

Kordalska, Aleksandra; Olczyk, Magdalena

Working Paper

CEE trade in services: Value added versus gross terms approaches

GUT FME Working Paper Series A, No. 2/2018 (48)

Provided in Cooperation with:

Gdańsk University of Technology, Faculty of Management and Economics

Suggested Citation: Kordalska, Aleksandra; Olczyk, Magdalena (2018) : CEE trade in services: Value added versus gross terms approaches, GUT FME Working Paper Series A, No. 2/2018 (48), Gdańsk University of Technology, Faculty of Management and Economics, Gdańsk

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/202496>

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.



<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/deed.pl>



GDAŃSK UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY
FACULTY OF MANAGEMENT AND ECONOMICS

CEE TRADE IN SERVICES: VALUE ADDED VERSUS GROSS TERMS APPROACHES

Aleksandra Kordalska *, Magdalena Olczyk **

GUT Faculty of Management and Economics

Working Paper Series A (Economics, Management, Statistics)

No 2/2018 (48)

March 2018

* Gdansk University of Technology, Faculty of Management and Economics,
Aleksandra.Kordalska@zie.pg.gda.pl (corresponding author)

**Gdansk University of Technology, Faculty of Management and Economics,
Magdalena.Olczyk@zie.pg.gda.pl



CEE trade in services: value added versus gross terms approaches

Aleksandra Kordalska¹ and Magdalena Olczyk²

FORTHCOMING IN: *EASTERN EUROPEAN ECONOMICS*

ABSTRACT

This paper aims to assess the impact of determinants on service exports in both value added terms and in gross terms for seven Central Eastern European economies in years 1995-2011. The results confirm the importance of increasing labour productivity and highly-skilled and medium-skilled workers for growth in services trade. Exports of services are also supported by linkages between domestic services, especially business services, and the manufacturing sector. The results show the impacts of the determinants are fairly similar when exports are measured in value added terms or in gross terms, however the strength of impact differs in some subgroup of analysed countries.

JEL classification codes: C23, D54, F14, L80

Keywords: gross exports, value added exports, CEE economies, trade in services

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge the comments on an earlier draft of this paper from the participants of the CASE 25th Anniversary Conference “The Future of Europe” in Warsaw and participants of seminar at Faculty of Management and Economics, Gdańsk University of Technology. We especially appreciate the comments and suggestions received from Professor Aleksandra Parteka from Gdańsk University of Technology.

¹ Gdansk University of Technology, Faculty of Management and Economics, Gabriela Narutowicza 11/12, 80-233 Gdansk, Poland (corresponding author Aleksandra.Kordalska@zie.pg.gda.pl).

² Gdansk University of Technology, Faculty of Management and Economics, Gabriela Narutowicza 11/12, 80-233 Gdansk, Poland.

1. Introduction

Global value chains (GVCs) have been rapidly evolving over the last decade. They come in different shapes and sizes and it may be neither possible nor desirable to create a one-size-fits-all policy to support the position and participation of countries in them. Government policy decisions require new data – new indicators to estimate and evaluate the position of countries in the new global economy. A possible solution could be analysis of trade in value added (VA), which takes into account the added value embodied in intermediate flows, in contrast with gross trade statistics, where this flow is overlooked and so may possibly lead to biased estimations (Foster-McGregor and Stehrer 2013; Stehrer 2013). EU countries are encountering competition in GVCs from emerging economies such as China, Brazil and India, and increasingly for high-value products. For this reason, the European Commission has “refocused attention on the central importance of a strong, competitive and diversified industrial manufacturing value chain for the EU’s competitiveness and job creation potential” (EUR-Lex 2010). The importance of global value chains measured as a percentage of a country’s total exports is even greater for Central Eastern European countries (CEE countries) than for other developed EU countries (i.e. 62.4% for the Czech Republic, 56.6% for Hungary, 50.2% for Lithuania, 49.5% for Germany, 45.9% for France)³ and exporters from CEE countries are usually located further ‘downstream’ – i.e. closer to the customer buying the finished product – than their euro area partners.

In spite of the fact that the European Commission is paying attention to the competitiveness of the manufacturing sector, the growing role of services in manufacturing goods makes it worth examining the service sector closely. The problem is how the importance of services in an economy should be measured, in gross terms or in value-added terms. Differences between these measures of trade in services can be seen in the results of studies which focus on the distribution of revealed comparative advantages (RCA) as a measure of competitiveness, e.g. RCA indices for German business services are significantly higher in value-added terms than in gross export terms, leading to the conclusion that the German business services sector has comparative advantages rather than disadvantages (Deb and Hauk 2017). Similar calculations for business services in India indicate that RCAs based on added value are lower than indices based on gross exports (Wang, Wei, and Zhu 2013). This leads to a new more important and still open question regarding the factors that determine a growth in trade in services measured in terms of added value.

³https://www.ecb.europa.eu/home/pdf/research/compnet/20131212/ws_3_iossifov.pdf?12244fa23bc7a0682cd1ec77c52f6659.

So far, few analyses related to the determinants of trade in services have been conducted and they are mainly based on gross trade data. They mostly use gravity models, which often only show the impact of a few determinants on exports: market size, geographical location, language and gaps between economies in terms of resources and technology (Dao, Pham, and Doan 2015; Grunfeld and Moxnes 2013; Guardia Bueno, Molero Zayas, and Valadez 2005; Kimura and Lee 2008; Walsh 2008). Kimura and Lee's (2008) results imply that a gravity model performs better for trade in services than for trade in goods and that geographical distance has a greater influence on services than on goods. Many studies confirm the significant role of GDP for both importing and exporting countries (Dao, Pham, and Doan 2015), the FDI flow (Grunfeld and Moxnes 2013) and a common language (Walsh 2008) in explaining trade in services. Additionally, according to Wörz's (2008) analysis of the Austrian economy, a highly-skilled workforce and high levels of labour productivity also have a positive effect on the competitiveness of the service sector. Marel (2011), in turn, indicates the quality of country governance as an important determinant of comparative advantage in conventional trade in services.

The main weakness of all the above-mentioned analyses is their use of service trade data in gross terms. The approach proposed by Landesmann, Leitner, and Stehrer (2015) partly eliminates this gap. Their study is an econometric analysis of the determinants of exports for 35 industries and 40 countries over the period 1995-2007 in both gross and VA terms and for both manufacturing and services. Their model includes explanatory variables highlighted by traditional and new trade theories, i.e. labour productivity, skill composition, the vertical cross-border production integration ratio and domestic and foreign business service linkages, among others. However, a weakness of their analysis is a high heterogeneity of the economies grouped in the same sample. In the present study we only focus on CEE countries, which form quite a homogenous group of economies in terms of their GDP per capita, the large shares of manufacturing goods in their total exports and the importance of the EU market as their main export destination. We also analyse the character of the linkages between the manufacturing sector and the chosen service sectors in more detail.

The aim of this study is thus to fill the gap in the empirical literature by finding the determinants of the export flows of services measured in both value added and gross terms for seven selected CEE economies – the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland and Slovakia – using data on seven tradable service sectors (NACE 1.1) for the years 1995-2011.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In the first section, the significance of services in trade, in global value chains and in manufacturing is discussed. This is followed by the research

methodology and model specification. The next section contains a presentation of the data used in the analysis. In the subsequent section, we present the results of our empirical analysis of the importance of the chosen determinants in trade in services in the selected CEE countries in the period 1995-2011. The final section concludes.

2. The role of services in trade, global value chains and manufacturing

Services now represent the largest share in domestic economies, especially in advanced countries, and account for almost 70% of global GDP and more than 55% of global employment (World Bank 2016a). In the European Union their contribution is even higher – in 2016 services account for 73,9 % of the EU 28's gross value added (Eurostat 2017) and about 71% of total EU employment (World Bank 2016a). An increasing role of services can also be observed in international trade. There are two main reasons for this phenomenon. First, the tradability of services has very strongly risen over the last decade, i.e. there has been a large increase in the range of services that can be digitized and traded globally, such as processing insurance claims, call centres, desktop publishing, compiling audits, completing tax returns, transcribing medical records and online education (Ghani, Goswami, and Kharas 2012). For this reason, trade in newer types of services, particularly those that can be conducted via the internet, has been growing rapidly in recent years (OECD 2016). Second, deregulation in the service sector and liberalization in service trade connected with the multilateral rules on service trade established in the Uruguay Round negotiations have made a large contribution to the growth in service trade. The result of all this is that during the last decade (2005-2015) commercial service trade has grown 2 percentage points faster than merchandise trade on average.⁴ Two factors – human capital and information technologies – are crucial to explain the dynamic growth in the export of modern services, especially in developing countries (Goswami, Mattoo, and Saez 2011).


Evidence can also be found at the micro level to confirm a special role of services in trade intensity. According to Lodefalk (2013), the probability of exporting is associated with the availability and quality of services. Additionally, this availability of services is associated with the share of firms that export (Lodefalk 2014).

However if we analyse statistics on international transactions drawn from balance of payments (BOP) figures, which reflect transactions between residents and non-residents, the share of services in world trade would seem to have been quite stable over the last two decades and only to have oscillated around 20% (Lanz and Maurer 2015). In contrast, when the role of

⁴ Commercial service exports are defined as total services excluding government service; own calculation based on the WTO database time series on international trade.

services in trade is assessed using the share of services in the added value of gross exports, service exports become much more important. The content of services in gross exports is around 50% of world cross-border trade, but for five of the seven CEE countries analysed here this share becomes even larger (Figure 1). This discrepancy between the ‘BOP approach’ and the ‘value added approach’ to measuring service trade can be explained by the new role of services in world trade as intermediate services, i.e. they are not only directly exported but first of all they are traded indirectly as part of the export of goods.

Figure 1 The percentage of the value added content of services in gross exports in 2011



Source: own calculation, OECD-WTO TiVA Database

Note. The domestic (foreign) share of the added value of services in gross exports is the share of the domestic (foreign) value added by service industries in the total gross exports by industry *i* in country *c*. For this measure, the service industries include ISIC Rev. 3 (NACE Rev. 1) divisions 45 to 95.

The dynamic growth of intermediate services in trade is connected with the rapid growth of GVCs, which are characterized by a large fragmentation of production, specialization in tasks/activities and the outsourcing of activities. In GVCs, services provide the ‘link’ or the ‘glue’ at each point in the chain without which it could not happen, e.g. transport, telecommunications, logistics, distribution, marketing, design, R&D etc. UCTAD (2013) finds evidence that the quality and cost of services determine country participation in GVCs. How services are linked into the worldwide value chain can be shown in the case of car production in the US, where service inputs are supplied all along the value chain and they represent close to thirty percent of the value

of the finished car (WEF 2012).⁵ The size of the demand for services in GVCs is shown in another case study. The Swedish machine tool firm Sandvik Tooling uses over 40 different types of services in the various stages of production, and in addition Sandvik also supplies about 15 different types of service itself (OECD, WTO, and World Bank 2014).⁶ On the macro scale, more than 70 percent of world service imports today are intermediate services used in production organized in GVCs (OECD 2012).

Services play an exceptional role in the manufacturing sector. OECD (2014) finds a strong positive correlation between business service productivity and labour productivity in manufacturing. There are three key drivers which encourage manufacturers to incorporate more services at all stages in product value chains (USITC 2013): first, an increasing geographical dispersion of supply chains with specialization, which causes a movement of low-skill production work to low-wage locations; second, a need to cut costs and improve efficiency, which forces firms to use a variety of new technologies (often ICT services); and third, opportunities for premium pricing or improved market positions by providing services (often business services) to better differentiate and customize products.

The increasing role of services in manufacturing is often described in the literature as the ‘servicification’ of manufacturing,⁷ i.e. the idea that value added by the service sector is becoming more important in manufacturing (Baldwin, Forslid, and Ito 2015). The great intensity of servicification is an effect of modern manufacturing production processes, which take the shape of a ‘smile’ curve and are characterized by three major stages: pre-fabrication services (high value added), fabrication (low value-added, with activities offshored to emerging and developing economies) and post-fabrication services (high value added).⁸ This means that the content of service added value in manufacturing trade is high, and also in CEE manufacturing exports, where service added value accounts for almost 40% of the gross exports of manufacturing industries (Figure 2).


⁵ The activities and components that go into the production of a typical American car are the following (services in bold): 1. R&D for advanced technology (Japan – 17.5%) 2. Design (3% (estimate)) 3. Assembly (Korea – 30%) 4. Assembly (US – 37%) 5. Supply of minor parts (Taiwan – 4%) 6. Advertising and marketing (UK – 2.5%) 7. Data processing (Ireland and Barbados – 2%) 8. Transport and insurance (4% (estimate))(WEF 2012).

⁶ In another case study, only 9% of the value of a 450US\$ man’s suit jacket made in China and exported to the United States can be traced to direct manufacturing costs. The other 91% consists of various services, intellectual property, profits, and other ‘invisibles’ that are difficult to quantify (OECD 2014).

⁷ ‘Servicification’ of manufacturing is a synonym of the terms ‘servicizing’ and ‘manuservice’ (Low 2013).

⁸ Some argue that there has been a tendency in OECD countries for the smile curve to deepen, moving from relatively flat – meaning value evenly spread all along the chain – to U-shaped – with fabrication and assembly accounting for a much lower share of value (OECD 2013).

Figure 2 Percentage service added value content in manufacturing exports in 2011



Source: own calculation on the OECD-WTO TiVA database

Note. The domestic (foreign) share of the added value of services in gross exports is the share of the domestic (foreign) value added by service industries in the total gross exports by industry *i* in country *c*. For this measure, the service industries include ISIC Rev. 3 (NACE Rev. 1) divisions 45 to 95.

Even though domestic sourcing of services accounts for most of the servicification in world manufacturing, international sourcing of services, as captured by the foreign service added value content of exports, is significant in some CEE countries like the Czech Republic, Hungary, Estonia and Slovakia. Among these services, financial intermediation and business services play an extremely important role. They are an integral part of global value chains, and are often outsourced and/or offshored by companies in GVCs. Both of the sectors – financial intermediation (sector J) and business services (subsectors K71-74) – have the highest shares in the total trade in services in 2011, unlike 10 years ago (OECD 2012).

In sum, the service sector is more and more making a significant contribution to export growth in all countries, and at the same time represents a large opportunity to find new comparative advantages in trade.

3. Research methodology and model specification

In order to evaluate the trade in service sectors and its determinants, we take two concepts into consideration. The first approach is based on total gross exports and the second uses domestic value added exports.

The decomposition of gross export flows uses a methodology proposed by Wang, Wei, and Zhu (2013) (henceforth WWZ).⁹ WWZ's approach provides detailed information about 16 components of exports, in particular about the domestic value added exports which is absorbed abroad (DVA). In the general case of G countries and N sectors, WWZ's model of the decomposition of total exports is expressed in the following way:¹⁰

$$\begin{aligned}
E^{s*} = & \underbrace{(V^s B^{ss})^T \# \sum_{r \neq s}^G Y^{sr}}_{DVA_FIN} + \underbrace{(V^s L^{ss})^T \# (\sum_{r \neq s}^G A^{sr} B^{rr} Y^{rr})}_{DVA_INT1} + \underbrace{(V^s L^{ss})^T \# (\sum_{r \neq s}^G A^{sr} \sum_{t \neq s, r}^G B^{rt} Y^{tt})}_{DVA_INTrexI1} \\
& + \underbrace{(V^s L^{ss})^T \# (\sum_{r \neq s}^G A^{sr} B^{rr} \sum_{t \neq s, r}^G Y^{rt})}_{DVA_INTrexF} + \underbrace{(V^s L^{ss})^T \# (\sum_{r \neq s}^G A^{sr} \sum_{t \neq s}^G \sum_{ru \neq s, t}^G B^{rt} Y^{tu})}_{DVA_INTrexI2} \\
& + (V^s L^{ss})^T \# (\sum_{r \neq s}^G A^{sr} B^{rr} Y^{rs}) + (V^s L^{ss})^T \# (\sum_{r \neq s}^G A^{sr} \sum_{t \neq s, r}^G B^{rt} Y^{ts}) \\
& + (V^s L^{ss})^T \# (\sum_{r \neq s}^G A^{sr} B^{rs} Y^{ss}) + (V^s L^{ss})^T \# (\sum_{r \neq s}^G A^{sr} \sum_{t \neq s}^G B^{rs} Y^{st}) \\
& + (V^s B^{ss} - V^s L^{ss})^T \# (\sum_{r \neq s}^G A^{sr} X^r) + (\sum_{r \neq s}^G V^r B^{rs})^T \# Y^{sr} + (\sum_{t \neq s, r}^G V^t B^{ts})^T \# Y^{sr} \\
& + (\sum_{r \neq s}^G V^r B^{rs})^T \# (A^{sr} L^{rr} Y^{rr}) + (\sum_{t \neq s, r}^G V^t B^{ts})^T \# (A^{sr} L^{rr} Y^{rr}) \\
& + \sum_{r \neq s}^G (V^r B^{rs})^T \# (A^{sr} L^{rr} E^{r*}) + \sum_{t \neq s, r}^G (V^t B^{ts})^T \# (A^{sr} L^{rr} E^{r*}),
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where E^{s*} is a $N \times 1$ vector of the total gross exports by country s , A^{sr} is an $N \times N$ block matrix of input-output coefficients, B^{sr} is an $N \times N$ block global Leontief inverse matrix, X^{sr} is a $N \times 1$ vector of gross output, Y^{sr} is a $N \times 1$ vector for global use, V^s is a $1 \times N$ vector of the direct value added coefficients of country s and L^{rr} is an $N \times N$ local Leontief inverse matrix.

When considering domestic value added which is absorbed abroad, both exports of final goods (FIN) and exports of intermediates (INT) are taken into account. There are two patterns in the trade of intermediates: they can be exported to direct trade partners (DVA_INT1) or re-exported to third countries via a direct partner (DVA_INT2). Additionally, domestic value added in intermediate exports that are re-exported to third countries as intermediates can be used to produce domestic final goods (DVA_INTrexI1) or to produce exports (DVA_INTrexI2). They can also be re-exported as final goods (DVA_INTrexF). We note that according to WWZ's decomposition domestic value added which is absorbed abroad is described by the fraction of the country-sector's gross exports that is produced domestically. This is the so-called backward-linkage-based value added approach for the exporting sector and it explains the phenomenon from the importer's or user's perspective.

⁹ We use the decompR package provided by Quast and Kummitz (2015).

¹⁰ For the details of the decomposition, we refer readers to the source article by Wang, Wei, and Zhu (2013), Appendix J.

In our investigation, in addition to the levels of total gross exports and domestic value added we use revealed comparative advantage (RCA) indices constructed on the basis of both gross exports and DVA. The RCA indices use the classic formula proposed by Balassa (1965),

$$RCA_{i,j} = \frac{X_{i,j}}{\sum_j X_{i,j}} \bigg/ \frac{\sum_i X_{i,j}}{\sum_i \sum_j X_{i,j}}, \quad (2)$$

and express the relative comparative advantage of a particular tradable service sub-sector i of country j in relation to the total exports of the country as a share of world exports.

The literature review in the previous section of the paper allows us to identify the factors determining trade in services. In addition to the labour force composition and labour productivity, due to the growing role of indirect exports of services through manufacturing sectors, our model takes into account the servicification of manufacturing. The phenomenon is reflected in the service value added share of manufacturing exports (SMlink). Depending on the source of service production, we distinguish between domestic (domestic_SMlink) and foreign (foreign_SMlink) service contents of exported manufactured goods. The lack of a complete database on the phenomenon forced us to prepare the necessary variables.¹¹ To calculate them, we use the OECD TiVA methodology (OECD 2015). The domestic value added by services and the foreign value added by services embodied in a country's manufacturing exports are calculated in the following way:

$$domestic_SMlink = V_{domSERV} (I - A)^{-1} TEXP_{manuf}, \quad (3)$$

$$foreign_SMlink = V_{forSERV} (I - A)^{-1} TEXP_{manuf}, \quad (4)$$

where V is an $N \times GN$ matrix with the share of the value added in the total output of the particular tradable service sector of interest and zero otherwise, $(I-A)^{-1}$ is a $GN \times GN$ inverse global Leontief matrix and $TEXP_{manuf}$ is a $GN \times G$ matrix reflecting the gross exports of the manufacturing sector in the CEE countries and zero otherwise.

All of the calculations are conducted separately for each country and each year. In our case, for the domestic linkages calculations V is a 34×1394 matrix, where 34 reflects the number of sectors in the economy. In this matrix only seven non-zero values are observed, one value per row for particular service sector. These values reflect the value added share of gross output for the individual service sector i (e.g. for sector I60 – inland transport) and for the individual country j (e.g. for the Czech Republic). $TEXP_{manuf}$ is a 1394×1 vector for the particular CEE

¹¹ In the OECD TiVA database (OECD 2015) the intersectoral linkages are available for 1995, 2000, 2005, 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011.

country j in the analysis (e.g. for the Czech Republic). The vector $TEXP_{manuf}$ contains data on manufacturing exports (sectors 15-36) for the country and is zero otherwise. The inverse Leontief matrix is a 1394×1394 matrix. The calculations are made according to formula (3).

The only differences between the domestic and foreign linkages calculations are observed in matrix V . When the calculations for the foreign linkages have been made, the 34×1394 V matrix contains the value added share of gross output for the given service sector i (e.g. for sector I60 – inland transport) and for all countries apart from country j (we consider all the WIOD countries after extracting, e.g., the Czech Republic). We note that at the same time country j is an exporter of manufactured goods and its manufacturing exports are reflected in vector $TEXP_{manuf}$, which looks identical to that for the domestic linkages calculations. The further calculations are based on formula (4).

The total service sector content of the manufacturing exports of country j is the sum of the domestic and foreign contents.¹²

Before evaluating the trade in services in the CEE countries, we assess the unit root of the variables used in the analysis. To do this, we employ the ADF-Fisher test for unbalanced panels. The selection of lag length is based on the Akaike criterion.

The relationship between an export performance measure and its determinants for the tradable service sectors i and for selected CEE countries j over the period 1995 – 2011 is expressed by the following equation:

$$EXP_IND_{ijt} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 HS_{ijt} + \beta_2 MS_{ijt} + \beta_3 \ln LPRO_{ijt} + \beta_4 Smlink_{ijt} + \mu_i + \nu_j + \varepsilon_{ijt}. \quad (5)$$

In our model, as an export performance measure (EXP_IND) we use four indicators. First, the logarithm of exports of services in gross terms ($\ln TEXP$) and flows expressed as the logarithm of domestic value added exports in services ($\ln DVA$) are compared. The second approach compares the results obtained for revealed comparative advantage indices calculated on the basis of both gross exports (RCA_TEXP) and domestic value added (RCA_DVA). The source of $TEXP$ is the WIOD database, World Input-Output Tables.¹³ The same tables are used for WWZ's decomposition and for calculation of the DVA variable. Both of the RCA indices are based on formula (2).

In our approach we do not use the explanatory variables, which are often used in gravity model (such as GDP per capita, language, distance), because in our opinion they do not explain

¹² All our calculations of intersectoral linkages are available on request.

¹³ In our investigation we decide to use NACE rev. 1.1 due to the fact that the complete WIOD database release 2016 (World Input Output Tables and Socio Economic Accounts) which uses NACE rev.2 is still unavailable. Among other reasons, the Socio Economic Accounts contain data for the structure of employment, which we use in our model specification. According to information on the WIOD website, the Socio Economic Accounts, Release 2016, are expected to be published in January 2018.

the nature of services trade. From the perspective of export growth, an increase in highly-skilled labour is a good factor of labour productivity growth. Thus, the structure of employment is taken into account. *HS* and *MS* denote the respective shares of hours worked by highly-skilled and medium-skilled workers in the total hours worked. Both of the variables are directly derived from the WIOD database, Socio Economic Accounts.

LnLPRO is the logarithm of labour productivity, which is obtained as the relation between value added based on 1995 prices corrected using the current exchange rate and the total hours worked by employed persons. Value added at current prices in national currency, price indices of gross value added (1995=100) and total hours worked by employed persons are taken from the WIOD database, Socio Economic Accounts. The source for exchange rates is the OECD database.

SMlink reflects the sum of domestic linkages calculated according to formula (3) and foreign linkages calculated according to formula (4). All of the calculations use the WIOD database.

Additionally, given the high importance of financial intermediation and business services we aim to assess whether this specific group of services comprising sector J and sector K71t74 and its linkages to the manufacturing sector influence export performance. To do this, interactive variables are calculated, *SMlink_J* and *SMlink_K71t74*, as the product of *SMlink* and dummy variables constructed for sector J and sector K71t74. Analogous variables are computed for domestic and foreign linkages.

4. Data description


Our investigation uses an unbalanced panel which is built on the basis of country-sector annual data for seven selected CEE countries – the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland and Slovakia – and for seven service sub-sectors treated as tradable. The analysis covers the period 1995-2011. The tradable service sector which is taken into consideration in NACE 1.1 consists of transport services – inland transport (I60), water transport (I61), air transport (I62), other transport services (I63), post and telecommunication services (I64), financial intermediation services (J) and business services (K71t74)¹⁴, which comprise rental

¹⁴ The definition of business services included in one of the first documents linked to the phenomenon (COM 1998) does not take category K73 (research and development) into account. In newer Eurostat documents (European Commission, Eurostat 2009) business services only contain categories K72 and K74.1 to K74.5. However, in, e.g., OECD publications (OECD 2012) the category Research and Development is classified as a business service sector. In the WIOD database, release 2013, the main database used for our analysis, the divisions from K71 to K74 are taken together and there is no possibility of excluding particular categories, e.g. K73, from the wider category K71-K74. As a result, in empirical papers the whole category K71-K74 is treated as a business services sector (Wang, Wei and Zhu 2013, Landesmann et al. 2015; Melikhova et al. 2017, Rodríguez and Camacho 2016).

services for machinery and equipment, computer and related services, research and development and other business activities.

For all the countries and for the whole period, the VAX ratio, which reflects the share of domestic value added in gross exports (Johnson and Noguera 2012) is higher for the service sector in comparison to the VAX ratio calculated for the total economy (Figure 3). The ratio fluctuates from 72% for Estonia to 83% for Lithuania at the end of the period. However, the highest level of the ratio is observed for 1995 for Poland (90%). The VAX ratio for the total economy declines for all the countries except Estonia, where a very slight growth is observed. The main reason for this downward trend is a drop in the DVA for manufacturing sectors due to growth in the importance of vertical specialization over the years analysed.

Figure 3 VAX ratio for the service sector and the total economy, share of service DVA in total DVA, and share of service gross exports in total exports, [%]




Source: own elaboration based on WIOD and Wang, Wei and Zhu's (2013) decomposition.

Regardless of which economy and period are analysed, the share of domestic value added by service activities in total domestic value added is higher than that of gross service exports in total gross exports. At the end of the period, the highest level of this share is observed for Latvia, with 85% of the total DVA generated in the economy represented by DVA in services.

Moreover, the other Baltic countries achieve a higher share than the other CEE countries: 56% and 47% respectively for Lithuania and Estonia. At the end of 2011, DVA in services constituted less than 20% of the total DVA for the Czech Republic, Poland and Slovakia.

Regarding RCA indices (Figure 4), especially those measured in domestic value added, the advantage revealed for the Baltic countries in the area of trade in services should be highlighted. Latvia and Estonia achieve advantages over the whole period, whereas for Lithuania a stable growth in its RCA is observed, with comparative advantages from 2004 for Lithuanian trade in services (the RCA index based on gross exports is greater than 1 for the whole period). The patterns of the RCAs for the Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia are similar. For Czech and Slovak trade in services after 1998 and for Hungarian trade after 1999, the RCA based on DVA is higher than the RCA based on gross exports, but it does not provide comparative advantages for these countries.

Figure 4 RCA indices based on domestic value added and gross exports




Source: own elaboration based on WIOD and Wang, Wei and Zhu's (2013) decomposition.

Taking into consideration intersectoral linkages, for 2011, the highest service value added content of manufacturing exports is observed for Hungary and the Czech Republic: 37% and 32% respectively (Figure 5). For the Baltic countries this share fluctuates from 24% to 27%. The

results differ slightly in comparison to Figure 2, where the Baltic countries and Latvia especially play key roles in service contribution to manufacturing exports. The difference is a result of the number of service sectors taken into account: seven tradable sectors rather than divisions 45-95. However, when comparing the structure of the service value added contribution, the importance of foreign services is observed. For the service sectors analysed at the end of the period, domestic service content only exceeds foreign content for Latvia and Estonia.


Figure 5 Percentages of domestic and foreign service content of total manufacturing exports



Source: own elaboration based on WIOD.

Regarding the structure of the total service contribution to manufacturing exports by type of service sector, it is worth underlining the growing role of financial intermediation and business service sector K71t74 (Figure 6). At the end of the period, the joint input of both service sectors to manufacturing exports is the highest for Hungary, with 27%, and then for the Czech Republic and Slovakia (21% and 19%). Their significance in indirect exports through manufacturing is also visible in the growth in this contribution over the years analysed. Between 1995 and 2011, Hungary enlarged its service sector share in exported manufactured goods by 16 percentage points, the Czech Republic by 13 points, and Estonia, Latvia, Poland and Slovakia by about 10% points. The lowest growth is observed for Lithuania with 7 percentage points of growth, which is relatively high in comparison to the growth in the other sectors.

Figure 6 Structure of the total service content in the manufacturing sector by service sector, [%]



Source: own elaboration based on WIOD and Appendix 1.

The second sector which contributes strongly to manufacturing is inland transport (sector I60). In this area, the leading countries are Lithuania with a contribution of 9% and then Estonia and the Czech Republic (5.5%).

5. Estimation results

The estimation procedure consists of two stages. First, as dependent variables in model (5) we use exports measured in gross terms and in value added terms. Next, as the explained variable in the same model we use RCA indices determined using both gross exports and value added in exports.

The results for exports measured in the two ways are reported in Table 1. Comparing all four estimations, only slight discrepancies between the coefficients for particular variables are observed. Regardless of the regression estimated, we obtain stable and statistically significant coefficients for highly-skilled and medium-skilled workers, labour productivity and domestic linkages between service sectors in manufacturing.

Considering skill composition, contrary to the findings of, e.g., Landesmann, Leitner and Stehrer (2015) for 40 countries and analogous service sectors, the influences of highly- and medium-skilled labour on export performance are quite similar. The strength of the impact does not depend either on the specification of the model or on the export measure. Each growth in hours worked for both groups of workers generates an increase in the export indicator of around 5%. Due to the concentration of CEE services exporting to the high-income EU countries, the

role of highly- and medium-skilled labour in achieving a high quality of services is not surprising (Bustos 2011).

Table 1 The impact of selected determinants on gross exports and on domestic value added

| | <i>lnTEXP</i> | | <i>lnDVA</i> | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| <i>HS</i> | 0.052** [0.021] | 0.048** [0.021] | 0.048** [0.021] | 0.044** [0.021] |
| <i>MS</i> | 0.053** [0.021] | 0.048** [0.021] | 0.051** [0.021] | 0.046** [0.022] |
| <i>lnLPRO</i> | 0.642*** [0.076] | 0.640*** [0.077] | 0.671*** [0.076] | 0.669*** [0.078] |
| <i>total_Smlink</i> | -0.028 [0.037] | | -0.050 [0.037] | |
| <i>total_Smlink_J</i> | -0.010 [0.076] | | 0.015 [0.075] | |
| <i>total_Smlink_71t74</i> | 0.099** [0.040] | | 0.121*** [0.039] | |
| <i>domestic_Smlink</i> | | -0.193*** [0.056] | | -0.194*** [0.054] |
| <i>domestic_Smlink_J</i> | | 0.200* [0.110] | | 0.217** [0.108] |
| <i>domestic_Smlink_71t74</i> | | 0.307*** [0.068] | | 0.314*** [0.066] |
| <i>foreign_Smlink</i> | | 0.086 [0.053] | | 0.050 [0.052] |
| <i>foreign_Smlink_J</i> | | -0.153 [0.110] | | -0.125 [0.109] |
| <i>foreign_Smlink_71t74</i> | | -0.037 [0.055] | | -0.004 [0.055] |
| R2 | 0.7384 | 0.7427 | 0.7517 | 0.7551 |
| N | 733 | 733 | 733 | 733 |

Note: * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01. Robust standard errors in parentheses. The panel is specified using country-industry pairs. In all the specifications, time-invariant fixed effects both for countries and individual service sectors are included.

Source: own calculations.

As a main determinant of export activity in new trade theory (see Melitz's (2003) model), labour productivity affects export indicators in a positive and significant way, which is in line with our expectations.

Given the aim of this paper, it is interesting to look closer at the linkages between service sectors, in particular business service sectors and manufacturing exports. We hypothesize that a specific structure, i.e. strong linkages between domestic/foreign service and manufacturing exports, indirectly supports trade in services. Services play a crucial role as intermediate inputs for manufacturing export, and trade is an important channel through which firms can improve their

access to foreign services, either in the form of lower prices or greater choice (more variety). It has two effects. First, countries that have open service markets tend to be more competitive in manufacturing (Francois and Woerz 2008; Nordås 2010) and have productivity gains in downstream manufacturing firms (Arnold, Javorcik and Mattoo 2011). Second, exposing domestic service firms to foreign competition affects the quality of service exports and supports the direct exports of tradable service industries. For these results to hold, a country must have a good business environment (Amiti, Khandelwal 2013). Due to the variable quality of institutions in CEE countries (high in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania and relatively low in Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and Slovakia), which we analyse using the World Bank's 'Doing Business Survey,' we expect a slight positive effect of growing foreign value added by services embodied in a country's manufacturing exports on direct service exports.

Analysing the coefficients from regressions (1) and (3), the only significant influence is observed in the case of linkages with sector K71t74. This sector's contribution to manufacturing trade is significant (Figure 6) and this can be a reason for the impact revealed of this sector on service trade. Our research confirms the worldwide trend in trade in services where business services propel the manufacturing trade (Loungani et al. 2017). Business services seem to allow productivity growth by means of the same Kaldorian mechanisms that have traditionally made manufacturing the key driver of growth (Di Meglio et al. 2015).

More details of the relationship can be shown by dividing the total service content of manufacturing exports according to the location of the production of services. The domestic added value of all the tradable service sector content of domestic manufacturing exports does not support service export performance. In order to precisely explain the negative coefficient for domestic linkages (domestic_Smlink) in regressions (2), (4), (6) and (8), we additionally estimate these models replacing the variable with a new variable where sectors J and K71t74 are removed. Keeping the other coefficients stable, the results show a strong negative and statistically significant impact of the factor when only non-business sectors are taken into consideration. This finding suggests strong domestic service linkages tend to hinder the performance of some service exports. This is related to domestic transport services (land, water and air transport), i.e. a growing content of transport services in manufacturing exports does not support direct exports by tradable service industries. The reason could be the poorly developed market for transport services in the CEE countries, which is confirmed by their low positions in the International LPI Global Ranking (World Bank 2016b).¹⁵ By their nature, transport services are sourced externally

¹⁵ The Global Ranking of Countries by Performance Logistics Index published by the World Bank ranks 160 countries on six dimensions of trade – including customs performance, infrastructure quality, and timeliness of

by most manufacturers. Many manufacturing exporters sell their products in a value chain and they expect top quality reliability standards of transport services to reduce costs. A low quality or high cost of transport services, especially in poorly developed transport markets, negatively affects the competitiveness of manufacturing exports and of course does not support the direct export of such services (Nordås, Kim 2013).

But when we take business service sectors into consideration, a strong positive and statistically significant influence on export of services is observed. This means that this dynamically growing sector which strongly contributes to manufacturing trade, through this channel also supports trade in services. Domestically produced services matter in shaping export flows, but services which are produced abroad as intermediates and are exported by manufacturing do not influence exports of services.

As a second step we evaluate the impact of selected determinants on RCA indices, again measured in two ways: in gross terms and value added terms (Table 2). As previously, an increase in the hours worked by both highly-skilled and medium-skilled employees leads to growth in the exports indicator. Both of the groups strongly determine the growth in the comparative advantages in CEE countries. However, the influence of the human factor is almost twice as strong when we take value-added-based RCA into account.

When considering the coefficients related to the service content of manufacturing exports, crucial discrepancies between the influence of the determinants of RCA, measured in the two ways, are also observed. The revealed comparative advantage index constructed on the basis of value added reacts much more strongly to changes in service-manufacturing linkages, especially in the case of totally domestically produced services. When taking into consideration total service linkages, a statistically significant influence is only revealed in the value added model. As in our first step, the total linkages affect RCA in a negative way, but both of the business service sectors (J and K71t74), regardless of the source of their production, enlarge RCAs. The same situation is observed in the case of domestic services contributing to the manufacturing sector. Contrary to foreign linkages, only domestic services are able to support the growth in comparative advantages.

The only difference in comparison to the results obtained in the first step is for labour productivity, which has a negative and significant impact on value-added-based RCA. The negative impact of growing labour productivity on RCA can be explained by labour migration and earlier retirement of highly-skilled workers, which results in a growth in wages faster than in the EU overall.

shipments – that have been increasingly recognized as important to development (https://wb-lpi-media.s3.amazonaws.com/LPI_Report_2016.pdf).

Table 2 The impact of selected determinants on RCA based on gross exports and on domestic value added

| | <i>RCA_TEXP</i> | | <i>RCA_DVA</i> | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|-----------|----------------|-----------|
| | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| <i>HS</i> | 0.080*** | 0.071*** | 0.046*** | 0.034*** |
| | [0.017] | [0.018] | [0.009] | [0.010] |
| <i>MS</i> | 0.065*** | 0.058*** | 0.043*** | 0.033*** |
| | [0.017] | [0.018] | [0.009] | [0.010] |
| <i>lnLPRO</i> | -0.059 | -0.058 | -0.074*** | -0.075*** |
| | [0.041] | [0.040] | [0.028] | [0.026] |
| <i>total_Smlink</i> | -0.043 | | -0.246*** | |
| | [0.074] | | [0.059] | |
| <i>total_Smlink_J</i> | 0.136* | | 0.227*** | |
| | [0.082] | | [0.060] | |
| <i>total_Smlink_71t74</i> | 0.068 | | 0.226*** | |
| | [0.074] | | [0.058] | |
| <i>domestic_Smlink</i> | | -0.445*** | | -0.771*** |
| | | [0.125] | | [0.134] |
| <i>domestic_Smlink_J</i> | | 0.356*** | | 0.566*** |
| | | [0.135] | | [0.140] |
| <i>domestic_Smlink_71t74</i> | | 0.371*** | | 0.674*** |
| | | [0.129] | | [0.135] |
| <i>foreign_Smlink</i> | | 0.240** | | 0.122* |
| | | [0.122] | | [0.074] |
| <i>foreign_Smlink_J</i> | | -0.002 | | 0.011 |
| | | [0.133] | | [0.080] |
| <i>foreign_Smlink_71t74</i> | | -0.157 | | -0.095 |
| | | [0.123] | | [0.075] |
| R2 | 0.4840 | 0.4694 | 0.5438 | 0.5413 |
| N | 733 | 733 | 733 | 733 |

Note: * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01. Robust standard errors in parentheses. The panel is specified using country-industry pairs. In all the specifications time-invariant fixed effects both for countries and individual service sectors are included.

Source: own calculations.

To sum up, our research supports the conclusions of Koopman et al. (2010) for manufacturing industries and Grater (2014) for service industries. Countries have a lower comparative advantage in their main industries when double counting of intermediate goods is taken out of the equation. These authors suggest that RCA should instead be calculated on the basis of domestic value-added data. In our study, the revealed comparative advantage index constructed on the basis of value added also reacts much more strongly to changes in selected factors than the RCA based on gross data.

When we compare Figure 3 and Figure 4, a kind of ‘Baltic countries model’ for Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania and ‘Visegrad countries model’ for the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia can be observed. For this reason, we decide to additionally evaluate the differences between the impact of selected determinants on exports and value added exports in the two groups of countries. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3 The impact of selected determinants on gross exports and on domestic value added for Baltic and Visegrad countries

| | <i>lnTEXP</i> | | | | <i>lnDVA</i> | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------|
| | Baltic Countries | | Visegrad Countries | | Baltic Countries | | Visegrad Countries | |
| | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 |
| <i>HS</i> | 0.057*** | 0.057*** | 0.083*** | 0.067** | 0.056*** | 0.056*** | 0.077*** | 0.063** |
| | [0.014] | [0.013] | [0.026] | [0.026] | [0.013] | [0.013] | [0.027] | [0.027] |
| <i>MS</i> | 0.040*** | 0.041*** | 0.058** | 0.043* | 0.040*** | 0.040*** | 0.059*** | 0.045* |
| | [0.014] | [0.014] | [0.023] | [0.023] | [0.014] | [0.013] | [0.023] | [0.024] |
| <i>lnLPRO</i> | 0.997*** | 1.001*** | 0.277** | 0.256** | 1.017*** | 1.021*** | 0.321*** | 0.303*** |
| | [0.037] | [0.037] | [0.111] | [0.111] | [0.036] | [0.035] | [0.116] | [0.116] |
| <i>total_Smlink</i> | -0.093** | | -0.013 | | -0.094** | | -0.060 | |
| | [0.039] | | [0.051] | | [0.037] | | [0.050] | |
| <i>total_Smlink_J</i> | 0.028 | | -0.166 | | 0.031 | | -0.115 | |
| | [0.069] | | [0.119] | | [0.068] | | [0.117] | |
| <i>total_Smlink_71t74</i> | 0.079* | | 0.098* | | 0.082* | | 0.145*** | |
| | [0.045] | | [0.056] | | [0.043] | | [0.054] | |
| <i>domestic_Smlink</i> | | -0.294*** | | -0.372*** | | -0.274*** | | -0.381*** |
| | | [0.054] | | [0.094] | | [0.050] | | [0.091] |
| <i>domestic_Smlink_J</i> | | 0.199* | | 0.172 | | 0.181 | | 0.196 |
| | | [0.116] | | [0.177] | | [0.112] | | [0.173] |
| <i>domestic_Smlink_71t74</i> | | 0.310*** | | 0.465*** | | 0.302*** | | 0.473*** |
| | | [0.062] | | [0.120] | | [0.059] | | [0.118] |
| <i>foreign_Smlink</i> | | 0.028 | | 0.311*** | | 0.015 | | 0.231*** |
| | | [0.040] | | [0.093] | | [0.039] | | [0.088] |
| <i>foreign_Smlink_J</i> | | -0.068 | | -0.454*** | | -0.051 | | -0.380** |
| | | [0.117] | | [0.161] | | [0.118] | | [0.158] |
| <i>foreign_Smlink_71t74</i> | | -0.074 | | -0.224** | | -0.067 | | -0.143 |
| | | [0.051] | | [0.096] | | [0.051] | | [0.091] |
| R2 | 0.7069 | 0.7426 | 0.7902 | 0.7999 | 0.7174 | 0.7501 | 0.8010 | 0.8091 |
| N | 315 | 315 | 418 | 418 | 315 | 315 | 418 | 418 |

Note: * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01. Robust standard errors in parentheses. The panel is specified using country-industry pairs. In all the specifications time-invariant fixed effects both for countries and individual service sectors are included.

Source: own calculations.

The most noticeable discrepancy is observed for labour productivity. This factor influences both gross exports and domestic value added much more strongly in the Baltic countries. Each 1% increase in LPro results in about 1% growth in exports for the latter group, while for the Visegrad countries this brings an increase in exports of around 0.25 – 0.32 %.

Regarding labour force composition, highly-skilled workers support growth in exports and value added exports more strongly than medium-skilled workers, especially in the Visegrad group. As the analysis conducted by Rodríguez, Melikhova and Camacho (2017) (based only on intermediate service exports) shows, in the Baltic countries the categories of more knowledge-intensive services are gaining more importance as exports, although traditional services report major shares in the total volume of intermediate service exports.

In comparison to the previous models, a positive and significant influence of total foreign service linkages on service exports is revealed, but this only takes place in the Visegrad countries. However, foreign financial intermediation, foreign business service sectors and their contribution to manufacturing exports are associated with decreasing service export performance. According to Melikhova et al. (2015), business services in the Visegrad countries appear to also be at the heart of service vertical FDI. This should normally be accompanied by a growth in exports. Similarly to the results in Table 1, the domestic services comprising sector K71t74 which contribute to manufacturing exports generate growth in the services trade.

6. Conclusions

In the modern economy, services are no longer non-transportable, non-tradable or non-scalable. They should instead be treated as a niche, where each economy can develop its comparative advantages beyond manufacturing and find a new path along which to increase trade. As our results show, service sectors have made a significant contribution to CEE exports, especially if we measure it in value added terms. Not only does the direct contribution of services to exports remain high, but so does their indirect contribution that is embedded in manufacturing exports.

In our analysis we pay particular attention on the potential differences resulting from the two forms to express the volume of the services exports flows. So far, analyses comparing the determinants of exports in value added and gross terms are rare. They often analyse the variables explaining manufacturing export using a gravity model (Choi 2013; Yücer, Guilhoto and Siroën 2014; Nakazawa, Norihiko and Webb 2014; Guilhoto, Yücer and Siroën 2015) or an econometric model, as highlighted in traditional and new trade theories (Landesmann, Leitner, and Stehrer 2015; Olczyk and Kordalska 2016). Although the results of these analyses are sometimes

misleading, they usually show a similar impact of selected determinants on manufacturing exports in value added or in gross terms. The same conclusion applies to analyses of the trade determinants in services. In our study and a few others (Landesmann, Leitner, and Stehrer 2015) calculations in value added and gross terms do not – in most instances – show very strongly differentiated results. In our opinion, the reason for this lies in methodology. There is still a noticeable incompleteness in the methodology for ‘trade-in-value-added.’ This does not allow capture of some potential differences in input-output structures which characterize export activity in an economy as compared to production for the domestic market. According to Landesmann, Leitner, and Stehrer (2015), the available studies based on the WIOD dataset do not differentiate between the input-output relationships which characterize these two different types of activity, i.e. production for exports and for the domestic market. This is because slicing of the value chains might distort the link between gross exports, domestic practices and cost trends. In further research an improvement in the trade-in-value-added methodology in these types of analysis is needed. Moreover, a modification of the conventional determinants of trade in value added would be very desirable, e.g. replacing the unit labour cost by the trade-weighted unit labour cost (Lommatzsch, Silgoner and Ramskogler 2016).

Our results also indicate that the linkages between domestic services (especially financial intermediation services and business services) and manufacturing are significant in explaining CEE export growth. The labour productivity and a high quality of human capital are crucial determinants of export growth in service sectors.

The results of this study should be regarded as preliminary and requiring verification. We hope that the results of the estimations will contribute to discussion of the instruments which can help accelerate service-led export growth in CEE economies. We consider this path to be the largest opportunity for CEE economies to deepen, generating more added value participation in global GVCs and also shortening the distance from the most developed economies. Therefore, policymakers should be open to a change in perspective when crafting trade policies by taking into account the development of service sectors.

The main policy recommendations that emerge from our analysis are aimed at opening up the service sector to foreign participation. More opened domestic services markets will foster innovation and productivity. Further regulatory reform of services markets will create opportunities for firms to develop new services, improve the quality of existing services and meet emerging global demands. In opening services markets especially desirable are the reduction of public ownership in competitive industries such as air transport and the reduction of entrepreneurship barriers.

We also recommend building up skills to move into more sophisticated services to generate greater added value. All partnerships and co-financing by firms, workers and governments to foster life-long learning is essential. Also the incentives for private financing of life-long learning should be improved as well as equitable access to formal and on-the-job learning.

Finally, we suggest to adapt innovation policies to the growing importance of services innovation. Policy makers should consider how existing public R&D can better address the needs of the services sector and how to improve the links between services sector firms and manufacturing.

Further analyses are needed. Any analysis which helps understanding of how various manufacturing GVCs use and supply services is very desirable. From the methodological point of view, further estimation of the models for a longer time series would be very appropriate. When the data become available in different databases, new explanatory variables such as ICT intensity or services restrictiveness can be taken into account in our model. Additionally, it is evident that there is a large and diverse range of business-related service that interface with manufacturing in different ways e.g. by providing varying technological, operational, distributive and financial capabilities. We can disaggregate the business services sector into more specific group e.g. for knowledge intensive business services and other business services and analyze more deeply the business services linkages to manufacturing sector.

Limitations related to data on services are very well understood. They are related to differences in reporting, reliability, definitions and collection methods among countries. Although many international efforts have been made to improve the comparability and coverage of service trade statistics, one should use some caution in interpreting the results.

References

- Amiti, M. and M. Khandelwal. "Import Competition and Quality Upgrading." *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 95, no. 2 (2013): 476-490. DOI: 10.1162/REST_a_00271.
- Arnold, J.M., B. Javorcik, and A. Mattoo. "Does Services Liberalization Benefit Manufacturing Firms? Evidence from the Czech Republic." *Journal of International Economics* 85, no. 1 (2011): 136-46. DOI: 10.1016/j.jinteco.2011.05.002.
- Balassa, B. "Trade Liberalisation and "Revealed" Comparative Advantage." *Manchester School of Economic & Social Studies* 33, no. 2 (1965): 99-123. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9957.1965.tb00050.x.
- Baldwin, R., R. Forslid, and T. Ito. 2015. "Unveiling the Evolving Sources in Value Added in Exports. Institute of Developing Economies." *JETRO Working Paper* 161. Retrieved from <http://www.ide.go.jp/English/Publish/Download/Jrp/pdf/161.pdf>.

- Bustos, P. "Trade Liberalization, Exports and Technology Upgrading: Evidence on the impact of MERCOSUR on Argentinean Firms." *American Economic Review* 101, no. 1 (2011): 304–340. DOI: 10.1257/aer.101.1.304.
- Choi, N. "Measurement and Determinants of Trade in Value Added." *KIEP Working Paper* 13-01 (2013): 1-49.
- COM. 1998. "The Contribution of Business Services to Industrial Performance. A Common Policy Framework. Communication from the Commission to the Council, 534 final" Retrieved from <http://aei.pitt.edu/3383/1/3383.pdf>.
- Dao, N. T., V. N. Pham, and Q. H. Doan. 2015. "Analyzing the Determinants of Services Trade Flow between Vietnam and European Union: Gravity Model Approach." *MPRA Paper* 63982. Retrieved from https://mpra.ub.unimuenchen.de/63982/1/MPRA_paper_63982.pdf.
- Deb, K. and W. R. Hauk. RCA indices, multinational production and the Ricardian trade model *International Economics & Economic Policy* 14, nos. 1 (2017): 1–25. DOI: 10.1007/s10368-015-0317-z.
- Di Meglio, G., J. Gallego, A. Maroto, and M. Savona. "Services in Developing Economies: A new chance for catching-up?" *SPRU Working Paper Series* 2015-32 (2015): 1-36.
- EUR-Lex. 2010. "An Integrated Industrial Policy for the Globalisation Era. Putting Competitiveness and Sustainability at Centre Stage. Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, 614." Retrieved from <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=celex:52010DC0614>.
- European Commission, Eurostat. 2009. "European Business Facts and Figures." Luxembourg : Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-statistical-books/-/KS-BW-09-001>.
- Eurostat. 2017. "National accounts and GDP." Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/National_accounts_and_GDP.
- Foster-McGregor, N. and R. Stehrer. "Value Added Content of Trade: A Comprehensive Approach." *Economics Letters* 120, nos. 2 (2013): 354–7. DOI: 10.1016/j.econlet.2013.05.003.
- Francois, J. F. and J. Woerz. "Producer Services, Manufacturing Linkages, and Trade." *Journal of Industry Competition and Trade* 8, no. 3-4 (2008):199-229. DOI: 10.1007/s10842-008-0043-0.
- Ghani, E., A. Goswami, and H. Kharas. 2012. "Sevices with the Smile". *The World Bank Report* 96. Retrieved from <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTPREMNET/Resources/EP96.pdf>.
- Goswami, A. G., A. Mattoo, and S. Saez, eds. *Exporting Services: A Developing Country Perspective*. Washington : World Bank, 2011.
- Grater, S. "Comparative advantage of value-added services: the case of South Africa." *Managing Global Transitions* 12, no. 3 (2014): 279-295.
- Grunfeld, L. and A. Moxnes. 2013. "The Intangible Globalisation: Explaining Patterns of International Trade in Services." *Norwegian Institute of International Affairs Paper* 657. Retrieved from <https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/nhd/handelsavtaler/intangible-glob.pdf>.
- Guardia Bueno, C. D., J. Molero Zayas, and P. Valadez. 2005. "International Competitiveness in Services in Some European Countries: Basic Facts and a Preliminary Attempt of Interpretation." *Madrid Working Papers* 1. Univerisdad Complutense. Retrieved from http://eprints.ucm.es/10531/1/WP_01-05.pdf.
- Guilhoto, J., A. Yücer and J.M. Siroën. "The Gravity model, Global Value Chain and the Brazilian States." *DLAL Working Papers* DT/2015/02, (2015): 1–20.

- Johnson, R. and G. Noguera. "Fragmentation and Trade in Value Added over Four Decades." *NBER Working Paper* 8186 (2012): 1–62.
- Kimura, F. and H. H. Lee. "The Gravity Equation in International Trade in Services." *Review of World Economics* 142, no. 1 (2008): 92–121. DOI: 10.1007/s10290-006-0058-8.
- Koopman, R., W. Powers, Z. Wang, and S.J. Wei. "Give Credit Where Credit is Due: Tracing Value Added in Global Production Chains." *NBER Working Paper* 16426 (2010): 1-58.
- Kordalska, A., A. Parteka and J. Wolszczak-Derlacz. "Global value chains and productivity gains: a cross-country analysis." *Roczniki Kolegium Analiz Ekonomicznych* 41 (2016): 11-28.
- Landesmann, M., S. Leitner, and R. Stehrer. "Competitiveness of the European Economy." *EIB Working Papers* 1 (2015): 1–66.
- Lanz, R. and A. Maurer. 2015. "Services and Global Value Chains: Some Evidence on servicification of Manufacturing and Services Networks." https://www.wto.org/english/res_e/reser_e/ersd201503_e.pdf.
- Lodefalk, M. "Servicification of manufacturing - evidence from Sweden." *International Journal of Economics & Business Research* 6, no. 1 (2013): 87–113. DOI: 10.1504/IJEER.2013.054855.
- Lodefalk, M. "The Role of Services for Manufacturing Firm Exports." *Review of World Economics* 150, no. 1 (2014): 59–82. DOI: 10.1007/s10290-013-0171-4.
- Lommatzsch, K., M. Silgoner, and P. Ramskogler. "Trade in value added: Do we need new measures of competitiveness?" *Deutsche Bundesbank Discussion Papers* 52 (2016): 1-39. Retrieved from: <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/149567/1/877725179.pdf>
- Loungani, P., S. Mishra, Ch., Papageorgiou, and K. Wang. "World Trade in Services: Evidence from A New Dataset", *IMF Working Paper* 17/77(2017): 1-44.
- Low, P. "The Role of Services in the Global Value Chains." In *Global Value Chains in Changing World*, edited by P. Low and D.Elms. Geneva: WTO, 2013.
- Marel, E. V. D. "Determinants of Comparative Advantage in Services." *Group d'Economie Mondiale Working Paper* 87 (2011): 1–48.
- Melikhova, Y., L. Bazó, , I. Holubcova, and J.A. Camacho. "Trade in services and tertiarisation of the Visegrád Four economies." *Post-Communist Economies* 27, no. 1 (2015): 1-22. DOI: 10.1080/14631377.2015.992219.
- Melitz, M. "The impact of trade in intra-industry reallocations and aggregate industry productivity." *Econometrica* 71, no 6 (2003): 1695–1725. DOI: 10.1111/1468-0262.00467.
- Nakazawa, E., Y. Norihiko, and C. Webb. 2014. "Determinants of Trade in Value-Added: Market Size, Geography and Technological Gaps." In The Third World KLEMS Conference. Retrieved from: <http://jsie.ws.hosei.ac.jp/nakazawa.pdf>.
- Nordås, H.K. "Trade in goods and services: two sides of the same coin?" *Economic Modelling* 27, no. 2 (2010): 496-506. DOI: 10.1016/j.econmod.2009.11.002.
- Nordås, H. and Y. Kim. 2013. "The Role of Services for Competitiveness in Manufacturing", *OECD Trade Policy Papers* 148. DOI: 10.1787/5k484xb7cx6b-en.
- OECD, WTO, and the World Bank. 2014. *Global Value Chains: Challenges, Opportunities and Implications for Policy. Report prepared for submission to the G20 Trade Ministers Meeting Sydney, Australia, (July 2014)*. Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/tad/gvc_report_g20_july_2014.pdf.
- OECD. "International Trade in Services." In *OECD Factbook 2015-2016: Economic, Environmental and Social Statistics*. Paris: OECD Publishing, 2016.
- OECD. "Service-Manufacturing Linkages." In *OECD Science, Technology and Industry Scoreboard 2015: Innovation for Growth and Society*. Paris:OECD Publishing, 2015.
- OECD. 2012. "Mapping Global Value Chains, Working Papers of the Trade Committee, TAD/TC/WP/RD," Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/dac/aft/MappingGlobalValueChains_web_usb.pdf.

- OECD. 2014. "Perspectives on Global Development 2014: Boosting Productivity to Meet the Middle-Income Challenge, Report of Development Centre," Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/dev/pgd/EN_Pocket%20Edition_PGD2014_web.pdf.
- Olczyk M. and A. Kordalska. "Gross Exports Versus Value-Added Exports: Determinants and Policy Implications for Manufacturing Sectors in Selected CEE Countries." *Eastern European Economics* 55, no. 1 (2017): 91-109. DOI: 10.1080/00128775.2016.1254564.
- Quast, B. and V. Kummritz. 2015. "DECOMPR: Global Value Chain Decomposition in R." *CTEI Working Papers*. Retrieved from http://graduateinstitute.ch/files/live/sites/iheid/files/sites/ctei/shared/CTEI/working_papers/CTEI-2015-01_Quast,%20Kummritz.pdf.
- Rodríguez, M. and A.J. Camacho. "Mapping world trade flows in business services." In *Globalisation and Services-Driven Economic Growth: Perspectives from the Global North and South*, edited by Beerepoot, N., B. Lambregts and J. Kleibert. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Rodríguez, M., Y. Melikhova, and J.A. Camacho. "Trade in services in the Baltic States: evolutions and futures prospects." *Technological and Economic Development of Economy* (2017): 1-15. DOI: 10.3846/20294913.2016.1213203.
- Stehrer, R. 2013. "Accounting Relations in Bilateral Value Added Trade." *The Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies Working Paper* 101.
- Timmer, M. P., E. Dietzenbacher, B. Los, R. Stehrer, and G. J. de Vries. "An Illustrated User Guide to the World Input–Output Database: the Case of Global Automotive Production." *Review of International Economics* 23, no. 3 (2015): 575–605. DOI: 10.1111/roie.12178.
- UNCTAD. 2013. "World Investment Report 2013 – Global Value Chains: Investment and Trade for Development, 1–264." Retrieved from http://unctad.org/en/PublicationsLibrary/wir2013_en.pdf.
- USITC. 2013. "Services Contribution to Manufacturing." *United States International Trade Commission Working Paper*, 332. Retrieved from <https://www.usitc.gov/publications/332/pub4440c.pdf>.
- Walsh, K. "Trade in Services: Does Gravity Hold?." *Journal of World Trade* 42, no. 2 (2008): 315–34.
- Wang, Z., S.-J. Wei, and K. Zhu. 2013. "Quantifying International Production Sharing at the Bilateral and Sector Levels." *Working NBER Papers* 19667. Retrieved from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w19677.pdf>.
- WEF. 2012. "The Shifting Geography of Global Value Chains: Implications for Developing Countries and Trade Policy," Retrieved from http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_GAC_GlobalTradeSystem_Report_2012.pdf.
- World Bank. 2016a. *World Development Indicators*. Retrieved from <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/23969/9781464806834.pdf>.
- World Bank. 2016b. *Connecting to Complete 2016*, Retrieved from https://wb-lpi-media.s3.amazonaws.com/LPI_Report_2016.pdf
- Wörz, J. 2008. "Austria's Competitiveness in Trade in Services." *FIW Research Series* 3. Retrieved from <http://www.fiw.ac.at/fileadmin/Documents/Publikationen/fiwstudie3.pdf>.
- Yücer, A., J. Guilhoto and J.M. Siroën. "Internal and International Vertical Specialization of Brazilian states – An Input-Output analysis." *Revue d'Economie Politique* 124, no. 4 (2014): 597–610.

Appendix

Appendix 1 Structure of the total service content in the manufacturing sector by service sector

| | | 60 | 61 | 62 | 63 | 64 | J | 71t74 |
|-----|------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
| CZE | 1995 | 3.8 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 2.7 | 5.5 |
| | 2011 | 5.5 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 2.8 | 2.3 | 6.1 | 15.3 |
| EST | 1995 | 4.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 1.4 | 2.1 | 4.1 |
| | 2011 | 5.5 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 3.3 | 13.2 |
| HUN | 1995 | 2.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 2.8 | 8.3 |
| | 2011 | 4.6 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 5.9 | 21.6 |
| LTU | 1995 | 5.6 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 2.2 |
| | 2011 | 9.3 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 3.1 | 2.2 | 3.1 | 8.0 |
| LVA | 1995 | 2.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 2.1 | 2.5 |
| | 2011 | 4.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 1.5 | 2.4 | 5.2 | 10.7 |
| POL | 1995 | 2.8 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 |
| | 2011 | 4.8 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 3.6 | 12.4 |
| SVK | 1995 | 5.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 3.6 | 3.7 |
| | 2011 | 4.9 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 3.7 | 15.0 |

Source: own elaboration based on WIOD.

Original citation:

Kordalska A., Olczyk M. (2018). CEE trade in services: value added versus gross terms approaches. GUT FME Working Paper Series A, No 2/2018(48). Gdansk (Poland): Gdansk University of Technology, Faculty of Management and Economics.

All GUT Working Papers are downloadable at: <http://zie.pg.edu.pl/working-papers>

GUT Working Papers are listed in Repec/Ideas

<http://ideas.repec.org/s/gdk/wpaper.html>



GUT FME Working Paper Series A jest objęty licencją Creative Commons Uznanie autorstwa-Użycie niekomercyjne-Bez utworów zależnych 3.0 Unported.



GUT FME Working Paper Series A is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported License.

Gdańsk University of Technology, Faculty of Management and Economics

Narutowicza 11/12, (premises at Traugutta 79)

80-233 Gdańsk, Poland phone: 58 347-18-99

www.zie.pg.edu.pl

