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**Beta** is a term widely used and accepted in the world of investments and corporate finance to measure volatility. Portfolio managers use beta to select securities of a desired risk level and financial analysts to estimate a project’s required rate of return and the cost of capital. Portfolio theory suggests that an equity asset with a beta of more than 1 exhibits more volatility than the market, and an equity asset with a beta of less than 1 exhibits less volatility than the market.

The concept of beta can be applied to targeted industry analysis. Berry and Blackwell propose that economic developers consider the employment beta of the industry when conducting targeted industry selection. The authors indicate that industries with higher betas exhibit greater swings in employment than industries with lower betas. Therefore, high beta industries can contribute to greater social upheaval due to the greater sensitivity of its employment to overall changes in national employment. Berry and Blackwell suggest that, other things equal, economic developers should prefer high growth/low beta industries to high growth/high beta industries. From a social costs standpoint, employment in low beta industries is not as sensitive to changes in national employment and thus provides more certainty in local employment levels.

This article does not recommend that a region shun or discourage the growth of any particular industry, as those decisions are best made locally. However, given scarce resources among communities, the employment beta concept is one way to focus economic development efforts.

As a starting point for economic developers across Indiana, employment growth and employment betas for supersectors for Indiana metro regions are provided (see Figure 1).

Beta estimates require monthly data and those are more readily available at the supersector level. Obviously, it is possible for an industry within the sector to exhibit a different growth/beta pattern from the overall sector. Therefore, growth/beta estimates provide initial information that might motivate a closer analysis of a specific industry targeted.

**Interpreting Employment Betas**

A beta of 1 implies that the respective supersector moves in parallel fashion with national employment. So, for example, if the nation’s employment increases by 1 percent, then one can expect employment in that particular supersector to increase by 1 percent on average.

A beta higher than 1 implies that employment in the supersector is more volatile than changes in employment at the national level. Suppose a supersector has a beta equal to 4. A 1 percent change in employment at the national level would produce a corresponding 4 percent change in employment in the respective supersector. Hence, supersectors with high betas are more sensitive to changes in national employment. High beta supersectors...
produce more jobs when national employment is on the upswing. When national employment is on the decline, however, these supersectors lose more jobs.

A beta of less than 1 implies that employment in the supersector is less volatile than changes in employment at the national level. A supersector with a beta of 0.5, for example, indicates that for a 1 percent change in employment at the national level, employment in the supersector will change by only 0.5 percent. Low beta supersectors have less sensitivity to changes in the overall economy. Therefore, when national employment is increasing, employment in the supersector increases at smaller rates. Conversely, when national employment is decreasing, local employment declines are smaller than national changes.

The Calculations
Monthly non-seasonally adjusted employment data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics are used to calculate employment growth and employment betas.

Growth: Average annual growth measures for metro total nonfarm payrolls and metro supersectors are calculated using average fourth quarter employment figures. The average annual rate of growth is calculated using the annual compound growth rate by using fourth quarter average employment in 1990 as the beginning value and fourth quarter average employment in 2006 as the ending value.

Betas: Monthly employment data are used to calculate employment betas. In this context, the monthly percentage change in employment is analogous to the monthly percentage return in a typical equity security calculation.

In a typical security beta calculation, ordinary least squares (OLS) is used to regress security returns against returns in a market portfolio. In calculating employment betas, the “market portfolio” is national total nonfarm payrolls.

Therefore, to calculate an employment beta, one can use OLS and regress monthly changes in employment at the local level against monthly changes in employment at the national level. This is done for total nonfarm payrolls in each metro area and for each supersector within each metro area. The coefficient on the independent variable, percentage change in monthly national total nonfarm payrolls, represents the employment beta.3

Beta Stability: The finance literature has debated the issue of beta stability. Is the beta stable for a security over different business cycles? The evidence suggests that the individual stock betas do change over time and portfolio betas exhibit more stability over time than individual securities.4 A supersector is, in essence, a portfolio of the individual industries; so the use of supersector data provides economic developers with betas that are potentially more stable and accurate.

Employment Volatility and Growth Categories
The classification method suggested by Berry and Blackwell is used to categorize Indiana’s supersectors into four categories (with one change as indicated below). Figure 1 shows these categories.

1. Desirable Target Industries: High growth/low volatility supersectors exceed the national average annual growth rate of 1.4 percent over the observation period and have a beta less than or equal to 1. These supersectors are desirable from the standpoint of higher than average annual growth and low volatility.

2. Acceptable Target Industries: High growth/high volatility supersectors have growth rates higher than the national average and betas greater than 1. So while these sectors experience growth above the national average, high volatility lessens their overall appeal.

3. Less Acceptable Target Industries: Low growth/low volatility sectors experience growth rates less than the national average and possess betas less than 1. These supersectors experience lower growth, but also enjoy less employment volatility.

4. Questionable Target Industries: Low growth/high volatility supersectors represent the least optimal combination of growth and volatility. Growth is less than the national average and employment volatility remains high. While economic developers should not necessarily shun these industries, the combination of low growth and high volatility can potentially inflict greater social costs on their respective regions. Given scarce resources, it might be wise to minimize the amount of time and resources dedicated to these supersectors. Berry and Blackwell refer to these as unacceptable. The label of questionable is preferred here in order to motivate the economic developer to question whether such industries represent a sound addition to a region’s growth strategy.

Supersector Highlights
Indiana’s weighted employment beta is analogous to the portfolio beta for equity securities. In essence, these can be interpreted as “average
betas” for employment in all metro regions. The weight of each beta is based on the metro region’s share of employment for all Indiana metro regions combined. Table 1 reports the overall metro betas by supersector. For example, the weighted average beta for all metro areas is 1.3. This suggests that employment volatility in Indiana’s metro areas is higher than changes in national employment.

As seen in Table 2, seven metro areas experienced growth greater than 1 percent annually, and three achieved growth higher than the national rate. Of these three, Bloomington had the highest employment beta at 1.6. The two metro areas with the highest betas, Anderson and Muncie, also observed the lowest annual rates of growth in employment, the least optimal combination of growth and volatility.

In Tables 3 through 6, we see that the durable goods supersector exhibits a beta of less than 1 in nine out of ten metro regions. One might find this counter-intuitive. However, recent evidence from the Federal Reserve and others points to the “great moderation” in overall employment volatility. Specifically, the evidence shows reduced volatility in the manufacturing and durable goods sectors. Indiana actually observed the fourth largest decrease in overall employment volatility in the nation from 1956–1983 to 1984–2002; in manufacturing, Indiana observed a 63.1 percent decline in volatility (Carlino 2007). Conversely, this stream of research points to an overall increase in services employment volatility.

Beta estimates were overwhelmingly statistically significant at the 5 percent level or higher. Only nine beta estimates were statistically insignificant.

Education and Health Services

Education and health services consistently appeared in the desirable category (see Table 3). The average annual growth in employment exceeded national growth and the
volatility was less than volatility at the national level. The Columbus area achieved the highest overall growth in education and health services (beta was significant at the 8 percent level).

**Professional and Business Services**
The professional and business services (PBS) supersector also produced some very impressive return/volatility combinations. Four metro areas ranked in the desirable category for the PBS sector. This is especially impressive for Gary and Muncie since both metros lagged Indiana and the nation in annual growth of total nonfarm employment. The PBS supersector might deserve a closer look by planners in Gary and Muncie (PBS beta for Muncie is significant at the 13 percent level). All other metro areas ranked in the acceptable category (see Table 4). These results show the potential of the PBS sector in Indiana and validate the assertions made by Marcus on the PBS sector in Indiana. Economic developers might think about the PBS sector in their respective region and its economic development advantages.

**Financial Activities**
Indianapolis, Louisville, and Bloomington were the only metro areas with return/beta combinations that ranked financial activities in the desirable category. Interestingly, all other metro areas appeared in the less than acceptable category (see Table 5). While less than the growth in national employment, six metro areas did observe average growth rates greater than zero. The positive growth in employment, coupled with low volatility, does provide some appeal to financial activities in these six metro areas.

### Table 4
**Acceptable Target Industries: High Growth and High Volatility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Annual Growth</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goods-Producing</td>
<td>Elkhart-Goshen</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>Kokomo</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elkhart-Goshen</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and Hospitality</td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terre Haute</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ft. Wayne</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evansville</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources, Mining,</td>
<td>Elkhart-Goshen</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Construction</td>
<td>Michigan City-La</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porte</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evansville</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kokomo</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ft. Wayne</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan City-La</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porte</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terre Haute</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elkhart-Goshen</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ calculations using Bureau of Labor Statistics data

### Table 5
**Less Acceptable Target Industries: Low Growth and Low Volatility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Annual Growth</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durable Goods</td>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ft. Wayne</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evansville</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan City-La</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porte</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terre Haute</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elkhart-Goshen</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>-0.4%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evansville</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ft. Wayne</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muncie</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kokomo</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan City-La</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porte</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evansville</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ft. Wayne</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evansville</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan City-La</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porte</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ calculations using Bureau of Labor Statistics data

### Table 6
**Less Acceptable Target Industries: Low Growth and Low Volatility**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Annual Growth</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muncie</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ft. Wayne</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan City-La</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Porte</td>
<td>-0.7%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evansville</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terre Haute</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terre Haute</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muncie</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elkhart-Goshen</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ft. Wayne</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evansville</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>Evansville</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>Michigan City-La</td>
<td>-1.0%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ft. Wayne</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terre Haute</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muncie</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan City-La</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ft. Wayne</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evansville</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ calculations using Bureau of Labor Statistics data
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metro region presumably contributes to the overall high growth and low volatility. Unfortunately, the overall loss of jobs placed manufacturing in the less acceptable category for the other metro areas. However, only two metro areas placed in the questionable category (see Table 6). Five of the metros in the less acceptable group did experience average growth rates that were either neutral or greater than zero. Combined with lower employment volatility, these metro regions do enjoy some advantages with respect to manufacturing. The lower volatility evident in these metro areas is supported by Warnock and Warnock (2000) and Carlino (2007).

Retail Trade
Perhaps retail exhibits the most surprising result. Municipal leaders and economic developers often like to point to the explosion of retail in their particular locales. Certainly, retail is desirable from the standpoint of enhancing the amenities available for its citizenry and the economic development benefits that can be attributed to attracting shoppers from outside the region.¹¹ The results here indicate, however, that retail across all metro areas ranked in the questionable category. Less than average growth rates in employment and the presence of high volatility make retail less desirable from a pure growth/volatility point of view. Seven metro areas exhibited negative growth rates and high volatility. However, the growth in retail employment was positive or neutral in eight metros, with Columbus being the highest. Evidence of higher volatility in the retail sector for Indiana warrants additional study.

Wholesale Trade
The wholesale sector for three metro areas appeared in the desirable category. A fourth metro region also placed wholesale in the acceptable category. While the other metro areas

---

**Table 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Metro Area</th>
<th>Annual Growth</th>
<th>Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Durable Goods</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>-6.8%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>-5.0%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kokomo</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terre Haute</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muncie</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods-Producing</td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muncie</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ft. Wayne</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan City-La Porte</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terre Haute</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indianapolis</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evansville</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louisville</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terre Haute</td>
<td>-6.9%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kokomo</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elkhart-Goshen</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bloomington</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elkhart-Goshen</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muncie</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michigan City-La Porte</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kokomo</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kokomo</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terre Haute</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kokomo</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muncie</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Bend</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ calculations using Bureau of Labor Statistics data
placed wholesale in the two other less favorable categories, we do observe positive employment in nine of the remaining metro areas. Only three of these nine metro areas observe high volatility in the wholesale sector. Overall, wholesale trade appears to be less volatile than the retail sector.

**Transportation and Utilities**

Louisville was the only metro area in which transportation and utilities ranked in the desirable category. The growth of a major employer and warehouse and distribution industries likely contributed to employment stability and overall growth. Four other metro areas fared in the acceptable category, and the remaining four metros observed positive growth, but less than the overall growth in national employment.

**Natural Resources, Mining, and Construction**

The one supersector that exhibited high volatility consistently was natural resources, mining, and construction. In all metro areas, volatility exceeded the variation in national employment. Six metro areas did, however, rank in the acceptable category. While the other metro areas appeared in the questionable category, all enjoyed positive employment growth, with the exception of Terre Haute.

**Leisure and Hospitality**

Similar to the natural resources, mining, and construction supersector, leisure and hospitality exhibited high volatility in all metro regions. Seven metro regions did enjoy average annual growth rates that exceeded the national growth in employment, thus placing these metros in the acceptable category. All other metro areas experienced positive or neutral annual growth rates, but high volatility. The questionable categorization is somewhat deceptive for leisure and hospitality, given that all metro regions exhibited positive growth. But the results clearly reveal a drawback of leisure and hospitality: a level of volatility that is consistently higher than national employment volatility.

**Government**

Employment in the government sector exhibited high volatility across all metro areas. Three metro regions experienced growth in employment that exceeded the national rate. Although growth is positive across the board, the combination of less than average national growth and high volatility placed government in the questionable category for the remaining metros.

**Conclusions**

Certain supersectors consistently provide the optimal growth/volatility combinations. Education and health services come out on top with respect to the highest annual growth and lowest volatility, while the professional and business services supersector was also notable. On the other hand, retail fared the worst, with high volatility and low growth. This introductory evidence is a potential tool that state and local economic developers can use in conducting targeted industry analysis. In addition to traditional growth measures, the employment beta can provide valuable information on the acceptability of an industry. Rather than focus only on growth in employment, this article recommends that the economic developer also consider employment volatility, as measured by the employment beta.

**Notes**

3. Developers can use a variety of statistical software packages, but Excel is sufficient to perform all calculations.
7. Statistically Significant Betas: Anderson Education and Health Services Bloomington Wholesale Columbus Information Columbus Education and Health Services (significance at 8 percent level) Kokomo Financial Activities Lafayette Non-Durable Goods Michigan City-LaPorte Information Muncie Financial Activities (significance at 13 percent level) Muncie Professional and Business Services (significance at 13 percent level) 8. In a recent paper, Dufrene et al. (2007) discuss the professional and business services performance across Indiana metro areas and its attractiveness in an area’s economic development strategy. The results here provide further evidence on the attractiveness of the professional and business services sector from an economic development perspective.