

Balcerzak, Adam P.; Pietrzak, Michal Bernard

**Working Paper**

## Quality of Institutions for Global Knowledge-based Economy and Convergence Process in the European Union

Institute of Economic Research Working Papers, No. 163/2015

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Institute of Economic Research (IER), Toruń (Poland)

*Suggested Citation:* Balcerzak, Adam P.; Pietrzak, Michal Bernard (2015) : Quality of Institutions for Global Knowledge-based Economy and Convergence Process in the European Union, Institute of Economic Research Working Papers, No. 163/2015, Institute of Economic Research (IER), Toruń

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/219778>

**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/3.0/>



**Institute of Economic Research Working Papers**

**No. 163/2015**

**Quality of Institutions for Global Knowledge-based Economy and  
Convergence Process in the European Union**

**Adam P. Balcerzak, Michał Bernard Pietrzak**

**Article published in journal: *Ekonomia. Rynek, Gospodarka, Społeczeństwo*, 2015, No 42. Quoting:**

Balcerzak, A. P., & Pietrzak, M. B. (2015). Quality of institutional systems for global knowledge-based economy and convergence process in the European Union. *Ekonomia. Rynek, Gospodarka, Społeczeństwo*, 42, 93-106. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17451/eko/42/2015/173>

**Toruń, Poland 2015**

**Adam P. Balcerzak**

Department of Economics, Nicolaus Copernicus University, e-mail:apb@umk.pl

**Michał Bernard Pietrzak**

Department of Econometrics and Statistics, Nicolaus Copernicus University, e-mail:

pietrzak@umk.pl

## **Quality of Institutions for Global Knowledge-based Economy and Convergence Process in the European Union**

### **Abstract**

The use of the potential of economic convergence is one of the key challenges of economic policy in case of European Union. Due to structural changes that have led to the growing role of knowledge-based economy (KBE), the analysis made in the paper is based on the assumption that the convergences process of the EU countries takes place in the reality of the KBE, thus in order to facilitate it, all the EU members should concentrate on building institutions that are adequate to the conditions of the KBE. In this context, the aim of the study is to verify the potential impact of the quality of institutional system of the EU countries on the process of convergence. In this regard, the analytical framework of conditional  $\beta$ -convergence was used with econometric dynamic panel modeling. To measure the quality of institutional system the authors proposed original synthetic indicator, which was designed with TOPSIS method. For this purpose the data was obtained from the Fraser Institute database. Dynamic panel econometric analysis carried out for the European Union countries in the years 2004-2010 confirms that the high quality and adequacy of the institutional system to the conditions of the KBE supports convergence process in the EU.

**Keywords:** institutional economics, quality of institutional system, global knowledge-based economy, conditional  $\beta$ -convergence, dynamic panel analysis

**JEL classification:** D02, 047

## **Introduction**

The current literature on the convergence process both at the national (Próchiak and Witkowski 2012, 25-58; 2013, 6-26; Lechman 2012, 95-109) and regional level (Pietrzak 2012, 167-185, Dańska-Borysiak 2011, 193-207) is very broad. In that context there is a basic question to ask: is there still a need for research in that field, especially in case of relatively developed countries such as European Union economies? In order to answer this question one should concentrate on two perspectives. First of all, the use of the potential of economic convergence is one of the key challenges of economic policy in case of European countries that have to reduce their development gap. This is of particular importance in regard to Central and Eastern European new member states. Then, utilizing the potential of convergence is also important from the perspective of the European Union, which can be helpful in improving the growth potential of the European economy as a whole and to enhance its macroeconomic structural stability. Thus, in spite of the vast stream of literature in the field, the study of factors influencing the pace of convergence process in case of European Union economies is still an important subject of research.

Due to structural changes resulting in growing role of knowledge-based economy (KBE) that have been observed for last twenty years, based on the historical experiences of the previous fundamental technological changes collected by New Institutional Economists (North 1994, DeLong and Summers 2001, 29-59, Mokyr 2001, 9-14; Devine 1983, 347-372), the analysis made in the paper is based on two assumptions: a) the countries aiming at reducing their development gap and increasing their speed of convergence must improve

quality of their institutions; b) in case of relatively developed economies of the European Union the condition for achieving high quality of institutions is their adequacy to the conditions of the KBE. In this context in order to operationalize the definition of quality of institutions transaction costs theory framework is used. High quality institutions are the once that tend to minimize the cost of operation and technological transformation of economy (Williamson, 1985). Thus, the aim of the study is to verify the potential impact of the quality of institutional system for the KBE in European Union countries on the process of convergence. In this regard, the analytical framework of  $\beta$ -convergence was used with econometric dynamic panel modeling. To measure the quality of institutional system the authors proposed synthetic indicator, which was designed with TOPSIS method. The data were obtained from the Fraser Institute database.

The paper is a continuation of previous research of the authors (see: Balcerzak and Pietrzak, 2015a; 2015b; 2015c, 71-91; 2014).

The research presented in the article should be treated as a contribution to the development of quantitative modeling methodology of institutional factors within New Institutional Economics framework. Then, the convergence process for the EU countries is analyzed here from the perspective of institutions and their adequacy to the conditions of the KBE not just from perspective of developing countries that can simply use the “benefits” of development gap. Furthermore, the survey is a source of important guidelines for regulatory and institutional policies, which should be responsible for creating conditions for long-term economic growth European countries.

## **The measurement of quality of insertions in the context of knowledge-based economy**

Last two decades were a period of great political and economic change. In this regard the emergence of the concept of knowledge-based economy (KBE) is usually pointed as one of the most important factors from the perspective of structural evolution of global economy (see OECD 1996; OECD 1999). It has significantly influenced all developed economies both at micro and macro level (see Ciborowski 2014, 57-72; Lechman 2014, 79-106; Balcerzak and Rogalska 2008, 71-87; Balcerzak 2009a, 279-290; 2009b, 95-105). The main characteristics of KBE is an indication on new main determinants of economic growth in developed economies in comparison with the once typical for industrial economy (Madrak-Grochowska 2015). Traditionally, the processes of growth was mostly determined by economies of scale with constant returns and the ability to invest in physical capital (Tokarski 1998, 271-291, 2001a, 213-245). However, in developed economies for last twenty years these factors can be only considered as a necessary condition for maintaining growth. The abundance of traditional factors of production is not any more a sufficient condition for keeping high growth rate, which could be seen in empirical research (OECD 1996, Piątkowski and Bart van Ark 2007, 3-26; Witkowski 2007, 43-60) and has significantly influence the theory of growth (Welfe (ed.) 2007, Tokarski 1996, 581-604; 2001, 213-245).

The experience of developed countries for the last two decades has proved that the ability to use so called knowledge capital is the necessary condition to maintain high rate of growth. This ability both at micro and macro level strongly depends on effectiveness of regulations and other factors influencing quality of institutions. The institutions influence the speed of diffusion of new technologies and new ideas in the sphere of organization, production and creation of products, which in the dynamic market process, using the Schumpeterian semantics (see Śledzik 2014, 67-77), affects the speed and macroeconomic effectiveness of

creative destruction (OECD, 2001; Bassanini, Scarpetta and Visco 2000, Balcerzak 2009c, 71-106, 2009d, 711-739). The research concerning the determinants of productivity growth in developed countries that have been done for last two decades pointed to the growing role of institutional factors influencing entrepreneurship and the competitive pressure in a given economy. Both these factors determine the number of enterprises that are able to achieve technological and organizational breakthroughs, which due to some spillover effects can result in higher total factor productivity growth (Bassanini, Scarpetta and Hemmings 2001, OECD 2000). Thus, based on the empirical research for developed countries and institutional transaction cost theory (Williamson 1985), it is possible to indicate four aspects of national institutional systems that in case of the KBE can especially influence rate of productivity changes:

1. the effectiveness of regulations aimed at supporting entrepreneurship - a high level of entrepreneurship positively influences supply of new enterprises with high growth potential (see. McKinsey Global Institute, 2001).
2. the effectiveness of juridical system in keeping low level of transaction costs and supporting effectiveness of market mechanism - the elimination of barriers to structural changes and the diffusion of new technologies or organizational changes is necessary condition for raising the rate of productivity growth (see. McKinsey Global Institute, 2002a)
3. competitive pressure and effectiveness of labour markets - a high level of competitive pressure is conducive to the phenomenon of Schumpeterian creative destruction and increases the rate of diffusion of the most effective technological solutions (see. McKinsey Global Institute, 2002b).
4. financial markets institutions as a stimulator of development of enterprises with high growth potential - developed and relatively efficient financial markets are conducive to faster

reallocation of capital from industries with low growth potential into new sectors with high development potential (OECD, 2001; Balcerzak, 2009e, 30-39).

Referring to the World Bank concept of pillars of the KBE these four institutional segments can be treated as the incentive pillar of the KBE (see: Chen and Dahlman 2005, 2004, Madrak-Grochowska 2015).

The additional argumentation for selection of above mentioned segments of national institutional system in the context of utilizing the potential of KBE is presented in Balcerzak and Pietrzak (2014) and Balcerzak (2015, 51-63).

Based on the above mentioned arguments it is obvious that the quality of institutions for KBE is a multidimensional phenomenon (see also: Olczyk 2014, 21-43; Kuc 2012a, 5-23, 2012b, 5-19, Balcerzak 2011, 456-46). As a result in order to measure TOPSIS method is applied. Based on the method it is possible to obtain the measure of development describing every aspect of the studied phenomenon by estimating its proximity to the positive ideal solution (for example maximum value of the variable) and its distance from negative ideal solution (for example minimum value of the variable). The final value of the synthetic measure is obtained as the arithmetic mean of the indicators obtained for all aspects under consideration. The formal presentation of the TOPSIS method applied in the research is available in Balcerzak and Pietrzak (2014).

The empirical research was done for the years 2004-2010. The short period of the analysis should be treated as a significant weakness of the research. However, in spite of this fact the year 2004 was chosen deliberately, as it is the year of the biggest enlargement of European Union, which can be treated as one of the most important institutional changes in Europe. The year 2010 was the last year with data available for all four institutional segments. The analysis of quality of institutions for the KBE was done for 24 EU countries. Due to unavailability of data for Luxemburg, Malta and Cyprus they were excluded from the research. Croatia was



also excluded from the analysis as it joined EU only in 2013. In order to utilize the comparable data on difficult to measure institutional factors, which additionally is prepared with single methodology, the data from Fraser Institute database created for the Economic Freedom of the World reports was utilized. A set of potential variables describing four institutional segments, influencing the economy ability to utilize potential of the KBE, is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1 The potential variables concerning quality of institutions from the perspective of KBE potential used for TOPSIS analysis**

$Y_1$ – formal regulations influencing entrepreneurship
$X_1^1$ – Administrative requirements for entrepreneurs
$X_2^1$ – Bureaucracy costs for entrepreneurs
$X_3^1$ – The cost of starting business
$X_4^1$ – Extra payments/bribes/favouritism
$X_5^1$ – Licensing restrictions
$Y_2$ – effectiveness of juridical system in keeping low level of transaction costs and supporting effectiveness of market mechanism
$X_1^2$ – Tax compliance
$X_2^2$ – Judicial independence
$X_3^2$ – Impartial courts
$X_4^2$ – Protection of property rights
$X_5^2$ – Integrity of the legal system
$X_6^2$ – Legal enforcement of contracts
$X_7^2$ – Regulatory restrictions on the sale of real property
$Y_3$ – competitive pressure and effectiveness of labour markets
$X_1^3$ – Revenue from trade taxes (% of trade sector)
$X_2^3$ – Mean tariff rate
$X_3^3$ – Standard deviation of tariff rates
$X_4^3$ – Non-tariff trade barriers
$X_5^3$ – Compliance costs of importing and exporting
$X_6^3$ – Regulatory trade barriers
$X_7^3$ – Foreign ownership/investment restrictions
$X_8^3$ – Capital controls
$X_9^3$ – Controls of the movement of capital and people
$X_{10}^3$ – Hiring regulations and minimum wage
$X_{11}^3$ – Hiring and firing regulations
$X_{12}^3$ – Centralized collective bargaining
$X_{13}^3$ – Hours Regulations

$X_{14}^3$ – Mandated cost of worker dismissal
$Y_4$ – financial markets institutions as a stimulator of development of enterprises with high growth potential
$X_1^4$ – Ownership of banks
$X_2^4$ – Private sector credit
$X_3^4$ – Interest rate controls/negative real interest rates

Source: own work.

Based on the information quality criteria for potential diagnostic variables that should be implemented in multivariate analysis, relating to the minimum level of accepted variation (it was assumed that coefficient of variation in case of potential variables at least should fulfill criterion  $V > 0.2$ ), the potential variables:  $X_5^1$ ,  $X_1^2$ ,  $X_6^2$ ,  $X_7^2$ ,  $X_1^3$ ,  $X_2^3$ ,  $X_{13}^3$ ,  $X_{14}^3$ ,  $X_3^4$  were eliminated. In the next stage the remaining diagnostic variables were normalized with classic standardization formula. Then a positive and negative ideal solution with maximum and minimum values respectively for all variables in the years 2004-2010 were pointed. Thus a constant positive and negative ideal solutions for the analyzed years were set (see more Balcerzak, Pietrzak, 2014). This is a condition for obtaining the time series that can be considered as an input data for future econometric research. Finally, with the application of the Euclidean metric a distance from positive and negative ideal solution for each of the four aspects were estimated. This enabled the calculation of partial taxonomic measures of development for the aspects. In the end the value of synthetic taxonomic measure of development (TMD) for all the four aspects altogether was evaluated. It was an arithmetic average based on the four previously calculated partial measures. The results are presented in Table 2. The data for replication of the described procedure is available in Balcerzak and Pietrzak (2014).

**Table 2 The values of taxonomic measure of development for quality of institutions for the KBE in the year 2004 and 2010**

2004		2010	
Country	TMD	Country	TMD
Denmark	0,846	Denmark	0,874
Finland	0,828	Finland	0,827
Netherlands	0,755	Sweden	0,799
Sweden	0,741	Netherlands	0,783
Ireland	0,740	United Kingdom	0,752
United Kingdom	0,737	Ireland	0,752
Austria	0,694	Estonia	0,653
Belgium	0,625	France	0,645
France	0,604	Belgium	0,644
Germany	0,596	Austria	0,633
Estonia	0,594	Germany	0,615
Spain	0,543	Spain	0,543
Slovakia	0,542	Slovenia	0,517
Lithuania	0,500	Slovakia	0,515
Czech Republic	0,491	Lithuania	0,506
Hungary	0,482	Latvia	0,499
Portugal	0,482	Czech Republic	0,493
Latvia	0,477	Hungary	0,480
Slovenia	0,476	Portugal	0,469
Italy	0,448	Italy	0,452
Bulgaria	0,396	Bulgaria	0,429
Greece	0,382	Poland	0,426
Poland	0,378	Greece	0,384
Romania	0,353	Romania	0,377

Source: own estimation based on data from Fraser Institute.

### **Econometric Analysis with the application of $\beta$ -convergence framework**

The aim of the article is to verify the potential impact of the quality of institutions in the context of the KBE in European Union countries on the process of convergence. As a result the parameters of the dynamic panel models for the period 2004-2010 were estimated, which enabled to identify  $\beta$ -convergence process.

The  $\beta$ -convergence process takes place when in a given group of countries in an analyzed period a common level of income per capita is reached within the long term steady state. In the first stage the unconditional  $\beta$ -convergence process in the EU countries was verified. The hypothesis of unconditional  $\beta$ -convergence is tested by estimation of parameters of dynamic panel model given with the equation 2 (Baltagi 1995: 135-155).

$$\ln(\mathbf{Y}_{it} / \mathbf{Y}_{it-1}) = \beta_0 - \beta_1 \ln \mathbf{Y}_{it-1} + \boldsymbol{\eta}_i + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{it} \quad (1)$$

$$\ln \mathbf{Y}_{it} = \beta_0 + \gamma \ln \mathbf{Y}_{it-1} + \boldsymbol{\eta}_i + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{it} \quad (2)$$

$$\gamma = (1 - \beta_1) \quad (3)$$

Where:  $\mathbf{Y}_{it}$  is the vector of GDP per capita in purchasing power standards,  $\beta_0$ ,  $\beta_1$ ,  $\gamma$  are the structural parameters of the model,  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i$  is the vector of individual effects of a panel model,  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{it}$  is the vector of disturbances. All the variables are determined for i-country in the period t.

In the literature the analysis of convergence is significantly enriched with the concept of conditional  $\beta$ -convergence. In that case it is assumed that every country tend to reach his own steady state, which means that the level of income in the steady state for every economy is determined by some fundamental macroeconomic conditions (Mankiw, Romer and Weil 1992: 407-437; Levine and Renelt 1992: 942-963). This means that conditional  $\beta$ -convergence is only possible provided that the countries are similar in terms of economic variables that determine the output in the steady state. The hypothesis of conditional  $\beta$ -convergence is tested by estimation of parameters of dynamic panel model given with the equation 4. In that case again the dependent variable was GDP per capita in purchasing power standards. The independent variable is the measure of quality of institutions for the KBE that was obtained as a result of procedure presented in previous section. The quality of institutions for the KBE is treated here as the fundamental macroeconomic factor influencing the

development of European economies. In order to confirm the positive influence of the quality of institutions on convergence process the parameter  $\alpha_1$  should be positive and statistically significant.

$$\ln Y_{it} = \beta_0 + \gamma \ln Y_{it-1} + \alpha_1 X_{1,it} + \eta_i + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (4)$$

$$\gamma = (1 - \beta_1) \quad (5)$$

Where:  $Y_{it}$  is the vector of GDP per capita in purchasing power standards,  $\beta_0$ ,  $\beta_1$ ,  $\alpha_1$ ,  $\gamma$  are the structural parameters of the model,  $\eta_i$  is the vector of individual effects of a panel model,  $\varepsilon_{it}$  is the vector of disturbances. All the variables are determined for i-country in the period t, variables  $X_1$  is the potential variable determining the output in the steady state, here it is TMD of quality of institutions for the KBE. All the variables are determined for i-country in the period t.

In case of both estimated equations obtaining the statistically significant value of parameter  $\gamma$  fulfilling the condition  $\gamma < 1$ , which means that the value of parameter  $\beta_1$  is positive, positively verifies the hypothesis of unconditional and conditional  $\beta$ -convergence for the analyzed countries. The lower the value of  $\gamma$ , the higher positive value of parameter  $\beta_1$ , the faster the process of convergence. As a result the value of parameter  $\gamma$  enables to estimate the average annual speed of convergence and the time that is needed for reaching the half of the distance between the starting level of output and the output in the steady state (Barro and Sala-i-Martin 1995). The average speed of convergence is described with the equation 6.

$$b = -\ln(\gamma) / T, \quad (6)$$

and the time that is needed for reaching the half way between the average starting level of GDP and the GDP in the steady state is given with equation (7):

$$\tau = -\ln(2) / \ln(\gamma) . \quad (7)$$

The convergence models are the example of dynamic models, as a result to estimate the parameters of the models 2 and 4 the system GMM estimator was applied (Blundell and Bond 1998: 321-340), that is a development of first-difference GMM estimator (Holtz-Eakin, Newey and Rosen 1988: 1371-1395, Arellano and Bond 1991: 277-297, Ahn and Schmidt 1995: 5–27). The idea of system GMM estimator is the estimation of both equations in first differences and equations in levels. The results of two-step estimation with asymptotic standard errors for unconditional  $\beta$ -convergence and conditional  $\beta$ -convergence are presented respectively in the table 3 and 4. The calculations were made with the application of the GRETL software (version 1.9.7).

**Table 3 The estimated unconditional  $\beta$ -convergence model for the EU countries in the years 2004-2010**

Parameter	Parameter estimate	P-value
$\gamma$	0,80	$\approx 0.000$
Statistical test		
Sargan Test	23,8	0,20
AR(1)	-3,15	0,0016
AR(2)	-2,62	0,0089

**Source:** own estimation based on Eurostat data.

**Table 4 The estimated conditional  $\beta$ -convergence model for the EU countries in the years 2004-2010**

Parameter	Parameter estimate	P-value
$\gamma$	0,77	$\approx 0.000$
$\alpha_1$	0,42	$\approx 0.000$
Statistical test		
Sargan Test	22,7	0,28
AR(1)	-2,86	0,004
AR(2)	-2,63	0,008

**Source:** own estimation based on Eurostat data.

The Sargant test enables testing of over-identifying restrictions (Blundell, Bond and Windmeijer 2000: 53-91). In case of both models the obtained statistics of the test are equal to 23,8 and 22,7, thus the null hypothesis that the over-identifying restrictions should be included cannot be rejected.

In case of both models the serial autocorrelation was tested. For both models the first-order serial correlation was negative and statistically significant. The second-order serial correlation was statically significant too.

The statistic of the test for first-order serial correlation equals -3,15 (model 1) and -2,86 (model 2) – one rejects the null hypothesis that there is no first-order serial correlation in both cases. The statistic of the test for second-order serial correlation equals -2,62 (model 1) and -2,63 (model 2) – one rejects the null hypothesis of no second-order serial correlation in both models (Baltagi 1995: 158). There is a statistically significant negative serial autocorrelation the conditions for consistent and efficient GMM estimator are not fulfilled. As it has been already pointed the main reason for this situation can be attributed to relatively short period of the analysis (see Balcerzak, Pietrzak and Rogalska 2014, 389-407).

In case of both models parameter  $\gamma$  are statistically significant and lower than 1, which enables to estimate the value of parameter  $\beta_1$  at the level 0,20 for the unconditional  $\beta$ -convergence and 0,23 for conditional  $\beta$ -convergence, thus in both cases the hypothesis of  $\beta$ -convergence is verified.

The average annual speed of convergence equals 22% of the distance (model 1) and 26% (model 2) of the distance provided similar level of quality of institutions. It means that the time needed for reaching the half way between average starting output and the output in the steady state is 3,10 years for the first model and 2,65 years for the second model. These high values additionally confirm that the period of the analysis is relatively short, it can be expected that in case of longer period of the analysis this speed would be lower.

In case of conditional  $\beta$ -convergence model the parameter  $\alpha_1$  is statistically significant. It means that variables  $X_1$  significantly determine the convergence process for analyzed EU countries. The positive estimate of the parameter  $\alpha_1$  suggests positive influence of quality of institutions in the context of the KBE on convergence process. Additionally, when one compares the speed of unconditional and conditional  $\beta$ -convergence, it can be seen that the quality of institutions for the KBE can increase the convergence speed. However, it must be remembered that the estimated speed of convergence for model 2 is only conditional. It means that only provided the unified quality of institutions for KBE for all the analyzed countries, it is possible to obtain the estimated speed of convergence process.

## **Conclusions**

The research conducted in the article was based on the assumption that the European countries aiming at reducing their development gap must improve quality of their institutions. Then in case of relatively developed economies of the European Union the condition for achieving high quality of institutions is their adequacy to the KBE. As a result the aim of the



analysis was to verify the potential impact of the quality of institutional system for the KBE in European Union countries on the process of convergence.

Dynamic panel econometric analysis carried out in the years 2004-2010 confirms that the quality and adequacy of the institutional system to the conditions of the KBE support convergence process in case of European economies.

The analysis of quality of institutions was based on the institutional perspective, precisely speaking the transaction theory framework. As a result from the methodological point of view, it can be seen that the qualitative approach of New Institutional Economics and quantitative perspective of mainstream economics should be treated as complementary.

From the perspective of policy supporting cohesion and stability of European economy, thus forming the guidelines for regulatory changes, it can be said that the reforms adjusting formal institutions to the conditions of the KBE should be treated as a priority. This is especially important in case of new member states of the EU that on average, with the exception of Estonia, are characterized with relatively low quality of institutions for the KBE. The institutional reforms should lead to reducing the transaction cost for enterprises able to implement technological and organizational changes, which in the process of Schumpeterian creative destruction can result in higher total factor productivity. The improvement of quality of institutions for KBE can help to increase the speed of convergence process in Europe, thus improve the global competitiveness of European economy as a whole.

## References

- Ahn, Seung C. and Peter Schmidt. 1995. "Efficient Estimation of Models for Dynamic Panel Data". *Journal of Econometrics* 68(1): 5–27.
- Arellano, Manuel and Stephen Bond. 1991. "Some tests of specification for panel data: Monte Carlo evidence and an application to employment equation" *Review of Economic Studies* 58(2): 277-297.
- Balcerzak, Adam P. 2015. „Wielowymiarowa analiza efektywności instytucjonalnej w krajach Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej w relacji do standardów OECD”. *Optimum. Studia Ekonomiczne* 1(74): 51-63.
- Balcerzak, Adam P. 2009a. „Limitations of the National Economic Policy in the Face of Globalization Process”. *Olsztyn Economic Journal* 4(2): 279-290.
- Balcerzak, Adam P. 2009b. "Monetary policy under conditions of NAIRU "flattening"". *Olsztyn Economic Journal* 4(1): 95-105.
- Balcerzak, Adam P. 2009c. „Wpływ działalności regulacyjnej państwa w obszarze kreowania ładu konkurencyjnego na rozwój nowej gospodarki”. In: *Aktywność regulacyjna państwa a potencjał rozwojowy gospodarki*. eds. Adam P. Balcerzak and Michał Moszyński. 71-106. Toruń: Polskie Towarzystwo Ekonomiczne Oddział w Toruniu.
- Balcerzak, Adam P. 2009d. „Efektywność systemu instytucjonalnego a potencjał gospodarki opartej na wiedzy” *Ekonomista* 6, 711-739.
- Balcerzak, Adam P. 2009e. Structure of Financial Systems and Development of Innovative Enterprises with High Grow Potential, In: M. Piotrowska, L. Kurowski ed., *Global Challenges and Politics of the European Union – Consequences for the “New Member States”*, Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu, nr 59, Wrocław.

- Balcerzak, Adam P. 2011. "Taksonomiczna analiza jakości kapitału ludzkiego w Unii Europejskiej w latach 2002-2008" *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego we Wrocławiu Taksonomia 18 Klasyfikacja i analiza danych – teoria i zastosowania*: 456-467.
- Balcerzak, Adam P. and Michał Bernard Pietrzak. 2014. „Are New EU Member States Improving Their Institutional Effectiveness for Global Knowledge-based Economy? TOPSIS Analysis for the Years 2000-2010”, *Institute of Economic Research Working Papers* 16/2014, [http://econpapers.repec.org/paper/peswpaper/2014\\_3ano16.htm](http://econpapers.repec.org/paper/peswpaper/2014_3ano16.htm).
- Balcerzak, Adam P. and Michał Pietrzak. 2015a. „Efektywność instytucjonalna krajów Unii Europejskiej w kontekście globalnej gospodarki opartej na wiedzy”. *Ekonomista* (forthcoming).
- Balcerzak, Adam P. and Michał Pietrzak. 2015b. “Human Development and Quality of Institutions in Highly Developed Countries” *Institute of Economic Research Working Papers* No 156/2015. Retrieved from RePEC EconPapers: [http://econpapers.repec.org/paper/peswpaper/2015\\_3ano156.htm](http://econpapers.repec.org/paper/peswpaper/2015_3ano156.htm).
- Balcerzak, Adam P. and Michał Pietrzak. 2015c. „Wpływ efektywności instytucji na jakość życia w Unii Europejskiej. Badanie panelowe dla lat 2004-2010”. *Przegląd Statystyczny* 62(1): 71-91.
- Balcerzak, Adam P., Michał Bernard Pietrzak and Elżbieta Rogalska, 2014. „Niekeynesowskie skutki polityki fiskalnej w krajach strefy euro, ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem wpływu na proces konwergencji gospodarczej”. *Przegląd Statystyczny* 61 (4), 389-407.
- Balcerzak, Adam P. and Rogalska Elżbieta. 2008. „Ochrona praw własności intelektualnej w warunkach nowej gospodarki”. *Ekonomia i Prawo* 4: 71-87.
- Baltagi, Badi H. 1995. *Econometric analysis of panel data*. Chichester: John Wiley&Sons Ltd.,

- Barro, Robert J and Xavier Sala-I-Martin. 1995. *Economic Growth Theory*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Bassanini, Andrea, Stefano Scarpetta and Ignazio Visco. 2000. "Knowledge, Technology and Economic Growth: Recent Evidence from OECD Countries". *OECD Economics Department Working Papers* No. 259, ECO/WKP (2000) 32.
- Bassanini, Andrea, Stefano Scarpetta and Philip Hemmings. 2001. "Economic Growth: The Role of Policies and Institutions. Panel Data Evidence From OECD Countries", *OECD Economics Department Working Papers* No. 283, ECO/WKP (2001) 9.
- Blundell Richard and Stephen Bond. 1998. "Initial Conditions and Moment Restrictions in Dynamic Panel Data Model". *Econometric Review* 19(3): 321-340.
- Blundell, Richard., Stephen Bond and Frank Windmeijer. 2000. "Estimation in Dynamic Panel Data Models: Improving on the Performance of the Standard GMM estimator". In: *Nonstationary Panels, Panel Cointegration and Dynamic Panels*, ed. B. Baltagi. 53-91. Amsterdam: Elsevier Science.
- Chen, Derek H. C. and Carl. J. Dahlman, 2004. "Knowledge and Development: A Cross-Section Approach." World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 3366.
- Chen, Derek H.C. and Carl J. Dahlman. 2005. "The Knowledge Economy, the KAM Methodology and World Bank Operations". World Bank Institute Working Paper No. 37256.
- Ciborowski, Robert. 2014. "Innovation Process Adjusting in Peripheral Regions. The Case of Podlaskie Voivodship" *Equilibrium. Quarterly Journal of Economics and Economic Policy* 9(2): 57-72, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/EQUIL.2014.011>
- Dańska-Borysiak, Barbara. 2011. *Dynamiczne modele panelowe w badaniach ekonomicznych*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

- DeLong, Bradford and Lawrence Summers, 2001. "The "New Economy": Background, Historical Perspective, Questions, and Speculations". *Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City Economic Review* Fourth Quarter: 29-59.
- Devine Warren, 1983. "From Shafts to Wires: Historical Perspective on Electrification". *Journal of Economic History* 43(2): 347-372.
- Holtz-Eakin, Douglas, Whitney Newey and Harvey S. Rosen. 1988. "Estimating vector autoregressions with panel Data". *Econometrica* 56(6): 1371-1395.
- Kuc, Marta. 2012a. "The Use of Taxonomy Methods for Clustering European Union Countries Due to the Standard of Living". *Oeconomia Copernicana* 3(2): 5-23.
- Kuc, Marta. 2012b. "The Implementation of Synthetic Variable for Constructing the Standard of Living Measure in European Union Countries". *Oeconomia Copernicana* 3(3): 5-19.
- Lechman, Ewa. 2012. "Catching-up and Club Convergence From Cross-National Perspective a Statistical Study for the Period 1980–2010". *Equilibrium. Quarterly Journal of Economics and Economic Policy* 7(3): 95-109.
- Lechman, Ewa. 2014. "New Technologies Adoption and Diffusion Patterns in Developing Countries. An Empirical Study for the Period 2000-2011". *Equilibrium. Quarterly Journal of Economics and Economic Policy* 8(4): 79-106, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/EQUIL.2013.028>.
- Levine, Ross and David Renelt. 1992. "A Sensitivity Analysis of Cross-country Growth Regressions". *American Economic Review* 82(4): 942-963.
- Madrak-Grochowska, Małgorzata 2015. "The Knowledge-based Economy as a Stage in the Development of the Economy". *Oeconomia Copernicana* 6(2).
- Madrak-Grochowska, Małgorzata. 2015. "The information infrastructure of knowledge-based economies in the years 1995-2010". *Ekonomia i Prawo. Economics and Law*, 14(4) (forthcoming).

- Mankiw, Gregory N, David Romer and David N. Weil. 1992. "A Contribution to the Empirics of Economic Growth, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 107(2): 407-437.
- McKinsey Global Institute, 2001. *US Productivity Growth 1995-2000. Understanding the Contribution of Information Technology Relative to Other Factors*, Washington D.C.
- McKinsey Global Institute, 2002a. *How IT Enables Productivity Growth. The US Experience Across Three Sectors in the 1990s*, McKinsey Global Institute, High Tech Practice, Business Technology Office, San Francisco.
- McKinsey Global Institute, 2002b. *Reaching Higher Productivity Growth in France and Germany*, McKinsey Global Institute.
- Mokyr, Joel, 2001. "Economic History and the New Economy". *Business Economics* 36(2): 9-14
- North, Douglas.C., 1994. "Institutions And Productivity In History", *Economic History* 9411003, EconWPA.
- OECD. 1996. *The Knowledge-Based Economy*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD. 1999. *The Knowledge-based Economy. A Set of Facts and Figures*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD. 2000. *A New Economy: The Changing Role of Information Technology in Growth*, Paris: OECD.
- OECD. 2001. *The New Economy. Beyond the Hype*. Paris: OECD.
- Olczyk, Magdalena. 2014. "Structural Heterogeneity Between EU15 and 12 New EU Members – the Obstacle to Lisbon Strategy Implementation?". *Equilibrium. Quarterly Journal of Economics and Economic Policy* 9(3): 21-43.
- Piątkowski, Marcin and Bartvan Ark. 2007. "Productivity growth, technology and structural reforms in transition economies: a two-phase convergence process". In: *Knowledge and innovation process in Central and East European economies*, ed. Krzysztof Piech, 3-24, Warsaw: The Knowledge & Innovation Institute.

- Pietrzak, Michał Bernard. 2012. "Wykorzystanie przestrzennego modelu regresji przełącznikowej w analizie regionalnej konwergencji w Polsce". *Ekonomia i Prawo* 11(4): 167-185.
- Próchniak, Mariusz and Bartosz Witkowski. 2012. „Konwergencja gospodarcza typu  $\beta$  w świetle bayesowskiego uśredniania oszacowań”. *Bank i Kredyt* 43(2).
- Próchniak, Mariusz and Bartosz Witkowski. 2013. „Real  $\beta$ -Convergence of Transition Countries: Robust Approach”. *Eastern European Economics* 51(3): 6-26
- Tokarski, Tomasz 2001b. „Dwadzieścia lat renesansu teorii wzrostu gospodarczego. Na ile lepiej rozumiemy jego mechanizm”. In: *Czy ekonomia nadąza z wyjaśnieniem rzeczywistości*, ed. Andrzej Wojtyna, 213-245, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo PTE – Bellona.
- Tokarski, Tomasz. 1996. „Postęp techniczny a wzrost gospodarczy w modelach endogenicznych”. *Ekonomista* 5, 581-604.
- Tokarski, Tomasz. 1998. „Postęp techniczny a wzrost gospodarczy w modelach Solowa i Lucasa”. *Ekonomista* 2-3: 271-291.
- Tokarski, Tomasz. 2001a. *Determinanty wzrostu gospodarczego w warunkach stałych efektów skali*. Łódź: Katedra Ekonomii Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.
- Welfe, Władysław, ed. 2007. *Gospodarka oparta na wiedzy*. Warszawa: Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne.
- Williamson, Oliver E. 1985. *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism. Firms, Markets, Relational Contracting*. The Free Press, a division of Simon & Schuster Inc.
- Witkowski, Bartosz. 2007. “Can R&D expenditures be found a growth factor in the EU countries”. In: *Knowledge and innovation process in Central and East European economies*, ed. Krzysztof Piech, 43-60, Warsaw: The Knowledge & Innovation Institute.

Śledzik, Karol. 2013. "Knowledge Based Economy in a Neo-Schumpeterian Point of View".

*Equilibrium. Quarterly Journal of Economics and Economic Policy* 8(4): 67-77, DOI:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/EQUIL.2013.027>.