

Validation of a microscopic model for spatial economic effects of transport infrastructure

Michiel de Bok¹

Department of Transport and Planning, Faculty of Civil Engineering and Geosciences
Delft University of Technology, PO Box 5048, NL-2600 GA Delft, The Netherlands,
p: +31 15 2784977, f: +31 15 2783179, m.a.debok@citg.tudelft.nl

Abstract

This article presents a micro simulation model of the behaviour of individual firms in a disaggregate urban environment. Objective of the model is to quantify effects of spatial and transport planning scenarios on firm dynamics and mobility. The presented Spatial Firm-demographic Micro-simulation (SFM) model simulates transitions and events in the firm population, including firm relocations, firm growth, firm dissolution and firm formation. The quality of locations is measured with advanced accessibility and agglomeration measures. Accessibility is measured with proximity to infrastructure access points and logsums of business and commuting trips from a transport model. Agglomeration measures are based on theories from urban economics and integrate travel time range bands into measures for specialisation and diversification.

The SFM-model is applied in a case study for the province of South Holland in The Netherlands. The area contains a firm population of about 90.000 firms that are distributed across 70.000 6-digit zip code locations. The model is estimated on an extensive longitudinal dataset with the full firm population from 1988 to 1997. This article presents the validation of the model on similar data for the successive period from 1997 to 2004.

KEYWORDS: Land use transport interaction, accessibility, agglomeration, micro simulation, firm demography

¹ Present adress: Significance, Schipholweg 13-15, 2316 XB Leiden, debok@significance.nl
T +31-71-5253-881, F +31-71-5253-801

1 Introduction

The construction of significant new transport infrastructure projects, such as the A4-extension from Rijswijk-Rotterdam, has long term spatial economic effects that are difficult to predict. Integrated land use and transport models make predictions of such effects and are becoming increasingly disaggregate, both in the spatial environment and the behaviour of agents (Timmermans, 2003). Motivation for this research is to provide an improved methodology for the projection of distributive effects of infrastructure and spatial planning scenarios.

This paper presents a micro simulation approach that quantifies the effects of different spatial and transport planning scenarios on the firm population and mobility. The presented The Spatial Firm demographic Micro simulation (SFM) model is founded on firm demography (Birch, 1979; Carroll and Hannan, 2000). It simulates transitions and events in the firm population, similar to the approach by Van Wissen (2000). These transitions and events include firm relocation, firm growth, firm dissolution and firm formation. In each time step of a model run, the firm population is processed through the separate components of the firm demographic micro simulation. The quality of locations is accounted for through advanced accessibility and agglomeration measures. Accessibility is measured with proximity to infrastructure access points and logsums of business and commuting trips from a transport model. Agglomeration measures are based on theories from urban economics and integrate travel time range bands into measures for specialisation and diversification.

The choice for a firm demographic approach is motivated by the need to improve the representation of firm behaviour in spatial economic models. This approach can improve the assessment of spatial economic effects for three reasons. First, it represents firm specific behaviour and heterogeneity in responses. Firm behaviour is influenced both by firm internal processes and attributes of the firm's location. For example, the most important reason for firms to relocate is firm growth (Brouwer et al., 2004; Louw, 1996). Second, it allows distinctive accessibility measures as explanatory variables for each event, such as firm relocation, firm performance, formation or firm dissolution. For instance, some firms perform better in the proximity of motorway onramps (Hilbers et al., 1994), while in a relocation decision, accessibility is evaluated in a different way. A third

advantage is the possibility to account for path dependency between events. For example, firm growth – e.g., triggered by a new motorway opening – might induce a firm relocation in the following years. By keeping record of the developments at the individual firm level, the life cycle of a firm and the causality between subsequent events can be modelled endogenously.

To test the assumptions underlying the presented approach, the model is applied to a case study for the province of South Holland in The Netherlands. This area contains a firm population of approximately 90.000 firms. The SFM model has been developed in three stages: model design, model estimation and validation. This article discusses the validation of the model with observations and simulations for the period from 1996 to 2004. The model is estimated on an extensive longitudinal dataset with the full firm population from 1990 to 1996, as described in De Bok (2007). The calibration of a previous model specification has been published in De Bok and Bliemer (2006).

2 The spatial firm demographic simulation model

2.1 Structure of the model

This article presents the design of a Spatial Firm demographic Micro simulation (SFM) that simulates the dynamics within a firm population in a disaggregate urban environment. Their behaviour is the outcome of their preferences and lifecycle and exogenous spatial and economic planning scenarios. Firm demographic micro simulation has a long tradition that started with Birch (1979), and many theories underlying the micro behaviour of firms have been described in the literature on demography of organisations. For a contemporary overview see Carrol and Hannan (2000). Van Wissen developed a firm demographic micro simulation for a case study in The Netherlands previously (Van Wissen, 2000). The SFM-model presented in this article is similar to a large extend but it incorporates the spatial dimension explicitly. This spatial dimension is represented with advanced accessibility and agglomeration measures.

The SFM model describes the change in the state of individual firms that are beneath aggregate economic developments. These transitions are the result of a number of firm demographic events that can occur to each individual firm, such as firm relocation, firm growth, firm dissolution, firm formation, or firm dissolution. Key principle is that these events are influenced by firm internal factors (e.g. size, age) or by location factors

(available locations, accessibility, agglomeration). These events are probabilistic in nature: they can or may not occur.

The causal structure is outlined in Figure 1. From the economic, planning and mobility scenario's at the top, the dependencies between elements are drawn. Bottom up, the approach simulates the firm population with distinctive sub populations (industry sectors) and individual firms. The actual developments are simulated at the individual firm level. The firm demographic events that are simulated include firm formation, firm growth, firm migration and firm dissolution. These events are first of all influenced by the life cycle of firms. This life cycle is captured in the state of the firm and its attributes (age, size) and through other firm demographic events. For instance, firm dissolution and firm migration can both be instigated by firm growth.

Additionally, accessibility and agglomeration are included as location factors in the firm demographic events. Accessibility is derived from a transport model. Agglomeration is derived from the (sub) firm population and travel times from the transport model.

The model represents the supply of industrial real estate at each firm location in order to account for constraints in location options explicitly. Each firm requires a corresponding firm location, in other words, an office related firm can only be located at a location that has the required amount of office real estate available. And during its existence a firm might relocate to another location in case of a firm migration. Changes in the real estate supply, as a result of new industrial or office sites, are included through exogenous plans.

The regional economic development is conditional to the micro developments that are simulated in the SFM model. Thus, individual firm developments are influenced by structural developments in the industry sector or other macro influences that are outside the scope of the analysis. The implementation of exogenous scenarios for the regional economic development implies that the model cannot account for generic effects of transport infrastructure. This is assumed to be acceptable. First of all, these generative effects are much less significant compared to distributive effects (Rietveld, 1994). Moreover, the scope of this urban simulation model is primary on (re) distributive effects of infrastructure investments (allocation of employment growth and relocation of firms).

The SFM model distinguishes three geographical scale levels: the research area, zones, and locations. The research area comprises of a region, province or state. Within this research area the microscopic developments in the firm population are simulated.

Interaction with regions outside this research area takes place through exogenous scenarios. Zones are applied as an intermediate level to describe the characteristics of the urban environment around a location. Moreover, zones are required in order to enable interaction with a transport model. The finest geographical scale level that is applied is at the firm location itself. Because individual firms are simulated, their exact location is known, enabling the computation of detailed spatial characteristics, such as proximity to train stations or highway onramps.

2.2 Accessibility and agglomeration in the SFM model

The spatial environment of firm locations is an explicit and important dimension in the presented simulation approach. The quality of this spatial environment is described with accessibility and agglomeration attributes.

2.2.1 Transport based accessibility

The transport based accessibility measures specifically measure the attributes of the transport infrastructure and the trips that can be made with it. The quality of the transport based accessibility is measured both with distance to infrastructure access points and logsum accessibility measures. The distance to train stations or highway onramps express a specific transport infrastructure quality that is easily interpreted. Previous empirical findings suggested that proximity measures to infrastructure access points are significant location factors in the location preference of firms (De Bok and Sanders, 2005).

Logsum accessibility measures are less easily interpreted, but provide the most conclusive approach to measure all opportunities that can be reached from a location, taking into account individual preferences, the available modes of transport, the variation of travel times and travel costs over the day (Geurs and Van Wee, 2004; De Jong et al., 2007). These measures are well founded in micro economic theory. In this application the logsums for two trip purposes are assumed to be relevant: the logsum for (non-home based) business trips and the (reflected) logsum for commuting trips. First of all, the logsum for business trips are assumed to be a representative measure for customer and supplier accessibility. The commuting trips are used to measure labour market accessibility.

2.2.2 Agglomeration

In urban economic literature spatial externalities are identified as important factors to spatial economic development (for a contemporary overview see Rosenthal and strange, 2004). These spatial externalities are derived from input sharing, labour market pooling or knowledge transfers. The common accessibility measures cover a part of these externalities but additional information about the composition of the firm population is required to measure the full extend of spatial externalities. Therefore, the SFM model features agglomeration measures for diversification and specialisation.

Following the example of Rosenthal and Strange (2003) and Van Der Panne (2004), the agglomeration measures are computed for specific range bands. These range bands are derived from a transport model and explicitly account for the structuring impact of transport infrastructure. The level of agglomeration within each range band can be measured by analysing the level and composition of employment within the range band. A range band represents the area that can be reached within a specific range of travel times. In this approach we take travel times to define our range bands instead of distance. In this way the effect of transportation developments on agglomeration is represented explicitly.

Concentration is measured as the representation of one industry within a specific travel range of a location relative to that industries share in the region. The measure is based on the commonly applied production specialisation index (PS), and is enhanced with a spatial dimension with range bands. For each location j the level of agglomeration is measured in specific range bands, R_{jb} . The level of agglomeration in each range band is derived from the level of employment in each industry sector in a range band. For location j the share of the employment in industry sector s in a range band R_{jb} from j is measured relative to the share of employment in that industry in the whole region. The production specialisation index for location j and range band R_{jb} becomes:

$$PS_{jsb} = \frac{E_{sR_{jb}} / \sum_s E_{sR_{jb}}}{\sum_j E_{sj} / \sum_s \sum_j E_{sj}}, \quad (1)$$

with $E_{sR_{jb}}$ as the employment in industry s , within range band R_{jb} . Figure 2 gives an example of a specialisation index for the business service sector in the range band 0-7.5 minutes.

Diversity externalities are measured with the similar range band concept as well. The common productivity diversity index (PD) that is computed for each range band, is based on the specification of Paci and Usai (1999). If the number of industry sectors is defined by S , and all industries are sorted in increasing order, the production diversity index PD_{jb} for location j and range band R_{jb} is defined as:

$$PD_{jb} = \frac{1}{(S-1)E_{SR_{jb}}} \sum_{s=1}^{S-1} E_{sR_{jb}}, \quad (2)$$

with $E_{SR_{jb}}$ as the employment in the largest industry within range band R_{jb} . The agglomeration attributes are visualised in Figure 2.

2.3 Firm demographic components

The firm demographic core of the SFM model consists of four components: firm migration, firm growth (either decline), firm formation and firm dissolution. Next, each component is specified in more detail.

2.3.1 Firm migration

With seven to eight percent of all firms relocating in a year (Pellenbarg, 1996), firm migration has a considerable influence on the location of the firm population. The empirical literature suggests that the move propensity of a firm is mainly determined by firm internal factors relating to the life-cycle of firms and to a lesser extent by site related factors (Louw, 1996; Van Dijk and Pellenbarg, 2000; Brouwer et al. 2004).

Similar to the simulation approach applied by Van Wissen (2000), firm migration is modelled as a stepwise procedure comprising of a joint decision to relocate, and for a new location. The relocation decision is determined by the satisfaction of a firm at its current location. Once the decision to relocate has been made, the firm will search for alternative locations. These are sampled from the available (unused) real estate supply. The probability that an alternative is being chosen depends on its attributes and the expected utility of this alternative.

For each simulation time interval t , let $P_{isj}^M(t)$ denote the unconditional migration probability that a firm i from industry sector s will relocate and choose location j as its new location. This probability is the product of the probability that the firm will relocate, $P_{is}^{M(1)}(t)$ and the probability that it chooses location j (out of a deterministic subset $L_{is}(t)$ with available alternatives for firm i at time t), $P_{isj|L_{is}(t)}^{M(2)}(t)$:

$$P_{isj}^M(t) = P_{is}^{M(1)}(t) \cdot P_{isj|L_{is}(t)}^{M(2)}(t). \quad (3)$$

The first step in the migration procedure is to calculate the probability to relocate. This probability is described with a binary regression model. The probability of relocating for each time interval is determined by the firm characteristics and the attributes of the location at the current time instance:

$$P_{is}^{M(1)}(t) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp[-(\beta_s^{M(1)} + \beta_1^{M(1)} g_i(t) + \beta_2^{M(1)} \delta_i(t) + \beta_3^{M(1)} Acc_i(t) + \beta_4^{M(1)} Agg_i(t))]}, \quad (4)$$

where $\beta_s^{M(1)}$ is an industry specific parameter, $g_i(t)$ is the growth rate of the firm at time t , $\delta_i(t)$ is a dummy variable for infrastructure proximity, and $Acc_i(t)$ and $Agg_i(t)$ are location attributes for accessibility or agglomeration. The parameters $\beta_{is}^{M(1)}$ and $\beta_x^{M(1)}$ are estimated. The probability to relocate is translated into a discrete relocation decision (“Yes” either “No”) through Monte Carlo simulation.

When a firm has decided to relocate, a deterministic choice set is sampled from the available and feasible real estate. Feasibility is determined by the size of the firms and the real estate object and the type of real estate. Each choice set contains maximum 20 alternatives.

The choice probability of each alternative is calculated with a spatial preference model in the form of a Competing Destination model (CD) model that accounts for the interdependencies between spatial alternatives (Fortheringham, 1983). By definition, the utility of an alternative consists of an observed component $V_{isj}(t)$ an unobserved (random) component and additionally a centrality measure $c_j(t)$, that accounts for spatial cluster membership of alternatives. The observed utility functions are industry specific and contain a number of accessibility and agglomeration attributes. The choice probabilities of each alternative in the choice context are defined as:

$$P_{isj|L_{is}(t)}^{M(2)}(t) = \frac{\exp(V_{isj}(t) + \theta_s^{M(2)} \ln c_j(t))}{\sum_{k \in L_{is}(t)} \exp(V_{isk}(t) + \theta_s^{M(2)} \ln c_k(t))}. \quad (5)$$

The resulting choice probabilities are translated into a discrete outcome (location j from choice set $L_{is}(t)$) through Monte Carlo simulation.

The observed utility of each alternative, V_{isj} , is specified with an industry specific linear additive utility function. It includes the accessibility and agglomeration attributes, as well as the distance between the original location and the location alternative, d_{ij} :

$$V_{isj}(t) = \beta_{1s}^{M(2)} d_{ij} + \beta_{2s}^{M(2)} \delta_i(t) + \beta_{3s}^{M(2)} Acc_i(t) + \beta_{4s}^{M(2)} Agg_i(t). \quad (6)$$

The competing destinations model includes a centrality measure $c_j(t)$ that accounts explicitly for the interdependency between spatial alternatives. This measure recognises the more proximal alternatives are in space, the more likely they are to be substitutes for one another. Similar to Fotheringham (1983), a sum of weighed distances is calculated from one alternative to all others, where the weight is the size of each alternative:

$$c_j(t) = (1/(K(t) - 1)) \sum_{k \neq j} w_k(t) / d_{kj}(t) \quad (7)$$

with $K(t)$ as the number of available firm locations at time t , $d_{kj}(t)$ as the distance between alternative k and j and $w_k(t)$ as the size of alternative k . The size of an alternative is specified as the available floorspace or industrial area at a firm location at time t .

2.3.2 Firm growth

The scope of the presented model is primary on distributive effects of transport infrastructure; regional economic development is exogenous input. Rietveld (1994) has shown that for the case of a new motorway opening, the distributive impacts are far more substantial compared to the generative effects. It is stressed that our presented approach neglects the generative effects of transport infrastructure, but accounts for structural developments within the industry sectors through economic scenarios. A two step approach is applied in computing the expected firm size. First, a tentative firm size is estimated based on the firm- and location attributes. Next, this tentative firm size is corrected to fit the total employment in the firm sector to the exogenous regional totals.

First of all, firm performance is assumed to be influenced by the proximity of transport infrastructure. Hilbers et al. (1994) provide evidence for better performances of specific industry sectors in the proximity of motorway onramps. However, firm size is mostly explained by firm attributes, relating to the size and lifecycle of a firm. Following

recent studies, such as Audretsch et al. (2002) and Van Wissen and Huisman (2003), an autoregressive model is applied that estimates the size of a firm, relative to the average firm size in the industry sector. The z-value of firm size, $z_{is}(t)$, is defined as the deviation of the log of the firm size from the average log of firm size:

$$z_{is}(t) = \log s_{is}^*(t) - \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{N_s(t)} \log s_{ks}(t)}{N_s(t)}, \quad (8)$$

where $s_{is}^*(t)$ is the tentative size of firm i , that belongs to sector s at time t and $N_s(t)$ is the number of firms in sector s . Following Audretsch et al. (2002) and Van Wissen and Huisman (2003), $z_{is}(t)$ is derived from the firm specific z-values for the two previous years and a location attribute. This first order autoregressive model includes a slope coefficient β_0^S and a first-order autocorrelation coefficient ρ_0^S :

$$z_{is}(t) = (\beta_{0s}^S + \rho_{0s}^S)z_{is}(t-1) + (-\beta_{0s}^S \rho_{0s}^S)z_{is}(t-2) + \beta_{1s}^S \delta_i(t) + \beta_{2s}^S Acc_i(t) + \beta_{3s}^S Agg_i(t) + \varepsilon_{is}(t), \quad (9)$$

where $\delta_i(t)$ is a dummy variable for infrastructure proximity and $\varepsilon_{is}(t)$ is a stochastic disturbance term. The parameters β_{0s}^S , ρ_{0s}^S , β_{xs}^S and $\varepsilon_{is}(t)$ are industry specific and are estimated. The tentative firm size $s_{is}^*(t)$, can be derived from rewriting the previous two equations. Next, this tentative firm size is corrected with a sector specific regional balancing factor in order to fit the total employment to the regional economic scenario:

$$s_{is}(t) = s_{is}^*(t) \frac{E_s(t)}{E_s^*(t)}, \quad (10)$$

where $s_{is}(t)$ is the firm size at time t , $E_s(t)$ is the regional employment in industry sector s , and $E_s^*(t)$ is the initially estimated regional employment.

2.3.3 Firm dissolution

In firm demographic literature it can be found that firm dissolution is mainly determined by firm characteristics: size, sector, age and firm growth (Carroll and Hannan, 2000; Van Wissen, 2000; Ekamper, 1996). Clearly, larger firms have a higher probability of surviving a time interval. With respect to age, the ‘survival of the fittest’ is apparent among young firms: the dissolution probability is high among young firms. Even though no empirical evidence has been found for a relation between firm dissolution and

accessibility, accessibility attributes will be included in the estimation of the dissolution probability.

The procedure includes a binary regression model to calculate the probability of dissolution, $P_{is}^D(t)$. This probability of dissolution is determined by firm- and location attributes:

$$P_{is}^D(t) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp[-(\beta_s^D + \beta_1^D g_i(t) + \beta_2^D \ln s_i(t) + \beta_3^D (1/a_i(t)) + \beta_4^D \delta_i(t) + \beta_5^D Acc_i(t) + \beta_6^D Agg_i(t))]}, \quad (11)$$

where β_s^D is an industry specific parameter, $g_i(t)$ is the growth rate of the firm, $s_i(t)$ the size of the firm, $a_i(t)$ the age of the firm and $\delta_i(t)$ a dummy variables for infrastructure proximity. β_s^D and all β_x^D parameters are estimated. During micro simulation the dissolution probability is determined for each firm. This dissolution probability is translated into a discrete dissolution event (“Yes” either “No”) through Monte Carlo simulation. In case of a firm dissolution event, the status of the corresponding firm is set to ‘Dissolved’.

2.3.4 Firm formation

Firm formation concerns a complex process of starting up a new firm. An important engine behind firm formation is the firm population itself (Van Wissen, 2000). An existing firm can induce a firm start up, for instance by splitting up or by starting a new branch. Another instigator for firm birth is the labour population: firms can also be formed by firm employees, school-leavers or an unemployed. In some studies report an effect of the urban environment on firm formation, such as Van Oort et al. (1999). Not many empirical examples exist on the effect of transport infrastructure on firm formation, but positive exceptions are Holl (2004a) and Holl (2004b). An analysis on firm level data of new manufacturing establishments in Spanish municipalities showed that new motorways affect the spatial distribution of formations of manufacturing establishments.

In the SFM-model, firm formation is an exception to the micro approach for it simulates firm start ups from sequential macro to micro steps. First the number of firm formations is computed for each industry sector from the firm population in the respective industry sector and the observed firm formation rates. Next, an initial firm size is randomly drawn from an observed distribution of firm sizes at start up. Finally the firm is allocated to a random location that is drawn from all available locations that are feasible as well.

3 Data and estimation of the SFM model

The research approach is applied to a case study for the South Holland region. This case study provides an empirical test bed to analyse the assumptions underlying the model and to gain more knowledge into the influence of accessibility and agglomeration on spatial firm dynamics.

3.1 Data

The model has been estimated on a longitudinal dataset, covering all developments in the firm population. This dataset has been constructed by linking the annual LISA datasets (National Information System of Employment) from 1988 to 2004. The model is estimated on period 1988 to 1997. This paper discusses model validation on the successive period: from 1997 to 2004. The observations include the following attributes for each firm: industry sector, size (in full time employment units), the change in size compared to previous year, the location (6 digit zip code) and dummy's for firm demographic events. The spatial detail of firm locations allows a detailed analysis of spatial attributes of each location. The firm population is segmented to 12 industry sectors.

The accessibility and agglomeration attributes are linked to the locations. The distance measures to highway onramps and trainstation are derived from the location of each firm (6 digit zip code) and a GIS analysis. The logsum accessibility attributes, and the travel time between zones in the study area, are provided by backcasting data from the National Modelling System (NMS), the national transport model for the Netherlands (Hague Consulting Group, 2000). The attributes for diversification or specialisation in the direct surroundings of a location or in specific range band from that location, are computed from the travel times from the NMS and the location of all firms in the LISA-dataset.

The input to the validation runs consists of the firm population in the baseyear, and a scenario for the economic development and the real estate developments. In baseyear 1996 the study area hosted 95 thousand firms. The validation runs are based on the observed regional economic development in the study area between 1996 and 2004. The macro economic development is input to the firm growth model and in such forms constraints to the simulation and influences the outcomes at micro level. The supply of industrial real estate determines the constraints to what locations are available to a firm.

Changes in this industrial real estate supply are implemented through synthesized real estate data for the corresponding period.

3.2 The estimated SFM model

Table 1 presents the estimated parameters for each module in the SFM-model. For a more elaborate discussion of the estimation procedure see De Bok (2007). In this article, the most important findings from the estimations are discussed.

The relocation probability can mostly be explained from the firm attributes, which is in line with firm demographic literature: bigger firms are less likely to relocate (Carroll and Hannan, 2000; Brouwer et al., 2004) and firms with relative large growth rates are more likely to relocate (Carroll and Hannan, 2000; Pellenbarg 1996; Louw, 1996). The relocation probability varies across industry sectors, but accessibility appears to have a limited influence. Agglomeration however, does have an effect: firms at diverse locations are more likely to relocate. This is interpreted as a pattern of successful firms that leave their breeding areas.

When firms relocate and search for a new location, they have a significant preference for locations in the proximity of their original location. This is interpreted as evidence for keep-factors: a relocating firm strives to maintain their existing spatial network. Moreover, the spatial clustering of location alternatives proves to have a significant influence on the choice behaviour of firms: alternatives that are clustered in space, individually have a smaller choice probability. This is in line with findings by Fortheringham and Pelligrini (2002). Furthermore, outspoken differences in location preference between industry sectors are measured for highway and/or train station proximity, which is also confirmed in empirical literature, for instance Hilbers *et.al.* (2004), Hunt (1997), Leitham *et al.* (2000), Holl (2004a, 2004b) or de Bok and Sanders (2005). Moreover, some industry sectors have a preference for locations with a good labour market accessibility. The estimations provide strong evidence that firms prefer locations that have a relatively high representation of firms from their own industry sector. This is interpreted as evidence for the existence of Marshall externalities and consistent with the findings of Duranton and Puga (2000) and Holl (2004b).

The firm growth model revealed a dominant influence of the growth pattern in the previous years on the expected firm size, consistent with firm demographic literature (Dunne and Hughes, 1994; McCloughan, 1995; Audretsch et al., 2002; Van Wissen and

Huisman, 2003). The estimated autoregressive coefficients were smaller than unity for all industry sectors, implying that large firms are expected to grow more slowly than small firms. All estimated ρ_0^s parameters have a negative sign, which implies a negative correlation between firm growth in subsequent years. In other words: a firm with a relative substantial growth in one year, is expected to grow less quickly the next year. Infrastructure proximity has a significant effect on firm performance for various industry sectors. Most estimated coefficients for diversity are negative, indicating relatively less growth at diversified locations. The estimation results for the specialisation coefficient reveal a positive influence of specialisation on the expected growth.

Firm dissolution can be explained with the firm attributes for the largest part: age and size. Firm dissolution is high among young firms. This confirms the liability of newness hypothesis (Stinchcombe, 1965). Larger firms have smaller dissolution probabilities, as well as firms that are growing in size. Both findings are in line with empirical literature (Hannan and Freeman, 1977; Ekamper, 1996; Van Wissen, 2000; Brouwer, 2004). Next, structural developments within industry sectors are significant as well. Firm dissolution appears to be higher among firms at locations with higher diversity indices. Firm dissolution appears to be a little bit higher in the proximity of highway onramps (γ -locations), probably indicating to a higher dynamics at industrial sites at such locations.

In conclusion the estimations confirm a complex interdependency between firm demographic events and confirm a significant influence of accessibility and agglomeration throughout the various events. In general the estimations provide a consistent pattern that can be understood from the life cycle of firms, as outlined in Duranton and Puga (2000). It is argued that the presented approach provides an advanced methodology to better understand the effect of infrastructure and spatial planning scenarios on firm dynamics, by taking into account the theories on urban economics and industrial organisations.

4 Validation

The SFM-model features individual behaviour, spatial externalities and geographic detail, with the objective to provide accurate and valid projections of firm dynamics under different spatial planning scenarios. The assumptions were first tested with the estimation of the firm-demographic models. This section will analyse if the estimated SFM-model

actually leads to valid simulation results. For this purpose, a number of validation runs are performed with the estimated coefficients. These runs are performed for the period 1996-2004. The simulated results from the model are compared with the observed developments, across different levels of aggregation.

4.1 Population aggregates

First, the aggregate results from the validation runs are compared to the aggregate development in the observed LISA data. Figure 3 shows the total number of simulated firms from 1996 to 2003 (indicated with black symbols) and the observed size of the firm population (indicated with grey squares). In general the average trend of the size of the simulated firm population is similar compared to the observed firm population. However, the size of the simulated firm population shows a more steady growth trend compared to the observed firm population. This can be explained from the estimation of the firm formation and firm dissolution models: these are estimated on a period of a few years. As a result, the estimated coefficients yield average formation and dissolution models. As a consequence, the dynamic trend is averaged out but the average trend in the population size is reproduced.

4.2 Micro results

The SFM model simulates spatial economic developments at the most disaggregated level possible: individual firms. This detailed level of analysis might suggest that the model aims at predicting individual behaviour. It is stressed that in this case micro-simulation is used to predict the behaviour of the whole spatial economic system. The micro-simulation accounts for the disaggregate dynamics underneath spatial economic development. The objective is to find answers to research questions that apply to intermediate levels of aggregation.

Figure 4 shows the microscopic results for six random firms. Their simulated size is compared to their observed size in the simulation period. The stochastics in the various demographic events prove to lead to very distinct developments at the micro level. For example: in case of firm 200000 (General services) in run 4 it grows from a firm with 10 employees over 8 years to a firm with 15 employees, while in run 5 the same firm is dissolved in the simulation period. It is argued that the distinctive developments at micro level, are representative for the element of coincidence in firm-demographic events. From

these microscopic results however, it can not be concluded if the behaviour of the spatial economic system as a whole is represented correctly.

4.3 Validation of simulated employment by zone

A simulation model should be validated relative to those measures of performance that will actually be used for decision making (Law and Kelton, 1991). The scope of the presented micro-simulation model is to make accurate predictions of the behaviour of the urban system. The measures that are relevant in the application of such urban simulation models, typically apply to intermediate levels of aggregation. For instance, what is the transport demand or the demand for industrial real estate in a particular neighbourhood? Hence, it seems relevant to analyse the validity of the SFM-model at zonal level. To analyse the goodness-of-fit of the predicted employment in the SFM-zones, the micro results are aggregated to zones.

The simulated employment totals by zone, indicated by X_o , is first analysed with the average from 10 replications with the SFM-model, defined as $\overline{X_o}(10)$. Confidence intervals, computed from a distribution of outcomes, are valued as a reliable measure for comparing a model with the real system (Law and Kelton, 1991). The confidence intervals for the ten replication runs are computed for the 95 percent confidence level. In this validation, it is tested if the observed employment per zone, Y_o , is contained by the confidence interval of the simulation runs:

$$\left\{ \overline{X_o}(10) - t_{9,0.95} \sqrt{\text{Var}(\overline{X_o}(10))} \right\} \leq Y_o \leq \left\{ \overline{X_o}(10) + t_{9,0.95} \sqrt{\text{Var}(\overline{X_o}(10))} \right\}. \quad (12)$$

Table 4 compares the observed and simulated employment totals. First, the Pearson correlation is computed between the average simulation output for 2004 and the observed zone employment in 2004. These correlation coefficients are used as an indication for the goodness-of-fit between the simulation output and the observed firm-demographic development after simulating eight time intervals (8 years). The correlation coefficients of the predicted and observed employment in a neighbourhood indicate a reasonable match between simulated and observed employment totals. The correlation between the total employment predicted and observed is 0.68-0.97. The correlation coefficients for sector specific outputs are less high. More static sectors appear to be easier predicted than others. For instance: the number of jobs in restaurants and food services is

pretty well predicted: $r = 0.97$. Other sectors are less easier to predict. In case of the health service sector, the correlation is much less: $r=0.62$. This is probably the result of structural developments in this sectors: merging of local health facilities and the concentration of health services might have lead to a relatively large redistribution of jobs.

The comparison of observed zonal employment with the Confidence Intervals of the simulation results, presented in Table 4, shows that a large share of the observed industry employment per zone falls within the simulated confidence intervals. Figure 5 presents a visual comparison of the observed employment with the simulated confidence intervals. Observed zone employment is indicated with dots and the simulation results with range bands. The 50 largest zones in the respective industry sectors are presented. For a fair share of zones it shows that their simulated results match satisfactory, but for still for a few zones the employment is ill-predicted. Also, it can be seen that the size of the confidence intervals is relatively large. For instance, the confidence interval for the largest zone, lies between 4500 and 14000 jobs, capturing the actual employment broadly.

5 Policy implications

In order to ensure sustainable development policy makers should evaluate the effects of transport- and urban plans adequately. It is argued here that appropriate tools for making projections of expected future traffic demand or demand for real estate do not exist. Sometimes, the consequences of this become visible by a congested road network or by unused office spaces in a dense urban environment.

Valid urban simulation models, that represent the crucial causal relationships, can help in providing insight into the effects from any planning alternative. The regional economy can then be supported by developing firm locations that better serves the (future) demand of the local firm population. The future demand for firm locations is a function of the existing firm population, and complicated developments that can be explained from the perspective of organisational and urban economic theories.

It is argued that the analysis in this article provide a number of lessons for the formalisation of such simulation models. First of all, it is important to account for disaggregate behaviour. The empirical results confirm that the preferences and responses of individual firms are very diverse and can be well understood from organisational theory. Second, a detailed geographic detail is required (building block) to adequately

measure different aspects of the quality of a firm location. Accessibility, the distance to infrastructure access points, or the composition of the firm population prove to be significant location factors that vary considerably at the intra-urban scale. To provide adequate projections of firm behaviour, the crucial elements of ‘accessibility’ should be represented in the individual preferences of firms.

6 Discussion

The validation of the SFM-model across different levels of aggregation showed interesting results. The simulated firm population size proves to follow the trend of the observed population size, however the observed growth pattern is more dynamic compared to the average pattern of the simulations. A sample of microscopic results showed the effect of the stochastic elements in the firm-demographic models. These stochastics prove to lead to very distinct developments at micro level, but these are argued to be representative for the element of coincidence in firm-demographic events. At zone level the results indicate a good match between observed and simulated development, although the variability in outcomes for some larger zones can vary quite considerably. It is concluded that the presented approach provides reliable estimates of future firm location but further enhancement of the models are desirable. The validation effort is exceptionally disaggregate providing many opportunities to enhance any of the sub models further.

It is argued that the presented approach provides an advanced methodology to better understand the effect of infrastructure and spatial planning scenarios on firm dynamics that can provide policy assessments with a higher validity. First of all the approach is based on accumulative firm-level responses to policy measures, that are founded on industrial organisation theory. Hence, individual firm characteristics are applied in the models, allowing heterogeneity in responses. A second distinctive feature is the inclusion of urban economic theories and advanced agglomeration measures that until now have only been applied marginally in projection models. A number of disaggregate agglomeration attributes are included that measure the level of specialisation or diversification in the composition of the local firm population. The transport dimension is included in these measures through travel times from a transport model. The estimation of the firm demographic sub models proved that these accessibility and agglomeration measures are important factors in the various firm demographic events. Finally the

microscopic nature of the responses that are simulated in the model are more intuitive compared to aggregate approaches. This can help in increasing the transparency of the model and the acceptability of the simulation results.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to acknowledge their appreciation for the following persons or institutes that made a valuable contribution to the research: Prof. Frank van Oort from Utrecht University and the Netherlands Institute for Spatial Research, Michiel Bliemer and Piet Bovy from Delft University of Technology, Prof. Leo Van Wissen from the University of Groningen and the Netherlands Interdisciplinary Demographic Institute and the Geo-Database Management Center at Delft University of Technology.

References

- Audretsch, D.B., L. Klomp and A.R. Thurik (2002) *Gibrat's law: are the services different?* ERIM: ERIM Report Series No. ERS-2002-04-STR, Rotterdam.
- Birch, D. (1979) *The job generating process*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (Mass.).
- Brouwer, A. (2004) The inert firm; why old firms show a stickiness to their location. *Proceedings of the 44th ERSA conference*, Porto.
- Brouwer, A.E., I. Mariotti and J.N. Van Ommeren (2004) The firm relocation decision: an empirical investigation. *The Annals of Regional Science*, Vol. 38(2), pp. 335-347.
- Carroll, G.R. and M.T. Hannan (2000) *The demography of corporations and industries*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- De Bok (2007) *Infrastructure and firm dynamics*. Draft PhD-Thesis. Delft University of Technology.
- De Bok, M. and F. Sanders (2005) Firm relocation and the accessibility of locations: empirical results from The Netherlands. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, No. 1902, pp. 35-43.
- De Bok, M. and M.C.J. Bliemer (2006) Land Use and Transport Interaction: Calibration of a Micro Simulation Model for Firms in the Netherlands. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, No. 1977, pp. 132-144.
- De Jong, G., A. Daly, M. Pieters and T. Van Der Hoorn (2007) The Logsum as an evaluation measure: review of the literature and new results. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, Volume 41, Pages 874-889
- Dunne, P. and A. Hughes (1994) Age, size, growth and survival. *The Journal of Industrial Economics*, Vol. 42, pp. 115-140.

- Duranton, G. and D. Puga (2000) Diversity and specialisation in cities: why, where and when does it matter? *Urban Studies*. Vol. 37(3), pp. 533-555.
- Duranton, G. and D. Puga (2004) Micro-foundations of urban agglomeration economies. In: J. V. Henderson and J. F. Thisse, *Handbook of regional and urban economics*. Vol 4, pp. 2064-2086.
- Ekamper, P. (1996) Opheffing van bedrijfsvestigingen: een sterftetafelbenadering. *Planning*. Vol. 48, pp. 12-21.
- Fortheringham, A.S. (1983) A new set of spatial-interaction models: the theory of competing destinations. *Environment and Planning A*, Vol. 15, pp. 15-36.
- Geurs, K.T. and B. van Wee (2004) Accessibility evaluation of land-use and transport strategies: review and research directions. *Journal of Transport Geography*, Vol. 12(2), pp. 127-140.
- Hague Consulting Group (2000) Het Landelijk Model Systeem versie 7.0. The Hague (in Dutch).
- Hannan, M.T. and J. Freeman (1977) The population ecology of organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 82, pp. 929-964.
- Hilbers, H., P. Jorritsma and P. Louter (1994) The relationship between accessibility and regional development explored for the region of Amersfoort. *Proceedings of the 21st Colloquium Vervoerplanologisch Speurwerk*, Zeist.
- Holl, A. (2004a) Manufacturing location and impacts of road transport infrastructure: empirical evidence from Spain. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, Vol. 34, pp. 341-363.
- Holl, A. (2004b) Start ups and relocations: manufacturing plant location in Portugal. *Papers in Regional Science*, Vol. 83, pp. 649-668.
- Hunt, J.D. (1997) Stated-preference examination of location choice behavior of small retail firms. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*. No. 1606, pp. 25-32.
- Law, A.M. and W.D. Kelton (1991) *Simulation Modeling and Analysis*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Leitham, S., R.W. McQuaid, and J.D. Nelson. (2000) The influence of transport on industrial location choice: a stated preference experiment. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*. Vol. 34, pp. 515-535.
- Louw, E. (1996) *Kantoorgebouw en vestigingsplaats*. Ph.D. Thesis, OTB Research Institute, Delft.
- McCloughan, P. (1995) Simulation of Concentration Development from Modified Gibrat Growth-Entry-Exit Processes. *The Journal of Industrial Economics*. Vol 43(4), pp. 405-433.
- Paci, R. and S. Usai (1999) Externalities, knowledge spillovers and the spatial distribution of innovation. *GeoJournal* Vol 49, pp. 381-390.
- Pellenbarg, P.H. (1996) Structuur en ontwikkeling van bedrijfsmigratie in Nederland. *Planning*, Vol. 48, pp. 22-32.

- Pelligrini, P.A. and A.S. Fortheringham (2002) Modelling spatial choice: a review and synthesis in a migration context. *Progress in Human Geography*, Vol. 26(4), pp. 487-510.
- Rietveld, P. (1994) Spatial economic impacts of transport infrastructure supply. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, Vol. 28, pp. 329-341.
- Rosenthal, S.S. and W.C. Strange (2003) Geography, industrial organisation, and agglomeration. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 85(2), pp. 377-393.
- Rosenthal, S.S. and W.C. Strange (2004) Evidence on the nature and sources of agglomeration economies. In: J. V. Henderson and J. F. Thisse, *Handbook of regional and urban economics*. Vol 4, pp. 2119-2167.
- Shukla, V. and P. Waddell (1991) Firm location and land use in discrete urban space: A study of the spatial structure of Dallas-Fort worth. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, Vol. 21, pp. 225-253.
- Stinchcombe, A.L. (1965) Social structure and organisations. In: J. March, *Handbook of organisations*. Chicago: Rand McNally. Pp. 142-193.
- Van Der Panne, G. (2004) *Entrepreneurship and localised knowledge spillovers*. Ph.D. Thesis, Delft University of Technology.
- Van Dijk, J. and P. Pellenbarg (2000) Firm relocation decisions in The Netherlands: An ordered logit approach. *Papers in Regional Science*, Vol. 79, pp. 191-219.
- Van Oort, F., B. van der Knaap and W. Slegers (1999) New firm formation, employment growth and the local environment: emperical observations in South-Holland. In: J. Van Dijk and P. Pellenbarg (Ed.) *Demography of firms; Spatial Dynamics of Firm Behavior*. Utrecht/Groningen: Netherlands Geographical Studies 262, pp. 173-204.
- Van Wissen, L. (2000) A micro-simulation model of firms: Applications of concepts of the demography of the firm. *Papers in Regional Science*, Vol. 79, pp. 111-134.
- Van Wissen, L. and C. Huisman (2003) Firm growth across regions: a regional test of Gibrat's law: are the services different? 43rd European Regional Science Association Congress, Jyvaskyla.
- Waddell, P. and G.F. Ulfarsson (2003) Accessibility and Agglomeration: Discrete-Choice Models of Employment Location by Industry Sector. Proceedings of the 82nd Annual Meeting of the Transportation Research Board, Washington, D.C..
- Waddell, P.; Ulfarsson, G.F.; Franklin, J.P.; Lobb, J. (2007) Incorporating land use in metropolitan transportation planning, *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, Volume 41, pp. 382-410

Table 1: Estimated parameters in the location choice (LC-0 and LC-1) and firm performance (FP-0 and FP-1) models.

LOCATION CHOICE	Finance		Business services				Government				Education				Health Services				General Services					
	LC-0		LC-1		LC-0		LC-1		LC-0		LC-1		LC-0		LC-1		LC-0		LC-1					
	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.				
Migration attribute																								
Distance to original loc.[km ^{1/2}]	-2.38	0.12	-2.42	0.12	-1.89	0.04	-1.89	0.04	-1.95	0.15	-1.91	0.15	-2.44	0.13	-2.46	0.14	-2.74	0.10	-2.75	0.10	-2.12	0.10	-2.20	0.10
Accessibility attributes																								
α -location; near trainstation			0.77	0.29										1.14	0.37									
β -location; near trainstation & highway onramp			0.70	0.24			0.45	0.10			0.68	0.28			0.79	0.26						0.56	0.23	
γ -location; near highway onramp			0.36	0.15			0.13	0.06			0.38	0.21										0.41	0.14	
ρ -location; neither																								
Reflected logsum commuting trips			0.32	0.09			0.23	0.04											0.15	0.07				
Logsum business trips																								
Agglomeration attributes																								
Diversity Rb < 7,5 min.							-0.38	0.17																
Specialisation Rb < 7,5 min.			0.24	0.09			0.51	0.06															-0.44	0.14
Centrality parameter																								
Teta	-1.18	0.28	-2.33	0.39	-0.70	0.11	-1.18	0.15	-0.32	0.34			-0.88	0.33	-1.20	0.35	-0.74	0.30	-0.97	0.31	-0.70	0.24	-0.61	0.26
Number of observations	428		428		1992		1992		185		185		312		312		742		742		442		442	
Init log-likelihood	-1282		-1282		-5968		-5968		-554		-554		-935		-935		-2223		-2223		-1324		-1324	
Final log-likelihood	-655		-638		-3622		-3557		-359		-356		-443		-434		-884		-882		-715		-705	
Rho-square	0.489		0.503		0.393		0.404		0.352		0.358		0.526		0.535		0.602		0.603		0.460		0.468	
FIRM PERFORMANCE																								
Finance		FP-1		Business services				Government				Education				Health Services				General Services				
FP-0		FP-1		FP-0		FP-1		FP-0		FP-1		FP-0		FP-1		FP-0		FP-1		FP-0		FP-1		
β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	
Firm attributes																								
Size previous years: slope coefficient BETA	0.987	0.001	0.983	0.001	0.978	0.001	0.982	0.001	0.987	0.003	0.981	0.003	0.994	0.001	0.995	0.001	0.989	0.001			0.986	0.001	0.983285	0.001001
Size previous years: autocorrelation coefficient	-0.165	0.007	-0.163	0.007	-0.112	0.004	-0.117	0.004	-0.064	0.015	-0.062	0.015	-0.153	0.007	-0.154	0.007	-0.188	0.005			-0.158	0.005	-0.156164	0.004656
Accessibility attributes																								
α -location; nearby trainstation			0.020	0.007																				
β -location; nearby trainstation & highway onramp							0.008	0.003						0.006	0.005									
γ -location; nearby highway onramp							0.005	0.003						0.007	0.003									
ρ -location; neither																								
Agglomeration attributes																								
Diversity Rb < 7,5 min.			-0.035	0.007			-0.01	0.00																
Specialisation Rb < 7,5 min.			0.01	0.00			0.02	0.00																
Number of observations	22342		22342		87780		87780		5684		5684		21220		21220		41350		41350		51813		51813	
R2 (adjusted)	0.949		0.949		0.941		0.941		0.945		0.946		0.969		0.969		0.955		0.955		0.938		0.938	
S.E. of estimate	0.077		0.077		0.093		0.093		0.125		0.125		0.061		0.061		0.079		0.079		0.069		0.069	

Table 2: Estimated parameters in the location choice (LC-0 and LC-1) and firm performance (FP-0 and FP-1) models.

LOCATION CHOICE	Manufacturing				Construction				Logistics				Agriculture				Trade and retail				Restaurants & Food services			
	LC-0		LC-1		LC-0		LC-1		LC-0		LC-1		LC-0		LC-1		LC-0		LC-1		LC-0		LC-1	
	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.		
Migration attribute																								
Distance to original loc.[km ^{1/2}]	-1.73	0.06	-1.73	0.06	-1.88	0.05	-1.89	0.05	-1.63	0.06	-1.60	0.06	-2.98	0.17	-3.00	0.17	-2.04	0.04	-2.05	0.04	-2.91	0.28	-2.99	0.29
Accessibility attributes																								
α -location; near trainstation																							1.20	0.56
β -location; near trainstation & highway onramp											0.38	0.17											1.06	0.39
γ -location; near highway onramp							0.24	0.08			0.28	0.09							0.52	0.06				
ρ -location; neither																								
Reflected logsum commuting trips			0.18	0.06							0.12	0.05			-0.52	0.14			0.13	0.04				
Logsum business trips																								
Agglomeration attributes																								
Diversity Rb < 7,5 min.			-0.88	0.26											-1.30	0.50								
Specialisation Rb < 7,5 min.			0.42	0.09			0.40	0.10			0.37	0.04							0.99	0.10				
Centrality parameter																								
Teta	-1.01	0.24	-0.94	0.30	-1.54	0.22	-1.26	0.24	-1.47	0.22	-1.96	0.27	-4.72	0.73	-3.84	0.77	-2.05	0.15	-2.03	0.16	-1.80	0.84	-2.14	0.86
Number of observations	752		752		1033		1033		896		896		408		408		2229		2229		134		134	
Init log-likelihood	-2253		-2253		-3095		-3095		-2684		-2684		-1222		-1222		-6676		-6676		-401		-401	
Final log-likelihood	-1356		-1331		-1711		-1697		-1805		-1743		-368		-360		-3324		-3237		-130		-126	
Rho-square	0.398		0.409		0.447		0.451		0.328		0.351		0.699		0.705		0.502		0.515		0.676		0.685	
FIRM PERFORMANCE																								
	Manufacturing		FP-1		Construction		FP-1		Logistics		FP-1		Agriculture		FP-1		Trade and retail		FP-1		Restaurants & Food services		FP-1	
	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.
Firm attributes																								
Size previous years: slope coefficient BETA	0.987	0.001	0.983	0.001	0.982	0.001	0.980	0.001	0.982	0.001	0.979	0.001	0.961	0.001	0.952	0.002	0.986	0.000	0.978	0.001	0.971	0.001	0.954	0.002
Size previous years: autocorrelation coefficient	-0.122	0.005	-0.120	0.005	-0.123	0.005	-0.123	0.005	-0.135	0.006	-0.134	0.006	-0.156	0.005	-0.153	0.005	-0.161	0.002	-0.157	0.002	-0.166	0.005	-0.161	0.005
Accessibility attributes																								
α -location; nearby trainstation																							0.019	0.006
β -location; nearby trainstation & highway onramp																								
γ -location; nearby highway onramp							0.005	0.003			0.009	0.004							0.003	0.001				
ρ -location; neither																								
Agglomeration attributes																								
Diversity Rb < 7,5 min.			-0.028	0.004			-0.018	0.004			-0.029	0.004			-0.040	0.003			-0.035	0.002			-0.050	0.003
Specialisation Rb < 7,5 min.			0.006	0.002			0.006	0.002			0.006	0.001							0.004	0.001				
Number of observations	39960		39960		42045		42045		32044		32044		48631		48631		208664		208664		42964		42964	
R2 (adjusted)	0.964		0.964		0.951		0.951		0.948		0.948		0.868		0.868		0.927		0.927		0.863		0.864	
S.E. of estimate	0.072		0.072		0.080		0.080		0.095		0.095		0.077		0.077		0.072		0.071		0.096		0.095	

Table 3: Estimated parameters in the firm dissolution (FD-0 and FD-1) and firm mobility (FM-0 and FM-1) models.

	FIRM DISSOLUTION				FIRM MOBILITY			
	FD-0		FD-1		FM-0		FM-1	
	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.	β	S.E.
Constant	-2.734	0.028	-2.956	0.040	-3.566	0.028	-3.893	0.040
Individual firm attributes								
Log of size	-0.351	0.008	-0.354	0.009	-0.0387	0.006	-0.040	0.006
Growth rate	-0.270	0.026	-0.269	0.026	0.40171	0.026	0.401	0.026
1 / age	0.747	0.025	0.730	0.026				
Industry sector								
Agriculture	-0.187	0.050	-0.087	0.052	-0.5381	0.045	-0.394	0.047
Manufacturing	0.460	0.039	0.471	0.039	0.21294	0.039	0.236	0.039
Construction	0.280	0.040	0.285	0.040	0.51787	0.036	0.538	0.036
Trade & Retail	0.354	0.029	0.366	0.029	-0.0829	0.03	-0.064	0.030
Restaurants & Food service	-0.179	0.043	-0.196	0.043	-1.2587	0.06	-1.301	0.060
Logistics	0.475	0.040	0.472	0.040	0.70042	0.037	0.712	0.037
Finance	0.524	0.043	0.535	0.043	0.40845	0.043	0.420	0.043
Business services	0.467	0.030	0.473	0.030	0.739	0.031	0.748	0.031
Government	1.094	0.084	1.080	0.084	0.54512	0.071	0.530	0.071
Education	0.431	0.051	0.428	0.051	0.07316	0.05	0.089	0.050
Health service	-0.131	0.044	-0.131	0.044	0.17657	0.039	0.181	0.039
General Services (ref.)								
Accessibility attributes								
α -location; near trainstation								
β -location; near trainstation & highway onramp							0.057	0.021
γ -location; near highway onramp			0.046	0.015			-0.038	0.016
ρ -location; neither (ref.)								
Reflected logsum commuting trips								
Logsum business trips								
Agglomeration attributes								
Diversity Rb < 7,5 min.			0.214	0.036			0.371	0.036
Specialisation Rb < 7,5 min.			0.061	0.012			0.066	0.011
Number of observations	307,215		307,215		641,469		641,469	
Cox and Snell	0.01535		0.01556		0.00653		0.00678	
Nagelkerke	0.03735		0.03785		0.02625		0.02725	

Table 4: Validation of observed zonal employment by correlation between the average simulated and observed zonal employment for 2004, and an outside/within-comparison of observed employment with the simulated Confidence Intervals (CI).

	Correlation *) simulated means	within CI **) (n)	outside CI (n)	within CI (%)	outside CI (%)
Agriculture	0.68	326	107	75	25
Manufacturing	0.83	359	74	83	17
Construction	0.74	358	75	83	17
Trade and Retail	0.91	269	164	62	38
Restaurants and Foodservice	0.97	358	75	83	17
Transp. Wareh. and Comm.	0.79	352	81	81	19
Finance	0.83	393	40	91	9
Businessservices	0.81	289	144	67	33
Government	0.84	319	114	74	26
Education	0.84	370	63	85	15
Healthservice	0.62	362	71	84	16
Generalservice	0.89	372	61	86	14
Totalpopulation	0.90	219	214	51	49
N (number of zones)	433				

*) The Pearson Correlations is computed of observed and simulated zonal averages

*) The observed zonal employment is compared to the simulated 90 percent confidence intervals (CI)




Figure 1: Causal structure of the SFM framework




Figure 2: Examples of logsum accessibility (top) and specialisation index (bottom)




Figure 3: Observed and simulated size of firm population






Figure 4: Sample of micro results, observed vs. simulated size development

Business services



Government



Manufacturing




Figure 5: Confidence intervals of simulated employment vs. observed employment for 50 largest zones in respective industries.