

Measuring Aggregate Human Capital in Portugal. An update up to 2001

Aurora Amélia Castro Teixeira

**CEMPRE - Centro de Estudos
Macroeconómicos e Previsão**



FACULDADE DE ECONOMIA

UNIVERSIDADE DO PORTO

www.fep.up.pt

MEASURING AGGREGATE HUMAN CAPITAL IN PORTUGAL. AN UPDATE UP TO 2001

AURORA AMÉLIA CASTRO TEIXEIRA[†]

[†] CEMPRE, [♦] Faculdade de Economia da Universidade do Porto
Rua Dr. Roberto Frias,
4200-464 Porto Portugal;
e-mail: ateixeira@fep.up.pt

ABSTRACT

Recent studies conclude that human capital should be a high priority because it is a key growth input, particularly in an increasingly knowledge based economy and an important lever of social cohesion policy. However, existing studies focusing on cross-country growth performance have produced opposing results. Several researchers argue that these conflicting results derived from poor quality data used in some of those studies. They further acknowledge that main reason for the use of poor proxies of the stock of human capital is that in most empirical growth studies, the choice of the human capital proxy is hardly reflected upon and depends very much on data availability. This paper updates Teixeira's (1998) estimation of the stock of human capital for the Portuguese economy up to 2001 providing an improved proxy for human capital stock based on education attainment. This work might potentially facilitate further empirical works on the relation between human capital and long-term economic growth.

KEYWORDS: human capital; education; measurement, economic growth

JEL-CLASSIFICATION: J24; I20; C19; O40

[♦] CEMPRE - Centro de Estudos Macroeconómicos e Previsão - is supported by the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, Portugal, through the Programa Operacional Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação (POCTI) of the Quadro Comunitário de Apoio III, which is financed by FEDER and Portuguese funds.

1. INTRODUCTION

Many lines of economic research depend on having accurate measure of individual human capital, which in turn require measuring investment in education and other inputs for human capital. Measurement problems are particularly acute in the case of human capital (Hanushek, 1996; Sianesi and van Reenen, 2003).

Many economists and policy-makers consider human capital an important production factor, highly complementary with technological capital, and earlier studies focusing on cross-country growth performance over long periods generally yielded positive results (e.g., Barro, 1991; Barro and Lee, 1994; Makiw et al., 1992). However, a substantial number of subsequent studies has not always supported this view (Benhabib and Spiegel, 1994; Caselli et al., 1996; Prichett, 1995). De la Fuente and Doménech (2000; 2002) and de la Fuente et al. (2003) argue that these negative results derived from poor quality data used in those studies, which led to high measurement error hiding in this way the connection between human capital accumulation and productivity growth.

Computing ‘corrected estimates’ of human capital stock, de la Fuente (2003) found that the productivity effects of human capital are substantial. In fact, in an earlier EC report (de la Fuente and Ciccone, 2002) it is estimated that an additional year of average school attainment raises productivity in the average EU country by 6.2% on impact and by a further 3.1% in the long run through its contribution to faster technological progress. The first of these effects is considerably higher in the cohesion countries, reaching 9.2% in the case of Portugal.

Theoretical models of human capital and growth are built around the hypotheses that knowledge and skills embodied in human capital directly raise productivity and increase economy’s ability to develop and to adopt new technologies. In order to explore its implication and open the way for its empirical testing, this basic hypothesis is generally formalised in one of two (not mutually exclusive) ways: 1) introducing the stock of human capital as an additional input in an otherwise standard production function linking the aggregate output to the stocks of productive inputs (generally employment and physical capital) and to an index of total factor productivity; 2) including the stock of human capital as a determinant of the rate of technological progress (cf. Nelson and Phelps, 1966).

Pack (1994) suggests nevertheless that the main flaw of empirical studies on economic growth derives from the fact that they have been tested earlier Solow-style neoclassical growth models, rather than testing growth endogenous theory itself. Illustrating the scantiness of few systematic tests of endogenous growth theory, Pack (1994: 69) stresses that cross-country regressions aiming at explaining growth rates provide “rough orders of magnitude and indications of where to search for explanations of growth, but cannot articulate the connection between factor accumulation and economic growth”. He argues that the challenge for empirical work is to test the implications of the new theory against the economic evolution of individual countries using time series data.

However, country-specific studies are scarce (Pina and St. Aubyn, 2002). Some attempts to estimate the human capital contribution to individual country’s economic growth are, in the case of Portugal, Dias (1992), Teixeira (1997), Pina and St. Aubyn (2002), Teixeira and Fortuna (2003) and Pereira (2004). At the international level this type of studies are not abundant either being Chuang (2000), for Taiwan, and Laroche and Mérette (2000), for Canada, some examples. The small number of such studies is explained in large extent by the increased complexity and difficulty of estimating continuous time series for human capital stock giving data paucity.

This paper tries to facilitate the emergence of further empirical works on the relation between human capital and long-term economic growth by updating Teixeira’s (1998) estimation of the stock of human capital for the Portuguese economy up to 2001.¹ It is presented here an improved proxy of Portuguese human capital stock based on education attainment.

In the next section, we review a set of alternative measures for human capital stock discussing the corresponding strengths and drawbacks. Section 3 focus on the updating of human capital stock, presenting its methodological underpins. A brief comparison between the present estimates and the available estimates at the Portuguese and cross-country level is provided in Section 4. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper pointing further pathways for future research.

¹ The work by Teixeira and Fortuna (2003), which analyses the long-term relationship between human capital, innovation capability and economic growth, uses the human capital stock detailed in the present paper.

2. A REVIEW OF ALTERNATIVE MEASURES FOR HUMAN CAPITAL STOCK

A review of the measures of the stock of human capital used in empirical growth research reveals that human capital is mostly poorly proxied (Wossmann, 2003). The main reason for the use of poor proxies of the stock of human capital is that in most empirical growth studies, the choice of the human capital proxy is hardly reflected upon and depends very much on data availability.

The choice of adult literacy rates as a proxy for human capital stock (e.g., Azariadis and Drazen, 1990; Romer, 1990) reflects in most studies ease of data availability and a broad coverage of countries by the available data. However, they miss out most of the investments made in human capital because they only reflect the very first part of these investments. In fact, using adult literacy rates as a proxy for the stock of human capital implies the assumption that none of the additional investments over the basic education level directly adds to the productivity of the labour force.

An alternative proxy, school enrolment ratios (Barro, 1991; Mankiw et al., 1992; Levine and Renelt, 1992), tends to be considered a poor measure of the stock of human capital available for current production. Indeed, enrolment ratios are flow variables, and the children currently enrolled in schools are by definition not yet a part of the labour force. The accumulated stock of human capital depends indirectly on lagged values of school enrolment ratios, where the time lag between schooling and future additions to the human capital stock can be very long and also depends on the ultimate length of the education phase. Enrolment ratios may not even accurately represent changes in the human capital stock, especially during the periods of rapid educational and demographic transition (Wossmann, 2003). Specifically, they do not measure the human capital embodied in the entrants of the labour force this year, but the human capital acquired by current students who might enter the labour force at some time in the future. Moreover, the education of current students may not at all translate into additions to the human capital stock embodied in the labour force because part of current enrolment may be wasted due to grade repetition and dropping out. Finally, net investment flows would have to take into account of the human capital content of the workers who are retiring from the labour force that year.

The educational attainment is clearly a stock variable and it takes into account the total amount of formal education received by the labour force. Therefore it has become the

most popular and commonly used measure (Barro and Sala-i-Martin, 2004; Barro, 1997, 1999; Benhabib and Spiegel, 1994). Well-known cross-country data on the levels of education attainment and average years of schooling are those of Pascharopoulos and Arriagada (1988), Kyriacou (1991), Barro and Lee (1993; 1996; 2000), de la Fuente and Doménech (2000; 2002) and de la Fuente and Ciccone (2002). Concerning time series data, we have for Portugal the studies of Teixeira (1997; 1998), Pina and St. Aubyn (2002) and Pereira (2004). These measures have recently been targets of major criticisms (Cohen and Soto, 2001; Sianesi and van Reenen, 2003; Wossmann, 2003). On one side, specifying human capital by average years of schooling implicitly gives the same weight to any year of schooling acquired by a person – a year of schooling should be weighted differently depending on how many years of schooling the person has already accumulated. On the other side, it does not take into account of differences in the quality of schooling across countries and time.

The money value of human capital stock (e.g., Laroche and Mérette, 2000; Cohen and Soto, 2001; Pereira, 2004) overcomes some of the limitations of the years of education proxy. The human capital measure is constructed by combining data on years of schooling with rates of return estimated in micro labour studies which weight each year of schooling by its market return, i.e., by the earning it generates in the labour market. This measure is not widely applicable to international comparisons due the limited availability of detailed wage data for most countries (Barro and Lee, 2000). In the case of time series, the limited coverage is still more severe (in the case of Portugal, Pereira (2004), for example, presents only 16 observations). Additionally, there are potential problems with the available estimates of return to education because of biases through unmeasured characteristics like ability and because the disregard of social benefits (Barro and Lee, 2000). In the case that wages change substantially, this measure tends to fluctuate unnecessarily (Mulligan and Sala-i-Martin, 1995).

There has been considerable more work in improving international measures of human capital. International test scores of students (IEA, Third International Mathematics and Science Study 1994-1995) provide useful information on the quality of education. However, two shortcomings of these data may be pointed. Firstly, the observations apply to different years and are most abundant for the 1990s; the sample sizes are also much smaller than those for average years of schooling. Secondly, they do not directly measure the educational capital held by a country's working-age population. The

international adult literacy survey (OECD and Human Resources Development Canada, 1998) is a very promising attempt to measure directly the skills of the labour force for international comparison. This measure is still in earlier stages and covers only 12 OECD countries (it excludes Portugal). Additionally to its limited coverage it has been criticized because of measurement errors in modelling techniques (Barro and Lee, 2000).

In this context, data on educational attainment still provide the best available information about the amount of human capital stock for a broad number of countries and for a country during time.

3. AN UPDATE ESTIMATION OF THE PORTUGUESE HUMAN CAPITAL STOCK

Portuguese economic growth has been comprehensively tackled with the outstanding research by Reis (1993) and Lains (1995; 2002; 2003b), concerning the period pre-1950s, and, for more recent time spans, Lains (2003a), Afonso (1999) and Afonso and Aguiar (2004).

However, studies explicitly concerned with the relation between economic growth and human capital are for Portuguese economy rather scarce. The first ones emerged in the 1990s with the works of Dias (1992), Nunes (1993) and Teixeira (1997). Recently, nonetheless, there has been a renewed interest in this line of investigation with the works of Pina and Sy. Aubyn (2002), Teixeira and Fortuna (2003) and Pereira (2004). This recent spurt has been in part explained by the availability of a continuous time series for the Portuguese human capital stock based on education attainment, which has been first introduced in Teixeira (1997, 1998).

Pina and Sy. Aubyn (2002), based on Teixeira's (1997) work, introduced some methodological changes and adopted a more encompassing definition of human capital, considering data on formal training besides education. Their estimate covers the period 1977-2001. More recently, Pereira (2004) estimated three time series of human capital stock for Portugal, one based on education attainment for the period 1960-2001, and the other two based on labour market income for the period 1982-1998. Similarly to Teixeira (1997, 1998), and contrary to Pina and St. Aubyn (2002), the proxy refers only to formal education (not including formal training). Differently from the Teixeira's and Pina and St. Aubyn's studies, which consider 'adult active population' people over 25

years old, Pereira (2004) uses a broader set of population (over 15 years old, as Barro and Lee, 2000) and adjusts for population mortality.

It is important to refer that the inclusion of training as component of human capital, as in Pina and St. Aubyn (2002), does not significantly change growth regressions results, as the authors themselves concluded. Additionally, the extension of the population set (adding the population with 15-24 years old) included in the estimation of Pereira by comparison with that of Teixeira's (1997, 1998) is not likely to produce significant improvements as the percentage of 15-24 years old group in the total working age population is small and declining over time (representing 21% of the total in 2001), being still smaller as percentage of the effective workforce. Concerning the adjustment for population mortality, Pereira (2004) uses a global average mortality rate for each period not being able (due data constraints) of adjusting for mortality by age and schooling level, which would be the relevant issue regarding the estimation of the human capital stock for an individual country.

Given the above considerations, we opt for estimating and updating up to 2001 the work of Teixeira (1997, 1998) who estimated the Portuguese human capital stock based on educational attainments, i.e., the average years of the Portuguese adult working age population. Thus, the following methodological description follows closely that in Teixeira (1998).

The estimation of the Portuguese human capital stock was pursued accordingly to the methodologies of Barro and Lee (1993) original work and Kyriacou (1991). In a first phase, the data on the education attainment levels of adult Portuguese population was compiled. This information was drawn from census statistics (1960, 1970, 1981, 1991 and 2001) gathered by the National Statistical Institute (INE).

Using the perpetual inventory method it was possible to extrapolate, from the existing census figures, the portion of Portuguese population that achieved each of the education levels in intra-census adjacent years (see Table A1 of the Appendix). Starting with the census figures as benchmark, the perpetual inventory method uses the school enrolment ratios (PRImary, SECondary, and HIGHer) to estimate changes from the benchmarks. Then, applying the formulas derived by Barro and Lee (1993) we were able to estimate the fraction of adult working age population (25 years and over) from whom j is the

highest level attained ($j=1$ for total primary, $j=2$ for total secondary and $j=3$ for tertiary). As a result, we have census-based values of h_{jt} for 1960, 1970, 1981, 1991 and 2001, seeking to estimate the missing values.

$$h_{1,t} = \left(1 - \frac{L25_t}{L_t}\right) \cdot h_{1,t-5} + \frac{L25_t}{L_t} \cdot (PRI_{t-15} - SEC_{t-10}) \quad (1)$$

$$h_{2,t} = \left(1 - \frac{L25_t}{L_t}\right) \cdot h_{2,t-5} + \frac{L25_t}{L_t} \cdot (SEC_{t-10} - HIG_{t-5}) \quad (2)$$

$$h_{3,t} = \left(1 - \frac{L25_t}{L_t}\right) \cdot h_{3,t-5} + \frac{L25_t}{L_t} \cdot (HIG_{t-5}) \quad (3)$$

where

L_t : population aged 25 and over at time t ;

$L25_t$: population aged [25, 29] at time t . It represents those who entered into the overall population aged 25 and above, during the last five years;²

$h_{jt} = \frac{H_{jt}}{L_t}$: the proportion of the adult population for whom j is the highest level of educational attainment [j : total primary (1), total secondary (2) and higher/tertiary (3)];

$PRI_{t-\tau}$: the gross enrolment ratio for primary school observed at time $t-\tau$,

$SEC_{t-\tau}$: the gross enrolment ratio for secondary school observed at time $t-\tau$,

$HIG_{t-\tau}$: the gross enrolment ratio for higher school observed at time $t-\tau$.

For the period in question, 1960-2001, census data corresponded to 11,9% of the values for each education level. The perpetual inventory method allowed to fill in more 11,9% of the values for primary education, 11,9% in case of secondary education and 9,5% for higher education (see Table A1). To obtain the remaining missing values we use, similarly to Kyriacou (1991), a regression combining those two kinds of information previously referred (census and perpetual inventory-estimated attainment levels).

² Barro and Lee (1993) neglected here any mortality for people aged 20-24 five years previously, and assumed that the survival probability for people who were 25 and over is independent of the level of educational attainment.

Differently from Kyriacou, we introduce an additional explanatory variable to take into account population structure (and in this way be more close to the perpetual inventory method).

$$\ln h_{1,t} = -48,506 - 0,309 \ln \left(\frac{L25_t}{L_t} \right) + 0,854 \ln(PRI_{t-15} - SEC_{t-10}) + e_{1,t} \quad (4)$$

(-5,916) (-0,586) (4,988) $\bar{R}^2 = 0,818$

$$\ln h_{2,t} = -2,461 - 0,720 \ln \left(\frac{L25_t}{L_t} \right) + 0,702 \ln(SEC_{t-10} - HIGH_{t-5}) + e_{2,t} \quad (5)$$

(-1,129) (-0,721) (7,746) $\bar{R}^2 = 0,895$

$$\ln h_{3,t} = 0,382 + 0,478 \ln \left(\frac{L25_t}{L_t} \right) + 1,031 \ln(HIGH_{t-5}) + e_{3,t} \quad (6)$$

(0,143) (0,403) (8,631) $\bar{R}^2 = 0,927$

All regressions present a good fit. The output of these estimations is presented in the appendix, Table A2.

In the following step we estimate the portion of adult population disaggregating it into finer levels of education: incomplete and complete primary, secondary and higher education level. Once again the starting point was the census data with reference to the individuals that attained one of the three levels of education by degree of completeness. The resulting conclusion ratios are reported in Table A3 (Appendix). Subsequently, and in the same line of Psacharopoulos and Arriagada (1986) and Barro and Lee (1993), the estimates of human capital stock were assemble from the following formula:

$$H = D_p \left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot h_{ip} + h_{cp} \right) + (D_p + D_{s1}) h_{is} + (D_p + D_{s1} + D_{s2}) h_{cs} + \left(D_p + D_{s1} + D_{s2} + \frac{1}{2} D_{hig} \right) h_{ihig} + (D_p + D_{s1} + D_{s2} + D_{hig}) h_{chig} \quad (7)$$

where

H : average years of schooling

Each percentage refers to the fraction of the population for which the j^{th} level of schooling is the highest level attained [$j = ip$ for incomplete primary, cp for complete

primary, *is* for the first cycle of secondary, *cs* for the second cycle of secondary, *ihig* for incomplete higher, and *chig* for complete higher].

D_i : the duration in years of the *ith* level of schooling [$i = p$ for primary, *s1* for the first cycle of secondary, *s2* for the second cycle of secondary, and *hig* for higher].

For D_i we consider the official length for each level of education as it is reported by INE (1979/80): four years for primary, 6 years first cycle of lower secondary, 9 years for second cycle of lower secondary, 12 years for upper secondary and 18 years for higher school.

The whole set of estimates for the Portuguese human capital stock is reported in the appendix, Table A4. We estimate four measures of the average years of the Portuguese working age population. A first measure, H , we consider only the three main levels of education without distinguish complete from incomplete levels. The other three estimates differ from each other relatively to the length of the first cycle of secondary school. H' considers that the individuals that do not complete any of the three education levels achieved at least half of the years officially required. H'' the same as H' but considering incomplete secondary those individuals that do not go further than the first cycle of lower secondary school. H''' the same as H'' but now the relevant length is the second cycle of lower secondary school, which happens to be the compulsory education level for Portuguese education system). Next figure presents the evolution of the proxy of the Portuguese human capital stock assuming this last hypothesis.




Figure 1: Average years of education of Portuguese adult working age population (individuals aged 25 and over), 1960-2001.

Source: See Table A4 in the Appendix.

The examination of the Portuguese human capital stock evolution over these four decades highlights the remarkable pace of increase in the average years of education on the behalf of the Portuguese adult working age population. From 1,4 average years of education, that reference group achieved by 2001 7,4 years of education. Notwithstanding the notable progress, it is important to note that the level is still well below the length corresponding to the present compulsory schooling level (9 years).

Table 1: Average years of education of the Portuguese working age population (simple mean)

	1960-70	1971-80	1981-90	1991-2001
<i>H</i> (average years of education)	2,0	3,4	4,8	6,3

It is interesting to point that this gradual increase in the stock of human capital was accompanied with substantial increases in the returns to education, particularly after mid 1980s (Hartog et al., 2001). Speculating the causes behind the rise of the returns to education, Hartog et al. (2001) maintain that skill-based technological change seemed to be the chief explanation for a shift in the demand towards educated labour. This was primarily based on the fact that the shift in the use of more educated labour was due to changes taking place within the industries (consistent with technological change).

4. COMPARISON WITH OTHER TIME SERIES AND CROSS-COUNTRY ESTIMATES

Given the existence of other similar estimates for the Portuguese human capital stock, both based on time series (Pina and St. Aubyn, 2002; Pereira, 2004) and cross-country data sets (Barro and Lee, 2000; Cohen and Soto, 2001; de la Fuente e Doménech, 2002), it seems important to present and discuss the corresponding comparable figures.³

In a first stage, and in order to assess the main differences between our results and similar figures obtained in other frequently used cross-country data sets, we compile the available estimates for the human capital stock with reference to Portugal.

³ Pereira (2004) presents a similar but slightly more comprehensive comparison by computing the reliability ratios for the whole alternative estimates using Krueger and Lindahl (2000) approach.

Table 2: Comparison between the estimated human capital stock and other time series (national) and cross-country (international) estimations

	Time series (Continuous)			Cross-country (Five or ten-year period)		
	Teixeira	Pereira (2004)	Pina and St. Aubyn (2002)	Barro and Lee (2000)	Cohen and Soto (2001)	de la Fuente and Doménech (2002)
1960	1,36	2,24	N/A	1,94	3,15	4,37
1965	2,01	2,55	N/A	2,24	N/A	4,62
1970	2,74	3,05	N/A	2,44	4,11	4,87
1975	3,24	3,54	N/A	2,79	N/A	5,29
1980	3,91	4,26	4,29	3,27	5,57	5,73
1985	4,69	4,91	5,03	3,57	N/A	6,06
1990	5,15	5,61	5,61	4,33	5,91	6,41
1995	5,90	6,52	6,60	4,54	N/A	N/A
2000	7,19	7,31	7,47	4,91	7,28	N/A

Notes: Population groups vary as follows. Teixeira, Pina and St. Aubyn (2002), Barro and Lee (2000) and de la Fuente and Doménech (2002) population aged 25 and over; Pereira (2004) and Cohen and Soto (2001), population 15-64 years old.

Comparing with other time series estimates (Pina and St. Aubyn, 2002; Pereira, 2004), our measure presents smaller figures, particularly in the initial periods. Notwithstanding, as we can see in table 3, the Pearson linear correlation coefficient is rather high between these three measurement procedures, nearby the condition of perfect correlation.

Regarding the parallel between our measure and those based on cross-country estimates, our proxy seems much more similar in levels to that of Barro and Lee (2000) at least for the period 1960-1985. Beyond 1985, the corresponding estimates are rather distinct, with Barro and Lee's figures abnormally low. This departure is corroborated by correlation figures with our measure presenting the lowest correlation (although still high, 0,985) with Barro and Lee.

It is appealing the fact that, despite some relevant methodological differences, Cohen and Soto's and de la Fuente and Doménech's estimates present the highest correlation with our human capital stock proxy.

Table 3: Comparison between the estimated human capital stock and other time series (national) and cross-country (international) estimations – Pearson Linear Correlation Coefficient

		Time series (Continuous)			Cross-country (Five or ten-year period)		
		Teixeira	Pereira (2004)	Pina and St. Aubyn (2002)	Barro and Lee (2000)	Cohen and Soto (2001)	de la Fuente & Domené- ch (2002)
Time series	Teixeira		0,994	0,992	0,985	0,986	0,997
	Pereira (2004)			0,999	0,993	0,979	0,997
	Pina and St. Aubyn (2002)				0,965	0,972	0,996
Cross- country	Barro and Lee (2000)					0,971	0,988
	Cohen and Soto (2001)						0,977

Notes: Idem Table 2.

Using the reliability ratios presented in Krueger and Lindahl (2000) we can further discuss the relative advantages of the above-mentioned human capital stock proxies. We limit this analysis to time series estimates as in the case of cross-country data the amount of observations available does not permit to carry out a serious comparative exercise of the respective reliability.⁴

The reliability ratio of an imperfect measure of average years of schooling, S^l (R_l) is computed as the ratio of the covariance between S^l and an alternative imperfect measure S^2 to the variance of S^l . Formally,

$$R_l = \frac{Cov(S^l, S^2)}{Var(S^l)} \quad (8)$$

where

$$S^l_j = S^*_j + e^l_j$$

$$S^2_j = S^*_j + e^2_j$$

Being S^* is the true schooling and e the measurement error.

⁴ In spite of this shortcoming, Pereira (2004) computed and presented the reliability ratios for both time series and cross-country estimates.

The computation of the reliability ratio assumes that e^1 and e^2 are uncorrelated. This assumption is, however, very demanding as in the case of the alternative time series estimates presented here the corresponding measurement errors are likely to be correlated given that, to some extent, they rely on the same mismeasured enrollment data. Consequently, the reliability ratios derived from comparing such measures probably provide an upper bound on the reliability of the data series (Krueger and Lindahl, 2000).

Table 4: Comparison between the estimated human capital stock and other time series estimates – Krueger and Lindahl’s reliability ratios

Estimated time series in	Teixeira’s reliability ratio (S^1)		Pereira’s (2004) reliability ratio (S^1)		Pina & St Aubyn’s (2002) reliability ratio (S^1)	
	S^2 =Pereira	S^2 =Pina & St Aubyn	S^2 =Teixeira	S^2 = Pina & St Aubyn	S^2 =Teixeira	S^2 =Pereira
Levels	0,906	0,923	*	0,953	0,973	0,962
Differences	0,096	0,158	0,733	0,253	0,529	0,037

* Violates classical assumptions. The reliability ratio is above 1.

The time series data have considerable signal, with the reliability ratio exceeding 0,90 for all data (excluding Pereira, which presents correlated error terms relative to Teixeira). This suggests that above 90 percent of the variability in observed average years of education in the different data sets represent true levels. However, considering differences instead of levels, reliability ratios suffer a significant fall, particularly in Teixeira and Pina and St. Aubyn when referred to Pereira. In changes, Pereira data convey more signal than the other two measures of human capital stock. Indeed, between 25 and 73 percent of the variability in observed changes in years of education in Pereira data represent true changes. For Teixeira the corresponding figures are, 9,6 and 15,8 percent and in the case of Pina and St. Aubyn 3,7 and 52,9 percent.

Results based on reliability ratios suggest that Pereira’s data might constitute a preferable proxy for the average years of education of the Portuguese working age population. Yet, given the highly likelihood of those three data series present correlated measurement errors and the fact that Pearson linear correlation coefficients are very high for the whole set of data series, the relative performance and validity of these three proxies have to be tested against growth regression exercises.

5. CONCLUSION

This paper aimed at providing an update up to 2001 of the stock of human capital for the Portuguese economy. With that it seeks to stimulate works on long-term economic growth and to endorse further investigation on the alternative roles of human capital on economic long-term dynamics.

The review of the different measures for the stock of human capital used in empirical growth research revealed that human capital is mostly poorly proxied, being the choice of the human capital proxy hardly reflected upon and dependent very much on data availability.

Notwithstanding the increasing considerable work in improving international measures of human capital data, with the emergence of income-based human capital measures, measures which account for quality such as international test scores and those that account for different components of human capital as the international adult literacy surveys, educational attainment still provide the best available information about the amount of human capital stock for a broad number of countries and for a country during time.

The inspection of the evolution of the updated Portuguese human capital stock over the last four decades draw attention to its noteworthy rate of growth. In fact, from a meagre 1,4 average years of education, the Portuguese working age population accomplished, by 2001, 7,4 years of education. Albeit the prominent progress, that level is still well below the length of currently compulsory schooling level (9 years).

The exercise of comparing our human capital measure with other recent proxies revealed a rather high correlation (well above 0,90) among these measures. Nevertheless, results based on reliability ratios seem to give more credit to Pereira's (2004) data indicating that it might constitute a preferable proxy for the average years of education of the Portuguese working age population. But reliability ratio computation are pervade with classical assumption violation, which weaken results achieved.

In our opinion, a more definitive comparison of the relative merits of the different proxies requires their use and appraisal in empirical growth regressions estimations. This is simultaneously a challenge and a pathway for further research.

REFERENCES

- Afonso, O. (1999) *Contributo do Comércio Externo para o Crescimento Económico Português, 1960-1993*, Lisboa, Conselho Económico e Social.
- Afonso, O. and Aguiar, A. (2004), “Comércio Externo e Crescimento da Economia Portuguesa no Século XX”, *FEP Working Paper* nº 146, Faculdade de Economia da Universidade do Porto.
- Azariadis, C., Drazen, A. (1990), “Threshold Externalities in Economic Development”, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 105, pp. 501-526.
- Barro, R. (1991), “Economic growth in a cross-section of countries”, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 106, pp. 407-443.
- Barro, R. (1997), *Determinants of Economic Growth: A Cross-Country Empirical Study*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Barro, R. (1999), “Inequality, Growth, and Investment”, *NBER Working Papers* 7038, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- Barro, R., Lee, J-W. (1993), “International comparisons of educational attainment”, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, vol. 32, pp. 363-394.
- Barro, R., Lee, J-W. (1994), “Sources of economic growth”, *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy*, vol. 40, pp. 1-46.
- Barro, R., Lee, J-W. (2000), “International data on educational attainment updates and implications”, *NBER Working Papers* 7911, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- Barro, R. and Sala-i-Martin, X. (2004), *Economic Growth*, 2nd edition, Cambridge MA, MIT Press.
- Benhabib, J., Spiegel, M. (1994), “The role of human capital in economic development: evidence from aggregate cross-country data”, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, vol. 34, pp. 143-173.
- Caselli, F., Esquivel, G., Lefort, F. (1996), “Reopening the Convergence Debate: A New Look at Cross-Country Growth Empirics”, *Journal of Economic Growth*, vol. 1, pp. 363-389.
- Chuang, Y. (2000), “Human capital, exports, and economic growth: a causality analysis for Taiwan, 1952-1995”, *Review of International Economics*, vol. 8 (4), pp. 712-720.

- Cohen, D. and Soto, M. (2001), "Growth and human capital: good data, good results", *CEPR Discussion Paper Series* n° 3025, October 2001.
- de la Fuente, A. (2003), *Human capital in a global and knowledge –based economy, Part II: assessment at the EU country level*, Final report, European Commission: Employment and Social Affairs, April 2003.
- de la Fuente, A. and Ciccone, A. (2002), *Human capital in a global and knowledge –based economy*, Final report, European Commission, May 2002.
- de la Fuente, A. and Doménech, R. (2000), "Human capital in growth regressions: how much difference does data quality make?", *CEPR Discussion Paper* n° 2426.
- de la Fuente, A. and Doménech, R. (2002), "Human capital in growth regressions: how much difference does data quality make? An update and further results", *CEPR Discussion Paper* n° 3587
- de la Fuente, A., Domenech, R. and Jimeno, J. (2003), "Human capital as a factor of growth and employment at the regional level. The case of Spain", *UFAE and IAE Working Papers* 610.04, Unitat de Fonaments de l'Anàlisi Econòmica (UAB) and Institut d'Anàlisi Econòmica (CSIC).
- Dias, A. (1992), "Avaliação do QCA do lado da oferta", *mimeo*, DPP, Lisbon.
- Hanushek, E., (1996), "Measuring investment in education", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 9-30.
- Harbison, F., and Mayers, C. (eds) (1965), *Manpower and education*, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Hartog, J., Pereira, P. and Vieira, J. (2001), "Changing returns to education in Portugal during the 1980s and early 1990s: OLS and quantile regression estimators", *Applied Economics*, vol.33, pp. 1021-1037.
- Krueger, A., and Lindahl, M. (2000), "Education for growth: why and for whom?", *NBER Working Papers* n° 7591, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- Kyriacou, G. (1991), *Level and growth effects of human capital: a cross-country study of the convergence hypothesis*, C.V. Starr Center for Applied Economics, New York University, New York.
- Lains, P. (1995), *A Economia Portuguesa no Século XIX. Crescimento Económico e Comércio Externo*, Lisbon, Imprensa Nacional.

- Lains, P. (2002), “Southern European Economic Backwardness Revisited: The Role of Open Economy Forces in Portugal and the Balkans, 1870-1913”, *Scandinavian Economic History Review*, vol. 50, pp. 24-43.
- Lains, P. (2003a). ‘Catching-Up to the European Core: Portuguese Economic Growth, 1910-1990”, *Explorations in Economic History*, vol. 40, pp. 369-86.
- Lains, P. (2003b), “Portugal's Growth Paradox, 1870-1950”, *FEP Working Papers* n° 135, Faculdade de Economia da Universidade do Porto.
- Laroche, M., and Mérette., M. (2000), “Measuring human capital in Canada”, *Department of Finance* 2000-05.
- Levine, R., Renelt, D. (1992), “A sensitivity analysis of cross-country growth regressions”, *The American Economic Review*, vol. 82(4), pp. 942-963.
- Mankiw, N., Romer, D., Weil, D. (1992), “A contribution to the empirics of economic growth”, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 106(2), pp. 407-437.
- Mulligan, C., and Sala-i-Martin, X. (1995), “Measuring aggregate human capital”, *NBER Working Paper* n° 5016.
- Nelson R, Phelps E (1966), “Investment in humans, technological diffusion and economic growth”, *The American Economic Review*, vol. 56(2), pp. 69-75.
- Nunes, A. (1993), “Education and economic growth in Portugal: a simple regression approach”, *Estudos de Economia*, Vol.XIII(2), Jan-Mar, pp. 181-205.
- OECD and Human Resources Development Canada (1998), *Literacy skills for the knowledge society: further results from the international adult literacy survey*, Paris and Ottawa.
- Pack, H. (1994), “Endogenous growth theory: intellectual appeal and empirical shortcomings”, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 55-72.
- Pereira J (2004) *A Medição do Capital Humano em Portugal*, MPhil Dissertation, Universidade Técnica de Lisboa.
- Pina, A., and St. Aubyn, M. (2002), “Public capital, human capital and economic growth: Portugal 1977-2001”, *Departamento de Prospectiva e Planeamento*, Ministério das Finanças, October 2002.
- Pritchett, L. (1995), “Divergence, Big Time”, *World Bank - Country Economics* Department, Papers 1522

- Psacharopoulos, G. and Arriagada, A. (1986), “La composition de la population active par niveau d’instruction: une comparaison internationale”, *Revue Internationale du Travail*, Vol. 125, pp. 617-631.
- Reis, J. (1993). *O Atraso Económico Português em Perspectiva Histórica, 1850-1930*. Lisbon, Imprensa Nacional.
- Romer, P. (1990), “Human capital and growth: theory and evidence”, *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy*, 32, pp. 251-286.
- Sianesi, B. and van Reenen, J. (2003), “The returns to education: macroeconomics”, *Journal of Economic Surveys*, vol. 17, pp. 157-200, April 2003.
- Teixeira, A. A. C. (1997), *Capacidade de inovação e capital humano: contributos para o estudo do crescimento económico português, 1960-1991*, Mphil Dissertation, Faculdade de Economia da Universidade do Porto.
- Teixeira, A. A. C. (1998), “Human capital stock: an estimation of a time series for Portugal”, *Estudos de Economia*, Vol. XVIII, nº 4, pp. 423-441.
- Teixeira, A. A. C. and Fortuna, N. (2003), “Human capital, innovation capability and economic growth in Portugal, 1960 – 2001”, *FEP Working Papers* nº 131, Faculdade de Economia da Universidade do Porto.
- Wossmann, L. (2003), “Specifying human capital: a review, some extensions, and development effects”, *Journal of Economic Surveys*, vol. 17(3), pp. 239-270.

Table A1: Estimation by the perpetual-inventory method of the fraction (h) of the Portuguese working age population that attained a given education level i ($i=1$ for primary; 2 for secondary; 3 for higher)

Year	Enrolment ratios				Census data			From 1960			From 1970			From 1981			From 1991		
	PRI_{t-15}	SEC_{t-10}	HIG_{t-5}	$L25_{t-5}$	h_1	h_2	h_3	h_1	h_2	h_3	h_1	h_2	h_3	h_1	h_2	h_3	h_1	h_2	h_3
1960	0.8516	0.0708	0.0230	0.1389	0.2279	0.0334	0.0098	0.2279	0.0334	0.0098	0.3071	0.0788	0.0122	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1961	0.8715	0.0712	0.0241	0.1381	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	0.2454	0.0991	0.0348	0.0925	0.1364	0.0600
1962	0.8724	0.0738	0.0249	0.1365	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1963	0.9080	0.0763	0.0259	0.1350	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1964	0.9112	0.0830	0.0278	0.1335	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1965	0.9643	0.0888	0.0315	0.1319	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	0.3133	0.0365	0.0126	0.3821	0.0760	0.0147	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1966	1.0031	0.0989	0.0347	0.1303	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	0.3312	0.0946	0.0348	0.1983	0.1270	0.0567
1967	1.0452	0.1099	0.0368	0.1287	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1968	1.1895	0.1136	0.0386	0.1271	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1969	1.2396	0.1368	0.0414	0.1256	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1970	1.2602	0.1528	0.0434	0.1081	0.4604	0.0796	0.0178	0.3991	0.0444	0.0159	0.4604	0.0796	0.0178	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1971	1.2782	0.1696	0.0464	0.1081	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	0.4152	0.0977	0.0361	0.2966	0.1266	0.0556
1972	1.2910	0.1841	0.0481	0.1122	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1973	1.2975	0.2022	0.0515	0.1122	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1974	1.2966	0.2166	0.0557	0.1147	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1975	1.2793	0.2294	0.0627	0.1183	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	0.4761	0.0589	0.0215	0.4962	0.0756	0.0209	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1976	1.2993	0.2402	0.0671	0.1284	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	0.4979	0.1073	0.0400	0.3945	0.1325	0.0571
1977	1.2861	0.2482	0.0707	0.1315	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1978	1.2747	0.2569	0.0712	0.1332	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1979	1.2586	0.2771	0.0768	0.1339	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1980	1.2604	0.3178	0.0714	0.1357	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	0.5394	0.0843	0.0283	0.5390	0.0775	0.0265	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1981	1.2457	0.3466	0.0851	0.1194	0.5458	0.1257	0.0454	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	0.5458	0.1257	0.0454	0.4547	0.1479	0.0604
1982	1.2348	0.3758	0.0967	0.1210	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1983	1.2419	0.4236	0.0922	0.1229	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1984	1.3082	0.4727	0.0860	0.1242	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1985	1.4594	0.4654	0.0828	0.1260	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	0.5967	0.1219	0.0351	0.6009	0.0877	0.0322	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1986	1.4936	0.5125	0.0917	0.1282	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	0.6089	0.1295	0.0505	0.5222	0.1829	0.0644
1987	1.5184	0.5310	0.0909	0.1291	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1988	1.5114	0.5620	0.0939	0.1291	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1989	1.4919	0.5139	0.0942	0.1311	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1990	1.4001	0.5601	0.1056	0.1310	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	0.6285	0.1655	0.0444	0.6482	0.1070	0.0388	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1991	1.2977	0.5992	0.0958	0.1168	0.5428	0.2203	0.0681	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	0.6490	0.1441	0.0553	0.5428	0.2203	0.0681
1992	1.3041	0.6203	0.0982	0.1171	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1993	1.3396	0.6749	0.0973	0.1164	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1994	1.4192	0.6948	0.1209	0.1150	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1995	1.3688	0.7119	0.1336	0.1145	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	0.6476	0.1877	0.0514	0.6650	0.1359	0.0465	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1996	1.3775	0.7540	0.1611	0.1144	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	0.6587	0.1753	0.0599	0.5897	0.2428	0.0712
1997	1.3797	0.7303	0.2216	0.1146	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1998	1.3948	0.7263	0.2439	0.1143	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
1999	1.4036	0.7889	0.2647	0.1144	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
2000	1.3841	0.8602	0.2845	0.1138	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	0.6763	0.2149	0.0607	0.6917	0.1690	0.0564	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A
2001	1.3164	0.8918	0.3110	0.1151	0.4247	0.3402	0.1225	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	0.6858	0.2056	0.0716	0.6062	0.2653	0.0816

Notes:
 L_t : population aged 25 and over at time t ; $L25_t$: population aged [25, 29] at time t . It represents those who entered into the overall population aged 25 and above, during the last five years.
 $h_{jt} = \frac{H_{jt}}{L_t}$: proportion of the adult population for whom j is the highest level of educational attainment [j : total primary (1), total secondary (2) and higher/tertiary (3)].
 PRI_{t-15} : the gross enrolment ratio for primary school observed 15 years ago; SEC_{t-10} : the gross enrolment ratio for secondary school observed 10 years ago; HIG_{t-5} : the gross enrolment ratio for higher school observed 5 years ago.

$$h_{1,t} = \left(1 - \frac{L25_t}{L_t}\right) \cdot h_{1,t-5} + \frac{L25_t}{L_t} \cdot (PRI_{t-15} - HIG_{t-10}); \quad h_{2,t} = \left(1 - \frac{L25_t}{L_t}\right) \cdot h_{2,t-5} + \frac{L25_t}{L_t} \cdot (SEC_{t-10} - HIG_{t-5}); \quad h_{3,t} = \left(1 - \frac{L25_t}{L_t}\right) \cdot h_{3,t-5} + \frac{L25_t}{L_t} \cdot (HIG_{t-5})$$

Table A2: OLS estimation for the missing cases

Year	PS	SS	S	LL	lnPS	lnSS	lnS	lnLL	$\hat{lnh1}$	$\hat{h1}$	$\hat{lnh2}$	$\hat{h2}$	$\hat{lnh3}$	$\hat{h3}$
1960	0.7808	0.0478	0.0230	0.1389	-0.2474	-3.0418	-3.7719	-1.9737	-1.0032	0.3667	-3.1753	0.0418	-4.4503	0.0117
1961	0.8003	0.0471	0.0241	0.1381	-0.2227	-3.0552	-3.7249	-1.9796	-0.9870	0.3727	-3.1805	0.0416	-4.4046	0.0122
1962	0.7986	0.0489	0.0249	0.1365	-0.2249	-3.0187	-3.6927	-1.9911	-0.9695	0.3793	-3.1465	0.0430	-4.3770	0.0126
1963	0.8317	0.0504	0.0259	0.1350	-0.1843	-2.9868	-3.6545	-2.0025	-0.9403	0.3905	-3.1159	0.0443	-4.3430	0.0130
1964	0.8282	0.0551	0.0278	0.1335	-0.1884	-2.8985	-3.5810	-2.0139	-0.9235	0.3971	-3.0458	0.0476	-4.2726	0.0139
1965	0.8755	0.0573	0.0315	0.1319	-0.1330	-2.8586	-3.4590	-2.0255	-0.8898	0.4107	-3.0094	0.0493	-4.1524	0.0157
1966	0.9042	0.0643	0.0347	0.1303	-0.1007	-2.7449	-3.3617	-2.0378	-0.8615	0.4225	-2.9208	0.0539	-4.0579	0.0173
1967	0.9354	0.0731	0.0368	0.1287	-0.0668	-2.6161	-3.3030	-2.0506	-0.8319	0.4352	-2.8211	0.0595	-4.0036	0.0183
1968	1.0759	0.0750	0.0386	0.1271	0.0731	-2.5902	-3.2541	-2.0624	-0.7744	0.4610	-2.7944	0.0612	-3.9589	0.0191
1969	1.1028	0.0954	0.0414	0.1256	0.0978	-2.3495	-3.1851	-2.0745	-0.7484	0.4731	-2.6166	0.0730	-3.8935	0.0204
1970	1.1074	0.1095	0.0434	0.1081	0.1020	-2.2122	-3.1378	-2.2249	-0.5104	0.6003	-2.4120	0.0896	-3.9166	0.0199
1971	1.1086	0.1232	0.0464	0.1081	0.1031	-2.0941	-3.0698	-2.2249	-0.5101	0.6005	-2.3291	0.0974	-3.8465	0.0214
1972	1.1069	0.1360	0.0481	0.1122	0.1016	-1.9953	-3.0343	-2.1872	-0.5699	0.5656	-2.2869	0.1016	-3.7918	0.0226
1973	1.0953	0.1506	0.0515	0.1122	0.0910	-1.8929	-2.9657	-2.1872	-0.5728	0.5639	-2.2150	0.1091	-3.7211	0.0242
1974	1.0800	0.1608	0.0557	0.1147	0.0770	-1.8273	-2.8874	-2.1652	-0.6113	0.5426	-2.1848	0.1125	-3.6299	0.0265
1975	1.0499	0.1667	0.0627	0.1183	0.0487	-1.7917	-2.7693	-2.1349	-0.6670	0.5132	-2.1817	0.1128	-3.4936	0.0304
1976	1.0591	0.1731	0.0671	0.1284	0.0574	-1.7540	-2.7014	-2.0530	-0.7936	0.4522	-2.2142	0.1092	-3.3845	0.0339
1977	1.0379	0.1775	0.0707	0.1315	0.0372	-1.7290	-2.6487	-2.0284	-0.8380	0.4326	-2.2143	0.1092	-3.3184	0.0362
1978	1.0178	0.1856	0.0712	0.1332	0.0177	-1.6839	-2.6418	-2.0157	-0.8634	0.4217	-2.1918	0.1117	-3.3052	0.0367
1979	0.9815	0.2003	0.0768	0.1339	-0.0187	-1.6080	-2.5668	-2.0105	-0.8816	0.4141	-2.1422	0.1174	-3.2254	0.0397
1980	0.9427	0.2464	0.0714	0.1357	-0.0591	-1.4010	-2.6390	-1.9972	-0.9138	0.4010	-2.0065	0.1345	-3.2935	0.0371
1981	0.8992	0.2615	0.0851	0.1194	-0.1063	-1.3415	-2.4637	-2.1255	-0.7248	0.4844	-1.8723	0.1538	-3.1741	0.0418
1982	0.8590	0.2791	0.0967	0.1210	-0.1520	-1.2762	-2.3357	-2.1119	-0.7590	0.4682	-1.8363	0.1594	-3.0356	0.0480
1983	0.8183	0.3313	0.0922	0.1229	-0.2005	-1.1046	-2.3833	-2.0961	-0.7974	0.4505	-1.7272	0.1778	-3.0772	0.0461
1984	0.8354	0.3867	0.0860	0.1242	-0.1798	-0.9500	-2.4532	-2.0859	-0.8077	0.4459	-1.6261	0.1967	-3.1443	0.0431
1985	0.9940	0.3827	0.0828	0.1260	-0.0060	-0.9606	-2.4919	-2.0717	-0.7817	0.4576	-1.6437	0.1933	-3.1774	0.0417
1986	0.9812	0.4208	0.0917	0.1282	-0.0190	-0.8656	-2.3897	-2.0539	-0.8133	0.4434	-1.5898	0.2040	-3.0636	0.0467
1987	0.9874	0.4401	0.0909	0.1291	-0.0127	-0.8208	-2.3976	-2.0474	-0.8219	0.4396	-1.5631	0.2095	-3.0686	0.0465
1988	0.9494	0.4681	0.0939	0.1291	-0.0519	-0.7590	-2.3657	-2.0474	-0.8328	0.4348	-1.5197	0.2188	-3.0357	0.0480
1989	0.9780	0.4198	0.0942	0.1311	-0.0222	-0.8681	-2.3625	-2.0322	-0.8485	0.4280	-1.6072	0.2004	-3.0251	0.0486
1990	0.8400	0.4544	0.1056	0.1310	-0.1744	-0.7887	-2.2477	-2.0323	-0.8906	0.4104	-1.5514	0.2119	-2.9068	0.0546
1991	0.6985	0.5034	0.0958	0.1168	-0.3588	-0.6864	-2.3457	-2.1476	-0.7602	0.4676	-1.3965	0.2475	-3.0630	0.0467
1992	0.6838	0.5221	0.0982	0.1171	-0.3801	-0.6499	-2.3209	-2.1450	-0.7703	0.4629	-1.3728	0.2534	-3.0361	0.0480
1993	0.6646	0.5777	0.0973	0.1164	-0.4085	-0.5488	-2.3302	-2.1504	-0.7697	0.4631	-1.2980	0.2731	-3.0483	0.0474
1994	0.7245	0.5739	0.1209	0.1150	-0.3223	-0.5554	-2.1128	-2.1626	-0.7265	0.4836	-1.2938	0.2742	-2.8300	0.0590
1995	0.6569	0.5783	0.1336	0.1145	-0.4203	-0.5476	-2.0132	-2.1676	-0.7459	0.4743	-1.2847	0.2767	-2.7297	0.0652
1996	0.6235	0.5928	0.1611	0.1144	-0.4724	-0.5228	-1.8257	-2.1682	-0.7594	0.4680	-1.2669	0.2817	-2.5367	0.0791
1997	0.6494	0.5087	0.2216	0.1146	-0.4318	-0.6758	-1.5071	-2.1664	-0.7510	0.4719	-1.3756	0.2527	-2.2073	0.1100
1998	0.6685	0.4824	0.2439	0.1143	-0.4027	-0.7289	-1.4112	-2.1685	-0.7395	0.4774	-1.4113	0.2438	-2.1095	0.1213
1999	0.6147	0.5242	0.2647	0.1144	-0.4866	-0.6459	-1.3291	-2.1683	-0.7632	0.4662	-1.3532	0.2584	-2.0248	0.1320
2000	0.5239	0.5757	0.2845	0.1138	-0.6465	-0.5522	-1.2570	-2.1733	-0.7998	0.4494	-1.2839	0.2770	-1.9528	0.1419
2001	0.4245	0.5808	0.3110	0.1151	-0.8567	-0.5433	-1.1679	-2.1619	-0.8761	0.4164	-1.2858	0.2764	-1.8555	0.1564

Note: Estimates were computed using the following regressions

$$\ln h_{1,t} = -48,506 - 0,309 \ln LL + 0,854 \ln PS + 0,024t + e_{1,t} ; \ln h_{2,t} = -2,461 - 0,720 \ln LL + 0,702 \ln SH + e_{2,t} ; \ln h_{3,t} = 0,382 + 0,478 \ln LL + 1,031 \ln H + e_{3,t}$$

Table A3: Conclusion ratios by educational level

<i>Year</i>	<i>CRPRIM</i>	<i>CRSEC</i>	<i>CRHIGH</i>
1960	0,625	0,395	0,600
1961	0,625	0,395	0,600
1962	0,625	0,395	0,600
1963	0,625	0,395	0,600
1964	0,625	0,395	0,600
1965	0,625	0,395	0,600
1966	0,625	0,395	0,600
1967	0,625	0,395	0,600
1968	0,625	0,395	0,600
1969	0,625	0,395	0,600
1970	0,625	0,395	0,600
1971	0,630	0,411	0,621
1972	0,635	0,428	0,642
1973	0,640	0,445	0,664
1974	0,645	0,464	0,687
1975	0,650	0,483	0,710
1976	0,655	0,502	0,734
1977	0,660	0,523	0,759
1978	0,665	0,544	0,786
1979	0,670	0,567	0,812
1980	0,676	0,590	0,840
1981	0,681	0,614	0,869
1982	0,685	0,618	0,872
1983	0,689	0,621	0,875
1984	0,693	0,625	0,878
1985	0,697	0,629	0,881
1986	0,701	0,633	0,884
1987	0,705	0,637	0,887
1988	0,709	0,640	0,890
1989	0,714	0,644	0,893
1990	0,718	0,648	0,896
1991	0,722	0,652	0,899
1992	0,726	0,655	0,904
1993	0,730	0,657	0,900
1994	0,734	0,660	0,897
1995	0,738	0,662	0,894
1996	0,742	0,665	0,890
1997	0,746	0,667	0,887
1998	0,750	0,670	0,883
1999	0,754	0,672	0,880
2000	0,759	0,675	0,877
2001	0,763	0,678	0,865

Notes: CRPRIM: primary conclusion ratios; CRSEC: secondary conclusion ratios; CRHIGH: higher education conclusion ratios. In the computation of the conclusion ratios, census data (1970; 1981; 1991 and 2001) are the benchmarking figures. We further assume that these ratios varied uniformly over time, that is, for each year we apply the average annual change rates. The absence of data for 1960-1969 period forced us to presuppose that conclusion ratios assumed 1970's values.

Table A4: Estimates of the Portuguese human capital stock - average years of schooling of the Portuguese adult working age population

Year	H	H'	H''	H'''
1960	1,623	1,337	1,286	1,362
1961	1,729	1,425	1,374	1,450
1962	1,863	1,534	1,482	1,560
1963	2,009	1,653	1,599	1,680
1964	2,200	1,810	1,752	1,838
1965	2,403	1,978	1,919	2,008
1966	2,544	2,096	2,030	2,128
1967	2,690	2,215	2,143	2,251
1968	2,787	2,295	2,221	2,332
1969	3,018	2,484	2,395	2,528
1970	3,276	2,690	2,581	2,744
1971	3,423	2,823	2,708	2,880
1972	3,523	2,919	2,803	2,978
1973	3,672	3,058	2,937	3,119
1974	3,783	3,169	3,048	3,229
1975	3,886	3,279	3,162	3,337
1976	3,913	3,325	3,216	3,379
1977	3,994	3,414	3,310	3,467
1978	4,074	3,500	3,398	3,551
1979	4,239	3,664	3,563	3,715
1980	4,439	3,851	3,741	3,906
1981	4,781	4,179	4,061	4,239
1982	4,960	4,354	4,232	4,415
1983	5,144	4,518	4,383	4,585
1984	5,316	4,671	4,523	4,744
1985	5,248	4,616	4,473	4,688
1986	5,466	4,825	4,675	4,899
1987	5,527	4,886	4,733	4,962
1988	5,665	5,018	4,861	5,097
1989	5,453	4,841	4,698	4,912
1990	5,700	5,078	4,928	5,152
1991	5,982	5,322	5,150	5,408
1992	6,024	5,369	5,194	5,457
1993	6,198	5,530	5,343	5,624
1994	6,370	5,710	5,524	5,804
1995	6,463	5,811	5,624	5,904
1996	7,132	6,422	6,202	6,532
1997	7,263	6,559	6,339	6,668
1998	7,411	6,713	6,493	6,822
1999	7,579	6,886	6,666	6,996
2000	7,770	7,080	6,861	7,190
2001	7,985	7,296	7,076	7,405

Notes:

H , we do not distinguish complete from incomplete levels. $H = 4 \times h_1 + (4 + 8) \times h_2 + (4 + 8 + 6) \times h_3$

H' considers that the individuals that do not complete any of the three education levels achieved at least half of the years officially required. $H' = 4 \times \left(\frac{hpi}{2} + hpc \right) + \left(4 + \frac{8}{2} \right) \times hsi + (4 + 8) \times hsc + \left(4 + 8 + \frac{6}{2} \right) \times hhigi + (4 + 8 + 6) \times hhigc$

H'' the same as H' but considering incomplete secondary those individuals that do not go further than the first cycle of lower secondary school. $H'' = 4 \times \left(\frac{hpi}{2} + hpc \right) + (4 + 2) \times hsi + (4 + 8) \times hsc + \left(4 + 8 + \frac{6}{2} \right) \times hhigi + (4 + 8 + 6) \times hhigc$

H''' as H'' but now the relevant length is the second cycle of lower secondary school, i.e., the compulsory education level for Portuguese education system). $H''' = 4 \times \left(\frac{hpi}{2} + hpc \right) + (4 + 5) \times hsi + (4 + 8) \times hsc + \left(4 + 8 + \frac{6}{2} \right) \times hhigi + (4 + 8 + 6) \times hhigc$

Recent FEP Working Papers

Nº 151	Ana Paula Delgado and Isabel Maria Godinho, The evolution of city size distribution in Portugal: 1864-2001 , July 2004
Nº 150	Patrícia Teixeira Lopes and Lúcia Lima Rodrigues, Accounting practices for financial instruments. How far are the Portuguese companies from IAS? , July 2004
Nº 149	Pedro Cosme Costa Vieira, Top ranking economics journals impact variability and a ranking update to the year 2002 , June 2004
Nº 148	Maria do Rosário Correia, Scott C. Linn and Andrew Marshall, An Empirical Investigation of Debt Contract Design: The Determinants of the Choice of Debt Terms in Eurobond Issues , June 2004
Nº 147	Francisco Castro, Foreign Direct Investment in a Late Industrialising Country: The Portuguese IDP Revisited , May 2004
Nº 146	Óscar Afonso and Álvaro Aguiar, Comércio Externo e Crescimento da Economia Portuguesa no Século XX , May 2004
Nº 145	Álvaro Aguiar and Manuel M. F. Martins, O Crescimento da Produtividade da Indústria Portuguesa no Século XX , May 2004
Nº 144	Álvaro Aguiar and Manuel M. F. Martins, Growth Cycles in XXth Century European Industrial Productivity: Unbiased Variance Estimation in a Time-varying Parameter Model , May 2004
Nº 143	Jorge M. S. Valente and Rui A. F. S. Alves, Beam search algorithms for the early/tardy scheduling problem with release dates , April 2004
Nº 142	Jorge M. S. Valente and Rui A. F. S. Alves, Filtered and Recovering beam search algorithms for the early/tardy scheduling problem with no idle time , April 2004
Nº 141	João A. Ribeiro and Robert W. Scapens, Power, ERP systems and resistance to management accounting: a case study , April 2004
Nº 140	Rosa Forte, The relationship between foreign direct investment and international trade. Substitution or complementarity? A survey , March 2004
Nº 139	Sandra Silva, On evolutionary technological change and economic growth: Lakatos as a starting point for appraisal , March 2004
Nº 138	Maria Manuel Pinho, Political models of budget deficits: a literature review , March 2004
Nº 137	Natércia Fortuna, Local rank tests in a multivariate nonparametric relationship , February 2004
Nº 136	Argentino Pessoa, Ideas driven growth: the OECD evidence , December 2003
Nº 135	Pedro Lains, Portugal's Growth Paradox, 1870-1950 , December 2003
Nº 134	Pedro Mazedo Gil, A Model of Firm Behaviour with Equity Constraints and Bankruptcy Costs , November 2003
Nº 133	Douglas Woodward, Octávio Figueiredo and Paulo Guimarães, Beyond the Silicon Valley: University R&D and High-Technology Location , November 2003.
Nº 132	Pedro Cosme da Costa Vieira, The Impact of Monetary Shocks on Product and Wages: A neoclassical aggregated dynamic model , July 2003.
Nº 131	Aurora Teixeira and Natércia Fortuna, Human Capital, Innovation Capability and Economic Growth , July 2003.
Nº 130	Jorge M. S. Valente and Rui A. F. S. Alves, Heuristics for the Early/Tardy Scheduling Problem with Release Dates , May 2003.
Nº 129	Jorge M. S. Valente and Rui A. F. S. Alves, An Exact Approach to Early/Tardy Scheduling with Release Dates , May 2003.
Nº 128	Álvaro Almeida, 40 Years of Monetary Targets and Financial Crises in 20 OECD Countries , April 2003.

Nº 127	Jorge M. S. Valente, Using Instance Statistics to Determine the Lookahead Parameter Value in the ATC Dispatch Rule: Making a good heuristic better , April 2003.
Nº 126	Jorge M. S. Valente and Rui A. F. S. Alves, Improved Heuristics for the Early/Tardy Scheduling Problem with No Idle Time , April 2003.
Nº 125	Jorge M. S. Valente and Rui A. F. S. Alves, Improved Lower Bounds for the Early/Tardy Scheduling Problem with No Idle Time , April 2003.
Nº 124	Aurora Teixeira, Does Inertia Pay Off? Empirical assessment of an evolutionary-ecological model of human capital decisions at firm level , March 2003.
Nº 123	Alvaro Aguiar and Manuel M. F. Martins, Macroeconomic Volatility Trade-off and Monetary Policy Regime in the Euro Area , March 2003.
Nº 122	Alvaro Aguiar and Manuel M. F. Martins, Trend, cycle, and non-linear trade-off in the Euro Area 1970-2001 , March 2003.
Nº 121	Aurora Teixeira, On the Link between Human Capital and Firm Performance. A Theoretical and Empirical Survey , November 2002.
Nº 120	Ana Paula Serra, The Cross-Sectional Determinants of Returns: Evidence from Emerging Markets' Stocks , October 2002.
Nº 119	Cristina Barbot, Does Airport Regulation Benefit Consumers? , June 2002.
Nº 118	José Escaleira, A Procura no Sector das Artes do Espectáculo. Tempo e Rendimento na Análise das Audiências. Um Estudo para Portugal , June 2002.
Nº 117	Ana Paula Serra, Event Study Tests: A brief survey , May 2002.
Nº 116	Luís Delfim Santos and Isabel Martins, A Qualidade de Vida Urbana - O caso da cidade do Porto , May 2002.
Nº 115	Marcelo Cabús Klötzle and Fábio Luiz Biagini, A Restruturação do Sector Eléctrico Brasileiro: Uma análise comparativa com a Califórnia , January 2002.
Nº 114	António Brandão and Sofia B. S. D. Castro, Objectives of Public Firms and Entry , December 2001.
Nº 113	Ana Cristina Fernandes and Carlos Machado-Santos, Avaliação de Estratégias de Investimento com Opções , December 2001.
Nº 112	Carlos Alves and Victor Mendes, Corporate Governance Policy and Company Performance: The Case of Portugal , December 2001.
Nº 111	Cristina Barbot, Industrial Determinants of Entry and Survival: The case of Ave , October 2001.
Nº 110	José Rodrigues de Jesús, Luís Miranda da Rocha e Rui Couto Viana, Avaliação de Pequenas e Médias Empresas e Gestão de Risco , October 2001.
Nº 109	Margarida de Mello and Kevin S. Nell, The Forecasting Ability of a Cointegrated VAR Demand System with Endogeneous vs. Exogenous Expenditure Variable: An application to the UK imports of tourism from neighbouring countries , July 2001.
Nº 108	Cristina Barbot, Horizontal Merger and Vertical Differentiation , June 2001.
Nº 107	Celsa Machado, Measuring Business Cycles: The Real Business Cycle Approach and Related Controversies , May 2001.

Editor: Prof. Aurora Teixeira (ateixeira@fep.up.pt)

Download available at:

<http://www.fep.up.pt/investigacao/workingpapers/workingpapers.htm>

also in <http://ideas.repec.org/PaperSeries.html>



FACULDADE DE ECONOMIA

UNIVERSIDADE DO PORTO

www.fep.up.pt