Wage Effects from Changes in Local Human Capital in Britain

Ioannis Kaplanis (SERC, Department of Geography & Environment, London School of Economics)

January 2010

Wage Effects from Changes
in Local Human Capital in Britain

Ioannis Kaplanis[*]

January 2010

* SERC, Department of Geography & Environment, London School of Economics

Office for National Statistics Data usage

This work contains statistical data from ONS which is Crown copyright and reproduced with the permission of the controller of HMSO and Queen's Printer for Scotland. The use of the ONS statistical data in this work does not imply the endorsement of the ONS in relation to the interpretation or analysis of the statistical data. This work uses research datasets which may not exactly reproduce National Statistics aggregates.

Abstract

This paper examines the wage effects arising from changing local human capital in the labour market areas of Britain. Employing wage regressions, it is found that individuals' wages are positively associated with changes in the employment shares of high-paid occupation workers in the British travel-to-work-areas for the late 1990s. I examine this positive association for different occupational groups (defined by pay) in order to disentangle between production function and consumer demand driven theoretical justifications. The former refer to production complementarities or wider productivity spillovers arising in areas with high shares of high-skill workers. According to the latter, the presence of a high income workforce in the economy boosts the demand for consumer services leading to an increase in low-pay, service related employment. As these services are non-traded, the increased demand for local low-paid services should be reflected in a wage premium for the relevant low-paid occupation employees in the areas with larger shares of high-paid workers. The wage impact is found to be stronger and significant for the bottom occupational quintile compared to the middle-occupational quintiles and using also sectoral controls the paper argues to provide some preliminary evidence for the existence of consumer demand effects. The empirical investigation addresses potential sources of biases controlling for time invariant unobserved area-specific characteristics and unobserved individual characteristics. Nevertheless, the paper points to a number of caveats of the analysis that warrant future research.

I. Introduction

Following stable wage structures for most of the 20th Century, earnings inequality in many Western economies started to rise from the mid-1970s onwards and drew the attention of researchers and policy makers. Most economists favoured an explanation along the lines of 'skill-biased technological change' (SBTC) in order to account for the rise in inequality (for reviews see Katz and Autor, 1999; Machin, 2008).

Although SBTC might be able to explain the processes at the upper-tail of the wage distribution, recently economists started to challenge its capacity to adequately account for the processes at the lower tail of the wage distribution. In particular, they document trends of rising job polarisation in UK and US that the SBTC explanation would fail to predict (Goos and Manning, 2007; Autor et al. 2006, 2008). There was already an important relevant research in the 1980s and 1990s looking into polarisation of employment, but since it was mainly associated with the deindustrialisation thesis, it suffered the same criticisms with it and received less attention over the years. The revival of the interest in polarisation came after a nuanced view on technological change offered by Autor, Levy and Murnane (2003) and taken forward by Goos and Manning (2007) on their work on polarisation in UK.

However, these accounts on polarisation do not have a specific spatial element, as they lie on a solely technological explanation. Recently it has been argued that polarisation can get a spatially differentiated pattern and empirical evidence for the British regions has shown London to be unique in terms of the magnitude of its employment polarisation (Kaplanis, 2007). Therefore this paper examines a relatively

less researched explanation that is based on a consumer demand mechanism and has spatial considerations.

It is suggested that a spatially differentiated pattern for polarisation might arise through the expansion of consumer demand for non-traded locally produced consumer services. There have been contributions to this direction both from the urban geography/sociology and the economics literature (Sassen, 2001; Manning, 2004; Mazzolari and Ragusa, 2007). This paper attempts to shed some light on this hypothesis for Britain by looking at wage effects from changes in the local human capital of local areas (measured by occupational composition).

In brief, the suggested consumer demand mechanism is the following. There is a growing high-skill workforce residing in the cities that takes advantage both of the high-rewarded and specialised employment opportunities in the new growth sectors and the urban amenities offered in the cities. The rise of this high-skill workforce employed mainly in financial and business services induces further growth of consumption amenities and services through increased spending. A significant proportion of these services refer to the low-pay sector and notable examples are cleaning, security, restaurant and bar services as well as the retail sector. As they are also non-traded, they have to be produced and consumed locally and this implies physical proximity of the high-income workforce and the low-paid service workers.

This mechanism has the potential to generate spatially differentiated patterns of polarisation when there is a spatial sorting of high-skilled workers. Given an upward sloping supply curve, the increased demand for these local low-skill service jobs

should be reflected in a wage premium for the respective low-skill service workers in the local areas with growing shares of high-skill workforce[1]. Therefore the empirical analysis will examine the wage effects arising from a larger share of high-skilled employment in the local area and particularly their effect on the wages of low-skill service jobs.

Using ASHE data for the period 1997-2001, a scatter plot shows a strong positive association between the median real hourly wage of a travel-to-work-area and its employment share of high-skilled occupations like managers and senior officials (Figure 1). This is not surprising and the positive relationship can be attributed to various roots including worker characteristics (i.e. more productive workers) and area specific characteristics like industrial mix, urban status and historical reasons. Controlling for observed personal characteristics of the area's population but also for some unobserved individual and area heterogeneity, this paper will seek to examine if there still remains a positive relationship between wages and shares of high-skilled workers in an area. In that respect, the main aim is to shed light on the existence of positive human capital spillover effects on wages: otherwise similar workers earn a wage premium in areas with higher human capital (above the one that that their individual characteristics would dictate).

There exists an important literature on human capital externalities which is also associated with research on agglomeration economies and productivity gains through knowledge spillovers, local input sharing and labour market pooling (Marshall, 1890;

---

[1] The positive shift of the labour demand for low-skilled workers should also have employment effects. Kaplanis (2009) applies a probit model to LFS microdata in order to examine how the employment probability of otherwise similar individuals is associated with changes in the share of degree holders in the local area.

Lucas, 1988; Glaeser, 1999; Acemoglu and Angrist, 2000; Moretti, 2004). Besides such production function accounts, I am interested to find if there are wage effects arising through a consumer demand mechanism and examine its contribution to the overall outcome. Therefore the consumption demand hypothesis is examined in comparison with two competing production related accounts: production complementarities and wider productivity spillovers. The former refer to productivity increases due to imperfect substitutability between low and high-skilled workers; the latter to human capital externalities through face-to-face interaction with high-skilled workers and knowledge spillovers.

The following section II provides a brief overview of the literature and the theoretical framework. Section III explains the data, the spatial level of the analysis and the empirical strategy that is employed. Section IV presents the samples used and the empirical results. The last section V sums up the findings and concludes.

II. Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

As said, I attempt to distinguish between wage effects that come through a consumer demand mechanism and wage effects through the production function, whether productivity spillovers or production complementarities[2].

---

[2] A more extended discussion of the theoretical framework and the relevant literature is available in Kaplanis (2009).

Consumer demand explanation

Let's first see the working hypothesis for the consumer demand mechanism. According to this hypothesis, cities have complementarities with high-skilled workers and increasing returns to human capital or local urban amenities might lure growing numbers of high-skilled workers to cities. The growing numbers of high-skilled workers in cities can induce further growth of consumption amenities and services through their spending. High-income, high educated workers spend more (in absolute and relative terms), compared to the other income and education groups, for services that are income and education elastic, like some leisure activities and personal services (as in Clark, 1957; Leonardi, 2008). Examples can be spending on restaurants and bars as well as care, cleaning and security.

Most of these services refer to the low-pay sector of the economy. As these services are labour intensive and technology cannot easily substitute for human labour in their performance, there will be increased demand for the relevant low-skill service occupations[3]. Furthermore, as they are non-traded, they need to be produced and consumed locally and this requires physical proximity of the high-income workforce and the low-paid service workers. Therefore, this consumer demand mechanism has the potential to create polarisation outcomes that differ across urban areas depending on the growth of the high-skilled individuals. It may be expected that urban areas or city regions with faster growing shares of high-skilled individuals will experience greater polarisation.

---

[3] See relevantly Baumol's (1967) discussion of the "technologically non-progressive" sectors. More recently, Autor et al. (2003) and Goos and Manning (2007) have examined technology's inability to perform non-routine tasks, that are not only found in high-skill jobs but also in low-skill manual jobs.

Albeit within different contexts, accounts relevant to the consumer demand story have been extensively analysed in the urban economics literature (Glaeser et al. 2001; Glaeser and Saiz, 2004; Shapiro, 2006). In their discussion of 'consumer city', Glaeser et al. (2001) argue that cities offer urban amenities and consumption opportunities that enabled them to sustain and increase their population and workforce giving rise to the recent urban resurgence. Urban amenities are vital to attracting high skill labour that in turn fosters the economic success of cities and thus may benefit the poorer city residents as well. At the same time, empirical evidence from the US shows that high skill individuals are more likely to make use of the urban amenities and go to a performance or dine outside at a restaurant (Glaeser and Gottlieb, 2006). Consequently, restaurants, theatres and other consumption amenities tend to proliferate in cities with higher shares of educated residents. Shapiro (2006) showed that cities with higher human capital experienced higher growth of restaurants per capita in US in the nineties.

Important contributions to this direction have been offered by researchers in the urban sociology and geography disciplines that have theorised the transformation of cities by the growth of financial services and the new economy sector in the recent era of increased capital mobility and intensified competition (Friedman and Wolf, 1982; Mollenkopf and Castells, 1991; Sassen, 2001; Perrons, 2004). According to Sassen's original contribution, these new growth sectors with their soared profits concentrate in global cities which are the strategic sites for the location of global command functions because of the available infrastructure and facilities. The consequent expansion of high-income workforce in the cities has led to "high income residential and

commercial gentrification [that] is labor intensive and raises the demand for maintenance, cleaning, delivery, and other types of low-wage workers" (2001, p.286).

There have also been recently contributions by economists along similar lines that offer empirical evidence for US. Manning (2004) and Mazzolari and Ragusa (2007) theoretical accounts lie on the outsourcing of non-traded housework activities by the high-skilled that generates increased demand for low-skilled workers in the home services sector. Manning (2004) provides empirical evidence for the broader non-traded sector (which is more in line with the analysis of this paper), while Mazzolari and Ragusa distinguish between the broader non-traded sector and the home services sector finding evidence just for the latter. Specifically, Manning (2004) presents empirical evidence for US that cities with higher shares of college graduates have increased employment rate of low-skill workers. This effect declines for the medium-skill groups and disappears for the high-skilled ones. Higher shares of college graduates in a city increase employment of the low-skilled in the non-traded sector while decrease low-skill employment in the traded sector. This pattern is not documented for the other skill groups.

Mazzolari and Ragusa (2007) use US consumer expenditure data to demonstrate that richer or more educated households spend a larger part of their budget share on home services. They attribute that to the higher value of time for these households that tend to hire labour for services they would normally do themselves like housework and childcare. Employing a panel of US cities they find evidence of a positive association between growth of relative wages at the bottom and the top of the distribution. This association increases with larger shares of low-wage workers employed in home

services but not affected by larger shares of low-wage workers in the broader non-traded sector. As it also not affected by larger shares of college graduates in the city, they interpret this as evidence against the existence of human capital externalities or production complementarities as alternative accounts.

Production function explanations

Let's now consider the alternative explanations to the consumer demand story that are production related and can give rise to wage effects. These can be distinguished to human capital externalities and production complementarities between low skill and high skill workers.

There is an extensive literature on human capital externalities and therefore the discussion here will be brief. Lucas (1988) was arguing that some form of formal or informal interactions between workers generate external effects of human capital and enhance productivity of fellow workers. Subsequently, a strand of mainly empirical research has emerged trying to estimate these external effects of human capital (Rauch, 1993; Acemoglu and Angrist, 2000; Moretti, 2003, 2004; Ciccone and Peri, 2006). Researchers in this strand have often employed wage regressions that control for individual characteristics and human capital and include the level of human capital at the city or state level as an additional variable, in order to capture its external effects.

But the source of the externalities that this exercise estimates might come from the kind of interactions that the agglomeration literature examines (see Duranton, 2006

for such an argument). This important literature, that stems out of Marshall's work (1890), attempts to examine the interactions between firms/workers in the workplace or the city level and their impact on productivity (Ciccone and Hall, 1996; Glaeser and Mare, 2001; Duranton and Puga, 2004; Rosenthal and Strange, 2004; Combes and Overman, 2004; Gordon and McCann, 2005; Combes et al., 2008). As it is argued, firms agglomerate in space as they can gain productivity benefits from economies of scale due to local input sharing, labour market pooling and knowledge spillovers. In the agglomeration literature productivity benefits come from sectoral and/or urban agglomeration rather than higher human capital in a spatial unit (as the human capital externalities literature examines). However, it is reasonable to expect that locations with high human capital would offer increased provision of specialised inputs and reduced labour matching frictions due to the availability of appropriately skilled labour (Duranton, 2006). Furthermore, there is empirical evidence that cities with higher human capital favour communication interactions, which foster productivity (Charlot and Duranton, 2004).

Productivity spillovers should be expected to arise for all educational groups to one extent or another (Moretti, 2004). On the other hand, if we make the reasonable assumption of imperfect substitutability between different skill groups, then productivity increases could arise without the need for a greater productivity spillover effect. In a standard neoclassical model of perfect competition with two types of labour, skilled and unskilled, an increase in the numbers of skilled labour would raise the productivity of the unskilled labour just because of production complementarities (for relevant research see Moretti, 2004; Ciccone and Peri, 2006).

9

In order to disentangle between these two production mechanisms, Moretti (2004) looks on wage effects from higher human capital in US cities for different skill groups. For the low-skill groups, the productivity spillovers and the production complementarities mechanisms have both positive wage effects as they increase the productivity of the workers. For the high-skill groups, while knowledge spillovers tend to increase the productivity of the workers, the increased supply of high-skill workers has a negative wage effect as predicted by a downward sloping demand curve, leaving the direction of the final wage effect indecisive. The empirical pattern that arises for US is very consistent with the simultaneous effect of these two mechanisms. The wage premium is found to decrease as we move up the educational ladder. Specifically, 1% rise in the share of college graduates in the city increases the wages of high-school drop-outs by 1.9%, of high school graduates by 1.6% and of college graduates by 0.4%.

III. Empirical Strategy and Data Used

The Data

The main empirical exercise conducted for this paper involves wage regressions and the data come from the historic series of Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (ASHE) for Britain, that applies ASHE methodology to the earlier New Earnings Survey data (NES). ASHE is the survey that succeeded the New Earnings Survey (NES) in 2004 offering an improved version of it. As NES, it is an employer-based

survey and covers all individuals whose national insurance number ends in a specific pair of digits- approximately 160,000 individuals a year. Statistical imputation for item non-response, weighting to be consistent with LFS population estimates and better coverage of low-earners and people who recently changed or started new jobs have been the main improvements compared to NES. The NES does not cover people who earn less than the threshold for paying national insurance contributions and therefore ASHE includes a supplement survey to improve their coverage. For the years before 2004, the NES data have been re-constructed using the ASHE methodology in order to give historic data for the period 1997-2003. Therefore for the period 1997-2003, historic data for ASHE exist that do not include though the supplementary sample of low-earners. These are essentially NES data with imputation and weighting that is applied to ASHE and henceforth referred as 'ASHE' for simplicity reasons (rather than 'historic ASHE'). As the occupational coding changes in 2002 and in order to have a consistent coding for a sufficient time span, this paper examines the five year period 1997-2001. Detailed geographical information on the workplace of each employee at the postcode level enables analysis at different spatial levels (NES did not offer information at the postcode level). One of the limitations of the ASHE dataset is its lack of information on education. Therefore, an empirical strategy that does not use educational information but focuses on occupations has been developed and presented in the subsequent section.

The empirical strategy

The main task of the empirical strategy is to discern between the consumption demand hypothesis outlined earlier and alternative production function related

approaches. The latter, as discussed, refer to the productivity spillovers and production complementarities mechanisms. Wage equations are applied to ASHE microdata to examine to what extent individuals accrue a wage premium in localities with larger shares of high-skilled individuals. Since ASHE does not have any information on education, I use a measure of skill based on pay and the explanatory variable of interest is defined as the share of individuals in the locality who are employed in the top-paid occupations.

Applying wage regressions to the whole sample of individuals is not particularly useful since all three accounts could generate a positive shift of the labour demand curve and contribute to the wage premium found. According to the consumer demand hypothesis, abundant high income high skilled individuals stimulate the local demand for low-paid low-skilled consumer services and inflate the wages for the relevant low paid occupations. Alternatively, the existence of human capital externalities would imply that abundant high-skilled labour force raises the productivity of the local workers through physical interaction and knowledge spillovers. However, it is possible to expect positive productivity spillovers even without the presence of wider human capital externalities if low and high skilled workers are considered to be imperfect substitutes. Then the productivity of low-skilled workers increases with the presence of larger numbers of high-skilled workers due to production complementarities as in a standard neoclassical model.

It should be noted here that the exact impact on wages from the outward shift of the labour demand would also depend on the elasticity of the labour supply. Assuming a

non-elastic labour supply curve at least in the short run, larger shares of high-skilled individuals would exert an upward force on the wages.

Since these three mechanisms discussed above do not have a similar impact across the skill distribution, it is more informative to split the sample in different skill groups and apply separate regressions for each of them. The consumer demand and the production complementarities accounts would affect predominantly the wages of the low skilled groups while we expect productivity spillovers to have a similar effect across different skill groups. I compose these skill groups from occupation cells characterised by different median wages. These broader occupational groupings that denote different skill groups might serve better the purposes of capturing the consumer demand hypothesis than skill groups defined by qualifications would do. We will see in a following section that the low-paid occupational groups refer mainly to consumer and personal service occupations that are non-traded and according to the theoretical framework described earlier they are increasingly dependent on consumer demand arising from the presence of high-income workforce on the locality. Moretti (2004) used qualification groups and in a similar vein applied separate wage regressions to them although his purpose was to inform on productivity spillovers while abstracting from production complementarities effects.

Before seeing in more detail how the differential impact of the share of high-skilled individuals on different occupational categories can inform on the three different accounts, let's first consider the main model that is used.

Model specification

Equation (i) presents the basic econometric specification employed in my empirical model.

$$log(w_{iat}) = X'_{it}\beta + \lambda * SHARE10_{at} + d_o + d_{rt} + u_{iat} \qquad (i)$$

It shows the log hourly wage of individual i who resides in area a in year t. Region-year fixed effects d_{rt} are included in the model to control for economic cycles at the broader regional level[4]. X_{it} is a vector of individual characteristics (a proxy of experience based on age and its quadratic form, dummies for gender, part-time employment, trainee/junior rate employment) and d_o is a set of occupational fixed effects (3-digit Standard Occupational Classification SOC90). u is the error term which ideally it would be independently and identically distributed across individuals, areas and years. Finally, *SHARE10* is our variable of interest that stands for the employment share of individuals who do the highest-paid occupations in the area a at a given year t.

Classifying individuals in occupation groups according to pay

The 3-digit SOC90 occupational coding is used in order to classify occupations according to pay with 1997 as the base year. Each of the 367 occupational cells is ranked from worst (1) to best (367) according to its median hourly pay in Britain in 1997 and then grouped into broader occupation categories so that each category

---

[4] I have also produced results using a less restricted specification with just yearly fixed effects that control for national cycles.

contains the 10% of the employees nationally for 1997. This way ten 'occupational deciles' are created. The explanatory variable of interest *SHARE10* denotes the percentage of employees who are employed in occupations that form the highest paid occupational decile (i.e. the 10th). Although *SHARE10* is 10% nationally for 1997 by construction, it varies across areas and years. The variable of interest was constructed using the highest decile since it aims to capture only the occupations that are very highly remunerated and serve as a proxy for the high-skilled.

As discussed in the 'Emprical Strategy' subsection, the main empirical exercise is to examine how *SHARE10* impacts on wages of different skill groups. I construct these different skill groups from occupational cells as did with the *SHARE10*, but now 'occupational quintiles' rather than 'deciles' are used since I am interested in a broader definition of skill. There are now five 'occupational quintiles' (Q1-Q5) created according to pay data for Britain in 1997 (in a similar way with the creation of the 'occupational deciles'). Occupation quintile 1 (Q1) contains workers who are employed in the lowest paid occupations so that they form nationally the 20% of the employees in 1997, while Q5 is the highest-paid occupation quintile. The main regression (i) is repeated separately for these five occupational quintiles, in order to examine how the share of the high-skilled jobs in an area (*SHARE10*) affects the wages of different skill groups ('occupational quintiles Q1-Q5').

A detailed list of occupations that form the top occupational decile *SHARE10* and their employment share in 1997 is shown in the Appendix A (Table 15). As most of them are in business and finance as well as the new economy sectors, they match the notion of the high-income workforce that is put forward in the consumer demand

driven approach. For example, occupation cells of substantial size are the marketing and sales managers, that take up 1.9% of the total employment share in 1997, and brokers (0.7%). In Appendix A (Table 16), the bottom paid occupations that form occupational quintile Q1 are also presented. The most sizable occupation cells are care assistants (1.9% of total employment), cleaners (3.3%) and sales assistants (5.2%), which is also the largest of all 367 cells.

The spatial level of the analysis

An important issue for consideration is the spatial units of the analysis, denoted as *a* in equation (i). For the years 1997-2001 ASHE has information only on the workplace and not on the residence of an individual. Since workplace information would be more informative for production related human capital externalities, while residence information for the consumer demand hypothesis, this limits the potential for such dual analysis. Then although ASHE allows analysis to very fine geographies like postcode area or local authorities (LAs), I have to opt for larger geographical entities like travel-to-work-areas, where the majority of the employees live in the same area that they work and thus reasonably consume within it. The travel-to-work-areas (TTWAs) definition is the best we can get to self-contained labour markets. By definition they are constructed such that the bulk of their population lives and works within the same area and are discussed in further detail below. Another advantage of using TTWAs is that they are based in non-administrative boundaries unlike the local authority districts.

Travel-to-Work-Areas (TTWAs)

Office for National Statistics (ONS) constructed TTWAs for UK according to a logarithm that ensures that the majority of the workers of an area live in the same area and also the majority of residents of an area work in the same area (75%). The population can vary widely but the lowest threshold by construction is 3,500 individuals. The London TTWA is the largest one and includes both London Government Office Region and few adjacent localities. ONS defined 243 TTWAs for UK utilising the 2001 Census information on home and work addresses of the population. Excluding Northern Ireland, there are 232 TTWAs for Britain which is the focus of study.

ASHE does not have information on the 2001 TTWAs but rather on the outdated 1991 TTWAs that were 314. Therefore, I used the postcode information available in ASHE on the workplace of an employee to make the match to the corresponding 2001 TTWA. After the cleaning of the sample, TTWAs that were left with few observations (less than 50) were dropped so that each TTWA has large enough sample size for reliable analysis. The final working set consists of 195 TTWAs for Britain.

Regions

When controlling for cycles in the regional economy, region-year fixed effects are included. The working definition of 'region' refers to standard administrative spatial entities used for regional analysis in Britain. These are the 9 Government Office Regions of England (North East, North West, Yorkshire & Humber, East Midlands,

West Midlands, South West, East, London, South East) together with the devolved administrations of Wales and Scotland (11 in total).

Local Authorities (LAs)

The main empirical analysis is conducted at the TTWAs level but it has been tried also at lower spatial entities like local authorities (LAs) for comparison purposes. There are 408 local authority/unitary authority districts in Britain that correspond to administrative entities. Dropping a district due to small sample size (Isles of Scilly), we are left with 407 LAs for the empirical analysis.

Dealing with Potential Sources of Bias

In estimating the basic regression (i), an issue of concern is potential sources of biases arising from omitted variables. Firstly, there may be area-specific unobserved characteristics that are correlated both with the share of high-paid occupation workers *SHARE10* but also with wages. For example, areas with better urban amenities will attract a larger number of high-paid occupation workers (see Glaeser et al. 2001 for such an argument) and also pay higher wages to compensate for the higher urban rents. Similarly, dynamic areas that due to their industrial mix or historic reasons are booming generate more managerial and new economy sector jobs while at the same time pay higher wages. A way to control for variations in the wages that are caused from the time invariant part of area differences (industrial structure, historic reasons, physical and cultural amenities) is to use area fixed effects (d_a) (Equation (ii)). This can be seen like deflating with an area deflator the wages to adjust for area differences in the levels of the wages.

Another potential source of bias can arise from unobserved individual characteristics. Education and ability are both unobserved in our empirical model as data are not available in the ASHE dataset to control for them. Employees who are better educated and/or more able (e.g. a sale assistant with a bachelor degree) would possibly be more productive and a non-random sorting of them across areas will bias the results. If areas with more abundant high-paid workforce offer better returns to education/ability, then they would attract better educated/able employees. As these employees might be more productive compared to other areas' employees with similar observed characteristics doing similar jobs, a correlation of the share of high-paid occupation workers and high wages arises.

To control for time-invariant unobserved education/ability, I use individual fixed effects (d_i). Now, I essentially estimate how changes in the wage of a specific individual are associated with changes in the percentage of the top-paid jobs in the area. I drop atemporal personal characteristics like gender and keep experience and its quadratic form, full/part time status, trainee/adult rate and occupational dummies as my controls. The point of keeping the occupational dummies is to control for variation in the wages of individuals who move to jobs that have a higher remuneration.

Therefore using both individual and area fixed effects (Equation (ii)), the identification for the coefficient *SHARE10* comes from two sources: people who stay in the same area and how changes in the shares of top-paid jobs in the area affect their wages, as well as from people who move to other areas. In the latter case,

identification comes from a change in the wage of the mover by more (less) than is the level effect associated with that area and taken away with the area fixed effect.

$$log(w_{iat}) = d_i + d_a + X'_{it}\beta + \lambda * SHARE10_{at} + d_o + d_{rt} + u_{iat} \qquad (ii)$$

However, this econometric specification (individual; area fixed effects) might still generate a positive coefficient for the share of top-paid jobs for the wrong reasons. For example it might be the case that high-paid occupation workers move between areas for job purposes only if they are going to get a higher wage (above the area level effect) and at the same time they are attracted to areas that have higher percentages of top-paid jobs because these areas also offer better urban amenities. To control for that and estimate how changes in the percentage of top paid jobs affects the wage premium of people who stay in the same area over time, an econometric specification with individual interacted with area fixed effects ('individual-area', d_{ia}) is used (Equation (iii)). Therefore a person will get a different dummy if she moves to another area and the identification in the econometric specification comes from the effect of the share of top-paid jobs on her wage in the subsequent years.

$$log(w_{iat}) = d_{ia} + X'_{it}\beta + \lambda * SHARE10_{at} + d_o + d_{rt} + u_{iat} \qquad (iii)$$

This is my preferred econometric specification which is applied both for the full sample and for different subsamples representing different skill groups. An earlier subsection explained the construction of five 'occupation quintiles' (Q1-Q5) based on pay, that correspond to different skill groups. The next section examines how the

differential performance of the preferred econometric specification for the different occupational quintiles might aid my identification strategy.

Distinguishing between the three different accounts

As said, the purpose of the empirical strategy is to shed light on the effect of the consumer demand mechanism and discern it from the two alternative production related mechanisms. The way to do so is to examine the differential impact of the share of top-paid occupation workers on the wages of the various occupational quintiles, that represent different skill groups. Regarding the productivity spillovers account, it is not expected to find a differential impact amongst the various occupational groups. Rather, human capital externalities arising from larger shares of high-killed workers would raise the productivity of the average worker in each of the occupational quintiles causing a shift of the corresponding labour demand. The induced wage impact should be roughly similar for the different occupational quintiles.

In contrast, if having more managers, bankers and generally top-paid occupation workers in an area boosts the labour demand for local low paid occupations such as cleaners, care workers and bartenders through consumption, the wage impact would affect the bottom occupational quintile (Q1). Also, if managers and bankers demand more receptionists and security staff in their workplace, then a wage premium at the bottom occupation quintile could be generated from production complementarities rather than consumer demand. Therefore, it could be informative to compare the coefficient of the share of top-paid occupation workers found for the bottom (Q1) and

that found for the other occupational quintiles (Q2-Q5). A higher positive coefficient for bottom occupational quintile compared to the other quintiles can be considered a product of the simultaneous effect of consumer demand and production complementarities. However, it can prove more difficult to separate between the consumer demand and production complementarities effects.

Looking at the industrial composition of the area could be informative. Firstly, using occupation-industry fixed effects in the analysis can abstract from the coefficient of the variable of interest capturing changes in the industrial composition rather than genuine consumer demand effects. For example, it is possible that production complementarities could generate a move of cleaners and security staff from the housework sector to corporate sectors where remuneration might be higher and this could be picked up at the corresponding wage premium found. Occupation-industry fixed effects control for this possibility.

Furthermore, I would expect that production complementarities take place predominantly within the same industrial sector rather than across sectors, since larger shares of top-paid occupation workers would tend to generate demand for low-paid occupation workers of the same sector. Therefore I add a variable that captures the share of top-paid occupation workers in the same sector and area with the individual. At the same time I amend the variable of interest so that it captures the share of top-paid occupation workers in local area excluding the sector that the individual observation belongs to. The relevant econometric specification is shown below.

$$log(w_{iats}) = d_{ia} + X'_{it}\beta + \lambda * SHARE10_{at,-s} + \mu * SHARE10_{sat} + d_o + d_{rt} + u_{iat} \qquad \text{(iv)}$$

where s stands for the sector of the individual i in year t and area a.

$SHARE10_{at,-s}$ is similar to (iii) but now excludes the own sector, while $SHARE10_{sat}$ is the share of top-paid occupation workers that changes across sectors s, areas a and years t.

In that respect I interpret the coefficient of $SHARE10_{sat}$ as capturing production complementarities and productivity spillover effects within sectors, while the coefficient $SHARE10_{at,-s}$ capturing mainly the consumer demand effect at the area level. The coefficient of $SHARE10_{at,-s}$ is possibly an underestimate of the true consumer demand effect if there are consumer demand effects within sectors and an overestimate if there are production complementarities and productivity spillovers between sectors. To the extent that these opposing biases are small or cancel out, a coefficient close to an unbiased one would be expected.

As discussed in section II, wage effects from production complementarities might arise for the low-skill workers due to imperfect substitutability of low and high-skill labour. Wider productivity spillovers (on top of production complementarities) refer to human capital externalities that arise from increased knowledge spillovers, provision of specialised local inputs and availability of skilled labour force in areas with higher human capital. For our case this is not straightforward but depends to the extent that the share of top-paid occupation workers in an area ($SHARE10_{at,-s}$) or an industry-area ($SHARE10_{sat}$) can be thought as a reasonable proxy to measure human capital in the respective unit. Then, if there are external returns from the overall level

of human capital above the individual returns to human capital, productivity spillovers can be said to emerge.

Since in the case of $SHARE10_{sat}$ the economies are generated within the same sector, these productivity gains can be thought as 'localisation economies' that are internal to the industry but external to the firm (using the terminology of the agglomeration literature). These are localisation economies not in the standard usage of the term that refers to economies of industrial agglomeration but rather as simply human capital externalities within the same sector. In a similar vein, $SHARE10_{at,-s}$ can be thought as capturing 'urbanisation economies' that are external to the sector but internal to the area. Again it should be noted that these are urbanisation economies not in the standard usage of the term referring to urban agglomeration economies that arise from increased city size or density but human capital externalities between sectors for a specific travel-to-work-area.

This distinction between localisation and urbanisation economies might be useful to have in our mind when interpreting the coefficients, but its explanatory capacity might be limiting when the econometric specification is applied to just the bottom occupational quintile (Q1). As said earlier, wage effects for this quintile can come from all three accounts: productivity spillovers, production complementarities or consumer demand effects. In that respect, it might be more useful and accurate to restrain from this terminology for the rest of the paper and think of $SHARE10_{sat}$ and $SHARE10_{at,-s}$ as capturing 'within' or 'between sectors' effects respectively (coming from any of the three accounts).

In order to control for production complementarities or productivity spillovers that are firm-specific, I add a variable that controls for the share of top-paid occupation workers in the individual firm. As seen in (v):

$$log(w_{iats}) = d_{ia} + X'_{it}\beta + \lambda * SHARE10_{at} + \mu * SHARE10_{fat} + d_o + d_{rt} + u_{iat} \qquad (v)$$

where $SHARE10_{fat}$ stands for the share of top-paid occupation workers within the firm.

Since firms cannot be identified over years in the ASHE dataset, it is not possible to add firm fixed effects in the model and exploit the potential of this approach as well. A firm fixed effects specification would abstract from identification arising from workers moving between firms.

Finally, I select a subset of occupations out of the bottom occupational quintile that refer to consumer and personal service occupations but are not affected by production complementarities or spillovers in a straightforward way. Then I apply wage regressions to just this subset of occupations. To the extent that my selection criterion is satisfied, the variable of interest ($SHARE10_{at}$) may capture a wage impact that mainly feeds through the consumer demand mechanism rather than production related ones. The selected occupations combined make up 8.6% of the total national employment in 1997 and are presented in Appendix A (Table 17). The most sizeable of them are cleaners (3.3%), care assistants (1.9%), bar staff (0.8%), childcare workers (0.8%), cooks (0.7%) and waiters/waitresses (0.5%).

IV. Empirical Results

Samples used and Descriptive Statistics

The sample is restricted to men and women of age 16-64. Only individuals who appear in the sample for more than one year in the period 1997-2001 are included so that variation comes from multiple observations of the same individual in the individual-area fixed effects specifications. I drop observations whose pay was affected by absence and also those with unrealistically low or high real hourly wages (below £1 or above £200 in 2001 prices). Finally, observations with missing information on the location of workplace are excluded. The final sample I get is 610,016 observations in total for 1997-2001, that correspond to 169,842 individuals. The employees stay on the sample on average for 3.6 years. Summary statistics for this sample are shown in Table 1. This is the sample that is going to be used in most of the analysis that follows. It is slightly reduced for the analysis that includes sectoral controls since observations with missing information on industry were dropped.

Distribution of SHARE10

The share of top-paid occupation employees *SHARE10* varies across 195 TTWAs and 5 years. Considering its distribution over the 975 area-years, the median TTWA had 7.4% of employees working at the top occupational decile (Table 2). The average is 7.7% with standard deviation 2.7. It is interesting to see that the bottom 1% of the TTWAs have a share below 1.8% and the top 1% of TTWAs a share above 16.7%.

Table 2 shows also the distribution of median real hourly wages for the TTWAs of the sample. The median sample size for the TTWAs is 299 with standard deviation 1488 (mean 626).

Regressions

Table 3 presents results on the basic wage regression (Equation (i)) for all workers. This pooled regression does not link individuals that appear in the sample more than once but considers them separately. Log hourly wages are regressed on the share of the top-paid occupational decile workers *SHARE10* in the TTWA along with other controls. Other controls include occupational fixed effects and personal characteristics with information available in the ASHE dataset, such as gender, a proxy of experience based on age and its quadratic form, as well as dummies for part-time employment, trainee/junior rate employment. The specification in the first column uses year dummies that control for shocks in the national economy, while the second column uses region-year dummies to account for region specific shocks. In all econometric specifications that follow, the standard errors are corrected for the grouped nature of the data (area-year clusters).

The variable of interest, the share of the top-paid occupational decile workers *SHARE10* in the TTWA, has strongly significant positive coefficients in both specifications, 1.875 in the first column and 1.139 in the second column. Henceforth, I allow for regions to experience different shocks over time and present results for the

region-year dummies specification[5]. Overall, using this specification it is found that a 1 percentage point increase in the share of top-paid occupational workers in the area is associated with a 1.15% rise in wages.

As suggested earlier, it would be more informative for my research purposes to repeat this exercise for different occupational groups. Firstly, I restrict the sample to only workers employed in the bottom paid occupational quintile. The observations are now 113,499, roughly a fifth of the full sample. The results for the basic model specification are presented in the first column of results of Table 4. The wage premium arising to the bottom occupational quintile workers (Q1) from a higher share of top-paid occupational decile workers in the local area is now 0.84%. The magnitude and the significance of the coefficient are still quite high, although they declined compared to those of the full sample. Similarly, the coefficients of the other controls used have been diminished as well as the R^2 which is now almost a third of that for the full sample.

In order to control for some unobserved area heterogeneity that is time invariant (e.g. industrial structure, historic reasons, physical amenities), area fixed effects are included in the regression. The results are shown in Col.2 of Table 4 for the pooled sample of bottom-paid occupational quintile workers. The coefficient of *SHARE10* now drops significantly to 0.238 but still remains marginally significant at the 1% significance level. The controls used have coefficients quite similar to the basic model specification.

---

[5] This way I miss any particular effect driven from London since the region of London is roughly the same with its TTWA. But this might not alter things much, since using the less restricted year dummies specification, the increase in my variation comes from just five extra values of the *SHARE10* over time (London TTWA over the five years).

In column 3 of the same table, the results of the specification with area and individual fixed effects are shown. In this specification (Equation (ii)), I am controlling for the time-invariant part of unobserved characteristics of individuals, like education and ability (of course, both education and ability could possibly change). I now get identification in the model from two sources: the effect on the wage of an individual from changes in the share of high paid occupation workers in her area; wage gains (losses) from people who move between areas. The coefficient of *SHARE10* now takes a value of 0.217 and is significant at the 1% level. Only individual control variables that might change over time are included in the regression and their coefficients change substantially due to the inclusion of the individuals' fixed effects.

However, as discussed earlier this specification can still provide biased results. An example can be that individuals move to other areas only if they are to get wages higher than the premium associated with that area (i.e. the area fixed effect) and at the same time they self-select themselves to areas with better urban amenities, that are also the ones with abundant high-paid workforce.

In order to abstract from variation arising from individuals moving between areas, a specification with individual interacted with area fixed effects ('individual-area') is used (Col.4/Table 4). This is the preferred specification for this analysis and a full set of controls is used as in Equation (iii). The coefficient now of *SHARE10* stands to 0.225 and the t-statistic has risen to 3.00. This can be interpreted as a 0.23% rise in the hourly wage of an individual when the surrounding share of top-paid occupation workers in the TTWA increases by 1 percentage point. It corresponds to a wage rise

of 0.62% for one standard deviation increase in *SHARE10* (2.7 percentage points). It should be noted that although the sample size is 610,016, identification of the variable of interest *SHARE10* comes from an effective sample of 975, since *SHARE10* varies over 195 TTWAs and 5 years.

Table 5 presents comparative results from separate regressions on the 5 different occupational quintiles of workers. The specification used is the preferred one with a full set of individual-area fixed effects (Equation (iii)). It is found that the share of high-paid occupation workers at the local area *SHARE10* has differential impact for different occupational quintile workers. Its coefficient is higher and strongly significant for the bottom occupational quintile, positive but weakly significant for the top occupational quintile, while insignificant for all other quintiles (though positive).

According to the discussion in the Empirical Strategy subsection in III, a comparison of the coefficient for the different occupational quintiles can possibly inform on the three different accounts, consumer demand, production complementarities and productivity spillovers. The strongest coefficient found for the bottom occupational quintile can be interpreted as the product of the simultaneous effect of the consumer demand and production complementarities on top of productivity spillovers that are expected to have a roughly similar effect across occupational quintiles. The second occupational quintile has also a relatively high coefficient although insignificant and this might also be due to the effect of production complementarities, to the extent that the relevant low-skill employees are imperfect substitutes with the high-skilled employees captured by the variable of interest. Examining the list of occupations that compose the second occupational quintile, effects from a consumer demand root are

less likely. The third and fourth occupational quintiles have low positive coefficients which are also insignificant, failing to show any strong impact arising from productivity spillovers. The relatively high and weakly significant coefficient for the top occupational quintile (Q5) poses some caution in its analysis and possible interpretation. Since this quintile includes workers of the 9th and the 10th occupational decile, when trying to extract meaningful results on the relationship between the employment share of the 10th occupational decile (*SHARE10*) and the wages of workers of the same decile, the direction of the causation is not clear. For example, it may be the case that migrant high skilled workers are attracted to the local area due to the higher growth of wages (or the rising productivity) of the high-skilled workers that reside in the area. In that respect, there is an important relevant literature examining human capital flows through domestic migration for the UK regions (Fielding, 1993; Faggian and McCann, 2006; 2009; Champion and Coombes, 2007).

Table 6 has similar regressions with Table 5 but now the share of the individual's own quintile is added as an additional control. The share of employment of the own quintile might account for supply changes in the same skill group as the individual belongs to. The coefficient of *SHARE10* is not affected much by the inclusion of this control variable for the quintiles one to four (Columns 1-4). For the top quintile (Q5), the results are not meaningful as there is overlap of variable *SHARE10* that refers to the share of the highest decile (D10) and the own quintile's share which consists of deciles 9 and 10 (D9-D10). The coefficients for the personal controls are similar to the regressions without the supply control.

Taking a more agnostic approach, Table 7 presents similar regressions with Table 5 where now shares from all other occupational deciles are included as explanatory variables as well (where the reference base is decile 5). The purpose is to investigate if *SHARE10* was picking up earlier the effect on wages from high shares of other 'occupational deciles'[6]. As shown in column 1 which refers to the bottom quintile sample, the coefficient of *SHARE10* remains strong and highly significant while all other coefficients are insignificant with the exception of the coefficient of the share of the third decile *SHARE3* which is weakly significant. Therefore, it can be seen that the top-paid occupational decile is the variable that drives the effect on the wages of the bottom-paid occupational quintile workers. For the middle occupational quintiles (Q2-Q4), all coefficients are insignificant. For the top occupational quintile (Q5), it appears that the shares of deciles 9 and 10 have the strongest positive association with wages, although their interpretation is suspect to issues of causation as briefly discussed earlier.

Instrumental variable attempts

Although similar criticism for reverse causation can also apply to the regressions of the other occupational quintiles, for the top occupational quintile is clearly more relevant since it refers to the same sample from both sides of the equation. However, it is less clear why this reverse causation should matter for the bottom occupational quintile but not for the middle-occupational quintile ones. This can give some reassurance over my estimates for the bottom occupational quintile and the

---

[6] As seen in III, these 'occupational deciles' were constructed so that each makes up 10% of the workforce in Britain in 1997. They vary over areas and years and their share is higher (lower) than 10% in an area-year if the respective occupations are over-represented (under-represented) in that area-year relative to the share for Britain in 1997.

interpretation put forward in this paper. Of course, a formal treatment of concerns about reverse causality would require an empirical specification using instrumental variables. It has been difficult to find adequate variables to instrument for the share of top-paid occupation workers in the travel-to-work-area over time[7].

I have tried to use the number of first degrees qualifications awarded in the previous year (t-1) in the TTWA as an instrument for the share of workers of top-paid occupations ($SHARE10_{at}$) in year t in the TTWA. The correlation might arise since university students that graduated with a first degree in year (t-1) might stay in the same TTWA in the following year (t) and enter employment in high-skilled jobs. Given a three year study period for the vast majority of undergraduates, most of the graduates of year (t-1) applied for university admission three years before their graduation. Since the undergraduate admissions policy and application procedure for each university took place four years before the year of consideration (i.e. in t-4), it could be argued that it is largely unrelated with contemporaneous unobserved economic conditions that feed through as residuals in our wage regressions and thus considered exogenous. The assumption here is that the number of undergraduate admissions is determined by the admissions policy of the relevant institution and the number of undergraduate applicants, which are both argued to be unaffected by economic conditions in the university area in year t. Regarding the latter, there is some relevant empirical evidence from UK that choice of university has largely to do with university specific characteristics rather than the local employment opportunities of the university area available on graduation (Faggian and McCann, 2006).

---

[7] Experimenting with possible atemporal candidates like using a dummy for areas that have a pre-1992 university or the number of registered university students in the area in an earlier year (e.g. 1995) has not been successful. The main reason is that my observed pattern arises from changes in the share of top-paid occupation workers over time rather than the levels of this share.

Furthermore, it may be expected that the number of undergraduates graduating in academic year (*t-1*) would be correlated with the share of high-skilled employees in the relevant travel-to-work-area in the following year (*t*) and therefore be a relevant instrument for my variable of interest $SHARE10_{at}$. Using data for broader spatial entities like the UK regions, Faggian and McCann (2006) found that universities serve as 'conduits' that attract undergraduate human capital into a region, while many of the students stay to work in the local economy upon graduation.

Experimenting with this proposed instrument for finer spatial entities like TTWAs, I found a positive correlation for the 65 areas that have universities (out of the total 195). However, the first stage regression points to issues regarding the strength of the instrument and therefore the results are briefly presented here with a great degree of caution. I restricted the sample of observations to the 65 TTWAs that had at least one university in my period of study. Using data from the Higher Education Statistics Authority (HESA), I constructed a variable that measures the total number of first degrees qualifications awarded in year (*t-1*) from all universities based in travel-to-work-area *a* in order to instrument for *SHARE10* in year *t* and area *a* (e.g. awards in academic year 1995-1996 as an instrument for *SHARE10* in 1997). The IV regression gives a coefficient for *SHARE10* of 2.616 which is insignificant and has a high standard error of 1.72. The F statistic for the excluded instrument is very strong (279.21), but its Shea's partial R^2 is very low at 0.006 and undermines the relevance of this instrument.

Further examination of the bottom occupational quintile

With these caveats in mind, let's try now to shed more light in the strong positive significant coefficient found for the bottom occupational quintile in Table 5 (Column 1). Since there was not much evidence in favour of productivity spillovers from the analysis at the middle-paid occupational quintiles, this coefficient can be considered to be the outcome both of consumer demand mechanism and production complementarities. Before trying to discern between these two accounts, I present some more robustness checks for that quintile.

In Table 8, I add the log average hourly wage of the top-decile (*D10*) as an additional control to my econometric specification (Equation (iii)). Its coefficient shows a small elasticity of 0.014%, which is weakly significant at the 10% level, while the coefficient of *SHARE10* does not change much. In that respect, this result suggests that the main wage effect comes largely from greater shares of workers in top-paid occupations in the area and to a much less extent by higher levels of their wages.

Furthermore, I control for effects arising from unaccounted changes in the industrial composition by using occupation-industry dummies. The 367 occupations are now interacted with 13 industries (1-digit SIC03) to compose the occupation-industry dummies[8]. In that respect, a cleaner in the 'Hotels and Restaurant' sector is distinguished from a cleaner in the 'Financial Intermediation' Sector. The regression results are shown in Column 2 of Table 9 and are very similar to the specification

---

[8] Information on very detailed industries referring to the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC03) is available for each observation in ASHE. Using the one digit classification there are 17 sectors and aggregating further I end up with 13 industrial sectors.

with just occupational dummies (Column 1; reproduced from Col.1/Table 5). Therefore this gives me some reassurance on the results presented so far and for computational simplicity reasons I am going to continue with the occupational dummies specification (Equation (iii)).

In order to capture production complementarities within sectors, I include a variable $SHARE10_{sat}$ that denotes the employment share of top-paid occupation workers in the same industrial sector and area with the individual observation. The variable of interest $SHARE10_{at,-s}$ is amended to refer to the share of top-paid occupation workers employed in the area when excluding the sector the individual observation belongs to. The results are shown in Column 3 of Table 9. The coefficient of interest now captures consumer demand effects as well as production complementarities (and productivity spillovers) between sectors. As discussed in III, if the latter are minimal or cancel out with an opposing downward bias from within-sector consumer demand effects, $SHARE10_{at,-s}$ can be argued to capture the consumer demand impact generated from rising shares of high-paid occupation workers in the area. Both coefficients in the regression result are positive and significant. The wage effect arising from higher-shares of top-paid occupation workers within the sector is 0.119% and very strongly significant (as the share now changes across sectors, areas and years). Its inclusion reduces the coefficient of the variable of interest which now takes a lower value of 0.139 (down from 0.225 in Column 1) while it is still significant at the 5% level.

Column 4 of the same Table (4-9) shows results from the econometric specification that controls for the employment share of top-paid occupation workers in the same firm (Equation v). This control accounts for production complementarities or

productivity spillovers that are firm-specific. Its coefficient is found to be positive and strongly significant, while the coefficient of interest is slightly reduced to 0.219 and remains significant at the 1% level. Since this control has the potential to account for production complementarities at the very micro level, the workplace, it would be very powerful for the analysis if only the samples were larger. Unfortunately, since the ASHE sample covers only about 1% of the total workforce, the majority of firms in the sample have only one observation although their actual employment may be higher as seen from linked data from IDBR (Inter-Departmental Business Register)[9]. As IDBR does not have data on occupations or education but only on the number of employees, it is not possible to get the relevant information from there. Additional time-varying area variables, constructed from IDBR, have been included as controls in column 5. I use the log of the employment in the area to capture any size effects, and also the log of the number of the establishments. The use of these variables is quite common in the agglomeration literature (e.g. Combes et al., 2008) in order to capture any urbanisation type effects[10]. Both coefficients for these variables are found positive but insignificant and do not alter my results.

The regression results for the selected subset of consumer and personal service occupations are presented in Columns 1 and 2 of Table 10. As seen in section III, these occupations were selected out of the list of bottom quintile occupations so that they largely match the notion of consumer demand hypothesis rather than production related accounts. Applying the preferred econometric specification, the coefficient of interest now increases to 0.319 compared to 0.225 for the full set off occupations,

---

[9] Inter-Departmental Business Register is a census of the UK businesses and can be linked to ASHE data (more info on IDBR and its usage for research on productivity in Criscuolo et al. 2003).

[10] Although the use of the log of the density of employment in the area might have been preferable to capture these urbanisation type effects.

possibly reflecting stronger wage effects through a consumer demand root for this selected set of occupations. Due to the nature of these occupations, it is expected that a larger part of the wage premium from higher shares of top-paid occupation workers can be attributed to consumer demand explanations rather than production side ones.

The result from the regression that controls for within-sectors wage effects is consistent with such an argument (Column 2/ Table 10). The coefficient of interest rises to 0.230 compared to a value of 0.139 obtained for the full set of occupations (Col.3/ Table 9). As discussed, this value will get a downward bias if within-sector consumer demand effects exist and an upward bias if there are production complementarities or productivity spillovers between sectors. To the extent that these opposing biases are minimal or cancel out, an unbiased estimate of the relevant wage impact might be given by this regression. The assertion that $SHARE10_{at,-s}$ might capture largely consumer demand effects is reinforced when looking at its performance in the regressions for the remaining bottom quintile occupations (i.e. the ones that do not belong to my 'selected subset' of occupations) (Columns 3 and 4; Table 10). There $SHARE10_{at,-s}$ has its coefficient close to zero, while the coefficient of $SHARE10_{sat}$ that captures the share of top-paid occupations workers in the sector-area remains significant. It appears that for the 'selected subset' of occupations there are both between and within-sector wage effects from higher human capital; while for the remaining occupations of the same bottom quintile, there are only within-sector wage effects. Whether this is the product of between-sector effects coming from the consumption side, while within-sector effects coming from the production side, is still debatable, but plausible. Having in mind the caveats of this analysis, a tentative concluding result is the following: cleaners, carers and personal service workers

accrue a wage rise of 0.23% when the share of top-paid occupation jobs in their travel-to-work area rises by 1 percentage point.

Results for specific demographic groups

Table 11 presents results informing on the wage premium acquired by bottom occupational quintile workers when the sample is split for different demographic groups. The analysis is conducted at TTWA spatial level using the preferred econometric specification (iii). There are not big differences in the coefficient of interest for men, women and the full-time subsamples. However, the coefficient for men although having a value close to the full sample, it has now become insignificant. The regression ran only for part-timers gives a coefficient for the share of the top-paid occupation workers that is positive although small and far from being statistically significant. Since the part-timers make up more than half of the jobs for the bottom occupational quintile, this is an important concern for the story put forward here. Of course, while there might be issues with measurement error regarding the hourly wages of part-timers, further investigation would be needed for conclusive answers.

Examining urban effects

It is of interest to examine if there is any urban specific story that might affect my variables. Therefore I add as an additional control *U_SHARE10*, the interaction of my *SHARE10* variable and an urban dummy for the 79 TTWAs that are classified as

'primary urban'[11]. I construct similar urban interacted variables for my between and within-sectors share variables (noted by the prefix *U*). The results of the wage regressions are presented in Table 12. Column 1 shows the baseline regression for the bottom quintile. The coefficient for *U_SHARE10* is 0.145 which should be added to the reference coefficient of 0.160 for *SHARE10* in order to get the full effect for the urban areas. However, this difference is not statistically significant. When controlling for within-sector effects, it is found that the coefficient for the urban interacted variable *U_SHARE10*$_{at,-s}$ (that captures the between sector effects) is even stronger, as can be seen in column 2. Again, the difference with the baseline coefficient *SHARE10*$_{at,-s}$ is not statistically significant. The stronger effect for the urban areas is not present when looking at the coefficient of the urban interacted variable that captures mainly within-sector effects (*U_SHARE10*$_{sat}$). Therefore, an urban specific case appears to have some validity when looking for between sector effects and not when looking for within sector effects. Considering the former, it might be consistent with the consumer demand story as I would expect that consumer demand effects that are captured at the area level (between sectors) to be more prominent in urban areas. It is also consistent with stronger wage effects of an 'urbanisation economies' type in urban areas than rural areas, which is what we would expect. On the other hand, 'localisation economies' type wage effects (as captured by the within-sector share variable) do not show any urban specific differentiation.

Finally, when Scotland is excluded, a similar analysis provides interesting results that are presented in Table 13. The regressions that refer now just to England and Wales

---

[11] These are the TTWAs that contain a Primary Urban Area (PUAs). Primary Urban Areas are defined using their physical extent and have a minimum population of 125,000 (more information on PUAs is available from 'State of the English Cities' project and the relevant CLG website). Similar notions were used in order to come up with meaningful definitions of PUAs for Wales and Scotland.

give coefficients substantially higher than those for Britain. The coefficient for the males subsample is now significant at the 10% level. The coefficient for the part-timers has increased and although its p-value has risen as well, it still fails to be statistically significant.

Results for Local Authorities

I repeat the comparative analysis of the different occupational quintiles using local authorities (LAs) rather than travel-to-work-areas. Now subscript a in the econometric specification (iii) stands for the local authority that corresponds to the workplace of each worker. The results are presented in Table 14 and should be compared with those of Table 5. Since the local authorities are finer geographies and referring to the workplace of each job, they are much more likely to capture production related accounts rather than the consumer demand one. Although workers might still consume at the local shops nearby their workplace, they probably do so to a less extent than consuming nearby their homes. This interpretation is partly confirmed by the regression results. The coefficient of interest for the bottom occupation quintile is less now at 0.134, possibly reflecting weaker consumer demand effects. It is now significant at 5%, compared to 1% for the TTWAs analysis. The coefficients of the 3rd and 4th quintile have roughly doubled although they still remain insignificant. This change in the coefficients for the middle-occupational quintile regressions might reflect the ability of the variable *SHARE10* to capture production complementarities/spillovers, something that was not possible before at the more aggregate geographical level.

Although not presented here, I have experimented adding time varying area controls at the local authority level in my wage regressions for England and Wales. Local unemployment rate and log median house prices in the local authority area had coefficients close to zero and my results were largely unaffected. However, there is a caveat here since both variables were residence based while the empirical analysis was workplace based. In future research, additional area controls can be applied both at the local authorities level but also and more importantly at the travel-to-work-area one.

Some additional considerations

An issue left to consider is whether the introduction of the minimum wage might have created a spurious positive significant coefficient of *SHARE10* for the bottom quintile, which is the one with the least paid occupations. Since the National Minimum Wage (NMW) legislation came in full effect in 1st April 1999 which is in the middle of the examined period, splitting the sample does not leave a long enough panel to examine this empirically in a satisfactory way (getting inference from variation of *SHARE10* over time). For what it is worth, I repeated my preferred wage regression of the bottom quintile (Col.1, Table 5) for pairs of years (1997-98; 1998-99; 1999-00; 2000-01) to examine if there is a peculiar result for the years around the change of legislation. These essentially differences-in-differences regressions do not produce statistically significant coefficients for the share of workers in top-paid occupations (*SHARE10*). The coefficients are positive insignificant for the 1997-98, 1999-00 and 2000-1 regressions with the highest coefficient for the 2000-01 pair of years. Since there is evidence that the strongest impact of the NMW was within the first two

months of its introduction (Dickens and Manning, 2004), this should not be worrying for the story that is put forward in this paper. The regression for the years 1998-99 gives a negative insignificant coefficient for *SHARE10* that coincides with the introduction of the minimum wage[12]. This suggests that if the minimum wage had any effect on the coefficient of *SHARE10* for the full panel of 1997-2001 this was probably to mitigate it. Intuitively, this might have been expected. In principle it can be argued that the minimum wage would be binding and affecting the wages of the low-paid individuals more in areas with slack demand, i.e. creating an upward bias of wages in areas where the percentage of the high-paid occupation workers is lower. In that respect, it seems unlikely that the main conclusions of this paper are spuriously driven by the introduction of the minimum wage, although it is an issue worth considering.

V. Concluding Remarks

The paper examined how high local human capital in a local area affects the wages of the individuals in the area. A positive association between the two is well documented in the literature and mainly attributed to production related accounts like production complementarities and wider productivity spillovers. The paper examines also an account through consumer demand that has not been discussed extensively so far. According to this account, a larger share of a high-skilled workforce in the local area boosts the demand for consumer services that are not necessities like personal and

---

[12] Since the NES questionnaires (where the historic ASHE is based) were sent in April each year, it is quite likely that the 1999 wage figures have incorporated the increase in wages due to the introduction of the minimum wages. There is also evidence that some employers adjusted their pay structures in anticipation of the introduction in the months before April 1999 (Low Pay Commission, 2001).

leisure services. These services are labour intensive and to a large extent involve low-pay sector occupations. Furthermore, as they are non-traded, they need to be produced and consumed locally and this requires physical proximity of the high-skilled high-income workforce and the low-paid service workers. The paper presents an empirical strategy that attempts to discern the effect of the consumer demand account from that of the production related accounts. Wage regressions are applied to ASHE microdata for the period 1997-2001 adding an additional variable that captures local human capital, the share of top-paid occupation workers in the travel-to-work-area. In order to shed light on the three different accounts, I examine the differential wage impact of the share of top-paid occupation workers on employees of different occupation quintiles defined by pay. The wage impact is stronger and significant for the bottom occupational quintile compared to the middle-occupational quintiles. This is argued to be the simultaneous product of production complementarities and consumer demand effects on top of productivity spillovers. Specifically, it is found that 1 percentage point rise in the share of high-paid occupation workers in the travel-to-work-area, increases the hourly wages of least-paid quintile occupation workers by roughly 0.23%. Accounting for within-sectors effects, the wage impact remains positive that is argued to come from consumer demand or production complementarities between sectors. If the latter are minimal, then my specification can be argued to capture a positive wage impact that comes mainly through the consumer demand mechanism.

Applying the analysis to a subset of the bottom occupational quintile that consists of personal and consumer service occupations (like cleaners, carers and waiters/waitresses) gives even stronger results in consistence with a consumer demand explanation. A final result of the paper is the following: cleaners, carers and

personal service workers accrue a wage premium of 0.62% when the share of top-paid occupation jobs in their travel-to-work area rises by one standard deviation[13]. When using urban interacted effects, it appears that between-sector wage effects are stronger in the urban areas compared to the rural ones, while within-sector wage effects are similar in urban and rural areas. However, the results are tentative subject to the limitations of the analysis and the paper has pointed to a number of caveats regarding the successful separation of the three different accounts and possible concerns with endogeneity of the variable of interest. Future research would be needed in order to deal with these issues.

---

[13] which corresponds to £66 pay rise a year for an hourly wage of £5 and a 40 hour week.

FIGURES

Figure 1. Median real hourly wage against the share of top-paid occupation workers *SHARE10* of a travel-to-work-area; 1997-2001 (in £; 2001 prices)

Source: ASHE
Notes:
Median real hourly wages are shown, deflated using the Retail Price Index (RPI) for 2001 prices.
High-paid occupations are defined in Section III and shown in Appendix A (Table 15).
Travel-to-work-areas are defined such as the bulk of the population lives and works in the same area. There are 243 TTWAs for UK and 232 for Britain when excluding the Northern Ireland (defined according to 2001 Census data). Dropping TTWAs with small sample size (less than 50), my final set consists of 195 TTWAs.

TABLES

Table 1. Summary Statistics for 1997-2001

Observations (pooled sample)	N	Age	Real hourly wage (£) (2001prices)	Male	Full-time	Trainee/ Junior
All that stay in sample (>1 year)	610,016	39.4 (11.5)	£10.16 (7.46)	52.1%	77.9%	1.7%

Source: ASHE

1. Standard deviations in brackets.

2. Trainee/junior rate employment status rather than normal adult rate employment affects the earnings of the employee.

3. Considering only individuals who appear in the sample at least for two years, I end up with a panel of 610,016 observations, that correspond to 169,842 individuals. The employees stay on the sample on average for 3.6 years.

4. Average hourly real wages are shown that are deflated with RPI for 2001 prices.

Table 2. Distributions of time-varying area characteristics for 1997-2001

Variable/ **Spatial level**	**Mean**	**Standard deviation**	**1%**	**50%**	**99%**
TTWAs 195 TTWAs x 5 years=975					
SHARE10 (%) (share of top-paid occ.workers)	7.66	2.74	1.83	7.37	16.70
Real hourly wage (£ in 2001)	7.35	0.89	5.57	7.25	10.51

Source: APS

1. '*SHARE10*' in a travel-to-work-area stands for the share of employment that belongs to the highest paid occupational decile.
2. Travel-to-work-areas are constructed by ONS so that the bulk of their population lives and works in the same area (75%) using 2001 Census information.
3. Real hourly wages have been deflated for 2001 prices using the Retail Price Index (RPI).

Table 3. Wage effect of share of top-paid occupation workers on all workers

Explanatory Variables	Basic Model	Basic Model (Equation (i))
SHARE10	1.875	1.139
	(31.64)	(24.64)
Experience	0.024	0.024
	(73.97)	(74.42)
Experience sq. (coeff.x100)	-0.043	-0.042
	(-66.74)	(-68.40)
Trainee rate	-0.366	-0.365
	(-58.97)	(-58.62)
Part-time	-0.081	-0.080
	(-43.80)	(-45.69)
Female	-0.153	-0.153
	(-77.09)	(-75.82)
Occupation dummies	Yes	Yes
Year dummies	Yes	
Region-Year dummies		Yes
R^2	0.66	0.66
N	610,016	610,016

Source: ASHE

Notes:

The dependent variable is log hourly wage of the individual.

SHARE10 stands for the employment share of individuals who do the highest-paid occupations in the area *a* at a given year *t*.

Additional controls include a proxy of experience based on age and its quadratic form, dummies for gender, part-time employment, trainee/junior rate employment) and occupational dummies (SOC90).

T-statistics shown in parenthesis are corrected for area-year clusters.

Table 4. Wage effect of share of top-paid occupation workers on bottom-paid occupational quintile (Q1)

Explanatory Variables	Basic Model	area effects	area, individual effects	areaXindiv. effects
	(Equation (i))		(Equation (ii))	(Equation (iii))
	1	2	3	4
SHARE10	0.835	0.238	0.217	0.225
	(17.03)	(2.58)	(2.90)	(3.00)
Experience	0.012	0.012	0.031	0.033
	(47.31)	(47.15)	(5.79)	(6.09)
Experience sq. (coeff.x100)	-0.022	-0.022	-0.045	-0.046
	(-43.81)	(-43.69)	(-25.29)	(-25.33)
Trainee rate	-0.217	-0.216	-0.147	-0.147
	(-24.57)	(-24.49)	(-19.36)	(-19.42)
Part-time	-0.059	-0.059	0.046	0.047
	(-16.11)	(-16.05)	(11.78)	(12.11)
Female	-0.101	-0.101		
	(-31.45)	(-31.37)		
Occup.dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region-Year dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Area dummies		Yes	Yes	
Individ. dumm.			Yes	
areaXindiv. dummies				Yes
R^2	0.25	0.26	0.78	0.78
N	113,499	113,499	113,499	113,499

Source: ASHE

Notes:

The dependent variable is log hourly wage of the individual.

SHARE10 stands for the employment share of individuals who do the highest-paid occupations in the area *a* at a given year *t*.

Additional controls include a proxy of experience based on age and its quadratic form, dummies for gender, part-time employment, trainee/junior rate employment) and occupational dummies (SOC90).

T-statistics shown in parenthesis are corrected for area-year clusters.

Table 5. Wage effect of share of top-paid occupation workers on the various occupational quintiles (Q1-Q5) (Equation (iii))

Explanatory Variables	Bottom Quintile	2nd Quintile	3rd Quintile	4th Quintile	Top Quintile
SHARE10	0.225	0.091	0.035	0.019	0.170
	(3.00)	(1.55)	(0.52)	(0.26)	(1.93)
Experience	0.033	0.027	0.040	0.031	0.056
	(6.09)	(6.21)	(8.56)	(6.19)	(9.63)
Experience sq. (coeff.x100)	-0.046	-0.059	-0.067	-0.077	-0.114
	(-25.33)	(-35.36)	(-36.14)	(-39.52)	(-20.64)
Trainee rate	-0.147	-0.210	-0.241	-0.235	-0.242
	(-19.42)	(-22.19)	(-23.03)	(-19.14)	(-17.26)
Part-time	0.047	0.050	0.094	0.106	0.179
	(12.11)	(11.30)	(15.62)	(14.40)	(19.09)
Occ.dumm.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region-Year dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
areaXindiv dum.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
R2	0.78	0.85	0.88	0.89	0.89
N	113,499	119,830	108,034	119,296	117,575

Source: ASHE

Notes:

The dependent variable is log hourly wage of the individual.

SHARE10 stands for the employment share of individuals who do the highest-paid occupations in the area a at a given year t.

Additional controls include a proxy of experience based on age and its quadratic form, dummies for gender, part-time employment, trainee/junior rate employment) and occupational dummies (SOC90).

T-statistics shown in parenthesis are corrected for area-year clusters.

Table 6. Wage effects including a supply control ('own quintile share')

Explanatory Variables	Bottom Quintile	2nd Quintile	3rd Quintile	4th Quintile	Top Quintile
SHARE10	0.242	0.088	0.033	0.017	-0.089
	(3.10)	(1.50)	(0.49)	(0.23)	(-0.69)
Own quintile share	0.030	-0.023	-0.040	-0.009	0.251
	(0.77)	(-0.58)	(-0.83)	(-0.19)	(3.05)
Other Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
areaXindiv. dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
R^2	0.78	0.85	0.88	0.89	0.89
N	113,499	119,830	108,034	119,296	117,575

Source: ASHE

Notes:

The dependent variable is log hourly wage of the individual.

SHARE10 stands for the employment share of individuals who do the highest-paid occupations in the area *a* at a given year *t*.

Additional controls include a proxy of experience based on age and its quadratic form, dummies for gender, part-time employment, trainee/junior rate employment) and occupational dummies (SOC90).

The share of the quintile that each observation belongs to is added as a regressor in order to control for supply effects ('*Own quintile share*').

T-statistics shown in parenthesis are corrected for area-year clusters.

Table 7. Wage effect of various occupational deciles (SHARE1-SHARE10) on the five occupational quintiles (Q1-Q5)

Explanatory Variables	Bottom Quintile	2nd Quintile	3rd Quintile	4th Quintile	Top Quintile
SHARE10	0.308***	0.110	0.061	0.026	0.331**
	(2.86)	(1.28)	(0.62)	(0.22)	(2.38)
SHARE9	0.044	0.022	0.054	0.003	0.377***
	(0.44)	(0.25)	(0.52)	(0.03)	(2.86)
SHARE8	0.120	0.098	0.047	-0.175	0.185
	(1.15)	(1.10)	(0.48)	(-1.56)	(1.38)
SHARE7	0.012	0.030	0.010	0.094	0.225*
	(0.13)	(0.39)	(0.11)	(0.86)	(1.91)
SHARE6	0.053	-0.061	0.004	-0.024	0.104
	(0.54)	(-0.72)	(0.04)	(-0.21)	(0.80)
SHARE5	-	-	-	-	-
SHARE4	0.002	-0.012	0.094	0.079	-0.003
	(0.02)	(-0.15)	(1.03)	(0.75)	(-0.03)
SHARE3	0.179*	-0.006	0.091	-0.042	0.016
	(1.78)	(-0.07)	(1.02)	(-0.38)	(0.13)
SHARE2	0.050	0.000	0.028	-0.013	0.202*
	(0.54)	(-0.01)	(0.34)	(-0.13)	(1.66)
SHARE1	0.125	0.026	0.021	0.006	0.165
	(1.45)	(0.37)	(0.27)	(0.06)	(1.53)
Other Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
areaXindiv. dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
R^2	0.78	0.85	0.88	0.89	0.89
N	113,499	119,830	108,034	119,296	117,575

Source: ASHE

Notes:

The dependent variable is log hourly wage of the individual.

SHARE10 stands for the employment share of individuals who do the highest-paid occupations in the area *a* at a given year *t*.

Additional controls include a proxy of experience based on age and its quadratic form, dummies for gender, part-time employment, trainee/junior rate employment) and occupational dummies (SOC90).

T-statistics shown in parenthesis are corrected for area-year clusters (* 10%, ** 5%, *** 1%).

D5 is dropped to avoid multicollinearity.

Table 8. Include average wage of top-paid occupation workers as an additional control *('wage control')*

Explanatory Variables	Bottom quintile
	Eq.(iii)
	1
SHARE10$_{at}$	0.235
	(3.11)
Wage control	0.014
	(1.91)
Other controls	Yes
areaXindiv dummies	Yes
R^2	0.78
N	113,473

Source: ASHE

Notes:

The dependent variable is log hourly wage of the individual.

SHARE10 stands for the employment share of individuals who do the highest-paid occupations in the area *a* at a given year *t*.

Additional controls include a proxy of experience based on age and its quadratic form, dummies for gender, part-time employment, trainee/junior rate employment) and occupational dummies (SOC90).

T-statistics shown in parenthesis are corrected for area-year clusters.

 '*Wage control*' stands for the log of the average hourly wage of the workers who make up the highest decile (D10).

Table 9. Regression results using sectoral and firm controls (Bottom Quintile)

Explanatory Variables	Eq.(iii)	Occupation-Industry dummies	Area-sector control Eq.(iv)	Firm control Eq.(v)	Additional area controls
	1	2	3	4	5
$SHARE10_{at}$	0.225 (3.00)	0.221 (2.95)		0.219 (2.93)	
$SHARE10_{at,-s}$			0.139 (2.07)		0.138 (2.04)
$SHARE10_{sat}$			0.119 (5.19)		0.118 (5.17)
$SHARE10_{fat}$				0.048 (4.09)	
$Ln(employment)_{at}$					0.020 (1.26)
$Ln(establishments)_{at}$					0.045 (0.80)
Occ.dumm.	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes
Occ.-insustry dummies		Yes			
Region-Year dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
areaXindiv dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
R2	0.78	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.78
N	113,499	113,000	113,000	113,499	113,000

Source: ASHE, IDBR

Notes:

The dependent variable is log hourly wage of the individual.

$SHARE10_{at}$ stands for the employment share of individuals who do the highest-paid occupations in the area a at a given year t.

$SHARE10_{at,-s}$ is similar to $SHARE10_{at}$ but now excludes the own sector s

$SHARE10_{sat}$ is the share of top-paid occupation workers in sector s, area a and year t.

Additional controls include a proxy of experience based on age and its quadratic form, dummies for gender, part-time employment, trainee/junior rate employment) and occupational dummies (SOC90).

In column 5, additional controls include the log of total employment and the log of the number of establishments in the area (constructed from IDBR).

T-statistics shown in parenthesis are corrected for area-year clusters.

Table 10. Regression results for 'Selected occupations' out of the Bottom Quintile and the 'Rest'

Explanatory Variables	Selected occupations	Selected Occupations	Rest occupations	Rest occupations
	Eq.(iii)	Eq.(iv)	Eq.(iii)	Eq.(iv)
	1	2	3	4
$SHARE10_{at}$	0.319		0.090	
	(2.29)		(1.01)	
$SHARE10_{at,-s}$		0.230		-0.008
		(1.91)		(-0.10)
$SHARE10_{sat}$		0.137		0.087
		(3.71)		(2.89)
Occ.dumm.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region-Year dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
areaXindiv dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
R2	0.78	0.78	0.81	0.81
N	42,233	41,800	71,266	71,200

Source: ASHE

Notes:

The dependent variable is log hourly wage of the individual.

$SHARE10_{at}$ stands for the employment share of individuals who do the highest-paid occupations in the area a at a given year t.

$SHARE10_{at,-s}$ is similar to $SHARE10_{at}$ but now excludes the own sector s

$SHARE10_{sat}$ is the share of top-paid occupation workers in sector s, area a and year t.

Additional controls include a proxy of experience based on age and its quadratic form, dummies for gender, part-time employment, trainee/junior rate employment) and occupational dummies (SOC90).

'Selected occupations' were selected out of the bottom quintile occupations so that they match the notion of consumer demand hypothesis (e.g. cleaners, care assistants, bar staff).

'Rest' refers to the remaining occupations of the bottom occupational quintile.

T-statistics shown in parenthesis are corrected for area-year clusters.

Table 11. Wage effect on the bottom occupational quintile by demographic group (Equation (iii))

Explanatory Variables	All	Male	Female	Full-time	Part-time
SHARE10	0.225	0.217	0.240	0.232	0.096
	(3.00)	(1.59)	(2.70)	(2.57)	(0.85)
Experience	0.033	0.046	0.027	0.041	0.026
	(6.09)	(4.97)	(4.12)	(6.93)	(3.06)
Experience sq. (coeff.x100)	-0.046	-0.058	-0.041	-0.061	-0.032
	(-25.33)	(-14.17)	(-18.62)	(-29.04)	(-10.26)
Trainee rate	-0.147	-0.150	-0.144	-0.191	-0.135
	(-19.42)	(-12.54)	(-16.15)	(-15.66)	(-11.63)
Part-time	0.047	0.026	0.053	-	-
	(12.11)	(3.32)	(13.53)		
Occ.dumm.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region-Year dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
areaXindiv dum.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
R^2	0.78	0.83	0.74	0.89	0.73
N	113,499	30,581	82,918	50,292	63,207

Source: ASHE

Notes:

The dependent variable is log hourly wage of the individual.

SHARE10 stands for the employment share of individuals who do the highest-paid occupations in the area *a* at a given year *t*.

Additional controls include a proxy of experience based on age and its quadratic form, dummies for gender, part-time employment, trainee/junior rate employment) and occupational dummies (SOC90).

T-statistics shown in parenthesis are corrected for area-year clusters.

Table 12. Urban effects on the wage premium

Explanatory Variables	Bottom quintile	Bottom quintile
	Eq.(iii)	**Eq.(iv)**
	1	2
$SHARE10_{at}$	0.160	
	(1.69)	
$U\_SHARE10_{at}$	0.145	
	(1.00)	
$SHARE10_{at,-s}$		0.060
		(0.68)
$U\_SHARE10_{at,-s}$		0.173
		(1.35)
$SHARE10_{sat}$		0.119
		(3.19)
$U\_SHARE10_{sat}$		0.005
		(0.10)
Occ.dumm.	Yes	Yes
Region-Year dummies	Yes	Yes
areaXindiv dummies	Yes	Yes
R^2	0.78	0.78
N	113,499	113,000

Source: ASHE

Notes: The dependent variable is log hourly wage of the individual.

$SHARE10_{at}$ stands for the employment share of individuals who do the highest-paid occupations in the area a at a given year t.

$SHARE10_{at,-s}$ is similar to $SHARE10_{at}$ but now excludes the own sector s

$SHARE10_{sat}$ is the share of top-paid occupation workers that changes across sectors s, areas a and years t.

Additional controls include a proxy of experience based on age and its quadratic form, dummies for gender, part-time employment, trainee/junior rate employment) and occupational dummies (SOC90).

T-statistics shown in parenthesis are corrected for area-year clusters.

The prefix U stands for an interaction of the regressor with an urban dummy that gets the value 1 for the TTWAs that are classified as "urban".

Table 13. England & Wales: Analysis by demographic group for the bottom quintile (Q1)

Explanatory Variables	All	All	Male	Female	Full-time	Part-time
	Eq.(iii)	Eq.(iv)	Eq.(iii)	Eq.(iii)	Eq.(iii)	Eq.(iii)
$SHARE10_{at}$	0.271		0.280	0.281	0.267	0.129
	(3.27)		(1.86)	(2.84)	(2.63)	(1.03)
$SHARE10_{at,-s}$		0.199				
		(2.67)				
$SHARE10_{sat}$		0.121				
		(4.86)				
Occ.dumm.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region-Year dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
areaXindiv dum.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
R^2	0.78	0.78	0.84	0.75	0.89	0.73
N	102,653	102,188	27,748	74,905	45,244	57,409

Source: ASHE

Notes:

The dependent variable is log hourly wage of the individual.

$SHARE10_{at}$ stands for the employment share of individuals who do the highest-paid occupations in the area a at a given year t.

$SHARE10_{at,-s}$ is similar to $SHARE10_{at}$ but now excludes the own sector s

$SHARE10_{sat}$ is the share of top-paid occupation workers in sector s, area a and year t.

Additional controls include a proxy of experience based on age and its quadratic form, dummies for gender, part-time employment, trainee/junior rate employment) and occupational dummies (SOC90).

T-statistics shown in parenthesis are corrected for area-year clusters.

Table 14. Local Authorities analysis- Wage effect of share of top-paid occupation workers on the various occupational quintiles (Q1-Q5) (Equation (iii))

Explanatory Variables	Bottom Quintile	2nd Quintile	3rd Quintile	4th Quintile	Top Quintile
SHARE10	0.134	0.076	0.063	0.052	0.108
	(2.56)	(2.04)	(1.43)	(1.16)	(2.06)
Personal controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Region-Year dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
areaXindiv dum.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
R2	0.79	0.86	0.89	0.90	0.90
N	116,951	124,696	112,093	122,160	117,452

Source: ASHE

Notes:

The dependent variable is log hourly wage of the individual.

SHARE10 stands for the employment share of individuals who do the highest-paid occupations in the area *a* at a given year *t*.

Additional controls include a proxy of experience based on age and its quadratic form, dummies for gender, part-time employment, trainee/junior rate employment) and occupational dummies (SOC90).

T-statistics shown in parenthesis are corrected for area-year clusters.

APPENDIX A

Table 15. Top occupational decile (*SHARE10*); Britain, 1997

Pay rank	SOC	Label of Occupation Cell	Empl.Share %	Median wage £
367	101	General managers; large companies and organisations	0.07	49.99
366	100	General administrators; national government	0.02	31.41
365	331	Aircraft flight deck officers	0.04	28.32
364	703	Air, commodity and ship brokers	0.02	23.09
363	120	Treasurers and company financial managers	0.49	22.15
362	113	Managers in mining and energy industries	0.03	21.36
361	152	Police officers (inspector and above)	0.06	20.36
360	241	Barristers and advocates	0.01	20.17
359	232	Education officers, school inspectors	0.04	19.75
358	220	Medical practitioners	0.42	19.00
357	126	Computer systems and data processing managers	0.38	17.88
356	125	Organisation and methods and work study managers	0.08	17.84
355	222	Ophthalmic opticians	0.02	17.69
354	223	Dental practitioners	0.03	17.34
353	215	Chemical engineers	0.03	17.27
352	253	Management consultants, business analysts	0.16	17.20
351	242	Solicitors	0.23	16.81
350	131	Bank, Building Society and Post Office managers	0.46	16.77
349	330	Air traffic planners and controllers	0.02	16.65
348	361	Underwriters, claims assessors, brokers, investment analysts	0.67	16.41
347	290	Psychologists	0.05	16.27
346	230	University and polytechnic teaching professionals	0.43	16.27
345	235	Special education teaching professionals	0.17	16.10
344	212	Electrical engineers	0.11	16.07
343	240	Judges and officers of the Court	0.01	16.02
342	384	Actors, entertainers, stage managers, producers & directors	0.11	15.84
341	252	Actuaries, economists and statisticians	0.06	15.82
340	233	Secondary education teaching professionals	1.70	15.81
339	123	Advertising and public relations managers	0.20	15.69
338	121	Marketing and sales managers	1.87	15.69
337	214	Software engineers	0.30	15.29
336	124	Personnel, training and industrial relations managers	0.30	15.10

Source: ASHE

Notes:
Shading indicates the largest five occupations in terms of employment share.
Wages are median real hourly wages deflated for 2001 prices using the RPI.

Table 16. Bottom occupational quintile (Q1) (Britain 1997)

Pay rank	SOC	Label of Occupation Cell	Occup. Decile	Empl.Share %	Median wage £
1	732	Market and street traders and assistants	1	0.01	2.34
2	621	Waiters, waitresses	1	0.52	3.67
3	622	Bar staff	1	0.81	3.67
4	660	Hairdressers, barbers	1	0.17	3.74
5	952	Kitchen porters, hands	1	0.67	3.89
6	556	Tailors and dressmakers	1	0.01	3.94
7	722	Petrol pump forecourt attendants	1	0.08	4.04
8	953	Counterhands, catering assistants	1	0.96	4.14
9	956	Window cleaners	1	0.01	4.15
10	958	Cleaners, domestics	1	3.30	4.20
11	673	Launderers, dry cleaners, pressers	1	0.18	4.24
12	659	Other childcare and related occupations	1	0.76	4.33
13	670	Domestic housekeepers and related occupations	1	0.02	4.36
14	791	Window dressers, floral arrangers	1	0.04	4.40
15	720	Sales assistants	1	5.16	4.41
16	951	Hotel porters	2	0.05	4.43
17	553	Sewing machinists, menders, darners, embroiderers	2	0.51	4.45
18	959	Other occupations in sales and services	2	0.04	4.48
19	955	Lift and car park attendants	2	0.05	4.48
20	721	Retail cash desk and check-out operators	2	0.84	4.54
21	593	Musical instrument makers, piano tuners	2	-	
22	619	Other security and protective service occupations	2	0.11	4.68
23	644	Care assistants and attendants	2	1.91	4.73
24	902	All other occupations in farming and related	2	0.10	4.75
25	934	Driver's mates	2	0.02	4.79
26	699	Other personal and protective service occupations	2	0.45	4.80
27	651	Playgroup leaders	2	0.03	4.81
28	999	All others in miscellaneous occupations	2	0.03	4.85
29	620	Chefs, cooks	2	0.70	4.90
30	954	Shelf fillers	2	0.25	4.97
31	813	Winders, reelers	2	0.02	5.02
32	661	Beauticians and related occupations	2	0.04	5.07
33	812	Spinners, doublers, twisters	2	0.03	5.11
34	643	Dental nurses	2	0.15	5.11
35	595	Horticultural trades	2	0.08	5.12
36	863	Weighers, graders, sorters	2	0.07	5.15
37	920	Mates to woodworking trades workers	2	0.02	5.15
38	862	Packers, bottlers, canners, fillers	2	1.07	5.17
39	800	Bakery and confectionery process operatives	2	0.17	5.18
40	671	Housekeepers (non-domestic)	2	0.03	5.21
41	581	Butchers, meat cutters	2	0.15	5.24
42	950	Hospital porters	2	0.08	5.24
43	591	Glass product & ceramics finishers & decorators	2	0.07	5.25
44	641	Hospital ward assistants	2	0.11	5.28
45	652	Educational assistants	2	0.52	5.28
46	615	Security guards and related occupations	2	0.62	5.30
47	460	Receptionists	2	0.85	5.32
48	874	Taxi, cab drivers and chauffeurs	2	0.12	5.36
49	544	Tyre and exhaust fitters	2	0.05	5.39
50	990	All other labourers and related workers	2	0.46	5.40

Notes on Table 16 (previous page):
Shading indicates the largest five occupations in terms of employment share.
Wages are median real hourly wages deflated for 2001 prices using the RPI.

Table 17. Selected occupations out of the bottom occupational quintile (1997)

Pay rank	SOC	Label of Occupation Cell	Occup. Decile	Empl.Share %	Median wage £
1	732	Market and street traders and assistants	1	0.01	2.34
2	621	Waiters, waitresses	1	0.52	3.67
3	622	Bar staff	1	0.81	3.67
4	660	Hairdressers, barbers	1	0.17	3.74
6	556	Tailors and dressmakers	1	0.01	3.94
10	958	Cleaners, domestics	1	3.30	4.20
11	673	Launderers, dry cleaners, pressers	1	0.18	4.24
12	659	Other childcare and related occupations	1	0.76	4.33
23	644	Care assistants and attendants	2	1.91	4.73
27	651	Playgroup leaders	2	0.03	4.81
29	620	Chefs, cooks	2	0.70	4.90
32	661	Beauticians and related occupations	2	0.04	5.07
48	874	Taxi, cab drivers and chauffeurs	2	0.12	5.36

Source: ASHE

Notes:
Wages are median real hourly wages deflated for 2001 prices using the RPI.
These occupation cells make up together 8.57% of the total employment in 1997.

REFERENCES

Acemoglu, D. and Angrist, J. (2000) 'How Large Are Human Capital Externalities? Evidence from Compulsory Schooling Laws', in: Bernanke, B. and K. Rogoff, (eds.) *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, pp.9-58, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass

Autor, D.H., Katz, L.F. and Kearney, M.S. (2006) 'The Polarization of the US Labor Market', *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings*, 96(2), pp.189-194

Autor, D.H., Katz, L.F. and Kearney, M.S. (2008) 'Trends in U.S. Wage Inequality: Re-assessing the Revisionists', *Review of Economics and Statistics* 90: 300-323.

Autor, D.H., Levy F. and Murnane, R.J.(2003) 'The Skill Content of Recent Technological Change: An Empirical Exploration', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(4), pp.1279-1333

Baumol, W.J. (1967) 'Macroeconomics of Unbalanced Growth: The Anatomy of Urban Crisis, *American Economic Review*, 57, pp.415-26

Card D. and DiNardo J. (2002) 'Skill Biased Technological Change and Rising Wage Inequality: Some Problems and Puzzles', *Journal of Labor Economics* 20: 733–783.

Champion, T. and Coombes, M. (2007) 'Using the 2001 Census to study human capital movements affecting Britain's larger cities: insights and issues', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society A*, 170, Part 2, pp. 447-467

Charlot, S. and Duranton, G. (2004) 'Communication Externalities in Cities', Journal of Urban Economics 56: 581-613.

Ciccone, A. and Hall, R.E. (1996) Productivity and the density of economic activity, *American Economic Review*, 86, pp. 54–70.

Ciccone, A. and Peri, G. (2006) 'Identifying human capital externalities: Theory with applications', *Review of Economic Studies*, 73, pp.381–412

Clark, C. (1957) *The Conditions of Economic Progress*, London: Macmillan

Combes, P.P. and Overman, H.G. (2004) 'The spatial distribution of economic activities in the European Union', in: Henderson, V. and Thisse, J. F., (eds.) *Handbook of regional and urban economics: cities and geography*. North Holland, pp. 2845-2910

Combes, P.P., Duranton, G. and Gobillon, L., (2008) 'Spatial Wage Disparities: Sorting Matters!', *Journal of Urban Economics*, 63(2), pp.723-742.

Dickens, R. and Manning, A. (2003) 'Minimum wage, minimum impact', in Dickens R, Gregg P and Wadsworth J (eds.) *The Labour Market Under New Labour*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

Duranton, G. (2006) 'Human Capital Externalities in Cities: Identification and Policy Issues' in: Arnott, R. and McMillen, D. (eds.) *A Companion to Urban Economics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Duranton, G. and Puga, D. (2004) 'Microfoundations of urban agglomeration economies' in Vernon Henderson and JacquesFrançois Thisse (eds.) Handbook of

Regional and Urban Economics, volume 4. Amsterdam: NorthHolland, 2063–2117.

Faggian, A. and McCann, P. (2006) 'Human Capital and Regional Knowledge Assets: a Simultaneous Equation Model', *Oxford Economic Papers*, Vol.58, No. 3, pp. 475-500

Faggian, A. and McCann, P. (2009) Universities, agglomerations and graduate human capital mobility, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, Vol.100, No.2, pp. 210–223

Fielding, A.J. (1993) 'Migration and the metropolis', *Progress in Planning*, 39, pp.71-166

Friedman, J. & Wolf, G. (1982) 'World City formation. An agenda for research and action', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 6, pp.309-344.

Gibbons, S., Green A., Gregg, P. and Machin, S. (2005), 'Is Britain Pulling Apart? Area Disparities in Employment, Education and Crime', in Pearce N. and Paxton W. (eds.) (2005) *Social Justice: Building a Fairer Britain London*, Politico's IPPR, London

Glaeser, E. (1999) 'Learning in cities', *Journal of Urban Economics*, 46: 254–277.

Glaeser, E. and Gottlieb, J.D. (2006) 'Urban Resurgence and the Consumer City,' *Urban Studies* 43(8):1275-1299.

Glaeser, E. and Mare, D. (2001) 'Cities and Skills,' *Journal of Labor Economics* 19(2), pp.316-342.

Glaeser, E. and Saiz, A. (2004) 'The Rise of the Skilled City,' *Brookings-Wharton Papers on Urban Affairs 5* (2004): 47-94.

Glaeser, E., Kolko J. and Saiz, A. (2001) 'Consumer City,' *Journal of Economic Geography* 1: 27-50.

Goos, M. and Manning, A. (2007) 'Lousy and Lovely Jobs: The Rising Polarization of Work in Britain', *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 89, 118-133

Gordon, I.R. and Kaplanis, I. (2009) 'Accounting for Big City Growth in Low Paid Occupations: Immigration and/or Service Class Consumption', Mimeo.

Gordon, I.R. and McCann, P. (2005) Innovation, agglomeration and regional development, *Journal of Economic Geography*, 5, pp.523–43.

Kaplanis, I. (2007) 'The Geography of Employment Polarisation in Britain', *Institute for Public Policy Research*, IPPR, London.

Kaplanis, I. (2009) 'Local human capital and its impact on local employment chances in Britain', *SERC Discussion Paper*

Kaplanis, I. (2009) *Spatial occupational structure and local human capital spillover effects in Britain*, unpublished PhD Thesis, London School of Economics.

Katz, L.F. and Autor, D.H. (1999) 'Changes in the Wage Structure and Earnings Inequality' in Ashenfelter O. and Card D. (eds.) *Handbook of Labor Economics*, Vol.3a, Amsterdam: North Holland: 1463–1555.

Leonardi, M. (2008) 'Product Demand Shifts and Wage Inequality', Mimeo.

Lucas, R. (1988), On the Mechanics of Economic Development, *Journal of Monetary Economics* 22: 3-42

Machin, S. (2008) 'An Appraisal of Economic Research on Changes in Wage Inequality', Labour (Special Issue), No.22, pp.7-26

Manning, A. (2004) 'We Can Work it Out: The Impact of Technological Change on the Demand for Low-Skill Workers', *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, 51(5), pp.581-608

Marshall, A. (1890) *Principles of Economics*, Macmillan, London

Mazzolari, F. and Ragusa, G. (2007) 'Spillovers from High-Skill Consumption to Low-Skill Labor Markets', *IZA Discussion Papers, No.3048*, September 2007.

Mollenkopf, J. & Castells, M. (Eds.) (1991) *Dual City – Restructuring New York*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York

Monastiriotis, V. (2002) **'**Human capital and wages: evidence for external effects from the UK regions', *Applied Economics Letters*, 9 (13), pp.843-846

Moretti, E. (2003) 'Human Capital Externalities in Cities' (chapter 8), in J. Vernon Henderson and Jacques-Franois Thisse (Eds.), *Handbook of Urban and Regional Economics,* North Holland–Elsevier

Moretti, E. (2004) 'Estimating the Social Return to Higher Education: Evidence from Longitudinal and Repeated Cross-Sectional Data,' *Journal of Econometrics* 121:1–2, 175–212.

Perrons, D. (2004) *Globalization and social change. People and places in a divided world,* Routledge, London

Rauch, J.E. (1993) 'Productivity gains from geographic concentration of human capital: evidence from the cities,' *Journal of Urban Economics,* 34, pp.380–400.

Rosenthal, S.S. and Strange, W.C. (2004) 'Evidence on the Nature and Sources of Agglomeration Economies' in: J.V. Henderson and J-F. Thisse (eds.) *Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics* vol. 4: Cities and Geography. Amsterdam: Elsevier-North Holland

Sassen, S. (2001) *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*, second revised edition (first ed., 1991), Princeton University Press, Princeton and Oxford

Shapiro, J. (2006) 'Smart Cities – Quality of Life, Productivity, and the Growth Effects of Human Capital,' *Review of Economics and Statistics* 88: 324-335

Yankow, J.J. (2006) 'Why do cities pay more? An empirical examination of some competing theories of the urban wage premium', *Journal of Urban Economics*, 60, pp.139-161

Spatial Economics Research Centre (SERC)
London School of Economics
Houghton Street
London WC2A 2AE

Tel: 020 7852 3565
Fax: 020 7955 6848
Web: www.spatialeconomics.ac.uk