth: An Empirical Assessment, May 2011.
Forthcoming in: The Review of Economics and Statistics.

21 Karaçuka, Mehmet and Çatik, A. Nazif, A Spatial Approach to Measure Productivity Spillovers of Foreign Affiliated Firms in Turkish Manufacturing Industries, May 2011.
Published in: The Journal of Developing Areas, 46 (2012), pp. 65-83.

20 Çatik, A. Nazif and Karaçuka, Mehmet, A Comparative Analysis of Alternative Univariate Time Series Models in Forecasting Turkish Inflation, May 2011.
Published in: Journal of Business Economics and Management, 13 (2012), pp. 275-293.

19 Normann, Hans-Theo and Wallace, Brian, The Impact of the Termination Rule on Cooperation in a Prisoner's Dilemma Experiment, May 2011.
Published in: International Journal of Game Theory, 41 (2012), pp. 707-718.

18 Baake, Pio and von Schlippenbach, Vanessa, Distortions in Vertical Relations, April 2011.
Published in: Journal of Economics, 103 (2011), pp. 149-169.

17 Haucap, Justus and Schwalbe, Ulrich, Economic Principles of State Aid Control, April 2011.
Forthcoming in: F. Montag & F. J. Säcker (eds.), European State Aid Law: Article by Article Commentary, Beck: München 2012.

16 Haucap, Justus and Heimeshoff, Ulrich, Consumer Behavior towards On-net/Off-net Price Differentiation, January 2011.
Published in: Telecommunication Policy, 35 (2011), pp. 325-332.

15 Duso, Tomaso, Gugler, Klaus and Yurtoglu, Burcin B., How Effective is European Merger Control? January 2011.
Published in: European Economic Review, 55 (2011), pp. 980-1006.

14 Haigner, Stefan D., Jenewein, Stefan, Müller, Hans Christian and Wakolbinger, Florian, The First shall be Last: Serial Position Effects in the Case Contestants evaluate Each Other, December 2010.
Published in: Economics Bulletin, 30 (2010), pp. 3170-3176.

13 Suleymanova, Irina and Wey, Christian, On the Role of Consumer Expectations in Markets with Network Effects, November 2010.
Published in: Journal of Economics, 105 (2012), pp. 101-127.

12 Haucap, Justus, Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Karaçuka, Mehmet, Competition in the Turkish Mobile Telecommunications Market: Price Elasticities and Network Substitution, November 2010.
Published in: Telecommunications Policy, 35 (2011), pp. 202-210.

11 Dewenter, Ralf, Haucap, Justus and Wenzel, Tobias, Semi-Collusion in Media Markets, November 2010.
Published in: International Review of Law and Economics, 31 (2011), pp. 92-98.

10 Dewenter, Ralf and Kruse, Jörn, Calling Party Pays or Receiving Party Pays? The Diffusion of Mobile Telephony with Endogenous Regulation, October 2010.
Published in: Information Economics and Policy, 23 (2011), pp. 107-117.

09 Hauck, Achim and Neyer, Ulrike, The Euro Area Interbank Market and the Liquidity Management of the Eurosystem in the Financial Crisis, September 2010.

08 Haucap, Justus, Heimeshoff, Ulrich and Luis Manuel Schultz, Legal and Illegal Cartels in Germany between 1958 and 2004, September 2010.
Published in: H. J. Ramser & M. Stadler (eds.), Marktmacht. Wirtschaftswissenschaftliches Seminar Ottobeuren, Volume 39, Mohr Siebeck: Tübingen 2010, pp. 71-94.

07 Herr, Annika, Quality and Welfare in a Mixed Duopoly with Regulated Prices: The Case of a Public and a Private Hospital, September 2010.
Published in: German Economic Review, 12 (2011), pp. 422-437.

06 Blanco, Mariana, Engelmann, Dirk and Normann, Hans-Theo, A Within-Subject Analysis of Other-Regarding Preferences, September 2010.
Published in: Games and Economic Behavior, 72 (2011), pp. 321-338.

05 Normann, Hans-Theo, Vertical Mergers, Foreclosure and Raising Rivals' Costs – Experimental Evidence, September 2010.
Published in: The Journal of Industrial Economics, 59 (2011), pp. 506-527.

04 Gu, Yiquan and Wenzel, Tobias, Transparency, Price-Dependent Demand and Product Variety, September 2010.
Published in: Economics Letters, 110 (2011), pp. 216-219.

03 Wenzel, Tobias, Deregulation of Shopping Hours: The Impact on Independent Retailers and Chain Stores, September 2010.
Published in: Scandinavian Journal of Economics, 113 (2011), pp. 145-166.

02 Stühmeier, Torben and Wenzel, Tobias, Getting Beer During Commercials: Adverse Effects of Ad-Avoidance, September 2010.
Published in: Information Economics and Policy, 23 (2011), pp. 98-106.

01 Inderst, Roman and Wey, Christian, Countervailing Power and Dynamic Efficiency, September 2010.
Published in: Journal of the European Economic Association, 9 (2011), pp. 702-720.

Heinrich-Heine-University of Düsseldorf

Düsseldorf Institute for
Competition Economics (DICE)

Universitätsstraße 1 _ 40225 Düsseldorf
www.dice.hhu.de

ISSN 2190-9938 (online)
ISBN 978-3-86304-085-7