

THE DRIVERS OF EFFECTIVENESS IN COMPETITION POLICY

**JOAN-RAMON BORRELL
JUAN-LUIS JIMÉNEZ**

FUNDACIÓN DE LAS CAJAS DE AHORROS
DOCUMENTO DE TRABAJO
Nº 363/2008

De conformidad con la base quinta de la convocatoria del Programa de Estímulo a la Investigación, este trabajo ha sido sometido a evaluación externa anónima de especialistas cualificados a fin de contrastar su nivel técnico.

La serie **DOCUMENTOS DE TRABAJO** incluye avances y resultados de investigaciones dentro de los programas de la Fundación de las Cajas de Ahorros.
Las opiniones son responsabilidad de los autores.

The drivers of effectiveness in competition policy¹

Joan-Ramon Borrell² and Juan-Luis Jiménez³

Abstract

This paper shows which institutional and policy characteristics drive the effectiveness of antitrust policy using cross-country data on the perception of effectiveness of competition policy. It concludes that antitrust cannot be successful in a vacuum. Effective policies are income related and tailored at the EU level in Europe. However, some details of competition policy design have a significant impact on policy results. Effectiveness is driven by having an independent antitrust authority with a final say on prohibitions of competition restraints. It is good to have leniency programs to enforce cartel prohibitions, and particularly to use an economic approach to judge dominance and abusive practices. The legal mandate on merger policy should focus on competition in markets rather than in broader defined public interests.

Keywords: Antitrust; Policy Effectiveness; Political economy.

JEL Codes: D7; L4; O4.

¹ This paper has benefited from helpful comments and suggestions from Germà Bel, Javier Campos, Andrés Gómez-Lobo, Pilar Socorro and participants at seminars at Department of Applied Economics (University of Las Palmas de Gran Canaria) and Real Colegio Complutense at Harvard University. The usual disclaimer applies.

² Dept. de Política Económica. Grup de Recerca en Polítiques Públiques i Regulació Econòmica. Institut d'Economia Aplicada (IREA). Av. Diagonal 690. 08034. Barcelona. e-mail: jrborrell@ub.edu; tlf: +34 934 039 722

³ Dept. de Anàlisi Econòmic Aplicado. Grupo de Economía de las Infraestructuras y el Transporte. Facultad de CC.EE. y EE. Despacho D. 2-12. Campus de Tafira. 35017. Las Palmas. e-mail: jljimenez@daea.ulpgc.es; tlf: +34 928 458 191.

1. Introduction

There is a growing literature that tests a set of theory findings regarding the impact competition policy on country performance variables such as productivity, growth and price stability (Dutz and Hayri 2000, Przybyla and Roma 2005, Borrell and Tolosa 2007).

However, research is lacking on identifying the distinct features of antitrust which drives the effectiveness of the policy of promoting competition in domestic markets. Voigt (2006) tackle a related question by analyzing the effect of some distinctive objective characteristics of competition policy across countries on total factor productivity⁴. Borrell and Tolosa (2007) and Voigt (2006) also use the available subjective measures of antitrust effectiveness to analyze the impact of effectiveness on productivity. These are survey measures that show what business people think about the effectiveness of antitrust in the country they are working in.

This paper has codified information regarding objective characteristics of antitrust across several countries around the world. It then gets a comprehensive insight into what drives the effectiveness of competition policy from cross-country variation, and also from variations across policy domains. The main objective is to show how differences in design and enforcement of competition policy in each country matters in terms of perceived antitrust effectiveness.

The paper is organized as follows. After this introductory section, section 2 turns to review the literature on antitrust effectiveness. Section 3 describes the data and the empirical strategy, section 4 shows and discusses the results, and section 5 concludes.

⁴ In a previous paper, Feld and Voigt (2003) analyze whether judicial independence affects economic growth for a cross section of 57 countries.

2. Literature review

Competition policy is the core of a set of policies designed to foster product competition in the markets for goods and services. Promoting competition has become an intermediate objective of government policy which is enforced to pursue the ultimate goal of improving economic performance.

Policy-makers claim that having a competition legislation and antitrust institutions that effectively promote and protect competition in the product markets improves welfare. Designing and enforcing antitrust is claimed to render welfare gains. Some different studies have been done in this topic. Areeda (1994) contains an insightful discussion of the interplay of political and judicial factors that influence antitrust. Dutz and Vagliasindi (2000) study the relationship between competition policy and intensity of competition policy, using data from eastern european transition economies based on three main dimensions of enforcement, competition advocacy and institutional effectiveness. By contrast, Crandall and Winston (2003) highlight that little empirical evidence that past interventions of antitrust authorities have provided much direct benefit to consumers and those authorities would be well advised to prosecute only the most egregious anticompetitive violations.

According to Aghion and Schankerman (2004), there are three channels through which competition-enhancing policies, reforms and certain types of physical infrastructure facilitate welfare gains: cost reduction (*restructuring*), market selection of more efficient firms and entry. First, competition changes the incentives for firms to reduce their production cost. Static efficiency gains are realized through the reduction of slack in the use of inputs and improved resource allocation in response to higher competitive pressures (**cost reduction** or *restructuring*). Second, competition moves market shares from high-cost to low-cost firms, and this reduces the industry average production costs (**market selection**

of more efficient incumbent firms). Third, post-entry competition reduces the incentives for new high-cost firms to enter the market, and it encourages entry by low-cost potential entrants (**entry**).

Additionally, competition might render other dynamic gains such as fostering innovation. Dynamic efficiency gains are expected due to higher efforts to innovate and a faster diffusion of innovations and adoption of new technologies; see Aghion and Howitt (1996). These effects can boost productivity over long periods of time, as innovation involves complementarities, positive feedbacks, and the non-rivalry of ideas. And dynamic efficiency matters. There is consistent evidence of high social rates of innovation, far above the private ones, see Jones and Williams (1998).

Although there is a consensus in the literature that competition provides welfare gains, it is less clear cut how the effective enforcement of antitrust law fosters competition in the market place, and whether antitrust policy spurs welfare. There is no common consensus on how antitrust should be designed and enforced, in order to effectively promote competition. There is a large literature on regulatory effectiveness. Recent papers such as Gutiérrez (2003), Stern and Trillas (2003), Levine, Stern and Trillas (2005), Stern and Cubbin (2005) and Cubbin and Stern (2006) discuss theoretically and empirically what drives effectiveness in regulation of telecoms and energy. By contrast, less effort has been devoted to analyse the drivers of antitrust effectiveness.

It is far from settled how to measure the effectiveness of competition policy across countries. There are two main avenues of research. On one hand, some papers such as Dutz and Hayri (2000) and Borrell and Tolosa (2007) rely mostly on subjective indicators that try to assess the effectiveness of competition policy across countries.

Subjective indicators measure the perceived effectiveness of policy using surveys, mostly by business people. There are two measures of perceived effectiveness of

competition policy. The one compiled in the Executive Opinion Survey that it is used by the World Economic Forum (WEF) to construct the Global Competitiveness Report. It asks executives to rank their country according to the following statement: “Antimonopoly policy in your country is 1=*lax and not effective at promoting competition*, 7=*effective and promotes competition*.” The other is the indicator compiled by the International Institute for Management Development (IMD) for producing the World Competitiveness Yearbook. IMD asks “do antitrust laws prevent unfair competition in your country?”

According to Voigt (2006), the before mentioned two subjective measures of perceived competition policy effectiveness are highly correlated (correlation coefficient larger than 80%). All these three papers find additionally a high correlation of competition policy effectiveness and performance measured in terms of growth (Dutz and Hayri 2000), or the level of total factor productivity (Borrell and Tolosa 2007, and Voigt 2006).

Neither the WEF nor the IMD indicator of competition policy effectiveness offer data separating out the effect of national competition policy from the EU competition policy. Therefore, the data offers an indicator of the overall effect of both policies for the EU member states.

On the other hand, synthetic indexes are used to obtain a comprehensive picture of the strength of competition policy based on objective indicators that rank countries with respect a set of characteristics that are assumed to drive antitrust effectiveness (see Serebrisky 2004 or Voigt 2006). The composite indicator comprises information from different aspects of policy, like the absence or presence of certain legal provisions, severity of penalties, resources available to the competition authority or its autonomy.

Rules adjudicating antitrust cases differ strongly across countries and policy domains. In some countries, some restrains of competition such as price fixing agreements, bid rigging or imposing minimum resale prices are *per se* illegal. For example Australia,

Greece, Mexico and the US find price fixing agreements illegal *per se*: conduct is unlawful regardless of competitive effect. Italy also joined in 1990 this group of countries that find price-fixing as *per se* illegal.

By contrast, in most countries competition restraints are judged according to the rule of reason. Even price fixing tends to be adjudicated using the rule of reason on a case by case basis in the European Union and in most European jurisdictions. Conducts are judged lawful or unlawful depending on its actual effect on competition, as proven by the evidence on a case by case basis. As highlighted by Motta (2004), article 81(3) of the Treaty of the European Union states that all agreements among competitors do not fall under a *per se* rule of prohibition. That is, the prohibition of agreements among competitors is inapplicable to any agreement “which contributes to improving the production or distribution of goods or to promoting technical or economic progress, while allowing consumers a fair share of the resulting benefit.”

On the contrary, Gual *et al* (2005) and Ahlborn, Evans and Padilla (2004) state that Europe tends to use the *per se* illegality rule when adjudicating the use of exclusionary practices such as foreclosure, predatory pricing, price squeezes, fidelity rebates, or tying by dominant firms. Similar cases are judged using the rule of reason on a case by case basis in the US and other jurisdictions.

Differences across countries are not only on adjudicating rules but also on matters such as the degree of independence of antitrust authorities, the use of criminal sanctions, the way plaintiffs can obtain redress before civil courts, the more economic or legal approach to abuse of dominant position cases, and the objectives and enforcement of merger policy.

Nicholson (2004) reviews the different efforts undertaken to quantify antitrust regimes. There have been different efforts to compare in a systematic way competition

rules and institutions across countries. *CUTS international* has reviewed around 100 jurisdictions in the world. *Global Competition Review* publishes reviews of specific legal and enforcement aspects of competition policy in different domains such as cartels, abuses of dominant position and mergers.

Competition policy has been introduced across countries in the world very gradually. Canada passed the first antitrust statute in 1889. The US has an antitrust policy that dates back to the Sherman Act of 1890, although according to ABA Section of Antitrust Law (2003), by the time of the adoption of the first federal antitrust law, 13 states had enacted some form of antitrust statute. Kansas enacted in 1889 the first state antitrust law of general application. Even senator Sherman described the federal law he was promoting as supplementary to state antitrust statutes.

Most European countries have antitrust policies only since the mid twentieth century. The EU has antitrust statutes since the Rome Treaty in 1957. Other countries have only adopted an antitrust regime much more recently as part of their convergence towards more market oriented policies (South Eastern Asia and Latin America), or towards regional agreements (such as the countries of Eastern Europe towards the EU), or towards multilateral agreements (such as those embraced by the members of the WTO after the Uruguay Round). Currently, around 100 countries in the world have competition laws. Merger policy was set in the US in 1914, but prior notifications of mergers are only compulsory since 1976. In the EU, merger control with a prior notification system was established by a Council regulation in 1990.

Voigt (2006) has undertaken the most comprehensive quantitative analysis of competition laws. He gathered cross-country information regarding the objectives of competition laws (basis), the legal regimes and economic approach (*per se* rules versus rule of reason), the structure of competition authorities (*de jure* and *de facto* independence). He

constructed indicators regarding these aspects of competition policy, and making some assumptions on how these elements made competition policy effective. He then estimates the effect of those indicators regarding the quality of competition policy on total factor productivity. It turned out that objective indicators of competition policy quality explain differences in total factor productivity, although the impact is not robust to the inclusion of indicators for the general quality of institutions. Voigt (2006) does not show whether the results are robust to changes in the way the indexes of objective measures have been constructed and weighted.

Both subjective and objective measures have strengths and weaknesses. The subjective measures depend strongly on the expectations of the business people surveyed regarding how competition policy turns to be effective. Objective indexes depend strongly on how they are constructed. A higher value of the index can be achieved by optimizing only certain areas, while the really important elements have been replaced by less decisive or incomplete components. This can blur the robustness of the whole policy in the evaluation exercise. Contributing to make more explicit the nature of the relationship between objective indicators of antitrust design and enforcement and subjective measures of effectiveness will help to understand the strength and weaknesses of comparative antitrust analysis across countries.

3. Empirical Strategy and Data

In this paper we will let cross-country data talk about the relationship between perceived effectiveness of antitrust and a set of objective characteristics of competition policy design and enforcement.

We use the variable from World Economic Forum (WEF) named “effectiveness of antitrust policy” as the dependent variable to be explained. This dependent variable is

explained by a rich set of covariates. We have gathered a cross-section data base including 47 countries around the world including not only developed but also developing ones. Table 1 shows the definition of the codified variables. The objective measures of competition effectiveness come from the information published by *CUTS international*, *Global Competition Review*, the *International Competition Network*, the annual reports of the OECD and the national government agencies web pages and statistics.

Almost all the data is for 2004 but depending on the variable analyzed if 2004 data is not available the last available one has been taken (2002 or 2003). Estimates will use the cross-section variation on the data, and therefore as most variables are not expected to vary considerably from one year to another. We can make inferences from the cross-section variance using data around 2004.

All but one covariate of objective characteristics or antitrust design and enforcement are dummies taking values 0 or 1. We have also computed four indexes related to the organizational structure of competition policy (authority independence), the stance of cartel policy (active stance of cartel policy), the approach to dominance law and enforcement (economic approach to dominance law), and the characteristics of merger policy (competition focused merger policy). These four indices combine the information of the detailed characteristics reported in table 1.

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of the variables used in our analysis. Antitrust effectiveness ranges from 2.8 to 6.1 in our sample. Table 2 also shows that most competition authorities take decisions on prohibiting and sanctioning restrains (agreements and abuses of dominant position) independently from the government by administrative or judicial bodies. Table 3 shows that only Colombia, Costa Rica and Venezuela have prohibition of competition restrains enforced directly by government. We have also gathered information on whether it is the government or the independent authority who investigate and file the cases. Table 3 shows that it is only in Belgium, France, India, Latvia, Spain and

Malta where the government investigate the cases which are finally adjudicated by whether judicial or administrative independent authorities. The index named “Authority Independence” sums these two dummy variables.

The index called the “Active stance of cartel policy” is the sum of the five antitrust characteristics that help to enforce cartel policy. As highlighted by the literature on enforcement of antitrust -- Polinsky and Shavell (1989), Klapow and Shavel (1994), Berges-Sennou *et al* (2002), Barros (2003), Demougin and Fluet (2004) and Borrell (2007) -- defining cartels as *per se* illegal have a stronger deterrence effect than defining them illegal under the rule of reason. Having a system of civil sanctions by which firms have to pay damages to those injured by competition restrains, and having criminal penalties also spurs deterrence. Having guidelines of enforcement is also supposed to improve effectiveness of antitrust, as the leniency programs by which firms and executives may report misbehaviors to antitrust authorities obtaining complete or partial redemption of the past sanctions. Table 2 shows that the mean of this index is just 1.64 out of 5. Table 3 shows the distribution of cartel policy design in this domain.

By contrast, defining abuses of dominant position as *per se* illegal is increasingly contested. Gal (2003) and Borrell (2007) highlight that in large, integrated and mature markets it is better to judge abusive practices by dominant firms using a rule of reason approach. As markets around the world are becoming increasingly integrated, we would generally expect the rule of reason, and a more economic approach to abuses of dominant position, to become more and more effective. This is also what Gual et al (2005) and Ahlborn, Evans and Padilla (2004) suggest in the case for Europe.

The index named “Economic approach in dominance law” is a composite measure of three covariates.⁵ It sums the one that codifies the legal standard for judging abuses of dominant position and whether dominance is defined using a fixed market share. These are

⁵ It is obtained as follows: $-\text{dompos} - \text{thresdom} + (\text{levthresd}/100)$

expected to have a negative effect on antitrust effectiveness. By contrast, it subtracts in percentage from the market share threshold that defines dominance. Enforcement is expected to get better as the market share that defines dominance gets larger, as the market share definition bind is less tight. Table 4 shows the distribution of market shares that define dominance in different countries: it ranges from 20% in Brazil (tight constrain, practices by firms that are just slightly dominant are investigated) to 70% in the US (a lax constrain, only practices of very dominant firms are investigated). Table 2 shows that the index of “Economic approach in dominance law” has a mean of -0.74, and that it ranges from -1.75 to 0.

Finally, the index named “Competition focused merger policy” sums three covariates: whether the government has a final say on merger policy or the antitrust authority is the one making decisions in this policy domain; whether the legal mandate of merger policy is a focus mandate to protect competition, or a broad mandate to pursue the public interest in general; and, whether merger guidelines have been published or not. Table 2 shows that this index has a mean of 2.11 out of 3. Table 3 shows that there are a large number of countries in which governments have a last say on mergers such as the largest European economies such as France, Germany, Italy or Spain, smaller antitrust effective countries such as Finland and New Zealand, and others such as Argentina, India and Taiwan. There is however a rather small group of countries in which the legal mandate in merger law is to protect competition: Argentina, Poland, Portugal and Taiwan. And 29 out of 47 countries have merger guidelines (62%).

We identify and quantify the drivers of effectiveness in two steps. First, regressing effectiveness on the broad indexes describing the characteristics of antitrust enforcement before mentioned by OLS and Instrumental Variables techniques,

$$\log(\text{effectiveness}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Auth.Independ.} + \beta_2 \text{Act. Stance} + \beta_3 \text{Dominance Law} + \beta_4 \text{Merger Policy} + \beta_5 \text{Log(GDP)} + \beta_6 \text{EU15(dummy)} + \beta_7 \text{EnlargEU(dummy)} + \beta_8 \text{Bulgaria-Rumania (dummy)}$$

(1)

Secondly, we have estimated how individual aspects of institutional design have an impact on effectiveness using same econometrical techniques. We evaluate the stand alone effect of each institutional characteristic on antitrust effectiveness:

$$\begin{aligned} \log(\text{effectiveness}) = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Independence} + \beta_2 \text{Gov.Prosec.} + \beta_3 \text{Cartel Perse} + \beta_4 \text{Cartel guide} + \\ & \beta_5 \text{Criminal sanctions} + \beta_6 \text{Damages} + \beta_7 \text{Leniency} + \beta_8 \text{Dominance Perse} \\ & \beta_9 \text{Dom. share} + \beta_{10} \text{Dom. threshold} + \beta_{11} \text{Gov. mergers} + \beta_{12} \text{Comp. mergers} \\ & \beta_{13} \text{Log(GDP)} + \beta_{14} \text{EU15(dummy)} + \beta_{15} \text{EnlargEU(dummy)} + \beta_{16} \text{Bulgaria-Rumania (dummy)} \end{aligned}$$

(2)

The estimates using the broad policy indices should be more precise than the ones using the detailed policy characteristics because the latter leaves less degree of freedom in the estimation and may be more correlated than the former. The former show the effect of broad policy shifts; while the latter show what particular characteristics matter most.

4. Results

Tables 5 and 6 show the results of the regression analysis. Table 5 shows the impact of the broad indexes of antitrust design and enforcement in different policy domains on effectiveness: independence, cartel policy, dominance policy and merger policy. Table 6 details the impact of each one of the codified covariates of antitrust design and enforcement on effectiveness. In both tables we show the impact of the policy covariates on effectiveness without controls (column 1), controlling for the effect of EU antitrust (column 2), controlling for per capita GDP (column 3), and controlling for both EU antitrust and per capita GDP (column 4).

As outlined before, when per capita GDP is included in the regression as a control we run the regression using instrumental variable techniques. The last available per capita

GDP for all the countries is that of 2003. We instrument it using the per capita GDP of 1994 and its square. We estimate the IV regression using a cumulative updated GMM routine which computes standard errors robust to heterocedastic disturbance matrix. We report the Hansen J overidentification test which shows that the instruments are valid. We have also computed tests that show that instruments are strong.

Comparing the estimates of the regressions that include per capita GDP using OLS and IV techniques shows that OLS estimates are slightly upward biased. That is, OLS estimates not only picks the causal positive selection effect of per capita GDP on antitrust effectiveness, but also the simultaneous positive policy effect of antitrust effectiveness on per capita GDP as it was already shown in Borrell and Tolosa (2007).

Table 5 shows that even controlling for per capita GDP and the effect of EU country membership, the design of antitrust policy matters. Particularly, how dominance policy is designed and enforced make a difference. Countries that embrace an economic approach in investigating alleged abuses dominant positions by firms have a more effective antitrust policy. This way of enforcing dominance policy has a statistically significant impact on policy. Additionally, having a more competition focused merger policy is good for antitrust effectiveness. This effect is however statistically weaker than the previous. It is statistically significant only at 10%.

Having an active stance on cartel policy has also a positive effect on antitrust effectiveness. However, the significance of cartel policy is not robust to including the per capita GDP control. This result suggests that having an active stance on cartel policy is highly correlated to per capita GDP.

What it appears that not driving antitrust effectiveness is the authority independence index. This index combines independence in deciding on cartel and dominance cases, and in investigating the cases. We will see below that it is not clear cut whether having

investigation powers on the competition authority or on the government makes any difference.

Table 6 shows the inference of the impact of all the covariates on antitrust effectiveness. It allows to detail which are the main drivers of the results previously outlined, although the large number of covariates make our inference weaker because collinearly make increase our standard errors and make our estimates less precise.

Table 6 shows how authority independence drives antitrust effectiveness. Even controlling for per capita GDP and EU membership and the rest of covariates, authority independence on cartel and dominance cases makes antitrust more effective. On average, the three countries of our sample lacking an independent authority have worse competition policy (Colombia, Costa Rica and Venezuela). By contrast, having the power of investigation within the government is not making competition policy less effective conditional on having an independent authority calling the shots.

Although we have previously seen that an active stance on cartel policy was not having a robust impact on effectiveness, leniency programs stand out as having an individual impact on effectiveness. Those countries that have recently implemented innovative leniency programs are the ones that have a more effective antitrust policy. Interestingly, appears that it is not important whether cartels are prohibited using the rule of reason or the *per se* illegality rule. This result suggests that there is not a legal rule that fits all countries as also Borrell (2007) highlights.

Table 6 also shows the details of why the approach to dominance policy is important for antitrust effectiveness. Countries that enforce dominance policy using a *per se* illegality rule have significantly worse antitrust effectiveness (around 9%). Countries that set a fixed market share to define dominant position have also worse competition policy effectiveness (around 16%). However, as the market share that defines dominant position gets larger, antitrust effectiveness improves.

Finally, in merger policy what appears to be important is to have a competition oriented legal mandate rather than who (government/agency) decides on mergers.

5. Concluding remarks

Although antitrust statutes have been enacted worldwide, antitrust law design and implementation differs substantially across countries. It is an open question as to the type of institution and as to which policy practices drive sounder enforcement. The aim of this paper is to shed light on whether some of the distinctive characteristics related to the way antitrust is enforced generally spur policy effectiveness. In order to do so, we have coded qualitative information on objective features of competition policy from several countries around the world. Next we offer a comprehensive insight into what drives the effectiveness of competition policy, from cross country variations in antitrust design and implementation in various policy areas.

Although there is a large literature on regulatory effectiveness (Gutiérrez, 2003; Stern and Trillas, 2003; Levine, Stern and Trillas, 2005; Stern and Cubbin, 2005; and Cubbin and Stern, 2006), less effort has been devoted to analyse the drivers of antitrust effectiveness. Most papers on competition policy effectiveness have been focused on subjective indicators that try to assess the effectiveness of competition policy across countries, in terms of their respective growth and productivity (Dutz and Hayri, 2000; and Borrell and Tolosa, 2007).

Effectiveness of antitrust policy varies strongly across countries. This paper concludes that antitrust cannot be effective in a vacuum. Competition policy effectiveness is driven by per capita GDP and EU membership. It also shows how European Eastern countries are finding particularly difficult to enforce effective antitrust.

Conditional on income and EU membership, there are ways to make antitrust more effective. Particularly, authority independence on taking decisions on prohibiting cartels and abuses of dominant positions seem a prerequisite to sound antitrust. However, it is not so important whether it is an independent agency or the government who conducts antitrust investigations. And, more importantly, it makes antitrust more effective to engage in innovative policies such as leniency, to investigate dominance using an economic approach that avoid *per se* illegality rules and underscores market shares in the investigations, and to have a competition focused merger policy.

Future research agenda will be directed to the following two extensions: first, we will consider a panel data approach which might let us evaluate how institutional changes across time may be having an impact on antitrust effectiveness; and, secondly, we will study more closely the relationship between competition policy effectiveness and development.

References

- ABA Section of Antitrust Law (2003), 'State Antitrust Enforcement Handbook', American Bar Association - *Section of Antitrust Law*, Chicago.
- Ahlborn, C.; D. S. Evans and A. J. Padilla (2004) 'The antitrust economics of tying: a farewell to *per se* illegality', *The Antitrust Bulletin*, Spring-Summer, 49(1&2), 287-341.
- Aghion, P. and M. Schankerman (2004) 'On the welfare effects and political economy of competition-enhancing policies', *The Economic Journal*, 114, 800-824.
- Aghion, P. and P. Howitt (1996) 'A model of growth through creative destruction', *Econometrica*, 60, 323-51.
- Areeda, P. (1994). 'Antitrust policy'. in Feldstein, Martin, Editor, 1994. *American Economic Policy in the 1980's*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Barros, P. P. (2003) 'Looking behind the Curtain - Effects from Modernization of European Union Competition Policy', *European Economic Review*, 47, 613-624.
- Berges-Sennou F., F. Loss, E. Malavolti-Grimal and T. Verge (2002) 'Modernisation de la politique communautaire de concurrence: Regime d' autorisation ou d'exception legale? (European Competition Policy Reform: Autorisation or Exemption Regime?)', *Revue Economique*, 53, 437-47.
- Borrell, J.R. (2007) 'Fashioning Antitrust Regimes', in Wayne D. Collins (ed.) *Issues in Competition Law and Policy*, vol. 1, chapter 3, ABA Section of Antitrust Law, forthcoming.
- Borrell, J.R. and M. Tolosa (2008) 'Endogenous antitrust: Cross-country evidence on the impact of competition-enhancing policies on productivity', *Applied Economics Letters*, forthcoming.

- Crandall, R. and C. Winston (2003), 'Does Antitrust policy improve consumer welfare? Assessing the evidence', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 17, pp. 3-26.
- CUTS international (2006) *Competition Regimes in the World. A Civil Society Report*.
- Cubbin, J. and J. Stern (2006) 'The Impact of Regulatory Governance and Privatization on Electricity Industry Generation Capacity in Developing Economies', *World Bank Economic Review*, 20(1), 115-141.
- Demouguin, D. and C. Fluet (2004) 'Deterrence vs Judicial Error: a Comparative View of Standards of Proof', Centre Interuniversitaire sur le Risque, les Politiques Économiques et l'Emploi, *Working Paper* 04-18.
- Dutz, M.A. and A. Hayri (2000) 'Does more intense competition lead to higher growth?', *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, 2320 and *CEPR Discussion Paper* No. 2249.
- Dutz, M.A. and M. Vagliasindi (2000) 'Competition policy implementation in transition economies: an empirical assessment', *European Economic Review*, 44 (4-6), pp. 762-772.
- Feld, L. and S. Voigt (2003) 'Economic growth and judicial independence: cross country evidence using a new set of indicators', *European Journal of Political Economy*, 19 (3), pp. 497-527.
- Gal, M. A. (2003) *Competition Policy for Small Market Economies*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Gual, J., M. Hellwig, A. Perrot, M. Polo, P. Rey, K. Schmidt and R. Stenbacka (2005) 'An Economic Approach to Article 82', *Report of the EAGCP*.
- Gutiérrez, L. H. (2003) 'The effect of endogenous regulation on telecommunications expansion and efficiency in Latin America', *Journal of Regulatory Economics*, 23:3, 257-286.

- Jones, C.I., Williams, J.C. (1998) 'Measuring the social return to R&D', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 113, 1119-1135.
- Kaplow, L. and S. Shavell (1994) 'Accuracy in the determination of liability', *Journal of Law and Economics*, 37, 1-15.
- Levine P., J. Stern and F. Trillas (2005) 'Utility price regulation and time inconsistency: comparisons with monetary policy', *Oxford Economic Papers*, 57(3), 447-478.
- Motta, M. (2004) *Competition policy. Theory and practice*. Cambridge University Press.
- Nicholson, M. W. (2004) 'Quantifying Antitrust Regimes', *FTC Working Paper*, Washington DC.
- Polinsky A. M. and S. Shavell (1989) 'Legal error, litigation, and the incentive to obey the law', *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization*, 5, 99-108.
- Przybyła, M. and M. Roma (2005) 'Does product market competition reduce inflation?' Evidence from EU countries and sectors, *Working Paper Series from ECB*, No. 453.
- Serebrisky, T. (2004) 'What do we know about competition agencies', *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3221*, Washington DC.
- Stern, J and F. Trillas (2003) 'Independence and discretion in telecommunications regulation: lessons from independent central banks', *Utilities Policy*, 11(4), 191-201.
- Stern J. and J. Cubbin, J. (2005) 'Regulatory effectiveness: the impact of regulation and regulatory governance arrangements on electricity industry outcomes', *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, N. 3536., Washington DC.
- Voigt S. (2006) 'The economic effects of competition policy: cross-country evidence using four new indicators', *Social Science Research Network Working Paper*, No. 925794. Available at <http://ssrn.com/abstract=925794>.

Table 1. Data description

Name	Acronym	Source	Description
Antitrust effectiveness	effectiv	WEF	Anti-monopoly policy in your country, 1 = is lax and not effective at promoting competition, 7 = effectively promotes competition.
Independence on antitrust decisions	indcart	Authors	1= There is an independent competition authority deciding on antitrust cases (cartel and abuse of dominant position); 0 = Otherwise.
Government prosecution	mininst	Authors	1= a body of the executive files and investigates complains; 0 = The independent authority files and investigate antitrust cases.
Cartel per se illegal	cartperse	Authors	1= Agreements among firms are deemed <i>per se</i> illegal ; 0= Agreements are adjudicated using the <i>rule of reason</i> .
Published guidelines for cartel enforcement	cartelguide	Authors	1= There is a guide on anti-cartel enforcement; 0= Otherwise.
Criminal sanctions	penalcart	Authors	1 = Cartels are criminal felonies; 0 = Otherwise.
Punitive damages	danoscart	Authors	1= It is possible to claim punitive damages (treble damages) before the judiciary; 0 = Otherwise.
Leniency programs	leniency	Authors	1= There is a leniency program in your country; 0 = Otherwise.
Dominance abuses per se illegal	dompos	Authors	1= Dominance abuses are deemed <i>per se</i> illegal; 0 = Dominance abuses are adjudicated using the <i>rule of reason</i> .
Dominance defined by market share	thresdom	GCR	1= There is an explicit market share threshold for defining dominant positions in the investigation procedures; 0= Otherwise.
Dominance threshold (0 or 20 to 70%)	levthresd	GCR	1= If it exists, market share threshold for defining a dominant position; 0 = Otherwise.
Published guidelines for merger enforcement	mergerguide	Authors	1= There is a guide on merger enforcement; 0= Otherwise.
Government has the last say on mergers	findemerg	Authors	1= Government takes the decision on authorising mergers; 0 = The competition authority takes the decision on authorising mergers.
Protecting competition in merger law	objectimerg	Authors	1= Legal mandate for merger control is protecting competition; 0 = It is protecting the public interest in general.
Per capita GDP	cgdp	Penn Tables	GDP (current US dollars), 2003

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics

	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
Antitrust effectiveness	47	4.66	0.89	2.8	6.1
Independence on antitrust decisions	47	0.94	0.25	0	1
Government prosecution	47	0.13	0.34	0	1
Cartel per se illegal	47	0.34	0.48	0	1
Published guidelines for cartel enforcement	47	0.23	0.43	0	1
Criminal sanctions	47	0.36	0.49	0	1
Punitive damages	47	0.23	0.43	0	1
Leniency programs	47	0.47	0.50	0	1
Dominance abuses per se illegal	47	0.32	0.47	0	1
Dominance defined by market share	47	0.70	0.46	0	1
Dominance threshold (0 or 20 to 70%)	47	28.36	21.15	0	70
Published merger guidelines	47	0.62	0.49	0	1
Government has the last say on mergers	47	0.43	0.50	0	1
Protecting competition in merger law	47	0.91	0.28	0	1
Authority Independence	47	0.81	0.40	0	1
Active stance in cartel policy	47	1.64	1.24	0	5
Economic approach in dominance law	47	-0.74	0.56	-1.75	0
Competition focussed merger policy	47	2.11	0.87	0	3
Per capita GDP	47	19,164.81	9,111.38	3,212.53	37,313.33
EU-15	47	0.30	0.46	0	1
EU-Enlargement 2004	47	0.21	0.41	0	1
Bulgaria & Rumania	47	0.04	0.20	0	1

Table 3. Comparative competition policy design

Variable	Value	Countries for which the variable takes the value shown
Independence of antitrust decisions	0	Colombia, Costa Rica, Venezuela
Government prosecution	1	Belgium, France , India, Latvia, Spain, Malta
Cartel per se illegal	1	<u>Australia</u> , Austria , Chile, Costa Rica, Slovenia, France, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Korea , Latvia, Mexico, Rumania , South Africa, <u>USA</u> , Venezuela.
Published guidelines for cartel enforcement	1	<u>Canada</u> , Greece, Netherlands, Ireland , Japan, Korea, Malta, New Zealand, Sweden, United Kingdom, USA .
Criminal sanctions	1	<u>Canada</u> , Czech Republic, Estonia, France , India, Ireland, Island , Israel, <u>Japan, Korea, Mexico, Norway</u> , Slovak Republic, Slovenia , Taiwan, United Kingdom, USA .
Punitive damages	1	<u>Canada</u> , Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary , <u>New Zealand, Norway, Slovak Republic, Slovenia</u> , Taiwan, <u>USA</u> .
Leniency programs	1	<u>Canada, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Netherlands, Hungary, Ireland, Korea, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Rumania, South Africa, Slovak Republic, Sweden, United Kingdom, USA</u> .
Dominance abuses per se illegal	1	Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Greece, Hungary , India, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Mexico, Rumania , South Africa, Venezuela.
Dominance defined by market share	0	<u>Australia, Belgium</u> , Chile, Cyprus , Colombia, Costa Rica, Finland Japan, Kenya, <u>Luxemburg, Mexico, New Zealand, Portugal, Rumania, Spain</u> , Venezuela.
Published merger guidelines	1	<u>Australia, Austria, Belgium</u> , Brazil, <u>Canada, Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Japan, Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Rumania</u> , South Africa, Slovak Republic, Spain, Sweden <u>Switzerland, Taiwan, United Kingdom, USA</u> , Venezuela.
Protecting competition in merger law	0	Argentina, Poland, Portugal , Taiwan.
Government has the last say on mergers	1	Argentina, Belgium, Cyprus , Colombia, Costa Rica, Finland, France, Germany, Greece , India, Israel, Italy, Malta, Norway <u>New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Rumania, Spain</u> , Taiwan.

OCDE countries underlined, and **EU** countries bolded.

Table 4. Dominance threshold by country

Country	Dominance threshold (%)
Brazil	20
India	25
Austria	30
<u>Hungary</u>	30
Germany	33
Bulgaria	35
<u>Canada</u>	35
Croatia	40
Czech Republic	40
Denmark	40
Estonia	40
Greece	40
<u>Italy</u>	40
Latvia	40
Lithuania	40
Malta	40
Poland	40
Slovak Republic	40
Slovenia	40
Sweden	40
<u>Switzerland</u>	40
United Kingdom	40
South Africa	45
France	50
Israel	50
<u>Korea</u>	50
Netherlands	50
Norway	50
Taiwan	50
Turkey	50
Ireland	60
<u>USA</u>	70

Table 5. Broad policy design

	log(effectiveness)			
	(1) OLS	(2) OLS	(3) IV	(4) IV
Intercept	-0.53 *** (6.07)	-0.57 *** (7.43)	-2.97 *** (5.66)	-2.20 *** (4.11)
Authority Independence	0.03 (0.46)	0.05 (0.88)	0.02 (0.26)	0.04 (0.81)
Active stance in cartel policy	0.05 ** (2.18)	0.05 *** (2.93)	0.02 (0.94)	0.03 (1.57)
Economic approach in dominance law	0.13 *** (2.72)	0.13 *** (2.86)	0.08 ** (2.04)	0.09 *** (2.34)
Competition focussed merger policy	0.04 (1.23)	0.04 (1.5)	0.04 (1.59)	0.04 * (1.87)
Log per capita GDP			0.25 *** (4.85)	0.17 *** (3.12)
EU-15		0.17 *** (3.55)		0.07 * (1.69)
EU-Enlargement 2004		-0.08 (1.36)		-0.08 * (1.81)
Bulgaria & Rumania		-0.22 *** (4.24)		-0.12 * (1.67)
R ²	0.32	0.61	0.53	0.64
F test		F(7,39)=60.69	F(5,41)=6.95***	F(8,38)=16.29***
Hansen Over-id J test			Chi(1)=0.85	Chi(1)=0.89

t statistics robust to heterocedasticity in parenthesis. *, **, *** for 10%, 5%, and 1% significance level

Table 6. Detailed policy designed

	log(effectiveness)							
	(1) OLS		(2) OLS		(3) IV		(4) IV	
Intercept	-0.84	(5.54)	-0.83 ***	(7.72)	-3.00 ***	(5.77)	-2.02 ***	(5.04)
Independence on antitrust decisions	0.25 ***	(2.96)	0.25 ***	(3.45)	0.06	(0.95)	0.17 ***	(2.57)
Government prosecution	-0.01	(0.21)	-0.01	(0.26)	-0.04	(0.74)	-0.01	(0.14)
Cartel per se	0.02	(0.31)	0.03	(0.58)	0.01	(0.34)	0.02	(0.41)
Cartel guide	0.04	(0.9)	-0.02	(0.43)	-0.04	(1.10)	-0.04	(1.57)
Criminal sanctions	0.06	(1.11)	0.06	(1.10)	0.05	(1.07)	0.05	(1.25)
Punitive damages	-0.05	(0.68)	-0.01	(0.12)	-0.09 *	(1.74)	-0.05	(0.77)
Leniency programs	0.09	(1.54)	0.09 *	(1.89)	0.08 **	(2.06)	0.09 ***	(2.65)
Per se dominance abuses rules	-0.13 *	(1.73)	-0.14 **	(2.23)	-0.07 *	(1.66)	-0.09 **	(2.10)
Dominance defined by market share	-0.24 **	(2.56)	-0.21 **	(2.64)	-0.16 *	(1.79)	-0.16 **	(2.10)
Dominance threshold (0 or 20 to 70%)	0.01 **	(2.55)	0.004 **	(2.19)	0.00	(1.43)	0.003 *	(1.93)
Government has the last say on mergers	0.06	(1.11)	0.02	(0.54)	0.001	(0.02)	0.01	(0.22)
Protecting competition in merger law	0.17	(1.36)	0.18 **	(2.05)	0.11	(1.23)	0.14 **	(2.06)
Log per capita GDP					0.25 ***	(4.10)	0.14 ***	(2.98)
EU-15			0.11 **	(2.04)			0.03	(0.87)
EU-Enlargement 2004			-0.12 *	(1.95)			-0.12 ***	(2.65)
Bulgaria & Rumania			-0.28 ***	(5.03)			-0.21 ***	(3.53)
R ²	0.52		0.74		0.63		0.77	
F test	F(12,34)=8.44***		F(15,31)=27.90***		F(13, 33)=12.12***		F(16,30)=18.37***	
Hansen Overid J test					Chi-sq(1)=0.81		Chi-sq(1)=0.49	

t statistics robust to heterocedasticity in parenthesis. *, **, *** for 10%, 5%, and 1% significance level

FUNDACIÓN DE LAS CAJAS DE AHORROS

DOCUMENTOS DE TRABAJO

Últimos números publicados

- 159/2000 Participación privada en la construcción y explotación de carreteras de peaje
Ginés de Rus, Manuel Romero y Lourdes Trujillo
- 160/2000 Errores y posibles soluciones en la aplicación del *Value at Risk*
Mariano González Sánchez
- 161/2000 Tax neutrality on saving assets. The spanish case before and after the tax reform
Cristina Ruza y de Paz-Curbera
- 162/2000 Private rates of return to human capital in Spain: new evidence
F. Barceinas, J. Oliver-Alonso, J.L. Raymond y J.L. Roig-Sabaté
- 163/2000 El control interno del riesgo. Una propuesta de sistema de límites
riesgo neutral
Mariano González Sánchez
- 164/2001 La evolución de las políticas de gasto de las Administraciones Públicas en los años 90
Alfonso Utrilla de la Hoz y Carmen Pérez Esparrells
- 165/2001 Bank cost efficiency and output specification
Emili Tortosa-Ausina
- 166/2001 Recent trends in Spanish income distribution: A robust picture of falling income inequality
Josep Oliver-Alonso, Xavier Ramos y José Luis Raymond-Bara
- 167/2001 Efectos redistributivos y sobre el bienestar social del tratamiento de las cargas familiares en
el nuevo IRPF
Nuria Badenes Plá, Julio López Laborda, Jorge Onrubia Fernández
- 168/2001 The Effects of Bank Debt on Financial Structure of Small and Medium Firms in some Euro-
pean Countries
Mónica Melle-Hernández
- 169/2001 La política de cohesión de la UE ampliada: la perspectiva de España
Ismael Sanz Labrador
- 170/2002 Riesgo de liquidez de Mercado
Mariano González Sánchez
- 171/2002 Los costes de administración para el afiliado en los sistemas de pensiones basados en cuentas
de capitalización individual: medida y comparación internacional.
José Enrique Devesa Carpio, Rosa Rodríguez Barrera, Carlos Vidal Meliá
- 172/2002 La encuesta continua de presupuestos familiares (1985-1996): descripción, representatividad
y propuestas de metodología para la explotación de la información de los ingresos y el gasto.
Llorenç Pou, Joaquín Alegre
- 173/2002 Modelos paramétricos y no paramétricos en problemas de concesión de tarjetas de credito.
Rosa Puertas, María Bonilla, Ignacio Olmeda

- 174/2002 Mercado único, comercio intra-industrial y costes de ajuste en las manufacturas españolas.
José Vicente Blanes Cristóbal
- 175/2003 La Administración tributaria en España. Un análisis de la gestión a través de los ingresos y de los gastos.
Juan de Dios Jiménez Aguilera, Pedro Enrique Barrilao González
- 176/2003 The Falling Share of Cash Payments in Spain.
Santiago Carbó Valverde, Rafael López del Paso, David B. Humphrey
Publicado en "Moneda y Crédito" nº 217, pags. 167-189.
- 177/2003 Effects of ATMs and Electronic Payments on Banking Costs: The Spanish Case.
Santiago Carbó Valverde, Rafael López del Paso, David B. Humphrey
- 178/2003 Factors explaining the interest margin in the banking sectors of the European Union.
Joaquín Maudos y Juan Fernández Guevara
- 179/2003 Los planes de stock options para directivos y consejeros y su valoración por el mercado de valores en España.
Mónica Melle Hernández
- 180/2003 Ownership and Performance in Europe and US Banking – A comparison of Commercial, Co-operative & Savings Banks.
Yener Altunbas, Santiago Carbó y Phil Molyneux
- 181/2003 The Euro effect on the integration of the European stock markets.
Mónica Melle Hernández
- 182/2004 In search of complementarity in the innovation strategy: international R&D and external knowledge acquisition.
Bruno Cassiman, Reinhilde Veugelers
- 183/2004 Fijación de precios en el sector público: una aplicación para el servicio municipal de suministro de agua.
M^a Ángeles García Valiñas
- 184/2004 Estimación de la economía sumergida en España: un modelo estructural de variables latentes.
Ángel Alañón Pardo, Miguel Gómez de Antonio
- 185/2004 Causas políticas y consecuencias sociales de la corrupción.
Joan Oriol Prats Cabrera
- 186/2004 Loan bankers' decisions and sensitivity to the audit report using the belief revision model.
Andrés Guiral Contreras and José A. Gonzalo Angulo
- 187/2004 El modelo de Black, Derman y Toy en la práctica. Aplicación al mercado español.
Marta Tolentino García-Abadillo y Antonio Díaz Pérez
- 188/2004 Does market competition make banks perform well?.
Mónica Melle
- 189/2004 Efficiency differences among banks: external, technical, internal, and managerial
Santiago Carbó Valverde, David B. Humphrey y Rafael López del Paso

- 190/2004 Una aproximación al análisis de los costes de la esquizofrenia en España: los modelos jerárquicos bayesianos
F. J. Vázquez-Polo, M. A. Negrín, J. M. Cavasés, E. Sánchez y grupo RIRAG
- 191/2004 Environmental proactivity and business performance: an empirical analysis
Javier González-Benito y Óscar González-Benito
- 192/2004 Economic risk to beneficiaries in notional defined contribution accounts (NDCs)
Carlos Vidal-Meliá, Inmaculada Domínguez-Fabian y José Enrique Devesa-Carpio
- 193/2004 Sources of efficiency gains in port reform: non parametric malmquist decomposition tfp index for Mexico
Antonio Estache, Beatriz Tovar de la Fé y Lourdes Trujillo
- 194/2004 Persistencia de resultados en los fondos de inversión españoles
Alfredo Ciriaco Fernández y Rafael Santamaría Aquilué
- 195/2005 El modelo de revisión de creencias como aproximación psicológica a la formación del juicio del auditor sobre la gestión continuada
Andrés Guiral Contreras y Francisco Esteso Sánchez
- 196/2005 La nueva financiación sanitaria en España: descentralización y prospectiva
David Cantarero Prieto
- 197/2005 A cointegration analysis of the Long-Run supply response of Spanish agriculture to the common agricultural policy
José A. Mendez, Ricardo Mora y Carlos San Juan
- 198/2005 ¿Refleja la estructura temporal de los tipos de interés del mercado español preferencia por la liquidez?
Magdalena Massot Perelló y Juan M. Nave
- 199/2005 Análisis de impacto de los Fondos Estructurales Europeos recibidos por una economía regional: Un enfoque a través de Matrices de Contabilidad Social
M. Carmen Lima y M. Alejandro Cardenete
- 200/2005 Does the development of non-cash payments affect monetary policy transmission?
Santiago Carbó Valverde y Rafael López del Paso
- 201/2005 Firm and time varying technical and allocative efficiency: an application for port cargo handling firms
Ana Rodríguez-Álvarez, Beatriz Tovar de la Fe y Lourdes Trujillo
- 202/2005 Contractual complexity in strategic alliances
Jeffrey J. Reuer y Africa Ariño
- 203/2005 Factores determinantes de la evolución del empleo en las empresas adquiridas por opa
Nuria Alcalde Fradejas y Inés Pérez-Soba Aguilar
- 204/2005 Nonlinear Forecasting in Economics: a comparison between Comprehension Approach versus Learning Approach. An Application to Spanish Time Series
Elena Olmedo, Juan M. Valderas, Ricardo Gimeno and Lorenzo Escot

- 205/2005 Precio de la tierra con presión urbana: un modelo para España
Esther Decimavilla, Carlos San Juan y Stefan Sperlich
- 206/2005 Interregional migration in Spain: a semiparametric analysis
Adolfo Maza y José Villaverde
- 207/2005 Productivity growth in European banking
Carmen Murillo-Melchor, José Manuel Pastor y Emili Tortosa-Ausina
- 208/2005 Explaining Bank Cost Efficiency in Europe: Environmental and Productivity Influences.
Santiago Carbó Valverde, David B. Humphrey y Rafael López del Paso
- 209/2005 La elasticidad de sustitución intertemporal con preferencias no separables intratemporalmente: los casos de Alemania, España y Francia.
Elena Márquez de la Cruz, Ana R. Martínez Cañete y Inés Pérez-Soba Aguilar
- 210/2005 Contribución de los efectos tamaño, book-to-market y momentum a la valoración de activos: el caso español.
Begoña Font-Belaire y Alfredo Juan Grau-Grau
- 211/2005 Permanent income, convergence and inequality among countries
José M. Pastor and Lorenzo Serrano
- 212/2005 The Latin Model of Welfare: Do 'Insertion Contracts' Reduce Long-Term Dependence?
Luis Ayala and Magdalena Rodríguez
- 213/2005 The effect of geographic expansion on the productivity of Spanish savings banks
Manuel Illueca, José M. Pastor and Emili Tortosa-Ausina
- 214/2005 Dynamic network interconnection under consumer switching costs
Ángel Luis López Rodríguez
- 215/2005 La influencia del entorno socioeconómico en la realización de estudios universitarios: una aproximación al caso español en la década de los noventa
Marta Rahona López
- 216/2005 The valuation of spanish ipos: efficiency analysis
Susana Álvarez Otero
- 217/2005 On the generation of a regular multi-input multi-output technology using parametric output distance functions
Sergio Perelman and Daniel Santin
- 218/2005 La gobernanza de los procesos parlamentarios: la organización industrial del congreso de los diputados en España
Gonzalo Caballero Miguez
- 219/2005 Determinants of bank market structure: Efficiency and political economy variables
Francisco González
- 220/2005 Agresividad de las órdenes introducidas en el mercado español: estrategias, determinantes y medidas de performance
David Abad Díaz

- 221/2005 Tendencia post-anuncio de resultados contables: evidencia para el mercado español
Carlos Forner Rodríguez, Joaquín Marhuenda Fructuoso y Sonia Sanabria García
- 222/2005 Human capital accumulation and geography: empirical evidence in the European Union
Jesús López-Rodríguez, J. Andrés Faña y Jose Lopez Rodríguez
- 223/2005 Auditors' Forecasting in Going Concern Decisions: Framing, Confidence and Information Processing
Waymond Rodgers and Andrés Guiral
- 224/2005 The effect of Structural Fund spending on the Galician region: an assessment of the 1994-1999 and 2000-2006 Galician CSFs
José Ramón Cancelo de la Torre, J. Andrés Faña and Jesús López-Rodríguez
- 225/2005 The effects of ownership structure and board composition on the audit committee activity: Spanish evidence
Carlos Fernández Méndez and Rubén Arrondo García
- 226/2005 Cross-country determinants of bank income smoothing by managing loan loss provisions
Ana Rosa Fonseca and Francisco González
- 227/2005 Incumplimiento fiscal en el irpf (1993-2000): un análisis de sus factores determinantes
Alejandro Estellér Moré
- 228/2005 Region versus Industry effects: volatility transmission
Pilar Soriano Felipe and Francisco J. Climent Diranzo
- 229/2005 Concurrent Engineering: The Moderating Effect Of Uncertainty On New Product Development Success
Daniel Vázquez-Bustelo and Sandra Valle
- 230/2005 On zero lower bound traps: a framework for the analysis of monetary policy in the 'age' of central banks
Alfonso Palacio-Vera
- 231/2005 Reconciling Sustainability and Discounting in Cost Benefit Analysis: a methodological proposal
M. Carmen Almansa Sáez and Javier Calatrava Requena
- 232/2005 Can The Excess Of Liquidity Affect The Effectiveness Of The European Monetary Policy?
Santiago Carbó Valverde and Rafael López del Paso
- 233/2005 Inheritance Taxes In The Eu Fiscal Systems: The Present Situation And Future Perspectives.
Miguel Angel Barberán Lahuerta
- 234/2006 Bank Ownership And Informativeness Of Earnings.
V́ctor M. González
- 235/2006 Developing A Predictive Method: A Comparative Study Of The Partial Least Squares Vs Maximum Likelihood Techniques.
Waymond Rodgers, Paul Pavlou and Andres Guiral.
- 236/2006 Using Compromise Programming for Macroeconomic Policy Making in a General Equilibrium Framework: Theory and Application to the Spanish Economy.
Francisco J. André, M. Alejandro Cardenete y Carlos Romero.

- 237/2006 Bank Market Power And Sme Financing Constraints.
Santiago Carbó-Valverde, Francisco Rodríguez-Fernández y Gregory F. Udell.
- 238/2006 Trade Effects Of Monetary Agreements: Evidence For Oecd Countries.
Salvador Gil-Pareja, Rafael Llorca-Vivero y José Antonio Martínez-Serrano.
- 239/2006 The Quality Of Institutions: A Genetic Programming Approach.
Marcos Álvarez-Díaz y Gonzalo Caballero Miguez.
- 240/2006 La interacción entre el éxito competitivo y las condiciones del mercado doméstico como determinantes de la decisión de exportación en las Pymes.
Francisco García Pérez.
- 241/2006 Una estimación de la depreciación del capital humano por sectores, por ocupación y en el tiempo.
Inés P. Murillo.
- 242/2006 Consumption And Leisure Externalities, Economic Growth And Equilibrium Efficiency.
Manuel A. Gómez.
- 243/2006 Measuring efficiency in education: an analysis of different approaches for incorporating non-discretionary inputs.
Jose Manuel Cordero-Ferrera, Francisco Pedraja-Chaparro y Javier Salinas-Jiménez
- 244/2006 Did The European Exchange-Rate Mechanism Contribute To The Integration Of Peripheral Countries?.
Salvador Gil-Pareja, Rafael Llorca-Vivero y José Antonio Martínez-Serrano
- 245/2006 Intergenerational Health Mobility: An Empirical Approach Based On The Echp.
Marta Pascual and David Cantarero
- 246/2006 Measurement and analysis of the Spanish Stock Exchange using the Lyapunov exponent with digital technology.
Salvador Rojí Ferrari and Ana Gonzalez Marcos
- 247/2006 Testing For Structural Breaks In Variance With additive Outliers And Measurement Errors.
Paulo M.M. Rodrigues and Antonio Rubia
- 248/2006 The Cost Of Market Power In Banking: Social Welfare Loss Vs. Cost Inefficiency.
Joaquín Maudos and Juan Fernández de Guevara
- 249/2006 Elasticidades de largo plazo de la demanda de vivienda: evidencia para España (1885-2000).
Desiderio Romero Jordán, José Félix Sanz Sanz y César Pérez López
- 250/2006 Regional Income Disparities in Europe: What role for location?.
Jesús López-Rodríguez and J. Andrés Faña
- 251/2006 Funciones abreviadas de bienestar social: Una forma sencilla de simultanear la medición de la eficiencia y la equidad de las políticas de gasto público.
Nuria Badenes Plá y Daniel Santín González
- 252/2006 "The momentum effect in the Spanish stock market: Omitted risk factors or investor behaviour?".
Luis Muga and Rafael Santamaría
- 253/2006 Dinámica de precios en el mercado español de gasolina: un equilibrio de colusión tácita.
Jordi Perdiguero García

- 254/2006 Desigualdad regional en España: renta permanente versus renta corriente.
José M.Pastor, Empar Pons y Lorenzo Serrano
- 255/2006 Environmental implications of organic food preferences: an application of the impure public goods model.
Ana Maria Aldanondo-Ochoa y Carmen Almansa-Sáez
- 256/2006 Family tax credits versus family allowances when labour supply matters: Evidence for Spain.
José Felix Sanz-Sanz, Desiderio Romero-Jordán y Santiago Álvarez-García
- 257/2006 La internacionalización de la empresa manufacturera española: efectos del capital humano genérico y específico.
José López Rodríguez
- 258/2006 Evaluación de las migraciones interregionales en España, 1996-2004.
María Martínez Torres
- 259/2006 Efficiency and market power in Spanish banking.
Rolf Färe, Shawna Grosskopf y Emili Tortosa-Ausina.
- 260/2006 Asimetrías en volatilidad, beta y contagios entre las empresas grandes y pequeñas cotizadas en la bolsa española.
Helena Chuliá y Hipòlit Torró.
- 261/2006 Birth Replacement Ratios: New Measures of Period Population Replacement.
José Antonio Ortega.
- 262/2006 Accidentes de tráfico, víctimas mortales y consumo de alcohol.
José M^a Arranz y Ana I. Gil.
- 263/2006 Análisis de la Presencia de la Mujer en los Consejos de Administración de las Mil Mayores Empresas Españolas.
Ruth Mateos de Cabo, Lorenzo Escot Mangas y Ricardo Gimeno Nogués.
- 264/2006 Crisis y Reforma del Pacto de Estabilidad y Crecimiento. Las Limitaciones de la Política Económica en Europa.
Ignacio Álvarez Peralta.
- 265/2006 Have Child Tax Allowances Affected Family Size? A Microdata Study For Spain (1996-2000).
Jaime Vallés-Giménez y Anabel Zárata-Marco.
- 266/2006 Health Human Capital And The Shift From Foraging To Farming.
Paolo Rungo.
- 267/2006 Financiación Autonómica y Política de la Competencia: El Mercado de Gasolina en Canarias.
Juan Luis Jiménez y Jordi Perdiguero.
- 268/2006 El cumplimiento del Protocolo de Kyoto para los hogares españoles: el papel de la imposición sobre la energía.
Desiderio Romero-Jordán y José Félix Sanz-Sanz.
- 269/2006 Banking competition, financial dependence and economic growth
Joaquín Maudos y Juan Fernández de Guevara
- 270/2006 Efficiency, subsidies and environmental adaptation of animal farming under CAP
Werner Kleinhanß, Carmen Murillo, Carlos San Juan y Stefan Sperlich

- 271/2006 Interest Groups, Incentives to Cooperation and Decision-Making Process in the European Union
A. Garcia-Lorenzo y Jesús López-Rodríguez
- 272/2006 Riesgo asimétrico y estrategias de momentum en el mercado de valores español
Luis Muga y Rafael Santamaría
- 273/2006 Valoración de capital-riesgo en proyectos de base tecnológica e innovadora a través de la teoría de opciones reales
Gracia Rubio Martín
- 274/2006 Capital stock and unemployment: searching for the missing link
Ana Rosa Martínez-Cañete, Elena Márquez de la Cruz, Alfonso Palacio-Vera and Inés Pérez-Soba Aguilar
- 275/2006 Study of the influence of the voters' political culture on vote decision through the simulation of a political competition problem in Spain
Sagrario Lantarón, Isabel Lillo, M^a Dolores López and Javier Rodrigo
- 276/2006 Investment and growth in Europe during the Golden Age
Antonio Cubel and M^a Teresa Sanchis
- 277/2006 Efectos de vincular la pensión pública a la inversión en cantidad y calidad de hijos en un modelo de equilibrio general
Robert Meneu Gaya
- 278/2006 El consumo y la valoración de activos
Elena Márquez y Belén Nieto
- 279/2006 Economic growth and currency crisis: A real exchange rate entropic approach
David Matesanz Gómez y Guillermo J. Ortega
- 280/2006 Three measures of returns to education: An illustration for the case of Spain
María Arrazola y José de Hevia
- 281/2006 Composition of Firms versus Composition of Jobs
Antoni Cunyat
- 282/2006 La vocación internacional de un holding tranviario belga: la Compagnie Mutuelle de Tramways, 1895-1918
Alberte Martínez López
- 283/2006 Una visión panorámica de las entidades de crédito en España en la última década.
Constantino García Ramos
- 284/2006 Foreign Capital and Business Strategies: a comparative analysis of urban transport in Madrid and Barcelona, 1871-1925
Alberte Martínez López
- 285/2006 Los intereses belgas en la red ferroviaria catalana, 1890-1936
Alberte Martínez López
- 286/2006 The Governance of Quality: The Case of the Agrifood Brand Names
Marta Fernández Barcala, Manuel González-Díaz y Emmanuel Raynaud
- 287/2006 Modelling the role of health status in the transition out of malthusian equilibrium
Paolo Rungo, Luis Currais and Berta Rivera
- 288/2006 Industrial Effects of Climate Change Policies through the EU Emissions Trading Scheme
Xavier Labandeira and Miguel Rodríguez

- 289/2006 Globalisation and the Composition of Government Spending: An analysis for OECD countries
Norman Gemmell, Richard Kneller and Ismael Sanz
- 290/2006 La producción de energía eléctrica en España: Análisis económico de la actividad tras la liberalización del Sector Eléctrico
Fernando Hernández Martínez
- 291/2006 Further considerations on the link between adjustment costs and the productivity of R&D investment: evidence for Spain
Desiderio Romero-Jordán, José Félix Sanz-Sanz and Inmaculada Álvarez-Ayuso
- 292/2006 Una teoría sobre la contribución de la función de compras al rendimiento empresarial
Javier González Benito
- 293/2006 Agility drivers, enablers and outcomes: empirical test of an integrated agile manufacturing model
Daniel Vázquez-Bustelo, Lucía Avella and Esteban Fernández
- 294/2006 Testing the parametric vs the semiparametric generalized mixed effects models
María José Lombardía and Stefan Sperlich
- 295/2006 Nonlinear dynamics in energy futures
Mariano Matilla-García
- 296/2006 Estimating Spatial Models By Generalized Maximum Entropy Or How To Get Rid Of W
Esteban Fernández Vázquez, Matías Mayor Fernández and Jorge Rodríguez-Valez
- 297/2006 Optimización fiscal en las transmisiones lucrativas: análisis metodológico
Félix Domínguez Barrero
- 298/2006 La situación actual de la banca online en España
Francisco José Climent Diranzo y Alexandre Momparler Pechuán
- 299/2006 Estrategia competitiva y rendimiento del negocio: el papel mediador de la estrategia y las capacidades productivas
Javier González Benito y Isabel Suárez González
- 300/2006 A Parametric Model to Estimate Risk in a Fixed Income Portfolio
Pilar Abad and Sonia Benito
- 301/2007 Análisis Empírico de las Preferencias Sociales Respecto del Gasto en Obra Social de las Cajas de Ahorros
Alejandro Esteller-Moré, Jonathan Jorba Jiménez y Albert Solé-Ollé
- 302/2007 Assessing the enlargement and deepening of regional trading blocs: The European Union case
Salvador Gil-Pareja, Rafael Llorca-Vivero y José Antonio Martínez-Serrano
- 303/2007 ¿Es la Franquicia un Medio de Financiación?: Evidencia para el Caso Español
Vanessa Solís Rodríguez y Manuel González Díaz
- 304/2007 On the Finite-Sample Biases in Nonparametric Testing for Variance Constancy
Paulo M.M. Rodrigues and Antonio Rubia
- 305/2007 Spain is Different: Relative Wages 1989-98
José Antonio Carrasco Gallego

- 306/2007 Poverty reduction and SAM multipliers: An evaluation of public policies in a regional framework
Francisco Javier De Miguel-Vélez y Jesús Pérez-Mayo
- 307/2007 La Eficiencia en la Gestión del Riesgo de Crédito en las Cajas de Ahorro
Marcelino Martínez Cabrera
- 308/2007 Optimal environmental policy in transport: unintended effects on consumers' generalized price
M. Pilar Socorro and Ofelia Betancor
- 309/2007 Agricultural Productivity in the European Regions: Trends and Explanatory Factors
Roberto Ezcurra, Belen Iraizoz, Pedro Pascual and Manuel Rapún
- 310/2007 Long-run Regional Population Divergence and Modern Economic Growth in Europe: a Case Study of Spain
María Isabel Ayuda, Fernando Collantes and Vicente Pinilla
- 311/2007 Financial Information effects on the measurement of Commercial Banks' Efficiency
Borja Amor, María T. Tascón and José L. Fanjul
- 312/2007 Neutralidad e incentivos de las inversiones financieras en el nuevo IRPF
Félix Domínguez Barrero
- 313/2007 The Effects of Corporate Social Responsibility Perceptions on The Valuation of Common Stock
Waymond Rodgers , Helen Choy and Andres Guiral-Contreras
- 314/2007 Country Creditor Rights, Information Sharing and Commercial Banks' Profitability Persistence across the world
Borja Amor, María T. Tascón and José L. Fanjul
- 315/2007 ¿Es Relevante el Déficit Corriente en una Unión Monetaria? El Caso Español
Javier Blanco González y Ignacio del Rosal Fernández
- 316/2007 The Impact of Credit Rating Announcements on Spanish Corporate Fixed Income Performance: Returns, Yields and Liquidity
Pilar Abad, Antonio Díaz and M. Dolores Robles
- 317/2007 Indicadores de Lealtad al Establecimiento y Formato Comercial Basados en la Distribución del Presupuesto
Cesar Augusto Bustos Reyes y Óscar González Benito
- 318/2007 Migrants and Market Potential in Spain over The XXth Century: A Test Of The New Economic Geography
Daniel A. Tirado, Jordi Pons, Elisenda Paluzie and Javier Silvestre
- 319/2007 El Impacto del Coste de Oportunidad de la Actividad Emprendedora en la Intención de los Ciudadanos Europeos de Crear Empresas
Luis Miguel Zapico Aldeano
- 320/2007 Los belgas y los ferrocarriles de vía estrecha en España, 1887-1936
Alberte Martínez López
- 321/2007 Competición política bipartidista. Estudio geométrico del equilibrio en un caso ponderado
Isabel Lillo, M^a Dolores López y Javier Rodrigo
- 322/2007 Human resource management and environment management systems: an empirical study
M^a Concepción López Fernández, Ana M^a Serrano Bedía and Gema García Piqueres

- 323/2007 Wood and industrialization. evidence and hypotheses from the case of Spain, 1860-1935.
Iñaki Iriarte-Goñi and María Isabel Ayuda Bosque
- 324/2007 New evidence on long-run monetary neutrality.
J. Cunado, L.A. Gil-Alana and F. Perez de Gracia
- 325/2007 Monetary policy and structural changes in the volatility of us interest rates.
Juncal Cuñado, Javier Gomez Biscarri and Fernando Perez de Gracia
- 326/2007 The productivity effects of intrafirm diffusion.
Lucio Fuentelsaz, Jaime Gómez and Sergio Palomas
- 327/2007 Unemployment duration, layoffs and competing risks.
J.M. Arranz, C. García-Serrano and L. Toharia
- 328/2007 El grado de cobertura del gasto público en España respecto a la UE-15
Nuria Rueda, Begoña Barruso, Carmen Calderón y M^a del Mar Herrador
- 329/2007 The Impact of Direct Subsidies in Spain before and after the CAP'92 Reform
Carmen Murillo, Carlos San Juan and Stefan Sperlich
- 330/2007 Determinants of post-privatisation performance of Spanish divested firms
Laura Cabeza García and Silvia Gómez Ansón
- 331/2007 ¿Por qué deciden diversificar las empresas españolas? Razones oportunistas versus razones económicas
Almudena Martínez Campillo
- 332/2007 Dynamical Hierarchical Tree in Currency Markets
Juan Gabriel Brida, David Matesanz Gómez and Wiston Adrián Risso
- 333/2007 Los determinantes sociodemográficos del gasto sanitario. Análisis con microdatos individuales
Ana María Angulo, Ramón Barberán, Pilar Egea y Jesús Mur
- 334/2007 Why do companies go private? The Spanish case
Inés Pérez-Soba Aguilar
- 335/2007 The use of gis to study transport for disabled people
Verónica Cañal Fernández
- 336/2007 The long run consequences of M&A: An empirical application
Cristina Bernad, Lucio Fuentelsaz and Jaime Gómez
- 337/2007 Las clasificaciones de materias en economía: principios para el desarrollo de una nueva clasificación
Valentín Edo Hernández
- 338/2007 Reforming Taxes and Improving Health: A Revenue-Neutral Tax Reform to Eliminate Medical and Pharmaceutical VAT
Santiago Álvarez-García, Carlos Pestana Barros y Juan Prieto-Rodríguez
- 339/2007 Impacts of an iron and steel plant on residential property values
Celia Bilbao-Terol
- 340/2007 Firm size and capital structure: Evidence using dynamic panel data
Víctor M. González and Francisco González

- 341/2007 ¿Cómo organizar una cadena hotelera? La elección de la forma de gobierno
Marta Fernández Barcala y Manuel González Díaz
- 342/2007 Análisis de los efectos de la decisión de diversificar: un contraste del marco teórico “Agencia-Stewardship”
Almudena Martínez Campillo y Roberto Fernández Gago
- 343/2007 Selecting portfolios given multiple eurostoxx-based uncertainty scenarios: a stochastic goal programming approach from fuzzy betas
Enrique Ballester, Blanca Pérez-Gladish, Mar Arenas-Parra and Amelia Bilbao-Terol
- 344/2007 “El bienestar de los inmigrantes y los factores implicados en la decisión de emigrar”
Anastasia Hernández Alemán y Carmelo J. León
- 345/2007 Governance Decisions in the R&D Process: An Integrative Framework Based on TCT and Knowledge View of The Firm.
Andrea Martínez-Noya and Esteban García-Canal
- 346/2007 Diferencias salariales entre empresas públicas y privadas. El caso español
Begoña Cueto y Nuria Sánchez- Sánchez
- 347/2007 Effects of Fiscal Treatments of Second Home Ownership on Renting Supply
Celia Bilbao Terol and Juan Prieto Rodríguez
- 348/2007 Auditors’ ethical dilemmas in the going concern evaluation
Andres Guiral, Waymond Rodgers, Emiliano Ruiz and Jose A. Gonzalo
- 349/2007 Convergencia en capital humano en España. Un análisis regional para el periodo 1970-2004
Susana Morales Sequera y Carmen Pérez Esparrells
- 350/2007 Socially responsible investment: mutual funds portfolio selection using fuzzy multiobjective programming
Blanca M^a Pérez-Gladish, Mar Arenas-Parra , Amelia Bilbao-Terol and M^a Victoria Rodríguez-Uría
- 351/2007 Persistencia del resultado contable y sus componentes: implicaciones de la medida de ajustes por devengo
Raúl Iñiguez Sánchez y Francisco Poveda Fuentes
- 352/2007 Wage Inequality and Globalisation: What can we Learn from the Past? A General Equilibrium Approach
Concha Betrán, Javier Ferri and Maria A. Pons
- 353/2007 Eficacia de los incentivos fiscales a la inversión en I+D en España en los años noventa
Desiderio Romero Jordán y José Félix Sanz Sanz
- 354/2007 Convergencia regional en renta y bienestar en España
Robert Meneu Gaya
- 355/2007 Tributación ambiental: Estado de la Cuestión y Experiencia en España
Ana Carrera Poncela
- 356/2007 Salient features of dependence in daily us stock market indices
Luis A. Gil-Alana, Juncal Cuñado and Fernando Pérez de Gracia
- 357/2007 La educación superior: ¿un gasto o una inversión rentable para el sector público?
Inés P. Murillo y Francisco Pedraja

- 358/2007 Effects of a reduction of working hours on a model with job creation and job destruction
Emilio Domínguez, Miren Ullibarri y Idoya Zabaleta
- 359/2007 Stock split size, signaling and earnings management: Evidence from the Spanish market
José Yagüe, J. Carlos Gómez-Sala and Francisco Poveda-Fuentes
- 360/2007 Modelización de las expectativas y estrategias de inversión en mercados de derivados
Begoña Font-Belaire
- 361/2008 Trade in capital goods during the golden age, 1953-1973
M^a Teresa Sanchis and Antonio Cubel
- 362/2008 El capital económico por riesgo operacional: una aplicación del modelo de distribución de pérdidas
Enrique José Jiménez Rodríguez y José Manuel Fera Domínguez
- 363/2008 The drivers of effectiveness in competition policy
Joan-Ramon Borrell and Juan-Luis Jiménez