



**HAL**  
open science

## R&D, spillovers, innovation systems and the genesis of regional growth in Europe

Andrés Rodríguez-Pose, Riccardo Crescenzi

► **To cite this version:**

Andrés Rodríguez-Pose, Riccardo Crescenzi. R&D, spillovers, innovation systems and the genesis of regional growth in Europe. *Regional Studies*, 2008, 42 (01), pp.51-67. 10.1080/00343400701654186 . hal-00582317

**HAL Id: hal-00582317**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00582317>**

Submitted on 1 Apr 2011

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



**R&D, spillovers, innovation systems and the genesis of regional growth in Europe**

Journal:	<i>Regional Studies</i>
Manuscript ID:	CRES-2006-0172.R2
Manuscript Type:	Main Section
JEL codes:	R11 - Regional Economic Activity: Growth, Development, and Changes < R1 - General Regional Economics < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics, R12 - Size and Spatial Distributions of Regional Economic Activity < R1 - General Regional Economics < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics, R58 - Regional Development Policy < R5 - Regional Government Analysis < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics
Keywords:	Economic growth, Innovation, Knowledge, Spillovers, Innovation systems, Regions

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 **R&D, spillovers, innovation systems, and the genesis**  
17  
18  
19  
20 **of regional growth in Europe**  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 by

26  
27  
28 **Andrés Rodríguez-Pose and Riccardo Crescenzi**  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Authors' addresses:

35  
36  
37 **Andrés Rodríguez-Pose**

38 Department of Geography and Environment  
39 London School of Economics  
40 Houghton St  
41 London WC2A 2AE, UK  
42 Tel: +44-(0)20-7955 7971  
43 Fax: +44-(0)20-7955 7412  
44 E-mail: [A.Rodriguez-Pose@lse.ac.uk](mailto:A.Rodriguez-Pose@lse.ac.uk)  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 **Riccardo Crescenzi**

50 Dipartimento di Economia  
51 Università degli Studi Roma Tre  
52 Via Silvio d'Amico, 77  
53 00145 – Rome, Italy  
54 Tel: +39-06-57114 655  
55 Fax: +39-06-57114 771  
56 E-mail: [rcrescen@uniroma3.it](mailto:rcrescen@uniroma3.it)  
57  
58  
59  
60

## **R&D, spillovers, innovation systems, and the genesis of regional growth in Europe**

**Abstract:** Research on the impact of innovation on regional economic performance in Europe has fundamentally followed three approaches: a) the analysis of the link between investment in R&D, patents, and economic growth; b) the study of the existence and efficiency of regional innovation systems; and c) the examination of the geographical diffusion of regional knowledge spillovers. These complementary approaches have, however, rarely been combined. Important operational and methodological barriers have thwarted any potential cross-fertilization. In this paper, we try to fill this gap in the literature by combining in one model R&D, spillovers, and innovation systems approaches. A multiple regression analysis is conducted for all regions of the EU-25, including measures of R&D investment, proxies for regional innovation systems, and knowledge and socio-economic spillovers. This approach allows us to discriminate between the influence of internal factors and external knowledge and institutional flows on regional economic growth. The empirical results highlight how the complex interaction between local and external research, on the one hand, with local and external socio-economic and institutional conditions, on the other, shapes the innovation capacity of every region. They also indicate the importance of proximity for the transmission of economically productive knowledge, as spillovers are affected by strong distance decay effects.

**JEL Classification:** R11, R12, R58

**Keywords:** Economic growth, innovation, R&D, knowledge, spillovers, innovation systems, regions, European Union

## I+D, 'spillovers', sistemas de innovación y la génesis del crecimiento regional en Europa

La investigación sobre el impacto de la innovación sobre el desempeño económico en Europa ha seguido fundamentalmente tres enfoques: a) el análisis del vínculo entre la inversión en I+D, patentes y crecimiento económico; b) el estudio de la existencia y eficacia de sistemas de innovación regionales y c) el examen de la difusión geográfica del conocimiento (spillovers). A pesar de su complementariedad, estos enfoques apenas se han combinado. La presencia de barreras metodológicas y operacionales ha minado cualquier posibilidad de interacción. En este artículo nuestra intención es cubrir este hueco en la literatura, combinando en un modelo los enfoques basados I+D, spillovers y sistemas de innovación. Esto se realiza mediante un análisis de regresión múltiple que incluye variables de inversión en I+D, componentes de los sistemas de innovación regional y spillovers de conocimiento y de carácter socioeconómico. Este enfoque nos permite discriminar entre la influencia de los factores internos y los flujos externos de conocimiento e institucionales sobre el crecimiento económico. Los resultados empíricos subrayan cómo la interacción entre la investigación local y la realizada en otros espacios, por un lado, con las condiciones socioeconómicas e institucionales tanto en el ámbito local como en otras áreas, por otro, influye en la capacidad innovativa de cada región. Los resultados también ponen de manifiesto la importancia de la cercanía geográfica en la transmisión del conocimiento productivo, ya que la eficacia de los spillovers se ve fuertemente afectada por la distancia.

**Clasificación JEL:** R11, R12, R58

**Palabras clave:** Crecimiento económico, innovación, I+D, conocimiento, spillovers, sistemas de innovación, regiones, Unión Europea

## 1. Introduction

The capacity to innovate and to assimilate innovation have regularly been considered as two of the key factors behind the economic dynamism of any territory (Feldman and Florida, 1994; Audretsch and Feldman, 1996; Cantwell and Iammarino, 1998; Furman, Porter, and Stern, 2002). Yet, despite this agreement on the essentials, different researchers have tried to untangle the link between research, innovation, and economic growth in very different ways. Three different approaches to this relationship predominate. The first is the so-called 'linear model' (Bush, 1945; Maclaurin, 1953), whereby basic research leads to applied research and to inventions, that are then transformed into innovations, which, in turn, lead to greater growth. Empirically, this type of analysis focuses fundamentally on the link between R&D and patents, in the first instance, followed by that between patents and growth. Such analyses are fundamentally conducted by 'mainstream economists' and, despite criticisms (e.g. Rosenberg, 1994), the approach remains popular with academics and policy makers. A second group can be classified under the denominations of 'systems of innovation' (Lundvall, 1992) or 'learning region' (Morgan, 1997) approaches. These approaches, associated with evolutionary economics (Dosi et al, 1988; Freeman, 1994), concentrate on the study of territorially-embedded institutional networks that favour or deter the generation of innovation. The capacity of these networks to act as catalysts for innovation depends, in turn, on the combination of social and structural conditions in every territory, the so-called 'social filter' (Rodríguez-Pose, 1999). These approaches tend to be fundamentally qualitative and mainly conducted by geographers, evolutionary economists, and a number of economic sociologists. Finally, there is a large group of scholars who has mainly concentrated on the diffusion and assimilation of innovation (Jaffe, 1986; Audretsch and Feldman, 1996; Cantwell and Iammarino, 2003; Sonn and Storper, 2005). This

1  
2 knowledge spillovers approach has been generally adopted by economists and  
3  
4 geographers, using both quantitative and qualitative methods.  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 Although such a variety of approaches contributes to improve our understanding of  
10 the process of innovation and of the linkages between innovation and economic  
11 development, there has been little cross-fertilisation between these different, but  
12 nevertheless complementary strands of literature. Major operational and  
13 methodological barriers have hitherto kept any potential interaction to a bare  
14 minimum. The main reasons for this lack of interaction are related to the different  
15 disciplinary backgrounds of the researchers working on innovation, to the different  
16 methods used in the various approaches, and to the difficulties in operationalising  
17 some of the concepts employed by the diverse scholarly strands.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 This paper represents an attempt to try to bridge this gap in the literature by  
34 combining in one model linear, innovation systems, and spillover approaches. The  
35 aim is to show how factors which have been at the centre of these research strands  
36 (i.e. innovative effort, socio-institutional contextual factors, and localised knowledge  
37 spillovers) interact and account for a significant part of the growth trends of the  
38 regions of the enlarged EU after 1995. An additional objective is to shed new light on  
39 the role of geographical distance in the process of innovation, by focusing on the  
40 “continuing tension between two opposing forces” (Storper and Venables 2004,  
41 p.367): the increasingly homogeneous availability of standard ‘codified’ knowledge,  
42 on the one hand, and the spatial boundedness of ‘tacit’ knowledge and contextual  
43 factors, on the other. Such tension is an important determinant of the present  
44 economic geography of European regions, which is further accentuated by the  
45 underlying socio-economic differences.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 In order to achieve this aim, we ground our approach on a series of fundamental  
6  
7 theoretical mechanisms which make knowledge and its transmission an important  
8  
9 explanation for regional diversity in economic growth. First, that, as highlighted by  
10  
11 the linear model of innovation, local innovative activities are crucial for the  
12  
13 'production' of new knowledge and the economic exploitation of existing knowledge,  
14  
15 given the presence of a minimum threshold of local innovation capabilities (as put  
16  
17 forward by evolutionary economics and neo-Schumpeterian strands). Such activities  
18  
19 are not geographically evenly distributed and thus become a localised source of  
20  
21 competitive advantage for some areas rather than others. Second, that information is  
22  
23 not automatically equivalent to economically-useful knowledge (Sonn and Storper,  
24  
25 2005). A successful process of innovation depends on "localised structural and  
26  
27 institutional factors that shape the innovative capacity of specific geographical  
28  
29 contexts" (Iammarino, 2005, p.499), as indicated by the systems of innovation  
30  
31 (Lundvall, 2001), regional systems of innovation (Cooke et al., 1997), and learning  
32  
33 regions (Morgan, 2004; Gregersen and Johnson, 1996) approaches. And third, that  
34  
35 technological improvements in 'communication infrastructures' have not affected all  
36  
37 kinds of information in the same way. While 'codified information' can be  
38  
39 transmitted over increasingly large distances, 'tacit' knowledge tends to be  
40  
41 geographically bound and a key factor behind the concentration of innovation  
42  
43 (Audretsch and Feldman, 2004; Cantwell and Iammarino, 2003; Sonn and Storper,  
44  
45 2005; Charlot and Duranton, 2006; Iammarino and McCann, 2006).

46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56 The paper is organised into four further sections. First, we introduce the theoretical  
57  
58 framework for the analysis. The second section presents the empirical model and  
59  
60



1  
2 provides its theoretical justification. In the third section the empirical results are  
3  
4 discussed. The final section concludes with some economic policy implications.  
5  
6

## 7 8 **2. R&D, innovation systems and knowledge spillovers** 9

10 From a pure neoclassical perspective, factors such as the percentage of investment in  
11 research and development (R&D) or where the actual research is conducted matter  
12 little. The traditional neoclassical view of knowledge as a public good (non rivalrous  
13 and non excludable), available everywhere and to everybody simultaneously implies  
14 that innovation flows frictionless from producers to a full set of intended and  
15 unintended beneficiaries (as 'manna from heaven'), contributing to generate a long-  
16 term process of convergence across countries and regions (Solow, 1957; Borts and  
17 Stein, 1964). However, this view of innovation as a factor that could be overlooked in  
18 the genesis of economic development is now firmly on the retreat. It is not just that  
19 innovation is considered as one of the key sources of progress (Fagerberg 1994), but  
20 also that technology and innovation have become regarded as essential instruments in  
21 any development policy (Trajtenberg, 1990). Differences in innovation capacity and  
22 potential become thus, from an 'endogenous growth' perspective (e.g. Grossman and  
23 Helpman, 1991), one of the basic explanations for persistent differences in wealth and  
24 economic performance. By bringing innovation to the fore, it is often assumed that  
25 greater investment in basic R&D will lead to greater applied research and to an  
26 increase in the number of inventions, that, when introduced in the production chain,  
27 become growth-enhancing innovations. This linear perception of the innovation  
28 process places localised R&D investment at the heart of technological progress and,  
29 eventually, economic growth. In essence, the implications of this approach are that the  
30 higher the investment in R&D, the higher the innovative capacity, and the higher the  
31 economic growth. Despite being much derided (e.g. Fagerberg, 1988; Verspagen,  
32 1991; Rosenberg, 1994; Morgan, 1997), the linear model remains popular with  
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

1  
2 academics and policy makers because of its simplicity and powerful explanatory  
3  
4 capacity: nations and regions that invest more in R&D, generally tend to innovate  
5  
6 more, and often grow faster. But by focusing on local R&D, the linear model  
7  
8 completely overlooks key factors about how innovation is actually generated. These  
9  
10 factors are related to the context in which innovation takes place and to the potential  
11  
12 for territories to assimilate innovation being produced elsewhere.  
13  
14

15  
16  
17  
18 It has now become widely accepted that innovation is a territorially-embedded  
19  
20 process and cannot be fully understood independently of the social and institutional  
21  
22 conditions of every space (Lundvall, 1992; Asheim, 1999). The ‘territorially-  
23  
24 embedded’ factors influencing the process of innovation have thus become the main  
25  
26 focus for a number of theoretical perspectives: from innovative milieus (Camagni,  
27  
28 1995) and industrial districts (Becattini, 1987) to learning regions (Morgan, 1997) and  
29  
30 systems of innovation (Cooke et al., 1997; Cooke, 1998). These approaches are  
31  
32 characterised by powerful insights that help us improve our understanding of how and  
33  
34 under which conditions the process of innovation takes place. Some of the most  
35  
36 relevant findings related to these approaches are the relevance of proximity, local  
37  
38 synergies, and interaction (Camagni, 1995, p.317) and the importance of “inter-  
39  
40 organization networks, financial and legal institutions, technical agencies and research  
41  
42 infrastructures, education and training systems, governance structures, innovation  
43  
44 policies” (Iammarino, 2005, p.499) in shaping innovation. The explanatory capacity  
45  
46 of such approaches is, however, somewhat constrained by the problems of  
47  
48 operationalising in a relatively homogenous way across space the territorially-  
49  
50 embedded networks, social economic structures, and institutions that lie at their heart.  
51  
52 By nature, the systemic interactions among (local) actors are intrinsically unique and  
53  
54 thus hard to measure and compare across different systems. A potential solution to  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 this problem is the ‘evolutionary integrated view of the regional systems of  
3 innovation’ (Iammarino, 2005). From the perspective of evolutionary economics, a  
4 meso-level analysis can be developed by contrasting the macro-level (national  
5 systems) with the micro-level (the level of the individual innovative actors). This  
6 meso-level constitutes “the essential thing that is changing in a process of  
7 evolutionary economic change” (Dopfer et al., 2004, p.269) and accounts for local  
8 and regional variety in terms of absorption, diffusion, and generation of new  
9 knowledge<sup>1</sup>. The concepts of industrial district, learning region, innovation system,  
10 etc. – from an evolutionary economics point of view – can all be referred back to this  
11 ‘meso’ perspective. An integrated micro-meso-macro approach to the socio-  
12 institutional determinants of innovative performance is a means for dealing with the  
13 heterogeneity and path dependency – in terms of “local structural regularities from  
14 past knowledge accumulation and learning” (Iammarino, 2005, p. 503) – of the  
15 regional economy which, in its turn, shapes and constrains new growth opportunities.  
16 This approach provides a flexible theoretical tool for the identification of a series of  
17 “external conditions in which externalised learning and innovation occur” (Cooke et  
18 al., 1997, p.485) that can be identified across innovation systems and on which  
19 innovation strategies can be based. These factors act as “conditions that render some  
20 courses of action easier than others” (Morgan, 2004) or as ‘social filters’, that is, the  
21 unique combination “of innovative and conservative (...) elements that favour or  
22 deter the development of successful regional innovation systems” (Rodríguez-Pose,  
23 1999, p. 82) in every space.

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 Finally territories rely not only on their internal capacity to produce innovation either  
57 through direct inputs in the research process or through the creation of innovation  
58 prone systems in the local environment, but also on their capacity to attract and  
59  
60

1  
2 assimilate innovation produced elsewhere. At the micro-level, innovative units (R&D  
3  
4 departments within firms, universities, research centres, etc.), as well as local  
5  
6 institutions and individuals, interact with each other and with their external  
7  
8 environment through the networks described above. Such interactions produce the  
9  
10 transmission of knowledge in the form of 'knowledge spillovers' (Jaffe, 1986; Acs,  
11  
12 Audretsch, and Feldman, 1992) that are reaped by local actors. The origin of  
13  
14 knowledge spillovers can be local, but they can also be generated outside the borders  
15  
16 of the locality or region object of the analysis, as "there is no reason that knowledge  
17  
18 should stop spilling over just because of borders, such as a city limit, state line or  
19  
20 national boundary" (Audretsch and Feldman, 2004, p.6). As there are internal and  
21  
22 external sources of spillovers, important questions arise. The first relate to the balance  
23  
24 between internally generated innovation and externally transmitted knowledge and the  
25  
26 extent to which a territory can rely on externally-generated knowledge for innovation.  
27  
28 The second group of questions concerns the local and external conditions that  
29  
30 maximise the diffusion of knowledge. The final group deals with the capacity of  
31  
32 knowledge spillovers to travel and the potential for distance decay effects. In order to  
33  
34 address these questions we have to resort to the theoretical distinction between  
35  
36 codifiable information and tacit knowledge. According to Leamer and Storper (2001,  
37  
38 p. 650) codifiable information "is cheap to transfer because its underlying symbol  
39  
40 systems can be widely disseminated through information infrastructure". Hence  
41  
42 codifiable information can be disseminated relatively costlessly over large distances  
43  
44 and does not suffer from strong distance decay effects. However, all information is  
45  
46 not completely codifiable. The presence of some specific features make, in some  
47  
48 cases, codification impossible or too expensive. "If the information is not codifiable,  
49  
50 merely acquiring the symbol system or having the physical infrastructure is not  
51  
52 enough for the successful transmission of a message" (Storper and Venables, 2004, p.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 354). In the latter case there is thus a need to disseminate tacit knowledge by an  
3  
4 intrinsically 'spatial' communication technology, among which face-to-face  
5  
6 interaction is key. Face-to-face contacts, as discussed in Storper and Venables (2004)  
7  
8 or in Charlot and Duranton (2006), do not only act as a communication technology  
9  
10 but also pursue other functions (such as generating greater trust and incentives in  
11  
12 relationship, screening and socialising, rush and motivation) which make  
13  
14 communication not only possible but also more effective, and ultimately ease the  
15  
16 innovation process.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 However, and in contrast with codifiable information, the process of transmission of  
24  
25 tacit knowledge is costly and suffers from strong distance decay effects. Face-to-face  
26  
27 contacts are maximised within relatively small territories, due to a combination of  
28  
29 proximity and the presence of common socio-institutional infrastructures and  
30  
31 networks. The potential to reap knowledge spillovers will thus be maximised within  
32  
33 the region. Some of this knowledge will nevertheless spill over beyond the borders of  
34  
35 the region or locality flowing into neighbouring areas, as a consequence of the  
36  
37 existence of different forms of inter-regional contacts. Flows of interregional  
38  
39 knowledge are thus important as agents of innovation, but their influence is likely to  
40  
41 wane with distance (Anselin et al., 1997; Adams and Jaffe, 2002; Adams, 2002), as  
42  
43 the potential for face-to-face and other forms of interaction decay.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

### 51 **3. The model: putting the different strands together**

52 The three strands of literature presented above rely on three crucial factors: internal  
53  
54 innovative efforts, socially and territorially embedded factors, and more or less  
55  
56 spatially-bound knowledge spillovers. Although these three factors are  
57  
58 complementary, disciplinary and methodological barriers have frequently prevented  
59  
60

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

researchers working on these fields from interacting with one another. The difficulties of operationalising some of the factors in systemic and knowledge spillover approaches, given existing statistical information, provides an additional barrier for cross-fertilisation. In this section we propose a simple model which tries to combine the key factors from these three approaches in order to study how they affect innovation and how innovation influences economic growth. The model is aimed at understanding – and, to a certain extent, discriminating among – the role of the different innovation factors proposed by different strands in order to generate economic dynamism in the regions of the EU-25 after 1995. As presented in Table 1, the model combines inputs in the innovation process (R&D expenditure) with the socio-economic local factors that make the presence of favourable regional systems of innovation more likely and controls for the wealth of European regions. These factors are considered locally, i.e. the R&D and the local conditions in the region being considered, and externally, i.e. the conditions in neighbouring regions. Finally we control for the influence of national factors, such as the presence of national systems of innovation, by the introduction of a set of national dummies.

[Insert Table 1 around here]

By developing the framework above, we obtain the following model:

$$\frac{1}{T} \ln \left( \frac{Y_{i,t}}{Y_{i,t-T}} \right) = \alpha + \beta_1 \ln(y_{i,t-T}) + \beta_2 RD_{i,t-T} + \beta_3 SocFilter_{i,t-T} + \beta_4 Spillov_{i,t-T} + \beta_5 ExtSocFilter_{i,t-T} + \beta_6 ExtGDPcap_{i,t-T} + \beta_7 D + \varepsilon \quad (1)$$

where:

$\frac{1}{T} \ln \left( \frac{Y_{i,t}}{Y_{i,t-T}} \right)$  is the usual logarithmic transformation of the ratio of regional per capita GDP in region  $i$  at the two extremes of the period of

- 1  
2 analysis ([t-T,t], where t-T is the initial period, t is the final period  
3  
4 and T is the length of the period of analysis);  
5  
6  
7  $\alpha$  is a constant;  
8  
9  $\ln(y_{i,t-T})$  is the log of the GDP per capita of region  $i$  at the beginning of the  
10  
11 period of analysis (t-T);  
12  
13  $RD_{t-T}$  is expenditure in R&D as a % of GDP in region  $i$  at time (t-T);  
14  
15  
16  $SocFilter_{i,t-T}$  is a proxy for the socio-economic conditions of region  $i$   
17  
18 representing its ‘social filter’;  
19  
20  
21  $Spillov_{i,t-T}$  is a proxy for regional spillovers (accessibility to extra-regional  
22  
23 sources of innovation);  
24  
25  
26  $ExtSocFilter_{i,t-T}$  is a measure of the ‘social filter’ of neighbouring regions;  
27  
28  
29  $ExtGDPcap_{i,t-T}$  is a measure of the GDP per capita in neighbouring regions;  
30  
31  
32  $D$  is a set of national dummy variables;  
33  
34  $\varepsilon$  is the error term.  
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

*Initial level of GDP per capita* – As customary in the literature on the relationship between innovation and growth, the initial level of GDP per capita is introduced in the model in order to account for the region’s initial wealth and, according to Fagerberg (1988), for the stock of existing knowledge and of its distance to the technological frontier, as well<sup>2</sup>.

*R&D expenditure* – As highlighted earlier, the percentage of regional GDP devoted to R&D is the main measure of the economic input in order to generate innovation in each region used by proponents of the linear model of innovation. Local R&D expenditure is also frequently used as a proxy for the local capability to adapt to innovation produced elsewhere (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990; Maurseth and

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

Verspagen, 1999). There are, however, measurement problems associated to this variable that must be borne in mind, as they may partially hide the contribution of R&D towards economic performance. First, the relevant time lag structure for the effect of R&D activities on productivity and growth is unknown and may vary significantly across sectors (Griliches, 1979). Second, as pointed out by Bilbao-Osorio and Rodríguez-Pose (2004) for the case of European regions, the returns from public and private R&D investments may vary significantly. Furthermore, the fact that not all innovative activities pursued at the firm level are classified as formal ‘Research and Development’ may be a source of further bias in the estimations. Having acknowledged these points, we assume R&D expenditure is a proxy for “the allocation of resources to research and other information-generating activities in response to perceived profit opportunities” (Grossman and Helpman, 1991, p.6) in order to capture the existence of a system of incentives (in the public and the private sector) towards intentional innovative activities.

*Social Filter* – The multifaceted concept of ‘social filter’ is introduced in the analysis by means of a composite index, which combines a set of variables describing the socio-economic realm of the region. In particular, the variables which seem to be more relevant for shaping the social filter of a region are those related to three main domains: educational achievements (Lundvall, 1992; Malecki, 1997), productive employment of human resources, and demographic structure (Fagerberg et al., 1997; Rodríguez-Pose, 1999). For the first domain, the educational attainment (measured by the percentage of the population and of the labour force having completed higher education) and participation in lifelong learning programmes are used as an indication of the accumulation of skills at the local level. For the second area, the percentage of labour force employed in agriculture and long-term unemployment are included in the analysis. The reasons for choosing these two variables are related to the traditionally



1  
2 low productivity of agricultural employment in relationship to that of other sectors  
3  
4 and to the use of agricultural employment, in particular in the new members of the  
5  
6 EU, as virtually synonymous to 'hidden unemployment'. The role of long term  
7  
8 unemployment as an indicator of both the rigidity of the labour market and of the  
9  
10 presence of individuals whose possibilities of being involved in productive work are  
11  
12 persistently hampered by inadequate skills (Gordon, 2001) is the reason behind the  
13  
14 inclusion of this variable. The percentage of population aged between 15 and 24 was  
15  
16 used as our measure of the demographic structure. It represents a proxy for the flow of  
17  
18 new human resources entering the labour force and thus of the renewal of the existing  
19  
20 stock of knowledge and skills. The European Commission has made explicit the  
21  
22 challenges of an ageing population when regions have to rely on the benefits of a  
23  
24 knowledge based society and highlighted "the risk of a slower spread of new  
25  
26 technologies that could be associated with ageing" (European Commission, 2006;  
27  
28 p.6).

29  
30 From this perspective the percentage of young people is a particularly relevant  
31  
32 indicator of the economic potential of a region, as far as its social filter is concerned.  
33  
34

35  
36 Problems of multicollinearity prevent the simultaneous inclusion of all these variables  
37  
38 in our model. Principal Component Analysis is therefore applied to the set of  
39  
40 variables discussed above, in order to merge them into an individual indicator able to  
41  
42 preserve as much as possible of the variability of the initial information. The output of  
43  
44 the Principal Component Analysis is shown in Table 2a.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54  
55  
56 **[Insert Tables 2A and 2B around here]**  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 The eigenanalysis of the correlation matrix shows that the first principal component  
3  
4 alone accounts for around 43% of the total variance with an eigenvalue significantly  
5  
6 larger than 1.  
7

8  
9  
10  
11 Consequently, the first principal component's scores are computed from the  
12  
13 standardised<sup>3</sup> value of the original variables by using the coefficients listed under PC1  
14  
15 in Table 2b. These coefficients emphasize the educational dimension of the social  
16  
17 filter by assigning a large weight to the educational achievements of the population  
18  
19 (0.576) and of the labour force (0.554) and to the participation in life long learning  
20  
21 programmes (0.395). A negative weight is, as expected, assigned to the agricultural  
22  
23 labour force (-0.430) and, with a smaller coefficient, to long term unemployment (-  
24  
25 0.140). The weight of the population between 15 and 24 is much smaller (0.019) in  
26  
27 this first principal component. This procedure provides us with a 'joint measure' for  
28  
29 each region's social filter.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 *Spillovers* – While in models based on knowledge production functions, spillovers are  
38  
39 assessed in terms of their contribution towards the creation of new local knowledge,  
40  
41 in our framework we analyse the capacity of spillovers to influence regional economic  
42  
43 performance. For this purpose we rely on a somewhat artificial<sup>4</sup> distinction between  
44  
45 intra-regional spillovers (i.e. those generated within the boundaries of the  
46  
47 geographical unit of analysis) and extra-regional spillovers (i.e. those accruing from  
48  
49 neighbouring regions). The aggregate nature of the data prevents us from  
50  
51 distinguishing – within the boundaries of the individual region – between the impact  
52  
53 of different sources of knowledge, that is to discriminate between the economic  
54  
55 impact of the effort produced by individual innovative actors from that of the  
56  
57 externalities produced by this process. Consequently, regional R&D investment not  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 only proxies local innovative effort but also accounts for the impact of intra-regional  
3  
4 spillovers. Conversely, extra-regional spillovers are proxied by a specific variable i.e.  
5  
6 the distance-weighted innovative activities pursued in neighbouring regions. Thus,  
7  
8 while the effect of intra-regional spillovers is captured by the R&D investment  
9  
10 variable, where innovative activities pursued in the neighbouring regions are shown to  
11  
12 exert a positive impact on local economic performance, there is also evidence in  
13  
14 favour of inter-regional spillover effects: knowledge produced in one region spills  
15  
16 over into another (through the mechanisms discussed in the previous section),  
17  
18 influencing its economic performance. Such spillover variable captures the  
19  
20 'aggregate' impact of innovative activities pursued in the neighbourhood (and its  
21  
22 sensitivity to geographical distance), but does not allow us to single out whether and  
23  
24 to what extent this process is the result of intentional (either market-mediated or non-  
25  
26 market mediated contacts) knowledge flows or of unintentional spillovers<sup>5</sup>. The  
27  
28 significance of this indicator suggests that accessibility to extra-regional innovation  
29  
30 permits the inter-regional transfer of knowledge. In particular, in the framework  
31  
32 presented in the previous section, face-to-face contacts enable the transmission of  
33  
34 non-codifiable knowledge which, in turn, has an impact on regional growth.  
35  
36 Furthermore, the transmission of formally codified knowledge, which is less sensitive  
37  
38 to proximity relationships for its diffusion, is also partially captured by this 'spatial'  
39  
40 variable. Even if the differential impact of formally codified knowledge flows  
41  
42 depends more on the local absorptive capacity (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990) than on  
43  
44 geographical constraints, research on patent citations suggests that proximity  
45  
46 facilitates a faster diffusion of the latter kind of knowledge as well (Sonn and Storper,  
47  
48 2005).  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For this purpose we develop a measure of ‘accessibility’ to extra-regional innovative activities, introduced in the analysis by means of a standardised ‘index of accessibility to innovation’<sup>6</sup>. The index is a potential measure of the ‘innovative activities’ (in terms of nationally weighted millions of Euros invested in R&D activities) that can be ‘reached’ from each region at a ‘cost’ which increases with distance.

Our index is based on the usual formula for accessibility indices:

$$A_i = \sum_j g(r_j) f(c_{ij}) \quad (2)$$

Where  $A_i$  is the accessibility of region  $i$ ,  $r_j$  is the activity  $R$  to be reached in region  $j$ ,  $c_{ij}$  is the generalised cost of reaching region  $j$  from region  $i$  and  $g(\cdot)$  and  $f(\cdot)$  are the ‘activity’ function (i.e. the activities/resources to be reached) and the ‘impedance’ function (i.e. the effort, cost/opportunity to reach the specific activity) respectively.

In our index the ‘activity’ to be reached is R&D expenditure, thus:

$$g(r_j) = (\text{R\&D expenditure})_j$$

and the ‘impedance’ is the bilateral trip-time distance between region  $i$  and region  $j$ :

$$f(c_{ij}) = \begin{cases} w_{ii} = 0 & \text{if } i=j \\ \frac{1}{d_{ij}} & \text{if } i \neq j \\ w_{ij} = \frac{1}{\sum_j d_{ij}} & \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

where  $d_{ij}$  is the average trip-length (in minutes) between region  $i$  and  $j$  and  $w$  the corresponding inverse-distance weight.

We base our analysis on the travel time calculated by the IRPUD (2000) for the computation of peripherality indicators and made available by the European Commission<sup>7</sup>. We chose road distance, rather than straight line distance, as it gives a more realistic representation of the real ‘cost’ of interaction and contacts across space.

1  
2 In addition the use of trip-length rather than kilometres allows us to take account of  
3  
4 “different road types, national speed limits, speed constraints in urban and  
5  
6 mountainous areas, sea journeys, border delays (...) as also congestion in urban areas”  
7  
8 (IRPUD, 2000, p.22), which significantly affect real-world interactions.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14 The amount of knowledge flowing from outside the region is thus proxied by the  
15  
16 average magnitude of all other regions’ R&D expenditure weighted by the inverse of  
17  
18 the bilateral time-distance. The resulting variable is then standardised by making it  
19  
20 range from zero to one, in order to make it perfectly comparable with the social filter  
21  
22 index.  
23

24  
25  
26  
27  
28 *Extra regional social filter* – Following a similar procedure we calculate, for each  
29  
30 region, the inverse-distance-weighted average of the social filter index of all the other  
31  
32 regions in the EU. As a consequence  $f(c_{ij})$  remains the same as in equation (2),  
33  
34 while:  
35

36  
37  
38  $g(r_j)$  becomes the *Social Filter Index*<sub>j</sub>  
39

40  
41 The aim of including this variable is to assess whether proximity to regions with  
42  
43 favourable social conditions and dynamic innovation systems matters, i.e. whether  
44  
45 socio-economic and institutional spillovers have a similar role to knowledge  
46  
47 spillovers. Given that “innovation systems can be viewed as institutional  
48  
49 arrangements to facilitate spillovers (provide connectivity) among economic actors”  
50  
51 (Carlsson, 2004, p.4), when such connectivity is assessed in its inter-regional scope,  
52  
53 being in an innovation-prone neighbourhood may enhance the local capability to  
54  
55 absorb and produce innovation.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 *GDP in neighbouring regions* – Again the same weighing procedure is pursued in  
5  
6 order to introduce the initial economic conditions (GDP per capita) of neighbouring  
7  
8 regions. In this case:

9  
10  
11  $g(r_j)$  denotes *GDP per capita*<sub>*j*</sub> in equation (2)  
12  
13

14  
15  
16  
17 This variable accounts for the advantage of proximity to relatively well-off regions.  
18

19  
20 Although the introduction of these two final variables is suggested by the detection of  
21  
22 spatial autocorrelation in the residuals of previous specifications (reflecting the spatial  
23  
24 structure of the data), their justification stems directly from the model underlying this  
25  
26 paper. As presented in Table 1, the model explicitly aims at assessing the impact of  
27  
28 both internal and external conditions on regional innovative performance.  
29  
30 Consequently, the inclusion of the social-filter and economic wealth in neighbouring  
31  
32 regions makes it possible to isolate the impact of a favourable geographical location  
33  
34 of any given region not only in terms of its capacity to reap knowledge spillovers, but  
35  
36 also to benefit from other innovation-enhancing conditions of interconnected regions.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

#### 43 44 **4. Results of the analysis**

##### 45 46 **4.1 Estimation issues and data availability**

47  
48 In this section we estimate the model outlined above by means of heteroskedasticity-  
49  
50 consistent OLS (Ordinary Least Square). In order to minimize the effect of spatial  
51  
52 autocorrelation (i.e the lack of independence among the error terms of neighbouring  
53  
54 observations), we include in the analysis a set of national dummy variables,  
55  
56 accounting for ‘national fixed effects’, which, in turn, take into consideration a  
57  
58 consistent part of the similarities between neighbouring regions. Furthermore, by  
59  
60 introducing spatially lagged variables in our analysis, we explicitly aim at modelling

1  
2 the interactions between neighbouring regions and thus minimizing their effect on the  
3  
4 residuals. Another major problem concerns endogeneity, which we address by  
5  
6 including in the model the value of the explanatory variables as a mean over the five  
7  
8 years preceding the first year of the period of analysis (i.e. over the period  $[t-T-5, t-$   
9  
10  $T]$ ), while the average growth rate was calculated over the period  $[t-T, t]$ <sup>8</sup>. In  
11  
12 addition, in order to resolve the problem of different accounting units, explanatory  
13  
14 variables are expressed, for each region, as a percentage of the respective GDP or  
15  
16 population.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 The empirical model was estimated for the period 1995-2003, allowing us to include  
24  
25 all the EU-25 members for which regional data are available. Because of data  
26  
27 constraints, but also for reasons of homogeneity and coherence in terms of the  
28  
29 relevant institutional level, the analysis uses NUTS1 regions for Germany, Belgium,  
30  
31 and the UK and NUTS2 for all other countries (Spain, France, Italy, the Netherlands,  
32  
33 Greece, Austria, Portugal, Finland, Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia).  
34  
35 Countries without a relevant regional articulation (Denmark, Ireland, Luxemburg,  
36  
37 Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Slovenia, Malta, and Cyprus) were necessarily excluded  
38  
39 from the analysis<sup>9</sup>. In addition, regional data on R&D expenditure are not available in  
40  
41 the Eurostat databank for Sweden. In total, 166 regions from 15 different countries are  
42  
43 covered in the analysis.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 EUROSTAT Regio data, the main source of information, have been complemented  
52  
53 with Cambridge Econometrics (CAMECON) data for GDP. Table A-1 in the  
54  
55 appendix provides a detailed definition of the variables included in the analysis.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

#### 4.2 Innovation, spillovers and social filter

1  
2 The estimation results for the empirical model outlined in the previous section are  
3 presented in Table 3. The results of different regressions are reported. In Regressions  
4 1-3 the variables for 'social filter' and 'accessibility to external sources of innovation'  
5 are progressively introduced. In Regressions 4-9 the individual components of the  
6 social filter are introduced separately in order to discriminate among them. In  
7 Regressions 10-12 the effect of the endowment of neighbouring regions in terms of  
8 social filter and economic wealth is assessed.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18  
19  
20 The  $R^2$  confirms the overall goodness-of-fit of all the regressions presented and, in all  
21 cases, the probability of the F-statistics lets us reject the null hypothesis that all of the  
22 regression coefficients are zero. V.I.F. tests have been conducted for the variables  
23 included in all the specifications of the model excluding the presence of  
24 multicollinearity. No spatial autocorrelation in the residuals was detected using  
25 Moran's I statistic<sup>10</sup>.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 **[Insert Table 3 around here]**  
39  
40  
41

42 Several implications can be extracted from the results of the empirical analysis. First  
43 is that the initial level of GDP per capita is significant in a few cases only, thus  
44 suggesting that for the period under analysis, neither regional convergence, nor  
45 divergence can be recorded (Rodríguez-Pose and Fratesi, 2004). Only when social  
46 conditions are explicitly controlled for (regressions 3, 10, 11 and 12) there is evidence  
47 of a weak degree of regional convergence. However, the magnitude of the  
48 convergence parameter, where significantly different from zero, is in all cases very  
49 small, implying a speed of convergence of 0.6% per year, with a half-life of  
50 approximately 102 years.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4 Second, local R&D expenditure generally shows a positive and significant  
5 relationship with economic growth in all regressions, in line with earlier research  
6  
7 (Fagerberg et al., 1997; Rodríguez-Pose, 1999, 2001; Cheshire and Magrini, 2000;  
8  
9 Bilbao-Osorio and Rodríguez-Pose, 2004; Crescenzi, 2005). For the European regions  
10  
11 considered, investing in R&D seems to be a more important source of economic  
12  
13 growth than relying of knowledge spillovers from neighbouring regions. When  
14  
15 considering both factors together (Regression 1) the coefficient of local R&D  
16  
17 expenditure is positive and significant, while the impact of innovation generated  
18  
19 outside the region is insignificant. Relying exclusively on local R&D inputs is,  
20  
21 however, not a guarantee for achieving greater growth, as such relationship proves to  
22  
23 be not always robust when controlling for social conditions (the ‘social filter’  
24  
25 variable). As highlighted in Regression 2, the local socio-economic conditions are a  
26  
27 better predictor of economic growth than investment in R&D. The social filter  
28  
29 variable is always positively associated with economic growth and statistically  
30  
31 significant. The relevance of the ‘social filter’ is enhanced when R&D investment and  
32  
33 exposure to knowledge spillovers are considered in conjunction with local conditions  
34  
35 (Regression 3). The results point out that having a good social filter increases the  
36  
37 potential of European regions to assimilate spillovers, making local R&D expenditure  
38  
39 irrelevant. These results highlight that while investing in R&D locally enhances  
40  
41 economic growth, relying of knowledge spillovers stemming from other regions is an  
42  
43 important alternative source of competitive advantage where adequate socio-  
44  
45 economic structures – that would guarantee the reception and assimilation of those  
46  
47 spillovers – exist. This does not mean that local innovative efforts are unimportant for  
48  
49 regional economic performance. However, as far as knowledge may flow also from  
50  
51 outside the region (both in the form of codified and non-codified knowledge  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 spillovers), local socio-economic conditions may prove to be the true differential  
3  
4 competitive factor by enabling the translation of all sources of knowledge into  
5  
6 successful innovation and economic growth.  
7  
8

9  
10  
11 Introducing the individual sub-components of the social filter uncovers the specific  
12  
13 importance of the educational endowment of both the population and the labour force  
14  
15 for economic growth (Regressions 4 and 5). The role of life-long learning, the  
16  
17 percentage of the labour force working in agriculture, the level of long term  
18  
19 unemployment, and the demographic structure of the population, are, in contrast, not  
20  
21 significant. Agricultural employment and long-term unemployment, in addition, limit  
22  
23 the capacity of regions to assimilate knowledge spillovers (Regressions 6 and 7). In  
24  
25 these cases, relying on knowledge spillovers is no substitute of local investment in  
26  
27 R&D.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 The results underscore that accessibility to extra-regional innovation, our proxy for  
36  
37 knowledge spillovers, is related in a positive and statistically significant way to  
38  
39 regional growth performance, in particular when associated to an appropriate measure  
40  
41 for socio-economic conditions. This confirms that knowledge spillovers, by  
42  
43 increasing the 'amount of knowledge' available in the region, reinforce the effect of  
44  
45 local innovative activities, and, to a certain extent, may even compensate for a weak  
46  
47 contribution of the innovative activities pursued locally. Thus, other things being  
48  
49 equal, a region within an innovative neighbourhood is more advantaged than one in  
50  
51 the vicinity of less innovative areas. In contrast, both the socio-economic endowment  
52  
53 (Regression 11) and the level of wealth (Regression 12) of neighbouring regions (i.e.  
54  
55 extra-regional wealth) have no significant effect on local economic performance. The  
56  
57 extra-regional social filter is significant only when considered jointly with internal  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 features, as in Regression 10 where the total accessibility to innovation prone space is  
3  
4 considered by including in a single variable both the region's features and that of its  
5  
6 neighbourhood<sup>11</sup>.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 On the basis of these results, the economic potential of a region is maximized when an  
12  
13 appropriate set of social conditions is combined with local investment in R&D. The  
14  
15 reception of R&D spillovers from neighbouring regions is an important additional  
16  
17 source of advantage which, in any case, requires an appropriate social infrastructure in  
18  
19 order to be productively translated into innovation and economic growth. In this  
20  
21 framework the analysis of the spatial scope of such spillovers, which we will discuss  
22  
23 in the next subsection, becomes particularly important for understanding the role of  
24  
25 geography in a knowledge-based economy.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

### 33 **4.3 The spatial extent of innovative spillovers**

34  
35 Understanding the spatial scope of knowledge spillovers is extremely relevant from  
36  
37 both a theoretical and a public policy point of view. Even if, as discussed in section 2,  
38  
39 a variety of contributions provides significant evidence in support of the role of  
40  
41 proximity as a relevant factor for the transmission of knowledge, in a recent review of  
42  
43 the research on geographical knowledge spillovers, Döring and Schnellbach (2006)  
44  
45 highlight that “no consensus is reached about the spatial range that can be attributed to  
46  
47 knowledge spillovers, and in fact the majority of studies refuse to quantify the range  
48  
49 at all” (p.384). Since the seminal work by Anselin et al. (1997) on the influence of the  
50  
51 location of universities and private R&D facilities on local innovative productivity,  
52  
53 the spatial extent of knowledge flows in the US has been extensively studied. Acs  
54  
55 (2002, ch.3) compares the results of a number of earlier studies based on different  
56  
57 estimation techniques and concludes that university research spills over a range of 50  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 miles from the innovative Metropolitan Statistical Areas (MSAs), while the spillovers  
3  
4 from private R&D tend to be contained within the MSA itself. Even if such results  
5  
6 adjust downward the 75 mile radius previously measured by Varga (2000), the range  
7  
8 50-75 miles provides a 'consolidated' measure for the geographical extent of  
9  
10 knowledge spillovers in the US case. At the EU level, the scarcity (and heterogeneity)  
11  
12 of research efforts in this direction have prevented the formation of any consensus.  
13  
14 Greunz (2003) finds a positive and significant effect on local patenting activity of  
15  
16 innovative efforts pursued in first and second order neighbouring regions (190 miles  
17  
18 or 306 Km on average). The magnitude of this effect sharply decreases when reaching  
19  
20 the third order neighbourhood (274 miles or 441 Km on average) and is no longer  
21  
22 significant thereafter. Bottazzi and Peri (2003) find evidence of spillover effects, with  
23  
24 a positive impact of neighbouring regions' R&D efforts on local productivity, only  
25  
26 within a 200-300 km limit. In the same vein, Moreno et al. (2005) estimate a similar  
27  
28 spatial scope of regional spillovers: "innovative activity in a region is positively  
29  
30 related to the level of innovative activity in regions located within 250 kilometres of  
31  
32 distance, but no further" (p.7). Our analysis helps filling the existing gap in the  
33  
34 empirical literature on the measure of the spatial extent of regional spillovers in the  
35  
36 EU by including the regions of the entire EU25. In addition, our empirical analysis,  
37  
38 while delivering comparable results, differs from previous studies in that:  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 a) it is not based on a Knowledge Production Function but on a regional growth  
48  
49 model thus capturing the effects of neighbouring regions' innovative efforts on the  
50  
51 overall productivity of the regional economy, rather than on the production of  
52  
53 innovative output only;

54 b) distance is introduced into the model by means of a (time-based) trip-length  
55  
56 measure which captures more accurately the differential quality of connections  
57  
58 between regions;  
59  
60

1  
2 c) the model explicitly accounts for the underlying socio-economic conditions.  
3  
4  
5

6  
7 In what follows, we focus in greater detail on the relevant 'spatial scale' for the  
8  
9 transmission of growth-enhancing knowledge spillovers, by attempting to quantify the  
10  
11 concept of 'proximity' for the regions of the EU-25.  
12  
13

14  
15  
16 **[Insert Table 4 around here]**  
17  
18

19  
20  
21 Table 4 presents various estimations of our empirical model in which regional  
22  
23 spillovers' proxies are calculated by means of different 'spatial weights'. As in the  
24  
25 case of the regressions presented in Table 3 all usual diagnostic statistics confirm the  
26  
27 robustness of our results.  
28  
29

30  
31  
32  
33 Regression 1, used as the benchmark, shows our estimation results when regional  
34  
35 spillovers are proxied by the index of accessibility to extra-regional innovation as in  
36  
37 all regressions in the previous table. The regression not only confirms that knowledge  
38  
39 flowing from neighbouring regions improves regional growth performance, as was  
40  
41 underlined before, but also shows that spillovers are geographically bounded and  
42  
43 decay with distance. The weighing mechanism on which the variable is based makes  
44  
45 the importance of other regions' innovative activities decrease with distance thus  
46  
47 emphasizing the effect of innovative activities pursued in neighbouring regions. More  
48  
49 precisely, regions can rely upon the research strength of regions within a three hour  
50  
51 drive (ca 200 kms) as shown by the increase in significance of the spillover variable  
52  
53 once a 180 minute cut off is introduced in the weighing matrix (Regression 2). When  
54  
55 more remote regions are taken into consideration, by fixing the cut off trip length at  
56  
57 300 and 600 minutes (Regressions 3 and 4 respectively), the variable is no longer  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 significant thus showing that beyond a 180 minute trip-time the returns to extra-  
3 regional innovative activities are inexistent. Such measure for the spatial extent of  
4 regional spillovers is, as discussed above, in line with the empirical evidence  
5 produced so far. However, trip-length distance has allowed a more accurate measure  
6 of distance as a barrier to human interactions across geographical space. These results  
7 are confirmed also when total accessibility to innovative activities is considered by  
8 introducing a variable capturing both internal and distance-weighted R&D expenditure  
9 (Regressions 5-12). In this second case the 'institutional' borders of the region are  
10 overcome by focusing on a 'continuous' space which results from the aggregation, in  
11 an individual variable, of the total R&D expenditure that can be reached from a  
12 certain location regardless of regional borders. In doing this, we aim to measure the  
13 total impact of R&D agglomeration on economic performance.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Our results show once again that only the variables combining the strength of internal  
34 efforts with those pursued in more proximate (within the 180 minutes limit) areas  
35 produce a positive and significant effect on regional growth performance. The 180  
36 minutes limit for interregional knowledge flows comes to reinforce the idea of a  
37 'human-embodied' transmission technology since it allows the maximization of face-  
38 to-face contacts between agents. Agents within driving distance from one another can  
39 exchange their information face-to-face potentially on a daily basis, at a much lower  
40 marginal cost in comparison to those where an overnight stay is necessary (Sonn and  
41 Storper, 2005).  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55

## 56 **5. Conclusions**

57 The objective of this paper has been to analyse, for EU regions, the role played by the  
58 different combinations of factors identified by different approaches to the study of  
59  
60

1  
2 innovation, and to discriminate among them. The results of the empirical analysis  
3  
4 uncover the importance not only of the traditional linear model local R&D innovative  
5  
6 efforts, but also of the local socio-economic conditions for the genesis and  
7  
8 assimilation of innovation and its transformation into economic growth across  
9  
10 European regions. In addition, it shows the importance of proximity for the  
11  
12 transmission of economically productive knowledge. The results highlight that not  
13  
14 only knowledge flowing from neighbouring regions improves regional growth  
15  
16 performance, but also that spillovers are geographically bounded and that there is a  
17  
18 strong distance decay effect, which in the European case expands to more or less a  
19  
20 200 km radius. These outcomes shed additional light on the role of geography in the  
21  
22 process of innovation, by supporting the idea of an existing tension between two  
23  
24 forces: the increasingly homogeneous availability of standard 'codified' knowledge  
25  
26 and the spatial boundedness of 'tacit' knowledge and contextual factors. Such tension  
27  
28 is an important force behind the present economic geography of European regions and  
29  
30 its role is further accentuated by the underlying socio-economic differences.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 The analysis also has important regional policy implications. When innovation is  
41  
42 recognized as the key source of sustained economic growth, the mechanics of its  
43  
44 contribution to economic performance becomes crucial for an effective policy  
45  
46 targeting. In this respect the results of the analysis show that, in terms of innovation, a  
47  
48 region can rely on both internal and external sources of innovation, but that the socio-  
49  
50 economic conditions in order to maximize the innovation potential of each region are  
51  
52 necessarily internal, as socio-economic conditions in neighbouring regions do not  
53  
54 have any substantial impact on local economic performance.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

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

Consequently, policies based on innovation may deliver, at a regional level in Europe, very different results, according to the possibility of every region of benefiting from knowledge spillovers (location advantage) and favourable underlying socioeconomic conditions (internal conditions). R&D investment in core regions, which benefits from both a location and social filter advantage, is overall more conducive to economic growth due to its impact on both local and neighbouring regions' performance. Conversely, in peripheral regions investment in R&D may not yield the expected returns. The limited R&D investment capacity of regions in the periphery, their inadequate social filters, and their lower exposure, because of their location, to R&D spillovers are likely to undermine the R&D effort conducted within the borders of these regions. Does this mean that it is not worth investing in innovation in the periphery? While investing in promoting innovation is likely to remain a key factor for the development of peripheral regions in Europe, these sort of policies will need, much more than in the case of core regions, to be complemented by policies specifically aimed at tackling the local social and economic barriers that prevent the generation and the reception and assimilation of innovation. This fundamentally implies developing policies targeted at improving education, training, and skills, in order to guarantee not only greater returns from any innovation effort, but also – and perhaps more importantly in these environments – a better assimilation of knowledge spillovers generated in neighbouring regions and a better transformation of innovation into economically productive activities.

Overall, our analysis supports the idea that while the neo-Schumpeterian threshold of expenditure is an important factor in determining the returns of investment in R&D, for most regions in the EU addressing the capacity of the local population to assimilate whatever research is being generated locally or in neighbouring regions and



1  
2 to transform it into innovation and economic activity may be an important condition  
3  
4 for the success of innovation-based economic development policies. However, the  
5  
6 road ahead for peripheral regions in Europe is likely to remain tortuous. Given the  
7  
8 structural constraints that many backward regions face, the potential transformation of  
9  
10 the European periphery into innovation prone societies – if it ever happens – will in  
11  
12 most cases be a slow process, fraught with difficulties.  
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

1  
2 **Acknowledgements** – We are grateful to Roberta Capello, Carlo Pietrobelli, the  
3  
4 anonymous referees, and to participants in the seminars held in London, Naples,  
5  
6 Rome, Volos, Edinburgh, and Lisbon for their comments to earlier drafts of this  
7  
8 paper. The authors are solely responsible for any errors contained in the paper. This  
9  
10 paper could not have been written without the financial support of the Royal Society-  
11  
12 Wolfson Research Merit Award.  
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

## Endnotes

1. In this paper we adopt the definition of ‘knowledge’ developed by Döring and Schnellenbach (2006): we understand “knowledge as comprising all cognitions and abilities that individuals use to solve problems, make decisions and understand incoming information (...), knowledge is a tool that can be consciously used by individuals” (p.377).
2. GDP per capita is usually considered as a proxy for the level of productivity: the lower the productivity (GDP per capita) of a region, the farther it is from its technological frontier.
3. Standardised in order to range from zero to 1
4. As discussed in the previous section there is no reason that knowledge should stop spilling over just because of the (often arbitrary) boundaries of the NUTS regions on which the analysis is based.
5. Taking into account these caveats, our measurement of spillovers represents not only ‘pure knowledge externalities’ but also, more generally, the broader set of knowledge flows produced by any external source and appropriated by local innovative agents. “The pathways by which knowledge spills over in this way are many and various; they include written texts, informal conversations, input-output links, inter-firm mobility of workers, strategic alliances and so on” (Scott, 2006, p.9). The analysis of such pathways is outside the scope of this paper which, in this regard, inevitably shares the limitations of other studies based on a similar approach (compare Breschi and Lissoni, 2001).
6. The indicator of accessibility to innovation used in this article is purely geographical. While we acknowledge that geographical distance may neither be a sufficient, nor a necessary condition for the assimilation of spillovers, and cognitive, organizational, social, and institutional proximity play an important role

1  
2 in the diffusion of knowledge (Boschma, 2005; see also Iammarino and McCann,  
3  
4 2006), the quantitative nature of the analysis prevents us from focusing on these  
5  
6 other forms of proximity. Hence we measure the geographical distance between  
7  
8 different socio-economic structures in regions, but not the social distance between  
9  
10 these same structures.  
11  
12

- 13  
14 7. As the time distance-matrix is calculated either at the NUTS1 or at the NUTS2  
15  
16 level, in order to make it coherent with our data which combine different Nuts  
17  
18 levels we relied on the NUTS distance matrix using the NUTS 2 regions with the  
19  
20 highest population density, in order to represent the corresponding NUTS1 level  
21  
22 for Belgium, Germany, and the UK.  
23  
24
- 25  
26 8. In the case of the New Member States data availability has prevented us from  
27  
28 calculating the mean of the explanatory variables over the five year period (t-T-5)  
29  
30 forcing us to use a shorter time span. For some EU 15 countries slightly different  
31  
32 time spans have been used, as a consequence of differences in data availability for  
33  
34 each variable.  
35  
36
- 37  
38 9. As far as specific regions are concerned, no data are available for the French  
39  
40 Départments d'Outre-Mer (Fr9), Uusimaa (Fi16) and Etela-Suomi (Fi17) were  
41  
42 excluded from the analysis due to the lack of data on socio-economic variables.  
43  
44 Trentino-Alto Adige (IT31) was also excluded as it has no correspondent in the  
45  
46 NUTS2003 classification. Due to the nature of the analysis, the islands (PT2  
47  
48 Açores, PT3 Madeira, FR9 Departments d'Outre-Mer, ES7 Canarias) and Ceuta y  
49  
50 Melilla (ES 63) were not considered, as time-distance information, necessary for  
51  
52 the computation of spatially lagged variables, is not available.  
53  
54
- 55  
56 10. The value of the Moran's I from the regression residuals is reported in the tables  
57  
58 for each regression, alongside the usual diagnostic statistics. The weight matrix  
59  
60 for the computation of the Moran's I is based on the same weighting scheme

(Equations 2 and 3) adopted for the calculation of the spatially lagged variables included in the model (spillovers and social filter conditions of neighbouring regions). In addition to this weighting scheme (based on distance), first order contiguity has been also tested delivering similar results.

11. In this case:

$$f(c_{ij}) = \begin{cases} w_{ii} = 1 & \text{for } i = j \\ w_{ij} = \frac{1}{d_{ij}} & \\ w_{ij} = \frac{1}{\sum_j \frac{1}{d_{ij}}} & \text{for } i \neq j \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

As a result the variable is equal to the sum of the region's social filter index and the inverse-distance weighted average of other regions' social filter index (Accessibility to Innovation Prone Extra-Regional areas).

## References

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 ACS Z.J., AUDRETSCH D.B. and FELDMAN, M.P. (1992) Real effects of academic research:  
7 comment, *American Economic Review* **82**, 363-367.
- 8 ACS Z.J. (2002) *Innovation and growth in cities*. Edward Elgar, Northampton, MA
- 9 ADAMS J.D. (2002) Comparative localization of academic and industrial spillovers, *Journal of*  
10 *Economic Geography* **2**, 253-278.
- 11 ADAMS J.D. and JAFFE A.B. (2002) Bounding the effects of R&D: an investigation using matched  
12 firm and establishment data, *Rand Journal of Economics* **27**, 700-721.
- 13 ANSELIN L., VARGA A. and ACS Z. (1997) Local Geographic Spillovers between University  
14 Research and High Technology Innovations, *Journal of Urban Economics* **42**, 422-448.
- 15 ASHEIM, B.T. (1999) Interactive learning and localised knowledge in globalising learning  
16 economies, *GeoJournal* **49**, 345-352.
- 17 AUDRETSCH D.B. and FELDMAN M.P. (1996) R&D spillovers and the geography of innovation and  
18 production, *American Economic Review* **86**, 630-640.
- 19 AUDRETSCH D.B. and FELDMAN M. (2004) Knowledge Spillovers and the Geography of  
20 Innovation, in HENDERSON J.V. and J.F. THISSE (eds.) *Handbook of Urban and Regional*  
21 *Economics*, Vol.4, pp. 2713-2739. Elsevier, Amsterdam
- 22 BECATTINI G. (1987) *Mercato e forze locali. Il distretto industriale*. Il Mulino, Bologna.
- 23 BILBAO-OSORIO B. and RODRÍGUEZ-POSE A. (2004) From R&D to innovation and economic growth  
24 in the EU, *Growth and Change* **35**, 434-55.
- 25 BORTS G.H. and STEIN J.L. (1964) *Economic growth in a free market*. Columbia University Press,  
26 New York.
- 27 BOSCHMA R.A. (2005) Proximity and innovation: a critical assessment. *Regional Studies* **39**, 61-74
- 28 BOTTAZZI L. and PERI G. (2003) Innovation and spillovers in regions: evidence from European  
29 patent data, *European Economic Review* **47**, 687-710.
- 30 BRESCHI S. and LISSONI F. (2001) Knowledge Spillovers and Local Innovation Systems: A Critical  
31 Survey, *Industrial and Corporate Change* **10**, 975-1005.
- 32 BUSH V. (1945) *Science: The endless frontier*. Ayer, North Stanford.
- 33 CAMAGNI R. (1995) The concept of innovative milieu and its relevance for public policies in  
34 European lagging regions, *Papers in Regional Science* **74**, 317-340.
- 35 CANTWELL J. and IAMMARINO S. (1998) MNCs, Technological Innovation and Regional Systems in  
36 the EU: Some Evidence in the Italian Case, *International Journal of the Economics of Business*  
37 **5**, 383-408.
- 38 CANTWELL J. and IAMMARINO S. (2003) *Multinational corporations and European regional*  
39 *systems of innovation*. Routledge, London.
- 40 CARLSSON B. (2004) Innovation systems: a survey of the literature from a Schumpeterian  
41 perspective, *Paper for the International J.A. Schumpeter Society Conference*, Milan, mimeo
- 42 CHARLOT S. and DURANTON G. (2006) Cities and workplace communication: Some quantitative  
43 French evidence, *Urban Studies* **43**, 1365-1394.
- 44 CHESHIRE P. and MAGRINI S. (2000) Endogenous processes in European regional growth:  
45 Convergence and policy, *Growth and Change* **31**, 455-479.
- 46 COHEN W. and LEVINTHAL D. (1990) Absorptive capacity: A new perspective on learning and  
47 innovation. *Administration Science Quarterly* **35**, 128-152.
- 48 COOKE P. (1997) Regions in a global market: The experiences of Wales and Baden-Wurttemberg,  
49 *Review of International Political Economy* **4**, 349-381.
- 50 COOKE P. (1998) Origins of the concept in BRACZYK H., COOKE P. and HEIDENREICH M. (eds),  
51 *Regional Innovation Systems*. UCL Press, London.
- 52 COOKE P., GÓMEZ URANGA M., ETXEBERRIA G. (1997) Regional innovation systems: Institutional  
53 and organizational dimensions, *Research Policy* **26**, 475-91.
- 54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 CRESCENZI R. (2005) Innovation and regional growth in the enlarged Europe: the role of local  
4 innovative capabilities, peripherality and education, *Growth and Change* **36**, 471-507.
- 5 DOPFER K., FOSTER J. and POTTS J. (2004) Micro-meso-macro, *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*  
6 **14**, 263-279.
- 7  
8 DÖRING T. and SCHNELLENBACH J. (2006) What do we know about geographical knowledge  
9 spillovers and regional growth?: a survey of the literature, *Regional Studies* **40**, 375-395.
- 10 DOSI G., FREEMAN C., NELSON R., SILVERBERG G. and SOETE L. (Eds) (1988) *Technical Change*  
11 *and Economic Theory*. Pinter, London.
- 12 EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2006) *The demographic future of Europe – from challenge to opportunity*,  
13 *COM(2006) 571 final*, Brussels
- 14 FAGERBERG J. (1988) Why growth rates differ, in Dosi, G., Freeman, C., Nelson, R., Silveberg, G.,  
15 and Soete, L. (eds), *Technological change and economic theory*. Pinter, London.
- 16 FAGERBERG J. (1994) Technology and international differences in growth rates, *Journal of*  
17 *Economic Literature* **32**, 1147-1175.
- 18 FAGERBERG J., VERSPAGEN B., and CANIËLS M. (1997) Technology, growth and unemployment  
19 across European Regions, *Regional Studies* **31**, 5, 457-466.
- 20 FELDMAN M.P. and FLORIDA R. (1994) The geographic sources of innovation - technological  
21 infrastructure and product innovation in the US. *Annals of the Association of American*  
22 *Geographers* **84**(2), 210-229.
- 23 FREEMAN C. (1994) Critical survey: the economics of technical change, *Camb. J. Econ.* **18**, 463-  
24 512.
- 25 FURMAN J.L., PORTER M.E. and STERN S. (2002) The determinants of national innovative capacity,  
26 *Research Policy* **31**(6), 899-933.
- 27 GORDON I.R. (2001) Unemployment and spatial labour markets: strong adjustment and persistent  
28 concentration in R. Martin and P. Morrison (eds.) *Geographies of Labour Market Inequality*,  
29 Routledge, London.
- 30 GREGERSEN B. and JOHNSON B. (1996) Learning economies, innovation systems and European  
31 integration, *Regional Studies* **31**, 479-490.
- 32 GREUNZ L. (2003) Geographically and technologically mediated knowledge spillovers between  
33 European regions, *Annals of Regional Science* **37**, 657-80.
- 34 GRILICHES Z. (1979) Issues in Assessing the Contribution of Research and  
35  
36 GROSSMAN G. M. and HELPMAN E. (1991) *Innovation and Growth in the Global Economy*. MIT  
37 Press, Cambridge (MA).
- 38 IAMMARINO S. (2005) An evolutionary Integrated View of Regional Systems of innovation:  
39 concepts, measures and historical perspectives, *European Planning Studies* **13**(4), 497-519.
- 40 IAMMARINO S. and MCCANN P. (2006) The structure and evolution of industrial clusters:  
41 transactions, technology and knowledge spillovers, *Research Policy* **35**, 1018-1036
- 42 IRPUD (2000) *European Peripherality Indicators (E.P.I.)*. IRPUD GIS database. Dortmund:  
43 Institute of Spatial Planning.
- 44 JAFFE A.B. (1986) Technological opportunity and spillovers of R&D: Evidence from firms' patents,  
45 profits and market share, *American Economic Review* **76**, 984-1001.
- 46 LEAMER E. and STORPER M. (2001) The Economic Geography of the Internet Age, *Journal of*  
47 *International Business Studies* **32**(4), 641-665.
- 48 LUNDVALL B.Å. (1992) *National systems of innovation: Towards a theory of innovation and*  
49 *interactive learning*. Pinter, London.
- 50 LUNDVALL B.Å. (2001) Innovation policy in the globalising learning economy in ARCHIBUGI D. and  
51 LUNDVALL B.Å. (eds.). *The globalising learning economy*. Oxford University Press.
- 52 MACLAURIN W. R. (1953) The sequence from invention to innovation and its relation to economic  
53 growth, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* **67**, 97-111.
- 54 MALECKI E. (1997) *Technology and Economic Development: The Dynamics of Local, Regional and*  
55 *National Competitiveness*, 2nd edition, Addison Wesley Longman, London.
- 56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 MAURSETH P.B. and B. VERSPAGEN (1999) Europe: One or several systems of innovation? An  
4 analysis based on patent citations in FAGERBERG J., P.GUERRIERI and B.VERSPAGNEN (eds). *The*  
5 *economic challenge for Europe*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.  
6  
7 MORENO R., PACI R. and USAI S. (2005) Spatial spillovers and innovation activity in European  
8 regions, *Environment and Planning A* **37**, 1793-1812.  
9  
10 MORGAN K. (1997) The learning region: Institutions, innovation and regional renewal. *Regional*  
11 *Studies* **31**, 491-503.  
12  
13 MORGAN K. (2004) The exaggerated death of geography: learning, proximity and territorial  
14 innovation systems, *Journal of Economic Geography* **4**, 3-21.  
15  
16 RODRÍGUEZ-POSE A. (1999) Innovation prone and innovation averse societies. Economic  
17 performance in Europe, *Growth and Change* **30**, 75-105.  
18  
19 RODRÍGUEZ-POSE A. (2001) Is R&D investment in lagging areas of Europe worthwhile? Theory and  
20 Empirical evidence. *Papers in Regional Science* **80**, 275-295.  
21  
22 RODRÍGUEZ-POSE A. and Fratesi U. (2004) Between development and social policies: The impact of  
23 European Structural Funds in Objective 1 regions, *Regional Studies* **38**(1): 97-113.  
24  
25 ROSENBERG N. (1994). *Exploring the black box: Technology, economics, and history*. Cambridge  
26 University Press, New York.  
27  
28 SOLOW R. (1957) Technical Change and the aggregate production function, *Review of Economics and*  
29 *Statistics* **39**, 312-320.  
30  
31 SCOTT A.J. (2006) Entrepreneurship, Innovation and Industrial Development, *Small business*  
32 *economics* **26**, 1-24  
33  
34 SONN J.W. and STORPER M. (2005) *The increasing importance of geographical proximity in*  
35 *technological innovation: an analysis of U.S. patent citations, 1975-1997*. Mimeo.  
36  
37 STORPER M. and VENABLES A.J. (2004) Buzz: face-to-face contact and the urban economy, *Journal*  
38 *of Economic Geography* **4**, 351-370.  
39  
40 TRAJTENBERG M. (1990) *Economic analysis of product innovation*. Cambridge University Press,  
41 Cambridge.  
42  
43 VARGA A. (2000) Local academic knowledge spillovers and the concentration of economic activity,  
44 *Journal of Regional Science* **40**, 289-309.  
45  
46 VERSPAGEN B. (1991) A new empirical approach to Catching up and falling behind, *Structural*  
47 *Change and Economic Dynamics* **12**, 374-97.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



Table 1 – Structure of the empirical model

	<b>Internal factors</b>	<b>External factors (Spillovers)</b>
<b>R&amp;D</b>	Investment in R&D in the region	Investment in R&D in neighbouring regions
<b>Regional systems of innovation</b>	Conditions conducive to the establishment of a regional system of innovation	Conditions conducive to the establishment of a regional system of innovation in neighbouring regions
<b>GDP per capita</b>	As a proxy for initial conditions and potential	Initial conditions in neighbouring regions
<b>National effect</b>	Controlled for by a set of national dummies	

Table 2a - Principal Component Analysis: Eigenanalysis of the Correlation Matrix

	<i>PC1</i>	<i>PC2</i>	<i>PC3</i>	<i>PC4</i>	<i>PC5</i>	<i>PC6</i>
Eigenvalue	2.5886	1.2723	0.9083	0.6418	0.5661	0.0229
Proportion	0.431	0.212	0.151	0.107	0.094	0.004
Cumulative	0.431	0.643	0.795	0.902	0.996	1

For Peer Review Only

Table 2b - Principal Component Analysis: Principal Components' Coefficients

<b>Variable</b>	<i>PC1</i>	<i>PC2</i>
Education Population	0.576	-0.224
Education Labour Force	0.554	-0.313
Life-Long Learning	0.395	0.26
Agricultural Labour Force	-0.43	-0.285
Long Term Unemployment	-0.14	-0.459
Young People	0.019	0.701

For Peer Review Only

Table 3 - H-C OLS estimation of the empirical model. R&amp;D, social filter and knowledge spillovers. Annual growth rate of regional GDP (1995-2003).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Constant	0.09406*** (0.02572)	0.12284*** (0.02814)	0.12182*** (0.02796)	0.1126*** (0.02563)	0.10707*** (0.02561)	0.09655*** (0.02671)	0.08491*** (0.03019)	0.08989*** (0.0292)	0.10777*** (0.02709)	0.12054*** (0.02802)	0.12187*** (0.02805)	0.12059*** (0.02809)
Log GDP 95	-0.003098 (0.003255)	-0.005756 (0.00353)	-0.00663* (0.003543)	-0.00574* (0.003267)	-0.005112 (0.003268)	-0.003359 (0.003346)	-0.00196 (0.003803)	-0.002733 (0.003478)	-0.004345 (0.003339)	-0.006577* (0.003571)	-0.006349* (0.003668)	-0.007705* (0.003929)
R&D expenditure	0.2682** (0.1174)	0.1424 (0.1207)	0.1791 (0.1218)	0.1366 (0.1212)	0.166 (0.1208)	0.2556** (0.1229)	0.2664** (0.1177)	0.2653** (0.1182)	0.2548** (0.1172)	0.1883 (0.1213)	0.177 (0.1223)	0.1909 (0.1234)
Social Filter Index		0.01052** (0.004626)	0.010787** (0.004598)								0.010538** (0.004682)	0.011422** (0.004713)
Accessibility to ExtraRegional Innovation	0.013236 (0.008148)		0.01387* (0.008031)	0.013157* (0.007908)	0.013733* (0.007975)	0.012717* (0.0083)	0.012262 (0.008336)	0.013353 (0.008182)	0.013807* (0.008119)	0.014184* (0.008052)	0.013936* (0.008059)	0.014229* (0.008067)
National Dummies	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
<i>Social Filter Individual Components:</i>												
Education Population				0.017003*** (0.005341)								
Education Labour Force					0.019224*** (0.006986)							
Life-Long Learning						0.00385 (0.01076)						
Agricultural Labour Force							0.003802 (0.006528)					
Long Term Unemployment								0.001892 (0.006205)				
Young People									-0.009089 (0.005882)			
<i>Extra-Regional Social Filter</i>												
Total accessibility to innovation prone space										0.012617*** (0.005656)		
Accessibility to Innovation Prone Extra-Regional areas											-0.00808 (0.0261)	
Accessibility to wealth neighbouring regions												8.8E-07 (0.00000138)
Observations	166	166	166	166	166	166	166	166	166	166	166	166
R-Sq	0.659	0.665	0.672	0.681	0.676	0.66	0.66	0.659	0.665	0.67	0.672	0.672
R-Sq (adj)	0.62	0.626	0.631	0.642	0.636	0.618	0.618	0.618	0.624	0.63	0.629	0.63
F	16.84	17.27	16.7	17.45	17.03	15.82	15.85	15.81	16.19	16.61	15.72	15.77
Moran's I	-0.0193012	-0.0185667	-0.0189041	-0.0194612	-0.0198153	-0.0193265	-0.0198503	-0.0195195	-0.0199182	-0.0188243	-0.0188376	-0.0189403

\*, \*\* and \*\*\* denote significance at a 10%, 5% and 1% level respectively. SE in parentheses

**Table 4 - H-C OLS estimation of the empirical model: accessibility to innovation. Annual growth rate of regional GDP (1995-2003).**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Constant	0.12182*** (0.02796)	0.134*** (0.02838)	0.12317*** (0.02822)	0.12551*** (0.02844)	0.12107*** (0.028)	0.12176*** (0.02799)	0.1216*** (0.02799)	0.12116*** (0.028)	0.09082*** (0.02532)	0.09202*** (0.02533)	0.08063*** (0.02512)	0.09103*** (0.02533)
Log GDP 95	-0.00663 (0.003543)	-0.007635** (0.003612)	-0.006016* (0.003571)	-0.005813 (0.003537)	-0.005554 (0.003506)	-0.005661 (0.003506)	-0.005642 (0.003505)	-0.005572 (0.003506)	-0.001745 (0.003166)	-0.001913 (0.003168)	-0.000093 (0.003078)	-0.001779 (0.003168)
R&D expenditure	0.1791 (0.1218)	0.1486 (0.1194)	0.1458 (0.1211)	0.1475 (0.1211)								
Social Filter Index	0.010787** (0.004598)	0.01074** (0.004579)	0.01101** (0.004724)	0.010379** (0.004638)	0.01081** (0.00455)	0.010656** (0.004538)	0.010685** (0.004538)	0.010782** (0.00455)				
<i>Accessibility to ExtraRegional Innovation</i>												
Continuous Space	0.01387* (0.008031)											
180 minutes cutoff		0.00983** (0.00481)										
300 minutes cutoff			0.002556 (0.004712)									
600 minutes cutoff				-0.005154 (0.007263)								
<i>Total accessibility to Innovation (Extra+Intra regional)</i>												
Continuous Space					0.005349 (0.004505)				0.008264* (0.004401)			
180 minutes cutoff						0.006191 (0.004619)				0.009091** (0.004518)		
300 minutes cutoff							0.006103 (0.004628)					-0.000643 (0.004707)
600 minutes cutoff								0.005447 (0.004506)				0.00836* (0.004402)
National Dummies	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Observations	166	166	166	166	166	166	166	166	166	166	166	166
R-Sq	0.672	0.674	0.666	0.666	0.665	0.666	0.666	0.665	0.652	0.653	0.644	0.652
R-Sq (adj)	0.631	0.634	0.625	0.625	0.626	0.627	0.627	0.627	0.615	0.616	0.606	0.615
F	16.7	16.89	16.25	16.28	17.27	17.34	17.33	17.28	17.46	17.55	16.84	17.47
Moran's I	-0.0189041	-0.0196286	-0.0186123	-0.019055	-0.0189909	-0.0192397	-0.0191901	-0.0189931	-0.0188665	-0.0191502	-0.0165446	-0.0188604

\*, \*\* and \*\*\* denote significance at a 10%, 5% and 1% level respectively. SE in parentheses

## Appendix

Table A-1 – Description of the variables

Variable	Definition
Dependent variable	Annual growth rate of regional GDP (1995-2003)
<b>Internal factors</b>	
Log GDP 95	Natural logarithm of regional GDP per capita
<i>Innovation</i>	
R&D	Expenditure on R&D (all sectors) as a % of GDP
<i>Social Filter</i>	
Life-Long Learning	Rate of involvement in Life-long learning - % of Adults (25-64 years) involved in education and training
Education Labour Force	% of employed persons with tertiary education (levels 5-6 ISCED 1997).
Education Population	% of total population with tertiary education (levels 5-6 ISCED 1997).
Agricultural Labour Force	Agricultural employment as % of total employment
Long Term Unemployment	Long term unemployed as % of total unemployment.
Young People	People aged 15-24 as % of total population
Social Filter Index	The index combines, by means of Principal Component Analysis, the variables describing the socio-economic realm of the region (listed above).
<b>External factors (Spillovers)</b>	
Accessibility to ExtraRegional Innovation	Index $A_i$ which, for each region $i$ , is the inverse-distance-weighted average of nationally-weighted millions of Euros invested in R&D activities of the $n_j - 1$ (with $j \neq i$ ) regions.
Total accessibility to Innovation	For each region $i$ , is the inverse-distance-weighted average of the nationally-weighted millions of Euros invested in R&D activities over $N$ regions (including region $i$ it self, with weight $w_{ii} = 1$ )
Accessibility to Innovation Prone Extra-Regional areas	For each region $i$ , is the inverse-distance-weighted average of the Social Filter Index over the $n_j - 1$ (with $j \neq i$ ) regions.
Total accessibility to innovation prone space	For each region $i$ , is the inverse-distance-weighted average of the Social Filter Index over $N$ regions (including region $i$ it self, with weight $w_{ii} = 1$ )
Accessibility to wealth neighbouring regions	For each region $i$ , is the inverse-distance-weighted average of the GDP per capita over the $n_j - 1$ (with $j \neq i$ ) regions.