UNIVERSITY OF WUPPERTAL
BERGISCHE UNIVERSITÄT WUPPERTAL

EUROPÄISCHE WIRTSCHAFT
UND
INTERNATIONALE MAKROÖKONOMIK

Jens K. Perret

Comments on the Impact of Knowledge on Economic Growth across the Regions of the Russian Federation

Europäische Wirtschaft und Internationale Wirtschaftsbeziehungen
European Economy and International Economic Relations

Jens K. Perret

Comments on the Impact of Knowledge on Economic Growth across the Regions of the Russian Federation

April 2015

Summary: Using a basic growth accounting approach it is deduced how far the regional knowledge infrastructure plays any significant role across the regions of the Russian Federation. Aside from aspects of the size of the regional innovation system, like the number of researchers and students, it is discussed in how far the inflow and outflow of knowledge plays a role in determining the economic growth.

The study shows thereby that while the Russian growth dynamics are indeed driven by the exploitation of natural resources, foremost of oil and gas, a significant part of Russian growth is due to its innovation system. This shows that innovation oriented growth politics as promoted by former president Dmitry Medvedev do have a solid foundation to be built on.

Zusammenfassung: Unter Nutzung eines Growth Accounting Ansatzes wird herausgearbeitet inwieweit regionale Wissensinfrastruktur eine signifikante Rolle im Kontext der russischen Regionen spielt. Neben Charakteristika, die die Größe des regionalen Innovationssystems beschreiben – wie die Anzahl der aktiven Forscher und Studenten – wird berücksichtigt inwiefern der Zu- und Abfluss von Wissen eine Rolle bei der Generierung wirtschaftlichen Wachstums spielt.

Die Untersuchung zeigt, dass das russische Wirtschaftswachstum zwar wie erwartet zum größten Teil durch die Gewinnung und Kommerzialisierung natürlicher Ressourcen, insbesondere Öl und Gas getrieben wird. Das russische Innovationssystem spielt hingegen ebenfalls eine signifikante Rolle, was zum einen die neoklassische theoretische Basis im Kontext der russischen Föderation belegt, zum anderen aber auch zeigt, dass Förderungen, wie die des früheren Präsidenten Dmitry Medvedev, nach einer stärker Innovations-getriebenen Wachstumspolitik eine solide theoretisch fundierte Basis vorfinden, auf welcher sie bauen können.

Jens K. Perret
European Institute for International Economic Relations at the University of Wuppertal, Rainer-Gruenter-Str. 21, 42119 Wuppertal, Germany, Tel.: +49 202 439 3174, e-mail: perret@wiwi.uni-wuppertal.de

Comments on the Impact of Knowledge on Economic Growth across the Regions of the Russian Federation

Discussion Paper 207

Table of Contents

List of Tables

1. Introduction

Not only since the works by Machlup[1], who described the modern society as a knowledge society, has the aspect of knowledge as a production factor and an essential building block of economic growth been acknowledged.

A broad range of studies exist that have reported empirical results on the importance of knowledge in economic growth. However most of these studies focus on Western Europe, the European Union, its member states, the USA or other highly developed economies. A smaller range of studies focuses on how knowledge, and in specific the inflow of knowledge, can facilitate economic growth in developing economies, especially those in transition.

Internationally the Russian Federation is generally considered as a provider of basic resources or low quality goods. Only a few authors have considered the Russian innovation system and thereby the contribution of knowledge to Russian economic growth. In some part this shortcoming is motivated by the lack of suitable data.

In the present study this research gap is filled by providing a insight into the effects regionally domestic knowledge sources, as well as intra-regional knowledge flows, have on Russian economic growth.

In the following second section the research design is presented while in the third section the results from a dynamic spatial panel regression are presented and discussed before in the fourth section some preliminary conclusions are drawn.

2. Knowledge Extended Growth Accounting

Using a growth model approach, this section argues how different sources of knowledge, knowledge spillovers and the absorptive capacity, influence the economic situation in the Russian Federation, measured by the GRP. A number of studies like Guellec and Van Pottelsberghe de la Potterie (2004) exist that analyze the importance of R&D and the institutional environment on the output of an economy. For the Russian Federation, however, Ahrend (2002) argues that political and institutional features are almost unimportant and can therefore be left out of a growth-related analysis.

In addition to the knowledge inputs generated inside the region, knowledge inputs generated outside the region that enter the region in the form of interregional spillovers and through international channels of knowledge transfer like foreign trade or direct investments are considered.

From a theoretical point of view the model picks up on the Solow growth model, assuming an influence of the labor and capital inputs on the level of the GRP. However, the most interesting aspect lies in modeling the Solow residual.

---

[1] See Machlup (1960) or Machlup (1962).

Finally, the new economic geography stresses the importance of the underlying spatial structure, motivating thereby the implementation of spatial models.

The model underlying the following estimations is always considered to be in log-linear form. Therefore, all variables, as long as they do not represent a quota or percentage, are logarithmized versions.

As the state-owned sector makes up a comparatively large share of total production, but might be considered less efficient than the private sector[2], and the amount of government personnel can also be interpreted as a proxy variable for corruption, which should also have a negative effect on growth, government personnel is included as a control variable[3].

Partially hand in hand with the importance of state-owned firms goes the share of natural resources in the Russian economy, of which the oil and gas sector comprises a significant share; therefore, the amount of produced oil and gas is included into the model as well. Here the hypothesis of the 'resource curse' can be recalled, as it proclaims a negative relation between the development of the GDP and the amount of non-renewable natural resources - especially natural oil and gas[4].

The knowledge input side of the economy is represented by four indicators: the number of researchers, the expenditures on R&D, the number of students and the number of patents granted. As spillover effects are to be included in the model as well, but respective indicators are only available for patents granted by the EPO, only patents granted by the EPO are considered in the analysis.

Finally, from an international perspective, the exports and imports as well as the openness indicator - to give a general insight into the integration of a region into the world economy - are considered[5]. However Lichtenberg and Von Pottelsberghe de la Potterie (1998) argues that it is not so much the intensity of the imports, and thereby the exports as well, but the distribution of the countries of origin or their destination that influence economic development. The trade related indicators are accompanied by the amount of FDI inflows - as another channel through which knowledge can enter a region[6].

Running a series of tests on a first basic model reveals that only the fixed effects model will produce reliable estimates for the model, and it also suffers from heteroskedastic error terms. The ongoing analyses therefore rely on robust standard errors.

Application of a Moran's I test and robust Lagrange multiplier tests for spatial autocorrelation effects reveal significant spatial autocorrelation effects.

---

[2] While the results in Netter and Megginson (2001) strengthen this argument, for the Russian Federation Berkowitz and DeJong (2003) show that ownership has no impact on firm performance; they instead highlight more the firms' distance from Moscow, which in this study is implicitly included in the fixed effects.

[3] It would be more suitable to include a variable like the Corruption Perception Index, or the ICRG - index of corruption - advocated by Kim (2010) or the Bribe Payers Index advocated by Ofer (2010); however, they are not available on a regional level for a continuous span of years. Note as well the arguments by Brown and Shackman (2007) who link corruption and the long-term development of the GDP per capita and a continuing deterioration of law and order.

[4] Refer for the resource curse hypothesis to Auty (1993), for example.

[5] For the Russian Federation Popov (2001) for example stresses the importance of the level of export shares for the regional performance.

[6] See Doehrn and Von Westernhagen (2003) as one article that stresses the importance of FDI for growth in transition economies.

2

Further testing shows that the model suffers from serial autocorrelation as well. Summarizing these results leads to the use of the Blundell-Bond estimator for dynamic panel models in the context of an Han Philips Spatial Dynamic estimation method[7].

To account for a structural break, which is rather likely in the event of the crisis in 1998, the total time frame has been divided into the transition years including 1998 and the later years starting with 1999. To test for a structural break in levels a dummy variable for the transition years is included in a first regression (model I). In two other regressions the transition (model II) and the later years (model III) are considered separately.

Since the correlation matrix for the independent variables suggests that some of the variables are highly correlated, VIF are calculated, revealing that severe problems with multi-collinearity exist. Testing different reduced versions of the basic model leads to the result that it can be cleaned of multi-collinearity - or rather of variables reporting VIF larger than ten - by omitting the labor and capital variables, which are highly correlated with each other as well as with the researchers, R&D expenditures and government personnel.

The expenditures on R&D have been removed as well since they are highly correlated with the researchers and the government personnel.

As a fourth variable, either the researcher or the government personnel variable needs to be removed from the equation. While removing the researchers leads to a qualitatively better model in general, their removal would also exclude an essential insight on the influence of the tacit knowledge potential on the economic development across regions. Therefore, two basic models have been estimated - one with researchers and one with government personnel. The model implementing government personnel is considered as well as a stability test for the results of the researcher model.

While it can be argued that the approach is no longer valid since labor and capital variables as base variables of the underlying production function structure had to be excluded, the approach here can be seen as measuring the effect of mostly knowledge-oriented inputs that influence economic growth aside from labor and capital, which are natural drivers of economic development and growth nonetheless. Referring to the neoclassical growth model, this reduced version is basically an approach to quantify the Solow residual.

3. Empirical Analysis

While the patent variable and the spillover variables are based on patent data by the European Patent Office all other variables are based on the regional statistical yearbooks by Rosstat.

Data has been used for the years 1994 to 2009 in a first model which does not include spillover effects and for the years 1994 to 2006 in a second model which includes spillover

---

[7] See Blundell and Bond (1998) and Bond et al. (2001) who consider the Blundell-Bond estimator to be superior to the Arellano-Bond estimator in a growth related context.

effects. Therefore, the estimation considers sixteen or thirteen years and 80 cross-sections each[8] leading to a total of 1,280 or 1,040 observations respectively.

Table 1:   Regression Results using Researchers

	Lag Model			Durbin Model		
	I	II	III	I	II	III
LAGT-1	0.5416***	0.7647***	0.7093***	0.7127***	0.9567***	0.7815***
	(8.02)	(9.04)	(8.62)	(10.11)	(8.43)	(13.33)
EX	0.0012	0.0367***	0.0248***	-0.0069*	0.0336***	0.0241***
	(0.37)	(4.42)	(5.73)	(-1.79)	(4.39)	(5.27)
IM	0.0062	0.0243**	0.0320***	0.0046	0.0206*	0.0186***
	(1.41)	(2.06)	(6.43)	(0.82)	(1.83)	(3.49)
FDI	0.0016	0.0133***	0.0133***	0.0017	0.0149***	0.0093***
	(1.51)	(7.22)	(7.35)	(1.30)	(7.96)	(4.70)
RES	0.0027	0.3286***	0.3216***	-0.0115	0.3623***	0.3896***
	(0.18)	(20.72)	(25.02)	(-0.64)	(23.32)	(24.69)
OILGAS	0.0414***	0.0668***	0.0690***	0.0760***	0.0781***	0.1092***
	(3.03)	(8.50)	(11.53)	(4.13)	(9.09)	(14.12)
OPEN	-0.1481***	-0.0696**	-13.1829***	-0.1316***	-0.0257	-9.0161***
	(-3.73)	(-2.01)	(-5.13)	(-3.40)	(-0.58)	(-3.00)
STUD	0.0054	0.0026	0.0516***	0.0063	-0.0021	0.0577***
	(1.55)	(0.50)	(6.60)	(1.49)	(-0.40)	(6.36)
TRDUM	-0.0062			-0.2264***		
	(-0.68)			(-8.30)		
λ	0.9867***	0.7557***	0.7609***			
	(69.99)	(68.85)	(93.82)			
λEX				-0.4297***	-0.2939***	0.1763***
				(-14.53)	(-3.74)	(4.05)
λIM				0.1987***	-0.2472***	0.1504***
				(8.17)	(-5.18)	(4.10)
λFDI				0.0222**	-0.0246	0.0564***
				(2.33)	(-0.71)	(5.93)
λRES				-2.6035***	1.2334***	0.7180***
				(-8.53)	(16.93)	(11.28)
λOILGAS				2.7668***	0.4634**	1.7463***
				(16.83)	(2.28)	(11.27)
λOPEN				-1.2464***	-1.3894***	157.3314***
				(-7.47)	(-3.60)	(-11.80)
λSTUD				0.1605*	-0.3029***	-0.5056***
				(1.76)	(-3.27)	(-6.83)
CONST	0.0235	0.0066**	0.0130***	3.5984***	0.0039	0.0108***
	(0.60)	(2.22)	(3.58)	(10.21)	(1.32)	(2.58)
R^2	0.882	0.991	0.995	0.746	0.993	0.994
F-Test	458.37	2k	3k	349.16	954.66	2k

---

[8] In total 80 regions have been considered. The three sub-regions of the Tyumen Oblast have been jointly considered as well as Archangelsk and the Nenetsia Autonomous Okrug.

4

Table 2: **Regression Results using Government Personnel**

	Lag Model			Durbin Model		
	I	II	III	I	II	III
LAGT-1	0.5419***	0.9600***	0.8458***	0.7029***	0.9418***	0.8644***
	(7.89)	(13.99)	(6.80)	(10.05)	(10.18)	(13.93)
EX	0.0013	0.0355***	0.0235***	-0.0019	0.0068	0.0022
	(0.41)	(3.95)	(5.32)	(-0.48)	(1.18)	(0.72)
IM	0.0050	0.0210	0.0435***	0.0037	0.0101	0.0114***
	(1.13)	(1.60)	(8.60)	(0.67)	(1.25)	(3.20)
FDI	0.0015	0.0116***	0.0152***	0.0013	0.0061***	0.0035***
	(1.37)	(5.95)	(8.19)	(1.04)	(3.94)	(2.59)
GOVPERS	0.1926**	0.4968***	0.8713***	0.0965	1.4609***	1.5185***
	(2.33)	(14.38)	(30.40)	(0.75)	(42.82)	(46.46)
OILGAS	0.0395***	0.0591***	0.0519***	0.0645***	0.0543***	0.0576***
	(2.89)	(6.69)	(9.62)	(3.35)	(8.73)	(10.37)
OPEN	-0.1579***	-0.1593***	-20.0553***	-0.1189***	-0.2114***	3.4836*
	(-3.96)	(-5.52)	(-7.51)	(-3.54)	(-4.63)	(1.72)
STUD	0.0049	0.0107**	0.0277***	0.0078*	0.0010	-0.0074
	(1.41)	(2.02)	(3.89)	(1.89)	(0.25)	(-1.13)
TRDUM	-0.0106			-0.0703***		
	(-1.14)			(-3.20)		
λ	0.9486***	0.5291***	0.2167***			
	(44.16)	(17.21)	(8.96)			
λEX				-0.1493***	-0.2827***	0.1408***
				(-4.68)	(-4.10)	(4.88)
λIM				0.0168	-0.0894***	0.1129***
				(0.61)	(-2.84)	(4.57)
λFDI				0.0205**	-0.0555*	0.0432***
				(2.28)	(-1.79)	(6.83)
λGOVPERS				1.8023***	-0.5768***	-0.6859***
				(7.94)	(-10.86)	(-15.21)
λOILGAS				1.5518***	0.7163***	1.0807***
				(7.49)	(4.77)	(8.88)
λOPEN				-1.4631***	-0.5637	-0.1002***
				(-9.94)	(-1.39)	(-12.75)
λSTUD				0.2865***	0.4686***	0.0320
				(3.23)	(6.86)	(0.64)
CONST	-0.2514**	0.0251***	-0.0188***	-1.4790***	0.0013	0.0106***
	(-2.03)	(6.83)	(-4.16)	(-7.03)	(0.54)	(3.80)
R^2	0.882	0.989	0.996	0.673	0.996	0.997
F-Test	607.60	2k	3k	327.02	967.59	2k

For reasons of multicollinearity researchers and government personnel are not implemented together, therefore Table 1 summarizes the results for the model without spillover effects including the researcher variable while Table 2 summarizes the results for the model without spillover effects including the government personnel variable[9].

Comparing the tables there is no big difference in the signs of the coefficients whether researchers or government personnel are used as a variable. Quality indicators like the R^2 and the F-test yield similar results for the lag-model; with the Durbin model the F-statistics are significantly larger in the case of using the government personnel variable. However, they are a first indicator that the results are stable.

Additionally, when comparing the results for the spatial lag and the Durbin model the variables retain their signs even though a few lose their significance the quality statistics indicate largely comparable results.

Considering the signs of the variables themselves most of them represent results expected from economic theory. The only exceptions are the positive impact of imports, the negative impact of openness and the positive impact of the government personnel.

However, the positive impact of imports can be explained by assuming that the positive relation is not a direct effect but rather represents the effects of an antecedent variable. Having a better economic situation in a regions leads on the one hand to higher GRP values and on the other it leads to a larger number of wealthy inhabitants who in turn are more interested in acquiring foreign products.

On the other hand it can be assumed that a region that is producing efficiently also requires quality equipment which in turn is imported from abroad - a similar argument holds for foreign direct investments as well which on the one hand raise the economic output of a region but on the other hand might lead to higher imports of intermediate goods.

Nevertheless, a peculiar result is the consistently positive impact of the government personnel which, from the perspective that state ownership generates less efficiency as well as from the perspective that the number of government personnel can be used as a proxy for the level of corruption, can be seen as counter intuitive. Especially, since the comparatively large coefficient implies that a doubling of the amount of government personnel will lead to unrealistically high growth rates. This effect might be generated via the large share of government activity in the sector of natural resources which biases the analysis from the start.

Considering that the spatial lag variable is highly significant in the spatial lag model and that most of the spatially lagged variables in the Durbin model are highly significant this shows that there are important links between the regions. This goes along with the consistently positive and highly significant lagged variable which shows that economic growth across the regions of the Russian Federation is highly path-dependent.

Regarding the size of the coefficients the most important result of this study stems from comparing the researchers and the oil and gas production coefficients. While a doubling of the amount of produced oil and gas only results in raising the GRP by roughly 5% to 7%, a

---

[9] For reasons of a better readability the coefficients for the openness variable has been multiplied by the factor thousand.

doubling of the amount of researchers results in raising the GRP by roughly 25% to 32% [10]. Even considering that the results might be biased by measurement errors it shows the remarkable importance of the research sector for the economic development of the Russian regions. Furthermore, it strengthens the hypothesis that investments in Russian high technology, research intensive sectors is not only more sustainable in the long term, but has consistently - even in the transition years - been driving the Russian regional development process.

Additionally, the importance of FDI inflows is even less significant for Russian growth as a rise of FDI inflows by one percent only leads an additional 0.01% of economic growth. However it needs to be considered that on average it is much easier to double the inflow of FDI than doubling the output of the oil and gas sector.

---

[10] In other words raising the number of researchers by one percent leads to rise in GDP by 0.32% while a one percent rise in oil and gas output only leads to a rise in GDP by 0.05% to 0.07% - considering that researchers are measured absolutely and production of oil and gas in thousand tons.

Table 3:   Regression Results using Researchers

	Lag Model			Durbin Model		
	I	II	III	I	II	III
LAGT-1	0.5337***	0.7676***	0.6603***	1.7321***	0.5639***	0.7584***
	(7.28)	(8.82)	(7.08)	(10.30)	(6.87)	(9.09)
PATEPO	0.1723	0.0048**	-0.4821	0.1238	2.9759	-0.9755
	(0.19)	(2.15)	(-0.30)	(0.14)	(1.26)	(-0.62)
PATZIT	-1.8045*	4.5306***	18.1540***	-0.3742	3.0140*	14.4048***
	(-1.84)	(2.81)	(4.45)	(-0.37)	(1.79)	(3.58)
PATGEN	0.3196	-1.3661	4.1923***	0.0094	0.4196	4.0536**
	(0.43)	(-1.07)	(2.58)	(0.01)	(0.31)	(2.49)
MOBIN	0.1766	0.9549	-0.3093	-0.3438	1.2636	-0.4260
	(0.34)	(0.72)	(-0.36)	(-0.67)	(0.90)	(-0.49)
MOBOUT	-0.3831	-4.1656**	0.8150	0.1989	-3.3247	12014
	(-0.64)	(-2.01)	(1.01)	(0.33)	(-1.52)	(1.49)
EX	-0.0020	0.0388***	0.0299***	-0.0059	0.0341***	0.0209***
	(-0.56)	(4.41)	(5.78)	(-1.42)	(4.27)	(3.94)
IM	0.0048	0.0253*	0.0292***	0.0050	0.0115	0.0202***
	(0.95)	(1.91)	(5.22)	(0.91)	(0.96)	(3.51)
FDI	0.0008	0.0134***	0.0163***	0.0000	0.0144***	0.0103***
	(0.60)	(6.49)	(7.16)	(0.02)	(6.55)	(4.29)
RES	-0.0046	0.3224***	0.3554***	-0.0034	0.3705***	0.4209***
	(-0.26)	(17.89)	(24.09)	(-0.19)	(21.36)	(25.22)
OILGAS	0.0498***	0.0682***	0.0739***	0.0554***	0.0726***	0.1026***
	(3.15)	(7.69)	(11.65)	(2.62)	(7.93)	(12.66)
OPEN	-0.1720***	-0.0660*	-14.0198***	-0.0923***	-0.0718	-6.4719**
	(-3.96)	(1.69)	(-4.84)	(-3.72)	(-1.17)	(-2.03)
STUD	0.0010	0.0029	-0.0003	-0.0005	0.0032	-0.0019
	(0.83)	(1.11)	(-0.17)	(-0.43)	(1.12)	(-0.96)
TRDUM	-0.0053			-0.2106***		
	(-0.51)			(-8.45)		
λ	0.9920***	0.7573***	0.7509***			
	(49.28)	(60.70)	(76.51)			
λPATEPO				87.4550	-288.7600***	172842
				(0.70)	(-3.94)	(0.77)
λPATZIT				89.7519***	-31.8619	-409.8724***
				(5.28)	(-0.79)	(-4.47)
λPATGEN				-49.1100***	132.5739***	-210194
				(-4.29)	(3.66)	(-0.57)
λMOBIN				-34.6833***	-10.8976	-31.0710**
				(-5.96)	(-0.35)	(-2.52)
λMOBOUT				21.8302***	215.7066***	60879
				(3.93)	(4.35)	(0.75)
λEX				-0.4180***	-0.5521***	-0.0994
				(-10.27)	(-3.41)	(-1.42)
λIM				0.2579***	-0.7076***	0.3127***
				(8.64)	(-5.44)	(2.91)
λFDI				-0.1185***	-0.0902	-0.0185
				(-7.11)	(-1.46)	(-0.77)
λRES				-0.4519	1.5370***	0.9082***
				(-0.92)	(13.20)	(8.75)
λOILGAS				2.0935***	0.1225	0.9992***
				(12.46)	(0.55)	(6.08)
λOPEN				0.1928	-1.4693	-107.1882***
				(1.04)	(-1.59)	(-4.29)
λSTUD				-0.1947***	-0.0430	-0.1789***
				(-8.36)	(-0.46)	(-4.19)
CONST	0.0246	0.0084**	0.0117***	0.7670***	0.0001	0.0053
	(0.48)	(2.27)	(2.93)	(3.19)	(-0.04)	(1.22)
R^2	0.835	0.991	0.996	0.492	0.994	0.995
F-Test	189.74	914.04	1k	667.44	715.87	675.46

8

Table 4: **Regression Results using Government Personnel**

	Lag Model			Durbin Model		
	I	II	III	I	II	III
LAGT-1	0.5320***	0.9774***	1.1061***	0.5933***	0.5539***	0.9279***
	(7.14)	(14.00)	(10.46)	(7.75)	(7.41)	(10.86)
PATEPO	0.2089	2.3829	0.4885	1.3471	-0.2333	0.4737
	(0.23)	(1.04)	(0.36)	(1.23)	(-0.13)	(0.53)
PATZIT	-1.7037*	6.5726***	24.9893***	-1.3375	4.3330***	20.7063***
	(-1.74)	(3.95)	(7.46)	(-1.17)	(3.34)	(9.16)
PATGEN	0.3086	-1.8594	8.1275***	0.9906	-0.0500	3.5223***
	(0.42)	(-1.41)	(6.04)	(1.13)	(-0.05)	(3.80)
MOBIN	0.1417	0.9827	-0.7521	-0.8265	0.7706	-0.9993**
	(0.27)	(0.72)	(-0.99)	(-1.32)	(0.71)	(-2.03)
MOBOUT	-0.3709	-2.3467	0.5557	-0.1999	-0.6271	0.6870
	(-0.62)	(-1.10)	(0.82)	(-0.28)	(-0.37)	(1.49)
EX	-0.0018	0.0410***	0.0159***	-0.0001	0.0088	-0.0039
	(-0.50)	(4.29)	(3.45)	(-0.03)	(1.42)	(-1.22)
IM	0.0041	0.0239	0.0244***	0.0037	0.0058	0.0113***
	(0.81)	(1.63)	(5.11)	(0.52)	(0.64)	(3.41)
FDI	0.0007	0.0114***	0.0117***	0.0001	0.0070***	0.0007
	(0.53)	(5.25)	(6.07)	(0.05)	(4.01)	(0.53)
GOVPERS	0.1218	0.4927***	1.0444***	0.3458***	1.4068***	1.4075***
	(1.31)	(12.66)	(34.44)	(2.83)	(36.29)	(49.89)
OILGAS	0.0488***	0.0609***	0.0513***	0.0775***	0.0562***	0.0695***
	(3.09)	(6.12)	(9.75)	(4.24)	(8.04)	(13.71)
OPEN	-0.1780***	-0.1476***	-11.3195***	-0.0935***	-0.1710***	3.6484**
	(-4.07)	(-4.58)	(-4.55)	(-5.67)	(-3.49)	(1.98)
STUD	0.0010	0.0019	-0.0017	0.0012	0.0016	-0.0026**
	(0.79)	(0.71)	(-1.05)	(0.83)	(0.72)	(-2.39)
TRDUM	-0.0080			-0.1344***		
	(-0.76)			(-7.35)		
λ	0.9683***	0.5316***	0.0591**			
	(35.72)	(15.38)	(2.21)			
λPATEPO				74.0486***	-80.6887	58.3000***
				(4.01)	(-1.47)	(4.43)
λPATZIT				-19.4453	169.2441***	250042
				(-1.13)	(4.94)	(0.44)
λPATGEN				45.1487***	13.3786	-180638
				(3.07)	(0.51)	(-0.87)
λMOBIN				-45.9673***	0.1547	-50.6418***
				(-5.90)	(0.01)	(-6.80)
λMOBOUT				-10.7531	78.3841**	69260
				(-1.44)	(2.11)	(1.49)
λEX				-0.2037***	-0.1223	-0.0947**
				(-4.65)	(-1.00)	(-2.28)
λIM				-0.2669***	-0.5976***	0.2012***
				(-8.87)	(-5.54)	(3.19)
λFDI				0.0800***	-0.0239	-0.0160
				(5.04)	(-0.49)	(-1.09)
λGOVPERS				0.3692	-0.2765***	-0.5196***
				(1.01)	(-3.39)	(-9.59)
λOILGAS				1.7628***	0.8175***	1.2022***
				(7.22)	(4.96)	(11.73)
λOPEN				-2.3512***	-0.9477	-94.5788***
				(-19.04)	(-1.29)	(-6.76)
λSTUD				-0.0001	0.2452***	-0.0963***
				(-0.00)	(-3.23)	(-4.17)
CONST	-0.1632	0.0337***	-0.0100**	-0.6522	-0.0002	0.0036
	(-1.12)	(7.03)	(-2.55)	(-0.41)	(0.06)	(1.39)
R^2	0.837	0.989	0.997	0.910	0.996	0.998
F-Test	235.09	703.93	872.01	219.58	753.15	554.58

The consistently significant spatial effects reported in Tables 1 and 2 show that there needs to be some kind of interregional link between the regional entities of the Russian Federation. Assuming this link to be based on the diffusion of knowledge is, at least from a Western European perspective, a viable option.

If the time horizon is cropped to allow for the use of the patents at the EPO[11] and active as well as passive patent citations[12] - as proxies for the in and outflow of codified knowledge - and inventor inflows and outflows[13] - as proxies for the in- and outflow of tacit knowledge[14]. Tables 3 and 4 capture the results of the extended models[15].

The basic impacts of the variables that were previously implemented do not change and the qualitative indicators also do not change significantly. Thus, knowledge spillovers are rather unimportant for Russian regional growth and Russian regional growth benefits more from domestically generated and available knowledge than from foreign knowledge. The patent variable - a proxy for the generation of new codified knowledge - is only in rare cases significant. Thus, tacit knowledge - researchers and students - plays a more important role in regional growth than codified knowledge.

The results of this extended model show that the results discussed above remain stable - not alone regarding their signs but also regarding the coefficients - showing that they are independent of interregional knowledge spillovers[16].

In light of the fact that most of the spillover variables are insignificant in at least one sub-period it not possible to deduce a consistent result as to the impact of knowledge spillovers. One minor insight arises as both patent citation variables are positive and, at least in the later years, also significant. Patent citations can also be viewed as an indirect indicator of the presence of a significant research structure which generates the patents and a pool of qualified inventors that are involved in the respective research. Therefore, this positive impact can be viewed as a sign that a better research system and better legislation regarding practical research will be beneficial for the economic development of a region.

Finally, as the spatial term remains highly significant even though not all of the spatial interactions are covered by knowledge spillovers. Especially since the importance of the spillovers is rather marginal there are more important links between the regions besides knowledge flows that have not been explicitly included into the model.

---

[11] As only a version of the Patstat database from early 2008 has been available, comprehensive patent data has only been available up to 2006.

[12] An active patent citation takes place if an inventor from the region under consideration cites another patent, whereas a passive patent citation takes place if a patent is cited of which one inventor is registered living in the region.

[13] An inventor inflow is registered if a patent is granted with an inventor being listed as living in the region who has been listed in a previous patent as living in a different region. Inventor outflows are defined vice versa.

[14] All patent citation as well as inventor flow variables are calculated based on EPO patent data, thereby accounting only for internationally important knowledge.

[15] For a better readability the coefficients of the patent and the four spillover variables have been multiplied by a factor of thousand.

[16] Only the students variable - before significant and positive in the later years - becomes insignificant in the extended model.

4. Conclusions

The present study analyzed economic growth dynamics across the regions of the Russian Federation. Besides proving the path-dependency of Russian economic growth on a regional level, as well as its dependence on oil and gas, it has been shown that knowledge does and always has played an important role in the regional economic growth process. Here it is mostly researchers and to some very minor degree the amount of students - as proxies of the stock of tacit knowledge - that enhance economic growth while the amount of new patents - as a proxy of the codified knowledge generated in each period - and most knowledge inflows or outflows do not influence the economic development in any way.

In particular it has been shown that the impact of a doubling of the output of the oil and gas sector does generate less additional economic growth than a doubling of the number of researchers. Considering the future development of the Russian Federation it is an important insight especially since the result remains stable even during the transition years. It shows not only that science intensive sectors are benefactor of economic growth but also that the main dynamics of economic growth work comparably to Western European economies. Russia can therefore learn from their growth strategies and structural change programs to switch from being a resource-based to being a knowledge-based economy.

References

AHREND, R. (2002), "Speed of Reform, Initial Conditions, Political Orientation, or What? Explaining Russian Regions' Economic Performance", DELTA Working Paper 2002-10.

AUTY, R. (1993), "Sustaining Development in Mineral Economies: The Resource Course Thesis", Routledge, 1. edition.

BERKOWITZ, D. and DEJONG, D. (2003), "Policy Reform and Growth in Post-Soviet Russia", European Economic Review 47, 337-352.

BLUNDELL, R. and BOND, S. (1998), "Initial Conditions and Moment Restrictions in Dynamic Panel Data Models", Journal of Econometrics 87, 115-143.

BOND, S.; HOEFFLER, A. and TEMPLE, J. (2001), "GMM Estimation of Empirical Growth Models", CEPR Discussion Paper 3048.

BROWN, S. and SHACKMAN, J. (2007), "Corruption and Related Socioeconomic Factors: A Time Series Study", KYKLOS 60, 319-347.

DOEHRN, R. and VON WESTERNHAGEN, N. (2003), "The Role of Foreign Direct Investment in Transformation", In Lane, T.; Oding, N. and Welfens, P. (Editors) "Real and Financial Economic Dynamics in Russia and Eastern Europe", 251-278, Springer Heidelberg, 1. edition.

EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE (2007), "Patstat Database", http://www.epo.org.

GUELLEC, D. and VAN POTTELSBERGHE DE LA POTTERIE, B. (2004), "From R&D to Productivity Growth: Do the Institutional Settings and the Source of Funds of R&D Matter?", Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics 66, 353-378.

KIM, M. J. (2010), "Corruption and Economic Growth", EACGS Conference.

LICHTENBERG, F.R. and VAN POTTELSBERGHE DE LA POTTERIE, B. (1998), "International R&D Spillovers: A Comment", European Economic Review 42, 1483-1491.

MACHLUP, F. (1960), "The Supply of Inventors and Inventions", Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv 85, 210-254.

MACHLUP, F. (1962), "The Production and Distribution of Knowledge in the U.S.", Princeton University Press Princeton, 1. edition.

NETTER, J. and MEGGINSON, W. (2001), "From State to Market: A Survey of Empirical Studies on Privatization", Journal of Economic Literature 39, 321-389.

OFER, G. (2010), "Twenty Years Later and the Socialist Heritage is Still Kicking", UNU-WIDER Working Paper 59.

POPOV, V. (2001), "Reform Strategies and Economic Performance of Russia's Regions", World Development 29, 865-886.

ROSSTAT (2012), "Regions of Russia 2012 / Regiony Rossii 2012", http://www.gks.ru.

SURINOV, A. (1999), "Questions of a Quanititative Measurement of Regional Price Indices / Voprosy Kolichestvennoj Otsenki Mezhregionalnykh Indeksov Tsen", Economic Journal of the VSHE / Ekonomicheskij Zhurnal VSHE 4, 604-613.

WORLD BANK (2012), "World Development Indicators Database", http://www.worldbank.org.

Appendix

The abbreviations used in the presentation of the econometrical results are summarized in the following table. It also contains the data sources of the variables.

Table 5:   Abbreviation of Variables and List of Sources

Abbreviation	Variable	Source
CONST	Constant	-
GRPPC	Gross Regional Product per Capita	Rosstat (2012), Surinov (1999), World Bank (2012)
EX	Exports	Rosstat (2012)
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment Flows	Rosstat (2012)
IM	Imports	Rosstat (2012)
INMOIN	Inflows of Inventors	EPO (2007)
INMOOU	Outflows of Inventors	EPO (2007)
LAGT-1	One Year Lagged Dependent Variable	-
OPEN	Openness	Own calculations and Rosstat (2012)
PATSTO	Stock of Patents at the EPO	EPO (2007)
RES	Researchers	Rosstat (2012)
SHADOW	Share of Shadow Economy	Own calculations and Rosstat (2012)
SME	Share of Small and Medium sized enterprises	Rosstat (2012)
STUD	Students	Rosstat (2012)
TRDUM	Dummy Variable for the Transition Years	-
λ	Spatial Lag Effects	-

EIIW Discussion Papers

Die Zusammenfassungen der Beiträge finden Sie im Internet unter:
The abstracts of the publications can be found in the internet under:

http://www.eiiw.eu

No. 100 **Gavrilenkov, E.:** Macroeconomic Situation in Russia - Growth, Investment and Capital Flows, October 2002

No. 101 **Agata, K.:** Internet, Economic Growth and Globalization, November 2002

No. 102 **Blind, K.; Jungmittag, A.:** Ausländische Direktinvestitionen, Importe und Innovationen im Dienstleistungsgewerbe, February 2003

No. 103 **Welfens, P.J.J.; Kirn, T.:** Mittelstandsentwicklung, BASEL-II-Kreditmarktprobleme und Kapitalmarktperspektiven, Juli 2003

No. 104 **Standke, K.-H.:** The Impact of International Organisations on National Science and Technology Policy and on Good Governance, March 2003

No. 105 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Exchange Rate Dynamics and Structural Adjustment in Europe, May 2003

No. 106 **Welfens, P.J.J.; Jungmittag, A.; Kauffmann, A.; Schumann, Ch.:** EU Eastern Enlargement and Structural Change: Specialization Patterns in Accession Countries and Economic Dynamics in the Single Market, May 2003

No. 107 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Überwindung der Wirtschaftskrise in der Eurozone: Stabilitäts-, Wachstums- und Strukturpolitik, September 2003

No. 108 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Risk Pricing, Investment and Prudential Supervision: A Critical Evaluation of Basel II Rules, September 2003

No. 109 **Welfens, P.J.J.; Ponder, J.K.:** Digital EU Eastern Enlargement, October 2003

No. 110 **Addison, J.T.; Teixeira, P.:** What Have We Learned About The Employment Effects of Severance Pay? Further Iterations of Lazear et al., October 2003

No. 111 **Gavrilenkov, E.:** Diversification of the Russian Economy and Growth, October 2003

No. 112 **Wiegert, R.:** Russia's Banking System, the Central Bank and the Exchange Rate Regime, November 2003

No. 113 **Shi, S.:** China's Accession to WTO and its Impacts on Foreign Direct Investment, November 2003

No. 114 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** The End of the Stability Pact: Arguments for a New Treaty, December 2003

No. 115 **Addison, J.T.; Teixeira, P.:** The effect of worker representation on employment behaviour in Germany: another case of -2.5%, January 2004

No. 116 **Borbèly, D.:** EU Export Specialization Patterns in Selected Accession Countries, March 2004

No. 117 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Auf dem Weg in eine europäische Informations- und Wissensgesellschaft: Probleme, Weichenstellungen, Politikoptionen, Januar 2004

No. 118 **Markova, E.:** Liberalisation of Telecommunications in Russia, December 2003

No. 119 **Welfens, P.J.J.; Markova, E.:** Private and Public Financing of Infrastructure: Theory, International Experience and Policy Implications for Russia, February 2004

No. 120 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** EU Innovation Policy: Analysis and Critique, March 2004

No. 121 **Jungmittag, A.; Welfens, P.J.J.:** Politikberatung und empirische Wirtschaftsforschung: Entwicklungen, Probleme, Optionen für mehr Rationalität in der Wirtschaftspolitik, März 2004

No. 122 **Borbèly, D.:** Competition among Cohesion and Accession Countries: Comparative Analysis of Specialization within the EU Market, June 2004

No. 123 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Digitale Soziale Marktwirtschaft: Probleme und Reformoptionen im Kontext der Expansion der Informations- und Kommunikationstechnologie, Mai 2004

No. 124 **Welfens, P.J.J.; Kauffmann, A.; Keim, M.:** Liberalization of Electricity Markets in Selected European Countries, July 2004

No. 125 **Bartelmus, P.:** SEEA Revision: Accounting for Sustainability?, August 2004

No. 126 **Welfens, P.J.J.; Borbèly, D.:** Exchange Rate Developments and Stock Market Dynamics in Transition Countries: Theory and Empirical Analysis, November 2004

No. 127 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Innovations in the Digital Economy: Promotion of R&D and Growth in Open Economies, January 2005

No. 128 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Savings, Investment and Growth: New Approaches for Macroeconomic Modelling, February 2005

No. 129 **Pospiezna, P.:** The application of EU Common Trade Policy in new Memberstates after Enlargement – Consequences on Russia's Trade with Poland, March 2005

No. 130 **Pospiezna, P.; Welfens, P.J.J.:** Economic Opening up of Russia: Establishment of new EU-RF Trade Relations in View of EU Eastern Enlargement, April 2005

No. 131 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Significant Market Power in Telecommunications: Theoretical and Practical Aspects, May 2005

No. 132 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** A Quasi-Cobb Douglas Production Function with Sectoral Progress: Theory and Application to the New Economy, May 2005

No. 133 **Jungmittag, A.; Welfens, P.J.J:** Institutions, Telecommunications Dynamics and Policy Challenges: Theory and Empirical Analysis for Germany, May 2005

No. 134 **Libman, A.:** Russia's Integration into the World Economy: An Interjurisdictional Competition View, June 2005

No. 135 **Feiguine, G.:** Beitritt Russlands zur WTO – Probleme und Perspektiven, September 2005

No. 136 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Rational Regulatory Policy for the Digital Economy: Theory and EU Policy Options, October 2005

No. 137 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Schattenregulierung in der Telekommunikationswirtschaft, November 2005

No. 138 **Borbèly, D.:** Determinants of Trade Specialization in the New EU Member States, November 2005

No. 139 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Interdependency of Real Exchange Rate, Trade, Innovation, Structural Change and Growth, December 2005

No. 140 **Borbély D., Welfens, P.J.J.:** Structural Change, Innovation and Growth in the Context of EU Eastern Enlargement, January 2006

No. 141 **Schumann, Ch.:** Financing Studies: Financial Support schemes for students in selected countries, January 2006

No. 142 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Digitale Innovationen, Neue Märkte und Telekomregulierung, März 2006

No. 143 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Information and Communication Technology: Dynamics, Integration and Economic Stability, July 2006

No. 144 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Grundlagen rationaler Transportpolitik bei Integration, August 2006

No. 145 **Jungmittag, A.:** Technological Specialization as a driving Force of Production Specialization, October 2006

No. 146 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Rational Regulatory Policy for the Digital Economy: Theory and EU-Policy Options, October 2006

No. 147 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Internationalization of EU ICT Industries: The Case of SAP, December 2006

No. 148 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Marktwirtschaftliche Perspektiven der Energiepolitik in der EU: Ziele, Probleme, Politikoptionen, Dezember 2006

No. 149 **Vogelsang, M.:** Trade of IT Services in a Macroeconomic General Equilibrium Model, December 2006

No. 150 **Cassel, D., Welfens, P.J.J.:** Regional Integration, Institutional Dynamics and International Competitiveness, December 2006

No. 151 **Welfens, P.J.J., Keim, M.:** Finanzmarktintegration und Wirtschaftsentwicklung im Kontext der EU-Osterweiterung, März 2007

No. 152 **Kutlina, Z.:** Realwirtschaftliche und monetäre Entwicklungen im Transformationsprozess ausgewählter mittel- und osteuropäischer Länder, April 2007

No. 153 **Welfens, P.J.J.; Borbély, D.:** Structural Change, Growth and Bazaar Effects in the Single EU Market, September 2008

No. 154 **Feiguine, G.:** Die Beziehungen zwischen Russland und der EU nach der EU-Osterweiterung: Stand und Entwicklungsperspektiven, Oktober 2008

No. 155 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Ungelöste Probleme der Bankenaufsicht, Oktober 2008

No. 156 **Addison J.T.:** The Performance Effects of Unions. Codetermination, and Employee Involvement: Comparing the United States and Germany (With an Addendum on the United Kingdom), November 2008

No. 157 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Portfoliomodell und langfristiges Wachstum: Neue Makroperspektiven, November 2008

No. 158 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Growth, Structural Dynamics and EU Integration in the Context of the Lisbon Agenda, November 2008

No. 159 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Growth, Innovation and Natural Resources, December 2008

No. 160 **Islami, M.:** Interdependence Between Foreign Exchange Markets and Stock Markets in Selected European Countries, December 2008

No. 161 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Portfolio Modelling and Growth, January 2009

No. 162 **Bartelmus, P.:** Sustainable Development – Has It Run Its Course?, January 2009

No. 163 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Intégration Européenne et Mondialisation: Défis, Débats, Options, February 2009

No. 164 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКИЙ РОСТ, ИННОВАЦИИ И ПРИРОДНЫЕ РЕСУРСЫ, February 2009

No. 165 **Welfens, P.J.J.; Vogelsang, M.:** Regulierung und Innovationsdynamik in der EU-Telekommunikationswirtschaft, February 2009

No. 166 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** The International Banking Crisis: Lessons and EU Reforms, February 2009

No. 167 **Schröder, C.:** Financial System and Innovations: Determinants of Early Stage Venture Capital in Europe, March 2009

No. 168 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Marshall-Lerner Condition and Economic Globalization, April 2009

No. 169 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Explaining Oil Price Dynamics, May 2009

No. 170 **Welfens, P.J.J.; Borbély, D.:** Structural Change, Innovation and Growth in the Single EU Market, August 2009

No. 171 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Innovationen und Transatlantische Bankenkrise: Eine ordnungspolitische Analyse, August 2009

No. 172 **Erdem, D.; Meyer, K.:** Natural Gas Import Dynamics and Russia´s Role in the Security of Germany´s Supply Strategy, December 2009

No. 173 **Welfens P.J.J; Perret K.J.:** Structural Change, Specialization and Growth in EU 25, January 2010

No. 174 **Welfens P.J.J.; Perret K.J.; Erdem D.:** Global Economic Sustainability Indicator: Analysis and Policy Options for the Copenhagen Process, February 2010

No. 175 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Rating, Kapitalmarktsignale und Risikomanagement: Reformansätze nach der Transatlantischen Bankenkrise, Februar 2010

No. 176 **Mahmutovic, Z.:** Patendatenbank: Implementierung und Nutzung, Juli 2010

No. 177 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Toward a New Concept of Universal Services: The Role of Digital Mobile Services and Network Neutrality, November 2010

No. 178 **Perret J.K.:** A Core-Periphery Pattern in Russia – Twin Peaks or a Rat´s Tail, December 2010

No. 179 **Welfens P.J.J.:** New Open Economy Policy Perspectives: Modified Golden Rule and Hybrid Welfare, December 2010

No. 180 **Welfens P.J.J.:** European and Global Reform Requirements for Overcoming the Banking Crisis, December 2010

No. 181 **Szanyi, M.:** Industrial Clusters: Concepts and Empirical Evidence from East-Central Europe, December 2010

No. 182 **Szalavetz, A.:** The Hungarian automotive sector – a comparative CEE perspective with special emphasis on structural change, December 2010

No. 183 **Welfens, P.J.J.; Perret, K.J.; Erdem, D.:** The Hungarian ICT sector – a comparative CEE perspective with special emphasis on structural change, December 2010

No. 184 **Lengyel, B.:** Regional clustering tendencies of the Hungarian automotive and ICT industries in the first half of the 2000's, December 2010

No. 185 **Schröder, C.:** Regionale und unternehmensspezifische Faktoren einer hohen Wachstumsdynamik von IKT Unternehmen in Deutschland; Dezember 2010

No. 186 **Emons, O.:** Innovation and Specialization Dynamics in the European Automotive Sector: Comparative Analysis of Cooperation & Application Network, October 2010

No. 187 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** The Twin Crisis: From the Transatlantic Banking Crisis to the Euro Crisis?,January 2011

No. 188 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Green ICT Dynamics: Key Issues and Findings for Germany, March 2012

No. 189 **Erdem, D.:** Foreign Direct Investments, Energy Efficiency and Innovation Dynamics, July 2011

No. 190 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Atomstromkosten und -risiken: Haftpflichtfragen und Optionen rationaler Wirtschaftspolitik, Mai 2011

No. 191 **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Towards a Euro Fiscal Union: Reinforced Fiscal and Macroeconomic Coordination and Surveillance is Not Enough, January 2012

No. 192 **Irawan, Tony:** ICT and economic development: Conclusion from IO Analysis for Selected ASEAN Member States, November 2013

No. 193 **Welfens, P.J.J.; Perret, J.:** Information & Communication Technology and True Real GDP: Economic Analysis and Findings for Selected Countries, February 2014

No. 194 **Schröder, C.:** Dynamics of ICT Cooperation Networks in Selected German ICT Clusters, August 2013

No. 195 **Welfens, P.J.J.; Jungmittag, A.:** Telecommunications Dynamics, Output and Employment, September 2013

No. 196 **Feiguine, G.; Solojova, J.:** ICT Investment and Internationalization of the Russian Economy, Septemper 2013

No. 197 **Kubielas, S.; Olender-Skorek, M.:** ICT Modernization in Central and Eastern Europe, May 2014 Trade and Foreign Direct Investment New Theoretical Approach and Empirical Findings for US Exports & European Exports

No. 198 **Feiguine, G.; Solovjova, J.:** Significance of Foreign Direct Investment for the Development of Russian ICT sector, May 2014

No. 199 **Feiguine, G.; Solovjova, J.:** ICT Modernization and Globalization: Russian Perspectives, May 2014

No. 200 **Syraya, O.:** Mobile Telecommunications and Digital Innovations, May 2014

No. 201 **Tan, A.:** Harnessing the Power if ICT and Innovation Case Study Singapore, June 2014

No. 202 **Udalov, V.:** Political-Economic Aspects of Renewable Energy: Voting on the Level of Renewable Energy Support, November 2014

No. 203 **Welfens, P.J.J.;** Overcoming the EU Crisis and Prospects for a Political Union, November 2014

No. 204 **Welfens, P.J.J.; Irawan, T.:** Trade and Foreign Direct Investment: New Theoretical Approach and Empirical Findings for US Exports and European Exports, November 2014

No. 205 **Welfens, P.J.J.,:** Competition in Telecommunications and Internet Services: Problems with Asymmetric Regulations, Dezember 2014

No. 206 **Welfens, P.J.J.,:** Innovation, Inequality and a Golden Rule for Growth in an Economy with Cobb-Douglas Function and an R&D Sector, März 2015

EIIW Economic Policy Analysis:

No. 1   **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Globalisierung der Wirtschaft und Krise des Sozialstaats: Ist die Wirtschaftswissenschaft am Ende?, April 1997

No. 2   **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Nach der D-Mark kommt die E-Mark: Auf dem Weg zur EU-Währungsunion, Juli 1997

No. 3   **Welfens, P.J.J.:** Beschäftigungsförderliche Steuerreform in Deutschland zum Euro-Start: Für eine wachstumsorientierte Doppelsteuerreform, Oktober 1998

Fordern Sie den EIIW Newsletter an: www.eiiw.eu

Please subscribe to EIIW Newsletter: www.eiiw.eu

Weitere Beiträge von Interesse:
Titels of related interest:

Most recent books also see the last page.

PERRET, J.K. (2013), Knowledge as a Driver of Regional Growth in the Russian Federation, Heidelberg: Springer.

WELFENS, P.J.J. (2013), Nachhaltige Überwindung der Euro-Krise, Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius.

SCHULZ, M. (2013), Der gefesselte Riese – Europas letzte Chance, Reinbek: Rowohlt Verlag.

WELFENS, P.J.J. (2012), Die Zukunft des Euro, Berlin: Nicolai Verlag.

WELFENS, P.J.J., HENNICKE, P. (2012), Energiewende nach Fukushima, München: Oekom Verlag.

WELZER, H.; WIEGANDT, K. (2012), Perspektiven einer nachhaltigen Entwicklung: Wie sieht die Welt im Jahr 2050 aus?, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Verlag.

WELFENS, P.J.J (2011), Cluster- und Innovationsdynamik in Europa: Neue Perspektiven der Automobil- und IKT-Wirtschaft, Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius.

WELFENS, P.J.J.; EMONS, O.; SCHRÖDER, C. (2011), Europäische Innovations- und Spezialisierungsdynamik im Gesundheitssektor, Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius.

ISLAMI, M. (2010), Interdependenz zwischen Devisen- und Aktienmärkten in ausgewählten EU-Ländern: Theorie und empirische Analyse, Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovac.

VOGELSANG, M. (2010), Digitalization in Open Economies, Heidelberg: Springer.

WELFENS, P.J.J.; et al. (2009), A Europe of achievements in a Changing World, European Commission.

WELFENS, P.J.J.; BORBÉLY, D. (2009), Europäische Integration und Digitale Weltwirtschaft, Band 4: EU-Ostererweiterung, IKT und Strukturwandel, Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius.

BLEISCHWITZ, R.; WELFENS, P.J.J.; ZHANG, Z. (2009), Sustainable Growth and Resource Productivity, Sheffield: Greanleaf.

WELFENS, P.J.J.; ADDISON, J.T. (2009), Innovation, Employment and Growth Policy Issues in the EU and the US, Heidelberg: Springer.

WELFENS, P.J.J.; RYAN, C.; CHIRATHIVAT, S.; KNIPPING, F. (2009), EU-ASEAN, Facing Economic Globalisation, Heidelberg: Springer.

WELFENS, P.J.J. (2009), Transatlantische Bankenkrise, Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius.

WELFENS, P.J.J.; WOLF, H.C.; WOLTERS, J. (eds., 2008), International Economics and Economic Policy, Heidelberg: Springer.

WELFENS, P.J.J.; WALTHER-KLAUS, E. (eds., 2008), Digital Excelence, University Meets Economy, Heidelberg: Springer.

WELFENS, P.J.J. (2008), Digital Integration, Growth and Rational Regulation, Heidelberg: Springer.

WELFENS, P.J.J. (2007), Innovation in Macroeconomics, Heidelberg: Springer.

WELFENS, P.J.J.; WESKE, M. (eds., 2007), Digital Economic Dynamics, Innovations, Networks and Regulations, Heidelberg: Springer.

WELFENS, P.J.J., WESKE, M. (eds., 2006): Innovations, Digital Economic Dynamics and Regulatory Policy, Heidelberg: Springer.

WELFENS, P.J.J., KNIPPING, F., CHIRATHIVAT, S., RYAN, C. (eds., 2006): Integration in Asia and Europe: Historical Dynamics, Political Issues and Economic Perspectives, Heidelberg: Springer.

BROADMAN, H.G., PAAS, T., WELFENS, P.J.J. (eds., 2006): Economic Liberalization and Integration Policy Options for Eastern Europe and Russia, Heidelberg: Springer.

BORBÉLY, D. (2006): Trade Specialization in the Enlarged European Union, Heidelberg/Berlin: Springer.

JUNGMITTAG, A. (2006): Internationale Innovationsdynamik, Spezialisierung und Wirtschaftswachstum in der EU, Heidelberg: Physica.

WELFENS, P.J.J., WZIATEK-KUBIAK, (eds., 2005): Structural Change and Exchange Rate Dynamics – The Economics of EU Eastern Enlargement; Heidelberg: Springer.

WELFENS, P.J.J., ZOCHE, P., JUNGMITTAG, A. (et al. 2005): Internetwirtschaft 2010 (final Report for the German Federal Government; joint study EIIW and Fraunhofer Institute for System Dynamics and Innovation, Karlsruhe), Heidelberg: Physica.

GRAHAM, E., ODING, N., WELFENS, P.J.J., (2005): Internationalization and Economic Policy Reforms in Transition Countries, Heidelberg: Springer.

GAVRILENKOW, E., WELFENS, P.J.J., (2005): Infrastructure, Investments and Economic Integration: Perspectives for Eastern Europe and Russia, Moscow: HSE.

APOLTE, T.; CASPERS, R.; WELFENS, P.J.J. (2004), Ordnungsökonomische Grundlagen nationaler und internationaler Wirtschaftspolitik, Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius.

GAVRILENKOV, E.; WELFENS, P.J.J.; WIEGERT, R. (2004), Economic Opening Up and Growth in Russia, Heidelberg and New York: Springer.