

Eckey, Hans-Friedrich; Kosfeld, Reinhold; Turck, Matthias

**Conference Paper**

## Regional Convergence in Germany. A Geographically Weighted Regression Approach

46th Congress of the European Regional Science Association: "Enlargement, Southern Europe and the Mediterranean", August 30th - September 3rd, 2006, Volos, Greece

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

European Regional Science Association (ERSA)

*Suggested Citation:* Eckey, Hans-Friedrich; Kosfeld, Reinhold; Turck, Matthias (2006) : Regional Convergence in Germany. A Geographically Weighted Regression Approach, 46th Congress of the European Regional Science Association: "Enlargement, Southern Europe and the Mediterranean", August 30th - September 3rd, 2006, Volos, Greece, European Regional Science Association (ERSA), Louvain-la-Neuve

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/118404>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

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

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

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

**Terms of use:**

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

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

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

## **Regional Convergence in Germany. A Geographically Weighted Regression Approach**\*

Hans-Friedrich-Eckey<sup>†</sup>, Reinhold Kosfeld<sup>‡</sup>, Matthias Türck<sup>§</sup>

### Abstract

Regional convergence of German labour markets represents a politically important question. Different studies have examined convergence processes in Germany. We derive equations to estimate the speed of convergence on the basis of an extended Solow model. The technique of geographically weighted regression permits a detailed analysis of convergence processes, which has not been conducted for Germany so far yet. It allows to estimate a separate speed of convergence for every region resulting from the local coefficients of the regression equations. The application of this technique to German labour market regions shows regions moving with a different speeds towards their steady states. The half-live times in the model of conditional convergence disperse less than the same coefficients in the absolute convergence model. Moreover, the speed of convergence is substantially slower in the manufacturing sector than in the service sector.

JEL C21, R11, R58

Keywords: Regional Convergence, Spatial Econometrics, Geographically Weighted Regression

---

\* We are grateful to the referees for their helpful comments.

<sup>†</sup> Prof. Dr. Hans-Friedrich Eckey, Economics Department, University of Kassel, Nora-Platiel-Str. 4, D-34109 Kassel, Germany. Telephone: +49-561-804/3045, Telefax: +49-561-804/3045, e-mail: [eckey@wirtschaft.uni-kassel.de](mailto:eckey@wirtschaft.uni-kassel.de).

<sup>‡</sup> Prof. Dr. Reinhold Kosfeld, Economics Department, University of Kassel, Nora-Platiel-Str. 4, D-34109 Kassel, Germany. Telephone: +49-561-804/3084, telefax: +49-561-804/3045, e-mail: [rkosfeld@wirtschaft.uni-kassel.de](mailto:rkosfeld@wirtschaft.uni-kassel.de).

<sup>§</sup> Matthias Türck, Economics Department, University of Kassel, Nora-Platiel-Str. 4, D-34109 Kassel, Germany. Telephone: +49-561-804/3044, telefax: +49-561-804/3045, e-mail: [tuerck@wirtschaft.uni-kassel.de](mailto:tuerck@wirtschaft.uni-kassel.de).

## 1. Introduction

Regional convergence is a politically important question. In the European Community contract the adjustment of the living conditions is explicitly mentioned (s. Lammers 1998, p. 197). The Basic Constitutional Law of the Federal Republic of Germany (Grundgesetz) mentions uniform living conditions (Art. 72 GG). From this the necessity for an economic policy aligned to convergence can be justified. The Planning Committee for Regional Economic Structure, to which important federal ministers are members, passed a law in 2004 (33. Rahmenplan der Gemeinschaftsaufgabe "Verbesserung der regionalen Wirtschaftsstruktur") about regional policy. In that law regional equalization is explicitly mentioned (cf. Eberstein/Karl 1996 cont., D II 2, pp. 7, see also Irmen/Strubelt 1998, p. 2). So, many fiscal programmes aim at a reduction of regional differences.

Because of the high political importance, many studies have dealt with the issue of convergence and divergence. On the one hand, researchers provide surveys on the European level (see for example Neven 1995, Thomas 1995, Engel/Rogers 1996, Thomas 1996, Helliwell 1998, Nitsch 2000, Martin 2001, Niebuhr 2002, Fingleton 2003, Bottazzi/Peri 2003, Arbia/Paelinck 2003, Greunz 2003, López-Bazo/Vayá/Artis 2004 and Eckey/Kosfeld/Türck 2005 a).

On the other hand, there are many elaborate analyses of the convergence process in Germany. Smolny (2003) examines the extent to which the poor economic development in East German regions can be explained by a growth model. But he finds no convincing explanation for the low productivity. He assumes that East Germany will not catch up with West Germany soon. The same conclusion is conducted by Ragnitz (2000) who gives several structural reasons for the productivity lag, such as different sectoral patterns, a low capital intensity of production and a weak market position of firms. Klodt (2000) concludes that the fading out of the catching-up process since the mid-1990s has been caused by an inappropriate design of industrial policy, which is concentrated on the subsidy of physical capital.

Kemper (2004) analyses the internal migration in East and West Germany. Before unification there were different ways of migration. While in the GDR there were tendencies towards urbanisation, in West Germany there was deconcentration. The 1990s are represented by a convergent development towards a suburbanisation in both parts of Germany. At the end of the decade there were further tendencies towards divergence in the internal migration.

Other aspects of convergence are the process of specialisation of industries as well as the employment. The paper of Niebuhr (2000) is based on two economic growth equilibriums. First, the development of productivity is explained by the level of production. Second, a regression model analyses the relationship between an indicator of agglomeration and the growth of employment. Both approaches show a convergent development in West Germany's planning regions. Suedekum (2004) does not find a trend towards spatial specialisation or concentration. Only in some regions the specialisation is increasing. These areas benefit from it by an above-average employment growth. Suedekum and Blien (2004) supply an accurate analysis of the distribution of employment. The shift share regression of West German administrative districts yields a negative effect of regional wages on employment growth. Employment growth differs, especially suburban regions gain jobs from the core cities. The study of Görzig, Gornig and Werwatz (2005) shows that the catching-up process of East German

wages has slowed down during the last ten years. Bayer and Juessen (2004) conduct a time series approach to find out, whether the unemployment rate in the West German Länder will converge. The used data cover the period from 1960 to 2002. Some tests suggest a convergence process and others not.

An important indicator is also labour productivity. Barrel and Velde (2000) provide empirical evidence for a catching-up process of East Germany compared to West Germany. They estimate unbalanced panel models and identify the emergence of West German firms besides exogenous and endogenous technical processes as important factors. Kosfeld, Eckey and Dreger (2005) estimate a convergence rate of 7.6 % across German regional labour markets. On the basis of an extended Solow model they predict an increase of relative labour productivity from 74 % to 88 % in East Germany in comparison to West Germany in the decade from 2000 to 2010.

Researchers often use the GDP per capita to examine convergence processes. Funke and Strulik (2000) develop a two-region endogenous growth model to study the regional development of the output. The speed of convergence in unified Germany depends on the expansion of the infrastructure. They introduce several scenarios, which all suggest a quite fast convergence process of both parts of Germany. In the most optimistic scenario East Germany will reach 80 per cent of West Germany's GDP per capita after 20 years. Juessen (2005) finds out using descriptive statistics of the GDP per capita that poor regions are catching up. A nonparametric kernel approach provides evidence for regional divergence in the long run.

Some researchers use regression models with income or GDP per capita as the dependent variable. Herz and Röger (1995) find a half-life time of 16 years for 75 West German "Raumordnungsregionen" using the period 1957-1988. Bohl (1998) identifies tendencies towards regional divergence, because the null hypothesis of the unit root test for panel data (Levin Lin test) is not rejected. But the result is limited by the fact that there can be found stationarity in some federal states. Kosfeld and Lauridson (2004) estimate an error-correction mechanism to cover tendencies towards convergence in German labour market regions. The adjustment coefficient is not significant, so they conclude: "At the end of the 20s century only weak local adjustment processes (...) towards a global equilibrium can be established" (Kosfeld/Lauridson 2004, p. 720). Funke and Niebuhr (2005 a) use regression models in order to explain economic growth from West Germany's planning regions. Because the estimations do not fit well, they provide a kernel approach to cluster the regions. They find three convergence clubs, which have different growth equilibriums. Funke and Niebuhr (2005 b) provide insights of  $\beta$ -convergence in West Germany's planning regions. For the period of 1976 to 1996 a slow rate of convergence is detected. Kosfeld, Eckey and Dreger (2005) study  $\beta$ -convergence in German functional regions for the period from 1992 to 2000. In an absolute convergence model the speed of convergence amounts to 6.5 %. The convergence rate in a conditional growth model decreases to 4 %.

Beside of  $\beta$ -convergence Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1991, pp. 112) introduced  $\sigma$ -convergence. This concept measures the changing in earning differences. If the gap is closing, there is a tendency towards convergence. Only a few papers use the concept of  $\sigma$ -convergence. Bode (1998) analyses this approach by using Markov chain models. He concludes that West German regions are converging since the 1970s. Kosfeld, Eckey and Dreger (2005) find diminishing variances of income per capita and labour productivity in German labour regions, so the hypothesis of  $\sigma$ -convergence is confirmed.

A new aspect is the calculation of locally different parameters of  $\beta$ -convergence, because the variation of parameters can lead to inconsistent estimators (Temple 1999, pp. 126). Locally different parameters can be calculated by the technique of geographically weighted regression, which is developed by Brunson, Charlton and Fotheringham (see for example Brunson/Fotheringham/Charlton 1998, p. 957, Fotheringham/Brunson/Charlton 2000 and Fotheringham/Brunson/Charlton 1998). Only one convergence study uses this model. Bivand and Brunstad (2005) estimate a geographically weighted regression of Western Europe. Their coefficients have changing signs. They find convergence of some regions and divergence of others.

However, a model, which uses different regression coefficients for German regions, has not been estimated until now. In addition most models of conditional  $\beta$ -convergence, which use the approach of Mankiw, Romer and Weil (1992), assume the same growth rate of technological progress and rate of depreciation in all regions or neglect the term (see for example Islam 1995, Huang 2005).

The aim of this paper is to estimate a convergence model with locally different parameters of German regions taking into consideration the problems specified above. The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we present a neoclassical growth model, which augments the Solow model by human capital. Section 3 outlines the geographically weighted regression. In particular, we show how this approach is estimated and tested. In addition we explain the used data. The estimated models are presented in Section 4. Section 5 concludes.

## 2. Growth model

We use a model that has been suggested by Mankiw, Romer and Weil (1992). They add human capital, which is stressed in the endogenous growth theory (s. for example Lucas 1988, Grossmann/Helpman 1989 and as an overview Frenkel/Hemmer 1999, pp. 200) to the Solow model. Human capital is important, because this production factor explains tendencies towards convergence in East Germany at the beginning of the 1990s (Barrel/Velde 2000). The production function of type Cob-Douglas in period  $t$  is given by:

$$(1) \quad Y_t = K_t^\alpha \cdot H_t^\beta \cdot (A_t \cdot L_t)^{1-\alpha-\beta},$$

where  $Y$  is the output,  $K$  represents the stock of physical capital,  $H$  the stock of human capital,  $A$  the level of technology and  $L$  the labour (Mankiw/Romer/Weil 1992, p. 416). Dividing the production function (1) by  $A_t \cdot L_t$  yields the equation:

$$(2) \quad y_t = k_t^\alpha \cdot h_t^\beta,$$

where the lower cases stand for quantities per effective unit of labour, i. e.  $y_t = Y_t / (A_t \cdot L_t)$ ,  $k_t = K_t / (A_t \cdot L_t)$  and  $h_t = H_t / (A_t \cdot L_t)$ . The steady state of output per effective can derived from this production function (s. Romer 1996, p. 133 and Mankiw/Romer/Weil 1992, pp. 416):

$$(3) \quad y^* = \ln \left( \frac{s_k}{n + g + \delta} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} \cdot h^{\frac{\beta}{1-\alpha}}$$

with  $s_k$  as saving rate of capital,  $n$  as growth rate of labour  $L$ ,  $g$  as rate of technological progress and  $\delta$  as depreciation rate. Barro and Sala-i-Martin (2004, p. 61) have shown that approximating equations (2) and (3) around the steady state yields, if one takes a Taylor series expansion:

$$(4) \quad \ln y_t - \ln y_0 = -(1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \cdot \ln y_0 + (1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \cdot \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha - \beta} \ln s_k \\ + (1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \cdot \frac{\beta}{1 - \alpha - \beta} \ln s_h - (1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \cdot \frac{\alpha + \beta}{1 - \alpha - \beta} \ln(n + g + \delta).$$

The growth of the output is positively determined by the proportion of output, which is invested in physical and human capital, and negatively affected by the initial level of output as well as the growth rate of labour force, technological progress and depreciation (Mankiw/Romer/Weil 1992, p. 423). Equation (4) studies conditional convergence. This is a convergence process, where poorer regions grow faster than richer regions after controlling for relevant variables. Then the regression coefficient for the starting level of output will be significantly negative.

The conditional convergence model can be also expressed with the human capital in the steady state instead of the invested share in human capital. The relationship follows from formula (4):

$$(5) \quad \ln y_t - \ln y_0 = -(1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \cdot \ln y_0 + (1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \cdot \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \ln s_k \\ + (1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \cdot \frac{\beta}{1 - \alpha} \ln h^* - (1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \cdot \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \ln(n + g + \delta).$$

A significant conditional convergence does not necessarily mean that an absolute convergence process takes place. Absolute convergence applies a negative relationship between the initial output and growth of output without using control variables:

$$(6) \quad \ln y_t - \ln y_0 = -(1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \cdot \ln y_0.$$

In empirical analyses quantities per capita and not per effective unit of labour are usually used, because the level of technology  $A$  is unknown. The equations (5) and (6) are given in units per capita as follows (s. Hemmer/Lorenz 2004, p. 49 and Temple 1999, p. 122):

$$(7) \quad \ln \left( \frac{Y_t}{L_t} \right) - \ln \left( \frac{Y_0}{L_0} \right) = -(1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \cdot \ln \left( \frac{Y_0}{L_0} \right) + (1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \cdot \ln A_0 + gt.$$

and

$$(8) \quad \ln \left( \frac{Y_t}{L_t} \right) - \ln \left( \frac{Y_0}{L_0} \right) = -(1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \cdot \ln \left( \frac{Y_0}{L_0} \right) + (1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \cdot \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \ln s_k \\ + (1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \cdot \frac{\beta}{1 - \alpha} \ln \left( \frac{H}{L} \right)^* - (1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \cdot \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} \ln(n + g + \delta) \\ + (1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \cdot \ln A_0 + gt.$$

Note that the restriction of model (5) of absolute equal coefficients for  $\ln s_k$  and  $\ln(n + g + \delta)$  leads to the equation:

$$(9) \quad \ln \left( \frac{Y_t}{L_t} \right) - \ln \left( \frac{Y_0}{L_0} \right) = -(1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \cdot \ln \left( \frac{Y_0}{L_0} \right) + (1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \cdot \frac{\alpha}{1 - \alpha} [\ln s_k - \ln(n + g + \delta)] \\ + (1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \cdot \frac{\beta}{1 - \alpha} \ln \left( \frac{H}{L} \right)^* + (1 - e^{-\lambda t}) \cdot \ln A_0 + gt.$$

However, the investments in human capital are difficult to measure, because the foregone labour earnings can hardly be figured out. Mankiw, Romer and Weil (1992) use the percentage of working-age-population that attends secondary school. They assume that their input based indicator is proportional to the investments. So the estimators will not be biased. This input based indicator is criticised by Dinopoulos and Thompson (1999, pp. 141-142). They argue that the indicator from Mankiw, Romer and Weil (1992) will underestimate human capital in poor countries and overestimate it in rich countries.

Dinopoulos and Thompson (1999) point out further reasons for the inadequacy of this indicator. First, human capital involves tertiary education and training on the job, too. Second, the attendance at school does not necessarily imply that human capital is rising. There are differences in the ability of learning. In addition, some educated skills are difficult to use in practice. However, because the human capital stock in the steady state is unknown and there are not available data for the investments in human capital, the human capital stock should be used instead (Hemmer/Lorenz 2004, p. 158).

Note that in the conditional convergence model of Mankiw, Romer and Weil (1992, p. 411)  $g_t$  is a constant, because the period  $t$  is fixed [s. formula (9)]. Mankiw, Romer and Weil argue that the differences in the technological level i. e. climatic and institutional circumstances can be measured by a constant  $\alpha$  and a country-specific error term  $\varepsilon$ :

$$(10) \quad \ln A_0 = \alpha + \varepsilon.$$

Their assumption of noncorrelation between this error term and the independent variables seem not to be convincing (Islam 1995, p.1134 and Klenow/Rodriguez-Clare 1997). The technological growth depends rather on institutional characteristics and endowments, which differ across regions (Gundlach 2005, pp. 553). So we measure  $g_t$  and  $A_0$  by locally specific constants. However, there is empirical evidence for threshold values of regional convergence or different regional parameters of  $\beta$ -convergence (s. for example Bivand/Brunstad 2005, Funke/Niebuhr 2005 a, Juessen 2005, Huang 2005). Thus we allow also regionally different values for all other parameters to prevent inconsistent estimators (Temple 1999, p. 126). In addition we do not use the unconvincing assumption of the same growth rate of technological progress and rate of depreciation in all regions (see Temple 1999, p. 122, Kosfeld/Eckey/Dreger 2005). All regression coefficients, especially the rate of convergence, are estimated separately for all regions. This model of conditional convergence is given by:

$$(11) \quad \ln\left(\frac{Y_t}{L_t}\right)_i - \ln\left(\frac{Y_0}{L_0}\right)_i = -(1 - e^{-\lambda_i t}) \cdot \ln\left(\frac{Y_0}{L_0}\right)_i \\ + (1 - e^{-\lambda_i t}) \cdot \frac{\alpha_i}{1 - \alpha_i} \left[ \ln s_{k_i} - \ln(n_i + g_i + \delta_i) \right] \\ + (1 - e^{-\lambda_i t}) \cdot \frac{\beta_i}{1 - \alpha_i} \ln\left(\frac{H}{L}\right)_i + (1 - e^{-\lambda_i t}) \cdot \ln A_{0_i} + g_i t.$$

The analogical model of absolute convergence can be expressed as follows:

$$(12) \quad \ln\left(\frac{Y_t}{L_t}\right)_i - \ln\left(\frac{Y_0}{L_0}\right)_i = -(1 - e^{-\lambda_i t}) \cdot \ln\left(\frac{Y_0}{L_0}\right)_i + (1 - e^{-\lambda_i t}) \cdot \ln A_{0_i} + g_i t.$$

### 3. Regression model and data sources

#### 3.1 Geographically weighted regression

The influence between a dependent variable  $Y$  and some independent variables  $X_k$  differs often across regions (spatial nonstationarity). Therefore our regression models consist of locally different parameters [cf. formulas (11) and (12)]. We use a geographically weighted regression (GWR) which has been developed by Brunson, Charlton and Fotheringham in the past ten years (see for example Brunson/Fotheringham/Charlton 1998, p. 957, Fotheringham/Brunson/Charlton 2000 and Fotheringham/Brunson/Charlton 1998).

The global regression model without taking into consideration a spatial dependence is written by the form

$$(13) \quad y_i = \beta_0 + \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k \cdot x_{ki} + u_i,$$

where  $y_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , are the observation of the dependent variable  $Y$ ,  $\beta_k$  ( $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m$ ) represent the regression coefficients,  $x_{ki}$  is the  $i$ th value of  $X_k$  and  $u_i$  are the error terms. In matrix notation (13) is given by

$$(14) \quad \mathbf{y} = \beta_0 + \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_k \cdot \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{u}$$

with  $\mathbf{y}$  as vector of the dependent variable,  $\mathbf{x}_k$  as vector of the  $k$ th independent variable and  $\mathbf{u}$  as vector of the error term. In geographically weighted regression the global regression coefficients in (13) are replaced by local parameters:

$$(15) \quad y_i = \beta_{0i} + \sum_{k=1}^m \beta_{ki} \cdot x_{ki} + u_i,$$

where  $\beta_{ki}$  ( $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m$ ) is the regression coefficient, which expresses the influence of  $x_{ki}$  on  $y_i$ . If the  $\beta_{ki}$  are constant for all  $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n$ , the global model of equation (13) or (14) respectively holds (cf. Brunson/Fotheringham/Charlton 1996, pp. 282 and Fotheringham/Charlton/Brunson 1997, pp. 62). In model (12) the dependent variable  $y_i$  is  $\ln(Y_t/L_t)_i - \ln(Y_0/L_0)_i$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  assembles the independent variables in a  $n \times 2$ -matrix. It contains a column of 1s to estimate the influence of  $\ln A_{0i} + g_i t$  on  $Y$ . In the second column stand the values of  $\ln(Y_0/L_0)_i$ . The conditional convergence model (11) differs only regarding  $\mathbf{X}$  from model (12). The matrix  $\mathbf{X}$  contains two further columns, first  $[\ln s_{ki} - \ln(n_i + g_i + \delta_i)]$ , second  $\ln(H/L)_i$ . Thus the global model is a special case of the GWR function. For every region separate parameters are estimated, which is an advantage over the spatial error and the spatial lag model (cf. Anselin 1988). A spatial dependence in the error term can be caused by a missing spatial varying relationship (Brunson/Fotheringham/Charlton 1999, pp. 497).

How can the GWR parameters be estimated, because there are more unknowns in (15) than degrees of freedom? In the calibration observations are weighted in accordance with its proximity to region  $i$ . As the distance between two regions becomes smaller, the weight will be greater. We use the Euclidean distance between two regions  $d_{ij}$  to calculate the weights (Gaussian weighting function):

$$(16) \quad w_{ij} = e^{-0,5 \cdot (d_{ij}/\text{bandwidth})^2}.$$



The bandwidth indicates the extent to which the distances are weighted. With a greater bandwidth the smoothing increases. Then regions  $i$  and  $j$  get a smaller (greater) weight  $w_{ij}$ , if they are far from (close to) each other. The bandwidth is computed by cross-validation or minimising the Akaike information criterion (Fotheringham/Brunsdon/Charlton 2000, pp. 56; Fotheringham/Charlton/ Brunsdon 1998, p. 1910).

The regression coefficients are estimated by weighted least squares (WLS). The values of the independent variables from regions which are nearer to region  $i$  have a greater influence, because they are multiplied with the weight matrix  $\mathbf{W}_i$  for region  $i$ :

$$(17) \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i = (\mathbf{X}' \cdot \mathbf{W}_i \cdot \mathbf{X})^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{X}' \cdot \mathbf{W}_i \cdot \mathbf{y} .$$

$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i$  is the GWR estimator for the  $i$ th region:

$$(18) \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i = (\hat{\beta}_{i0} \quad \hat{\beta}_{i1} \quad \dots \quad \hat{\beta}_{im})'$$

and  $\mathbf{W}_i$  a  $n$  by  $n$  diagonal matrix, which is denoted by the weights  $w_{ij}$ ,  $j = 1, 2, \dots, n$ :

$$(19) \quad \mathbf{W}_i = \begin{bmatrix} w_{i1} & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & w_{i2} & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & w_{in} \end{bmatrix} .$$

However, one should test if the GWR model is appropriate. The global test of nonstationarity compares a regression of  $\mathbf{y}$  on  $\mathbf{X}$  with sum of squared residuals to a geographically weighted regression. The extra complexity of varying regression coefficients is worthwhile only, if the GWR model supplies a smaller residual sum of squares in comparison to the OLS estimation. The sum of squared residuals from the OLS model can be expressed as:

$$(20) \quad \hat{\mathbf{u}}_0' \cdot \hat{\mathbf{u}}_0 = \mathbf{y}' \cdot \mathbf{R}_0 \cdot \mathbf{y}$$

with

$$(21) \quad \mathbf{R}_0 = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{S}_0)' \cdot (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{S}_0)$$

and

$$(22) \quad \mathbf{S}_0 = \mathbf{X} \cdot (\mathbf{X}' \cdot \mathbf{X})^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{X}' .$$

$\mathbf{S}_0$  is called OLS smoothing operator, because it transfers or "smooths" the observed values  $\mathbf{y}$  to the expected values  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ :

$$(23) \quad \hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{S}_0 \cdot \mathbf{y} .$$

The  $i$ th row of the GWR smoothing operator  $\mathbf{S}_1$  is given by

$$(24) \quad \mathbf{s}_i = \mathbf{x}_i' \cdot (\mathbf{X}' \cdot \mathbf{W}_i \cdot \mathbf{X})^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{X}' \cdot \mathbf{W}_i .$$

Letting  $\mathbf{R}_1$  be a quadratic matrix computed with the GWR smoothing operator:

$$(25) \quad \mathbf{R}_1 = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{S}_1)' \cdot (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{S}_1) ,$$

the GWR residuals may be written using the quadratic form of this matrix

$$(26) \quad \hat{\mathbf{u}}_1' \cdot \hat{\mathbf{u}}_1 = \mathbf{y}' \cdot \mathbf{R}_1 \cdot \mathbf{y} .$$

If we assume  $\mathbf{y}$  has a normal distribution, the ratio

$$(27) \quad F = \frac{(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_0' \cdot \hat{\mathbf{u}}_0 - \hat{\mathbf{u}}_1' \cdot \hat{\mathbf{u}}_1) / v}{(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_1' \cdot \hat{\mathbf{u}}_1) / w} ,$$

where  $v$  denotes the trace of  $\mathbf{R}_1 - \mathbf{R}_0$  and  $w$  the trace of  $\mathbf{R}_1$ , is approximative F-distributed (Brunsdon/Fotheringham/Charlton 1999, pp. 501). If the null hypothesis of stationarity is rejected, the GWR model is appropriate.


Beside the nonstationarity of all regression coefficients one can check if one parameter is nonstationary. The test is based on a Monte Carlo simulation (for details see Fotheringham/Brunsdon/Charlton 2000, pp. 56). If the null hypothesis of stationarity is rejected for some but not all parameters, a mixed GWR model could be appropriate (Fotheringham/Brunsdon/Charlton 2000, pp. 65; Mei/He/Fang 2004). If the global test of nonstationarity suggests using a geographically weighted regression model and the Monte Carlo simulation is not significant for all coefficients, one should also use a GWR approach.

### 3.2 Sources of data

We estimate an absolute and a conditional convergence model for Germany [cf. formulas (11) and (12)]. As spatial units we do not use administrative units (Kreise). A regression analysis with administrative units can provoke spatial autocorrelation (Keilbach 2000, pp. 120 and Döring 2005, p. 100) which is strengthened by suburbanization tendencies (Kühn 2001, Kaltenbrunner 2003, Motzkus 2001, pp. 196 and Schönert 2003). This spatial autocorrelation would cause an inefficiency of the geographically weighted regression.

Instead our analysis is based on 180 labour market regions, which Eckey defined by commuter flows (Eckey/Horn/Klemmer 1990; Eckey 2001). This demarcation worked satisfactorily in different studies (s. for example Kosfeld/Lauridsen 2004, Kosfeld/Eckey/Dreger 2005, Eckey/Kosfeld/Türck 2005 and Eckey/Kosfeld 2005). The official data on the basis of 440 administrative units (Kreise) can be aggregated to labour market regions.

Fig. 1: Investment rate and technological progress per annum (1995-2002)



Official data are used to estimate the convergence models, which cover the period between 1995 and 2002 (Statistische Ämter des Bundes und der Länder 2003 and 2004). We focus on labour productivity ( $Y/L$ ) which is measured by gross value added per employee. The conditional model contains additional variables. The investment rate in physical capital  $s_k$  is given by gross investments in physical capital divided by gross value added (s. Fig. 1 a). Human capital covers the labour force with a degree of an upper school providing vocational education (tertiary education), a university of applied sciences or a university. We use the initial values to prevent an endogeneity bias (s. Temple 1999, pp. 128). The growth of labour force  $n$  is given by the official statistics. The depreciation rate can be computed using the gross investments and the physical capital stock.<sup>1</sup>

Table 1: Descriptive statistics

| Variable  | Mean      | Standard deviation | Minimum  | Maximum    |
|---|-----------|--------------------|----------|------------|
| Gross value (Y) 1995  | 9391.956  | 14922.431          | 950.000  | 88829.000  |
| Gross value (Y) 2002  | 10882.694 | 17479.038          | 1039.000 | 108565.000 |
| Labour force (L) 1995   | 207.506   | 284.761            | 36.100   | 1936.900   |
| Labour force (L) 2002   | 214.839   | 298.759            | 30.700   | 1894.600   |
| Human capital (H) 1995  | 15.436    | 28.777             | 1.100    | 222.400    |
| Physical capital (K) 1995   | 48910.661 | 72357.732          | 4303.300 | 452136.500 |
| Physical capital (K) 2002   | 57657.334 | 82425.905          | 6262.300 | 503232.500 |
| Investment rate in physical capital ( $s_k$ ) per annum (1995-2002) | 0.268     | 0.131              | 0.080    | 0.937      |
| Growth rate of labour force ( $n$ ) per annum (1995-2002)           | 0.002     | 0.010              | -0.034   | 0.026      |
| Growth rate of technological progress ( $g$ ) per annum (1995-2002) | 0.012     | 0.005              | -0.002   | 0.025      |
| Rate of depreciation ( $\delta$ ) per annum (1995-2002)             | 0.023     | 0.002              | 0.020    | 0.027      |

In many studies a constant rate of technological progress is used for all regions (see for example Islam 1995, p. 1139, Barro 1999, p. 122 and Kosfeld/Eckey/Dreger 2005, pp. 198), which is not realistic (Gundlach 2005, pp. 553). We estimate  $g$  with a panel GWR approach of the production function:

$$(28) \quad Y = f(\text{dummy West / East, dummy for } g, L, K, H).$$

The dummy variable for estimating  $g$  is 1, if the values of 2002 are used. The regression coefficient belonging to this dummy yields the growth rate over the whole period. Fig. 1 b provides a visual impression of the spatial structure. The rate of technological progress is high in some regions around Munich and Stuttgart as well as in East

<sup>1</sup> The regional capital stock is not denoted by the official statistics. We use therefore an estimation, which is described in the appendix.

Germany and low in the industrially shaped Ruhr district and Saarland.<sup>2</sup> The average growth rate for Germany corresponds with the estimation of Grömling (2004).<sup>3</sup>

## 4. Empirical evidence on convergence

### 4.1 Absolute convergence

At first we estimate an absolute convergence model of the neoclassical growth theory for two reasons. On the one hand, this model, which was developed by Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1992 and 1991, pp. 112), is now a standard model. It is used by many researchers (see for example Kosfeld/Eckey/Dreger 2005, Seitz 1995, Kim 2003, Cuadrado-Roura 2001, Martin 2001, Fingleton 2003 and Gundlach 2003) but with the exception of Bivand and Brunstad (2005) only for stationary regression coefficients. This assumption of the same convergence rate of every region is not realistic (Temple 1999, pp. 126). On the other hand, the absolute convergence model permits a sectoral analysis of the convergence process, because sectoral data are not available for the control variables.

The absolute convergence is estimated with labour productivity, which is measured by gross value added per employee. The average growth of labour productivity is explained by the initial labour productivity level. The GWR equilibrium of this model can be expressed as [s. formulas (12) and (15)]:

$$(29) \quad \frac{\ln y_{i,2002} - \ln y_{i,1995}}{7} = \beta_{0i} + \beta_{1i} \cdot \ln y_{i,1995} + u_i.$$

The results of the calculations are listed in Table 2. The coefficient of determination  $R^2$  (global OLS estimation of the equilibrium

$$(30) \quad \frac{\ln y_{i,2002} - \ln y_{i,1995}}{7} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot \ln y_{i,1995} + u_i)$$

yields a value of 33.7 %. This proportion of explained variation is significant. The regression coefficients have the expected sign. We obtain a level of technology in the base period 1995, which is expressed by the intercept, of 0.137. The negative coefficient of the initial labour productivity level confirms a convergence of German regions. Regions, which have a low labour productivity, grow faster than regions with a high labour productivity. The parameter  $\beta_1$  is linked to the speed of convergence  $\lambda$  by the following relationship (s. Barro/Sala-i-Martin 2004, p. 462):

$$(31) \quad \beta_1 = -(1 - e^{-\lambda}).$$

The speed of convergence in the global OLS model,

$$(32) \quad \lambda = \ln(1 - \beta_1) = \ln[1 - (-0.032)] = \ln(1.032) = 0.031 [\hat{=} 3.1 \%,$$

shows quite a fast decline in regional disparities. A 3.1 % convergence rate implies about a:

<sup>2</sup> In addition we estimated the rate of technological progress with the Solow residual (Barro 1999 and Barro/Sala-i-Martin 2004, pp. 434). The regional results of this approach, which is usually used (see for example Grömling 2001 and Grömling 2004), do not convey a great deal, because the coefficient  $g$  is negative in about 10 % of the regions.

<sup>3</sup> Our estimation averages out 1.1 %.

$$(33) \quad t = \frac{-\ln(1/2)}{\lambda} = \frac{-\ln(1/2)}{0,031} = 22$$

year half-life time of the convergence process.


Table 2: Absolute convergence of the labour productivity

| Coefficient  | Minimum | Lower Quartile | Median | Upper Quartile | Maximum | Global OLS |
|--|---------|----------------|--------|----------------|---------|------------|
| $\beta_{0i}$ or $\beta_0$  | 0.042   | 0.079          | 0.110  | 0.147          | 0.183   | 0.137**    |
| $\beta_{1i}$ or $\beta_1$  | -0.046  | -0.035         | -0.025 | -0.017         | -0.007  | -0.032**   |
| $R_i^2$ or $R^2$   | 0.158   | 0.278          | 0.333  | 0.407          | 0.521   | 0.337**    |
| AIC = -6.764; Bandwidth = 1.419; Global test of nonstationarity: F = 7.646** |         |                |        |                |         |            |

Notes:  $R^2$ : coefficient of determination;  $R_i^2$ : local coefficient of determination; F: empirical F-value; \*\*: significant at the 1 % level; \*: significant at the 5 % level; (\*): significant at the 10 % level

Because the null hypothesis of the global test of nonstationarity [s. formula (27)] is rejected, we estimate a GWR model, too.<sup>4</sup> The regression coefficients vary remarkable, but the signs are all the same. Thus the results can be well interpreted. The intercept is always positive and it shows the different extent of using technology. The slope has a negative sign, so German labour regions are converging concerning the labour productivity. The convergence speed covers the range between 0.7 % and 4.5 %.

Fig. 2: Average growth of labour productivity and half-life time of the convergence process 1995-2002




<sup>4</sup> In addition the nonstationarity of the two regression coefficients is checked by Monte Carlo simulation (the p-values are smaller than 0.01). These tests confirm the result of the global test of nonstationarity.

Fig. 2 a shows the distribution of the average labour productivity growth in the period from 1995 to 2002 and the half-life time across German labour regions. Especially regions in the former GDR and in Bavaria have comparably high growth rates. The values increase from the west to the east. The subsidies in the former GDR favoured investments in capital intensive branches (Quehenberger 2000, pp. 122-123). This process caused a labour-saving technological progress and a high growth in labour productivity.

The half-life time of the convergence process varies in German labour regions (s. Fig. 2 b). Its value increases from the north to the south. Regions in south Bavaria and Baden-Württemberg as well as in Saarland need more than fifty years to achieve half of the rise in labour productivity to their steady state, while this value lies in Northern Germany at less than 20 years.

Fig. 3: Half-life time of the convergence process 1995-2002



Figs. 3 a and 3 b provide a visual impression of the spatial structure of the half-life time in combination with the labour productivity and the labour productivity growth. The regions in the former GDR have a low labour productivity and a short half-life time. Their steady state of the labour productivity will probably not reach the value of most regions in West Germany, because their relative high growth in the mid 1990s is declining. Some regions in the south of Bavaria and near Stuttgart have a high final labour productivity, an above average growth of this variable and a long half-life time. They will be the most prosperous regions of Germany on a long-term basis.

We also estimate an absolute convergence model of the manufacturing sector and the service sector. For both models the global test of nonstationarity is significant. The explained variance in the approach of the service sector is much higher than the same value of the service sector model (cf. Table 3 and Table 4).

Table 3: Absolute convergence of the labour productivity (manufacturing sector)

| Coefficient  | Minimum | Lower Quartile | Median | Upper Quartile | Maximum | Global OLS |
|--|---------|----------------|--------|----------------|---------|------------|
| $\beta_{0i}$ or $\beta_0$  | 0.037   | 0.089          | 0.123  | 0.156          | 0.325   | 0.118**    |
| $\beta_{1i}$ or $\beta_1$  | -0.080  | -0.036         | -0.014 | -0.017         | -0.002  | -0.026**   |
| $R_i^2$ or $R^2$   | 0.025   | 0.278          | 0.206  | 0.277          | 0.471   | 0.221**    |
| AIC = -5.022; Bandwidth = 1.567; Global test of nonstationarity: F = 4.346** |         |                |        |                |         |            |

Notes:  $R^2$ : coefficient of determination;  $R_i^2$ : local coefficient of determination; F: empirical F-value; \*\*: significant at the 1 % level; \*: significant at the 5 % level; (\*): significant at the 10 % level


Table 4: Absolute convergence of the labour productivity (service sector)

| Coefficient  | Minimum | Lower Quartile | Median | Upper Quartile | Maximum | Global OLS |
|--|---------|----------------|--------|----------------|---------|------------|
| $\beta_{0i}$ or $\beta_0$  | 0.088   | 0.173          | 0.193  | 0.225          | 0.278   | 0.217**    |
| $\beta_{1i}$ or $\beta_1$  | -0.073  | -0.060         | -0.051 | -0.046         | -0.025  | -0.057**   |
| $R_i^2$ or $R^2$   | 0.164   | 0.337          | 0.560  | 0.725          | 0.815   | 0.654**    |
| AIC = -6.745; Bandwidth = 1.521; Global test of nonstationarity: F = 4.999** |         |                |        |                |         |            |

Notes:  $R^2$ : coefficient of determination;  $R_i^2$ : local coefficient of determination; F: empirical F-value; \*\*: significant at the 1 % level; \*: significant at the 5 % level; (\*): significant at the 10 % level

The half-life time of the manufacturing sector exceeds the corresponding value of the service sector (s. Fig. 4). The reason is that most regions have similar basic services (Corrado/Martin/Weeks 2005, p. C145). Note that the spatial pattern of both sectors is different, too. Many regions, which have a long half-life time in one sector, will converge quite fast in the other sector. On an aggregated level this difference will compensate each other.

Fig. 4: Half-life time of the convergence process 1995-2002 (different sectors)



## 4.2 Conditional convergence

The conditional model differs from the model of the absolute convergence by the fact that control variables are included. We use a model which was conducted by Mankiw, Romer and Weil (1992). They added the human capital, which is stressed in the endogenous growth theory (s. for example Lucas 1988, Grossmann/Helpman 1989 and as an overview Frenkel/Hemmer 1999, pp. 200) to a Solow model.

The equation of the labour productivity growth model with locally different regression coefficients is given by [cf. formulas (11) and (15)]:

$$(34) \quad \frac{\ln y_{i,2002} - \ln y_{i,1995}}{7} = \beta_{0i} + \beta_{1i} \cdot \ln y_{i,1995} + \beta_{2i} \cdot \ln[\ln s_{ki} - \ln(n_i + g_i + \delta_i)] + \beta_{3i} \cdot \ln h_i + u_i,$$

where  $y_{i,2002}$  represents the labour productivity 2002 in region  $i$  and  $y_{i,1995}$  the same quantity in 1995 and all other variables are denoted as before. The global test of nonstationarity suggests using a geographically weighted regression model.<sup>5</sup>

The influence of the control variables is quite small. In the global OLS estimation the coefficient of human capital is not significant at the 10 % level. In the GWR a significance test of the local parameters is not computed, but the coefficients lie all in the proximity of zero. The regression coefficient of the investment rate and the growth rate of labour force and technological progress as well as the rate of depreciation rate is significant at the 5 % level. So the local coefficients of determination are only slightly

<sup>5</sup> The Monte Carlo simulation does not reject the null hypothesis of stationarity for all regression coefficients in both conditional convergence models. However, the local determination coefficients are higher in the GWR model, so this model is more appropriate.



higher than in the model of the absolute convergence, although we use substantially more variables.

Table 5: Conditional convergence of the labour productivity

| Coefficient               | Minimum | Lower Quartile | Median | Upper Quartile | Maximum | Global OLS |
|---------------------------|---------|----------------|--------|----------------|---------|------------|
| $\beta_{0i}$ or $\beta_0$ | 0.061   | 0.095          | 0.110  | 0.117          | 0.140   | 0.110**    |
| $\beta_{1i}$ or $\beta_1$ | -0.035  | -0.029         | -0.027 | -0.022         | -0.013  | -0.026**   |
| $\beta_{2i}$ or $\beta_2$ | 0.002   | 0.003          | 0.003  | 0.004          | 0.004   | 0.003*     |
| $\beta_{3i}$ or $\beta_3$ | -0.001  | 0.000          | 0.000  | 0.001          | 0.001   | 0.000      |
| $R_i^2$ or $R^2$          | 0.231   | 0.400          | 0.444  | 0.488          | 0.532   | 0.360**    |

AIC = -6.776; Bandwidth = 2.429; Global test of nonstationarity: F = 6.090\*\*

Notes:  $R^2$ : coefficient of determination;  $R_i^2$ : local coefficient of determination; F: empirical F-value; \*\*: significant at the 1 % level; \*: significant at the 5 % level; (\*): significant at the 10 % level

The GWR parameters of the initial labour productivity lie in the range between -0.035 and -0.013. The negative signs confirm the result of the absolute convergence model that all regions are converging. The parameters indicate a speed of convergence, which disperse less than the coefficients in the model of absolute convergence.

Fig. 5: Half-life time of the convergence process 1995-2002




Fig. 5 a shows the spatial structure of half-life time, which is calculated using the speed of convergence. The half-life time increases from northwest to southeast. Some regions at the east border of Saxony and Bavaria will need more than 35 years to achieve half of the rise in labour productivity to their steady state value. Fig. 5 b gives a visual

impression of the half-life time in combination with the labour productivity in 2002. The white shaped regions have a small labour productivity and a short half-life time. They are located peripherally in the Harz, in the north of the former GDR and between Cologne and Saarbrücken. In contrast to the models of absolute convergence many regions of East Germany exhibit an above-average half-life time. Most regions in Bavaria and in Baden-Württemberg have above-average values of labour productivity and half-life time.

## 5. Conclusion

The assumption of stationarity cannot be founded theoretically for most research questions. The behaviour and attitudes of people as well as the infrastructure vary across regions. That will cause locally different parameters, which is ignored by a global approach. In addition a global estimation may lead to a bias and provoke auto-correlation. To that extent the geographically weighted regression represents an important extension of spatial econometrics.

The technique of geographically weighted regression is applied to a convergence model of German labour market regions. The estimation yields different speeds of convergence of the regions. In particular it showed that Bavarian regions have a long and north German districts a short half-life time. The approach provides evidence that the south German regions with a high labour productivity and a small unemployment rate will be the most prosperous regions in Germany. On the basis of the economic development in the long-run there will be a gap between north and south Germany.

The substantially varying coefficients show that a global convergence model, which was estimated by many researchers (see for example Kosfeld/Lauridson 2004, Funke/Niebuhr 2005 a, Funke/Niebuhr 2005 b, Kosfeld/Eckey/Dreger 2005) might be improved by a geographically weighted regression approach. Our paper represents the first step of a local analysis of convergence processes in Germany.

## References

- Anselin, L. (1988) *Spatial Econometrics. Methods and Models*, Dordrecht, Boston, London.
- Arbia, G., J. H. P. Paelinck (2003) Economic Convergence or Divergence? Modeling the Interregional Dynamics of EU Regions, *Journal of Geographical Systems*, 5, 291-314.
- Barrel, R., D. W. te Velde (2000) Catching-up of East German Labour Productivity in the 1990s, *German Economic Review*, 1, 271-297.
- Barro, R. J. (1999) Notes on Growth Accounting, *Journal of Economic Growth*, 4, 119-137.
- Barro, R. J., X. Sala-i-Martin (1991) Convergence across States and Regions, *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1, 107-179.
- Barro, R. J., X. Sala-i-Martin (1992) Convergence, *Journal of Political Economy*, 100, 223-251.
- Barro, R. J., X. Sala-i-Martin (2004) *Economic Growth*, 2nd ed., Cambridge.
- Bayer, C., F. Juessen, F. (2004) Convergence in West German Regional Unemployment Rates, <http://ideas.repec.org/p/wpa/wuwpur/0411007.html> (2005/08/01).
- Bivand, R. and R. Brunstad (2005) Further Explorations of Interactions between Agricultural Policy and Regional Growth in Western Europe. Approaches to Nonstationarity in Spatial Econometrics, [http://www.uni-kiel.de/ifw/konfer/spatial/bivand\\_brunstadt.pdf](http://www.uni-kiel.de/ifw/konfer/spatial/bivand_brunstadt.pdf) (2005/08/01).
- Bode, E. (1998) Wirtschaftliche Konvergenz in Deutschland, in *Ökonomische Konvergenz in Theorie und Praxis* (Eds.) B. Fischer, T. Straubhaar, Baden-Baden, 163-188.
- Bohl, M. (1998) Konvergenz westdeutscher Regionen? Neue empirische Ergebnisse auf der Basis von Panel-Einheitswurzelttests, *Konjunkturpolitik*, 44, 82-99.
- Brunsdon, C., A. S. Fotheringham, M. E. Charlton (1996) Geographically Weighted Regression. A Method for Exploring Spatial Nonstationarity, *Geographical Analysis*, 28, 281-298.
- Brunsdon, C., A. S. Fotheringham, M. E. Charlton (1998) Spatial Nonstationarity and Autoregressive Models, *Environment and Planning A*, 30, 957-973.
- Brunsdon, C., A. S. Fotheringham, M. E. Charlton (1999) Some Notes on Parametric Significance Tests for Geographically Weighted Regression, *Journal of Regional Science*, 39, 497-524.
- Corrado, L., R. Martin, M. Weeks (2005) Identifying and Interpreting Regional Convergence Clusters across Europe, *Economic Journal*, 115, C133-C160.
- Cuadrado-Roura, J. R. (2001) Regional Convergence in the European Union. From Hypothesis to the Actual Trend, *Annals of Regional Science*, 35, pp. 333-356.
- Dinopoulos, E., P. Thompson (1999) Reassessing the Empirical Validity of the Human-Capital Augmented Neoclassical Growth Model, *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 9, 135-154.
- Döring, T. (2005) Räumliche Externalitäten von Wissen und ihre Konsequenzen für die Ausgestaltung für den Finanzausgleich, in *Das föderative System in Deutschland. Bestandsaufnahme, Reformbedarf und Handlungsempfehlungen aus raumwirtschaftlicher Sicht* (Ed.) G. Färber, Hanover, 93-120.

- Eberstein, H. H., H. Karl (1996 cont.) (eds.) *Raumordnung und Wirtschaftsförderung*, 3rd ed., Köln.
- Eckey, H.-F. (2001) *Der wirtschaftliche Entwicklungsstand in den Regionen des Vereinigten Deutschlands*, Volkswirtschaftliche Diskussionspapiere at the University of Kassel, No. 20/01, Kassel.
- Eckey, H.-F., K. Horn, P. Klemmer (1990) *Abgrenzung von Diagnoseeinheiten zum Zwecke der regionalen Wirtschaftsförderung*, Bochum.
- Eckey, H.-F., R. Kosfeld (2005) *Regionaler Wirkungsgrad und räumliche Ausstrahlungseffekte der Investitionsförderung*, *Jahrbuch für Regionalwissenschaft*, 27, 149-174.
- Eckey, H.-F., R. Kosfeld, W. Stock (2000) *Regionale Produktivitäts- und Substitutionseffekte der Verkehrsinfrastruktur*, Aachen.
- Eckey, H.-F., R. Kosfeld, M. Türck (2005 a) *Intra- und internationale Spillover-Effekte zwischen den EU-Regionen*, *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik*, 225, 600-621.
- Eckey, H.-F., R. Kosfeld, M. Türck (2005 b) *Regionale Produktionsfunktionen mit Spillover-Effekten für Deutschland*, *Schmollers Jahrbuch*, 125, 239-267.
- Eckey, H.-F., M. Türck (2005) *Deutsche Innovationsregionen*, in *von Innovationssystemen* (Ed.) M. A. Weissenberger-Eibl, Kassel, 383-402.
- Engel, C., J. H. Rogers (1996) *How Wide is the Border?*, *American Economic Review*, 86, 1112-1125.
- Fingleton, B. (2003) *Models and Simulations of GDP per Inhabitant across Europe's Regions. A Preliminary View*, in *European Regional Growth* (Ed.) B. Fingleton, Berlin et al., 11-53.
- Fotheringham, A. S., C. Brunsdon (1999) *Local Forms of Spatial Analysis*, *Geographical Analysis*, 31, 340-358.
- Fotheringham, A. S., C. Brunsdon, M. E. Charlton (2000) *Geographically Weighted Regression. The Analysis of Spatial Varying Relationships*, Chichester.
- Fotheringham, A. S., M. E. Charlton, C. Brunsdon (1997) *Measuring Spatial Variations in Relationships with Geographically Weighted Regression*, in *Recent Developments in Spatial Analysis* (Eds.) M. M. Fischer, A. Getis, Berlin et al., 60-82.
- Fotheringham, A. S., M. E. Charlton, C. Brunsdon (1998) *Geographically Weighted Regression. A Natural Evolution of the Expansion Method for Spatial Data Analysis*, *Environment and Planning*, 30(11), 1905-1927.
- Frenkel, M., H.-R. Hemmer (1999) *Grundlagen der Wachstumstheorie*, Munich.
- Funke, M., A. Niebuhr (2005 a) *Threshold Effects and Regional Economic Growth. Evidence from West Germany*, *Economic Modelling*, 22, pp. 61-80.
- Funke, M., A. Niebuhr (2005 b) *Regional Geographic Research and Development Spillovers and Economic Growth. Evidence from West Germany*, *Regional Studies*, 39, 143-153.
- Funke, M., H. Strulik (2000) *Growth and Convergence in a Two-Region Model of Unified Germany*, *German Economic Review*, 1, 363-384.
- Görzig, B., M. Gornig, A. Werwatz (2005) *Nichtparametrische Dekomposition der Lohndifferenzen zwischen ost- und westdeutschen Betrieben*, *Allgemeines Statistisches Archiv*, 89, 365-381.

- Greunz, L. (2003) Geographically and Technologically Mediated Knowledge Spillovers between European Regions, *Annals of Regional Science*, 37, 657-680.
- Grossman, G. M., E. Helpman (1989) Production Development and International Trade. *Journal of Political Economy*, 97, 1261-1283.
- Grömling, M. (2001) Produktionstrends der 90er Jahre, *iw-trends*, 28, 21-37.
- Grömling, M. (2004) Wirtschafts- und Produktionswachstum in Deutschland, *iw-trends*, 31, 1-15.
- Gundlach, E. (2003) Growth Effects of EU Membership: The Case of East Germany. *Empirica*, 30, 237-270.
- Gundlach, E. (2005) Solow vs. Solow: Notes on Identification and Interpretation in the Empirics of Growth and Development. *Review of World Economics*, 141, 237-270.
- Helliwell, J. F. (1998) *How Much Do National Borders Matter?*, Washington.
- Hemmer, H.-R., A. Lorenz (2004) *Grundlagen der Wachstumsempirie*, Munich.
- Herz, B., W. Röger (1995) Economic Growth and Convergence in Germany, *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, 131, 132-143.
- Huang, H.-C. (2005) Diverging Evidence of Convergence Hypothesis, *Journal of Macroeconomics*, 27, 233-255.
- Irmen, E., W. Strubelt (1998) Raumordnung und Wirtschaftsförderung, in: H. H. Eberstein, H. Karl (eds.) *Handbuch der regionalen Wirtschaftsförderung*, 3rd ed., Köln, IV, 1-36.
- Islam, N. (1995) Growth Empirics. A Panel Data Approach. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 110, 1127-1170.
- Juessen, F. (2005) A Distribution Dynamics Approach to Regional GDP Convergence in Reunified Germany, <http://ideas.repec.org/p/wpa/wuwpur/0506008.html> (2005/08/01).
- Kaltenbrunner, R. (2003) Scholle und Rand. Wohnen und Suburbanisierung – ein kaum steuerbarer Zusammenhang, *Raumordnung und Raumforschung*, 61, pp. 319-333.
- Kemper, F.-J. (2004) Internal Migration in Eastern and Western Germany. Convergence or Divergence of Spatial Trends after Unification?, *Regional Studies*, 38, 659-678.
- Keilbach, M. (2000) *Spatial Knowledge Spillovers and the Dynamics of Agglomeration and Regional Growth*, Diss., Heidelberg, New York.
- Kim, S. (2003) Lack of Convergence across Former West German States, Working Paper of the Department of Economics at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, [http://www.uwm.edu/~kim/papers/conv\\_rev2.pdf](http://www.uwm.edu/~kim/papers/conv_rev2.pdf) (12/13/2002).
- Klenow, P. J., A. Rodriguez-Clare (1997) The Neoclassical Revival in Growth Economics. As it gone too far?, *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, 12, pp. 73-102.
- Klodt, H. (2000) Industrial Policy and the East German Productivity Puzzle, *German Economic Review*, 1, 315-333.
- Kosfeld, R., H.-F. Eckey, C. Dreger (2005) Regional Productivity and Income Convergence in the Unified Germany. A Spatial Econometric Perspective, in *Advances in Macroeconometric Modeling* (Eds.) C. Dreger, H. P. Galler, Baden-Baden, 189-214.
- Kosfeld, R., J. Lauridsen (2004) Dynamic Spatial Modelling of Regional Convergence Processes, *Empirical Economics*, 29, 705-722.

- Kühn, M. (2001) Regionalisierung der Städte. Eine Analyse von Stadt-Umland-Diskursen räumlicher Forschung und Planung, *Raumordnung und Raumforschung*, 59, 402-411.
- Lammers, K. (1998) Wirtschaftliche Konvergenz in der politischen Diskussion, in *Ökonomische Konvergenz in Theorie und Praxis* (Eds.) B. Fischer, T. Straubhaar, Baden-Baden, 195-206.
- López-Bazo, E., E. Vayá, M. Artis. (2004) Regional Externalities and Growth, *Journal of Regional Science*, 44, 43-73.
- Lucas, R. E. (1988) On the Mechanics of Economic Development, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 22, 3-42.
- Mankiw, N. G., D. Romer, D. N. Weil (1992) A Contribution to the Empirics of Economic Growth, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 107, 407-437.
- Martin, R. (2001) EMU versus the Regions? Regional Convergence and Divergence in Euroland, *Journal of Economic Geography*, 1, 51-80.
- Mei, C.-L., S.-Y. He, K.-T. Fang (2004) A Note on the Mixed Geographically Weighted Regression Model, *Journal of Regional Science*, 44, 143-157.
- Motzkus, A. H. (2001) Verkehrsmobilität und Siedlungsstrukturen im Kontext einer nachhaltigen Raumentwicklung von Metropolregionen, *Raumordnung und Raumforschung*, 59, pp. 192-204.
- Neven, D. (1995) Regional Convergence in the European Community, *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 33, 47-65.
- Niebuhr, A. (2000) Räumliche Wachstumszusammenhänge. Empirische Befunde für Deutschland, *HWWA Discussion Paper*, No. 84, Hamburg.
- Niebuhr, A. (2002) Spatial Dependence of Regional Unemployment in the European Union, *HWWA Discussion Paper*, No. 186, Hamburg.
- Nitsch, V. (2000) National Borders and International Trade. Evidence from the European Union, *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 33, 1091-1105.
- Quehenberger, M. (2000) Ten Years After. Eastern Germany's convergence at a halt?, *EIB Papers*, 5, 117-136.
- Ragnitz, J. (2000) Produktivitätsunterschiede und Konvergenz von Wirtschaftsräumen. Das Beispiel der neuen Länder, *RWI-Mitteilungen*, 51(3/4) 219-232.
- Romer, D. (1996) *Advanced Macroeconomics*, New York.
- Rovolis, A., N. Spence (2002) Duality Theory and Cost Function Analysis in a Regional Context. The Impact of Public Infrastructure Capital in the Greek Regions, *Annals of Regional Science*, 36, 55-78.
- Schätzl, L. (2000) *Wirtschaftsgeographie 2. Empirie*, 3rd ed., Paderborn et al.
- Schönert, M. (2003) 20 Jahre Suburbanisierung der Bevölkerung. Zur Stadt-Umland-Wanderung in westdeutschen Großstadtreionen, *Raumordnung und Raumforschung*, 61, 457-471.
- Seitz, H. (1995) Konvergenz. Theoretische Aspekte und empirische Befunde für westdeutsche Regionen, *Konjunkturpolitik*, 41, 168-198.
- Smolny, W. (2003) National Borders and International Trade. Evidence from the European Union, *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik*, 223, 239-254.
- Statistische Ämter des Bundes und der Länder 2003 (eds.) *Statistik regional. Daten für die Kreise und kreisfreien Städte Deutschlands*, o. O.

- 
- Statistische Ämter des Bundes und der Länder 2004 (eds.) Statistik regional. Daten für die Kreise und kreisfreien Städte Deutschlands, o. O.
- Suedekum, J. (2004) Concentration and Specialisation. Trends in Germany since Reunification, HWWA Discussion Paper, No. 285, Hamburg.
- Suedekum, J., U. Blien (2004) Wages and Employment Growth. Disaggregated Evidence for West Germany, Institute For Study of Labour (IZA) Discussion Paper, No. 1128, Bonn.
- Temple, J. (1999) The New Growth Evidence. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 37, 112-156.
- Tengler, H. (1989) Die Shift-Analyse als Instrument der Regionalforschung, Stuttgart.
- Thomas, I. P. (1995) Konvergenz und Divergenz in der europäischen Union, Kiel Working Papers of the Kiel Institute of World Economics, No. 682, Kiel.
- Thomas, I. P. (1996) Regional Policy, Convergence and Subsidiarity in the European Community, Kiel Working Papers of the Kiel Institute of World Economics, No. 737, Kiel.
- Tortosa-Ausina, E. et al. (2005) Growth and Convergence Profiles in the Spanish Provinces (1965-1997), *Journal of Regional Science*, 45, 147-182.

## **Appendix: Estimation of the capital stock**

Mostly the physical capital stock is estimated with the "perpetual inventory accounting"-method (cf. for example Rovolis/Spence 2002, pp. 67 and Eckey/Kosfeld/Stock 2000, pp. 41-49). This very complex procedure has the disadvantage that the initial capital stock must be specified and the same depreciation rate is used for all regions. Thus we estimate the capital stock with a similar approach to shift analysis. For checking purposes we calibrate our estimation with the official data. Our estimated capital stock was already used in different studies (Eckey/Kosfeld/Türk 2005 b; Eckey/Türk 2005).

We have calculated the physical capital stock on the basis of the gross fixed capital (equipment and other plants) to replacement prices. As usual in a shift analysis (Schätzl 2000, pp. 77, Tengler 1989, pp. 110) we distinguish between the structural and the location component. The structural factor indicates whether, due to the industrial structure of a region, an above or below average capital stock can be expected, thus capital-intensive industries are over- or underrepresented. The location factor expresses that we expect a high capital stock in regions with high investments in the last ten years. Data of the investments and the industry structure are taken from the official statistics. By weighting the German capital stock with the regional structure and location factors we get a first estimation, which is adjusted to west and east differences (the official statistics shows that the capital intensity in West Germany is around 5.1 % higher).

An evaluation of the estimation is possible for the three city states Berlin, Bremen and Hamburg. Our own estimations deviate from the results of the official statistics between 1.4 % and 9 %. Therefore in the last step a correction on regional level is calibrated. The estimated regional capital stocks are weighted in such a way that their sum for the federal states corresponds to the results of the official statistics.