



HAL
open science

Exploratory spatial data analysis of the distribution of regional per capita GDP in Europe, 1980-1995

Julie Le Gallo, Cem Ertur

► **To cite this version:**

Julie Le Gallo, Cem Ertur. Exploratory spatial data analysis of the distribution of regional per capita GDP in Europe, 1980-1995. [Research Report] Laboratoire d'analyse et de techniques économiques(LATEC). 2000, 25 p., Graph, ref. bib.: 29 ref. hal-01527222

HAL Id: hal-01527222

<https://hal.science/hal-01527222>

Submitted on 24 May 2017

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.

LATEC

LABORATOIRE D'ANALYSE ET DE TECHNIQUES ÉCONOMIQUES

UMR 5118 CNRS

DOCUMENT DE TRAVAIL



Pôle d'Économie et de Gestion

2, bd Gabriel - BP 26611 - F-21066 Dijon cedex - Tél. 03 80 39 54 30 - Fax 03 80 39 54 43
Courrier électronique : secretariat.latec@u-bourgogne.fr

ISSN : 1260-8556

n° 2000-09

**Exploratory spatial data analysis of the distribution
of regional per capita GDP in Europe, 1980-1995**

Julie LE GALLO, Cem ERTUR

August 2000

e-mail :

JleGallo@aol.com

Cem.Ertur@u-bourgogne.fr

Website :

<http://www.u-bourgogne.fr/LATEC>

Previous versions of this paper were presented at the 6th RSAI World Congress 2000 “Regional Science in a Small World”, Lugano, Switzerland, May 16-20, 2000 and 40th ERSACongress “European Monetary Union and Regional Policy”, Barcelona, Spain, 29 August – 1 September, 2000. We would like to thank R. Florax and C. Baumont for their helpful comments. Any errors or omissions remain our responsibility.

Exploratory Spatial Data Analysis of the distribution of regional per capita GDP in Europe, 1980-1995

Abstract. The aim of this paper is to study the dynamics of European regional per capita product over time and space. This purpose is achieved by using the recently developed methods of Exploratory Spatial Data Analysis. Using a sample of European regions over the 1980-1995 period, we find strong evidence of global and local spatial autocorrelation in per capita GDP throughout the period. The detection of clusters of high and low per capita products during the period is an indication of the persistence of spatial disparities between European regions. This analysis is finally refined by the investigation of the spatial pattern of regional growth.

JEL classification: C21, O18, O52, R11, R12

Key words: exploratory spatial data analysis, distribution of regional per capita GDP, European Union, spatial autocorrelation, regional inequalities

1 Introduction

The integration of the European market has stimulated the analysis of regional economic convergence within the European Union in the recent macroeconomic literature (Neven and Gouyette 1995; Abraham and Von Rompuy 1995; Armstrong 1995; Molle and Broeckhout 1995). Most of the time, the empirical methods that have been used are identical to the methods used in international studies. However, at the regional scale, spatial effects and particularly spatial autocorrelation are determining for the analysis of convergence processes. Several factors, like trade between regions, technology and knowledge diffusion and more generally regional externalities and spillovers, lead to geographically dependent regions: there are spatial interactions between regions and the geographical location plays an important role. Despite their importance, the role of spatial effects in convergence processes has been only

recently examined using spatial statistics and spatial econometric methods (López-Bazo et al. 1999; Fingleton 1999; Rey and Montouri 1999).

Therefore, this paper aims at studying the dynamics of European regional per capita product over time and space. In this purpose, we use the recently developed methods of Exploratory Spatial Data Analysis to examine the spatial distribution of regional per capita products. The detection of global and local spatial autocorrelation enables to characterize the way the economic activities are located in the European Union and the way this pattern of location has changed over the period.

In the second section, we briefly present the principles and methods of Exploratory Spatial Data Analysis (ESDA). Using a sample of European regions over the 1980-1995 period, we compute in the third section a global spatial autocorrelation statistic, as well as local Moran autocorrelation statistics (Moran scatterplot and LISA; Anselin 1995, 1996) in order to detect clusters of high and low per capita products. Indeed, the existence of those clusters during the period would be an indication of the persistence of spatial disparities between European regions. The spatial pattern of regional growth is finally investigated.

2 Exploratory Spatial Data Analysis

Exploratory Spatial Data Analysis (ESDA) is a set of techniques aimed at describing and visualizing spatial distributions, at identifying atypical localizations or spatial outliers, at detecting patterns of spatial association, clusters or hot spots, and at suggesting spatial regimes or other forms of spatial heterogeneity (Haining 1990; Bailey and Gatrell 1995; Anselin 1998a, 1998b). These methods provide measures of global and local spatial autocorrelation.

2.1 Global spatial autocorrelation

Spatial autocorrelation can be defined as the coincidence of value similarity with locational similarity (Anselin 2000). Therefore there is positive spatial autocorrelation when high or low values of a random variable tend to cluster in space and there is negative spatial

autocorrelation when geographical areas tend to be surrounded by neighbors with very dissimilar values.

The measurement of global spatial autocorrelation is based on the Moran's I statistic, which is the most widely known measure of spatial clustering (Cliff and Ord 1973, 1981; Upton and Fingleton 1985; Haining 1990). For each year of the period 1980-1995, this statistic is written in the following way:

$$I_t = \frac{n}{S_0} \frac{\sum_i \sum_j w_{ij} (x_{i,t} - \mu_t)(x_{j,t} - \mu_t)}{\sum_i (x_{i,t} - \mu_t)^2} \quad t = 1, \dots, 16 \quad (1)$$

where x_{it} is the observation in region i and year t , μ_t is the mean of the observations across regions in year t . n is the number of regions. w_{ij} is the element of the spatial weight matrix W . This matrix contains the information about the relative spatial dependence between the n regions i . The elements w_{ii} on the diagonal are set to zero whereas the elements w_{ij} indicate the way region i is spatially connected to the region j . Finally, S_0 is a scaling factor equal to the sum of all the elements of W .

The spatial weight matrix we use in this study is based on the 10 nearest neighbors calculated from the great circle distance between region centroids. In Europe, regions have on average 5 to 6 contiguous neighbors, our choice of 10 yields a ring around each region of approximately the first and second order contiguous regions and moreover connects United-Kingdom as well as some islands such as Sicilia, Sardegna, and Baleares to continental Europe. Furthermore, it also connects Greece to Italy, so that the block-diagonal structure of the simple contiguity matrix is avoided. This feature is of particular interest when working on a sample of European regions, which are less compact than US states.

Noting z_t the vector of the n observations for year t in deviation from the mean μ_t , (1) can be written in the following matrix form:

$$I_t = \frac{n}{S_0} \cdot \frac{z_t' W z_t}{z_t' z_t} \quad t = 1, \dots, 16 \quad (2)$$

In order to normalize the outside influence upon each region, the spatial weight matrix is row-standardized such that the elements in each row sum to 1. In this case, the expression (2) simplifies since for row-standardized weights $S_0 = n$.

Moran's I statistic gives a formal indication on the degree of linear association between the vector z_t of observed values and the vector Wz_t of spatially weighted averages of neighboring values, called the spatially lagged vector. Values of I larger than the expected value $E(I) = -1/(n-1)$ indicate positive spatial autocorrelation, while values smaller than the expected indicate negative spatial autocorrelation. Inference is based on the permutation approach with 10000 permutations. In this approach, it is assumed that, under the null hypothesis, each observed value could have occurred at all locations with equal likelihood. But instead of using the theoretical mean and standard deviation (given by Cliff and Ord 1981), a reference distribution is empirically generated for I , from which the mean and standard deviation are computed. In practice this is carried out by permuting the observed values over all locations and by re-computing I for each new sample. The mean and standard deviation for I are then the computed moments for the reference distribution for all permutations (Anselin 1995).

2.2 Local spatial autocorrelation

Moran's I statistic is a global statistic: it does not enable us to appreciate the regional structure of spatial autocorrelation. However, one can wonder which regions contribute more to the global spatial autocorrelation, if there are local spatial clusters of high or low values, and finally to what point the global evaluation of spatial autocorrelation masks atypical localizations or "pockets of local nonstationarity", i.e. respectively regions or groups of contiguous regions, which deviate from the global pattern of positive spatial autocorrelation.

The analysis of local spatial autocorrelation is carried out with two tools: first, the Moran scatterplot (Anselin 1996), which is used to visualize local spatial instability, and second, local indicators of spatial association “LISA” (Anselin 1995), which are used to test the hypothesis of random distribution by comparing the values of each specific localization with the values in the neighboring localizations.

Moran Scatterplot

Inspection of local spatial instability is carried out by the means of the Moran scatterplot (Anselin 1996), which plots the spatial lag Wz_i against the original values z_i . The four different quadrants of the scatterplot correspond to the four types of local spatial association between a region and its neighbors: (HH) a region with a high¹ value surrounded by regions with high values (Quadrant I in top on the right), (LH) a region with a low value surrounded by regions with high values (Quadrant II in top on the left), (LL) a region with a low value surrounded by regions with low values (Quadrant III in bottom on the left), (HL) a region with a high value surrounded by regions with low values (Quadrant IV in bottom on the right). Quadrants I and III refer to positive spatial autocorrelation indicating spatial clustering of similar values whereas quadrants II and IV represent negative spatial autocorrelation indicating spatial clustering of dissimilar values. The Moran scatterplot may thus be used to visualize atypical localizations, i.e. regions in quadrant II or in the quadrant IV. Moreover, the use of standardized variables allows the Moran scatterplots to be comparable across time.

The global spatial autocorrelation may also be visualized in this graph since, from (2) Moran’s I is formally equivalent to the slope coefficient of the linear regression of Wz_i on z_i using a row-standardized weight matrix. Therefore, this regression can be assessed with diagnostics for model fit. The detection of outliers and sites, which exert strong influence on Moran’s I , is based on standard regression diagnostics: studentized residuals and leverage measures are used to detect outliers, and Cook’s distance is an influence measure (Belsley et al. 1980; Haining 1994, 1995). The studentized residual is a measure of the extreme character

of an observation along the dependent variable domain and is calculated as the studentized difference between the actual value and the predicted value. The leverage quantifies the extreme nature of an observation in the range of the independent variable and is assessed using the diagonal elements of the hat matrix² (Haoglin and Welsch 1978). Finally, the Cook's distance combines the two previous diagnostics and measures the extent to which regression coefficients are changed by the deletion of a particular observation (Cook 1977; Weisberg 1985).

Let us note however that the Moran scatterplot does not give any indications of significant spatial clustering and therefore, it cannot be considered as a Local Indicator of Spatial Association in the sense defined by Anselin (1995).

Local indicators of spatial association (LISA)

Anselin (1995) defines a local indicator of spatial association as any statistics satisfying two criteria³. First, the LISA for each observation gives an indication of significant spatial clustering of similar values around that observation; second, the sum of the LISA for all observations is proportional to a global indicator of spatial association.

The local version of the Moran's I statistic for each region i and year t can then be written as following:

$$I_{i,t} = \frac{(x_{i,t} - \mu_t)}{m_0} \sum_j w_{ij} (x_{j,t} - \mu_t) \quad \text{with } m_0 = \sum_i (x_{i,t} - \mu_t)^2 / n \quad (3)$$

where the summation over j is such that only neighboring values of j are included. It is straightforward to see that the sum of local Moran's statistics can be written:

$$\sum_i I_{i,t} = \frac{1}{m_0} \sum_i (x_{i,t} - \mu_t) \sum_j w_{ij} (x_{j,t} - \mu_t) = \frac{1}{m_0} \sum_i \sum_j w_{ij} (x_{i,t} - \mu_t) (x_{j,t} - \mu_t) \quad (4)$$

¹ High (respectively low) means above (respectively below) the mean.

² The hat matrix is defined as $H = X(X'X)^{-1}X'$ where X is the matrix of observations on the explanatory variables in a regression.

³ Note that the Getis and Ord (1992) local statistics $G_i^*(d)$ and $G_i^*(d)$ are not LISAs in the sense defined by Anselin (1995) since they are not related to a global statistic of spatial association and will not be used in this study.

From (1), it follows that the global Moran's I statistic is proportional to the sum of local Moran's statistics:

$$I_t = \sum_i I_{i,t} / S_0 \quad (5)$$

For a row-standardized weight matrix, $S_0 = n$ so that $I_t = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i I_{i,t}$: the global Moran's I equals the mean of the local Moran's statistics. A positive value for $I_{i,t}$ indicates clustering of similar values (high or low) whereas a negative value indicates clustering of dissimilar values.

Due to the presence of global spatial autocorrelation, inference must be based on the conditional permutation approach: the value x_i at site i is held fixed, while the remaining values are randomly permuted over all locations (note that only the quantity $\sum_j w_{ij} (x_{i,t} - \mu_t)$ needs to be computed for each permutation since the term $(x_{i,t} - \mu_t) / m_0$ remains constant for a given region i). It should be stressed that p -values obtained for the local Moran's statistics are actually pseudo-significance levels. Inference is further complicated by the fact that local Moran's statistics will be correlated when the neighborhood sets of two regions contain common elements (Ord and Getis 1995; Anselin 1995). This is actually a problem of multiple statistical comparison and the significance levels must be approximated by the Bonferroni inequality or by the procedure elaborated by Sidák (1967)⁴. As noted by Anselin (1995, p.96): "This means that when the *overall* significance associated with the multiple comparisons (correlated tests) is set to α , and there are m comparisons, then the individual significance α_i should be set to α/m (Bonferroni) or $1 - (1 - \alpha)^{1/m}$ (Sidák)". With $m = n$, the number of regions of the sample, these procedures can be overly conservative to assess the significance of local Moran's statistics. The second procedure requires that the variables are multivariate normal, which is unlikely to be the case with LISA. In this respect, we will present the results obtained with both the usual 5% pseudo-significance level, which may be too liberal, and the 10% Bonferroni pseudo-significance level (with $n = 138$, we get $\alpha_i = 7.246 \cdot 10^{-4}$), which may

be too conservative in opposition to the preceding one. These two significance level can therefore be considered as the two extreme bounds for the inference.

Anselin (1995) gives two interpretations for local Moran's statistics: they can be used, first, as indicators of local spatial clusters (or hot spots), which can be identified as locations or sets of neighboring locations for which the LISA are significant and second, as diagnostics for local instability, i.e. for significant outliers with respect to the measure of global spatial autocorrelation (atypical localizations or pockets of nonstationarity). The second interpretation of the LISA statistics is similar to the use of a Moran scatterplot to identify outliers and leverage points for Moran's I : since there is a link between the local indicators and the global statistic, LISA outliers will be associated to the regions which are the most influential on Moran's I .

3 Empirical results

We apply ESDA techniques to European regional data on per capita GDP in logarithms. The data are extracted from the EUROSTAT-REGIO databank⁵. Our sample includes 138 regions for 11 countries (Denmark, Luxembourg and United Kingdom in NUTS1 level and Belgium, Spain, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Netherlands and Portugal in NUTS2 level⁶) over the 1980-1995 period⁷.

3.1 Global spatial autocorrelation

Table 1 displays the evolution of the spatial autocorrelation of per capita GDP over the 1980-1995 period for the 138 European regions of our sample. It appears that per capita regional GDPs are positively spatially autocorrelated since the statistics are significant with

⁴ More about this problem can be found in Savin (1984).

⁵ Series E2GDP measured in Ecu_hab units.

⁶ We use Eurostat 1995 nomenclature of statistical territorial units, which is referred to as NUTS: NUTS1 means European Community Regions while NUTS2 means Basic Administrative Units.

⁷ We exclude Groningen in the Netherlands from the sample due to some anomalies related to North Sea Oil revenues, which increase notably its per capita GDP. We exclude also Canary Islands and Ceuta y Mellila, which are geographically isolated. Corse, Austria, Finland, Ireland and Sweeden are excluded due to data non-availability over the 1980-1995 period in the EUROSTAT-REGIO databank. Berlin and East Germany are also excluded due to well-known historical and political reasons.

$p = 0.0001$ for every year⁸. This result suggests that the hypothesis of spatial randomness is rejected and that the distribution of per capita regional GDP is by nature clustered over the whole period. In other words, the regions with relatively high per capita GDP (respectively low) are localized close to other regions with relatively high per capita GDP (respectively low) more often than if this localization was purely random.

If we consider now the evolution of the Moran's I statistics over the period, we can see that the value of the statistic has slightly increased over the period. If this scheme keeps on in the future, the spatial distribution of per capita GDP will remain clustered and will not tend toward a spatially random distribution. Moran's I statistics thus indicates a global significant trend to the geographical clustering of similar regions in terms of log per capita GDP.

[Table 1 about here]

3.2 Moran scatterplots

Since Moran's I yields a single result for the entire data set, it cannot discriminate between a spatial clustering of high values and a spatial clustering of low values in the case of a global positive spatial autocorrelation. Furthermore, it may mask regions that deviate from this global pattern. These limitations are overcome by the Moran scatterplots.

Figures 1 and 2 display the Moran scatterplots for the initial and final years of our sample: 1980 and 1995. On the one hand, we can see that almost all of the European regions are characterized by positive spatial association (as indicated by the slope of the regression line). On the other hand, there are little "atypical" regions i.e. deviating from the global pattern of positive autocorrelation. More precisely, as can be seen in table 4, in 1980, 97.8% of the European regions show association of similar values (65.2% in quadrant I (HH) and 32.6% in quadrant III (LL)) and in 1995, 94.9% of the European regions show this positive association (56.5% in quadrant I (HH) and 38.4% in quadrant III (LL)). This may indicate the existence of two regimes of spatial autocorrelation, the first one corresponding to the HH scheme and the second one to the LL scheme, both of them representing positive spatial

⁸ All computations are carried out by the means of the SpaceStat 1.90 software (Anselin 1999).

association. Not surprisingly, the Moran scatterplots reveal a clear north-south polarization of the regions: northern regions are to be found in the first quadrant (HH type) while southern regions are in the third quadrant (LL type). The major change between 1980 and 1995 concerns the British regions: they are in the third quadrant in 1995 (LL) whereas they were in the first quadrant in 1980 (HH).

In 1980, only 3 regions show association of dissimilar values (2 in quadrant II (LH) and 1 in quadrant IV (HL)). We can note however that Aquitaine (France) is located at the border between the French regions, which are HH regions, and the Spanish regions, which are LL regions. This geographical situation explains why Aquitaine is a HL region. The 2 LH regions are Wales and Northern Ireland (United-Kingdom). In 1995, there are 7 atypical regions (Hainaut and Namur (Belgium), Languedoc-Roussillon (France), East Anglia (United Kingdom)) in quadrant II (LH) and Aquitaine, Midi-Pyrénées (France) and Lazio (Italy) in quadrant IV (HL)).

[Figures 1 and 2 about here]

The Moran scatterplot can also be used to assess the presence of outliers, which are defined as the points further than 2 units away from the origin. In 1980, there are no regions that have a per capita GDP more than two standard deviations above the mean whereas Voreio Aigaio (Greece) and all Portuguese regions (except the capital region Lisboa) have per capita GDPs less than two standard deviations below the mean (horizontal axis in Figure 1). There is no outlier on the vertical axis (Figure 1). In 1995, Hamburg and Darmstadt (Germany) are outliers with per capita GDPs more than two standard deviations above the mean (Figure 2). The Portuguese regions cannot be considered as outliers anymore except Alentejo (Portugal) as well as Ipeiros and Voreio Aigaio (Greece).

The first 2 columns and first 2 rows of Table 2 display a summary of the most extreme observations according to the Moran regression diagnostics for 1980 and 1995. First, the largest studentized residuals represent large deviations from the model fit. In the table are reported the 7 studentized residuals larger than 2 in absolute value in 1980 and 1995. Second

are reported the observations associated with leverages higher than $2p/n$ (where p is the number of explanatory variables in the regression, i.e. $p=2$ and $n=138$). There are 12 such observations in 1980 and 1995, most of them being located in Portugal, Greece and Germany. Finally, a region is considered to be influential if the associated Cook's distance is larger than $F(0.5; p; n-p) = 0.6967$ with $p=2$ and $n=138$. The results are not reported in the table since there was no occurrence of a region exceeding this level for all years (the highest value is 0.216 for Alentejo (Portugal) in 1988). These results suggest that, although some regions have large leverages and studentized residuals, no region appears to be particularly influential in the sample.

[Table 2 about here]

More insight to the evolution of Moran's scatterplots over time is provided by a newly introduced measure of space-time transitions, which is based on the classification of the transitions over time of a region and its neighbors in four groups (Rey, 1999). The first includes the transitions with a relative move of only the region, for example a HH region in the first period that becomes a LH region in the following period. The other cases are HL-LL, LH-HH and LL-HL. The second group contains the transitions of the neighbors only: HH-HL, HL-HH, LH-LL and LL-LH while the transitions of both a region and its neighbors belong to the third group: HH-LL, HL-LH, LH-HL and LL-HH. Finally, the 4 cases in which the region and its neighbors remain at the same level are in the fourth group. High stability in the types of transitions is reflected by a high amount of type 4 transitions and low values of the flux (or instability) measure, which is defined as the frequency of the first and second type of transitions over all 15 years of transitions. For time intervals of 1, 5 and 10 years, the fourth type of transition is always the most common one (95.6%, 89.9% and 85.3%) and the flux measure is respectively equal to 4%, 7.9% and 8.8%. These results denote a high cohesion between European regions and a very low rate of mobility, increasing very slowly with the transition interval. This finding is refined by the study of local spatial autocorrelation statistics.

3.3 Local Spatial Autocorrelation Statistics

In order to examine further these results that are consistent with EU economic reports, it is worth computing the local indicators of spatial dependence since no indication of significant local spatial clustering is provided by the Moran scatterplots. With the aim of identifying the spatial movements that occurred during the whole 1980-1995 period, we will only retain the phenomena of local clusters and the atypical localizations for which the local Moran's statistics are significant. The results of this procedure are summarized in Table 3.

[Table 3 about here]

The number of years over the whole period with significant local statistics (using a pseudo-level of significance of 5% and a Bonferroni pseudo-level of significance of 10%) is displayed in the second column⁹. The number of years during which the region falls into a certain quadrant of the Moran scatterplot with a significant local statistics are displayed in the following columns (HH, HL LH or LL). The corresponding years are finally displayed in the two last columns. Several points can be highlighted.

First, the local pattern of spatial association reflects the global trend to positive spatial autocorrelation since 98.83% of the significant local indicators, using the 5% pseudo-significance level, fall either into quadrant I or in quadrant III of the scatterplot, i.e. representing HH and LL types of clustering. We note however that the distribution between associations of the HH and LL types is uneven since 62.23% of the regions fall into quadrant I: we thus mainly detect regions or sets of regions with high per capita GDP surrounded by other regions with high per capita GDP¹⁰.

Second, deviations of the global trend are marginal and are dominated by a particular form of negative spatial association: the LH type, where a region with low per capita GDP is surrounded by regions with high per capita GDP (0.68% of the significant LISA). Only two HL regions, or "diamonds in the rough", are detected: Madrid (Spain) for 1991 and 1992. The

⁹ We can note that 66.1% of these indicators are significant at the 5% pseudo-significance level (1459 versus a total of 2208) and only 28.4% at the 10% Bonferroni pseudo-significance level (628 versus a total of 2208).

“doughnuts” or LH clusters are Brabant Wallon for 3 years, Hainault for 2 years and Namur for 3 years (Belgium), Friesland for 6 years and Drenthe for only one year (Netherlands), these regions constitute therefore a little pocket of non-stationnarity for a limited period of time¹¹.

Third, four regional clusters persist in time. The first is a significant LL form of clustering between all the Portuguese regions and almost all the Spanish regions. We can note that these “poor” regions entered the EU in 1986, that they benefited since 1989 of the regional aid to the so-called Objective 1 regions but that over all the period, the per capita GDP of these regions remains lower than the average. The same comment apply for the two LL form of clustering between some Italian Objective 1 regions (Puglia, Basilicata, Calabria, Sicilia) and between all the Greek regions (the Greek and the Portuguese regions are even significant using the 10% Bonferroni pseudo-significance level). The last clustering, of the HH type, relates mainly to German regions but also to some Belgian, French, Dutch and north Italian regions. However, most of the French regions that were significant in 1980 do not belong to the cluster any more in 1995 (only 4 northern regions of the 16 regions remain significant). These results show a high persistence of spatial inequality between the European regions across time: the regions that were surrounded by rich neighbors still benefit from their environment whereas the regions with poor neighbors remain negatively affected.

[Figures 3 and 4 about here]

The spatial outliers identified by the 2 sigma rule are shown in the last set of rows in table 2. In 1980, all the Portuguese regions as well as the Spanish region Extremadura indicated clustering of very similar values. The situation in 1995 is very different since the Portuguese regions are replaced by the Greek regions (only Alentejo remains a spatial outlier).

¹⁰ Using the Bonferroni 10% pseudo-significance level, the picture is quite different since 11.78% of significant LISA fall in quadrant I and 16.67% of significant LISA fall in quadrant III, the latter including the regions with low per capita GDP surrounded by other regions with low per capita GDP.

¹¹ No atypical localization is found when the Bonferroni 10% pseudo-significance level is used.

3.4 Spatial patterns of growth rates

To refine this analysis, we apply the ESDA techniques to the growth rates of per capita GDP in order to study the geographical patterns in growth processes.

The computation of Moran's I statistics on the growth rate of per capita GDP between 1980 and 1995 of the various regions reveals a positive spatial autocorrelation (0.422 with a p -value of 0.0001). It means that the regions with relatively high per capita GDP growth rate (respectively low) are localized close to other regions with relatively high per capita GDP growth rate (respectively low) more often than if this localization was purely random.

The Moran scatterplot for growth rates is displayed in figure 5. Compared to the scatterplots for per capita GDP in 1980 and 1995, there is much more instability: only 73.2% of the European regions show association of similar values (33.3% in quadrant I (HH) and 39.9% in quadrant III (LL)) while 26.8% of the regions are negatively associated (11.6% in quadrant II (LH) and 15.2% in quadrant IV (HL)). All the Portuguese regions have growth rates more than two standard deviations above the mean. Let's recall that they were outliers in the opposite quadrant in 1980. We will come back to this inverse relationship between the per capita GDP in 1980 and growth rates at the end of this paragraph. Finally, the most extreme observations according to the Moran regression diagnostics are shown in the last column of table 2. As for per capita GDP in 1980 and 1995, there was no influential region according to the Cook's distance criterion.

[Figure 5 about here]

The procedure of evaluation of local spatial autocorrelation applied to the growth rates (table 4, 3rd column) shows that the patterns of spatial association remain dominated by clustering of LL or HH types¹². Galicia and Asturias in Spain are the 2 regions with low growth rates surrounded by regions with high growth rates. The regions with high growth rates surrounded by regions with low growth rates are to be found in Greece : Anatoliki Makedonia, Ionia Nisia and Kriti. The significant LISA at the 5% level are shown in figure 6.

[Figure 6 about here]

To study the possible geographical characteristics implied by β -convergence processes, we compared the pattern of spatial association of growth rate with the pattern of spatial association of initial per capita GDP (table 4, first and 3rd columns) in order to look for a possible inverse relationship. Several results can be underlined.

It appears that, in only 43% of the cases, the regions that were in a certain quadrant for per capita GDP level in 1980 are in the opposite quadrant for their growth rate. But this global feature masks different behaviors. Thus, the regions of Portugal and some Spanish regions had in 1980 a low per capita GDP and were surrounded by regions with low per capita GDP (clustering of the LL type) but their growth rate is, as for their neighbors, higher than the average (clustering of the HH type). The spatial autocorrelation indicators highlight the dynamic character of these regions, whose economic performances within the group of the Southern regions of Europe were often underlined. On the contrary, the majority of the French regions, the British regions, some regions in Belgium and in the Netherlands, are characterized by a configuration of the initial per capita GDP of HH type and a configuration of the growth rates of the LL type.

Other characteristics between the patterns of spatial association can be highlighted. On the one hand, within the group of the Southern regions, certain poor regions of Spain, Italy and Greece do not manage to take off, just like their neighbors (configurations of the LL type for the initial per capita GDP and the growth rates) or in spite of the dynamism of their neighbors (configuration of the LL type for the initial per capita GDP and of LH type for the growth rates). These regions thus show strong signs of delay of development. On the other hand, almost all the German regions are very dynamic since they started with high levels, as well as their neighbors and still had a HH type form of clustering for their growth rates.

[Table 4 about here]

¹² 42.7% (15.2%) of the LISA computed are significant at the 5% pseudo-level (resp. 10% Bonferroni pseudo-level).

4 Conclusion

The study of the spatial distribution of regional per capita GDP in Europe over 1980-1995 using Exploratory Spatial Data Analysis (ESDA) highlights the importance of spatial interactions and geographical locations in regional growth and convergence issues. ESDA appears therefore as a powerful tool to finely reveal the characteristics of economic development of each region in relation to those of its geographical environment.

First, ESDA reveals significant positive global spatial autocorrelation, which is persistent over the whole period: regions with relatively high (resp. low) per capita GDP are and remain localized close to other regions with relatively high (low) per capita GDP and that the spatial distribution of regional per capita GDP is not random. From the applied econometrics perspective, this result has a major implication for the suitable estimation of β -convergence models: spatial autocorrelation should systematically be tested for in cross section specifications and if detected, an appropriate spatial specification (spatial autoregressive model, spatial error model or spatial cross regressive model) should be estimated using the proper econometric tools to achieve reliable statistical inference.

Second, the Moran scatterplot and LISA show the persistence of the high-high and low-low clustering types for regional per capita GDP, confirming the north-south polarization of European regions. This reveals some kind of spatial heterogeneity hidden in the global positive spatial autocorrelation pattern and may indicate the co-existence of two distinct spatial regimes. Spatial effects could then perform differently in Northern Europe than in Southern Europe. Moreover the convergence process, if it exists, may be different across regimes. Once again from the applied econometrics perspective, this result suggest that the potential for distinct spatial regimes should also be considered carefully in the estimation of β -convergence models, which should be tested for structural instability. All these aspects will be studied in further research.

References

- Abraham F, Von Rompuy P (1995) Regional convergence in the European Monetary Union. *Papers in Regional Science* 74: 125-142
- Anselin L (1995) Local indicators of spatial association-LISA. *Geographical Analysis* 27: 93-115
- Anselin L (1996) The Moran scatterplot as an ESDA tool to assess local instability in spatial association. In: Fisher M, Scholten HJ, Unwin D (eds) *Spatial analytical perspectives on GIS*. Taylor & Francis, London
- Anselin L (1998a) Interactive techniques and exploratory spatial data analysis. In: Longley PA, Goodchild MF, Maguire DJ, Wind DW (eds) *Geographical information systems: principles, techniques, management and applications*. Wiley, New York
- Anselin L (1998b) Exploratory spatial data analysis in a geocomputational environment. In: Longley PA, Brooks SM, McDonnell R, Macmillan B (eds) *Geocomputation, a primer*. Wiley, New York
- Anselin L (1999) *SpaceStat, a software package for the analysis of spatial data, Version 1.90*. Ann Arbor, BioMedware
- Anselin L (2000) Spatial econometrics. In: Baltagi B (eds) *Companion to econometrics*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Armstrong H (1995) Convergence among the regions of the European union. *Papers in Regional Science* 74: 143-152
- Bailey T, Gatrell AC (1995) *Interactive spatial data analysis*. Harlow, Longman
- Belsley D, Kuh E, Welsch R (1980) *Regression diagnostics: identifying influential data and sources of collinearity*. Wiley, New York
- Cliff AD, Ord JK (1973) *Spatial autocorrelation*. London, Pion
- Cliff AD, Ord JK (1981) *Spatial processes: models and applications*. London, Pion
- Cook R (1977) Detection of influential observations in linear regression. *Technometrics* 19: 15-18
- Fingleton B (1999) Estimates of time to economic convergence: an analysis of regions of the European Union. *International Regional Science Review* 22: 5-34
- Getis A, Ord JK (1992) The analysis of spatial association by use of distance statistics. *Geographical Analysis* 24: 189-206
- Haining R (1990) *Spatial data analysis in the social and environmental sciences*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- Haining R (1994) Diagnostics for regression modeling in spatial econometrics. *Journal of Regional Science* 34: 325-341
- Haining R (1995) Data problems in spatial econometric modeling. In: Anselin L, Florax R (eds) *New directions in spatial econometrics*. Springer, Berlin
- Hoaglin D, Welsch R (1978) The hat matrix in regression and ANOVA. *The American Statistician* 32: 17-22
- López-Bazo E, Vayá E, Mora A, Suriñach J (1999) Regional economic dynamics and convergence in the European union. *Annals of Regional Science* 33: 343-370
- Molle W, Boeckhout S (1995) Economic disparity under conditions of integration – A long term view of the European case. *Papers in Regional Science* 74: 105-123
- Neven D, Gouyette C (1995) Regional convergence in the European community. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 33: 47-65
- Ord JK, Getis A, 1995, Local spatial autocorrelation statistics: distributional issues and an application. *Geographical Analysis* 27: 286-305
- Rey S (1999) Spatial empirics for economic growth and convergence, *mimeo*, San Diego State University, September
- Rey S, Montouri B (1999) US regional income convergence: a spatial econometric perspective. *Regional Studies* 33: 143-1564
- Savin NE (1984) Multiple hypotheses testing. In: Griliches Z, Intriligator MD (eds) *Handbook of Econometrics, volume II*. Elsevier Science Publishers
- Sidák Z (1967) Rectangular confidence regions for the means of multivariate normal distributions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 62: 626-633
- Upton GJG, Fingleton B (1985) *Spatial data analysis by example*. Wiley, New York
- Weisberg S (1985) *Applied linear regression*. Wiley, New York

Table 1. Moran's *I* statistics for log per capita GDP over 1980-1995

| Year | Moran's I | Standard deviation | Standardized value |
|------|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1980 | 0.774 | 0.033940 | 23.024 |
| 1981 | 0.760 | 0.033971 | 22.574 |
| 1982 | 0.746 | 0.033956 | 22.161 |
| 1983 | 0.779 | 0.034083 | 23.060 |
| 1984 | 0.757 | 0.034019 | 22.446 |
| 1985 | 0.766 | 0.034077 | 22.692 |
| 1986 | 0.785 | 0.034126 | 23.213 |
| 1987 | 0.789 | 0.034164 | 23.289 |
| 1988 | 0.773 | 0.034196 | 22.802 |
| 1989 | 0.750 | 0.034221 | 22.113 |
| 1990 | 0.762 | 0.034242 | 22.461 |
| 1991 | 0.754 | 0.034311 | 22.174 |
| 1992 | 0.770 | 0.034323 | 22.651 |
| 1993 | 0.790 | 0.034272 | 23.259 |
| 1994 | 0.799 | 0.034267 | 23.514 |
| 1995 | 0.802 | 0.034222 | 23.653 |

Note: The expected value for Moran's *I* statistic is constant for each year: $E(I) = -0.007$. All statistics are significant at $p = 0.0001$.

Table 2. Outliers : initial and terminal years and growth rates for log per capita GDP

| | 1980 | | 1995 | | Growth | |
|---|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| | Region | Studentized Residual | Region | Studentized Residual | Region | Studentized Residual |
| Studentized residuals exceeding 2 in absolute value | Stereia Ellada | -3.445158 | Ile de France | -3.139385 | Andalucia | 3.497511 |
| | Bruxelles | -2.893242 | Hamburg | -2.886250 | Extremadura | 2.822284 |
| | Hamburg | -2.500151 | Bruxelles | -2.654439 | Galicia | 2.745314 |
| | Attiki | -2.298205 | Luxembourg (Lux) | -2.612451 | Luxembourg (Lux) | -2.666020 |
| | Ile de France | -2.225954 | Attiki | -2.337432 | Asturias | 2.591420 |
| | Asturias | -2.099516 | Darmstadt | -2.130149 | Kriti | -2.436728 |
| | Lüneburg | 2.073019 | Madrid | -2.005542 | Ionia Nisia | -2.195220 |
| | | | | | Notio Aigaio | -2.142425 |
| leverage exceeding 4/N | Region | Leverage | Region | Leverage | Region | Leverage |
| | Centro | 0.072428 | Ipeiros | 0.052553 | Algarve | 0.105763 |
| | Norte | 0.065610 | Hamburg | 0.046399 | Centro | 0.102492 |
| | Alentejo | 0.062048 | Voreio Aigaio | 0.040424 | Norte | 0.089878 |
| | Algarve | 0.058095 | Alentejo | 0.038027 | Stereia Ellada | 0.065942 |
| | Voreio Aigaio | 0.038353 | Darmstadt | 0.037616 | Lisboa | 0.064531 |
| | Hamburg | 0.036314 | Centro | 0.034994 | Luxembourg (Lux) | 0.055558 |
| | Extremadura | 0.035489 | Norte | 0.032597 | Alentejo | 0.054656 |
| | Ipeiros | 0.035076 | Dyptiki Ellada | 0.031850 | Picardie | 0.030390 |
| | Bruxelles | 0.032278 | Oberbayern | 0.031539 | | |
| | Lisboa | 0.031164 | Luxembourg (Lux) | 0.030974 | | |
| | Ionia Nisia | 0.029664 | Peloponnissos | 0.030740 | | |
| | Anatoliki Makedonia | 0.029641 | Bremen | 0.029290 | | |
| LISA outliers (2-sigma rule) | Region | LISA | Region | LISA | Region | LISA |
| | Extremadura | 3.668896 | Anatoliki Makedonia | 2.995502 | Norte | 3.708258 |
| | Norte | 4.323912 | Kentriki Makedonia | 2.587855 | Centro | 5.333233 |
| | Centro | 5.100167 | Dyptiki Makedonia | 2.769021 | Lisboa | 4.516306 |
| | Lisboa | 3.432059 | Thessalia | 2.891856 | Alentejo | 4.173558 |
| | Alentejo | 4.938435 | Ipeiros | 3.841003 | Algarve | 5.762157 |
| | Algarve | 4.744208 | Ionia Nisia | 2.69785 | | |
| | | | Dyptiki Ellada | 3.108809 | | |
| | | | Stereia Ellada | 2.663872 | | |
| | | | Peloponnissos | 3.045441 | | |
| | | | Voreio Aigaio | 3.275564 | | |
| | | Alentejo | 2.801488 | | | |




Fig. 1. Moran scatterplot for log per capita GDP 1980




Fig. 2. Moran scatterplot log per capita GDP 1995

Table 3. Local Indicators of Spatial Association (LISA): Log per capita GDP (1980-1995)

| Code | Region | Signif | HH | LH | LL | HL | Years 5% | Years 10% Bonf. |
|------|--------------------|---------|---------|----|---------|----|---------------------|----------------------|
| | BELGIUM | | | | | | | |
| Be1 | Bruxelles | 1 (0) | 1 | | | | 80 | |
| Be21 | Anvers | 6 (0) | 6 | | | | 80-81;87; 93-95 | |
| Be22 | Limburg (B) | 12 (0) | 12 | | | | 80-83;85-88;92-95 | |
| Be23 | Oost Vlaanderen | 4 (0) | 4 | | | | 80-81;94-95 | |
| Be24 | Vlaams Brabant | 4 (0) | 4 | | | | 80-81;94-95 | |
| Be25 | West Vlaanderen | 5 (0) | 5 | | | | 80-81;93-95 | |
| Be31 | Brabant Wallon | 5 (0) | 2 | 3 | | | 80;95 / 81;93-94 | |
| Be32 | Hainaut | 4 (0) | 2 | 2 | | | 80-81 / 94-95 | |
| Be33 | Liège | 4 (0) | 4 | | | | 80;93-95 | |
| Be34 | Luxembourg (B) | 9 (0) | 9 | | | | 80-81;86-88;92-95 | |
| Be35 | Namur | 5 (0) | 2 | 3 | | | 80-81 / 93-95 | |
| | GERMANY | | | | | | | |
| De11 | Stuttgart | 16 (15) | 16 (15) | | | | 80-95 | 80;82-95 |
| De12 | Karlsruhe | 16 (16) | 16 (16) | | | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| De13 | Freiburg | 16 (16) | 16 (16) | | | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| De14 | Tübingen | 16 (16) | 16 (16) | | | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| De21 | Oberbayern | 16 (9) | 16 (9) | | | | 80-95 | 83-84;87-88;91-95 |
| De22 | Niederbayern | 16 (9) | 16 (9) | | | | 80-95 | 87-95 |
| De23 | Oberpfalz | 16 (16) | 16 (16) | | | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| De24 | Oberfranken | 16 (13) | 16 (13) | | | | 80-95 | 83-95 |
| De25 | Mittelfranken | 16 (15) | 16 (15) | | | | 80-95 | 80;82-95 |
| De26 | Unterfranken | 16 (13) | 16 (13) | | | | 80-95 | 83-95 |
| De27 | Schwaben | 16 (13) | 16 (13) | | | | 80-95 | 83-95 |
| De5 | Bremen | 16 (0) | 16 | | | | 80-95 | |
| De6 | Hamburg | 16 (3) | 16 (3) | | | | 80-95 | 93-95 |
| De71 | Darmstadt | 16 (2) | 16 (2) | | | | 80-95 | 93;95 |
| De72 | Giessen | 16 (11) | 16 (11) | | | | 80-95 | 80;83-84;86-88;91-95 |
| De73 | Kassel | 16 (4) | 16 (4) | | | | 80-95 | 92-95 |
| De91 | Braunschweig | 16 (11) | 16 (11) | | | | 80-95 | 80;82-84;87-88;91-95 |
| De92 | Hannover | 16 (7) | 16 (7) | | | | 80-95 | 80;82-84;93-95 |
| De93 | Lüneburg | 16 (14) | 16 (14) | | | | 80-95 | 80-88;91-95 |
| De94 | Weser-Ems | 16 (5) | 16 (5) | | | | 80-95 | 80-83;95 |
| Dea1 | Düsseldorf | 14 (0) | 14 | | | | 80-90;93-95 | |
| Dea2 | Köln | 14 (0) | 14 | | | | 80-81;83;85-95 | |
| Dea3 | Münster | 16 (0) | 16 | | | | 80-95 | |
| Dea4 | Detmold | 16 (2) | 16 (2) | | | | 80-95 | 93;95 |
| Dea5 | Arnsberg | 16 (3) | 16 (3) | | | | 80-95 | 93-95 |
| Deb1 | Koblenz | 16 (3) | 16 (3) | | | | 80-95 | 93-95 |
| Deb2 | Trier | 12 (0) | 12 | | | | 80-81;85-90;92-95 | |
| Deb3 | Rheinessen-Pfalz | 16 (16) | 16 (16) | | | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| Dec | Saarland | 16 (0) | 16 | | | | 80-95 | |
| Def | Schleswig-Holstein | 16 (10) | 16 (10) | | | | 80-95 | 81-87;93-95 |
| Dk | DENMARK | 16 (7) | 16 (7) | | | | 80-95 | 80;82-84;93-95 |
| | SPAIN | | | | | | | |
| Es11 | Galicia | 16 (15) | | | 16 (15) | | 80-95 | 80-91;93-95 |
| Es12 | Asturias | 16 (10) | | | 16 (10) | | 80-95 | 80-88;94 |
| Es13 | Cantabria | 16 (0) | | | 16 | | 80-95 | |
| Es21 | Pais Vasco | 9 (0) | | | 9 | | 81-87 ;94-95 | |
| Es22 | Navarra | 7 (0) | | | 7 | | 81-87 | |
| Es23 | La Rioja | 11(0) | | | 11 | | 80-88;94-95 | |
| Es24 | Aragon | 4 (0) | | | 4 | | 82-85 | |
| Es3 | Madrid | 16 (7) | | | 14 (7) | 2 | 80-90;93-95/91-92 | 81-87 |
| Es41 | Castilla-Leon | 16 (5) | | | 16 (5) | | 80-95 | 81-85 |
| Es42 | Castilla-la Mancha | 16 (2) | | | 16 (2) | | 80-95 | 82-83 |
| Es43 | Extremadura | 16 (16) | | | 16 (16) | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| Es51 | Cataluna | 0 (0) | | | | | | |
| Es52 | Valenciana | 13 (0) | | | 13 | | 80-89;93-95 | |
| Es53 | Islas Baleares | 9 (0) | | | 9 | | 80-86;94-95 | |
| Es61 | Andalucia | 16 (16) | | | 16 (16) | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| Es62 | Murcia | 16 (5) | | | 16 (5) | | 80-95 | 81-85 |
| | FRANCE | | | | | | | |
| Fr1 | Ile de France | 2 (0) | 2 | | | | 80-81 | |
| Fr21 | Champagne-Ardenne | 9 (0) | 9 | | | | 80-82 ;85-87 ;93-95 | |
| Fr22 | Picardie | 10 (0) | 10 | | | | 80-83;85-87;93-95 | |
| Fr23 | Haute-Normandie | 10 (0) | 10 | | | | 80-89 | |
| Fr24 | Centre | 8 (0) | 8 | | | | 80-87 | |
| Fr25 | Basse-Normandie | 10 (0) | 10 | | | | 80-89 | |
| Fr26 | Bourgogne | 11 (1) | 11(1) | | | | 80-90 | 81 |
| Fr3 | Nord-Pas-De-Calais | 3 (0) | 3 | | | | 80-81;95 | |
| Fr41 | Lorraine | 16 (0) | 16 | | | | 80-95 | |
| Fr42 | Alsace | 16 (2) | 16 (2) | | | | 80-95 | 80;95 |
| Fr43 | Franche-Comté | 16 (0) | 16 | | | | 80-95 | |
| Fr51 | Pays de la Loire | 8 (0) | 8 | | | | 80-87 | |
| Fr52 | Bretagne | 10 (0) | 10 | | | | 80-89 | |
| Fr53 | Poitou-Charentes | 8 (0) | 8 | | | | 80-87 | |
| Fr61 | Aquitaine | 0 (0) | | | | | | |
| Fr62 | Midi-Pyrénées | 0 (0) | | | | | | |

| Code | Region | | HH | LH | LL | HL | Years 5% | Years 10% Bonf. |
|------|---------------------------|---------|--------|------|---------|------|------------------------|-----------------|
| Fr63 | Limousin | 9 (0) | 9 | | | | 80-88 | |
| Fr71 | Rhône-Alpes | 2 (0) | 2 | | | | 86-87 | |
| Fr72 | Auvergne | 4 (0) | 4 | | | | 80-82 ;86 | |
| Fr81 | Languedoc-Roussillon | 0 (0) | | | | | | |
| Fr82 | PACA | 9 (0) | 9 | | | | 83-91 | |
| | GREECE | | | | | | | |
| Gr11 | Anatoliki Makedonia | 16 (16) | | | 16 (16) | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| Gr12 | Kentriki Makedonia | 16 (16) | | | 16 (16) | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| Gr13 | Dytiki Makedonia | 16 (16) | | | 16 (16) | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| Gr14 | Thessalia | 16 (16) | | | 16 (16) | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| Gr21 | Ipeiros | 16 (16) | | | 16 (16) | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| Gr22 | Ionia Nisia | 16 (16) | | | 16 (16) | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| Gr23 | Dytiki Ellada | 16 (16) | | | 16 (16) | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| Gr24 | Stereia Ellada | 16 (16) | | | 16 (16) | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| Gr25 | Peloponnisos | 16 (16) | | | 16 (16) | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| Gr3 | Attiki | 16 (16) | | | 16 (16) | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| Gr41 | Voreio Aigaio | 16 (16) | | | 16 (16) | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| Gr42 | Notio Aigaio | 16 (16) | | | 16 (16) | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| Gr43 | Kriti | 16 (16) | | | 16 (16) | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| | ITALY | | | | | | | |
| It11 | Piemonte | 14 (0) | 14 | | | | 81-94 | |
| It12 | Valle d'Aosta | 16 (0) | 16 | | | | 80-95 | |
| It13 | Liguria | 10 (0) | 10 | | | | 83-92 | |
| It2 | Lombardia | 12 (3) | 12 (3) | | | | 83-94 | 89-91 |
| It31 | Trentino – Alto Adige | 15 (2) | 15 (2) | | | | 81-95 | 90-91 |
| It32 | Veneto | 12 (1) | 12 (1) | | | | 83-94 | 91 |
| It33 | Friuli – Venezia Giulia | 14 (1) | 14 (1) | | | | 82-95 | 91 |
| It4 | Emilia – Romagna | 9 (0) | 9 | | | | 84-92 | |
| It51 | Toscana | 7 (0) | 7 | | | | 86-92 | |
| It52 | Umbria | 0 (0) | | | | | | |
| It53 | Marche | 0 (0) | | | | | | |
| It6 | Lazio | 0 (0) | | | | | | |
| It71 | Abruzzo | 0 (0) | | | | | | |
| It72 | Molise | 1 (0) | | | 1 | | 95 | |
| It8 | Campania | 4 (0) | | | 4 | | 80-82;95 | |
| It91 | Puglia | 16 (2) | | | 16 (2) | | 80-95 | 94-95 |
| It92 | Basilicata | 6 (0) | | | 6 | | 80-82;93-95 | |
| It93 | Calabria | 16 (2) | | | 16 (2) | | 80-95 | 94-95 |
| Ita | Sicilia | 8 (0) | | | 8 | | 80-83;85;93-95 | |
| Itb | Sardegna | 0 (0) | | | | | | |
| Lu | LUXEMBOURG | 7 (0) | 7 | | | | 80-81;86-87;93-95 | |
| | NEDERLAND | | | | | | | |
| NI12 | Friesland | 16 (0) | 10 | 6 | | | 80-87;93-95 / 85;88-92 | |
| NI13 | Drenthe | 16 (1) | 15 (1) | 1 | | | 80-91;93-95 / 92 | 80 |
| NI2 | Oost Nederland | 12 (0) | 12 | | | | 80-88;93-95 | |
| NI31 | Utrecht | 14 (0) | 14 | | | | 80-90;93-95 | |
| NI32 | Noord-Holland | 12 (0) | 12 | | | | 80-88;93-95 | |
| NI33 | Zuid-Holland | 5 (0) | 5 | | | | 80-81;93-95 | |
| NI34 | Zeeland | 5 (0) | 5 | | | | 80-81;93-95 | |
| NI41 | Noord-Brabant | 12 (0) | 12 | | | | 80-83;86-90;93-95 | |
| NI42 | Limburg (NL) | 6 (0) | 6 | | | | 80-81;87 ;93-95 | |
| | PORTUGAL | | | | | | | |
| Pt11 | Norte | 16 (16) | | | 16 (16) | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| Pt12 | Centro | 16 (16) | | | 16 (16) | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| Pt13 | Lisboa e vale do Tejo | 16 (16) | | | 16 (16) | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| Pt14 | Alentejo | 16 (16) | | | 16 (16) | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| Pt15 | Algarve | 16 (16) | | | 16 (16) | | 80-95 | 80-95 |
| | UNITED-KINGDOM | | | | | | | |
| Uk1 | North | 0 (0) | | | | | | |
| Uk2 | Yorkshire and Humberside | 0 (0) | | | | | | |
| Uk3 | East Midlands | 0 (0) | | | | | | |
| Uk4 | East Anglia | 1 (0) | 1 | | | | 81 | |
| Uk5 | South East | 0 (0) | | | | | | |
| Uk6 | South West | 0 (0) | | | | | | |
| Uk7 | West Midlands | 0 (0) | | | | | | |
| Uk8 | North West | 0 (0) | | | | | | |
| Uk9 | Wales | 0 (0) | | | | | | |
| Uka | Scotland | 0 (0) | | | | | | |
| Ukb | Northern Ireland | 0 (0) | | | | | | |
| | Signif. tot. 5% | 1459 | 908 | 15 | 534 | 2 | | |
| | % versus total of 2208 | 66.08 | 41.12 | 0.68 | 24.18 | 0.09 | | |
| | % versus signif. tot. 5% | | 62.23 | 1.03 | 36.6 | 0.14 | | |
| | Signif. tot. 10% Bonf. | (628) | (260) | (0) | (368) | (0) | | |
| | % versus total of 2208 | 28.44 | 11.78 | 0 | 16.67 | 0 | | |
| | % versus signif. tot. 10% | | 41.4 | 0 | 58.6 | 0 | | |

Note: signif: number of years local statistics is significant at 5% pseudo-significance level (in brackets at 10% Bonferroni pseudo-significance level) based on 10000 permutations; HH, LH, LL and HL: number of years local statistics is respectively in quadrant I, II, III and IV of Moran's scatterplot.

TABLE 4. Spatial Association Patterns: initial and terminal years and growth rates for log per capita GDP (1980-1995)

| Code | Region | 1980 | 1995 | growth | Code | Region | 1980 | 1995 | growth |
|------|--------------------|------|------|--------|------|--------------------------|------|------|--------|
| | BELGIUM | | | | | | | | |
| Be1 | Bruxelles | HH | HH | LL | Fr51 | Pays de la Loire | HH | HH | LL |
| Be21 | Anvers | HH | HH | LL | Fr52 | Bretagne | HH | HH | LL |
| Be22 | Limburg (B) | HH | HH | HL | Fr53 | Poitou-Charentes | HH | HH | LL |
| Be23 | Oost Vlaanderen | HH | HH | LL | Fr61 | Aquitaine | HL | HL | LL |
| Be24 | Vlaams Brabant | HH | HH | HL | Fr62 | Midi-Pyrénées | HH | HL | LL |
| Be25 | West Vlaanderen | HH | HH | HL | Fr63 | Limousin | HH | HH | LL |
| Be31 | Brabant wallon | HH | HH | LL | Fr71 | Rhône-Alpes | HH | HH | LL |
| Be32 | Hainaut | HH | LH | LL | Fr72 | Auvergne | HH | HH | LL* |
| Be33 | Liège | HH | HH | LH | Fr81 | Languedoc-Roussillon | HH | LH | LL |
| Be34 | Luxembourg (B) | HH | HH | HH | Fr82 | PACA | HH | HH | LL |
| Be35 | Namur | HH | LH | LH | | GREECE | | | |
| | GERMANY | | | | Gr11 | Anatoliki Makedonia | LL* | LL* | HL |
| De11 | Stuttgart | HH* | HH* | HH | Gr12 | Kentriki Makedonia | LL* | LL* | LL |
| De12 | Karlsruhe | HH* | HH* | HH | Gr13 | Dytiki Makedonia | LL* | LL* | LL |
| De13 | Freiburg | HH* | HH* | HL | Gr14 | Thessalia | LL* | LL* | LL |
| De14 | Tübingen | HH* | HH* | HH | Gr21 | Ipeiros | LL* | LL* | LL |
| De21 | Oberbayern | HH | HH* | HH | Gr22 | Ionia Nisia | LL* | LL* | HL |
| De22 | Niederbayern | HH | HH* | HH | Gr23 | Dytiki Ellada | LL* | LL* | LL |
| De23 | Oberpfalz | HH* | HH* | HH | Gr24 | Stereia Ellada | LL* | LL* | LL |
| De24 | Oberfranken | HH | HH* | HH | Gr25 | Peloponnisos | LL* | LL* | LL |
| De25 | Mittelfranken | HH* | HH* | HH | Gr3 | Attiki | LL* | LL* | LL |
| De26 | Unterfranken | HH | HH* | HH | Gr41 | Voreio Aigaio | LL* | LL* | HL |
| De27 | Schwaben | HH | HH* | HH | Gr42 | Notio Aigaio | LL* | LL* | HL |
| De5 | Bremen | HH | HH | HH | Gr43 | Kriti | LL* | LL* | HL |
| De6 | Hamburg | HH | HH* | HH | | ITALY | | | |
| De71 | Darmstadt | HH | HH* | HH | It11 | Piemonte | HH | HH | LL |
| De72 | Giessen | HH* | HH* | HH | It12 | Valle d'Aosta | HH | HH | LL |
| De73 | Kassel | HH | HH* | HH | It13 | Liguria | HH | HH | HL |
| De91 | Braunschweig | HH* | HH* | HH | It2 | Lombardia | HH | HH | LH |
| De92 | Hannover | HH* | HH* | HH | It31 | Trentino – Alto Adige | HH | HH | HH |
| De93 | Lüneburg | HH* | HH* | HH | It32 | Veneto | HH | HH | HH |
| De94 | Weser-Ems | HH* | HH* | HL | It33 | Friuli – Venezia Giulia | HH | HH | HH |
| Dea1 | Düsseldorf | HH | HH | LL | It4 | Emilia – Romagna | HH | HH | LH |
| Dea2 | Köln | HH | HH | HH | It51 | Toscana | HH | HH | LH |
| Dea3 | Münster | HH | HH | HL | It52 | Umbria | LL | LL | LH |
| Dea4 | Detmold | HH | HH* | HH | It53 | Marche | LL | LL | LH |
| Dea5 | Arnsberg | HH | HH* | LH | It6 | Lazio | LL | HL | HL |
| Deb1 | Koblenz | HH | HH* | HH | It71 | Abruzzo | LL | LL | HL |
| Deb2 | Trier | HH | HH | HH | It72 | Molise | LL | LL | HL |
| Deb3 | Rheinessen-Pfalz | HH* | HH* | LH | It8 | Campania | LL | LL | LL |
| Dec | Saarland | HH | HH | HH | It91 | Puglia | LL | LL* | LL |
| Def | Schleswig-Holstein | HH | HH* | HH | It92 | Basilacata | LL | LL | LH |
| Dk | DENMARK | HH* | HH* | HH | It93 | Calabria | LL | LL* | HL |
| | SPAIN | | | | Ita | Sicilia | LL | LL | LH |
| Es11 | Galicia | LL* | LL* | LH* | Itb | Sardegna | LL | LL | HL |
| Es12 | Asturias | LL* | LL | LH | Lu | LUXEMBOURG | HH | HH | HL |
| Es13 | Cantabria | LL | LL | LH | | NEDERLAND | | | |
| Es21 | Pais Vasco | LL | LL | HH | Ni12 | Friesland | HH | HH | LL |
| Es22 | Navarra | LL | LL | HH | Ni13 | Drenthe | HH* | HH | LL |
| Es23 | La Rioja | LL | LL | HH | Ni2 | Oost Nederland | HH | HH | LL |
| Es24 | Aragon | LL | LL | HH | Ni31 | Utrecht | HH | HH | HL |
| Es3 | Madrid | LL | LL | HH | Ni32 | Noord-Holland | HH | HH | LL |
| Es41 | Castilla-Leon | LL | LL | HH | Ni33 | Zuid-Holland | HH | HH | LL |
| Es42 | Castilla-la Mancha | LL | LL | HH | Ni34 | Zeeland | HH | HH | LL |
| Es43 | Extremadura | LL* | LL* | HH* | Ni41 | Noord-Brabant | HH | HH | HL |
| Es51 | Cataluna | LL | LL | HL | Ni42 | Limburg (NL) | HH | HH | LL |
| Es52 | Valenciana | LL | LL | HH | | PORTUGAL | | | |
| Es53 | Islas Baleares | LL | LL | HH | Pt11 | Norte | LL* | LL* | HH* |
| Es61 | Andalucia | LL* | LL* | HH* | Pt12 | Centro | LL* | LL* | HH* |
| Es62 | Murcia | LL | LL | HH | Pt13 | Lisboa e vale do Tejo | LL* | LL* | HH* |
| | FRANCE | | | | Pt14 | Alentejo | LL* | LL* | HH* |
| Fr1 | Ile de France | HH | HH | LL | Pt15 | Algarve | LL* | LL* | HH* |
| Fr21 | Champagne-Ardenne | HH | HH | LL | | UNITED-KINGDOM | | | |
| Fr22 | Picardie | HH | HH | LL | Uk1 | North | HH | LL | LL* |
| Fr23 | Haute-Normandie | HH | HH | LL | Uk2 | Yorkshire and Humberside | HH | LL | LL* |
| Fr24 | Centre | HH | HH | LL* | Uk3 | East Midlands | HH | LL | LL* |
| Fr25 | Basse-Normandie | HH | HH | LL* | Uk4 | East Anglia | HH | LH | LL |
| Fr26 | Bourgogne | HH | HH | LL* | Uk5 | South East | HH | HH | LL |
| Fr3 | Nord-Pas-De-Calais | HH | HH | LL | Uk6 | South West | HH | LL | LL* |
| Fr41 | Lorraine | HH | HH | LH | Uk7 | West Midlands | HH | LL | LL* |
| Fr42 | Alsace | HH* | HH* | LH | Uk8 | North West | HH | LL | LL* |
| Fr43 | Franche-Comté | HH | HH | LL | Uk9 | Wales | LH | LL | LL* |
| | | | | | Uka | Scotland | HH | LL | LL* |
| | | | | | Ukb | Northern Ireland | LH | LL | LL* |

Note: in bold significant at 5% (* significant at 10% Bonferroni) pseudo-significance level based on 10000 Permutations.




Fig. 3. Significant LISA Log per capita GDP 1980




Fig. 4. Significant LISA Log per capita GDP 1995

