

Service regulation and growth: evidence from OECD countries

Guglielmo Barone and Federico Cingano[§]

August 2010

Abstract

We study the effects of anti-competitive service regulation by examining whether OECD countries with less anti-competitive regulation see better economic performance in manufacturing industries that use less-regulated services more intensively. Our results indicate that lower service regulation increases value added, productivity, and export growth in downstream service intensive industries. The regulation of professional services and energy provision has particularly strong negative growth effects. Our estimates are robust to accounting for alternative forms of regulation (i.e., product and labour market regulation), alternative measures of financial development and a range of other specification checks.

JEL: O40, L51, L80

Keywords: Regulation, financial development, sector analysis, growth

[§] We are extremely grateful to Antonio Ciccone and Alfonso Rosolia for their help and suggestions. We thank Andrea Ichino, Tullio Jappelli, Giovanni Pica, Paolo Pinotti, Fabiano Schivardi, two anonymous referees and seminar participants at the Bank of Italy, University of Bologna, University of Cagliari, CSEF Salerno and MILLS 2007 for very useful comments. We are responsible for any mistakes. The opinions expressed here are our own and do not necessarily correspond to those of the Bank of Italy. Correspondence: Bank of Italy, Research Department, via Nazionale 91, 00184 Rome, Italy; e-mail: federico.cingano@bancaditalia.it; guglielmo.barone@bancaditalia.it.

1. Introduction

Do countries with less anti-competitive service regulation perform better economically? Policy makers appear to think so as regulatory barriers have fallen in many countries. And their position is generally supported by a large empirical literature looking at the effects of entry barriers, red-tape costs or legal requirements on economic performance. Much of this literature examines the effects of regulation on the performance of the regulated sector. Less is known about the impacts on downstream manufacturing activities, which is surprising as regulation affects many key service inputs.

In this paper, we study how regulation in the supply of a variety of services affects the economic performance of downstream manufacturing industries. We do so by examining whether countries with less service regulation see faster value added, productivity, and export growth in manufacturing industries using services more intensively (this methodology was pioneered for financial services by Rajan and Zingales, 1998). We measure service dependence across manufacturing industries using input-output account matrices. Our measures of service regulation are OECD indicators designed to capture anti-competitive regulatory settings for the energy sector (electricity and gas), the telecommunication and the transportation sectors and for professional services. These account for barriers to entry, for the integration between a priori competitive activities and natural monopolies (in the case of energy), and for the existence of restrictions on prices and fees, advertising or the form of business (in professional services).

Our empirical findings indicate that lower service regulation has non-negligible positive effects on the value added, productivity and export growth rates of service intensive users. To get a sense for the size of the regulation effect, consider the annual value added growth differential between an industry at the 75th percentile (Pulp, paper and printing) relative to one at the 25th percentile (Fabricated metal products) of the distribution of service dependence. Our estimates imply that this differential is 0.7-1% higher in a country with average regulation at the 25th percentile (as Canada) than in a country at the 75th percentile (as France) of the distribution of service regulation. We find this effect is mainly driven by regulation in energy and in professional services. Also, the average effect is driven by larger economies in the sample. The results are not sensitive to how we account for other forms of regulation (i.e., product and labor market regulation) and prove robust to a number of specification checks.

Our findings have important implications for the ongoing debate surrounding service deregulation. In particular, our estimates imply that the strongest gains from deregulation would come from specific policies such as the removal of conduct regulation (i.e., of restrictions to price and tariff setting) by professions, or the complete separation of ownership between energy generation and other segments of the industry (the so-called “unbundling”). Both measures are among those ranking highest in the current EU competition policy agenda and in policy recommendations by international organizations.¹

Research on the economic effects of regulation has grown in recent years, in part because of the increased availability of comparable cross-country data. Empirical work has focused mainly on the *direct* effects of regulation on the regulated sector or stage of business development. Economy-wide restrictions such as barriers to entry have been shown to hamper economy-wide entrepreneurship by stifling growth in the number of firms (Klapper et al., 2006), by increasing industry concentration (Fisman and Sarria-Allende, 2004), and by reducing responsiveness to global demand and technology shifts (Ciccone and Papaioannou, 2007). Sector-specific restrictions, such as those prevailing in utilities and services, have been shown to decrease investment (Alesina et al., 2005) and employment (Bertrand and Kramartz, 2002), and to increase prices (Martin et al., 2005) in the regulated sectors. Yet, regulation may also have relevant *indirect* effects on the allocation of resources among downstream industries, in particular when affecting the production of key non-tradable inputs.

In theoretical models of industry interdependence, the under-development of markets for non-tradable inputs has been shown to constrain (or even prevent) the diffusion of input-intensive technologies, thus affecting the patterns of resource allocation and international specialization (Rodriguez-Clare, 1996; Okuno-Fujiwara, 1988). Empirical research into the relationship between upstream markets development and the allocation of resources across downstream industries has, however, been largely confined to the case of finance.

¹ The reduction and harmonization of legal and administrative barriers is the main goal of the recent EU Services Directive, implemented at the end of 2009 and motivated by the concern for the knock-on effects that barriers in services may trigger “given the integration of services into manufacturing”. The Third Legislative Package on Energy Markets is a controversial recent set of Directives by the Commission promoting the unbundling of network operation from supply and generation in energy. Similarly, the OECD recently recommended revising the energy regulatory framework in most member countries, and indicated the liberalization of professional services as a priority policy area for six European countries (including France, Germany and Italy), and Canada (OECD, 2009, *Going for Growth*).

Rajan and Zingales' (1998) test of the finance-growth nexus using country-industry data represents a major contribution to this literature. The authors exploit industry heterogeneity in financial dependence (i.e. the need for external funds) to show that in countries with better developed financial markets, financially dependent industries experience faster value added growth than less dependent industries. Their findings, confirmed by many subsequent studies, point to financial development as one relevant determinant of the patterns of international specialization. One contribution of our work is to show that the growth effects of service regulation can be just as large. As in the case of finance studies, our main explanatory variable is obtained as the interaction of an industry characteristic (service dependence) with a country characteristic (service regulation). The coefficient for this variable measures whether countries with lower service regulation grow relatively more in industries that depend more intensively on regulated services. Following Rajan and Zingales, we use country and industry fixed-effects to deal with various concerns arising in standard growth analysis (e.g. reverse causation and omitted variables).

By highlighting the relevance of service regulation for both value added and export growth our work closely relates to a growing literature on the relevance of institutions and policies for resource allocation and comparative advantages. Recent works focused on the ability to enforce written contracts. Nunn (2007) showed that countries with better contract enforcement specialize in contract intensive industries, those for which relationship-specific investment is more important. Levchenko (2007) found these countries also tend to export goods that, by requiring a large variety or range of inputs, are more institutionally dependent. In an earlier contribution, Claessens and Laeven (2003) explored the nexus between property rights protection and growth in industries that are more intensive in intangible assets, whose returns are more exposed to the actions of competitors. Looking at labor market institutions, Caballero et al. (2006) found that, in countries with strong rule of law, higher job security is associated with slower adjustment to shocks and lower productivity growth. Cuñat and Melitz (2007) found that countries with light regulation of employment relationships specialize in high-volatility industries. Against this background, our results emphasize the role of regulatory settings that are on top of competition policy agendas.

Two recent papers combined indexes of service regulation with input-output coefficients to estimate the impact of regulation and productivity growth (Conway et al., 2006;

Arnold et al., 2008). Differently from us, they focus on the relevance of regulation for the transfer of technology to firms behind the productivity frontier, estimated exploiting the time series relationship between productivity in frontier and non-frontier countries. Their results indicate that regulation significantly slows technology transfers, and suggest that this happens, in particular, because it increases the costs of absorbing new technologies (as ICTs). Our interest on the patterns of specialization and trade requires that we focus on different specifications and outcomes. In line with the literature of reference, we also employ a different measure of regulatory impact (both papers use the recently issued OECD Regulation Impact Indicators, see Conway and Nicoletti, 2006). As we will see, such change turns out to have relevant empirical implications.²

Our results indicate that service efficiency matters for growth even in a restricted sample of high-income countries, for which the relationship between financial development and growth has previously been shown to be weak (Manning, 2003). We argue that this difference can be traced to our use of value added data at constant rather than current prices. To illustrate the point we use a simple theoretical framework in which countries produce differentiated goods and lower regulation raises output in service-intensive industries by reducing the service component of production costs. In this case there are two countervailing effects of lower regulation on nominal value added of service-intensive industries: a positive effect due to higher output and a negative effect due to lower prices. Estimates of the combined effect will therefore understate the impact of service regulation on production. We find empirical support for this hypothesis: lower regulation and higher financial development reduce the growth rate of (implicit) prices relatively more in service-intensive manufacturing industries. Accordingly, we do not find any significant effects of regulation or financial development on nominal value added growth.

² Three other papers used input-output linkages to study the consequences of upstream markets inefficiencies, but focused on specific countries. Allegra et al. (2004) looked at competition problems (as measured by the number of antitrust cases) and exports in Italian manufactures. Faini et al. (2006) focused on the link between regulation of network industries and productivity growth in Germany, Italy and the UK. Arnold et al. (2007) showed that barriers to FDI in services slowed TFP growth by Czech manufacturing firms.

2. Background

In this section we introduce a simple framework relating service regulation to the costs of production in downstream industries, and illustrate why regulation might affect industry specialization using insights from the recent trade literature. We start by considering an economy with access to two production technologies $j = 1, 2$ combining labour (L) and an intermediate input Z , $y_j = Z_j^{\gamma_j} L_j^{1-\gamma_j}$. We assume that industry 1 is relatively more intensive in input Z : ($\Delta\gamma = \gamma_1 - \gamma_2 > 0$). The intermediate input is a composite of different production services $x(i)$, $Z_j = \left(\int_0^1 x(i)^\sigma di \right)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}$, where $\sigma \in (0, 1)$ determines the elasticity of substitution ($\chi = 1/(1-\sigma)$) between varieties. Each variety is produced using one unit of labour, priced w . The price index of the composite service can be obtained from maximization conditions as

$$p_z = \left(\int_0^1 p(i)^{\frac{\sigma}{1-\sigma}} di \right)^{\frac{1-\sigma}{\sigma}}, \text{ where } p(i) \text{ is the price of the } i^{\text{th}} \text{ service.}$$

Service regulation is introduced assuming that only a fraction $\varphi \in (0, 1)$ of varieties can be bought at competitive prices, while the share $(1-\varphi)$ is available in regulated markets, where inputs are sold at monopolistic prices. This assumption implies that $p(i)=w$ if $i \in (0, \varphi)$, and $p(i)=w/\sigma$ when $i \in (\varphi, 1)$ and regulation grants monopoly profits to producers of service varieties.

The equilibrium price of the composite service becomes

$$p_z = w \left(\varphi + (1-\varphi)\sigma^{\frac{\sigma}{1-\sigma}} \right)^{\frac{1-\sigma}{\sigma}} = wC(\varphi)$$

where $C'(\varphi) < 0$, $C(\varphi)=1/\sigma > 1$ if $\varphi=0$ (fully regulated services) and $C(\varphi)=1$ if $\varphi=1$ (fully competitive services). The expression above implies that, given the unit cost function $c_j = p_z^{\gamma_j} w^{1-\gamma_j}$, the relative cost in the service intensive industry can be written as a decreasing function of the fraction of deregulated markets φ :

$$\frac{c_1}{c_2} = p_z^{\Delta\gamma} w^{-\Delta\gamma} = C(\varphi)^{\Delta\gamma}$$

To see how regulation can affect the equilibrium allocation of production and trade consider first the case of a small open economy taking world relative prices of final goods $p = p_1/p_2$ as given. In this case, the condition for diversification

$$C(\phi)^{\Delta\gamma} = p$$

identifies a threshold level of regulation $\phi^*(p)$ such that any country would in general be fully specialized in production. If $\phi^* \in (0,1)$, regulatory reforms raising the share of liberalized input markets above the threshold ϕ^* would imply a dramatic shift in the country production structure, from full specialization in labour intensive industries to full specialization in service intensive industries.

Less extreme predictions can be obtained following the modern trade literature to think of firms within each industry as supplying varieties of imperfectly substitutable goods (see Helpman and Krugman, 1985). For simplicity, varieties will be differentiated by country of origin (as in Armington, 1969). In this case, producers of country c in industry j will face a downward sloping world-demand curve $q_{j,c} = p_{j,c}^{-\varepsilon} \Omega_{j,c}$, where $p_{j,c}$ is the domestic price, and $\varepsilon > 1$ is the constant elasticity of substitution across varieties. The scale variable $\Omega_{j,c}$ includes the amount of domestic and foreign expenditures allocated to industry j , which can be considered exogenous to the producer. Prices are set applying a constant mark up over marginal costs ($p_j = \mu \phi_z^{\gamma_j} w^{1-\gamma_j}$), so that the equilibrium relative production of the service intensive variety will be an increasing function of the share of liberalized service markets ϕ :

$$\frac{q_{1,c}}{q_{2,c}} = \Theta C(\phi)^{-\varepsilon^* \Delta\gamma}$$

(recall that $C'(\phi) < 0$). The elasticity of relative production to regulation is $\varepsilon_q = -\Lambda \varepsilon$ where ε is the price elasticity of demand and $\Lambda = \Delta\gamma^* (1/(1-\chi))$ measures the impact of a change in regulation on relative prices. In this framework, service deregulation would therefore imply an increase in the service intensive industry share of total production, driven by shifts in both domestic and foreign demand. From profit maximization one can derive that relative labour productivity in the service intensive industry is also increasing in the extent of deregulation.

Notice that if the value of production is measured at current prices (i.e. $r_{j,c} = p_{j,c} q_{j,c}$) the above relation becomes $r_{1,c}/r_{2,c} = \tilde{\Theta} C(\phi)^{(1-\varepsilon)^* \Delta\gamma}$. Because of the counteracting effects on

prices, the elasticity of relative production to regulation $\varepsilon_r = \Lambda(1 - \varepsilon)$ is therefore lower when production is measured at current rather than constant prices (and tends to zero as the substitutability across varieties - ε - decreases). Hence, an empirically interesting implication of this framework is that detecting the effects of regulation on the structure of industrial production would be easier using real as opposed to nominal measures of value added, as they allow insulating the industry accounts from the offsetting effects of deregulation on industry prices.

The framework above suggests that the process of service liberalization many developed countries started in the early 1990s should have implied a shift in the long run composition of production towards service intensive industries.³ In the empirical part we will check whether such reallocation reflected in industry growth differentials by testing whether service intensive industries grew more in low regulation countries relative to less intensive service users. One reason for looking at growth rates is that production reallocation across industries is likely to be a lengthy process. A second reason is that such specification eases comparison of the results with those in the financial development literature, an important benchmark when studying the consequences of service underdevelopment.

3. Data and sample

All the data needed to perform our exercise are available from the OECD.⁴ Information on value added, export and employment at the country-industry-year level is obtained from the Structural Analysis (STAN) dataset. STAN has been assembled by the OECD complementing member countries' Annual National Accounts with information from other sources, such as national business surveys and censuses. The data are classified according to the ISIC Rev. 3 industry list; they cover 17 countries and 15 manufacturing industries.

³ An alternative way to model the role of services would be thinking of regulation as limiting the number of available input varieties in a model featuring increasing returns from specialization. Rodriguez-Clare (1996), Ciccone and Matsuyama (1996) and Rodrik (1996) are examples of papers showing that, with heterogeneous industry-intensity in non-traded intermediate inputs, the long run industry composition of a small open economy will significantly vary with the amount of locally produced inputs. As in the framework presented here, this occurs because the relative cost of service-intensive industries will decrease as the intermediate sector develops.

⁴ See the Data Appendix and Table 1 for detailed variable definition and sources.

Measuring service regulation: Exposure of manufacturing industries to service regulation is measured combining country-level information on service regulation and industry-level data on service dependence. Specifically, our main indicator is the weighted average

$$SERVREG_{j,c} = \sum_s (w_{j,s} X_{c,s})$$

where $X_{c,s}$ is an index of service regulation in sector s and country c , and $w_{j,s}$ captures industry j dependence on regulated services.

Cross-country measures of service regulation ($X_{c,s}$) are obtained from the OECD Product Market Regulation (PMR) database. We focused on four upstream service activities: energy (electricity and gas), communication (telecommunication and postal services), transportation (air, road, rail transportation services) and professional services (including accountants, architects, engineers and legal services). For each sector, the OECD codes a large amount of basic information on regulatory settings into quantitative scores increasing in the amount of restrictions to competition (see Conway and Nicoletti, 2006). Following Alesina et al. (2005), we only considered those scores designed to measure ex-ante anti-competitive restrictions: barriers to entry, vertical integration and market conduct.⁵ While the OECD-PMR database covers regulation in energy, communication and transports since 1975, only two observations (in 1996 and 2003) are available for professions.

Two measures of industry j dependence on service s ($w_{j,s}$) were recovered from input-output account matrices. The first measure, capturing direct dependence, is obtained as the ratio between the cost of service inputs and the value of industry output (the so-called “technical coefficients”). The second is recovered from the inverse Leontief matrix, whose coefficients account for both direct and indirect contributions of service s to the value of production in industry j .⁶ In our baseline specification, service dependence will be computed based on the US input-output tables (i.e. $w_{j,s} = w_{j,s}^{US}$). As in the rest of the literature following Rajan and Zingales (1998), we therefore start assuming that US input-output coefficients reflect

⁵ Entry barriers include measures distorting the structure of markets relative to a competitive outcome, as the conditions for third party access to electricity and gas transmission grids, the existence of legal limitations on the number of competitors in communications or to the number services each profession has an exclusive right to provide. Vertical integration measures whether a priori competitive activities (as electricity generation or the final supply of energy) are separated from natural monopolies such as the national grid. Finally, conduct regulation includes restrictions on prices and fees, advertising, the form of business etc. in professional services.

⁶ These weights thus account for potential effects of anti-competitive service regulation working through industry j linkages with other, possibly non-regulated, industries in the economy. See the Data Appendix for more information on how the direct and indirect weights are obtained from the available input-output accounts.

technological differences rather than country-specific determinants, as the level of regulation itself.⁷ Accordingly, the US is excluded from the sample. In the robustness section, however, we will exploit the availability of country-specific weights taken from the OECD input-output database to construct an alternative measure of service dependence not reflecting input intensities that are specific to a country or a level of regulation (Ciccone and Papaioannou, 2006). As we will see, the two approaches produce very similar results.

Alternative measures: The OECD has recently made available a measure of the relevance of service regulation (the Regulation Impact Indicator, *RII*) constructed in a way similar to *SERVREG*. Specifically, the *RII* is obtained as $RII_{j,c} = \sum_s w_{j,s}^c X_{c,s}^{RII}$, where $w_{j,s}^c$ are country-specific input-output coefficients and $X_{c,s}^{RII}$ are measures of service regulation from the PMR database. Service sectors s include energy, communication, transportation and professional services (as in our measure) and retail trade. Recent papers used the *RII* to study the relation between regulation and technology transfer (see Conway et al., 2006; Arnold et al., 2008). Despite the obvious similarities, there are several reasons to expect the *RII* would be less appropriate than *SERVREG* to study the relevance of service regulation in our framework. First, as already discussed, the Rajan and Zingales approach requires that input-output coefficients should be a measure of technological determinants of service dependence. Such condition would be hardly met using country-specific input-output coefficients as they might reflect unobserved determinants of service dependence at the country level, introducing potentially relevant sources of bias. If, in particular, country-specific weights are a combination of technological service dependence and country-specific shocks that are independent of other model determinants, then they would tend to distort the estimated coefficients towards zero (attenuation bias).⁸ Second, given the focus on the relevance of services as input providers, unlike the *RII* our indicator excludes retail trade from the list of regulated services. Because it does not cover wholesale activities, the OECD measure of retail regulation is in fact based on information that is unlikely to matter for downstream performance.⁹ Finally, while the index

⁷ In our data, the US is the country featuring the lowest average level of service regulation for the longest time period (see Figure in the Supplementary Appendix).

⁸ On the other hand if country-specific weights respond to country-level regulation, the error in measurement could be non-classical and the direction of the bias undetermined a priori (see Ciccone and Papaioannou, 2006).

⁹ The retail trade indicator covers restrictions as the existence of barriers to entry in food distribution, limits to shops opening hours and price controls on products as food, pharmaceutical, tobacco and gasoline. Such retail activities have a very low relevance as input to manufactures: according to the 1997 US “use” matrix their

$X_{c,s}^{RII}$ accounts for all regulatory areas covered by the OECD regulation database, including for example the extent of public ownership, we focused on measures capturing ex-ante anti-competitive practices (as barriers to entry). As we will see, comparing the results obtained using the two measures confirms our concerns regarding the appropriateness of using the *RII* in our framework.

Assembling the data imposes constraints on the number of available observations: in particular, we are forced to restrict the analysis to a relatively limited growth period, starting in 1996. The reason is twofold: first indicators of regulation in professional services are available at earlier dates; second, the number of missing entries in value added data significantly increases shifting to earlier dates, due to both the reduction in the number of available countries and to changes in industry classification within each country.¹⁰

The main variables used in the empirical part are summarized and described in Tables 1 to 3.

4. Results

Regulation and output growth: Table 4 reports the results obtained from our baseline value added growth regression

$$\hat{V}A_{j,c} = \alpha + \beta \text{SERVREG}_{j,c} + \phi \text{SHARE}_{j,c} + \mu_c + \mu_j + \varepsilon_{j,c}$$

where $\hat{V}A_{j,c}$ is the average (1996-2002) real value added growth in industry j and country c , $\text{SHARE}_{j,c}$ is the beginning-of-period value-added industry share, and μ_c and μ_j are country- and industry-specific fixed-effects. As explained above, $\text{SERVREG}_{j,c}$ captures differences in the relevance of service regulation in country c for each manufacturing industry j . Regulation indicators are measured in 1996. There is a negative link between regulation and growth if $\beta < 0$.

The coefficient reported in column 1 of Table 4 indicates that lowering beginning-of-period anti-competitive regulation in the provision of services has a significant and positive effect on growth. One way to get a sense for the size of this effect is thinking of the annual

purchase represented 0.1% of manufacturing production (against 5.7% of wholesale trade). Notice also that the OECD input-output matrices we use throughout the paper do not separate retail from wholesale trade, and would thus have provided an inappropriate weight for trade regulation.

value added growth differential between an industry with overall service-dependence ($D_j = \sum_s (w_{j,s})$) at the 75th percentile (Pulp, paper and printing) and an industry at the 25th percentile (Fabricated metal products). The coefficient estimated in column 1 implies this differential would rise by approximately 0.75% if regulation were to be uniformly lowered in the four services by an amount corresponding to the difference in average regulation between the 75th (France) to the 25th (Canada) most regulated countries. For comparison, the median value added growth rate in our sample is 1.8%. This finding is confirmed irrespective of which of the two available measures of industry dependence on regulated services ($w_{j,s}$) we use. This can be seen in column 2 where we replicate the previous regression using the so-called Leontief transformation of the technical coefficients, thus accounting for both direct and indirect intersectoral relationships. While the point estimate is unchanged, the implied effect of service deregulation would be slightly larger (about 1%) in this case.¹¹

A first important robustness check for the above findings consists in accounting for the well-documented empirical nexus between finance and industry growth. This is obtained augmenting the baseline specification with two alternative measures of financial development, both proposed by Rajan and Zingales (1998). Column 3 focuses on the ratio of bank credit to GDP, while column 4 considers accounting standards. In both cases, the interaction term is US industry external finance dependence. Neither of the two variables affects the relevance of service regulation. On the other hand, financial development confirms as a significant growth determinant. The coefficient estimated in column 3, for example, implies the growth differential between an industry at the 75th percentile and one at the 25th percentile of external finance dependence (Plastic products and Pulp and paper, respectively) would increase of approximately 0.2% moving from a country with private credit at the 25th percentile to a country close to the 75th percentile of financial development (Norway and the Netherlands, respectively).

The last two columns in Table 4 test the robustness of our estimate to changes in the regression specification. In column 5 we focus on the relationship between industry growth and

¹⁰ For example, as early as in 1990 the number of observations falls by nearly 25% with respect to 1996.

¹¹ The positive coefficient we estimate on initial shares, indicating that countries tend to experience relatively faster growth in those industries they are more specialized in, is in contrast with results obtained by most of the comparable literature. While apparently puzzling, this finding can be explained by the large weight Western

average (as opposed to initial) service regulation in 1996-2002 using initial regulation as instrument, an approach recently followed in the financial development literature. Results are slightly stronger than in previous specification. Finally, in column 6 we account for the possibility that our estimates are at least in part capturing the effects of changes in regulation occurred between 1996 and 2002. This would be the case if countries with high initial regulation implemented relatively stronger subsequent deregulation processes, and regulation has level-effects on value added. We checked for this possibility augmenting the regression with a measure ($DSERVREG = SERVREG_{96} - SERVREG_{02}$) that is increasing in the extent of deregulation. The positive and significant coefficient attracted by $DSERVREG$ does in fact indicate that, holding beginning-of-period regulation constant, value added growth in service intensive industries benefits from higher deregulation.¹² But our baseline estimate is, if anything, larger than in previous specifications.

Output and price effects: Several works adopting the Rajan-Zingales approach noticed that the empirical relevance of the finance-growth nexus is subject to strong variability depending on the countries included in the sample (Favara, 2003), and loses statistical significance as developing countries are omitted (Carlin and Mayer, 2003; Manning, 2003).¹³ Building on time-series results as those in Rousseau and Wachtel (1998), one proposed explanation for this finding is that alternative financial instruments (as equity, debt, and derivative markets) may substitute for credit availability in advanced economies. But the significant coefficients we estimated in Table 4, obtained examining a sample of OECD countries, suggest we should look for a different explanation.

In a world where high-income countries tend to produce differentiated goods, one way to reconcile our findings with the literature is thinking of a possible counteracting role of prices. While we look at the growth of output (as measured by value added at constant prices), most of the existing cross-country cross-industry papers use nominal value added data. As shown at the end of section 2, if lower regulation raises output in service-intensive industries by

European countries have in our sample. The recent intense process of economic and monetary integration seems in fact to have resulted in increased industrial specialization in these countries (see Midelfart et al. 2003).

¹² To get a sense for the size of this effect, consider the comparison between a country with deregulation at the 75th percentile (e.g. Germany) and a country at the 25th percentile (e.g. Japan). Our estimates imply an annual growth gap between the industry at the 75th and the industry at the 25th percentile of service-intensity of nearly 1%.

¹³ Using the same dataset (UNIDO Industrial Statistics) and regression specification of Rajan and Zingales (1998) we found, for example, that their baseline estimate (0.118, with a standard deviation of 0.037, see Tab. 4, column

lowering the service component of the cost of production, then there are two countervailing effects on nominal value added: a positive effect due to higher output and a negative effect due to lower prices. Their combination will tend to weaken the relation between service underdevelopment and industry output when this is measured in nominal terms.

We explore this issue in greater detail in Table 5, estimating the effects of regulation on industry prices. We do in fact find that, among OECD countries, lower regulation and higher financial development translate into lower prices in service-intensive manufacturing industries (Table 5, columns 1 to 3). As a result, when we replicate the real value added analysis of Table 4 using nominal value added the effect becomes, as in above mentioned works, largely insignificant (Table 5, columns 4 to 6). Even so, the issue remains of why using nominal output does allow estimating significant effects when the sample includes a large share of less developed countries. According to the above argument, one possibility is that less developed countries produce more homogeneous commodities relative to advanced countries, facing a higher elasticity of demand. In this case, the counteracting effect of prices would become less and less relevant, on average, as the share of developing countries in the sample increases allowing to recover significant estimates even with nominal data.

Regulation, productivity and exports: Does lower regulation improve productive efficiency or are the estimated value added growth differentials absorbed by offsetting shifts in industry employment? Despite its relevance, the interaction between service regulation and labor productivity has so far received relatively little empirical attention. Our cross-country and industry results indicate that service regulation has a significant impact on the growth rate of value added per worker in service intensive industries (see Table 6, panel A). This finding is robust to accounting for financial development or by changing the regression specification, as in Table 4. To get a sense for the economic relevance of the estimated coefficients, consider the annual productivity growth differential between Pulp and paper and Fabricated metal products (the two industries at the 75th and 25th percentile of the distribution of service-dependence, respectively). The coefficient in column 1 implies this growth differential is approximately 0.9% larger in a low than in a high regulation country (respectively Canada and France). For comparison, the median productivity growth rate in our sample is 2.2%.

2 of Rajan and Zingales, 1998) falls to -0.004 (0.019) when the analysis is restricted to OECD countries, and to -0.021 (0.017) when further focusing on the sub-sample of developed countries we use here.

Finally, we exploited the availability of industry data on exports to explore whether the sectoral reallocation patterns implied by our value added results correspond to changes in international specialization. Results reported in panel B of Table 6 indicate that service regulation is an important determinant of comparative advantages. Throughout all the empirical specifications adopted in the previous tables we find that exports by service intensive industries tend to grow disproportionately more in countries with low levels of service regulation. The usual thought experiment yields an increase of about 1% in the 25th-75th industry growth differential following a reduction in regulation.

All in all, our empirical findings point to the existence of non-negligible indirect effects of lack of competition in upstream markets for the patterns of international specialization and comparative advantages.

5. Robustness

Having established our baseline findings, we proceeded to a number of robustness checks considering the potential confounding role of regulation in other markets, the appropriateness of US weights as a measure of service dependence, the role of influential observations and the suitability of our measure of regulation impact compared to other possible measures.

The role of product and labor market regulation: We first considered the possibility that our estimates are driven by omitted country-industry shocks not captured by either country or industry fixed-effects and correlated with service regulation. If regulation is a countrywide phenomenon, our findings might in particular be capturing anti-competitive measures targeting other markets, as the labor or the product market. We checked for this possibility augmenting the baseline specification with regulation-related variables, which have been shown to significantly affect industry growth. In columns 1 and 2 of Table 7 we accounted for country-level measures of employment protection and administrative (red-tape) barriers to entrepreneurship (Djankov et al., 2002; Nicoletti and Scarpetta, 2003; Bassanini et al. 2009). Both variables are negatively related to industry growth, although the relationship is statistically significant only in the case of labor market regulation. On the other hand, the estimated impact of services regulation is unaffected. The next two columns show that our results are robust to accounting for alternative forms of regulation in services, as restrictions to

foreign direct investment (col. 3), or the extent of public ownerships in energy, transportation and communication services (col. 4). Finally, column 5 shows robustness to accounting for all regulation variables simultaneously. The Supplementary Appendix reports further robustness checks to alternative channels highlighted by the literature on the determinants of international specialization and comparative advantages.¹⁴

The appropriateness of US weights: We next dealt with the possibility that using input-output weights from a benchmark country does not allow to correctly measure technological dependence on service inputs because country-specific weights differ from “true” weights by a idiosyncratic component. Such component could be unrelated to other determinants of industry growth, a case in which our estimates would be subject to standard attenuation bias, or depend on the level of regulation itself, so that using a benchmark country would induce a priori ambiguous biases in the estimated coefficients (Ciccone and Papaioannou, 2006). These considerations suggest that neither choosing a different benchmark country nor using an average of input-output weights recovered from multiple sources would solve the measurement problems. An alternative procedure consists in recovering a measure of average service-dependence not reflecting input intensities specific to a country or to a level of regulation, and use it as an instrument for the benchmark-country index of service-dependence. Following Ciccone and Papaioannou (2006), one such measure was estimated for each service sector s in two steps. First, we regressed country-industry weights $w_{j,c}$ on country dummies, industry dummies and industry dummies interacted with country-level regulation in sector s , to estimate the marginal effect of regulation on industry dependence: $w_{j,c} = \mu_j + \mu_c + \delta_j X_c + \varepsilon_{j,c}$.¹⁵ In this regression, the most deregulated country \bar{c} is excluded from the sample. Second, we estimated $\hat{w}_{j,\bar{c}}$ as the fitted values of $w_{j,c}$ when regulation is set at the minimum observed value ($X_{\bar{c}}$) and country-specific averages are set to zero: $\hat{w}_j = \hat{\mu}_j + \hat{\delta}_j X_{\bar{c}}$. The fitted weights $\hat{w}_{j,\bar{c}}$ will therefore not reflect input intensities that are

¹⁴ In particular, we show our estimates are unaffected when accounting for the role of human and physical capital (as in Ciccone Papaioannou, 2007) and property rights (Claessens and Laeven, 2003) in value added growth regressions; and for the role of institutional quality and contract enforcement in export regressions (we used the same specifications as in Levchenko, 2007 and Nunn, 2007, respectively).

¹⁵ The regressions account for the fact that the dependent variable is fractional (Papke and Wooldridge 1996).

regulation or country-specific, and can be used as instruments for US weights in the empirical specification.

The results obtained following this procedure are reported in columns 6 and 7 of Table 7 and confirm the negative role of anti-competitive service regulation for growth. The only difference between the two columns consists in the choice of the country excluded from the service-specific first stage regressions. In column 6, we excluded the US, the country with the lowest levels of regulation from an historical perspective. In column 7, we excluded the least regulated country in each service sector in 1996 (the US for communications, the UK for energy and transportation, Finland for professional services).

The role of influential observations: The last two columns of Table 8 report results obtained removing from the sample the most and the least service intensive industries (Other non metallic mineral products and Machinery and equipment, respectively; col. 8), and the most and the least regulated countries (Greece and Sweden, respectively; col. 9). The estimated coefficient on the growth effect of service regulation is robust to both exercises.

Alternative definitions of regulation impact: Two recent papers used the OECD Regulation Impact Indicator (*RII*) described in section 3 to estimate the effect of regulation on productivity growth in a time-series framework (Conway et al., 2006; Arnold et al., 2008). In their analyses, productivity growth in an industry is expressed as a function of regulation and of the industry “technological distance” from the frontier (i.e. from the country with the highest productivity level).¹⁶ The latter variable, a measure of the potential for technology transfer, allows estimating the speed of convergence to the productivity leader. In this context, regulation is allowed for both direct and indirect (i.e. through the speed of convergence) effects on growth. Both papers find that higher regulation hinders productivity growth by slowing the speed of convergence to the technological frontier. In the sub-sample of ICT intensive (mainly service) industries they also find evidence of direct effects of regulation on growth.

Despite the two works differ from ours in many dimensions, it is important to empirically assess the relevance and robustness of our findings against the OECD Regulation Impact Indicator. In the Supplementary Appendix we report results obtained when (a) the *RII* replaces *SERVREG* in our baseline specifications, and (b) the *RII* is added to our baseline

¹⁶ The empirical analysis moves from a first-order autoregressive distributed lag model [ADL(1,1)] where own productivity is cointegrated with frontier productivity. In the long run, this has an Error Correction Model (ECM) representation, which is the relationship estimated in the two papers.

specifications. The results suggest that the OECD indicator tends to understate the relevance of service regulation for industry growth, thus confirming our concerns regarding its appropriateness in our framework (see section 3). On one hand, using the *RII* as main explanatory variable yields to estimate non-significant effects of regulation on two out of three of the outcomes we focus on (productivity and exports). When significant, the coefficient estimated using the *RII* implies much lower gains from deregulation with respect to what we obtained using *SERVREG*. In particular, the implied effect of a one standard deviation reduction in regulation on value added industry growth would be nearly 50% lower. Finally, all estimates obtained using *SERVREG* are robust to contemporaneously adding the *RII*, whose impact on growth is not statistically significant (or even positive).¹⁷

6. Extensions

To further qualify the role of service regulation in the next sections we focus on two potential dimensions of heterogeneity in the estimated average coefficient: by size of the regulated market and by regulated service.

Service regulation and country size: The benefits from lower regulation might vary with the extent of the regulated market. Recent cross-country evidence by Hoekman et al. (2004) showed, for example, that the positive relation between entry barriers and average mark-ups in manufacturing is substantially higher in large than in small countries. In a world with imperfect competition and fixed costs of production this would happen if the level of existing regulatory barriers (e.g. licenses) is such that there is greater scope for profitable entry in larger than in smaller economies. In our setting, the positive effects of lower service regulation could therefore be stronger in countries characterized by a larger extent of demand by downstream industries.

We checked for this possibility splitting the sample in two groups of large and small OECD countries. Large countries account for nearly 90% of total manufacturing employment

¹⁷ The Supplementary Appendix also reports results obtained considering a third measure of regulation impact, computed to highlight the relevance of using benchmark-country (or “global”) indicators of service dependence. Such measure is obtained interacting the ex-ante anti-competitive regulation index we use throughout the paper ($X_{c,s}$) with country-specific input-output weights ($w_{j,s}^c$), as in the *RII*. Using this “mixed” regulation index yields statistically significant effects on value added and productivity, but not on export growth. The implied effects of a one-standard deviation reduction in regulation is slightly higher than in the case of *RII*, but still nearly a half of

in our data.¹⁸ Table 8 reports the results obtained estimating alternative specifications of the value added growth regression in the two sub-samples and compares it to the average coefficient. In all cases, our evidence indicates that previous results are determined by the positive growth effects of lower regulation in the sub-set of larger countries, suggesting these economies should expect substantial payoffs from competition policies. For example, the coefficient estimated in column 8 implies that the annual growth differential between Pulp and paper and Fabricated metal products (the two industries at the 75th and 25th percentile of the distribution of service-dependence, respectively) would rise by nearly 1.4% if regulation in a large and highly regulated country as France was lowered to the level of Canada. On the other hand, the estimates are largely insignificant in the case of smaller economies.¹⁹

Sector-specific effects: We allow for sector-specific effects focusing on the unrestricted specification

$$\hat{VA}_{j,c} = \alpha + \sum_s \beta_s (w_{j,s} X_{c,s}) + \phi SHARE_{j,c} + \mu_c + \mu_j + \varepsilon_{j,c} .$$

The coefficients β_s are easier interpreted recalling they represent a second derivative $\beta = \partial \hat{VA} / \partial w \partial X$. Hence, $\beta_s < 0$ indicates that, other things equal, intensive users of service s fare better in those countries where the provision of such service is relatively less regulated.

Our results, reported in Table 9, point to the existence of significant sectoral heterogeneity underlying the aggregate estimates presented in previous tables. This can be seen in columns 1 to 4 where we separately considered the role of energy, professional services, communication and transportation services, respectively. All estimated coefficients are negative, but only the first two are statistically significant, a result confirmed when all regressors are jointly considered (column 5). In both cases, the implied effect of regulation is non-negligible. Consider, for example, the annual value added growth differential between an industry with an intensity in professional services at the 75th percentile (Textile and textile products) and an industry at the 25th percentile (Transport equipment). The estimated

what would be obtained using *SERVREG*. Finally, the estimates obtained using *SERVREG* are robust to adding the “mixed” regulation indicator, which in turn has very little statistical significance in all specifications.

¹⁸ The sample of large countries include Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Spain and the UK; small countries are Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Norway, Portugal and Sweden. The cross-country variability of our measure of service regulation is very similar in the two sub-samples (and close to the value for the whole sample).

¹⁹ In the Supplementary Appendix we show these findings extend to productivity and, although to a lesser extent, exports.

coefficient in column 5 implies this growth differential is approximately 0.8% higher in a country with regulation of professions at the 25th percentile (as the UK) than in a country close to the 75th percentile (as Spain). This effect is large relative to the median industry value-added growth rates in our sample (1.8%) and represents more than one-third of the observed 25th-75th difference in industry growth rates. In the case of energy, moving from a heavily regulated (e.g. Italy) to a deregulated (e.g. Finland) country would imply an even larger effect on the industry growth differential (1.4%).²⁰

All specifications already account for the possibility of contemporaneous effects from labor and product market regulation. In column 6, we further checked for the potential confounding role of short run shocks. This amounts to distinguishing whether low regulation induces faster growth by service intensive industries or rather facilitates downstream firms exploiting industry-level worldwide short run shocks. While still of interest, evidence in favor of the second mechanism would imply that absent these shocks, deregulation would have no effects on growth. Fisman and Sarria-Allende, (2004) raised this point in the case of finance, suggesting a test for robustness to short run shocks obtained interacting the country-level variable of interest with a direct measure of worldwide industry-specific shocks (see the Table note for a detailed description of how we obtained such measure). The underlying idea is simple: if estimates in column 5 were to reflect short run shocks, they should be dominated by direct measures of the opportunities of expansion faced by different industries. Interestingly, our results indicate that lower regulation of professional services (but not of energy) does help accommodating short run shocks. On the other hand, however, our previous findings are unaffected and still statistically significant.²¹

Data limitations (e.g. the lack of comparable data on prices, the quality or efficiency of each of the four services, etc.) prevent a thorough analysis of the reasons why regulation is more relevant in some services than others. Interestingly, however, our results highlight the relevance of two sectors (energy and professional services) that have recently attracted

²⁰ Unlike the case of professional services, the OECD measure of energy regulation is available before 1996, allowing in principle to focus on a longer growth period. Unfortunately, as we go back in time the number of missing information on the dependent variables rapidly increases, complicating the comparison of estimates. As an example, the Supplementary Appendix shows the results obtained when the specification in column 1, Table 8 is considered, and growth rates are computed starting in various years from 1980 to 1996. We always estimate negative coefficients which become statistically insignificant starting in the mid-1980s, when the number of observations becomes nearly a half with respect to those available in 1996.

increasing attention by policymakers in many developed economies.²² Our findings can therefore be used to infer the potential growth effects of competition policies that are high in the current policy agenda: those addressing barriers to entry in energy and conduct regulation in professional services. Our estimates imply that the complete removal of the two main determinants of conduct regulation, that is (a) bans to comparative or price advertising and (b) the regulation of price and tariffs, would imply the Textiles-Transport equipment growth differential to rise by 0.3 and 0.5 percentage points, respectively.²³ As to the energy market, our findings imply the industry growth differential associated to (a) creating a liberalized wholesale market for electricity, (b) allowing third party access to the electricity and gas transmission grid, or (c) imposing the separation of ownership between energy production (or import) and its distribution would increase by 0.3, 0.7 and 0.9 percentage points per year, respectively.

7. Conclusions

Growing concerns that high levels of regulation might not reflect public interest have motivated a number of academic and policy-oriented researches aimed at evaluating the impact of regulatory barriers on the performance of regulated firms. We contribute to this debate highlighting the non-negligible indirect effects of anti-competitive regulation on downstream industries, focusing on the case of service inputs. Our results indicate that service regulation has a significant negative impact on the growth rate of value added, productivity and exports of service dependent industries. Interestingly, the impact of regulation appears to be particularly relevant in the case of those service activities (energy supply and professional services) the recent competition policy debate has been focusing on most intensively, both in Europe and in

²¹ In the Supplementary Appendix, we show that our previous results on the aggregate effect of regulation (see Tab. 4) are also robust to accounting for a measure of global opportunities.

²² See the European Commission “Third Legislative Package on Energy Markets” (July 2009), promoting among other things the unbundling of network operation from supply and generation in energy, and the Commission report on “Competition in Professional Services” (February 2004), urging “the reform of unjustified restrictions in the professional services sector”. See also the chapter on Structural Policy Priorities in “Going for Growth” (OECD, 2009).

²³ For each service sector, the OECD regulation index $X_{c,s}$ is obtained as the weighted average of several sub-indexes measuring the extent of regulation in different areas (see the Data Appendix). The thought exercises reported in the text are obtained considering the change in the $X_{c,s}$ implied by the maximum possible variation of each of the sub-indexes. In the case of regulation of prices and fees in professions, for example, this would correspond to moving from having “minimum prices in all services” (as in the case of legal service in Italy) to “no regulation” (as in the case of accounting service in Canada).

other developed countries. Also, our findings suggest the payoffs from lower service regulation would be more significant the larger the extent of the domestic market.

Our results leave several interesting questions open to future research. On one hand, the increased availability of detailed firm-level data should allow disentangling whether the aggregate growth effects we estimated here are mainly due to entry and exit of firms, to the performance of existing firms or both. On the other, it would be important to look deeper into the mechanisms underlying our findings, focusing on how regulation affects the industrial organization of services (for example, in terms of number and size of firms, of turnover rates etc), on how this shapes service market outcomes and, eventually, the patterns of international specialization and comparative advantages.

Bibliography

- Alesina, A., Ardagna, S., Nicoletti, G. and Schiantarelli, F. (2005). 'Regulation and Investment', *Journal of the European Economic Association*, vol. 3(4), pp. 791-825.
- Allegra, E., Forni, M., Grillo, M. and Magnani, L. (2004). 'Antitrust Policy and National Growth: Some Evidence from Italy', *Giornale degli Economisti e Annali di Economia*, vol. 63, pp. 69-86.
- Armington, P. S. (1969). 'A Theory of Demand for Products Distinguished by Place of Production', *IMF Staff Papers*, vol. 16, pp. 159-178.
- Armstrong M. and D.E.M. Sappington (2006). 'Regulation, Competition, and Liberalization', *Journal of Economic Literature*, Vol. XLIV, 325-366
- Arnold, J., Javorcik, S. and Matoo. A. (2007). 'Does Services Liberalization Benefit Manufacturing Firms? Evidence from Czech Republic', *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, N. 4109.
- Arnold, J., Nicoletti, G. and Scarpetta, S. (2008). 'Product Market Policies, Allocative Efficiency and Productivity: a Cross-Country Analysis', *OECD Economics Department Working Papers*, N. 616.
- Bassanini, A., Nunziata, L. and Venn, D. (2009), 'Job protection legislation and productivity growth in OECD countries', *Economic Policy*, vol. 24, pp. 349-402.
- Bertrand, M. and Kramartz, F. (2002). 'Does Entry Regulation Hinder Job Creation? Evidence From The French Retail Industry', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 117(4), pp. 1369-1413.
- Caballero, R., Cowan, K., Engel, E. and Micco, A. (2006). 'Effective Labour Regulation and Microeconomic Flexibility', *Cowles Foundation Discussion Paper*, N. 1480
- Carlin, W. and Mayer, C. (2003). 'Finance, investment, and growth', *Journal of Financial Economics*, vol. 69(1), pp. 191-226.
- Ciccone, A. and Matsuyama, K. (1996). 'Start-up Costs and Pecuniary Externalities as Barriers to Economic Development', *Journal of Development Economics*, vol. 49, pp. 33-59.
- Ciccone, A. and Papaioannou, E. (2006). 'Adjustment to Target Capital, Finance and Growth', *CEPR Discussion Paper*, N. 5969.
- Ciccone, A. and Papaioannou, E. (2007). 'Red Tape and Delayed Entry', *Journal of the European Economic Association*, vol. 5, pp. 444-458.
- Claessens, S., and, Laeven, L. (2003). 'Financial Development, Property Rights, and Growth', *Journal of Finance*, vol. 58(6), pp. 2401-2436.
- Conway, P., de Rosa, D., Nicoletti, G. and Steiner, F. (2006). 'Product Market Regulation and Productivity Convergence', *OECD Economic Studies*, N. 43.

- Conway, P. and Nicoletti, G. (2006). 'Product Market Regulation in the Non-Manufacturing Sectors of OECD Countries: Measurement and Highlights', *OECD Economics Department Working Papers*, N. 530.
- Cuñat, A., and Melitz, M. J. (2007). 'Volatility, Labor Market Flexibility, and the Pattern of Comparative Advantage', *NBER Working Papers*, N. 13062.
- Djankov, S., La Porta, R., Lopes-de-Silanes, F. and Shleifer A. (2002). 'The Regulation of Entry', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 117, pp. 1-37.
- Faini, R., Haskel, J., Barba Navaretti, G., Scarpa, C. and Wey, C. (2006). 'Contrasting Europe's decline: do product market reforms help?', in (Boeri T. et al., eds.), *Structural Reforms without Prejudices*, Oxford University Press.
- Favara, G. (2003). 'An Empirical Reassessment of the Relationship Between Finance and Growth', *IMF Working Paper*, N. 03/123.
- Fisman, R. and Sarria-Allende, V. (2004). 'Regulation of Entry and the Distortion of Industrial Organization', *NBER Working Paper*, N. 10929.
- Fonseca, R. and Utrero, N. (2005). 'Financial Development, Labor and Market Regulations and Growth', *Document de Recherche EPEE*, N. 05-05.
- Helpman, E. and Krugman, P. (1985). *Market Structure and Foreign Trade*, Cambridge (MA): The MIT Press.
- Hoekman B., H. Kee and M. Olarreaga, (2004). "Tariffs, Entry Regulation and Markups: Country Size Matters," *The B.E. Journal of Macroeconomics*, Berkeley Electronic Press, vol. 0(1).
- Klapper, L, Laeven, L. and Rajan, R. G. (2006). 'Entry Regulation as a Barrier to Entrepreneurship', *Journal of Financial Economics*, vol. 82, pp.591-629.
- Koyama, T. and Golub, S. S. (2006). 'OECD's FDI Regulatory Restrictiveness Index: Revision and Extension to more Economies', *OECD Working Papers on International Investment*, 2006/4.
- Levchenko, A. A. (2007). 'Institutional Quality and International Trade', *Review of Economic Studies*, vol. 74, pp. 791–819.
- Martin, R., Roma, M. and Vansteenkiste, I. (2005). 'Regulatory Reforms in Selected EU Network Industries', *ECB Occasional Papers Series*, N.28.
- Manning, M. J. (2003). 'Finance Causes Growth: Can We Be So Sure?', *The BE Journals in Macroeconomics: Contributions to Macroeconomics*, Vol. 3, Article 12.
- Midelfart, K. H., Overman, H. G. and Venables, A. J. (2003). 'Monetary Union and the Economic Geography of Europe', *Journal of Common Market Studies*, vol. 41, pp. 847-868.
- Nicoletti, G. and Scarpetta, S. (2003). 'Regulation, productivity and growth: OECD evidence', *Economic Policy*, vol. 18, pp. 9-72.

- Nicoletti, G., Scarpetta, S. and Boylaud, O. (1999). 'Summary Indicators of Product Market Regulation with an Extension to Employment Protection Legislation', *OECD Economics Department Working Papers*, N. 226.
- Nunn, N. (2007). 'Relationship-specificity, Incomplete Contracts, and the Pattern of Trade', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 122(2), pp. 569-600.
- OECD (2009). *Going for growth*, Paris: OECD.
- Okuno-Fujiwara, M. (1988). 'Interdependence of industries, coordination failure and strategic promotion of an industry', *Journal of International Economics*, vol. 25(1-2), pp. 25-43.
- Papke, L. E. and Wooldridge, J. M. (1996). 'Econometric Methods for Fractional Response Variables with an Application to 401(k) Plan Participation Rates', *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, vol.11, pp. 619-632.
- Rajan, G. R. and Zingales, L. (1998). 'Financial Dependence and Growth', *American Economic Review*, vol. 88, pp. 559-586.
- Rodrick, D. (1996). 'Coordination Failures and Government Policy: A Model with Applications to East Asia and Eastern Europe', *Journal of International Economics*, vol. 40, pp. 1-22.
- Rodriguez-Clare, A. (1996). 'The division of labor and economic development' *Journal of Development Economics*, vol. 49(1), pp. 3-32.
- Rousseau, P. L. and Wachtel, P. (1998). 'Financial Intermediation and Economic Performance: Historical Evidence from Five Industrialized Countries', *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, vol. 30, pp. 657-678.

Data Appendix

Country sample:

Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States.

Industry sample:

“Food products, beverages and tobacco” (Isic Rev. 3 = “15-16”), “Textiles and textile products” (Isic Rev. 3 = “17-18”), “Leather, leather products and footwear” (Isic Rev. 3 = “19”) , “Wood and products of wood and cork” (Isic Rev. 3 = “20”) , “Pulp, paper, paper products, printing and publishing” (Isic Rev. 3 = “21-22”), “Coke, refined petroleum products and nuclear fuel” (Isic Rev. 3 = “23”), “Chemicals and chemical products” (Isic Rev. 3 = “24”), “Rubber and plastics products” (Isic Rev. 3 = “25”), “Other non-metallic mineral products” (Isic Rev. 3 = “26”), “Basic metals” (Isic Rev. 3 = “27”), “Fabricated metal products, except machinery and equipment” (Isic Rev. 3 = “28”), “Machinery and equipment, N.E.C.” (Isic Rev. 3 = “29”), “Electrical and optical equipment” (Isic Rev. 3 = “30-33”), “Transport equipment” (Isic Rev. 3 = “34-35”), “Manufacturing N.E.C., recycling” (Isic Rev. 3 = “36-37”).

Dependence of manufacturing industries on service inputs

Throughout most of the paper we use weights $w_{j,s}$ computed as the technical coefficients derived from the 1997 US Input-Output matrix. They are given by the elements of the matrix $T = M \text{diag}(\mathbf{y})^{-1}$ where M is the industry-by-industry (44×44) input-output matrix, \mathbf{y} is the (44×1) vector of industry output. In Table 4, col. 2, weights are instead computed as the product of the elements of the inverse Leontief matrix by a vector of the industry value added-to-output ratios. More specifically, let \mathbf{v} be the (44×1) vector of industry value added. The inverse Leontief matrix is $F = (I - T)^{-1}$ and satisfies $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{q}'F$, where $\mathbf{q} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{y})^{-1}\mathbf{v}$ is the vector of industry value added-to-output ratios. According to the last relation the value of production in each sector (normalized to one) is decomposed in the contribution of value added produced in all the sectors (\mathbf{q}) weighted with the (direct and indirect) measure of intersectoral dependence (F). For each industry, the relation can be written as $1_j = \sum_{k=1}^{44} q_k f_{k,j}$ with $k = 1, \dots, 44$. The indirect weights used in Table 4, col. 2 are given by the elements $q_k f_{k,j}$.

Data on regulation in selected non-manufacturing sectors

All the regulatory indicators range on a common (0-6) scale from least to most restrictive conditions for competition. Data are available for seven non-manufacturing sectors: electricity and gas supply, road freight, air passenger transport, rail transport, post and telecommunications and professional services (accounting, architects, engineers and legal services). For each sector, a set of sub-indexes is available covering different forms of regulation: barriers to entry, vertical integration, market structure, price regulation, conduct regulation and public ownership. See Table 1 and the main text for a description of the sub-indexes we focused on in the analysis. See Nicoletti et al. (1999) and Conway and Nicoletti (2006) for a complete description of the OECD-PMR database.

Table 1: Variables definition and sources

| Variable | Definitions and sources |
|-----------------------|---|
| Industry level | |
| $w_{j,s}$ | Industry dependence on service s , computed on 1997 US Input-Output accounts. It includes energy ($w_{j,ENERGY}$), telecommunications and post ($w_{j,TLCPOST}$), transports ($w_{j,TRANSP}$) and professional services ($w_{j,PROSERV}$). Source: our calculations. See also the Data Appendix. |
| ED_j | Industry dependence on external finance, defined as capital expenditure minus internal funds. Source: de Serres <i>et al.</i> (2006) on Thomson Financial Worldscope database. |
| $LABINT_j$ | Industry labor intensity measured as the ratio between employees and total assets in the US in 1996. Source: OECD STAN database (total assets are computed from investment data using the perpetual inventory method with a 15% depreciation rate). |
| $GROP_j$ | Annual compounded growth rate of production in real terms in industry j in USA over the 1996-2002 period. Source: OECD STAN database. |
| $\hat{w}_{j,s}$ | Industry dependence on service s net of regulation- and country-specific determinants of inputs demand. For each of the four service sectors $\hat{w}_{j,s}$ have been estimated according to the following two-steps procedure (see also Ciccone and Papaioannou, 2006): (a) Regress country-specific input-output coefficients $w_{j,s,c}$ on country dummies, industry dummies and industry dummies interacted with country-level regulation in sector s ; the most deregulated country \bar{c} is excluded from the regression and the estimation follows Papke and Wooldridge (1996) to account for the fact that the dependent variable is fractional. (b) Obtain $\hat{w}_{j,s}$ as the fitted values of $w_{j,s,c}$ when regulation is set at country \bar{c} levels and country fixed effects are set to zero. Country \bar{c} is set to either the USA sectors (tab. 7, col. 5) or Great Britain (for energy and transport), USA ($TLCPOST$) and Finland ($PROSERV$) for $ENERGY$ and $TRANSP$, $TLCPOST$ and $PROSERV$, respectively (Table 7, column 6). |
| $GLOPP_{j,s}$ | Estimated world-average industry growth opportunities. For each of the four service sectors global opportunities ($GLOPP_j$) are the estimated industry value added growth over the period 1996-2002 obtained according to the following two-steps procedure (see also Ciccone and Papaioannou, 2006): (a) Regress $GROWTH_{j,c}$ on country dummies, industry dummies and industry dummies interacted with country-level regulation in sector s ; the USA are excluded from the regression. (b) Obtain $GLOPP_j$ as the predicted values of $GROWTH_{j,c}$ for the USA. |
| Country level | |
| $X_{c,s}$ | Regulation indexes on a 0-6 scale (from least to most restrictive conditions) in 1996 in four non-manufacturing industries. $X_{c,s}$ includes $X_{c,ENERGY}$, $X_{c,TLCPOST}$, $X_{c,TRANSP}$, $X_{c,PROSERV}$ referring to energy (electricity and gas), communications (posts and telecommunications), transports (air, rail and road), professional services (legal, accounting, engineering and architects). Source: OECD Product market Regulation database. $X_{c,ENERGY}$ takes into account entry barriers and the degree of vertical integration in electricity and gas supply; $X_{c,TLCPOST}$ accounts for entry barriers in postal and telecommunications services; $X_{c,TRANSP}$ accounts for entry barriers in air, rail and road services and on vertical integration in rail; $X_{c,PROSERV}$ accounts for entry barriers and the regulation of market conduct in legal services, accounting services, engineers and architects. See also Data Appendix. |
| FD_c | Financial development in country c measured as Private Credit by Deposit Money Banks over GDP in 1996. Source: World Bank's financial development and structure database (based on IMF's Financial Statistics). |
| $ACCSTAN_c$ | Indicator of financial disclosure in 1983. Source: Rajan, Zingales (1998). |
| LMR_c | Indicator of employment protection in 1988-1995. Source: Fonseca, Utrero (2005). |
| $COST_c$ | Direct start-up costs of obtaining legal status to operate a firm as a share of per capita GDP in 1999. Source: Djankov <i>et al.</i> (2002). |

Table 1: Variables definition and sources (continued)

| Variable | Definition and source |
|--------------------------|--|
| Industry - Country level | |
| $GROWTH_{j,c}$ | Annual compounded growth rate of real value added in industry j in country c over the 1996-2002 period. Source: OECD STAN database. |
| $NGROWTH_{j,c}$ | Annual compounded growth rate of nominal value added in industry j in country c over the 1996-2002 period. Source: OECD STAN database. |
| $DEFGROWTH_{j,c}$ | Annual compounded growth rate of the value added implicit deflator in industry j in country c over the 1996-2002 period. Source: OECD STAN database. |
| $LPGROWTH_{j,c}$ | Annual compounded growth rate of labor productivity (value added at constant prices per employee) in industry j in country c over the 1996-2002 period. Source: OECD STAN database. |
| $EXGROWTH_{j,c}$ | Annual compounded growth rate of exports at constant prices (current exports are deflated with the value added deflator) in industry j in country c over the 1996-2002 period. Source: OECD STAN database. |
| $SHARE_{j,c}$ | Share of industry j in total value added in manufacturing in country c in 1996. Source: OECD STAN database. |
| $EXSHARE_{j,c}$ | Share of industry j in exports in manufacturing in country c in 1996. Source: OECD STAN database. |
| $LLP_{j,c}$ | Natural logarithm of labor productivity (value added at constant prices per employee) in industry j in country c in 1996. Source: OECD STAN database. |
| $SERVREG_{j,c}$ | Index of exposure of manufacturing industry j to regulation in four service sectors (energy, communications, transport and professional services). It is computed as $\sum_s w_{j,s} X_{c,s}$ where $s = ENERGY, TLCPOST, TRASP, PROSERV$. Source: OECD Product market Regulation database and USA 1997 Input-Output accounts. |
| $DSERVREG_{j,c}$ | Difference between $SERVREG_{j,c}$ in 1996 and in 2002. Source: OECD Product market Regulation database and USA 1997 Input-Output accounts. |
| $POWN_{j,c}$ | Index of exposure of manufacturing industry j to the degree of public ownership in three service sectors (energy, communications, transport). It is computed as $\sum_s w_{j,s} POWN_{c,s}$ where $POWN_{c,s}$ is an index measuring on a 0-6 scale (increasing with the role of public sector) the degree of public ownership in 1996 and $s = ENERGY, TLCPOST$ and $TRASP$. Source: OECD Product market Regulation database and USA 1997 Input-Output accounts. |
| $FDIREG_{j,c}$ | Index of exposure of manufacturing industry j to restriction to foreign investment in four service sectors. It is computed as $\sum_s w_{j,s} Z_{c,s}$ where $Z_{c,s}$ are FDI restriction indicators in electricity, telecommunications, transport and professional services. Source: Koyama and Golub (2006) and USA 1997 Input-Output accounts. |

Table 2: Summary statistics

| Variable | Obs | Mean | St. Dev. | Min | Max |
|--|-----|-------|----------|--------|-------|
| Industry level | | | | | |
| Dependence on energy [$w_{j,ENERGY}$] | 15 | 0.018 | 0.010 | 0.007 | 0.039 |
| Dependence on communications [$w_{j,TLCPOST}$] | 15 | 0.004 | 0.001 | 0.002 | 0.007 |
| Dependence on transports [$w_{j,TRANSP}$] | 15 | 0.030 | 0.014 | 0.011 | 0.063 |
| Dependence on professional services [$w_{j,PROSERV}$] | 15 | 0.027 | 0.011 | 0.013 | 0.055 |
| External dependence [ED_j] | 15 | 0.697 | 1.595 | -0.450 | 6.200 |
| Labor intensity [$LABINT_j$] | 15 | 0.028 | 0.013 | 0.004 | 0.052 |
| Growth opportunities [$GROP_j$] | 15 | 0.010 | 0.029 | -0.028 | 0.093 |
| Country level | | | | | |
| Regulation in energy in 1996 [$X_{c,ENERGY}$] | 16 | 4.475 | 1.338 | 1.808 | 6.000 |
| Regulation in communications in 1996 [$X_{c,TLCPOST}$] | 16 | 2.868 | 1.614 | 0.000 | 5.680 |
| Regulation in transports in 1996 [$X_{c,TRASP}$] | 16 | 2.949 | 1.062 | 1.530 | 5.133 |
| Reg. in professional services in 1996 [$X_{c,PROSERV}$] | 16 | 2.464 | 1.160 | 0.830 | 4.178 |
| Financial development [FD_c] | 16 | 0.718 | 0.272 | 0.304 | 1.141 |
| Labor market regulation [LMR_c] | 16 | 1.359 | 0.491 | 0.300 | 1.933 |
| Red tape costs [$COST_c$] | 16 | 0.146 | 0.141 | 0.012 | 0.586 |
| Financial disclosure [$ACCSTAN_c$] | 16 | 0.647 | 0.122 | 0.420 | 0.810 |
| Industry - Country level | | | | | |
| Value added growth 1996-2002 (real terms) [$GROWTH_{j,c}$] | 220 | 0.018 | 0.034 | -0.081 | 0.204 |
| Val. added gr. 1996-2002 (nominal terms) [$NGROWTH_{j,c}$] | 220 | 0.032 | 0.038 | -0.123 | 0.221 |
| Implicit deflator growth 1996-2002 [$DEFGROWTH_{j,c}$] | 220 | 0.014 | 0.030 | -0.095 | 0.189 |
| Labor productivity growth 1996-2002 [$LPGROWTH_{j,c}$] | 220 | 0.025 | 0.026 | -0.051 | 0.162 |
| Export growth 1996-2002 [$EXGROWTH_{j,c}$] | 205 | 0.050 | 0.050 | -0.094 | 0.194 |
| Value added share in 1996 [$SHARE_{j,c}$] | 220 | 0.069 | 0.047 | 0.001 | 0.234 |
| Log labor productivity in 1996 [$LLP_{j,c}$] | 220 | 3.864 | 0.481 | 2.821 | 6.932 |
| Export share in 1996 [$EXSHARE_{j,c}$] | 220 | 0.068 | 0.068 | 0.000 | 0.364 |
| Service regulation [$SERVREG_{j,c}$] | 220 | 0.246 | 0.109 | 0.070 | 0.628 |
| Change in service deregulation [$DSERVREG_{j,c}$] | 220 | 0.080 | 0.054 | 0.001 | 0.291 |

Table 3: Correlation between regulation indicators in four service sectors in 1996

| | Energy [$X_{c,ENERGY}$] | Communications [$X_{c,TLCPOST}$] | Transports [$X_{c,TRASP}$] | Prof. serv. [$X_{c,PROSERV}$] |
|---|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Energy [$X_{c,ENERGY}$] | 1.000 | | | |
| Communications [$X_{c,TLCPOST}$] | 0.549 | 1.000 | | |
| Transports [$X_{c,TRASP}$] | 0.801 | 0.541 | 1.000 | |
| Professional services [$X_{c,PROSERV}$] | 0.497 | 0.519 | 0.645 | 1.000 |

Table 4: Service regulation and growth

| | (1) Baseline, direct weights | (2) Baseline, indirect weights | (3) Financial Development 1 | (4) Financial Development 2 | (5) Average 1996-02 regulation | (6) Deregulation (1996-2002) |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| Service regulation [$SERVREG_{j,c}$] | -0.172* (0.069) | -0.170* (0.072) | -0.176** (0.068) | -0.158* (0.071) | -0.198** (0.075) | -0.287** (0.080) |
| Financial dev. \times external dep. [$FD_c \times ED_j$] | | | 0.010* (0.004) | | 0.011* (0.004) | 0.009* (0.004) |
| Accounting stand. \times ext. dep. [$ACCSTAN_c \times ED_j$] | | | | 0.013+ (0.007) | | |
| Change in service regulation [$DSERVREG_{j,c}$] | | | | | | 0.320** (0.116) |
| Initial industry share [$SHARE_{j,c}$] | 0.189** (0.071) | 0.198** (0.069) | 0.169* (0.067) | 0.187** (0.072) | 0.174** (0.066) | 0.163** (0.062) |
| Constant | 0.037 (0.023) | 0.048+ (0.025) | 0.006 (0.019) | -0.001 (0.020) | 0.005 (0.019) | 0.014 (0.019) |
| Observations | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 |
| R-squared | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.68 | 0.69 |

+ significant at 10%; * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%

Notes:

The dependent variable is the annual compounded growth rate of real value added at the country-industry level for the period 1996-2002 ($GROWTH_{j,c}$). $SERVREG_{j,c}$ measures exposure to service regulation at the country-industry level as a weighted average ($\sum_s w_{j,s} * X_{c,s}$) of country-level anti-competitive regulation indexes from the OECD-PMR databases. Service regulation ($X_{c,s}$) is measured in 1996 except in col. (5) where it is the 1996-2002 average value. Interaction weights $w_{j,s}$ are (“direct”) technical coefficients of dependence between service sector s and manufacturing industry j computed on the 1997 USA Input-Output matrix, except for col. (2) where they are measured to account for both direct and indirect dependence (see the Data Appendix for computational details). Financial development is measured as Private Credit by Deposit Money Banks over GDP in 1996 (FD_c , col. 3) and as accounting standards in 1983 ($ACCSTAN_c$, col. 4). It is interacted with External dependence (ED_j), an industry-level measure of reliance on external finance obtained from US firm-level data. Both interactions follow Rajan and Zingales (1998). $DSERVREG_{j,c}$ measures exposure to service deregulation obtained as $\sum_s w_{j,s} * \Delta X_{c,s}$, where $\Delta X = X_{1996} - X_{2002}$ is the 1996-2002 change in regulation of service s in country c . $SHARE_{j,c}$ indicates the industry share in total value added in manufacturing in 1996. All regressions include country- and industry-fixed effects and use (employment) weighted least squares as estimation method. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

Table 5: Financial development, prices and nominal growth

| | Prices | | | Nominal growth | | |
|--|------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | (1) Service Regulation | (2) Financial Development | (3) Regulation and Fin. Dev. | (4) Service Regulation | (5) Financial Development | (6) Regulation and Fin. Dev. |
| Service regulation [<i>SERVREG_{j,c}</i>] | 0.210** (0.072) | | 0.211** (0.070) | -0.004 (0.078) | | -0.006 (0.078) |
| Financial dev. × external dep. [<i>FD_c × ED_j</i>] | | -0.009* (0.005) | -0.009* (0.004) | | 0.005 (0.005) | 0.005 (0.004) |
| Initial industry share [<i>SHARE_{j,c}</i>] | | | | 0.027 (0.049) | 0.017 (0.048) | 0.017 (0.050) |
| Constant | 0.015 (0.014) | 0.056** (0.006) | 0.019 (0.013) | 0.037* (0.016) | 0.036** (0.012) | 0.037* (0.016) |
| Observations | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 |
| R-squared | 0.62 | 0.60 | 0.63 | 0.64 | 0.64 | 0.64 |

+ significant at 10%; * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%

Notes:

In cols. 1-3 the dependent variable is the annual compounded growth rate of value added implicit deflator at the industry-country level for the period 1996-2002 (*DEFGROWTH_{j,c}*); in cols. 4-6 the dependent variable is the annual compounded growth rate of nominal value added at the industry-country level for the period 1996-2002 (*NGROWTH_{j,c}*). *SERVREG_{j,c}* measures exposure to service regulation at the country-industry level as a weighted average ($\sum_s w_{j,s} * X_{c,s}$) of country-level anti-competitive regulation indexes from the OECD-PMR databases. Service regulation ($X_{c,s}$) is measured in 1996. Interaction weights $w_{j,s}$ are (“direct”) technical coefficients of dependence between service sector s and manufacturing industry j computed on the 1997 USA Input-Output matrix. Financial development is measured as Private Credit by Deposit Money Banks over GDP in 1996 (FD_c) and is interacted with External dependence (ED_j), an industry-level measure of reliance on external finance obtained from US firm-level data. *SHARE_{j,c}* indicates the industry share in total value added in manufacturing in 1996. All regressions include country- and industry-fixed effects and use (employment) weighted least squares as estimation method. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

Table 6: Service regulation, productivity and exports

| | (1) Baseline, direct weights | (2) Baseline, indirect weights | (3) Financial Development 1 | (4) Financial Development 2 | (5) Average 1996-02 regulation | (6) Deregulation (1996-2002) |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|
| Panel A: Productivity growth | | | | | | |
| Service regulation [$SERVREG_{j,c}$] | -0.201* (0.081) | -0.218* (0.100) | -0.202* (0.080) | -0.194* (0.085) | -0.228* (0.090) | -0.280** (0.106) |
| Financial dev. \times external dep. [$FD_c \times ED_j$] | | | 0.009 (0.006) | | 0.010 (0.006) | 0.008 (0.005) |
| Accounting stand. \times ext. dep. [$ACCSTAN_c \times ED_j$] | | | | 0.006 (0.006) | | |
| Change in service regulation [$DSERVREG_{j,c}$] | | | | | | 0.228 (0.158) |
| Initial labor productivity [$LLP_{j,c}$] | 0.031** (0.012) | 0.032* (0.012) | 0.028* (0.012) | 0.031** (0.012) | 0.030** (0.011) | 0.030** (0.011) |
| Constant | -0.079+ (0.047) | -0.062 (0.048) | -0.069 (0.047) | -0.082+ (0.047) | -0.073 (0.046) | -0.066 (0.045) |
| Observations | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 |
| R-squared | 0.58 | 0.58 | 0.59 | 0.58 | 0.60 | 0.60 |
| Panel B: Export growth | | | | | | |
| Service regulation [$SERVREG_{j,c}$] | -0.213+ (0.108) | -0.249* (0.111) | -0.215* (0.106) | -0.202+ (0.108) | -0.242* (0.119) | -0.297* (0.121) |
| Financial dev. \times external dep. [$FD_c \times ED_j$] | | | 0.005 (0.007) | | 0.006 (0.007) | 0.005 (0.006) |
| Accounting stand. \times ext. dep. [$ACCSTAN_c \times ED_j$] | | | | 0.010 (0.013) | | |
| Change in service regulation [$DSERVREG_{j,c}$] | | | | | | 0.229 (0.179) |
| Initial industry export share [$EXSHARE_{j,c}$] | -0.013 (0.054) | -0.007 (0.053) | -0.017 (0.052) | -0.015 (0.055) | -0.016 (0.052) | -0.024 (0.050) |
| Constant | 0.060** (0.018) | 0.081** (0.025) | 0.059** (0.018) | 0.055** (0.019) | 0.007 (0.023) | 0.070** (0.019) |
| Observations | 205 | 205 | 205 | 205 | 205 | 205 |
| R-squared | 0.72 | 0.72 | 0.72 | 0.72 | 0.72 | 0.72 |

+ significant at 10%; * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%

Notes:

In Panel A the dependent variable is the annual compounded growth rate of labor productivity (value added per employed worker) at the industry-country level for the period 1996-2002 ($LPGROWTH_{j,c}$). In Panel B the dependent variable is the annual compounded growth rate of exports at the industry-country level for the period 1996-2002 ($EXPROWTH_{j,c}$). $SERVREG_{j,c}$ measures exposure to service regulation at the country-industry level as a weighted average ($\sum_s w_{j,s} * X_{c,s}$) of country-level anti-competitive regulation indexes from the OECD-PMR databases. Service regulation ($X_{c,s}$) is measured in 1996 except in col. (5) where it is the 1996-2002 average value. Interaction weights $w_{j,s}$ are (“direct”) technical coefficients of dependence between service sector s and manufacturing industry j computed on the 1997 USA Input-Output matrix, except for col. (2) where they are measured to account for both direct and indirect dependence (see the Data Appendix for computational details). Financial development is measured as Private Credit by Deposit Money Banks over GDP in 1996 (FD_c , col. 3) and as accounting standards in 1983 ($ACCSTAN_c$, col. 4). It is interacted with External dependence (ED_j), an industry-level measure of reliance on external finance obtained from US firm-level data. Both interactions follow Rajan and Zingales (1998). $DSERVREG_{j,c}$ measures exposure to service deregulation obtained as $\sum_s w_{j,s} * \Delta X_{c,s}$, where $\Delta X = X_{1996} - X_{2002}$ is the 1996-2002 change in regulation of service s in country c . $LLP_{j,c}$ indicates the log of labor productivity in 1996. $EXSHARE_{j,c}$ indicates the industry share in total exports in manufacturing in 1996. All regressions include country- and industry-fixed effects and use (employment) weighted least squares as estimation method. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

Table 7: Robustness checks

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
|---|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | Other regulation measures | | | | | Weights | | Influential obs. | |
| | Empl. Protect. | Red tape | FDI regulation | Public Own. | All | IV- US | IV-lowest country | Most/least dependent industries | Most/least regulated countries |
| Service regulation [<i>SERVREG_{j,c}</i>] | -0.191** (0.071) | -0.203** (0.067) | -0.182** (0.068) | -0.232** (0.074) | -0.272** (0.073) | -0.193* (0.087) | -0.218* (0.105) | -0.274** (0.088) | -0.180* (0.072) |
| Fin. dev. × external dep. [<i>FD_c × ED_j</i>] | 0.011** (0.004) | 0.010* (0.004) | 0.011** (0.004) | 0.010** (0.004) | 0.012** (0.004) | 0.010* (0.004) | 0.010* (0.004) | 0.008* (0.004) | 0.013** (0.004) |
| Lab. market reg. × lab. int. [<i>LMR_c × LABINT_j</i>] | -0.400 (0.323) | | | | -0.578+ (0.304) | | | | |
| Red tape costs × gr. opp. [<i>COST_c × GROP_j</i>] | | -1.449+ (0.871) | | | -1.599+ (0.871) | | | | |
| FDI restrictions [<i>FDIREG_{j,c}</i>] | | | 0.879 (0.794) | | 0.807 (0.806) | | | | |
| Public ownership [<i>POWN_{j,e}</i>] | | | | 0.084+ (0.047) | 0.059 (0.047) | | | | |
| Initial industry share [<i>SHARE_{j,c}</i>] | 0.182** (0.067) | 0.135+ (0.069) | 0.167* (0.067) | 0.152* (0.063) | 0.135* (0.066) | 0.167* (0.068) | 0.165* (0.068) | 0.155* (0.071) | 0.184* (0.073) |
| Constant | 0.019 (0.024) | 0.015 (0.019) | -0.009 (0.022) | 0.003 (0.019) | 0.020 (0.025) | 0.039 (0.025) | 0.014 (0.026) | 0.055* (0.027) | 0.035 (0.024) |
| Observations | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 | 188 | 193 |
| R-squared | 0.68 | 0.68 | 0.68 | 0.68 | 0.70 | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.69 |

+ significant at 10%; * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%

Notes:

The dependent variable is the annual compounded growth rate of real value added at the industry-country level for the period 1996-2002 ($GROWTH_{j,c}$). $SERVREG_{j,c}$ measures exposure to service regulation at the country-industry level as a weighted average ($\sum_s w_{j,s} * X_{c,s}$) of country-level anti-competitive regulation indexes from the OECD-PMR databases. Service regulation ($X_{c,s}$) is measured in 1996. Interaction weights $w_{j,s}$ are (“direct”) technical coefficients of dependence between service sector s and manufacturing industry j computed on the 1997 USA Input-Output matrix. Financial development is measured as Private Credit by Deposit Money Banks over GDP in 1996 (FD_c) and is interacted with External dependence (ED_j), an industry-level measure of reliance on external finance obtained from US firm-level data. Labor market regulation (LMR_c) is an indicator of employment protection in 1988-1995 and is interacted with labor intensity ($LABINT_j$) computed as the ratio between employees and total assets in the USA in 1996. Red tape costs ($COST_c$) are direct start-up costs of obtaining legal status to operate a firm as a share of per capita GDP in 1999; this variable is interacted with growth opportunities ($GROP_j$) measured as the growth rate of real value added growth in industry j in USA over the 1996-2002 period. FDI restrictions in services ($FDIREG_{j,c}$) is an index of exposure of each manufacturing industry j to the degree of FDI regulation in four service sectors (electricity, telecommunications, transport and professional services). It is computed as $\sum_s w_{j,s} Z_{c,s}$ where $s = ELECTRICITY, TLCPOST, TRASP, PROSERV$ where $Z_{c,s}$ are FDI restriction indicators on a 0-1 scale (increasing with the degree of restrictiveness). Weights $w_{j,s}$ are the technical coefficients computed on the USA 1997 Input-Output matrix (see also Data Appendix). Public ownership ($POWN_{j,c}$) is an index of exposure of industry j to the degree of public ownership in services. It is computed as $\sum_s w_{j,s} POWN_{c,s}$ where $POWN_{c,s}$ is an index measuring on a 0-6 scale (increasing with the role of public sector) the degree of public ownership in 1996 and $s = ENERGY, TLCPOST$ and $TRASP$. Cols. 6 and 7 report IV estimates obtained using $\sum_s \hat{w}_{j,s} X_{c,s}$ as instrument for $SERVREG_{j,c}$. $\hat{w}_{j,s}$ is the estimated industry j 's dependence on service s net of regulation- and country-specific determinants of factor demand. See Table 1 and Section 5 in the main text for more information on the IV approach. Results in cols 8 and 9 are obtained removing from the sample the most and least intensive industrial users of regulated services (“Other non-metallic mineral products” and “Machinery and equipment N.E.C.”) and the most and least service-regulated countries (Greece and Sweden), respectively. $SHARE_{j,c}$ is the industry share in total value added in manufacturing in 1996. All regressions include country- and industry-fixed effects and use (employment) weighted least squares as estimation method. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

Table 8: Service regulation, growth and country size

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| | Baseline | | | Including financial development | | | Including all controls | | |
| | All countries | Large countries | Small countries | All countries | Large countries | Small countries | All countries | Large countries | Small countries |
| Service regulation [<i>SERVREG_{j,c}</i>] | -0.172* (0.069) | -0.191* (0.080) | 0.019 (0.131) | -0.176** (0.068) | -0.182* (0.078) | 0.096 (0.141) | -0.272** (0.073) | -0.313** (0.086) | 0.107 (0.174) |
| Initial industry share [<i>SHARE_{j,c}</i>] | 0.189** (0.071) | 0.262** (0.098) | 0.072 (0.055) | 0.169* (0.067) | 0.226* (0.092) | 0.090 (0.055) | 0.135* (0.066) | 0.200* (0.092) | 0.048 (0.047) |
| Constant | 0.037 (0.023) | 0.051* (0.023) | 0.026 (0.018) | 0.006 (0.019) | 0.049* (0.022) | 0.021 (0.016) | 0.020 (0.025) | 0.036 (0.038) | 0.033 (0.030) |
| Observations | 220 | 113 | 107 | 220 | 113 | 107 | 220 | 113 | 107 |
| R-squared | 0.66 | 0.70 | 0.52 | 0.67 | 0.72 | 0.55 | 0.70 | 0.75 | 0.59 |

Notes:

The dependent variable is the annual compounded growth rate of real value added at the country-industry level for the period 1996-2002 ($GROWTH_{j,c}$). $SERVREG_{j,c}$ measures exposure to service regulation at the country-industry level as a weighted average ($\sum_s w_{j,s} * X_{c,s}$) of country-level anti-competitive regulation indexes from the OECD-PMR databases. Service regulation ($X_{c,s}$) is measured in 1996. Interaction weights $w_{j,s}$ are (“direct”) technical coefficients of dependence between service sector s and manufacturing industry j computed on the 1997 USA Input-Output matrix. Specifications in cols. 4-9 include (unreported) controls for financial development [$FD_c \times ED_j$]. In cols. 7-9 further account for (unreported) Labour market regulation [$LMR_c \times LABINT_j$], Red tape costs [$COST_c \times GROP_j$], FDI restrictions [$FDIREG_{j,c}$] and Public ownership [$POWN_{j,c}$] (see Table 1 for the definition of these variables). Large countries are Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Spain and the UK; small countries include Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Norway, Portugal and Sweden. All regressions include country- and industry-fixed effects and use (employment) weighted least squares as estimation method. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

Table 9: Sector-specific effects

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|--|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| | Energy services | Prof. services | Commun. services | Transp. services | All services | Rob. to GLOPP |
| Energy Regulation × Energy dependence [$X_{c,ENERGY} \times w_{j,ENERGY}$] | -0.482** (0.147) | | | | -0.540* (0.232) | -0.530* (0.232) |
| Prof. Serv. Regulation × Prof. Serv. dependence [$X_{c,PROSERV} \times w_{j,PROSERV}$] | | -0.286* (0.124) | | | -0.254* (0.118) | -0.259* (0.114) |
| Communications Regulation × Comm. dep. [$X_{c,TLCPOST} \times w_{j,TLCPOST}$] | | | -0.417 (1.193) | | 0.115 (1.147) | 0.206 (1.100) |
| Transports Regulation × Transports dependence [$X_{c,TRANSP} \times w_{j,TRANSP}$] | | | | -0.231 (0.160) | 0.101 (0.247) | 0.112 (0.246) |
| Energy Regulation × Global opportunities (energy) [$X_{c,ENERGY} \times GLOPP_{j,ENERGY}$] | | | | | | 0.038 (0.072) |
| Prof. Serv. Regulation × Global opp. (prof. serv.) [$X_{c,PROSERV} \times GLOPP_{j,PROSERV}$] | | | | | | -0.343** (0.131) |
| Financial dev. × external dep. [$FD_c \times ED_j$] | 0.010* (0.004) | 0.011** (0.004) | 0.010* (0.005) | 0.011* (0.005) | 0.011** (0.004) | 0.011** (0.004) |
| Initial industry share [$SHARE_{j,c}$] | 0.171* (0.067) | 0.156* (0.073) | 0.169* (0.069) | 0.167* (0.069) | 0.159* (0.069) | 0.182** (0.062) |
| Constant | 0.004 (0.017) | 0.014 (0.020) | -0.007 (0.022) | 0.004 (0.020) | 0.021 (0.030) | 0.039 (0.031) |
| Observations | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 |
| R-squared | 0.69 | 0.68 | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.70 | 0.71 |

+ significant at 10%; * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%

Notes:

The dependent variable is the annual compounded growth rate of real value added at the industry-country level for the period 1996-2002 ($GROWTH_{j,c}$). Variables $X_{c,s}$ * $w_{j,s}$ are interaction terms between country-level measures of regulation in energy, professional services, communications, transports in 1996 ($X_{c,s}$) and the corresponding industry-level indicators of dependence ($w_{j,s}$). Interaction weights $w_{j,s}$ are (“direct”) technical coefficients of dependence between service sector s and manufacturing industry j computed on the 1997 USA Input-Output matrix. Financial development is measured as Private Credit by Deposit Money Banks over GDP in 1996 (FD_c) and is interacted with External dependence (ED_j) an industry-level measure of reliance on external finance obtained from US firm-level data. $GLOPP_{j,ENERGY}$ and $GLOPP_{j,PROSERV}$ are the estimated industry value added growth in the USA. For each of the service sector $ENERGY$ and $PROSERV$, global opportunities ($GLOPP_{j,s}$) are obtained according to the following two-steps procedure: (a) Regress $GROWTH_{j,c}$ on country dummies, industry dummies and industry dummies interacted with country-level regulation in sector s ; USA are excluded from the regression. (b) Obtain $GLOPP_j$ as the predicted values of $GROWTH_{j,c}$ for the USA. $SHARE_{j,c}$ indicates the industry share in total value added in manufacturing in 1996. All regression include (unreported) controls for labor market regulation and red tape costs (see Table 1 for the definition of these variables). All regressions also include country- and industry-fixed effects and use (employment) weighted least squares as estimation method. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

Supplementary Appendix

to the paper

“Service regulation and growth: evidence from OECD countries”

by

Guglielmo Barone and Federico Cingano

August 2010

Table A1: Alternative determinants of international specialization and comparative advantages

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| | Value added growth | | | | Exports | |
| | Human Capital | Physical Capital | Both | Property Rights | Contract Enforcement (a) | Enforcement (b) |
| Service regulation [<i>SERVREG_{j,c}</i>] | -0.154* (0.066) | -0.174* (0.068) | -0.154* (0.067) | -0.176* (0.068) | -6.786* (3.011) | -3.688+ (2.032) |
| Financial dev. × external dep. [<i>FD_c × ED_j</i>] | 0.007+ (0.004) | 0.010* (0.004) | 0.007+ (0.004) | 0.010* (0.004) | 0.405** (0.144) | 0.298+ (0.158) |
| Human capital × skill intensity | 0.101* (0.048) | | 0.101* (0.048) | | | |
| Physical capital × physical capital intensity | | -0.468 (2.885) | 0.082 (2.790) | | | |
| Property rights × intangible intensity | | | | -0.001 (0.003) | | |
| Quality of contract enforcement × contract intensity | | | | | 0.144** (0.048) | |
| Quality of contract enforcement × institutional dependence | | | | | | 0.003* (0.001) |
| Initial industry share [<i>SHARE_{j,c}</i>] | 0.141* (0.064) | 0.169* (0.067) | 0.141* (0.064) | 0.171* (0.067) | | |
| Constant | -0.789* (0.382) | 0.023 (0.106) | -0.793* (0.366) | 0.009 (0.022) | 2.595 (1.736) | 6.634** (2.207) |
| Observations | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 |
| R-squared | 0.69 | 0.67 | 0.69 | 0.67 | 0.79 | 0.37 |

+ significant at 10%; * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%

Notes:

In cols. 1-4 the dependent variable is the annual compounded growth rate of real value added at the country-industry level for the period 1996-2002 ($GROWTH_{j,c}$); in col. 5 the dependent variable is the natural logarithm of total exports in industry j from country c in 1996; in col. 6 the dependent variable is an index of export specialization given by $(EXPONENTS_{j,c} / \sum_c EXPONENTS_{j,c}) / (\sum_j EXPONENTS_{j,c} / \sum_{j,c} EXPONENTS_{j,c})$, where j and c represent industries and countries, respectively. $SERVREG_{j,c}$ measures exposure to service regulation at the country-industry level as a weighted average ($\sum_s w_{j,s} * X_{c,s}$) of country-level anti-competitive regulation indexes from the OECD-PMR databases. Service regulation ($X_{c,s}$) is measured in 1996. Interaction weights $w_{j,s}$ are (“direct”) technical coefficients of dependence between service sector s and manufacturing industry j computed on the 1997 USA Input-Output matrix. Financial development is measured as Private Credit by Deposit Money Banks over GDP in 1996 (FD_c) and is interacted with External dependence (ED_j) an industry-level measure of reliance on external finance obtained from USA firm-level data (see Table 1). In cols. 1 and 3, Human capital is an index of labor force quality on a (0-100) scale taken from Bosworth and Collins (2003). It is interacted with average years of schooling at the industry level in 1980 (as obtained from the US 1990 Integrated PUMS). In cols. 2 and 3, Physical capital is the physical capital-to-GDP ratio in 1980. The capital stock is calculated using the perpetual inventory method as implemented by Klenow and Rodriguez-Clare (2005). Source: Penn World Table 5.6. It is interacted with US capital-value added ratio at industry level in 1995 taken from the EUKLEMS database (<http://www.euklems.net/>). In col. 4, “Property rights” is an index of the protection of the private property across countries. It is interacted with an industry-level measure of intangible intensity in US industries. Both are taken from Claessens and Laeven (2003). In cols. 5 and 6, “Quality of contract enforcement” measures the extent to which agents have confidence in and abide by the rules of society (Kaufmann, Kraay and Mastruzzi, 2003). In col. 5, contract enforcement is interacted with Nunn (2007) measure of contract intensity (i.e., of the importance of relationship-specific investments). In col. 6 it is interacted with a measure of institutional dependence. Following Levchenko (2007), this is computed as the (opposite of) an Herfindahl index of intermediate input use from the U.S. Input-Output Use Table for 1997. $SHARE_{j,c}$ indicates the industry share in total value added in manufacturing in 1996. All regressions include country- and industry-fixed effects and use (employment) weighted least squares as estimation method. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

Table A2: Alternative measures of regulation impact

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
|--|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| | Value added growth | | | Productivity growth | | | Export growth | | |
| | ALTERN. | SERVREG | BOTH | ALTERN. | SERVREG | BOTH | ALTERN. | SERVREG | BOTH |
| Panel A : OECD Regulation Impact Indicator (<i>RII</i>) | | | | | | | | | |
| Reg. imp. ind. [<i>RII</i> _{<i>j,c</i>}] | -0.246* (0.120) | | -0.158 (0.111) | -0.164 (0.144) | | -0.043 (0.120) | 0.199 (0.150) | | 0.352* (0.162) |
| Service reg. [<i>SERVREG</i> _{<i>j,c</i>}] | | -0.176** (0.068) | -0.145* (0.064) | | -0.202* (0.080) | -0.193* (0.075) | | -0.215* (0.106) | -0.279** (0.102) |
| Implied effects | -0.009 | -0.019 | - | -0.006 | -0.022 | - | 0.007 | -0.023 | - |
| Observations | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 | 205 | 205 | 205 |
| R-squared | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.57 | 0.59 | 0.59 | 0.71 | 0.72 | 0.76 |
| Panel B : “Mixed” indicator of Service Regulation | | | | | | | | | |
| Serv. reg. mixed [<i>MIXED</i> _{<i>j,c</i>}] | -0.076* (0.036) | | -0.052 (0.037) | -0.086* (0.038) | | -0.058+ (0.035) | -0.016 (0.039) | | 0.028 (0.043) |
| Service reg. [<i>SERVREG</i> _{<i>j,c</i>}] | | -0.176** (0.068) | -0.123+ (0.070) | | -0.202* (0.080) | -0.140* (0.071) | | -0.215* (0.106) | -0.242* (0.116) |
| Implied effects | -0.011 | -0.019 | - | -0.012 | -0.022 | - | -0.002 | -0.023 | - |
| Observations | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 | 220 | 205 | 205 | 205 |
| R-squared | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.68 | 0.59 | 0.59 | 0.60 | 0.71 | 0.72 | 0.72 |

+ significant at 10%; * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%

Notes:

In cols. 1-3 the dependent variable is the annual compounded growth rate of real value added at the country-industry level for the period 1996-2002 (*GROWTH*_{*j,c*}). In cols. 4-6 the dependent variable is the annual compounded growth rate of labor productivity (value added per employed worker) at the industry-country level for the period 1996-2002 (*LPGROWTH*_{*j,c*}). In cols. 7-9 the dependent variable is the annual compounded growth rate of exports at the industry-country level for the period 1996-2002 (*EXPGROWTH*_{*j,c*}). *SERVREG*_{*j,c*} measures exposure to service regulation at the country-industry level as a weighted average ($\sum_s w_{j,s} * X_{c,s}$) of country-level anti-competitive regulation indexes from the OECD-PMR databases. Service regulation ($X_{c,s}$) is measured in 1996. Interaction weights $w_{j,s}$ are (“direct”) technical coefficients of dependence between service sector *s* and manufacturing industry *j* computed on the 1997 USA Input-Output matrix. In Panel A the Regulation Impact Indicator (*RII*) is the OECD measure of the relevance of service regulation for manufacturing industries (taken from Conway and Nicoletti, 2006). In Panel B, the “Mixed” indicator of Service regulation is computed as a weighted average ($\sum_s w_{j,s}^c * X_{c,s}$). Country-specific weights $w_{j,s}^c$ are (“direct”) technical coefficients of dependence between service sector *s* and manufacturing industry *j* computed on the OECD Input-Output matrices. All regressions include (unreported) controls for financial development and for initial conditions: *SHARE*_{*j,c*} in cols. 1-3, *LLP*_{*j,c*} in cols. 4-6 and *EXSHARE*_{*j,c*} in cols. 7-9 (see Table 1 for the definition of these variables). All regressions also include country- and industry-fixed effects and use (employment) weighted least squares as estimation method. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

Table A3: Global opportunities and average regulation

| | (1) Without other controls | (2) With other controls |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Service regulation [$SERVREG_{j,c}$] | -0.185** (0.068) | -0.234** (0.070) |
| Average service regulation × global opportunities | -0.101 (0.099) | -0.035 (0.123) |
| Fin. dev. × external dep. [$FD_c \times ED_j$] | 0.009* (0.004) | 0.011** (0.004) |
| Initial industry share [$SHARE_{j,c}$] | 0.160* (0.067) | 0.148* (0.068) |
| Constant | 0.016 (0.020) | 0.042+ (0.025) |
| Observations | 220 | 220 |
| R-squared | 0.68 | 0.69 |

+ significant at 10%; * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%

Notes:

The dependent variable is the annual compounded growth rate of real value added at the industry-country level for the period 1996-2002 ($GROWTH_{j,c}$). $SERVREG_{j,c}$ measures exposure to service regulation at the country-industry level as a weighted average ($\sum_s w_{j,s} * X_{c,s}$) of country-level anti-competitive regulation indexes from the OECD-PMR databases. Service regulation ($X_{c,s}$) is measured in 1996. Interaction weights $w_{j,s}$ are (“direct”) technical coefficients of dependence between service sector s and manufacturing industry j computed on the 1997 USA Input-Output matrix. Average service regulation is the simple average of sectoral regulation given by $(X_{c,ENERGY} + X_{c,PROSERV} + X_{c,TLCPOST} + X_{c,TRANSP}) / 4$. It is interacted with an industry-level measure of global opportunities obtained according to the following two-steps procedure: (a) Regress $GROWTH_{j,c}$ on country dummies, industry dummies and industry dummies interacted with country-level simple average of sectoral regulation; USA are excluded from the regression. (b) Obtain global opportunities as the predicted values of $GROWTH_{j,c}$ for the USA. All regression include (unreported) controls for financial development, labor market regulation and red tape costs (see Tables 1, 2 and 7 for the definition of these variables). $SHARE_{j,c}$ is the industry share in total value added in manufacturing in 1996. All regressions include country- and industry-fixed effects and use (employment) weighted least squares as estimation method. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

Table A4: Service regulation and country size

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| | Value added growth | | | Productivity growth | | | Export growth | | |
| | All countries | Large countries | Small countries | All countries | Large countries | Small countries | All countries | Large countries | Small countries |
| Service reg. [<i>SERVREG_{j,c}</i>] | -0.272** (0.073) | -0.313** (0.086) | 0.107 (0.174) | -0.282** (0.101) | -0.340** (0.124) | 0.012 (0.127) | -0.241* (0.104) | -0.270+ (0.145) | -0.233 (0.180) |
| Constant | 0.020 (0.025) | 0.036 (0.038) | 0.033 (0.030) | -0.070 (0.048) | -0.083 (0.065) | 0.017 (0.054) | 0.028 (0.030) | 0.006 (0.047) | -0.006 (0.043) |
| Observations | 220 | 113 | 107 | 220 | 114 | 106 | 205 | 98 | 107 |
| R-squared | 0.70 | 0.75 | 0.59 | 0.61 | 0.65 | 0.52 | 0.75 | 0.80 | 0.75 |

+ significant at 10%; * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%

Notes:

In cols. 1-3 the dependent variable is the annual compounded growth rate of real value added at the country-industry level for the period 1996-2002 ($GROWTH_{j,c}$). These columns replicate results of table 8, cols. 7-9 in the main text. In cols. 4-6 the dependent variable is the annual compounded growth rate of labor productivity (value added per employed worker) at the industry-country level for the period 1996-2002 ($LPGROWTH_{j,c}$). In cols. 7-9 the dependent variable is the annual compounded growth rate of exports at the industry-country level for the period 1996-2002 ($EXPGROWTH_{j,c}$). $SERVREG_{j,c}$ measures exposure to service regulation at the country-industry level as a weighted average ($\sum_s w_{j,s} * X_{c,s}$) of country-level anti-competitive regulation indexes from the OECD-PMR databases. Service regulation ($X_{c,s}$) is measured in 1996. Interaction weights $w_{j,s}$ are (“direct”) technical coefficients of dependence between service sector s and manufacturing industry j computed on the 1997 USA Input-Output matrix. All regressions include (unreported) controls for financial development [$FD_c \times ED_j$], Labour market regulation [$LMR_c \times LABINT_j$], Red tape costs [$COST_c \times GROP_j$], FDI restrictions [$FDIREG_{j,c}$], Public ownership [$POWN_{j,c}$] and the corresponding initial conditions [$SHARE_{j,c}$, $LLP_{j,c}$ and $EXSHARE_{j,c}$]. See Table 1 for the definition of these variables. The sample of large countries include Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Spain and the UK while the sample of small ones include Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Norway, Portugal and Sweden. All regressions also include country- and industry-fixed effects and use (employment) weighted least squares as estimation method. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.

Table A5: Sector-specific effects over longer horizons: Energy

| | (1) Initial year: 1980 | (2) Initial year: 1984 | (3) Initial year: 1988 | (4) Initial year: 1992 | (5) Initial year: 1996 |
|--|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Energy Regulation \times Energy dependence [$X_{c,ENERGY} \times w_{j,ENERGY}$] | -0.206 (0.207) | -0.210 (0.175) | -0.434* (0.182) | -0.469** (0.178) | -0.482** (0.147) |
| Observations | 139 | 139 | 154 | 220 | 220 |
| R-squared | 0.74 | 0.74 | 0.75 | 0.66 | 0.69 |

+ significant at 10%; * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%

Notes:

The dependent variable is the annual compounded growth rate of real value added at the industry-country level for the period 1996-2002 ($GROWTH_{j,c}$). $X_{c,ENERGY} * w_{j,ENERGY}$ is an interaction term between country-level measures of regulation in energy in 1996 ($X_{c,ENERGY}$) and the corresponding industry-level indicators of dependence ($w_{j,ENERGY}$). The interaction weight $w_{j,ENERGY}$ is the (“direct”) technical coefficients of dependence between energy and manufacturing industry j computed on the 1997 USA Input-Output matrix. All regression include (unreported) controls for financial development, labor market regulation and red tape costs (see Tables 1, 2 and 7 for the definition of these variables), and the industry share in total value added in manufacturing in 1996. All regressions also include country- and industry-fixed effects and use (employment) weighted least squares as estimation method. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses.


Additional bibliography

Bosworth, B. P. and Collins, S. M. (2003), ‘The Empirics of Growth: An Update’, *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 2, pp. 114–206.

Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A., and Mastruzzi, M. (2003), ‘Governance Matters III: Governance Indicators for 1996–2002’, World Bank Working Paper, N. 3106.

Klenow, P. J., and Rodriguez-Clare, A. (2005). ‘Externalities and Growth’ in (Aghion P. et al., eds.), *The Handbook of Economic Growth*, Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Figure: Service regulation in USA and other OECD countries



Notes:

Service regulation is the simple average of the OECD measures of regulation ($X_{c,s}$) in energy, communications and transports. Other countries are: Austria, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Denmark, Finland, France, Great Britain, Greece, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain and Sweden.