



university of
 groningen

faculty of economics
 and business

2021017-GEM

**Productivity Spillovers of
 Multinational Enterprises through
 Worker Mobility: New Evidence for
 the Netherlands**

November 2021

Marzieh Abolhassani



SOM is the research institute of the Faculty of Economics & Business at the University of Groningen. SOM has seven programmes:

- Accounting
- Economics, Econometrics and Finance
- Global Economics & Management
- Innovation & Organization
- Marketing
- Operations Management & Operations Research
- Organizational Behaviour

Research Institute SOM
Faculty of Economics & Business
University of Groningen

Visiting address:
Nettelbosje 2
9747 AE Groningen
The Netherlands

Postal address:
P.O. Box 800
9700 AV Groningen
The Netherlands

T +31 50 363 9090/7068/3815

www.rug.nl/feb/research



Productivity Spillovers of Multinational Enterprises through Worker Mobility: New Evidence for the Netherlands

Marzieh Abolhassani
University of Groningen, Faculty of Economics and Business, Global Economics and
Management
m.abolhassani@rug.nl

Productivity Spillovers of Multinational Enterprises through Worker Mobility: New Evidence for the Netherlands

Marzieh Abolhassani*

Abstract

Labor mobility has been considered as one of the major sources of knowledge diffusion. Foreign firms generally heavily invest in education and training of their employees to improve their productivity. Domestic firms which hire former employees of foreign firms can benefit from these employees' embodied knowledge and skills, which may have a positive effect on domestic firms' productivity. This study investigates the link between productivity and worker mobility. I test the hypothesis that hiring workers from multinational firms increases domestic firms' productivity using a comprehensive matched employee-employment data set from the Netherlands. I find that firms that hired new workers from multinationals experience a productivity gain one year after hiring. Moreover, I show that the positive effects of hiring from multinationals coincide with the level of education and skills of newly hired employees. Additionally, my analysis revealed a negative association between the reduction in productivity and unskilled workers moving within domestic firms.

Keywords: Productivity; Foreign direct investment; labour mobility; knowledge spillover.

JEL:D24; J24; J62; L60.

*University of Groningen, Faculty of Economics and Business; Nettelbosje 2, 9747 AE, Groningen, The Netherlands; m.abolhassani@rug.nl

1 Introduction

Over the last few decades, many scholars have examined the theoretical knowledge spillover effects of foreign direct investment in the host country (see e.g, Fosfuri et al. (2001); Markusen (2001); Cooper (2001); Glass and Saggi (2002); Dasgupta (2012)). The literature has developed in several directions and has identified different channels along which knowledge may spill over from a multinational enterprise to a local firm (Saggi (2002)).

Labour mobility has been considered as one of the major sources of knowledge spillover across firms (Görg and Strobl (2005)). Foreign firms generally heavily invest in education and training of their employees to improve their productivity (Fosfuri et al. (2001)).¹ Domestic firms which hire former employees of foreign firms can benefit from these employees' embodied knowledge and skills, which may have a positive effect on domestic firms' productivity (Zucker et al. (2002); Palomeras and Melero (2010); Stoyanov and Zubanov (2012)). Generally, employees do not leave the foreign firm unless offered better working conditions by other firms. Thus, productivity spillovers only take place if the foreign firm's employee is hired by a domestic firm, because he is offered a sufficiently attractive wage rate. There is some supportive evidence for this. Balsvik (2011) shows that Norwegian workers previously employed by multinationals received a wage premium of more than 3 percent compared to their new colleagues hired from non-multinationals. Poole (2013) confirms this finding for the Brazilian manufacturing sector. Likewise, Pesola (2011) reports that highly educated employees in Finland earn a return on prior experience in a foreign-owned firm, which is over and above the return on other previous work experience. Martins (2005) finds that Portuguese firms pay workers previously employed by multinationals higher salaries than similar employees without such a prior foreign experience. However, this study also reports that workers suffer sizable pay cuts when moving from foreign to domestic firms.

¹In this study I use foreign firms and multinationals interchangeably.

Javorcik (2004) argues that, foreign firms have strong incentives to prevent technological leakage through demonstration effects and labour movement, as local competitors can gain strength and challenge foreign firms. For instance, foreign firms may try to prevent their former employees from being hired elsewhere. Many firms add non-compete covenants in their contracts, resulting in a number of court cases dealing with their violations (Stoyanov and Zubanov (2012)). This protective tendency led some researchers to conclude that the scope for positive productivity spillovers is limited in an intra-industry context. Using Danish data, Stoyanov and Zubanov (2012) examine how the productivity gains are distributed between the hiring firms, the incumbent employees and the new employees. Consistent with the findings of Balsvik (2011), who shows that the private returns to mobility are smaller than the productivity effect at the plant level, Stoyanov and Zubanov (2012) find that the hiring firm benefits most from labour mobility.

To study the spillover effects of the presence of multinational enterprises through labour mobility, I build on the recent work of Stoyanov and Zubanov (2012) and Poole (2013) using administrative data for the Netherlands. In particular, the study focuses on mobility of workers who were previously employed by foreign firms. I distinguish between skilled and unskilled workers, as notably skilled workers take their knowledge with them to share it with their new co-workers, thereby promoting new collaborative networks and ideas (Laudel (2003)). For instance, Almeida and Kogut (1999) show that inter-firm mobility of patent holders in the semiconductor industry of the US influences the local transfer of knowledge across firms. Breschi and Lissoni (2009) find similar results for US inventors in certain technological fields.

I test the hypothesis that hiring skilled workers from multinational firms increases domestic firms' productivity using data of the Dutch firms provided by Statistics Netherlands(CBS). Multinational firms are very important for the Dutch economy. FDI to the

Netherlands makes up a large share of GDP, increasing to nearly \$US 154 billion in 2016 (equivalent to 19.8% of its GDP).² The core of the dataset is an employer-employee dataset covering the entire Dutch labour force, matched with administrative records on firms in manufacturing sectors. This data set allows me to study the labour flows from multinational to domestic firms. I apply two different productivity proxies calculated as the natural logarithm of turnover per employee and value added per employee, both normalized by the applicable industry-year average. The panel feature of the data set allows me to track firms from 1999 to 2013, and hence look at cross-sectional variability and changes over time.

I find that domestic firms that hired workers from multinationals experience productivity gains one year after hiring. Estimation results suggest that a 10 percentage point increase in employees hired from multinationals coincides with an increase of about 2.7 percentage point of the turnover-labor ratio in the receiving firm. Similarly, receiving firms experience a 2.1 percentage point increase in value added per worker. My results suggest that positive spillovers from FDI occur mainly via skilled workers. Additionally, my analysis reveals a negative association between domestic firm labour productivity and mobility of unskilled workers among domestic firms. This underlines the importance of taking education and skills into account, when analyzing worker mobility and knowledge spillovers.

This study contributes to the literature in several ways. To the best of my knowledge, this study is one of the first to examine spillovers via worker mobility considering skill and education levels of mobile workers as well as their experience and it is the first of this kind for the Netherlands. Additionally, unlike to previous studies (e.g. Stoyanov and Zubanov (2012)) this study considers movement of employees not only within manufac-

²The information on FDI inflows of the Netherlands is obtained from the World Bank data base (data.worldbank.org).

turing sectors but also from the service sectors to manufacturing industries and vice versa. Many of the workers who are moving from multinational service firms to manufacturing industries might be managers and can have a strong impact on the productivity of the firms one year after hiring. Foreign firms usually benefit from advanced technology and are more productive and therefore are more likely to be better run by managers and therefore ex-managers of multinational service firms can take and apply the achieved managerial experience and knowledge to receiving manufacturing firms resulting in a higher level of productivity. However, these important employees were neglected in the previous researches. Furthermore, this study employs a rich longitudinal data set of the Dutch workforce which covers a longer and more recent period compared to previous studies, notably Pesola (2011), Poole (2013) and Stoyanov and Zubanov (2012).³

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 reviews the existing literature and highlights the contribution of this research. Section 3 describes the data and methodology and Section 4 shows the results. Finally, Section 5 interprets the results and concludes.

2 Literature review

A vast literature highlighted the effect of foreign firms' presence on local labour market conditions and productivity spillovers of foreign direct investment.⁴ Regarding worker

³Pesola (2011) and Poole (2013) studied spillover through worker mobility in the Finish and Brazilian manufacturing sector during 1994-2002 and 1996-2001, respectively. They both attribute multinational spillovers to the increase in wages of incumbent domestic labors. Stoyanov and Zubanov (2012) studied spillovers from more productive firms during 1995-2007 in Denmark.

⁴See, e.g., Aitken and Harrison (1999); Saggi (2002); Görg and Greenaway (2004); Driffield and Girma (2003); Lipsey (2004); Sjöholm and Lipsey (2006), and Abolhassani and Danakol (2019). See Havranek and Irsova (2012) for a survey of the literature on productivity spillovers of FDI.

mobility as a knowledge spillover channel, the theoretical literature generally predicts a positive effect of FDI presence on domestic firms' productivity (Kaufmann (1997); Haacker (1999); Fosfuri et al. (2001); Glass and Saggi (2002)). Fosfuri et al. (2001) were among the first to formally model this channel of multinational enterprise knowledge spillovers. According to their model, a multinational invests in training of its employees to compete with domestic firms for the services of the trained workers. Therefore, the employee would not leave multinational enterprise unless he is offered better working conditions such as a higher wage. The model of Markusen and Trefler (2009) predicts similar results. Glass and Saggi (2002) reach comparable conclusions, and argue that the foreign firm can either pay a wage premium to prevent the movement of their trained employees or relocate its operations to keep up its technological superiority. Anecdotal evidence confirms that this might be the reason that multinationals choose to export instead of investing abroad. Görg and Strobl (2005) state that multinational firms invest in training and in the absence of slavery, it is impossible to forbid such resources to move to other firms. As a result, the movement of labour from multinational to domestic firms can generate productivity improvements. These improvements occur via two mechanisms: (1) a direct spillover to other workers of the domestic firm; and (2) workers who move may transfer knowledge of new technologies or new management methods to domestic firms (Görg and Strobl (2005)).

However, empirical studies attempting to identify the spillover effects via labour mobility and the mechanism behind it, generate inconclusive results. Using data from the Brazilian manufacturing sector Poole (2013) provides evidence of wage spillovers from the workforce of multinationals to workers of domestic firms. He attributes spillovers to the increase in wages of incumbent domestic labour. Markusen and Trefler (2009) studied variation in wages across Colombian manufacturing sectors and find evidence supporting the hypothesis that 'experts' hired from foreign firms can transfer skills to domestic workers. Görg and Strobl (2005), using a small survey from Ghana, report that firms whose owners once worked in a foreign firm in the same industry immediately prior to opening up

their own firm are more productive than those working in similar domestic firms. However, they could not identify any positive productivity effects following experience in a foreign firm in a different industry.

Some studies focusing on developed countries show a positive effect of labour mobility on firms' productivity. Balsvik (2011) attributes spillovers from multinational to the increase in wages of incumbent domestic labour and shows that new workers hired from multinationals receive a wage premium compared to those hired from non-multinationals. Stoyanov and Zubanov (2012) set up a more general framework to trace the effects of labour mobility using employer-employee data. Tracking the flows in Danish manufacturing firms, they find that the productivity gains associated with hiring from more productive firms are equivalent to 0.35 percent per year for an average firm.

Most previous studies on knowledge spillovers of FDI do not examine in much detail how these spillovers occur. Therefore, in my study I attempt to explain the mechanism behind the spillovers by considering the education level of workers. There is a vast literature addressing the association between skilled worker mobility and knowledge transfer. Arrow (1962), Rosen (1972) and Stephan (1996) were among the first to formally model this association. Skilled workers might obtain new knowledge and learn new techniques and when they move to a new firm, they share these skills and knowledge in the new company and with their new co-workers. They also promote new collaborative networks and ideas and promote new combinations of knowledge (Laudel (2003)). Hence, the role of skills and education in the level of knowledge diffusion is key. In line with this reasoning, I formulate the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis : *Hiring from multinational firms increases domestic firms' productivity; this effect is driven by the mobility of high-skilled workers.*

I extend the literature by building on models proposed by previous studies notably Stoyanov and Zubanov (2012) and Poole (2013), using a unique dataset for the Netherlands. Furthermore, I try to explain the mechanism behind the knowledge spillover by considering the education level of workers.

3 Data and Methodology

3.1 Data Sources

The dataset used in this study is a matched employer-employee dataset from Statistics Netherlands (CBS) which covers the entire private sector. At the worker level, it contains information on employment status, in particular, the employer, the type of contract, the number of days worked, the starting date of employment, and the annual wage received. I define mobile workers as those employees with a new job in a new firm. All firms and individuals have unique identification numbers, which enables me to link the observations to administrative firm records and worker characteristics, such as age, gender and education.

The core of the firm data is the Business Registry data (ABR), which incorporates the whole population of firms and reports annual statistics on the number of employees, detailed industry codes of the establishment, and its location. I merge the Business Registry data with Production Statistics (PS-Industry and PS-Service), which consist of information about turnover, value added and the wage bill. An important variable in this study is foreign ownership, which is reported as the percentage of firms' equity owned by foreign investors in the Financial Statistics of Large Enterprises (SFGO) survey.⁵ The SFGO incorporates firms with total assets of at least 22.69 million Euros. Our foreign ownership

⁵Statistiek financiën van grote (niet-financiële) ondernemingen, in Dutch.

measure is therefore limited to large firms, which account for the vast majority of foreign investment. I define firms with at least 10% foreign ownership as multinational.⁶ From the SFGO, together with its equivalent for small firms SFKO⁷ and the NFO survey⁸, I obtain information on turnover, value added, wages, capital and the number of employees of enterprises.

In order to track the movement of workers across firms, I create a panel data set at the employee level including all workers in the manufacturing and service sectors. I dropped all part time workers (defined as people with a work contract for less than 75% of a full-time equivalent) and those with very low wages or for whom no wage was reported. I also excluded employees with flexible hour contracts.⁹ Finally, I eliminated workers who changed jobs more than once in a year. Unlike Stoyanov and Zubanov (2012), our data covers all manufacturing and service firms, and therefore it covers not only workers moving within manufacturing but also those moving from service sectors to manufacturing sectors or vice versa. After calculating all necessary variables, I aggregated the data to the firm level. The final sample is an unbalanced panel data covering the years between 1999 and 2013 comprising 133,229 (503583) firm-year observations for manufacturing (service) sectors. Appendix A describes the sample in more detail.

⁶For some years, the SFGO survey contains a direct measure of the firm being either a multinational or a domestic firm. Most firms with foreign ownership higher than 10% are reported as a multinational (about 95%). We use the 10% threshold to measure foreign ownership consistently in all years.

⁷Statistiek financiën kleine ondernemingen, in Dutch.

⁸As of 2000, SFGO and SFKO have been merged into a single data set, the so-called statistics on finances of non-financial enterprises (NFO-statistiek financiën van niet-financiële ondernemingen in Dutch). However, SFGO is still available.

⁹Workers with flexible hours contract are reported as employees who have a contract without fixed working hours, and firms use them when needed. Therefore, their wages can fluctuate heavily depending on the number of times they are called in.

3.2 Methodological Approach

In this section, I develop a model to test whether and to what extent productivity growth is realized via mobility of workers previously employed by multinationals. I measure the spillover effect as the relationship between the labour productivity of domestic firms and the share of their workers with previous experience at multinational firms. The greater the share of employees who previously worked at a multinational firm, the greater is the probability of a transfer of technology and knowledge. Therefore, the main explanatory variables of interest are H_{it}^{Multi} and H_{it}^{Dom} , i.e. the total number of new employees hired from multinational and from domestic establishments respectively, as the percentage of all employees N_{it} :

$$H_{it}^{Multi} = \frac{\sum_s I_{st}^F H_{st}}{N_{it}}$$

$$H_{it}^{Dom} = \frac{\sum_s (1 - I_{st}^F) H_{st}}{N_{it}}$$

Here, I_{st}^F is a dummy variable equal to one if firm s (sending firm) is a multinational and zero otherwise, and H_{st} denotes the number of workers hired from firm s . To test whether the hiring of workers from foreign-owned firms affects productivity of the hiring firm, relative to hiring from domestic firms, I estimate the following model:

$$A_{it+1} = \gamma A_{it} + \alpha_1 H_{it}^{Multi} + \alpha_2 H_{it}^{Dom} + \beta_1 X_{it} + \beta_2 Y_{it} + \beta_3 Z_{it} + \tau_{kt} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

The dependent variable A_{it+1} is firm's productivity one year after hiring. I apply two different productivity measures: $A^{Turnover}$ and $A^{ValueAdded}$ defined as the natural logarithm of turnover per employee and value added per employee; both measures are normalized by the applicable industry-year average based on the NACE rev. 1.1 industry classification

at the 5 digit level (SBI 5 digit level)¹⁰. I control for contemporaneous productivity to account for persistence in the dependent variable.

Furthermore, to account for other sources of productivity growth, I add a number of controls in the equations, including firm characteristics, labour characteristics and industry-year fixed effects (see also Stoyanov and Zubanov (2012)). The vector X_{it} includes firm characteristics, such as the number of employees, the number of newly hired workers relative to total employment and the natural logarithm of the capital labor ratio. Y_{it} is the vector of incumbent workers' characteristics and consists of average skill, average age, percentage of female and average number of years of work experience. Z_{it} is vector of characteristics of new workers and includes: averages of age, skill, year of work experience and percentage of new female employees as a ratio of total employees. Finally, to account for unobserved industry-specific time-varying effects I include a full set of industry-time fixed effects τ_{kt} of manufacturing sectors. ε is the disturbance terms.

The coefficients of interest are α_1 and α_2 , which denote the productivity gain from hiring workers from multinational and domestic firms, respectively. Note that I control for the hiring share in the vector X already, and hence I test whether the composition of the hires affects productivity.

Further, in order to identify the workers which are most likely the main source of knowledge spillovers, I differentiate between hiring highly skilled ($D_j^{Skill} = 1$) and non-highly skilled ($D_j^{Skill} = 0$) workers from multinational and domestic firms, since high-skilled workers are most likely to transfer knowledge and skills. I define highly skilled workers as those who have tertiary education, resulting in a bachelor, master or Doctoral

¹⁰SBI stands for 'standaard bedrijfsindeling' which corresponds to the Dutch version of the NACE industry classification. Note industry is defined at the 5-digit level of the NACE classification

degree or equivalent (see Appendix A for more details):

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Hired skilled workers from multinationals} &= HS_{it}^{Multi} = \frac{\sum_s I_{st}^F \sum_j D_{jst}^{Skill}}{N_{it}} \\
\text{Hired unskilled workers from multinationals} &= HUS_{it}^{Multi} = \frac{\sum_s I_{st}^F \sum_j (1-D_{jst}^{Skill})}{N_{it}} \\
\text{Hired skilled workers from domestic firms} &= HS_{it}^{Dom} = \frac{\sum_s (1-I_{st}^F) \sum_j D_{jst}^{Skill}}{N_{it}} \\
\text{Hired unskilled workers from domestic firms} &= HUS_{it}^{Dom} = \frac{\sum_s (1-I_{st}^F) \sum_j (1-D_{jst}^{Skill})}{N_{it}}
\end{aligned}$$

Next, using these definitions I explore the additional productivity impact of hiring highly skilled versus non-highly skilled workers, respectively, by amending the empirical model as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{it+1} = \gamma A_{it} + \alpha_1 HS_{it}^{Multi} + \alpha_2 HS_{it}^{Dom} + \alpha_3 HUS_{it}^{Multi} + \alpha_4 HUS_{it}^{Dom} + \beta_1 X_{it} \\
+ \beta_2 Y_{it} + \beta_3 Z_{it} + \tau_{st} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (2)
\end{aligned}$$

To isolate productivity shocks which can result in more hiring and in particular hiring workers from multinationals who are likely to be of better quality, I add productivity lags to all models presented above. Further, I estimate the equations for large and small firms. Additionally, I repeat the analysis with a subsample of start-ups and young firms.

3.3 Descriptive Analysis

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics measured at the worker level. The figures reported cover the whole labour force of the Netherlands between 1999 and 2013.¹¹ As shown in Table 1, the average hiring rate is 13.8 %, while 4% of the newly hired workers

¹¹The total number of worker-year observations in the Netherlands in the final sample is about 84.1 million; about 7.4 million is for manufacturing sectors.

come from multinationals. The average age of job stayers is 40.5 years and about 25% are female. The majority of stayers are in the middle-skilled group and the rest is almost equally spread between low- and high-skilled groups.¹² In comparison, new workers are on average 32 years old and about 8 years younger than stayers, and they are more likely to be in the middle-skilled group. The average annual wage of stayers is about 3% higher than that of newly hired employees, while employees who moved from multinationals are paid 2% more than stayers. This wage premium is consistent with numbers reported by Stoyanov and Zubanov (2012) for the Danish workforce. Hiring firms tend to be larger than non-hiring firms (non-hiring firms in our sample have on average about 6 employees). Firms which hired workers previously employed by multinationals have on average 63 employees and are relatively large firms.

Table 1: Summary statistics for workers

Variable	Sample	Stayer	New Hire	H FDI
ln(value added)	3.90	3.64	3.96	3.96
ln(turnover)	4.92	4.85	4.97	4.97
ln(wage)	10.24	10.25	10.22	10.27
Age (workers)	38.8	40.5	31.97	38.2
Low-skilled	29.6	29.9	29.4	25.8
Middle-skilled	42.3	39.1	44.5	46.1
High-skilled	28.1	31	26.1	28.1
Female(manufacturing's labor)	26.4	25.6	25.5	10.25
Female(whole labor force)	40.5			
Average firm size	26.6		58.43	63.42
Labour hiring rate (%)			13.8	4

The number of worker-year observations for manufacturing is about 7.4 million.

The average size of the firms with no hiring in our sample is 5.7.

The pairwise correlation of the main independent variables is presented in Table 2.¹³ The table shows a positive correlation between hiring from foreign firms and both productivity measures of domestic firms. These correlations remain positive after differentiating

¹²I define skilled workers as workers who have tertiary education, bachelor, master, Doctoral or equivalent. However, in Table 1 I split workers in 3 groups to give a better overview of the Dutch workforce (see Appendix A for more details).

¹³The correlation matrix of all variables is shown in Table 7 in Appendix A.

between hiring highly skilled and unskilled workers from multinationals. Hiring employees from domestic firms is positively correlated with the productivity measure based on turnover. This is caused by the hiring of highly skilled workers as the the correlation between productivity ($A^{Turnover}$) and the hiring of non-skilled workers is negative. The correlation between hiring from domestic firms and A^{Value} is negative. However, this negative correlation is driven by the relationship between the hiring of unskilled workers and productivity growth; the hiring of skilled workers from domestic firms is positively correlated with value added per worker of the receiving firms. These correlations are consistent with the main hypothesis of this study. In the next section, I report the results of a regression analysis to further test this hypothesis.

Table 2: Pairwise correlation of main variables

	$A^{Turnover}$	A^{Value}	HS^{Multi}	HUS^{Multi}	HS^{Dom}	HUS^{Dom}	H^{Multi}	H^{Dom}
$A^{Turnover}$	1							
A^{Value}	0.7467	1						
HS^{Multi}	0.0285	0.0353	1					
HUS^{Multi}	0.0113	0.0089	0.0159	1				
HS^{Dom}	0.0213	0.0321	0.0321	0.0047	1			
HUS^{Dom}	-0.0103	-0.027	0.0047	0.0310	0.0119	1		
H^{Multi}	0.0495	0.0498	0.2676	0.5492	0.0336	0.0632	1	
H^{Dom}	0.0227	-0.037	0.0234	0.0517	0.2565	0.5595	0.1637	1

4 Results

I start by estimating the model introduced in section 3.2 for all Dutch manufacturing firms during 1999-2013. Columns 1 and 2 of Table 3 show the results for equation 1 for 2 different productivity proxies. I find a positive and significant association between hiring new employees who were previously employed by multinational enterprises and the productivity of the receiving domestic firm. In contrast, hiring new employees from domestic firms

does not seem to have a significant effect on the productivity of the receiving domestic firm.

As shown in Columns 3 and 4 of Table 3, notably the hiring of highly skilled workers has a significantly positive effect on labour productivity of the receiving domestic firm after one year. A ten percentage point increase in the ratio of hiring high-skilled workers from multinational firms corresponds to a 1.83 and 4.12 percentage point increase in the turnover-labor ratio and the value-added-labor ratio, respectively. By contrast, hiring low-skilled workers from multinational firms seems not to have a significant effect on productivity of the receiving domestic firm. Hiring highly skilled workers from domestic firms has a significantly positive effect on productivity in the receiving domestic firm as well, no matter whether productivity is measured based on value added or turnover. But hiring low-skilled employees from domestic firms appears to have a significant negative effect on the receiving domestic firm's performance after one year. A 10 percentage point increase in unskilled employees newly hired from domestic firms reduces turnover per employee by about 1 and value added per employee by 1.1 percentage point. I find similar results for service sectors (See Appendix B). However for service companies hiring unskilled workers from both multinationals and domestic firms appear to have negative effect on productivity of the receiving firms while hiring skilled workers is positively associated with hiring domestic firms' productivity one year after hiring.

Next, I split the sample into large (number of employees ≥ 50) and small firms (number of employees < 50). One reason why large domestic firms might benefit more from knowledge spillovers could be that hiring firms in this study are relatively larger (58 employees) than non-hiring firms (about 6 employees) and firms which hired ex-employees of multinationals have on average 63 employees. Beside this, most of multinationals are also large firms or share relevant characteristics with large firms (Malchow-Møller et al. (2013)). Additionally, larger firms are more likely to be better run by managers (Lucas

Table 3: Hiring skilled workers from multinationals

VARIABLES	Base Model		Skilled vs. Unskilled	
	Turnover	Value added	Turnover	Value added
Turnover	.661*** (.012)		0.688*** (0.002)	
Value		.560*** (.013)		0.625*** (0.003)
H^{FDI}	.270** (.014)	.206** (.015)		
H^{Dom}	.079 (.108)	-.031 (.116)		
HS^{FDI}			0.183** (0.077)	0.412*** (0.150)
HUS^{FDI}			0.072 (0.048)	-0.059 (0.099)
HS^{Dom}			0.301*** (0.060)	0.376*** (0.112)
HUS^{Dom}			-0.097** (0.034)	-.112* (0.068)
Ln(labour)	0.10** (0.005)	0.017*** (0.006)	0.032*** (0.001)	0.027*** (0.002)
New labour ratio	0.126*** (0.045)	0.120*** (0.050)	0.112*** (0.047)	0.109*** (0.053)
Ln(capital)	0.012*** (0.003)	0.005** (0.004)	0.015*** (0.001)	0.007*** (0.001)
Female	-0.043** (0.017)	-0.039** (0.014)	-0.042*** (0.009)	-0.052*** (0.013)
Highly skilled	0.139*** (0.036)	0.280*** (0.042)	0.126*** (0.049)	0.171*** (0.058)
Experience	0.002 (0.001)	0.002 (0.001)	0.005** (0.001)	0.002* (0.001)
Age	-0.004 (0.002)	-0.007 (0.002)	-0.0001 (0.0003)	0.0002 (0.001)
Age of new worker	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.0003 (0.0004)	-0.001 (0.0004)
New worker skill ratio	0.102*** (0.024)	0.036** (0.025)	0.047*** (0.008)	0.043*** (0.011)
Experience of new worker	0.008*** (0.001)	0.003** (0.003)	0.003*** (0.001)	0.002** (0.001)
Constant	.095 (0.025)	0.065 (0.047)	0.106*** (0.005)	0.117*** (0.008)
Observations	133,229	56,163	133,229	56,163
R-squared	0.508	0.418	0.509	0.419

Columns 1 and 2 show the results for equation 1 and Columns 2 and 4 show the results for equation 2 for 2 different productivity proxies. All specifications include industry-year effects and characteristics of incumbent firms' workers and new workers (X_{it} and Z_{it}).

Robust standard errors in parentheses; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

(1978)). Better management can help facilitate the application of knowledge of newly hired employees resulting in higher levels of productivity. Columns 1-4 of Table 4 present the estimation results for these sub samples for both productivity proxies. Hiring highly skilled employees from multinationals has a positive and significant effect on domestic firm productivity, but this effect is larger for large firms than for small firms. Similarly, hiring highly skilled workers from domestic firms is positively associated with domestic firm productivity and the coefficients are larger for enterprises with at least 50 employees. The effect of hiring low-skilled workers on productivity seems to be insignificant except for turnover per employee. This means that for large firms hiring from multinationals is positively associated with their turnover-labor ratio, regardless of the level of education and skill of new employees. Moreover, I find a significantly negative effect of hiring low-skilled employees from domestic firms for large firms. For small firms, hiring low-skilled workers who were not previously employed by a multinational lowers turnover per employee, although these results have weak significance.

Start-ups have a powerful impact on productivity and job creation. In particular, firms younger than 5 years have been found to be job creators, while older firms might be job destroyers (Haltiwanger et al. (2013)). Additionally, young firms are less likely to have been hit by productivity shocks which could affect their hiring choices. I therefore repeat the analysis with a subsample of start-ups and young firms. This sub sample includes only enterprises that have existed for less than 5 years since their establishment ($\text{firm age} \leq 5$). Columns 5 and 6 in Table 4 report the estimation results for these young firms. I find a significantly positive association between domestic firm productivity and recruiting skilled workers from multinationals. A 10 percentage point increase in hiring skilled workers from foreign firms seems to increase turnover and value added per employee in young domestic firms by 2.5 and 5 percentage points, respectively. The effect of hiring low-skilled labour from domestic firms remains significantly negative for small firms.

Table 4: Large vs. small firms and young firms

VARIABLES	Turnover	Value added	Turnover	Value added	Turnover	Value added
$A_{it-1}^{Turnover}$	0.775*** (0.003)		0.663*** (0.002)		.652*** (.003)	
$A_{it-1}^{Valueadded}$		0.598*** (0.004)		0.644*** (0.004)		.589*** (.005)
HS_{it}^{FDI}	0.868** (0.340)	.958*** (0.381)	0.174** (0.084)	0.219* (0.117)	0.248** (.099)	.501** (.221)
HUS_{it}^{FDI}	0.616*** (0.189)	0.076 (0.221)	0.053 (0.053)	-0.033 (0.117)	-.004 (.063)	-.333** (.16)
HS_{it}^{Dom}	0.833*** (0.248)	0.881*** (0.292)	0.285*** (0.066)	0.371*** (0.128)	0.192** (.079)	.199 (.189)
HUS_{it}^{Dom}	-0.367*** (0.122)	-0.456*** (0.148)	-0.066* (0.037)	-0.009 (0.080)	-.122*** (.047)	-.175* (.102)
	$N \geq 50$		$N < 50$		Age < 6	
Observations	35,698	20,342	97,531	35,821	66,937	24,404
R squared	0.607	0.393	0.438	0.415	.448	.369

Column 1 and 2 shows estimation result for large firm and Column 3 and 4 represent result for small firms. Last two Column shows result for start-up.

All specifications include industry-year effects and characteristics of firms, incumbent workers and new workers (X_{it} and Z_{it}).

Robust standard errors in parentheses; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

5 Conclusions

The goal of this paper is to investigate the role of labour mobility in knowledge spillovers from multinationals to domestic firms for the Netherlands. Theoretical literature suggests that information externalities may be created by the movement of trained workers of foreign firms to domestic firms. However, empirical studies on these effects are rare. This research offers evidence based on a comprehensive linked employee-employment data set for transmission of technology and knowledge through worker turnover for a developed country. Moreover, my study emphasizes the potential importance of skills and education in knowledge spillovers from multinationals via worker mobility.

I find that the hiring by domestic firms of new workers previously employed by a multinational is positively associated with labour productivity of the receiving domestic firm. My results also suggest that the movement of labour from one domestic firm to another has no significant effect on productivity. Additionally, I find hiring highly skilled

workers from domestic firms has a significantly positive effect on productivity in the receiving domestic firm. Finally, I provide evidence that hiring low-skilled employees from domestic firms is negatively associated with the receiving firm's performance after one year.

Moreover, I show that the positive effect of hiring from foreign firms is related to the education level and skills of the workers. This finding confirms the argument that skilled workers might better obtain new knowledge and learn new technologies. Additionally, they can better transfer this knowledge to their new working environment and promote new collaborative networks and ideas (see, e.g. Laudel (2003)). I also find a negative link between unskilled workers moving across domestic firms and labour productivity of the receiving firm.

The main results of this study are consistent with the spillover through labour mobility theory according to which new employees bring knowledge and skills from their previous position. In particular, the comparison of results for hiring from multinationals affirm the theory introduced by Fosfuri et al. (2001) and Markusen and Trefler (2009). Moreover, when I do not control for the level of skills of workers, my findings confirm the finding of previous empirical studies of Poole (2013) and Balsvik (2011). However, when I take the skills of former employees of multinationals into account, my results suggest that the level of education of workers plays a key role in knowledge diffusion. Furthermore, I demonstrate that the results obtained are not driven by productivity shocks since my results for newly established firms are consistent with those based on the full sample. Since my estimates are stable across various measures of productivity they reveal a genuine relationship.

Although an individual country study of the Netherlands does not lend itself easily to generalizations, the consistency of my results with other studies for EU nations, suggests that my findings are relevant for other developed countries as well. Consequently, I believe that even though my research focuses on a single country, my empirical evidence provides

valuable insights into the role of FDI in transferring knowledge and technology into the host countries' enterprises, and may be applied to other European country settings. It has been argued that knowledge diffusion via worker mobility and the ability of workers to apply new knowledge can be dependent on workers' occupation (Song et al. (2003)). Therefore, an interesting avenue for future work may be to examine whether workers' previous occupation and position in multinationals plays a role in the knowledge spillovers of multinational firms to domestic firms.

References

- Abolhassani, M. and S. H. Danakol (2019). Wage and competition channels of foreign direct investment and new firm entry. *Small Business Economics* 53(4), 935–960.
- Aitken, B. J. and A. E. Harrison (1999). Do domestic firms benefit from direct foreign investment? evidence from venezuela. *American Economic Review* 89(3), 605–618.
- Almeida, P. and B. Kogut (1999). Localization of knowledge and the mobility of engineers in regional networks. *Management Science* 45(7), 905–917.
- Arrow, K. J. (1962). The economic implications of learning by doing. *The Review of Economic Studies* 29(3), 155–173.
- Balsvik, R. (2011). Is labor mobility a channel for spillovers from multinationals? evidence from norwegian manufacturing. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 93(1), 285–297.
- Breschi, S. and F. Lissoni (2009). Mobility of Skilled Workers and co-Invention Networks: an Anatomy of Localized Knowledge Flows. *Journal of Economic Geography* 9(4), 439–468.
- Cooper, D. (2001). Innovation and reciprocal externalities: Information transmission via job mobility?. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 45, 403-425.
- Dasgupta, K. (2012). Learning and knowledge diffusion in a global economy. *Journal of International Economics* 87(2), 323–336.
- Driffield, N. and S. Girma (2003). Regional foreign direct investment and wage spillovers: plant level evidence from the uk electronics industry. *Oxford bulletin of economics and statistics* 65(4), 453–474.

- Fosfuri, A., M. Motta, and T. Ronde (2001). Foreign direct investment and spillovers through workers' mobility. *Journal of International Economics* 53(1), 205–222.
- Glass, A. and K. Saggi (2002). Multinational firms and technology transfer. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 104(4), 495–513.
- Görg, H. and D. Greenaway (2004). Much Ado About Nothing? Do Domestic Firms Really Benefit from Foreign Direct Investment? Technical report.
- Görg, H. and E. Strobl (2005). Spillovers from foreign firms through worker mobility: An empirical investigation. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 107(4), 693–709.
- Haacker, M. (1999). Spillovers from foreign direct investment through labour turnover: the supply of management skills. *CEP Discussion Paper, London School of Economics*.
- Haltiwanger, J., R. Jarmin, and J. Miranda (2013). Who creates jobs? small versus large versus young. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 95(2), 347–361.
- Havranek, T. and Z. Irsova (2012). Survey article: Publication bias in the literature on foreign direct investment spillovers. *The Journal of Development Studies* 48(10), 1375–1396.
- Javorcik, B. S. (2004). Does foreign direct investment increase the productivity of domestic firms? in search of spillovers through backward linkages. *The American Economic Review* 94(3), 605–627.
- Kaufmann, L. (1997). A model of spillovers through labor recruitment. *International Economic Journal* 11(3), 13–34.
- Laudel, G. (2003). Studying the brain drain: Can bibliometric methods help? *Scientometrics* 57(2), 215–237.

- Lipsey, R. and F. Sjöholm (2004). Foreign direct investment, education and wages in Indonesian manufacturing. *Journal of Development Economics* 73(1), 415–422.
- Lipsey, R. E. (2004, February). *Home- and Host-Country Effects of Foreign Direct Investment*, pp. 333–382. University of Chicago Press.
- Lucas, R. E. (1978). On the size distribution of business firms. *The Bell Journal of Economics* 9(2), 508–523.
- Malchow-Møller, N., J. Markusen, and B. Schjerning (2013). Foreign firms, domestic wages. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 115(2), 292–325.
- Markusen, J. (2001). Contracts, intellectual property rights, and multinational investment in developing countries. *Journal of International Economics* 53(1), 189–204.
- Markusen, J. and N. Trofimenko (2009). Teaching locals new tricks: Foreign experts as a channel of knowledge transfers. *Journal of Development Economics* 88(1), 120–131.
- Martins, P. (2005). Inter-firm employee mobility, displacement, and foreign direct investment spillovers. *mimeo, Queen Mary, University of London*.
- Palomeras, N. and E. Melero (2010). Markets for inventors: Learning-by-hiring as a driver of mobility. *Management Science* 56(5), 881–895.
- Pesola, H. (2011). Labour mobility and returns to experience in foreign firms. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 113(3), 637–664.
- Poole, J. (2013). Knowledge transfers from multinational to domestic firms: Evidence from worker mobility. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 95(2), 393–406.
- Rosen, S. (1972). Learning and expertise in the labor market. *The Journal of Human Resources*.

- Saggi, K. (2002). Trade, foreign direct investment, and international technology transfer: A survey. *World Bank Research Observer* 17(2), 191–235.
- Sjöholm, F. and R. Lipsey (2006). Foreign firms and Indonesian manufacturing wages: An analysis with panel data. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 55(1), 201–21.
- Song, J., P. Almeida, and G. Wu (2003). Learning-by-hiring: When is mobility more likely to facilitate interfirm knowledge transfer? *Management Science* 49(4), 351–365.
- Stephan, P. (1996). The economics of science. *Journal of Economic Literature* 34(3), 1199–1235.
- Stoyanov, A. and N. Zubanov (2012). Productivity spillovers across firms through worker mobility. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 4(2), 168–198.
- Zucker, L., M. Darby, and M. Torero (2002). Labor mobility from academe to commerce. *Journal of Labor Economics* 20(3), 629–660.

Appendix A: Data Description

Table 5 reports the main variables used in this study including their sources. In Section 3.3 I refer to 3 educational groups, namely low-skilled, middle-skilled and high-skilled workers. This classification is based on the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED). The low-skilled group refers to education codes 0,1 and 2, namely people with lower secondary education or lower certificate. The mid-skilled group include workers with upper secondary or post secondary education (education codes 3 and 4). Finally, the high-skilled group consists of workers with education code 5: short-cycle tertiary education, bachelor or master and education code 6: people with doctoral or equivalent certificate. In the analysis, I refer to skilled workers if they are highly skilled (workers with education code of 5 or 6).

Table 5: Variables: Description and data sources

VARIABLE	DESCRIPTION	DATA SOURCE
$A^{Turnover}$	Total turnover divided by total employment at time t normalized by the applicable industry-year average	Production Statistics, SFGO, NFO, SFKO
$A^{ValueAdded}$	Valued Added divided by total employment at time t normalized by the applicable industry-year average	Production Statistics, SFGO, SFKO,
FDI	Firm's foreign equity at time t	SFGO
$\ln(\text{Labor})$	Logarithm of total number of employees in firm i at time t	Business Register
Capital	Capital of firm i divided by total number of employees of i at time t	SFGO, SFKO, NFO
Firm Age	The number of the years since a firm has been established	Business Register
Age	Average age of workforce in firm i at time t	GBA
Female	Proportion of female employees in firm i at time t	GBA
Skill	The proportion of high-skilled employees who have a college education	Educational Level

International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) forms the basis for the variable SKILLit. Namely, employees with the educational level 5 or 6 based on ISCED codes are considered as highly-skilled workers. Programmes classified at ISCED level 5 include, for example: (higher) technical education, community college education, technician or advanced/higher vocational training, associate degree. Likewise, programs classified at ISCED level 6 cover, for example: bachelor's programs, license, or first university cycle.

The descriptive statistics (including the definition of the variables) and the pairwise

correlation matrix are reported in Table 6 and Table 7, respectively. One can see from Table 6 that Dutch manufacturing firms employ on average about 29 employees with an average age of 38, of which 33% are highly skilled workers and 26 percent are female. The employees on average have 5.03 years of work experience in the same company while newly hired people on average worked 2.03 years in a previous company. Moreover, sending firms have about 45 employees on average while the multinational sending firms are much larger with an average number of employees of 296. This not unexpected since the information for FDI is obtained from SFGO and incorporates firms with total assets of at least 22.69 million euros and firms with such a large balance sheet generally are big and have a high number of employees. Hiring firms on average hired 5 new workers during the sample period, with an average age of 32, of which 28 % are female.

Table 6: Summary statistics

Variable	Description	Mean	Std.	Min	Max
$A^{Turnover}$	Normalized turnover per employee	-.0045	.89	-.5.87	5.08
$A^{ValueAdded}$	Normalized value added per employee	-.0044	.76	-.5.29	4.93
Size of sending firm	Average size of sending firm	45.47	245.59	1	35018
Size of FDI sending firm	Average size of sending firm if it is foreign	296.58	562.58	25	9489
Labour	Total number of employees of firm i at time t	29.5	191.62	0	35018
Age firm	Years since a firm is established at time t	9.51	10.64	0	37
Capital	Firm capital stock divided by total number of employees at time t	13933.13	130354.7	0	9558426
Hiring ratio	Total number of new workers divided by total number of employees at time t	0.233	0.276	0	1
Experience	Total number of years that an employee has work experience	5.034	4.121	0	49
Female	The proportion of female employees of firm i at time t	0.264	0.288	0	1
Skilled	The proportion of highly skilled employees of firm i at time t	0.329	0.213	0	1
Age	Average age of the workforce of firm i at time t	38.8	8.82	16	80
Age new	Average age of new workers hired in firm i at time t	31.97	9.93	16	80
Experience new	Total number of years that new workers hired worked in previous firm at time t	2.03	2.93	0	49
Female new	The proportion of female in new workers hired in firm i at time t	0.28	0.35	0	1
Hiring	Total number of new workers hired in firm i at time t	5.38	33	0	7895

Note: All statistics reported in this table are based on the sample of 239,168 firm-year observations.

Table 7: Pairwise Correlation

	A^T	A^V	Gap^T	Gap^V	Age Firm	ln(labour)	Hiring	Exp	Female	Skill	Age	Age new	Skill new	Exp new
$A^{Turnover}$	1													
A^{Value}	0.746	1												
$Gap^{turnover}$	-0.527	-0.358	1											
Gap^{Value}	-0.359	-0.480	0.687	1										
Age firm	0.003	-0.010	0.005	-0.075	1									
ln(labour)	0.021	-0.054	-0.038	-0.021	0.194	1								
Hiring	0.004	0.022	0.039	0.01	-0.145	-0.189	1							
Experience	-0.002	0.020	-0.022	-0.004	0.126	0.36	-0.425	1						
Female	-0.010	-0.039	0.005	0.019	0.036	-0.09	0.057	-0.12	1					
Skill	0.097	0.086	-0.064	-0.052	0.051	0.101	-0.027	0.015	0.045	1				
Age	-0.066	0.030	-0.010	0.023	-0.034	0.006	-0.288	0.401	-0.068	0.079	1			
Age new	-0.013	0.013	0.010	0.033	-0.119	-0.035	0.059	0.034	-0.039	0.064	0.652	1		
Skill new	-0.053	0.010	-0.026	0.001	-0.039	-0.336	-0.499	0.21	0.005	0.212	0.275	0.069	1	
Experience new	0.020	0.036	0.031	0.043	-0.06	0.001	-0.003	0.045	-0.068	0.012	0.226	0.347	-0.027	1
ln(Capital)	0.083	0.068	0.073	0.062	0.104	0.312	0.119	0.013	0.007	0.045	0.11	0.094	0.041	0.006

Appendix B: Service Sectors

Table 8 represents estimation results for equation 1 for 2 different productivity proxies, for all Dutch Service firms during 1999-2013. As shown in Columns 1 and 2 of Table 8, notably the hiring of highly skilled workers from either multinationals or domestic firms has a significantly positive effect on labour productivity of the receiving domestic firm after one year. A one percentage point increase in the ratio of hiring high-skilled workers from multinational firms (domestic firms) corresponds to a 0.198 (0.220) and 0.249 (0.363) percentage point increase in the turnover-labor ratio and the value-added-labor ratio, respectively for the hiring firms. By contrast, hiring low-skilled workers from both multinational and domestic firms have a negative significant effect on productivity of the receiving domestic service firm. However, the negative effect of hiring low-skilled employees from domestic firms appears to be slightly larger. A 10 percentage point increase in unskilled employees newly hired from domestic firms reduces turnover per employee by about 1.32 and value added per employee by 6.59 percentage point.

Table 8: Service Sector

VARIABLES	Turnover	value Added
Turnover	0.615*** (0.001)	
Value		0.572*** (0.004)
HS^{FDI}	0.198*** (0.031)	0.249** (0.102)
HUS^{FDI}	-0.117*** (0.024)	-0.477*** (0.099)
HS^{Dom}	0.220*** (0.024)	0.363*** (0.079)
HUS^{Dom}	-0.132*** (0.017)	-0.659*** (0.066)
Observations	503,583	69,554
R-squared	0.542	0.495

Columns 1 and 2 show the results for equation 2 for Service sectors using 2 different productivity proxies. All specifications include industry-year effects and characteristics of incumbent firms' workers and new workers (X_{it} and Z_{it}). Robust standard errors in parentheses; *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1



List of research reports

16001-GEM: Hoorn, A. van, How Are Migrant Employees Managed? An Integrated Analysis

16002-EEF: Soetevent, A.R., Te Bao, A.L. Schippers, A Commercial Gift for Charity

16003-GEM: Bouwmeester, M.C., and J. Oosterhaven, Economic Impacts of Natural Gas Flow Disruptions

16004-MARK: Holtrop, N., J.E. Wieringa, M.J. Gijsenberg, and P. Stern, Competitive Reactions to Personal Selling: The Difference between Strategic and Tactical Actions

16005-EEF: Plantinga, A. and B. Scholtens, The Financial Impact of Divestment from Fossil Fuels

16006-GEM: Hoorn, A. van, Trust and Signals in Workplace Organization: Evidence from Job Autonomy Differentials between Immigrant Groups

16007-EEF: Willems, B. and G. Zwart, Regulatory Holidays and Optimal Network Expansion

16008-GEF: Hoorn, A. van, Reliability and Validity of the Happiness Approach to Measuring Preferences

16009-EEF: Hinlopen, J., and A.R. Soetevent, (Non-)Insurance Markets, Loss Size Manipulation and Competition: Experimental Evidence

16010-EEF: Bekker, P.A., A Generalized Dynamic Arbitrage Free Yield Model

16011-EEF: Mierau, J.A., and M. Mink, A Descriptive Model of Banking and Aggregate Demand

16012-EEF: Mulder, M. and B. Willems, Competition in Retail Electricity Markets: An Assessment of Ten Year Dutch Experience

16013-GEM: Rozite, K., D.J. Bezemer, and J.P.A.M. Jacobs, Towards a Financial Cycle for the US, 1873-2014

16014-EEF: Neuteleers, S., M. Mulder, and F. Hindriks, Assessing Fairness of Dynamic Grid Tariffs

16015-EEF: Soetevent, A.R., and T. Bružikas, Risk and Loss Aversion, Price Uncertainty and the Implications for Consumer Search

16016-HRM&OB: Meer, P.H. van der, and R. Wielers, Happiness, Unemployment and Self-esteem

16017-EEF: Mulder, M., and M. Pagan, Influence of Environmental Policy and Market Forces on Coal-fired Power Plants: Evidence on the Dutch Market over 2006-2014

16018-EEF: Zeng, Y., and M. Mulder, Exploring Interaction Effects of Climate Policies: A Model Analysis of the Power Market



16019-EEF: Ma, Yiqun, Demand Response Potential of Electricity End-users Facing Real Time Pricing

16020-GEM: Bezemer, D., and A. Samarina, Debt Shift, Financial Development and Income Inequality in Europe

16021-EEF: Elkhuizen, L, N. Hermes, and J. Jacobs, Financial Development, Financial Liberalization and Social Capital

16022-GEM: Gerritse, M., Does Trade Cause Institutional Change? Evidence from Countries South of the Suez Canal

16023-EEF: Rook, M., and M. Mulder, Implicit Premiums in Renewable-Energy Support Schemes

17001-EEF: Trinks, A., B. Scholtens, M. Mulder, and L. Dam, Divesting Fossil Fuels: The Implications for Investment Portfolios

17002-EEF: Angelini, V., and J.O. Mierau, Late-life Health Effects of Teenage Motherhood

17003-EEF: Jong-A-Pin, R., M. Laméris, and H. Garretsen, Political Preferences of (Un)happy Voters: Evidence Based on New Ideological Measures

17004-EEF: Jiang, X., N. Hermes, and A. Meesters, Financial Liberalization, the Institutional Environment and Bank Efficiency

17005-EEF: Kwaak, C. van der, Financial Fragility and Unconventional Central Bank Lending Operations

17006-EEF: Postelnicu, L. and N. Hermes, The Economic Value of Social Capital

17007-EEF: Ommeren, B.J.F. van, M.A. Allers, and M.H. Vellekoop, Choosing the Optimal Moment to Arrange a Loan

17008-EEF: Bekker, P.A., and K.E. Bouwman, A Unified Approach to Dynamic Mean-Variance Analysis in Discrete and Continuous Time

17009-EEF: Bekker, P.A., Interpretable Parsimonious Arbitrage-free Modeling of the Yield Curve

17010-GEM: Schasfoort, J., A. Godin, D. Bezemer, A. Caiani, and S. Kinsella, Monetary Policy Transmission in a Macroeconomic Agent-Based Model

17011-I&O: Bogt, H. ter, Accountability, Transparency and Control of Outsourced Public Sector Activities

17012-GEM: Bezemer, D., A. Samarina, and L. Zhang, The Shift in Bank Credit Allocation: New Data and New Findings

17013-EEF: Boer, W.I.J. de, R.H. Koning, and J.O. Mierau, Ex-ante and Ex-post Willingness-to-pay for Hosting a Major Cycling Event



17014-OPERA: Laan, N. van der, W. Romeijnders, and M.H. van der Vlerk, Higher-order Total Variation Bounds for Expectations of Periodic Functions and Simple Integer Recourse Approximations

17015-GEM: Oosterhaven, J., Key Sector Analysis: A Note on the Other Side of the Coin

17016-EEF: Romensen, G.J., A.R. Soetevent: Tailored Feedback and Worker Green Behavior: Field Evidence from Bus Drivers

17017-EEF: Trinks, A., G. Ibikunle, M. Mulder, and B. Scholtens, Greenhouse Gas Emissions Intensity and the Cost of Capital

17018-GEM: Qian, X. and A. Steiner, The Reinforcement Effect of International Reserves for Financial Stability

17019-GEM/EEF: Klasing, M.J. and P. Milionis, The International Epidemiological Transition and the Education Gender Gap

2018001-EEF: Keller, J.T., G.H. Kuper, and M. Mulder, Mergers of Gas Markets Areas and Competition amongst Transmission System Operators: Evidence on Booking Behaviour in the German Markets

2018002-EEF: Soetevent, A.R. and S. Adikyan, The Impact of Short-Term Goals on Long-Term Objectives: Evidence from Running Data

2018003-MARK: Gijsenberg, M.J. and P.C. Verhoef, Moving Forward: The Role of Marketing in Fostering Public Transport Usage

2018004-MARK: Gijsenberg, M.J. and V.R. Nijs, Advertising Timing: In-Phase or Out-of-Phase with Competitors?

2018005-EEF: Hulshof, D., C. Jepma, and M. Mulder, Performance of Markets for European Renewable Energy Certificates

2018006-EEF: Fosgaard, T.R., and A.R. Soetevent, Promises Undone: How Committed Pledges Impact Donations to Charity

2018007-EEF: Durán, N. and J.P. Elhorst, A Spatio-temporal-similarity and Common Factor Approach of Individual Housing Prices: The Impact of Many Small Earthquakes in the North of Netherlands

2018008-EEF: Hermes, N., and M. Hudon, Determinants of the Performance of Microfinance Institutions: A Systematic Review

2018009-EEF: Katz, M., and C. van der Kwaak, The Macroeconomic Effectiveness of Bank Bail-ins

2018010-OPERA: Prak, D., R.H. Teunter, M.Z. Babai, A.A. Syntetos, and J.E. Boylan, Forecasting and Inventory Control with Compound Poisson Demand Using Periodic Demand Data



2018011-EEF: Brock, B. de, Converting a Non-trivial Use Case into an SSD: An Exercise

2018012-EEF: Harvey, L.A., J.O. Mierau, and J. Rockey, Inequality in an Equal Society

2018013-OPERA: Romeijnders, W., and N. van der Laan, Inexact cutting planes for two-stage mixed-integer stochastic programs

2018014-EEF: Green, C.P., and S. Homroy, Bringing Connections Onboard: The Value of Political Influence

2018015-OPERA: Laan, N. van der, and W. Romeijnders, Generalized alpha-approximations for two-stage mixed-integer recourse models

2018016-GEM: Rozite, K., Financial and Real Integration between Mexico and the United States

2019001-EEF: Lugalla, I.M., J. Jacobs, and W. Westerman, Drivers of Women Entrepreneurs in Tourism in Tanzania: Capital, Goal Setting and Business Growth

2019002-EEF: Brock, E.O. de, On Incremental and Agile Development of (Information) Systems

2019003-OPERA: Laan, N. van der, R.H. Teunter, W. Romeijnders, and O.A. Kilic, The Data-driven Newsvendor Problem: Achieving On-target Service Levels.

2019004-EEF: Dijk, H., and J. Mierau, Mental Health over the Life Course: Evidence for a U-Shape?

2019005-EEF: Freriks, R.D., and J.O. Mierau, Heterogeneous Effects of School Resources on Child Mental Health Development: Evidence from the Netherlands.

2019006-OPERA: Broek, M.A.J. uit het, R.H. Teunter, B. de Jonge, J. Veldman, Joint Condition-based Maintenance and Condition-based Production Optimization.

2019007-OPERA: Broek, M.A.J. uit het, R.H. Teunter, B. de Jonge, J. Veldman, Joint Condition-based Maintenance and Load-sharing Optimization for Multi-unit Systems with Economic Dependency

2019008-EEF: Keller, J.T. G.H. Kuper, and M. Mulder, Competition under Regulation: Do Regulated Gas Transmission System Operators in Merged Markets Compete on Network Tariffs?

2019009-EEF: Hulshof, D. and M. Mulder, Renewable Energy Use as Environmental CSR Behavior and the Impact on Firm Profit

2019010-EEF: Boot, T., Confidence Regions for Averaging Estimators

2020001-OPERA: Foreest, N.D. van, and J. Wijngaard. On Proportionally Fair Solutions for the Divorced-Parents Problem

2020002-EEF: Niccodemi, G., R. Alessie, V. Angelini, J. Mierau, and T. Wansbeek. Refining Clustered Standard Errors with Few Clusters



2020003-I&O: Bogt, H. ter, Performance and other Accounting Information in the Public Sector: A Prominent Role in the Politicians' Control Tasks?

2020004-I&O: Fisch, C., M. Wyrwich, T.L. Nguyen, and J.H. Block, Historical Institutional Differences and Entrepreneurship: The Case of Socialist Legacy in Vietnam

2020005-I&O: Fritsch, M. and M. Wyrwich. Is Innovation (Increasingly) Concentrated in Large Cities? An Internatinal Comparison

2020006-GEM: Oosterhaven, J., Decomposing Economic Growth Decompositions.

2020007-I&O: Fritsch, M., M. Obschonka, F. Wahl, and M. Wyrwich. The Deep Imprint of Roman Sandals: Evidence of Long-lasting Effects of Roman Rule on Personality, Economic Performance, and Well-Being in Germany

2020008-EEF: Heijnen, P., On the Computation of Equilibrium in Discontinuous Economic Games

2020009-EEF: Romensen, G.J. and A.R. Soetevent, Improving Worker Productivity Through Tailored Performance Feedback: Field Experimental Evidence from Bus Drivers

2020010-EEF: Rao, Z., M. Groneck, and R. Alessie, Should I Stay or Should I Go? Intergenerational Transfers and Residential Choice. Evidence from China

2020011-EEF: Kwaak, C. van der, Unintended Consequences of Central Bank Lending in Financial Crises

2020012-EEF: Soetevent, A.R., Determinants choice set variation in demand estimation – with an application to the electric vehicle public charging market

2020013-EEF: Kwaak, C. van der, Old-Keynesianism in the New Keynesian model

2020014-EEF: Plaat, m. van der, Loan Sales and the Tyranny of Distance in U.S. Residential Mortgage Lending

2020015-I&O: Fritsch, M., and M. Wyrwich, Initial Conditions and Regional Performance in the Aftermath of Disruptive Shocks: The Case of East Germany after Socialism

2020016-OPERA: Laan, N. van der, and W. Romeijnders, A Converging Benders' Decomposition Algorithm for Two-stage Mixed-integer Recourse Models

2021001-OPERA: Baardman, L., K.J. Roodbergen, H.J. Carlo, and A.H. Schrotenboer, A Special Case of the Multiple Traveling Salesmen Problem in End-of-aisle Picking Systems

2021002-EEF: Wiese, R., and S. Eriksen, Willingness to Pay for Improved Public Education and Public Health Systems: The Role of Income Mobility Prospects.

2021003-EEF: Keller, J.T., G.H. Kuper, and M. Mulder, Challenging Natural Monopolies: Assessing Market Power of Gas Transmission System Operators for Cross-Border Capacity

2021004-EEF: Li, X., and M. Mulder, Value of Power-to-Gas as a Flexibility Option in Integrated Electricity and Hydrogen Markets



2021005-GEM: Rozite, K., J.P.A.M. Jacobs, and D.J. Bezemer, Investor Sentiment and Business Investment

2021006-EEF: Spierdijk, L., and T. Wansbeek, Differencing as a Consistency Test for the Within Estimator

2021007-EEF: Katz, M., and C. van der Kwaak, To Bail-in or to Bailout: that's the (Macro) Question

2021008-EEF: Haan, M.A., N.E. Stoffers, and G.T.J. Zwart, Choosing Your Battles: Endogenous Multihoming and Platform Competition

2021009-I&O: Greve, M., M. Fritsch, and M. Wyrwich, Long-Term Decline of Regions and the Rise of Populism: The Case of Germany

2021010-MARK: Hirche, C.F., T.H.A. Bijmolt, and M.J. Gijsenberg, When Offline Stores Reduce Online Returns

2021011-MARK: Hirche, C.F., M.J. Gijsenberg, and T.H.A. Bijmolt, Promoting Product Returns: Effects of Price Reductions on Customer Return Behavior

2021012-MARK: Hirche, C.F., M.J. Gijsenberg, and T.H.A. Bijmolt, Asking Less, Getting More? The Influence of Fixed-Fee and Threshold-Based Free Shipping on Online Orders and Returns

2021013-I&O: Sorgner, A., and M. Wyrwich, Calling Baumol: What Telephones Can Tell Us about the Allocation of Entrepreneurial Talent in the Face of Radical Institutional Changes

2021014-I&O: Slavtchev, V., and M. Wyrwich, TV and Entrepreneurship

2021015-EEF: Kate, F. ten, M.J. Klasing, and P. Milionis, Diversity, Identity and Tax Morale

2021016-EEF: Bergemann, A., and R.T. Riphahn, Maternal Employment Effects of Paid Parental Leave

2021017-GEM: Abolhassani, M., Productivity Spillovers of Multinational Enterprises through Worker Mobility: New Evidence for the Netherlands



www.rug.nl/feb