R&D activity in a dynamic factor demand model: a panel data analysis of small and medium size German firms

Andrew J. Buck, Manfred Stadler

Buck, Andrew J., and Manfred Stadler. 1991. “R&D activity in a dynamic factor demand model: a panel data analysis of small and medium size German firms.” Augsburg: Volkswirtschaftliches Institut, Universität Augsburg.

INSTITUT FÜR VOLKSWIRTSCHAFTSLEHRE

der

UNIVERSITÄT AUGSBURG

R&D Activity in a Dynamic Factor Demand Model:

A Panel Data Analysis of Small and Medium Size German Firms

von

Andrew J. Buck und Manfred Stadler

Beitrag Nr. 68

Dezember 1991

lkswirtschaftliche Diskussionsreihe

Institut für Volkswirtschaftslehre
Universität Augsburg

Memminger Straße 14
8900 Augsburg
Tel.-Nr. (08 21) 5 98-(1)
Telex 5 3 830 uniaug
Telefax (08 21) 5 98-55 05

R&D Activity in a Dynamic Factor Demand Model:

A Panel Data Analysis of Small and Medium Size German Firms

von

Andrew J. Buck und Manfred Stadler

Beitrag Nr. 68

Dezember 1991

R&D Activity in a Dynamic Factor Demand Model:
A Panel Data Analysis of Small and Medium Size German Firms

by

Andrew J. Buck and Manfred Stadler*

Abstract

The focus of this paper is an econometric analysis of the determinants of the firms' R&D expenditures in the context of a general dynamic factor demand model. Besides the traditional production factors we treat technological knowledge, endogenously determined by private R&D expenditures, as a further input factor. While labor and materials are assumed to be variable, capital and know-how are considered as quasi-fixed. The dynamic demand equations for labor, capital investment and R&D which are derived from an intertemporal cost minimization are estimated for a panel data set of small and medium size German firms. The data covers the period between 1978 and 1982 and includes 408 firms. It turns out that R&D activity depends on the underlying production structure as suggested by neoclassical theory. In addition, by introducing firm specific effects, we can show that firm size and market concentration influence innovative behavior in accordance with the Schumpeterian hypotheses.

---

* Temple University, Philadelphia, USA and University of Augsburg, FRG.

We would like to thank Prof. Albach for providing us with the panel data set. Helpful suggestions and comments were received from seminar participants at the University of Augsburg and at the fourth DFG workshop "Marktstruktur und gesamtwirtschaftliche Entwicklung" in Munich. Financial support of DFG is gratefully acknowledged.

1. Introduction

Most empirical studies of firms' innovative behavior have followed Schumpeterian lines of analysis. Private R&D expenditures were related to firm size, market share or market concentration ratios. The main issue of these studies was the identification of an optimal firm size or an optimal degree of concentration implying maximum innovative activity and hence economic growth (see e.g. Kamien, Schwartz 1982 for a survey). In modern production theory, however, R&D expenditures are considered as investment in a stock of technological knowledge embodied in the firm similar to capital investment. Hence, if technological knowledge can usefully be treated as a production factor in its own right, R&D expenditures should not depend only on firm size and market concentration, but also on the relative prices of all factor inputs.

The objective of this paper is to examine the importance of the relationships between R&D expenditures and the demands for the other factor inputs capital, labor and materials. As usual in modern production theory our model is based on the approach of dynamic duality. We adapt a rather flexible restricted cost function to derive a system of dynamic interrelated factor demands. Following recent work of Mohnen, Nadiri, Prucha (1986) and Bernstein, Nadiri (1989), labor and materials are assumed to be variable, while capital and knowledge are treated as quasi-fixed. That is, while firms are able to adjust labor and materials instantaneously in response to a change in relative factor prices, they can adjust their stocks of capital and technological know-how only slowly and at some cost measured in terms of foregone output. In contrast to these earlier studies we allow for a more general production structure. In particular, we account for autonomous technological change due to knowledge not accumulated within the firms and for non-constant returns to scale by using a non-homothetic cost function. Since we explicitly derive the demand functions by dynamic cost minimization, our model belongs to the so-called "third generation models of dynamic factor demand" (Berndt, Morrison, Watkins 1981).

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, the dynamic demand equations for labor, capital investment and R&D investment are derived from an intertemporal cost minimization problem using a normalized restricted cost function. Section 3 contains a short description of the data and the econometric specification of our model. The estimation results of the interrelated factor demand system are presented in section 4. Section 5 highlights the additional impact of market structure on the factor demands. Section 6 finally contains some concluding remarks.

A w

2. The Theoretical Model of the Production Structure

We assume that the firms' production process for any period t can be described by a production function

$$(1) \quad Y_t = Y(V_t, F_{t-1}, \Delta F_t)$$

where a single output, Y_t, is produced with variable and quasi-fixed inputs. The vector $V_t = (L_t,Z_t)'$ represents the variable inputs labor and materials and the vector $F_t = (K_t,T_t)'$ represents the end of period stocks of the quasi-fixed inputs, capital and technological knowledge. The vector $\Delta F_t = F_t - F_{t-1}$ accounts for internal adjustment costs in terms of foregone output due to changes in the stocks of the quasi-fixed factors.

As Morrison, Berndt (1981) and Denny, Fuss, Waverman (1981) have shown with formulations in continuous time, the intertemporal minimization of the present value of the cost of producing a given flow of output subject to the production function constraint in (1) results in a normalized restricted cost function

$$(2) \quad C_t = C(w_t, F_{t-1}, \Delta F_t, Y_t, t)$$

where w_t is the vector of the variable input factor prices normalized by the price of one of the variable inputs. In our specification the price of intermediate goods is taken to be the numeraire. Thus, w_t is the wage rate divided by the price of intermediate goods and the variable normalized costs are $C_t=Z_t+w_tL_t$. Lau (1976) has shown that (2) must satisfy the following regularity conditions in order to be an appropriate restricted cost function: It should be increasing in w, ΔF and Y, but decreasing in F. Further, it should be concave in w, but convex in F and ΔF.

For the empirical analysis we use a rather flexible form of the normalized restricted cost function Following Mohnen, Nadiri, Prucha (1986) we relax the usual assumption of separability in the quasi-fixed input factors and estimate the model in a non-separable form. In extending their work, however, we account for non-constant returns to scale by using a non-homothetic cost function. We also account for autonomous technological advance which is conventionally represented by a time index (see Chambers 1988, ch. 6). These additional variables are included in our cost function in a way similar to Morrison's (1988) Generalized Leontief restricted cost function. Thus, our specification of (2) takes the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
(3) \qquad C_t = \; & [\, a_0 + a_w\, w_t + (1/2)\, a_{ww}\, w_t^2 + a_{wY}\, w_t Y_t + a_{wt}\, w_t t \,]\; Y_t \\
& + a_K\, K_{t-1} + a_T\, T_{t-1} + c_K\, \Delta K_t + c_T\, \Delta T_t \\
& + (1/2)\, a_{KK}\, K_{t-1}^2/Y_t + (1/2)\, a_{TT}\, T_{t-1}^2/Y_t + a_{KT}\, K_{t-1} T_{t-1}/Y_t \\
& + a_{wK}\, w_t K_{t-1} + a_{wT}\, w_t T_{t-1} + a_{KY}\, K_{t-1} Y_t + a_{TY}\, T_{t-1} Y_t \\
& + a_{Kt}\, K_{t-1} t + a_{Tt}\, T_{t-1} t \\
& + (1/2)\, b_{KK}\, (\Delta K_t)^2/Y_t + (1/2)\, b_{TT}\, (\Delta T_t)^2/Y_t + b_{KT}\, \Delta K_t \Delta T_t/Y_t \\
& + c_{KK}\, \Delta K_t K_{t-1}/Y_t + c_{TT}\, \Delta T_t T_{t-1}/Y_t \\
& + c_{wK}\, w_t \Delta K_t + c_{wT}\, w_t \Delta T_t + c_{KT}\, \Delta K_t T_{t-1} + c_{TK}\, \Delta T_t K_{t-1} \\
& + c_{KY}\, \Delta K_t Y_t + c_{TY}\, \Delta T_t Y_t + c_{Kt}\, \Delta K_t t + c_{Tt}\, \Delta T_t t \,.
\end{aligned}
$$

At a stationary point, where ΔK and ΔT must equal zero, marginal internal adjustment costs have to be zero too. In our case, these stationary conditions $\partial C_t/\partial(\Delta K_t)|_{\Delta K_t=0}=0$ and $\partial C_t/\partial(\Delta T_t)|_{\Delta T_t=0}=0$ will hold for any w, K, T, Y and t only if the restrictions

$$
(4) \qquad c_K = c_T = b_{KT} = c_{KK} = c_{TT} = c_{wK} = c_{wT} = c_{KT} = c_{TK} = c_{KY} = c_{TY} = c_{Kt} = c_{Tt} = 0
$$

are imposed (see e.g. Morrison, Berndt 1981, 348). Then our normalized variable cost function (3) reduces to

$$
\begin{aligned}
(5) \qquad C_t = \; & (a_0 + a_w\, w_t + (1/2)\, a_{ww}\, w_t^2 + a_{wY}\, w_t Y_t + a_{wt}\, w_t t)\, Y_t \\
& + a_K\, K_{t-1} + a_T\, T_{t-1} \\
& + (1/2)\, a_{KK}\, K_{t-1}^2/Y_t + (1/2)\, a_{TT}\, T_{t-1}^2/Y_t + a_{KT}\, K_{t-1} T_{t-1}/Y_t \\
& + a_{wK}\, w_t K_{t-1} + a_{wT}\, w_t T_{t-1} + a_{KY}\, K_{t-1} Y_t + a_{TY}\, T_{t-1} Y_t \\
& + a_{Kt}\, K_{t-1} t + a_{Tt}\, T_{t-1} t \\
& + (1/2)\, b_{KK}\, (\Delta K_t)^2/Y_t + (1/2)\, b_{TT}\, (\Delta T_t)^2/Y_t \; .
\end{aligned}
$$

To derive the demand equations for the two quasi-fixed inputs, capital and technological knowledge, we have to solve the following intertemporal cost minimization problem with respect to the quasi-fixed factors:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(6) \qquad & J(K,T,t) = \min_{K,T} \Sigma_{t=0}^{\infty} (C_t + p_{It}\, I_t + p_{Rt}\, R_t)\, (1 + r)^{-t} \\
& \text{s.t.} \quad I_t = K_t - (1-\delta)\, K_{t-1} \\
& \qquad\quad R_t = T_t - (1-\mu)\, T_{t-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

where I is real investment in physical capital, K, and R is real R&D expenditures for the accumulation of the firm specific stock of knowledge, T. Further, p_I and p_R are the normalized acquisition prices of investment in capital and knowledge, respectively. Depreciation rates of capital and knowledge are denoted by δ and μ. To explicitly solve the problem, we have to assume that firms have static expectations on all factor prices, output and the interest rate. The optimal time paths of investment and R&D must satisfy a set of necessary conditions given by the Euler equations

$$
\begin{aligned}
(7) \qquad & - b_{KK}\, K_{t+1} + [\, a_{KK} + (r+2)\, b_{KK}\,]\, K_t + a_{KT}\, T_t - (r+1)\, b_{KK}\, K_{t-1} \\
& \qquad = - [\, a_K + a_{wK}\, w_t + a_{KY}\, Y_t + a_{Kt}\, t + p_{It}(r+\delta)\,]\, Y_t
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$(8) \quad - b_{TT}\, T_{t+1} + [\, a_{TT} + (r+2)\, b_{TT} \,]\, T_t + a_{KT}\, K_t - (r+1)\, b_{TT}\, T_{t-1}$$

$$= - [\, a_T + a_{wT}\, w_t + a_{TY}\, Y_t + a_{Tt}\, t + p_{Rt}(r+\mu) \,]\, Y_t \,.$$

Equations (7) and (8) can be transformed into the matrix equation

$$(9) \quad - B\, F_{t+1} + [\, A + (r+2)\, B \,]\, F_t - (r+1)\, B\, F_{t-1} = v_t$$

where the 2x2 matrices A and B and the 2x1 vector v are defined as

$$(10) \quad A = \begin{bmatrix} a_{KK} & a_{KT} \\ a_{KT} & a_{TT} \end{bmatrix} ; \qquad B = \begin{bmatrix} b_{KK} & 0 \\ 0 & b_{TT} \end{bmatrix} ;$$

$$v_t = - \begin{bmatrix} a_K + a_{wK}\, w_t + a_{KY}\, Y_t + a_{Kt}\, t + p_{It}(r+\delta) \\ a_T + a_{wT}\, w_t + a_{TY}\, Y_t + a_{Tt}\, t + p_{Rt}(r+\mu) \end{bmatrix} Y_t \,.$$

Based on a model similar to that of Epstein, Yatchew (1985), it has been shown by Mohnen, Nadiri, Prucha (1986) that the solution corresponding to the stable roots of a system like (9) can be equivalently expressed in feedback form as a flexible accelerator equation system

$$(11) \quad \Delta F_t = M\, (F^* - F_{t-1})$$

where

$$(12) \quad M = \begin{bmatrix} m_{KK} & m_{KT} \\ m_{TK} & m_{TT} \end{bmatrix}$$

is the 2x2 matrix of own and cross adjustment coefficients of the quasi-fixed input factors. Thus, the factor demand equations for capital and technological knowledge (but not for the variable labor demand function) look like the disequilibrium interrelated factor demand equations of Nadiri, Rosen (1969) and Schott (1978). However, the partial adjustment matrix M is exogenous in their approach, but endogenously determined in our dynamic cost minimization model.

$F^* = (K^*,T^*)'$ is the stationary solution of (9) where all input factors are on the desired levels and hence there are no further adjustments. Setting $F_{t+1}=F_t=F_{t-1}$ in (9) yields

(13) $F^* = A^{-1}v_t$.

These optimum levels will rarely be reached due to stochastic shocks to demand. During the adjustment process the stocks will change due to the first-order difference equation system (11). Inserting (13) gives

(14) $\Delta F_t = D\, v_t - M\, F_{t-1}$

with D defined as

(15) $D = MA^{-1}$.

The adjustment matrix M and hence D are related in a complex fashion to the technology matrices A and B. Substituting for F_{t+1} and F_t from (11) in (9) yields

(16) $[\, BM^2 + (A+rB)M \,]\, F^* - [\, BM^2 + (A+rB)\, M - A \,]\, F_{t-1} = v_t$.

Thus, to be consistent with the stationary solution (13), M has to satisfy the polynomial

(17) $BM^2 + (A+rB)\, M - A = 0$.

As long as we allow for non-separability in the quasi-fixed factors, we cannot explicitly solve for M in terms of A and B. Instead we will adopt the following strategy. First, we will empirically determine the elements of D and M in (14) and then calculate the matrices A and B as

(18) $A = D^{-1}M$

and

(19) $B = (A-AM)\,(M^2+rM)^{-1}$

to see whether the regularity conditions of our cost function are fulfilled. Since the calculated matrix A will not be symmetric and the calculated matrix B will not be diagonal as imposed in (10), our regularity criterion will be that both calculated matrices are positive-definite.

According to (14) we get the following demand equations for the quasi-fixed factor inputs capital and technological knowledge:

$$(20) \quad K_t - K_{t-1} = - d_{KK} \, [\, a_K + a_{wK} w_t + a_{KY} Y_t + a_{Kt} t + p_{It}(r+\delta) \,] \, Y_t$$
$$- d_{KT} \, [\, a_T + a_{wT} w_t + a_{TY} Y_t + a_{Tt} t + p_{Rt}(r+\mu) \,] \, Y_t$$
$$- m_{KK} K_{t-1} - m_{KT} T_{t-1} \,,$$

$$(21) \quad T_t - T_{t-1} = - d_{TK} \, [\, a_K + a_{wK} w_t + a_{KY} Y_t + a_{Kt} t + p_{It}(r+\delta) \,] \, Y_t$$
$$- d_{TT} \, [\, a_T + a_{wT} w_t + a_{TY} Y_t + a_{Tt} t + p_{Rt}(r+\mu) \,] \, Y_t$$
$$- m_{TK} K_{t-1} - m_{TT} T_{t-1} \,.$$

Further, applying Shepard's Lemma to (5), we derive the labor demand equation

$$(22) \quad L_t = \, [\, a_w + a_{ww} w_t + a_{wY} Y_t + a_{wt} t \,] \, Y_t + a_{wK} K_{t-1} + a_{wT} T_{t-1} \,.$$

The demand for intermediate goods could be calculated as $Z_t = C_t - w_t L_t$. Since we have no data for the material inputs, we have to omit this equation. Thus, our entire system of estimating equations consists of the three factor demand equations (20) to (22).

3. Data and Econometric Specification

The derived dynamic factor demand model is estimated with panel data for 408 small and medium size German firms with not more than 2500 employees. The data set includes employees, revenue, investment in capital and R&D expenditures. All firms could be related to 22 two-digit industries of the manufacturing sector. The period ranges from 1978 to 1982. The data for the first year is lost due to the construction of lagged variables. Hence the data falls in the period of the German recession following the second oil price shock. This panel data set was augmented by input and output price indices on the industry level, concentration indices and interest rates. A detailed description of the data sources and the construction of all variables is given in the data appendix.

The stocks of capital and knowledge were constructed as the accumulated sum of past real investment and real R&D expenditures for each firm, i.e.

$$(23)\quad K_t = K_0 + \Sigma_{\tau=1}^{t} I_\tau ,$$

$$(24)\quad T_t = T_0 + \Sigma_{\tau=1}^{t} R_\tau .$$

Since we have no data for firm specific depreciation we had to neglect the rates δ and μ. The introduction of arbitrary depreciation rates did not change the main empirical results.[1] The initial stocks K_0 and T_0 at period 1978 are estimated within the model as elements of the slope coefficients in the last two terms of equations (20) to (22). The resulting values in (23) and (24) are certainly not very good proxies for the stocks. An alternative method to obtaining the benchmarks K_0 and T_0 is to divide real R&D expenditures in 1978 by the depreciation rates and the average growth rates of some stock for the years succeeding 1978 (see e.g. Nadiri 1980, 376). However, due to many missing values at the beginning of our data set, we did not follow these lines. For similar reasons we were not able to treat the stocks as weighted sums of investment in the last years (see Griliches 1979).

To reduce the problem of heteroscedasticity, we divided all demand equations by output. Since we are primarily interested in the determinants of the factor demands, we decided to use the following estimation strategy. In a first step, we estimate the slope coefficients of all variables without restrictions. These coefficients are used in a second step to calculate the remaining coefficients of our cost function.

Thus, the following system of input-output equations constitutes our basic empirical specification of the system of factor demands:

$$(25)\quad L_t/Y_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 w_t + \alpha_2 Y_t + \alpha_3 t + \alpha_4 \Sigma_{\tau=1}^{t-1} I_\tau/Y_t + \alpha_5 \Sigma_{\tau=1}^{t-1} R_\tau/Y_t + \alpha_6 (1/Y)_t + u_{Lt} ,$$

$$(26)\quad I_t/Y_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 w_t + \beta_2 Y_t + \beta_3 t + \beta_4 p_{It}(r+\delta) + \beta_5 p_{Rt}(r+\mu)$$
$$+ \beta_6 \Sigma_{\tau=1}^{t-1} I_\tau/Y_t + \beta_7 \Sigma_{\tau=1}^{t-1} R_\tau/Y_t + \beta_8 (1/Y)_t + u_{It} ,$$

$$(27)\quad R_t/Y_t = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 w_t + \gamma_2 Y_t + \gamma_3 t + \gamma_4 p_{It}(r+\delta) + \gamma_5 p_{Rt}(r+\mu)$$
$$+ \gamma_6 \Sigma_{\tau=1}^{t-1} I_\tau/Y_t + \gamma_7 \Sigma_{\tau=1}^{t-1} R_\tau/Y_t + \gamma_8 (1/Y)_t + u_{Rt}$$

---

[1] Nadiri (1980), Mohnen, Nadiri, Prucha (1986) and Bernstein, Nadiri (1989) assume a depreciation rate for technological knowledge of 10%, Jaffe (1986) one of 15%.

with the slope coefficients defined as

$$\alpha_0 = a_w ,\ \alpha_1 = a_{ww} ,\ \alpha_2 = a_{wY} ,\ \alpha_3 = a_{wt} ,\ \alpha_4 = a_{wK} ,\ \alpha_5 = a_{wT} ,\ \alpha_6 = a_{wK}K_0 + a_{wT}T_0 ,$$

$$\beta_0 = - d_{KK}\, a_K - d_{KT}\, a_T ,\ \beta_1 = - d_{KK}\, a_{wK} - d_{KT}\, a_{wT} ,\ \beta_2 = - d_{KK}\, a_{KY} - d_{KT}\, a_{TY} ,$$
$$\beta_3 = - d_{KK}\, a_{Kt} - d_{KT}\, a_{Tt} ,\ \beta_4 = - d_{KK} ,\ \beta_5 = - d_{KT} ,\ \beta_6 = - m_{KK} ,\ \beta_7 = - m_{KT} ,$$
$$\beta_8 = - m_{KK}K_0 - m_{KT}T_0 ,$$

$$\gamma_0 = - d_{TK}\, a_K - d_{TT}\, a_T ,\ \gamma_1 = - d_{TK}\, a_{wK} - d_{TT}\, a_{wT} ,\ \gamma_2 = - d_{TK}\, a_{KY} - d_{TT}\, a_{TY} ,$$
$$\gamma_3 = - d_{TK}\, a_{Kt} - d_{TT}\, a_{Tt} ,\ \gamma_4 = - d_{TK} ,\ \gamma_5 = - d_{TT} ,\ \gamma_6 = - m_{TK} ,\ \gamma_7 = - m_{TT} ,$$
$$\gamma_8 = - m_{TK}K_0 - m_{TT}T_0 .$$

The stochastic disturbance vector $(u_{Lt}, u_{It}, u_{Rt})'$ reflects optimization errors or technology shocks. The error terms are assumed to be jointly normally distributed, with zero expected value, $E(u)=0$, and with positive-definite symmetric covariance matrix, $E(uu')=\Omega$.

So far the firms' demand decisions are modeled without any consideration of firm or industry specific characteristics. Indeed, the usual empirical work in this field does not make any attempt to account for either firm or industry fixed effects. However, the assumption that all firms behave identically with respect to disturbances in the relative factor prices may not be warranted. One would expect that firms as well as industries differ in their employment, investment and especially in their R&D behavior due to different expectations, technological opportunities, appropriability of pioneer profits, market entry conditions, etc. (see Nelson, Winter 1982). One of the major advantages of a panel data set over conventional cross-sectional or time-series data sets is the possibility to account for those unobservable effects in a fixed or random effects model (see e.g. Hsiao 1986). Thus, we will compare our basic data pooling model with an industry or firm fixed effects model allowing for specific time invariant differences between the industries or firms in our sample (for the estimating procedure see Judge et al. 1985, Chap. 13).

4. Empirical Results

To estimate the coefficients of our factor demand system we used the iterative Zellner efficient (IZEF) estimator without restrictions. The IZEF estimator yields parameter estimates that are numerically equivalent to those of the maximum likelihood estimator under the null hypothesis that our model is the correct characterization of firm behavior (see

Oberhofer, Kmenta 1974). All estimates were performed with RATS386. The estimation procedure converged by the second step in the basic model as well as in the two fixed effects models.

The estimated coefficients of the factor demand functions are reported on column I in table 1 for levels of the variables. Keeping in mind the large size of the data set and the fact that we are using panel data, the fit of the demand models is quite good.

In a previous study the single labor demand equation was estimated for various specifications (see Flaig, Stadler 1988). The empirical evidence did not change very much in our simultaneous three equation approach. Labor demand depends significantly and negatively on its own normalized price, i.e. real wages. The positive signs of quasi-fixed production factors imply that capital and knowledge inputs are complements to the labor input, although the capital coefficient is not statistically significant. Increasing productivity of the labor input is evidenced by the negative coefficient on time. The latter result is apparent in the other two factor demand equations as well.

The investment equation is not terribly successful, but such equations seldom are. The factor prices are not significant. Most of the variation in investment is explained by autonomous technological progress, the inherited capital stock and output. The negative coefficient on the autonomous technological progress variable suggests the presence of increasing capital productivity among the small firms of the sample.

Particular attention should be given to the determinants of R&D activity. The factor equation modeling the demand for technological knowledge has the best fit of the three input factor equations. This results to a large degree from the positive influence of the available stock of knowledge. As in the investment equation the cumulated stock of knowledge spurs further endeavors to advance the frontiers of knowledge. As theoretically expected the own R&D factor price index has a negative influence on R&D activity, while increases in the user cost of capital or wages increase R&D intensity. Autonomous technological advance, which can result from interindustry or intra-industry spillovers of knowledge, seems to be a substitute for the firm's own research agenda. This result is consistent with the findings in Bernstein, Nadiri (1989) who explicitly emphasize spillover effects.

It should be mentioned that both own adjustment coefficients, m_{KK} and m_{TT}, have negative signs. Thus, there is no evidence for a stable adjustment process. This shortcoming is probably caused by the weakness of our stock variables. However, it will be shown that with fixed firm effects the signs and magnitudes of these coefficients are quite plausible.

Table 1

Estimates of the parameters of the factor demand equations in levels (I), with fixed industry effects (II) and with fixed firm effects (III)*

Parameter	(I)	(II)	(III)
α_0 (10^{-2})	4.77 (4.62)	-	-
$\alpha_1$$(10^{-2})$	-0.90 (-3.68)	-1.33 (-0.99)	-0.93 (-3.02)
α_2 (10^{-8})	-3.13 (-11.23)	-2.62 (-10.67)	-5.22 (-12.85)
α_3 (10^{-4})	-4.10 (-3.21)	-5.16 (-4.52)	-2.25 (-6.09)
α_4 (10^{-2})	0.09 (0.67)	0.59 (4.89)	0.18 (3.56)
α_5 (10^{-2})	1.42 (6.51)	0.60 (2.96)	0.02 (0.21)
α_6	11.29 (4.43)	8.43 (3.76)	53.84 (16.79)
β_0	1.11 (8.95)	-	-
β_1 (10^{-2})	0.01 (0.00)	-18.37 (-1.22)	-9.87 (-0.97)
β_2 (10^{-8})	9.37 (3.42)	8.15 (2.99)	2.47 (0.18)
β_3 (10^{-2})	-1.37 (-8.77)	-1.25 (-7.13)	0.86 (5.82)
β_4 (10^{-4})	8.95 (1.36)	13.28 (1.43)	16.67 (2.64)
β_5 (10^{-4})	-4.13 (-0.55)	-7.60 (-0.94)	-10.30 (-1.87)
β_6 (10^{-2})	21.02 (16.67)	17.34 (12.94)	-25.83 (-15.59)
β_7 (10^{-2})	-0.66 (-0.30)	1.28 (0.57)	1.08 (0.33)
β_8 (10^{2})	1.59 (6.34)	1.73 (6.97)	9.46 (8.93)

Table 1 continued

Parameter		(I)	(II)	(III)
γ_0		0.42	-	-
		(12.56)		
$\gamma_1(10^{-2})$		3.48	-8.76	2.78
		(5.09)	(-2.15)	(1.58)
$\gamma_2\ (10^{-8})$		-0.21	0.36	-14.60
		(-0.28)	(0.49)	(-6.34)
$\gamma_3\ (10^{-2})$		-0.54	-0.53	0.04
		(-12.83)	(-11.10)	(1.38)
$\gamma_4\ (10^{-4})$		10.25	10.98	0.79
		(5.78)	(4.37)	(0.74)
$\gamma_5\ (10^{-4})$		-3.16	-6.23	-0.25
		(-1.56)	(-2.83)	(-0.27)
$\gamma_6\ (10^{-2})$		-0.12	0.33	0.27
		(-0.36)	(0.90)	(0.94)
$\gamma_7\ (10^{-2})$		30.89	29.63	-2.21
		(52.52)	(48.71)	(-3.97)
γ_8		0.67	0.54	115.43
		(0.10)	(0.08)	(6.35)
L - equation:	$\bar{R}^2$	0.20	0.39	0.38
	DW	0.60	0.60	1.98
I - equation:	$\bar{R}^2$	0.26	0.29	0.21
	DW	1.82	1.83	2.30
R - equation:	$\bar{R}^2$	0.76	0.77	0.09
	DW	1.26	1.25	1.92
N		1151	1151	1151

* t-values in brackets

We specified the fixed effects models because we felt that there are probably differences across industries and firms which cannot be explained by the production structure alone. Hence, there is some empirical evidence that R&D and capital investment are asymmetrically determined by different factors (see Lach, Schankerman 1989). For instance certain industries with high technological opportunities are thought of as always being on the forefront of new technology while others are always regarded as laggards. Further, there should be some differences in firms' creativity, intuition, experience and luck that are not part of the optimization problem.

To test the overall significance of these differences, we employed the likelihood ratio (LR) test procedure. The LR test statistic is

$$LR = N \left[\ln|\hat{\Sigma}_{\omega}| - \ln|\hat{\Sigma}_{\Omega}| \right]$$

where $\hat{\Sigma}_{\omega}$ is the restricted estimator of the residual variance-covariance matrix, $\hat{\Sigma}_{\Omega}$ is the unrestricted estimator, and N is the number of observations in the pooled sample (see e.g. Berndt 1991, 467). The LR test statistic is asymptotically distributed as chi-square random variable with degrees of freedom equal to the number of independent slope coefficients in the equation system. There are 22 fixed industry effects and 408 fixed firm effects for each of our three factor demand equations. The calculated test statistic is 456.0 for the fixed industry effects model and 6793.7 for the fixed firm effects model. The critical values of $\chi^2(63)$ and $\chi^2(1221)$ at the 1% level are 92.0 and 1338.1 respectively. Therefore, the null hypotheses of an unchanging structure of the demand functions for labor, investment, and R&D had to be rejected.

The coefficient estimates of the factor demands with industry and firm fixed effects are shown on columns (II) and (III) in table 1. In the labor equations the results do not differ much. The influence of the lagged capital stock is now significant too. On the other side, wages in the fixed industry effects model and know-how in the fixed firm effects model are no longer statistically significant. The R-squared rises in both models.

The fixed industry effects model for the investment equation shows the same results as the model in levels, but in the fixed firm effects models some significant changes appear. The signs of the trend coefficient and of the lagged capital stock coefficient are changing. The own adjustment coefficient of capital, m_{KK}, now has the correct sign and a plausible magnitude of 26%. The R-squared does not change very much in the three versions of the investment equation.

In the R&D equation there are some changes which are hard to explain. In the fixed industry effects model the wage coefficient becomes negative. In the fixed firm effects version the R-squared falls drastically. All factor prices are now insignificant, indicating the existence of important individual effects. Similar to the investment equation, the own adjustment coefficient of technological knowledge, m_{TT}, now has a positive value of 2% within a year. The cross adjustment coefficients m_{KT} and m_{TK} are insignificant, but the negative signs suggest that capital and knowledge will be dynamic complements rather than substitutes.

Table 2

Calculated Values for the Parameters of the Cost Function

Parameter	(I)	(II)	(III)
a_w (10^{-2})	4.77	-	-
a_{ww} (10^{-2})	-0.90	-1.33	-0.93
a_{wY} (10^{-8})	-3.13	-2.62	-5.22
a_{wt} (10^{-4})	-4.10	-5.16	-2.25
a_{wK} (10^{-2})	0.09	0.56	0.17
a_{wT} (10^{-2})	1.14	0.61	0.03
d_{KK} (10^{-4})	-8.95	-13.28	-16.67
d_{KT} (10^{-4})	4.13	7.60	10.3
d_{TK} (10^{-4})	-10.25	-10.98	-0.79
d_{TT} (10^{-4})	3.16	6.23	0.25
a_K (10^2)	-12.45	-	-
a_T (10^2)	-53.82	-	-
a_{KY} (10^{-4})	-2.16	-64.13	-38.34
a_{TY} (10^{-4})	-6.95	-113.12	-62.31
a_{K_t}	14.77	503.16	3.64
a_{T_t}	65.25	895.63	-2.51
A positive-definite	yes	yes	yes
B positive-definite	yes	yes	yes
K_0 and T_0 positive	yes	no	no

This means that if R&D is in excess demand the adjustment in capital will slow down, and vice versa. These results are similar to those of previous comparable studies (see Nadiri 1980, Morrison, Berndt 1981, Bernstein, Nadiri 1989).

The estimated values were used to calculate the parameters in the factor demand equations (20) to (22). Without the restrictions implied by the optimization problem some of the equations are overidentified. For example, there are a number of ways to compute a_{wK} and a_{wT} from the estimated coefficients. To resolve the problem we projected the estimates onto the column space spanned by the restrictions implied by the theoretical model and calculated the parameter values presented in table 2. These values were plugged in (18) and (19) to calculate elements of the matrices A and B. These matrices should both be positive definite in order to satisfy the regularity conditions. Indeed, all regularity conditions, as reported above, are satisfied in all three versions of our model. Thus, our restricted normalized cost function seems to be an appropriate description of the firms' underlying technology. Unfortunately, the estimated stocks at the beginning of our estimation period became negative in the fixed effects models. But we know that there is a lot of noise, resulting from any different effects, in our estimated benchmark stocks.

5. Neo-Classical Firm Behavior and Schumpeterian Hypotheses

So far we have argued that firms may treat technological know-how as a quasi-fixed factor of production. The firms will invest in R&D in pursuit of a growth path which minimizes their discounted costs. We demonstrated that as an empirical matter our model is quite plausible. Indeed, in our model without fixed effects all factor prices influence R&D behavior in the fashion suggested by neoclassical theory. Such optimizing behavior would hardly be contemplated in an evolutionary view of the firm. However, by taking into account individual effects due to unobserved variables, the impact of the system of relative input prices is no longer significant.

Therefore, our investigation does not end with an analysis of the neoclassical behavior of firms in response to changing factor prices. A question which arises from the Schumpeterian hypotheses is whether there is a relationship between firm size and market concentration on the one side and R&D activity on the other side (see the surveys to this literature in Kamien, Schwartz 1982, Baldwin, Scott 1987, Cohen, Levin 1989 and Scherer, Ross 1990, Chap. 17). To see whether the usual empirical evidence still holds after accounting for the production structure of the firm, we decided to estimate the relationship between any of our firm fixed elements on the one side and firm size and market concentration on the other side. Our simultaneous equation framework is

$$(28)\quad \bar{\alpha}_t = a_{L0} + a_{L1} S_t + a_{L2} H_t + a_{L3} H_t^2 + \varepsilon_{Lt} \ ,$$

$$(30)\quad \bar{\beta}_t = a_{I0} + a_{I1} S_t + a_{I2} H_t + a_{I3} H_t^2 + \varepsilon_{It} \ ,$$

$$(29)\quad \bar{\gamma}_t = a_{R0} + a_{R1} S_t + a_{R2} H_t + a_{R3} H_t^2 + \varepsilon_{Rt} \ ,$$

where $(\bar{\alpha},\bar{\beta},\bar{\gamma})'$ is the vector of firm fixed effects from the labor, investment and R&D equations. The error terms ε are assumed to be jointly normally distributed. The variables characterizing the market structure are S for firm size, measured as the number of employees, and market concentration, H, represented by the Herfindahl index. The Herfindahl has been used instead of the more traditional concentration ratios since it includes data from all firms in the industry rather than just the largest firms, which are certainly not in our sample of small and medium size firms.

The coefficient estimates of the market structure variables are shown in table 3. There seems to be strong evidence that market structure matters even after controlling for the production theoretic variables. In particular, the fit of the labor equation is quite good. The fixed effects of the labor demand model depend significantly and positively on the firm size. Thus, labor demand is, in addition to the production structure effects, promoted by larger firms and inhibited by smaller firms. Further, there is significant evidence for an inverted U shaped relationship between market concentration and the fixed effect from the labor demand equation with a maximum at a Herfindahl index value of 0.056 which lies within the range of the various concentration indices of the industries in our sample.

In the investment equation we also derive a positive and significant influence of the firm size on investment, but the inverted U-shaped pattern of the market concentration effect is not significant.

Some interesting results arise for the R&D intensity equation. In accordance with previous cross-sectional studies we derive a positive, monotonic relationship between firm size and R&D activity (see e.g. Soete 1979, Link 1980, Loeb 1983, Meisel, Lin 1983). Several arguments in favor of this relationship are offered in the Schumpeterian literature: First, capital market imperfections could confer an advantage on large firms in securing external R&D finance. Secondly, due to economies of scope in production, large diversified firms

Table 3

Firm Fixed Effects of the Factor Demand Equations and Market Structure

Parameter	$\bar{\alpha}$	$\bar{\beta}$	$\bar{\gamma}$
a_0 (10^{-2})	2.83	-66.36	-3.82
	(144.88)	(-205.94)	(-33.05)
a_1 (10^{-5})	0.77	4.72	2.73
	(31.26)	(11.60)	(18.74)
a_2 (10^{-6})	0.45	2.89	5.62
	(3.56)	(1.38)	(7.48)
a_3 (10^{-10})	-0.40	-5.50	-5.37
	(-2.33)	(-1.93)	(-5.24)
$\bar{R}^2$	0.47	0.10	0.28

may be able to exploit unforeseen technological advances more efficiently. Thirdly, there may be some complementary marketing activities or activities for gaining control over the channels of distribution which are more developed within large firms.

The sign pattern on the coefficients clearly produces a concave relationship between R&D intensity and market concentration. Maximum R&D activity occures at a Herfindahl index value of 0.052 which lies in the middle of the concentration indices in our sample. This non-linear inverted U shaped relationship was first dicovered by Scherer (1967) and replicated e.g. by Scott (1984) and Levin, Cohen, Mowery (1985). As Schumpeter argued, an oligopolistic market structure with some market power for the firms should be most conducive to innovative activity. On the one side, firms in concentrated industries may more easily appropriate the returns from R&D investment. On the other side, in monopolistic industries X-efficiency as described by Leibenstein may occur. In our sample, for example, the chemical and the electrical engineering industries seem to be too concentrated to achieve maximum technological advance.

6. Summary and Conclusions

In this paper we developed a dynamic interrelated factor demand model with two variable inputs, labor and materials, and two quasi-fixed inputs, capital and technological knowledge. A system of factor demands for labor, capital, and knowledge was estimated in levels and with fixed industry and firm specific effects using a panel data set for small and medium size firms in the manufacturing sector of the FRG for the period 1978 to 1982.

The empirical results are encouraging for further work. Our non-homothetic restricted cost function with technological knowledge as an additional production factor seems to be an appropriate description of the firms' technology. The consideration of internal adjustment costs of capital and knowledge explains the behavior of the factor demand equations fairly well. In particular, R&D activities respond to relative factor prices as suggested by neoclassical theory. However, these price effects disappear if individual effects are included in the analysis. There is strong empirical evidence that, in addition of the production theoretic elements, market structure matters in the factor demands as suggested by the Schumpeterian hypotheses.

It seems to be necessary to re-estimate the model with new data. It would be adequate to use dicriminating data for R&D activities related to product and to process innovations. In addition, the use of realized innovation data would be superior to the use of innovative input data (see e.g. Acs, Audretsch 1990). There is also a need for increasing the length of the time-series in order to construct better proxies for the stocks of capital and knowledge.

There are several topics for future work. For instance, our model is based on the restrictive assumption of static expectations for output and relative factor prices. Other forms of expectation should be taken into account (see Pakes, Schankerman 1984 for the simplifying case of technological knowledge as the own quasi-fixed input factor). Another issue of importance is to explicitly analyze the relationship between a firm's own R&D activity and spillovers due to R&D activities pursued by rivals in the same industry (intra-industry spillovers) and by firms in other industries (inter-industry spillovers).

Appendix:
Data Sources and Construction

The annual data for the period 1978 to 1982 have been pooled from various sources. Basically, we used a panel data set for 463 firms in the manufacturing sector of the FRG as collected by the Institut für Gesellschaftswissenschaften of the University of Bonn (Prof. Albach). The set of variables reported in this data set includes employees, revenue, investment in capital, investment in R&D, and the industrial classification of the firm.

A total of 55 firms have been excluded from the sample. 42 firms were excluded because they reported sales and employment for fewer than three years. Most of these firms did not report their sales at all. The data of four firms had obvious data errors. The orignal intent of the survey was to learn about the R&D activity of firms with fewer than 2500 employees. However, seven participating firms reported having more than 2500 employees, so they also have been eliminated from the data set. One of the remaining firms was excluded because its revenue was twice as large as the next largest firm. In a scatterplot of employment versus revenue this firm was an obvious outlier. Finally, there was only one respondent from the shipbuilding industry, for which there are no adequate producer prices.

The industrial classification of the panel data enables us to add input and output price indices on the industry level. Data for nominal gross output, real value added, nominal intermediate input, the price index for capital investment, and average gross wages of employees are taken from the yearly disaggregated national income accounts of the Statistisches Bundesamt (StaBu, Fachserie 18). The price indices for industry gross output are calculated as a weighted sum of the producer price indices of bundles of goods (StaBu, Fachserie 17). The weights for the bundles of goods in each industry are obtained with the help of the disaggregated goods' input-output table for 1982 (StaBu, Fachserie 18, Reihe 2, table 4.2). Dividing nominal industry gross output by the industry producer price indices yields the real industry gross output. The price index for intermediate inputs is derived by dividing nominal intermediate inputs by the difference between the calculated real gross output and real value added. The price indices for R&D expenditures are calculated as a weighted sum of the price indices for intermediate inputs, labor inputs and investment inputs. The weights are given by the shares of the corresponding expenditures in the industry R&D expenditure (Source: Stifterverband für die Deutsche Wissenschaft).

The Herfindahl indices of market concentration are taken from StaBu, Fachserie 4, Reihe S. 9. For the interest rates we used the current yield on long-term bonds (Source: Deutsche Bundesbank).

References:

Acs, Z.J., Audretsch, D.B. (1990), Innovation and Small Firms, Cambridge.

Baldwin, W.L., Scott, J.T. (1987), Market Structure and Technological Change, New York.

Berndt, E.R. (1991), The Practice of Econometrics: Classic and Contemporary, Reading.

Berndt, E.R., Morrison, C.J., Watkins G.C. (1981), Dynamic Models of Energy Demand: An Assessment and Comparison, E.R. Berndt, B.C. Field (eds.), Modeling and Measuring Natural Resource Substitution, Cambridge, 259-289.

Bernstein, J., Nadiri, M.I. (1989), Research and Development and Intra-Industry Spillovers: An Empirical Application of Dynamic Duality, Review of Economic Studies 56: 249-269.

Chambers, R.G. (1988), Applied Production Analysis. A Dual Approach. Cambridge.

Cohen, W.M., Levin, R.C. (1989), Empirical Studies of Innovation and Market Structure, R. Schmalensee, R.D. Willig (eds.), Handbook of Industrial Organization, Vol. II, Amsterdam, 1059-1107.

Denny, M., Fuss, M.A., Waverman, L. (1981), Substitution Possibilities for Energy: Evidence from U.S. and Canadian Manufacturing Industries, E.R. Berndt, B.C. Field (eds.), Modeling and Measuring Natural Resource Substitution, Cambridge, 230-258.

Epstein, L.G., Yatchew, A.J. (1985), The Empirical Determination of Technology and Expectations: A Simplified Procedure, Journal of Economerics 27: 235-258.

Flaig, G., Stadler, M. (1988), Beschäftigungseffekte privater F&E-Aufwendungen. Eine Paneldaten-Analyse, Zeitschrift für Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften 108: 43-61.

Griliches, Z. (1979), Issues in Assessing the Contribution of Research and Development to Productivity Growth, Bell Journal of Economics 10: 92-116.

Hsiao, C., (1986), Analysis of Panel Data, Cambridge.

Jaffe, A.G. (1986), Technological Opportunity and Spillovers of R&D: Evidence from Firms' Patents, Profits, and Market Value, American Economic Review 76: 984-1001.

Judge, G.G. et al. (1985), The Theory and Practice of Econometrics, New York.

Kamien, M.I., Schwartz, N.L. (1982), Market Structure and Innovation, Cambridge.

Lach, S., Schankerman, M. (1989), Dynamics of R&D and Investment in the Scientific Sector, Journal of Political Economy 97: 880-904.

Lau, L.J. (1976), A Characterization of the Normalized Restricted Profit Function, Journal of Economic Theory 12: 131-163.

Levin, R.C., Cohen, W.M., Mowery, D.C. (1985), R&D Appropriability, Opportunity, and Market Structure: New Evidence of Some Schumpeterian Hypotheses, American Economic Review, P&P 75: 20-24.

Link, A.N. (1980), Firm Size and Efficient Entrepreneurial Activity: A Reformulation of the Schumpeter Hypothesis, Journal of Political Economy 88: 771-782.

Loeb, P.D. (1983), Further Evidence of the Determinants of Industrial Research and Development Using Single and Simultaneous Equation Models, Empirical Economics 8: 203-214.

Meisel, J.B., Lin, S.A.Y. (1983), The Impact of Market Structure on the Firm's Allocation of Resources to Research and Development, Quarterly Review of Economics and Business 23: 28-43.

Mohnen, P.A., Nadiri, M.I., Prucha, I.R. (1986), R&D, Production Structure and Rates of Return in the U.S., Japanese and German Manufacturing Sectors. A Non-Separable Dynamic Factor Demand Model, European Economic Review 30: 749-771.

Morrison, C.J., Berndt, E.R. (1981), Short-run Labor Productivity in a Dynamic Model, Journal of Econometrics 16: 339 - 365.

Morrison, C.J. (1988), Quasi-Fixed Inputs in U.S. and Japanese Manufacturing: A Generalized Leontief Restricted Cost Function Approach, Review of Economics and Statistics 70: 275-287.

Nadiri, M.I. (1980), Contributions and Determinants of Research and Development Expenditures in U.S. Manufacturing Industries, G. von Furstenberg (ed.), Capital Efficiency and Growth, Ballinger Publishing Company, Cambridge, 361-392.

Nadiri, M.I., Rosen, S. (1969), Interrelated Factor Demand Functions, American Economic Review 59: 457-471.

Nelson, R.R., Winter, S.G. (1982), An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change, Cambridge.

Oberhofer, W., Kmenta, J. (1974), A General Procedure for Obtaining Maximum Likelihood Estimates in Generalized Regression Models, Econometrica 42: 579-590.

Pakes, A., Schankerman, M. (1984), The Rate of Obsolescence of Patents, Research Gestation Lags, and the Private Rate of Return to Research Resources, Z. Griliches (ed.), R&D, Patens and Productivity, Chicago, 73-88.

Scherer, F.M. (1967), Market Structure and the Employment of Scientists and Engineers, American Economic Review 57: 524-531.

Scherer, F.M., Ross, D. (1990), Industrial Market Structure and Economic Performance, 3rd edition, Boston.

Schott, K. (1978), The Relation between Industrial Research and Development and Factor Demand, Economic Journal 88: 85-106.

Scott, J.T. (1984), Firm versus Industry Variability in R&D Intensity, Z. Griliches (ed), R&D, Patents, and Productivity, Chicago, 233-245.

Soete, L.L.G. (1979), Firm Size and Innovative Activity: The Evidence Reconsidered, European Economic Review 12: 319-340.

Statistisches Bundesamt, Fachserien 4, 17, 18, various years.

Stifterverband für die Deutsche Wissenschaft, Forschung und Entwicklung in der Wirtschaft, various years.

Bisher erschienen unter der Fachgruppe Makroökonomie

Beitrag Nr.	1:	Bernhard Gahlen	Neuere Entwicklungstendenzen und Schätzmethoden in der Produktionstheorie
Beitrag Nr.	2:	Ulrich Schittko	Euler- und Pontrjagin-Wachstumspfade
Beitrag Nr.	3:	Rainer Feuerstack	Umfang und Struktur geburtenregelnder Maßnahmen
Beitrag Nr.	4:	Reinhard Blum	Der Preiswettbewerb im § 16 GWB und seine Konsequenzen für ein "Neues Wettbewerbskonzept"
Beitrag Nr.	5:	Martin Pfaff	Measurement Of Subjective Welfare And Satisfaction
Beitrag Nr.	6:	Arthur Strassl	Die Bedingungen gleichgewichtigen Wachstums

Bisher erschienen unter dem Institut für Volkswirtschaftslehre

Beitrag Nr.	7:	Reinhard Blum	Thesen zum neuen wettbewerbspolitischen Leitbild der Bundesrepublik Deutschland
Beitrag Nr.	8:	Horst Hanusch	Tendencies In Fiscal Federalism
Beitrag Nr.	9:	Reinhard Blum	Die Gefahren der Privatisierung öffentlicher Dienstleistungen
Beitrag Nr.	10:	Reinhard Blum	Ansätze zu einer rationalen Strukturpolitik im Rahmen der marktwirtschaftlichen Ordnung
Beitrag Nr.	11:	Heinz Lampert	Wachstum und Konjunktur in der Wirtschaftsregion Augsburg
Beitrag Nr.	12:	Fritz Rahmeyer	Reallohn und Beschäftigungsgrad in der Gleichgewichts- und Ungleichgewichtstheorie
Beitrag Nr.	13:	Alfred E. Ott	Möglichkeiten und Grenzen einer Regionalisierung der Konjunkturpolitik

Beitrag Nr.	14:	Reinhard Blum	Wettbewerb als Freiheitsnorm und Organisationsprinzip
Beitrag Nr.	15:	Hans K. Schneider	Die Interdependenz zwischen Energieversorgung und Gesamtwirtschaft als wirtschaftspolitisches Problem
Beitrag Nr.	16:	Eberhard Marwede Roland Götz	Durchschnittliche Dauer und zeitliche Verteilung von Großinvestitionen in deutschen Unternehmen
Beitrag Nr.	17:	Reinhard Blum	Soziale Marktwirtschaft als weltwirtschaftliche Strategie
Beitrag Nr.	18:	Klaus Hüttinger Ekkehard von Knorring Peter Welzel	Unternehmensgröße und Beschäftigungsverhalten - Ein Beitrag zur empirischen Überprüfung der sog. Mittelstands- bzw. Konzentrationshypothese -
Beitrag Nr.	19:	Reinhard Blum	Was denken wir, wenn wir wirtschaftlich denken?
Beitrag Nr.	20:	Eberhard Marwede	Die Abgrenzungsproblematik mittelständischer Unternehmen - Eine Literaturanalyse -
Beitrag Nr.	21:	Fritz Rahmeyer Rolf Grönberg	Preis- und Mengenanpassung in den Konjunkturzyklen der Bundesrepublik Deutschland 1963 - 1981
Beitrag Nr.	22:	Peter Hurler Anita B. Pfaff Theo Riss Anna Maria Theis	Die Ausweitung des Systems der sozialen Sicherung und ihre Auswirkungen auf die Ersparnisbildung
Beitrag Nr.	23:	Bernhard Gahlen	Strukturpolitik für die 80er Jahre
Beitrag Nr.	24:	Fritz Rahmeyer	Marktstruktur und industrielle Preisentwicklung
Beitrag Nr.	25:	Bernhard Gahlen Andrew J. Buck Stefan Arz	Ökonomische Indikatoren in Verbindung mit der Konzentration. Eine empirische Untersuchung für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland
Beitrag Nr.	26A:	Christian Herrmann	Die Auslandsproduktion der deutschen Industrie. Versuch einer Quantifizierung

Beitrag Nr.	26B:	Gebhard Flaig	Ein Modell der Elektrizitätsnachfrage privater Haushalte mit indirekt beobachteten Variablen
Beitrag Nr.	27A:	Reinhard Blum	Akzeptanz des technischen Fortschritts - Wissenschafts- und Politikversagen -
Beitrag Nr.	27B:	Anita B. Pfaff Martin Pfaff	Distributive Effects of Alternative Health-Care Financing Mechanisms: Cost-Sharing and Risk-Equivalent Contributions
Beitrag Nr.	28A:	László Kassai	Wirtschaftliche Stellung deutscher Unternehmen in Chile. Ergebnisse einer empirischen Analyse (erschienen zusammen mit Mesa Redonda Nr. 9)
Beitrag Nr.	28B:	Gebhard Flaig Manfred Stadler	Beschäftigungseffekte privater F&E-Aufwendungen - Eine Paneldaten-Analyse
Beitrag Nr.	29:	Gebhard Flaig Viktor Steiner	Stability and Dynamic Properties of Labour Demand in West-German Manufacturing
Beitrag Nr.	30:	Viktor Steiner	Determinanten der Betroffenheit von erneuter Arbeitslosigkeit - Eine empirische Analyse mittels Individualdaten
Beitrag Nr.	31:	Viktor Steiner	Berufswechsel und Erwerbsstatus von Lehrabsolventen - Ein bivariates Probit-Modell
Beitrag Nr.	32:	Georg Licht Viktor Steiner	Workers and Hours in a Dynamic Model of Labour Demand - West German Manufacturing Industries 1962 - 1985
Beitrag Nr.	33:	Heinz Lampert	Notwendigkeit, Aufgaben und Grundzüge einer Theorie der Sozialpolitik
Beitrag Nr.	34:	Fritz Rahmeyer	Strukturkrise in der eisenschaffenden Industrie - Markttheoretische Analyse und wirtschaftspolitische Strategien

Beitrag Nr.	35	Manfred Stadler	Die Bedeutung der Marktstruktur im Innovationsprozeß - Eine spieltheotische Analyse des Schumpeterschen Wettbewerbs
Beitrag Nr.	36	Peter Welzel	Die Harmonisierung nationaler Produktionssubventionen in einem Zwei-Länder-Modell
Beitrag Nr.	37	Richard Spies	Kostenvorteile als Determinanten des Marktanteils kleiner und mittlerer Unternehmen
Beitrag Nr.	38A	Viktor Steiner	Langzeitarbeitslosigkeit, Heterogenität und "State Dependence": Eine mikroökonometrische Analyse
Beitrag Nr.	38B	Peter Welzel	A Note on the Time Consistency of Strategic Trade Policy
Beitrag Nr.	39	Günter Lang	Ein dynamisches Marktmodell am Beispiel der Papiererzeugenden Industrie
Beitrag Nr.	40	Gebhard Flaig Viktor Steiner	Markup Differentials, Cost Flexibility, and Capacity Utilization in West-German Manufacturing
Beitrag Nr.	41	Georg Licht Viktor Steiner	Abgang aus der Arbeitslosigkeit, Individualeffekte und Hysteresis. Eine Panelanalyse für die Bundesrepublik
Beitrag Nr.	42	Thomas Kuhn	Zur Theorie der Zuweisungen im kommunalen Finanzausgleich
Beitrag Nr.	43	Uwe Cantner	Produkt- und Prozeßinnovation in einem Ricardo-Außenhandelsmodell
Beitrag Nr.	44	Thomas Kuhn	Zuweisungen und Allokation im kommunalen Finanzausgleich
Beitrag Nr.	45	Gebhard Flaig Viktor Steiner	Searching for the Productivity Slowdown: Some Surprising Findings from West German Manufacturing
Beitrag Nr.	46	Manfred Stadler	F&E-Verhalten und Gewinnentwicklung im dynamischen Wettbewerb. Ein Beitrag zur Chaos-Theorie
Beitrag Nr.	47	Alfred Greiner	A Dynamic Theory of the Firm with Engogenous Technical Change

48	Horst Hanusch Markus Hierl	Productivity, Profitability and Innovative Behavior in West-German Industries
49	Karl Morasch	F&E-Erfolgswahrscheinlichkeit und Kooperationsanreize
50	Manfred Stadler	Determinanten der Innovationsaktivitäten in oligopolistischen Märkten
51	Uwe Cantner Horst Hanusch	On the Renaissance of Schumpeterian Economics
52	Fritz Rahmeyer	Evolutorische Ökonomik, technischer Wandel und sektorales Produktivitätswachstum
53	Uwe Cantner Horst Hanusch	The Transition of Planning Economies to Market Economies: Some Schumpeterian Ideas to Unveil a Great Puzzle
54	Reinhard Blum	Theorie und Praxis des Übergangs zur marktwirtschaftlichen Ordnung in den ehemals sozialistischen Ländern
55	Georg Licht Viktor Steiner	Individuelle Einkommensdynamik und Humankapitaleffekte nach Erwerbsunterbrechungen
56	Thomas Kuhn	Zur theoretischen Fundierung des kommunalen Finanzbedarfs in Zuweisungssystemen
57	Thomas Kuhn	Der kommunale Finanzausgleich - Vorbild für die neuen Bundesländer?
58	Günter Lang	Faktorsubstitution in der Papierindustrie bei Einführung von Maschinen und Energiesteuern
59	Peter Welzel	Strategische Interaktion nationaler Handelspolitiken. Freies Spiel der Kräfte oder internationale Organisation?
60	Alfred Greiner	A Dynamic Model of the Firm with Cyclical Innovations and Production: Towards a Schumpeterian Theory of the Firm
61	Uwe Cantner Thomas Kuhn	Technischer Fortschritt in Bürokratien

Beitrag Nr.	62	Klaus Deimer	Wohlfahrtsverbände und Selbsthilfe - Plädoyer für eine Kooperation bei der Leistungserstellung
Beitrag Nr.	63	Günter Lang Peter Welzel	Budgetdefizite, Wahlzyklen und Geldpolitik: Empirische Ergebnisse für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland, 1962-1989
Beitrag Nr.	64	Uwe Cantner Horst Hanusch	New Developments in the Economics of Technology and Innovation
Beitrag Nr.	65	Georg Licht Victor Steiner	Male-Female Wage Differentials, Labor Force Attachment, and Human-Capital Accumulation in Germany
Beitrag Nr.	66	Heinz Lampert	The Development and the Present Situation of Social Policy in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) within the Social-Market-Economy
Beitrag Nr.	67	Manfred Stadler	Marktkonzentration, Unsicherheit und Kapitalakkumulation