

Andrzej WRÓBEL

ECONOMIC GROWTH AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT;  
THE CASE OF POLAND

The present paper deals with the question of the dependence of the regional structure of the economy on the character of economic growth, considered mainly with respect to structural change. The links between the processes of structural change of the economy and economic growth have been fully recognized for a long time. The works of Colin Clark and F. Perroux are probably the most outstanding cases of the recognition of these links. Similarly, in the main current of regional development studies since the early 1960s, structural economic changes have been recognized as both the source and outcome of regional growth processes. Yet, the main focus of attention has been on the region's economic structure conceived as a set of interindustrial linkages, and on the problems connected with the transmission of growth impulses originating in the dynamic sectors /propulsive industries/; less attention has been paid to the interregional growth differentials arising as a consequence of the structural change of the whole national economy.

It was within the framework of shift-share analysis that gave expression to the idea that the changes in the distribution of the whole complex of economic activities /as measured by the total employment or total output/ might be looked upon as an outcome of two types of changes:

1/ changes in the spatial distribution of individual sectors of the economy;

2/ changes in the structure of the national economy, occurring as a consequence of the intersectoral differentiation of the rates of growth and affecting the interregional differentiation of growth rates because of the fact that regions have different sectoral structures /activity mix/.

In the framework of shift-share analysis, this idea found expression in the definition of the total shift as the sum of differential shift and structural /activity mix/ shift.

In the present paper, I do not intend to enter into the critical discussion of various problems connected either with definition of concepts or with the interpretation of results of this analysis. I shall operate with the simplest, "classical" formula of the definitions of the component concepts and will abstract from such problems as dependence of the results on the definition of sectors, setting the arbitrary time-intervals for calculations that are affected by this decision, or other arbitrary measures inherent in the use of the method. These special problems are irrelevant from the point of view of the purpose of this paper. I will use the concepts of shift-share analysis as a frame of reference for some reflections on the relations between structural changes of the economy and the interregional differentiation of growth.

In the text of the paper, a positive total shift for a region is treated as equivalent to economic growth and the "national economy" is conceived of as being synonymous with the "whole economy", which is a convenient way of avoiding the question of international economic interdependencies. The differential shift is considered mainly from the

point of view of the "locational tendency": as used here, the latter term refers to one aspect only of the locational behaviour of an economic sector; namely, to the perspective of "concentration - deconcentration" either with or without reference to the hierarchical structure of the spatial economic organization. Similarly, the term "locational tendency" is used in reference to the total shift. The term "sector of economy" is used here, unless otherwise specified, as equivalent to "economic activity" or industry"; while "dynamic sector" denotes the sector characterized by higher than average rate of growth.

#### Determinants of structural shift

The differential and structural shifts do not represent some distinct type of forces and do not constitute different, independent movements in space: the very definitions of these shifts are not free from certain conventions. Indeed, changes in the spatial distribution of individual sectors of the economy are to a large extent caused by the processes generating structural changes. Therefore, considering the impact of structural changes resulting in interregional shifts, we distinguish the "direct impact", expressed by the structural shift, and the indirect impact, more difficult to measure and affecting the volume of differential shift. Particularly, since individual sectors have various locational tendencies, the direction of national structural change, dependent on which sectors are dynamic, determines also whether the positive structural shifts are accompanied or not by positive differential shifts. If dynamic sectors tend to grow more rapidly in regions of existing concentration of

these sectors /i.e., regions where these sectors define the specialization of their economy/, the effect of structural change measured by positive structural shift will be enlarged by the differential shift of the same sign.

In which type of situations are structural shifts particularly high?

In order to define the magnitude of the structural shift for a region, let's denote

$a_i^r$  as the share of sector  $i$  in the total regional employment,

$a_i^N$  share of sector  $i$  in the total national employment,

$E$  total regional employment,

$\alpha_i$  national growth rate of sector  $i$  in the given period

$\alpha_T$  national growth rate of total employment.

The definition of the structural shift for a region is thus

$$S = \sum_i a_i^r E / \alpha_i - \alpha_T /$$

Let's assume that the national economy is composed of only two sectors: the dynamic one / $i$ / and the sector of remaining activities / $j$ /, so that

$$\alpha_i < \alpha_T < \alpha_j$$

Then, the structural shift for the region equals 0, as by definition in the closed set of regions

/"country"/, in the situation described by the equation

$$a_i \text{ E } \alpha_i - \alpha_T + a_j \text{ E } \alpha_j - \alpha_T = 0$$

When the regional share of the dynamic sector is higher than its share in the national economy, i. e., when

$$a_i^r > a_i^N$$

then

$$s > 0$$

In that case, the positive structural effect for the region is directly proportional to

1/ the value of the initial share of the dynamic sector in the region as compared with its share in the country  $/a_i^r > a_i^N/$ .

2/ the value of the difference between the national rate of growth of the dynamic sector and the average rate for the national economy  $\alpha_i - \alpha_T$ .

In other words, the more dissimilar is the initial spatial distribution of the dynamic sector as compared with the remaining activities and the more rapid is the change in the sectoral structure of the national economy, the higher is the structural effect for the region.

Let's now take into consideration a sequence of periods for which the interregional shifts in the spatial distribution of the economy of the country are calculated. In case of the continuation of previous locational tendencies of sectors as well as

differences in their relative growth rates, both the differential and structural shifts are identical as to sign and location. If for a given region or set of regions both the differential and structural shifts have the same sign, so is the case with the total shift, which means the continuation of previous general locational tendency expressed by the total shift.

The change of this general locational tendency in relation to the previous period may occur, however, in case of changes in the relative differences of growth rates of sectors, resulting in the emergence of new dynamic sectors. Whether or not the general locational tendency changes in this situation depends on: a/whether the new dynamic sectors have a different spatial distribution in relation to the old ones; and b/ whether they have different locational tendencies in relation to the spatial organization of the economy.

#### Relative importance of structural changes as a factor of interregional differentiation of growth

The above considerations permit certain stages of economic growth to be distinguished in which the impact of the changing structure of the national economy on the spatial growth patterns tends to be particularly marked. The first of these is the stage of transition from predominantly agricultural economy to an industrial one. When the economy of a country is undergoing such a transformation in a short time, high structural shifts are likely to occur in its regions since both determinants of the intensity of these shifts are present: the initial regional distribution of in-

dustry is, as a rule, uneven; and the rate of industrial employment growth exceeds distinctly the rate for total employment /while the rate of agricultural employment growth is in most cases negative/. The intensity of the resulting structural shifts may be, however, highly differentiated among countries depending on the relative values of the growth rates for individual sectors as well as for total employment, in the respective economies.

The second type of situation characterized by a strong impact of structural economic changes on regional development arises in economically advanced countries in the period of the "shift to service economy", which - according to one of the students of the problem - "is bringing about a fundamental restructuring of both labor markets and the economic geography of the country" /Noyelle, 1985, p. 241/. Again, locational tendencies of services are not identical with those of industry, and while the employment growth rates in this stage are generally lower, there still exists a marked difference between employment growth rates in services and those in other sectors. On the other hand, the character of structural shift is here different in its geographical characteristics as compared with the stage of rapid industrialization, since it is most marked in the perspective of hierarchical strata /ranks/ of the urban system. Thus, the likely effect of this type of structural change is the new tendency in the evolution of the spatial organization of the economy.

### Polish experiences

Both types of spatial changes resulting from the changing structure of the national economy are documented by the studies on regional differentiation of economic growth in Poland. In the earlier studies of the present author /Wróbel 1980, 1985/, there were calculated, for the period 1950-1978, the shifts that have occurred in Poland in the economies of the voivodeships grouped into two large areas: underdeveloped East and more developed West. According to these studies, the negative structural effect of the high share of the agricultural sector in the economy of the East was so great that the total shift of economically active population for this area was highly negative, equal to about 740.000 persons, i.e., almost twice the volume of the positive shift of nonagricultural employment totalling 380.000 and resulting in the greatest part from the industrial location policy favouring the underdeveloped areas. This negative shift in total employment had its counterpart in the negative shift of population, which amounted to about 1.2 million.

As may be seen by comparing the relevant figures presented above, the effect of locational policies did not offset entirely the structurally determined tendency towards greater concentration of population in the more developed regions; however, it succeeded in curbing this tendency and diminished the interregional income differences /see Wróbel 1980/, and thus furthered to a considerable degree the "regional balance" in the process of economic growth.

Thus far, I have compared the results of regionally directed development policies with the direct consequences of structural changes in the national economy. The indirect impact of these changes, however, also must be taken into account. A contention of my paper is that this indirect impact was a very significant factor of success of regional development policies. In other words, the above described "regionally balanced" growth in Poland was achieved in specific conditions related to the structural characteristics of growth processes that, in turn, were shaped by specific economic policies.

First of all, it must be pointed out that the structurally determined tendencies towards further concentration of economic development in Poland were not very strong, in contrast to the intensity of the processes occurring in most European countries. To demonstrate this, I will change the level of spatial aggregation from the two macroregions to the whole set of provinces /49 since the year 1975/. In this approach, I will take the value of interprovincial population shifts as a measure of the intensity of the tendencies towards areal concentration /only positive values will be added, since the total of positive and negative shift values is 0 by definition/. As a relevant country of comparison, I will take Spain: a country with a different social and economic system; but otherwise comparable to Poland in terms of area, population number, and number of provinces /50/.

The sum of positive shifts for Spain in the 1960s - a period of rapid industrialization comparable in intensity to Polish - was equal to about

2.600.000 persons, while for Poland only about 580.000; that is, less than one quarter of the former value. By way of explanation, I draw your attention to the relatively low rate of outflow of labour from agriculture. The importance of the above variable is self evident, since it was the high rate of decline of agricultural employment combined with the high share of agriculture in the economy of less developed regions that was described earlier as the structural component of the tendency towards the concentration of economic activities. Decline in agricultural employment is a variable related to other components of employment structure and growth, namely to the rates of change of total employment and nonagricultural employment, as well as the ratio of nonagricultural to agricultural employment at the beginning of the period under consideration.

In the Polish case, the yearly rate of decline of agricultural employment in the 1960s /as in the proceeding decade/ was very low: -0,8 %; although the rate of growth of nonagricultural employment was high /3,5 %/. Yet, the high demand for labour outside agriculture was naturalized by the very high rate of growth in the supply of labour originating from: a/ high natural increase of population in the preceeding years /postwar population boom/; an b/ high, and growing, activity rate, i.e., the share of employed persons in the total population /0.467, 0.503, and 0.514 in 1960, 1970, and 1978 respectively/. The latter factor, in turn, besides its demographic determinants, was associated with the type of economic development model adopted /i.e., the model of extensive character, relating

the growth of production mainly to growth of employment and massive investments, and, to a more limited degree, to increases in productivity/.

The above refers to a large extent also to the situation in the 1970s, although the determinants of the interregional population shifts have changed. The rates of growth both of total employment /now 0.8 annually/ and nonagricultural employment /2,6; for industry alone much less/ diminished, while the share of agriculture in the total employment was now lower; consequently, the rate of decline of agricultural employment rose considerably /-2,8/. The sum of interprovincial population shifts has therefore risen, but was still much lower in comparison to the Western European countries in the similar stage of structural transformation.

The second group of "specific conditions" related to structural characteristics of economic growth processes that helped to achieve the "regionally balanced" growth in Poland refers to the relative role of industry in economic development of the country, as well as to its employment growth rate as compared with the service sector. The rate of industrial employment growth in Poland was very high /see Table 1/ due to the model of extensive-type development mentioned above. Thus, the share of industrial employment increase in the increase of the total volume of nonagricultural employment in Poland was equal almost to one half /46%/ in the 1960s, and the 1970s it was still equal to one third /34%/.

The above figures help us to understand why the regional distribution of additional industrial employment in Poland determined to a high degree the distribution of the increments of tertiary employment /the same is true also of the distribution of investments in the two sectors/. In other words, the industrial location policy, favouring the less developed regions, was determining at the same time to a large extent the regional shifts of the total volume of nonagricultural employment.

Although this dependence of urban growth on industrial development was most marked in the early period of post-war industrialization, it was still important in the 1970s, when the rate of industrial employment as well as its share in total employment diminished. This fact is illustrated by the 1970 - 78 data in Table 2, in which all the provinces of the country have been grouped according to their degree of urbanization in 1970. There may be seen a tendency towards a more balanced growth of urban population, the rates of which were inversely proportional to the initial degree of urbanization. The data demonstrate simultaneously how strongly such a pattern of urban population growth was still conditioned at that time by the intensity of industrial employment growth, even more differentiated in favour of less urbanized regions. However, the more urbanized the provinces, the less their total employment growth was dependent on industry.

Thus, it may be stated that one of the conditions of the efficiency of regional development policy in terms of "balanced regional growth" was the severe sectoral bias in the distribution of investment funds in favour of industry and general under-

development of services /as well as all types of infrastructure/; a bias that over the years was negatively conditioning the efficiency of the national economy and later constituted an element aggravating the economic crisis of the late 1970s.

I would like to devote the last part of my paper to the changes occurring during the time of the crisis. The year of the last Polish Population Census /1978/ may be considered as a terminous of a certain era in post-war economic and regional development. The subsequent years witnessed a far-reaching economic and social crisis. For the first time in Polish post-war economic history, there appeared such phenomena as a decline in national income figures, in industrial output, employment, investments, etc. For the first time also the trends of changes in the sectoral structure of employment were reversed: the share of industrial employment diminished and that of agricultura increased.

In these circumstances, regional development policy lost its traditional tools and, indeed, changed character. It became concerned mainly with reducing the intensity of certain phenomena influencing negatively the role of regions /particularly environmental pollution/. It is, however, interesting to note that the process of diminishing of interregional inequalities was occurring even in the conditions of absence of any policy deliberately promoting it. This finds its explanation in the fact that the most urbanized and most industrialized provinces were hit most severely by recession.

It should be kept in mind, though, that in the conditions of socialist economy, crisis or recession is connected not with lack of demand but

with inadequate supply. The latter refers both to consumption goods and to production inputs.

The decline in the standard of living was most acute in great cities and urban agglomerations; this, taken together with employment decline, resulted in diminishing to about one half the volume of interprovincial migrations as well as migrations from villages to cities.

In the sphere of production and employment, most vulnerable to the supply difficulties were industries manufacturing final products and other goods of high stages of elaboration: these were mostly located in greater cities and industrial agglomerations. Thus, while industry as a whole experienced a marked employment decline, the latter was highly differentiated in favour of less developed provinces /the least urbanized ones hardly experienced any industrial employment decline; see Table 2, data for 1978 - 84/. Since changes in service employment were similarly differentiated to the advantage of less urbanized provinces, the rates of total employment change /negative for the national economy/ were again differentiated in favour of these provinces, which even experienced a positive rate of growth for the "least urbanized" class.

References

- NOYELLE, T. J. /1985/ The shift to services, technological change, and the restructuring of the system of cities in the United States, in: International economic restructuring and the territorial community, UNIDO, Vienna, p. 240-263.
- WRÓBEL, A. /1980/ Industrialization as a factor of regional development in Poland, Geographia Polonica , vol. 43, p. 187-197.
- WRÓBEL, A. /1985/ Structural changes of economy and regional development inequalities, Geographia Polonica , vol. 52, p. 147-152.

Table 1

Yearly rates of change of total employment and its components /in %/

Sectors;	1960-70	1970-78	1978-84
Total Empl.	1.7	0.8	x/
Agriculture	- 0.8	- 2.8	x/
Nonagricultural sectors	3.5	2.6	- 0.3
Industry	3.6	2.0	- 1.4
Othes sectors	3.3	3.0	0.5

x/ no comparable data available

Table 2

Yearly growth rates of urban population and employment  
outside agriculture /socialized sector only/

Voivodships according to degree of urbanization in 1970	Urban Population		Employment outside agriculture /socialized sector only/					
	1970-78	1978-84	Total	Industry	Servi-ces	Total	Industry	Servi-ces
1. Voivodships containing large urban agglomerations	1.7	1.2	2.1	1.1	3.0	- 1.0	- 1.7	- 0.4
2. Remaining voivodships with share of urban population: over 40 %	2.3	2.2	2.8	2.3	3.2	- 0.2	- 1.6	0.9
30-40 %	2.4	2.5	3.5	3.6	3.4	0.0	- 0.6	1.3
below 30 %	3.2	3.2	4.5	5.4	4.0	1.0	- 0.2	2.0
P O L A N D	2.1	1.7	2.7	2.1	3.2	- 0.3	- 1.4	0.5

x/ Warszawa, Gdansk, Katowice, Kraków, Łódź, Poznan, Szczecin, Wrocław