

Tondl, Gabriele; Vuksic, Goran

**Working Paper**

## What makes regions in Eastern Europe catching up? The role of foreign investment, human resources and geography

ZEI Working Paper, No. B 12-2003

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

ZEI - Center for European Integration Studies, University of Bonn

*Suggested Citation:* Tondl, Gabriele; Vuksic, Goran (2003) : What makes regions in Eastern Europe catching up? The role of foreign investment, human resources and geography, ZEI Working Paper, No. B 12-2003, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn, Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung (ZEI), Bonn

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/39510>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung  
Center for European Integration Studies  
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn



Gabriele Tondl, Goran Vuksic

**What Makes Regions in  
Eastern Europe Catching  
Up? The Role of Foreign  
Investment, Human  
Resources, and Geography**

**Working Paper**

**B 12  
2003**

# **What makes regions in Eastern Europe catching up? The role of foreign investment, human resources and geography<sup>\*</sup>**

*by Gabriele Tondl<sup>a</sup> and Goran Vuksic<sup>b</sup>*

<sup>a</sup> Research Institute for European Affairs/ Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien and ZEI Universität Bonn

<sup>b</sup> Research Institute for European Affairs/ Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien

This paper analyses regional growth in Eastern Europe in the second half of the 1990s, when regional disparities sharply increased. We aim to identify the factors behind growth and investigate in particular the role of (foreign) investment, education and innovation as well as geographical factors in a model of economic growth. The key relationships are estimated with spatial econometric tools on empirical data for the period 1995-2000. We find that foreign direct investment was paramount for growth in that period. EU border regions and capital areas clearly outperformed others. Further, regional growth clusters have appeared. Surprisingly, the high level of secondary education played no role to growth. Higher education, in contrast, was important, also for technology transfer.

JEL classification: R11, P25, C21, F15

Key words: Regional growth, Eastern Europe, foreign direct investment, education, spatial econometrics.

<sup>\*</sup> Research for this paper was undertaken within the OeNB-Jubiläumsfondprojekt no. 8869 “EU integration and regional development: Prospects for Eastern Europe” financed by the Oesterreichische Nationalbank.

<sup>a</sup> corresponding author, Research Institute for European Affairs, Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien, Althanstrasse 39-45, A-1090 Vienna, Austria, phone: 0043 1 31336 5566, FAX: 0043 1 31336 758, e-mail: gabriele.tondl@wu-wien.ac.at

<sup>b</sup> address as above

## 1. Introduction

This paper wishes to investigate the determinants of regional growth in the Eastern European EU candidate countries. Since their economic prospects are determined by catching-up, growth is a primary issue for these countries.

Since the mid-1990s, we observe a superior growth performance of Eastern European countries vis-à-vis Western Europe, providing evidence that a process of catching-up is underway. However, it shows that there are big internal growth differences within the Eastern European countries. Under this perspective, the question arises why growth rates differ across the regions of these countries. Why do some Eastern regions show a very dynamic growth while others only a weak?

Economic growth theory offers a number of hypotheses with respect to growth determinants, upon which a huge empirical literature emerged in the 1990s. Some investigated growth factors within large, worldwide country sets (e.g. Sachs and Warner 1995, Sala-i-Martin 1997, Gallup et al. 1998), others looked at growth factors within OECD economies (e.g. de la Fuente 1995, Bassanini et al. 2001). A number of studies also investigated growth factors in the EU at the regional level (e.g. Fagerberg and Verspagen 1996; Fagerberg et al. 1997; Vanhoudt et al. 2000; Paci and Pigliaru 2001; Tondl 2001; Badinger and Tondl 2003). In contrast, for Eastern Europe, there are only a few studies at the country level which investigate multiple growth factors (e.g. Campos and Kinoshita 2002) but there are practically no growth factor studies at the regional level.<sup>1</sup>

So far, most country studies on Eastern European growth are interested in exploring the causes of why some countries managed transition and recovery faster than others, and therefore investigated particular factors likely to influence growth in transition. Thus many growth studies focused on the role of institutional reform and market liberalization for growth in Eastern Europe (Hernández-Cáta 1997, Fischer, Sahey and Vegh 1998, Falcetti, Raiser and Sanvey 2002, Havrylyshyn 2000, Fidrmuc 2000) or of economic policies (Barlow and Radulescu 2002). Only a few studies investigate growth

---

<sup>1</sup> There are, however, some studies which address the issue of regional specialization and employment dynamics in Eastern European countries, e.g. Resmini (2002), Traistaru and Wolff (2002) and Traistaru, Nijkamp and Longhi (2002).

factors which are relevant at the post-transition stage such as investment, FDI and education (Fidrmuc 2000, Campos and Kinoshita 2002).

As transition was completed and regional growth differences in the catching-up process have become manifest in Eastern Europe, however, a general interest arises to know which are the factors behind dynamic growth. In this view, our paper wishes to fill the gap in Eastern European regional growth analysis.

We investigate regional growth in a sample comprising 36 regions from the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary and Poland, and of Slovenia for the period 1995-2000, - a time when those countries had generally started to catch up (WIIW 2002). For that purpose, we created a comprehensive regional databank, EAST RegStat, compiled from national statistical data. Investigating the causes of regional growth in the post transition period we look at a variety of factors which seem to be particularly relevant in Eastern European countries, namely capital accumulation and foreign direct investment (FDI), which reached rather high levels in this period, labour force participation, which decreased due to mounting unemployment, educational attainment of secondary and higher level, where Eastern European countries partly rank fairly high, and innovation. In addition, we investigate the role of geographical factors such as the location in the EU border area or the role of capital areas and spatial dependencies among regions. An important concern of this study is also to investigate factors which may explain technological progress, manifest by a strong increase in productivity in Eastern European regions in this period. Thus we look at the role of innovation activity and technology diffusion in achieving technological progress.

The results indicate that foreign direct investment and location factors are most important for regional growth in Eastern Europe. Border regions, and even more capital areas, often outperform other regions. Moreover, spatial dependencies suggest a tendency of emerging growth clusters in Eastern Europe. With respect to human capital, we find that the high level of secondary education in the population has no significant impact on growth. Higher level education, by contrast, seems to be an important factor for technology diffusion as effected e.g. by FDI.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 reviews the literature and puts forward our hypotheses with respect to growth factors in Eastern European regions. Section 3 sets up the theoretical model to be tested. Section 4 describes our data set EAST RegStat and gives first insights on regional developments from the data. Section 5 explains the estimation procedure and presents the results of the estimations. Section 6 concludes.

## **2. Likely sources of growth in Eastern European regions in the post-transition period**

In principle, growth theory considers two distinct sources of growth. First, growth and hence catching-up is determined by factor accumulation of capital and labour, whereby usually a certain level of human capital is attached to the latter. Second, growth depends on productivity growth which according to the new growth theory can be either generated by own R&D or derive from technology transfer.

The existing empirical growth literature largely concludes that capital accumulation is an important factor for growth, particularly in the early development stages. But also for EU regions, capital accumulation was found to be important for growth (Vanhoudt et al. 2000, Badinger and Tondl 2003). Similarly, the extent of participation of labour in the work process is essential for income growth. For EU regions, this has been shown in several studies (Fagerberg et al. 1997, Carmeci and Mauro 2002, Badinger and Tondl 2003). However, education and technological progress was found to be of much higher importance than factor accumulation in OECD country as well as EU regional studies (e.g. Bassanini and Scarpetta 2002, recently for the OECD; de la Fuente 1996, Fagerberg et al. 1997, Vanhoudt et al. 2000, Lodde 2000, Tondl 2001, Badinger and Tondl 2003, for EU regions).

With respect to Eastern Europe there is still very little empirical evidence on the factors behind dynamic growth. Thus we have no evidence whether the sharp increase of investment, fed also importantly by FDI, has been essential for growth in these economies. We do not know to which extent rising unemployment and falling participation in the work process decelerate income growth. Also with respect to human capital and innovation there is little evidence. There is however a considerable literature that has focused on the role of market liberalization, institutional features

(Hernández-Cáta 1997, Fischer, Sahey and Vegh 1998, Piazzolo 1999, Falcetti, Raiser and Sanvey 2002, Havrylyshyn 2000, Fidrmuc 2000) and FDI (Fidrmuc 2000, Campos and Kinoshita 2002) for growth.

Since Eastern European economies are in a very specific situation of economic development, where basically the downsizing of transformation is completed and was replaced by rebuilding and modernization, we may expect that other factors than in the EU economy are important for growth. Furthermore, the determinants of growth may well differ from those in the less developed EU regions since their historical economic trajectories cannot be compared. Catching-up in income after socialism is likely to be very different from the situation of catching-up from a backward economy.

There are a number of factors which we consider potentially important for regional growth in Eastern Europe and which are open for investigation as data is now available. Those are investment, the participation rate, educational attainment, innovation activity, the stock of FDI as well as spatial dependencies and location factors. Our arguments behind these likely growth factors and the existing findings in the growth literature of Eastern Europe will be discussed in the following.

First, with respect to investment, we have to note that domestic saving and capital accumulation have been higher in Eastern Europe than in the EU since the mid 1990s (25 per cent versus 19 per cent on average in 1994-97; Dobrinsky 2001, Campos and Coricelli 2002), whereby foreign direct investment played an important role (13 per cent of investment in 1997/99; Campos and Coricelli 2002). This increase in capital accumulation should have had an important impact on regional growth. There is already some evidence for this argument in the scarce empirical growth literature on Eastern Europe. Campos and Kinoshita (2002) found that capital formation showed a significantly positive effect on growth in Central and Eastern European countries.

Further, there is reason to assume that growth of regional per capita incomes in Eastern Europe in the 1990s has been related to labour market developments. In the first 5 years of transformation, participation rates had in general significantly declined (Boeri 2000) but stabilized in the second half of the 1990s, with the exception of many Czech and Slovak regions. The reasons for a decline in participation rates can be either demographic or related to the labour market. In the first case,

emigration and the resulting population aging may have reduced labour participation in Eastern Europe. In the second case, the mismatch of skills and labour saving efficiency gains will have led to increased unemployment and thus to lower participation. Indeed, unemployment rates had steadily increased in Eastern Europe until 1994, then showed a tendency to decline until 1998 (Burda 1998), but increased again thereafter (Eurostat). Also did employment after a short expansion after 1994 drop again in the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Poland (WIIW 2002). Emigration of active population, either abroad or to other regions in the country, was important and may have contributed to a decline of participation rates as it resulted in population ageing.

The fall in participation rates will lead to reduced growth prospects of a region as produced output has to be shared with a larger inactive population share. Therefore, high unemployment and emigration will reduce the growth potential of a region. Thus the question arises to which extent labour participation rates have been important for regional growth in the post-1995 period.

Next, we may assume that educational attainment, which is given a primary role in endogenous growth models, has played an important role for regional growth in Eastern Europe because of the relatively high education level, - at least of secondary school attainment. 45-55 per cent of the population have finished secondary school. In the richer regions of the EU this rate stands at 41 per cent and in the less developed regions of the EU cohesion countries the rate is only 25 per cent. Higher level education attainment rates are less striking. 5 to 6 per cent of the population have finished higher education, whereas the rate is 10 per cent in the cohesion countries and 16 per cent in the richer EU regions.

As raised above, economic growth theory has strongly argued that education should be considered as an important factor for growth since it provides knowledge and skills that enter into the production process and determine its efficiency (Lucas 1988; Mankiw, Romer and Weil 1992). In addition, higher level education is considered to have a direct impact on the research capacity (Romer 1990). Empirical studies for EU regions have found that educational attainment played a major role for regional growth (Vanhoudt et al. 2000; Tondl 2001, Badinger and Tondl 2003).



Therefore, we may guess that the exceptionally high level of secondary schooling should trigger fast growth in the Eastern European countries. However, this relationship may be less clear for a number of reasons. First, we should know that the high rate of secondary school attainment reflects the fact that vocational schools, - as opposed to general education -, have a much more important role in the accession countries than in the EU. Vocational schools account for 80 per cent of upper secondary education in the East. In the EU, only in Germany and Austria the share of vocational schools is almost equally high with 70 per cent. In contrast, vocational schools account only for 20-40 per cent in the Southern EU countries (Eurostat 2000). This explains the different size of secondary school rates across Europe. Then, as Boeri (2000) points out, qualifications in the East tend to be very narrowly specified and are often not transferable to new jobs. Therefore, high school attainment rates would not reflect the actual level of qualification. So far, growth regressions for Eastern European countries provide mixed evidence. Fidrmuc (2000) found that secondary education has a positive impact on growth, whereas Campos (2002) found a negative impact

Recent growth literature stresses that productivity growth has become the most important source of growth in advanced economies (Easterly and Levine 2001). Given the large productivity gap of Eastern countries, productivity growth should be also highly important in Eastern European regions and should play a central role to maintain the catching-up process. As shown by Dobrinsky (2001) in a growth accounting exercise, total factor productivity growth started to become a driving force for growth in these countries since the mid-1990s.

In principle, productivity growth can be generated either by improving knowledge and skills through education (see above), or by technological progress that either stems from own R&D or is the result of technology transfer.

The common source of technological progress in advanced countries, namely own innovations, may not be that important for growth in Eastern European countries since R&D expenditures are generally not very high, with some exception for the capital regions. In contrast, the second source of technological progress, technology transfer may play an important role for Eastern European regions.

A primary source for technology transfer may be FDI, which has reached a substantial level in the Eastern European countries, not least because lower wage costs, generous tax concessions of the recipient countries to foreign investors, and the prospect of EU integration (Sedmihradsky and Klazar 2002, Altomonte and Resmini 2001). FDI may be a most effective way of technology transfer since not only technology incorporated in capital goods is transferred but also process knowledge and managerial skills. A number of studies appeared recently which attempted to test for technology spillovers through FDI, either on the microeconomic or on the macroeconomic level. The argument is that there is a direct effect of productivity increase in the plant where FDI was received and an indirect effect on productivity of other firms in the same location or same sector (Baldwin et al. 1999). Indirect productivity spillovers may take place through labour force that gets trained and switches to other firms in the area (Fosfuri et al. 2001) or through upstream and downstream interfirm relationships (Blomström and Kokko 1998, Markusen and Venables 1999). Microeconomic studies rest on firm level panel data and explicitly model the transmission mechanisms for technology spillovers, e.g. by starting from the home R&D activity of the investing firm (Lichtenberg and van Pottelsberghe de la Potterie 2001). Technology spillovers will then also be conditioned on the social capability of local firms (Abramowitz 1986) in particular the education level of the local workforce (Borensztein, De Gregorio, and Lee 1998) or own engagement in R&D (Kinoshita 2000). The results of studies using firm level data are mixed. For example, Aitken and Harrison (1999) and others that look at FDI in developing countries find a negative effect on local firms productivity growth, which may be due to a competition effect to local firms. Foreign investment may drive domestic firms operating in the same activity out of the market, leaving small scale, traditional branches to domestic owners and thus resulting into a dual industry structure. Braconier, Ekholm and Knarvik (2001) also find no proof for technology spillover effects of multinational investment in Sweden. Barrios and Strobl (2002) investigate spillovers of FDI on domestic firms in Spain and find that these only occur if local firms are highly export-oriented and thus paying attention to competitiveness. Kinoshita (2000) tests for technology spillovers of FDI on local firms in the Czech Republic and finds that these depend on the extent of own R&D activity of local firms. In contrast, Djankov and Hoekman (1998), which do not account for the absorption capacity of local firms, find no clear evidence for spillovers from FDI in the

Czech Republic. Opposite to microlevel studies on FDI, there are macroeconomic and sectoral studies which directly assess the growth impact of FDI on the economy or sector. Those come to a positive assessment of its growth effects. Thus, Altomonte and Resmini (2001) could verify a positive growth impact of foreign owned firms on downstream and upstream firms in Poland. Before, De Gregorio (1992) proved the positive growth impact of FDI with a broad sample of countries. Carkovic and Levine (2002), trying to overcome econometric problems of previous studies, also look at a large set of countries and find that FDI only exerts a positive impact on growth in interaction with other variables. For Eastern European countries, Hunya (2002) and Campos and Kinoshita (2002) similarly find that FDI has a positive growth impact, whereby the latter show that it depends on the level of human capital.

Initially, FDI was fairly concentrated on certain regions in Eastern Europe but has recently become more spread (Altomonte and Resmini 2001). Thus the question arises to which extent FDI has been important for growth in Eastern European regions. As described by Resmini (2000), FDI is not targeted at labour intensive sectors in the considered countries, but rather on capital intensive and even science based sectors. Therefore, there should be ample possibility of technology transfer through FDI in the regions regarded in this study. Furthermore, since the educational level and technological ability is relatively high and rather homogenous across regions, such technology transfer through FDI should be facilitated in Eastern European regions.

Given our focus on regional economies, it is straightforward that we also check growth differences under the view of economic geography aspects and spatial effects. First, we shall check for spatial dependencies among regions in Eastern Europe. An obvious way to check for general spatial dependencies is to look at growth spillovers between regions. Such spillovers of growth may be the outcome of a variety of interactions between regions, such as interregional trade flows, labour market interactions, productivity spillovers, etc. A number of regional growth analyses detected such growth spillovers, for example Rey and Montouri (1999), Fingleton (2001), Niebuhr (2001), and Kosfeld et al. (2002). There are also studies in the literature which explicitly analyse the interactions underlying such growth spillovers. For example, Cheshire and Magrini (2000) analyse interregional migration flows, Paci and Pigliaru (2001) analyse productivity spillovers across EU regions, and Paci and Usai

(2001) and Funke and Niebuhr (2001) analyse regional R&D spillovers. Nevertheless, since we wish to account for the total spillover effects between regions rather than single effects, for which data is not always available, we shall focus on growth spillovers. This effect will be analysed by using a spatial econometric model as suggested in the spatial econometric literature (Anselin 1988, Anselin and Florax 1995, Kelejian and Prucha 1998).

Second, we shall test for the relevance of peripherality (agglomeration) effects for Eastern European regions. More precisely, we shall look at access to market demand in Eastern European and EU markets, whereby that access is a function of distance and quality of transport. Thus we shall test the argument that regions which are more closely located to centres in the EU and national centres with high demand and that have a better transportation link to these centres enjoy superior growth.

Third, and alternatively to the second proposition, we shall directly test the question to which extent regions located along the EU border and capital regions register higher growth.

Of course, there are a number of other factors which may have an important influence on growth. First, as we know from country level statistics, foreign trade, above all with the EU, has become very important in the East. However, we can suppose that regions trade to a different extent. Thus it would be interesting to find out whether differences in trade intensity have led to growth differences. Intensive trade usually leads to higher growth since it unleashes pro-competitive effects and facilitates technology transfer. Furthermore, as country level studies have shown, differences in socio-political and institutional factors were responsible for growth differences in Eastern Europe. These factors can be expected to vary even more across regions and thus could be important in explaining growth differences. Unfortunately, for both factors, there are no statistics on the regional level and therefore we cannot test for their effect.

In summary, we shall test the following hypotheses in this paper:

- (i) Improved investment was important for regional growth in the post transition period.
- (ii) Decreasing participation rates negatively affected regional growth.
- (iii) The high educational level promoted regional growth in Eastern Europe

- (iv) Innovating regions experienced higher growth rates.
- (v) Technology transfer was a major source of regional growth.
- (vi) Foreign direct investment was important for regional growth after transition.
- (vii) Spatial dependencies and location matters for regional growth in Eastern Europe.

### 3. The theoretical model

We start from the augmented Solow model as specified by Mankiw, D. Romer and Weil (1992)

$$Y = AK^a H^b L^g \quad (1)$$

where  $Y$  is income,  $K$  is physical capital,  $H$  human capital,  $L$  labour and  $A$  total factor productivity.

$a$ ,  $b$  and  $g$  are elasticities of output with respect to physical capital, human capital and labour. We assume constant returns to scale so that  $a + b + g = 1$

Equation (1) becomes

$$Y = AK^a H^b (POP \cdot PART)^g \quad (2)$$

if population  $POP$  is different from labour force  $L$ , and  $PART$  is the participation rate  $POP/L$ .

In intensive form equation (2) becomes

$$y = Ak^a h^b PART^g \quad (3)$$

where per capita income  $y = Y / POP$ , per capita capital  $k = K / POP$ , and the stock of human capital per person  $h = H / POP$ .

Since we are interested in the causes of changes in per capita income we write the model in log differences

$$\Delta \ln y = \Delta \ln A + a\Delta \ln k + b\Delta \ln h + g\Delta \ln PART \quad (4)$$

We proxy capital accumulation  $\Delta \ln k$  by the investment rate  $INV$ ,  $\Delta \ln h$  is the change in educational attainment rates in the population,  $\Delta \ln PART$  is the change in the participation rate and  $\Delta \ln A$  is technological progress.

At first, education is considered as a factor of production. It represents knowledge that determines efficiency of production. Changes in educational attainment should therefore lead to higher growth. In another sense, however, the level of education determines also the capacity to generate technological progress, i.e. productivity growth (Benhabib and Spiegel 1994; 2003; Temple 1999). Finally, education can also be a conditioning factor for technology diffusion (see below).

In the empirical growth literature a controversy emerged whether indeed changes in education would yield any growth effect. First, Benhabib and Spiegel (1994) and Pritchett (1996), looking at a large set of countries, failed to find a significant relationship between changes in education and growth. In contrast, they detected a positive relationship between the level of education and growth and considered this as evidence that education is primarily a factor which determines technological advance. In the following, de la Fuente and Domenech (2000) and Bassanini and Scarpetta (2001) could demonstrate that the failure to verify positive effects of educational changes was indeed a problem of data accuracy. We shall consider two types of education in this study. First, we look at secondary educational attainment, in which respect Eastern European countries rank fairly high in country comparisons. Second, we look at higher educational attainment which is average in these countries. Considering the possible interpretations of human capital raised in the literature, both the level effect as well as the effect of changes will be examined.

We consider several possibilities how technological progress  $\Delta \ln A$  is generated. In line with endogenous growth theory, innovation activity should be the primary source of technological progress. Further, technological progress can happen by technological diffusion which clearly is more important in developing and transition economies that do not yet possess a large R&D sector. FDI may be a particularly important channel for technology diffusion.

As to the first source of technological progress, innovation, we measure R&D activity in the tradition of Romer (1990) and Aghion and Howitt (1992) by the resources devoted to R&D, R&D expenditures

$R\&D_{exp}$  and R&D personnel  $R\&D_{pers}$ . In line with the critique of Jones (1995), that the absolute scale of R&D resources shows little correlation with technological advance, and recent suggestions of R&D activity indicators used in empirical research (Bassanini et al. 2001, Fagerberg et al. 1997) we use relative indicators. Thus  $R\&D_{exp} / Y$  are expenditures in per cent of GVA and in addition to R&D personnel we use the share of R&D personnel in the labour force  $R\&D_{pers} / L$  as innovation indicator. Thus we can write:

$$\Delta \ln A = \mathbf{d}_{11} (R \& D_{exp} / Y) \quad (5.1)$$

$$\mathbf{d}_{12} R \& D_{pers} \quad (5.2)$$

$$\mathbf{d}_{13} (R \& D_{pers} / L) \quad (5.3)$$

Note that according to the above arguments on education, particularly higher level education should also be a direct variable for innovation capacity.

As to the second source of technological progress, technology diffusion, we start from Nelson and Phelps (1966) and Benhabib and Spiegel (2003) and consider the potential of technology diffusion to be a positive function of the technology gap of a region. The technology gap  $GAP$  is proxied by the productivity gap of Region  $i$  with respect to the EU average:

$$GAP_i = [(Y / L)_{EU} - (Y / L)_i] / (Y / L)_i \quad (6.1)$$

so that

$$\Delta \ln A = \mathbf{d}_{21} GAP \text{ and} \quad (6.2)$$

$$\Delta \ln A = \mathbf{d}_{22} GAP * h \quad (6.3)$$

if we consider that the availability of human capital in the region is a precondition for technology diffusion, as suggested by Nelson and Phelps (1966) and specified by Benhabib and Spiegel (1994; 2003).

Finally, we consider that the presence of foreign direct investment enables technology transfer so that

$$\Delta \ln A = f_1 FDI \quad (7.1)$$

$$\Delta \ln A = f_2 FDI * h \quad (7.2)$$

$$\Delta \ln A = f_3 FDI * (R \& D_{\text{exp}} / Y) \quad (7.3)$$

where FDI is the stock of foreign direct investment as a share of regional GVA. Alternatively, technology transfer through FDI may be subject to the absorption capacity of the region which may either be determined by its human capital as argued by Borenzstein, De Gregorio and Lee (1998) in the tradition of Nelson and Phelps (1966), or own innovation in the sense of Griffith, Redding and Van Reenen (2000), who argue that own R&D increases the propensity that a region can absorb foreign technology.

Last, we wish to include spatial aspects and new economic geography aspects in our model.

We assume that there are regional growth spillovers so that a region's growth is determined by the growth of its surrounding regions.

$$\Delta \ln y_t = \mathbf{W} \Delta \ln y_t \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathbf{W}$  is the  $N \times N$  spatial weights matrix of the dimension equivalent to the number of regions  $N$  with elements  $w_{ij}$  which describes the interaction between region  $i$  and region  $j$ . We choose a contiguity spatial weights matrix where  $w_{ij} = 1$  if region  $i$  and  $j$  have a common border and  $w_{ij} = 0$  otherwise.<sup>2</sup>

In addition to growth spillovers, the effect of access to market demand was tested. Hereby we start from the peripherality indicator given as

---

<sup>2</sup> Alternatively to the contiguity matrix we used two weights matrix specifications where the influence of other regions' growth declined with increasing distance. One of the form  $w_{ij} = d_{ij}^{-d}$  where  $d_{ij}$  denotes the distance between the centres of two regions and  $d$

Fingleton 2001; Badinger and Tondl 2003). Another took the form  $w = \exp(-d \cdot \quad)$

$d$  various values were tried. In both cases, a high value had to be taken for  $d$  in order to get a correctly specified spatial econometric model. This indicates that spatial dependencies diminish very fast between Eastern European regions. Therefore we selected a contiguity matrix as a spatial weights matrix.



$$Peripherality_i = \sum_{j=1}^N Y_j \cdot t_{ij} \quad (9.1)$$

$$ACCESS = - (Peripherality) \quad 0 < ACCESS < 100 \quad (9.2)$$

Peripherality of region  $i$  is determined by the market size of all regions  $j$  located either in Eastern Europe or in the EU,  $Y_j$ , and weighted by transport time  $t_{ij}$  from region  $i$  to region  $j$  by lorry (Schürmann and Talaat 2002). This means that a region is the more peripheral the longer it takes to reach large markets. The inverse of the peripherality indicator is the market access indicator  $ACCESS$ . Regions have the higher market access the closer they are to market demand. The market access indicator ranges between 0 and 100, 100 indicating the highest access. If market access is important for growth, this means that there are tendencies of agglomeration in the sense of the New Economic Geography models (Krugman 1991). Those Eastern regions with high market access to the EU are then potential parts of the European core.

Here the question arises whether the spatial lag model with spatial lags of regional growth conflicts with the access variable. In principle, the market access indicator covers access to market demand of all regions (EU and East), whereby distant ones enter less because of increasing transport time. Since growth spillovers in the spatial lag model cover also demand linkages, market access would have to be considered as an alternative to the spatial lag model if that model is specified with a weights matrix with a distance decay function. Since we use a spatial lag model with a contiguity matrix, which covers only growth spillovers from neighbouring regions, we may include the access variable since it covers also more distant demand effects. If rich EU regions are reachable in a reasonable time, they will have a higher weight in the level of the access variable.

In summary, we can specify the following variants of the model which will be estimated:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \ln y &= a + \Delta \ln A & + & & \mathbf{a} \Delta \ln k + \mathbf{b} \Delta \ln h + \mathbf{g} \Delta \ln PART + W \Delta \ln y + u_{it} \\ &= a + \mathbf{d}_{11} (R\&D_{exp}/Y) & + & & \dots \\ &= a + \mathbf{d}_{12} R\&D_{pers} & + & & \dots \\ &= a + \mathbf{d}_{13} (R\&D_{pers}/L) & + & & \dots \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \dots + \mathbf{d}_{21}GAP + \dots \\
&= \dots + \mathbf{d}_{22}GAP * h + \dots \\
&= \dots + \mathbf{f}_1FDI + \dots \\
&= \dots + \mathbf{f}_2FDI * h + \dots \\
&= \dots + \mathbf{f}_3FDI * (R\&D_{exp}/Y) + \dots \\
&= \dots + \dots + \dots + \dots + EU\ border + u_{it} \\
&= \dots + \dots + \dots + \dots + capital + u_{it} \\
&= \dots + \dots + \dots + \dots + ACCESS + u_{it}
\end{aligned}
\tag{10}$$

#### 4. Data issues and a first view on empirical developments in the regions

For this study a unique dataset, EAST RegStat, was created for which a substantial amount of data from national statistical offices was compiled and used along with data from Eurostat. The dataset covers 36 NUTS II level regions from Central and Eastern Europe, i.e. regions from the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Slovenia, which in the Eurostat regional system is not divided into NUTS II regions. In general, the collected data covers the period 1995-2000. For most indicators, Eurostat data was taken as the principal data source. Missing values were taken from national statistics, if available, checking for trend consistency of time series. For several indicators, however, national statistics were the main data source. In a number of cases data for missing values had to be filled by the means of extrapolation, whereby consistency was checked in various ways, e.g. by allocation of country level data to regions.

The following indicators are used for our analysis:

- (i) average annual real growth of GVA per capita 1995-2000
- (ii) average gross fixed capital formation (all sectors) 1996-2000
- (iii) average annual change in the labour participation rate 1995-2000

- (iv) average secondary level and higher level educational attainment in 1996-2000  
(per cent of the population with secondary/higher level education)
- (v) average annual change of educational attainment rates 1995-2000
- (vi) average stock of FDI in per cent of GVA, 1996-2000
- (vii) market access indicator 1997<sup>3</sup>

Exact data definitions and sources are given in the appendix.

Note that we calculated the average growth rate by regressing annual logs of GVA on a constant and time trend, rather than computing growth from GVA from the beginning and the end of the period. This should yield growth rates which are less influenced by short term instability, as explained in Temple (1999). Growth rates of other indicators are calculated in the same fashion.

Before presenting the results of our estimation, we would like to briefly describe the main empirical facts on regional development given by our data (see tables 1- 4).

**insert tables 1 – 4 about here**

Table 1 shows that average regional per capita income growth in the period 1995-2000 in the accession countries was about 4 per cent, except for the Czech Republic where it was little above 0 per cent. However, growth rates varied significantly across regions (see figure 1). In all countries, capital areas showed higher growth than the average growth in the country. In the Czech Republic and in Poland capital area growth was even twice the average. Furthermore we see that the EU border region in Hungary showed a much higher growth than the rest of the country.

**insert figure 1 about here**

According to table 2, regional investment rates in 1996-2000 ranged from an average of 20 per cent in Poland to almost 40 per cent in Slovakia. Again we find that investment is significantly, namely two thirds higher in capital areas. In Bratislava investment even reached more than 70 per cent of GVA.

---

<sup>3</sup> We thank Carsten Schürmann, Ahmed Talaat and Michael Wegener for kind permission to use their access indicator statistics.

EU border regions only show slightly superior investment than the average region in the country, except for Bratislava which is both capital and border region.

Table 3 shows that FDI stocks in the Eastern European regions have reached a very high level of 32 per cent of GVA in Hungary and 26 per cent in the Czech Republic, but still much less in the other countries, where the FDI stock accounted for 10-15 per cent of GVA. Also in this context, capital regions have accumulated a higher share than other regions, reaching stocks twice as high as on average. Border regions only have accumulated a higher than average FDI share in Hungary and Slovakia.

The situation with respect to education is shown in table 4. We see that secondary level educational attainment rates are fairly steady across regions within a country. However, there are country differences. In the Czech Republic average regional secondary level attainment accounts for 55 per cent and in the Slovak Republic for 48 per cent, while it is 43 per cent in Poland and Slovenia and 37 per cent in Hungary. Secondary level educational attainment has on average slightly increased in the accession countries regions. By contrast, higher level educational attainment rates are fairly steady across countries ranging between 6-7 per cent. Only Slovenia has a higher tertiary educational attainment rate with 9 per cent. Clearly, higher level educational attainment rates are significantly higher in capital areas, reaching 12-15 per cent in Budapest, Prague and Bratislava. In all countries except for Poland, higher level education has increased in the period under concern.

As higher level education, R&D activity is concentrated in capital areas, where it accounts for 1.5 – 2.4 per cent of GVA. On average, regional R&D rates are fairly modest in the accession countries. Only in Slovenia and the Czech Republic they reach a higher value with 1.6 respectively 1.3 per cent.

## **5. Results of the estimation**

In the following we estimated a spatial lag model assuming a contiguity matrix to model spatial dependencies.

From an econometric point of view the model can be expressed as

$$y = \mathbf{r}_1 \mathbf{W}y + \mathbf{X}\mathbf{b} + u_{it} \quad (11)$$

$$u_{it} = \mathbf{r}_2 \mathbf{W}u + \mathbf{e}_{it}$$

$$\text{with } |\mathbf{r}_1| < 1, |\mathbf{r}_2| < 1$$

where  $y$  ( $N \times 1$ ) is the dependent, endogenous variable and  $\mathbf{X}$  ( $N \times K$ ) is the vector of  $K$  explanatory variables,  $\mathbf{W}$  is the contiguity spatial weights matrix.  $\mathbf{r}_1$  and  $\mathbf{r}_2$  are (scalar) spatial correlation parameters, and the vector  $\mathbf{b}$  ( $K \times 1$ ) contains the parameters of the explanatory variables.  $u_{it}$  is a non-spherical disturbance term, while  $\mathbf{e}_{it}$  is assumed to be distributed NID ( $0, \mathbf{s}^2$ ).

For estimation we employ the feasible generalised spatial two stages least squares estimator (FGS2SLS) developed by Kelejian and Prucha (1998) which is considered as an unbiased estimator for spatial econometric models with known asymptotic properties (Debabrata et al. 2003). Estimation is effected with an Eviews programme developed in Badinger and Tondl (2003). As a test for spatial dependence, the standardized Moran's I statistic is used. We test for the form of spatial dependence (spatial error versus spatial lag model) with the  $LM_{ERR}$  and  $LM_{LAG}$  test statistics (see Anselin and Rey 1991, Anselin and Bera 1998, Anselin and Florax 1995).

We start to estimate a core model (table 5, model (1)) which includes as explanatory variables regional investment, changes in the participation rate and a spatial lag of growth, measuring growth spillovers from neighbouring regions. All coefficients are significant and have the expected sign. The  $LM_{LAG}$  statistic suggests that the spatial lag model is the correct form to model spatial dependencies. The estimates suggest that changes in the participation rate and growth of neighbouring regions are highly important for a region's growth. In contrast, investment has a positive but fairly modest impact on growth.

**insert table 5 about here**

We know that participation rates slightly continued to fall with our regions after 1995. Remember that changes in the participation rate partly reflect demographic changes, partly changes in unemployment. Population aging and emigration reduced the participation rate in a part of regions. In addition, unemployment continued to rise, even after transformation was completed. As described by Keune

(2000), the initiated growth process was not accompanied by a similar degree of employment creation. Growth was labour saving. Our results indicate that lower participation rates have been problematic under the perspective to increase welfare in terms of per capita incomes. Low participation limits income growth.

Next, we estimate the augmented Solow model including human capital. First we add the level of educational attainment as advocated by Benhabib and Spiegel (1994), both of secondary as well as of higher level education (table 5, model (2)). Here, only the level of higher education has a positive and statistically significant impact, along with the spatial lag of growth. The other variables become insignificant in this specification. (More precisely, this change of coefficients only happens with the level of higher educational attainment, not with secondary level.) Since higher level education is highly concentrated in capital regions (correlation coefficient 0.76), this specification is likely to capture the capital effect, which is a general growth factor as we shall see below. The coefficient of the level of secondary educational attainment is negative, although not significant. Alternatively to adding human capital as level we included the change in educational attainment, which - we remember - increased in general. In this specification (table 5, model (3)), all included factors become significant again. The coefficients of investment, of changes in the participation rate and of the spatial lag get again the order of the basic model. Changes in secondary level education seem to have a positive impact on growth, whereas – surprisingly – changes in higher level education have a negative impact. As a third possibility, human capital was included both in levels as well as a change (table 5, model (4)). Now we see that higher level educational attainment is important, both in levels and as a change, along with spatial lag of growth. All other factors, however, are not significant.

From this basic model, we can draw several conclusions with respect to the growth impact of human capital in Eastern European regions. First, higher level education was an important factor for growth, but an increase in tertiary level education in the population had a negative growth effect. An explanation may be that the increase of university education was a reaction of youths to avoid job search in a tight labour market and may at the same time have lowered participation rates so that it did not induce more growth. A more general interpretation may simply be that additional university education had decreasing returns since the level of higher education was already sufficient. A change

in the structure of study disciplines may be yet another reason for the negative growth effect of increased higher education levels. Indeed, we find that the number of graduates from engineering and manufacturing went down in all countries. In Poland, also graduation in social sciences and business went significantly down in favour of humanities and education. In the Czech Republic and Hungary, however, we do not find this pattern, social sciences and business even increased. (OECD 1995-2000.) In summary, thus there was a certain shift to disciplines which do not contribute directly to productivity growth in the business sector. This may partly explain the negative growth effect of increases in higher education. Second, the relatively high medium level education rate in Eastern European regions seems to have had no significant effect on growth. This gives support to the possibility of a serious skill mismatch of educational standards and labour market requirements. However, changes of the secondary level education rate had a positive impact on growth. The generally slight increase of secondary education must have helped to upgrade skills.

The estimated coefficients for human capital are disappointing in view of the common support of the literature of the importance of human capital for growth. However, there is similarly puzzling evidence in the study of Campos and Kinoshita (2002) who investigated the growth impact of human capital (measured by the average number of years of schooling in the population) and found that it was negative in the period 1990-1998. They argue that human capital was artificially high in Eastern European countries, largely not coinciding with the actual qualification standards, and thus may not be such an important variable in the catching-up process.

Since the inclusion of human capital in levels clearly leads to a misspecified model because the coefficients are insignificant, we select the model with changes in human capital as the basic model for further estimations.

In the following we test for possible sources of technological progress: innovation, technology transfer and technology spillovers through FDI.

In table 6, starting from the basic model, the impact of innovation activity is tested. Three different indicators of innovation are checked: the absolute number of employment in the R&D sector, the share of labour force employed in R&D and the R&D expenditures to GVA ratio. In all estimations, R&D

has a positive sign but is statistically insignificant. If the share of R&D personnel is used, other coefficients as investment and changes in the participation rate become insignificant. A result which resembles the case of the level of higher education attainment rates. In fact, both the R&D labour force share and the higher level educational attainment rate are highly correlated with a factor of 0.88. Thus both variables capture innovation activity, as suggested in the growth model of Benhabib and Spiegel (1994). Further, both factors are particularly concentrated in capital areas. Thus they may actually capture the capital area effect which leaves other factors insignificant. (We shall see below with FDI that the capital area effect makes other variables such as FDI insignificant as well.)

The results of including innovation activity in the estimation suggest that, - irrelevant which indicator is used -, R&D does not seem to play a significant role for regional growth in Eastern Europe.

**insert table 6 about here**

As a second source for technological improvement, technology transfer was tested. Remember that a huge technological gap is considered as a high potential for technology transfer and therefore regions with a big technology gap should show higher growth. Contrary to that hypothesis, table 7 shows that regions with a high technology gap do not show the highest growth. However, if technology transfer is conditioned on the higher level educational attainment rate there is slight support for the proposed relationship, although the coefficient is not significant. The same does not apply for medium level human capital. Thus regions with a large technology gap would only benefit from technology diffusion if there is enough higher level educational attainment.

**insert table 7 about here**

In a next step, we analyse the possibility of technology spillovers through FDI, starting from our basic model (3) (see table (8)). First, we add the GVA share of FDI stock as a variable (model (11)) and find that the FDI stock has a paramount impact on regional growth in Eastern Europe. Regions which have twice as much FDI than others have almost 6 times higher growth rates while general investment has a much lesser impact on growth. Note that general investment includes private and public investment and of course also FDI (about 13 per cent of total investment). However, our FDI variable does not interfere with investment since the stock of FDI is regarded. A rise of the investment rate by one per



cent increases growth only by 0.09 per cent. In model (12) and (13), the impact of FDI is conditioned on a region's absorption capacity, given by the extent of medium level and higher level educational attainment. In both cases, the impact of FDI is significantly positive. Note that with model (12) and (13) FDI enters in an interactive term, therefore we cannot compare the size of the estimated coefficients with that of FDI alone. However, we can say that higher level education is more important for promoting spillovers than medium level education. We can conclude that human capital, particularly tertiary educational attainment, is important for drawing growth effects from FDI, but FDI by itself already promotes growth significantly.

In models (14) and (15) we checked if the significance of R&D and GAP would improve if considered together with FDI. The results show that, again, neither R&D nor GAP is significant. Consequently, we dismiss both variables as sources for technological progress.

**insert table 8 about here**

Next we consider the effect of geographical factors (see tables 9 and 10). If we include the market access variable, which should capture demand effects from national and EU centres, depending on their easiness of access, we get the strange result of a negative effect of market access. However, this requires more inspection. First, one has to be aware that our spatial lag model covers growth spillovers from surrounding regions. Second, the market access variable will only cover more distant demand if that is easily to be reached. If EU demand is too distant and transport linkages are bad that will not enter into access. Therefore it is very likely that the spatial lag and the access variable are correlated. Thus this may explain the negative coefficient. To check our argument, we can look at the coefficient of market access in the OLS estimation where spatial lags are not included. Indeed, the coefficient of access becomes positive, although statistically not significant, in the OLS estimation. (Note that the same story about the access variable appears not only in the basic model, but also in the extended model with human capital and FDI; see table 10, models (21) and (22).)

Thus we can conclude that market access is to some extent important for Eastern European regions, but that access to market demand is dominated by national centres and not EU centres to which transport linkages are still insufficient.

**insert table 9 about here**

In addition, we tested to which extent EU border regions and capital regions had a superior growth performance.

Why should EU border regions show a higher growth? Those regions changed from peripheral locations in the former socialist period to most advantageous locations, close to the EU markets. Many of them registered massive structural changes and are the destination of FDI, e.g. in Western Hungary (Nemes-Nagy (2000)). The geographical closeness to the EU means an advantage in transaction costs and we may expect that these regions also have a high share of export.

In many EU border regions, intensive cross border relationships have developed. Factor movements both of capital and of labour are very intensive. Thus it is not only big scale investment, which is oriented towards the border regions, but, in addition, firms from the neighbouring EU region would invest in smaller scale branches there, creating intensive cross border interactions and the possibility of technology and knowledge transfer. Similarly, labour market cross-border interactions are important. These regions are largely day to day commuting areas. A substantial share of the population receives higher wages from across the border which becomes extra revenue of the regional GDP, and again is also a source of knowledge transfer. Indeed, our estimation results indicate that the status of being a border region had a positive and mostly significant impact on growth (table 10, model (22) and table 10, model (23).)

Finally, if we look at the coefficient of capital area status, those are clearly growth leaders. Being a capital area largely makes other variables insignificant (see table 9, model (21) and table 10, model (24).

It should be noted, that coefficients of investment, of changes in higher level education, of FDI and spatially lagged income growth are fairly stable across different specifications. This suggests robustness of the results. By contrast, changes in labour force participation become less significant in more comprehensive models, which suggests that if other factors are present, they are more important for growth and negative consequences of declining participation rates affect growth less.

**insert table 10 about here**

In summary, we can draw the following conclusions:

- (i) Our estimations suggest that the strong inflow of foreign direct investment played a paramount role for high growth in Eastern European regions. Regions with a two times higher FDI stock showed six times higher growth. Increased capital accumulation as such is far less important.
- (ii) In addition to having a high stock of FDI, the fact of having the status of an EU border region was most influential for high growth in Eastern European regions. Being an EU border region improves growth by 1.3 per cent.
- (iii) Further, there are significant spatial dependencies between closely located regions, so that a region's growth is significantly more likely to be higher if being a neighbour of other high growth regions. About a fifth of a region's growth is determined by that of surrounding regions. This indicates a tendency for growth clusters in Eastern Europe.
- (iv) Being a capital area is more important than any other factor.
- (v) The increase in tertiary education levels had a negative impact on growth, most likely because it lowered participation rates. Nevertheless, the estimations show that higher education per se is important for accommodating technology diffusion and technology spillovers from FDI in Eastern European regions.
- (vi) The high level of secondary schooling among the Eastern European population has no influence on growth. This lends support to the argument that there is a serious skill mismatch between qualifications that once were acquired at school and those demanded by a restructuring industry.
- (vii) The negative growth effect of falling participation rates, largely due to rising unemployment is lessened by the presence of other key growth factors.
- (viii) Regions in Eastern Europe with an unfavourable location (Eastern border, internal regions), a low stock of FDI, a low level of higher education, no improvement of

secondary education and high unemployment had no chance to catch up in income level in the period 1995-2000.

## **6. Conclusions**

This paper wished to shed some light on the factors that determined regional growth in Eastern Europe in the second half of the 1990s, a period when transformation was largely settled and catching-up established to a quite different degree among Eastern European regions.

We set up our hypothesis on growth factors in an economic growth model and argued that the high observed capital accumulation and high educational level in Eastern Europe might have been important for growth in dynamic regions. Further we expected that technology transfer, in particular through FDI might have played an important role. In addition, we supposed that location factors and spatial dependencies mattered for growth.

The empirical analysis was done with a sample of 36 NUTS II level regions from the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Poland and Slovenia for the period 1995-2000. To take likely spatial dependencies into account, we set up our growth regressions in a spatial econometric framework. It turned out that a spatial lag model, where per capita income growth is also dependent on growth of surrounding regions, would be most appropriate for our context. For estimation we used the general spatial two stage least squares procedure suggested by Kelejian and Prucha (1998), a two stage instrumental variable estimator which is considered as an unbiased estimator for the spatial context with established asymptotic properties.

Our results partly prove our proposed hypotheses, partly reveal new surprising aspects.

First, it was in particular foreign direct investment and not capital accumulation as such which was the main driving factor behind regional growth in Eastern Europe. Second, there are clear agglomeration advantages and better resources (human capital, research, FDI) in capital areas, which make those regions to growth leaders. In addition, EU border regions, where also a large share of FDI is registered and intensive cross border relations have established, generally could enjoy higher growth. The location advantage of closeness to EU markets benefits the EU border regions and puts other regions

at a disadvantage. Third, we can observe regional clustering of growth, regions surrounded by high growth areas showed a high growth performance. However, as our experiments with market access measures and different spatial weights matrixes have shown, spatial effects were geographically rather limited, probably an evidence for insufficient transport infrastructures.

Evidently, own innovation activity still played an insignificant role for regional growth. By contrast technology transfer was the main source of productivity growth in Eastern European regions. Testing the technology gap model with human capital as a conditioning factor, we find that this was a likely way of technology transfer. Above all, however, FDI has to be considered as a main channel of technology spillovers, the more if combined with human capital of higher level education.

Surprisingly, the high ranking of Eastern regions with respect to secondary level schooling had no effect on regional growth, which suggests a problem of skill mismatch between qualifications acquired and those demanded in the labour market. Therefore our further result that improvements in secondary level education had a positive growth effect is not surprising. By contrast, the extent of higher level education proves to have been important for growth. It was essential for accommodating technology transfer and provides the pool for own innovation activity. However, the increase in higher education that took place did not benefit growth.

We should expect that regional disparities between Eastern European regions remain due to agglomeration forces and location advantages along the EU border. This calls for more concern about transport infrastructures to overcome location disadvantages. The education situation is much less satisfactory in Eastern European regions than considered at first sight. Improvement of qualifications and skills will become essential to meet the labour market requirements. Education will also be a key for attracting foreign direct investment, which will remain crucial for growth. These are big challenges for national policy makers and will need to be considered by EU regional policies.

# APPENDIX

## EAST RegStat

### Data and definitions

36 NUTS II level regions from  
Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Poland, Slovenia, time period 1995-2000

|                                      | DEFINITION   | SOURCE  |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| <i>Gross Value Added</i>             | nominal and real GVA in Euro, at 1995 prices and 1995 exchange rates.  | 1995-1999 EUROSTAT. 2000 GUS, SURS, CSU, KSH and INFOSTAT.  |
| <i>Population</i>                    | Total population.  | CZ, HU, SI: 1995-1999 EUROSTAT, 2000 extrapolation. PL: 1995, 1998-1999 EUROSTAT, 1996 and 2000 GUS. SK: 1996-1999 EUROSTAT, 1995, 2000 INFOSTAT.   |
| <i>Employment</i>                    | Total employment. Number of persons employed.  | CZ and HU: EUROSTAT. PL: GUS. SI: SURS. SK: 1997-2000 INFOSTAT, 1995-1996 extrapolation based on GDP trend.   |
| <i>R&amp;D expenditures</i>          | Total expenditures for research and development in business sector, government sector and higher education sector.   | CZ: 1995-1997 EUROSTAT, 1998-2000 extrapolation. HU: KSH. PL: GUS. SI: EUROSTAT. SK: 1995-1997 EUROSTAT, 1998-2000 INFOSTAT.  |
| <i>R&amp;D employment</i>            | Total employment in research and development in business sector, government sector and higher education sector.  | CZ: 1995-1997 EUROSTAT, 1998-2000 extrapolation. HU: KSH. PL: GUS. SI: EUROSTAT. SK: 1995-1997 EUROSTAT, 1998-2000 INFOSTAT.  |
| <i>Gross Fixed Capital Formation</i> | Gross fixed capital formation in Euro, at 1995 prices and 1995 exchange rates.   | CZ: 1995-1999 EUROSTAT, 2000 allocation of country investment. HU: KSH. PL: 1998-1999 EUROSTAT, 1995-1997 and 2000 extrapolation, allocation of country investment. SI: SURS. SK: 1995-1999 EUROSTAT, 2000 from country data.   |
| <i>Foreign Direct Investment</i>     | Stock of foreign direct investment in Euro, at 1995 prices and 1995 exchange rates.  | CZ: 1998-2000 CNB, 1995-1997 extrapolation based on allocation of country FDI stock. HU: calculated using regional data from KSH and allocation of country FDI stock. PL: calculated, based on regional FDI flows and allocation of country FDI stock. SI: WIIW. SK: 1996-2000 NBS, 1995 calculated from country FDI stock. |
| <i>Education</i>                     | Educational attainment. Number of persons who have completed secondary and higher level education.<br>Secondary level education includes ISCED-97 sectors 3 and 4. Entrance is at age 15-16 after compulsory school. It comprises general education preparing for university entrance, vocational schools and also upper secondary level apprenticeship programmes of the dual system in Germany.<br>Higher level education corresponds to ISCED-97 sectors 5 and 6. Sector 5 includes short degrees like bachelor (UK), | EUROSTAT Labour Force Survey for CZ: 1998-2000, HU: 1997-2000, PL: 1998-2000, SI: 1996-2000, SK: 1999-2000. Other years extrapolation.  |

|                          |  |  |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| <i>education</i> (cont.) | Fachhochschule (D) and laurea breve (I), but also longer higher education programmes like Diplom (D) and master (UK). Education in section 6 awards an advanced research qualification, like PhD programmes and doctoral studies. (See OECD, education at a glance 2002, Paris, OECD)  |  |
| <i>Peripherality</i>     | European Peripherality Index EPI (market access indicator is the inverse function). The <i>market size</i> and the <i>distance</i> of the region of destination are taken into account. Market size is represented by regional population or GDP. Distance corresponds to travel time between two regions by different modes of transport. | Institute for Spatial Planning (IRPUD), University of Dortmund.<br>For details see:<br>Schürmann, C., Talaat, A. (2000): <i>Towards a European Peripherality Index. Final Report</i> . Report for Directorate General XVI Regional Policy of the European Commission. Dortmund, IRPUD. |

---

**NOTES:** CZ - Czech Republic, HU - Hungary, PL - Poland, SI - Slovenia, SK - Slovak Republic;  
**Data sources:** CNB - Czech National Bank, CSU - Czech Statistical Office, EUROSTAT – Statistical Office of the EC, GUS - Polish Official Statistics, INFOSTAT Institute of Informatics and Statistics Slovakia, KSH - Hungarian Central Statistical Office, NBS - National Bank of Slovakia, SURS - Statistical Office of the Republic of Slovenia, WIIW - Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies.

## List of variables used in the estimations

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| $\dot{A}y$        | average growth of real GVA per capita, 1995-2000, in per cent   |
| $\dot{A}part$     | average growth of participation rate (employment / population), 1995-2000, in per cent  |
| <i>inv</i>        | average investment rate (investment / GVA), 1996-2000, in per cent  |
| <i>RD_l</i>       | average R&D employment, logarithm, 1996-2000  |
| <i>RD_ls</i>      | employment in R&D in per cent of total employment, average 1996-2000  |
| <i>RD_e</i>       | R&D expenditures in per cent of GVA, average 1996-2000  |
| <i>hc_m</i>       | per cent of population (all ages) with secondary educational attainment in total population, average 1996-2000  |
| $\dot{A}hc_m$     | average growth of secondary educational attainment rate, 1996-2000, in per cent   |
| <i>hc_h</i>       | per cent of population (all ages) with higher educational attainment in total population, average 1996-2000   |
| $\dot{A}hc_h$     | average growth of higher educational attainment rate, 1996-2000, in per cent  |
| <i>GAP</i>        | productivity gap to EU average in 1995.<br>$GAP_i = (\text{productivity}_{EU} - \text{productivity}_i) / \text{productivity}_i$ , whereby <i>i</i> indicates the region |
| <i>GAP*hc_h</i>   | interaction term GAP and higher level educational attainment  |
| <i>GAP*hc_m</i>   | interaction term GAP and secondary level educational attainment   |
| <i>FDI_s</i>      | stock of FDI in per cent of GVA, average 1996-2000  |
| <i>FDI_s*hc_m</i> | interaction term FDI and secondary educational attainment rate  |
| <i>FDI_s*hc_h</i> | interaction term FDI and higher level education   |
| <i>access_GDP</i> | market access indicator, using GDP as measure for market size, ranges from 0-100, 100 = best access, derived from European Peripherality Index                          |
| <i>access_POP</i> | market access indicator, using population as indicator for market size, ranges from 0-100, 100 = best access, derived from European Peripherality Index                 |
| <i>EU_border</i>  | dummy variable for EU border regions  |
| <i>capital</i>    | dummy variable for capital city regions   |

## **References**

- Abramowitz, M. (1986), Catching-up, forging ahead or falling behind, *Journal of Economic History*, 46, pp. 385-406.
- Aghion, P. and Howitt, P. (1992), A model of growth through creative destruction, *Econometrica*, 60, pp. 323-351.
- Aitken, B.J. and Harrison, A.E. (1999), Do Domestic Firms Benefit from Direct Foreign Investment? Evidence from Venezuela, *American Economic Review*, 89(3), pp. 605-618.
- Altomonte, C. and Resmini, L. (2001), Multinational Corporations as Catalyst for Industrial Development: The Case of Poland, *William Davidson Institute Working Paper*, no. 368.
- Anselin, L. (1988), *Spatial econometrics: Methods and models*, Dordrecht, Kluwer.
- Anselin, L. and Florax, J.G.M. (1995), *New directions in spatial econometrics*, Berlin et al., Springer.
- Badinger, H. and Tondl, G. (2003), Trade, human capital and innovation. The engines of European regional growth in the 1990s, in: Fingleton, B. (ed.), *European regional growth*, Series: Advances in Spatial Science, Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 215-240.
- Baldwin, R., Braconier, H. and Forslid, R. (1999), Multinationals, endogenous growth and technology spillovers: Theory and evidence, *CEPR Discussion Paper*, no. 2155, London: Centre for Economic Policy Research.
- Barlow, D. and Radulescu, R. (2002), The Relationship between Policies and Growth in Transition Countries, *Economics of Transition*, 10(3), pp. 719-745.
- Barrios, S., Gorg, H. and Strobl, E. (2001), Explaining Firms' Export Behaviour: The Role of R&D and Spillovers, *GEP Research Paper*, no. 2001/27, University of Nottingham.
- Bassanini, A. and Scarpetta, S. (2000), Does Human Capital Matter for Growth in OECD Countries? A Pooled Mean-Group Approach, *Economics Letters*, 74(3), pp. 399-405.
- Bassanini, A., Scarpetta, S. and Hemmings, P. (2001), Economic Growth: The role of policies and institutions. Panel data evidence from OECD countries, *OECD Economics Department Working Paper*, no. 283, Paris: OECD.
- Benhabib, J. and Spiegel, M. (1994), The role of human capital in economic development: Evidence from aggregate cross-country data, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 34(2), pp. 143-173.
- Benhabib, M. and Spiegel, J. (2003), Human capital and technology diffusion, *Working Paper*, no. 2003/02, Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.



- Blomstrom, M. and Kokko, A. (1998), Foreign Investment as a Vehicle for International Technology Transfer, in: Navaretti, G.B. et al, (eds.), *Creation and transfer of knowledge: Institutions and incentives*, Heidelberg and New York: Springer, pp. 279-311.
- Boeri, T. (2000), *Structural change, welfare systems, and labour reallocation: Lessons from the transition of formerly planned economies*, New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Borensztein, E., De Gregorio, J. and Lee, J.W. (1998), How Does Foreign Direct Investment Affect Economic Growth?, *Journal of International Economics*, 45(1), pp. 115-135.
- Braconier, H., Ekholm, K. and Midelfart Knarvik, K.H. (2001), In Search of FDI-Transmitted R&D Spillovers: A Study Based on Swedish Data, *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv/Review of World Economics*, 137(4), pp. 644-665.
- Burda, M.C. (1998), The Consequences of EU Enlargement for Central and Eastern European Labor Markets, *CEPR Discussion Paper*, no. 1881, London: Centre for Economic Policy Research.
- Campos, N.F. and Coricelli, F. (2002), Growth in Transition: What We Know, What We Don't and What We Should, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 40(3), pp. 793-836.
- Campos, N.F. and Kinoshita, Y. (2002), Foreign Direct Investment as Technology Transferred: Some Panel Evidence from the Transition Economies, *William Davidson Institute Working Paper*, no. 438.
- Carkovic, M. and Levine, R. (2002), Does Foreign Direct Investment Accelerate Economic Growth?, *Working Paper*, University of Minnesota.
- Carmeci, G. and Mauro, L. (2002), The Convergence of the Italian Regions and Unemployment: Theory and Evidence, *Journal of Regional Science*, 42(3), pp. 509-532.
- Cheshire, P. and Magrini, S. (2000), Endogenous Processes in European Regional Growth: Convergence and Policy, *Growth and Change*, 31(4), pp. 455-79.
- Debabrata, D., Kelejian, H. and Prucha, I. (2003), Finite sample properties of estimators of spatial autoregressive models with autoregressive disturbances, *Papers in Regional Science* 82 (1), pp. 1-26.
- De Gregorio, J. (1992), Economic growth in Latin America, *Journal of Development Economics*, 39(1), pp. 59-84.
- de la Fuente, A. (1995), Catch-up, Growth and Convergence in the OECD, *CEPR Discussion Paper*, no. 1274, London: Centre for Economic Policy Research.
- de la Fuente, A. and Domenech, R. (2000), Human capital in growth regressions: How much difference does data quality make?, *CEPR Discussion Paper*, no. 2466, London: Centre for Economic Policy Research.


- de-la-Fuente, A. (1996), On the Sources of Convergence: A Close Look at the Spanish Regions, *CEPR Discussion Paper*, no. 1543, London: Centre for Economic Policy Research.
- Djankov, S. and Hoekman, B.M. (2000), Foreign Investment and Productivity Growth in Czech Enterprises, *World Bank Economic Review*, 14(1), pp. 49-64.
- Dobrinsky, R. (2001), Convergence in per capita income levels, productivity dynamics and real exchange rates in the candidate countries on the way to EU accession, *Interim Report*, no. IR-01-038, IIASA – International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg.
- Easterly, W. and Levine, R. (2001), It's Not Factor Accumulation: Stylized Facts and Growth Models, *World Bank Economic Review*, 15(2), pp. 177-219.
- Eurostat (2000), Educating young Europeans. Similarities and differences between the EU member states and the Phare countries, *Statistics in focus*, theme 3 – 14/2000.
- Fagerberg, J. and Verspagen B. (1996), Heading for Divergence? Regional Growth in Europe Reconsidered, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 34(3), pp. 431-448.
- Fagerberg, J., Verspagen, B. and Caniels, M. (1997), Technology, Growth and Unemployment across European Regions, *Regional Studies*, 31(5), pp. 457-466.
- Falcetti, E., Raiser, M. and Sanfey, P. (2002), Defying the Odds: Initial Conditions, Reforms, and Growth in the First Decade of Transition, *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 30(2), pp. 229-250.
- Fidrmuc, J. (2000), Liberalization, Democracy and Economic Performance during Transition, *ZEI Economic Policy Papers*, no. B05-2000, Bonn: Centre for European Integration Studies.
- Fingleton, B. (2001), Theoretical economic geography and spatial econometrics: dynamic perspectives, *Journal of Economic Geography*, 1, pp. 201-225
- Fischer, S., Sahay, R. and Vegh, C.A. (1998), How Far is Eastern Europe from Brussels? *IMF Working Paper*, no. 98/53, Washington: International Monetary Fund.
- Fosfuri, A., Motta, M. and Ronde, T. (2001), Foreign Direct Investment and Spillovers through Workers' Mobility, *Journal of International Economics*, 53(1), pp. 205-222.
- Funke, M. and Niebuhr, A. (2000), Spatial R&D spillovers and economic growth – Evidence from West Germany, *HWWA Discussion Paper*, no. 98, Hamburg, Hamburgisches Weltwirtschafts-Archiv.
- Gallup, J.L., Sachs, J.D. and Mellinger, A.D. (1998), Geography and Economic Development, *NBER Working Paper*, no. 6849, Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Havrylyshyn, O. and van Rooden, R. (2000), Institutions Matter in Transition, but so do Policies, *IMF Policy Working Paper*, no. 00/70, Washington: International Monetary Fund.

- Hernandez Cata, E. (1997), Liberalization and the Behavior of Output During the Transition From Plan to Market, *IMF Working Paper*, no. 97/53, Washington: International Monetary Fund.
- Hunya, G. (2002), Recent Impacts of Foreign Direct Investment on Growth and Restructuring in Central European Transition Countries, *WIIW Research Report*, no. 284, Vienna: WIIW.
- Jones, C.I. (1995), R&D-Based Models of Economic Growth, *Journal of Political Economy*, 103(4), pp. 759-784.
- Kelejian, H. and Prucha, I. (1998), A generalized two-stage least squares procedure for estimating a spatial autoregressive model with autoregressive disturbances, *Journal of Real State Finance and Economics*, 17, pp. 99-121.
- Keune, M. (2000), Employment problems and regional differences in Central and Eastern Europe: the need for local development initiatives, in: Petrakos, G., Maier, G. and Gorzelak, G. (eds.), *Integration and Transition in Europe*, Routledge.
- Kinoshita, Y. (2000), R&D and Technology Spillovers via FDI: Innovation and Absorptive Capacity, *William Davidson Institute Working Paper*, no. 349.
- Klazar, S., Sedmihradsky, M. and Vancurova, A. (2001), Returns of Education in the Czech Republic, *International Tax and Public Finance*, 8(4), pp. 609-620.
- Kosfeld, R., Eckey, H.F. and Creger, C. (2002), Regional Convergence in Unified Germany: A Spatial Econometric Perspective, *Volkswirtschaftliche Diskussionsbeiträge*, no. 41/02, Universität Kassel.
- Krugman, P. (1991), Increasing Returns and Economic Geography, *Journal of Political Economy*, 99(3), pp. 483-99.
- Lodde, S. (2000), Education and Growth: Some Disaggregate Evidence from the Italian Regions, *International Review of Economics and Business*, 47(2), pp. 267-293.
- Lucas, R.E. (1988), On the mechanics of economic development, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 22(1), pp. 3-42.
- Mankiw, G., Romer, D. and Weil, D. (1992), A contribution to the empirics of economic growth, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 107, pp. 407-437.
- Markusen, J.R. and Venables, A.J. (1999), Foreign Direct Investment as a Catalyst for Industrial Development, *European Economic Review*, 43(2), pp. 335-356.
- Nelson R, Phelps E (1966) Investment in humans, technological diffusion, and economic growth. *American Economic Review*, Papers and Proceedings, 61: 69-75
- Nemes-Nagy, J. (2000), The new regional structure in Hungary, in: Petrakos, G., Maier, G. And Gorzelak, G. (eds.), *Integration and Transition in Europe*, Routledge.

- Niebuhr, A. (2001), Convergence and the effects of spatial interaction, *Jahrbuch für Regionalwissenschaft*, 21, pp. 113-133.
- OECD, education at a glance, Paris, OECD, several years.
- Paci, R. and Pigliaru, F. (2001), Technological diffusion, spatial spillovers and regional convergence in Europe, *CRENoS Working Paper*, no. 01/01, University of Cagliari.
- Paci, R. and Usai, S. (2000), Externalities, knowledge spillovers and the spatial distribution of innovation, *GeoJournal*, 49(4), pp. 381-390.
- Paci, R., Pigliaru, F. and Pugno, M. (2001), Disparities In Economic Growth And Unemployment Across The European Regions: A Sectoral Perspective, *CRENoS Working Paper*, no. 01/3, University of Cagliari.
- Piazolo, D. (1999), Growth Effects of Institutional Change and European Integration, *Economic Systems*, 23(4), pp. 305-330.
- Pritchett, L. (1996), Where has all the education gone?, *World Bank Working Papers*, no. 1581.
- Resmini, L. (2000), The Determinants of Foreign Direct Investment in the CEECs: New Evidence from Sectoral Patterns, *Economics of Transition*, 8(3), pp. 665-689.
- Resmini, L. (2002), Specialization and Growth Patterns in Border Regions of Accession Countries, *ZEI Working Paper*, no. B17-2002, Bonn: Centre for European Integration studies.
- Rey, S. and Montouri, B. (1999), US regional income convergence: A spatial econometric perspective, *Regional Studies*, 33(2), pp. 145-156.
- Romer, P. (1990), Endogenous technological change, *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5), pp. S71-102.
- Sachs, J.D. and Warner, A. (1995), Economic convergence and economic policies, *NBER Working Paper*, no. 5039, Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Sala-i-Martin, X. (1997), I Just Ran Two Million Regressions, *American Economic Review*, 87(2), pp. 178-183.
- Schürmann, C. and Talaat, A. (2000), *Towards a European Peripherality Index. Final Report*, Report for General Directorate XVI Regional Policy of the European Commission, Dortmund: IRPUD.
- Temple, J. (1999), The New Growth Evidence, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 37(1), pp. 112-156.
- Tondl, G. (2001), *Convergence after divergence? Regional growth in Europe*, Springer, Wien, Heidelberg, New York: Springer.
- Traistaru, I. and Wolff, G.B. (2002), Regional Specialization and Employment Dynamics in Transition Countries, *ZEI Working Paper*, no. B18-2002, Bonn: Centre for European Integration Studies.

- Traistaru, I., Nijkamp, P. and Longhi, S. (2002), Regional Specialization and Concentration of Industrial Activity in Accession Countries, *ZEI Working Paper*, no. B16-2002, Bonn: Centre for European Integration Studies.
- van Pottelsberghe de la Potterie, B. and Lichtenberg, F. (2001), Does Foreign Direct Investment Transfer Technology across Borders?, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 83(3), pp. 490-497.
- Vanhoudt, P., Matha, T. and Smid, B. (2000), How Productive Are Capital Investments in Europe?, *EIB Papers*, 5(2), pp. 81-106.
- WIIW (2002), Countries in Transition 2002, *WIIW Handbook of Statistics*, Vienna: WIIW.

**Figure 1: Growth of gross value added per capita 1995-2000 and initial income of Eastern European regions**



**Table 1: Average growth of regional GVA p.c. in Eastern Europe 1995-2000 (in per cent)**

|                 | average | capital region | EU border regions | rest |
|-----------------|---------|----------------|-------------------|------|
| Czech Republic  | 0.2     | 4.1            | -0.7              | 0.0  |
| Hungary         | 4.2     | 5.7            | 7.1               | 3.3  |
| Poland          | 4.4     | 8.8            | 4.2               | 4.1  |
| Slovenia*       | 4.6     | -              | -                 | -    |
| Slovak Republic | 4.2     | 5.0            | 5.0               | 3.9  |

Notes: \* Slovenia: national level; data sources: see Appendix

**Table 2: Average regional investment rate in Eastern Europe 1996-2000 (in per cent of GVA)**

|                 | average | capital region | EU border regions | rest |
|-----------------|---------|----------------|-------------------|------|
| Czech Republic  | 31.7    | 43.7           | 30.8              | 29.3 |
| Hungary         | 22.7    | 27.4           | 24.2              | 21.4 |
| Poland          | 20.4    | 30.9           | 21.5              | 19.3 |
| Slovenia*       | 28.4    | -              | -                 | -    |
| Slovak Republic | 39.8    | 74.7           | 74.7              | 28.2 |

Notes: \* Slovenia: national level; data sources: see Appendix

**Table 3: Average regional FDI stocks in Eastern Europe 1996-2000 (in per cent of GVA)**

|                 | average | capital region | EU border regions | rest |
|-----------------|---------|----------------|-------------------|------|
| Czech Republic  | 26.2    | 59.5           | 21.7              | 21.3 |
| Hungary         | 32.3    | 69.3           | 35.8              | 24.2 |
| Poland          | 15.0    | 22.3           | 15.7              | 14.2 |
| Slovenia*       | 15.1    | -              | -                 | -    |
| Slovak Republic | 10.7    | 25.3           | 25.3              | 5.8  |

Notes: \* Slovenia: national level; data sources: see Appendix

**Table 4: Human capital and innovation in Eastern Europe regions 1996-2000**

| attainment rate - secondary level education (in per cent of total population) |         |                |                   |      |
|---|---------|----------------|-------------------|------|
|   | average | capital region | EU border regions | rest |
| Czech Republic  | 55.8    | 56.2           | 55.0              | 56.3 |
| Hungary   | 37.2    | 38.8           | 39.5              | 36.5 |
| Poland  | 43.7    | 44.9           | 44.8              | 43.3 |
| Slovenia*   | 43.3    | -              | -                 | -    |
| Slovak Republic   | 48.5    | 49.2           | 49.2              | 48.3 |
| attainment rate - higher level education (in per cent of total population)    |         |                |                   |      |
|   | average | capital region | EU border regions | rest |
| Czech Republic  | 6.6     | 14.9           | 5.6               | 5.2  |
| Hungary   | 7.0     | 12.1           | 6.8               | 6.0  |
| Poland  | 6.1     | 9.3            | 6.1               | 5.9  |
| Slovenia*   | 9.1     | -              | -                 | -    |
| Slovak Republic   | 7.0     | 15.3           | 15.3              | 4.3  |
| R%D expenditure (in per cent of GVA)  |         |                |                   |      |
|   | average | capital region | EU border regions | rest |
| Czech Republic  | 1.3     | 2.4            | 0.4               | 1.6  |
| Hungary   | 0.5     | 1.4            | 0.2               | 0.4  |
| Poland  | 0.5     | 1.8            | 0.3               | 0.5  |
| Slovenia*   | 1.6     | -              | -                 | -    |
| Slovak Republic   | 0.9     | 1.5            | 1.5               | 0.7  |

Notes: \* Slovenia: national level; data sources: see Appendix

**Table 5: estimation results - basic model**

|                     |           | dependant variable: $\ddot{A}y$ |           |         |           |         |           |         |  |
|---------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|--|
|                     | model (1) |                                 | model (2) |         | model (3) |         | model (4) |         |  |
| intercept           | -1.592    | (-1.09)                         | 0.247     | (0.08)  | -1.179    | (-1.04) | -1.194    | (-0.37) |  |
| inv                 | 0.079**   | (2.25)                          | 0.001     | (0.01)  | 0.115***  | (3.99)  | 0.019     | (0.45)  |  |
| $\ddot{A}part$      | 0.302**   | (2.24)                          | 0.103     | (0.79)  | 0.264**   | (2.45)  | 0.072     | (0.63)  |  |
| hc_m                |           |                                 | -0.055    | (-1.07) |           |         | -0.010    | (-0.16) |  |
| hc_h                |           |                                 | 0.427***  | (2.77)  |           |         | 0.482***  | (3.09)  |  |
| $\ddot{A}hc_m$      |           |                                 |           |         | 0.338**   | (2.33)  | 0.218     | (1.05)  |  |
| $\ddot{A}hc_h$      |           |                                 |           |         | -0.348*** | (-3.41) | -0.293*** | (-3.04) |  |
| lag $\ddot{A}y$     | 0.169***  | (3.41)                          | 0.157***  | (3.83)  | 0.140***  | (3.71)  | 0.138***  | (3.92)  |  |
| $\ddot{n}_2$        | 0.170     |                                 | 0.157     |         | 0.140     |         | 0.138     |         |  |
| z(I)                | 2.23      |                                 | 1.02      |         | 1.10      |         | 0.57      |         |  |
| LM <sub>ERR</sub>   | 2.60      |                                 | 0.15      |         | 0.19      |         | 0.00      |         |  |
| LM <sub>LAG</sub>   | 7.96***   |                                 | 7.43***   |         | 5.35**    |         | 7.41***   |         |  |
| adj. R <sup>2</sup> | 0.50      |                                 | 0.67      |         | 0.78      |         | 0.79      |         |  |
| no. obs.            | 36        |                                 | 36        |         | 36        |         | 36        |         |  |

Notes: estimated using the general spatial two stage least squares procedure given in Kelejian/Prucha 1998, t-statistics in parenthesis, z(I) is the standardized z-value of Moran's I, LM<sub>ERR</sub> is the Lagrange multiplier test for residual spatial autocorrelation, LM<sub>LAG</sub> is the Lagrange multiplier test for endogenous spatial lag, \*\*\* significant at the 1% level, \*\* significant at the 5% level, \* significant at the 10% level

**Table 6: estimation results - basic model and R&D**

|                     |           | dependant variable: $\ddot{A}y$ |           |         |           |         |           |         |  |
|---------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|---------|--|
|                     | model (3) |                                 | model (5) |         | model (6) |         | model (7) |         |  |
| intercept           | -1.179    | (-1.04)                         | -5.028    | (-1.68) | -0.614    | (-0.48) | -1.350    | (-1.18) |  |
| inv                 | 0.115***  | (3.99)                          | 0.092***  | (2.91)  | 0.065     | (1.56)  | 0.093***  | (2.86)  |  |
| $\ddot{A}part$      | 0.264**   | (2.45)                          | 0.192     | (1.64)  | 0.181     | (1.55)  | 0.240**   | (2.18)  |  |
| $\ddot{A}hc_m$      | 0.338**   | (2.33)                          | 0.271     | (1.53)  | 0.292*    | (1.83)  | 0.368**   | (2.40)  |  |
| $\ddot{A}hc_h$      | -0.348*** | (-3.41)                         | -0.293*** | (-3.10) | -0.324*** | (-3.34) | -0.354*** | (-3.51) |  |
| RD <sub>I</sub>     |           |                                 | 0.520     | (1.39)  |           |         |           |         |  |
| RD <sub>Is</sub>    |           |                                 |           |         | 0.872     | (1.52)  |           |         |  |
| RD <sub>e</sub>     |           |                                 |           |         |           |         | 0.703     | (1.32)  |  |
| lag $\ddot{A}y$     | 0.140***  | (3.71)                          | 0.140***  | (2.99)  | 0.140***  | (3.27)  | 0.150***  | (3.85)  |  |
| $\ddot{n}_2$        | 0.140     |                                 | 0.140     |         | 0.139     |         | 0.149     |         |  |
| z(I)                | 1.10      |                                 | 0.84      |         | 0.72      |         | 1.15      |         |  |
| LM <sub>ERR</sub>   | 0.19      |                                 | 0.06      |         | 0.01      |         | 0.26      |         |  |
| LM <sub>LAG</sub>   | 5.35**    |                                 | 4.14**    |         | 4.75**    |         | 5.90**    |         |  |
| adj. R <sup>2</sup> | 0.78      |                                 | 0.63      |         | 0.70      |         | 0.76      |         |  |
| no. obs.            | 36        |                                 | 36        |         | 36        |         | 36        |         |  |

Notes: estimated using the general spatial two stage least squares procedure given in Kelejian/Prucha 1998, t-statistics in parenthesis, z(I) is the standardized z-value of Moran's I, LM<sub>ERR</sub> is the Lagrange multiplier test for residual spatial autocorrelation, LM<sub>LAG</sub> is the Lagrange multiplier test for endogenous spatial lag, \*\*\* significant at the 1% level, \*\* significant at the 5% level, \* significant at the 10% level



**Table 7: estimation results - basic model and technology transfer**

| dependant variable: $\ddot{A}y$ |            |         |            |         |            |         |
|---------------------------------|------------|---------|------------|---------|------------|---------|
|                                 | model (8)  |         | model (9)  |         | model (10) |         |
| intercept                       | 1.4731     | (0.81)  | -1.3879    | (-1.28) | 1.8963     | (1.07)  |
| inv                             | 0.0990***  | (3.26)  | 0.0739     | (1.38)  | 0.1139***  | (4.01)  |
| $\ddot{A}part$                  | 0.1659     | (1.40)  | 0.2203*    | (1.90)  | 0.1655     | (1.49)  |
| $\ddot{A}hc\_m$                 | 0.1570     | (0.83)  | 0.2957*    | (1.94)  | 0.1498     | (0.93)  |
| $\ddot{A}hc\_h$                 | -0.2476*** | (-2.82) | -0.3387*** | (-3.12) | -0.2518*** | (-2.75) |
| GAP                             | -0.9773**  | (-2.07) |            |         |            |         |
| GAP*hc_h                        |            |         | 0.0820     | (1.02)  |            |         |
| GAP*hc_m                        |            |         |            |         | -0.0253**  | (-2.41) |
| lag $\ddot{A}y$                 | 0.1669***  | (3.42)  | 0.1370***  | (3.95)  | 0.1437***  | (3.48)  |
| $\ddot{n}_2$                    | 0.1669     |         | 0.1370     |         | 0.1437     |         |
| z(I)                            | 1.04       |         | 0.94       |         | 0.70       |         |
| LM <sub>ERR</sub>               | 0.19       |         | 0.94       |         | 0.01       |         |
| LM <sub>LAG</sub>               | 5.55**     |         | 5.43**     |         | 5.68**     |         |
| adj. R <sup>2</sup>             | 0.55       |         | 0.63       |         | 0.69       |         |
| no. obs.                        | 36         |         | 36         |         | 36         |         |

Notes: estimated using the general spatial two stage least squares procedure given in Kelejian/Prucha 1998, t-statistics in parenthesis, z(I) is the standardized z-value of Moran's I, LM<sub>ERR</sub> is the Lagrange multiplier test for residual spatial autocorrelation, LM<sub>LAG</sub> is the Lagrange multiplier test for endogenous spatial lag, \*\*\* significant at the 1% level, \*\* significant at the 5% level, \* significant at the 10% level

Table 8: estimation results - basic model and FDI

| dependant variable: $\dot{A}y$ |           |         |            |         |            |         |            |         |            |         |            |         |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|------------|---------|------------|---------|------------|---------|------------|---------|------------|---------|
|                                | model (3) |         | model (11) |         | model (12) |         | model (13) |         | model (14) |         | model (15) |         |
| intercept                      | -1.179    | (-1.04) | -2.162*    | (-1.73) | -0.945     | (-0.81) | -2.140*    | (-1.76) | -2.199*    | (-1.7)  | -2.2091*   | (-1.81) |
| inv                            | 0.115***  | (3.99)  | 0.081**    | (2.70)  | 0.063*     | (2.04)  | 0.081**    | (2.67)  | 0.073**    | (2.19)  | 0.0677     | (0.39)  |
| $\dot{A}part$                  | 0.264**   | (2.45)  | 0.136      | (1.20)  | 0.118      | (1.06)  | 0.159      | (1.41)  | 0.123      | (1.06)  | 0.1313     | (1.05)  |
| $\dot{A}hc\_m$                 | 0.338**   | (2.33)  | 0.086      | (0.51)  | 0.126      | (0.77)  | 0.215      | (1.38)  | 0.081      | (0.44)  | 0.1106     | (0.65)  |
| $\dot{A}hc\_h$                 | -0.348*** | (-3.41) | -0.280***  | (-3.19) | -0.292***  | (-3.46) | -0.314***  | (-3.42) | -0.268***  | (-3.07) | -0.2969*** | (-3.16) |
| FDI_s                          |           |         | 5.819**    | (2.63)  |            |         |            |         | 5.565**    | (2.35)  | 5.3801**   | (2.36)  |
| hc_h*FDI_s                     |           |         |            |         | 4.832***   | (3.04)  |            |         |            |         |            |         |
| hc_m*FDI_s                     |           |         |            |         |            |         | 1.169**    | (2.39)  |            |         |            |         |
| RD_e                           |           |         |            |         |            |         |            |         | 0.278      | (0.54)  |            |         |
| GAP*hc_h                       |           |         |            |         |            |         |            |         |            |         | 0.0339     | (0.47)  |
| lag $\dot{A}y$                 | 0.140***  | (3.71)  | 0.198***   | (4.36)  | 0.178***   | (4.20)  | 0.195***   | (4.43)  | 0.202***   | (4.27)  | 0.1917***  | (4.42)  |
| $\bar{u}_2$                    | 0.140     |         | 0.197      |         | 0.179      |         | 0.195      |         | 0.202      |         | 0.1918     |         |
| z(I)                           | 1.10      |         | 1.82       |         | 1.72       |         | 1.69       |         | 1.75       |         | 1.71       |         |
| LM <sub>ERR</sub>              | 0.19      |         | 1.04       |         | 0.94       |         | 0.79       |         | 1.02       |         | 0.92       |         |
| LM <sub>LAG</sub>              | 5.35**    |         | 7.80***    |         | 8.04***    |         | 7.48***    |         | 7.84***    |         | 7.87***    |         |
| adj. R <sup>2</sup>            | 0.78      |         | 0.65       |         | 0.66       |         | 0.71       |         | 0.61       |         | 0.71       |         |
| no. obs.                       | 36        |         | 36         |         | 36         |         | 36         |         | 36         |         | 36         |         |

Notes: estimated using the general spatial two stage least squares procedure given in Kelejian/Prucha 1998, t-statistics in parenthesis, z(I) is the standardized z-value of Moran's I, LM<sub>ERR</sub> is the Lagrange multiplier test for residual spatial autocorrelation, LM<sub>LAG</sub> is the Lagrange multiplier test for endogenous spatial lag, \*\*\* significant at the 1% level, \*\* significant at the 5% level, \* significant at the 10% level.

**Table 9: estimation results - basic model with geographical factors**

| dependant variable: $\ddot{A}y$ |            |         |            |         |            |         |            |         |            |         |
|---------------------------------|------------|---------|------------|---------|------------|---------|------------|---------|------------|---------|
|                                 | model (16) |         | model (17) |         | model (18) |         | model (19) |         | model (20) |         |
| intercept                       | -1.592     | (-1.09) | -1.966     | (-1.17) | -1.644     | (-1.06) | -2.282*    | (-1.72) | -0.1708    | (-0.12) |
| inv                             | 0.079**    | (2.25)  | 0.100**    | (2.56)  | 0.085**    | (2.43)  | 0.074**    | (2.21)  | -0.0052    | (-0.14) |
| $\ddot{A}part$                  | 0.302**    | (2.24)  | 0.275*     | (2.00)  | 0.316**    | (2.37)  | 0.316**    | (2.49)  | 0.1208     | (1.01)  |
| $\ddot{A}hc\_m$                 |            |         |            |         |            |         |            |         |            |         |
| $\ddot{A}hc\_h$                 |            |         |            |         |            |         |            |         |            |         |
| FDI_s                           |            |         |            |         |            |         |            |         |            |         |
| access_GDP                      |            |         | -0.047     | (-0.49) |            |         |            |         |            |         |
| access_POP                      |            |         |            |         | -0.015     | (-0.37) |            |         |            |         |
| EU_border                       |            |         |            |         |            |         | 0.929      | (1.21)  |            |         |
| capital                         |            |         |            |         |            |         |            |         | 3.5282***  | (3.67)  |
| lag $\ddot{A}y$                 | 0.169***   | (3.41)  | 0.196***   | (4.28)  | 0.187***   | (3.74)  | 0.204***   | (4.49)  | 0.1934***  | (3.90)  |
| $\bar{n}_2$                     | 0.170      |         | 0.196      |         | 0.187      |         | 0.204      |         | 0.1934     |         |
| z(I)                            | 2.23       |         | 1.77       |         | 2.59       |         | 2.46       |         | 3.02       |         |
| LM <sub>ERR</sub>               | 2.60       |         | 1.25       |         | 3.02*      |         | 3.05*      |         | 5.57       |         |
| LM <sub>LAG</sub>               | 7.96***    |         | 6.74***    |         | 7.10***    |         | 8.48***    |         | 11.63***   |         |
| adj. R <sup>2</sup>             | 0.50       |         | 0.56       |         | 0.55       |         | 0.61       |         | 0.50       |         |
| no. obs.                        | 36         |         | 36         |         | 36         |         | 36         |         | 36         |         |

Notes: estimated using the general spatial two stage least squares procedure given in Kelejian/Prucha 1998, t-statistics in parenthesis, z(I) is the standardized z-value of Moran's I, LM<sub>ERR</sub> is the Lagrange multiplier test for residual spatial autocorrelation, LM<sub>LAG</sub> is the Lagrange multiplier test for endogenous spatial lag, \*\*\* significant at the 1% level, \*\* significant at the 5% level, \* significant at the 10% level

**Table 10: estimation results - extended model with geographical factors**

| dependant variable: $\ddot{A}y$ |            |         |            |         |            |         |            |         |
|---------------------------------|------------|---------|------------|---------|------------|---------|------------|---------|
|                                 | model (20) |         | model (21) |         | model (22) |         | model (23) |         |
| intercept                       | -1.735     | (-1.17) | -1.136     | (-0.80) | -2.757**   | (-2.32) | -1.309     | (-1.07) |
| i                               | 0.090**    | (2.66)  | 0.093***   | (3.07)  | 0.066**    | (2.18)  | 0.014      | (0.41)  |
| $\ddot{A}part$                  | 0.119      | (0.99)  | 0.130      | (1.16)  | 0.131      | (1.21)  | 0.066      | (0.65)  |
| $\ddot{A}hc\_m$                 | 0.091      | (0.53)  | 0.015      | (0.09)  | 0.083      | (0.53)  | 0.131      | (0.91)  |
| $\ddot{A}hc\_h$                 | -0.281***  | (-3.13) | -0.309***  | (-3.43) | -0.287***  | (-3.13) | -0.260***  | (-3.11) |
| FDI_s                           | 5.883**    | (2.61)  | 5.622**    | (2.54)  | 6.578**    | (2.87)  | 3.392      | (1.41)  |
| access_GDP                      | -0.045     | (-0.54) |            |         |            |         |            |         |
| access_POP                      |            |         | -0.055     | (-1.40) |            |         |            |         |
| EU_border                       |            |         |            |         | 1.295*     | (1.99)  | 1.509**    | (2.54)  |
| capital                         |            |         |            |         |            |         | 2.650**    | (2.63)  |
| lag $\ddot{A}y$                 | 0.191***   | (4.12)  | 0.226***   | (4.59)  | 0.229***   | (4.97)  | 0.227***   | (5.46)  |
| $\bar{n}_2$                     | 0.191      |         | 0.226      |         | 0.229      |         | 0.227      |         |
| z(I)                            | 1.73       |         | 1.92       |         | 1.91       |         | 1.71       |         |
| LM <sub>ERR</sub>               | 0.73       |         | 0.91       |         | 0.99       |         | 0.69       |         |
| LM <sub>LAG</sub>               | 7.14***    |         | 7.20***    |         | 8.12***    |         | 9.93***    |         |
| adj. R <sup>2</sup>             | 0.66       |         | 0.70       |         | 0.77       |         | 0.81       |         |
| no. obs.                        | 36         |         | 36         |         | 36         |         | 36         |         |

Notes: estimated using the general spatial two stage least squares procedure given in Kelejian/Prucha 1998, t-statistics in parenthesis, z(I) is the standardized z-value of Moran's I, LM<sub>ERR</sub> is the Lagrange multiplier test for residual spatial autocorrelation, LM<sub>LAG</sub> is the Lagrange multiplier test for endogenous spatial lag, \*\*\* significant at the 1% level, \*\* significant at the 5% level, \* significant at the 10% level

|             |   |   |
|-------------|---|---|
| <b>2008</b> |   |   |
| B01-08      | <b>Euro-Diplomatie durch gemeinsame „Wirtschaftsregierung“</b>  | <i>Martin Seidel</i>                                    |
| <b>2007</b> |   |   |
| B03-07      | <b>Löhne und Steuern im Systemwettbewerb der Mitgliedstaaten der Europäischen Union</b>   | <i>Martin Seidel</i>                                    |
| B02-07      | <b>Konsolidierung und Reform der Europäischen Union</b>   | <i>Martin Seidel</i>                                    |
| B01-07      | <b>The Ratification of European Treaties - Legal and Constitutional Basis of a European Referendum.</b>                         | <i>Martin Seidel</i>                                    |
| <b>2006</b> |   |   |
| B03-06      | <b>Financial Frictions, Capital Reallocation, and Aggregate Fluctuations</b>  | <i>Jürgen von Hagen, Haiping Zhang</i>                  |
| B02-06      | <b>Financial Openness and Macroeconomic Volatility</b>  | <i>Jürgen von Hagen, Haiping Zhang</i>                  |
| B01-06      | <b>A Welfare Analysis of Capital Account Liberalization</b>   | <i>Jürgen von Hagen, Haiping Zhang</i>                  |
| <b>2005</b> |   |   |
| B11-05      | <b>Das Kompetenz- und Entscheidungssystem des Vertrages von Rom im Wandel seiner Funktion und Verfassung</b>                    | <i>Martin Seidel</i>                                    |
| B10-05      | <b>Die Schutzklauseln der Beitrittsverträge</b>   | <i>Martin Seidel</i>                                    |
| B09-05      | <b>Measuring Tax Burdens in Europe</b>  | <i>Guntram B. Wolff</i>                                 |
| B08-05      | <b>Remittances as Investment in the Absence of Altruism</b>   | <i>Gabriel González-König</i>                           |
| B07-05      | <b>Economic Integration in a Multicore World?</b>   | <i>Christian Volpe Martinicus, Jennifer Pédussel Wu</i> |
| B06-05      | <b>Banking Sector (Under?)Development in Central and Eastern Europe</b>   | <i>Jürgen von Hagen, Valeriya Dinger</i>                |
| B05-05      | <b>Regulatory Standards Can Lead to Predation</b>   | <i>Stefan Lutz</i>                                      |
| B04-05      | <b>Währungspolitik als Sozialpolitik</b>  | <i>Martin Seidel</i>                                    |
| B03-05      | <b>Public Education in an Integrated Europe: Studying to Migrate and Teaching to Stay?</b>                                      | <i>Panu Poutvaara</i>                                   |
| B02-05      | <b>Voice of the Diaspora: An Analysis of Migrant Voting Behavior</b>  | <i>Jan Fidrmuc, Orla Doyle</i>                          |
| B01-05      | <b>Macroeconomic Adjustment in the New EU Member States</b>   | <i>Jürgen von Hagen, Iulia Traistaru</i>                |
| <b>2004</b> |   |   |
| B33-04      | <b>The Effects of Transition and Political Instability On Foreign Direct Investment Inflows: Central Europe and the Balkans</b> | <i>Josef C. Brada, Ali M. Kutan, Tanner M. Yigit</i>    |
| B32-04      | <b>The Choice of Exchange Rate Regimes in Developing Countries: A Multinomial Panel Analysis</b>                                | <i>Jürgen von Hagen, Jizhong Zhou</i>                   |
| B31-04      | <b>Fear of Floating and Fear of Pegging: An Empirical Analysis of De Facto Exchange Rate Regimes in Developing Countries</b>    | <i>Jürgen von Hagen, Jizhong Zhou</i>                   |
| B30-04      | <b>Der Vollzug von Gemeinschaftsrecht über die Mitgliedstaaten und seine Rolle für die EU und den Beitrittsprozess</b>          | <i>Martin Seidel</i>                                    |
| B29-04      | <b>Deutschlands Wirtschaft, seine Schulden und die Unzulänglichkeiten der einheitlichen Geldpolitik im Eurosystem</b>           | <i>Dieter Spethmann, Otto Steiger</i>                   |
| B28-04      | <b>Fiscal Crises in U.S. Cities: Structural and Non-structural Causes</b>   | <i>Guntram B. Wolff</i>                                 |
| B27-04      | <b>Firm Performance and Privatization in Ukraine</b>  | <i>Galyna Grygorenko, Stefan Lutz</i>                   |
| B26-04      | <b>Analyzing Trade Opening in Ukraine: Effects of a Customs Union with the EU</b>   | <i>Oksana Harbuzyuk, Stefan Lutz</i>                    |
| B25-04      | <b>Exchange Rate Risk and Convergence to the Euro</b>   | <i>Lucjan T. Orlowski</i>                               |
| B24-04      | <b>The Endogeneity of Money and the Eurosystem</b>  | <i>Otto Steiger</i>                                     |
| B23-04      | <b>Which Lender of Last Resort for the Eurosystem?</b>  | <i>Otto Steiger</i>                                     |
| B22-04      | <b>Non-Discretionary Monetary Policy: The Answer for Transition Economies?</b>  | <i>Elham-Mafi Kreft, Steven F. Kreft</i>                |
| B21-04      | <b>The Effectiveness of Subsidies Revisited: Accounting for Wage and Employment Effects in Business R+D</b>                     | <i>Volker Reinthaler, Guntram B. Wolff</i>              |
| B20-04      | <b>Money Market Pressure and the Determinants of Banking Crises</b>   | <i>Jürgen von Hagen, Tai-kuang Ho</i>                   |
| B19-04      | <b>Die Stellung der Europäischen Zentralbank nach dem Verfassungsvertrag</b>  | <i>Martin Seidel</i>                                    |

|             |  |  |
|-------------|--|--|
| B18-04      | <b>Transmission Channels of Business Cycles Synchronization in an Enlarged EMU</b>   | <i>Iulia Traistaru</i>   |
| B17-04      | <b>Foreign Exchange Regime, the Real Exchange Rate and Current Account Sustainability: The Case of Turkey</b>  | <i>Sübidey Togan, Hasan Ersel</i>                                    |
| B16-04      | <b>Does It Matter Where Immigrants Work? Traded Goods, Non-traded Goods, and Sector Specific Employment</b>  | <i>Harry P. Bowen, Jennifer Pédussel Wu</i>                          |
| B15-04      | <b>Do Economic Integration and Fiscal Competition Help to Explain Local Patterns?</b>  | <i>Christian Volpe Martincus</i>                                     |
| B14-04      | <b>Euro Adoption and Maastricht Criteria: Rules or Discretion?</b>   | <i>Jiri Jonas</i>  |
| B13-04      | <b>The Role of Electoral and Party Systems in the Development of Fiscal Institutions in the Central and Eastern European Countries</b>                       | <i>Sami Yläoutinen</i>   |
| B12-04      | <b>Measuring and Explaining Levels of Regional Economic Integration</b>  | <i>Jennifer Pédussel Wu</i>  |
| B11-04      | <b>Economic Integration and Location of Manufacturing Activities: Evidence from MERCOSUR</b>   | <i>Pablo Sanguinetti, Iulia Traistaru, Christian Volpe Martincus</i> |
| B10-04      | <b>Economic Integration and Industry Location in Transition Countries</b>  | <i>Laura Resmini</i>   |
| B09-04      | <b>Testing Creditor Moral Hazard in Sovereign Bond Markets: A Unified Theoretical Approach and Empirical Evidence</b>  | <i>Ayse Y. Evrensel, Ali M. Kutan</i>                                |
| B08-04      | <b>European Integration, Productivity Growth and Real Convergence</b>  | <i>Taner M. Yigit, Ali M. Kutan</i>                                  |
| B07-04      | <b>The Contribution of Income, Social Capital, and Institutions to Human Well-being in Africa</b>  | <i>Mina Baliamoune-Lutz, Stefan H. Lutz</i>                          |
| B06-04      | <b>Rural Urban Inequality in Africa: A Panel Study of the Effects of Trade Liberalization and Financial Deepening</b>  | <i>Mina Baliamoune-Lutz, Stefan H. Lutz</i>                          |
| B05-04      | <b>Money Rules for the Eurozone Candidate Countries</b>  | <i>Lucjan T. Orłowski</i>  |
| B04-04      | <b>Who is in Favor of Enlargement? Determinants of Support for EU Membership in the Candidate Countries' Referenda</b>                                       | <i>Orla Doyle, Jan Fidrmuc</i>                                       |
| B03-04      | <b>Over- and Underbidding in Central Bank Open Market Operations Conducted as Fixed Rate Tender</b>  | <i>Ulrich Bindseil</i>   |
| B02-04      | <b>Total Factor Productivity and Economic Freedom Implications for EU Enlargement</b>  | <i>Ronald L. Moomaw, Euy Seok Yang</i>                               |
| B01-04      | <b>Die neuen Schutzklauseln der Artikel 38 und 39 des Beitrittsvertrages: Schutz der alten Mitgliedstaaten vor Störungen durch die neuen Mitgliedstaaten</b> | <i>Martin Seidel</i>   |
| <b>2003</b> |  |  |
| B29-03      | <b>Macroeconomic Implications of Low Inflation in the Euro Area</b>  | <i>Jürgen von Hagen, Boris Hofmann</i>                               |
| B28-03      | <b>The Effects of Transition and Political Instability on Foreign Direct Investment: Central Europe and the Balkans</b>                                      | <i>Josef C. Brada, Ali M. Kutan, Taner M. Yigit</i>                  |
| B27-03      | <b>The Performance of the Euribor Futures Market: Efficiency and the Impact of ECB Policy Announcements (Electronic Version of International Finance)</b>    | <i>Kerstin Bernoth, Juergen von Hagen</i>                            |
| B26-03      | <b>Sovereign Risk Premia in the European Government Bond Market (überarbeitete Version zum Herunterladen)</b>  | <i>Kerstin Bernoth, Juergen von Hagen, Ludger Schulknecht</i>        |
| B25-03      | <b>How Flexible are Wages in EU Accession Countries?</b>   | <i>Anna Iara, Iulia Traistaru</i>                                    |
| B24-03      | <b>Monetary Policy Reaction Functions: ECB versus Bundesbank</b>   | <i>Bernd Hayo, Boris Hofmann</i>                                     |
| B23-03      | <b>Economic Integration and Manufacturing Concentration Patterns: Evidence from Mercosur</b>   | <i>Iulia Traistaru, Christian Volpe Martincus</i>                    |
| B22-03      | <b>Reformzwänge innerhalb der EU angesichts der Osterweiterung</b>   | <i>Martin Seidel</i>   |
| B21-03      | <b>Reputation Flows: Contractual Disputes and the Channels for Inter-Firm Communication</b>  | <i>William Pyle</i>  |
| B20-03      | <b>Urban Primacy, Gigantism, and International Trade: Evidence from Asia and the Americas</b>  | <i>Ronald L. Moomaw, Mohammed A. Alwosabi</i>                        |
| B19-03      | <b>An Empirical Analysis of Competing Explanations of Urban Primacy Evidence from Asia and the Americas</b>  | <i>Ronald L. Moomaw, Mohammed A. Alwosabi</i>                        |

|             |   |  |
|-------------|---|--|
| B18-03      | <b>The Effects of Regional and Industry-Wide FDI Spillovers on Export of Ukrainian Firms</b>  | <i>Stefan H. Lutz, Oleksandr Talavera, Sang-Min Park</i> |
| B17-03      | <b>Determinants of Inter-Regional Migration in the Baltic States</b>  | <i>Mihails Hazans</i>                                    |
| B16-03      | <b>South-East Europe: Economic Performance, Perspectives, and Policy Challenges</b>   | <i>Iulia Traistaru, Jürgen von Hagen</i>                 |
| B15-03      | <b>Employed and Unemployed Search: The Marginal Willingness to Pay for Attributes in Lithuania, the US and the Netherlands</b>            | <i>Jos van Ommeren, Mihails Hazans</i>                   |
| B14-03      | <b>FICs and Economic Activity: Some International Evidence</b>  | <i>Charles Goodhart, Boris Hofmann</i>                   |
| B13-03      | <b>The IS Curve and the Transmission of Monetary Policy: Is there a Puzzle?</b>   | <i>Charles Goodhart, Boris Hofmann</i>                   |
| B12-03      | <b>What Makes Regions in Eastern Europe Catching Up? The Role of Foreign Investment, Human Resources, and Geography</b>                   | <i>Gabriele Tondl, Goran Vuksic</i>                      |
| B11-03      | <b>Die Weisungs- und Herrschaftsmacht der Europäischen Zentralbank im europäischen System der Zentralbanken - eine rechtliche Analyse</b> | <i>Martin Seidel</i>                                     |
| B10-03      | <b>Foreign Direct Investment and Perceptions of Vulnerability to Foreign Exchange Crises: Evidence from Transition Economies</b>          | <i>Josef C. Brada, Vladimír Tomsík</i>                   |
| B09-03      | <b>The European Central Bank and the Eurosystem: An Analysis of the Missing Central Monetary Institution in European Monetary Union</b>   | <i>Gunnar Heinsohn, Otto Steiger</i>                     |
| B08-03      | <b>The Determination of Capital Controls: Which Role Do Exchange Rate Regimes Play?</b>   | <i>Jürgen von Hagen, Jizhong Zhou</i>                    |
| B07-03      | <b>Nach Nizza und Stockholm: Stand des Binnenmarktes und Prioritäten für die Zukunft</b>  | <i>Martin Seidel</i>                                     |
| B06-03      | <b>Fiscal Discipline and Growth in Euroland. Experiences with the Stability and Growth Pact</b>   | <i>Jürgen von Hagen</i>                                  |
| B05-03      | <b>Reconsidering the Evidence: Are Eurozone Business Cycles Converging?</b>   | <i>Michael Massmann, James Mitchell</i>                  |
| B04-03      | <b>Do Ukrainian Firms Benefit from FDI?</b>   | <i>Stefan H. Lutz, Oleksandr Talavera</i>                |
| B03-03      | <b>Europäische Steuerkoordination und die Schweiz</b>   | <i>Stefan H. Lutz</i>                                    |
| B02-03      | <b>Commuting in the Baltic States: Patterns, Determinants, and Gains</b>  | <i>Mihails Hazans</i>                                    |
| B01-03      | <b>Die Wirtschafts- und Währungsunion im rechtlichen und politischen Gefüge der Europäischen Union</b>                                    | <i>Martin Seidel</i>                                     |
| <b>2002</b> |   |  |
| B30-02      | <b>An Adverse Selection Model of Optimal Unemployment Assurance</b>   | <i>Marcus Hagedorn, Ashok Kaul, Tim Mennel</i>           |
| B29B-02     | <b>Trade Agreements as Self-protection</b>  | <i>Jennifer Pédussel Wu</i>                              |
| B29A-02     | <b>Growth and Business Cycles with Imperfect Credit Markets</b>   | <i>Debajyoti Chakrabarty</i>                             |
| B28-02      | <b>Inequality, Politics and Economic Growth</b>   | <i>Debajyoti Chakrabarty</i>                             |
| B27-02      | <b>Poverty Traps and Growth in a Model of Endogenous Time Preference</b>  | <i>Debajyoti Chakrabarty</i>                             |
| B26-02      | <b>Monetary Convergence and Risk Premiums in the EU Candidate Countries</b>   | <i>Lucjan T. Orlowski</i>                                |
| B25-02      | <b>Trade Policy: Institutional Vs. Economic Factors</b>   | <i>Stefan Lutz</i>                                       |
| B24-02      | <b>The Effects of Quotas on Vertical Intra-industry Trade</b>   | <i>Stefan Lutz</i>                                       |
| B23-02      | <b>Legal Aspects of European Economic and Monetary Union</b>  | <i>Martin Seidel</i>                                     |
| B22-02      | <b>Der Staat als Lender of Last Resort - oder: Die Achillesverse des Eurosystems</b>  | <i>Otto Steiger</i>                                      |
| B21-02      | <b>Nominal and Real Stochastic Convergence Within the Transition Economies and to the European Union: Evidence from Panel Data</b>        | <i>Ali M. Kutan, Taner M. Yigit</i>                      |
| B20-02      | <b>The Impact of News, Oil Prices, and International Spillovers on Russian Financial Markets</b>  | <i>Bernd Hayo, Ali M. Kutan</i>                          |

|             |   |  |
|-------------|---|--|
| B19-02      | <b>East Germany: Transition with Unification, Experiments and Experiences</b>   | <i>Jürgen von Hagen, Rolf R. Strauch, Guntram B. Wolff</i>   |
| B18-02      | <b>Regional Specialization and Employment Dynamics in Transition Countries</b>  | <i>Iulia Traistaru, Guntram B. Wolff</i>                     |
| B17-02      | <b>Specialization and Growth Patterns in Border Regions of Accession Countries</b>  | <i>Laura Resmini</i>   |
| B16-02      | <b>Regional Specialization and Concentration of Industrial Activity in Accession Countries</b>  | <i>Iulia Traistaru, Peter Nijkamp, Simonetta Longhi</i>      |
| B15-02      | <b>Does Broad Money Matter for Interest Rate Policy?</b>  | <i>Matthias Brückner, Andreas Schaber</i>                    |
| B14-02      | <b>The Long and Short of It: Global Liberalization, Poverty and Inequality</b>  | <i>Christian E. Weller, Adam Hersch</i>                      |
| B13-02      | <b>De Facto and Official Exchange Rate Regimes in Transition Economies</b>  | <i>Jürgen von Hagen, Jizhong Zhou</i>                        |
| B12-02      | <b>Argentina: The Anatomy of A Crisis</b>   | <i>Jiri Jonas</i>  |
| B11-02      | <b>The Eurosystem and the Art of Central Banking</b>  | <i>Gunnar Heinsohn, Otto Steiger</i>                         |
| B10-02      | <b>National Origins of European Law: Towards an Autonomous System of European Law?</b>  | <i>Martin Seidel</i>   |
| B09-02      | <b>Monetary Policy in the Euro Area - Lessons from the First Years</b>  | <i>Volker Clausen, Bernd Hayo</i>                            |
| B08-02      | <b>Has the Link Between the Spot and Forward Exchange Rates Broken Down? Evidence From Rolling Cointegration Tests</b>                                    | <i>Ali M. Kutan, Su Zhou</i>                                 |
| B07-02      | <b>Perspektiven der Erweiterung der Europäischen Union</b>  | <i>Martin Seidel</i>   |
| B06-02      | <b>Is There Asymmetry in Forward Exchange Rate Bias? Multi-Country Evidence</b>   | <i>Su Zhou, Ali M. Kutan</i>                                 |
| B05-02      | <b>Real and Monetary Convergence Within the European Union and Between the European Union and Candidate Countries: A Rolling Cointegration Approach</b>   | <i>Josef C. Brada, Ali M. Kutan, Su Zhou</i>                 |
| B04-02      | <b>Asymmetric Monetary Policy Effects in EMU</b>  | <i>Volker Clausen, Bernd Hayo</i>                            |
| B03-02      | <b>The Choice of Exchange Rate Regimes: An Empirical Analysis for Transition Economies</b>  | <i>Jürgen von Hagen, Jizhong Zhou</i>                        |
| B02-02      | <b>The Euro System and the Federal Reserve System Compared: Facts and Challenges</b>  | <i>Karlheinz Ruckriegel, Franz Seitz</i>                     |
| B01-02      | <b>Does Inflation Targeting Matter?</b>   | <i>Manfred J. M. Neumann, Jürgen von Hagen</i>               |
| <b>2001</b> |   |  |
| B29-01      | <b>Is Kazakhstan Vulnerable to the Dutch Disease?</b>   | <i>Karlygash Kuralbayeva, Ali M. Kutan, Michael L. Wyzan</i> |
| B28-01      | <b>Political Economy of the Nice Treaty: Rebalancing the EU Council. The Future of European Agricultural Policies</b>                                     | <i>Deutsch-Französisches Wirtschaftspolitisches Forum</i>    |
| B27-01      | <b>Investor Panic, IMF Actions, and Emerging Stock Market Returns and Volatility: A Panel Investigation</b>   | <i>Bernd Hayo, Ali M. Kutan</i>                              |
| B26-01      | <b>Regional Effects of Terrorism on Tourism: Evidence from Three Mediterranean Countries</b>  | <i>Konstantinos Drakos, Ali M. Kutan</i>                     |
| B25-01      | <b>Monetary Convergence of the EU Candidates to the Euro: A Theoretical Framework and Policy Implications</b>   | <i>Lucjan T. Orłowski</i>                                    |
| B24-01      | <b>Disintegration and Trade</b>   | <i>Jarko and Jan Fidrmuc</i>                                 |
| B23-01      | <b>Migration and Adjustment to Shocks in Transition Economies</b>   | <i>Jan Fidrmuc</i>   |
| B22-01      | <b>Strategic Delegation and International Capital Taxation</b>  | <i>Matthias Brückner</i>                                     |
| B21-01      | <b>Balkan and Mediterranean Candidates for European Union Membership: The Convergence of Their Monetary Policy With That of the European Central Bank</b> | <i>Josef C. Brada, Ali M. Kutan</i>                          |
| B20-01      | <b>An Empirical Inquiry of the Efficiency of Intergovernmental Transfers for Water Projects Based on the WRDA Data</b>                                    | <i>Anna Rubinchik-Pessach</i>                                |
| B19-01      | <b>Detrending and the Money-Output Link: International Evidence</b>   | <i>R.W. Hafer, Ali M. Kutan</i>                              |

|             |  |  |
|-------------|--|--|
| B18-01      | <b>Monetary Policy in Unknown Territory. The European Central Bank in the Early Years</b>  | <i>Jürgen von Hagen, Matthias Brückner</i>                               |
| B17-01      | <b>Executive Authority, the Personal Vote, and Budget Discipline in Latin American and Caribbean Countries</b>   | <i>Mark Hallerberg, Patrick Marier</i>                                   |
| B16-01      | <b>Sources of Inflation and Output Fluctuations in Poland and Hungary: Implications for Full Membership in the European Union</b>                                  | <i>Selahattin Dibooglu, Ali M. Kutan</i>                                 |
| B15-01      | <b>Programs Without Alternative: Public Pensions in the OECD</b>   | <i>Christian E. Weller</i>   |
| B14-01      | <b>Formal Fiscal Restraints and Budget Processes As Solutions to a Deficit and Spending Bias in Public Finances - U.S. Experience and Possible Lessons for EMU</b> | <i>Rolf R. Strauch, Jürgen von Hagen</i>                                 |
| B13-01      | <b>German Public Finances: Recent Experiences and Future Challenges</b>  | <i>Jürgen von Hagen, Rolf R. Strauch</i>                                 |
| B12-01      | <b>The Impact of Eastern Enlargement On EU-Labour Markets. Pensions Reform Between Economic and Political Problems</b>   | <i>Deutsch-Französisches Wirtschaftspolitisches Forum</i>                |
| B11-01      | <b>Inflationary Performance in a Monetary Union With Large Wage Setters</b>  | <i>Lilia Cavallar</i>  |
| B10-01      | <b>Integration of the Baltic States into the EU and Institutions of Fiscal Convergence: A Critical Evaluation of Key Issues and Empirical Evidence</b>             | <i>Ali M. Kutan, Niina Pautola-Mol</i>                                   |
| B09-01      | <b>Democracy in Transition Economies: Grease or Sand in the Wheels of Growth?</b>  | <i>Jan Fidrmuc</i>   |
| B08-01      | <b>The Functioning of Economic Policy Coordination</b>   | <i>Jürgen von Hagen, Susanne Mundschenk</i>                              |
| B07-01      | <b>The Convergence of Monetary Policy Between Candidate Countries and the European Union</b>   | <i>Josef C. Brada, Ali M. Kutan</i>                                      |
| B06-01      | <b>Opposites Attract: The Case of Greek and Turkish Financial Markets</b>  | <i>Konstantinos Drakos, Ali M. Kutan</i>                                 |
| B05-01      | <b>Trade Rules and Global Governance: A Long Term Agenda. The Future of Banking.</b>   | <i>Deutsch-Französisches Wirtschaftspolitisches Forum</i>                |
| B04-01      | <b>The Determination of Unemployment Benefits</b>  | <i>Rafael di Tella, Robert J. McCulloch</i>                              |
| B03-01      | <b>Preferences Over Inflation and Unemployment: Evidence from Surveys of Happiness</b>   | <i>Rafael di Tella, Robert J. McCulloch, Andrew J. Oswald</i>            |
| B02-01      | <b>The Konstanz Seminar on Monetary Theory and Policy at Thirty</b>  | <i>Michele Fratianni, Jürgen von Hagen</i>                               |
| B01-01      | <b>Divided Boards: Partisanship Through Delegated Monetary Policy</b>  | <i>Etienne Farvaque, Gael Lagadec</i>                                    |
| <b>2000</b> |  |  |
| B20-00      | <b>Breakin-up a Nation, From the Inside</b>  | <i>Etienne Farvaque</i>  |
| B19-00      | <b>Income Dynamics and Stability in the Transition Process, general Reflections applied to the Czech Republic</b>  | <i>Jens Hölscher</i>   |
| B18-00      | <b>Budget Processes: Theory and Experimental Evidence</b>  | <i>Karl-Martin Ehrhart, Roy Gardner, Jürgen von Hagen, Claudia Keser</i> |
| B17-00      | <b>Rückführung der Landwirtschaftspolitik in die Verantwortung der Mitgliedsstaaten? - Rechts- und Verfassungsfragen des Gemeinschaftsrechts</b>                   | <i>Martin Seidel</i>   |
| B16-00      | <b>The European Central Bank: Independence and Accountability</b>  | <i>Christa Randzio-Plath, Tomasso Padoa-Schioppa</i>                     |
| B15-00      | <b>Regional Risk Sharing and Redistribution in the German Federation</b>   | <i>Jürgen von Hagen, Ralf Hepp</i>                                       |
| B14-00      | <b>Sources of Real Exchange Rate Fluctuations in Transition Economies: The Case of Poland and Hungary</b>  | <i>Selahattin Dibooglu, Ali M. Kutan</i>                                 |
| B13-00      | <b>Back to the Future: The Growth Prospects of Transition Economies Reconsidered</b>   | <i>Nauro F. Campos</i>   |



|             |   |  |
|-------------|---|--|
| B12-00      | <b>Rechtsetzung und Rechtsangleichung als Folge der Einheitlichen Europäischen Wahrung</b>                         | <i>Martin Seidel</i>                                       |
| B11-00      | <b>A Dynamic Approach to Inflation Targeting in Transition Economies</b>  | <i>Lucjan T. Orłowski</i>                                  |
| B10-00      | <b>The Importance of Domestic Political Institutions: Why and How Belgium Qualified for EMU</b>                     | <i>Marc Hallerberg</i>                                     |
| B09-00      | <b>Rational Institutions Yield Hysteresis</b>   | <i>Rafael Di Tella, Robert MacCulloch</i>                  |
| B08-00      | <b>The Effectiveness of Self-Protection Policies for Safeguarding Emerging Market Economies from Crises</b>         | <i>Kenneth Kletzer</i>                                     |
| B07-00      | <b>Financial Supervision and Policy Coordination in The EMU</b>   | <i>Deutsch-Franzosisches Wirtschaftspolitisches Forum</i> |
| B06-00      | <b>The Demand for Money in Austria</b>  | <i>Bernd Hayo</i>  |
| B05-00      | <b>Liberalization, Democracy and Economic Performance during Transition</b>   | <i>Jan Fidrmuc</i>   |
| B04-00      | <b>A New Political Culture in The EU - Democratic Accountability of the ECB</b>                                     | <i>Christa Randzio-Plath</i>                               |
| B03-00      | <b>Integration, Disintegration and Trade in Europe: Evolution of Trade Relations during the 1990's</b>              | <i>Jarko Fidrmuc, Jan Fidrmuc</i>                          |
| B02-00      | <b>Inflation Bias and Productivity Shocks in Transition Economies: The Case of the Czech Republic</b>               | <i>Josef C. Brada, Arthur E. King, Ali M. Kutan</i>        |
| B01-00      | <b>Monetary Union and Fiscal Federalism</b>   | <i>Kenneth Kletzer, Jurgen von Hagen</i>                  |
| <b>1999</b> |   |  |
| B26-99      | <b>Skills, Labour Costs, and Vertically Differentiated Industries: A General Equilibrium Analysis</b>               | <i>Stefan Lutz, Alessandro Turrini</i>                     |
| B25-99      | <b>Micro and Macro Determinants of Public Support for Market Reforms in Eastern Europe</b>                          | <i>Bernd Hayo</i>  |
| B24-99      | <b>What Makes a Revolution?</b>   | <i>Robert MacCulloch</i>                                   |
| B23-99      | <b>Informal Family Insurance and the Design of the Welfare State</b>  | <i>Rafael Di Tella, Robert MacCulloch</i>                  |
| B22-99      | <b>Partisan Social Happiness</b>  | <i>Rafael Di Tella, Robert MacCulloch</i>                  |
| B21-99      | <b>The End of Moderate Inflation in Three Transition Economies?</b>   | <i>Josef C. Brada, Ali M. Kutan</i>                        |
| B20-99      | <b>Subnational Government Bailouts in Germany</b>   | <i>Helmut Seitz</i>  |
| B19-99      | <b>The Evolution of Monetary Policy in Transition Economies</b>   | <i>Ali M. Kutan, Josef C. Brada</i>                        |
| B18-99      | <b>Why are Eastern Europe's Banks not failing when everybody else's are?</b>  | <i>Christian E. Weller, Bernard Morzuch</i>                |
| B17-99      | <b>Stability of Monetary Unions: Lessons from the Break-Up of Czechoslovakia</b>                                    | <i>Jan Fidrmuc, Julius Horvath and Jarko Fidrmuc</i>       |
| B16-99      | <b>Multinational Banks and Development Finance</b>  | <i>Christian E. Weller and Mark J. Scher</i>               |
| B15-99      | <b>Financial Crises after Financial Liberalization: Exceptional Circumstances or Structural Weakness?</b>           | <i>Christian E. Weller</i>                                 |
| B14-99      | <b>Industry Effects of Monetary Policy in Germany</b>   | <i>Bernd Hayo and Birgit Uhlenbrock</i>                    |
| B13-99      | <b>Financial Fragility or What Went Right and What Could Go Wrong in Central European Banking?</b>                  | <i>Christian E. Weller and Jurgen von Hagen</i>           |
| B12-99      | <b>Size Distortions of Tests of the Null Hypothesis of Stationarity: Evidence and Implications for Applied Work</b> | <i>Mehmet Caner and Lutz Kilian</i>                        |
| B11-99      | <b>Financial Supervision and Policy Coordination in the EMU</b>   | <i>Deutsch-Franzosisches Wirtschaftspolitisches Forum</i> |
| B10-99      | <b>Financial Liberalization, Multinational Banks and Credit Supply: The Case of Poland</b>                          | <i>Christian Weller</i>                                    |
| B09-99      | <b>Monetary Policy, Parameter Uncertainty and Optimal Learning</b>  | <i>Volker Wieland</i>                                      |
| B08-99      | <b>The Connection between more Multinational Banks and less Real Credit in Transition Economies</b>                 | <i>Christian Weller</i>                                    |

- B07-99 **Comovement and Catch-up in Productivity across Sectors: Evidence from the OECD** *Christopher M. Cornwell and Jens-Uwe Wächter*
- B06-99 **Productivity Convergence and Economic Growth: A Frontier Production Function Approach** *Christopher M. Cornwell and Jens-Uwe Wächter*
- B05-99 **Tumbling Giant: Germany's Experience with the Maastricht Fiscal Criteria** *Jürgen von Hagen and Rolf Strauch*
- B04-99 **The Finance-Investment Link in a Transition Economy: Evidence for Poland from Panel Data** *Christian Weller*
- B03-99 **The Macroeconomics of Happiness** *Rafael Di Tella, Robert McCulloch and Andrew J. Oswald*
- B02-99 **The Consequences of Labour Market Flexibility: Panel Evidence Based on Survey Data** *Rafael Di Tella and Robert McCulloch*
- B01-99 **The Excess Volatility of Foreign Exchange Rates: Statistical Puzzle or Theoretical Artifact?** *Robert B.H. Hauswald*
- 1998**
- B16-98 **Labour Market + Tax Policy in the EMU** *Deutsch-Französisches Wirtschaftspolitisches Forum*
- B15-98 **Can Taxing Foreign Competition Harm the Domestic Industry?** *Stefan Lutz*
- B14-98 **Free Trade and Arms Races: Some Thoughts Regarding EU-Russian Trade** *Rafael Reuveny and John Maxwell*
- B13-98 **Fiscal Policy and Intranational Risk-Sharing** *Jürgen von Hagen*
- B12-98 **Price Stability and Monetary Policy Effectiveness when Nominal Interest Rates are Bounded at Zero** *Athanasios Orphanides and Volker Wieland*
- B11A-98 **Die Bewertung der "dauerhaft tragbaren öffentlichen Finanzlage" der EU Mitgliedstaaten beim Übergang zur dritten Stufe der EWWU** *Rolf Strauch*
- B11-98 **Exchange Rate Regimes in the Transition Economies: Case Study of the Czech Republic: 1990-1997** *Julius Horvath and Jiri Jonas*
- B10-98 **Der Wettbewerb der Rechts- und politischen Systeme in der Europäischen Union** *Martin Seidel*
- B09-98 **U.S. Monetary Policy and Monetary Policy and the ESCB** *Robert L. Hetzel*
- B08-98 **Money-Output Granger Causality Revisited: An Empirical Analysis of EU Countries (überarbeitete Version zum Herunterladen)** *Bernd Hayo*
- B07-98 **Designing Voluntary Environmental Agreements in Europe: Some Lessons from the U.S. EPA's 33/50 Program** *John W. Maxwell*
- B06-98 **Monetary Union, Asymmetric Productivity Shocks and Fiscal Insurance: an Analytical Discussion of Welfare Issues** *Kenneth Kletzer*
- B05-98 **Estimating a European Demand for Money (überarbeitete Version zum Herunterladen)** *Bernd Hayo*
- B04-98 **The EMU's Exchange Rate Policy** *Deutsch-Französisches Wirtschaftspolitisches Forum*
- B03-98 **Central Bank Policy in a More Perfect Financial System** *Jürgen von Hagen / Ingo Fender*
- B02-98 **Trade with Low-Wage Countries and Wage Inequality** *Jaleel Ahmad*
- B01-98 **Budgeting Institutions for Aggregate Fiscal Discipline** *Jürgen von Hagen*
- 1997**
- B04-97 **Macroeconomic Stabilization with a Common Currency: Does European Monetary Unification Create a Need for Fiscal Insurance or Federalism?** *Kenneth Kletzer*
- B-03-97 **Liberalising European Markets for Energy and Telecommunications: Some Lessons from the US Electric Utility Industry** *Tom Lyon / John Mayo*
- B02-97 **Employment and EMU** *Deutsch-Französisches Wirtschaftspolitisches Forum*
- B01-97 **A Stability Pact for Europe** *(a Forum organized by ZEI)*

---

ISSN 1436 - 6053

---

Zentrum für Europäische Integrationsforschung  
Center for European Integration Studies  
Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn

Walter-Flex-Strasse 3  
D-53113 Bonn  
Germany

Tel.: +49-228-73-1732  
Fax: +49-228-73-1809  
[www.zei.de](http://www.zei.de)