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Why this study?

- Connectivity—or “globalization”—and its relationship to economic growth is often viewed in one dimension (i.e., trade, migration, FDI, transport, etc.) through its impact on the transfer of ideas and technological knowledge
  - But these connections can be complements or substitutes
    - Migration and trade; FDI and trade; Migration and FDI

- To whom you are connected to might be just as important as the type of connection
  - Trade with Germany may be more important than trade with Algeria—not only due to the level of technological potential embodied in exports/imports, but also the connections of your partner’s connections

- Growth analysis using a “multidimensional connectivity” in a network framework is a natural way to address these potential complementarities and “partner-of-partner” effects.

- This is the first study to develop a multidimensional network connectivity measure and apply it to analyzing growth
Key findings

- Being well-connected in the global network of countries is important for long-run economic growth.

- Nonetheless, because of complementarities in types of connections (trade, FDI, migration, etc.), a balanced connectivity profile maybe more important for growth than being well connected in a single dimension.
Stylized Facts for ECA
Trade has grown within ECA, although China is taking a larger share of global trade

(Exports + Imports, size of node is total value)

Red nodes are Europe and emerging ECA countries
ECA’s inward FDI has grown, but inflows have increased from outside the region
(Inward stocks, size of node is total value)

Red nodes are Europe and emerging ECA countries
ECA’s intra-regional migration has increased and is a larger share of global migration
(Inward Stocks, size of node is total number)
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Red nodes are Europe and emerging ECA countries
ECA’s intra-regional ICT has not increased relative to the rest of the world
(Index of internet and phone flows, size of node is outgoing communication)

Russia data not available in 2000.
Red nodes are Europe and emerging ECA countries
Multidimensional Connectivity
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Growth Model with Network Effects

\[ g_{it} = a + BX_{it} + \phi \Theta'_{it} + e_{it} \]

- \( X_i \) is a matrix of covariates which determine growth (initial GDP per capita, education, government size and inflation)

- \( \Theta'_i \) is a network centrality measure which proxies the amount of “knowledge” in country \( i \) due to its overall connectivity (position in the network)

- We assume that knowledge travels through the various channels: international trade, FDI and migration
Classic PageRank Algorithm

\[ PR_i = \lambda \sum_k L_{ki} \ PR_k + \rho_i \]

where:

- \( L_{ki} \) indicates if web page \( k \) links to web page \( i \)
- \( \rho_i \) indicates the “relevance” of the web page content for a given search query
- \( \lambda \) is weight parameter
PageRank Centrality and Economic Growth

\[ \Theta_{it} = \lambda \sum_k \left( x_{ikt_0}^a f_{ikt_0}^\beta m_{ikt_0}^\gamma c_{ikt_0}^\eta \right) \Theta_{kt} + y_{it} \]

where \( y_i \) is GDP per capita (or another proxy for the intrinsic knowledge in country \( i \))

\[ x_{ik} = \frac{\text{TRADE FLOW}_{ik}}{\sqrt{\text{GDP}_i \text{GDP}_k}}; \]

\[ f_{ik} = \frac{\text{FDI STOCK}_{ik}}{\sqrt{\text{GDP}_i \text{GDP}_k}}; \]

\[ m_{ik} = \frac{\text{MIGRATION STOCK}_{ik}}{\sqrt{\text{POP}_i \text{POP}_k}}; \]

\[ c_{ik} = \frac{\text{ICT FLOW}_{ik}}{\sqrt{\text{POP}_i \text{POP}_k}}; \]

Finally, in order to adjust for the fact that initial GDP per capita appears in the centrality measure as well as the list of independent variables in the growth equation we modify the PageRank centrality in the following way:

\[ \Theta'_{it} = \Theta_{it} - y_{it} \]
Econometric model

MAIN EQUATIONS

\[ g_i = a + BX_i + \phi \Theta'_i + e_i \]

\[ \Theta_i = \lambda \sum_k x_{ik}^\alpha f_{ik}^\beta m_{ik}^\gamma c_{ik}^\eta \Theta_k + y_i \]

\[ x_{ik} = \frac{\text{TRADE FLOW}_{ik}}{\sqrt{GDP_i GDP_k}}; \]

\[ f_{ik} = \frac{\text{FDI STOCK}_{ik}}{\sqrt{GDP_i GDP_k}}; \]

\[ m_{ik} = \frac{\text{MIGRATION STOCK}_{ik}}{\sqrt{POP_i POP_k}}; \]

\[ c_{ik} = \frac{\text{ICT FLOW}_{ik}}{\sqrt{POP_i POP_k}}; \]

MAIN FEATURES

• More connected countries have greater stocks of knowledge (\( \Theta \))

• Each economy has a “base” level of knowledge which is proportional to its income per capita (technology)

• Deeper connections to high income countries are preferable

• The information channels (trade, FDI, migration, ICT) are not perfect substitutes - the more diversified the links the better

• \( \Theta'_i \) represents the stock of knowledge due only to the network connections
### Empirical results

#### Growth Regressions (2000-2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial GDP per capita</td>
<td>-1.00***</td>
<td>-1.017***</td>
<td>-0.996***</td>
<td>-1.018***</td>
<td>-1.028***</td>
<td>-1.032***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of schooling</td>
<td>.380***</td>
<td>.398***</td>
<td>.369***</td>
<td>.399***</td>
<td>.406***</td>
<td>.411***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government size</td>
<td>-.059*</td>
<td>-.066*</td>
<td>-.060*</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>-.059*</td>
<td>-.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Openness</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>.004*</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.0038</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Network Effects (PageRank)

**Multidimensional Connectivity**

- **Trade (t₀)**: 28.86*
- **Migration (t₀)**: 72.66**
- **Fdi (t₀)**: 33.959*
- **ICT (t₀)**: -58.71
- **Adj-R2**: 0.436 0.418 0.409 0.393 0.389 0.39
Efficiency of Transmission Channels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade ((\alpha))</td>
<td>0.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration ((\beta))</td>
<td>0.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI ((\gamma))</td>
<td>0.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT ((\eta))</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The main transmission channels for growth-relevant technological information are international trade and migration.
- FDI links appear to have a weaker effects in transferring information.
- We don’t find any significant effect of our proxy for ICT.
Policy Tool (example)

What is the optimal investment location from a multidimensional connectivity perspective
A Simple Policy Problem

- Kazakhstan wants to invest $100M in Central Europe
- We assume that the risk-adjusted return on the investment has been equalized across the countries by the market
- What is the optimal location for this investment from the growth/connectivity perspective?
Policy Simulation: Kazakhstan Example

SIMULATION RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Knowledge in Target Country ($θ_k$)</th>
<th>Knowledge in Kazakhstan ($θ_i$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>0.0067</td>
<td>0.0053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>0.0118</td>
<td>0.0051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Rep.</td>
<td>0.0117</td>
<td>0.0052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>0.0111</td>
<td>0.0052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>0.0068</td>
<td>0.0051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>0.0098</td>
<td>0.0051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- We simulate an FDI investment of $100M from Kazakhstan to each Central European country and its effect on connectivity and access to knowledge in Kazakhstan.
- Although countries like Poland are more integrated in the global network, their weak links with Kazakhstan in terms of migration and trade reduce the informational effectiveness of the investment.
- Despite having lower overall knowledge, Bulgaria offers the greatest marginal informational benefits to Kazakhstan due to the deeper bilateral links (there are complementarities between trade, FDI and migration).
Kazakhstan Example (cont’d)

- The optimal investment Central European location for Kazakhstan is Bulgaria.
- The difference between the first (Bulgaria) and second place (Poland) is approximately 0.002% of economic growth.
- This translates to approximately $1.85M of additional annual growth grains over the long-run.
Areas for Further Research

- Impact of connectivity on the income growth of the poorer members of society
- Effect of the educational level of migrants on the sending and receiving countries
- Growth impact of FDI in different sectors (e.g. excluding FDI in raw materials)