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Motivations

• Scholars have developed various indicators to map and measure the involvement of countries and sectors in GVCs
  • Hummels et al., 2001; Johnson and Noguera, 2012; Koopman, Wang and Wei, 2014; Borin et al., 2021.

• Recently, a strand of the literature has developed new measures of the positioning of countries and sectors in GVCs
  • Fally, 2012; Antràs et al., 2012; Antràs and Chor, 2013; Fally and Hillberry, 2015; Alfaro et al., 2019; Millerand Temurshoev, 2017; Wang et al., 2017

• Using global Input-Output tables it is now possible to compute upstreamness and downstreamness measures of specific industries and countries.

• Together with the GVCs participation indicators, these positioning measures: i) help enrich and complete empirical analyses on GVCs, ii) can be included in the economic models of GVCs, iii) and can inform policymaking.
A new dataset of GVC positioning indicators at the country, sector and country-sector level ready to use and available to scholars

- Measure of distance or **upstreamness** of a production sector from final demand
  - developed by Fally (2012), Antras et al. (2012), and Antras and Chor (2013, 2019)
- Measure of distance or **downstreamness** of a given sector from the economy’s primary factors of production (or sources of value-added)
  - originally proposed by Fally (2012)
- **International comparison**, by sectors and regions, of these indicators and their evolution over time.
- Present a pilot test on the **effects** of these indicators on productivity.
A new dataset of GVC positioning

Data source

- **EORA26** dataset (189 countries and 26 sectors) for the period 1995-2015.

- **ADB MRIO** database (63 countries and 56 sectors) for the period 2007-2019.

**Coming next:**

- **Long-run WIOD** dataset (25 countries and 23 sectors for the period 1965-2000)

- **TiVA OECD** dataset (66 countries and 45 sectors for the period 1995-2018)

**Added-value of this work:** Researchers working on GVCs and belonging to different disciplines – economic sociology, international economics, economic geography, international political economy, international business – will benefit from these ready-to-use indicators.
Computing indicators

- **Upstreamness** (Fally, 2012; Antras et al., 2012; Antras and Chor, 2013)

  Captures the distance of a given sector from final demand (average number of production stages).

  A relatively upstream sector is one that sells a small share of its output to final consumers, and instead sells disproportionately to other sectors that themselves sell relatively little to final consumers.

- **Downstreamness** (Fally, 2012)

  Captures the distance of a given sector from the economy’s primary factors of production (or sources of value-added).

  An industry in each country is downstream if its production process embodies a larger amount of intermediate inputs relative to its use of primary factors of production.
Formally...

By using the intermediate use matrix (Z), the final demand matrix (FD) and the value-added matrix (VA):

**Upstreamness**

\[
Y_i^r = \sum_{s=1}^{S} \sum_{j=1}^{J} Z_{ij}^{rs} + \sum_{j=1}^{J} FD_{ij}^r =
\]

\[
= \sum_{s=1}^{S} \sum_{j=1}^{J} a_{ij}^{rs} Y_j^s + FD_i^r
\]

where \( Y_i^r \) is the gross output in sector \( r \) in country \( i \) and \( a_{ij}^{rs} = \frac{Z_{ij}^{rs}}{Y_j^s} \)

\[
Y_i^r = FD_i^r + \sum_{s=1}^{S} \sum_{j=1}^{J} a_{ij}^{rs} FD_j^s + \sum_{s=1}^{S} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \sum_{t=1}^{S} \sum_{k=1}^{J} a_{ij}^{rs} a_{ik}^{st} FD_k^t + \ldots
\]

multiplying each term by its respective production-staging distance from final use +1 and dividing everything by \( Y_i^r \):

\[
U_i^r = 1 \times \frac{FD_i^r}{Y_i^r} + 2 \times \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{S} \sum_{j=1}^{J} a_{ij}^{rs} FD_j^s}{Y_i^r} + 3 \times \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{S} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \sum_{t=1}^{S} \sum_{k=1}^{J} a_{ij}^{rs} a_{ik}^{st} FD_k^t}{Y_i^r} + \ldots
\]
Formally...

- **Downstreamness**

\[ Y_j^s = \sum_{r=1}^{S} \sum_{i=1}^{J} Z_{ij}^{rs} + VA_j^s = \]

\[ = \sum_{r=1}^{S} \sum_{i=1}^{J} b_{ij}^{rs} Y_i^r + VA_j^s \]

where \( b_{ij}^{rs} = \frac{Z_{ij}^{rs}}{Y_i^r} \)

\[ Y_j^s = VA_j^s + \sum_{r=1}^{S} \sum_{i=1}^{J} b_{ij}^{rs} VA_i^r + \sum_{r=1}^{S} \sum_{i=1}^{J} \sum_{t=1}^{S} \sum_{k=1}^{J} b_{tr}^t b_{ij}^{rs} VA_k^t + \ldots \]

multiplying each term by its respective production-staging distance from primary factors stage +1 and dividing everything by \( Y_j^s \):

\[ D_j^s = 1 * \frac{VA_j^s}{Y_j^s} + 2 * \frac{\sum_{r=1}^{S} \sum_{i=1}^{J} b_{ij}^{rs} VA_i^r}{Y_j^s} + 3 * \frac{\sum_{r=1}^{S} \sum_{i=1}^{J} \sum_{t=1}^{S} \sum_{k=1}^{J} b_{tr}^t b_{ij}^{rs} VA_k^t}{Y_j^s} + \ldots \]
Economic interpretation

Upstreamness (U) index:

- The $U$ index measures *how many stages of production are left before the goods or services reach final consumers.* It takes as a point of reference the sources of final demand at the end of each production chain, and compute the upstreamness of the country-industry relative to final use.
- Final goods can be considered 1 step away from demand, inputs directly used to produce final goods are 2 steps away from demand, inputs used to produce inputs are 3 steps away from demand, and so on.
- $U \geq 1$: larger values are associated with relatively higher levels of upstreamness of the output originating from one sector.

Downstreamness (D) index:

- The $D$ index captures the downstreamness of each country-industry from where production processes commence, namely from primary factors. It measures distance of a given sector from the economy’s primary factors of production (or sources of value-added).
- $D \geq 1$: larger values are associated with relatively higher levels of downstreamness of an industry.
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Our empirical test: positioning and productivity


- we adopt a standard Cobb-Douglas production function with $L$ and $K$, augmented with indicators of GVCs positioning
- we assume that a technology shifter is driven by a standard process of economic innovation and a range of trade-related determinants, including trade and GVC performances

$$\theta_{cjt} = \alpha_{ct} + \beta_1 k_{cjt} + \beta_2 pos_{cjt} + \eta_{jt} + \omega_{cj} + \epsilon_{cjt}$$

where

$\theta_{cjt}$ is the country-sectoral value added per worker of the manufacturing sectors, $k_{cjt}$ is country-sectoral capital intensity and $pos_{cjt}$ is a measure of GVC positioning. $\alpha_{ct}$, $\eta_{jt}$, $\omega_{cj}$ are country-time, sector-time, and country-sector effects, respectively.
## Results: baseline estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DepVar: Labor Productivity (ln)</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital stock per employee (ln)</td>
<td>0.181***</td>
<td>0.112***</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>0.046**</td>
<td>0.045**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.041)</td>
<td>(0.040)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.022)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
<td>(0.018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downstreamness (ln, t-1)</td>
<td>-1.284***</td>
<td>-1.115**</td>
<td>-1.319***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.342)</td>
<td>(0.492)</td>
<td>(0.426)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upstreamness (ln, t-1)</td>
<td>0.448***</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.710**</td>
<td>(0.108)</td>
<td>(0.344)</td>
<td>(0.304)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.108)</td>
<td>(0.344)</td>
<td>(0.304)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-3.343***</td>
<td>-4.324***</td>
<td>-1.977***</td>
<td>-2.948***</td>
<td>-2.177***</td>
<td>-2.851***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.389)</td>
<td>(0.338)</td>
<td>(0.453)</td>
<td>(0.312)</td>
<td>(0.396)</td>
<td>(0.290)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>7,614</td>
<td>7,548</td>
<td>7,598</td>
<td>7,532</td>
<td>7,598</td>
<td>7,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country-Year FEs</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country-Sector FEs</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector-Year FEs</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure: Elasticities between upstreamness and labor productivity
Results

- General robust **negative association** between **downstreamness** and value added performances.
  - focusing on manufacturing sectors → cut of the right end of the standard “smiling curve”.
  - elasticity between D and LP is negative for all regions.
  - elasticities are negative for all the sectors.

- **Mixed evidence** for **upstreamness**.
  - controlling for the full set of fixed effects → negative association.
  - excluding sector-specific fixed effects → coefficient turns positive
  - no significance at regional level.
  - elasticity between U and LP is negative for all sectors except for Wood and Paper.
Concluding remarks

- We compute and provide **access to a new dataset of GVC positioning indicators** - now well established in the literature- at the country-sector level for a large number of countries and a long time span.
- We show that $U$ and $D$ are strongly **correlated** overtime, in line with Antràs and Chor (2018) work on WIOD data.
- We present **some pilot tests** starting from one of the most intriguing and important relationship, namely that between productivity and GVC positioning.
- We find that **positioning along the GVCs matters** in determining changes in value added.

**Availability of new indicators of GVCs positioning** at the country and sectoral level provided by this work

→ **Unprecedented opportunity to carry out** qualitative and quantitative analyses on economic aspects related to GVCs.
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