

Factor Content of Intra-European Trade Flows

Götz Zeddies

March 2011

No. 6

IWH-Diskussionspapiere

IWH Discussion Papers

Factor Content of Intra-European Trade Flows

Götz Zeddies

March 2011

No. 6

Author: *Goetz Zeddies*
Department Macroeconomics
E-mail: Goetz.Zeddies@iwh-halle.de
Phone: +49 (0) 345 7753-854

The responsibility for discussion papers lies solely with the individual authors. The views expressed herein do not necessarily represent those of the IWH. The papers represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion with the authors. Citation of the discussion papers should account for their provisional character; a revised version may be available directly from the authors.

Comments and suggestions on the methods and results presented are welcome.

IWH Discussion Papers are indexed in RePEc-Econpapers and in ECONIS.

Editor:
HALLE INSTITUTE FOR ECONOMIC RESEARCH – IWH
Prof Dr Dr h. c. Ulrich Blum (President), Dr Hubert Gabrisch (Research Director)
The IWH is a member of the Leibniz Association.

Address: Kleine Maerkerstrasse 8, D-06108 Halle (Saale), Germany
Postal Address: P.O. Box 11 03 61, D-06017 Halle (Saale), Germany
Phone: +49 (0) 345 7753-60
Fax: +49 (0) 345 7753-820
Internet: <http://www.iwh-halle.de>

Factor Content of Intra-European Trade Flows

Abstract

In recent decades, the international division of labor expanded rapidly in course of globalization. In this context, highly developed countries specialized on (human) capital intensively manufactured goods and increasingly sourced parts and components from low-wage countries. Since this should be beneficial for the high-skilled and harmful for the lower qualified workforce, especially the opening up of Eastern Europe and the international integration of newly industrializing Asian economies are considered as main reasons for increasing unemployment of the lower qualified in high-wage countries. The present paper addresses this issue for selected Western European countries by analyzing factor content of trade, which allows inferring on factor demand patterns resulting from international trade. This is not only done for countries' total external trade, but also for bilateral trade flows, using input-output analyses. Thereby, differences in factor inputs and production technologies are considered, allowing for product differentiation. According to the results, factor content of bilateral trade flows between Western European high-wage countries does hardly differ. However, the results are different for East-West trade, since exports from Western to Eastern Europe are distinctly more human capital intensively manufactured than imports of Western European high-wage countries from Eastern Europe.

Keywords: European integration, international trade, labor markets, input-output analysis

JEL-Classification: C 67, F 11, F 15, F 16

Faktorgehalt innereuropäischer Handelsströme

Zusammenfassung

Die Globalisierung ging in den vergangenen Jahrzehnten mit einer erheblichen Ausweitung der internationalen Arbeitsteilung einher. In diesem Zusammenhang spezialisierten sich die hochentwickelten Länder zunehmend auf (human-)kapitalintensiv produzierte Güter, und die heimischen Unternehmen verlagerten arbeitsintensive Teilelemente der Wertschöpfungsketten in Niedriglohnländer. Folglich wird die Öffnung Osteuropas und die Integration der asiatischen Schwellenländer in die Weltwirtschaft als ein wesentlicher Grund für den Anstieg der Arbeitslosigkeit insbesondere Geringqualifizierter in Hochlohnländern angesehen. Die vorliegende Studie greift diese Problematik durch die Analyse des Faktorgehalts des Außenhandels ausgewählter westeuropäischer Länder mit Hilfe des Input-Output-Modells auf. Dies erlaubt Rückschlüsse auf die Wirkung des Außenhandels auf die Faktornachfrage in den betrachteten Ländern. Die Untersuchungen beschränken sich jedoch nicht auf den gesamten Außenhandel der Länder, sondern umfassen auch Analysen des Faktorgehalts bilateraler Handelsströme. Durch die Berücksichtigung unterschiedlicher nationaler Faktoreinsatzrelationen und intersektoraler Verflechtungen wird in den bilateralen Analysen Produktdifferenzierung in das Modell integriert. Die Ergebnisse zeigen, dass sich im bilateralen Handel der westeuropäischen Länder der Faktorgehalt von Exporten und Importen kaum voneinander unterscheidet. Dies stellt sich für den Außenhandel zwischen den west- und den osteuropäischen Ländern erwartungsgemäß anders dar. So werden die von West- nach Osteuropa exportierten Güter offenbar deutlich humankapitalintensiver gefertigt als die Importe der westeuropäischen Länder aus Osteuropa.

Schlagwörter: Europäische Integration, Außenhandel, Arbeitsmärkte, Input-Output-Analyse

JEL-Klassifikation: C 67, F 11, F 15, F 16

1. Introduction

In recent decades, the international division of labor expanded rapidly in course of globalization. Since 1980, world production grew about 270% in real terms. In contrast, world trade in goods and services more than quintupled in this period. In this context, highly developed countries did increasingly specialize on (human) capital-intensively manufactured goods and sourced labor-intensively manufactured products and particularly parts and components from low-wage countries. Hence, especially the opening up of Eastern Europe and the international integration of the Newly Industrializing East Asian Economies is often considered as a vital cause for increasing unemployment of the lower qualified in high-wage countries, since international trade should favor the high-skilled in those countries (e.g. Wood 1995, Freeman 1995). The present paper addresses this question by analyzing the factor content of total as well as of bilateral, intra-European trade flows of selected EU Member States. In contrast to existing studies, national factor input and technology matrices of all countries considered for determining bilateral factor content of trade (even for Eastern European countries) are used in order to allow for product differentiation.¹ Thereby, the focus is on two input factors: ‘high-skilled’ workers on the one hand and ‘lower qualified’ labor on the other. Since (human) capital-abundant countries² should, according to theory, specialize on and export (human) capital-intensively manufactured goods and, in reverse, import more labor-intensively manufactured products, exports of these countries should embody more high-skilled factor services than imports. Hence, factor content of trade allows inferring on countries’ factor demand patterns resulting from international trade. As the analyses show, the results do largely depend on whether product differentiation is allowed for or not. Whereas factor content of bilateral trade flows between the Western European countries seems to be quite similar even in case of product differentiation, the opposite is the case for East-West trade.

The following section 2 contains a description of the theoretical background and the model used for calculating factor content of trade as well as a review of the literature. In section 3, international trade patterns and factor endowments of selected EU Member States will be analyzed in order to assess specialization patterns of different countries. Afterwards, in section 4, factor content of total and bilateral trade flows of five Western European countries are calculated by applying input-output techniques. Finally, section 5 closes with some concluding remarks on possible labor market effects of European integration.

¹ Theoretically, product differentiation goes hand in hand with different factor inputs and/or technology matrices.

² In the following, countries classified as (human) capital abundant are characterized by a (human) capital to labor ratio exceeding that of the rest of the world or of the trading partner country/countries, respectively.

2. Theoretical Background

One of the main theoretical foundations for explaining international trade patterns and their consequences on factor demand and income distribution in trading partner countries is the classical Heckscher-Ohlin (HO) model of trade. According to the latter, international trade flows arise from comparative advantages, resulting from differences in countries' factor endowments. Hence, bilateral trade volumes should be the higher, the more countries differ with respect to factor endowments, since each country will then specialize on and export commodities utilizing its abundant and thus comparatively cheap factors of production. In contrast, goods utilizing a country's scarce factors of production will be imported. A modification of the traditional HO-Model suggests that, under the assumption of balanced trade, identical production technologies, identical and homothetic preferences across countries, no factor intensity reversals and free trade, international trade accomplishes the task of exchanging the services of production factors embodied in tradable goods (and services). Hence, this Heckscher-Ohlin-Vanek (HOV) version of the classical HO-Model implies that countries should have a net export of relatively abundant factor services and a net import of relatively scarce factor services (Vanek 1968). As a consequence, factor prices should converge in the course of countries' specialization. Whereas prices of countries' scarce production factor(s) should decline, prices of the abundant factor(s) should increase until factor prices are equalized across countries.³ Thereby, factor content of trade serves as an indicator for adjustment effects on factor markets induced by international trade. For instance, a net export of high-skilled labor services and, as a consequence thereof, a net import of lower qualified labor services, which is usually the case for high-wage countries, should be beneficial for the high-skilled workforce and harmful for the lower qualified in the countries concerned. In the following, the HOV-Model shall be formally derived.

Beside direct factor inputs, the production of one good in industry i does normally require intermediate inputs from other industries in order to produce country m 's (gross) output Y_{gross}^m . These are captured by the $(i \times i)$ input-output-matrix of country m , which can be easily transformed into a technical coefficients matrix, denoted as A^m . Each element in A^m shows the units of input from different industries necessary for producing one unit of output in industry i . Hence, under the presence of intermediate inputs, the interrelationship between gross and net output is given by,

$$Y_{net}^m = (I - A^m)Y_{gross}^m \quad (1)$$

³ Of course, in the real world, factor price equalization is hardly to observe. But even in the absence of factor price equalization as well as homothetic preferences, exports of a capital-abundant country will embody a higher capital-labor ratio than exports of a labor-abundant country (*Brecher and Choudhri* (1982), *Helpman* (1984)).

where I represents the $(i \times i)$ identity matrix. Assuming that $(I - A^m)$ is invertible, a $(f \times i)$ matrix of total (direct and indirect) factor input requirements, indicating the required amount of different production factors f for producing one unit of output in each industry i of country m (B_{total}^m), can be defined as:

$$B_{total}^m = B^m (I - A^m)^{-1} \quad (2)$$

In equation (2), B^m denotes the $(f \times i)$ direct factor input matrix, containing the direct factor inputs in each industry i . The matrix B_{total}^m can either be used to determine the factor content of country m 's net exports or, alternatively, for calculating the factor content of exports and imports separately.⁴ For calculating the factor content of net exports, assume that Y_{net}^m stands for the $(i \times 1)$ net output vector of industries i in country m and D^m denotes country m 's $(i \times 1)$ domestic demand vector for goods of each industry i . The difference between domestic production and domestic demand yields the $(i \times 1)$ net trade vector of country m (T_{net}^m):

$$T_{net}^m = Y_{net}^m - D^m \quad (3)$$

The factor content of country m 's net exports F^m is thus determined by the (direct and indirect) factor input matrix in production times net exports:

$$F^m = B_{total}^m T_{net}^m = B^m (I - A^m)^{-1} T_{net}^m \quad (4)$$

On the basis of equation (4), (net) employment effects of international trade can be determined for different factors of production. Thereby, it is assumed that exports are associated with job creation, whereas imports are coming along with domestic job losses, since with increasing imports, domestic production will *ceteris paribus* be reduced.

According to the HO-Model, factor content of trade should be determined by countries' factor endowments. If all countries would share a common technology matrix B_{total} , under the assumption of full employment, factor endowment of country m (V^m) should equal factor input in production (left-hand side of equation (5)):

$$B_{total} Y_{net}^m = B (I - A)^{-1} Y_{net}^m = V^m \quad (5)$$

Accordingly, world factor endowment (V^w) must equal factor input in world production, as denoted in equation (6):

⁴ Thereby, it would be assumed that imports are manufactured with the same production technologies as domestically manufactured import substitutes. This problem will be addressed later on.

$$B_{total} Y_{net}^W = B(I - A)^{-1} Y_{net}^W = V^W \quad (6)$$

If preferences are homothetic across countries, country m 's vector of final goods demand (D^m), under market equilibrium, equals the world output vector (Y_{net}^W) times country m 's share in total world expenditure (s^m):

$$D^m = s^m Y_{net}^W \quad (7)$$

By multiplying equation (7) with the common technology matrix B_{total} , it follows that:

$$B_{total} D^m = s^m V^W \quad (8)$$

Given equation (3) and subtracting equation (8) from equation (5) yields the following equation (9) of the HOV-model:

$$B_{total} (Y_{net}^m - D^m) = B_{total} T_{net}^m = F^m = V^m - s^m V^W \quad (9)$$

The left-hand side of equation (9) depicts the so called measured factor content of trade (F^m), which consists of a total (direct and indirect) coefficients matrix of factor inputs and a net trade vector of country m . The right-hand side of equation (9) represents the predicted factor content of trade of country m , resulting from endowment differences between country m and total world (Leamer 1980). Hence, according to the HOV-Model, endowment differences should result in (net) exports of factor services.

However, an empirical test of the HO-model for the United States performed by Leontief (1953) seemed to disprove the hypothesis that countries' patterns of specialization are determined by factor proportions. In a model with two production factors (capital and labor), Leontief disaggregated the U.S. economy into 50 industries, of which 38 produced tradable goods. He showed that in 1947, U.S. imports were 30% more capital-intensive than U.S. exports, although at that time, the U.S. were considered as one of the most capital-abundant countries in the world. For this Leontief paradox, different theoretical explanations were developed. Firstly, it is imaginable that countries' comparative advantages are not only determined by supply-side, but also by demand-side factors. For instance, a home bias of consumers in a capital-abundant country could increase prices of capital-intensively manufactured domestic goods, in which the country would otherwise have comparative advantages (Salvatore 2001). Secondly, the Leontief paradox might be explained by factor intensity reversals. If a good is labor-intensively manufactured in one country, but capital-intensive in another, the labor abundant country should, according to theory, export the labor-intensively manufactured product. However, in the case prescribed above, it must do so in exchange of a good which is labor-intensively manufactured in the other, capital abundant country. Hence, if the first country satisfies the HO-theorem, the other cannot do so. Thirdly, trade barriers might distort interna-

tional trade flows, leading to a divergence of factor endowments and trade patterns. But probably the most important reason for the Leontief paradox are differences in labor force qualifications. If labor force would have been subdivided into human capital and lower qualified labor, the measured factor content of U.S. exports and imports would probably have been in line with the predictions of the HO-model of trade (Baldwin 1971, Kravis 1956). Additionally, the quality of the labor force determines the effective supply of labor. Although in the U.S., labor was numerically small in relation to the capital stock in the 1950s already, effective labor supply was comparatively large due to higher labor productivity. Hence, the U.S. should have been classified as labor abundant (Trefler 1993). In this context, knowledge capital resulting from R&D is another important factor determining a country's pattern of trade, since both should increase the value of output at a given stock of material and labor resources. In the meantime, it is widely accepted that, beside trade barriers, the missing distinction between high-skilled and lower qualified labor is the main reason for the Leontief paradox.

So far, several analyses investigating the factor content of trade for different countries exist, whereof many are mainly focused on testing the HOV-theorem. For instance, Engelbrecht (1996) and Brautzsch/Ludwig (2009) analyze factor content of trade for Germany, Webster (1993) for the UK, Wicksell (2005) for Sweden or Dasgupta et al. (2009) for India. However, a critical concern could be that the bulk of these studies assume identical production technologies and factor inputs across countries for calculating factor content of countries' net trade. As a consequence, these studies conclude that factor content of exports and imports does hardly deviate from each other. Actually, production technologies between trading partner countries do partially differ considerably, especially with respect to North-South or, in Europe, East-West trade. More recent empirical analyses investigating factor content of trade on a bilateral level are using technology matrices of both, the exporting and the importing countries (e.g. Lundberg and Wiker (1997), Torstensson (1998), Davis and Weinstein (2003), Choi and Krishna (2004) or Nishioka (2006)). However, all of these analyses are restricted to highly developed OECD countries, which do probably share quite similar production technologies and factor endowments. The same holds for the few analyses focused on EU Member States. Consequently, although allowing for product differentiation, differences in the degree of specialization between those countries should be rather low. Although Hakura (1999) found for EU Member States that the HOV-model performs quite well if different technology matrices are used for the countries regarded, only bilateral trade relations between the Western European countries Belgium, Germany, France, Italy, and the Netherlands were considered. Only Cabral et al. (2006 and 2009) focused on trade between high-income countries (the U.K. and others, respectively) and middle-income countries. However, for the former, only the United Kingdoms' and for the latter, only the Portuguese technology matrix were used and considered as representative. Nevertheless, the results show that with different technology matrices, factor contents of exports and imports differ quite reasonably.

Against this background, the present study will analyze the factor content of intra-European trade flows between selected Western, but also between Western and Eastern European countries. Thereby, for all countries considered, *national* factor input and input-output matrices will be used. This allows considering country specific factor inputs resulting from endowment differences. In the analyses, total labor force will be subdivided into human capital and lower qualified labor in order to deduce on factor demand patterns arising from international trade between EU Member States, for both, the high-skilled and the lower qualified workforce.

3. International Trade Patterns and Factor Endowments of selected EU Member States

Before analyzing the factor content of intra-European trade flows, international trade patterns and factor endowments of EU Member States shall be regarded. Theoretically, international trade can be subdivided into inter- and intra-industry trade. Inter-industry trade is, according to traditional trade theories, mainly traced back to differences in relative prices emerging either from different factor productivities (Ricardo) or factor endowments between countries (Heckscher-Ohlin), or to different patterns of demand. As described above, countries will specialize on commodities manufactured with the domestically abundant production factors and will thus exchange goods emanating from different industries. As a consequence, trade-induced reallocation will divert resources between sectors. Thereby, in each country income will be re-distributed from the scarce to the abundant factors of production (Stolper and Samuelson 1941). In contrast, intra-industry trade (IIT), i.e. the exchange of products emerging from the same industries, was for a long time supposed to involve little labor market adjustment (*smooth adjustment hypothesis*, Balassa 1966). Initially, monopolistically competitive markets and increasing returns to scale, offering especially producers in larger countries the opportunity to realize competitive advantages through specialization, served as the theoretical basis for IIT (Krugman (1979), Lancaster (1980) and Helpman (1981)). Further analysis about the impact of product differentiation on foreign trade goes back to Linder (1961). Accordingly, there is a positive correlation between product-quality, prices and the income levels of consumers. Consequently, international differences in per capita incomes and income distributions between countries would imply diverging consumer preferences with respect to quality and prices and should thus reduce the exchange of homogenous goods. Therefore, international trade between high-income countries with similar levels of development should be mainly intra-industry.

Over time, intra-industry trade was subdivided into the above prescribed *horizontal* IIT on the one hand and *vertical* IIT on the other. Especially the latter kind of IIT gained more and more interest in recent years. Whereas horizontal IIT comprises the exchange of homogenous goods manufactured with identical factor inputs across countries, in the

approach of Falvey (1981) and Falvey and Kierzkowski (1987), vertical IIT basically follows traditional endowment-based models. But other than in the Heckscher-Ohlin approach, capital is sector-specific, whereas labor is assumed to be mobile between sectors. In the two-country-two-goods case where each country produces a capital-intensive and a labor-intensive good, the capital-intensive good is vertically differentiated, i.e. produced in different qualitative varieties, whereas the labor-intensive good is homogeneous. The model suggests that higher-quality varieties of a product require comparatively high (human) capital-intensities in production, whereas lower quality varieties of a product are manufactured more labor-intensive. As a consequence, (human) capital abundant countries will produce and export high-quality varieties of the (human) capital-intensive good and in return import lower quality varieties of the capital-intensive as well as the labor-intensive good. Subsequently, even parts of intra-industry trade might be explained by differences in factor endowments between trading partner countries and could thus entail labor market adjustment just as inter-industry trade (Cabral et al. 2006).⁵

By classifying countries' international trade, it is possible to identify those parts of international trade probably resulting from endowment differences and involving adjustment effects on factor markets. This kind of trade should be characterized by divergent factor contents of exports and imports and hence divergent patterns of factor demand in trading partner countries. Empirically, the Grubel-Lloyd-Index (Grubel and Lloyd 1975) depicted in equation (10) is used to determine the share of intra-industry trade in country m 's total trade:

$$IIT_m = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^I (X_{im} + M_{im}) - \sum_{i=1}^I |X_{im} - M_{im}|}{\sum_{i=1}^I X_{im} + M_{im}} \quad (10)$$

Whereas IIT_m depicts intra-industry trade coefficient of country m , X_{im} stands for exports in product groups i of country m to the rest of the world and M_{im} represents country m 's imports in product group i from the rest of the world. If all trade between country m and the rest of the world would be intra-industry, the Grubel-Lloyd index would equal one, and if all trade would be inter-industry, the index would equal zero.⁶ As described above, intra-industry trade can be further subdivided into horizontal and vertical IIT. Again, the former represents the exchange of commodities originating from the same

⁵ Another vertical intra-industry trade model developed by *Flam and Helpman* (1987) is in line with the Ricardo approach for inter-industry trade and says that the source of quality differentiation is not the (human) capital-intensity of production, but the technology used. Consequently, technologically advanced countries have comparative advantages in higher-quality varieties of a product.

⁶ Hence, $1-IIT_m$ depicts the share of inter-industry trade in country m 's total trade.

product group and differentiated at best by attributes, whilst the latter represents trade in commodities of different quality, requiring different factor intensities in production. It is assumed that differences in quality are reflected by differences in prices, which can be proxied by unit values. The generally applied indicator for quality differences are thus unit values calculated per ton (Abd-el-Rahman 1991, Greenaway, Hine and Milner 1994). In the following, horizontal intra-industry trade will be defined as the simultaneous export and import of a 4-digit-HS (*Harmonized System*) item where the unit value of exports relative to the unit value of imports is within a range of $\pm 15\%$, denoted as α . This range is generally used for disentangling horizontal and vertical intra-industry trade, because it seems to be feasible that other factors than quality differences, like for instance transportation and other freight costs, are unlikely to account for a difference in unit values of more than 15% (Blanes and Martin 2000). Hence, the formula for identifying horizontal IIT takes the following form:

$$1 - \alpha \leq \frac{UV_{im}^X}{UV_{im}^M} \leq 1 + \alpha \quad (11)$$

Whereas UV_{im}^X denotes unit value (Euro per ton) of country m 's exports in product group i to the rest of the world, UV_{im}^M stands for unit value of country m 's imports in product group i . All intra-industry trade not classified as horizontal by equation (11) is then considered as vertical IIT.

Table 1: Trade Patterns of selected EU Member States


	Inter-industry trade coefficient	Intra-industry trade coefficient (IIT)	Horizontal IIT coefficient	Vertical IIT coefficient
Denmark	0,40	0,60	0,15	0,45
France	0,31	0,69	0,35	0,34
Germany	0,34	0,66	0,22	0,44
Netherlands	0,27	0,73	0,19	0,54
Sweden	0,42	0,58	0,20	0,38

Sources: EUROSTAT, own calculations.

Table 1 depicts international trade patterns of five selected Western European countries. As could be expected for highly developed countries, international trade is largely intra-industry. With the exception of Denmark and Sweden, this is the case for two thirds up to three quarters of countries' international trade. However, for all countries, intra-in-

dustry trade is mainly vertical in nature. Hence, the bulk of intra-industry trade might be, similarly like inter-industry trade, due to different factor endowments, which should favor the high-skilled workforce in (human) capital-abundant countries. In contrast, classical horizontal IIT, for which the smooth adjustment hypothesis should hold, accounts for less than one fourth in countries' total trade, France being the only exception.

Figure 1:
Shares of High-skilled and Lower Qualified in Total Population in 2005



Source: EUROSTAT, own calculations.

Against this background, the question arises which patterns of specialization countries will choose in inter- and vertical intra-industry trade. These should be mainly determined by (differences) in factor endowments. Since in the present paper, the effects of international trade on demand for high-skilled and lower qualified labor shall be investigated, especially countries' endowments with the latter two production factors is of particular importance. Figure 1 depicts the shares of high-skilled (persons with tertiary education) and lower qualified in countries' total population in 2005. In addition to the Western European countries contained in table 1, some Eastern European economies are added for comparison. As can be seen from figure 1, the share of human capital in total population is, as expected, higher in Western than in Eastern European countries. Interestingly, in Germany, the share of high-skilled in total population is comparatively low compared to the other four Western European countries, and not much higher than in Poland and Hungary. However, the figures indicate that Western European countries are supposed to specialize on (human) capital-intensively manufactured goods. This should hold for inter- as well as for vertical intra-industry trade relations. In contrast, Eastern European countries, which became increasingly important trading partners for Western

European countries in the last two decades, should rather specialize on more labor-intensively manufactured goods or product varieties. Hence, it must be assumed that East-West trade is harmful for the lower qualified in Western European countries. In the following empirical analyses, these specialization patterns (and possible backlashes on factor demand) shall be identified by investigating the factor content of trade flows of selected countries in more detail.

4. Empirical Analyses

4.1 Methodological Issues

In the following section, factor content of country m 's trade shall be determined in two different ways. Initially, equation (4) will be taken as a basis for calculating country m 's factor content of trade. However, unlike in equation (4), factor content of exports and imports shall be calculated separately.⁷ Thereby, it is possible to infer on possible adjustment effects for different skill groups induced by imports on the one hand and on factor demand for export production on the other. Therefore, total (direct and indirect) factor input matrix B_{total}^m will be multiplied with the $(i \times 1)$ export (Ex^m) and import (Im^m) vectors of country m , depicting country m 's total exports and imports, respectively, in industries i . Hence, factor content of country m 's exports (F_{Ex}^m) is calculated by the following formula (12):

$$F_{Ex}^m = B_{total}^m Ex^m = B^m (I - A^m)^{-1} Ex^m \quad (12)$$

Likewise, factor content of imports (F_{Im}^m) will be calculated by multiplying the total factor input matrix B_{total}^m with country m 's import vector:

$$F_{Im}^m = B_{total}^m Im^m = B^m (I - A^m)^{-1} Im^m \quad (13)$$

Of course, the methodology described above rests upon the assumption that imported commodities are manufactured abroad with the same technology and factor inputs as domestic import substitutes. In this case, imports would be perfectly homogeneous to domestically manufactured goods. However, in the real world, product differentiation

⁷ Equation (4) would yield the absolute factor content of country m 's net trade, i.e. the difference between factor services exports and imports. Of course, the latter depends on countries trade balances. The higher a countries' export surplus, the more factor services should be exported, independent from the pattern of specialization. Hence, this approach would be misleading in the present context, since the results for several countries are difficult to compare if countries' trade balances differ.

became increasingly important in the course of globalization. Thus, quantifying domestic job losses for different skill groups induced by imports requires calculating factor content of imports by using technology as well as factor input matrices of trading partner countries. However, data on factor endowments and input-output matrices for the aggregate world or trading partner country aggregates are hardly available. Hence, in order to abandon the critical assumption of similar production technologies across countries, factor content of country m 's exports and imports can only be calculated on a bilateral level. Therefore, in a second step, equations (14) and (15) will be used:

$$F_{Ex}^{mn} = B_{total}^m Ex^{mn} = B^m (I - A^m)^{-1} Ex^{mn} \quad (14)$$

Whereas in equation (14), F_{Ex}^{mn} depicts factor content of country m 's exports to country n , Ex^{mn} stands for country m 's ($i \times 1$) export vector to country n . B_{total}^m represents, as above, total factor input matrix of country m , consisting of direct factor input matrix B^m and technology matrix A^m . Respectively, for country m 's imports from country n , the equation takes the following form:

$$F_{Im}^{mn} = B_{total}^n Im^{mn} = B^n (I - A^n)^{-1} Im^{mn} \quad (15)$$

According to equation (15), factor content of country m 's imports from country n (F_{Im}^{mn}) is determined by country m 's ($i \times 1$) import vector from country n (Im^{mn}) times country n 's total factor input matrix B_{total}^n . The latter is calculated from direct factor input matrix (B^n) and technology matrix (A^n) of country n . In the following section, the data basis used to calculate factor content of trade of selected EU Member States is presented.

4.2. Description of the Data

The following empirical analyses draw on equations (12) to (15) depicted in section 4.1. Hence, factor content of exports and imports of the five Western European countries Denmark, France, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden shall be analyzed. Whereas in a first step, factor content of total exports and imports will be regarded, in a second step, factor content of bilateral exports shall be examined. This allows considering different production technologies in trading partner countries. In these bilateral analyses, reciprocal trade of the above mentioned countries as well as trade of these countries with the Eastern European countries Hungary, Poland, Slovakia and the Czech Republic, already shown in figure 1, shall be analyzed.⁸

⁸ These four countries are the most important Eastern European trading partners of the Western European countries considered in this study. Moreover, these four Eastern European countries are best suited with respect to data availability.

According to equations (12) to (15), identifying factor content of exports and imports requires the following data: Firstly, the $(f \times i)$ direct factor input matrices of countries m (B^m) and n (B^n), containing the inputs of production factors, in this case labor input by qualifications, in each industry i . Secondly, in order to capture intermediate inputs, it is necessary to calculate input coefficients between industries i from input-output tables of countries A^m and A^n , respectively. Finally, export and import vectors over industries i are needed for determining factor content of export production and imports. When factor content of total exports and imports are calculated according to equations (12) and (13), total export and import vectors can be drawn from country m 's input-output tables. If factor content in bilateral trade is considered, bilateral export and import vectors have to be applied. Therefore, bilateral trade data of the Harmonized System were drawn from the EUROSTAT database and assigned to industries following United Nations correspondence tables. Similarly like bilateral trade data, input-output tables for countries m required for calculating intermediate factor input coefficient matrices were drawn from EUROSTAT. Input-output tables provide data for 59 industries.

In order to compare estimation results for different countries/country pairs, data are drawn from a sole data source. Direct factor input matrices for different EU Member States are provided by EU KLEMS, offering data on total hours worked (per year) for total economy and 31 industries (manufacturing *and* services) as well as a subdivision of working hours on high, medium and low skilled employees.⁹ These data allow calculating total working hours of all three skill groups by industry. Since it is generally accepted that transitions between the two groups 'medium-' and 'low skilled' are quite smooth, these groups are summarized to one group, henceforth referred to as 'lower qualified'. However, according to EU KLEMS, even the cross-country comparability of data on high-skilled employees is not ensured (Kangasniemi et al. 2007). For instance, for some countries, data are retracted from labor force surveys, whereas in other cases, use has been made of establishment surveys or a social-security database or a mix of sources (O'Mahony et al. 2007). To overcome this deficiency, EUROSTAT Labor Force Surveys were taken into account, whose international comparability is, according to EUROSTAT, "...considerably higher than that of any other existing set of statistics on employment and unemployment for EU Member States" (European Commission 2003, p.11).¹⁰ However, EUROSTAT Labor Force Surveys do only provide data on the num-

⁹ The circumstance that EUROSTAT input-output tables are disaggregated to 59 industries, but EU KLEMS employment data only to 31 industries does not pose a problem, since both, EUROSTAT as well as EU KLEMS data, follow the CPA classification system (2-digit). The sole difference is that in EU KLEMS, some of the 2-digit-CPA-industries are aggregated. For instance, in EU KLEMS, employment data are only provided for agriculture, forestry and fishing as a whole. Hence, these three categories have to be aggregated in EUROSTAT input-output tables.

¹⁰ This is due to the recording of the same set of characteristics in each country, a close correspondence between the EU list of questions and the national questionnaires, the use of the same definitions for all countries, the use of common classifications and the data being centrally processed by EUROSTAT.

ber of employees by qualification for the economy as a whole. Against this background, for EUROSTAT Labor Force Surveys, the shares of persons with tertiary education on the one hand and lower education (primary and secondary) on the other were calculated and compared to the shares of the two skill groups in total working hours displayed by EU KLEMS (for total economy). According to EU KLEMS, the group of the high-skilled contains persons holding bachelor or higher educational degrees. Hence, the group of the high-skilled in EU KLEMS should be comparable to persons with tertiary education in EUROSTAT labor force surveys. Consequently, the lower qualified (i.e. ‘medium-‘ and ‘low skilled’) employees in EU KLEMS should be coincident with employees with primary and secondary education in EUROSTAT.

Afterwards, for each skill group, the relation of the share in total employment obtained from EUROSTAT data to the one obtained from EU KLEMS was determined. Finally, these quotients were taken as a multiplier to adjust the shares of skill groups (in total working hours) in each industry of the EU KLEMS tables.¹¹ With these ‘adjusted’ shares, total working hours for the high-skilled and the lower qualified were calculated for each industry. In the following section, empirical results of the analyses are presented for 2005. This is the last year for which input-output tables are available for all of the countries considered.

4.3 Measuring the Factor Content of Trade

a) Factor content of total exports and imports

In a first step, factor content of Western European high-wage countries’ total exports and imports (sourced from input-output tables) are determined on the basis of equations (12) and (13). Thereby, it is assumed that imports are manufactured with the same production technology as goods produced domestically. As can be seen from equations (12) and (13), the calculations reveal total working hours of high-skilled and lower qualified workforce for total exports (equation (12)) and imports (equation (13)). Of course, total

¹¹ The circumstance that EUROSTAT reports the number of employees and EU KLEMS working hours for each skill group would only cause problems if working hours of high-skilled and working hours of the lower qualified would differ from country to country in opposite directions. In this case, the original data in the EU KLEMS tables in working hours by level of qualification could be distorted by this adjustment procedure. But this is seemingly not the case. Unfortunately, EUROSTAT does only provide data on working hours by occupation (for the whole economy only). Assuming that the high-skilled are mainly found in the occupational groups 1 and 2 (‘legislators, senior officials, managers and professionals’), in all countries, working hours per week of members of these two groups are higher than working hours of members of the remaining occupational groups, who are probably lower qualified (ranging from ‘technicians, clerks, and service workers’ to ‘plant and machine operators and assemblers’ and ‘elementary occupations’). The only exception is Hungary, where weekly working hours in occupations of the higher qualified are almost the same as in occupations of the lower qualified. In the remaining countries, weekly working hours in *superior* occupations exceed those in *inferior* qualifications between 6% (Czech Republic) and 13% (France).

working hours do depend on total export and import volumes and thus on country sizes. As a consequence, the results for the five selected Western European countries are difficult to compare. Therefore, in the following, not absolute factor inputs, but the shares of high-skilled and lower qualified workers in total labor input for export and import production will be presented. Table 2 shows the results for factor content of country m 's total exports and imports in 2005:

Table 2:

Factor Content of Countries' Total Exports and Imports in 2005

- Share of high-skilled and lower qualified labor in total labor services embodied in exports and imports in percent -

Country m	Factor Content of Country m 's Exports		Factor Content of Country m 's Imports	
	High-skilled	Lower Qualif.	High-skilled	Lower Qualif.
Denmark	25,2	74,8	26,4	73,6
France	24,2	75,8	24,1	75,9
Germany	24,1	75,9	23,5	76,5
Netherlands	26,5	73,5	26,2	73,8
Sweden	23,9	76,1	23,4	76,6

Sources: EUROSTAT, own calculations.

As can be seen from table 2, factor services embodied in country m 's total exports and imports differ only slightly. Seemingly, imports of the highly developed countries regarded in this analysis do not contain considerably more lower qualified factor services than exports. Only Germany's exports contain slightly more high-skilled factor services than imports sourced from the rest of the world. For Denmark, the opposite is the case. These results might seem quite surprising, since according to theory, one would expect that the international division of labor leads to a specialization of high-wage countries on (human) capital-intensively manufactured goods being exported, whereas labor-intensively manufactured products are conversely imported. Moreover, countries' international trade patterns analyzed in section 3 suggest that a large portion of total trade should result from specialization due to differences in factor endowments. However, the results presented in table 2 are derived from equations (12) and (13), respectively, assuming that trading partner countries use the same production technologies and factor inputs as domestic producers. But this assumption is only justified if imports are perfect substitutes to home-produced goods. Under these assumptions, differences in factor services embodied in total exports and imports could only result from diverging patterns of exports and imports. This is the case in inter-industry trade relations, where for instance highly developed countries do export goods from rather (human) capital-intensive industries and, in return, import products from more labor-intensive industries. In the following, the critical assumption of identical production technologies shall be abandoned.

b) *Factor content of trade between Western European countries*

In this sub-section, factor content of countries' exports and imports shall be calculated on a bilateral basis, as depicted in equations (14) and (15). Thereby, we consider the production technology of country m 's trading partner n for computing the factor content of imports. Thus, international product differentiation is taken into account.

Calculating factor content in bilateral trade requires not only trading partners' input-output matrices and factor input vectors, but also bilateral trade vectors, i.e. bilateral trade by industries provided by EUROSTAT.¹² However, bilateral trade data are only available for goods, but not for services. This shortcoming will be solved in two ways. In a first mode of calculation, it will be assumed that bilateral trade in services does not take place at all. This means that in the bilateral export and import vectors, trade flows are set to zero in the services sectors. In fact, services are of minor importance in international trade. For four of the countries considered, the share of services ranges from only 14% (in German exports) up to 24% (in Swedish exports). Only for Denmark, services trade is of higher relevance, since services share amounts to 34% in total exports and to 33% in total imports (according to balance of payments statistics for 2005, the year underlying the calculations). In a second mode of calculation, it is assumed that the composition of *bilateral* trade in goods and services is similar to the composition of countries' *total* goods and services exports and imports. For the latter, data are available from input-output tables. Hence, the relation of single services exports and imports to country m 's *total* manufacturing exports and imports, respectively, is calculated from input-output tables. Afterwards these coefficients are used for estimating notional *bilateral* services trade volumes in the services sectors.

In a first step, factor content of trade between the five Western European countries is computed. The results for the first mode of calculation (without services trade) are depicted in table 3 (the results for the second mode of calculation, including notional services trade, can be found in table A-1 in the appendix).

12 http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/portal/page/portal/external_trade/data/database

Table 3:

Factor Content of Western European Trade Relations in 2005

- Share of high-skilled and lower qualified labor in total labor services embodied in exports and imports in percent -

Country m	Trading Partner n	Factor Content of Country m's Exports		Factor Content of Country m's Imports	
		High-skilled	Lower Qualif.	High-skilled	Lower Qualif.
Denmark	France	24,1	75,9	21,7	78,3
	Germany	22,2	77,8	22,3	77,7
	Netherlands	26,3	73,7	22,7	77,3
	Sweden	26,6	73,4	20,8	79,2
France	Denmark	21,7	78,3	25,1	74,9
	Germany	23,1	76,9	24,3	75,7
	Netherlands	20,7	79,3	22,8	77,2
	Sweden	24,2	75,8	20,8	79,2
Germany	Denmark	22,3	77,7	22,4	77,6
	France	24,3	75,7	23,1	76,9
	Netherlands	21,8	78,2	22,9	77,1
	Sweden	24,0	76,0	21,0	79,0
Netherlands	Denmark	23,2	76,8	24,9	75,1
	France	22,8	77,2	20,8	79,1
	Germany	22,7	77,3	21,8	78,2
	Sweden	23,5	76,5	21,4	78,6
Sweden	Denmark	20,5	79,5	27,0	73,0
	France	21,0	79,0	24,4	75,6
	Germany	21,6	78,4	24,2	75,8
	Netherlands	20,4	79,6	23,3	76,7

Sources: EUROSTAT, EU KLEMS, own calculations.

Compared to the results for total exports and imports presented in table 2, differences in factor contents of bilateral exports and imports between highly developed Western European economies are only a little more distinct even if the product differentiation ap-

proach is applied (i.e. if factor content of imports is computed by using input-output tables and factor input matrices of trading partner countries n instead of country m 's). This result corresponds to the findings of Davis and Weinstein (2003), who analyzed factor content of trade between the U.S. and other highly developed countries by using both, the US technology matrix for all countries as well as countries' national technology matrices. This is seemingly also the case for factor content of bilateral trade between Western European countries, which are quite similar with respect to factor endowments and stages of development.¹³ However, for Denmark, exports to the four trading partner countries contain slightly more high-skilled factor services than imports from the corresponding countries. Surprisingly, the opposite is the case for Sweden.¹⁴ For Germany and the Netherlands, the picture is inconclusive. But overall, factor content of bilateral exports and imports differ only slightly in trade between these Western European countries. Hence, structural labor demand shifts resulting from bilateral trade of the Western European countries should be rather low. If notional services trade is included into the calculations (table A-1 in the appendix), human capital content of all trade flows is slightly higher, except for German exports (and imports of the other countries from Germany). However, the results do not change substantially. In the next subsection, the same calculations shall be performed for trade between the selected Western European countries on the one hand and Eastern European low-wage countries on the other.

c) Factor content of trade between Western and Eastern European countries

For computing factor content of exports and imports in East-West trade, the Eastern European countries depicted in figure 1 were chosen: the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovakia. Especially the Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovakia were important recipients of foreign direct investment from Western European countries in the course of the establishment of international production networks, which are considered to be harmful especially for the lower qualified workforce in Western European high-wage countries. Table 4 shows the computational results (the results including notional services trade can be found in table A-2 in the appendix).

¹³ The deviations in the shares of factor services embodied in bilateral exports and imports are due to inconsistencies in trade statistics. Of course, the share of high-skilled factor services embodied in exports from country m to country n should equal the share of high-skilled factor services embodied in imports of country n from country m . This is not always the case since total export values declared from country m to country n in industries i are not identical to imports of country n from country m in industries i declared in trade statistics.

¹⁴ In the case of Sweden, human capital intensity of exports to the Western European trading partner countries is lower than total exports (table 2) due to the fact that cork, wood and products thereof (paper, paperboard, books), which are manufactured more labor-intensive, are considerably more important in Swedish exports to the European trading partner countries than to the rest of the world. Moreover, export surpluses in these product groups are much higher in intra- than in extra-European trade of Sweden.

Table 4:

Factor Content of East-West Trade in 2005

- Share of high-skilled and lower qualified labor in total labor services embodied in exports and imports in percent -

Country m	Trading Partner n	Factor Content of Country m's Exports		Factor Content of Country m's Imports	
		High-skilled	Lower Qualif.	High-skilled	Lower Qualif.
Denmark	Czech Rep.	24,5	75,5	8,8	91,2
	Hungary	23,8	76,2	13,9	86,1
	Poland	22,4	77,6	12,0	88,0
	Slovakia	25,3	74,7	8,0	92,0
France	Czech Rep.	24,4	75,6	9,0	91,0
	Hungary	24,6	75,4	13,1	86,9
	Poland	24,3	75,7	14,3	85,7
	Slovakia	25,3	74,7	8,0	92,0
Germany	Czech Rep.	23,8	76,2	8,8	91,2
	Hungary	24,0	76,0	13,3	86,7
	Poland	23,2	76,8	13,0	87,0
	Slovakia	24,8	75,2	8,8	91,2
Netherlands	Czech Rep.	24,4	75,6	9,0	91,0
	Hungary	24,4	75,6	13,3	86,7
	Poland	23,1	76,9	11,1	88,9
	Slovakia	23,6	76,4	9,5	90,5
Sweden	Czech Rep.	20,1	79,9	9,0	91,0
	Hungary	24,1	75,9	12,9	87,1
	Poland	19,2	80,8	15,1	84,9
	Slovakia	21,6	78,4	9,1	90,9

Sources: EUROSTAT, EU KLEMS, own calculations.

Compared to the results for Western European bilateral trade relations, factor contents of Western European imports from CEECs do noticeably differ from factor content of exports from Western to Eastern Europe. This is especially the case for imports from the

Czech Republic and Slovakia, which are clearly less human capital intensively manufactured than the corresponding exports. In contrast, factor services embodied in imports from Hungary and Poland, the most important Eastern European trading partner country for the Western European economies, are a little bit more human capital intensive. Overall, (net) exports of high-skilled factor services to Eastern Europe are lowest for Sweden and Germany. Exports of Denmark, France and the Netherlands are obviously more human capital intensively manufactured than Swedish and German exports, though only slightly. However, mainly due to geographical proximity, East-West trade is of higher importance especially for Germany than for the other Western European countries.

The results for the second mode of calculation depicted in table A-2 in the appendix reveal that human capital content of trade increases if (notional) services trade is considered (as above, only for German exports the opposite is the case). But interestingly, human capital content of Western European imports from Eastern European countries increases much more than human capital content of Western European exports to Eastern Europe. Hence, considering (notional) services trade reduces the differences in factor content of bilateral East-West trade relations.

Overall, the calculations show that factor content of exports and imports differs quite noticeably in trade between countries with different stages of development. These results are obtained by allowing for product differentiation (resulting from divergent factor inputs and/or technology matrices). This holds all the more, the higher differences in factor endowments between trading partner countries are.

4.4 Addressing the Problem of Re-Exports

In the analyses above, it is assumed that new jobs are created by export production, whereas imports are harmful for domestic employment. This assumption becomes obsolete, if previously imported goods are exported without entering the domestic production process of a country (so called *re-exports*). These kinds of trade flows do not affect domestic factor demand at all. For the Western European countries considered in this study, the *re-export ratio*, defined as the share of goods re-exported without entering into domestic production in total exports, ranges in between 4% (Sweden) and 15% (Germany). Only for the Netherlands, the re-export ratio is considerably higher, amounting to 33%, probably due to the Rotterdam-effect. Whereas for countries' total trade, re-exports can be identified in the import tables provided together with the EUROSTAT input-output-tables, this is presumably not always the case in bilateral trade data. According to EUROSTAT, the Community statistics are compiled by the special trade system, where re-exports are excluded, as far as extra-EU trade is concerned. Since intra-EU trade statistics, which are used in these analyses, do not have a direct link to customs procedures, they aren't compiled on a special trade basis in general and should thus also contain re-exports (EUROSTAT 2009). Of course, an imported product which is re-

exported without being processed domestically leaves the country with the same factor content it entered the country. In this case, using different technology and factor input matrices for calculating factor content of exports and imports would be misleading. Against this background, the results obtained for factor content of bilateral, intra-European trade flows must be qualified.

5. Conclusions

In the course of globalization, high-wage countries experienced rising unemployment, especially of the lower qualified. Theoretically, this development is, at least partly, ascribed to the integration of the Central and Eastern European as well as the Newly Industrializing Asian Economies into the international division of labor. In this context, (human) capital-abundant industrialized countries are expected to specialize on capital- and skill-intensively manufactured goods. Moreover, globalization promoted the establishment of international production networks, where producers in high-wage countries increasingly sourced intermediate inputs from low-wage countries. Both developments are supposed to be favorable for the high-skilled but harmful for the lower qualified workforce in the highly developed countries. Against this background, the present paper analyzed factor content of intra-European trade flows by using input-output techniques. For five selected Western European economies the results of the analyses show that factor content of exports and imports differ only slightly under the assumption that all trading partner countries share the same production technology as the five EU Member States considered in this study. However, abandoning this critical assumption and allowing for product differentiation yields considerably different results. This is achieved by computing factor content of trade bilaterally using national technology and factor input matrices for the exporting and importing country, respectively. Whereas for trade flows in between Western European countries, factor content of exports and imports does hardly differ, the opposite is the case for bilateral trade between Western and Eastern European countries. Hence, exports from Western to Eastern Europe contain considerably more high-skilled factor services than imports of Western European countries from their Eastern European trading partners. Consequently, allowing for product differentiation, East-West trade could be a vital cause of labor market pressures in Western European high-wage countries.

APPENDIX

Table A-1:

Factor Content of Western European Trade Relations in 2005 (including notional services trade)

- Share of high-skilled and lower qualified labor in total labor services embodied in exports and imports in percent -

Country m	Trading Partner n	Factor Content of Country m's Exports		Factor Content of Country m's Imports	
		High-skilled	Lower Qualif.	High-skilled	Lower Qualif.
Denmark	France	24,5	75,5	23,4	76,6
	Germany	23,3	76,7	21,5	78,5
	Netherlands	25,9	74,1	23,4	76,6
	Sweden	26,0	74,0	22,4	77,6
France	Denmark	23,0	77,0	26,7	73,3
	Germany	24,1	75,9	24,2	75,8
	Netherlands	22,2	77,8	24,5	75,5
	Sweden	24,9	75,1	21,9	78,1
Germany	Denmark	21,8	78,2	24,3	75,7
	France	23,3	76,7	24,4	75,6
	Netherlands	21,4	78,6	24,5	75,5
	Sweden	23,1	76,9	21,9	78,1
Netherlands	Denmark	23,8	76,2	28,1	71,9
	France	23,6	76,4	23,6	76,4
	Germany	23,5	76,5	22,2	77,8
	Sweden	24,1	75,9	22,9	77,1
Sweden	Denmark	22,0	78,0	30,0	70,0
	France	22,4	77,6	26,9	73,1
	Germany	22,8	77,2	24,5	75,5
	Netherlands	22,5	77,5	26,3	73,7

Sources: EUROSTAT, EU KLEMS, own calculations.

Table A-2:

Factor Content of East-West Trade in 2005 (including notional services trade)

- Share of high-skilled and lower qualified labor in total labor services embodied in exports and imports in percent -

Country m	Trading Partner n	Factor Content of Country m's Exports		Factor Content of Country m's Imports	
		High-skilled	Lower Qualif.	High-skilled	Lower Qualif.
Denmark	Czech Rep.	24,8	75,2	11,0	89,0
	Hungary	24,3	75,7	15,6	84,4
	Poland	23,5	76,5	14,4	85,6
	Slovakia	25,2	74,8	10,2	89,8
France	Czech Rep.	25,1	74,9	10,5	89,5
	Hungary	25,2	74,8	14,7	85,3
	Poland	25,0	75,0	15,5	84,5
	Slovakia	25,2	74,8	10,6	89,4
Germany	Czech Rep.	23,0	77,0	10,4	89,6
	Hungary	23,1	76,9	15,0	85,0
	Poland	22,4	77,6	14,4	85,6
	Slovakia	23,8	76,2	11,1	88,9
Netherlands	Czech Rep.	24,7	75,3	11,5	88,5
	Hungary	24,7	75,3	16,3	83,7
	Poland	23,8	76,2	13,8	86,2
	Slovakia	24,1	75,9	12,5	87,5
Sweden	Czech Rep.	21,7	78,3	11,9	88,1
	Hungary	24,6	75,4	16,3	83,7
	Poland	21,0	79,0	17,3	82,7
	Slovakia	22,8	77,2	12,3	87,7

Sources: EUROSTAT, EU KLEMS, own calculations.

References

- Abd-el-Rahman, K. (1991):* Firms' Competitive and National Comparative Advantages as Joint Determinants of Trade Composition. *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv* 127 (1), pp. 83-97.
- Balassa, B. (1966):* Tariff Reductions and Trade in Manufactures among the Industrial Countries. *American Economic Review* 56 (3), pp. 466-473.
- Baldwin, R.E. (1971):* Determinants of the Commodity Structure of U.S. Trade. *American Economic Review* 61, pp. 126-146.
- Blanes, J. and C. Martin (2000):* The Nature and Causes of Intra-Industry Trade: Back to the Comparative Advantage Explanation? The Case of Spain. *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv* 136 (3), pp. 423-441.
- Bowen, H., Leamer, E. and L. Sveikauskas (1987):* Multicountry, Multifactor Tests of the Factor Abundance Theory. *American Economic Review* 77, pp. 791-809.
- Brautzsch, U. and U. Ludwig (2009):* Deutsche Exportgüterproduktion: Relativer Überschuss an Qualifikationsgehalt gering – Eine Untersuchung mit dem Input-Output-Modell. *Wirtschaft im Wandel* 11/2009, pp. 481-488.
- Brecher, R.A. and E.U. Choudhri (1982):* The Factor Content of International Trade without Factor Price Equalization. *Journal of International Economics* 12, pp. 277-283.
- Cabral, M.; Falvey, R. and C. Milner (2009):* Does Skill Content Explain Total Trade and Intra-Industry Trade? *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 71 (5), pp. 601-619.
- Cabral, M.; Falvey, R. and C. Milner (2006):* The Skill Content of Inter- and Intra-Industry Trade: Evidence for the UK. *Review of World Economics* 142, pp. 546-566.
- Dasgupta, P.; Dhar, A. and Chakraborty, D. (2009):* Some Further Evidence on the Factor Content of India's Foreign Trade, http://www.iioa.org/pdf/17th%20Conf/Papers/1046452179_090529_093632_FULLPAPER-CONFERENCE2009.PDF, accessed 19th Nov. 2010.
- Davis, D.R. and D.E. Weinstein (2003):* The Factor Content of Trade. Choi, K. and J. Harrigan (Eds.), *Handbook of International Trade*, Basil, Blackwell.
- Engelbrecht, H.J. (1996):* The Composition of the Human Capital Stock and the Factor Content of Trade: Evidence for West(ern) Germany. *Economic Systems Research* 8 (3), pp. 271-297.

- European Commission (2003):* The European Union Labour Force Survey – Methods and Definitions 2001, Luxemburg.
- EUROSTAT (2009):* Quality Report on External Trade Statistics, Revised Edition 2009, Brussels.
- Falvey, R. (1981):* Commercial Policy and Intra-Industry Trade. *Journal of International Economics* 11, pp. 495-511.
- Falvey, R. and H. Kierzkowski (1987):* Product Quality, Intra-Industry Trade and (Im)Perfect Competition, in: Kierzkowski, H. (ed.): *Protection and Competition in International Trade*, Blackwell, Basil.
- Flam, H. and E. Helpman (1987):* Vertical Product Differentiation and North-South Trade. *American Economic Review* 77, pp. 810-822.
- Freeman, R.B. (1995):* Are Your Wages set in Beijing? *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 9 (3), pp. 15-32.
- Greenaway, D., Hine, R. and C. Milner (1994):* Country-Specific Factors and the Pattern of Horizontal and Vertical Intra-Industry Trade in UK. *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv* 130 (1), pp. 77-100.
- Grubel, H. and P. Lloyd (1975):* Intra-Industry Trade, London, Macmillan.
- Hakura, D.S. (1999):* A Test of the General Validity of the Heckscher-Ohlin Theorem for Trade in the European Community, IMF Working Paper No. 9970.
- Helpman, E. (1984):* The Factor Content of Foreign Trade. *Economic Journal* 94, pp. 84-94.
- Helpman, E. (1981):* International Trade in the Presence of Product Differentiation, Economies of Scale and Monopolistic Competition – A Chamberlin/Heckscher-Ohlin Approach. *Journal of International Economics* 11, pp. 305-340.
- Kangasniemi, M.; O'Mahony, M.; Timmer, M.; Stuivenwold, E.; van Moergastel, T. and G. Ypma (2007):* EU KLEMS Growth and Productivity Accounts, Version 1.0, Part I – Methodology, http://www.euklems.net/data/EUKLEMS_Growth_and_Productivity_Accounts_Part_I_Methodology.pdf, accessed 19th Nov. 2010.
- Kravis, I.B. (1956):* Wages and Foreign Trade. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 38, pp. 14-30.
- Krugman, P. (1979):* Increasing Returns, Monopolistic Competition, and International Trade. *Journal of International Economics* 9, pp. 469-479.

- Lancaster, K. (1980):* Intra-Industry Trade under Perfect Monopolistic Competition. *Journal of International Economics* 10, pp. 151-175.
- Leamer, E. (1980):* The Leontief Paradox Reconsidered. *Journal of Political Economy* 88 (3), pp. 495-503.
- Leontief, W. (1953):* Domestic Production and Foreign Trade: The American Capital Position Re-examined, *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 97, pp. 332-349.
- Linder, S. (1961):* An Essay on Trade and Transformation, Uppsala, Almqvist&Wiksell.
- Lundberg, L. and P. Wiker (1997):* Skilled Labor and International Specialization in OECD Countries. *International Review of Applied Economics* 11 (3), pp. 369-385.
- Maskus, K.E. (1985):* A Test of the Heckscher-Ohlin-Vanek Theorem: The Leontief Commonplace. *Journal of International Economics* 19, pp. 201-212.
- Nishioka, S. (2006):* An Explanation of OECD Factor Trade with Knowledge Capital and the HOV Model, *Discussion Papers in Economics*, University of Colorado at Boulder, Working Paper No. 05-06.
- O'Mahony, M.; van Ark, B. and M. P. Timmer (2007):* EU KLEMS Growth and Productivity Accounts: An Overview. *International Productivity Monitor* 14, pp. 71-85.
- Salvatore, D. (2001):* International Economics, John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Stolper, W.F. and P.A. Samuelson (1941):* Protection and Real Wages. *Review of Economic Studies* 9, pp. 58-73.
- Torstensson, J. (1992):* Factor Endowments, Product Differentiation and International Trade, *Lund Economic Studies* 47, Lund.
- Trefler, D. (1993):* International Factor Price Differences: Leontief was Right! *Journal of Political Economy* 101(6), pp. 961-987.
- Vanek, J. (1968):* The Factor Proportions Theory: The N-Factor Case. *Kyklos* 21, pp. 749-756.
- Webster, A. (1993):* The Skill and Higher Educational Content of UK Net Exports. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 55 (2), pp. 141-159.
- Widell, L.M. (2005):* On Measurements of the Factor Content of Trade: The Case of Sweden, *ESI Working Paper Series*, No. 2005:7, Örebro University.
- Wood, A. (1995):* How Trade hurt unskilled Workers. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 9 (3), pp. 57-80.