

Working Papers | 58 |

October
2009

Neil Foster and Johannes Pöschl

The Importance of Labour Mobility for Spillovers across Industries



wiwi Working Papers published since 2003:

- No. 58 N. Foster and J. Pöschl: The Importance of Labour Mobility for Spillovers across Industries. October 2009
- No. 57 J. Crespo-Cuaresma, G. Doppelhofer and M. Feldkircher: The Determinants of Economic Growth in European Regions. September 2009
- No. 56 W. Koller and R. Stehrer: Trade Integration, Outsourcing and Employment in Austria: A Decomposition Approach. July 2009
- No. 55 U. Schneider and M. Wagner: Catching Growth Determinants with the Adaptive Lasso. June 2009
- No. 54 J. Crespo-Cuaresma, N. Foster and R. Stehrer: The Determinants of Regional Economic Growth by Quantile. May 2009
- No. 53 C. Lennon: Trade in Services and Trade in Goods: Differences and Complementarities. April 2009
- No. 52 J. F. Francois and C. R. Shiells: Dynamic Factor Price Equalization and International Convergence. March 2009
- No. 51 P. Esposito and R. Stehrer: Effects of High-Tech Capital, FDI and Outsourcing on Demand for Skills in West and East. March 2009
- No. 50 C. Fillat-Castejón, J. F. Francois and J. Wörz: Cross-Border Trade and FDI in Services. February 2009
- No. 49 L. Podkaminer: Real Convergence and Inflation: Long-Term Tendency vs. Short-Term Performance. December 2008
- No. 48 C. Bellak, M. Leibrecht and R. Stehrer: The Role of Public Policy in Closing Foreign Direct Investment Gaps: An Empirical Analysis. October 2008
- No. 47 N. Foster and R. Stehrer: Sectoral Productivity, Density and Agglomeration in the Wider Europe. September 2008
- No. 46 A. Iara: Skill Diffusion by Temporary Migration? Returns to Western European Work Experience in Central and East European Countries. July 2008
- No. 45 K. Laski: Do Increased Private Saving Rates Spur Economic Growth? September 2007
- No. 44 R. C. Feenstra: Globalization and Its Impact on Labour. July 2007
- No. 43 P. Esposito and R. Stehrer: The Sector Bias of Skill-biased Technical Change and the Rising Skill Premium in Transition Economies. May 2007
- No. 42 A. Bhaduri: On the Dynamics of Profit- and Wage-led Growth. March 2007
- No. 41 M. Landesmann and R. Stehrer: Goodwin's Structural Economic Dynamics: Modelling Schumpeterian and Keynesian Insights. October 2006
- No. 40 E. Christie and M. Holzner: What Explains Tax Evasion? An Empirical Assessment based on European Data. June 2006
- No. 39 R. Römisch and M. Leibrecht: An Alternative Formulation of the Devereux-Griffith Effective Average Tax Rates for International Investment. May 2006
- No. 38 C. F. Castejón and J. Wörz: Good or Bad? The Influence of FDI on Output Growth. An industry-level analysis. April 2006
- No. 37 J. Francois and J. Wörz: Rags in the High Rent District: The Evolution of Quota Rents in Textiles and Clothing. January 2006
- No. 36 N. Foster and R. Stehrer: Modelling GDP in CEECs Using Smooth Transitions. December 2005
- No. 35 R. Stehrer: The Effects of Factor- and Sector-biased Technical Change Revisited. September 2005
- No. 34 V. Astrov, Sectoral Productivity, Demand, and Terms of Trade: What Drives the Real Appreciation of the East European Currencies? April 2005
- No. 33 K. Laski: Macroeconomics versus 'Common Sense'. December 2004
- No. 32 A. Hildebrandt and J. Wörz: Determinants of Industrial Location Patterns in CEECs. November 2004
- No. 31 M. Landesmann and R. Stehrer: Income Distribution, Technical Change and the Dynamics of International Economic Integration. September 2004
- No. 30 R. Stehrer: Can Trade Explain the Sector Bias of Skill-biased Technical Change? May 2004
- No. 29 U. Dulleck, N. Foster, R. Stehrer and J. Wörz: Dimensions of Quality Upgrading in CEECs. April 2004
- No. 28 L. Podkaminer: Assessing the Demand for Food in Europe by the Year 2010. March 2004
- No. 27 M. Landesmann and R. Stehrer: Modelling International Economic Integration: Patterns of Catching-up, Foreign Direct Investment and Migration Flows. March 2004
- No. 26 M. Landesmann and R. Stehrer: Global Growth Processes: Technology Diffusion, Catching-up and Effective Demand. January 2004
- No. 25 J. Wörz: Skill Intensity in Foreign Trade and Economic Growth. November 2003; revised version January 2004
- No. 24 E. Christie: Foreign Direct Investment in Southeast Europe: a Gravity Model Approach. March 2003
- No. 23 R. Stehrer and J. Wörz: Industrial Diversity, Trade Patterns and Productivity Convergence. November 2002; revised version July 2003

Neil Foster is Research Economist at the Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies (wiiw). Johannes Pöschl is Junior Researcher at wiiw.

Part of this publication was produced in the framework of MICRO-DYN (www.micro-dyn.eu), an international economic research project focusing on the competitiveness of firms, regions and industries in the knowledge-based economy. The project is funded by the EU Sixth Framework Programme (www.cordis.lu) with socio-economic sciences and humanities (http://ec.europa.eu/research/social-sciences/index_en.html).

This publication reflects only the authors' views, the European Community is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.



*Neil Foster and
Johannes Pöschl*

**The Importance of
Labour Mobility for
Spillovers across
Industries**

Contents

<i>Abstract</i>	<i>i</i>
1 Introduction	3
2 Literature Overview	5
3 Innovation and Labour Mobility	7
3.1 R&D Intensity and Human Capital	7
3.2 Labour Mobility and Industry Proximity	8
4 Theoretical Model	10
5 Empirical Model and Construction of Variables	13
6 Data	16
6.1 Data Sources	16
6.2 Descriptive Analysis	17
7 Estimation Results	20
8 Concluding Remarks	24
9 References	25
10 Appendix	27
10.1 Theoretical Model – Value and Cost of Knowledge	27
10.2 Tables	31

List of Tables

Table 1	Summary statistics	18
Table 2	Percentage of workers moving from industry i to j.....	19
Table 3	Stationarity tests	20
Table 4	Estimation results	21
Table 5	Sensitivity analysis.....	23
Table 6A	Average annual TFP growth in percent (1995-2005)	31
Table 7A	Average annual growth of R&D investment per sectors and country in percent	32
Table 8A	Average current job tenure and deviation from the sectoral average.....	33

Abstract

This paper addresses the link between productivity and labour mobility. The hypothesis tested in the paper is that technology is transmitted across industries through the movement of skilled workers embodying human capital. The embodied knowledge is then diffused within the new environment creating spillovers and leading to productivity improvements. A theoretical framework is presented wherein productivity growth is modelled through knowledge acquisition with respect to labour mobility. The empirical estimates confirm the existence of positive cross-sectoral knowledge spillovers and indicate that labour mobility has beneficial effects on industry productivity. Due to the fact that labour mobility is closely linked to input-output relations this finding provides evidence suggesting that part of the estimated productivity effects of domestic rent spillovers are in fact due to knowledge spillovers resulting from labour mobility.

Keywords: *knowledge spillovers, labour mobility, productivity, manufacturing, industry, human capital, growth*

JEL classification: *J24, J60, O47*

1 Introduction

The recent literature on endogenous growth emphasizes the importance of R&D as a source of productivity growth and analyzes the spillover of the resulting knowledge and technology across firms, industries and countries. A number of channels of technology diffusion have been considered, including input-output linkages, trade, human capital and FDI. Despite a theoretical foundation for diffusion being provided by the relatively recent development of endogenous growth theory, a number of empirical papers on spillovers, particularly those on domestic spillovers, predate the development of endogenous growth models indicating the long-held belief in the importance of such diffusion (see for example, Gerschenkron, 1962)

Griliches (1979) broadly categorizes the spillover channels into two main sources of potential externalities generated by R&D activities – rent spillovers and knowledge spillovers. Rent spillovers occur if prices are not fully adjusted for quality improvements. The inability of firms to set prices that account for the total quality increase is caused by imperfect monopolistic pricing resulting from competitive pressure in the product segment. If the innovator could perfectly discriminate, these spillovers would not occur. The second externality, namely knowledge spillovers arise because of the imperfect appropriability of the knowledge associated with innovations (Cincera et al. 2001). The reason is that the output of research is on the one hand information that is incorporated in goods, and on the other hand an increase in the human capital of research workers. The first part can, to a large extent, be codified or protected by patents. This doesn't hold true for what Zucker, Darby and Brewer (1998) have called intellectual human capital. Firm specific information, or knowledge, that is referring to patented innovations of the company may be protected by contracts, but not the full set of ideas that a worker acquires during the research process. Arrow (1962) already addresses this problem and states that “no amount of legal protection can make a thoroughly appropriable commodity of something as intangible as information” (p.615). He also identifies mobility of personnel among firms as a way of spreading information.

This paper will take a closer look at these knowledge spillovers and will investigate to what extent knowledge acquired in a research intensive environment can be transferred across industries in the form of human capital. The estimated empirical model is constructed on the basis of the recent rent spillover literature but goes further in two respects. Firstly the model was extended and re-estimated with separate coefficients for high, medium and low technology industries accounting for the heterogeneity of the manufacturing sector, including both traditional and high technology sectors. These industry groups are found to differ with respect to the size of the knowledge spillovers. Secondly, the knowledge depreciation rate was varied separately for high, medium and low technology industries in a sensitivity analysis in order to take differences in technology lifecycles into account. This leads in almost all cases to more robust results which overall confirm the importance of labour mobility for knowledge spillovers across industries.

2 Literature Overview

A large empirical literature has developed considering the extent of technology diffusion across firms, industries and countries. The recent literature on R&D spillovers has mainly focused on rent spillovers. The pioneering work of Terleckyj (1974) points out the importance of input/output relations for domestic technological spillovers. The estimated indirect effects of privately financed R&D on other industries are considerably larger than the direct effects on the industry conducting R&D. Terleckyj finds no comparable effects for government-financed industrial R&D. Despite the early stage of his framework he already includes human capital into the analysis. Another study of inter-industry spillovers was that of Bernstein and Nadiri (1988) who analyse five high-technology industries in the US and find that “variable costs for each industry was reduced by R&D capital spillovers” (p.5f). In their analysis they estimate the social rate of return to R&D through spillovers to be 77 to 150% greater than the private return and thus confirm the finding of Terleckyj (1974).

Coe and Helpman (1995) (henceforth CH) extend the approach adopted by Terleckyj (1974) to the international context using import weights rather than input-output weights to model how R&D is imported across countries. In their model TFP depends on the cumulative domestic R&D effort in an economy as well as on the foreign technological knowledge, transmitted through trade. Therefore countries trading primarily with partners having high levels of technological knowledge will benefit more from spillovers than countries whose trading partners have comparatively low levels of technological knowledge. They test their model on 22 OECD economies finding evidence in favour of the importance of international trade of goods and services for the diffusion of technology across countries.¹

The method used by Coe and Helpman to calculate the foreign R&D stock has been criticized on a number of grounds. Lichtenberg and van Pottelsberghe de la Potterie (1996) (henceforth LP) correct the original specification of the foreign knowledge variable for an aggregation that makes the estimation results very sensitive to country mergers. Keller (1998) questions the assertion that a country’s benefit from knowledge created abroad is taken to be a trade-weighted average of foreign countries knowledge stocks. He compares the results of CH with those from assigning bilateral trade partners randomly and finds that regressions based on simulated data generate on average larger estimated foreign knowledge spillovers. Coe and Hoffmaister (1999) re-examine the work of Keller (1998) noting that the weights he constructs are essentially simple averages with a random error and that by choosing them completely randomly, the R&D spillover variable is no longer significant to explain TFP. They conceded however that the actual intensity of the trading relationship may be of limited importance because of the public good nature of knowledge.

More important for the analysis in this paper are the studies focussing on inter-industry technology transmission. Most of the studies in this field use input-output relations in order to

¹ This approach was extended to consider the importance of North-South spillovers by Coe, Helpman and Hoffmaister (1997).

measure spillovers since they have been shown to perform better than technology flow matrices which indicate the usage of technology developed in other industries (Keller 2002). Following the first studies by Bernstein and Nadiri (1988) and Terleckyj (1974), more recently, Wang (2007) analyses trade related North-South and indirect South-South technology spillovers at the industry level. The results clearly show that North-South trade related R&D has substantial impact on TFP in the South whereas South-South trade also promotes technological spillovers but the effects tend to be smaller. Wang also looks at the importance of human capital for the absorptive capacity of a country and finds that increases in human capital in developing countries have a much larger impact on TFP than increases in R&D in the North (see also Engelbrecht, 2002 and Falvey, Foster, Greenaway, 2007). Similar studies have been conducted for OECD countries by Engelbrecht (1997) and Frantzen (2000) and confirmed the importance of human capital for the absorptive capacity.

Human capital not only plays a role in absorptive capacity however, it is also a direct source of spillovers. Workers switching jobs between industries take their human capital with them and apply the prior obtained experience and knowledge in the new environment. Thus labour mobility is potentially an important source of knowledge spillovers.

The focus of the knowledge spillover analysis however has been international spillovers through Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) (LP 1996, Lee 2006). Lee examines rent spillovers through trade but also analyses FDI flows and their importance for cross-country knowledge flows. His findings based on the DOLS estimation method support the statistical significance only of inward FDI and therefore contradict the results of LP (1996) who find the effects of outward FDI to be significant. Lee's result seems more intuitive, since the FDI home countries usually have higher levels of technological knowledge than the host countries and are therefore likely to bring knowledge to the countries they are investing in. The importance of FDI channels however is still a controversial issue in the literature.

Apart from the analysis of knowledge spillovers through FDI there have been some recent contributions to the empirical research regarding labour mobility. Guarino and Tedeschi (2006) find that the proximity of industries is strongly related to inter-industry labour mobility – hence workers are able to use obtained technological knowledge in other related industries. With respect to technical employees and Almeida and Kogut (1996) demonstrate by using patent data from the semiconductor industry that ideas are spread through mobility of key engineers. Since labour mobility involves a threat to the innovating firm, R&D intensive firms tend to have more durable employer-employee relationships and steeper wage curves (Moen 2000).

The literature on international knowledge spillovers through labour mobility is still sparse due to problems of data comparability and further research in this area is of great importance for the understanding of knowledge spillovers.

3 Innovation and Labour Mobility

The first step in order to analyse the size of the knowledge spillovers associated with labour mobility will be to study the effects of R&D intensity on learning and turnover rates. This will be done by looking at the Pakes-Nitzan model whose implications have been tested by Moen (2000). The results are essential for the theoretical model that will be presented in this paper. Afterwards, labour mobility with respect to industry proximity, the second important pre-condition for the model in this paper will be examined.

3.1 R&D Intensity and Human Capital

The model by Pakes and Nitzan (1983) picks up the problem of hiring scientists when one takes explicit account of the fact that they may be able to use the information acquired during the project in a rival enterprise. The so called Pakes-Nitzan model is a two period model whose aim is to find optimal labour contracts for this kind of employment status. It is based on the assumption that both scientists and firms are aware of the fact that being part of a research project gives access to valuable information. As a result, researchers are therefore willing to accept an initial wage lower than their market value because they gain access to information that will raise their human capital stock. Once they have acquired the information the employer has to pay a higher wage reflecting their new market value in order to keep them from joining or setting up a rival. The theoretical model predicts that entrepreneurs are able to avoid knowledge outflows through labour mobility by sharing the monopoly rent with the workers.

The predictions of this model have been empirically analyzed by Moen (2000). He uses Norwegian data allowing him to follow the working history of the entire working population from 1986-1995. The theoretical model leads to the conclusion, that turnover rates should be lower for more R&D intensive firms. Moen confirms this prediction using descriptive analysis and finds that R&D investment greatly reduces churning – the number of hires and quits above the level necessary to accomplish changes in the number of employees. Churning can be measured by the excess turnover rate which is defined as separations out of jobs that continue divided by the number of continuing jobs. R&D intensive firms are likely to have a higher “necessary” fluctuation of staff since they have to deal with a higher level of uncertainty. Those who stay are subject to a lower fluctuation however. The significance of this finding is confirmed by a simple tobit regression analysis which looks at the excess turnover rate with respect to the R&D intensity. Moen concludes that more innovative firms cultivate more durable employer-employee relationships.

Since potential knowledge outflows through labour mobility are an important factor in the determination of R&D investments, firms need to account for them. The finding shows that entrepreneurs are able to reduce the negative external effects of flexible labour markets on R&D investment and indicates that this effort increases with the R&D intensity of a firm.

This is a weak indicator in favour of the hypothesis that the R&D intensity of a firm affects human capital acquisition. The longer workers stay in a company the more human capital they acquire and the more valuable they become for a firm. Firm specific knowledge, which is defined as knowledge that has productive value in only one particular company, should not play a major role since employees always acquire firm specific knowledge disregarding the R&D intensity. A more likely explanation for firms trying to reduce turnover rates would be transferable knowledge. Workers in a R&D intensive environment are likely to enhance their human capital stock more with respect to the fields they are working in. Given that the set of ideas they acquire is partly the basis for later inventions, the knowledge leaks and thus the loss in human capital per worker seems to be higher for R&D intensive firms.

Coming back to the Pakes-Nitzan model, the predicted major instrument to reduce excess turnover rates are wages. Moen also takes a look at this prediction and studies the effects of R&D on the earning profiles of technical staff. The empirical findings support the theory and suggest that scientists and engineers in R&D intensive firms accept a significant wage discount at the beginning of their career that transforms into a wage premium at the end of their career. More specifically, workers with higher than secondary technical education starting in high R&D intensive firms have on average 6.1 percent lower wages in their first year compared to low R&D intensive firms. After 16-20 years of experience the wage discount transforms into a wage premium that reaches 6.8 percent at the end of their career.

These results are however most likely subject to an ability bias since one would expect people who learn more easily and thus have lower learning costs to self-select into more R&D intensive firms. Therefore the wage discount at the beginning of the career may be underestimated while the wage premium towards the end may be overestimated. Another interesting result is that “workers with technical or scientific education in R&D intensive firms who do not change employer, have higher wage growth throughout their career.” (Moen, 2000, p.15).

The findings strongly support the theory that the R&D intensity of a firm affects learning opportunities for the employees. Workers are willing to accept jobs with lower wages in view of better learning chances at the beginning of their career in order to increase their human capital stock and thus future productivity and wages. Hence it seems feasible to use R&D intensity as a proxy for human capital acquisition later in the empirical part of this paper.

After looking at R&D intensity of companies related to human capital accumulation, wages and labour turnover, the next section of this paper will focus on the question of whether labour mobility and industry proximity are interrelated phenomena.

3.2 Labour Mobility and Industry Proximity

Pack and Paxson (1999) analyze this topic investigating whether flexible labour markets lubricate growth. They look at Taiwan, Republic of China, because its sectoral structure has changed considerably over the past decades and structural change has been accompanied by a high degree of

inter-industry labour mobility. If labour mobility has enhanced growth, then turnover should not be random but workers should rather move to closer industries that can make better use of their accumulated human capital. Their hypothesis is “that workers acquire both general and industry-specific skills that can be transferred to other industries, but that the degree to which skills are transferable varies across pairs of industries” (p.4). That means, that for example knowledge acquired in the rubber and plastics sector may be of value in the petroleum industry, but not applicable in the paper production sector. Therefore workers from the rubber and plastics sector are expected to move with a higher probability to the petroleum industry. Because of their valuable knowledge they should also earn higher wages in the latter than workers coming from other industries.

Pack and Paxson use Input-Output tables as a measure of industry proximity to test whether workers are more likely to move to closer industries. Specifically workers should more likely move from an industry i to an industry j if

1. industry i supplies a large share of industry j 's intermediate inputs
2. industry i receives a large share of its intermediate inputs from industry j
3. industries i and j use similar intermediate input bundles (correlation between input bundles)

The estimated equation takes the form

$$\ln(N_{ijt}) = \delta_i + \theta_j + \mu_t + \beta z_{ijt} + \varepsilon_{ijt}$$

N_{ijt} denotes the number of workers who have moved from industry i to industry j at time t , δ_i , θ_j and μ_t are dummies for industry of origin, destination and time period and finally β estimates the effect of industry proximity z_{ijt} on labour mobility using the above measures.

Pack and Paxson (1999) find the coefficients on proximity measures all to be highly significant. Even if all three measures are included together they are still individually and jointly significant. The size of the effects is fairly large. Using only the first measure for example, z_{ijt} equals the ratio of inputs purchased by sector j from sector i to total sales of sector j . The results using this measure indicate that the elasticity of N_{ijt} with respect to z_{ijt} is around 7.5. That would mean that a 1% increase of z_{ijt} leads to an increase in the number of workers moving from industry i to j by 7.8%.

The second part of Pack and Paxson's paper looks at the effects of industry proximity on wages. Since wages are strongly related to productivity this analysis can be seen as an examination of the effects of industry proximity on the productivity of moved labour. Of course, when using wages one immediately faces the problem of a range of observable and unobservable factors that influence the variable apart from the criteria of interest. The authors control for attributes like age, years of education, marital status, gender and a set of dummy variables for firm size, year and job tenure.

The results support the hypothesis that a move to more similar industries produces larger wage gains. This is especially true when the industries' similarity is measured by method 3 when both

industries use similar input bundles.² Therefore we can conclude that workers tend to move to “closer” industries where they can make better use of their accumulated human capital, are more productive and receive higher wages.³ Based on this finding, the industry proximity measures that usually approximate vaguely defined knowledge spillovers will be substituted by labour mobility patterns in the empirical model in order to get hold of knowledge flows between the industries.

4 Theoretical Model

The next section will provide a theoretical background for the empirical analysis. The framework fits into the category of endogenous growth models with the focus on labour augmenting knowledge spillovers. To my knowledge, there exists no literature modelling growth allowing for labour mobility and associated knowledge spillovers.

The output of an industry i is assumed to be produced according to a Cobb Douglas production function with the inputs labour, information and communication technology (ICT), capital services K_{ICT} and non ICT capital services K_N .

$$Y_i = A_i K_{iN}^\alpha K_{iICT}^\beta L_i^\gamma \quad \alpha + \beta + \gamma = 1 \quad (1)$$

L_i is effective labour input in industry i expressed by the unobservable “real” labour productivity function g_i depending on the productivities of the employees $r \in [1..m_i]$ in industry i . This function is not equal to the sum of the worker’s productivities but a more complex one that takes spillover and synergy effects between workers into account. These effects could be different educational backgrounds or experience levels leading to superior deductions or more efficient working processes that may prove useful and are then adopted by others.

$$L_i = g_i \left(p_{1i}(\vec{h}_1, \vec{\omega}_i, \cdot), \dots, p_{mi}(\vec{h}_m, \vec{\omega}_i, \cdot) \right) \quad (2)$$

The worker’s productivity p_{ri} in an industry i depends on \vec{h}_r , the human capital stock which is a vector of knowledge stocks in a finite number of knowledge fields. Since each industry has special

² A possible alternative interpretation of the results of the paper would be that industries that are closely linked due to input-output factors tend to locate in the same region. Therefore workers could be moving to closer industries not because their knowledge makes them more productive there, but because mobility costs are lower. This explanation is unlikely though when looking at wages, since workers that move to closer industries just because of lower mobility costs should not receive higher wages there.

³ There may exist a problem with self-selection however, namely that workers could move to industries only because of higher wages paid in this industry. In a perfectly competitive labour market, this does not happen, since the price for a specific qualification profile should to be the same across industries. In fact, a large part of the wage differences across sectors can be explained by differences in qualification profiles. If some industries pay systematically higher wages for the same qualification profile however, this is expected to bias the labour mobility patterns.

requirements and therefore different needs for certain types of knowledge, the stocks are weighted using industry specific weightings \bar{w}_i .⁴ The similarity of these weighting vectors depends on the industry proximity and is reflected by the labour movements.

It is straightforward to see that hiring affects the function by adding new workers to the function while training and R&D directly affects the knowledge stocks \bar{h}_r of the workers in the firm. Higher labour mobility makes the diffusion of knowledge easier and usually leads to a decrease in hiring costs and also training costs to some extent. On the other hand labour mobility makes R&D less profitable because of knowledge leaks – workers that increased their productivity within the firm switch to other companies and take their knowledge stock with them.

The empirical model that is presented in the next chapter tries to estimate the size of knowledge spillover effects through mobility of skilled labour in order to better explain the unobservable “real” aggregated labour productivity function g_i . This is done by looking at the effects of labour mobility on total factor productivity, which in this framework is defined as

$$TFP_i = \frac{Y_i}{K_{iN}^\alpha K_{iICT}^\beta (m_{ih}^\theta m_{im}^\mu m_{il}^\lambda)} \quad \theta + \mu + \lambda = \gamma \quad (3)$$

This definition follows the EU KLEMS database, which will be used for the subsequent empirical analysis. The inputs are ICT capital services K_{iCT} and non ICT capital services K_N as before plus the variables for the estimated labour productivity L . In the EU KLEMS database the labour productivity is calculated regressing on the number of employees in the industry differentiated by skill level. m_{ih} , m_{im} and m_{il} represent the numbers of high, medium and low skilled workers respectively and the sum of estimated coefficients is assumed to be equal to the coefficient γ of the effective labour input L in equations (1).

⁴ The empirical model focuses on knowledge stocks and leaves aside other factors like personal characteristics that may influence the productivity of a worker. At the aggregated industry level they very likely do not account for huge differences. However, a more detailed version of the developed theoretical model including cost aspects of knowledge and personal characteristics of workers can be found in the Appendix.

Joining equations (3) and (1) and substituting from (2) leads to an industry specific total factor productivity of⁵

$$TFP_i = \frac{A_i K_{iN}^\alpha K_{iICT}^\beta L_i^\gamma}{K_{iN}^\alpha K_{iICT}^\beta (m_{ih}^\theta m_{im}^\mu m_{il}^\lambda)} = A_i \frac{g_i(\vec{p}_{it})^\gamma}{m_{ih}^\theta m_{im}^\mu m_{il}^\lambda} \quad (4)$$

Since we cannot observe the real productivity function $g_i(\vec{p}_{it})$ and the Labour Force Survey used for the empirical analysis doesn't provide a complete working history we need to simplify the function in order to make it empirically traceable. The assumption made affects the knowledge stock and thus the productivity of each worker. The theory behind it is that a worker r start with a knowledge stock \vec{h}_{ri0} and gains access to the knowledge of an industry approximated by the R&D stock R_i . The extent, to which a worker has absorbed the industry's knowledge depends on the transferability of knowledge β .⁶

$$\vec{h}_{rit} = \vec{h}_{ri0} * R_i^\beta \quad (5)$$

When new workers from other industries enter, the employees also get access to the human capital of other sectors. This is assumed to be depending on the share of high and medium skilled people moving away from that industry and the average initial human capital level of these workers.

⁵ At this stage, capital augmenting technological progress only appears as a factor A_{it} in the theoretical model as well as the empirical part. It would be interesting to include not only knowledge spillovers in the definition of output, but also rent spillovers. Starting from a more general definition of output where only labour and capital appear without differentiation into ICT and non-ICT capital services, capital K could be defined as a composite input of horizontally differentiate goods x of variety s

$$K = \left(\int_0^{n^e} x(s)^\alpha ds \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha}}$$

where n^e represents the range of intermediate inputs which are employed in the sector (Keller, 2002). In equilibrium the differentiated capital goods $x(s)$ are produced at level \bar{x} and we get the following equation:

$$\log(TFP_{it}) = \log(A_i) + \alpha \log(n^e) + \gamma \log(g_i(\vec{p}_{it})) - \theta \log(m_{iht}) - \mu \log(m_{imt}) - \lambda \log(m_{ilt})$$

However, as shown in the model by Pack and Paxson (1999), labour mobility is closely linked to input-output relations between sectors, there will therefore likely be problems with the estimation of the effects due to problems of multicollinearity and small samples. Hence, this approach is left for future research.

⁶ Unfortunately, there is no complete working history available for the dataset. Therefore we cannot include past working experiences into the estimations of the human capital stock.

If we also account for the different skill composition in the sector as in the TFP definition, the approximated effective labour productivity function can then be written as

$$\tilde{g}_i = \left(m_{ih}^\theta * m_{im}^\mu * m_{il}^\lambda * \left(R_i * \bar{h}_i * \frac{l_{ii}}{l_i} \right)^{\beta_s} \left(\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^J R_j * \bar{h}_j * \frac{l_{ji}}{l_j} \right)^{\beta_o} \right)^{\frac{1}{\gamma}} \quad (6)$$

m_{ih} , m_{im} and m_{il} are, as for TFP, the numbers of high, medium and low skilled workers respectively. R_i and R_j represent the R&D stocks of the industries and l_{ji} are the number of people moving from industry j to i . \bar{h}_i and \bar{h}_j are the average human capital levels of workers staying in industry i or moving from industry j respectively. Finally, β_s denotes the transferability of knowledge from the R&D stock in industry i and β_o transferability of knowledge from the R&D stocks of other industries, made available through the movement of skilled workers embodying human capital. Substituting into equation (4) yields the starting point for the later analysis.

$$TFP_i = A_i \frac{\tilde{g}_i^\gamma}{m_{ih}^\theta m_{im}^\mu m_{il}^\lambda} = A_i * \left(R_i * \bar{h}_i * \frac{l_{ii}}{l_i} \right)^{\beta_s} \left(\sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^J R_j * \bar{h}_j * \frac{l_{ij}}{l_j} \right)^{\beta_o} \quad (7)$$

5 Empirical Model and Construction of Variables

In this section, an empirical model will be presented that examines the effects of human capital mobility on productivity. The analysis focuses on intersectoral spillovers within a country. The hypothesis is that industries can profit from the R&D investments of other domestic sectors by hiring their workers. Therefore the model includes the industry's own R&D expenditures as well as the R&D investments of other sectors weighted by the share of workers coming from that sector.

According to general theory, the outcome of R&D undertaken in one industrial sector is influenced by R&D expenditures in other sectors that spill over through various channels (e.g. labour mobility, rent spillovers, knowledge exchange, etc).⁷ The theory behind this assumption is straightforward – the knowledge stock of workers coming from other sectors does not solely influence the productivity of the receiving sector by adding more human capital incorporated in new employees that are more productive (direct effect) but their knowledge is likely to be shared with other

⁷ This means that there should exist a multiplicative relationship between the two variables in the model. In the case of labour mobility this hypothesis is supported by the data. The estimation of the basic equation (8) presented later on in the empirical section leads to an R^2 of 0.83 assuming a multiplicative relationship compared with 0.70 when assuming an additive relationship.

employees and will therefore diffuse within the firm and, if valuable, be used in production processes or applied in other parts of the firm (spillover effect).

The direct effect is to a large extent captured by wages since the expected productivity of the new worker is influenced by his education and working history, which is known to the employer during the hiring process. Both the employer and the employee have expectations concerning the value of the new employee in the company, which are affected by signalling effects during the wage negotiations. However, there is asymmetric information on both sides - the new worker knows best about his abilities and future job performance but little about the new environment and his opportunities for development therein, whereas the employer knows about the company background but has incomplete information about the worker's capabilities. Therefore the wage will not fully capture the direct effects, but with time and reduced asymmetric information on both sides the wage should adjust with respect to the marginal productivity of the worker.

The size of the spillover effect is subject to the mode of operation and corporate philosophy. In a dog-eat-dog environment the workers usually see specific information as their advantage over other workers and are therefore not likely to share it. The better the corporate climate and the more team based the general culture of work is, the more the information will diffuse within the firm and thus create higher spillover effects.

With this formal specification the initial basic equation can be defined. The empirical model relates directly to equation (7) and follows the empirical model introduced by Lichtenberg et al.(1996)

$$\log TFP_{ict} = \alpha_t + \alpha_c + \alpha_i + \beta^s \log R_{ict-1}^s + \beta^o \log R_{ict-1}^o + \varepsilon_{ict} \quad (8)$$

The three dimensions of the equation are industry i , country c and time t . TFP_{ict} therefore denotes total factor productivity of industry i in country c at time t , α_t , α_c and α_i are dummy variables, ε_{ict} is an error term and finally β^s and β^o are the two coefficients to be estimated for the lagged explanatory R&D variables. These are R_{ict}^s , which stands for weighted R&D investments of the currently analysed industry and R_{ict}^o which is a weighted sum of R&D investments of the other industries. For industry i the variable R_{ict}^o is created as a sum over the R&D investments of all other industries j weighted by the percentage of workers leaving the originating industry j in order to work in industry i .

$$R_{ict}^o = \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^J S_{jct} * \frac{l_{jict}}{l_{jct}} * \bar{h}_j \quad R_{ict}^s = S_{ict} * \frac{l_{iict}}{l_{ict}} * \bar{h}_i \quad (9)$$

S_{jct} is the R&D stock of industry j in country c at time t , l_{jict} represents the number of workers moving from industry j to i and l_{jct} stands for the total number of people employed in industry j . That means that industry j 's R&D stock is weighted by the fraction of people moving from industry j

to industry i divided by the total number of workers originally employed in industry j .⁸ Likewise the R&D variable R_{ict}^s of the currently analysed industry is the R&D stock S_{ict} weighted by the share of people not leaving the industry. This weighting is applied because labour outflows create knowledge outflows that firms have to take into account. As a result, labour mobility out of the industry leads to a lower actual R&D stock of the current industry in the model⁹.

A very important issue in equation (9) is the usage of knowledge in the receiving industry. The R&D stock as a proxy for the knowledge transmitted is only weighted by labour flows, not by industry proximity which would give a measure of how well knowledge embodied in mobile workers can be used in the receiving industry. This was done for two reasons: first of all Pack and Paxson have shown that labour mobility patterns are closely related to industry proximity and thus these patterns are already a measure of the closeness of two industries. The second argument is that firms usually do not employ people if their working history doesn't match the job description. Therefore people who move to industries which are not closely linked to the one of origin are most likely doing so because their new environment is able to make good use of their abilities regardless of the industry proximity. As well, only job changes are considered where people were already part of the workforce one year before. Thus, many changes occur voluntarily, strengthening the previous matching argument.

There are a couple of issues that have to be addressed and accounted for before moving on to the estimations. The primary concerns are simultaneity and omitted variables. Demand shocks are an example of a set of effects that lead to a spurious correlation between productivity and R&D investments. A negative shock leads to lower revenues and usually higher stocks with similar input bundles since employment contracts are not terminated immediately. Therefore the measured productivity of the industry falls. Under pressure, firms in general cut future-oriented expenses which include R&D investments. Therefore, we are able to observe a spurious correlation between productivity and research capital. A similar effect can be observed during booms – when output increases productivity also rises and during periods of high growth firms hire more workers. These workers coming from other sectors then create knowledge spillover effects that are likely overestimated.

⁸ Another possible weighting for the R&D stock of other industries would be the number of people moving from industry j to industry i as a share of the people working in industry i . With different industry sizes, this however is not a good measure of the knowledge outflow since the people who move may be a large share of the people originally working in industry j , but only a small fraction of the people then working in i . Therefore it would not properly capture relative knowledge outflows since the size of the knowledge stocks already accounts for differences in industry size.

⁹ If we had assumed that knowledge is a public good, it would remain completely in the industry. But the assumption in this framework is that the ideas and experience that employees acquire during their work is the basis for future productivity increases and thus an outflow of this knowledge affects productivity increases negatively.

The usual solution for this problem is the adoption of an instrumental variable (IV) approach. Due to the fact that there are no good instruments available, the usually applied solution in this case is to lag the explanatory variables in order to avoid simultaneity biases.

Year dummies α_t are included to account for global shocks that affect all countries and industries. Country fixed effects α_c control for differences in human capital, institutions or regulation in the labour market. Last but not least, a set of industry dummies α_i is included to account for differences in productivity across sectors for example due to automatisisation possibilities that may vary by industry.

6 Data

6.1 Data Sources

The dataset used for the analysis contains 10 EU countries, namely Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom and covers the time period between 1995 and 2004.

Three main data sources were combined to setup the dataset. The total factor productivity indices were taken from EU KLEMS database (state March 2008), which provides data for the EU25 countries, Australia, Japan and the US at the industry level. The productivity levels were normalized to 1997=100 and then multiplied with TFP levels for 1997 that were estimated by Inklaar, Timmer and Ark (2008) and that exist by sector only for a few countries.

The data on labour flows was taken from the EU Labour Force Survey by Eurostat which covers the European countries from 1995 until 2005. The adjusted employment series by Eurostat were used to adjust for the existing breaks in the series. Only medium and high skilled workers (based on ISCED) were included in the calculation of the labour flows, since they are most likely the main source of knowledge spillovers. Furthermore, the sample of observed workers was reduced with respect to the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO). The major groups “clerks”, “service workers and shop and market sales workers” and “elementary occupations” have been excluded. The categories left in the final sample are “technicians and associate professionals”, “legislators, senior officials and managers”, “professionals”, “skilled agricultural and fishery workers”, “craft and related trades workers” and “plant and machine operators and assemblers” – these are considered the main source of knowledge spillovers in the manufacturing industries.

Finally data on research investments of the industries was taken from the STAN ANBERD database. In order to make R&D investments comparable across time and countries, they were adjusted using purchasing power parity exchange rates and deflated using the gross fixed capital formation deflator taken from Eurostat. The initial stock of R&D was calculated according to the following commonly used formula using a 10% depreciation rate (different depreciation rates for high, medium and low technology industries are used later in a sensitivity analysis)

$$S_0 = \frac{RINV_0}{g + \delta} \quad (10)$$

S_0 is the calculated R&D stock at the beginning of the sample and $RINV_0$ the R&D investment in that year, δ represents the assumed depreciation rate of R&D capital and g the logarithmic growth of the R&D investments over the analysed time period. The R&D stocks are then calculated based on the perpetual inventory model:

$$S_t = (1 - \delta) * S_{t-1} + RINV_{t-1} \quad (11)$$

This R&D stock is the basis for the construction of the R&D variables in equation (9).

6.2 Descriptive Analysis

A general descriptive analysis of the data for countries and sectors is provided in Table 1. The highest TFP growth rates in the sample are found in the sectors “Electrical and optical equipment” and “Chemicals and chemical products” with average annual growth rates of 4.68% and 1.72%. The only negative growth rate in the final sample with -0.08% can be found in the “Food, beverages and tobacco” sector. The industries “Coke, refined petroleum and nuclear fuel” and “Wood and of wood and cork” as well as “Manufacturing nec; recycling” had to be dropped because of huge fluctuations in TFP. In the case of “Coke, refined petroleum and nuclear fuel” these fluctuations mostly occurred due to high price volatility. These industries also downward biased the manufacturing TFP growth rates of the countries in Table 1 and led to negative growth rates for Denmark, Spain and Italy (see Appendix Table 6A for TFP growth rates by sectors and countries).

Considering R&D investment Denmark (8.93%) and Finland (10,11%) show extremely high annual growth rates. The share of non-public R&D funding in these two countries is far above the EU27 average and by looking at the data in more detail one finds that most investment has taken place in high technology sectors. “Electrical and optical equipment” for example has an R&D investment growth rate of 13.54 in Finland and 10.30 in Denmark (for more information on R&D investment across countries and sectors see Appendix Table 7A). When examining the industry shares in total R&D investment we discover that the sectors “Electrical and optical equipment” (29.69%), “Transport equipment” (26.94%) and “Chemicals and chemical products” (23.08%) invest by far the most in R&D and make up more than three quarters of all R&D investment in the sample.

Table 1 – Summary statistics

code	Country / Industry	Average TFP growth*	Average R&D inv. growth*	Relative size in terms of R&D**	Relative size in terms of labour***
BE	Belgium	0.80	3.36	3.24	2.70
DE	Germany	1.74	5.83	34.56	39.62
DK	Denmark	-0.43	8.93	0.99	2.08
ES	Spain	-0.64	5.58	2.62	4.89
FI	Finland	4.13	10.11	1.66	1.98
FR	France	2.11	2.91	21.29	16.49
IT	Italy	-1.17	-1.51	7.62	9.58
NL	Netherlands	1.82	3.52	3.98	3.92
SE	Sweden	3.71	4.82	5.57	1.55
UK	United Kingdom	1.08	0.91	15.38	17.18
15t16	Food, beverages and tobacco	-0.08	4.80	1.55	8.69
17t19	Textiles, textile, leather and footwear	1.08	5.26	0.63	5.38
20	Wood and of wood and cork	1.63	2.72	0.14	2.55
21t22	Pulp, paper, printing and publishing	0.32	3.33	0.70	8.78
23	Coke, refined petroleum & nuclear fuel	-2.96	-5.17	1.22	0.72
24	Chemicals and chemical products	1.72	5.19	23.08	7.92
25	Rubber and plastics	1.18	4.25	1.76	3.83
26	Other non-metallic mineral	1.14	2.87	1.07	3.13
27t28	Basic metals and fabricated metal	0.39	1.86	3.16	15.17
29	Machinery and equipment n.e.c.	0.98	4.35	9.47	13.37
30t33	Electrical and optical equipment	4.68	3.04	29.69	14.02
34t35	Transport equipment	1.38	3.27	26.94	11.40
36t37	Manufacturing nec; recycling	0.68	3.58	0.59	5.04

Notes: All indicators in percent. *Mean annual average growth between 1995 and 2005. **Based on USD PPP adjusted expenditures in 1995. ***Based on number of employees in 1997

Table 2 contains an overview of the labour mobility pattern within manufacturing. It shows the average annual percentage of workers in the sample moving from industry i to j . Included are all the workers having changed their job within the last year. There is a pattern observable, namely that there exists a positive net outflow of workers from low technology industries like “Food, beverages and tobacco” or “Pulp, paper, printing and publishing“ to higher technology sectors. The yearly industry net flows are mostly below 0.5% of the workers who switch jobs, but observed over a longer time period, this effect is not negligible.

Table 2 – Percentage of workers moving from industry i to j averaged across countries and years

from \ to		15t16	17t19	20	21t22	23	24	25	26	27t28	29	30t33	34t35	36t37	D
15t16	Food, beverages and tobacco	8.71	0.20	0.05	0.20	0.03	0.44	0.18	0.16	0.32	0.27	0.26	0.18	0.09	11.10
17t19	Textiles, textile, leather and footwear	0.15	4.05	0.03	0.11	0.00	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.23	0.13	0.14	0.14	0.19	5.39
20	Wood and of wood and cork	0.05	0.01	2.15	0.06	0.00	0.02	0.06	0.05	0.14	0.20	0.06	0.15	0.20	3.16
21t22	Pulp, paper, printing and publishing	0.18	0.05	0.09	9.27	0.02	0.17	0.15	0.11	0.20	0.22	0.22	0.14	0.13	10.94
23	Coke, refined petroleum & nuclear fuel	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.31	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.00	0.48
24	Chemicals and chemical products	0.35	0.12	0.03	0.15	0.05	4.36	0.18	0.05	0.14	0.21	0.14	0.09	0.10	5.96
25	Rubber and plastics	0.08	0.16	0.04	0.10	0.00	0.18	2.22	0.06	0.30	0.27	0.23	0.14	0.06	3.84
26	Other non-metallic mineral	0.06	0.06	0.12	0.04	0.00	0.06	0.13	2.08	0.28	0.19	0.09	0.12	0.03	3.27
27t28	Basic metals and fabricated metal	0.23	0.13	0.19	0.23	0.04	0.27	0.37	0.20	11.05	1.57	0.53	0.72	0.25	15.77
29	Machinery and equipment n.e.c.	0.21	0.11	0.07	0.35	0.05	0.23	0.17	0.12	1.96	9.21	0.69	0.64	0.14	13.96
30t33	Electrical and optical equipment	0.19	0.14	0.07	0.23	0.02	0.31	0.16	0.11	0.58	0.81	9.68	0.39	0.10	12.79
34t35	Transport equipment	0.12	0.04	0.06	0.05	0.00	0.14	0.17	0.03	0.63	0.70	0.40	5.96	0.17	8.47
36t37	Manufacturing nec; recycling	0.10	0.15	0.27	0.10	0.01	0.07	0.19	0.05	0.25	0.15	0.17	0.33	3.04	4.87
D	Total Manufacturing	10.44	5.22	3.18	10.91	0.53	6.31	4.14	3.05	16.12	13.96	12.62	9.03	4.49	100.00

Finally Appendix Table 8A provides information on the average tenure of jobs across countries and sectors. While Denmark has by far the lowest average job tenure with 10.1 years, Germany and France show the highest tenure in the sample with 13.1 and 13.0 years. Across the years the average current job tenure stays relatively constant with around 12.2 years across the sample. During the early 2000s recession there is a slight decrease of around 2% observable. These fluctuations are more apparent when looking at the average job duration, which cannot be calculated with the current dataset since it includes no data on past employment status.

In order to examine whether the variables are non-stationary which could lead to a spurious regression when estimated in levels, the panel unit root test developed by Levin, Lin and Chu (2002) is performed.

Table 3 – Stationarity tests

Levin-Lin-Chu (2002)	$\ln(TFP_{cit})$	$\ln(R_{cit}^s)$	$\ln(R_{cit}^o)$
no lags or trend included	0.1719	0.0000	0.0000
trend included	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

The tests show that the null hypothesis of nonstationarity can be rejected for the two R&D stock variables but not for the TFP variable. This is expected, since we are anticipating an upward trend in productivity. When the test accounts for this trend, the null-hypothesis of nonstationary behaviour can also be rejected for the TFP variable. This trend is accounted for in the model by the time dummies included for every year.

7 Estimation Results

The following section provides estimates for the size of the spillovers. Acknowledging that a part of the knowledge effects found could be due to rent spillovers and vice versa, the coefficients should be considered an upper bound for the true size of the knowledge spillovers.

The first regression (i) in Table 4 shows the results of the basic equation (8). The estimated coefficient of the industry's own R&D stock β_{cit}^s with a value of 0.1294 is around 5 times higher than the gains from the knowledge of other industries β_{cit}^o which is estimated as 0.0278 – both coefficients are highly significant. The coefficients can be interpreted as elasticities of total factor productivity with respect to labour movement weighted R&D investment. β_{cit}^s is a measure of the impact of the industry's own knowledge stock on TFP after adjusting for labour and thus knowledge outflows. Similarly β_{cit}^o measures the degree to which industry i will profit from the R&D investment of other industries by hiring their workers and thus by employing their human capital stock. This effect increases if the giving industries enhance their R&D activities and thus add to their human capital stock. A coefficient of 0.0278 for β_{cit}^o in estimation (i) therefore implies that a 1 percent increase in the R&D stock of the other sectors increases total factor productivity in the receiving industry by 0.028

percent. Since the R&D investments are weighted by labour movements in the model, the receiving industry can profit in a similar way from the human capital stock of other sectors by hiring more workers from those industries.

Table 4 – Estimation results

	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(v)
β_{cit}^s	0.1276*** (6.96)		0.1288*** (7.06)		0.1149*** (5.16)
$\beta_{cit}^{s\ high}$		0.1556*** (5.61)		0.1676*** (5.94)	
$\beta_{cit}^{s\ med}$		0.1409*** (7.36)		0.1393*** (7.29)	
$\beta_{cit}^{s\ low}$		0.0665*** (2.58)		0.0745*** (2.87)	
β_{cit}^o	0.0272*** (3.58)	0.0270*** (3.57)			0.0632*** (5.04)
$\beta_{cit}^{o\ high}$			0.0158*** (2.66)	0.0171*** (2.81)	
$\beta_{cit}^{o\ med}$			0.0195** (2.24)	0.0174** (1.98)	
$\beta_{cit}^{o\ low}$			0.0096** (1.95)	0.0085* (1.70)	
Industry	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Year	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Country	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
R ²	0.8316	0.8337	0.8329	0.8348	0.8312
F-statistic	151.08	151.52	142.31	143.46	130.48
Observations	709	709	709	709	528

t-statistics in parentheses. The dependent variable is $\ln(\text{TFP})$. All regressions include unreported dummies for years, countries and industries. Coefficients are estimated using ordinary least squares (OLS) with robust standard errors. <***>, <**> and <*> denote coefficients being significantly different from zero at a 1, 5 and 10 percent level, respectively.

To account for the heterogeneity of the manufacturing sector, including both traditional and high technology sectors, the empirical model was then extended and re-estimated with separate coefficients for high, medium and low technology industries. The knowledge spillovers from other industries have been differentiated by providing industry. The classification was done according to that developed by the OECD (2005). The high technology segment consists only of the industry “Electrical and optical equipment” (30–33). The medium technology sectors in the sample are “Chemicals and chemical products” (24), “Rubber and plastic products” (25), “Other non-metallic mineral products” (26),

“Basic metals and fabricated metal products” (27–28), “Machinery and equipment (n.e.c.)” (29) and “Transport equipment” (34–35). Finally, the low-tech category includes “Food products, beverages and tobacco” (15–16), “Textiles, textile products, leather and footwear” (17–19) and “Pulp, paper, paper products, printing and publishing” (21–22).

In regression (ii), separate coefficients were estimated for the industry’s own knowledge stock differentiated by technology segments (high, medium and low-tech). Regression (iii) subsequently uses coefficients for knowledge spillovers from other industries split up by technology level. Finally in estimation (iv) both original coefficients β_{cit}^s and β_{cit}^o were estimated for each technology segment.

As expected, the coefficients for high and medium technology industries are larger than those of the low technology sector. The estimated spillover effect from the medium technology industry is found to be higher than that from the high technology industry however, though the difference is not found to be significant. This finding can in general have various explanations - one being that the medium technology industries are not as specialized as the high technology ones and the knowledge gained there can therefore be better used in other sectors. As shown later, the coefficients depend on the depreciation rates chosen. Higher depreciation leads to lower initial R&D stocks and greater fluctuations in the sample. Since one would expect knowledge to depreciate more in high technology sectors than in traditional, low technology sectors, it is feasible to use different depreciation rates for the R&D investments. The sensitivity analysis presented in Table 5 addresses this issue and shows that the size of the coefficients relative to each other changes as a result.

The last estimation (v) uses 3-year averages of the labour weighted R&D stock variables. These averages increase the lag by which R&D investments can influence TFP. The coefficient for knowledge spillovers from other industries increases from 0.0278 to 0.0651. This indicates, that knowledge spillovers through labour mobility need more time to affect productivity in the new sector. This could be due to the fact that workers need to get acquainted with their new environment first. During this period they might not be as productive and their possibilities to bring in their knowledge may be limited.

The next set of results presented in Table 5 provides a sensitivity analysis. The depreciation rates for low, medium and high technology sectors have been arbitrarily set to 7.5%, 10% and 12.5% respectively. These different rates have been chosen since the currently required and applied knowledge changes more quickly in high than in low technology sectors. Therefore also the ideas and experience that employees acquire during their work that could lead to future productivity increases becomes obsolete faster in the more rapidly changing environment of high technology sectors.

Table 5 – Sensitivity analysis

	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(v)
β_{cit}^s	0.1346*** (7.61)		0.1356*** (7.73)		0.1218*** (5.68)
$\beta_{cit}^{s\ high}$		0.1864*** (7.26)		0.1992*** (7.56)	
$\beta_{cit}^{s\ med}$		0.1479*** (7.90)		0.1460*** (7.84)	
$\beta_{cit}^{s\ low}$		0.0735*** (2.98)		0.0821*** (3.30)	
β_{cit}^o	0.0258*** (3.72)	0.0256*** (3.68)			0.0612*** (5.91)
$\beta_{cit}^{o\ high}$			0.0155*** (2.54)	0.0180*** (2.87)	
$\beta_{cit}^{o\ med}$			0.0194** (2.25)	0.0168* (1.93)	
$\beta_{cit}^{o\ low}$			0.0103** (2.29)	0.0090** (1.98)	
Industry	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Year	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Country	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
R ²	0.8339	0.8366	0.8352	0.8378	0.8346
F-statistic	154.32	156.53	145.94	148.68	134.63
Observations	709	709	709	709	528

t-statistics in parentheses. The dependent variable is $\ln(\text{TFP})$. All regressions include unreported dummies for years, countries and industries. Coefficients are estimated using ordinary least squares (OLS) with robust standard errors. <***>, <**> and <*> denote coefficients being significantly different from zero at a 1, 5 and 10 percent level, respectively.

The regressions shown in Table 5 are the same as in Table 4 apart from the different depreciation rates depending on the technology level. The regressions (v) again uses 3-year averages of the labour weighted R&D stock variables and have therefore a reduced sample size. The results of regression (iv) show, that the relative size of the coefficients for the different technology sectors changes in comparison with the previous results and high technology sectors become the most important source of knowledge spillovers. Generally the coefficients become more significant in all three compared estimations, which is a result in favour of the assumption of different depreciation rates.

The estimations in the literature for rent as well as knowledge spillovers should be looked at in this context. Usually a fixed depreciation rate is assumed across all sectors but by looking at

knowledge in the textile industry and the computer industry it seems obvious that this assumption is not met. The sensitivity analysis mostly done uses different depreciation rates for the whole sample. Using higher rates leads to a lower initial R&D stock and therefore increases the volatility of the R&D stock. Moreover, if the variable is highly correlated with TFP, also the significance of the estimates increases.

Overall, the results in Table 4 and Table 5 confirm the importance of knowledge spillovers via labour mobility on productivity growth.

8 Concluding Remarks

Recent growth literature has emphasised the importance of domestic as well as international rent spillovers across industries. The paper tries to establish a role for knowledge spillovers through the mobility of a higher educated workforce in this framework. Based on recent theoretical findings that were confirmed by empirical evidence, a theoretical model is developed that explains labour productivity with respect to knowledge acquisition. The empirical analysis confirms the importance of the mobility of human capital that goes hand in hand with the diffusion of knowledge across industries for productivity growth. Due to the fact that labour mobility is closely linked to input-output relations as shown by Pack and Paxson (1999) this finding provides evidence suggesting that part of the estimated productivity effects of rent spillovers are in fact due to labour mobility.

Given the heterogeneity of the manufacturing sector, including both traditional and high technology sectors, the model was then extended and re-estimated with separate coefficients for high, medium and low technology industries. The results confirm the hypothesis that industries with a low technological level create lower knowledge spillovers to other sectors than medium and high technology industries.

There are a number of issues left to be addressed in future work. An important concern should be the magnitude of the spillover effects that can be attributed to rent spillovers and knowledge spillovers respectively. However the simultaneous estimation of the two effects is likely to lead to a multicollinearity problem since labour mobility and input-output relations are highly correlated and this difficulty could only be overcome with larger panel datasets. The estimation would also profit from the use of micro-level data that provides firm-level data and more information on the working history and characteristics of the population. This would reduce the distortion in the calculation of the human capital stocks of the workforce and thus improve the estimation results for the knowledge spillovers.

9 References

- Almeida, P. and Kogut, B. (1996). "Technology and geography: The localization of knowledge and the mobility of patent holders". Working Paper, The Huntsman Center for Global Competition and Innovation, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania.
- Arrow, K. J. (1962). "Economic Welfare and the allocation of resources for invention". in R. R. Nelson (ed.), *The Rate and Direction of Inventive Activity: Economic and Social Factors*, Vol. 13 of NBER Special Conference Series, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, pages 609-625.
- Bernstein, J. I., Nadiri, M.I. (1988). "Interindustry R&D Spillovers Rates of Return and Production in High-Tech Industries". *American Economic Review*, 1988, vol. 78, issue 2, pages 429-434.
- Cincera, M., van Pottelsberghe de la Potterie, B. (2001). "International R&D Spillovers: A Survey". *Cahiers Economiques de Bruxelles*, 2001, issue 169, pages 3-31
- Coe, D. T., Helpman, E. (1995). "International R&D Spillovers". *European Economic Review*, 1995, vol. 39, issue 5, pages 859-887.
- Coe, D. T., Hoffmaister, A. (1999). "Are there international R&D spillovers among randomly matched trade partners? A response to Keller". IMF Working Paper 18. International Monetary Fund, Washington
- Engelbrecht, H.-J. (1997). "International R&D spillovers human capital and productivity in OECD economies". *European Economic Review*, 1997, vol. 41, issue 8, pages 1479-1488.
- Engelbrecht, H.-J. (2002). "Human capital and international knowledge spillovers in TFP growth of a sample of developing countries: an exploration of alternative approaches". *Applied Economics*, vol. 34, issue 7, pages 831-841
- Falvey, R., Foster, N., Greenaway, D. (2007). "Relative Backwardness, Absorptive Capacity and Knowledge Spillovers". *Economics Letters*, 2007, vol. 97, issue 3, pages 230-234.
- Frantzen, D. (2000). "R&D Human Capital and International Technology Spillovers - A Cross-Country Analysis". *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 2000, vol. 102, issue 1, pages 57-75
- Gerschenkron, A. (1962). "Economic backwardness in historical perspective". Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1962
- Griliches, Z. (1979). "Issues in Assessing the Contribution of Research and Development to Productivity Growth". *Bell Journal of Economics*, 1979, vol. 10, issue 1, pages 92-116
- Guarino, A., Tedeschi, P. (2006). "Endogenous Knowledge Spillovers and Labor Mobility in Industrial Clusters". Università degli Studi di Milano-Bicocca Working Papers No. 20060507.
- Inklaar, R., Timmer, M. P., Ark, B.v. (2008) Market Services Productivity across Europe and the US". *Economic Policy*, 2008, vol. 23, issue 1, pages 139-194.

-
- Keller, W. (1998). "Are International R&D Spillovers Trade-Related - Analyzing Spillovers".
European Economic Review, 1998, vol. 42, issue 8, pages 1469-1481
- Keller, W. (2002). "Trade and the transmission of technology". Journal of Economic Growth, 2002,
vol. 7, issue 1, pages 5-24
- Lee, G. (2006). "The effectiveness of international knowledge spillover channels". European Economic
Review, vol. 50, issue 8, pages 2075-2088
- Lichtenberg, F., Pottelsberghe de la Potterie, B.v. (1996). "International R&D Spillovers - A re-
examination". NBER Working Papers 5668, National Bureau of Economic Research
- Moen, J. (2000). "Is Mobility of technical personnel a source of R&D spillovers?". NBER Working
Papers 7834, National Bureau of Economic Research
- OECD (2005). "Science, Technology and Industry: Scoreboard 2005". OECD, Paris.
- Pack, H., Paxson, C. H. (1999). "Inter-industry labor mobility in Taiwan, China". The World Bank,
Policy Research Working Paper Series, Working Paper No. 2154.
- Pakes, A., Nitzan, S. (1983) "Optimum Contracts for Research Personnel, Research Employment, and
the Establishment of "Rival" Enterprises". Journal of Labor Economics, 1983, vol. 1, issue 4,
pages 345-65
- Terleckyj, N. E. (1974). "Effects of R&D on the productivity growth of industries". National Planning
Association, Washington, DC, Report No. 140
- Wang, Y. (2007). "Trade, Human Capital and Technology Spillovers - an Industry-level Analysis".
Review of International Economics, 2007, vol. 15, issue 2, pages 269-283
- Zucker, L. G., Darby, M. R., Brewer, M. B. (1998). "Intellectual Human Capital and the Birth of U.S
Biotechnology Enterprises", American Economic Review, 1998, vol. 88, issue 1, pages 290-306

10 Appendix

10.1 Theoretical Model - Value and Cost of Knowledge

This section gives more background information on the theoretical model of chapter 4 and expands it on the micro level. With this framework and a matched employer-employee dataset including a complete working history the analysis done in this paper could be conducted more precisely at the firm level.

We start by assuming that each person has a human capital stock \vec{h} which is a vector of knowledge stocks h_f in a finite number of knowledge fields f .¹⁰ The exploitation possibilities of a specific knowledge stock h_f depend on the abilities in the other fields – for example somebody who has knowledge in electrical engineering might be able to use this knowledge when working in machinery. Knowledge however can be defined in a very broad sense so when referring to knowledge, abilities are also included. The unweighted utility U of a workers knowledge stock is given by

$$U = \prod_{f=1}^n h_f \quad h_f > 0 \quad \forall f \in \{1, \dots, n\} \quad (12)$$

Each industry has special requirements and therefore different needs for certain types of knowledge. Chemical engineering skills are of little use for economic analysis but essential for chemical plant design. Thus each industry weights the knowledge fields differently and the weighted utility for industry i is

$$U_i = \prod_{f=1}^n h_f^{\omega_{fi}} \quad \omega_{fi} \geq 0 \quad \forall f \in \{1, \dots, n\} \quad (13)$$

ω_{fi} represents the weighting of knowledge field f in industry i – values between 0 and 1 indicate decreasing returns to knowledge, values larger equal to 1 constant returns and values larger than 1 increasing returns to knowledge – all three possibilities are plausible. An example for increasing returns would be computer related knowledge. Though a lot of research had been done before in this sector the knowledge was of little use for most industries 25 years ago. Continuous progress made them applicable and nowadays computers are indispensable in (almost) all industries. Similar effects may be observed in the field of nanotechnology in the future. A doubling in the knowledge stock in

¹⁰ These fields are by assumption separable – otherwise this problem would extend to an n dimensional space in order to be able to capture all the interdependencies which unnecessarily complicates the problem.

this sector may lead to a more than doubling of the value of this knowledge for some industry sectors. This however may only be true for a certain time span when a threshold is reached.¹¹

Dealing with increasing returns always poses the problem of a finite solution. This problem will be addressed by inverse Inada conditions with respect to the cost of knowledge acquisition. To be more specific in the empirical model presented later on the knowledge stock in certain fields is implicitly modelled as a function of the current R&D stock in an industry. The more a sector invests in R&D the higher the growth of knowledge in the fields linked to that sector. There are however a number of restrictions on the achievable stock of knowledge. Firstly, the knowledge production function does not only depend on the R&D expenditures in this knowledge field, but also on innovation in other fields that either accelerate or simply enable progress. Simulations in the automobile industry or in economics as well as certain experiments in physics (e.g. particle accelerator in CERN) for instance would not be possible without today's computer power. Another example is the vast productivity increase in agriculture beginning in the 19th century. The use of products of other sectors like machines and fertilizers lead to a decrease in the share of people working in the primary sector and enabled the emergence of the bourgeoisie. As a result, the growth of knowledge depends on the knowledge stock of other fields.

The second restriction refers to the costs of knowledge accumulation. Usually the following rule applies: the more common the knowledge, the cheaper it is to obtain. In order to increase a firm's or sector's knowledge, managers can either hire people from other sectors with the required skills, train already employed workers or invest in R&D. Training of course is only an option, if knowledge is already available and not protected by patents. The more specific and novel the knowledge, the less people usually possess it and the more costly becomes the acquisition of this knowledge. It is therefore realistic to assume increasing costs of knowledge growth. If the knowledge is not yet available, R&D has to be undertaken, which is in general the most expensive form of knowledge acquisition meaning that the marginal cost of knowledge increases with respect to R&D is higher than the costs with respect to hiring or training.

Using the properties above, it is reasonable to assume, that with given resource constraints at time t , there exists an upper bound h_{fmax} for the knowledge stock that can be achieved. Expressed in mathematical terms this means that the assumed knowledge cost function with respect to knowledge is convex and bounded and has inverse Inada condition properties. The function is also defined to be decreasing with respect to time, since knowledge already "created" through research can later be more cheaply obtained through training or the hiring of specialists. All the other variables that may influence the costs of knowledge like hiring are denoted by a dot since they are not needed to show that there exists a finite solution.

¹¹ Increasing returns to knowledge at the beginning could also be represented by a sigmoid function, but this case is not dealt with in this framework. However, one could assume that this weighting is only valid for a specific time horizon.

$$c_{ft} = c(h_f, t, \cdot) \quad \frac{\partial c(h_f, t, \cdot)}{\partial h_f} > 0, \quad \frac{\partial c(h_f, t, \cdot)}{\partial t} < 0 \quad \frac{\partial c(h_f, t, \cdot)}{\partial^2 h_f} > 0 \quad (14)$$

Inverse Inada conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} c(0, t, \cdot) = 0 & \quad \frac{\partial c(0, t, \cdot)}{\partial h_f} = 0 \\ \lim_{h_f \rightarrow h_{fmax}} (c(h_f, t, \cdot)) = \infty & \quad \lim_{h_f \rightarrow h_{fmax}} \left(\frac{\partial c(h_f, t, \cdot)}{\partial h_f} \right) = \infty \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

With these properties defined, a finite optimal level of R&D expenditures exists and we can show that continuous productivity growth in this framework occurs as a result of R&D and decreasing cost of knowledge.

After setting up the environment, the next part will look at the relationship between productivity and knowledge. Starting from equation (13) the productivity and also an approximation of the wage of a worker r in a sector i is defined by

$$p_{ri} = \tau_{1i} + \tau_{2i} * \prod_{f=1}^n h_{fr}^{\omega_{fi}} * \prod_{e=1}^m p_{er}^{\varphi_{ei}} \quad (16)$$

The productivity of a worker in an industry has a certain base level τ_{1i} . The usage of his knowledge stock is assumed to depend on his personal characteristics p_{er} . These characteristics can be anything that forms or influences the worker's incentives and attitude to work. Each of these personal characteristics is weighted by an industry specific factor φ_{ei} since the effects may differ by sector. A preference for limited human contact for example limits the possibilities in the educational or retail sector whereas a preference for manual labour is usually not met in the service sector.

When estimating this equation empirically the knowledge stock of a worker can be approximated by years of education and field of education as well as experience in certain sectors. Observable measures for personal characteristics used by the empirical literature are often marital status, wage of the father, sex, age and so on.

In equilibrium, the marginal costs of each knowledge field in an industry i should be equal to the marginal returns in the industry:

$$\frac{\partial g_i(\vec{p}_i)}{\partial h_f} = \frac{\partial c(h_f, t, \cdot)}{\partial h_f} \quad \forall h_f \in [h_1, \dots, h_n] \quad (17)$$

With this information it is possible to calculate optimal stocks of knowledge for each worker at time t and rewrite the productivity of worker r in industry i in equilibrium as \vec{p}_{rit}^* .

$$\vec{p}_{rit}^* = \vec{f}_i(c(h_{1r}^*, t, \cdot), \dots, c(h_{nr}^*, t, \cdot), w_{1i}, \dots, w_{ni}) \quad (18)$$

This is now only a function of exogenous variables, namely the industry specific weights ω_{fi} and the cost function $c(h_f, t, \cdot)$. The current productivity in equilibrium therefore depends on the current cost of knowledge and the equilibrium stock of knowledge at time t .

10.2 Tables

Table 6A – Average annual TFP growth in percent (1995-2005)

nace2		BE	DE	DK	ES	FI	FR	IT	NL	SE	UK	mean
15t16	Food, beverages and tobacco	-0.03	0.26	-1.47	-1.91	4.44	-0.03	-1.61	0.93	-1.06	-0.29	-0.08
17t19	Textiles, textile, leather and footwear	2.20	2.62	0.15	-1.67	1.54	2.60	-2.00	2.35	0.40	2.59	1.08
20	Wood and of wood and cork	2.56	2.73	1.33	-1.47	3.31	4.47	1.66	-0.88	3.50	-0.89	1.63
21t22	Pulp, paper, printing and publishing	-0.18	0.10	0.14	0.30	2.13	0.93	-1.08	0.94	0.14	-0.22	0.32
23	Coke, refined petroleum & nuclear fuel	-6.57	-3.83	-11.92	-2.40	3.50	4.86	-23.68	5.74	5.78	-1.10	-2.96
24	Chemicals and chemical products	-0.40	3.95	3.27	-0.98	2.54	0.31	0.72	3.77	2.50	1.52	1.72
25	Rubber and plastics	2.98	1.63	-0.39	-0.16	-0.85	7.35	-0.29	0.81	0.79	-0.04	1.18
26	Other non-metallic mineral	-0.96	1.95	0.94	0.95	2.79	0.99	0.31	0.28	1.74	2.43	1.14
27t28	Basic metals and fabricated metal	1.09	0.76	-1.46	-0.44	1.43	0.58	-0.29	1.05	-1.00	2.14	0.39
29	Machinery and equipment n.e.c.	2.62	0.78	-1.62	-0.49	0.50	4.26	-1.27	1.74	1.55	1.71	0.98
30t33	Electrical and optical equipment	3.24	4.31	0.17	-1.45	12.35	4.71	-1.05	0.82	20.87	2.84	4.68
34t35	Transport equipment	2.30	1.96	-2.40	0.09	0.55	2.30	-0.87	4.91	3.82	1.13	1.38
36t37	Manufacturing nec; recycling	1.45	-0.11	-1.79	0.35	0.85	0.60	0.02	1.05	4.46	-0.11	0.68

Table 7A – Average annual growth of R&D investment per sectors and country in percent (1995-2005)

nace2		BE	DE	DK	ES	FI	FR	IT	NL	SE	UK	mean
15t16	Food, beverages and tobacco	7.43	5.03		8.50		5.70	3.73	-1.57			4.80
17t19	Textiles, textile, leather and footwear	-0.71	2.78		12.47	3.51	1.09	13.11	4.55			5.26
20	Wood and of wood and cork	-12.51	-2.93	14.86	14.66	1.88	0.89	-7.43	5.57	9.54		2.72
21t22	Pulp, paper, printing and publishing	-10.90	8.92		10.96	3.84	1.44	1.54	11.53	-0.71		3.33
23	Coke, refined petroleum & nuclear fuel	5.74	-0.89		0.96	-1.04	-1.20	-25.08	-23.73	1.72	-2.96	-5.17
24	Chemicals and chemical products	4.85	5.21	11.50	7.65	5.87	4.46	-1.30	4.36	7.93	1.38	5.19
25	Rubber and plastics	5.13	8.77	10.88	3.60	7.72	10.02	2.25	1.03	-5.73	-1.21	4.25
26	Other non-metallic mineral	-0.91	4.55	8.55	7.45	-5.88	1.36	8.25	7.69	-0.50	-1.88	2.87
27t28	Basic metals and fabricated metal	5.05	5.41	5.37	9.02	7.54	-2.64	-6.38	-1.62	4.51	-7.71	1.86
29	Machinery and equipment n.e.c.	3.46	4.81	1.77	6.62	3.83	3.19	7.19	10.27	-0.80	3.13	4.35
30t33	Electrical and optical equipment	1.10	3.13	10.30	0.26	13.54	1.51	-5.24	3.26	5.06	-2.53	3.04
34t35	Transport equipment	2.82	8.46		5.75	3.07	2.82	-1.73	0.19	5.11	2.93	3.27
36t37	Manufacturing nec; recycling	-1.48	-4.94		7.62	12.92	8.99	5.09	-5.02		5.43	3.58

Table 8A – Average current job tenure in years and deviation from the average sectoral job tenure (1995-2005)

nace2	BE	DE	DK	ES	FI	FR	IT	NL	SE	UK	mean
15t16	10.53 (-3.77%)	11.59 (5.89%)	10.49 (-4.14%)	10.12 (-7.54%)	11.55 (5.49%)	11.02 (0.72%)	11.18 (2.17%)	11.92 (8.86%)	10.81 (-1.20%)	10.24 (-6.49%)	10.9
17t19	11.25 (2.11%)	12.75 (15.70%)	9.66 (-12.34%)	9.39 (-14.82%)	12.45 (12.95%)	11.90 (7.98%)	10.03 (-9.01%)	10.76 (-2.32%)	11.75 (6.59%)	10.27 (-6.83%)	11.0
20	10.02 (-8.63%)	11.59 (5.70%)	10.06 (-8.26%)	9.55 (-12.94%)	11.61 (5.86%)	11.85 (8.10%)	10.78 (-1.66%)	12.71 (15.93%)	11.38 (3.81%)	10.10 (-7.92%)	11.0
21t22	10.58 (-10.11%)	12.45 (5.84%)	11.44 (-2.78%)	9.58 (-18.58%)	14.38 (22.20%)	11.76 (-0.03%)	11.30 (-3.94%)	11.75 (-0.12%)	14.28 (21.39%)	10.13 (-13.87%)	11.8
23	15.63 (0.31%)	16.07 (3.16%)	12.20 (-21.69%)	17.82 (14.39%)	16.40 (5.29%)	15.87 (1.85%)	15.84 (1.69%)	16.42 (5.41%)	15.23 (-2.25%)	14.31 (-8.17%)	15.6
24	12.21 (-1.02%)	14.27 (15.67%)	9.04 (-26.70%)	12.12 (-1.79%)	13.66 (10.70%)	12.90 (4.59%)	12.04 (-2.40%)	14.29 (15.83%)	11.49 (-6.85%)	11.35 (-8.02%)	12.3
25	10.46 (-3.74%)	11.83 (8.82%)	9.57 (-11.89%)	10.80 (-0.64%)	10.79 (-0.70%)	12.29 (13.07%)	10.52 (-3.16%)	10.99 (1.16%)	11.61 (6.84%)	9.81 (-9.75%)	10.9
26	12.24 (1.79%)	13.47 (12.01%)	9.86 (-18.01%)	10.59 (-11.96%)	10.94 (-9.00%)	13.88 (15.38%)	10.77 (-10.46%)	13.01 (8.15%)	13.74 (14.28%)	11.77 (-2.18%)	12.0
27t28	13.12 (7.78%)	13.58 (11.60%)	9.78 (-19.61%)	11.51 (-5.45%)	12.16 (-0.10%)	12.73 (4.62%)	11.20 (-7.96%)	12.88 (5.82%)	12.98 (6.65%)	11.76 (-3.36%)	12.2
29	11.68 (-4.41%)	13.88 (13.59%)	10.91 (-10.77%)	11.46 (-6.24%)	12.55 (2.69%)	13.98 (14.37%)	10.99 (-10.08%)	11.77 (-3.71%)	13.62 (11.45%)	11.38 (-6.88%)	12.2
30t33	12.08 (8.20%)	12.42 (11.26%)	9.10 (-18.52%)	10.81 (-3.19%)	8.81 (-21.15%)	13.19 (18.16%)	11.07 (-0.84%)	13.09 (17.21%)	11.05 (-1.07%)	10.04 (-10.06%)	11.2
34t35	12.30 (-7.77%)	14.45 (8.32%)	10.18 (-23.66%)	13.32 (-0.14%)	13.60 (1.96%)	16.21 (21.50%)	13.54 (1.49%)	13.39 (0.41%)	13.69 (2.62%)	12.71 (-4.73%)	13.3
36t37	10.18 (-5.19%)	12.13 (12.90%)	9.50 (-11.55%)	9.44 (-12.10%)	11.67 (8.66%)	11.75 (9.44%)	10.28 (-4.30%)	11.40 (6.16%)	11.70 (8.97%)	9.34 (-13.01%)	10.7
D	11.7	13.1	10.1	11.0	12.0	13.0	11.2	12.5	12.6	11.0	11.8

Short list of the most recent wiiw publications (as of October 2009)

For current updates and summaries see also
wiiw's website at www.wiiw.ac.at

The Importance of Labour Mobility for Spillovers across Industries

by **Neil Foster and Johannes Pöschl**

wiiw Working Papers, No. 58, October 2009
33 pages including 8 Tables
hardcopy: EUR 8.00 (PDF: free download from wiiw's website)

wiiw Monthly Report 10/09

edited by **Leon Podkaminer**

- Bulgaria: from campaign rhetoric to post-election *realpolitik*
 - Czech Republic: bottoming out likely
 - Hungary: external financing secured, economy in deep
 - Poland: recession resisted
 - Romania: export demand may ease recession
 - Slovakia: hitting bottom in the second quarter
 - Slovenia: best performer in deep trouble
 - Baltics: in the midst of depression
 - Statistical Annex: Selected monthly data on the economic situation in Central and Eastern Europe
- wiiw, October 2009
42 pages including 17 Tables
(exclusively for subscribers to the wiiw Service Package)
-

The Determinants of Economic Growth in European Regions

by **Jesus Crespo-Cuaresma, Gernot Doppelhofer und Martin Feldkircher**

wiiw Working Papers, No. 57, September 2009
32 pages including 7 Tables and 4 Figures
hardcopy: EUR 8.00 (PDF: free download from wiiw's website)

wiiw Monthly Report 8-9/09

edited by **Leon Podkaminer**

- Austria's economic relations with Ukraine
 - NMS grain production in 2009: calm on the market
 - Multiplier effects of governmental spending in Central and Eastern Europe: a quantitative assessment
 - Statistical Annex: Selected monthly data on the economic situation in Southeast Europe, Russia and Ukraine
- wiiw, September-October 2009
32 pages including 18 Tables and 6 Figures
(exclusively for subscribers to the wiiw Service Package)
-

Skills and Industrial Competitiveness

by **Michael Landesmann, Sebastian Leitner, Robert Stehrer and Terry Ward**

wiiw Research Reports, No. 356, August 2009
99 pages including 39 Tables and 18 Figures
hardcopy: EUR 8.00 (PDF: free download from wiiw's website)

Trade Integration, Outsourcing and Employment in Austria: A Decomposition Approach

by **Wolfgang Koller and Robert Stehrer**

wiiw Working Papers, No. 56, July 2009
33 pages including 11 Tables and 1 Figure
hardcopy: EUR 8.00 (PDF: free download from wiiw's website)

Where Have All the Shooting Stars Gone?

by **Vladimir Gligorov, Josef Pöschl, Sándor Richter et al.**

wiiw Current Analyses and Forecasts. Economic Prospects for Central, East and Southeast Europe, No. 4, July 2009
171 pages including 47 Tables and 50 Figures
hardcopy: EUR 70.00 (PDF: EUR 65.00)

wiiw Monthly Report 7/09

edited by **Leon Podkaminer**

- Austria's economic relations with Russia
 - The structure of jobs across the EU: some qualitative assessments
 - The government expenditure multiplier and its estimation for Poland
 - Statistical Annex: Selected monthly data on the economic situation in Southeast Europe, Russia and Ukraine
- wiiw, July 2009
28 pages including 10 Tables and 4 Figures
(exclusively for subscribers to the wiiw Service Package)
-

Catching Growth Determinants with the Adaptive Lasso

by **Ulrike Schneider and Martin Wagner**

wiiw Working Papers, No. 55, June 2009
34 pages including 8 Tables and 6 Figures
hardcopy: EUR 8.00 (PDF: free download from wiiw's website)

Inequality in Croatia in Comparison

by **Sebastian Leitner and Mario Holzner**

wiiw Research Reports, No. 355, June 2009
38 pages including 6 Tables and 10 Figures
hardcopy: EUR 22.00 (PDF: EUR 20.00)

wiiw Monthly Report 6/09

edited by **Leon Podkaminer**

- Crisis management in selected countries of Central, East and Southeast Europe
- The road to China's economic transformation: past, present and future
- Statistical Annex: Selected monthly data on the economic situation in Central and Eastern Europe

wiiw, June 2009

32 pages including 11 Tables and 2 Figures

(exclusively for subscribers to the wiiw Service Package)

The Determinants of Regional Economic Growth by Quantile

by **Jesus Crespo-Cuaresma, Neil Foster and Robert Stehrer**

wiiw Working Papers, No. 54, May 2009

28 pages including 7 Tables and 4 Figures

hardcopy: EUR 8.00 (PDF: free download from wiiw's website)

Changes in the Structure of Employment in the EU and their Implications for Job Quality

by **Robert Stehrer, Terry Ward and Enrique Fernández Macías**

wiiw Research Reports, No. 354, May 2009

106 pages including 29 Tables and 48 Figures

hardcopy: EUR 22.00 (PDF: free download from wiiw's website)

wiiw Database on Foreign Direct Investment in Central, East and Southeast Europe, 2009: FDI in the CEECs under the Impact of the Global Crisis: Sharp Declines

by **Gábor Hunya**. Database and layout by **Monika Schwarzhappel**

wiiw Database on Foreign Direct Investment in Central, East and Southeast Europe, May 2009

106 pages including 84 Tables

hardcopy: EUR 70.00 (PDF: EUR 65.00), CD-ROM (including hardcopy): EUR 145.00

MOEL im Sog der Krise

by **Vasily Astrov and Josef Pöschl**

wiiw Research Papers in German language, May 2009

(reprinted from: WIFO-Monatsberichte, Vol. 82, No. 5, May 2009)

14 pages including 6 Tables and 6 Figures

hardcopy: EUR 8.00 (PDF: free download from wiiw's website)

wiiw Monthly Report 5/09

edited by **Leon Podkaminer**

- New Hungarian government prescribes bitter medicine
- The steel industry in Central and Eastern Europe: restructuring and prospects
- Transition: unanswered questions
- Statistical Annex: Selected monthly data on the economic situation in Southeast Europe, Russia and Ukraine

wiiw, May 2009

28 pages including 11 Tables

(exclusively for subscribers to the wiiw Service Package)

wiiw Service Package

The Vienna Institute offers to firms and institutions interested in unbiased and up-to-date information on Central, East and Southeast European markets a package of exclusive services and preferential access to its publications and research findings, on the basis of a subscription at an annual fee of EUR 2,000.

This subscription fee entitles to the following package of **Special Services**:

- A free invitation to the Vienna Institute's **Spring Seminar**, a whole-day event at the end of March, devoted to compelling topics in the economic transformation of the Central and East European region (for subscribers to the wiiw Service Package only).
- Copies of, or online access to, **The Vienna Institute Monthly Report**, a periodical consisting of timely articles summarizing and interpreting the latest economic developments in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. The statistical annex to each *Monthly Report* contains, alternately, country-specific tables or graphs with monthly key economic indicators, economic forecasts, the latest data from the wiiw Industrial Database and excerpts from the wiiw FDI Database. This periodical is not for sale, it can only be obtained in the framework of the wiiw Service Package.
- Free copies of the Institute's **Research Reports** (including *Reprints*), **Current Analyses and Forecasts**, **Country Profiles** and **Statistical Reports**.
- A free copy of the **wiiw Handbook of Statistics** (published in October/November each year and containing more than 400 tables and graphs on the economies of Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, Russia, Serbia, the Slovak Republic, Slovenia and Ukraine)
- Free online access to the **wiiw Monthly Database**, containing more than 1200 leading indicators monitoring the latest key economic developments in ten Central and East European countries.
- **Consulting**. The Vienna Institute is pleased to advise subscribers on questions concerning the East European economies or East-West economic relations if the required background research has already been undertaken by the Institute. We regret we have to charge extra for *ad hoc* research.
- Free access to the Institute's specialized economics library and documentation facilities.

Subscribers who wish to purchase wiiw data sets **on CD-ROM** or special publications not included in the wiiw Service Package are granted considerable **price reductions**.

**For detailed information about the wiiw Service Package
please visit wiiw's website at www.wiiw.ac.at**

To
The Vienna Institute
for International Economic Studies
Rahlgasse 3
A-1060 Vienna

- Please forward more detailed information about the Vienna Institute's Service Package
- Please forward a complete list of the Vienna Institute's publications to the following address

Please enter me for

- 1 yearly subscription of *Research Reports* (including *Reprints*) at a price of EUR 180.00 (hardcopy, Europe), EUR 220.00 (hardcopy, overseas) and EUR 140.00 (PDF download with password) respectively
- 1 yearly subscription of *Current Analyses and Forecasts* a price of EUR 130.00 (hardcopy, Europe), EUR 145.00 (hardcopy, overseas) and EUR 120.00 (PDF download with password) respectively

Please forward

- the following issue of *Research Reports*
- the following issue of *Current Analyses and Forecasts*
- the following issue of *Working Papers*
- the following issue of *Research Papers in German language*
- the following issue of *wiiw Database on Foreign Direct Investment*
- the following issue of *wiiw Handbook of Statistics*
- (other)

.....
Name

.....
Address

.....
Telephone

Fax

E-mail

.....
Date

.....
Signature

Herausgeber, Verleger, Eigentümer und Hersteller:

Verein „Wiener Institut für Internationale Wirtschaftsvergleiche“ (wiiw),
Wien 6, Rahlgasse 3

Postanschrift: A-1060 Wien, Rahlgasse 3, Tel: [+431] 533 66 10, Telefax: [+431] 533 66 10 50

Internet Homepage: www.wiiw.ac.at

Nachdruck nur auszugsweise und mit genauer Quellenangabe gestattet.

P.b.b. Verlagspostamt 1060 Wien