SSOAR

Open Access Repository

www.ssoar.info

# An econometric decision model for equalizing regional unemployment in West and East Germany

Tangian, Andranik S.

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version
Arbeitspapier / working paper

**Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:**
SSG Sozialwissenschaften, USB Köln

**Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:**
Tangian, A. S. (2003). *An econometric decision model for equalizing regional unemployment in West and East Germany.* (WSI-Diskussionspapier, 115). Düsseldorf: Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaftliches Institut in der Hans-Böckler-Stiftung. https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-219393

**Nutzungsbedingungen:**
*Dieser Text wird unter einer Deposit-Lizenz (Keine Weiterverbreitung - keine Bearbeitung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.*
*Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.*

**Terms of use:**
*This document is made available under Deposit Licence (No Redistribution - no modifications). We grant a non-exclusive, non-transferable, individual and limited right to using this document. This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.*
*By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.*

gesis Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften

Mitglied der Leibniz-Gemeinschaft

# An econometric decision model for equalizing regional unemployment in West and East Germany

**Andranik S. Tangian**

**Diskussionspapier Nr. 115a**

**July 2003**

Privatdozent Dr. Dr. Andranik Tangian
WSI in der Hans Böckler Stiftung
Hans-Böckler-Straße 39
D-40476 Düsseldorf
Tel: +49 211 7778-259
Fax: +49 211 7778-190
Andranik-Tangian@Boeckler.De

# Abstract

Reducing disparities among regions within European countries is the aim of European and national structural policies. In particular, a European grant contributes to the German governmental program for equalizing regional unemployment. The goal is to bring it down to the national average by creating new and/or by safeguarding existing jobs.

In the given paper the distribution of available aid among 271 German labor market regions is considered as an econometric decision problem. At first, the dependence of the unemployment rate on the amount of aid is estimated for each eligible region. Using this dependence, the variance of regional unemployment rates is expressed as a function of the regional subsidies. The optimal aid distribution among regions is obtained by minimizing this variance subject to the total budget constraint and administrative restrictions.

The optimal figures computed are compared with statistical data for 2000–2002. They show that the regional unemployment in West Germany could be equalized better (with variance 3.50 against the actual 4.40) and with a simultaneous decrease in the average unemployment in West Germany from 7.45 to 7.28%. In East Germany all regions are eligible, implying no administrative constraints and a high optimization flexibility. It enables almost perfectly equalize regional indices down to the variance 0.28 against the actual 9.76.

Under the model assumptions, the actual results of the equalizing policy could be attained by half the budget granted. These underused possibilities explain the low efficiency of active labor market policies reported in empirical studies. To improve their performance, some tools for optimally distributing subsidies and predicting their effects are suggested.

**Keywords:** European Commission, structural fund grants, regional policy, equalizing regional unemployment rates, econometric optimization model.

## Acknowledgements

The help of several persons is gratefully acknowledged. Astrid Ziegler (Hans Böckler Stiftung in Düsseldorf) discussed the problem formulation and collected statistical data. Paul Elhorst (University of Groningen), Tobias Hagen (Zentrum für Europäische Wirtschaftsforschung in Mannheim), and Michael Lechner (University of St. Gallen) provided their unpublished articles on regional unemployment and/or gave useful hints. Josef Gruber (University of Hagen) read the draft and commented on it. Achim Truger (Hans Böckler Stiftung in Düsseldorf) thoroughly read the paper, made remarks and improved the style.

# Contents


**1 Introduction** **11**

1.1 Regional unemployment . . . . . 11

1.2 Active labor market policies . . . . . 12

1.3 Unemployment and optimization . . . . . 14

1.4 Econometric decision models . . . . . 16

1.5 About the given work . . . . . 18

**2 Model** **21**

2.1 Idea . . . . . 21

2.2 Data . . . . . 21

2.3 Unemployment as a function of subsidies . . . . . 22

2.4 Index of unemployment disparity . . . . . 23

2.5 Equalization of regional unemployment . . . . . 23

**3 Results** **25**

3.1 Overview . . . . . 25

3.2 Details . . . . . 29

3.3 Redistribution of aid . . . . . 38

3.4 Planning the budget for an equalization policy . . . . . 40

3.5 Economic gain from the model . . . . . 42

**4 Conclusion** **45**

4.1 Further perspectives . . . . . 45

4.2 Recapitulation . . . . . 45

**5 References** **47**

# List of Tables

3.1 Equalization of unemployment . . . . . 30
3.2 Economic gain from the unemployment equalization . . . . . 43

# List of Figures

1.1 Econometric optimization model . . . . . 15

3.1 Equalization of unemployment in **West** Germany (regions 1–204) . . . . . 26
3.2 Equalization of unemployment in **East** Germany (regions 205–271) . . . . 27
3.3 Equalization of unemployment in the **whole** of Germany (regions 1–271) . 28
3.4 Redistribution of aid among German regions . . . . . 39
3.5 Planning the budget of an unemployment equalization policy . . . . . 41

# Chapter 1

# Introduction

## 1.1 Regional unemployment

The regional unemployment rate is one of most important indicators of socio-economical equilibrium. Besides, it characterizes the regional governmental performance and serves as a governmental assistance criterion. Its equalization all over the country is expected to improve the national output and to decrease the inflation pressure (Taylor 1996).

According to Fothergill (2001) and Elhorst (2003), the unemployment disparity among regions within countries is becoming a source of troubles in the European Union. They are getting comparable with that among the countries themselves (Elhorst 1995, Taylor and Bradley 1997, European Commission 1999). The extension of the European Union to the East, where the economical imbalance is aggravated by transition processes, makes this problem even more acute.

Compared with the unemployment at national and intra-national levels, the regional unemployment is relatively little studied. The 3630 page *Handbook of Labor Economics* (Ashenfelter and Layard 1986, Ashenfelter and Card 1999) contains nothing on regional unemployment, and the *Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics* contains just a half-relevant chapter on urban unemployment (Crampton 1999). All of this illustrates how far the topic is from the mainstream research.

The belief that the nature of regional unemployment is similar to that of unemployment in general is rather superficial. The factors which are thought to explain disparities among countries (e.g., Phelps 1994, Malinvaud 1994, Bean 1994, OECD 1994, Scarpetta 1996), like institutions of wage bargaining, social security, retirement, and taxes are not relevant to regions. Indeed, they differ between countries but not between regions within countries; consequently some other factors should exist.

Elhorst (2003) has reviewed 41 empirical studies, where regional unemployment differentials are explained with the help of regional data. These models (some are not implemented in formulas) are classified as follows:

1. **Single equation models** (one independent and one dependent variable):

   (a) *empirical models*, mostly with no equations but nevertheless suggesting factors which might be used as explanatory variables,

(b) *the inverse unemployment-vacancy relationship*, or the Beveridge curve (e.g., Jones and Manning 1992, Holzer 1993),

(c) *the cyclical sensitivity model* which explains the regional unemployment as a linear function of the national unemployment; such a model makes sense if the regional and national unemployment *cointegrate* in the sense of Engle and Granger (1987) into an equilibrium configuration (e.g., Chapman 1991, Martin 1997, Baddeley et al. 1998),

(d) *the amenity model* which explains the regional unemployment as a function of aggregated attractiveness of the regions, for instance, reflected by the wage-to-infrastructure-index ratio (e.g., Marston 1985, Montgomery 1993).

2. **Implicit models**

(a) *the migration-based model* which explains the regional unemployment by migration flows (e.g., Molho 1995, Groenewold 1997),

(b) *the NAIRU model* (= non-accelerating inflation rates of unemployment), or the Phillips and wage-setting curves (e.g., Jones and Hyclak 1989, Payne 1995),

(c) *the Blanchard–Katz model* (1992) with four equations which links the regional unemployment rate to labor supply, labor demand, wage-setting, and migration of both population and firms; a similar study on the regional unemployment in the European Union is performed by Decressin and Fatás (1995).

3. **The accounting identity models** which are based on estimating the impact of a single individual, depending on his identification either as a local unemployed, or migrant, in-commuter, or out-commuter, etc. (e.g., Gordijn and Wissen 1992, Wissen and Ekamper 1995).

4. **The simultaneous models with interactions**, which take into account the feedback of the regional unemployment to the explanatory labor market variables, like the labor force participation rate, degree of employment and earnings, labor demand, etc. (e.g., Bilger et al. 1991, Blanchard and Katz 1992, Blackaby and Manning 1992, Decressin and Fatás 1995).

As concluded by Elhorst, the models reviewed provide clear-cut trends in the interaction between the regional unemployment and other labor market variables. It should be noted however that these models directly or indirectly assume a kind of labor market equilibrium, which is a certain idealization. The factors which violate the equilibrium, like governmental creation of new jobs, are not explicitly taken into account.

## 1.2 Active labor market policies

Active labor market policies are aimed at reducing unemployment and are implemented in all developed countries (Fay 1996, Heckman et al. 1999, Martin 2000, Steiner and Hagen 2002). They fall into three main schemes.

1. *Job creation* is offering subsidies to wages mainly for short-running projects in non-profit organizations. These jobs are often given to former long-term unemployed and are usually restricted to terms of about one year.

2. *Structural adjustments* is also offering wage subsidies but with other goals and in a closer collaboration with private firms. The subsidies are aimed at integrating the employees into the main activities and are given for terms of about three years.

3. *Public training* is a number of educational measures paid by the employment office. They are aimed at improving the chances for employment and increasing the employment stability.

According to Bundesanstalt für Arbeit (2003b), during the period of 1990–2002 only in East Germany 6.5 Mio workers, which is about the number of active employees, were involved in these programs with the overall budget 138 billion EURO. Expenditures of such a range require systematic analysis of their effects.

Microeconomic studies are based on comparisons between groups of participants and groups of non-participants; for surveys see Hagen and Steiner (2000) and Hujer and Caliendo (2001). As follows from these surveys, there is no clear evidence of either positive, or negative effects of the German active labor market policies on the future prospects of the participants. This indefiniteness has been also confirmed by the recent report based on large administrative data (Hujer et al. 2003).

Hagen (2003) criticizes the microeconomic approach for its *stable unit treatment value assumption* (Rubin 1980). In the given context it means that the control groups of non-participants are not affected by the programs. Since the programs are very extensive, their indirect effects on the non-participants are likely to be quite significant. It implies a violation of the basic assumption, making questionable the microeconomic investigations.

The macroeconomic approach, on the contrary, assumes simultaneity and reciprocal influence of all factors within the economy. Several authors selected it as more appropriate for estimating the indirect and *net* effects of active labor market policies (Heckman et al. 1999). However, the macroeconomic studies based on regional data reveal no unambiguous trends either (Büttner and Pray 1998, Steiner et al. 1998, Hagen and Steiner 2000, Schmid et al. 2001, Blien et al. 2002, Fertig et al. 2002, Hagen 2003).

In the most recent study Hagen (2003) applied three macroeconomic approaches to East German regional data:

- an augmented matching function approach which evaluates the effects of the active labor market policies on regional matching efficiency,

- a reduced-form approach based on the Beveridge curve which assesses the effects on the regional job seeker rate, including both unemployed and participants in the active labor market policies,

- a regional labor demand approach.

The main finding was a certain negative effect of job creation and no significant effect of structural adjustments and of public training on the regional employment. In spite of having used alternative approaches, a number of questions remained open.

It should be noticed that both micro- and macro- modelling do not take into account such general factors as accelerating technological transformations with new requirements to the employees, support of Eastern Europe and globalization which channelled financial flows out of developed countries and moved some industries and services to the Third World, and the recession which started in Asia in the mid-1990s and then expanded to the West. Their negative implications can mask the positive effect of the active labor market policies, without which the labor market situation might become much worse.

## 1.3 Unemployment and optimization

The point left with little attention is the quality of realizing governmental programs. According to Lechner and Smith (2003), "caseworkers do not do a very good job of allocating their unemployed clients to the subprograms so as to maximize their subsequent employment prospects." It can imply that not the policies intended but their implementation is responsible for their low efficiency reported in empirical studies. In a market economy, underused possibilities and a non-optimal behavior often cause redistributions and structural shifts which can lead away from the results expected. For instance, an imbalanced job creation causes migrations which reduce local effects.

Lechner and his colleagues (2003) took part in developing a statistical expert system which customizes the offer for each particular unemployed client. This may be the only instance of any kind of optimization approach in the vast research on active labor market policies. (In a personal communication Lechner was somewhat surprised to learn about my optimization interpretation of his work. Elhorst after having compiled a comprehensive survey was not aware of any optimization approach.)

Such a general neglect of optimization methods is amazing in two respects. The role which optimization plays in the modern economy is hard to overestimate (Samuelson 1971). As far as it concerns market relations, the (quasi) optimization is guided by 'the invisible hand', Adam Smith's (1776) metaphor for competition. This, however, is not the case in the public sector with central planning and budget governmental programs. Consequently, optimization should be primarily applied in the public sector and particularly in the domain discussed.

On the other hand, almost all quantitative studies on unemployment are essentially econometrical. Yet the founders of econometrics, the first winners of the Nobel Prize in economics (1969) Jan Tinbergen and Ragnar Frisch always linked econometrics to optimization. Among other things, both Tinbergen and Frisch were faced to unemployment problems and in the 1950s made pioneering contributions to econometric optimization models (Frisch 1963, Tinbergen 1952, 1956, see also Johansen 1974); this topic was selected by Frisch for his Nobel Address (1970). Consequently, there exist also historical prerequisites for interactions between unemployment studies, econometrics, and optimization.

How does it work in practice? To give an idea, imagine that we optimize unemployment vs. inflation within $0 \div 10\%$ by controlling inflation by the Central Bank's interest rate. The *operational space* is two dimensional, with axes being the unemployment rate $U$ and the inflation rate $I$ shown in Figure 1.1. (The direction of axes is inverted to keep the top-right direction of improvement as traditional in utility theory.)




Figure 1.1: Econometric optimization model

Certainly, not every combination of indices in the plain Unemployment–Inflation is attainable. Econometrical methods based on statistical observations enable us to estimate the analytical relation between unemployment and inflation called the Phillips curve. In Figure 1.1 it is shown by the line $U + I = 12\%$. Thus an econometric model imposes a *constraint*, restricting the feasible domain.

Next a policy maker has to decide which combinations of indices are preferable. In real multidimensional situations it is not that easy and an *objective function* (= utility function) which takes greater values at better alternatives is defined.

Figure 1.1 depicts the map of the utility hill with *indifference curves*, along which the preference remains constant. They are level curves of the objective function $y = -(U - 10)(I - 10)$. Its values lie in the third dimension beyond the plane, determining the relief of the utility hill.

Finally the *optimal solution*, that is, the preferable combination of unemployment and inflation rates, is found as the highest utility point along the Phillips curve from the following optimization problem

$$\begin{array}{rlcl} \text{minimize} & (U-10)(I-10) & \Longleftrightarrow & \text{maximize} \quad -(U-10)(I-10) \\ \text{subject to} & U + I = 12 & & \\ & 0 \le U \le 10 & & \\ & 0 \le I \le 10 \ . & & \end{array}$$

In Figure 1.1 the optimum is attained at the point (6%, 6%) where the constraint line is tangential to an indifference curve. To attain the optimum, the Central Bank has to cause the 6%-inflation by appropriately adjusting the interest rate (for this purpose

another econometric estimation may be needed).

Summing up what has been said, the objective function represents the desired, the constraint derived from the econometric model represents the feasible, and their interaction results in the optimal decision. Thus econometric equations can be regarded as constraints in optimization models. In a sense, optimization adds an active element, the choice, to descriptive econometric models, making the next step in controlling the situation.

## 1.4 Econometric decision models

Just this philosophy was developed by R. Frisch and J. Tinbergen. For the first time, the term 'decision model' (= econometric optimization model) was used in Frisch's work for the United Nations Economic and Employment Commission in 1949 (Bjerkholt and Strøm 2002). This work was published as late as in 1955 and the idea of decision models became popular owing to Tinbergen's *On the Theory of Economic Policy* (1952) where he acknowledged Frisch's priority. Both Tinbergen and Frisch strongly promoted the so-called quadratic-linear approach with a quadratic objective function maximized or minimized subject to linear constraints.

The bottle-neck was the objective function, and Frisch (1957, 1971) suggested the *Multiplex Method* to construct it from interviews. In the mid-1950s he conducted "well planned interviews" with the Norwegian Minister of Finance Trygve Bratteli who became Prime Minister for the Labour Party in the early 1970s. Later this approach was tentatively used by Van Eijk and Sandee (1959), Chossudovsky (1972a–b), Van der Geest (1977), Merkies and Nijman (1983), Van Daal and Merkies (1984), Merkies and Hofkies (1991), Hüsges and Gruber (1991), and Medelin, Aspedale and Pachio (1994).

Frisch intended objective functions for decision models, but these plans had few successors. Frisch's ideas were not really elaborated but only discussed by Hallet and Rees (1983), Rustem and Velupillai (1984), Hughes Hallet (1991), and some others. In particular, Oswald (1985) explained perspectives of using econometric decision models for the wage formation. Recovering objective functions of trade union leaders and of leaders of employer's associations were supposed to imply the tradeoff between wage level and unemployment.

Tinbergen payed a considerable attention to econometric decision models but was inclined to derive the objective function from the formulation of the problem rather than from interviews (Kol and de Wolf 1993). Many of his objective functions are linear, but some are quadratic. It is the case of the model with fixed targets (= the ideal combination of variables), where the distance to the given point is minimized (Tinbergen 1956).[1] Tinbergen's approach was further developed by Theil (1964), Fox et al. (1966), Chow (1975) and other leading economists.

Tinbergen's view at econometric decision models was 'more objectivistic' than that of Frisch. Deriving objective functions from sources other than interviews looked more impartial and 'scientific'. Sharing this standpoint, several authors revealed objective func-

[1]Strictly speaking, it is difficult to avoid subjectivity even here. The distance in the econometric space is ill-defined. Axes are measured in different units like percent, absolute figures, dollar, or EURO. Determining their substitution rates brings the problem back to Frisch's interviews.

tions from panel data, in particular from tradeoffs observed. These studies are however not quite relevant to proper decision models, since they are not aimed at finding decisions but operate on the ones already made (like consumer choices). Moreover, a 'decision' is regarded as a kind of equilibrium-based optimization which is not exactly the subject of decision models. For a survey of related works see Dantzing at al. (1989a–b) where the objective function of the U.S. economy is constructed.

Tinbergen and his successors often considered abstract objective functions for analytical purposes, without numerically determining their coefficients. The linear-quadratic decision model which seemed quite operational was rather a theoretical framework. Persistent Frisch's efforts to develop methods for constructing objective functions were not more than practice-*oriented*. As concluded by Bjerkholt and Strøm (2002), "Frisch left this field of interest with work undone".

Gruber (2002) remembers that in 1965, after 35 years of existence of the Econometric Society and 16 years after the idea of econometric decision models had been introduced, he found no operational method for constructing objective functions. In both American and German dissertations Gruber (1965, 1967) had to use a heuristic quadratic objective function with no cross-products and roughly estimated coefficients of squared variables.

In subsequent years the situation did not improve much (Gruber 1979) and he tried to animate studies in econometric decision models by having organized four international conferences (Gruber 1983, 1991; Tangian and Gruber 1997, 2002). Interesting experiments were reported by Merkies; for the self-survey see Merkies (2002). A special method for constructing quadratic and additive objective functions was developed by Tangian (2001–2003a) and applied by Hilles and Tangian (2002), Schwarm (2002), and Teibach (2002).

Dealing with econometric decision models turned out to be more complex than initially expected. Compared with purely econometric models, they include an additional element, the objective function, and result in optimization problems to be solved. Unlike statistical methods applicable to almost all data sets, optimization techniques are not that universal. Respectively, econometric models are generally solvable but econometric decision models are not.

This makes building a decision model a kind of art. It assumes the knowledge of the subject domain. Selecting important factors, sorting out secondary ones, and formalizing ill-defined notions, relations, and preferences by variables, equalities, inequalities, and objective functions requires intuition and inventiveness. Configuring sophisticated optimization methods into a consistent model needs mathematical skills. Finally, the whole construct must be mathematically manageable and computable.

These claims explain why purely econometric models prevail over their optimization extensions. Another cause is the situation in mathematics and computer science. Statistics as a mathematical discipline was well developed before the invention of computers, and statistical packages became available already in the 1960–1970s. Optimization, or *mathematical programming*, was developed mainly after the Second World War just to meet new technical endeavors. Accordingly, optimization software was delayed, especially in the user-friendliness, by at least 20 years.

The last but not least cause of disregarding decision models in economics is the specificity of scholarly work itself. Statistics meets its habitual tasks of description, classification, analysis, and systematization. Decision making belongs to the competence of

engineers, managers, and policy makers. So a psychological factor is also present.

Summing up what has been said, econometric decision models are still in their infancy. Due to a delay in their development and other difficulties, they are much less used by scholars than purely econometric models. The latter are often sufficient as explaining the dependence of economic variables and thereby restricting the choice of economic policies to feasible ones. However, the policies restricted that way are still too numerous to make the final selection. For this purpose an operational objective function, which distinguishes a decision model, is required.

In particularly it is the case of active labor market policies. Econometric studies analyze their effects: short- and long-term employment, labor demand, migration, future prospects of participants, etc. It is recognized that labor market policies are implemented administratively with little use of optimization methods. Therefore, there is a hope that developing dedicated decision models can optimize them and improve their performance.

## 1.5 About the given work

Reducing disparities among regions within European countries is the aim of the European and national structural policy. In particular, a European grant contributes to the German governmental program for equalizing regional unemployment. The goal is to bring it down to the national average by creating new and/or by safeguarding existing jobs (Deutscher Bundestag 2002, Tetsch et al. 1996). It should be emphasized that this grant is given to *equalize* rather than to decrease the regional unemployment. The latter goal is subsidized from other sources.

The equalization of unemployment resembles the stabilization of an airplane. The stabilizer consumes some energy of the engine but is necessary to provide a safe flight. The equalization of unemployment takes some resources from the main budget of active labor market policies but prevents from structural disproportions. A limited grant naturally results in a trend to subsidize in the first turn the jobs which need less subsidies rather than the jobs which are 'expensive' for grant-givers. Since the 'price' of a job depends of prevailing regional industries and services, some regions are little supported and others, on the contrary, get too much aid. This decreases the average unemployment but increases the disparity among regions.

At present Germany is divided into 271 labor market regions, 204 in West Germany, and 67 in East Germany. The European employment policy restricts the regions to be supported to 23.4% of the total population (Crome and Schwengler 2000, Hassold and Jung 2000). Taking into account economic difficulties in East Germany, all its regions are eligible, and the budget is separate for West and East Germany. During the control period 2000–2002 all eligible regions received about six billion EURO; West Germany received 617.8 Mio, about 1/10, and East Germany — 5360.1 Mio, 9/10 of the total.

In the given paper we develop an econometric decision model for redistributing the aid among eligible regions in East and West Germany. The optimization is performed to equalize regional unemployment, according to the goals of European and national structural policies.

The modelling falls into the following steps.

- **Collecting data on regional unemployment in Germany**

  These data are available from Bundesamt für Wirtschaft und Ausfuhrkontrolle (2003), Bundesanstalt für Arbeit (2003a), and Statistisches Bundesamt (2003).

- **Explaining regional unemployment rates as functions in regional subsidies**

  Effects of active labor market policies on the regional unemployment have been outlined in Section 1.2. As revealed by Hagen (2003) and several other authors, the regional unemployment rates depend on the subsidies granted to the regions. For our study, we use the simplest linear estimation directly derived from the available statistical figures.

- **Operationalizing the criterion of regional unemployment disparity**

  For this purpose, the least variance of regional unemployment rates is appropriate. The variance measures the mean deviation of regional rates from the national average, exactly what is required to minimize.

  The criterion of least variance, not always explicitly, is used in models of market stabilization (Gruber 1965, 1967), general economic stabilization (Pindyck 1973, Friedman 1975), and optimal control (Chow 1975, Blanchard and Fischer 1989). For using objective functions in budget distribution problems see Fandel and Gal (2001) and Tangian (2003b).

- **Expressing the regional unemployment disparity in regional subsidies**

  To express the variance $\mathsf{V} = \mathsf{V}(\text{Regional unemployment rates})$ as a function of regional subsidies it suffices to replace the Regional unemployment rates in $\mathsf{V}$ by the linear functions estimated at the previous step:

$$\text{Regional unemployment rate} = A \cdot \text{Regional subsidy} + B \quad \rightarrow \quad \mathsf{V} \ .$$

  Since the variance is a quadratic function in its entries, this linear substitution results in a quadratic objective function in regional subsidies.

- **Building a decision model**

  It remains to impose the total budget constraint and to restrict the aid to the eligible regions. The problem operationalized that way is linear-quadratic, with the quadratic variance function minimized subject to a linear budget constraint and eligibility restrictions.

- **Solving the optimization problem**

  The linearly restricted quadratic programming problem is implemented in a computer program written in the MATLAB programming environment. For larger applications it might be possible to use the fast algorithm (Tangian 2001).

- **Analyzing the optimal solution**

  The equalization is performed for West Germany and East Germany with separate budgets. The figures computed are compared with the actual statistical data for 2000–2002. They show how to improve the distribution of European and national

grants among the eligible regions. In West Germany, the variance (of regional unemployment) can be reduced from the actual 4.40 to 3.50 with a simultaneous decrease in the average regional unemployment from the actual 7.45% to 7.28%. In East Germany all regions are eligible, implying no administrative constraints and a high optimization flexibility. It enables an almost perfect equalization of regional indices with the variance 0.28 against the actual 3.12.

If the total budget were not separated for East and West Germany, the overall equalization could be much better, with the variance 17.32 against the actual 27.29. Moreover, the average regional unemployment also decreases to 9.49% against the actual 10.11%. It would however require to redistribute the aid to East Germany and reduce the budget of West Germany to 110 Mio EURO against the actual 617 Mio.

Chapter 2, "Model", contains rigorous assumptions and mathematical propositions. The 'motor' of the model is the objective function, which operationalizes the idea of equalization. As often happens in new applications, an additional theoretical development is needed. In our case, we introduce the *variance operator* which reduces computing the variance to a vector/matrix multiplication, separates linear and quadratic operations, and thereby makes the optimization problem solvable.

Chapter 3, "Results", explains the model output represented by figures and tables. Then we comment on the recommended redistribution of the budget among the eligible regions. Next we suggest a tool for predicting the equalization effects of subsidies of variable size, which may be useful while planning a future equalization policy. Finally, we estimate the economic gain from using the model.

Under the model assumptions, the actual results of the equalizing policy could be attained by half the budget granted. These underused possibilities explain the low efficiency of active labor market policies reported in empirical studies.

The last chapter "Conclusion" outlines perspectives for further developments and recapitulates the main results of the paper.

# Chapter 2

# Model

## 2.1 Idea

Imagine 20 pipes of different profiles with different levels of water. Imagine that we have to refill some 'eligible' pipes with totally 10 liter water to the end of equalizing the levels. Since some pipes are larger than others, the first question to be answered is: How fast can every pipe be refilled, i.e., which amount of water does increase its level by 1 cm?

This analogy helps to understand our task. The pipes are regions, the water levels are regional unemployment rates, and water is the subsidies given to regions which are transformed into jobs and change the unemployment rate.

An essential assumption here is the linear dependence of the regional unemployment on the number of subsidized jobs. In reality it is not that simple, but such an assumption literally meets the formulation of the problem: The grants are expected to have an effect, otherwise giving grants has no sense. The linearity is also not very restrictive. Indeed, the Taylor expansion of a process contains constant, linear, quadratic, and other constituents of higher degrees with vanishing role. Consequently, the first-order approximation can be always assumed linear.

## 2.2 Data

To be specific, consider West Germany with 204 labor market regions indexed by

$$r = 1, \ldots, 204 \ .$$

The same model will be applied to East Germany and to the whole of Germany.

Introduce vector notation for input data.

$\mathbf{u}$ the column 204-vector of regional numbers of **u**nemployed in 2002,

$\boldsymbol{u}$ the column 204-vector of regional $\boldsymbol{u}$nemployment rate in 2002, in %,

$\boldsymbol{a}$ the column 204-vector of $\boldsymbol{a}$id to regions from national German and European sources in the control period 2000–2002, in Mio EURO,

$\boldsymbol{j}$ the column 204-vector of $\boldsymbol{j}$obs subsidized in 2000–2002, in the number of jobs; if the $r$th region is not subsidized, the corresponding coordinate $j_r = 0$.

## 2.3 Unemployment as a function of subsidies

For each eligible region $r$ express the regional unemployment rate $y_r$ as a linear function of grant amount $x_r$, which we rewrite in an equivalent form better adaptable for interpretation:

$$\begin{aligned} y_r &= A_r + B_r \cdot x_r \\ &= \underbrace{n_r}_{\substack{\text{net}\\ \text{unem-}\\ \text{ploy-}\\ \text{ment}\\ \text{rate}}} - \underbrace{\frac{1}{p_r}}_{\substack{\text{'price' to}\\ \text{reduce}\\ \text{unem-}\\ \text{ployment}\\ \text{by 1\%}}} \cdot \underbrace{x_r}_{\substack{\text{grant}\\ \text{amount}}} . \end{aligned}$$

The regional net unemployment (with no aid) is certainly a function of numerous variables. However, in our model all these variables are 'passive', since we have no influence on them and they remain constant. Respectively, they are 'packed' together into the constant term $n_r = A_r$.

Now we make some intermediate estimations. From the given data, one can compute successively the following vectors.

$\boldsymbol{n}$ the column 204-vector of $\boldsymbol{n}$et unemployment rates in 2002 (with no aid). For this purpose we add the $\boldsymbol{j}$obs subsidized to the number of $\mathbf{u}$nemployed, and then proportionally derive the net unemployment rate:

$$\boldsymbol{n} = (\mathbf{u} + \boldsymbol{j}).*\boldsymbol{u}./\mathbf{u} \qquad (\text{recall } \mathbf{u} \neq \boldsymbol{u}) \ , \tag{2.1}$$

where $.*$ and $./$ are element-by-element multiplication and division of vectors.

Our estimate assumes that those who got jobs due to the governmental subsidies would otherwise remain unemployed. In reality unemployed can find jobs themselves, migrate, get retired, etc. If necessary, a comprehensive explanation of net unemployment can be substituted into the model.

$\boldsymbol{e}$ the column 204-vector of aid $\boldsymbol{e}$ffect (= the decrement in regional unemployment rates)

$$\boldsymbol{e} = \boldsymbol{n} - \boldsymbol{u} \ ,$$

$\boldsymbol{p}$ the column 204-vector of '$\boldsymbol{p}$rices' (= amount of aid required, in Mio EURO) for a 1%-decrement of regional unemployment rates

$$\boldsymbol{p} = \boldsymbol{a}./\boldsymbol{e} \qquad (\text{for non-eligible regions put } p_r = 0) \ .$$

From here we obtain the equation for the regional unemployment rate $\boldsymbol{y}$ as a function of the aid $\boldsymbol{x}$ to the regions:

$$\boldsymbol{y} = \boldsymbol{n} - \underbrace{\text{diagonalize}(\boldsymbol{p}.^{-1})}_{=\boldsymbol{Q}} \boldsymbol{x} \ , \tag{2.2}$$

where $\boldsymbol{Q}$ is the diagonal $(204 \times 204)$-matrix with the diagonal elements obtained from the vector $\boldsymbol{p}$ by inverting its non-zero coordinates $p_r \neq 0 \ \rightarrow \ \frac{1}{p_r}$ .

If statistical data were available for several control periods then equation (2.2) could be estimated econometrically more accurately.

## 2.4 Index of unemployment disparity

As already mentioned, the *index of regional unemployment disparity* is defined as the variance of regional unemployment rates. Its computing is convenient in a vector-matrix form.

**Theorem 1 (Variance operator)**
*Consider a vector of $m$ observations $\boldsymbol{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_m)$. Then their variance*

$$\mathsf{V}_y = \frac{1}{m-1} \sum_{r=1}^{m} \left( y_r - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{s=1}^{m} y_s \right)^2 = \frac{1}{m-1} \left\| \boldsymbol{V}\boldsymbol{y} \right\|^2 \ , \tag{2.3}$$

*where the* variance operator $\boldsymbol{V}$ *is the $(m \times m)$-matrix*

$$\boldsymbol{V} = \begin{pmatrix} 1-\frac{1}{m} & -\frac{1}{m} & \ldots & -\frac{1}{m} & -\frac{1}{m} \\ -\frac{1}{m} & 1-\frac{1}{m} & \ldots & -\frac{1}{m} & -\frac{1}{m} \\ \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots \\ -\frac{1}{m} & -\frac{1}{m} & \ldots & -\frac{1}{m} & 1-\frac{1}{m} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \ldots & 0 & 0 \\ \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots \\ 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} - \frac{1}{m} \ .$$

Obviously, to minimize the variance, it suffices to minimize $\left\| \boldsymbol{V}\boldsymbol{y} \right\|^2$.

## 2.5 Equalization of regional unemployment

Substituting (2.2) into (2.3), express the regional unemployment disparity as a function of regional subsidies:

$$\frac{1}{204-1} \left\| \boldsymbol{V}\boldsymbol{y} \right\|^2 = \frac{1}{203} \left\| \boldsymbol{V}\boldsymbol{n} - \boldsymbol{V}\boldsymbol{Q}\boldsymbol{x} \right\|^2 \ .$$

We have to take into account that the total budget is fixed, subsidies cannot be negative, and not all regions are eligible to receive them. Thus, the task of equalizing the regional unemployment is reduced to the linearly constrained quadratic optimization problem.

**Theorem 2 (Equalization of regional unemployment)**
*The regional unemployment disparity is minimal if the 204-vector of regional subsidies $\boldsymbol{x} = \{x_r\}$ is a solution to the linearly constrained quadratic optimization problem*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize} \quad & \left\| \boldsymbol{V}\boldsymbol{Q}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{V}\boldsymbol{n} \right\|^2 \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \sum_r x_r = A = \text{sum}(\boldsymbol{a}) \quad \textit{(the total aid granted)} \\ & x_r \geq 0 \quad \text{for all regions } r \\ & x_{r_n} = 0 \quad \text{for non-eligible regions } r_n \ , \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

*where the* $(204 \times 204)$*-matrices* $\boldsymbol{V}, \boldsymbol{Q}$ *and* 204*-vector* $\boldsymbol{n}$ *are defined in previous sections. The predicted equalized regional unemployment rates, average unemployment, and variance are respectively*

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{y} &= \boldsymbol{n} - \boldsymbol{Q}\boldsymbol{x} \\ \overline{y} &= \frac{\mathrm{sum}(\boldsymbol{y})}{204} \\ \mathsf{V}_y &= \frac{1}{203}\|\boldsymbol{V}\boldsymbol{y}\|^2 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

The results computed with this model are discussed in the next chapter.

# Chapter 3

# Results

## 3.1 Overview

The model is implemented in the MATLAB programming language, Version 6, with the Optimization Toolbox, Version 2. The program performs three runs of the model from Theorem 2, separately for West and East Germany with their separate budgets, and then tentatively for the whole of Germany with a joint budget. Each run outputs a figure with an overview of the equalization stages; see Figures 3.1–3.3.

The detailed results of all the three runs are compiled in Table 3.1.

1. Figure 3.1 contains four graphs with their horizontal axes displaying West German region numbers 1–204 (their names are listed in Table 3.1), and vertical axes showing the unemployment rate. The regional unemployment rates are depicted by circles which stem from the average unemployment level, thereby visualizing the standard deviation. Exact numbers are given in Table 3.1.

   (a) The top graph shows the initial situation in 2000 with the average regional unemployment 7.24% and variance 5.15.

   (b) The next graph depicts the actual situation in 2002 (= vector $\boldsymbol{u}$) with the average regional unemployment 7.45% and variance 4.40. Compared with 2000, the situation got worse.

   (c) The third graph shows that the subsidies improved the situation. It displays the net regional unemployment estimated (= vector $\boldsymbol{n}$), as it could be without subsidies. The average regional unemployment is then 7.80% and the variance 6.78.

   (d) The bottom graph represents the indices equalized. Compared with the actual situation in graph (b), the average unemployment and especially the variance, which is the index optimized, are brought down to 7.28% and 3.50, respectively.

2. Figure 3.2 results from processing East German regions numbered 205–271, also listed by name in Table 3.1. In 2000–2002 the unemployment increased in spite of subsidies (17.68% in 2000 and 18.21% in 2002), which also could not equalize it (the variance 8.91 in 2000 and 9.76 in 2002). Moreover, the natural self-regulation could




Figure 3.1: Equalization of unemployment in **West** Germany (regions 1–204)




Figure 3.2: Equalization of unemployment in **East** Germany (regions 205–271)




Figure 3.3: Equalization of unemployment in the **whole** of Germany (regions 1–271)

equalize it even better: The variance of the net unemployment 2002 in graph (c) is 9.17. So, the first aim of the subsidies was not attained.

The bottom graph in Figure 3.2 shows the regional unemployment rates of East Germany almost perfectly equalized with the variance reduced to 0.28. Since all East German regions are eligible to receive subsidies, the equalization for East Germany is more flexible than in case of West Germany. The subsidies are thereby channelled to reduce the variance rather than the average unemployment, which holds at the actual level 18.21.

3. Figure 3.3 illustrates what would be possible if the budgets of West and East Germany were not separate. The average unemployment could be reduced from the actual 10.11% to 9.49% and the variance from 27.29 to 17.42. This would require to redistribute 507.406 Mio EUR from West to East: Instead of 617 Mio EURO West Germany receives 110 Mio, or only 1.8% of the mutual budget.

## 3.2 Details

Table 3.1 with the program detailed output contains five vertical sections.

1. The first section displays the labor market regions and their numbers. As already mentioned, West German regions have numbers 1–204, and East German regions have numbers 205–271.

2. Section *Data* has six columns. The first two columns display the regional unemployment for the year 2000, in absolute figures and in %. These data are not used in computing but are important as the initial state of the control period.

   Next columns are vectors $\mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{a}, \boldsymbol{j}$ of $\boldsymbol{u}$nemployment in 2002, the granted $\boldsymbol{a}$id in 2000–2002, and the subsidized $\boldsymbol{j}$obs. Blank spaces mean that the region is not eligible to receive subsidies, and is not processed by the model.

3. The next section *Econometric estimation* contains three columns. Two columns contain coefficients of equation (2.2). They are vector $\boldsymbol{n}$, the $\boldsymbol{n}$et unemployment, which would occur with no aid, and vector $\boldsymbol{p}$, the '$\boldsymbol{p}$rice' which the grant-givers should pay to reduce the regional unemployment by 1%.

   The last column of the section, "Aid per one subsidized job", is auxiliary. It shows how 'expensive' is one job for the grant-givers.

4. Section *Separate optimization* contains two parts one upon another. The upper part in rows 1–204 displays the optimization output for West Germany, and the bottom section in rows 205–271 concerns East Germany, processed separately.

   Column "Redistribution of aid" displays the vector $\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{a}$, how the actual $\boldsymbol{a}$id should be changed with regard to the solution $\boldsymbol{x}$ of the problem (2.4). A negative number means that the region should give the subsidy or its fraction back; a positive number means an additional grant.

   Column "Equalized unemployment rate 2002" shows the vector $\boldsymbol{y}$ obtained from (2.6). This column is illustrated by the bottom graphs in Figures 3.1–3.3.

Table 3.1: Equalization of unemployment

| Nr. | Labour market region | Data | | | | | | Econometric estimation | | | Separate equalization | | | | Joint equalization | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Unemployment rate 2000 | Unemployed 2000 | $u$ Unemployment rate 2002 | u Unemployed 2002 | $a$ Granted aid | $j$ Subsidized jobs | $n$ Net unemployment rate 2002 with no aid | $p$ Aid needed to reduce unemployment by 1% | Aid per one subsidized job | $x-a$ Redistribution of aid | $y$ Equalized unemployment rate 2002 | $y-u$ Increment in unemployment rate 2002 | Increment in unemployed 2002 | $x-a$ Redistribution of aid | $y$ Equalized unemployment rate 2002 | $y-u$ Increment in unemployment rate 2002 | Increment in unemployed 2002 |
| | | % | Number | % | Number | Mio EUR | Number | % | Mio EUR | EUR | Mio EUR | % | % | Number | Mio EUR | % | % | Number |
| 1 | Husum | 7.4 | 5724 | 8.0 | 6409 | 1.460 | 183 | 8.23 | 6.391 | 7978 | −1.460 | 8.23 | 0.23 | 183 | −1.460 | 8.23 | 0.23 | 183 |
| 2 | Heide | 9.0 | 5628 | 9.2 | 6030 | | | 9.20 | | | | 9.20 | | | | 9.20 | | |
| 3 | Itzehoe | 8.5 | 5530 | 9.3 | 6263 | | | 9.30 | | | | 9.30 | | | | 9.30 | | |
| 4 | Flensburg | 8.7 | 11268 | 9.1 | 12318 | 7.050 | 2020 | 10.59 | 4.724 | 3490 | 4.689 | 8.11 | −0.99 | −1343 | −7.050 | 10.59 | 1.49 | 2020 |
| 5 | Lübeck | 10.8 | 21477 | 10.7 | 21552 | 9.900 | 2727 | 12.05 | 7.312 | 3630 | 15.632 | 8.56 | −2.14 | −4306 | −9.900 | 12.05 | 1.35 | 2727 |
| 6 | Kiel | 9.3 | 31794 | 9.4 | 33275 | 0.930 | 104 | 9.43 | 31.655 | 8942 | −0.930 | 9.43 | 0.03 | 104 | −0.930 | 9.43 | 0.03 | 104 |
| 7 | Ratzeburg | 7.6 | 6524 | 7.8 | 7089 | | | 7.80 | | | | 7.80 | | | | 7.80 | | |
| 8 | Hamburg | 8.1 | 108313 | 8.3 | 115298 | | | 8.30 | | | | 8.30 | | | | 8.30 | | |
| 9 | Braunschweig | 10.4 | 25198 | 10.3 | 25748 | 7.440 | 1844 | 11.04 | 10.086 | 4035 | 12.612 | 9.05 | −1.25 | −3126 | −7.440 | 11.04 | 0.74 | 1844 |
| 10 | Salzgitter | 12.9 | 6794 | 12.0 | 6320 | 1.900 | 391 | 12.74 | 2.559 | 4859 | 10.935 | 7.73 | −4.27 | −2250 | 4.104 | 10.40 | −1.60 | −845 |
| 11 | Wolfsburg | 10.0 | 13791 | 9.0 | 13001 | | | 9.00 | | | | 9.00 | | | | 9.00 | | |
| 12 | Göttingen | 11.6 | 14421 | 11.1 | 14239 | 21.080 | 4393 | 14.52 | 6.156 | 4799 | 16.872 | 8.36 | −2.74 | −3516 | −3.492 | 11.67 | 0.57 | 728 |
| 13 | Goslar | 12.0 | 8859 | 11.4 | 8412 | 11.400 | 1435 | 13.34 | 5.862 | 7944 | 18.129 | 8.31 | −3.09 | −2282 | −0.959 | 11.56 | 0.16 | 121 |
| 14 | Helmstedt | 11.8 | 5491 | 11.3 | 5398 | 3.730 | 821 | 13.02 | 2.170 | 4543 | 7.902 | 7.66 | −3.64 | −1739 | 2.260 | 10.26 | −1.04 | −497 |
| 15 | Einbeck | 10.6 | 7910 | 10.9 | 8317 | 6.770 | 1587 | 12.98 | 3.255 | 4266 | 9.930 | 7.85 | −3.05 | −2328 | 0.839 | 10.64 | −0.26 | −197 |
| 16 | Osterode | 12.6 | 5143 | 12.8 | 5288 | 18.020 | 2601 | 19.10 | 2.862 | 6928 | 14.367 | 7.78 | −5.02 | −2074 | 6.573 | 10.50 | −2.30 | −949 |
| 17 | Hannover | 9.8 | 53271 | 10.1 | 57904 | | | 10.10 | | | | 10.10 | | | | 10.10 | | |
| 18 | Sulingen | 6.3 | 6471 | 6.6 | 6986 | | | 6.60 | | | | 6.60 | | | | 6.60 | | |
| 19 | Hameln | 11.3 | 8838 | 11.6 | 9315 | 8.260 | 372 | 12.06 | 17.830 | 22204 | 21.215 | 10.41 | −1.19 | −955 | −8.260 | 12.06 | 0.46 | 372 |
| 20 | Hildesheim | 8.8 | 12234 | 8.7 | 12539 | 7.700 | 740 | 9.21 | 14.997 | 10405 | −7.700 | 9.21 | 0.51 | 740 | −7.700 | 9.21 | 0.51 | 740 |
| 21 | Holzminden | 9.6 | 3631 | 10.7 | 4071 | 1.360 | 50 | 10.83 | 10.349 | 27200 | 16.602 | 9.10 | −1.60 | −610 | −1.360 | 10.83 | 0.13 | 50 |
| 22 | Nienburg | 7.3 | 4304 | 7.8 | 4777 | 1.280 | 120 | 8.00 | 6.533 | 10667 | −1.280 | 8.00 | 0.20 | 120 | −1.280 | 8.00 | 0.20 | 120 |
| 23 | Stadthagen | 8.4 | 6502 | 9.0 | 7184 | | | 9.00 | | | | 9.00 | | | | 9.00 | | |
| 24 | Celle | 10.3 | 8671 | 9.6 | 8389 | 15.940 | 1628 | 11.46 | 8.556 | 9791 | 7.009 | 8.78 | −0.82 | −716 | −15.940 | 11.46 | 1.86 | 1628 |
| 25 | Lüneburg | 9.7 | 7886 | 10.3 | 8729 | 3.540 | 369 | 10.74 | 8.130 | 9593 | 12.960 | 8.71 | −1.59 | −1351 | −3.540 | 10.74 | 0.44 | 369 |
| 26 | Zeven | 6.5 | 5170 | 6.8 | 5642 | | | 6.80 | | | | 6.80 | | | | 6.80 | | |
| 27 | Soltau | 7.7 | 5145 | 8.0 | 5527 | 2.180 | 330 | 8.48 | 4.564 | 6606 | −0.362 | 8.08 | 0.08 | 55 | −2.180 | 8.48 | 0.48 | 330 |
| 28 | Stade | 6.9 | 6524 | 7.0 | 6734 | | | 7.00 | | | | 7.00 | | | | 7.00 | | |
| 29 | Uelzen | 11.6 | 8125 | 11.5 | 8230 | 5.320 | 759 | 12.56 | 5.016 | 7009 | 16.760 | 8.16 | −3.34 | −2391 | 1.181 | 11.26 | −0.24 | −168 |
| 30 | Verden | 6.2 | 4099 | 6.0 | 4104 | | | 6.00 | | | | 6.00 | | | | 6.00 | | |
| 31 | Emden | 12.0 | 12511 | 11.2 | 12465 | 9.620 | 312 | 11.48 | 34.316 | 30833 | −9.620 | 11.48 | 0.28 | 312 | −9.620 | 11.48 | 0.28 | 312 |
| 32 | Westerstede | 8.0 | 4525 | 7.8 | 4762 | 4.570 | 146 | 8.04 | 19.110 | 31301 | −4.570 | 8.04 | 0.24 | 146 | −4.570 | 8.04 | 0.24 | 146 |
| 33 | Oldenburg | 9.5 | 12753 | 9.3 | 13054 | 2.920 | 628 | 9.75 | 6.527 | 4650 | 5.716 | 8.42 | −0.88 | −1229 | −2.920 | 9.75 | 0.45 | 628 |
| 34 | Osnabrück | 7.2 | 17761 | 7.6 | 19636 | | | 7.60 | | | | 7.60 | | | | 7.60 | | |

Table 3.1: Equalization of unemployment (continued)

| Nr. | Labour market region | Data | | | | | | Econometric estimation | | | Separate equalization | | | | Joint equalization | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Unemployment rate 2000 | Unemployed 2000 | $u$ Unemployment rate 2002 | u Unemployed 2002 | $a$ Granted aid | $j$ Subsidized jobs | $n$ Net unemployment rate 2002 with no aid | $p$ Aid needed to reduce unemployment by 1% | Aid per one subsidized job | $x-a$ Redistribution of aid | $y$ Equalized unemployment rate 2002 | $y-u$ Increment in unemployment rate 2002 | Increment in unemployed 2002 | $x-a$ Redistribution of aid | $y$ Equalized unemployment rate 2002 | $y-u$ Increment in unemployment rate 2002 | Increment in unemployed 2002 |
| | | % | Number | % | Number | Mio EUR | Number | % | Mio EUR | EUR | Mio EUR | % | % | Number | Mio EUR | % | % | Number |
| 35 | Wilhelmshaven | 11.6 | 12718 | 11.2 | 12611 | 8.760 | 901 | 12.00 | 10.947 | 9723 | 21.885 | 9.20 | −2.00 | −2251 | −8.760 | 12.00 | 0.80 | 901 |
| 36 | Cloppenburg | 7.5 | 5202 | 7.2 | 5322 | 13.990 | 1192 | 8.81 | 8.675 | 11737 | −13.895 | 8.80 | 1.60 | 1184 | −13.990 | 8.81 | 1.61 | 1192 |
| 37 | Lingen | 8.5 | 11638 | 7.8 | 11385 | 6.900 | 368 | 8.05 | 27.368 | 18750 | −6.900 | 8.05 | 0.25 | 368 | −6.900 | 8.05 | 0.25 | 368 |
| 38 | Nordhorn | 7.0 | 4144 | 7.8 | 4890 | 7.290 | 491 | 8.58 | 9.308 | 14847 | −7.290 | 8.58 | 0.78 | 491 | −7.290 | 8.58 | 0.78 | 491 |
| 39 | Leer | 11.0 | 7775 | 10.9 | 8160 | 9.990 | 581 | 11.68 | 12.872 | 17194 | 17.518 | 9.54 | −1.36 | −1019 | −9.990 | 11.68 | 0.78 | 581 |
| 40 | Vechta | 5.5 | 3506 | 5.2 | 3572 | | | 5.20 | | | | 5.20 | | | | 5.20 | | |
| 41 | Nordenham | 9.4 | 4124 | 8.8 | 3973 | 10.370 | 504 | 9.92 | 9.289 | 20575 | −1.018 | 8.91 | 0.11 | 49 | −10.370 | 9.92 | 1.12 | 504 |
| 42 | Bremen | 11.5 | 40395 | 11.0 | 39753 | 6.090 | 464 | 11.13 | 47.433 | 13125 | −6.090 | 11.13 | 0.13 | 464 | −6.090 | 11.13 | 0.13 | 464 |
| 43 | Bremerhaven | 11.7 | 17720 | 11.9 | 18359 | 18.860 | 1746 | 13.03 | 16.665 | 10802 | 28.240 | 10.21 | −1.69 | −2614 | −18.860 | 13.03 | 1.13 | 1746 |
| 44 | Hëxter | 7.7 | 5412 | 8.4 | 6109 | | | 8.40 | | | | 8.40 | | | | 8.40 | | |
| 45 | Düsseldorf | 7.9 | 60257 | 7.7 | 60234 | | | 7.70 | | | | 7.70 | | | | 7.70 | | |
| 46 | Duisburg | 11.3 | 62320 | 10.8 | 61568 | 48.660 | 3466 | 11.41 | 80.034 | 14039 | −48.660 | 11.41 | 0.61 | 3466 | −48.660 | 11.41 | 0.61 | 3466 |
| 47 | Essen | 10.7 | 38323 | 10.6 | 38770 | | | 10.60 | | | | 10.60 | | | | 10.60 | | |
| 48 | Krefeld | 11.0 | 12409 | 10.7 | 12200 | 0.090 | 6 | 10.71 | 17.103 | 15000 | 7.143 | 10.28 | −0.42 | −476 | −0.090 | 10.71 | 0.01 | 6 |
| 49 | Viersen | 7.6 | 10900 | 7.7 | 11362 | | | 7.70 | | | | 7.70 | | | | 7.70 | | |
| 50 | Mönchengladbach | 10.4 | 13325 | 11.0 | 14411 | 0.590 | 59 | 11.05 | 13.101 | 10000 | 18.613 | 9.58 | −1.42 | −1861 | −0.590 | 11.05 | 0.05 | 59 |
| 51 | Heinsberg | 9.1 | 9817 | 8.8 | 10070 | 23.110 | 1946 | 10.50 | 13.590 | 11876 | −11.756 | 9.67 | 0.87 | 990 | −23.110 | 10.50 | 1.70 | 1946 |
| 52 | Wuppertal | 9.0 | 23393 | 9.5 | 25093 | | | 9.50 | | | | 9.50 | | | | 9.50 | | |
| 53 | Schwelm | 9.1 | 15245 | 8.5 | 14465 | | | 8.50 | | | | 8.50 | | | | 8.50 | | |
| 54 | Remscheid | 8.0 | 4880 | 8.5 | 5237 | | | 8.50 | | | | 8.50 | | | | 8.50 | | |
| 55 | Kleve | 7.9 | 11088 | 7.2 | 10763 | | | 7.20 | | | | 7.20 | | | | 7.20 | | |
| 56 | Aachen | 10.1 | 25710 | 9.6 | 25476 | | | 9.60 | | | | 9.60 | | | | 9.60 | | |
| 57 | Köln | 9.4 | 77411 | 9.3 | 80586 | | | 9.30 | | | | 9.30 | | | | 9.30 | | |
| 58 | Leverkusen | 9.6 | 7478 | 9.4 | 7449 | | | 9.40 | | | | 9.40 | | | | 9.40 | | |
| 59 | Bonn | 6.5 | 26724 | 6.8 | 29611 | | | 6.80 | | | | 6.80 | | | | 6.80 | | |
| 60 | Düren | 8.1 | 9668 | 8.7 | 10929 | | | 8.70 | | | | 8.70 | | | | 8.70 | | |
| 61 | Euskirchen | 6.4 | 5434 | 7.2 | 6501 | | | 7.20 | | | | 7.20 | | | | 7.20 | | |
| 62 | Gummersbach | 8.3 | 11251 | 8.1 | 11498 | | | 8.10 | | | | 8.10 | | | | 8.10 | | |
| 63 | Gelsenkirchen | 13.3 | 73103 | 13.1 | 73939 | 21.870 | 2077 | 13.47 | 59.431 | 10530 | −21.870 | 13.47 | 0.37 | 2077 | −21.870 | 13.47 | 0.37 | 2077 |
| 64 | Münster | 6.5 | 23394 | 6.9 | 26603 | | | 6.90 | | | | 6.90 | | | | 6.90 | | |
| 65 | Borken | 6.3 | 10497 | 7.1 | 12621 | | | 7.10 | | | | 7.10 | | | | 7.10 | | |
| 66 | Steinfurt | 6.4 | 12881 | 6.6 | 14013 | | | 6.60 | | | | 6.60 | | | | 6.60 | | |
| 67 | Bielefeld | 9.2 | 26261 | 10.3 | 30106 | | | 10.30 | | | | 10.30 | | | | 10.30 | | |
| 68 | Gütersloh | 6.6 | 11309 | 7.9 | 14237 | | | 7.90 | | | | 7.90 | | | | 7.90 | | |

Table 3.1: Equalization of unemployment (continued)

| Nr. | Labour market region | Data | | | | | | Econometric estimation | | | Separate equalization | | | | Joint equalization | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Unemployment rate 2000 | Unemployed 2000 | $u$ Unemployment rate 2002 | u Unemployed 2002 | $a$ Granted aid | $j$ Subsidized jobs | $n$ Net unemployment rate 2002 with no aid | $p$ Aid needed to reduce unemployment by 1% | Aid per one subsidized job | $x-a$ Redistribution of aid | $y$ Equalized unemployment rate 2002 | $y-u$ Increment in unemployment rate 2002 | Increment in unemployed 2002 | $x-a$ Redistribution of aid | $y$ Equalized unemployment rate 2002 | $y-u$ Increment in unemployment rate 2002 | Increment in unemployed 2002 |
| | | % | Number | % | Number | Mio EUR | Number | % | Mio EUR | EUR | Mio EUR | % | % | Number | Mio EUR | % | % | Number |
| 69 | Detmold | 7.9 | 13579 | 9.7 | 17173 | | | 9.70 | | | | 9.70 | | | | 9.70 | | |
| 70 | Minden | 7.6 | 11670 | 8.6 | 13433 | | | 8.60 | | | | 8.60 | | | | 8.60 | | |
| 71 | Paderborn | 8.3 | 11335 | 8.8 | 12720 | | | 8.80 | | | | 8.80 | | | | 8.80 | | |
| 72 | Bochum | 11.4 | 20328 | 11.1 | 20229 | | | 11.10 | | | | 11.10 | | | | 11.10 | | |
| 73 | Dortmund | 12.6 | 68307 | 12.3 | 69006 | 87.710 | 7866 | 13.70 | 62.557 | 11151 | −87.710 | 13.70 | 1.40 | 7866 | −87.710 | 13.70 | 1.40 | 7866 |
| 74 | Hagen | 10.6 | 10537 | 10.8 | 10751 | 11.800 | 525 | 11.33 | 22.374 | 22476 | −9.140 | 11.21 | 0.41 | 407 | −11.800 | 11.33 | 0.53 | 525 |
| 75 | Lüdenscheid | 7.8 | 17335 | 8.4 | 19061 | | | 8.40 | | | | 8.40 | | | | 8.40 | | |
| 76 | Meschede | 6.3 | 8647 | 7.2 | 10166 | | | 7.20 | | | | 7.20 | | | | 7.20 | | |
| 77 | Siegen | 7.1 | 9890 | 7.3 | 10444 | | | 7.30 | | | | 7.30 | | | | 7.30 | | |
| 78 | Olpe | 6.0 | 4137 | 6.2 | 4478 | | | 6.20 | | | | 6.20 | | | | 6.20 | | |
| 79 | Soest | 7.6 | 10965 | 8.6 | 12998 | | | 8.60 | | | | 8.60 | | | | 8.60 | | |
| 80 | Korbach | 7.4 | 5854 | 7.2 | 6020 | 4.810 | 672 | 8.00 | 5.985 | 7158 | −4.810 | 8.00 | 0.80 | 672 | −4.810 | 8.00 | 0.80 | 672 |
| 81 | Kassel | 11.5 | 24146 | 10.7 | 23151 | 26.280 | 2442 | 11.83 | 23.284 | 10762 | −15.564 | 11.37 | 0.67 | 1446 | −26.280 | 11.83 | 1.13 | 2442 |
| 82 | Eschwege | 11.8 | 6445 | 10.2 | 5725 | 10.530 | 2179 | 14.08 | 2.712 | 4832 | 6.634 | 7.75 | −2.45 | −1373 | −0.679 | 10.45 | 0.25 | 141 |
| 83 | Schwalm-Eder | 9.2 | 8224 | 8.4 | 7913 | 15.590 | 1160 | 9.63 | 12.660 | 13440 | −13.950 | 9.50 | 1.10 | 1038 | −15.590 | 9.63 | 1.23 | 1160 |
| 84 | Hersfeld | 9.5 | 5715 | 7.9 | 4874 | 6.410 | 942 | 9.43 | 4.198 | 6805 | −0.483 | 8.02 | 0.12 | 71 | −6.410 | 9.43 | 1.53 | 942 |
| 85 | Marburg | 7.2 | 8448 | 6.7 | 8134 | | | 6.70 | | | | 6.70 | | | | 6.70 | | |
| 86 | Lauterbach | 7.8 | 4374 | 7.4 | 4345 | 3.240 | 449 | 8.16 | 4.237 | 7216 | −2.635 | 8.02 | 0.62 | 365 | −3.240 | 8.16 | 0.76 | 449 |
| 87 | Fulda | 7.3 | 7482 | 7.0 | 7531 | | | 7.00 | | | | 7.00 | | | | 7.00 | | |
| 88 | Wetzlar | 7.8 | 9902 | 7.6 | 10001 | | | 7.60 | | | | 7.60 | | | | 7.60 | | |
| 89 | Gießen | 8.3 | 10247 | 8.3 | 10682 | | | 8.30 | | | | 8.30 | | | | 8.30 | | |
| 90 | Limburg | 6.0 | 4907 | 6.4 | 5438 | | | 6.40 | | | | 6.40 | | | | 6.40 | | |
| 91 | Wiesbaden | 6.5 | 14788 | 6.7 | 15716 | | | 6.70 | | | | 6.70 | | | | 6.70 | | |
| 92 | Frankfurt/Main | 6.2 | 64646 | 6.1 | 66424 | | | 6.10 | | | | 6.10 | | | | 6.10 | | |
| 93 | Hanau | 6.9 | 14029 | 6.5 | 13708 | | | 6.50 | | | | 6.50 | | | | 6.50 | | |
| 94 | Darmstadt | 6.2 | 13145 | 6.1 | 13458 | | | 6.10 | | | | 6.10 | | | | 6.10 | | |
| 95 | Erbach | 6.4 | 3068 | 6.1 | 3019 | | | 6.10 | | | | 6.10 | | | | 6.10 | | |
| 96 | Altenkirchen | 6.6 | 4110 | 7.2 | 4778 | | | 7.20 | | | | 7.20 | | | | 7.20 | | |
| 97 | Montabaur | 5.5 | 5328 | 5.9 | 6049 | | | 5.90 | | | | 5.90 | | | | 5.90 | | |
| 98 | Neuwied | 6.8 | 5779 | 7.9 | 7004 | | | 7.90 | | | | 7.90 | | | | 7.90 | | |
| 99 | Ahrweiler | 5.8 | 3498 | 6.1 | 3839 | | | 6.10 | | | | 6.10 | | | | 6.10 | | |
| 100 | Koblenz | 6.7 | 14367 | 6.9 | 15425 | | | 6.90 | | | | 6.90 | | | | 6.90 | | |
| 101 | Bad Kreuznach | 8.2 | 6086 | 7.8 | 6192 | 1.030 | 81 | 7.90 | 10.095 | 12716 | −1.030 | 7.90 | 0.10 | 81 | −1.030 | 7.90 | 0.10 | 81 |
| 102 | Idar-Oberstein | 8.7 | 3638 | 8.9 | 3906 | 0.910 | 71 | 9.06 | 5.625 | 12817 | 3.567 | 8.27 | −0.63 | −278 | −0.910 | 9.06 | 0.16 | 71 |

Table 3.1: Equalization of unemployment (continued)

| Nr. | Labour market region | Data | | | | | | Econometric estimation | | | Separate equalization | | | | Joint equalization | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Unemployment rate 2000 | Unemployed 2000 | $u$ Unemployment rate 2002 | u Unemployed 2002 | $a$ Granted aid | $j$ Subsidized jobs | $n$ Net unemployment rate 2002 with no aid | $p$ Aid needed to reduce unemployment by 1% | Aid per one subsidized job | $x-a$ Redistribution of aid | $y$ Equalized unemployment rate 2002 | $y-u$ Increment in unemployment rate 2002 | Increment in unemployed 2002 | $x-a$ Redistribution of aid | $y$ Equalized unemployment rate 2002 | $y-u$ Increment in unemployment rate 2002 | Increment in unemployed 2002 |
| | | % | Number | % | Number | Mio EUR | Number | % | Mio EUR | EUR | Mio EUR | % | % | Number | Mio EUR | % | % | Number |
| 103 | Cochem | 5.6 | 1716 | 5.1 | 1664 | | | 5.10 | | | | 5.10 | | | | 5.10 | | |
| 104 | Simmern | 7.2 | 3603 | 7.0 | 3721 | | | 7.00 | | | | 7.00 | | | | 7.00 | | |
| 105 | Trier | 7.9 | 8203 | 7.4 | 8075 | | | 7.40 | | | | 7.40 | | | | 7.40 | | |
| 106 | Bernkastel-Wittlich | 6.3 | 3396 | 6.2 | 3560 | | | 6.20 | | | | 6.20 | | | | 6.20 | | |
| 107 | Daun | 5.8 | 1678 | 6.2 | 1901 | | | 6.20 | | | | 6.20 | | | | 6.20 | | |
| 108 | Bitburg | 6.2 | 2485 | 5.8 | 2474 | | | 5.80 | | | | 5.80 | | | | 5.80 | | |
| 109 | Kaiserslautern | 9.5 | 16411 | 9.0 | 16077 | 8.500 | 786 | 9.44 | 19.318 | 10814 | −8.500 | 9.44 | 0.44 | 786 | −8.500 | 9.44 | 0.44 | 786 |
| 110 | Landau | 6.5 | 4722 | 6.5 | 4906 | | | 6.50 | | | | 6.50 | | | | 6.50 | | |
| 111 | Mainz | 6.1 | 11613 | 6.3 | 12520 | | | 6.30 | | | | 6.30 | | | | 6.30 | | |
| 112 | Alzey-Worms | 7.9 | 7775 | 7.6 | 7840 | | | 7.60 | | | | 7.60 | | | | 7.60 | | |
| 113 | Pirmasens | 10.2 | 9105 | 9.5 | 8652 | 15.090 | 1435 | 11.08 | 9.577 | 10516 | 5.170 | 8.96 | −0.54 | −492 | −15.090 | 11.08 | 1.58 | 1435 |
| 114 | Ludwigshafen | 7.0 | 20256 | 7.2 | 21359 | | | 7.20 | | | | 7.20 | | | | 7.20 | | |
| 115 | Germersheim | 6.6 | 4031 | 6.6 | 4235 | | | 6.60 | | | | 6.60 | | | | 6.60 | | |
| 116 | Merzig | 8.1 | 3793 | 7.0 | 3396 | 10.940 | 1631 | 10.36 | 3.254 | 6708 | −2.764 | 7.85 | 0.85 | 412 | −10.940 | 10.36 | 3.36 | 1631 |
| 117 | St. Wendel | 6.4 | 2796 | 6.3 | 2871 | | | 6.30 | | | | 6.30 | | | | 6.30 | | |
| 118 | Saarbrücken | 10.9 | 35391 | 10.1 | 33523 | 25.500 | 4283 | 11.39 | 19.761 | 5954 | −12.833 | 10.75 | 0.65 | 2155 | −25.500 | 11.39 | 1.29 | 4283 |
| 119 | Homburg/Saar | 7.7 | 5598 | 7.6 | 5683 | | | 7.60 | | | | 7.60 | | | | 7.60 | | |
| 120 | Stuttgart | 4.9 | 58819 | 4.9 | 60637 | | | 4.90 | | | | 4.90 | | | | 4.90 | | |
| 121 | Göppingen | 4.6 | 5977 | 4.8 | 6296 | | | 4.80 | | | | 4.80 | | | | 4.80 | | |
| 122 | Heilbronn | 5.5 | 12261 | 5.7 | 13091 | | | 5.70 | | | | 5.70 | | | | 5.70 | | |
| 123 | Schwäbisch Hall | 4.5 | 6649 | 5.3 | 8034 | | | 5.30 | | | | 5.30 | | | | 5.30 | | |
| 124 | Tauberbischofsheim | 5.1 | 3420 | 5.5 | 3817 | | | 5.50 | | | | 5.50 | | | | 5.50 | | |
| 125 | Heidenheim | 6.1 | 4038 | 6.4 | 4338 | | | 6.40 | | | | 6.40 | | | | 6.40 | | |
| 126 | Aalen | 5.8 | 8982 | 6.0 | 9576 | | | 6.00 | | | | 6.00 | | | | 6.00 | | |
| 127 | Baden-Baden | 5.0 | 6970 | 5.1 | 7356 | | | 5.10 | | | | 5.10 | | | | 5.10 | | |
| 128 | Karlsruhe | 5.7 | 19692 | 5.8 | 20960 | | | 5.80 | | | | 5.80 | | | | 5.80 | | |
| 129 | Heidelberg | 6.1 | 19466 | 5.9 | 19619 | | | 5.90 | | | | 5.90 | | | | 5.90 | | |
| 130 | Mannheim | 8.5 | 23577 | 8.2 | 23447 | | | 8.20 | | | | 8.20 | | | | 8.20 | | |
| 131 | Mosbach | 5.4 | 3819 | 5.7 | 4193 | | | 5.70 | | | | 5.70 | | | | 5.70 | | |
| 132 | Pforzheim | 5.7 | 8996 | 6.1 | 9817 | | | 6.10 | | | | 6.10 | | | | 6.10 | | |
| 133 | Calw | 4.0 | 3053 | 4.3 | 3478 | | | 4.30 | | | | 4.30 | | | | 4.30 | | |
| 134 | Freudenstadt | 4.1 | 2470 | 4.7 | 2963 | | | 4.70 | | | | 4.70 | | | | 4.70 | | |
| 135 | Freiburg | 5.8 | 16450 | 5.8 | 17540 | | | 5.80 | | | | 5.80 | | | | 5.80 | | |
| 136 | Offenburg | 4.8 | 9885 | 5.2 | 11139 | | | 5.20 | | | | 5.20 | | | | 5.20 | | |

Table 3.1: Equalization of unemployment (continued)

| Nr. | Labour market region | Data | | | | | | Econometric estimation | | | Separate equalization | | | | Joint equalization | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Unemployment rate 2000 | Unemployed 2000 | $u$ Unemployment rate 2002 | u Unemployed 2002 | $a$ Granted aid | $j$ Subsidized jobs | $n$ Net unemployment rate 2002 with no aid | $p$ Aid needed to reduce unemployment by 1% | Aid per one subsidized job | $x-a$ Redistribution of aid | $y$ Equalized unemployment rate 2002 | $y-u$ Increment in unemployment rate 2002 | Increment in unemployed 2002 | $x-a$ Redistribution of aid | $y$ Equalized unemployment rate 2002 | $y-u$ Increment in unemployment rate 2002 | Increment in unemployed 2002 |
| | | % | Number | % | Number | Mio EUR | Number | % | Mio EUR | EUR | Mio EUR | % | % | Number | Mio EUR | % | % | Number |
| 137 | Rottweil | 4.3 | 3043 | 4.8 | 3485 | | | 4.80 | | | | 4.80 | | | | 4.80 | | |
| 138 | Villingen-Schwenningen | 4.7 | 4909 | 5.4 | 5866 | | | 5.40 | | | | 5.40 | | | | 5.40 | | |
| 139 | Tuttlingen | 4.9 | 3350 | 4.9 | 3435 | | | 4.90 | | | | 4.90 | | | | 4.90 | | |
| 140 | Konstanz | 6.3 | 8197 | 6.5 | 8824 | | | 6.50 | | | | 6.50 | | | | 6.50 | | |
| 141 | Lörrach | 6.3 | 6790 | 5.5 | 6136 | | | 5.50 | | | | 5.50 | | | | 5.50 | | |
| 142 | Waldshut | 6.1 | 4977 | 5.2 | 4487 | | | 5.20 | | | | 5.20 | | | | 5.20 | | |
| 143 | Reutlingen/Tübingen | 4.9 | 11809 | 4.9 | 12314 | | | 4.90 | | | | 4.90 | | | | 4.90 | | |
| 144 | Balingen | 5.6 | 5582 | 5.7 | 5790 | | | 5.70 | | | | 5.70 | | | | 5.70 | | |
| 145 | Ulm | 5.1 | 11841 | 5.7 | 13664 | | | 5.70 | | | | 5.70 | | | | 5.70 | | |
| 146 | Biberach | 3.9 | 3451 | 4.3 | 4033 | | | 4.30 | | | | 4.30 | | | | 4.30 | | |
| 147 | Friedrichshafen | 4.7 | 4561 | 5.0 | 5043 | | | 5.00 | | | | 5.00 | | | | 5.00 | | |
| 148 | Ravensburg | 4.1 | 5311 | 4.6 | 6196 | | | 4.60 | | | | 4.60 | | | | 4.60 | | |
| 149 | Sigmaringen | 5.9 | 3807 | 6.0 | 4047 | | | 6.00 | | | | 6.00 | | | | 6.00 | | |
| 150 | Bad Reichenhall | 5.1 | 2440 | 5.7 | 2738 | | | 5.70 | | | | 5.70 | | | | 5.70 | | |
| 151 | Traunstein | 4.3 | 3494 | 4.8 | 4071 | | | 4.80 | | | | 4.80 | | | | 4.80 | | |
| 152 | Burghausen | 5.6 | 2923 | 6.4 | 3461 | | | 6.40 | | | | 6.40 | | | | 6.40 | | |
| 153 | Mühldorf | 5.2 | 2730 | 6.2 | 3377 | | | 6.20 | | | | 6.20 | | | | 6.20 | | |
| 154 | Rosenheim | 4.1 | 5816 | 4.7 | 6996 | | | 4.70 | | | | 4.70 | | | | 4.70 | | |
| 155 | Bad Tölz | 3.8 | 3926 | 4.3 | 4606 | | | 4.30 | | | | 4.30 | | | | 4.30 | | |
| 156 | Garmisch-Partenkirchen | 3.8 | 1619 | 4.2 | 1832 | | | 4.20 | | | | 4.20 | | | | 4.20 | | |
| 157 | Weilheim | 3.6 | 2206 | 3.8 | 2461 | | | 3.80 | | | | 3.80 | | | | 3.80 | | |
| 158 | Landsberg | 3.5 | 1741 | 3.8 | 2004 | | | 3.80 | | | | 3.80 | | | | 3.80 | | |
| 159 | München | 4.3 | 53287 | 4.8 | 63104 | | | 4.80 | | | | 4.80 | | | | 4.80 | | |
| 160 | Ingolstadt | 5.0 | 10773 | 5.3 | 11892 | | | 5.30 | | | | 5.30 | | | | 5.30 | | |
| 161 | Kelheim-Mainburg | 4.9 | 2673 | 5.0 | 2895 | | | 5.00 | | | | 5.00 | | | | 5.00 | | |
| 162 | Landshut | 4.5 | 4547 | 5.0 | 5357 | | | 5.00 | | | | 5.00 | | | | 5.00 | | |
| 163 | Dingolfing | 4.0 | 1867 | 4.2 | 2026 | | | 4.20 | | | | 4.20 | | | | 4.20 | | |
| 164 | Eggenfelden/Pfarrkirchen | 5.0 | 2899 | 5.7 | 3384 | | | 5.70 | | | | 5.70 | | | | 5.70 | | |
| 165 | Passau | 7.1 | 8130 | 7.6 | 8926 | 20.820 | 2870 | 10.04 | 8.520 | 7254 | −10.006 | 8.77 | 1.17 | 1379 | −20.820 | 10.04 | 2.44 | 2870 |
| 166 | Freyung | 6.7 | 2684 | 8.5 | 3441 | 2.650 | 862 | 10.63 | 1.245 | 3074 | 1.249 | 7.50 | −1.00 | −406 | −1.782 | 9.93 | 1.43 | 580 |
| 167 | Regen-Zwisel | 6.0 | 2418 | 7.5 | 3113 | 4.940 | 783 | 9.39 | 2.619 | 6309 | −0.622 | 7.74 | 0.24 | 99 | −4.940 | 9.39 | 1.89 | 783 |
| 168 | Deggendorf | 6.0 | 3438 | 6.8 | 4060 | | | 6.80 | | | | 6.80 | | | | 6.80 | | |
| 169 | Straubing | 5.4 | 3750 | 6.0 | 4337 | | | 6.00 | | | | 6.00 | | | | 6.00 | | |
| 170 | Cham | 6.4 | 4088 | 7.0 | 4642 | 9.090 | 1812 | 9.73 | 3.327 | 5017 | −2.868 | 7.86 | 0.86 | 572 | −9.090 | 9.73 | 2.73 | 1812 |

Table 3.1: Equalization of unemployment (continued)

| Nr. | Labour market region | Data | | | | | | Econometric estimation | | | Separate equalization | | | | Joint equalization | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Unemployment rate 2000 | Unemployed 2000 | $u$ Unemployment rate 2002 | u Unemployed 2002 | $a$ Granted aid | $j$ Subsidized jobs | $n$ Net unemployment rate 2002 with no aid | $p$ Aid needed to reduce unemployment by 1% | Aid per one subsidized job | $x-a$ Redistribution of aid | $y$ Equalized unemployment rate 2002 | $y-u$ Increment in unemployment rate 2002 | Increment in unemployed 2002 | $x-a$ Redistribution of aid | $y$ Equalized unemployment rate 2002 | $y-u$ Increment in unemployment rate 2002 | Increment in unemployed 2002 |
| | | % | Number | % | Number | Mio EUR | Number | % | Mio EUR | EUR | Mio EUR | % | % | Number | Mio EUR | % | % | Number |
| 171 | Regensburg | 6.4 | 9862 | 6.5 | 10374 | | | 6.50 | | | | 6.50 | | | | 6.50 | | |
| 172 | Schwandorf | 5.3 | 3816 | 6.0 | 4382 | | | 6.00 | | | | 6.00 | | | | 6.00 | | |
| 173 | Amberg | 7.2 | 5264 | 7.9 | 6014 | | | 7.90 | | | | 7.90 | | | | 7.90 | | |
| 174 | Neumarkt | 5.5 | 3417 | 6.0 | 3862 | | | 6.00 | | | | 6.00 | | | | 6.00 | | |
| 175 | Weiden | 6.4 | 4538 | 7.0 | 5189 | | | 7.00 | | | | 7.00 | | | | 7.00 | | |
| 176 | Marktredwitz | 8.3 | 6826 | 9.7 | 8044 | 11.150 | 3389 | 13.79 | 2.728 | 3290 | 5.302 | 7.76 | −1.94 | −1611 | −2.063 | 10.46 | 0.76 | 627 |
| 177 | Hof | 8.9 | 7081 | 10.7 | 8547 | 11.910 | 2776 | 14.18 | 3.427 | 4290 | 9.666 | 7.88 | −2.82 | −2253 | −0.010 | 10.70 | 0.00 | 2 |
| 178 | Bayreuth | 7.0 | 6485 | 8.6 | 8100 | | | 8.60 | | | | 8.60 | | | | 8.60 | | |
| 179 | Bamberg | 7.1 | 7494 | 7.2 | 8035 | | | 7.20 | | | | 7.20 | | | | 7.20 | | |
| 180 | Kulmbach | 8.0 | 3203 | 9.3 | 3771 | | | 9.30 | | | | 9.30 | | | | 9.30 | | |
| 181 | Kronach | 7.3 | 2921 | 8.3 | 3352 | | | 8.30 | | | | 8.30 | | | | 8.30 | | |
| 182 | Coburg | 7.5 | 5197 | 9.1 | 6319 | | | 9.10 | | | | 9.10 | | | | 9.10 | | |
| 183 | Lichtenfels | 6.0 | 2173 | 8.2 | 3005 | | | 8.20 | | | | 8.20 | | | | 8.20 | | |
| 184 | Erlangen | 5.8 | 10160 | 5.8 | 10516 | | | 5.80 | | | | 5.80 | | | | 5.80 | | |
| 185 | Nürnberg | 7.4 | 39817 | 8.2 | 44664 | | | 8.20 | | | | 8.20 | | | | 8.20 | | |
| 186 | Weißenburg-Gunzenhausen | 5.2 | 2479 | 6.7 | 3255 | | | 6.70 | | | | 6.70 | | | | 6.70 | | |
| 187 | Ansbach | 5.2 | 5727 | 5.9 | 6657 | | | 5.90 | | | | 5.90 | | | | 5.90 | | |
| 188 | Neustadt/Aisch | 4.4 | 2210 | 5.3 | 2757 | | | 5.30 | | | | 5.30 | | | | 5.30 | | |
| 189 | Kitzingen | 4.6 | 2091 | 4.7 | 2235 | | | 4.70 | | | | 4.70 | | | | 4.70 | | |
| 190 | Würzburg | 5.3 | 7521 | 5.6 | 8283 | | | 5.60 | | | | 5.60 | | | | 5.60 | | |
| 191 | Schweinfurt | 7.7 | 6423 | 7.6 | 6584 | | | 7.60 | | | | 7.60 | | | | 7.60 | | |
| 192 | Haßfurt | 6.1 | 2695 | 6.4 | 2966 | | | 6.40 | | | | 6.40 | | | | 6.40 | | |
| 193 | Bad Neustadt/Saale | 7.7 | 3228 | 8.0 | 3476 | | | 8.00 | | | | 8.00 | | | | 8.00 | | |
| 194 | Bad Kissingen | 7.3 | 3918 | 7.6 | 4199 | | | 7.60 | | | | 7.60 | | | | 7.60 | | |
| 195 | Lohr am Main | 4.3 | 2951 | 4.7 | 3275 | | | 4.70 | | | | 4.70 | | | | 4.70 | | |
| 196 | Aschaffenburg | 5.7 | 11024 | 6.2 | 12448 | | | 6.20 | | | | 6.20 | | | | 6.20 | | |
| 197 | Donauwörth-Nördlingen | 3.9 | 2517 | 3.8 | 2562 | | | 3.80 | | | | 3.80 | | | | 3.80 | | |
| 198 | Dillingen | 3.7 | 1748 | 3.9 | 1929 | | | 3.90 | | | | 3.90 | | | | 3.90 | | |
| 199 | Günzburg | 4.9 | 2983 | 5.8 | 3658 | | | 5.80 | | | | 5.80 | | | | 5.80 | | |
| 200 | Augsburg | 5.5 | 16765 | 6.4 | 20294 | | | 6.40 | | | | 6.40 | | | | 6.40 | | |
| 201 | Memmingen | 4.1 | 3703 | 5.1 | 4687 | | | 5.10 | | | | 5.10 | | | | 5.10 | | |
| 202 | Kaufbeuren | 4.3 | 3703 | 5.0 | 4441 | | | 5.00 | | | | 5.00 | | | | 5.00 | | |
| 203 | Kempten | 4.8 | 5141 | 5.6 | 6105 | | | 5.60 | | | | 5.60 | | | | 5.60 | | |
| 204 | Lindau | 3.7 | 1411 | 4.0 | 1553 | | | 4.00 | | | | 4.00 | | | | 4.00 | | |

Table 3.1: Equalization of unemployment (continued)

| Nr. | Labour market region | Data | | | | | | Econometric estimation | | | Separate equalization | | | | Joint equalization | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Unemployment rate 2000 | Unemployed 2000 | $\boldsymbol{u}$ Unemployment rate 2002 | u Unemployed 2002 | $\boldsymbol{a}$ Granted aid | $\boldsymbol{j}$ Subsidized jobs | $\boldsymbol{n}$ Net unemployment rate 2002 with no aid | $\boldsymbol{p}$ Aid needed to reduce unemployment by 1% | Aid per one subsidized job | $\boldsymbol{x-a}$ Redistribution of aid | $\boldsymbol{y}$ Equalized unemployment rate 2002 | $\boldsymbol{y-u}$ Increment in unemployment rate 2002 | Increment in unemployed 2002 | $\boldsymbol{x-a}$ Redistribution of aid | $\boldsymbol{y}$ Equalized unemployment rate 2002 | $\boldsymbol{y-u}$ Increment in unemployment rate 2002 | Increment in unemployed 2002 |
| | | % | Number | % | Number | Mio EUR | Number | % | Mio EUR | EUR | Mio EUR | % | % | Number | Mio EUR | % | % | Number |
| 205 | Pasewalk | 23.1 | 9733 | 25.6 | 10581 | 5.720 | 670 | 27.22 | 3.529 | 8537 | 26.040 | 18.22 | −7.38 | −3050 | 52.440 | 10.74 | −14.86 | −6142 |
| 206 | Greifswald | 18.8 | 16306 | 19.8 | 17010 | 51.090 | 2938 | 23.22 | 14.939 | 17389 | 22.907 | 18.27 | −1.53 | −1317 | 75.121 | 14.77 | −5.03 | −4320 |
| 207 | Stralsund | 20.2 | 18242 | 21.0 | 18776 | 35.560 | 1327 | 22.48 | 23.959 | 26797 | 64.615 | 18.30 | −2.70 | −2411 | 72.849 | 17.96 | −3.04 | −2719 |
| 208 | Bergen | 17.5 | 6883 | 19.1 | 7512 | 26.660 | 663 | 20.79 | 15.815 | 40211 | 13.124 | 18.27 | −0.83 | −326 | 63.559 | 15.08 | −4.02 | −1581 |
| 209 | Neubrandenburg | 20.8 | 27876 | 22.9 | 30451 | 61.020 | 3405 | 25.46 | 23.830 | 17921 | 109.555 | 18.30 | −4.60 | −6113 | 118.823 | 17.91 | −4.99 | −6630 |
| 210 | Waren | 19.2 | 7017 | 21.1 | 7822 | 39.600 | 2289 | 27.27 | 6.413 | 17300 | 18.393 | 18.23 | −2.87 | −1063 | 59.911 | 11.76 | −9.34 | −3463 |
| 211 | Güstrow | 18.9 | 10727 | 21.1 | 12015 | 35.670 | 1307 | 23.40 | 15.541 | 27292 | 43.995 | 18.27 | −2.83 | −1612 | 95.044 | 14.98 | −6.12 | −3483 |
| 212 | Rostock | 15.3 | 25500 | 16.7 | 27549 | 106.450 | 5362 | 19.95 | 32.750 | 19853 | −53.669 | 18.34 | 1.64 | 2703 | −106.450 | 19.95 | 3.25 | 5362 |
| 213 | Wismar | 16.4 | 13848 | 15.3 | 13111 | 53.110 | 2460 | 18.17 | 18.501 | 21589 | −53.110 | 18.17 | 2.87 | 2460 | −13.510 | 16.03 | 0.73 | 626 |
| 214 | Schwerin | 14.3 | 17580 | 13.1 | 15999 | 53.170 | 4573 | 16.84 | 14.200 | 11627 | −53.170 | 16.84 | 3.74 | 4573 | −20.026 | 14.51 | 1.41 | 1722 |
| 215 | Parchim | 17.1 | 9300 | 17.0 | 9450 | 11.720 | 1923 | 20.46 | 3.388 | 6095 | −4.133 | 18.22 | 1.22 | 678 | 21.381 | 10.69 | −6.31 | −3508 |
| 216 | Berlin | 15.5 | 328077 | 16.6 | 366447 | 536.660 | 45658 | 18.67 | 259.469 | 11754 | −536.660 | 18.67 | 2.07 | 45658 | −536.660 | 18.67 | 2.07 | 45658 |
| 217 | Brandenburg a.d. Havel | 19.2 | 13688 | 20.1 | 14444 | 58.590 | 3789 | 25.37 | 11.112 | 15463 | 20.545 | 18.25 | −1.85 | −1329 | 74.239 | 13.42 | −6.68 | −4801 |
| 218 | Belzig | 12.5 | 5027 | 12.7 | 5868 | 6.830 | 722 | 14.26 | 4.371 | 9460 | −6.830 | 14.26 | 1.56 | 722 | 7.271 | 11.04 | −1.66 | −769 |
| 219 | Cottbus | 17.5 | 30024 | 17.8 | 30624 | 78.380 | 4224 | 20.26 | 31.924 | 18556 | −17.093 | 18.34 | 0.54 | 921 | −78.380 | 20.26 | 2.46 | 4224 |
| 220 | Eberswalde | 16.7 | 6970 | 17.2 | 6385 | 16.730 | 1095 | 20.15 | 5.672 | 15279 | −5.837 | 18.23 | 1.03 | 382 | 32.350 | 11.50 | −5.70 | −2117 |
| 221 | Prenzlau | 22.3 | 17491 | 22.7 | 17449 | 43.490 | 1744 | 24.97 | 19.168 | 24937 | 84.653 | 18.28 | −4.42 | −3395 | 123.324 | 16.27 | −6.43 | −4945 |
| 222 | Finsterwalde | 19.9 | 13448 | 20.8 | 13878 | 28.930 | 3387 | 25.88 | 5.699 | 8541 | 14.651 | 18.23 | −2.57 | −1715 | 52.967 | 11.51 | −9.29 | −6201 |
| 223 | Frankfurt/Oder | 16.9 | 29316 | 18.1 | 22322 | 67.330 | 3615 | 21.03 | 22.970 | 18625 | −4.574 | 18.30 | 0.20 | 246 | 11.262 | 17.61 | −0.49 | −605 |
| 224 | Luckenwalde | 14.8 | 6065 | 14.1 | 5010 | 35.250 | 2454 | 21.01 | 5.104 | 14364 | −21.063 | 18.23 | 4.13 | 1466 | 14.313 | 11.30 | −2.80 | −996 |
| 225 | Neuruppin | 17.5 | 14230 | 18.5 | 18839 | 61.830 | 2888 | 21.34 | 21.802 | 21409 | 4.482 | 18.29 | −0.21 | −209 | 28.410 | 17.20 | −1.30 | −1327 |
| 226 | Perleberg | 19.0 | 9314 | 19.6 | 9450 | 31.250 | 1886 | 23.51 | 7.989 | 16569 | 10.877 | 18.24 | −1.36 | −656 | 58.197 | 12.32 | −7.28 | −3512 |
| 227 | Senftenberg | 22.7 | 16967 | 22.8 | 16651 | 135.020 | 3936 | 28.19 | 25.052 | 34304 | 112.546 | 18.31 | −4.49 | −3281 | 111.589 | 18.35 | −4.45 | −3253 |
| 228 | Salzwedel | 16.0 | 8241 | 16.1 | 8266 | 50.530 | 1166 | 18.37 | 22.250 | 43336 | −48.865 | 18.30 | 2.20 | 1128 | −27.927 | 17.36 | 1.26 | 644 |
| 229 | Stendal | 20.7 | 14944 | 21.2 | 14805 | 140.010 | 1493 | 23.34 | 65.490 | 93778 | 178.697 | 18.47 | −2.73 | −1906 | −140.010 | 23.34 | 2.14 | 1493 |
| 230 | Burg | 18.8 | 9783 | 17.5 | 8948 | 31.910 | 1337 | 20.11 | 12.203 | 23867 | −9.220 | 18.26 | 0.76 | 386 | 45.095 | 13.80 | −3.70 | −1889 |
| 231 | Magdeburg | 17.6 | 40586 | 17.0 | 38540 | 100.850 | 3923 | 18.73 | 58.280 | 25707 | −84.050 | 18.44 | 1.44 | 3269 | −100.850 | 18.73 | 1.73 | 3923 |
| 232 | Halberstadt | 19.7 | 25986 | 18.3 | 23845 | 192.440 | 5039 | 22.17 | 49.762 | 38190 | −5.358 | 18.41 | 0.11 | 140 | −192.440 | 22.17 | 3.87 | 5039 |
| 233 | Staßfurt | 23.2 | 12150 | 23.0 | 11809 | 39.660 | 2020 | 26.93 | 10.081 | 19634 | 47.914 | 18.25 | −4.75 | −2440 | 100.257 | 13.05 | −9.95 | −5106 |
| 234 | Schönebeck | 22.2 | 16503 | 20.9 | 15126 | 59.930 | 2347 | 24.14 | 18.480 | 25535 | 48.401 | 18.28 | −2.62 | −1895 | 90.127 | 16.02 | −4.88 | −3530 |
| 235 | Dessau | 20.9 | 24916 | 19.4 | 22623 | 67.480 | 2941 | 21.92 | 26.756 | 22945 | 29.044 | 18.31 | −1.09 | −1266 | 12.093 | 18.95 | −0.45 | −527 |
| 236 | Wittenberg | 19.8 | 13604 | 18.8 | 12531 | 45.980 | 2253 | 22.18 | 13.603 | 20408 | 7.329 | 18.26 | −0.54 | −359 | 61.222 | 14.30 | −4.50 | −3000 |
| 237 | Sangerhausen | 21.9 | 19389 | 23.1 | 19903 | 40.350 | 1724 | 25.10 | 20.166 | 23405 | 97.041 | 18.29 | −4.81 | −4146 | 130.699 | 16.62 | −6.48 | −5584 |
| 238 | Halle | 19.6 | 34424 | 19.8 | 33984 | 46.550 | 2787 | 21.42 | 28.668 | 16703 | 42.364 | 18.32 | −1.48 | −2536 | 5.060 | 19.62 | −0.18 | −303 |
| 239 | Bitterfeld | 22.6 | 12582 | 21.4 | 11416 | 193.890 | 2672 | 26.41 | 38.710 | 72564 | 117.565 | 18.36 | −3.04 | −1620 | −68.614 | 23.17 | 1.77 | 946 |

Table 3.1: Equalization of unemployment (continued)

| Nr. | Labour market region | Data | | | | | | Econometric estimation | | | Separate equalization | | | | Joint equalization | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Unemployment rate 2000 | Unemployed 2000 | $u$ Unemployment rate 2002 | u Unemployed 2002 | $a$ Granted aid | $j$ Subsidized jobs | $n$ Net unemployment rate 2002 with no aid | $p$ Aid needed to reduce unemployment by 1% | Aid per one subsidized job | $x-a$ Redistribution of aid | $y$ Equalized unemployment rate 2002 | $y-u$ Increment in unemployment rate 2002 | Increment in unemployed 2002 | $x-a$ Redistribution of aid | $y$ Equalized unemployment rate 2002 | $y-u$ Increment in unemployment rate 2002 | Increment in unemployed 2002 |
| | | % | Number | % | Number | Mio EUR | Number | % | Mio EUR | EUR | Mio EUR | % | % | Number | Mio EUR | % | % | Number |
| 240 | Naumburg | 21.6 | 39399 | 21.7 | 38615 | 120.020 | 2417 | 23.06 | 88.364 | 49657 | 277.107 | 18.56 | −3.14 | −5580 | −120.020 | 23.06 | 1.36 | 2417 |
| 241 | Erfurt | 16.3 | 24457 | 17.2 | 26120 | 133.440 | 7988 | 22.46 | 25.368 | 16705 | −28.130 | 18.31 | 1.11 | 1684 | −31.900 | 18.46 | 1.26 | 1910 |
| 242 | Weimar | 15.0 | 11650 | 16.1 | 12831 | 40.510 | 3734 | 20.79 | 8.646 | 10849 | −18.513 | 18.24 | 2.14 | 1706 | 30.716 | 12.55 | −3.55 | −2831 |
| 243 | Gera | 16.9 | 20773 | 17.0 | 20690 | 61.980 | 5935 | 21.88 | 12.710 | 10443 | −15.984 | 18.26 | 1.26 | 1531 | 38.337 | 13.98 | −3.02 | −3671 |
| 244 | Jena | 13.4 | 13386 | 13.2 | 13465 | 126.600 | 6997 | 20.06 | 18.457 | 18093 | −93.776 | 18.28 | 5.08 | 5183 | −51.951 | 16.01 | 2.81 | 2871 |
| 245 | Suhl | 13.3 | 8842 | 13.5 | 8935 | 71.520 | 5567 | 21.91 | 8.503 | 12847 | −40.308 | 18.24 | 4.74 | 3138 | 8.530 | 12.50 | −1.00 | −664 |
| 246 | Eichsfeld | 12.5 | 7290 | 14.2 | 8350 | 50.490 | 4588 | 22.00 | 6.471 | 11005 | −26.094 | 18.23 | 4.03 | 2371 | 15.668 | 11.78 | −2.42 | −1424 |
| 247 | Nordhausen | 18.3 | 9196 | 19.4 | 9659 | 38.030 | 2272 | 23.96 | 8.334 | 16739 | 9.668 | 18.24 | −1.16 | −578 | 58.028 | 12.44 | −6.96 | −3467 |
| 248 | Eisenach | 13.1 | 12947 | 12.8 | 12596 | 85.580 | 8957 | 21.90 | 9.402 | 9555 | −51.188 | 18.24 | 5.44 | 5357 | −0.138 | 12.81 | 0.01 | 14 |
| 249 | Mühlhausen | 15.1 | 9138 | 16.3 | 9839 | 24.840 | 3386 | 21.91 | 4.428 | 7336 | −8.520 | 18.22 | 1.92 | 1161 | 23.218 | 11.06 | −5.24 | −3165 |
| 250 | Sondershausen | 20.7 | 9908 | 22.2 | 10489 | 29.590 | 3017 | 28.59 | 4.634 | 9808 | 18.420 | 18.22 | −3.98 | −1878 | 51.300 | 11.13 | −11.07 | −5231 |
| 251 | Meiningen | 13.3 | 10081 | 13.7 | 10453 | 69.100 | 7660 | 23.74 | 6.883 | 9021 | −31.207 | 18.23 | 4.53 | 3459 | 12.222 | 11.92 | −1.78 | −1355 |
| 252 | Gotha | 14.0 | 10850 | 13.8 | 10798 | 67.910 | 6048 | 21.53 | 8.786 | 11229 | −39.024 | 18.24 | 4.44 | 3475 | 10.570 | 12.60 | −1.20 | −941 |
| 253 | Arnstadt | 17.2 | 10743 | 18.7 | 11801 | 61.560 | 4645 | 26.06 | 8.364 | 13253 | 3.847 | 18.24 | −0.46 | −290 | 52.292 | 12.45 | −6.25 | −3946 |
| 254 | Sonneberg | 10.1 | 3647 | 11.1 | 4012 | 47.810 | 3494 | 20.77 | 4.946 | 13683 | −35.244 | 18.23 | 7.13 | 2576 | −0.691 | 11.24 | 0.14 | 50 |
| 255 | Saalfeld | 15.7 | 10586 | 16.0 | 10792 | 32.560 | 4126 | 22.12 | 5.323 | 7891 | −11.857 | 18.23 | 2.23 | 1503 | 24.629 | 11.37 | −4.63 | −3121 |
| 256 | Pö | 14.0 | 7248 | 15.3 | 8005 | 31.650 | 4573 | 24.04 | 3.621 | 6921 | −10.576 | 18.22 | 2.92 | 1528 | 16.398 | 10.77 | −4.53 | −2369 |
| 257 | Altenburg | 20.4 | 11926 | 21.6 | 12443 | 38.110 | 3894 | 28.36 | 5.638 | 9787 | 19.006 | 18.23 | −3.37 | −1942 | 57.031 | 11.48 | −10.12 | −5827 |
| 258 | Leipzig | 17.6 | 69140 | 18.6 | 73167 | 262.640 | 12629 | 21.81 | 81.808 | 20797 | 5.116 | 18.54 | −0.06 | −246 | −262.640 | 21.81 | 3.21 | 12629 |
| 259 | Torgau/Oschatz | 18.5 | 17278 | 18.2 | 17025 | 66.870 | 6298 | 24.93 | 9.932 | 10618 | −0.460 | 18.25 | 0.05 | 43 | 51.627 | 13.00 | −5.20 | −4862 |
| 260 | Grimma | 17.2 | 11890 | 16.2 | 11490 | 23.570 | 2052 | 19.09 | 8.147 | 11486 | −16.612 | 18.24 | 2.04 | 1446 | 31.194 | 12.37 | −3.83 | −2716 |
| 261 | Freiberg | 16.3 | 20643 | 17.3 | 22033 | 175.140 | 14095 | 28.37 | 15.825 | 12426 | −15.354 | 18.27 | 0.97 | 1236 | 35.058 | 15.08 | −2.22 | −2821 |
| 262 | Chemnitz | 16.7 | 46713 | 17.4 | 47897 | 142.860 | 18243 | 24.03 | 21.556 | 7831 | −19.259 | 18.29 | 0.89 | 2459 | 6.247 | 17.11 | −0.29 | −798 |
| 263 | Annaberg | 17.2 | 28002 | 18.0 | 29600 | 189.870 | 16647 | 28.12 | 18.756 | 11406 | −5.291 | 18.28 | 0.28 | 464 | 35.252 | 16.12 | −1.88 | −3091 |
| 264 | Zwickau | 18.0 | 22081 | 18.3 | 22399 | 72.440 | 5551 | 22.84 | 15.973 | 13050 | 0.466 | 18.27 | −0.03 | −36 | 50.524 | 15.14 | −3.16 | −3872 |
| 265 | Plauen | 14.1 | 19895 | 16.0 | 22494 | 116.770 | 13412 | 25.54 | 12.240 | 8706 | −27.610 | 18.26 | 2.26 | 3171 | 26.712 | 13.82 | −2.18 | −3068 |
| 266 | Dresden | 14.8 | 48798 | 14.9 | 49409 | 238.700 | 15272 | 19.51 | 51.829 | 15630 | −182.234 | 18.42 | 3.52 | 11659 | −238.700 | 19.51 | 4.61 | 15272 |
| 267 | Riesa | 18.7 | 11901 | 19.3 | 12177 | 42.110 | 3040 | 24.12 | 8.740 | 13852 | 9.251 | 18.24 | −1.06 | −668 | 58.726 | 12.58 | −6.72 | −4240 |
| 268 | Pirna | 15.5 | 22002 | 16.8 | 23811 | 71.990 | 9567 | 23.55 | 10.665 | 7525 | −15.457 | 18.25 | 1.45 | 2054 | 37.743 | 13.26 | −3.54 | −5016 |
| 269 | Bautzen | 18.7 | 35672 | 19.7 | 37327 | 136.510 | 10480 | 25.23 | 24.681 | 13026 | 34.403 | 18.31 | −1.39 | −2641 | 36.664 | 18.21 | −1.49 | −2815 |
| 270 | Görlitz | 21.1 | 18173 | 22.6 | 19159 | 32.040 | 2464 | 25.51 | 11.023 | 13003 | 47.943 | 18.25 | −4.35 | −3687 | 101.551 | 13.39 | −9.21 | −7810 |
| 271 | Löbau-Zittau | 20.4 | 15727 | 22.5 | 16899 | 67.650 | 3822 | 27.59 | 13.294 | 17700 | 56.367 | 18.26 | −4.24 | −3185 | 110.471 | 14.19 | −8.31 | −6241 |
| | Variance (West) | 5.15 | | 4.40 | | | | 6.78 | | | | 3.50 | | | | | | |
| | Variance (East) | 8.91 | | 9.76 | | | | 9.17 | | | | 0.28 | | | | | | |
| | Variance (Germany) | 26.42 | | 27.29 | | | | 50.08 | | | | | | | | 17.32 | | |

Column "Increment in unemployment rate" displays vector $\boldsymbol{y} - \boldsymbol{u}$, the predicted change of the actual $\boldsymbol{u}$nemployment rate after the redistribution of subsidies.

These rate increments converted from percent to the absolute number of unemployed are given in the auxiliary column "Increment in unemployed".

5. The last section, *Joint optimization* displays the results of unemployment equalization for East and West Germany processed jointly. The columns of this sections are the same as of Section *Separate equalization*.

6. Three bottom lines of Table 3.1 show the variance of the regional unemployment rates. These indices appear in graph titles.

## 3.3 Redistribution of aid

The redistribution of aid for attaining the optimal equalization of unemployment is illustrated by Figure 3.4 It depicts Table's 3.1 columns "Aid per one subsidized job", "Aid needed to reduce unemployment by 1%" (= vector $\boldsymbol{p}$), and "Redistribution of aid" (= vector $\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{a}$) both for separate and joint equalization.

The greatest redistribution takes place in East Germany, where the subsidies are far from being optimal. Most affected are large cities. For instance, Berlin has to return all subsidies back. Dresden, Magdeburg, Jena, Wismar, Schwerin, Rostock should receive at most half their actual grants. On the contrary, some other areas should receive an additional aid: Naumburg (277 Mio EURO), Stendal (179 Mio EURO), Bitterfeld (118 Mio), etc.

The optimization tries to reduce the highest unemployment by least expenditures. If the unemployment is rather high, the model subsidizes the region even at a higher price. If the unemployment is not much higher than the average but reducing it is affordable then the model 'gives a grant'. The last subsidized are the regions whose unemployment is close to the average and at the same time reducing it is too expensive.

For instance, consider Berlin. It has a large population, and reducing its unemployment by one percent requires subsidizing too many jobs, which makes this 'percent' much more expensive than in small regions. On the other hand, Berlin's net unemployment rate (with no subsidies) 18.7% is very close to the East German average ($18.7 - 18.21 = 0.49\%$), so that it makes little sense to give a subsidy. Berlin's actual unemployment 16.6% means that the subsidy (536 Mio EURO) received was not only unnecessary but also superfluous. Indeed, instead of fitting the unemployment to the average it results in $18.21 - 16.6 = 1.61\%$-deviation, which is three times more distant from the average than with no subsidies at all.

Besides the size of the region, the 'price' of 1%-decrement in unemployment is determined by the aid per one subsidized job. For instance, consider Naumburg with the 'price' of one job about 50 Ths EURO. Naumburg's unemployment 21.4% significantly deviates from the East German average 18.21%. Accordingly, it receives an additional subsidy, in spite of a high 'price' for 1%-decrement in unemployment. If Naumburg is considered within the whole of Germany, its influence on the variance is about 3/10 of its influence




Figure 3.4: Redistribution of aid among German regions

within East Germany (1/217 against 1/67). This is deciding, and Naumburg looses its privilege and has to return the grant.

These and similar effects can be taken under control by certain weight coefficients. For instance, one may adjust the optimization process not to ignore large cities, or localities with expensive jobs like in ship-building.

## 3.4 Planning the budget for an equalization policy

Let us perform a kind of *sensitivity analysis* and investigate how the unemployment equalization depends on the budget. Figure 3.5 traces the effects of the equalization policy as a function of budget (a) for West Germany, (b) for East Germany, and (c) for the whole of Germany.

(a) Consider the top graph for West Germany. Its horizontal axis displays the variable budget. For several budget values, the regional unemployment is equalized. The resulted optimal average unemployment and variance are put into the table on the right hand. The corresponding table columns are depicted by dashed and solid *optimal curves* in the graph, respectively.

The actual (2002) average unemployment and variance are marked in the graph by asterisk * with the horizontal coordinate being the actual budget of West Germany 617.840 Mio EURO. Since neither the actual average unemployment, nor the actual variance are optimal, the corresponding marks are located above the optimal curves.

(b) The next graph for East Germany is similar. In particular, it visualizes the fact that the actual average unemployment is optimal: The corresponding mark is in the dashed curve. The variance is not optimal and lies significantly above the curve of optimal variance.

(c) For West Germany, the actual situation is not optimal either. The marks of actual average unemployment and variance lie above the optimal curves. Comparing with graph (b), graph (c) exhibits a much steeper decrease in the variance. This means that a joint budget might be quite efficient and could better equalize the situation in Germany than two separate budgets.

The curves and tables from Figure 3.5 enable us to predict the effect of an equalization policy with a certain budget. For instance, if we speak of West Germany and test a budget of 300 Mio EURO, then, under the optimal equalization, the predicted average regional unemployment is 7.44% and the variance 4.21. If we dispose a budget of 1 Bio EURO then the predicted average unemployment is 7.12% and the variance is 2.98. One can ask: Are we ready to pay additional 700 Mio for such a minor improvement?

Using the curves and tables from Figure 3.5, one can answer similar questions and select the most appropriate equalization policy with the best 'quality-to-price ratio' (the understanding of which depends on the policy maker). Then the optimal distribution of the budget among all the eligible regions follows immediately from the main model.

(a) Equalizing unemployment in **West** Germany




| Aid, Mio EURO | Average unemployment % | Variance $\%^2$ |
|---|---|---|
| 100 | 7.63 | 5.17 |
| 200 | 7.52 | 4.56 |
| 300 | 7.44 | 4.21 |
| 400 | 7.39 | 3.94 |
| 500 | 7.33 | 3.72 |
| 600 | 7.29 | 3.53 |
| 700 | 7.24 | 3.36 |
| 800 | 7.20 | 3.22 |
| 900 | 7.16 | 3.09 |
| 1000 | 7.12 | 2.98 |
| 1100 | 7.10 | 2.87 |
| 1200 | 7.07 | 2.78 |

(b) Equalizing unemployment in **East** Germany




| Aid, Mio EURO | Average unemployment % | Variance $\%^2$ |
|---|---|---|
| 1000 | 21.66 | 3.13 |
| 2000 | 20.70 | 1.58 |
| 3000 | 19.97 | 0.92 |
| 4000 | 19.22 | 0.55 |
| 5000 | 18.47 | 0.33 |
| 6000 | 17.75 | 0.21 |
| 7000 | 17.14 | 0.13 |
| 8000 | 16.51 | 0.08 |
| 9000 | 15.88 | 0.04 |
| 10000 | 15.24 | 0.02 |
| 11000 | 14.60 | 0.00 |
| 12000 | 14.26 | 0.00 |

(c) Equalizing unemployment in the **whole** of Germany




| Aid, Mio EURO | Average unemployment % | Variance $\%^2$ |
|---|---|---|
| 1000 | 10.96 | 38.51 |
| 2000 | 10.56 | 32.13 |
| 3000 | 10.25 | 27.31 |
| 4000 | 9.97 | 23.37 |
| 5000 | 9.72 | 20.08 |
| 6000 | 9.49 | 17.26 |
| 7000 | 9.26 | 14.85 |
| 8000 | 9.04 | 12.81 |
| 9000 | 8.84 | 11.08 |
| 10000 | 8.65 | 9.61 |
| 11000 | 8.48 | 8.35 |
| 12000 | 8.33 | 7.24 |

Figure 3.5: Planning the budget of an unemployment equalization policy

## 3.5 Economic gain from the model

As shown previously, the model promises a better equalization of the regional unemployment than actually attained. It implies that the actual degree of equalization is attainable with a smaller budget. Say, the results obtained for 6 billion EURO can be obtained for 4 billion. Then the gain from the model is 2 billion.

Let us trace this train of thought with Figure 3.5. Consider the mark * *Variance 2002* in the upper graph (a) for West Germany. It indicates the actual state attained for 617 Mio EURO. Moving to the left along the dash-dot line, we retain the equalization level but reduce the budget. Attaining the optimal variance curve means that no further economy is possible. The necessary budget is to be found below, 240.901 Mio EURO. Starting from the mark * *Average unemployment 2002* and proceeding in the same way, we find the minimal budget for the actual average unemployment 7.45%, 280.737 Mio EURO.

The budget which suffices to retain both indices at the actual level is consequently the maximal of these two, 280.737 Mio EURO. We save 337.103 Mio. If we restrict attention to the variance only, as required by the equalization program, the minimal budget is 240.901 Mio, which saves 376.939 Mio. Then the average unemployment is 7.48% which is 0.03% higher than the actual one.

These steps are tabulated in Table 3.2. Its three rows provide the estimates of economic gain for West Germany, East Germany, and the whole Germany.

1. Consider the first row for West Germany.

   (a) The first section *State 2002* specifies the location of marks * in Figure 3.5. The underlying data are represented by the second graph in Figure 3.1.

   (b) The next section of Table 3.2 *Optimal equalization* displays the equalization result for the whole budget. The optimal indices, compared with the actual ones, indicate at a gain in quality. The underlying data are represented by the bottom graph in Figure 3.1.

   (c) Section *Economy equalization AV* answers to the question: How can the actual budget be reduced with retaining both *A*verage unemployment and *V*ariance at the actual level? This section specifies the intersection of dash-dot lines with the optimal curves in Figure 3.5.

   (d) The last section *Economy equalization V* is similar but restricts the attention to the *V*ariance only. It specifies the intersection of the dash-dot line through the mark * *Variance 2002* with the optimal variance curve in Figure 3.5.

2. For East Germany, the situation is rather curious.

   (a) If we take care of both average unemployment and variance (Section *Economy equalization AV*), no economy is possible (0 EURO). It is explained by the fact that the average unemployment under the optimal equalization coincides with the actual one (compare with Section *Actual equalization*).

   (b) If we take care of the variance only then no grant is necessary at all (Section *Economy equalization V*). Indeed, the natural self-regulation provides a better

Table 3.2:Economic gain from the unemployment equalization

| | State 2002 | | | Optimal equalization | | | Economy equalization AV | | | | Economy equalization V | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Average unemployment rate | Variance | Aid amount | Average unemployment rate | Variance | Aid amount | Average unemployment rate | Variance | Sufficient aid | Economy | Average unemployment rate | Variance | Sufficient aid | Economy |
| | % | $\%^2$ | Mio EUR | % | $\%^2$ | Mio EUR | % | $\%^2$ | Mio EUR | Mio EUR | % | $\%^2$ | Mio EUR | Mio EUR |
| West Germany | 7.45 | 4.40 | 617.840 | 7.28 | 3.50 | 617.840 | 7.45 | 4.27 | 280.737 | 337.103 | 7.48 | 4.40 | 240.901 | 376.939 |
| East Germany | 18.21 | 9.76 | 5360.100 | 18.21 | 0.28 | 5360.100 | 18.21 | 0.28 | 5360.100 | 0.000 | 22.93 | 9.17 | 0.000 | 5360.100 |
| Whole of Germany | 10.11 | 27.29 | 5977.940 | 9.49 | 17.32 | 5977.940 | 10.11 | 25.30 | 3486.612 | 2491.328 | 10.25 | 27.29 | 3005.170 | 2972.770 |

variance than attained with the grant (see second and third graphs in Figure 3.2). Consequently, the total budget of 5360.100 Mio EURO can be saved.

3. The last row of Table 3.2 is similar, and exhibits the economy under both *Economy equalization AV* and *Economy equalization V* of order 2.5–3.0 billion EURO.

This efficiency estimate is certainly conditional. However, the order of economy comparable with the total budget is very unlikely due to the model inaccuracies only. It rather indicates at the really underused potential of the subsidies. Consequently, the situation can be improved by either making the grants work with a full efficiency, or by saving a considerable fraction of the grants.

# Chapter 4

# Conclusion

## 4.1 Further perspectives

A natural way of improving the model is explaining the regional unemployment as a function of subsidies (2.2) on the basis of longer control periods. It will improve the prediction accuracy of the model which is important for future planning.

Next, some more elaborated restrictions can be imposed, with regard to the size of localities, industries, and social factors.

Finally, some weight coefficients can be introduces into the model to reflect certain policy priorities.

The variance operator from Theorem 1 reduces computing the variance to a vector/matrix multiplication. This means that the restrictions and the prediction of the net unemployment can be arbitrarily complex, but if they are linear then the optimization problem is linear-quadratic and, consequently, solvable.

## 4.2 Recapitulation

1. The model developed contributes to equalizing the regional unemployment by optimally distributing the subsidies granted.

2. The difference between actual and optimized figures show that, most likely, the potential of active labor market policies is far from being exhausted.

3. In particular, it explains low efficiency of active labor market policies observed in empirical studies.

4. The methods suggested are aimed at the optimal use of European and national grants. Alternatively, policy goals can be attained with a more moderate budget, saving money for other purposes.

5. Econometric decision models of this type can be developed further to improve the performance of active labor market policies, implying socio-economical and political advantages.

# Chapter 5

# References


Ashenfelter, O., and Layard, R. (Eds.) (1986) *Handbook of Labor Economics, Vol. 1 and 2.* Amsterdam, Elsevier.

Ashenfelter, O., and Card, D. (Eds.) (1999) *Handbook of Labor Economics, Vol. 3A, 3B and 3C.* Amsterdam, Elsevier.

Baddeley, M., Martin, R., and Tyler, P. (1998) Transitory shock of structural shift? The impact of the early 1980s recession on British regional unemployment. *Applied Economics*, 30, 19–30.

Bean, C.R. (1994) European Unemployment: A Survey. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 32, 573–619.

Bilger, U., Genosko, J., and Hirte, G. (1991) Migration and regional labour market adjustment in West Germany. In: J. Stillwell and P. Congdon (Eds.) *Migration Models: Macro and Micro Approaches,* London, Belhaven Press, 152–167.

Bjerkholt, O., and Strøm, S. (2002) Decision models and preferences: The pioneering contributions of Ragnar Frisch. In: A.S. Tangian and J. Gruber (Eds.) *Constructing and Applying Objective Functions.* Berlin, Springer (Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems 510), 17–36.

Blackaby, D.H., and Manning, D.N. (1992) Regional earnings and unemployment – A simultaneous approach. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics,* 54, 481–501.

Blanchard, O.J., and Katz, L.F. (1992) Regional evolutions. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, No. 1, 1–75.

Blanchard, O.J., and Fischer, S. (1989) *Lectures on Macroeconomics.* Cambridge MA, MIT Press.

Blien, U. (2002) Ein Arbeitsmarktgesamtindikator zur regionalen Mittelverteilung für die aktive Arbeitsmarktpolitik. In: G. Kleinhenz (Ed.) IAB-Kpmpendium Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung, *Beiträge zur Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung*, 250, 335–344.

Büttner, T., and Prey, H. (1998) Does active labour market policy affect structural unemployment? An empirical investigation for West German regions, 1986 to 1993. *Zeitschrift für Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften* (ZWS), 118, 389–412.

*Bundesamt für Wirtschaft und Ausfuhrkontrolle (2003) Statistik der Gemainschaftsaufgabe "Verbesserung der regionalen Wirtschaftsstruktur"*, Eschborn.

Bundesanstalt für Arbeit (2003a) *Arbeitslosen- und Beschäftigtenstatistik.* Nürnberg.

Bundesanstalt für Arbeit (2003b) *Aufbau Ost — Der Beitrag der Bundesanstalt für Arbeit.* Nürnberg.

Chapman, P.G. (1991) The dynamics of regional unemployment in the UK, 1974–1989. *Applied Economics,* 23, 1059–1064.

Chossudovsky, M.J. (1972a) Optimal Policy Configurations under Alternative Community Group Preferences, *Kyklos*, 4, 754–768.

Chossudovsky, M.J. (1972b) *Do Political Parties Have Utility Functions?* Ottawa, Societe Canadiene de Science Economique.

Chow, G.C. (1975) *Analysis and Control of Dynamic Economic Systems.* New York, Wiley.

Crampton, G.R. (1999) Urban Markets. In: P. Cheshire and E.E. Mills (Eds.) *Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics, Vol. 3.* Amsterdam, Elsevier.

Crome, B., and Schwengler, B. (2000). Indikatoren zur Auswahl der Fördergebeite der Gemeinschaftsaufgabe "Verbesserung der regionalen Wirtschaftsstruktur". In: *Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnumg, Informationen zur Raumentwicklung,* Heft 2.2000 (Europäische und nationale Strukturpolitik im Zeichen der AGENDA 2000), 71–83.

Dantzig, G., McAllister, P.H., and Stone, J.C. (1989a) Deriving a utility function for the U.S. Economy. Parts 1–3, *Journal of Policy Modeling,* 11(3), 391–424.

Dantzig, G., McAllister, P.H., and Stone, J.C. (1989b) Deriving a utility function for the U.S. Economy. Parts 4–5, *Journal of Policy Modeling,* 11(4), 569–592.

Decression, J., and Fatás, A. (1995) Regional market dynamics in Europe. *European Economic Review,* 39, 1627–1655.

Deutsche Bundestag (06.03.2002). *31. Rahmenplan der Gemeinschaftsaufgabe "Verbesserung der regionalen Wirtschaftsstruktur" für den Zeitraum 2002 bis 2005*, Berlin, Drucksache 14/8463.

Elhorst, J.P. (1995) Unemployment disparities between regions in the European Union. In: H.W. Armstrong and R.W. Vickerman (Eds.) *Convergence and Divergence among European Unions*, London, Pion, 209–221.

Elhorst, J.P. (2003) The mystery of regional unemployment differentials: A survey of theoretical and empirical explanations. *Journal of Economic Surveys* (Forthcoming).

Engle, R., and Granger, C. (1987) Co-integration and error correction: representation, estimation and testing. *Econometrica,* 35, 251–276.

European Commission (1999) *Sixth Periodic Report on the Regions.* Brussel – Luxembourg.

Fandel, G., and Gal, T. (2001) Redistribution of funds for teaching and research among universities: The case of North Rhine-Westfalia. *European Journal of Operational Research,* 130, 111–120.

Fay, R. (1996) *Enhancing the Effectiveness of Active Labour Market Policies: Evidence from Programme Evaluations in OECD Countries.* Paris, OECD, Labour Market and Social Policy Occasional Papers No. 18.

Fertig, M., Schmidt, C.M., and Schneider, H. (2002) *Active labour market policy in Germany — Is there a successful policy strategy.* Bonn, IZA Discussion Paper No. 576.

Fothergill, S. (2001) The true scale of the regional problem in the UK. *Regional Studies,* 35, 241–246.

Fox, K.A., Sengupta, J.K., and Thorbecke, E. (1966, 1973) *The Theory of Quantitative Economic Policy with Applications to Economic Growth, Stabilization and Planning.* Amsterdam, North-Holland.

Friedman, B.M. (1975) *Economic Stabilization Policy: Methods in Optimization.* Amsterdam, North-Holland.

Frisch, Ragnar (1957) *The Multiplex Method for Linear and Quadratic Planning.* Economic Institute, University of Oslo.

Frisch, R. (1963) An implementation system for optimal national economic planning without detailed quantity fixation from a central authority," *Extrait des actes de la 3ème conférence Internationale de Recherche Operationelle,* Dunod, 20–59. Also in: Bjerkholt, O. (Ed.) (1995) *Foundation of Modern Econometrics; The Selected Essays of Ragnar Frisch*, Vols. I and II, Edward Elgar, Aldershot, UK.

Frisch, R. (1970) From utopian theory to practical applications: The case of econometrics. In: *Reimpression de les prix Nobel en 1969,* 213–243. Also in: Bjerkholt, O. (Ed.) (1995) *Foundation of Modern Econometrics; The Selected Essays of Ragnar Frisch*, Vols. I and II, Edward Elgar, Aldershot, UK.

Frisch, R. (1971) *Cooperation between Politicians and Econometricians on the Formalization of Political Preferences.* The Federation of Swedish Industries, Stockholm. Also in: F. Long (Ed.) *Economic Planning Studies.* Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 41–86.

GORDIJN, H., AND VAN WISSEN, L. (1992) Demography of firms. *Planning*, 43, 1–43 (Dutsch).

GROENEWOLD, N. (1997) Does migration equalize regional unemployment rates? Evidence from Australia. *Papers in Regional Science,* 76, 1–20.

GRUBER, J. (1965) *Econometric Simultaneous Equation Models of the Cattle Cycle in the United States and three Selected Regions.* Ph.D. Dissertation in economics, Iowa State University. University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor MI; Microfilm copy- or bookform; No. 65-12/474.

GRUBER, J. (1967) Eine ökonometrische Methode zur Ermittlung Werte wirtschaftspolitischer Instrumente. In: Gesellschaft für Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften des Landbaues e.V. (Herausgeber) *Quantitative Methoden in den Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften des Landbaues, Band 4*, München – Basel – Wien, Landwirtschaftsverlag, 425–452.

GRUBER, J. (1979) *Approaches to Determining the Weights in the Objective Function of Econometric Decision Models.* FernUniversität Hagen, Discussion Paper No. 35.

GRUBER, J. (ED.) (1983) *Econometric Decision Models.* Proceedings Hagen, FRG 1981. (Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems 208.) Berlin, Springer.

GRUBER, J. (ED.) (1991) *Econometric Decision Models. New Methods of Modeling and Applications*, Proceedings Hagen, FRG 1989. (Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems 366.) Berlin, Springer.

GRUBER, J. (2002) Opening remarks: A retrospection over 35 years of work. In: A.S. Tangian and J. Gruber (Eds.) *Constructing and Applying Objective Functions.* Berlin, Springer (Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems 510), 3–13.

HALLETT, A.H., AND REES, H. (1983) *Quantitative Economic Policies and Interactive Planning.* Cambridge UK, Cambridge University Press.

HAGEN, T. (2003) *Three Approaches to the Evaluation of Active Labour Market Policy in East Germany Using Regional Data.* Mannheim, Zentrum für Europäische Wirtschaftsforschung (ZEW Discussion Papper No. 03-27).

HAGEN, T., AND STEINER, V. (2000) Von der Finanzierung der Arbeitslosigkeit zur Förderung von Arbeit – Analysen und Handlungsempfehlungen zur Arbeitsmarktpolitik. *ZEW Wirtschaftsanalysen,* 51, Baden-Baden.

HASSOLD, H., AND JUNG, L. (2000). Die Neueabgrenzung der Fördergebiete der Gemeinschaftsaufgabe "Verbesserung der regionalen Wirtschaftsstruktur". In: *Bundesamt für Bauwesen und Raumordnumg, Informationen zur Raumentwicklung,* Heft 2.2000 (Europäische und nationale Strukturpolitik im Zeichen der AGENDA 2000), 59–70.

HECKMAN, J.J., LALONDE, R.J., AND SMITH, J.A. (1999) The economics and econometrics of active labor market programs. In: O. Ashenfelter and D. Card (Eds.) *Handbook of Labor Economics, Vol. 3A*, Amsterdam, Elsevier, 1865–2097.

Hilles, G., and Tangian, A. (2002) Choice of Customer Products on the Basis of a Decision Model. In: A.S. Tangian, and J. Gruber, J. (Eds.) (2002) *Constructing and Applying Objective Functions.* Berlin, Springer (Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems 510), 331–346.

Holzer, H.J. (1993) Structural/frictional and demand-deficient unemployment in local labor markets. *Industrial Relations,* 32, 307–328.

Hüsges, H., and Gruber, J. (1991) Least squares estimation of quadratic preference functions for econometric decision models based on survey data. In: J. Gruber (Ed.) *Econometric Decision Models. New Methods of Modeling and Applications*, Proceedings Hagen, FRG 1989, Berlin, Springer, 185–204.

Hughes Hallett, A (1991) Public preferences and their role in the design of economic policy. In: J. Gruber (Ed.) *Econometric Decision Models, New Methods of Modeling and Applications*, Proceedings Hagen, FRG 1989. Berlin, Springer.

Hujer, R., and Caliendo, M. (2001) Evaluation of active labor market policy — Methodological concepts and empirical estimates. In: I. Becker, N. Ott, and G. Rolf (Eds.) *Soziale Sicherung in einer dynamischen Gesellschaft,* Frankfurt aM, Campus-Verlag , 583–617.

Hujer, R., Caliendo, M., and Thomsen, S. (2003) *New Evidence on the Effects of Job Creation Schemes in Germany — A Matching Approach with Threefold Heterogeneity.* Frankfurt, IZA Discussion Paper No. 750.

Johansen, L. (1974) Establishing preference functions for macroeconomic decision models (some observations on Ragnar Frisch's contributions). *European Economic Review,* 5, 41–66.

Johnes, G., and Hyclak, T.J. (1989) Wage inflation and unemployment in Europe: The regional dimension. *Regional Studies*, 23, 19–26.

Jones, D.R., and Manning, D.N. (1992) Long term unemployment, hysteresis and the unemployment-vacancy relationship: A regional analysis. *Regional Studies,* 26, 17–29.

Kol, J., and De Wolff, P. (1993) Tinbergen's work: change and continuity. *De Economist*, 141, 1–28.

Lechner, M., and Smith, J.A. (2003) *What is the value added by caseworkers?* Unpublished manuscript, downloadable from the Internet.

Lechner, M., Steiger, H., and Frölich, M. (2003) Neue Auswahlinstrument steigert Wirksamkeit. *Panorama*, No. 2, 38–39.

Malinvaud, E. (1994) *Diagnosing Unemployment.* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Marston, S.T. (1985) Two views of the geographic distribution of employment. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 100, 57–79.

MARTIN, J.P. (2000) What works among active labour market policies: Evidence from OECD countries' experiences. *OECD Economic Studies,* 30 (1), 79–113.

MARTIN, R. (1997) Regional unemployment disparities and their dynamics. *Regional Studies*, 31, 237–252.

MEDELIN, M.A., ASPEDALE, L.P., AND PACHIO, D. (1994) Commercialization and Price Response of a Bean-growing Farming System in Colombia. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 795–816.

MERKIES, A.H.Q.M. (2002) Experiments with preference functions. In: A.S. Tangian and J. Gruber (Eds.) *Constructing and Applying Objective Functions.* Berlin, Springer (Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems 510), 37–60.

MERKIES, A.H.Q.M., AND HOFKES, M.W. (1991) Operationalizing a macroeconomic preference function. In: J. Gruber (Ed.) *Econometric Decision Models, New Methods of Modeling and Applications*, Proceedings Hagen, FRG 1989. Berlin, Springer, 205–221.

MERKIES, A.H.Q.M., AND NIJMAN, T.E. (1983) The measurement of quadratic preference functions with small samples. In: J. Gruber (Ed.) *Econometric Decision Models*, Proceedings Hagen, West-Germany 1981. Berlin, Springer, 242–263.

MOLHO, I. (1995) Migrant inertia, accessibility and local unemployment. *Economica*, 62, 123–132.

MONTGOMERY, E.B. (1993) *Patterns in Regional Labour Market Adjustment: The United States vs. Japan.* NBER, Cambridge, Working Paper No. 4414.

OSWALD, A.J. (1985) The Economic Theory of Trade Unions: An Introductory Survey. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 87, 160–93.

PHELPS. E.S. (1994) *Structural Slumps.* Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press.

PINDYCK, P.S. (1973) *Optimal Planning for Economic Stabilization. The Application of Control Theory to Stabilization Policy.* Amsterdam, North-Holland.

RUBIN, D. (1980) Comment of Badu, D. — Randomization analysis of experimental data: The Fischer randomization test. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 75, 591–593.

RUSTEM, B., AND VELUPILLAI, K. (1984) Cooperation between politicians and the econometricians and the search for optimal economic policy. *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 6 (3), 341–350.

SAMUELSON, P. (1971) Maximum principles in analytical economics (the Nobel Prize lecture). *Science,* 173, 991–997.

SCARPETTA, S. (1996) Assessing the role of labour market policies and institutional settings on unemployment: A cross-country study. *OECD Economic Studies*, No. 26, 43–98.

Schmid, G., Speckesser, S., and Hilbert, C. (2001) Does active labour market policy matter? An aggregate analysis for Germany. In: J. de Koning and H. Mosley (Eds.) *Labour Market Policy and Unemployment. An Evaluation of Active Measures in France, Germany, the Netherlands, Spain and Sweden.* Cheltenham, 77–114.

Schwarm, C. (2002) Constructing Quadratic Objective Functions by Linear Programming with an Application to Pure Exchange. In: A.S. Tangian, and J. Gruber, J. (Eds.) (2002) *Constructing and Applying Objective Functions.* Berlin, Springer (Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems 510), 309–330.

Smith, A. (1776): *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations.* Edinburgh.

Statistisches Bundesamt (2003) *Erwerbstätigenstatistik.* Wiesbaden.

Steiner, V., and Hagen, T. (2002) Was kann die aktive Arbeitsmarktpolitik in Deutschland aus der Evaluationsforschung in anderen europäischen Ländern lernen? *Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik*, 3 (2), 189–206.

Steiner, V., Wolf, E., Egeln, M., Almus, M., Schrumpf, H., and Feldotto, P. (1998) Strukturanalyse der Arbeitsmarktentwicklung in den neuen Bundesländern. *ZEW Wirtschaftsanalysen,* 30, Baden-Baden.

Tangian, A.S. (2001) Constructing a monotonic quadratic objective functions in $n$ variables from a few 2-dimensional indifferences. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 130, 276–304.

Tangian, A.S. (2002) Constructing a quasi-concave quadratic objective function from interviewing a decision maker. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 141, 608–640.

Tangian, A.S. (2003a) A model for ordinally constructing additive objective functions. *European Journal of Operational Research* (forthcoming).

Tangian, A.S. (2003b) Redistribution of university budgets with respect to the status quo. *European Journal of Operational Research* (forthcoming).

Tangian, A.S., and Gruber, J. (Eds.) (1997) *Constructing Scalar-Valued Objective Functions.* Berlin, Springer (Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems 453).

Tangian, A.S., and Gruber, J. (Eds.) (2002) *Constructing and Applying Objective Functions.* Berlin, Springer (Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems 510).

Taylor, J., and Bradley, S. (1997) Unemployment in Europe: A Comparative analysis of regional disparities in Germany, Italy and the UK. *Kyklos*, 50, 221–245.

Tetsch, F., Benterbusch, U., and Letixerant, P. (1996). *Die Bund-Länder-Gemeinschaftsaufgabe "Verbesserung der regionalen Wirtschaftsstruktur"*, Köln, Verlag Dr. Otto Schmidt.

Teibach, R. (2002) Ranking of Second-Hand Policies. In: A.S. Tangian, and J. Gruber, J. (Eds.) (2002) *Constructing and Applying Objective Functions.* Berlin, Springer (Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems 510), 260–279.

Theil, H. (1964) *Optimal Decision Rules for Government and Industry.* Amsterdam, North-Holland.

Tinbergen, J. (1952) *On the Theory of Economic Policy.* Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Tinbergen, J. (1956) *Economic Policy Principles and Design.* Amsterdam, North-Holland.

Van Daal, J., and Merkies, A.H.Q.M., (1984) *Aggregation in Economic Research, From Individual to Macro Relations.* Dordrecht, D. Reidel Publishing Company.

Van Der Geest, L. (1977) Het vastleggen van Economisch-Politieke Oordelen in Preferentiefuncties, *Economisch Statistische Berichten*, 994–999.

Van Eijk, C.J., and Sandee, J., (1959) Quantitative Determination of an Optimum Economic Policy, *Econometrica*, 27, 1–13.

Van Wissen, L., and Ekamper, P. (1995) A model of spatial dynamics in the population of firms. In: Fischer, M.M., Sikos, T., and Bassa, L. (Eds.) *Recent Developments in Spatial Information, Modelling and Processing*, Budapest, Geomarket, 218–247.