



NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY  
HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

*Olga A. Demidova*

# **THE ASYMMETRIC SPATIAL EFFECTS FOR EASTERN AND WESTERN REGIONS OF RUSSIA**

BASIC RESEARCH PROGRAM

WORKING PAPERS

SERIES: ECONOMICS  
WP BRP 50/EC/2014

This Working Paper is an output of a research project implemented at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE). Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.

*Olga A. Demidova*<sup>1</sup>

## **THE ASYMMETRIC SPATIAL EFFECTS FOR EASTERN AND WESTERN REGIONS OF RUSSIA**<sup>23</sup>

The purpose of this study is to identify the spatial effects of the main macroeconomic indicators of the eastern and western regions of Russia. These regions differ significantly in population density and the distances between cities. The main research question we are interested in is the following: how are events occurring in one of the western regions, such as economic growth or a decrease in the unemployment rate, effecting similar indicators in other western and eastern regions. The spatial effects of the western and eastern regions, when considered separately, may differ both qualitatively and with of the ‘flow on effect’. The determinants of the same macroeconomic indicators in the eastern and western regions may also differ. In order to test the hypothesis of a possible difference in the spatial effects and determinants for these regions, we have developed a special class of model with four spatial matrices (west-west, east-east, west-east, and east-west) and a double set of control variables (one for each type of region). As the macroeconomic indicators monitor the rate of unemployment in the region, the real regional wage and GRP growth for the year were chosen for our models. We controlled the variables describing the socio-demographic situation in the region, migration processes, economic development, and export-import activity in the region. The models were estimated by the Arellano-Bond method on panel data for Russian regions over 2000-2010. Our analysis revealed, 1) a positive spatial correlation of the main macroeconomic indicators for the western regions, 2) both positive and negative externalities for the eastern regions and 3) the asymmetric influence of eastern and western regions on each other. Usually “impulses” from the western regions have a positive effect on the eastern regions, but the “impulses” from the eastern regions usually do not affect the western regions.

JEL Classification: R1, C21.

Keywords: Russian regions, spatial effects, spatial econometric models.

---

<sup>1</sup> National Research University Higher School of Economics. Department of Applied Economics. Associate Professor; E-mail: demidova@hse.ru

<sup>2</sup> This study was carried out within “The National Research University Higher School of Economics’ Academic Fund Program in 2013-2014, research grant No. 12-01-0057”.

<sup>3</sup> I thank Anil K. Bera, Elena Vakulenko, Eugenia Kolomak, Anna Bykova, Tatiana Bukina, Andrey Emelyanov, Dmitriy Potapov, and participants of 60 th annual NARSC meeting (November, 2013, Atlanta), 53 rd ERSA congress (August 2013, Palermo), Empirical workshop “Empirical research in spatial economics” of HSE CMSSE (February 2013, Saint Petersburg), Second summer school “Economics and Imperfect Markets: Empirical Researches” of HSE CMSSE (July 2013, Saint Petersburg) for valuable comments and suggestions. Mistakes remain my own.

## Introduction

Spatial econometrics began with the pioneering articles of Paelink, Klaassen (1979) and Anselin (1980). The idea underlying spatial econometric models is quite simple; in modelling the macroeconomic indicators of a region, it is necessary to take macroeconomic indicators of this region into account and also to account for the values of these indicators in other regions, especially outlying regions. However, we cannot simply add the additional parameter for each region; in this case, the number of degrees of freedom would decrease dramatically. Therefore, we attempt to reduce the number of estimated parameters. In spatial econometric models, this is achieved by introducing a weighting matrix  $W$  (such as a boundary or a distance matrix, but possibly a matrix of trade flows). Thus, the number of parameters that reflect the influence of other regions is reduced to one – the spatial autocorrelation coefficient (which is similar to the autocorrelation coefficients in the time series). If this coefficient is significant and positive (negative), then positive (negative) externalities may exist; i.e. any change that has occurred in one region will lead to a similar (opposite) change in neighbouring regions (if you use the boundary matrix).

For thirty years, spatial econometrics has been a dynamically developing field. With the appearance of special modules in modern statistical software packages, the number of empirical studies in this area has sharply increased.

However, this has created some problems. Gibbons and Overman (2012) criticized the common practice in the assessment models SAR, SEM, SLX, etc. for excessive technicality and the strong assumption that weighted matrix  $W$  is known and represents real-world linkages. Corrado and Fingleton (2012) agree with them: "...so-called  $W$  matrix, which is integral to the structure of endogenous and exogenous spatial lags, and to spatial error processes, and which are almost the sine qua non of spatial econometrics. Moreover, it has been suggested that the significance of a spatially lagged dependent variable involving  $W$  may be misleading, since it may be simply picking up the effects of omitted spatially dependent variables, incorrectly suggesting the existence of a spillover mechanism". A more detailed description of these and other problems related to spatial models is given in Partridge (2012).

Vega and Elhorst (2013) partially agree with this criticism. They propose adding an extra decay parameter as a possible solution to this problem (and weighted matrix  $W$  depends on this parameter). This proposal has led to remarkable results in one empirical case, however it is hardly possible to argue that the introduction of a distance decay parameter solves the problem of choosing the specification in all cases.

Another possible way to solve the problems raised is the use of Bayesian methods of estimation. This is done, for example, in LeSage et al. (2007, 2008) and Fisher (2013). However, the Bayesian approach has both advantages and disadvantages (see details in Corrado and Fingleton, 2012).

One more way to relax the strong conditions of SAR, SEM, etc. models is a preliminary decomposition of spatial objects into several parts for which there may be a different spatial dependence. For example, Europe is often divided into east and west (see, for example, Basile, 2010), core and periphery (Basile, 2012). Regions of the same country are often also divided into parts – in particular, Germany into the eastern and western parts (Fuchs-Schundeln and Izem, 2012; Lottmann, 2012), Italy into the northern and southern parts (Basile, 2012). Here are just a few examples. Basile R. (2010) found that the regional distribution of labour productivity in Western Europe is characterized by a Core-Periphery spatial pattern. A spatial model of commuting is used by Fuchs-Schundeln and Izem (2012) to analyze the behaviour of the unemployment rate across the former East-West border in Germany. The authors found that the comparatively low labour productivity in East Germany after reunification was not caused by the depreciation of human capital at reunification, but rather by unfavourable job characteristics. Schioppa and Basile (2002) compare the unemployment situation of Italy's Mezzogiorno (regions located in the south of the country and in the islands) with that of other "Mezzogiornos" of Europe. They concluded that in the nineties, regional unemployment rate differentials within the EU widened.

The present study attempts to identify the spatial effects for Russia, the largest and also heterogeneous country. It should be noted that there are only scarce numbers of empirical studies that have used Russian data in a spatial context. For example, Lugovoy et al. (2007) noted that one could find significant spatial heterogeneity in economic development of Russian regions for the period 1998–2004. Kholodilin et al. (2009) revealed that the overall speed of regional convergence in Russia was low by international standards; however, there was a strong regional convergence among high-income regions located near other high-income regions. Demidova et al. (2012) revealed the spatial effects for youth unemployment in the Russian regions. Kolomak (2010) empirically demonstrated the heterogeneity of the Russian regions, and positive externalities were observed in the western regions, whereas negative externalities were observed in the eastern regions.

The present study continues the spatial econometrics work using Russian regional data. Following Kolomak, all regions are split into eastern and western. This paper develops the research in this area by using 1) both annual and average (for 11 years) calculated spatial effects, 2) a special class of model with four spatial matrices (west-west, east-east, west-east, and east-

west), and 3) a double set of control variables (one for each type of region). Such models allow us to identify the possible differences between eastern and western Russian regions and their asymmetric impact on each other.

The structure of the paper is as follows. The second section describes the Russian regional data used in the study and the macroeconomic variables that were analysed to determine whether they were exerting spatial effects. The third section contains the models for revealing the annual spatial effects, and the fourth section includes the models for the estimation of the average spatial effects. The final section concludes.

## Data and Dependent Variables

In this study, three macroeconomic indicators were selected to identify possible spatial effects: the unemployment rate in the region (as a percentage), real wages (the ratio of wages in the region and in Russia, on average, divided by the ratio of the minimum basket of goods and services price in the region and in Russia, on average, \* 100), and gross regional product (GRP) growth for the year (as a percentage). Thus, the identification of a positive spatial effect for GRP growth means that economically growing regions "drag" other regions. Simultaneously, the impact of negative spatial effects for GRP growth corresponds to the growing region taking resources, which does not give rise to other regions doing the same. Obviously, the spatial effects can experience dynamic changes over time. It makes sense to separate short-term and long-term (in this study, annual and 11 years, respectively) spatial effects. All calculations were performed on the data for the 2000-2010 period for 75 Russian regions. The data for the other 8 regions were not included in the study for the following reasons: 1) there were changes in the administrative-territorial structure of Russia, and 2) for some regions, such as Chechnya, official data for some years are absent. There were 52 western regions and the 23 eastern regions (a list of all regions is given in Table A1 in Appendix).

These two groups of regions are substantially different. Western regions are smaller and more density populated. Therefore, we can expect different spatial effects for these two groups of regions.

Traditionally, the identification of spatial effects begins with the calculation of the Moran indices (an analogue of the correlation coefficient in the spatial case).

Moran's index for variable X is defined as:

$$I(X) = \frac{N}{\sum_{i,j} w_{ij}} \frac{\sum_{i,j} w_{ij} (X_i - \bar{X})(X_j - \bar{X})}{\sum_i (X_i - \bar{X})^2}$$

where  $N$  is the number of spatial units indexed by  $i$  and  $j$ ,  $\bar{X}$  is the mean of  $X$ , and  $w_{ij}$  are elements of the weighted spatial matrix. Moran's  $I$  index values range from  $-1$  (indicating perfect dispersion) to  $1$  (indicating perfect correlation). A zero value indicates an absence of spatial correlation. For significance testing, Moran's  $I$  values can be transformed to  $Z$ -scores in which values greater than  $1.96$  or smaller than  $-1.96$  indicate spatial autocorrelation that is significant at the  $5\%$  level. A positive index indicates that any change in the other regions is given to the same (opposite) changes in considered region.

In the current study, two weighting matrices are used, boundary and inverse distance. Moran's  $I$  with the boundary weighting matrix reveals the influence of only the boundary regions, as in the case of Moran's  $I$  with inverted distance<sup>4</sup> spatial matrix - the impact of all the regions.

Tables 1-3 contain the Moran index for each indicator, year, and region (for all Russia and separately for the western and eastern regions).

**Tab. 1. Moran's spatial correlation indexes for the variable "Unemployment"**

Years	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Boundary weighted matrix</b>											
All Russia	0.387***	0.339***	0.334***	0.42***	0.345***	0.257***	0.346***	0.367***	0.343***	0.27***	0.248***
Western Regions	0.393***	0.382***	0.352***	0.405***	0.355***	0.252***	0.355***	0.411***	0.357***	0.233***	0.235***
Eastern Regions	0.132	0.068	0.14	0.367***	0.183*	0.163*	0.162	0.136	0.14	0.195*	0.12
<b>Inverted distance weighted matrix</b>											
All Russia	0.182***	0.159***	0.156***	0.19***	0.178***	0.132***	0.152***	0.17***	0.146***	0.103***	0.115***
Western Regions	0.209***	0.223***	0.198***	0.217***	0.212***	0.162***	0.194***	0.221***	0.182***	0.132***	0.168***
Eastern Regions	-0.021	-0.057	-0.035	0.147***	0.01	0.005	-0.025	-0.02	-0.022	-0.033	-0.062

**Tab. 2. Moran's spatial correlation indexes for the variable "Real Wage"**

Years	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Boundary weighted matrix</b>											
All Russia	0.347***	0.369***	0.412***	0.419***	0.448***	0.441***	0.445***	0.402***	0.396***	0.384***	0.396***

<sup>4</sup> Between the capitals of regions by roads.

Years	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Western Regions</b>	0.397***	0.467***	0.484***	0.485***	0.489***	0.514***	0.479***	0.461***	0.461***	0.414***	0.386***
<b>Eastern Regions</b>	0.016	0.031	0.022	0.046	0.076	0.055	0.131	0.049	0.026	0.024	0.035
<b>Inverted distance weighted matrix</b>											
<b>All Russia</b>	0.05***	0.053***	0.075***	0.086***	0.095***	0.103***	0.094***	0.109***	0.133***	0.123***	0.134***
<b>Western Regions</b>	0.086***	0.113***	0.146***	0.165***	0.157***	0.183***	0.184***	0.203***	0.228***	0.203***	0.206***
<b>Eastern Regions</b>	-0.102	-0.104	-0.103	-0.092	-0.078	-0.072	-0.055	-0.064	-0.058	-0.073	-0.074

**Tab. 3: Moran's spatial correlation indexes for the variable “GRP Growth”**

Years	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Boundary weighted matrix</b>											
<b>All Russia</b>	0.064	0.057	0.229***	0.141**	0.052	0.109	0.179**	0.076	0.293***	0.186**	0.179**
<b>Western Regions</b>	0.047	-0.007	0.297***	0.127*	0.051	0.168**	0.034	0.116***	0.363***	0.154*	0.04
<b>Eastern Regions</b>	-0.075	0.036	0.107	0.18	0.061	0.047	0.261**	-0.022	-0.09	0.281**	0.26**
<b>Inverted distance weighted matrix</b>											
<b>All Russia</b>	0.029**	0.009***	0.102***	0.042**	-0.019	0.058***	0.026	-0.011	0.068***	0.084***	0.059***
<b>Western Regions</b>	0.004	0.001	0.15***	0.048***	0.002	0.101***	-0.022	-0.002	0.056**	0.065***	-0.036
<b>Eastern Regions</b>	0.073**	-0.079	-0.08	0.021	-0.087	0.072*	0.036	-0.045	-0.063	0.19***	0.15***

A persistently positive and significant Moran index for the level of unemployment and real wages in the western regions indicates that similar processes are exerting effects in this part of Russia. For the eastern regions, the values and significance of the Moran index for the same indicators are unstable over time. Thus, we can assume that there are annual spatial effects only for the western Russian regions and only for the first two macroeconomic indicators.

## **Models for the detection of annual spatial effects**

The correlation matrix is just the first step in the regression analysis, and the Moran indices only permit the initial assumption about the existence of spatial effects. For example, a positive Moran index for the unemployment rate suggests that the level of unemployment in one

Russian region might affect the unemployment rates in other Russian regions. However, this is not sufficient; we must take into account the effects of other explanatory variables, such as GRP per capita.

Spatial annual effects are usually estimated with spatial autoregressive (SAR) models

$$Y = X\beta + \rho WY + \varepsilon, (1)$$

where  $X$  is a matrix of explanatory variables,  $\beta$  is a vector of the estimated coefficients,  $W$  is a weighted matrix,  $\varepsilon$  is a vector of disturbances, and  $\rho$  is a spatial correlation coefficient (the sign and significance of  $\rho$  precisely characterise the presence or absence of spatial effects).

The parameters of equation (1) cannot be assessed by a test such as the least squares method, as a necessary condition of uncorrelated factors and disturbances disrupted. For this purpose, the method of maximum likelihood is used. The following calculations were performed using the module in the STATA<sup>5</sup> statistical software package.

The following factors were selected for their explanatory power:

1) The share of the urban population in the region. (It is assumed that it is easier to find a job in the cities and, therefore, that the unemployment rate there must be lower and real wages higher. It is natural to assume that cities are locomotives of economic growth. However, in "monocities", the situation may be reversed when the core enterprise closes. To account for this ambiguity, the quadratic dependence was chosen.)

2) The population density. (The explanation of this variable's inclusion is similar to the share of urban population variable; it is assumed that it is easier to find a job and higher salary in a densely populated area.)

3) Net migration rate. (On the one hand, migrants tend to move to economically favourable areas with low unemployment, high wages, etc., and we can face the problem of endogeneity. On the other hand, if the flow of migrants is significant, it might change the economic situation in the region).

4) Real GRP per capita – calculated as the ratio of GRP per capita and in Russia, on average, and the cost of the minimum basket of goods and services in the region and in Russia, on average, \* 100%<sup>6</sup>. (It is assumed that the higher the GRP per capita, the better the economic situation, i.e. the lower the unemployment rate, the higher the real wages are and the higher the level of economic growth.)

5) The variables of the export-import activity in the region, which are calculated as the ratio of exports and imports in the region in roubles to GRP \* 100%. (It is assumed that sufficient export and import activity in the region can stimulate economic growth.

---

<sup>5</sup> The command spatreg.

<sup>6</sup> To avoid the problem of endogeneity, this variable is included in the model with an annual lag.



Simultaneously, the export activity in the region might encourage the creation of new jobs, reduce the unemployment rate and increase real wages. Intense flows of imports may have the opposite effect on these last indicators)<sup>7</sup>.

The results of the spatial lags coefficients of the models (1) with the dependent variables,  $Y_1$  (the unemployment rate in the region),  $Y_2$  (the real wage), and  $Y_3$  (the GRP growth in the region) are presented in Tables 4-6.

**Tab. 4. Annual spatial effects for the variable “Unemployment”**

Years	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Boundary weighted matrix</b>											
<b>All Russia</b>	0.383***	0.378***	0.352***	0.376***	0.296***	0.169	0.311***	0.417***	0.284**	0.257**	0.168
<b>Western Regions</b>	0.331**	0.290*	0.351**	0.254**	0.207	0.075	0.211	0.386***	0.256*	0.022	-0.094
<b>Eastern Regions</b>	-0.001	0.122	0.464**	0.503**	0.384*	0.242	0.137	0.221	0.05	0.1	0.148
<b>Inverted distance weighted matrix</b>											
<b>All Russia</b>	0.814***	0.715***	0.716***	0.770***	0.731***	0.524**	0.619***	0.691***	0.529**	0.38	0.426
<b>Western Regions</b>	0.723***	0.659***	0.713***	0.510**	0.545**	0.404	0.406	0.560**	0.363	0.016	0.291
<b>Eastern Regions</b>	-0.938*	-0.452	0.201	0.699***	0.435	0.374	0.266	-0.264	-0.348	-0.446	-0.405

**Tab. 5. Annual spatial effects for the variable “Real Wage”**

Years	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Boundary weighted matrix</b>											
<b>All Russia</b>	0.189***	0.327***	0.290***	0.335***	0.308***	0.282***	0.263***	0.224***	0.269***	0.269***	0.284***
<b>Western Regions</b>	0.244**	0.429***	0.349***	0.297***	0.368***	0.157*	0.067	0.058	0.038	0.143	0.034
<b>Eastern Regions</b>	-0.287	0.083	-0.02	0.059	0.087	0.043	0.183	0.069	0.019	-0.041	-0.072
<b>Inverted distance weighted matrix</b>											
<b>All Russia</b>	0.568***	0.612***	0.653***	0.727***	0.712***	0.690***	0.442**	0.476***	0.705***	0.595***	0.596***
<b>Western Regions</b>	0.688***	0.769***	0.596***	0.492**	0.505**	0.476**	0.127	0.204	0.390**	0.247	0.255

<sup>7</sup> The effect of export and import to CIS and non-CIS countries may differ.

Years	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Eastern Regions	-0.176	-0.143	-0.004	-0.08	0.145	0.106	0.101	0.181	0.167	-0.155	-0.217

**Tab. 6. Annual spatial effects for the variable “GRP Growth”**

Years	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
<b>Boundary weighted matrix</b>											
All Russia	-0.011	0.15	0.391***	0.025	0.109	0.078	0.166	-0.025	0.303**	0.18	0.456***
Western Regions	-0.036	0.066	0.27	0.059	0.06	0.047	-0.161	0.04	0.203	0.21	0.299*
Eastern Regions	-0.806***	0.246	0.022	-0.118	0.041	-0.206	0.257	-0.352	-0.048	-0.178	0.372
<b>Inverted distance weighted matrix</b>											
All Russia	0.362	0.019	0.676***	0.262	-0.44	0.428	-0.007	-0.625	0.203	0.553**	0.692***
Western Regions	0.045	0.000	0.700***	0.081	0.198	0.511	-0.916	-0.095	0.123	0.345	-0.213
Eastern Regions	-0.726	-1.211**	-1.081*	-0.481	-1.487**	0.053	0.021	-1.198***	-0.473	0.214	0.071

Because the study of Moran’s indices revealed fundamental differences between the western and eastern regions, the estimation of the models (1) was conducted for all observations and separately for the western and eastern regions. Unfortunately, the separation of the sample reduces the efficiency of the estimates of the coefficients.

According to the obtained results (Tables 4-6), we observe the following:

1) Spatial correlation coefficients estimates for the unemployment rate are significant and positive for Russia as a whole (with the exception of 2009 and 2010, which may indicate the influence of the global financial crisis) and for more than a half year in the western regions.

2) The estimates of the spatial lags for real wages are also significant and positive for Russia as a whole and for the western regions in most years.

3) The estimates of the spatial lags for GRP growth are mostly insignificant (even for the total sample) and positive only in some cases.

4) For almost all the eastern regions, the spatial lags are insignificant (this may be a consequence of the small sample size).<sup>8</sup>

In interpreting the obtained results, it should be noted that it was possible to identify the annual spatial effects for the real wages and the unemployment rate, i.e. if the level of real wages

<sup>8</sup> In this section, I discuss only short-term (annual) spatial effects.

increased in certain regions (or decreased the unemployment rate), this "impulse" would be transferred to other Russian regions.

Interpretations of the other results are deliberately omitted so as not to obscure the main research question about spatial effects.

The obtained results (i.e. the insignificance of many estimated coefficients) suggest that the identification of annual spatial effects on cross-sectional data for Russian regions is not a prospective approach. It is difficult to "catch" any spatial effects on small samples. It would be much more promising to search for average spatial effects in the panel data over a long time period.

The selection of a suitable model for this case is discussed in the next section.

## Models for the detection of average spatial effects

To identify the possible differences in the spatial effects for the eastern and western regions and to identify the mutual influence of the two groups of regions on one another, all the explanatory variables were divided into two parts that correspond to the observations for the western and eastern regions. The weight matrices were divided into four parts, with an explanation provided below. The following dynamic model is proposed:

$$\begin{pmatrix} Y_{i_w,t}^w \\ Y_{i_e,t}^e \end{pmatrix} = \sigma \begin{pmatrix} Y_{i_w,t-1}^w \\ Y_{i_e,t-1}^e \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \rho_l^{ww} W_l^{ww} & \rho_l^{we} W_l^{we} \\ \rho_l^{ew} W_l^{ew} & \rho_l^{ee} W_l^{ee} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Y_{i_w,t}^w \\ Y_{i_e,t}^e \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} X^w \beta^w \\ X^e \beta^e \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{k=1}^{10} \gamma_k d_{200k} + \alpha_i + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad (2)$$

where  $Y^w$  and  $Y^e$  are the "western" and "eastern" parts of the corresponding dependent variable (level of unemployment or real wage or GRP growth), respectively,  $i_w = 1, \dots, 52, i_e = 53, \dots, 75, i = 1, \dots, 75, t = 2000, \dots, 2010$ ,

$l = b(\text{boundary})$  and  $id(\text{inverted distance})$ , and  $d_{2001} - d_{2010}$  are dummy variables for the corresponding year,  $\alpha_i, i = 1, \dots, 75$  are individual regional effects, and  $\varepsilon_{it} \sim iid(0, \sigma_\varepsilon^2)$  are disturbances. Matrices  $X_w$  and  $X_e$  consist of the same variables, but with "western" and "eastern" sets of observations.

The weighted matrices (normalised by rows) are divided into four parts in the following manner:

$$\underbrace{W_l}_{(75 \times 75)} = \begin{pmatrix} \underbrace{W_l^{ww}}_{(52 \times 52)} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & W_l^{we} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ W_l^{ew} & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \underbrace{W_l^{ee}}_{(23 \times 23)} \end{pmatrix},$$

$l = b(\text{boundary})$  and  $id(\text{inverted distance})$ .

The matrices  $W_b^{ww}$  and  $W_{id}^{ww}$  reflect the influence of the western regions on one another, the matrices  $W_b^{ee}$  and  $W_{id}^{ee}$  reflect the impact of the eastern regions on one another,  $W_b^{we}$  and  $W_{id}^{we}$  reflect the impact of the eastern regions on the western regions, and  $W_b^{ew}$  and  $W_{id}^{ew}$  reflect the influence of western regions on the eastern regions.

In model (2), we estimated the following coefficients characterising the spatial effects:

$$\rho_l^{ww}, \rho_l^{we}, \rho_l^{ew}, \rho_l^{ee}.$$

The dynamic form of model (2) is not accidental due to the usual method of estimating such models (Arellano – Bond) provides estimates for the required parameters "with good properties" because of the use of instrumental variables.

The set of independent variables in model (2) is the same as in model (1), but each variable is doubled; thus, for example:

$$shurbanw = \begin{cases} shurban, & \text{if } i = 1, \dots, 52 (\text{west regions}) \\ 0, & \text{if } i = 53, \dots, 75 (\text{east regions}) \end{cases}$$

$$shurbane = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } i = 1, \dots, 52 (\text{west regions}) \\ shurban, & \text{if } i = 53, \dots, 75 (\text{east regions}) \end{cases}$$

Each pair of variables is included in the model, and the hypothesis of equality of the corresponding coefficients is tested for each pair. If this hypothesis is rejected, then we conclude that there is a difference in the effect of the same factor for the eastern and western Russian regions.

Table 7 shows the results of the estimation of model (2) for each selected dependent variable with a boundary or an inverse distance weighted matrix.

**Tab. 7. The dynamic models estimation results using the Arellano-Bond method**

Varia		Unemploym		Real wage		GRP	
ble		ent rate				growth	
<b>Spatial lag</b>		0.413***	0.377***	0.631***	0.689***	0.07***	0.072***
<b>pbww</b>	<i>pidww</i>	0.360***	0.677***	0.425***	1.022***	0.419***	1.147***
<b>pbee</b>	<i>pidde</i>	0.252***	0.652***	-0.067***	-1.366***	0.082	0.51**
<b>pbwe</b>	<i>pidwe</i>	-0.053	-1.472	0.303***	-2.536***	0.000	0.231
<b>pbew</b>	<i>pidew</i>	0.542**	-0.254	1.425**	2.558***	1.551***	1.195***
<b>shurbanw</b>		2.916***	3.43***	1.571	2.769***	2.916***	2.916***
<b>shurbansqw</b>		-0.02***	-0.025***	-0.01	-0.021**	-0.005	-0.005
<b>shurbane</b>		0.083	-0.036	-0.75	-1.386	-3.96***	-2.16***
<b>shurbansqe</b>		-0.001	0.000	-0.000	0.007	0.018***	0.029***
<b>densityw</b>		0.001	0.001	0.031***	0.033***	0.011**	0.010**
<b>densitye</b>		-0.467	-0.897*	-0.172	2.715*	0.984	0.845

<b>migrateposw</b>	0.009***	0.008***	-0.045***	-0.037***	-0.017	-0.026*
<b>migratepose</b>	-0.008	-0.004	-0.006	-0.011	-0.089**	-0.027
<b>migratenegw</b>	-0.007**	-0.01***	0.053***	0.053***	0.046***	0.044***
<b>migratenege</b>	0.009**	0.004	-0.006	-0.009	0.004	-0.021
<b>grpw</b>	-2.428***	-2.87***	12.974***	14.964***	16.35***	18.46***
<b>grpe</b>	-0.535	-0.646	14.599***	14.611***	9.089***	11.49***
<b>openexpcisw</b>	-4.721	-4.668	69.094*	39.174	1.66	-1.686
<b>openexpcise</b>	51.697***	42.002*	-47.023	-8.1	-9.538	-28.941
<b>openimpcisw</b>	12.193	13.93***	-4.66	8.013	-2.365	-2.41
<b>openimpcise</b>	-15.662	-7.927	-59.471	-52.658	20.223	71.062
<b>openexpotherw</b>	-0.188	-0.06	2.047	5.328**	-1.091	-0.125
<b>openexpothere</b>	0.011	0.141	14.703***	12.145***	-7.98***	-6.93***
<b>openimpootherw</b>	-0.156***	-0.193***	-0.98***	-1.02***	-0.63***	-0.77***
<b>openimpothere</b>	1.03**	0.742	-20.84***	-21.758***	3.47***	3.567***
<b>Time effects</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

As in the fourth section, we offer our interpretation only for spatial effects. Each respective hypothesis of the equality of the coefficients for the same “western” and “eastern” factors was tested and, if accepted, was incorporated into the model (thus, if the hypothesis  $\beta_{grp}^w = \beta_{grp}^e$  is not rejected, only one factor, GRP, is included in the model instead of both *grpw* and *grpe* factors).

In the qualitative results, signs and the significance of spatial effects do not change after incorporating the restriction; therefore, we omit the corresponding tables.

The results (presented in Table 7) indicate the following:

1) Estimates of average west-west spatial coefficients were positive and significant in all models, i.e. positive changes in one western region (GRP growth, lower unemployment, and higher wages) led to similar changes in other western regions.

2) Estimates of average east-east spatial coefficients were positive for the level of unemployment and negative for the level of real wages. Thus, if one eastern region reduces the unemployment rate, similar changes occur in other eastern regions. However, if real wages increase in one eastern region, similar increases do not occur in the other regions and the resources will move only to the first region.

3) Estimates of the average spatial coefficient that characterises the influence of the eastern regions on the western regions were insignificant for unemployment rate and GRP growth. So, unemployment rate and GRP growth in eastern regions do not affect the same indicators in western regions. The real wage spatial coefficient was positive for boundary matrix and negative for inverted distance matrix. Therefore, if real wages increase in one eastern region, similar increases occur only in the boundary western regions.

4) The estimates of the average spatial coefficient that characterise the influence of the western regions on the eastern regions were positive (for the unemployment rate only for the boundary weighted matrix, but for real wages and GRP growth in both cases). Thus, the western regions "pull up" the eastern regions with respect to the selected indicators.

5) The negative consequences of 2008-2009 financial crisis on the unemployment rate and real wages were revealed.

## Conclusions

The results obtained are briefly summarised below.

When using the two types of spatial econometric models estimated, correspondingly, on the cross-sectional and panel data, we obtained the following main results:

- Annual positive spatial effects for unemployment and real wages were revealed.
- Estimating the cross-sectional models separately for the eastern and western regions in Russia was problematic.
- In the western regions, the average positive spatial effects were identified for the unemployment rate, the real wage, and the GRP growth rate.
- In the eastern regions, the average positive spatial effects for the unemployment rate and the average negative spatial effects for real wage were revealed.
- There is an asymmetric average influence of eastern and western regions on one another (the effects from the western regions extend to the eastern regions over the long term, but not vice versa).
- A statistically significant difference in the determinants of the unemployment rate, real wages and GRP growth for both the western and eastern regions was found.

Estimated models revealed differences in economic development and the mutual influence of eastern and western Russian regions.

These results can be used for regional policies. Changes in its western part of Russia have a more significant impact on the entire country.

## References

- Anselin, L. (1980). Estimation models for Spatial Autoregressive Structures. Regional Science Dissertation and Monograph Series, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York.
- Basile R. "Labour productivity polarization across western European regions: threshold effects versus neighbourhood effects"// The labour market impact of the EU enlargement, Springer-Verlag Berlin, 2010, pp.75-98.

- Basile R., Girardi A. and Mantuano M., Migration and Regional Unemployment in Italy, *The Open Urban Studies Journal*, 2012, 5, 1-13.
- Corrado, L. and B. Fingleton (2012), “Where is the Economics in Spatial Econometrics?” *Journal of Regional Science*, 52(2), 210-239.
- Demidova O., Signorelli, M. (2012). Determinants of Youth Unemployment in Russian Regions. *Post-Communist Economies*, v.24, n.2, pp. 191-218. London: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Fisher M., LeSage J. “A Bayesian space-time approach to identifying and interpreting regional convergence clubs in Europe”. Paper presented at 53rd ERSA conference, Palermo, August 27-31, 2013.
- Fuchs-Schundeln N., Izem R. “Explaining the low labor productivity in East German – A spatial analysis // *Journal of Comparative Economics* 40, 2012, pp. 1-21.
- Gibbons, S. and H.G. Overman (2012), “Mostly Pointless Spatial Econometrics?” *Journal of Regional Science*, 52(2), 172-191.
- Kholodilin K., Siliverstovs B., Oshchepkov A. (2009). The Russian regional convergence process: Where does it go? *DIW Discussion Paper*, No.861.
- Kolomak, E. (2011). Spatial Externalities as a Source of Economic Growth. *Regional Research of Russia*, 1, 2, pp. 114–119. Moscow: Springer.
- LeSage, James and Manfred M. Fischer. 2008. “Spatial Growth Regressions: Model Specification, Estimation and Interpretation,” *Spatial Economic Analysis*, 3, 275–304.
- LeSage, James and Olivier Parent. 2007. “Bayesian Model Averaging for Spatial Econometric Models,” *Geographical Analysis*, 39, 241–267.
- Lottmann F. (2012): “Explaining regional unemployment differences in Germany: a spatial panel data analysis,” *Discussion Paper 2012-026*, CRC 649.
- Lugovoy O., Dashkeyev, I. Mazayev, D. Fomchenko, E. Polyakov. (2007). *Analysis of Economic Growth in Regions: Geographical and Institutional Aspect*. Consortium for Economic Policy Research and Advice. Moscow: IET.
- Paelinck, J. and Klaassen, L. (1979). *Spatial Econometrics*. Saxon House, Farnborough.
- Partridge, M.D., M. Boarnet, S. Brakman, and G. Ottaviano (2012), “Introduction: Whither Spatial Econometrics?” *Journal of Regional Science*, 52(2), 167-171.
- Schioppa K. P. and Basile R. (2002). “Unemployment dynamics of the ‘mezzogiorno of Europe’: lessons for the mezzogiorno of Italy”. Centre for Economic Policy Research, Discussion Paper No. 3594.
- Vega S.H. and Elhorst J.P. “On spatial econometric models, spillover effects, and W”. Paper presented at 53rd ERSA conference, Palermo, August 27-31, 2013.

## Appendix

**Table A1. List of Russian regions**

Number	Name	Number	Name
	<b>WESTERN REGIONS</b>	39	Republic of Bashkortostan
1	Belgorod region	40	Republic of Marii El
2	Bryansk region	41	Republic of Mordovia
3	Vladimir region	42	Republic of Tatarstan
4	Voronezh region	43	Republic of Udmurtia
5	Ivanovo region	44	Republic of Chuvashia
6	Kaluga region	45	Perm territory
7	Kostroma region	46	Kirov region
8	Kursk region	47	Nizhny Novgorod region
9	Lipetsk region	48	Orenburg region
10	Moscow region	49	Penza region
11	Orel region	50	Samara region
12	Ryazan region	51	Saratov region
13	Smolensk region	52	Ulyanovsk region
14	Tambov region		<b>EASTERN REGIONS</b>
15	Tver region	53	Kurgan region
16	Tula region	54	Sverdlovsk region
17	Yaroslavl region	55	Tumen region
18	Moscow	56	Chelyabinsk region
19	Republic of Karelia	57	Republic of Altay
20	Republic of Komi	58	Republic of Buryatia
21	Arkhangelsk region	59	Republic of Tyva
22	Vologda region	60	Republic of Khakassia
23	Kaliningrad region	61	Altay Territory
24	Leningrad region	62	Krasnoyarsk Territory
25	Murmansk region	63	Irkutsk region
26	Novgorod region	64	Kemerovo region
27	Pskov region	65	Novosibirsk region
28	Saint-Petersburg	66	Omsk region
29	Republic of Adygea	67	Tomsk region
30	Republic of Kabardino-Balkaria	68	Republic of Sakha (Yakutia)
31	Republic of Kalmykia	69	Kamchatka territory
32	Republic of Karachaevo-Cherkessia	70	Primorsky Territory
33	Republic of Northen Osetia – Alania	71	Khabarovsk Territory
34	Krasnodar Territory	72	Amur region
35	Stavropol Territory	73	Magadan region



36	Astrakhan region	74	Sakhalin region
37	Volgograd region	75	Jewish autonomous area
38	Rostov region		

**Contact details:**

Olga A. Demidova  
National Research University Higher School of Economics (Moscow, Russia). Department of Applied Economics. Associate Professor;  
E-mail: demidova@hse.ru, Tel. +7 (495) 772-95-90\*026051

**Any opinions or claims contained in this Working Paper do not necessarily reflect the views of HSE.**

© Demidova, 2014