



HAL
open science

Regional innovation systems in Hungary: The failing synergy at the national level

Balázs Lengyel, Loet Leydesdorff

► **To cite this version:**

Balázs Lengyel, Loet Leydesdorff. Regional innovation systems in Hungary: The failing synergy at the national level. *Regional Studies*, 2010, pp.1. 10.1080/00343401003614274 . hal-00608802

HAL Id: hal-00608802

<https://hal.science/hal-00608802>

Submitted on 15 Jul 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.



Regional innovation systems in Hungary: The failing synergy at the national level

Journal:	<i>Regional Studies</i>
Manuscript ID:	CRES-2008-0252.R3
Manuscript Type:	Main Section
JEL codes:	B52 - Institutional Evolutionary < B5 - Current Heterodox Approaches < B - Schools of Economic Thought and Methodology, O18 - Regional, Urban, and Rural Analyses < O1 - Economic Development < O - Economic Development, Technological Change, and Growth, P25 - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics Housing Transportation < P2 - Socialist Systems and Transitional Economies < P - Economic Systems, R12 - Size and Spatial Distributions of Regional Economic Activity < R1 - General Regional Economics < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics
Keywords:	innovation system, knowledge function synergy, configurational information, entropy statistics, transition economy, regions



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

Regional innovation systems in Hungary:
The failing synergy at the national level

Balázs Lengyel * and Loet Leydesdorff **

* Institute for World Economics, Hungarian Academy of Science, Országház u. 30, H-
Budapest, Hungary; e-mail: blengyel@vki.hu;

** Amsterdam School of Communications Research (ASCoR), University of Amsterdam,
Kloveniersburgwal 48, NL-1012 CX Amsterdam, The Netherlands; e-mail:
loet@leydesdorff.net; <http://www.leydesdorff.net> .

(Received October 2008; in revised form November 2009)

1
2
3
4
5
6 Abstract

7
8 We use entropy statistics in this paper to measure the synergies of knowledge exploration,
9
10 knowledge exploitation, and organizational control in the Hungarian innovation system. Our
11
12 data consists of high- and medium-tech firms and knowledge-intensive services categorized
13
14 by sub-regions (proxy for geography), industrial sectors (proxy for technology) and firm size
15
16 (proxy for organization). Configurational information along these three dimensions is used as
17
18 an indicator of reduction of uncertainty or, in other words, the synergy across the knowledge
19
20 functions. Our results indicate that three regimes have been created during the Hungarian
21
22 transition with very different dynamics: (1) Budapest and its agglomeration emerge as a
23
24 knowledge-based innovation system on every indicator; (2) the north-western part of the
25
26 country, where foreign-owned companies have induced a shift in knowledge-organization;
27
28 while (3) the system in the eastern and southern part of the country seems to be organized as a
29
30 response to government expenditure. The national level no longer adds to the synergy across
31
32 these regional innovation systems.
33
34
35
36
37

38
39 **Keywords:** *innovation system, knowledge function synergy, configurational information,*
40
41 *entropy statistics, transition economy, regions.*
42

43
44 **JEL codes:** B52, O18, P25, R12
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1. Introduction

When the Soviet-Union fell apart in the years 1989-1991, the countries of Eastern and Middle Europe regained their autonomy. A major task confronting national governments was to guide both the transition of their economies to modern knowledge-based economies in rapidly globalizing markets and to achieve accession to Western institutions such as NATO, the OECD, and thereafter also the European Union. The accession to the EU—achieved in 2004—required a transformation of the economic and legal systems of these countries. The institutionally-shaped bureaucracies of the socialist economies were unable to absorb the emerging knowledge-based dynamics sufficiently (e.g., Richta *et al.*, 1968). The newly elected governments were confronted with two transformations: economic opening up to the world market and the innovation dynamics of external forces such as transnational corporations. Foreign direct investment (FDI) became decisive in shaping the national and regional innovation systems in these countries (INZELT, 2003, RADOSEVIC, 2002).

In this paper, we focus on Hungary as a country that went through the process of transition and thereafter accession to the EU. The study follows the format of previous studies of the measurement of regional and national systems of innovation in The Netherlands and Germany (LEYDESDORFF *et al.*, 2006; LEYDESDORFF and FRITSCH, 2006) and combines their statistical apparatus with in-depth insights into the Hungarian system. The added value of this paper is the extension of the empirical model to transition economies. We have access to unique data that allow us to measure the effects of the transformation in terms of synergies in relevant innovation systems (CARLSSON, 2006). We use micro-level data on 660,290 firms in Hungary. These firms are classified as high- or medium-tech manufacturing or knowledge-intensive services by the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (HCSO). In

1
2
3 addition to this classification, the data contains the postal address and size (in number of
4
5 employees) of each firm.
6
7
8
9

10 The second main contribution is a more refined theoretical background of the
11 empirical model. We distinguish three knowledge functions of innovation systems, namely:
12 knowledge exploration, knowledge exploitation, and organizational control. Following the
13 above-mentioned studies, we use firm size as an indicator of organization (PUGH et al, 1969,
14 BLAU and SCHOENHERR, 1971), whereas the addresses allow us to decompose regional
15 dynamics at various levels of aggregation. Our research question is whether a national system
16 of innovation has been established in Hungary and, if not, how should the system be
17 characterized regarding differences across regions? We operationalize an innovation system
18 as a configuration along technological, geographic, and organizational dimensions
19 (STORPER, 1997) in which knowledge functions generate synergy. As a methodology, we
20 use configurational information as a measure of synergy among distributions in the three
21 dimensions.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 We shall argue that Hungary should now be understood as composed of three
42 innovation systems with very different dynamics: (1) the capital Budapest can be
43 characterized as a metropolitan innovation system, and operates increasingly on a par with
44 Vienna, Prague, and Munich as centers for knowledge-intensive services and knowledge-
45 based manufacturing; (2) the north-western parts of the country have been absorbed into the
46 Western-European innovation systems surrounding it; and (3) the eastern and southern parts
47 of the country are still predominantly integrated within old systems dynamics, largely
48 determined by and dependent upon government spending. The national system of Hungary no
49 longer adds to the knowledge-based dynamics of these three regional systems as it does in the
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 case of the Netherlands. In Germany, we found synergy at the state level (also defined as
4
5 NUTS-1). These conclusions will be quantitatively underpinned by the measurement of
6
7 synergies across technological, organizational, and territorial distributions of firms at the
8
9 various NUTS-levels.ⁱ
10
11

12 13 14 15 2. The evolutionary model

16
17 The literature on innovation systems starts by asking why and how nations and regions
18
19 differ in terms of the evolution in technology, industrial structure and institutional setting of
20
21 certain territories (COOKE et al., 2004, EDQUIST, 1997, LUNDVALL, 1992, NELSON,
22
23 1993). The inter-relatedness of the above mentioned settings is discussed in institutional and
24
25 evolutionary research agendas as the notion of co-evolution (BOSCHMA and FRENKEN,
26
27 2006, CORIAT and DOSI, 1998). However, the investigation of these co-evolutionary
28
29 mechanisms has focused primarily on innovation systems at the national level (NELSON,
30
31 1995). The model elaborated in this section enables us to investigate whether this inter-
32
33 relatedness occurs at national or regional levels of innovation systems.
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 Our model is based on Storper's (1997, at pp. 26 ff.) conjecture that the
42
43 interrelationships between technology, organization and territory in an economic system can
44
45 be considered a "holy trinity." Storper emphasizes that this holy trinity should not be studied
46
47 as an aggregate of its composing elements, but in terms of the relations between and among
48
49 these elements. These relationships shape regional economies. However, his proposal for a
50
51 "relational paradigm" was not operationalized in a way which permitted measurement.
52
53
54
55

56
57 Based on Triple Helix model of university-industry-government relations, Leydesdorff
58
59 (2003) proposed the concept of configurational information as an indicator of synergy in
60

1
2
3 Triple-Helix relations. This information measure—discussed in more detail below—can be
4
5 negative or positive, indicating the presence of synergy across three independent sources of
6
7 variance. For example, one can ask whether the interaction among sources in a region is
8
9 further enhanced by additionally considering the national level. By applying this concept to
10
11 Storper’s three dimensions, one can consider the following model. Here we used the
12
13 organizational dimension of the “holy trinity” as an operationalization of economic exchange
14
15 relations, as the latter can be expected to determine the size and scope of firms through
16
17 transaction costs in the market (COASE, 1937).
18
19
20

21
22 Figure 1 around here
23

24
25 This model enables us to distinguish knowledge functions in innovation systems in
26
27 addition to the two main dimensions of a political economy. Agents are geographically
28
29 positioned and endowed but are able to exchange irrespectively of these boundaries in
30
31 economic relations. A knowledge-based economy can be considered as based on interactions
32
33 between these two (traditional) drivers of a political economy with the new dimension of
34
35 knowledge creation, dissemination, and control (NELSON and WINTER, 1982; WHITLEY,
36
37 1984, 2001). The three dimensions operating upon each other can also be considered as a
38
39 triple helix which endogenously might be able to reduce uncertainty in a process of self-
40
41 organization. Our intent is to measure this reduction of uncertainty as a synergy. The method
42
43 is explained in detail below.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 In our three-dimensional model, knowledge functions of innovation systems are
52
53 defined as follows: knowledge exploration, knowledge exploitation and organizational
54
55 control. These can be considered the interaction terms at the interfaces between the three
56
57 independent dimensions. This specification of the knowledge functions in terms of relevant
58
59 dimensions enables us to connect the model to Storper’s “holy trinity” beyond the
60

1
2
3 operationalizations in previous studies of innovation systems in the Netherlands and
4
5 Germany.
6
7
8
9

10 *Knowledge exploitation* can be considered as the selection of existing routines, while
11 *knowledge exploration* refers to concerted variation and planned experimentation (MARCH,
12 1991, BAUM et al., 2000). In other words, exploitation is associated with the reuse of existing
13 competences and means, while exploration is associated with creating new alternatives. At the
14 systems level, mechanisms of knowledge exploitation represent the interface between
15 economic welfare and technological knowledge creation (GIBBONS et al., 1994). In our
16 understanding this interface does not necessarily depend on geographical locations because
17 economic welfare is created at the level of global markets, even if certain technologies
18 originate in single regions. We also argue that knowledge exploitation is connected to
19 locations only when there exists some synergy within an innovation system: the local pool of
20 suppliers, qualified labour, etc. Knowledge exploration, however, can be considered as a
21 place-dependent rather than a market-dependent mechanism because tacit knowledge is
22 essential in creating new knowledge and relates significantly to places. Strong evidence was
23 found on the effect of university R&D on the local economy (JAFFE et al., 1993) and on the
24 regional production of knowledge (ACS et al., 2002, VARGA, 2007).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 *Organizational control* mechanisms of innovation systems (e.g., economic policies)
49 focus mainly on territorial units having direct influence on economic exchange relations
50 (taxes and incentives etc.), but affect knowledge exploration and exploitation only indirectly
51 (infrastructure, cluster-programmes etc.). Institutions of innovation systems increase the
52 probability of the emergence of new knowledge. However, organizations are needed to foster
53 these institutions through organizational arrangements, new connections, and formal
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 responsibilities (LOASBY, 2001). Thus, the *organizational control* function in our model
4
5 represents the institutional and organizational elements of innovation systems. In our opinion,
6
7 it follows from the above outlined knowledge functions that the synergies across them mark
8
9 the quality of innovation systems.
10
11

12
13
14
15 As noted, this study leans methodologically on two previous studies of Germany and
16
17 the Netherlands. The main conclusions of these studies form the basis of our expectations in
18
19 the current study. These conclusions were as follows:
20
21

- 22 – medium- and high-tech manufacturing couple knowledge synergies of innovation
23 systems to geographical location;
 - 24 – medium-tech does this to a higher extent than high-tech;
 - 25 – knowledge-intensive services tend to decouple knowledge synergies from their
26 geographical location;
 - 27 – high-tech services counter-act this latter effect.
- 28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 The authors explained these findings in terms of the relative “footloose-ness” of
40
41 knowledge-intensive services and high-tech manufacturing (VERNON, 1979). Knowledge-
42
43 intensive services can be offered outside a region assuming the availability of transportation.
44
45 Thus the vicinity of an airport or major railway station is often more important than local and
46
47 regional factors. High-tech manufacturing is less embedded in a local economy than medium-
48
49 tech. The latter can be expected to enhance absorptive capacity in the region to an extent
50
51 larger than the former (COHEN and LEVINTHAL, 1989). High-tech services counter-act the
52
53 decoupling effect by tending to make R&D facilities (e.g., laboratories) a necessary condition.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Furthermore, these authors found an additional synergy at the level of the nation in the
4 case of Holland, but not in the case of Germany. In Germany, innovation systems are
5 integrated more at the level of federal states than the level of the nation according to this
6 indicator. In the case of Hungary, we initially expected it to function as a national system like
7 the Netherlands due to its' relative size. As noted, our data suggest that Hungary's national
8 innovation system decomposed into smaller subsystems, i.e. parts of the country operate
9 under different dynamics. Coordination problems at the national level will also be discussed.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 3. Selected issues of the Hungarian transition: regional distribution of FDI and R&D 23 expenditure 24 25

26 Since the political changes in 1989 and 1990, the relatively small Hungarian economy
27 has opened up. After a transition period, the country joined the EU in 2004. Articles in
28 economic geography note that the transition from a planned to a market economy first caused
29 significant economic decline (LENGYEL, 2004; VARGA, 2007): many medium-tech state-
30 owned companies went bankrupt and R&D expenditure wained. In the late '90s, three regions
31 (Central Hungary, Central Transdanubia and Western Transdanubia) began reducing the gap
32 between them and their Western-European counterparts with growth rates of 4-5% a year. The
33 three regions with dynamically expanding economies are situated in the northwest of Hungary
34 between Budapest and the Austrian border. Out of these three regions, the Central Hungarian
35 region (Budapest) had attained 96.5 % of the EU-25 average GDP per capita by the year
36 2005. The economic growth of the other four regions remained at 1.6-3% per year (HSCO,
37 2007). These four regions (Southern Transdanubia, Northern Hungary, the Northern Great
38 Plain and the Southern Great Plain) are situated south and east of Budapest.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In the Hungarian economy more than 50% of the registered capital of companies and
4 partnerships is in the hands of foreign owners. The international stake is significant in all
5
6 SME types, reaching at least 27-28 % (KÁLLAY and LENGYEL, 2008). As in large
7
8 companies, half of the capital of medium-sized enterprises is in foreign hands.ⁱⁱ The R&D
9
10 index in Hungary lags behind the European average. The total share of R&D expenditure in
11
12 GDP was 0.95% in 2005. 44,8 % of R&D expenditure took place in the business sector, 29,1
13
14 % in public research organizations and 26,1 % in universities (HCSO, 2006). Previous studies
15
16 have concluded that university-industry relations are weak in Hungary (INZELT, 2004;
17
18 PAPANEK, 2000). However, some regional centres have important universities that have
19
20 taken an active role in the transition. The Central-Hungarian Region (CHR)—including
21
22 Budapest—absorbs a significant share of Hungarian R&D resources Figure 2).

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
Figure 2 around here

31
32 The motives of foreign-owned companies for selecting specific locations (mainly in
33
34 the energy, banking and manufacturing sectors) were primarily labour costs, accessibility and
35
36 opportunities for privatisation at the beginning of the transition (BARTA, 2002). However,
37
38 the Budapest knowledge-base and the regional centres were more and more attractive for
39
40 multinational R&D (LENGYEL and CADIL, 2009; INZELT, 2003). In the period 1995-2003,
41
42 the growth of R&D spending by foreign affiliates was among the highest in Hungary
43
44 (UNCTAD, 2005, p. 127). The share of large foreign-owned companies in manufacturing
45
46 R&D is around 40 % (EUROSTAT, 2005); and the share of foreign affiliates in business
47
48 R&D around 80% (EC, 2005). The territorial distribution of foreign investment in the
49
50 Hungarian economy is uneven. The majority of foreign shares in foreign-owned companies
51
52 are located in Budapest, Central Hungary, Central Transdanubia and Western Transdanubia.

1
2
3 As noted, this paper focuses on how regional differences have developed during the
4 transition as a result of the entrance of foreign investors and the maintenance of public
5 expenditure. We consider foreign direct investment as an *external force* on innovation
6 systems (LORENZEN and MAHNKE, 2002; LUNDVALL et al, 2002). Companies locate
7 their R&D facilities in a region either to exploit their existing knowledge or to have access to
8 the local knowledge base (VON ZEDTWITZ and GASSMAN, 2002). Public expenditure on
9 R&D is transferred to the regions from the central budget. Private R&D is mostly controlled
10 by foreign-owned firms in Hungary. However, we follow here only the general outlook on
11 R&D, as it is an *internal mechanism* of regional innovation systems (TÖDTLING and
12 TRIPPL, 2005). In summary, we expect that:

- 13 – foreign-owned firms have a restructuring effect on the synergy of knowledge
14 functions;
- 15 – the contribution of research and development to the knowledge synergies is strongly
16 differentiated by regional innovation systems.

17 4. Data and methods

18 In the analysis we use a unique dataset to measure the existence of synergy at different
19 levels of innovation systems. Our indicator, configurational information, measures the
20 reduction in uncertainty of three independent sources of variance in the system. The stronger
21 the synergy across knowledge functions the more uncertainty is reduced in the system. A
22 three-dimensional matrix of data was needed to create this indicator based on the model
23 illustrated in Figure 1.

24 The dataset consists of 659,701 firms and was collected by the Hungarian Central
25 Statistical Office (HCSO). Since firms are required to supply data to the HCSO, our dataset

1
2
3 encompasses the entire population of firms. All data is from December 31, 2005. The use of
4
5 the statistical register of enterprises provides us with information at the company level. Each
6
7 company was classified into geographical, technological and organisational categories.
8
9

10
11
12 The geographical dimension was investigated at the LAN 1 (previously called NUTS
13
14 4) level of sub-regions. Hungary as a whole is considered a NUTS 1 unit according to the
15
16 Eurostat classification. There are seven regions (NUTS 2), 19 counties (NUTS 3) and 168
17
18 subregions (LAN 1) in Hungary. Since the data were collected at the level of subregions, we
19
20 were able to aggregate the information and define the uncertainty in geographical
21
22 distributions at the NUTS 3 county-level. Since Budapest is the only metropolitan district in
23
24 Hungary, it must be considered a special category in regional surveys: thus data from
25
26 Budapest were collected at the NUTS 3 level.
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 In order to measure the technological dimension we use the NACE code of industrial
34
35 sectors developed by the OECD and Eurostat. Since various sectors of the economy can be
36
37 expected to use different technologies, sector classifications can be used as a proxy for the
38
39 technology (PAVITT, 1984). The OECD (2001, pp.137 ff.) has provided indications of the
40
41 relative R&D intensity of the various sectors. Each enterprise is classified by its first activity
42
43 at the two-digit level. Our data consists of all firms classified within one of the 22 categories
44
45 listed in Table 1.
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Table 1 around here
53

54 The dimension of economic exchange relations in our model is operationalized by
55
56 organisational terms, i.e. the size of enterprises measured by the number of employees
57
58 (PUGH et al., 1969; BLAU and SCHOENHERR, 1971). The Hungarian enterprise register
59
60 has a category with zero or unknown number of employees that includes SMEs without
employees or that represent self-employment. This category contains, among others, spin-off

1
2
3 companies that are already on the market but whose owners are employed by mother
4
5 companies or universities (Table 2). Surprisingly, a high percentage of firms (53.7%) are
6
7 classified in the categories high- and medium-tech industries and knowledge-intensive
8
9 services.
10
11

12 Table 2 around here
13
14

15 We composed our dataset into a three-dimensional matrix of 168 lines (LAN 1
16
17 regions), 22 columns (NACE codes) and 6 levels (size categories).
18
19

20 21 Methods

22
23 Configurational information is closely connected to entropy measures. Entropy is
24
25 widely used in geography as a measure of inequalities across or diversity within territorial
26
27 units (BOSCHMA and IAMMARINO, 2009). We use it here as a measure of uncertainty
28
29 represented in a probabilistic distribution or system of distributions (Johnston *et al.*, 2000).
30
31 According to SHANNON's (1948) formula,ⁱⁱⁱ uncertainty in the distribution of variable x (\sum_x
32
33 p_x) is defined as $H_x = - \sum_x p_x \log_2 p_x$. Analogously, for two dimensional distributions $H_{xy} = -$
34
35 $\sum_x \sum_y p_{xy} \log_2 p_{xy}$. This uncertainty is the sum of the uncertainty in the two dimensions
36
37 diminished by their co-variation.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 When the basis of the logarithm is two, the values are expressed in bits of information.
46
47 Therefore our entropy measures are formal (probability) measures and thus independent of
48
49 size or any other reference to the empirical systems under study. The sigma in the formula
50
51 allows all the information terms to be fully decomposed. Our analysis is built on these
52
53 characteristics of the entropy. We measure how the system affects the decline in uncertainty
54
55
56
57
58

59 In the case of two dimensions, the uncertainty in the two potentially interacting
60
dimensions (x and y) can be reduced with the common entropy. Our aim is to mark systems,

1
2
3 thus we use the concept of configurational information or transmission, which captures the
4
5 reduction of uncertainty and is formalized in two dimensions as follows: $T_{xy} = (H_x + H_y) -$
6
7 H_{xy} (Equation 1).
8
9

10
11
12 In the limiting case that the distributions x and y are completely independent, $T_{xy} = 0$
13
14 and $H_{xy} = H_x + H_y$. In all other cases $T_{xy} > 0$, and therefore $H_{xy} < H_x + H_y$ (THEIL, 1972, at
15
16 pp. 59f.). In general, two interacting systems (or variables) determine each other in their
17
18 mutual entropy (H_{xy}). However, in the case of three interacting variables, one has two options:
19
20 the three interacting systems may have a common segment shared by all of them or not
21
22 (Figure 3a and 3b, respectively). In the latter case, the overlap can also be considered as
23
24 negative.
25
26
27
28

29 Figure 3 around here
30

31
32 In the case of overlaps, the mutual information is redundant. But in the other case the
33
34 cycling of the information between two dimensions can generate a synergy. This redundancy
35
36 of synergy can be expressed by an information measure (T_{xyz}) which ABRAMSON (1963, at
37
38 p. 129) derived from the Shannon formula^{iv}: $T_{xyz} = H_x + H_y + H_z - H_{xy} - H_{xz} - H_{yz} + H_{xyz}$
39
40 (Equation 2).
41
42
43
44
45

46 While two-dimensional systems reduce uncertainty, the trilateral term in turn feeds
47
48 back on this reduction and therefore adds another term to the uncertainty. Thus, the
49
50 configuration of the system determines the net result in terms of the value of T_{xyz} (MCGILL,
51
52 1954).
53
54
55
56

57
58 As noted, the three dimensions under study in this case will be (G)eography,
59
60 (T)echnology and (O)rganization and configurational information among them will

1
2
3 accordingly be indicated as the T_{GTO} . Similarly to Equation 2 one can formulate as follows:
4

5
6 $T_{GTO} = H_G + H_T + H_O - H_{GT} - H_{GO} - H_{TO} + H_{GTO}$ (Equation 3).
7
8
9

10 The value of T_{GTO} measures the interrelatedness of the three sources of variance and
11 the fit of the relations between and among them. The synergy across knowledge exploitation,
12 knowledge exploration and organizational control reduces uncertainty in the system. We use
13 T_{GTO} as a measure of the reduction of the uncertainty at a system level: high negative values
14 indicate a better fit. Note that the indicator does not measure the innovative activity or the
15 economic output of a system. It measures only the structural conditions in the system for
16 innovative activities and thus specifies an expectation.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 5. Results 30

31 As noted, the data can be disaggregated in terms of geographical regions (NUTS 2 and
32 NUTS 3) and we are able to distinguish between high- and medium-tech sectors and
33 knowledge-intensive services. The various dimensions can also be combined in order to
34 compute the configurational information among them in a next step.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 The counties differ in the number of firms and their geographical distribution inside
44 the counties (Table 3). While according to NACE categories only 8,722 enterprises proved to
45 be high-, medium-tech or knowledge-intensive in Nógrád county, Budapest contains 229,165
46 firms and Pest county 67,342 enterprises. The mean of analysed firms at the county level
47 (excluding Budapest) is 22,690.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 5.1. Entropy values 58 59 60

1
2
3 As the data were collected at the LAN 1 level, the first column of Table 3 informs us
4 about the uncertainty of the sub-regional distribution at the county level or, in other words,
5 about the concentration of economic activity. Budapest is a special case, as it is at the same
6 time a NUTS 3 and a LAN 1 region. Thus, there can be no uncertainty for the concentration
7 within the Budapest area. However, the Pest county has a large value on this indicator: it
8 contains 15 subregions. In this case, 3.54 bits of information is equal to 90.7% of the
9 maximum entropy of $\log_2(15) = 3.91$. One can understand this as a representation of the
10 spread of economic activity in sub-regions of the Budapest agglomeration. The remaining
11 counties with a high number of sub-regions are more centralised. For example, the
12 distribution of firms in Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén (with Miskolc as the second largest settlement
13 in Hungary) corresponds to 62.7% of the maximum entropy. The counties with strong
14 university centres are also more centralised. In these cases the value of probabilistic entropy
15 shows a lower percentage of the maximum entropy: Csongrád 62,5%, Baranya 54,2%, Hajdú-
16 Bihar 59%, Győr-Moson-Sopron 66,2%.

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 3 around here

The maximum entropy in the technological distribution is $\log_2(22) = 4.459$, and
 $\log_2(6) = 2.584$ in the organisational distribution. The entropy values in both dimensions
indicate a very skewed distribution at the country level. In the technological and
organisational dimensions the percentages of this maximum entropy are 61.1% and 44.9% at
the national level. In the analyses, the probabilistic entropy indicates the uncertainty only
across high- and medium-tech industries and knowledge-intensive services.

The probabilistic entropies (H_t and H_o) in the county decomposition show relatively
small variance. Counties do not differ in terms of their organizational or technological variety.
The value of H for the country as a whole corresponds to the mean of the values for counties

1
2
3 in technological and organisational dimensions: $H_t = 2.744 \pm 0.071$ and $H_o = 1.145 \pm 0.035$
4
5 bits of information. The low percentages of expected entropy indicate asymmetric
6
7 distributions in the organisational dimension. A possible reason for these skewed distributions
8
9 could be the large share of micro companies and firms without employees in our data.
10
11

12
13
14 Surprisingly, 75% of the total number of registered firms without employees in
15
16 Hungary is represented in the 22 NACE categories of high- and medium-tech industries and
17
18 knowledge-intensive services (see Table 2). The category of firms without employees in the
19
20 real-estate sector (NACE 70) is a good example for illustrating this highly uneven
21
22 distribution. There are 140,078 and this category contains 21,2% of all the establishments
23
24 included in the analysis. The category of micro firms with other business activities (NACE
25
26 74) has a similar weight: 156,807 units (23.7%). The firms without employees are included in
27
28 the analysis as they were in previous studies (LEYDESDORFF *et al*, 2006, LEYDESDORFF
29
30 and FRITSCH, 2006).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 The entropy values in two dimensions reduce the uncertainty of the system and can be
40
41 used as proxies to measure the knowledge functions outlined in section 2. Consequently, H_{gt}
42
43 is a proxy for knowledge exploration, H_{to} is a proxy for knowledge exploitation and H_{go} is a
44
45 proxy for organizational control. However, one can observe that redundancies in the
46
47 geographical and technological dimensions (H_{gt}), are relatively low in the counties with big
48
49 universities (Baranya, Csongrád, Győr-Moson-Sopron, Hajdú-Bihar). Consequently,
50
51 interdependence in the geographical and technological distribution of the studied industries is
52
53 low in these areas. On the other hand, interdependence seems to be high in Pest county,
54
55 though it has more centres, more universities and therefore a more diversified economy. This
56
57 means that knowledge exploration occurs on a higher level in the broader Budapest
58
59
60

1
2
3 agglomeration than in university towns, where one might also expect knowledge exploration
4
5 to stand out. It is an interesting issue for further research to prove this statement. We focus our
6
7 attention on configurational information in three dimensions and analyze the main anomalies
8
9 at the systems level in what follows.
10
11

12 13 14 15 5.2. The geographical decomposition of the configurational information 16

17 While high values for mutual information between two dimensions indicate the
18
19 strength of interaction across them, configurational information of three interacting
20
21 dimensions can be negative or positive. The value of configurational information depends on
22
23 the relation between the entropy values of two- and three-dimensional distributions (see
24
25 Equation 3 above). The question in our case is whether the knowledge functions of the
26
27 innovation system reduce the uncertainty among the geographical, technological and
28
29 organizational distributions. The synergy across knowledge exploration, knowledge
30
31 exploitation and organizational control may reduce the three-dimensional term (YEUNG,
32
33 2008). Thus, a more negative value of configurational information in three dimensions
34
35 indicates a decrease in the uncertainty prevailing at the systems level.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 The values for configurational information in three dimensions are negative for all
44
45 counties (Table 4). This indicates that counties are relevant innovation systems in Hungary.
46
47

48 Table 4 around here
49

50 The values for T_{GTO} already take account of the geographical distributions as one of
51
52 the relevant dimensions. Since the number of sub-regions varies across counties, these values
53
54 cannot be compared directly with one another. However, it can be noted that the value of
55
56 T_{GTO} is less pronounced for Hungary as a country than for any of its parts. In order to make
57
58 this comparison among regions possible, we weighted the values of T_{GTO} with the number of
59
60

1
2
3 firms in the counties. ΔT in millibits represents a value that we can interpret as a measure of
4
5 synergy within innovation systems. There is an inverse relation between the absolute value of
6
7 the indicator and the reduction of uncertainty in the system.
8
9

10
11
12 Our line of argument calls for marking the national innovation system first. In order to
13
14 do this, one advantage of entropy statistics is that the values can be fully decomposed
15
16 (THEIL, 1972): $T = T_0 + \sum_i n_i/N \times T_i$ (Equation 4); where T_0 is the in-between county
17
18 entropy, T_i is the entropy measured in county i , n_i is the number of firms in county i , N is the
19
20 number of firms in the whole country.
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 The in-between group uncertainty (T_0) is defined as the difference between the sum of
28
29 the uncertainties of the contributions and the uncertainty prevailing at the level of the
30
31 composed set (LEYDESDORFF et al., 2006). In this case T_0 is an indicator of the in-between
32
33 group contribution to configurational information in three dimensions. A negative value
34
35 would indicate that the national agglomeration adds to the synergy in the system, while a
36
37 positive value indicates that the synergy occurs on regional rather than national levels.
38
39
40
41
42

43 The high *positive* value of T_0 indicates that Hungary is far from integrated as a
44
45 national innovation system. The in-between region term adds to the uncertainty at the national
46
47 systems level. Previous studies found a negative value for the Netherlands (LEYDESDORFF
48
49 et al., 2006) and separate German states, but a positive value for Germany as a nation
50
51 (LEYDESDORFF and FRITSCH, 2006). Unlike the Netherlands, Germany is both a federal
52
53 state and a country with several eastern states “in transition.” Thus one would not expect this
54
55 synergy at the national level. The results for Hungary, however, are more dramatic. Hungary
56
57 is a nation-state and the contribution of the in-between county uncertainty ($T_0 = +10.94$ mbits)
58
59
60

1
2
3 is far larger than any of the reductions of uncertainty at the regional level. We will elaborate
4
5 our further tests on this finding and investigate the forces that shaped innovation systems in
6
7 the Hungarian transition.
8
9

10
11 Figure 4 around here

12
13 The synergies across knowledge functions in Hungary stand out in Budapest (ΔT
14
15 $=-9.63$ mbits), Pest county (-3.39 mbits), and Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén (-2.39 mbits). Our
16
17 results suggest that the strong differentiation in regional prosperity can be verified using this
18
19 methodology: the knowledge base of Budapest and its agglomeration becomes visible as
20
21 central to the country's economy (Figure 4).
22
23
24
25
26

27 In addition to Central Hungary's strong position, a few annoying problems emerge.
28
29 While one can observe parallel rankings across counties in the West in terms of
30
31 configurational information and on indicators of economic performance or internalization, one
32
33 does not find such correspondence in Eastern Hungary. In particular, the high level of
34
35 integration in Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén is unexpected: the employment rate in this area is
36
37 among the lowest and economic performance is the lowest in Hungary. It is also surprising
38
39 that the values for configurational information in Csongrád and Hajdú-Bihar do not stand out
40
41 from the surroundings, despite the presence of relatively large universities.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Previous studies analyzing the transition period suggest that Budapest and the north-
49
50 western part of Hungary, where most multinational firms put down stakes (these trends were
51
52 introduced in section 3), have developed a strong endogenous knowledge base
53
54 (ANTALÓCZY and SASS, 2005; INZELT, 2003; SZALAVETZ, 2004; TÖRÖK and PETZ,
55
56 1999). As our analysis is based on complexity perspectives and on stochastic measures, our
57
58 results indicate otherwise. Is it possible that the foreign-owned corporations have disturbed
59
60

1
2
3 the self-organization of local innovation systems, the texture of university-industry-
4
5 government relations in which medium-tech companies frequently play a leading role in
6
7 integrating the system?
8
9

10
11
12 We suggest that, with the exception of the metropolitan area of Budapest, the foreign-
13
14 owned capital have decoupled the knowledge synergies from their geographical rooting.
15
16 These companies have their headquarters in Western capitals and most important decisions
17
18 are not made in the local systems. In terms of knowledge functions, we argue that exploitation
19
20 came to the fore after the marketopening, contributing also to the transformation of local
21
22 synergies. The dynamics are thus very different from those of the Netherlands and (Western-)
23
24 Germany because these latter systems did not go through a transition period. Could this
25
26 geographical decoupling mean that the areas in Western Hungary are more integrated in the
27
28 EU or neighbouring countries than in the national system? Previous empirical studies have
29
30 found that FDI from Austria is concentrated in the North-Western regions of Hungary, close
31
32 to the Austrian border (INZELT, 2003, at p. 256). Moreover, these regions have been
33
34 incorporated in the Regional Innovation Strategy of Vienna, the capital of Austria (BORSI et
35
36 al., 2007). The eastern and southern part of Hungary have thus far been least affected by the
37
38 transition and therefore older innovation synergies appear to have remained in place.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 6. Investigating our expectations 49

50
51 While the geographic comparison is compounded with traditional industrial structure
52
53 such as firm density, all effects of the decomposition in terms of the sectoral classification of
54
55 high- and medium-tech sectors and knowledge-intensive services can be expressed as relative
56
57 effects, that is, as percentage increases or decreases of the negative value of configurational
58
59 information in three dimensions when a specific selection is compared with the population. In
60

1
2
3 the remainder of this study, we use the categories provided by the OECD and Eurostat (see
4
5 Table 1 above) as selection criteria for subsets and compare the results with those of the full
6
7 set—provided in the previous section—as a baseline. The structure of this section elaborates
8
9 our expectations: the first subsection reflects on the findings of previous studies in the
10
11 Netherlands and Germany while the second and third subsections investigate our expectations
12
13 in Hungary as a transition economy.
14
15

16 17 18 19 20 6.1. The role of geographical location in the synergy across knowledge functions

21
22 To pursue this investigation we first need a comparison of the sectoral effects on
23
24 configurational information in three dimensions. The sectoral effects were calculated as
25
26 shares in configurational information of the total system:
27
28

$$29 \quad (\text{Sector } T_{\text{gto}} - \text{Total } \Delta T) / \text{Total } \Delta T \times 100 \quad (5)$$

30
31
32
33
34
35
36 In this case, a negative value means that uncertainty reduction is lower in the sector
37
38 than the reduction in the total set and a positive value indicates a stronger sectoral effect on
39
40 knowledge function synergy in the region than on average.
41
42
43
44

45
46 The number of companies in high- and medium-tech sectors is declining compared to
47
48 knowledge intensive services but these sectors have strong effects on the knowledge function
49
50 synergy in the innovation system (Table 5). This small subgroup has an enormous effect on
51
52 configurational information in three dimensions and thus on the reduction of uncertainty; in
53
54 some cases by even more than 1000%. The selection of high- and medium-tech
55
56 manufacturing results in large differences. Budapest and Pest stand out with respect to the
57
58 strength of synergy in these sectors followed by counties like Fejér, Komárom-Esztergom,
59
60

1
2
3 Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén, Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok, and Bács-Kiskun (column 7 in table 5). The
4
5 knowledge function synergies are the weakest in South Transdanubia and the Southern Great
6
7 Plain.
8
9

10
11 Table 5 around here

12
13 One can observe that high- and medium-tech companies had positive effects on the
14
15 reduction of uncertainty in all counties and at the national level as well. Knowledge
16
17 exploration, knowledge exploitation and organizational control have synergistic effects on
18
19 each other in these sectors.
20
21

22
23
24 Comparing the sectoral effects of knowledge-intensive services on configurational
25
26 information our findings are similar to the results of studies following similar methods in the
27
28 Netherlands and Germany (LEYDESDORFF et al., 2006; LEYDESDORFF and FRITSCH,
29
30 2006). Column 4 of Table 5 indicates that knowledge-intensive services reduce uncertainty
31
32 less than the total set in all regions (the rates are all negative). We may therefore conclude that
33
34 knowledge-intensive services (KIS) have negative effects on knowledge function synergy in
35
36 Hungarian regional innovation systems. These services can be provided over a bigger
37
38 distance. Consequently they may link the local self-organization of regional innovation
39
40 systems to global contexts. The negative effect seems less pronounced than in the Netherlands
41
42 or Germany. However, this finding is an artefact of the comparatively large size of this subset
43
44 in the total population of firms: 97.1% of the units of analysis are classified in this category.
45
46 We may assume that this share also includes less active firms.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 In summary, we find that medium- and high-tech manufacturing couple knowledge
56
57 synergies of innovation systems into geographical location in Hungary. Knowledge-intensive
58
59
60

1
2
3 services tend to decouple knowledge synergies from their geographical location. These
4
5 findings are similar to results in previous studies of the Netherlands and Germany.
6
7
8
9

10 6.2. The effect of foreign-owned companies

11
12 Figure 5 shows the reduction of uncertainty due to configurational information in
13 high- and medium-tech sectors across the various regions. The selection of high- and
14 medium-tech manufacturing has a significant impact. The effects of the Budapest
15 agglomeration stand out. One can find an emergent North-South pole in the eastern part of the
16 country.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 Figure 5 around here

25
26 Not Budapest, but Fejér, Komárom-Esztergom, Pest, Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok, and Vas
27 show the largest effects (column 5, Table 5). The knowledge function synergy in these
28 counties appears to be driven mostly by foreign-owned high- and medium-tech companies.
29 Unfortunately we were unable to address company ownership as a fourth dimension in our
30 model and we had insufficient longitudinal data to analyze the relation between FDI and
31 configurational information. However we are able to highlight some interesting
32 correspondences with the results of a spatial analysis (Figure 6).
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Figure 6 around here

44
45 In Figure 6, we plotted the effect of high- and medium-tech industries' on entropy
46 against the county measures of foreign share in foreign-owned companies. The correlation
47 between the two indicators (0.53) becomes significant (at the 5% level) only when we remove
48 Budapest from the sample. Consequently, different tendencies prevail in the capital and in the
49 counties. One can observe a moderate positive relation among the foreign investment and
50 knowledge function synergies of high- and medium-tech industries, which is due to the
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 decisive role of foreign-owned firms in both knowledge exploration (e.g. their major part in
4 business R&D) and the opening-up in knowledge exploitation.
5
6
7
8
9

10 Foreign stake in foreign-owned companies reached 24 500 million EUR in Budapest
11 and exceeds two billion EUR only in four other counties: Pest, Komárom-Esztergom, Győr-
12 Moson-Sopron, and Fejér. In these counties the high- and medium-tech sectors contribute
13 importantly to the synergy across knowledge functions in the system. The results suggest that
14 the rise of value added and the development of supply chains caused these positive effects
15 during the transition. However, these sectors contain only a small number of companies that
16 can easily move to new locations. In other counties, the low level of foreign investment is
17 frequently linked to various levels of knowledge function synergy.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 This result accords with the expectation concerning the effect of the entrance of
32 foreign-owned companies on the restructuring of innovation systems. Foreign-owned firms
33 played a significant role in the transformation of innovation systems in Hungary, through the
34 privatization of R&D facilities, and green-field investments in knowledge exploration and
35 exploitation. However, a conditional statement has to be made here: foreign investments
36 induce different spatial synergies across knowledge exploitation, knowledge exploration, and
37 organizational control. In this sense, Hungary's Western regions stand out from the rest of the
38 country.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 6.3. Effects of high-tech knowledge-intensive services and R&D

52 High-tech knowledge-intensive services (HT-KIS) that played a core role in the
53 investigation of our last expectation are only a minor part of KIS: research and development,
54 IT services and post- and telecommunication services belong to this category. In our opinion,
55 the effects of HT-KIS and the remaining part of KIS have to be compared. HT-KIS can mean
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 knowledge- and technology creation whereas KIS can be considered representative of the
4
5 adaptation of knowledge and technology. More than knowledge-intensive services in general,
6
7 high-tech services can be expected to produce and transfer technology-related knowledge
8
9 (BILDERBEEK et al., 1998) and R&D is also expected to have stronger local knowledge
10
11 spillover effects (VARGA, 2007) than KIS. However, we find a relative decline of
12
13 configurational information in three dimensions in most regions when the subset of sectors
14
15 indicated as 'high-tech services' is compared with KIS (Table 6).
16
17
18
19

20 Table 6 around here
21

22 One can ask to what extent the trends of local knowledge transfer are similar in the
23
24 three sectors of HT-KIS. According to Miozzo and Soete (2001) telecommunication and IT
25
26 services belong to information network services while research and development belongs to
27
28 science-based services. Their taxonomy implies that the former group of services has an
29
30 increased transportability and make "networks work up to full capacity", assimilating them
31
32 with scale-intensive services. From this perspective, post- and telecommunications, and IT
33
34 services have different effects on knowledge function synergies than R&D. The former rather
35
36 decouple them from local circumstances while the later couple them to spatial systems, as in
37
38 the case of some East-German regions (LEYDESDORFF and FRITSCH, 2006). According to
39
40 our dataset, post- and telecommunications and IT services are more spatially distributed than
41
42 R&D. By nature, R&D is more concentrated. For example, from the seven R&D
43
44 organizations with more than 250 employees, five are located in Budapest and two in Szeged,
45
46 the seat of Csongrád county.
47
48
49
50
51

52 Figure 7 around here
53

54 HT-KIS effects on system synergy appear only in Budapest and Csongrád (Figure 7).
55
56 They also have the highest values on public research expenditure. However, one can argue
57
58 that the reasons for these effects differ: Budapest has a strengthening knowledge base in the
59
60

1
2
3 business sphere and employment in high-tech knowledge-intensive services surpasses 4.5% of
4 total employment (EUROSTAT, 2007, at p. 5). Our data show that Csongrád is relatively
5 strong in basic research (see Figure 1) despite the otherwise low level of economic
6 performance in the region (LENGYEL, 2009). Thus, knowledge function synergy in HT-KIS
7 exhibits different mechanisms in these areas. The coupling effect of R&D is stronger than the
8 decoupling effect of post- and telecommunications and IT services in Csongrád; large centres
9 of these services integrate innovation system synergies in the capital.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 In sum, the contribution of research and development to the knowledge synergies are
23 strongly differentiated across regional innovation systems. Research and development seems
24 to couple the knowledge function synergy of HT-KIS to the geographical location in two
25 emerging centres. On the other hand, the decoupling effect of post- and telecommunications
26 and IT services on the synergy from spatial circumstances in other regions may outweigh the
27 coupling effect of R&D. Public R&D still plays a major role in raising knowledge synergies
28 in the south-eastern part of the country. This means that transition in the Eastern part of the
29 country, where foreign investments are moderate, remains dependent on the institutions of the
30 state. This represented by organizational control in our model in section 2.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 7. Conclusion and discussion

47
48 The analysis has illustrated that high- and medium-tech manufacturing strengthens the
49 geographical characteristics of the knowledge-based economy in Hungary. In all cases they
50 have the effect of reducing uncertainty in regional innovation systems. Knowledge-intensive
51 services have weaker effects on decoupling from the geographical dimension in Hungary than
52 was found in the Netherlands and Germany (LEYDESDORFF et al., 2006, LEYDESDORFF
53 and FRITSCH, 2006). As found in the former East-German cases, high-tech knowledge-
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 intensive services couple the knowledge function synergies to geographical locations in R&D
4
5 centres. Values for configurational information based on high- and medium-tech industries
6
7 are more pronounced in the regions with a higher share of foreign-owned firms.
8
9

10
11
12 FDI in Hungary was initially driven by low labor costs. After a 10 to 15 year
13
14 acclimation period, these trends have been replaced by investments focused on improving
15
16 research potentials. This happened for example in the case of Audi in North-West Hungary
17
18 (LENGYEL et al., 2006). In terms of its share of GDP production, its leading role in the local
19
20 automotive cluster, its extended supply chain and its ownership of an institute at the local
21
22 university, Audi is one of the leading companies in Hungary. Such companies transform the
23
24 knowledge exploration and knowledge exploitation of innovation systems. Building on this
25
26 example, one could argue that the synergy of three knowledge functions in high- and medium-
27
28 tech industries measured by configurational information has been strongly reconstructed by
29
30 FDI in Hungary.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 According to these results we were able to identify three archetypes or paths of
40
41 regional innovation systems in terms of knowledge function synergy: Budapest as an
42
43 agglomeration economy; the north-western part of the country, which integrated to the
44
45 European Union; and the southern and eastern parts of the country, where central planning
46
47 and public R&D still have major effects on innovation system synergy.
48
49
50
51
52

53 When Hungary entered the transition period it was probably too late to shape the
54
55 National Innovation System with innovation policy initiatives to fulfil the requirements of
56
57 global competition (ENYEDI, 1995). In the period of transition from a centrally planned
58
59 economy to a market economy and under the pressure of globalization and Europeanization,
60

1
2
3 the Hungarian system was restructured not only in terms of linkages within the production
4 system, but also in relation to its relevant external environment. During this process internal
5 linkages were weakened and external linkages asynchronously reinforced (BARTA, 2002).
6
7
8 Budapest and the north-western part of the country were able to find a path to the European
9 marketplace more easily than the eastern part. Universities could further develop and build
10 upon existing international relations, never fully disrupted to begin with, and FDI became a
11 major factor in the transformation process. Thus to an even greater extent than traditional
12 economies like the Netherlands, able to transform and adapt their national structures more
13 gradually, the Hungarian system may have lost control of its political economy.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Our analysis was based on a three-dimensional model of innovation system synergy
28 built on Storper's 'holy trinity'. The indicator, the measurement of reduction in uncertainty,
29 has implication for further theoretical and empirical research. In particular, the complexity
30 aspects of evolutionary economic geography raise questions concerning the role of external
31 forces in local systems (MARTIN and SUNLEY, 2007). We believe that such forces, public
32 R&D spending and foreign investment, may induce shifts in uncertainty through bifurcation
33 effects. On the other hand, uncertainty is reduced in the system when agents develop their
34 expectations of others, which is the phenomenon of knowledge-based development.
35
36 Complexity aspects also highlight that agglomeration trends lead to far-from-equilibrium
37 states, in which the measurement of uncertainty in innovation systems might open up new
38 avenues for future research. Our model explained in section 2 also needs further elaboration.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Acknowledgements:
4

5 We thank for Hungarian Central Statistical Office and István Szabó for their help in
6 the data collection, Esben Sloth Andersen, Phil Cooke, David Ellison, Koen Frenken,
7
8 Annamária Inzelt, Imre Lengyel, Gábor Papanek, Bram Timmermans, Attila Varga and two
9
10 anonymous referees for helpful comments. All errors remain ours.
11
12
13
14

15
16
17 References:
18

- 19 ABRAMSON N. (1963) Information Theory and Coding. McGraw-Hill, New York.
20
21 ACS Z., ANSELIN L., and VARGA A. (2002) Patents and innovation counts as measures of
22 regional production of knowledge. Research Policy 31, pp. 1069-1085.
23
24 ANTALÓCZY K. and SASS M. (2005) A külföldi működőtőke-befektetések regionális
25 elhelyezkedése és gazdasági hatásai Magyarországon, Közgazdasági Szemle 52, pp.
26 494–520.
27
28 BARTA GY. (2002) Strong regional competition – weak co-operation. Attempts at “bottom-
29 up” co-operation and contradictions in governmental efforts in Hungary, European
30 Spatial Research and Policy 9, pp. 5-21.
31
32 BAUM J. A. C., LI S. X., and USHER, J. M. (2000) Making the next move: How experiential
33 and vicarious learning shape the locations of chains’ acquisitions. Administrative
34 Science Quarterly, 45: 766–801.
35
36 BILDERBEEK R., DEN HERTOOG P., MARKLUND G. and MILES I. (1998) Services in
37 innovation: knowledge intensive business services (KIBS) as C-producers of innovation.
38 STEP Report No. S14S
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

- 1
2
3 BORSI B., PAPANEK G. and MENSINK W. (2007) The ProAct benchmarking framework: a
4
5 method proposed to explore good practices in regional innovation and research policy.
6
7 Working Paper of ProAct consortia, FP6 (contract no. 030121). Budapest, April 2007.
8
9
- 10 BOSCHMA R., and FRENKEN K. (2006) Why is economic geography not an evolutionary
11
12 science? Towards an evolutionary economic geography. *Journal of Economic*
13
14 *Geography* 6, pp. 273-302.
15
16
- 17 BOSCHMA R.A. and IAMMARINO S. (2009) Related Variety, Trade Linkages and
18
19 Regional Growth. *Economic Geography* 85 (3), pp. 289-311.
20
21
- 22 CARLSSON B. (2006). Internationalization of Innovation Systems: A Survey of the
23
24 Literature. *Research Policy* 35(1), pp. 56-67.
25
26
- 27 COASE R.H. (1937) The Nature of the Firm, *Economica* 16, pp. 386-405.
28
29
- 30 COHEN W. and LEVINTHAL D. (1989) Innovation and Learning: The Two Faces of R&D,
31
32 *The Economic Journal* 99, pp. 569-596.
33
- 34 COOKE P., HEIDENREICH M., and BRACZYK H.J. (2004) Regional Innovation Systems.
35
36 Second Edition, The role of governance in a globalized world. Routledge, London and
37
38 New York.
39
40
- 41 CORIAT B., and DOSI G. (1998) The institutional embeddedness of economic change: an
42
43 appraisal of the evolutionary and regulationist research programmes, in K. Nielsen and
44
45 B. Johnson (Eds.) *Institutions and Economic Change*, Cheltenham, Edward Elgar,
46
47
- 48 EDQUIST C. (1997) *Systems of innovation: technologies, institutions, and organizations*.
49
50 Routledge, London and New York.
51
52
- 53 EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2005) *Towards a European Research Area, Science, Technology*
54
55 *and Innovation. Key Figures 2005*. European Commission, DG Research, Brussels.
56
57
- 58 ENYEDI GY. (1995) The transition of post-socialist cities, *European Review* 3, pp. 171-182.
59
60

1
2
3 EUROSTAT (2005) R&D and internalisation. Statistics in focus, Science and Technology
4
5 7/2005. European Communities.
6

7
8 EUROSTAT (2007) Employment and earnings in high-tech sectors. Statistics in focus,
9
10 Science and Technology 32/2007. European Communities.
11

12 GIBBONS M., LIMOGES C., NOWOTNY H., SCHWARTZMAN S., SCOTT P. and TROW
13
14 M. (1994) The new production of knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in
15
16 Contemporary Societies. SAGE, London.
17

18
19 HUNGARIAN CENTRAL STATISTICAL OFFICE (2006) Research and development,
20
21 2005. Budapest. Downloaded from:
22

23
24 <http://portal.ksh.hu/pls/ksh/docs/hun/xftp/idoszaki/tudkut/tudkut05.pdf>
25

26
27 HUNGARIAN CENTRAL STATISTICAL OFFICE (2007) National Accounts of Hungary,
28
29 2004-2005. Budapest. Downloaded from:
30

31
32 <http://portal.ksh.hu/pls/ksh/docs/hun/xftp/idoszaki/monsz/monsz0405.pdf>
33

34 INZELT A. (2003) Foreign involvement in acquiring and producing new knowledge: the case
35
36 of Hungary, in CANTWELL J. and MOLERO J. (Eds.) Multinational Enterprises,
37
38 Innovative Strategies and Systems of Innovation, pp. 234-268. Edward Elgar,
39
40 Cheltenham- Northampton.
41

42
43 INZELT A. (2004) The evolution of university- industry- government relationships during
44
45 transition. Research Policy 33, pp. 975-995.
46

47
48 JAFFE A.B., TRAJTENBERG M., and HENDERSON R. (1993) Geographic localization of
49
50 knowledge spillovers as evidenced by patent citations. Quarterly Journal of Economics
51
52 108, pp. 577-598.
53

54
55 JAKULIN A. and BRATKO I. (2004) Quantifying and visualizing attribute interactions: an
56
57 approach based on entropy. Retrieved from site: <http://arxiv.org/abs/cs.AI/0308002>
58
59
60

1
2
3 JOHNSTON R. J., GREGORY D., PRATT G. and WATTS M. (2000) The Dictionary of
4
5 Human Geography. Blackwell, Oxford.

6
7
8 KÁLLAY L. and LENGYEL I. (2008) The internationalisation of Hungarian SMEs, in
9
10 DANA L., HAN M., RATTEN V. and WELPE I. (Eds.) A Theory of
11
12 Internationalisation for European Entrepreneurship, pp. 277-295. Edward Elgar,
13
14 Cheltenham- Northampton.

15
16
17 KRIPPENDORFF K. (2009). Ross Ashby's information theory: a bit of history, some
18
19 solutions to problems, and what we face today. International Journal of General
20
21 Systems, 38, pp. 189-212.

22
23
24 LAAFIA I. (2002) Employment in high tech and knowledge intensive sectors in the EU
25
26 continued to grow in 2001. Statistics in Focus: Science and Technology, Theme 9(4),
27
28 Retrieved from site: [http://europa.eu.int/comm/eurostat/Public/datashop/print-](http://europa.eu.int/comm/eurostat/Public/datashop/print-product/EN?catalogue=Eurostat&product=KS-NS-02-004-__-N-EN&mode=download)
29
30 [product/EN?catalogue=Eurostat&product=KS-NS-02-004-__-N-EN&mode=download](http://europa.eu.int/comm/eurostat/Public/datashop/print-product/EN?catalogue=Eurostat&product=KS-NS-02-004-__-N-EN&mode=download)
31
32

33
34 LENGYEL B., LUKÁCS E. and SOLYMÁRI G. (2006) A külföldi érdekeltségű
35
36 vállalkozások és az egyetemek kapcsolata Győrött, Miskolcon és Szegeden, Tér és
37
38 Társadalom 11, 4, pp. 127-140.

39
40
41 LENGYEL B. and CADIL V. (2009) Innovation policy challenges in transition countries:
42
43 foreign business R&D in the Czech Republic and Hungary. Transition Studies Review
44
45 16, pp. 174-188.

46
47
48 LENGYEL I. (2004) The Pyramid Model: Enhancing Regional Competitiveness in Hungary,
49
50 Acta Oeconomica 54, pp. 323-342.

51
52
53 LENGYEL I. (2009) Knowledge-based local economic development for enhancing
54
55 competitiveness in lagging areas of Europe: the case of the University of Szeged. In
56
57 Varga A. (Ed.): Universities, Knowledge Transfer and Regional Development:
58
59
60

1
2
3 Geography, Entrepreneurship and Policy. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham-Northampton,
4
5 (forthcoming), p. 29.
6
7

8 LEYDESDORFF L. (2003) The mutual information of university-industry-government
9
10 relations: an indicator of the Triple Helix dynamics, *Scientometrics* 58, pp. 445-467.
11

12 LEYDESDORFF L. (2006) *The Knowledge-Based Economy: Modelled, Measured,*
13
14 *Simulated.* Universal Publishers, Boca Rota.
15

16
17 LEYDESDORFF L., DOLFSMA W. and VAN DER PANNE G. (2006) Measuring the
18
19 knowledge base of an economy in terms of Triple Helix relations among 'technology,
20
21 organization, and territory', *Research Policy* 35, pp. 181-199.
22
23

24 LEYDESDORFF L. and FRITSCH M. (2006) Measuring the knowledge base of regional
25
26 innovation systems in Germany in terms of a Triple Helix Dynamics, *Research Policy*
27
28 35, pp. 1538-1553.
29
30

31 LOASBY B.J. (2001) Time, knowledge and evolutionary dynamics: why connections matter,
32
33 *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* 11, pp. 393-412.
34
35

36 LORENZEN M. and MAHNKE V. (2002) Global strategy and the acquisition of local
37
38 knowledge: how MNCs enter regional knowledge clusters. DRUID Working Paper
39
40 2002-08.
41
42

43 LUNDEVALL B.-Å. (1992) *National Systems of Innovation.* Pinter, London.
44

45 LUNDEVALL B.-Å., JOHNSON B., ANDERSEN E.S. and DALUM B. (2002) National
46
47 Systems of Production, Innovation and Competence Building, *Research Policy* 31, pp.
48
49 213-231.
50
51

52 MARCH J.G. (1991) Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning, *Organization*
53
54 *Science* 2, pp. 71-87.
55
56

57 MARTIN R. and SUNLEY P. (2007) Complexity thinking and evolutionary economic
58
59 geography, *Journal of Economic Geography*, pp. 573-601.
60

- 1
2
3 MCGILL W. J. (1954) Multivariate information transmission, *Psychometrika* 19, pp. 97-116.
4
5
6 MIOZZO M. and SOETE L. (2001) Internationalization of services: a technological
7
8 perspective. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change* 67, pp. 159-185.
9
10 NELSON R. R. (1993) *National Innovation Systems: A Comparative Analysis*. Oxford
11
12 University Press, New York.
13
14
15 NELSON R. R. and WINTER S. G. (1982) *An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change*.
16
17 Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
18
19
20 NELSON R.R (1995) Co-evolution of Industry Structure, Technology and Supporting
21
22 Institutions, and the Making of Comparative Advantage. *International Journal of the*
23
24 *Economics of Business* 2, pp. 171-184.
25
26
27 OECD (2001) *Science, Technology and Industry Scoreboard: Towards a Knowledge-based*
28
29 *Economy*. OECD, Paris.
30
31
32 PAPANEK G. (2000) The relationship between Science, Industry and the Government in
33
34 Hungary, a country in transition. Paper presented at the Third Triple Helix Conference,
35
36 Rio de Janeiro.
37
38
39 PAVITT K. (1984) Sectoral patterns of technical change: Towards a theory and a taxonomy.
40
41 *Research Policy* 13, pp. 343-373.
42
43
44 PUGH D. S., HICKSON D. J. and HININGS, C. R. (1969) An empirical taxonomy of
45
46 structures of work organizations, *Administrative Science Quarterly* 14, pp. 115-126.
47
48
49 RADOSEVIC S. (2002) Regional Innovation Systems in Central and Eastern Europe:
50
51 Determinants, Organizers and Alignments, *Journal of Technology Transfer* 27, pp. 87-
52
53 96.
54
55
56 RADOSEVIC S. (2004) A Two-Tier or Multi-Tier Europe? Assessing the Innovation
57
58 Capacities of Central and East European Countries in the Enlarged EU. *Journal of*
59
60 *Common Market Studies* 42, pp. 641-666.

- 1
2
3 RICHTA, R., AUERHAN, J., BAREŠ, G., BÁRTA, D., BRENNER, V., CVEKL, J., *et al.*
4
5 (1968). Politische Oekonomie des 20. Jahrhunderts. Makol, Prague/Frankfurt am Main.
6
7
8 SHANNON C.E. (1948) A Mathematical theory of communication, Bell System Technical
9
10 Journal 27, pp. 379–423 and 623–656.
11
12
13 STORPER M. (1997) The Regional World - Territorial Development in a Global Economy.
14
15 Guilford Press, New York.
16
17
18 SZALAVETZ A. (2004) Technológiai fejlődés, szakosodás, komplementaritás,
19
20 szerkezetátalakulás, Közgazdasági Szemle 51, pp. 362–378.
21
22
23 TÖDTLING F. and TRIPPL M. (2005) One size fits all? Towards a differentiated regional
24
25 innovation policy approach. Research Policy 34, pp. 1203-1219.
26
27
28 TÖRÖK Á. and PETZ R. (1999) Kísérlet a K+F-intenzitás és az exportszerkezet közötti
29
30 összefüggések vizsgálatára a magyar gazdaságban. Közgazdasági Szemle 46, pp. 213–
31
32 230.
33
34
35 THEIL H. (1972) Statistical Decomposition Analysis. Amsterdam/ London: North-Holland.
36
37
38 UNCTAD (2005) World Investment Report 2005. Transnational Corporations and the
39
40 Internationalization of R&D. United Nations, New York and Geneva.
41
42
43 VARGA A. (2007) Localized knowledge inputs and innovation: the role of spatially mediated
44
45 knowledge spillovers in Hungary. Acta Oeconomica 57, pp. 1-20.
46
47
48 VERNON R. (1979). The Product Cycle Hypothesis in a New International Environment.
49
50 Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics 41, pp. 255-267.
51
52
53 VON ZEDWITZ M. and GASSMAN O. (2002) Market versus technology drive in R&D
54
55 internationalization: Four different patterns of managing research and development,
56
57 Research Policy 31, pp. 569-588.
58
59
60 WHITLEY R. D. (1984) The Intellectual and Social Organization of the Sciences. Oxford
University Press, Oxford.

1
2
3 WHITLEY R. D. (2001) National Innovation Systems. In SMELSER N. J. and BALTES P.
4
5 B. (Eds.) International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences, pp. 10303-
6
7 10309. Elsevier, Oxford.
8
9

10 YEUNG R. W. (2008) *Information Theory and Network Coding*. New York, NY: Springer;
11
12 available at <http://iest2.ie.cuhk.edu.hk/~whyung/post/main2.pdf> (accessed Oct. 1,
13
14 2008).
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

For Peer Review Only

Table 1: Classification of high-tech and knowledge-intensive sectors

<p><i>High-tech Manufacturing</i></p> <p>30 Manufacturing of office machinery and computers</p> <p>32 Manufacturing of radio, television and communication equipment and apparatus</p> <p>33 Manufacturing of medical precision and optical instruments, watches and clocks</p> <p><i>Medium-high-tech Manufacturing</i></p> <p>24 Manufacture of chemicals and chemical products</p> <p>29 Manufacture of machinery and equipment n.e.c.</p> <p>31 Manufacture of electrical machinery and apparatus n.e.c.</p> <p>34 Manufacture of motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers</p> <p>35 Manufacturing of other transport equipment</p>	<p><i>Knowledge-intensive Services (KIS)</i></p> <p>61 Water transport</p> <p>62 Air transport</p> <p>64 Post and telecommunications</p> <p>65 Financial intermediation, except insurance and pension funding</p> <p>66 Insurance and pension funding, except compulsory social security</p> <p>67 Activities auxiliary to financial intermediation</p> <p>70 Real estate activities</p> <p>71 Renting of machinery and equipment without operator and of personal and household goods</p> <p>72 Computer and related activities</p> <p>73 Research and development</p> <p>74 Other business activities</p> <p>80 Education</p> <p>85 Health and social work</p> <p>92 Recreational, cultural and sporting activities</p> <p>Of these sectors, 64, 72 and 73 are considered <i>high-tech services</i>.</p>
---	---

Source: Laafia, 2002: 7.

Table 2: Distribution of company data by size

Number of employees	Number of firms included in this study	Number of registered firms – 31st Dec. 2005	% included
0 or unknown	275,202	365,861	75
1-9	369,280	805,209	46
10-19	5,976	20,870	29
20-49	4,921	11,046	45
50-249	3,733	4,860	77
250 or more	589	944	62
Total	659,701	1,228,999	54

Source: Hungarian Central Statistical Office (HCSO)

Table 3: Values of probabilistic entropy of the distributions in three dimensions and their combinations, bits

Regions	Counties	$H_{\text{geography}}$	$H_{\text{technology}}$	$H_{\text{organisation}}$	H_{gt}	H_{go}	H_{to}	H_{gto}	Number of firms	Number of subregions
Central Hungarian Region	Budapest	0.000	2.598	1.169	2.598	1.169	3.644	3.616	229,165	1
	Pest	3.544	2.786	1.120	6.311	4.662	3.755	7.245	67,342	15
Western Transdanubia	Győr-Moson-Sopron.	1.858	2.658	1.130	4.500	2.985	3.577	5.380	28,177	7
	Vas	2.061	2.711	1.172	4.750	3.225	3.674	5.655	14,490	9
	Zala	1.978	2.717	1.155	4.679	3.132	3.663	5.595	16,538	6
Central Transdanubia	Fejér	2.345	2.715	1.152	5.043	3.493	3.701	5.984	24,075	10
	Komárom-Esztergom.	2.496	2.747	1.185	5.229	3.679	3.700	6.131	17,760	7
	Veszprém	2.739	2.756	1.144	5.474	3.880	3.671	6.342	20,533	9
Southern Transdanubia	Baranya	1.717	2.790	1.139	4.483	2.853	3.742	5.402	25,308	9
	Somogy	2.445	2.804	1.160	5.218	3.601	3.767	6.135	15,680	10
	Tolna	2.084	2.699	1.122	4.761	3.203	3.652	5.677	12,344	5
Northern Hungary	Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén	2.449	2.809	1.138	5.238	3.584	3.769	6.142	30,174	15
	Heves	2.174	2.832	1.195	4.991	3.366	3.788	5.901	15,095	7
	Nógrád	2.225	2.771	1.186	4.982	3.405	3.687	5.841	8,722	6
Northern Great Plain	Hajdú-Bihar	1.871	2.743	1.130	4.596	2.998	3.687	5.505	26,624	9
	Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok	2.215	2.801	1.181	4.996	3.392	3.772	5.920	16,513	7
	Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg	2.435	2.842	1.116	5.251	3.548	3.792	6.158	20,422	11
Southern Great Plain	Bács-Kiskun	2.574	2.769	1.174	5.329	3.745	3.742	6.258	25,158	10
	Békés	2.678	2.574	1.067	5.189	3.733	3.537	6.096	19,003	8
	Csongrád	1.755	2.767	1.067	4.506	2.819	3.686	5.397	26,122	7
Hungary		5.189	2.722	1.159	7.875	6.334	3.712	8.823	659,701	168

Table 4: The mutual information in three dimensions statistically decomposed at NUTS 3 level (counties) in millibits of information

Regions	Counties	T_{TGO} in millibits	ΔT in millibits	Number of firms
Central Hungary	Budapest	-27.75	-9.63	229,165
	Pest	-33.22	-3.39	67,342
Western Transdanubia	Győr-Moson-Sopron	-34.13	-1.46	28,177
	Vas	-48.89	-1.07	14,490
	Zala	-27.78	-0.70	16,538
Central Transdanubia	Fejér	-39.93	-1.46	24,075
	Komárom-Esztergom	-49.70	-1.34	17,760
	Veszprém	-43.45	-1.35	20,533
Southern Transdanubia	Baranya	-29.59	-1.13	25,308
	Somogy	-41.87	-0.99	15,680
	Tolna	-33.95	-0.63	12,344
Northern Hungary	Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén	-52.32	-2.39	30,174
	Heves	-42.19	-0.96	15,095
	Nógrád	-50.37	-0.67	8,722
Northern Great Plain	Hajdú-Bihar	-31.93	-1.29	26,624
	Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok	-42.04	-1.05	16,513
	Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg	-38.53	-1.19	20,422
Southern Great Plain	Bács-Kiskun	-41.28	-1.57	25,158
	Békés	-41.85	-1.20	19,003
	Csongrád	-25.26	-1.00	26,122
Hungary		-23.55		660,290
	Sum		-34.48	
T_0			10.94	

Note: In order to avoid reading difficulties we multiplied T_{GTO} values by 1000 and use the terms of millibit.


Table 5: High- and medium-high tech manufacturing vs. knowledge-intensive services and the effects on the mutual information in three dimensions

Regions	Counties	Knowledge-intensive services ΔT , millibits	Effect on the entropy %	Number of firms among knowledge-intensive service	High- and medium tech ΔT , millibits	Effect on the entropy %	Number of high-tech and medium-tech firms
Central Hungary	Budapest	-2.64	-18.9	64,791	-1.30	366.6	5,840
	Pest	-0.16	-51.7	8,495	-1.26	1179.0	2,551
Western Transdanubia	Gyor-M.-S.	-0.03	-47.9	24,684	-0.46	980.4	850
	Vas	-0.01	-57.0	18,563	-0.36	1064.9	321
	Zala	-0.01	-35.2	641,143	-0.15	636.0	464
Central Transdanubia	Komárom-E.	-0.01	-58.4	29,327	-0.53	1257.2	741
	Fejér	-0.02	-55.8	19,888	-0.54	1172.0	776
	Veszprém	-0.02	-46.3	25,299	-0.41	957.4	645
Southern Transdanubia	Baranya	-0.04	-16.9	27,327	-0.14	329.3	624
	Somogy	-0.02	-21.1	25,928	-0.11	298.5	394
	Tolna	-0.01	-29.6	24,313	-0.13	632.8	349
Northern Hungary	Borsod-A.-Z.	-0.07	-31.2	17,019	-0.51	633.8	847
	Heves	-0.01	-45.3	11,995	-0.29	948.5	498
	Nógrád	0.00	-49.6	14,597	-0.21	969.3	227
Northern Great Plain	Hajdú-Bihar	-0.03	-37.8	15,286	-0.30	712.4	696
	Jász-N.-Sz.	-0.01	-52.1	19,793	-0.37	1102.3	557
	Szabolcs-Sz.-B.	-0.03	-27.8	15,956	-0.23	551.7	629
Southern Great Plain	Bács-Kiskun	-0.03	-42.0	14,169	-0.45	886.5	845
	Békés	-0.03	-19.7	16,074	-0.16	351.0	440
	Csongrád	-0.03	-11.6	23,299	-0.09	206.4	823
Hungary		-19.28	-15.7	223,325	-3.08	351.7	19,147

Table 6: The contribution of high-tech services to knowledge function synergy


Regions	Counties	KIS mutual information ΔT , mbit	Effect on the entropy %	Number of records	HT-KIS mutual information ΔT , mbit	Effect on the entropy %	Number of records
Central Hungary	Budapest	-2.64	-18.9	64,791	-13.05	35.5	18,491
	Pest	-0.16	-51.7	8,495	-2.75	-18.7	5,019
Western Transdanubia	Gyor-Moson-Sopron	-0.03	-47.9	24,684	-0.25	-83.1	1,195
	Vas	-0.01	-57.0	18,563	-0.39	-63.3	640
	Zala	-0.01	-35.2	641,143	-0.24	-65.2	586
Central Transdanubia	Komárom-Esztergom	-0.01	-58.4	29,327	-0.31	-76.5	794
	Fejér	-0.02	-55.8	19,888	-0.67	-54.1	1,211
	Veszprém	-0.02	-46.3	25,299	-0.35	-74.4	836
Southern Transdanubia	Baranya	-0.04	-16.9	27,327	-0.14	-88.1	1,325
	Somogy	-0.02	-21.1	25,928	-0.58	-41.9	638
	Tolna	-0.01	-29.6	24,313	-0.32	-49.7	517
Northern Hungary	Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén	-0.07	-31.2	17,019	-0.81	-66.0	1,387
	Heves	-0.01	-45.3	11,995	-0.21	-78.1	668
	Nógrád	0.00	-49.6	14,597	-0.19	-71.3	332
Northern Great Plain	Hajdú-Bihar	-0.03	-37.8	15,286	-0.38	-70.4	1,225
	Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok	-0.01	-52.1	19,793	-0.38	-64.1	709
	Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg	-0.03	-27.8	15,956	-0.49	-58.9	811
Southern Great Plain	Bács-Kiskun	-0.03	-42.0	14,169	-0.91	-42.0	1,075
	Békés	-0.03	-19.7	16,074	-0.39	-67.8	571
	Csongrád	-0.03	-11.6	23,299	-1.82	82.0	1,383
Hungary		-19.28	-15.7	223,325	-12.02	-49.0	39,415

Figure 1. Synergy of knowledge functions in an innovation system



Source: adapted from LEYDESDORFF, 2006.


Figure 2. Distribution of foreign stake and R&D expenditure in Hungarian counties, 2005



Source: Based on unique data request from the HSCO and on data downloaded from the HSCO website:


http://portal.ksh.hu/pls/ksh/docs/eng/xstadat/xstadat_annual/tab16_03_02_05ie.html

Figure 3: Relations between probabilistic entropies (H), transmissions (T), and configurational information for three interacting variables.



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

Figure 4: Configurational information among three dimensions at NUTS 3 level in Hungary



Peer Review Only

Figure 5: Configurational information in high- and medium-tech sectors at the NUTS 3 level

in Hungary






Figure 6. Size of foreign stake in foreign-owned companies and the knowledge function synergy in high- and medium-tech industries, 2005



Review Only

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

Figure 7: Contribution of high-tech services to configurational information in three dimensions (% of normalized ΔT in mbits by HTKIS)



er Review Only

Notes:

ⁱ NUTS is an abbreviation of “Nomenclature des Unités Territoriales Statistiques”. This classification was established by Eurostat more than 25 years ago in order to provide a single uniform breakdown of territorial units for the production of regional statistics for the European Union; at http://europa.eu.int/comm/eurostat/ramon/nuts/introduction_regions_en.html.

ⁱⁱ It is important to note that in Hungary an enterprise with at least 10 % foreign business share falls in the definition of enterprises with a foreign stake.

ⁱⁱⁱ The higher the indicator of H_x the more diverse the system and the higher the prevailing level of uncertainty.

^{iv} Both YEUNG (2008, p. 59f.) and KRIPPENDORFF (2009, p. 200) noted that this information measure can no longer be considered a Shannon-type measure because of the possible circularity in the information transfers. Shannon-type entropy measures are by definition linear and positive. Since the measure sums Shannon-type measures in terms of bits of information, its dimensionality is also bits of information, and therefore it can be used as a measure of uncertainty and uncertainty reduction, respectively. YEUNG (2008, at pp. 51 ff.) further formalized configurational information in three or more dimensions into the I-measure μ^* .