What drives productivity of small states, global, regional or country specific factors?

Vasja Sivec
Statec Research

Presentation prepared for the Conference:
Competitiveness Strategies for the EU Small States
Chambre de Commerce Luxembourg, Kirchberg
19-20 April 2018
Several measures of productivity exist. We will focus on „Total Factor Productivity (TFP)“. Also defined as (Havik et al. (2017)):

\[
TFP = \frac{Y}{K^{(1-\alpha)} \times L^\alpha}
\]

How much we produce per labour and capital. Controls for size. Growth of TFP is also the difference between growth rate of output minus combined growth rates of capital and labour.

It measures efficiency (and utilization) in production.

In the long-run TFP is driven by technological progress.
What do we do?

• For 115 countries we decompose their productivity growth to world, regional and country specific factors.

• We then estimate what is the relative contribution of each factor to the dynamics of TFP growth? (what share of variance of TFP is due to global, regional and country specific factors)

• Do countries with a higher share of productivity related to global dynamics grow faster than countries with a lower share of productivity related to global dynamics? We find that it depends if a country is big or a small…

• We find that region specific factors play a minor role in explaining fluctuations in productivity. Kose et al. (2003, AER) find similar result for economic activity.
Model(s) & Data

MODEL
We use a simplified version of Beck, Hubrich and Marcellino (2015, JAE) model.
- They use a statistical procedure (Principal Components Analysis) to extract Euro Area, country and regional factors that drive inflation rates.
- We use their procedure to extract world, regional and country specific factors and investigate their contribution to the growth of productivity.

DATA
- Pen World Tables data for TFP and other variables.
- The Conference Board classification of world regions.
- Data was screened for outliers (observations outside of the 4 times the interquartile range are treated as outliers).
- For years 1990-2014 (due to balancing the data).
- Includes 115 countries.
RESULTS (1) – descriptive analysis

- We extract 2 world factors (Bai and Ng (2004) test proposes 2 or 9 factors).
- We extract 1 regional factor per region (due to data constraints for certain regions).
- Robustness checks up to 5 global factors and 5 regional factors (where possible).
Table 1: Average share of TFP growth related to Global, Regional and Country specific factors, by region and population size, 1991-2014

A: By region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region \ Factor</th>
<th>Global</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Global&amp;Regional</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cent. and East. Eur. and Cent. Asia</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle East</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Europe</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B: By population size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region \ Factor</th>
<th>Global</th>
<th>Regional</th>
<th>Global&amp;Regional</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POP2016 &gt; 3.5mio (N=23)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP2016 &lt;= 3.5mio (N=92)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pen World Tables, UN and own calculation.
Figure 1: Average TFP growth and share of TFP growth attributable to global factors, by population size, 1991-2014
In the 80s and 90s economists tried to establish linkages between long-term economic growth, economic-policy, political and institutional factors. 

Levine & Renelt (1992, AER) examine if studies linking the above factors to economic growth are robust. 

They find majority of results to be fragile. 

They establish that robust explanators of economic growth include: Initial level of real GDP (GDP_INIT), average annual rate of population growth (POP), investment share of real GDP (INV), secondary school enrolment (HC). 

We replace economic growth with productivity growth (TFP_GR - calculated as log-difference). 

We find that, for small states, a higher share of dynamics related to global factors is associated with higher productivity growth. This relation is absent for big states. 

RESULTS (2) – regression analysis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TFP_GR</td>
<td>TFP_GR</td>
<td>TFP_GR</td>
<td>TFP_GR</td>
<td>TFP_GR</td>
<td>TFP_GR</td>
<td>TFP_GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGDP_INIT</td>
<td>-0.639*** (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.696*** (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.681*** (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.719*** (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.750*** (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.975*** (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.768*** (0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV</td>
<td>0.107 (0.288)</td>
<td>0.091 (0.376)</td>
<td>0.086 (0.408)</td>
<td>0.089 (0.390)</td>
<td>0.085 (0.414)</td>
<td>0.012 (0.918)</td>
<td>0.038 (0.724)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>0.487** (0.004)</td>
<td>0.519** (0.001)</td>
<td>0.516** (0.001)</td>
<td>0.514** (0.002)</td>
<td>0.532*** (0.001)</td>
<td>0.588*** (0.000)</td>
<td>0.547*** (0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP_GR</td>
<td>-0.313* (0.013)</td>
<td>-0.289** (0.007)</td>
<td>-0.289** (0.008)</td>
<td>-0.292** (0.006)</td>
<td>-0.293** (0.007)</td>
<td>-0.300** (0.007)</td>
<td>-0.306** (0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP_TOT</td>
<td>-0.047 (0.615)</td>
<td>-0.045 (0.617)</td>
<td>-0.067 (0.489)</td>
<td>-0.042 (0.634)</td>
<td>-0.067 (0.461)</td>
<td>-0.072 (0.418)</td>
<td>-0.078 (0.399)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP_TOT_SS</td>
<td>0.239** (0.009)</td>
<td>0.314* (0.023)</td>
<td>0.242** (0.007)</td>
<td>0.232* (0.011)</td>
<td>0.263** (0.004)</td>
<td>0.235** (0.010)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

• Global factors explain approx. 30% and the regional approx. 20% of productivity dynamics.

• For small states only, a higher share of productivity related to global dynamics is associated with higher average productivity growth.

• It is likely that big states can rely on an internal market whereas small states need access to an external market, thereby strengthening the statistical association for the case of small states.

• This result could imply that promotion of international trade could aid productivity growth for small countries. This should be interpreted with caution since we do not establish causation.
Shortcomings and future work

• We identify global and regional factors by using a statistical approach, devoid of economic theory. Further work should focus on identifying sources of global and regional dynamics (technology/global demand/world credit cycle/demographics…).

• For identification purposes we assume factors are orthogonal. Moench et al. (2013) bypass this assumption by assuming a different model.

• Our factor model assumes constant variance for the period 1990-2014. It could be extended to allow for a time varying variance.

• „Share of variance explained by global factors“ is estimated/uncertain. Therefore we are likely over-estimating its statistical significance. A bootstrap procedure would be needed to correct for this.
Thank you for your attention!
Figure 1: Average TFP growth and share of TFP growth attributable to regional factors, by population size, 1991-2014
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\[ \rho = 0.05 (0.6) \]

Small States

\[ \rho = -0.1 (0.66) \]