

Regional Unemployment in Poland: Rural-Urban Contrasts

Ingham, Hilary; Ingham, Mike; Herbst, Jan

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Ingham, H., Ingham, M., & Herbst, J. (2009). Regional Unemployment in Poland: Rural-Urban Contrasts. *Applied Economics*, 1175-1186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036840802600293>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> 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.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> 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.

Mitglied der

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft



Regional Unemployment in Poland: Rural-Urban Contrasts

Journal:	<i>Applied Economics</i>
Manuscript ID:	APE-07-0570.R1
Journal Selection:	Applied Economics
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Aug-2008
Complete List of Authors:	Ingham, Hilary; Lancaster University, Economics Ingham, Mike; Ansdell Consulting Herbst, Jan; KLON/JAWOR
JEL Code:	J64 - Unemployment: Models, Duration, Incidence, and Job Search < J6 - Mobility, Unemployment, and Vacancies < J - Labor and Demographic Economics, J69 - Other < J6 - Mobility, Unemployment, and Vacancies < J - Labor and Demographic Economics, R11 - Regional Economic Activity: Growth, Development, and Changes < R1 - General Regional Economics < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics, R19 - Other < R1 - General Regional Economics < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics
Keywords:	Regional unemployment, Rurality, Industrial mix, Agriculture, Migration



Title:

Local Unemployment in Poland: Rural-Urban Contrasts

Authors:

Hilary Ingham, Department of Economics, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YX, UK.

Mike Ingham, Ansdell Consulting, 41 Blackpool Road, Lytham St Annes, FY8 4EJ, UK.

Jan Herbst, KLON/JAWOR, ul. Szpitalna 5, 111p 00-031, Warsaw, Poland.

Running Title:

Local Unemployment in Poland

Abstract:

Unemployment continues to bedevil Poland, albeit with striking sub-national differences, which this paper seeks to explain using random effects error component two-stage estimation for the country's NUTS 4 level powiats. Given the economy's peculiar configuration under communism, with its large private agricultural sector, emphasis is placed on rural-urban differences. While less densely populated areas do suffer higher unemployment rates, the effect is moderated by hidden unemployment in farming. On the other hand, powiats that housed the ex-state farms suffer a negative long-term legacy. Other notable results include an evident positive impact of foreign capital on local labour market fortunes.

Corresponding Author

Hilary Ingham, Department of Economics, Lancaster University, Lancaster LA1 4YX, UK, h.ingham@lancaster.ac.uk.

1. INTRODUCTION

Poland's headline unemployment rate has been consistently amongst the highest within the ten Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) countries that have recently acceded to the European Union (EU). Furthermore, in 2005 it housed four of the ten NUTS-2 (*nomenclature des unites territoriales statistiques*) regions with the highest unemployment rates in the then to be EU-27 (Mładý, 2006).¹ The general flavour of these observations is not particularly novel, of course, and there have been quite a large number of studies of Poland's national and major regional (voivodship) unemployment problems (e.g. Newell, 2006; Pastore, 2004; Walsh, 2003; Rutkowski and Przybyła, 2002; Góra and Lehmann, 1995). However, much less has been written about unemployment at more finely disaggregated spatial levels and detailed analysis of them has been rarer still. The purpose of this paper is therefore to examine the problem at the level of the powiat.² This accords better with the EU's ambition to reduce spatial unemployment disparities and its recognition of the need to enlist local actors in the process (CEC, 2005).

While the topic is of intrinsic interest, the study is also motivated by the greater opportunity that analysis at the powiat level affords to cast further light on what is widely recognised as the marked and enduring rural-urban divide within Poland (MARD, 2007; CEC, 1997). Important facets of this for current purposes include the fact that the raw statistics from the Labour Force Survey, although compiled on somewhat different conventions to the data utilised here,

¹ The four French overseas regions (Guadeloupe, Martinique, Guyane and Réunion) are excluded from this comparison.

² To our knowledge, the only analytical, as opposed to descriptive, work at this level, whether in English or Polish, are two evolving working papers by Joanna Tyrowicz and Piotr Wójcik of the Faculty of Economics, Warsaw University. Even these, however, are concerned with the statistical convergence properties of the unemployment series rather than their economic modelling.

1
2
3 indicate that unemployment among the non-farm rural population remains above
4 that among urban dwellers.³ On the other hand, private sector agriculture has
5
6 often been seen as a buffer zone shielding workers from the external labour
7
8 market and economic upheavals of recent years (Ingham and Ingham, 2004).
9
10 Nevertheless, while the underlying data he used will be subject to wide margins
11
12 of measurement error, Frenkel (2001) suggested that the pattern is not uniform
13
14 across the country and it is hoped that the current work will generate further
15
16 insights into this.
17
18
19
20
21

22 The next section outlines the basic administrative structure of Poland.
23
24 This is followed by a consideration of the powiat as a labour market. Section 4
25
26 contains an overview of theoretical explanations of within country spatial
27
28 unemployment differences, including those focusing on transitional economies.
29
30 Section 5 reviews various atypical features of the Polish economy, which suggest
31
32 that standard models of systemic change should be applied with care. Thereafter,
33
34 the empirical specification and estimator to be applied in the current analysis are
35
36 developed in Section 6. The results of the estimation exercise are presented in
37
38 Section 7. A summary and conclusions close the paper.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **2. THE TERRITORIAL DELINEATION OF POLAND**

47
48 The history of Poland's political transition has been widely documented and here
49
50 it is simply noted that the Polish elite, if not always the population at large, was
51
52 determined to pursue membership of the EU as an essential step in the country's
53
54 'return to Europe'. In order to achieve this goal, the country needed to comply
55
56
57

58
59 ³ Unless noted to the contrary, all data referred to in this paper are taken from official series
60 compiled and held by the Polish Central Statistical Office (GUS). Precise references can be found
in Ingham *et al.* (2008).

1
2
3 with the *acquis communautaire*, including the requirement that new members be
4
5 in a position to participate in the Structural Fund programmes and Cohesion
6
7 Fund actions from the date of entry. This mandatory stipulation is obviously
8
9 central for poorer applicant countries and its fulfilment dictates that a NUTS
10
11 consistent classification of their territory be established, which the prevailing
12
13 local government structure in Poland was not. While other factors were also at
14
15 work, this dictated the need for a thoroughgoing and domestically controversial
16
17 local government reorganization (Gorzalak and Jałowiecki, 2000).
18
19
20
21

22 The ultimate result was the Local Government Reform Act that came into
23
24 effect on 1 January 1999. This created sixteen NUTS 2 regions by reducing the
25
26 number of voivodships from the previous 49 and re-introduced the powiat tier of
27
28 government that had been abolished in 1974 as NUTS 4 (LAU 1 units from
29
30 2003).⁴ Amalgamations of powiats known as sub-regions represent the NUTS 3
31
32 tier, but these are largely a statistical artefact. In addition, the reform retained
33
34 2,489 NUTS 5 (now LAU 2) level gminas. Unfortunately, the reorganization
35
36 made labour market analysis of the voivodships much less informative; for
37
38 example, the coefficient of variation of their registered unemployment rates fell
39
40 from 115.7 per cent to just 27.5 per cent under the old and new boundaries at
41
42 December 1998.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **3. THE POWIAT AS A UNIT OF ANALYSIS**

52
53 As the only measure that can be made available on a comprehensive and reliable
54
55 basis at lower levels of spatial disaggregation, the current work seeks to model
56
57
58

59
60 ⁴ As a point of reference, the powiats, with an average population size of just over 103,000, are about three-quarters of the size of the districts that represent NUTS 4/LAU 1 regions in the UK.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

jobless rates based on the count of individuals who register their position at the local powiat labour office.⁵ In order to avoid problems with boundary changes and the reclassification of agricultural activity, discussed further below, the current analysis focuses upon an eight quarter, balanced panel of observations covering the years 2000 and 2001. Nationally, the unemployment rate stood at 14.0 per cent in 2000, rising to 16.2 per cent in the following year, with more than three million people on the register. As shown in Table 1, the corresponding powiat unemployment rates ranged from a low of 2.8 per cent in 2000 to a high of 35.7 per cent in 2001.

Utilising data at the level of the powiat is subject to the important caveat that functional local labour markets have not been defined for Poland. A typical way of constructing these is on the basis of the commuting patterns of workers, as with the Travel-To-Work Areas (TTWAs) for the UK. In practice, however, it is normally not possible to divide countries into an exhaustive set of self-contained labour markets and the UK, for example, adopts a criterion of 75 per cent self-containment for its TTWAs.⁶

Approximations aside, the boundaries of TTWAs are generally not co-terminus with those of administratively defined districts. Using the latter can therefore render the calculation of unemployment rates problematic whenever, as here, the data on unemployment and employment come from different sources: local labour offices for the former and establishment surveys for the latter.⁷

While controls designed to counter this difficulty will be introduced in the

⁵ ILO consistent self-certification data are available from the quarterly Labour Force Survey, but they cannot be used at the local level.

⁶ In areas where the working population exceeds 20,000 a level of containment of 70 per cent is deemed acceptable.

1
2
3 empirical work to follow, it should be noted that the correlation of recorded
4 powiat unemployment rates with residence based rates, defined as the
5 unemployed stock divided by the working age population, as preferred by ONS
6 (2002), was 0.81 in 2000 and 0.86 in 2001. These coefficients are highly
7 significant. Furthermore, local authorities tend to have powers of policy
8 intervention that abstractly constructed TTWAs typically do not.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **4. THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO SPATIAL UNEMPLOYMENT** 21 **DISPARITIES**

22
23 In most European countries at least, inequalities in unemployment across spatial
24 units often persist over very long periods of time (e.g. Elhorst, 2003; Badinger
25 and Url, 2002) and Poland represents no exception (Huber, 2006). Numerous
26 theoretical approaches to the explanation of regional unemployment differentials
27 exist, although those in the mainstream have common antecedents and therefore
28 tend not to be mutually exclusive. They do, however, emphasise different factors
29 as the major explanation of the failure of labour markets to clear through price
30 flexibility and factor mobility. What follows reviews certain influential strands of
31 the relevant literature.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44
45 One approach looks to compensating differentials to explain persistent
46 differences in unemployment rates (Harris and Todaro, 1970). In such models, a
47 zero migration equilibrium comes about as a result of some compensation
48 (relatively high wages, social benefits, transaction costs or good regional
49 amenities) offsetting a high risk of unemployment. In other words, utility is
50 equalised across space and high wages (or non-wage benefits) are associated
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

60 ⁷ The only definition of a local labour market used in Poland is in fact based on powiat

1
2
3 with high unemployment rates and the relationship persists over time. This
4
5 approach has also been labelled the amenity model (Marston, 1985).
6
7

8 Search models, on the other hand, predict a negative relationship between
9
10 unemployment and the real wage (Elhorst, *op. cit.*). The central idea is that
11
12 individuals maximise expected wages net of search costs, which underpins their
13
14 reservation wages. The optimal search strategy is then to accept the first wage
15
16 offer in excess of the latter. Migration and commuting expenses are transaction
17
18 costs to be added to search costs, while the regional distribution of job vacancies
19
20 is seen as part of the opportunity set. Unemployment benefits raise the
21
22 reservation wage, thereby prolonging search and raising the level of
23
24 unemployment. Within this framework, the size and dynamics of the local labour
25
26 market matter, with large or growing labour markets affording higher vacancy
27
28 rates and better job access, both of which speed up the job matching process.
29
30
31
32
33

34 Sector based models are also quite common explanations of spatial
35
36 unemployment disparities, with areas in which declining industries are
37
38 concentrated predicted to suffer relatively high unemployment rates. The malaise
39
40 persists through the depreciation of human capital stocks and deficiencies in the
41
42 adaptation of skill portfolios to the needs of growing sectors (Gripaios and
43
44 Wiseman, 1996). A related hypothesis is that the level of unemployment within
45
46 an area is likely to depend negatively on the degree of industrial diversity, insofar
47
48 as the latter promotes greater opportunities for labour redeployment in the face of
49
50 discriminatory demand shocks (Neumann and Topel, 1991).
51
52
53
54

55 The embarkation of numerous countries on the route from central
56
57 planning to a more or less free market configuration inspired various attempts to
58
59

60

boundaries.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

cast the attendant unemployment in a new light. One notable example, following *inter alia* Aghion and Blanchard (1994), is that focusing upon the Optimal Speed of Transition (OST). In essence, such models seek to establish the level of unemployment that is compatible with both the rate at which the state sector divests itself of labour and that with which the profit seeking private sector is willing to absorb it. A major conclusion is that the rate of release of workers by the former cannot be too fast, otherwise new firms will not be prepared to accept the tax burden implied by the unemployment benefits required to support those made redundant and the transition will fail. In turn, this lends support to a preference for gradualist rather than big-bang approaches to transformation.

The focus of attention on initial conditions, the rate of restructuring and intra-labour market flows implied by the OST approach are obviously potentially important considerations for analyses of transitional labour markets. It is a moot question, however, whether the differences between their situation and those involving transformations in other economic systems are often more than ones of degree. The impact of the closure of British coalfields during the 1980s and 1990s on their local labour markets (Beatty and Fothergill, 1996) represents just one example where similar concerns might be said to have arisen. What is more, OST was not originally conceived as a theory of regional unemployment differentials, although Walsh (*op. cit.*) and Lehmann and Walsh (1999), amongst others, have sought to explore its implications at the spatially disaggregated level.

This aside, formulations in this tradition have been criticised for their over-simplicity. Boeri (2006), for example, highlighted the need for the re-consideration of more traditional supply side rigidities in addition to the OST

1
2
3 emphasis on demand factors, if a firmer understanding of the behaviour of
4 transitional labour markets is to be achieved. As various surveys of the OST
5 literature already exist, including Ferragina and Pastore (2006) and Boeri (*op.*
6 *cit.*), this brief overview will not be developed further. Instead, the following
7 section undertakes a review of certain features of the Polish economy that would
8 indeed suggest the need for caution in applying the OST methodology too
9 literally in that country. The discussion will also serve as a prelude to the
10 empirical work that follows.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 **5. THE POLISH BACKGROUND**

26 A convenient simplification adopted by basic OST models is that transition
27 involves the reallocation of labour from an omnipresent state sector to an *ab*
28 *initio* private one. In fact, following an initial failed attempt to impose
29 agricultural collectivisation, Poland always had a sizeable private sector in the
30 post-war era in the form of its family farms, which employed 4.2 million workers
31 by 1989 or about one-quarter of all employment.⁸ What is more, controls on
32 private enterprise were relaxed somewhat in the 1980s and, by 1989, the private
33 sector non-agricultural workforce accounted for nine per cent of all jobs. To
34 these rather stark departures from the normal characterisation of the socialist
35 economies must, of course, be added the underground activity that was a
36 ubiquitous adjunct of central planning. It is therefore unrealistic to view state
37 restructuring as necessarily preceding the emergence of the private sector.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

⁸ Notwithstanding the private ownership of the farms, the state did, however, at various times exert a strong influence over their activities, although this waned in the 1980s (Wilkin, 1989).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Nevertheless, Poland did display many of the intended characteristics of the planning process, including forced industrialisation whereby particular areas were turned over to the production of a limited range of commodities. In addition, most agricultural activity – although not all of it (Wilkin, 1989) – was concentrated in the countryside, which gave rise to a frequently noted urban-rural dichotomy that partially reflected the uneasy relationship of the authorities with the private farming community. This does indeed then suggest that initial conditions might be important in determining future development trajectories, while at the same time highlighting the importance of structural change for the transition process.

Caution is also necessary regarding the assumption that unemployment was a phenomenon to emerge instantaneously. In truth, as might be expected in a labour market characterised by excess demand and narrow wage differentials, job changes were frequent.⁹ While unemployment was not recognised officially, the authorities did report the existence of a small number of job seekers. Admittedly, these were always minute in relation to the number of vacancies seemingly registered with the labour offices, although Witkowski (1993) presents official figures showing that the latter placed an annual average of 1.8 million workers in employment over the years 1985-1989. Furthermore, the same source notes that labour turnover (hires plus quits) amounted to 36 per cent of total employment in the socialised sector of the economy over that period.¹⁰ In addition, Poland exhibited very high levels of disguised unemployment, amounting to at least a quarter of the work force (Góra and Rutkowski, 1990).

⁹ Sometimes generous company specific non-pecuniary benefits acted as one brake on this.

¹⁰ In fact, the planned economies have long been known to have exhibited all forms of unemployment other than that associated with business cycles (Bornstein, 1978).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

The last observation suggests a concern that simple OST models ignore productivity growth and posit a constant wage differential between the public and private sectors. However, successful transition hinges on improved economic performance and increased living standards for the population. As Table 2 makes clear, Poland has achieved strong gains in labour productivity since the reforms began and this might be expected to hasten the pace at which the private sector grows, provided the advances were more heavily concentrated therein.¹¹

It is also unrealistic to assume that the public sector withers to nothing at the close of the transition process and more helpful to think in terms of restructured and unstructured activities. Thus, as shown in Table 3, public sector employment in Poland over the first four years of the current decade appeared relatively stable at something more than 3.5 million workers. At the same time, inflows to the unemployment pool have not emanated solely or even mainly from the public sector. As the Table confirms, the state sector only accounted for half of those on the unemployment register even in 1992 and the proportion declined thereafter.

Finally, it can be noted that the Aghion and Blanchard (*op. cit.*) assumption of a fixed labour force sits ill at ease with the facts. In particular, the Polish economic activity rate declined quite markedly in the years after 1989. Some part of this was undoubtedly attributable to an inflation of payrolls during the communist epoch. More important, however, was the liberal policy regime surrounding the granting of early retirement and invalidity pensions as a means of easing the personal burdens of transition; a practice that is still attracting critical comment from the OECD (2006). On the other hand, the working age

¹¹ In the context of Aghion and Blanchard (1994), the hiring function should drift upwards.

1
2
3 population continued to increase throughout the 1990s as a result of an earlier
4
5 baby boom.
6
7
8
9

10 **6. AN EMPIRICAL MODEL OF POWIAT UNEMPLOYMENT**

11
12 Modelling unemployment across powiats controls for a good deal of the intra-
13 regional variation that is suppressed in voivodship level studies, as Table 4
14
15 makes clear for 2001. However, the availability of data with which to test
16
17 hypotheses regarding the determinants of unemployment is less rich at the more
18
19 disaggregated level. Such problems sometimes therefore necessitate the use of
20
21 proxy measures. Nevertheless, the model developed in this section retains
22
23 theoretical underpinnings and the findings from the associated analysis should
24
25 yield further insights on the determinants of local unemployment disparities in
26
27 Poland.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 *Rurality*

37
38 Rural development remains a priority concern in Poland (Ingham and Ingham,
39
40 2008). Unfortunately, there is no unambiguous definition of rurality, with
41
42 adopted classifications based on administrative, contextual and functional criteria
43
44 all being common and frequently yielding dissimilar territorial divisions.
45
46 Attention here focuses upon population density based measures and the Polish
47
48 administrative definition.
49
50
51
52

53 The approach adopted by the OECD is straightforward. It defines NUTS
54
55 5 level communities as rural if they possess population densities of less than 150
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 people per square kilometre.¹² In Poland, rural areas are actually defined as
4
5 'territory situated outside town administrative boundaries' (MARD, 2002). Using
6
7 this definition, the Polish Ministry of Agriculture calculated that 38.1 per cent of
8
9 the country's population and 93.4 per cent of its land would be classified as rural
10
11 whereas, under the OECD definition, the corresponding figures are 35 per cent
12
13 and 91.7 per cent, respectively (*ibid.*).¹³ The basic unit of enumeration for such
14
15 calculations is the gmina, although their actual division is not simply into urban
16
17 and rural communities. Thus, while such are defined, there is an additional
18
19 category of mixed urban and rural gminas. The practice in official Polish
20
21 publications is to classify these sub-populations separately in computing urban
22
23 and rural population totals.
24
25
26
27
28

29
30 Seemingly arbitrary schema aside, probably the simplest approach to
31
32 classification is the continuous one relying on population density. At the very
33
34 least, it is a measure that has been subject to a good deal of rationalisation in the
35
36 labour market literature. Thus, density has been positively associated with
37
38 agglomeration and scale economies (Krugman, 1991; Fagerberg *et al.*, 1997),
39
40 with lower search costs and quicker matching (Badinger and Url, *op. cit.*) and
41
42 with worker (dis-)amenity (Partridge and Rickman, 1997).
43
44
45

46
47 Whatever the system of classification, there are various reasons for
48
49 expecting Polish rural areas to have higher levels of unemployment than urban
50
51 localities. Thus, the rural population is poorly educated (MARD, 2007) and low
52
53 levels of human capital are inimical to the conduct of modern economic activity.
54
55 With no measure of the stock, as opposed to flow, of educational attainment
56
57

58
59 ¹² At higher levels of spatial aggregation, the Organization's definitions focus on the percentage
60 of the population living in rural communities (European Commission, 1997).

¹³ The implied difference of 1.4 million people was considered 'insignificant' (MARD, 2002).

1
2
3 available, any measure of rurality will, at least partly, track this influence.
4
5
6 Further, many of Poland's rural areas are connected but poorly to the more
7
8 dynamic centres of the country's economy as a result of inferior physical
9
10 communications networks (MARD, *op. cit.*), which reflects the contextual
11
12 dimensions of isolation and peripherality. However, the distinctive characteristics
13
14 of Polish farming lead one to suspect that this posited relationship may not
15
16 always prevail.
17
18

19
20 The country's agriculture is certainly declining, insofar as its share of
21
22 GDP fell from 12.9 per cent in 1989 to just 2.6 per cent in 2003. However, its
23
24 employment total did not adjust accordingly and the sector still accounted for
25
26 almost 29 per cent of all in work in 2003.¹⁴ In short, the sector's more than four
27
28 million workers include many who are disguised unemployed. Furthermore,
29
30 given that prevailing regulations prevent individuals connected to family farms
31
32 receiving unemployment benefit, there may be little incentive for them to register
33
34 themselves as out of work. As such, it is natural to hypothesise that *cet. par.* the
35
36 more agricultural is an area the lower would be its unemployment rate.
37
38
39

40
41 As the powiats do not necessarily represent self-contained labour market
42
43 areas, they may experience commuter flows across their boundaries; that is, there
44
45 may be spatial spillovers. Certainly in the years prior to 1989, numerous workers
46
47 from the countryside were known to travel daily to industrial complexes in urban
48
49 localities for their employment. However, it is often remarked that those with
50
51 agricultural plots were the first to be laid off as enterprises rationalised in the
52
53 post-communist environment (Góra, 1991). Also, public transport services have
54
55
56
57
58

59
60 ¹⁴ Statistical sophistry subsequently erased some two million peasant farmers from the labour market map (GUS, 2004; Ingham and Ingham, 2004).

1
2
3 been curtailed in rural areas, thereby reducing the ease of commuting and
4
5 increasing peripherality. Nevertheless, some account needs to be taken of the
6
7 possibility that labour mobility could contaminate analyses of powiat
8
9 unemployment, with such flows regarded as more likely the more buoyant or
10
11 metropolitan are surrounding areas.
12
13
14
15
16

17 *Initial Conditions, Structural Change and Industry Mix*

18
19 As already noted, discussion of labour markets in transition economies
20
21 frequently places emphasis on the importance of initial conditions inherited from
22
23 the era of central planning. In general, this might be captured by the initial degree
24
25 of industrial diversification of local economies as a measure of their ability to
26
27 withstand the shocks of systemic change. However, in the particular case of
28
29 Poland, studies have tended also to stress the location of the ex-state farms as an
30
31 important negative structural inheritance from the past (Dzun, 2004). It is
32
33 certainly the case that this particular segment of agriculture has dwindled almost
34
35 to nothing. That said, the obverse of the size of private farming was a state sector
36
37 of limited proportion and the pure state farms, excluding co-operatives,
38
39 employed just 470,000 workers in 1990. Furthermore, not only were the state
40
41 farms relatively diversified enterprises in order to shield them from seasonal
42
43 fluctuations, early retirement and invalidity pensions were often used to shed
44
45 labour post-1989. Nevertheless, they were concentrated spatially, as shown in
46
47 Table 5, and the possibility that their demise generated localised problems should
48
49 be explored more formally than has been the case to date.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 The difficulty with an emphasis on initial conditions, particularly after a
58
59 reasonable lapse of time, is that economies evolve, as does the identity of those
60

1
2
3 participating in them. This implies a need to control for structural change.
4
5
6 Unfortunately, the industrial classification in use in Poland was revised with
7
8 effect from 1994 and the boundaries of the country's administrative areas
9
10 changed in 1999. This compounds the problem of only having employment data
11
12 available at the level of the voivodship and suggests that, in addition to
13
14 attempting to measure change over time, it might be necessary to explore the
15
16 power of point modernity measures. Natural candidates in this regard would
17
18 seem to be contemporary indicators that attempt to account for the degree of
19
20 diversification or the importance of the service sector.
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 *Economic Activity: Investment and FDI*

28
29 Ideally, a measure of local economic activity such as gross regional product
30
31 (GRP) would be used as a proxy for labour demand. Unfortunately, no tolerably
32
33 accurate measure of this is available at the powiat level and, in an attempt to
34
35 avoid over-reliance on variables relating to higher levels of spatial aggregation,
36
37 other indicators are employed.¹⁵ The first is the level of investment per capita,
38
39 which is itself an important component of GRP and might therefore be expected
40
41 to be inversely related to unemployment. However, it might also be an indicator
42
43 of the extent of modernisation being undertaken. While this could take the form
44
45 of more progressive and more competitive enterprises that create new work
46
47 opportunities, it might also herald the rationalisation of existing operations and,
48
49 at least initially, the destruction of jobs. The *a priori* net outcome of investment
50
51 on unemployment is therefore unclear.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

¹⁵ The relationship between GRP and unemployment has been shown to be complex (Elhorst, 2003: 732).

1
2
3 One might also look to the significance of companies with foreign capital
4 participation in the powiat business base, as recorded in the official REGON
5 register, in view of the attention paid to the potential role of FDI in transforming
6 economies. The most prevalent attitude, although not uncontested, is that it can
7 support transition by transferring technologies, managerial and labour skills,
8 marketing channels and a market-based business culture, while at the same time
9 supplementing domestic savings in the process of catching up with western
10 living standards (Lankes and Venables, 1997). Such developments might be
11 expected to reduce unemployment. While direct evidence is scarce, the numerical
12 weight of companies with foreign capital participation provides one test of the
13 role of the latter in local labour markets.¹⁶
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 *Labour supply and migration*

33
34 Having considered some important influences on the demand for labour,
35 attention here focuses on supply. Empirically, labour supply can be approximated
36 by the population of working age multiplied by the participation rate.¹⁷
37
38 Unfortunately, the participation rate is not available for powiats, although
39 working age population data are released and these are used as the basis for
40 examining labour supply pressures.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 The actual labour supply of working age is the outcome of a number of
49 flows, of which migration often receives emphasis in the literature on local
50 unemployment. Some, such as Marston (*op. cit.*), see it as a powerful and rapid
51
52
53
54
55

56 ¹⁶ The monetary volume of FDI, whether measured as a stock or a flow, is not available at the
57 level of the powiat.

58 ¹⁷ The measure is an approximation because some people participate even though they are outside
59 the accepted working age limits. Commuting across local area boundaries represents a further
60

1
2
3 equilibrating mechanism when unemployment rates diverge across space. If his
4
5 theoretical perspective is the correct one, there arises an endogeneity problem
6
7 when migration is introduced into an unemployment equation. However, the
8
9 evidence for countries other than the U.S. does not support the causal link from
10
11 unemployment through to migration nearly so strongly (Ferragina and Pastore,
12
13 *op. cit.*; Elhorst, *op. cit.*). Also, the housing shortage in Poland has been a
14
15 notorious constraint on mobility and, even though the situation has improved
16
17 somewhat in recent years, it still gives rise to concern (Ingham and Ingham,
18
19 2008). Nevertheless, movement does occur and the potential endogeneity of the
20
21 migration rate needs to be considered.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 *Model Specification and Preliminary Screening*

30
31 In view of the preceding discussion, attention focused on variants of the
32
33 following general model:
34

$$35 \quad U = f(\text{Rurality, Initial Conditions, Structural Change, Economic Activity, Labour} \\ 36 \quad \text{Supply, Controls})$$

37
38 in which U is the registered unemployment rate. The precise variables used as
39
40 regressors and their mnemonics are given in Table 6.
41
42
43
44

45
46 Initial estimation revealed that LS was highly negatively
47
48 correlated with AG and had to be excluded. The measure of agriculture's
49
50 importance is therefore capturing both industry mix and population age structure
51
52 effects. As expected, $RUROECD$, $RURPOL$ and $DENS$ were collinear, critically
53
54 so in the case of the former two, and they were therefore retained for alternative
55
56
57
58

59 distortion. However, other possible measures of labour supply, such as total population multiplied
60 by the overall participation rate, lead to even more serious problems.

1
2
3 specifications. However, notwithstanding evident stability, collinearity between
4 these rurality measures and agricultural intensity remained a concern. As the
5 problem was much less severe when population density was employed, its
6 inclusion defines the *a priori* preferred version of the model.
7
8
9
10
11

12 Data on a group of observational units over time raise questions about the
13 choice of modelling strategy. The straightforward option would be to ignore
14 heterogeneity within the sample and to pool the data. However, if heterogeneity
15 across powiats is present, it results in biased and inconsistent estimators. This
16 work therefore adopts a panel data approach and utilises the one-way error
17 correction model proposed by Baltagi (2008). Initial testing rejected the null of
18 no endogeneity for two of the model's explanatory variables, *INVPC* and *MIG*,
19 and Baltagi's (*op. cit.*) random effects error component two-stage estimator
20 (EC2SLS) was used to generate consistent, asymptotically efficient estimates of
21 the model.¹⁸ The estimator is explored more fully in Ingham et al. (*op. cit.*).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 7. RESULTS

38 Results from estimating four variants of the model by means of EC2SLS on the
39 available 2,984 observations are presented in Table 7. Equation (1) represents the
40 preferred specification and explains over 57 per cent of the variance in powiat
41 unemployment rates. Most of the regressors are significant at the five per cent
42 level or better and attract the expected signs. The findings indicate that higher
43 population densities – less rural areas – are associated with lower unemployment
44 rates, having controlled for the importance of agriculture, with the result being
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 ¹⁸ There has been much discussion in the literature on the relative merits of the fixed and random
59 effects approaches to panel data (Nerlove, 2002). However, with time-invariant regressors
60 (*PERIPH*, *STATEAG*, *HERF*, *STCH₀* and *STCH₁*), the individual-specific variables in the fixed
effects model are collinear with the constant term, hence this specification cannot be employed.

1
2
3 highly significant. However, the results are in general not sensitive to the precise
4 definition of rurality adopted, with only the peripherality measure losing the
5 significance it attains elsewhere when *DENS* is included in the first specification.
6
7 Nevertheless, the exclusion of any rurality measure (column (4)) renders the size
8 of agriculture wholly insignificant. The evident negative impact of agriculture on
9 the registered jobless rate undoubtedly reflects the hidden unemployment in
10 Polish farming, which is obscured when the sector's importance also has to
11 identify rural areas in general.¹⁹
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 On the other hand, powiats that historically formed centres of state
23 farming (*STFARM*) are still confronted with a statistically significant legacy
24 working in the opposite direction. Given the erstwhile concentration of such
25 activity, as highlighted above, the impact is also rather large. This finding
26 contrasts somewhat with that for the other initial condition included in the model;
27 the general industrial concentration measure, *HERF*₀. Thus, while this is both
28 large and of the expected sign, it only attains statistical significance at the ten per
29 cent level in the preferred specification and is weaker still in the other variants
30 reported. There is, therefore, at least some suggestion that the footprint of early
31 handicaps on local labour markets in Poland eventually fades.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Both of the restructuring indices employed, *STCH*₀ and *STCH*₁ are
46 statistically significant, although they exert opposing influences on the
47 unemployment rate. Powiats located in voivodships which experienced the most
48 restructuring during the period 1989-1993 were suffering from high
49 unemployment a decade later. Closer inspection revealed that the most
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58
59 ¹⁹ The negative relationship between agriculture and unemployment is the opposite of that found
60 by Fagerberg *et al.* (1997) for regions within the old EU-15, where the social role of farming is
much less significant.

1
2
3 significant component of the index was the collapse of manufacturing
4
5 employment, which was not offset by the increase of jobs in the commerce and
6
7 service sectors. The natural suggestion is that the employment lost was in the
8
9 most worthless of state enterprises, possibly situated in inappropriate locations
10
11 and with an eye to markets that have been largely lost. Restructuring between
12
13 1994 and 1998, however, was found to exert a negative influence on
14
15 unemployment. For this period, the largest components of the index were the
16
17 increased employment shares for the commerce, business service and financial
18
19 intermediation sectors. This represents the first piece of current evidence to
20
21 confirm that modern local economies generate jobs.
22
23
24
25
26

27 The last finding is reinforced by the downward pressure exerted on the
28
29 unemployment rate as the importance of *TOURISM* increases. Somewhat
30
31 perversely, however, the coefficient on the size of the overall service sector,
32
33 *SERV*, attracts a positive coefficient. One possible explanation for this result is
34
35 that small service sectors reflected concentrations of still to be privatised
36
37 industrial enterprises that continued to house hidden unemployment.²⁰
38
39 Alternatively, the variable used may have been measured inappropriately insofar
40
41 as the available service sector employment data contain not only those in the
42
43 supposed growth industries, such as business services and financial
44
45 intermediation, but also those in publicly provided services, such as health and
46
47 education.
48
49
50
51
52

53 Both investment and the presence of foreign capital are associated with
54
55 economic modernisation and the negative and significant parameter estimates for
56
57

58
59
60 ²⁰ In this regard, it might be worth noting that OECD (2006) criticised Poland for its tardiness in completing its privatisation programme.

1
2
3 *INV* and *PRCCFOR* indicate that both serve to lower unemployment,
4
5 notwithstanding possible theoretical suggestions to the contrary. Although the
6
7 FDI test applied is admittedly not very strong, the result does at least provide
8
9 some concrete evidence in a field that has been noted more for introspection and
10
11 circumstantial conclusions (Ferragina and Pastore, *op. cit.*).
12
13
14

15
16 The coefficient on net migration is negative, indicating that population
17
18 inflows are not associated with higher unemployment, a finding that is in line
19
20 with the contention that ‘people cause jobs’ (Layard, 1997) and one that
21
22 reiterates the results for other countries reported in OECD (2000). On the other
23
24 hand, the weighted average of contiguous powiat unemployment rates, *SPOVER*,
25
26 is both positive and highly significant. This is consistent with restricted
27
28 commuting, as opposed to migration, flows in depressed areas of the country.
29
30 However, *PERIPH*, which indicates whether or not a powiat is either a city, or is
31
32 adjacent to one, fails to achieve statistical significance in the preferred
33
34 specification, even though it does attract the anticipated negative sign; a finding
35
36 that may once again reflect limited commuting flows.
37
38
39
40

41
42 Finally, the three seasonal dummy variables are all negative and
43
44 significant, reflecting a tendency for unemployment rates to be lowest in the
45
46 summer.
47
48
49

50 **8. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

51
52 Poland has been plagued with stubbornly high unemployment in the years since
53
54 1990, although the severity of the problem has long been recognised to be
55
56 spatially uneven. Numerous attempts have previously been made to analyse the
57
58 factors driving the variation in experience across the macro regions of the
59
60

1
2
3 country, but the Local Government reform of 1999 rendered subsequent such
4
5 exercises much less incisive. The present work adopted a more disaggregated
6
7 perspective and analysed the issue at the level of the 373 powiats that existed in
8
9 the years 2000 and 2001, across which there was and remains a tremendous
10
11 variation in unemployment rates.
12
13

14
15 In addition to high aggregate unemployment, the country continues to
16
17 exhibit a marked rural development deficit. The findings of this paper indicate
18
19 that this goes hand in hand with higher jobless rates. However, the relationship is
20
21 tempered by the role that agriculture evidently plays in containing unemployment
22
23 totals, although, for the most part, this is but another facet of the failure of rural
24
25 reform efforts to date. The recent decision to reclassify many erstwhile farmers
26
27 as economically inactive will not effect any improvement in this regard. At the
28
29 same time, while consistent with a good deal of popular speculation, the finding
30
31 that the legacy of the dissolution of the ex-state farms remains was somewhat
32
33 surprising and a further indication of the depth of the country's rural malaise and
34
35 of the need for renewed policy initiatives in the area.
36
37
38
39

40
41 Other strong findings from the estimation of the chosen model, which
42
43 was well determined and evidently robust, were that the rate of investment and,
44
45 as has often been hypothesised, the presence of foreign capital, help to reduce
46
47 local unemployment rates. In-migration and contiguity with localities possessing
48
49 relatively healthy labour markets were also found to be benign influences.
50
51 Beyond the localised finding for the presence of state farming, there was not
52
53 strong evidence that conditions at the onset of the transition retained a lasting
54
55 influence. Furthermore, while past structural change seemingly has a role to play
56
57 in explaining later unemployment rates, the process appears to be complex and
58
59
60

1
2
3 would merit further study; as would the ambiguous influence of service sector
4
5 activity uncovered in the current work.
6
7

8 Greater understanding of the factors determining local unemployment in
9
10 Poland is overdue as it grapples with the challenges posed by membership of the
11
12 EU in what must now be regarded as its post-transition era. This paper reported
13
14 the results of work attempting to proceed towards that goal. Future research
15
16 efforts in this rather neglected field will hopefully carry it forward.
17
18

21 22 **Acknowledgement**

23
24 The authors wish to acknowledge the financial support of DFID for research
25
26 project R8097 and the helpful comments of the anonymous referee upon the
27
28 previous version of this paper.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

- Aghion, P. and O. Blanchard (1994) 'On the Speed of Transition in Central Europe', in: S. Fischer and J. Rotemberg (eds) *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, pp. 283-320, Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press.
- Badinger, H. and T. Url (2002), 'Determinants of Regional Unemployment: Some Evidence from Austria', *Regional Studies*, vol. 36, no. 9, pp. 977-88.
- Baltagi, B.H. (2008), *Econometric Analysis of Panel Data*, 4th edition, Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Beatty, C. and S. Fothergill (1996) 'Labour Market Adjustment in Areas of Chronic Industrial Decline: The Case of the UK Coalfields', *Regional Studies*, vol. 30, no. 7, pp. 627-640.
- Boeri, T. (2006) *Structural Change, Welfare Systems and Labour Reallocation: Lessons from the Transition of Formerly Planned Economies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bornstein, M. (1978), 'Unemployment in Capitalist Regulated Market Economies and Socially Centrally Planned Economies', *American Economic Review*, vol. 68, no. 2, Papers Proceedings, pp. 38-43.
- Caroleo, F. and S. Destefanis (2006) (eds), *The European Labour Market: Regional Dimensions*, Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag.
- CEC (Commission of the European Communities) (2005), 'Working Together for Growth and Jobs: Integrated Guidelines for Growth and Jobs (2005-08)', Communication to the Spring European Council.
- (1997), 'Agenda 2000 – Commission Opinion on Poland's Application for Membership of the European Union', DOC/97/16, Brussels.

- 1
2
3 Dzun, W. (2004), 'State Owned Farms in the Process of Systemic
4 Transformation', *Village and Agriculture*, Supplement to no. 3(124), pp.153-166.
5
6
7
8 Elhorst, J.P. (2003), 'The Mystery of Regional Unemployment Differentials:
9 Theoretical and Empirical Explanations', *Journal of Economic Surveys*, vol. 17,
10 no. 5, pp. 709-48.
11
12
13
14 European Commission (1997), 'Rural Developments', Directorate General for
15 Agriculture (DGVI), CAP 2000 Working Document.
16
17
18
19 Fagerberg, J., B. Verspagen and M. Caniëls (1997), 'Technology, Growth and
20 Unemployment across European Regions', *Regional Studies*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp.
21 457-66.
22
23
24
25
26
27 Ferragina, A. and F. Pastore (2006) 'Regional Unemployment in the OST
28 Literature', in: Caroleo and Destefanis (eds).
29
30
31 Frenkel, I. (2001), 'Rural Unemployment in Poland', in *Village and Agriculture*
32 – *Selected Papers*, Supplement to no. 4 (113), pp. 71-89, Warsaw: Polish
33 Academy of Sciences.
34
35
36
37
38
39 Góra, M. (1991), 'Shock Therapy for the Polish Labour Market', *International*
40 *Labour Review*, vol. 130, no. 2, pp.145-164
41
42
43
44 Góra, M. and H. Lehmann (1995), 'How Divergent is Regional Labour
45 Adjustment in Poland?', in: S. Scarpetta and A. Wörgötter (eds), *The Regional*
46 *Dimension of Unemployment in Transition Countries*, Paris: OECD.
47
48
49
50
51 Góra, M. And M. Rutkowski (1990), 'The Demand for Labour and the Disguised
52 Unemployment in Poland in the 1980s', *Communist Economies*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp.
53 325-335.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Gorzelak, G. and B. Jałowiecki (2000), 'Territorial Government Reform', in: L.
4
5 Kolarska-Bobińska (ed.), *The Second Wave of Polish Reforms*, Institute of Public
6
7 Affairs: Warsaw.
8
9
10 Gripiaios, P. and N. Wiseman (1996), 'The Impact of Industrial Structure on
11
12 Changes in Unemployment in GB Travel to Work Areas 1989-92', *Applied*
13
14 *Economics*, vol. 28, pp. 1263-67.
15
16
17 GUS (2004), *Employment in National Economy in 2003*, Warsaw.
18
19
20 Harris, J. and M. Todaro (1970), 'Migration, Unemployment and Development:
21
22 A Two Sector Analysis', *American Economic Review*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 126-42.
23
24
25 Huber, P. (2006), 'Regional Labor Market Developments in Transition', World
26
27 Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3896.
28
29
30 Ingham, H. and M. Ingham (2008), 'Worker Mobility within Polish Agriculture',
31
32 *Comparative Economic Studies*, forthcoming.
33
34 ——— (2004), 'How Big is the Problem of Polish Agriculture?', *Europe Asia*
35
36 *Studies*, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 213-34.
37
38
39 Ingham, H., M. Ingham and J. Herbst (2008), 'Why do Local Unemployment
40
41 Rates in Poland Vary so Much?', LUMS WP 2008/011, Lancaster University.
42
43
44 Krugman, P. (1991), *Economic Geography and Trade*, Cambridge MA/London:
45
46 MIT Press.
47
48
49 Lankes, H-P and A.J. Venables (1997), 'Foreign Direct Investment in Eastern
50
51 Europe and the Former Soviet Union', in: S. Zecchini (ed.), *Lessons From the*
52
53 *Economic Transition: Central and Eastern Europe in the 1990s*, Dordrecht:
54
55 Kluwer Academic Publishers for OECD.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Layard, R. (1997), 'Preventing Long-Term Unemployment: An Economic
4 Analysis', in: D. Snower and G. De La Dehesa (eds), *Unemployment Policy*,
5 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6
7
8
9
10
11 Lehmann, H. and P. Walsh (1999) 'Gradual Restructuring and Structural
12 Unemployment in Poland: A Legacy of Central Planning', LICOS Discussion
13 Paper 78/1999, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.
14
15
16
17
18 MARD (Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development) (2007), *National
19 Strategic Plan for 2007-2013 Rural Development*: Warsaw.
20
21
22 ——— (2002), *Coherent Structural Policy for Rural Areas and Agriculture
23 Development*, Warsaw.
24
25
26
27 Marston, S. (1985), 'Two Views of the Geographic Distribution of
28 Unemployment', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 100, pp. 57-79.
29
30
31 Mładý, M. (2006), 'Regional unemployment in the European Union, Bulgaria
32 and Romania in 2005', *Statistics in Focus*, Theme 1, 1/2006, Luxembourg:
33 Eurostat.
34
35
36
37
38
39 Nerlove, M. (2002), *Essays in Panel Data Econometrics*, Cambridge: Cambridge
40 University Press.
41
42
43
44 Neumann, G. and R. Topel (1991), 'Employment Risk, Diversification and
45 Unemployment', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 106, pp. 1341-65.
46
47
48
49 Newell, A. (2006), 'Skill Mismatch and Regional Unemployment in Poland', in:
50 Caroleo and Destefanis (eds).
51
52
53
54 OECD (2006), *Economic Survey of Poland 2006*, Paris.
55
56 ——— (2000), *Employment Outlook*, Paris.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ONS (Office for National Statistics) (2002), *Review of the Framework for*
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ONS (Office for National Statistics) (2002), *Review of the Framework for Labour Market Statistics*, National Statistics Quality Review Series, Report no. 11, London: ONS.

Partridge, M. and D. Rickman (1997), 'The Dispersion of US State Unemployment Rates: The Role of Market and Non-Market Equilibrium Factors', *Regional Studies*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 593-606.

Pastore, F. (2004), 'Regional Unemployment Persistence in Poland: A Survey of the Evidence and Some Insights from the Literature', *Current Politics and Economics of Russia, Eastern and Central Europe*, vol. 16, no. 3. pp. 97-116.

Rutkowski, J. and M. Przybyla (2002), 'Poland: Regional Dimensions of Unemployment', in: B. Funck and L. Pizzati (eds), *Labor, Employment and Social Policies in the EU Enlargement Process*, Washington DC: IBRD/World Bank.

Walsh, P. (2003) 'The Cyclical Pattern of Regional Unemployment Flows in Poland', *Economic Systems*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 155-169.

Wilkin, J. (1989), 'Private Agriculture and Socialism: The Polish Experience', in: R. Clarke (ed.) *Poland: The Economy in the 1980s*, Harlow: Longman.

Witkowski, J. (1993), 'Unemployment in the Period of Transition 1990-1993', GUS: Warsaw.

Table 1
Dimensions of Powiat Unemployment: Descriptive Statistics (June)

Year	National	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation	n
2000	13.6	2.8	31.3	15.6	5.9	373
2001	15.9	4.1	35.7	18.5	6.5	373

For Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 2
GDP per Worker: 1990 Prices (1990 = 100)

1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
97.2	102.6	108.3	112.7	120.2	123.1	127.7	134.1	141.6	152.4	159.0	170.7

For Peer Review

Table 3
Employment and Unemployment: Poland

	Employment (000)	Unemployment	
	Public Sector	Previously employed % of total	From public sector (%)
1989	9277.8	n.a.	n.a.
1990	8243.4	n.a.	n.a.
1991	7052.1	n.a.	n.a.
1992	6606.4	78.3	63.9
1993	6060.3	77.0	58.2
1994	5878.4	77.0	n.a.
1995	5623.1	78.9	n.a.
1996	5412.5	83.4	36.8
1997	5072.8	80.9	34.6
1998	4671.3	77.4	33.8
1999	4338.9	76.3	30.0
2000	3988.6	76.2	24.3
2001	3702.7	76.3	21.3
2002	3905.2	76.1	20.6
2003	3780.2	75.9	20.4
2004	3695.6	75.8	20.1

Table 4
Powiat Unemployment Rates 2001

Voivodship	Total (%)	Minimum (%)	Maximum (%)
Dolnośląskie	19.3	8.5	33.3
Kujawsko-pomorskie	20.1	10.7	29.3
Lubelskie	14.3	10.9	19.4
Lubuskie	22.4	11.5	32.1
Łódzkie	16.8	7.6	23.0
Małopolskie	12.9	7.4	20.3
Mazowieckie	11.7	4.1	28.5
Opolskie	16.3	8.9	25.0
Podkarpackie	16.3	9.1	22.0
Podlaskie	13.8	7.3	21.3
Pomorskie	17.6	6.8	34.0
Śląskie	14.3	6.2	26.2
Świętokrzyskie	17.2	8.4	25.1
Warmińsko-mazurskie	26.8	11.8	33.5
Wielkopolskie	13.5	4.3	26.3
Zachodniopomorskie	21.7	9.9	35.7

Table 5
Employment in State Agriculture in 1990 (% of total employment)

Voivodship	%
Kozalińskie	11.1
Elbląskie	10.9
Olsztyńskie	9.0
Pilskie	9.0
Gorzowskie	8.4
Leszczyńskie	7.5
Suwalskie	7.4
Szczecińskie	7.4
Zielonogórskie	5.7

Note: Only those old voivodships where state agriculture accounted for 5% or more of total employment are included.

Table 6
Variable Definitions¹

<u>Rurality</u>	
<i>RUROECD</i>	% of the population resident in whole or part gminas with population densities below 150 persons per square kilometre.
<i>RURPOL</i>	% of the population resident in wholly rural gminas or in the rural part of mixed gminas.
<i>DENS</i>	Population density.
<i>AG</i>	Agricultural employment as % of population of working age.
<i>PERIPH</i>	Dummy variable = 1 if powiat contiguous to a city powiat, = 0 otherwise. ²
<i>SPOVER</i>	Simple average unemployment rate across all contiguous powiats.
<u>Initial Conditions</u>	
<i>HERF₀</i>	Herfindahl index of industrial concentration across 17 sectors measured at the voivodship level in 1989. ³
<i>STFARM</i>	% employment in state farms (excluding co-operatives) in 1990 measured at the voivodship level.
<u>Structural Change</u>	
<i>STCH₀</i>	Index of structural change 1989-1993 across 17 sectors measured at the level of 49 voivodships. ⁴
<i>STCH₁</i>	Index of structural change 1994-1998 across 14 sectors measured at the level of 49 voivodships.
<i>SERV</i>	% employment in the service sector measured at the voivodship level. ⁵
<i>TOURISM</i>	Number of tourists accommodated per head of powiat population.
<u>Economic Activity</u>	
<i>INV</i>	Investment (real zloty) per capita.
<i>PRCCFOR</i>	The proportion of REGON commercial law enterprises with foreign capital participation.
<u>Labour Supply</u>	
<i>LS</i>	% of powiat population of working age.
<i>MIG</i>	Net internal and international migration (inflows minus outflows) for permanent stay per 1000 population.
<u>Controls</u>	
<i>S1</i>	Quarter 1 seasonal dummy.
<i>S2</i>	Quarter 2 seasonal dummy.
<i>S3</i>	Quarter 3 seasonal dummy.

Notes:

1. All variables measured at powiat level for the years 2000 and 2001 unless stated.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2. City powiats are treated as contiguous to themselves. Also, Warsaw Central was not designated officially as a city powiat until 2002, but has been treated as one in the current analysis.

3. When a powiat does not map completely into one old voivodship, a weighted average of the H measures for the voivodships involved is used, with weights equal to the powiat's resident population that would have been located in each.

4. $STCH_0 = \sum_i 0.5 |S_{i,t_1} - S_{i,t_0}|$ where S_{i,t_1} is the employment share of industry i in time period t_1 and S_{i,t_0} is the corresponding share for time period t_0 . $STCH_1$ is defined analogously.

5. Services comprise trade and repair, hotels and restaurants, transport, storage and communication, financial intermediation, real estate, renting and business activity, public administration and defence, compulsory social security, education, health and social work and other community, social and personal social services.

Table 7
Error Component Two-Stage Least Squares Estimates

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<i>Constant</i>	-1.7563 (0.91)	-4.6920 (2.32)	-3.9371 (1.95)	-2.2991 (1.15)
<i>DENS</i>	-0.0022 (5.96)			
<i>RURPOL</i>		0.03728 (4.15)		
<i>RUROECD</i>			0.02710 (3.03)	
<i>AG</i>	-0.0247 (2.64)	-0.0258 (2.59)	-0.0204 (2.06)	-0.0070 (0.78)
<i>INV</i>	-12.3802 (4.63)	-12.2650 (4.56)	-12.4828 (4.63)	-12.6263 (4.72)
<i>PRCCFOR</i>	-15.0676 (13.81)	-14.8142 (13.55)	-14.6222 (13.38)	-14.7292 (13.44)
<i>MIG</i>	-0.1342 (6.22)	-0.1320 (6.09)	-0.1292 (5.96)	-0.1287 (5.95)
<i>TOURISM</i>	-0.6479 (2.91)	-0.6269 (2.82)	-0.6339 (2.85)	-0.6412 (2.84)
<i>SERV</i>	0.1887 (7.00)	0.1908 (7.12)	0.1884 (7.01)	0.1927 (7.00)
<i>SPOVER</i>	0.7102 (52.68)	0.7139 (52.83)	0.7147 (52.82)	0.7155 (52.99)
<i>PERIPH</i>	-0.7053 (1.34)	-1.7105 (3.61)	-1.7894 (3.74)	-2.1094 (4.33)
<i>HERF₀</i>	7.0343 (1.72)	6.8720 (1.70)	6.3482 (1.57)	5.4569 (1.29)
<i>STFARM</i>	0.3175 (3.64)	0.3760 (4.39)	0.3511 (4.07)	0.3754 (4.19)
<i>STCH₀</i>	36.6977 (3.24)	39.3462 (3.51)	38.8727 (3.44)	35.5399 (3.03)
<i>STCH₁</i>	-42.6423 (2.19)	-42.1989 (2.19)	-41.9755 (2.16)	-50.0674 (2.48)
<i>S1</i>	-0.5734 (13.03)	-0.5700 (12.88)	-0.5690 (12.85)	-0.5682 (12.90)
<i>S2</i>	-0.7270 (15.94)	-0.7221 (15.75)	-0.7210 (15.71)	-0.7200 (15.76)
<i>S3</i>	-0.5697 (13.03)	-0.5664 (12.88)	-0.5656 (12.85)	-0.5649 (12.90)
<i>NT</i>			2,984	
<i>R² - within</i>	0.7500	0.7490	0.7487	0.7497
<i>R² - between</i>	0.5629	0.5517	0.5464	0.5259
<i>R² - overall</i>	0.5725	0.5619	0.5569	0.5374
σ_u	4.1168	4.0610	4.0728	4.2319
σ_e	0.8000	0.8049	0.8042	0.804
ρ	0.9636	0.9622	0.9624	0.9660
<i>Wald χ^2</i>	8063.31	7969.16	7863.42	7980.25