

Sectoral shifts, diversification and regional labour market performance: evidence from local labour systems in Italy

Roberto Basile, r.basile@isae.it

Alessandro Girardi, a.girardi@isae.it

Marianna Mantuano, m.mantuano@isae.it

ISAE (Institute for Studies and Economic Analyses)

Abstract

This work aims at assessing the effects of sectoral shifts and industry specialization patterns on regional unemployment in Italy, using Local Labour System (LLS) over the years 2004-2008, when huge worker reallocation caused by changes in the international context has occurred. Given her well-known North-South divide, Italy represents an interesting case study because of her huge degree of spatial heterogeneity in local labour market performances. Furthermore, the presence of strongly specialized LLS (Industrial Districts, IDs) allows us to test whether IDs perform better than highly diversified urban areas thanks to the effect of agglomeration economies, or *viceversa*. Building on a semiparametric spatial autoregressive framework, our empirical investigation documents that sectoral shifts and the degree of specialization exert a negative role on unemployment dynamics; by contrast, highly diversified areas turn out to be characterized by better labour market performances.

Keywords: Unemployment, sectoral shift, diversification, spatial dependence, nonparametrics

JEL codes: R23, C14, C21

1. Introduction

The ongoing process of international delocation of manufacturing activity towards Eastern European low-labour-cost regions and towards other emerging countries (such as China, India and Brazil) has been contributing to modify the European map of interregional specialization, with old member states (EU-15 countries) progressively more specialized in service sectors and the twelve newly accessed countries gradually more specialized in manufacturing activity. The reallocation of labour resources within the enlarged Europe, may have generated significant turmoil in the local labour markets, with backward areas being particularly exposed to these structural changes due to their weakness: lower diversification, higher specialization in low labour skilled intensive activities, lower attractiveness of foreign direct investments, economic dependence on more developed regions and poverty traps (Caroleo and Pastore, 2009).

A number of studies have analyzed the effects of sectoral shifts and industry specialization patterns on local labour market performances (Lilien, 1982; Samson, 1985; Newman and Topel, 1991; Chiarini and Piselli, 2000; Krajnyak and Sommer, 2004; Newell and Pastore, 2006; Ferragina and Pastore, 2008; Robson, 2009, among others). The present study contributes to this literature by focusing on Italian Local Labour Systems (LLS), over the most recent period (2004-2008), when huge worker reallocation mainly caused by changes in the international context has occurred.

Given the well-known North-South divide, Italy represents an interesting case-study: most of Southern LLS are expected to suffer more than others from these processes due to their traditional concentration of employment in industries where new competitors specialize and lack of automatic adjustment mechanisms (Contini and Trivellato, 2006). The case of Italy is also particularly interesting because of the

presence of strongly specialized LLS, known as Industrial Districts. While the Portfolio hypothesis (Simon, 1988; Simon and Nardinelli 1992) and Jacobs (1969) theory would suggest that, thanks to their high degree of diversification, urban areas should buffer better than specialized LLS adverse shocks, the Industrial Districts theory (Marshall, 1890; Becattini, 1991) posits that highly specialized areas may perform better than others due to the presence of agglomeration economies.

The objective of the study is therefore twofold: a) analyze the effects of sectoral shift and of specialization patterns on local labour market performances, using Local Labour System (LLS) over the years 2004-2008; b) compare the relative performance of specialized LLS (Industrial districts) and of urban areas. Building on a semiparametric spatial auto-regressive framework, our empirical investigation documents that sectoral shifts and the degree of specialization exert a negative role on unemployment dynamics; by contrast, urban and highly diversified areas turn out to be characterized by better labour market performances.

The structure of the work is as follows. In Section 2 we review the relevant literature. Section 3 illustrates data and variables used in the econometric analysis. Section 4 presents the econometric framework and our main empirical findings. Conclusions follow.

2. Review of the literature

A recent strand of literature, stimulated by the contribution of Lilien (1982), has pointed out the relevance of structural changes to explain spatial disparities in labour market performances. Economic integration processes and changes in technology are widely recognized as major sources of structural changes which are likely to produce - on both

advanced and backward regions - massive reallocation of labour resources (sectoral shifts) leading to increases in regional unemployment as labour that is displaced from declining industries takes time to be absorbed into the new growing sectors of the economy.

Based on the assumption that sectoral shifts are consequences of idiosyncratic shocks hitting some sectors/regions, a number of studies (Samson, 1985; Newell and Pastore, 2006; Krajnyak and Sommer, 2004) have confirmed the evidence firstly documented in Lilien (1982) according to which cross-industry dispersion of employment growth rates (measured by the Lilien's index) affects positively aggregate unemployment rates over time.

In keeping with the criticism raised by Abraham and Katz (1986), however, regional unemployment differentials are mainly caused by common aggregate shocks rather than by idiosyncratic disturbances and the observed spatial variability in sectoral shifts is mainly due to asymmetric consequences of the same aggregate shocks. In order to capture the effects of aggregate disturbances, a number of studies have included a measure of industrial diversity (such as, for instance, Herfindhal or Gini indexes) along with the Lilien's indicator (Newman and Topel, 1991; Chiarini and Piselli, 2000; Robson, 2009). It is widely recognized indeed that common shocks may generate asymmetric effects across industries: regions highly specialized in low-sensitive industries to aggregate shocks are expected to exhibit low vulnerability to aggregate disturbances and *viceversa*. More diversified economies, however, should be more able to absorb the adverse labour market effects of common shocks through inter-sectoral mobility, as suggested by the Portfolio hypothesis (Simon, 1988; Simon and Nardinelli, 1992; Ferragina and Pastore, 2008; Elhorst, 2003).

Similar conclusions were already obtained by Jacobs (1969) who argued that sectoral diversification may offer more job opportunities and, thus, reduce the unemployment rate of the region. An alternative hypothesis indicates specialization rather than diversity as a mechanism leading to local (urban) growth, however. According to Marshall (1890), workers are better protected from business uncertainty and demand shocks if located in a region with a large local base in their own industry. The local concentration of firms within the same industry gives rise to a greater number of employment opportunities to dismissed workers. In ultimate analysis, whether specialization or diversity are more beneficial for local labour market dynamics is an empirical question whose answer depends on the time period of the analysis, on the way the phenomena are measured, on which industry is considered, at which level of (sectoral and territorial) aggregation the analysis is carried out and on methodology adopted (see Beaudry and Schiffauerova, 2009, for a critical review).

3. Data and measurement

3.1 The spatial unit of analysis

Empirical studies on regional unemployment disparities usually adopt administratively defined areas (such as regions and provinces, i.e. NUTS-2 and NUTS-3 regions) within which labour market relevant policy measures can be taken by planning authorities (Elhorst, 2003). While this strategy has the advantage of data availability for these regions, its main drawback consists in usually having to cut and subdivide functionally linked labour market areas, which often do not follow administrative boundaries (Isserman et al., 1986). Disregarding the functional interdependencies can have serious

repercussions on the estimation of theory-based labour market models (Openshaw, 1984, among others).

Arbitrariness in boundaries and huge heterogeneity in size are commonly viewed as the main problems related to the use of administratively defined areas. On the grounds of those shortcomings, functional labour market regions are usually preferred.¹ The most common variable used to define functional labour market regions is the level of commuting to the core region (see, for example, ISTAT, 1991). Accordingly, a sub-zone is defined to belong to a certain labour market region when more than a certain percent of the local labour force commutes to the core of the region.

Given these preliminaries, we use data for 686 Italian Local Labour Systems (LLS). A further advantage of using LLS data in our case is related to exploit the official classification provided by ISTAT (Italian National Institute of Statistics) which identifies LLS on the basis of their degree of urbanization and specialization and whether or not they constitute an industrial district. This piece of information turns out to be of relevance for our analysis: while the degree of urbanization and specialization allows us to put into a test the effect of Jacobsian economies on local labour market performances, distinguishing between industrial districts and other LLS allows us to assess the role of Marshallian economies on unemployment rate dynamics at a very fine territorial level.

¹ There are several drawbacks with this concept in practical modelling situations, however. Functionally defined regions may be under the planning authority of several governmental institutions which makes the formulation of the relevant policy variables a rather difficult task. A second disadvantage is constituted by the arbitrariness of the cut-off points for the region defining variable. See Elhroost (2003) on this point.

3.2 Measure of labor market performance and their main determinants

Regional labour market performances are measured in terms of unemployment rate dynamics as in Overman and Puga (2002), Niebuhr (2003) and Basile et al. (2010), among others. We use ISTAT data over the years from 2004 to 2008 to construct our dependent variable, $y_i = \Delta \ln u_i$, which measures the four-year dynamics of the i -th LLS ($i = 1, 2, \dots, N = 686$) unemployment rate, u_i (Δ denoting the first difference operator and \ln the natural logarithmic transformation). Figure 1 reports the density estimates of LLS unemployment rates in 2004 and 2008 relative to the national average, while Figures 2A and 2B show the quartile spatial distribution of unemployment rates in 2004 and 2008. These graphs give strong evidence of the existence of two clusters of LLS in both years: a cluster of high-unemployment LLS is located in the South, while a group of low unemployment rates is located in the North. Figure 2C reports the quartile distribution of regional unemployment growth rates. Despite the clear picture emerging from the maps in Figures 2A and 2B, we document a strong heterogeneity across spatial units in terms of unemployment rate dynamics.

Figures 1 and 2

Explanatory variables used in the empirical analysis are measures of sectoral shift, sectoral specialization, initial conditions (the level of unemployment rate at the beginning of the sample span), labour supply-demand mismatch and population density. Here is an overview of these variables constructed using ISTAT data.

Sectoral shifts. We measure sectoral shifts by computing the Lilien's index of variance in industry employment growth as $lil_i = \left[\sum_{s=1}^S (x_{si}/x_i) (\Delta \ln x_{si} - \Delta \ln x_i)^2 \right]^{1/2}$, where x_{si} is the regional employment in industry $s = 1, 2, \dots, S = 43$ and x_i is the total

regional employment. High values of lil_i are expected to increase unemployment growth rates, especially for those LLS economically weaker than others. The expected sign for lil_i is, thus, positive. The choropleth map in Figure 3.A reports the quartile distribution of Lilien's indicator computed for the period 2004-2008. It emerges a concentration of high values of the index in the South of Italy, indicating a strong vulnerability of this area with respect to the structural changes occurred in the economy.

Figure 3

Specialization. On the grounds of the criticism put forward by Abraham and Katz (1986), a proper modeling approach needs to disentangle sectoral shifts and aggregate disturbances. This implies that lil_i captures “genuine” sectoral shifts only when a measure of the degree of industrial specialization is also included in the set of regressors (Neumann and Topel, 1991). As a measure of specialization we use the log of the Gini

index ($\ln G_i$), where $G_i = \frac{1}{S} \left[2 \left(\frac{\sum_{s=1}^S (S+1-s) x_{si}}{\sum_{s=1}^S x_{si}} \right) - 1 - S \right]$, where x_{si} is the regional

employment in industry s indexed in non-decreasing order. The quartile distribution of the Gini index suggests that Southern LLS are characterized by a lower diversification (Figure 3.B). As discussed in the previous Section, the Jacobsian approach predicts that the variety of industry within a geographic region is likely to raise the probability for dismissed workers to find employment in other sectors. Similarly, the *portfolio* theory (Simon and Nardinelli, 1992) posits that diversified urban areas should better absorb negative idiosyncratic shocks thanks to inter-industry externalities. An opposite effect of specialization is predicted by the Marshallian view of local growth: specialization is expected to better protect workers from business uncertainty and demand shocks, suggesting a negative effect of specialization measures on unemployment rates

dynamics (the higher the local base of a given industry, the lower the growth of unemployment rate). Thus, the ultimate effect of specialization on unemployment rate dynamics is ambiguous and it should be object of empirical scrutiny.

Initial conditions and supply-demand mismatch. In order to control for local labour market conditions, we include the (logarithm of the) unemployment rate at the beginning of the period, $\ln u_i$, as well as an indicator of the supply-demand mismatch, Δeld_i , measured as the difference between employment growth rate and labor participation growth rate. The expected sign for both regressors is negative. Higher initial conditions are expected to lower growth rates; labour demand above labour supply implies a decline in unemployment.

Population density. A further candidate explanatory variable is population density, den_i , measured as the ratio between population and square kilometers. Large and dense urban labour markets are expected to exhibit higher degree of efficiency in the matching process: more job-seekers and job offers lead to faster matching and lower unemployment (Niebuhr, 2003). On the other hand, population density may capture amenities of large LLS, which might induce congestion effects and, thus, higher unemployment.

4 Econometric analysis

4.1 Model specification

In modeling regional unemployment dynamics we resort to a flexible approach which allows for spatial dependence and nonlinearities. The model is specified so as to consider the possibility of spatial externalities, as we cannot disregard spatial contagion effects in the determination of unemployment patterns. Nonlinearities could be captured

by a polynomial regression model, as in Overman and Puga (2002), among others. We instead use a semiparametric methodology, since it is much more flexible than any parametric specification. By using a particular version of the semiparametric model that allows for additive components, we are able to obtain graphical representation of the relationship between unemployment dynamics and LLS characteristics. Additivity ensures that the effect of each of the model predictors can be interpreted net of the effect of the other regressors, as in linear multiple regression. A typical semiparametric additive model (AM) is specified as follows:

$$y_i = X_i^* \alpha^* + f_1(x_{1i}) + f_2(x_{2i}) + f_3(x_{3i}, x_{4i}) + \dots + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

where ε_i is a vector of independently, identically and normally distributed errors, $\varepsilon_i \sim iidN(0, \sigma_\varepsilon^2)$, $f_j(\cdot)$ are unknown smooth functions of the covariates, X_i^* is a vector of strictly parametric components (also including country dummies so as to partially capture unobserved heterogeneity) and α^* is the corresponding parameter vector. For our analysis, we employ the methodology proposed by Wood (2006) to estimate AMs with spline based penalized regression smoothers which allow for automatic and integrated smoothing parameters selection via Generalized Cross Validation (GCV).

In order to control for spatial interaction effects, Model (1) has to be augmented. As pointed out by Anselin (2004) and LeSage and Pace (2009), spatial externalities may occur either in unmodeled effects (when unmodeled variables subsumed in the error term jointly follow a spatial random process) or in modeled effects (when the exogenous terms affect the left hand side of the model through a ‘*global multiplier effect*’). In a parametric linear setting, such as $y = X' \alpha + \varepsilon$, global multiplier effects are modeled by replacing X and ε with $(I - \rho W)^{-1} X$ and $(I - \rho W)^{-1} \varepsilon$, respectively,

where I is an identity matrix, ρ is the parameter of spatial externality and W is a spatial weights matrix.² In the present context, the inverse spatial transformation of X and ε suggests that the unemployment growth rate of LLS i is affected not only by its own characteristics and random shocks, but also by the features and random shocks of all other LLS. However, given the characteristics of the standardized spatial weights matrix, the strength of spatial dependence between observed LLS declines with the distance between them (*'spatial diffusion with friction'*). The introduction of the spatial multiplier effect in the model yields a reduced form as $y = (I - \rho W)^{-1} X' \alpha + (I - \rho W)^{-1} \varepsilon$ and the structural form becomes the standard spatial autoregressive model (SAR) $y = \rho W y + X' \alpha + \varepsilon$. These arguments can be extended to the semiparametric AMs, with the obvious difference that the effect of spatial externalities may not be homogenous over space. Hence equation (1) can be extended by including the smooth term $f_4(\sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} y_j)$ on the right hand side (SAR-AM):

$$y_i = X_i^* \alpha^* + f_1(x_{1i}) + f_2(x_{2i}) + f_3(x_{3i}, x_{4i}) + f_4(\sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} y_j) + \dots + \varepsilon_i \quad (2)$$

It is worth noticing that the interpretation of positive spatial autocorrelation in terms of interregional spillovers and spatial contagion is based on the assumption of stationarity of the data generating process. When the DGP is non-stationary, the evidence of spatial dependence may be induced by the presence of spatial trends so that, after removing them, test statistics may reveal the absence of spatial autocorrelation or a random dispersion pattern (Diggle and Ribeiro, 2007). Spatial trend in the data can be

² The characteristic element of this matrix, w_{ij} , summarizes the interaction between regions i and j . Throughout the paper, we use a *knn* (*k-nearest-neighbours*) matrix with $k = 5$. The results are robust to the alternative choices of k .

properly captured by including in the model a nonparametric smooth interaction between latitude and longitude, $f(lat_i, lon_i)$.³

Finally, because of the feedbacks between y_i and its spatial lag term $\sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} y_j$, $f_4(\cdot)$ enters endogenously into equation (2), that is $f_4(\cdot)$ and ε_i are correlated. In order to deal with endogeneity problems in the estimation of nonparametric models, we use the procedure proposed by Blundell and Powell (2003), which consists of extending the “control function” method to semiparametric models through a two-step procedure. In the first one, an auxiliary semiparametric regression $\sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} y_j = X_i^* \alpha^* + f_1(x_{1i}) + f_2(x_{2i}) + f_3(x_{3i}, x_{4i}) + h(Z_i) + \dots + v_i$ is considered, with Z_i being a set of conformable instruments and v_i a sequence of random variables satisfying $E(v_i | Z_i) = 0$.⁴ Moreover, if Z_i and ε_i are independent, then it follows that $E(\varepsilon_i | v_i, Z_i) = E(\varepsilon_i | v_i)$ and, thus, $E(\varepsilon_i | \sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} y_j) \neq 0$ when $E(\varepsilon_i | v_i) \neq 0$. The second step consists of estimating an AM of the form:

$$y_i = X_i^* \alpha^* + f_1(x_{1i}) + f_2(x_{2i}) + f_3(x_{3i}, x_{4i}) + f_4(\sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} y_j) + f_5(\hat{v}_i) \dots + \varepsilon_i \quad (3)$$

Furthermore, as the employment rate and the participation rate have common components with the dependent variable by construction, a second endogeneity problem is likely to emerge for Δeld_i . Therefore another first step is estimated and the corresponding residual vector is introduced as an additional regressor in the second step.

³ While rarely considered for modelling economic data, spatial and spatio-temporal trends are widely included in biological models using generalized additive models (see, for example, Augustin et al. 2009).

⁴ We included in the set of instruments the first and second order spatial lags of all exogenous or predetermined variables.

4.2 Results

Table 1 reports the estimation results and diagnostics tests for our empirical model applied to analyze the spatial effects characterizing unemployment dynamics in Italian LLS. After considerable experimentation, we have opted for a regression model which admits two additional terms, \hat{v}_1 and \hat{v}_2 , representing the estimated residuals from two distinct first step estimations for the spatial lag of the dependent variable and for excess labour demand growth rate, respectively.

Table 1

Estimates for Model 1 provide strong evidence of spatial dependence: the *Wy* term is statistically significant and signals the presence of spatial spillovers, implying that neighboring units exhibit a higher degree of spatial contagion than do units located far apart even controlling for the presence of a spatial trend. All terms but *lil* and *den* enter non-linearly, as suggested by the estimated degrees of freedom (*edf*). Furthermore, *Wy* and Δeld turn out to be strong endogenous, since the two smooth terms $f(\hat{v}_1)$ and $f(\hat{v}_2)$ are statistically significant. As for the choice of the set of instruments, diagnostics tests point out that the null of excludability of the instruments from the first steps is strongly rejected. Finally, the specification is able to explain about 90 percent of cross-sectional variation in unemployment rates.

On the grounds of these findings, we specify a regression model where the linearity constraint is imposed for *lil* and *den*. In keeping with our theoretical priors, we document that sectoral shifts worsen labour market performances: *ceteris paribus*, labour pushed out from declining industries has not been absorbed into the other sectors leading to an increase (or to a relatively lower reduction) in unemployment rates in those areas where labour relocation phenomena has taken place. Moreover, the positive

coefficient of population density suggest that unemployment dynamics tend to be rather unfavourable in highly agglomerated LLS, as previously documented by Niebuhr (2003) for the case of European regions.

Graphs in Figure 4a-4c shows the fitted univariate smooth functions (solid line) for Model (2), alongside Bayesian confidence intervals (shaded gray areas) at the 95 percent level of significance (see Wood, 2004). In each plot, the vertical axis displays the scale of the expected values of unemployment dynamics, while the horizontal one reports the scale of initial conditions (Figure 4a), excess demand growth rates (Figure 4b) and specialization (Figure 4c). The perspective plot in Figure 4d shows the joint effect of latitude and longitude - $f(lat,lon)$: while the vertical axis reads as the previous graph, the two axes of the horizontal plane report the scale of latitude and longitude.

Figure 4

Italian provinces with a higher initial unemployment are more likely to reduce unemployment rates than other provinces up to a threshold (corresponding to around 12 percent). After such a maximum level, $\ln u$ has no effect on unemployment dynamics, since the confidence intervals include the horizontal axis. As expected, high excess labour demand growth rate lowers almost monotonically regional unemployment dynamics, as also documented in Basile et al. (2010). Furthermore, increasing specialization seems to exert detrimental effects on local labour market performances. The evidence of relatively smaller decreases in unemployment rates for specialized areas is at odds with the Marshallian view of specialization induced intra-sector mobility acting as an effective force for reducing unemployment. By contrast, our results are consistent with the idea that inter-sectoral mobility helps absorb adverse

labour market shocks (Simon and Nardinelli, 1992; Ferragina and Pastore, 2008) and that sectoral diversification may offer more job opportunities and, thus, improving local labour market performances (Jacobs, 1969). The spatial trend surface reveals a northing process not captured by the explanatory variables.

Figure 4

Finally, the Moran I plot (Figure 5) illustrates that the relationship between residuals (horizontal axis) and their spatial lag (vertical axis) is nonlinear and not statistically significant at the usual confidence levels, suggesting that our empirical model is able to remove spatial dependence.

Figure 5

4.3 Extension

Using the classification provided by ISTAT, we classify Italian LLS into eight main categories according to their degree of specialization and their population density (namely, non specialized, urban, port, tourism, agriculture, textile, other Made in Italy and heavy manufacturing). ISTAT also categorizes LLS according to whether or not they constitute an ID. Accordingly, we are able to identify 156 IDs in Italy.

Table 2 shows some descriptive statistics for Italian LLS taking into account both pieces of information. More in details, we report for each group the absolute number of observations, their share in percentage values, the unemployment rate at the beginning period (2004) and the unemployment dynamics over the sample span covered in the analysis (2004-2008). The last row of the Table collects national average figures.

Table 2

Three main remarks ensue. *First*, those entities of references belonging to groups with a starting unemployment rate above 10 percent have experienced a reduction in

unemployment rates greater than the national average. *Second*, LLS without a clear specialization pattern have exhibited the strongest decline in unemployment rates. *Third*, as for highly specialized industrial areas (textile, heavy manufacturing and other Made in Italy productions) IDs have recorded relatively better labour market performances with respect to their no-IDs counterparts.

In order to better understand those dynamics, Table 3 collects the results from the analysis of variance applied to test if the difference in means across groups for unemployment rate changes is statistically significant. We observe that some groups (non-ID areas specialized in textile as well as regions specialized in other Made in Italy productions) appear to be less performing than non-specialized areas (the reference category), with the remaining groups showing no statistically significant deviations from the reference category.

Table 3

Now, it turns out to be particularly interesting to assess whether Model 2 is able to fully capture these differences in the unemployment performance of the various groups of LLS. Accordingly, in Model (3) we augment the set of regressors employed for the estimation of previous regression models with the inclusion of the dummy variables used for the analysis of variance (with non-specialized areas as reference category). Thus, Model 3 takes into account not only the overall degree of specialization of a LLS (through $\ln G$) but also where (how) that region specializes (through the set of dummy variables). Furthermore, since the degree of urbanization is captured by *urb*, we exclude the continuous variable *dens* from the regressors.

Table 4

Estimation results in Table 4 document that our empirical framework allows to capture the heterogeneity emerging from the analysis of variance: all dummy variables turn out to be not statistically significant at the usual confidence levels, but *mID*. This implies that the conditional mean does not vary across groups, with the exception of highly specialized non-IDs regions in textile productions, which are randomly distributed in space and thus do not exhibit clear spatial pattern, as Figure 6 shows.

Figure 6

5 Conclusions

In this work we present an empirical framework to assess the effects of sectoral shifts and industry specialization patterns on regional unemployment applied to Italian LLS data over the years 2004-2008. We argue that Italy represents an interesting case-study not only for the huge dispersion across space in unemployment rates due to her well-known North-South divide but also for the presence of strongly specialized LLS (Industrial Districts, IDs). Understanding cross-sectional variation and assessing the role of possible intra-sectoral spillovers driven by agglomeration forces are indeed issues of particular relevance when analyzing local labour market performances.

Three main features characterize our setup. *First*, the chosen territorial units allow a detailed territorial approach and are constructed according to economic criteria instead of administrative ones. *Second*, we focus on a period during which huge worker reallocation caused by changes in the international context has occurred. The ongoing process of structural change which is transforming the economies from manufacturing to service ones may have indeed insightful implications for local labour market performances, since they are likely to differ according to the forces which can be at

work. *Third*, the use of spatial econometric techniques along with nonparametric methods allows us to capture spatial contagion phenomena, spatial non-stationarity and spatial heterogeneity (nonlinearities or parameter heterogeneity).

In order to explain the cross-sectional variation in unemployment rate dynamics we assess the role of several potential determinants of local labour market performances, including measures of sectoral shifts and specialization, initial conditions, supply-demand mismatch and population density. Building on a semiparametric spatial auto-regressive framework, our econometric results document that local labour market performances are characterized by significant differences across space. We also find that that sectoral shifts and the degree of specialization exert a negative role on unemployment dynamics; by contrast, highly diversified areas turn out to be characterized by more favourable unemployment dynamics.

In an effort to sharpen our understanding of how local labour market performances vary across spaces, we also try to compare the performance of IDs with respect to other LLS so as to take into account not only the overall degree of specialization of a certain spatial unit but also where (how) that region specializes. Results from the analysis of variance point out that some groups (non-ID areas specialized in textile as well as regions specialized in other Made in Italy productions) appear to be less performing than non-specialized areas. Controlling for a number of possible determinants of unemployment dynamics and allowing for spatial dependence and nonlinearities, our empirical framework is able to capture such a heterogeneous pattern except for highly specialized non-IDs regions in textile productions. A fuller explanation of the reasons behind the relatively worse performance in terms of unemployment growth rates for those LLS is left for future research.

References

- Abraham K. G. and Katz L. F. (1986), Cyclical unemployment: Sectoral shifts or aggregate disturbances? *Journal of Political Economy*, 94(3), 507–522.
- Anselin L. (2004) Spatial Externalities, Spatial Multipliers and Spatial Econometrics, *International Regional Science Review*, 26, 153-166.
- Augustin N., Musio M., von Wilpert K., Kublin E., Wood S. and Schumacher M. (2009), Modelling spatiotemporal forest health monitoring data, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104, 899-911
- Basile R, Girardi A. and Mantuano M. (2010), *Interregional migration and unemployment dynamics: evidence from Italian provinces*, mimeo
- Becattini, G. (1991). “Il distretto industriale marshalliano come concetto socio-economico”. In G. Becattini et. al. (Eds.), *Distretti industriali e cooperazione tra imprese in Italia*. Firenze: Banca Toscana
- Blundell R. and J. Powell (2003) Endogeneity in Nonparametric and Semiparametric Regression Models, in Dewatripont M., L. Hansen, and S. J. Turnovsky (eds), *Advances in Economics and Econometrics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge University Press.
- Caroleo, F.E. and Pastore, F. (2009), “Structural Change and Labour Reallocation across Regions. A Review of the Literature”, *mimeo*, Università di Napoli
- Chiarini B. and Piselli P. (2000), Unemployment, wage pressure and sectoral shifts: Permanent and temporary consequences of intersectoral shifts. *Journal of Policy Modelling*, 22(7), 777–799.
- Contini, B. and Trivellato, U. (2006), *Eppur si muove. Dinamiche e persistenze nel mercato del lavoro italiano*, Il Mulino, Bologna

- Diggle and Ribeiro (2007). *Model-based Geostatistics*. New York : Springer
- Elhorst, J.P. (2003), “The Mystery of Regional Unemployment Differentials: Theoretical and Empirical Explanations”, *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 17, 709-748
- Ferragina, A.M. e Pastore, F. (2008), “Mind the Gap: Unemployment in the New EU Regions”, *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 22 (1)
- Isserman A., Taylor C., Gerking S. and U. Schubert (1986), Regional labor market analysis. In *Handbook of regional and urban economics*, ed. P. Nijkamp. Amsterdam: North-Holland
- Istat (1991), *I sistemi locali del lavoro 1991*, Roma
- Jacobs J. (1969), *The Economy of Cities*, Random House, New York
- Krajnyák K. and Sommer M. (2004), Czech Republic, *IMF country Report*, n. 4/265, August.
- LeSage, J.P. and R.K. Pace (2009), *Introduction to Spatial Econometrics*, CRC Press Taylor & Francis Group, Boca Raton, London, New York
- Lilien D.M. (1982), Sectoral shifts and cyclical unemployment. *Journal of Political Economy*, 90(4), 777–793.
- Marshall, A., 1890. *Principles of Economics*. MacMillan, London
- Neumann G.R. and Topel R. H. (1991), Employment risk, diversification, and unemployment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106(4), 1341–1365.
- Newell, A. e Pastore, F. (2006), “Regional Unemployment and Industrial Restructuring in Poland”, *Eastern European Economics*, 44 (3), pp. 5-28
- Niebuhr A. (2003), “Spatial Dependence of Regional Unemployment in the European Union”, *HWWA Discussion Paper*, 186

- Openshaw S. (1984), *The modifiable areal unit problem*. Geo Books, Norwich, United Kingdom
- Overman, H.G. e Puga, D. (2002), “Unemployment Clusters across Europe’s Regions and Countries”, *Economic Policy*, 34: 116-147
- Robson M. (2009), Structural change, specialization and regional labour market performance: Evidence for the UK. *Applied Economics*, 41(3), 275–293.
- Samson L. (1985), A study of impact of sectoral shifts on aggregate unemployment in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 18(3), 518–530.
- Schiffauerova A. and Beaudry C. (2009), Who’s right, Marshall or Jacobs? The localization versus urbanization debate, *Research Policy*, 38(2), 318-337
- Simon C. J. (1988), Frictional unemployment and the role of industrial diversity. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 103(4), 715–728.
- Simon, C.J. e Nardinelli, C. (1992), “Does Unemployment Diversità always Reduce Unemployment? Evidence form the Great Depression and After”, *Economic Enquiry*, 30 (2), pp. 384-397
- Wood S. N. (2004) “Stable and efficient Multiple Smoothing Parameter estimation for Generalised Additive Models”, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 99, 673-686
- Wood S.N. (2006), *Generalized Additive Models. An Introduction with R*, Boca Ratom: Chapman & Hall/CRC

Table 1 – Estimation results

	Model 1		Model 2	
Parametric terms (β and p values)				
Intercept	-1.581 (0.000)		-1.821 (0.000)	
<i>lil</i>	.		0.510 (0.056)	
<i>den</i>	.		0.548 (0.022)	
<i>Wy</i>	0.297 (0.000)		0.294 (0.000)	
Nonparametric terms				
	F test and p values	edf	F test and p values	edf
$f(\ln u)$	30.647 (0.000)	3.249	30.280 (0.000)	3.258
$f(\Delta eld)$	85.760 (0.000)	3.975	86.250 (0.000)	3.976
$f(\ln G)$	5.944 (0.000)	3.601	5.580 (0.000)	3.555
$f(lil)$	3.351 (0.068)	1.000	.	.
$f(den)$	4.011 (0.023)	1.500	.	.
$f(lat, lon)$	13.710 (0.000)	6.512	13.670 (0.000)	6.535
$f(\hat{v}_1)$	9.816 (0.000)	2.268	10.000 (0.000)	2.279
$f(\hat{v}_2)$	27.901 (0.000)	3.957	28.200 (0.000)	3.957
R^2 adj.	0.916		0.916	
GVC score	2.329		2.331	
F test - first step (<i>Wy</i>)	137.27 (0.000)		137.27 (0.000)	
F test - first step (Δeld)	26.788 (0.000)		26.788 (0.000)	

Notes: the dependent variable is the average growth rate of regional unemployment rate over the period 2004-2008. The total number of observations is 686. A 5NN spatial weights matrix has been used. F tests are used to investigate the overall (“approximate”) significance of smooth terms. edf (effective degrees of freedom) reflect the flexibility of the model. \hat{v}_1 and \hat{v}_2 refer to the residuals of the first step for Wy and Δeld , respectively. p -values are in parentheses.

Table 2 – Descriptive statistics by LLS type

Definition	Type	Observation		u	Δu	
		Freq.	Share			
Not specialized	<i>nosp</i>	220	32.1	13.32	-2.92	
Urban	<i>urb</i>	46	6.7	4.93	-1.57	
Port	<i>port</i>	26	3.8	12.54	-3.83	
Tourism	<i>tur</i>	82	12.0	6.87	-2.42	
Agriculture	<i>agr</i>	24	3.5	12.21	-2.41	
Textile	no IDs	<i>tnID</i>	35	5.1	9.13	-0.84
	IDs	<i>tID</i>	65	9.5	6.53	-2.07
Other Made in Italy	no IDs	<i>onID</i>	57	8.3	4.88	-0.64
	IDs	<i>oID</i>	75	10.9	4.43	-1.08
Heavy Manufacturing	no IDs	<i>hnID</i>	44	6.4	4.08	-2.08
	IDs	<i>hID</i>	12	1.7	7.54	-2.80
			686	100.0	8.89	-2.18

Table 3 – Analysis of variance for unemployment growth rates

Intercept	-2.925*** (0.000)
<i>urb</i>	1.346 (0.105)
<i>port</i>	-0.912 (0.391)
<i>tur</i>	0.501 (0.450)
<i>agr</i>	0.513 (0.642)
<i>tnID</i>	2.083* (0.026)
<i>tlID</i>	0.852 (0.239)
<i>onID</i>	2.283** (0.003)
<i>olID</i>	1.845** (0.007)
<i>hnID</i>	0.118 (0.889)
<i>hlID</i>	1.181 (0.437)

Notes: the dependent variable is the average growth rate of regional unemployment rate over the period 2004-2008. The total number of observations is 686. *p*-values are in parentheses.

Table 4 –

Model 3		
Parametric terms (β and p values)		
Intercept	-1.795	(0.000)
<i>lil</i>	0.477	(0.079)
<i>Wy</i>	0.274	(0.000)
<i>urb</i>	-0.076	(0.812)
<i>port</i>	0.327	(0.346)
<i>tur</i>	-0.079	(0.736)
<i>agr</i>	-0.165	(0.621)
<i>tnID</i>	0.601	(0.043)
<i>tID</i>	-0.038	(0.883)
<i>onID</i>	0.186	(0.503)
<i>oID</i>	0.101	(0.709)
<i>hnID</i>	0.074	(0.794)
<i>hID</i>	-0.277	(0.556)
Nonparametric terms		
	F test and p values	edf
$f(\ln u)$	27.241 (0.000)	3.366
$f(\Delta eld)$	90.531 (0.000)	3.978
$f(\ln G)$	3.724 (0.006)	3.370
$f(lat, lon)$	12.382 (0.000)	6.465
$f(\hat{v}_1)$	11.285 (0.000)	2.296
$f(\hat{v}_2)$	25.828 (0.000)	3.954
R^2 adj.	0.915	
GVC score	2.386	
F test - first step (<i>Wy</i>)	137.27 (0.000)	
F test - first step (Δeld)	26.788 (0.000)	

Notes: see Table 1.

Figure 1 – Density estimates of relative unemployment rates






Figure 2 – Choropleth maps of unemployment rates (quartile distribution)

A. 2004

B. 2008



C. Growth rate (2004-2008)




Figure 3 – Choropleth map of Lilien's indicator and Gini index

A. Lilien

B. Gini





Figure 4 – Partial effects of smooth terms




Figure 5 – Moran I Plots




Figure 6 – Textile LLS

