

How Has the Portuguese Innovation Capability Evolved?

**Estimating a Time Series of the Stock of
Technological Knowledge, 1960-2001**

Aurora Amélia Castro Teixeira

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



FACULDADE DE ECONOMIA

UNIVERSIDADE DO PORTO

www.fep.up.pt

HOW HAS THE PORTUGUESE INNOVATION CAPABILITY EVOLVED?
ESTIMATING A TIME SERIES OF THE STOCK OF TECHNOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE, 1960-2001

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

The importance of promoting innovation has been elevated up to a status of official standard since the Lisbon European Summit in 2000. Here research and development (R&D) was singled out as an essential element of the foundation on which innovation could be built.

R&D has been a growing area of investigation namely at level of firms micro studies aimed at uncovering firms' innovation capability. At the macro level, the relevance of R&D for countries' innovation capability has been, in a dynamic perspective, more often presumed rather than effectively tested. This latter limitation is, to a large extent, explained by the paucity of aggregated continuous time series on innovation indicators specifically those based on R&D expenditures.

This paper aims at filling this gap by providing an estimate of the Portuguese innovation capability over the two last four decades based on the accumulated R&D efforts. Such indicator, albeit preliminary, will desirably endorse new investigation on the Portuguese catching-up process and, in this way, might inform present and future public programs related to R&D policies in particular and innovation policies in general.

KEYWORDS: Innovation; R&D expenditures; measurement, economic growth

JEL-CLASSIFICATION: O31; O32; 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

In the March 2000 European Summit held at Lisbon, it was put forward the strategic goal for Europe to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world over the next ten years. Moreover, it was highlighted the importance of promoting innovation and singled out research as an essential element of the foundation on which innovation can be built. In a knowledge-based economy Research, Development and Innovation are essential to the development of new products and processes, which in turn are critical to economic competitiveness, employment and the enhancement of society (OECD, 1992).

The Lisbon Strategy adopted an open co-ordination method, resorting to the use of qualitative and quantitative indicators, as an instrument to evaluate each country's performance and to spread information on best practices (Tavares, 2003). These indicators do not measure adequately the efforts of structural reforms as they have essentially a static nature. Thus, to some extent, they miss the evaluation of the catching up effort. Therefore, it is desirable to consider dynamic indicators, which might provide more comprehensive representation of countries' effort.

Recent studies within new growth literature agreed that an economy's productivity level depends on its cumulative R&D effort and on its effective stock of knowledge, with the two being inter-related (Coe and Helpman, 1993; Bönte, 2003). For them innovation feeds on knowledge which results from cumulative R&D experience on the one hand, and it contributes to the stock of knowledge on the other.

Although there has been some progress in modelling knowledge at the theoretical level, less progress has been made at the empirical level (Aghion and Howit, 1998). We do not have generally accepted empirical measures of such key theoretical concepts as the stock of (technological) knowledge and the stock of human capital (Teixeira, 2004).

This paper aims at providing a dynamic indicator of Portugal's stock of technological knowledge or innovation capability over four decades (1960-2001), based on R&D accumulated efforts. This, combined with other quantitative and qualitative indicators, is likely to provide a broader and accurate depiction of country's economic evolution.

The paper is structure as follows. In the next section (Section 2), a brief review of the significance of R&D efforts for nations' economic performance is documented. Then, in Section 3, the methodology for constructing the proxy for indigenous innovation

capability is detailed and the results of estimation presented. Finally, Section 4 presents the most important conclusions. The appendix presents all steps and results of the estimation procedure.

2. THE IMPORTANCE OF TECHNOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE STOCK FOR ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE. A REVIEW

Early neoclassical models (e.g., Solow, 1956) treated technical change as an exogenous variable, illustrating how long-run economic growth only depended on (exogenous) technical change. Arrow (1962), who endogeneized technology by assuming learning-by-doing, argued that it grew at a constant rate, and found that long-run growth vitally depends on population growth. Other important contributions in the 1960s were made by authors such as Uzawa (1965), Phelps (1966), Conlisk (1967) and Shell (1967), who related technology growth to some specification based on labour resources devoted to the development of new technologies and ideas.

Albeit physical capital stock has been for long considered as an important generator of returns and growth (Levine and Renelt, 1992), Hall and Hayashi (1989) underline that other forms of capital, such as knowledge or R&D capital (the accumulated know-how, technical expertise, trade secrets, etc., that are embodied, for instance in firms and the workforce) were also capable of generating high returns and could be more likely to generate more long-lasting, supra normal returns. In fact, the bulk of studies, mostly focusing North-American R&D, at both firm and industry levels do show high rates of return, around 25% and 15%, respectively (Nadiri, 1993).

Research on endogenous economic growth (Grossman and Helpman, 1991; Romer, 1990; Aghion and Howitt, 1998) considers commercially oriented innovation efforts that respond to economic incentives as a major engine of technological progress and productivity growth. For such stream of the literature, innovation feeds on knowledge that results from cumulative R&D experience on the one hand, and it contributes to this stock of knowledge on the other. Therefore, an economy's productivity level depends on its cumulative R&D effort and on its effective stock of knowledge, with the two being inter-related (Coe and Helpman, 1993).

Indigenous R&D produces traded and non-traded goods and services that bring about more effective use of existing resources and thereby raises a country's productivity level (Jones and Williams, 1999). Additionally, domestic R&D enhances a country's benefits

from foreign technical advances, and the better a country takes advantage of technological advances from the rest of the world the more productive it becomes (Coe et al., 1997).

The cumulative R&D effort is therefore intimately related to national innovative capacity of a country to produce and commercialise a flow of innovative technology over the long term (Stern et al., 2000). Innovative capacity depends on an interrelated set of investments, policies and resource commitments, which underpin the production of the new-to-the-world technologies. National innovative capacity is not the realized level of innovative output at a single point in time but reflects the more fundamental determinants of the innovation process. This concept draws heavily on ideas-driven endogenous growth theory (Romer, 1990; 1993). In models of ideas-driven growth, the ideas production function depends on two aggregate factors that influence the rate of innovation in an economy: the prior stock of knowledge accumulated by that economy, and the level of R&D effort devoted towards ideas production.

The theoretical framework described above highlights the potential importance of R&D for a country innovation capability and growth performance. The comprehensive study of Stern et al. (2000) suggests that public policy plays an important role in shaping a country's national innovative capacity. Besides simply increasing the level of R&D resources available to the economy, government actions play an important role in shaping human capital investment and innovation incentives. They point that countries such as Japan, Sweden, Finland and Germany, who implemented policies aimed at encouraging human capital investment in science and engineering as well as competition on the basis of innovation (e.g., through the adoption of R&D tax credits), increased their level of innovative capacity over the last quarter century.

Nowadays, there exists convincing empirical evidence, which shows that cumulative indigenous R&D effort is in fact an important determinant of country's productivity and growth performance (Griliches, 1988; Coe and Moghadam, 1993; Teixeira and Fortuna, 2003).¹

¹ Soete (1996), Young (1998) and de Loo and Soete (1999) argue, however, that R&D efforts may have become more and more devoted to product differentiation than to (product or) process innovation, thus hardly affecting economic growth but more so total consumers' welfare.

3. THE STOCK OF TECHNOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE AS PROXY FOR INDIGENOUS INNOVATION CAPABILITY – METHODOLOGICAL UNDERPINS

Progress in modelling knowledge at the empirical level has been more slowly than that experienced at the theoretical level. “To some extent the situation is one of the theory before measurement ...” (Aghion and Howit, 1998: 435). Few widely accepted empirical measures of the stock of (technological) knowledge and the stock of human capital (Teixeira, 2004) exist. Most of them are only available at cross-country level hampering long-term economic growth analysis of individual countries, given the absence of continuous time series.

The stock of technological knowledge has been proxied by several variables, number of scientists and engineers (Jones, 1993; Kortum, 1994), patents (Fagerberg, 1987, 1988; Kortum, 1993; 1994), R&D intensity, i.e., R&D/GDP ratio (Griliches, 1988), accumulated expenditures in R&D (Coe e Helpman, 1993; Coe et al., 1997), etc..

Fagerberg (1987) divides technological levels and technological activities measures into two types: technological input measures (education expenditures, R&D expenditures, scientists and engineer employment), and technological output measures (patents). The former are directly related to countries’ innovation capability, being also linked with countries imitation capability in the sense that a given scientific base is needed for imitation process to be well succeeded. The output measures are specifically related to innovative activities, i.e., product and process innovation.

Interest in R&D depends more on the new knowledge and innovations and the economic and social effects that result than on the activity itself. Unfortunately, while indicators of R&D output are clearly needed to complement input statistics, they are far more difficult to define and produce. In the present work we privilege technological input measures, specifically, R&D accumulated expenditures. This option, besides the availability of data, is intimately related to the fact that the Portuguese economic growth process has been characterized, in larger extent, by the adoption and diffusion of knowledge and lesser by its creation (Verspagen, 1993).

Analogous to Coe and Helpman’s (1993) empirical work, we use R&D accumulated expenditures as proxy for the stock of knowledge (indigenous innovation capability). Thus, we estimate, for Portugal, a proxy of the internal or indigenous stock of knowledge based on internal expenditures of R&D.

The estimates R&D capital stocks were constructed on the basis of R&D data published by the Observatório de Ciência e Ensino Superior (OCES), former Junta Nacional de Investigação Científica (JNICT), and the Instituto Nacional de Estatística (INE).

We opt to construct two capital stocks, Total R&D capital stock - R&D performed by the whole economy, Firms, the State, Tertiary Education Non-profit Organizations -, and Firm R&D capital stock (including only Firms). The reason relates to the fact that the meaning of the two above-mentioned measures is likely to be substantially different for the purpose of assessing their contribution for countries' economic growth. Firm R&D capital stock tends to be more intimately linked to market incentives while Total R&D capital stock, being more encompassing, tends to include knowledge spillovers from R&D activity which are likely to positively affect the whole society.

At the present time, R&D statistics are the result of the systematic development of surveys based on the Frascati Manual and are part of the statistical system of the OECD member countries. According to Frascati Manual (OCDE, 2002: 31), "Research and experimental development (R&D) comprise creative work undertaken on a systematic basis in order to increase the stock of knowledge, including knowledge of man, culture and society, and the use of this stock of knowledge to devise new applications."

R&D covers three activities, basic research, applied research and experimental development (OECD, 2002). Basic research is experimental or theoretical work undertaken primarily to acquire new knowledge of the underlying foundation of phenomena and observable facts, without any particular application or use in view. Applied research is also original investigation undertaken in order to acquire new knowledge. It is, however, directed primarily towards a specific practical aim or objective. Experimental development is systematic work, drawing on existing knowledge gained from research and/or practical experience, which is directed to producing new materials, products or devices, to installing new processes, systems and services, or to improving substantially those already produced or installed. R&D covers both formal R&D in R&D units and informal or occasional R&D in other units.

In this vein, as highlight in the previous section, R&D activities emerge as key factor for building countries' innovation and technological adoption capabilities.

Research and development is an investment flow. However, what affects output is most probably some accumulated stock of the previous results of such investments. Since

such results are not easily quantifiable, most authors have constructed some stock of R&D capital measure (Griliches, 1980; Coe and Helpman, 1993; Coe et al., 1997). Real R&D expenditures result from deflating nominal expenditures. For this purpose, we considered two deflators: GDP deflator (used by OCES and INE) and an index of R&D implicit prices.

The index of R&D implicit prices ($P_{R\&D}$) was constructed, following Coe and Helpman's (1993) suggestion, as a weighted average of GDP deflator (P_Y) and the index of workers average wages (P_W). However, differently from Coe and Helpman (1993), we take into account the effective composition of R&D expenditures. According to available data for the period 1964-2001, 60,03% of total R&D expenditures corresponded to labour costs (see Table A3 in the Appendix).

Thus, the index of R&D implicit prices ($P_{R\&D}$)² was computed as follows:

$$P_{R\&D} = 0,3997 \cdot P_Y + 0,6003 \cdot P_W \quad (1)$$




Figure 1: GDP deflator (P_Y) and an index of R&D implicit prices ($P_{R\&D}$), Portugal 1960-2001

Source: Author's calculations.

In spite of the two real R&D series do not significantly differ over the period in analysis (after 1995, though, their evolution is dissimilar), we opt by the index of R&D implicit prices as it is the most theoretical sound procedure.

² See Table A4 in the Appendix.

Firm real R&D investment reveals a more erratic trend than total real R&D investment, suffering in the two most problematic periods of the Portuguese recent economic history, 1971-1976 and 1990-1995, a significant drop. This might be explained, in some extent, by the fact that the large energy price shocks, the resulting fluctuations in capacity utilization, the substantial increase in uncertainty about the future absolute and relative prices may have forced many firms away from their long-run investment plans. Most recently, however, investment in R&D invigorated showing signs of considerable dynamism, with average annual rates of 9,9% and 18,2%, respectively for the total economy and for firms.

Table 1: Average real growth rates (in per cent) of the Portuguese Total and Firm R&D investment

	Total R&D Investment	Firm R&D Investment
1964-1971	8,1	9,0
1971-1976	-6,3	-12,2
1976-1980	13,2	22,2
1980-1986	8,4	6,8
1986-1990	10,9	10,7
1990-1995	2,3	-2,2
1995-2001	9,9	18,2

Sources:

1964-72: JNICT (1986), *Indicadores de Ciência e Tecnologia Portugal 1964-1982*.

1976-90: INE, *Anuário Estatístico do INE*.

1990-2001: INE e Observatório da Ciência e Ensino Superior.

R&D data are not available for all the years of the period 1960-2001. Therefore, in order to obtain a time continuous series, we use a specification relating real R&D expenditures to real product and investment (all in logs) to ‘predict’ the missing R&D data.³ The outcome of such estimation is presented in Table A6 of the Appendix.

R&D total/firm capital stock ($RTR\&D_t/RFR\&D_t$), which are defined as beginning of period stocks, are computed from real R&D expenditures following a perpetual inventory method:

$$RTR\&D_t = (1 - \delta)RTR\&D_{t-1} + RR\&D_t, \quad (2)$$

where $RTR\&D_t$ is the total R&D capital stock, in period t; $RR\&D_t$ is the real expenditure in R&D, in period t; and δ the rate of depreciation or knowledge obsolescence rate.

³ A similar procedure was suggested by Coe and Helpman (1993) to foresee missing R&D data for a set of small countries.

The benchmark for R&D capital stock ($RTR\&D_0$ or $RFR\&D_0$) is computed following the procedure suggested by Griliches (1980), as

$$RTR\&D_0 = \frac{RR\&D_0}{g + \delta}, \quad (3)$$

where g is the real average annual growth rate of R&D expenditures over the period for which published R&D data were available (1964-2001); $RR\&D_0$ is the real expenditure in the first year for which published R&D data were available (1964), and δ is the depreciation rate.

The depreciation of R&D is related to the loss of *quasi*-rents in the sense that the information generated by this activity becomes widely disseminated (Bosworth and Jobome, 2003).⁴ Given the absence of empirical studies that indicate the approximate rate of knowledge diffusion, i.e., the rate of knowledge obsolescence, we consider different rates of knowledge obsolescence (0%; 5%; 10% and 15%).⁵

As we can observe in figure 2, the evolution of R&D capital stocks associated with different obsolescence rates are similar, therefore the choice for one or another rate was not consider highly fundamental for the purpose of the analysis. We opt to consider an intermediate depreciation rate, 5%.




Figure 2: Total R&D capital stock assuming different rates of knowledge obsolescence ($\delta=0\%$; $\delta=5\%$; $\delta=10\%$; $\delta=15\%$), Portugal 1960-2001.

Source: Author's calculations (see Table A7 in the Appendix).

⁴ Caballero and Jaffe (1993) argue that knowledge obsolescence is an endogenous function of the number of new ideas. Here, for simplicity, we considered an exogenous depreciation rate.

⁵ One remarkable exception is the study by Nadiri and Prucha (1993) who estimated for the US total manufacturing sector the depreciation rate of physical capital (5,9%) and R&D capital (12%).

Between 1960 and 2001 the Portuguese R&D capital stock increased significantly, as the following figure shows. For the economy as whole (Total R&D capital stock) it increased by a factor of 10,5. Considering the private sector (Firms R&D capital stock) this stock was 13 fold larger by the end of the period than at the beginning.




Figure 3: Firm R&D capital stock assuming different rates of knowledge obsolescence ($\delta=0\%$; $\delta=5\%$; $\delta=10\%$; $\delta=15\%$), Portugal 1960-2001.
Source: Author's calculations (see Table A8 in the Appendix).




Figure 4: Total and Firm R&D capital stock, Portugal 1960-2001.
Source: Author's calculations (see Table A9 in the Appendix).

Such evidence seems to indicate that over the last four decades the Portuguese total and firm stock of knowledge have evolved favourably, which might to some extent constitute a potential factor of the Portuguese economic growth. In fact, Teixeira and Fortuna (2003), using the firm R&D capital stock estimated here, concluded that this latter constitutes an import growth factor of the Portuguese economy in the last forty years.

Table 2: Average real growth rates (in per cent) of the Portuguese Total and Firm R&D Capital Stock

	Total R&D Capital Stock	Firm R&D Capital Stock
1964-1971	5,9	6,0
1971-1976	5,7	6,5
1976-1980	4,9	5,2
1980-1986	5,3	6,9
1986-1990	7,1	7,6
1990-1995	6,6	6,3
1995-2001	7,4	8,4

Sources: Author's calculations based on estimations in Table A9 in the Appendix.

Analysing the average growth rates of the R&D capital stock (Table 2) it is possible to observe a slowdown in 1976-1980 and 1990-1995 periods and a recovering in the most recent period (1995-2001), particularly of the firm R&D capital stock.

4. CONCLUSION

In a knowledge-based economy Research, Development (R&D) and Innovation are consider an essential element for the development of new products and processes, which in turn are critical to economic competitiveness, employment and the enhancement of an economy.

In fact, studies on endogenous economic growth (Grossman and Helpman, 1991; Romer, 1990; Aghion and Howitt, 1998) consider commercially oriented innovation efforts that respond to economic incentives as a major engine of technological progress and productivity growth. It is argued that innovation feeds on knowledge that results from cumulative R&D experience on the one hand, and it contributes to this stock of knowledge on the other. Therefore, an economy's productivity level depends on its

cumulative R&D effort and on its effective stock of knowledge, with the two being inter-related (Coe and Helpman, 1993).

Progress in modelling knowledge at the empirical level has been falling behind progress at the theoretical level. Few generally accepted empirical measures of the stock of (technological) knowledge exist. Most of them are only available at cross-country level hampering long-term economic growth analysis of individual countries, given the absence of continuous time series.

In the present paper we provide a dynamic indicator of the Portuguese stock of technological knowledge or innovation capability since the 1960s up to 2001, based on R&D accumulated efforts. Following a perpetual inventory method, having total and firm R&D expenditures as benchmark indicators, we estimated total and firm R&D capital stock for the Portuguese economy.

Despite slowdowns observed in 1976-1980 and 1990-1995 periods, estimated data seem to indicate that over the last four decades the Portuguese total and firm stock of technological knowledge, i.e., nation's innovation capability, have evolved satisfactorily. Most recently (1995-2001), particularly firm stock of technological knowledge has experience a notorious recovering, growing 8,4% per year.

REFERENCES

- Aghion, P. and Howitt, P. (1998), *Endogenous Growth Theory*, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Arrow, K. (1962), "The Economic Implications of Learning by Doing", *Economic Studies*, Vol. 29, pp. 155-173.
- Bönte, W. (2003), "Does federally financed business R&D matter for US productivity growth?", *Applied Economics*, Vol. 35, pp. 1619-1625.
- Bosworth, Derek and Jobome1, Gregory (2003), "The Rate of Depreciation of Technological Knowledge: Evidence from Patent Renewal Data", *Economic Issues*, Vol. 8, Part 1, pp. 59-82.
- Caballero, R. and Jaffe, A. (1993), "How high are the giants shoulders: an empirical assessment of knowledge spillovers and creative destruction in a model of economic growth", *National Bureau of Economic Research Macroeconomics Annual Meeting*, pp. 15-74.

- Coe, D. and Helpman, E. (1993), "International R&D spillovers", *NBER Working Paper* 4444, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Coe, D. and Moghadam, R. (1993), "Capital and Trade as Engines of Growth in France", *IMF Staff Papers* 40.
- Coe, D., Helpman, E. and Hoffmaister, A. (1997), "North-South R&D spillovers", *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 107, pp. 134-149.
- Conlisk, J. (1967), "A modified neoclassical growth model with endogenous technical change", *The Southern Economic Journal*, Vol. 79, pp. 348-362.
- de Loo, I. and Soete, L. (1999), "The impact of technology on economic growth: some new ideas and empirical considerations", *MERIT Working Paper*, University of Maastricht.
- Fagerberg, J. (1987), "A technology gap approach to why growth rates differ", *Research Policy*, Vol. 16, pp. 87-99, in Freeman, C. (ed.), *The Economics of innovation*, 1990, pp. 55-67.
- Fagerberg, J. (1988), "Why Growth rates differ", in Dosi G., Freeman C., Nelson R., Silverberg G. and Soete L. (eds), *Technical change and economic theory*, pp. 432-457, London: Printer Publishers.
- Griliches, Z. (1980), "R&D and the Productivity Slowdown", *NBER Working Papers* 434, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Griliches, Z. (1988), "Productivity puzzles and R&D: another nonexplanation", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 2, N° 4, pp. 9-21.
- Grossman, G. and Helpman, E. (1991), *Innovation and growth in the global economy*, Cambridge, Massachusetts & London, England: The MIT Press.
- Hall, B. and Hayashi, F. (1989), "Research and development as an investment", *NBER Working Paper* 2973, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Jones, C. and Williams, J., (1999), "Too much of a Good Thing? The Economics of Investment in R&D", *NBER Working Paper* 7283, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Jones, C.I. (1993), "Time series tests of endogenous growth models", *Preliminary Version*, Department of Economics, MIT, Cambridge, MA 02139.

- Kortum, S. (1993), "Equilibrium R&D and the patent-R&D ratio: U.S. evidence", *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 83, N°2, pp. 451-457.
- Kortum, S. (1994), "A model of research, patenting, and productivity growth", *NBER Working Paper* 4646, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Levine, R. and Renelt, D. (1992), "A sensitivity analysis of cross-country growth regressions", *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 82(4), pp. 942-963.
- Nadiri, M. and Prucha, I. (1993), "Estimation of the depreciation rate of physical and R&D capital in the U.S. total manufacturing sector", *NBER Working Paper* 4591, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Nadiri, M.I. (1993), "Innovations and Technological Spillovers", *Working Papers* 93-31, *C.V. Starr Center for Applied Economics*, New York University.
- OECD (1992), *Technology and the Economy. The Key Relationships*, Paris: OECD
- OECD (2002), *Frascati Manual. Proposed standard practice for surveys on research and experimental development*, Paris, France. [available on-line at <http://www1.oecd.org/publications/e-book/9202081E.PDF>]
- Phelps, E. (1966), "Models of Technical Progress and the Golden Rule of Research", *Review of Economic Studies*, Vol. 33, pp. 133-145.
- Romer, P. (1990), "Endogenous technological change", *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 98, N° 5, pt. 2, pp. S71-S101.
- Romer, P. (1993), "Idea gaps and object gaps in economic development", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 32, pp. 543-573.
- Shell, K. (1967), "A model of innovative activity and capital accumulation", in Shell, K. (ed.), *Essays on the Theory of Economic growth*, pp. 67-85, Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Soete, L. (1996), "Uncertainty and technological change: discussion", in Fuhrer, J. and Little, S. (ed.), *Technology and Growth: Conference Proceedings*, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, pp. 119-125.
- Solow, R. (1956), "A contribution to the theory of economic growth", *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 70, pp. 65-94.
- Stern, S., Porter, M. and Furman, J. (2000) "The determinants of national innovative capacity", *NBER Working Paper* 7876, National Bureau of Economic Research.

- Tavares, C. (2003), “Economic reform in Portugal and the Lisbon Strategy”, communication presented at the *World Economic Forum*, Davos, January 2003.
- Teixeira, A. A. C. (2004), “Measuring aggregate human capital in Portugal. An update up to 2001”, *FEP Working Papers* n° 152, Faculdade de Economia da Universidade do porto.
- Teixeira, A. A. C. and Fortuna, N. (2003), “Human capital, innovation capability and economic growth in Portugal, 1960 – 2001”, *FEP Working Papers* n° 131, Faculdade de Economia da Universidade do Porto.
- Uzawa, H. (1965), “Optimum Technical Change in an Aggregative Model of Economic Growth”, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 70, pp. 18-31.
- Verspagen, B. (1993), *Uneven growth between interdependent economies: A evolutionary view on technology gaps, trade and growth*, Aldershot: Avebury.
- Young, A. (1998), “Growth without scale effects”, *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 106, pp. 41-63.

Table A1: Raw data used in the estimation of the Portuguese stock of technological knowledge

YEAR	Y	I	PY	PW
1960	295614	62438	0,298	0,114
1961	302511	72010	0,305	0,125
1962	336688	75739	0,304	0,132
1963	346517	69181	0,312	0,143
1964	361599	81112	0,315	0,155
1965	390061	91374	0,327	0,170
1966	411073	104403	0,345	0,185
1967	422593	102759	0,357	0,212
1968	470979	117840	0,362	0,228
1969	468014	124578	0,384	0,250
1970	514242	127339	0,397	0,285
1971	562445	154761	0,417	0,320
1972	603356	185375	0,450	0,366
1973	618259	191371	0,492	0,426
1974	603066	192072	0,585	0,561
1975	566466	161568	0,680	0,746
1976	607875	157794	0,791	0,882
1977	595757	177997	1,000	1,000
1978	630206	180207	1,217	1,135
1979	661572	206720	1,446	1,301
1980	681982	204154	1,745	1,601
1981	732441	245748	2,059	1,963
1982	728669	247866	2,487	2,360
1983	698714	226127	3,099	2,834
1984	702200	198866	3,862	3,101
1985	728904	198920	4,692	3,725
1986	755184	203461	5,652	4,473
1987	863563	248477	6,292	5,110
1988	892900	279132	7,018	5,910
1989	952261	282012	7,952	6,959
1990	993633	292810	9,106	8,214
1991	1007531	291141	10,334	9,664
1992	1101349	320684	10,815	11,023
1993	1130039	286536	11,411	11,508
1994	1131214	280019	12,183	11,913
1995	1176867	287678	12,799	14,094
1996	1314033	302862	13,186	15,432
1997	1385913	350274	13,494	15,978
1998	1466451	391076	13,861	15,582
1999	1531863	399986	14,179	16,340
2000	1580325	419351	14,591	17,136
2001	1616067	423982	15,233	18,176

Notes:

Y: Gross Domestic Product, factor costs, 1977 constant prices, million escudos

I: Investment (FGCF), 1977 prices, million escudos

PY: GDP deflator (base year: 1977)

PW: Average earnings per worker index (base year: 1977)

Data Sources:Neves, João César das (1994), *The Portuguese Economy: a picture in figures*, Universidade Católica Editora.

Banco de Portugal, Séries Longas da Economia Portuguesa.

Banco de Portugal, Relatórios Anuais.

Table A2: Real R&D (Total and Firm) expenditures, using GDP deflator

YEAR	TR&D	FR&D	PY	TR&D _Y	FR&D _Y
1960	#N/A	#N/A	0,29792	#N/A	#N/A
1961	#N/A	#N/A	0,30472	#N/A	#N/A
1962	#N/A	#N/A	0,30414	#N/A	#N/A
1963	#N/A	#N/A	0,31161	#N/A	#N/A
1964	265,8	58,8	0,31510	843,5	186,6
1965	#N/A	#N/A	0,32713	#N/A	#N/A
1966	#N/A	#N/A	0,34510	#N/A	#N/A
1967	320,4	51,7	0,35691	897,7	144,9
1968	#N/A	#N/A	0,36190	#N/A	#N/A
1969	#N/A	#N/A	0,38397	#N/A	#N/A
1970	#N/A	#N/A	0,39705	#N/A	#N/A
1971	751,2	#N/A	0,41716	1800,7	#N/A
1972	854,2	214,3	0,44961	1899,9	476,6
1973	#N/A	#N/A	0,49206	#N/A	#N/A
1974	#N/A	#N/A	0,58502	#N/A	#N/A
1975	#N/A	#N/A	0,67978	#N/A	#N/A
1976	1279,6	269,6	0,79052	1618,7	341,0
1977	#N/A	#N/A	1,00000	#N/A	#N/A
1978	2521,1	331,7	1,21672	2072,0	272,6
1979	#N/A	#N/A	1,44626	#N/A	#N/A
1980	4118,5	1179,6	1,74495	2360,2	676,0
1981	#N/A	#N/A	2,05945	#N/A	#N/A
1982	6541,2	2043,6	2,48686	2630,3	821,8
1983	#N/A	#N/A	3,09950	#N/A	#N/A
1984	11307,6	3347,7	3,86185	2928,0	866,9
1985	#N/A	#N/A	4,69220	#N/A	#N/A
1986	19867,6	5215,7	5,65181	3515,3	922,8
1987	#N/A	#N/A	6,29232	#N/A	#N/A
1988	29910,8	7351	7,01767	4262,2	1047,5
1989	#N/A	#N/A	7,95206	#N/A	#N/A
1990	52032,2	13585,6	9,10568	5714,3	1492,0
1991	#N/A	#N/A	10,33365	#N/A	#N/A
1992	80397,8	17452,2	10,81482	7434,0	1613,7
1993	#N/A	#N/A	11,41124	#N/A	#N/A
1994	#N/A	#N/A	12,18295	#N/A	#N/A
1995	92.229,2	19.291,9	12,79895	7206,0	1507,3
1996	#N/A	#N/A	13,18612	#N/A	#N/A
1997	115.654,6	25.975,6	13,49435	8570,6	1924,9
1998	#N/A	#N/A	13,86067	#N/A	#N/A
1999	163.342,1	37.048,5	14,17947	11519,6	2612,8
2000	#N/A	#N/A	14,59067	#N/A	#N/A
2001	203.131,7	65.920,0	15,23266	13335,3	4327,5

Notes:

TR&D: Total Research and Development expenditure, current prices (million escudos)

FR&D: Firm Research and Development expenditures, current prices (million escudos)

PY: GDP deflator (base year: 1977)

TR&D_Y: Total Research and Development expenditure, constant prices (million escudos)FR&D_Y: Firm Research and Development expenditures, constant prices (million escudos)**Data Sources:**1964-72: JNICT (1986), *Indicadores de Ciência e Tecnologia Portugal 1964-1982*.1976-90: INE, *Anuário Estatístico do INE*.1991-2001: INE, *Anuário Estatístico do INE*.PY: Neves, J. C. (1994), *The Portuguese Economy: picture in figures*, Universidade Católica Editora.

Table A3: Decomposition of R&D expenditures – share of labour costs

Anos	Current expenditures	Labour Expenditures	Other current expenditures	Capital expenditures
1964	87,25	57,45	29,80	12,75
1967	85,40	57,15	28,25	14,61
1972	86,52	60,96	25,56	13,49
1976	89,59	69,90	19,69	10,41
1980	76,75	57,13	19,62	23,26
1982	82,11	62,72	19,39	17,90
1986	75,04	54,07	20,97	24,96
1988	78,64	59,10	19,54	21,37
1990	79,85	60,29	19,56	20,15
1992	73,55	57,24	16,31	16,45
1999	83,53	62,60	20,93	16,47
2001	81,28	61,73	19,55	18,72
Average		60,03		

Data Sources:

1964-72: JNICT (1986), *Indicadores de Ciência e Tecnologia Portugal 1964-1982*.

1976-90: INE, *Anuário Estatístico do INE*.

1991-2001: INE, *Anuário Estatístico do INE*.

Table A4: GDP, Wages and R&D deflators

YEAR	P _Y	P _W	P _{R&D}
1960	0,29792	0,11433	0,18771
1961	0,30472	0,12455	0,19656
1962	0,30414	0,13177	0,20067
1963	0,31161	0,14296	0,21037
1964	0,31510	0,15453	0,21871
1965	0,32713	0,16974	0,23265
1966	0,34510	0,18466	0,24879
1967	0,35691	0,21161	0,26969
1968	0,36190	0,22833	0,28172
1969	0,38397	0,24991	0,30349
1970	0,39705	0,28477	0,32965
1971	0,41716	0,31961	0,35860
1972	0,44961	0,36567	0,39922
1973	0,49206	0,42551	0,45211
1974	0,58502	0,56085	0,57051
1975	0,67978	0,74566	0,71933
1976	0,79052	0,88196	0,84541
1977	1,00000	1,00000	1,00000
1978	1,21672	1,13454	1,16739
1979	1,44626	1,30051	1,35876
1980	1,74495	1,60124	1,65868
1981	2,05945	1,96276	2,00140
1982	2,48686	2,36016	2,41080
1983	3,09950	2,83414	2,94020
1984	3,86185	3,10099	3,40510
1985	4,69220	3,72516	4,11169
1986	5,65181	4,47293	4,94413
1987	6,29232	5,11028	5,58274
1988	7,01767	5,91011	6,35280
1989	7,95206	6,95933	7,35612
1990	9,10568	8,21412	8,57048
1991	10,33365	9,66372	9,93149
1992	10,81482	11,02263	10,93957
1993	11,41124	11,50817	11,46943
1994	12,18295	11,91343	12,02116
1995	12,79895	14,09407	13,57641
1996	13,18612	15,43175	14,53417
1997	13,49435	15,97825	14,98543
1998	13,86067	15,58160	14,89375
1999	14,17947	16,34012	15,47651
2000	14,59067	17,13581	16,11852
2001	15,23266	18,17554	16,99927

Notes:

P_Y: GDP deflator (base year: 1977)

P_W: Average earnings per worker index (base year: 1977)

P_{R&D}: R&D deflator [$P_{R\&D} = 0.3997 \cdot P_Y + 0.6003 \cdot P_W$]

The construction of P_{R&D} was based on Coe and Helpman's (1993) study. However, differently from Coe and Helpman we considered the effective composition of R&D expenditures (from Table A3 we concluded that, on average, labour costs represented 60,03% of total costs).

Data Sources:

Idem Table A1

Table A5: Total and firm real R&D expenditures using R&D deflator

YEAR	TR&D	FR&D	P _{R&D}	TR&D(P _{R&D})	FR&D(P _{R&D})
1960	#N/A	#N/A	0,1877	#N/A	#N/A
1961	#N/A	#N/A	0,1966	#N/A	#N/A
1962	#N/A	#N/A	0,2007	#N/A	#N/A
1963	#N/A	#N/A	0,2104	#N/A	#N/A
1964	265,8	58,8	0,2187	1215,3	268,8
1965	#N/A	#N/A	0,2327	#N/A	#N/A
1966	#N/A	#N/A	0,2488	#N/A	#N/A
1967	320,4	51,7	0,2697	1188,0	191,7
1968	#N/A	#N/A	0,2817	#N/A	#N/A
1969	#N/A	#N/A	0,3035	#N/A	#N/A
1970	#N/A	#N/A	0,3296	#N/A	#N/A
1971	751,2	#N/A	0,3586	2094,8	#N/A
1972	854,2	214,3	0,3992	2139,7	536,8
1973	#N/A	#N/A	0,4521	#N/A	#N/A
1974	#N/A	#N/A	0,5705	#N/A	#N/A
1975	#N/A	#N/A	0,7193	#N/A	#N/A
1976	1279,6	269,6	0,8454	1513,6	318,9
1977	#N/A	#N/A	1,0000	#N/A	#N/A
1978	2521,1	331,7	1,1674	2159,6	284,1
1979	#N/A	#N/A	1,3588	#N/A	#N/A
1980	4118,5	1179,6	1,6587	2483,0	711,2
1981	#N/A	#N/A	2,0014	#N/A	#N/A
1982	6541,2	2043,6	2,4108	2713,3	847,7
1983	#N/A	#N/A	2,9402	#N/A	#N/A
1984	11307,6	3347,7	3,4051	3320,8	983,1
1985	#N/A	#N/A	4,1117	#N/A	#N/A
1986	19867,6	5215,7	4,9441	4018,4	1054,9
1987	#N/A	#N/A	5,5827	#N/A	#N/A
1988	29910,8	7351	6,3528	4708,3	1157,1
1989	#N/A	#N/A	7,3561	#N/A	#N/A
1990	52032,2	13585,6	8,5705	6071,1	1585,2
1991	#N/A	#N/A	9,9315	#N/A	#N/A
1992	80397,8	17452,2	10,9396	7349,3	1595,3
1993	#N/A	#N/A	11,4694	#N/A	#N/A
1994	#N/A	#N/A	12,0212	#N/A	#N/A
1995	92.229,2	19.291,9	13,5764	6793,3	1421,0
1996	#N/A	#N/A	14,5342	#N/A	#N/A
1997	115.654,6	25.975,6	14,9854	7717,8	1733,4
1998	#N/A	#N/A	14,8937	#N/A	#N/A
1999	163.342,1	37.048,5	15,4765	10554,2	2393,9
2000	#N/A	#N/A	16,1185	#N/A	#N/A
2001	203.131,7	65.920,0	16,9993	11949,4	3877,8

Notes:

TR&D: Total Research and Development expenditure, current prices (million escudos)

FR&D: Firm Research and Development expenditures, current prices (million escudos)

IDT(P_{R&D}): Total Research and Development expenditure, constant 1977 prices (million escudos)IDE(P_{R&D}): Firm Research and Development expenditures, constant 1977 prices (million escudos)**Data sources:**

Idem Tables A1 and A4.1

Table A6: Estimating by OLS missing values of total and firm R&D stock

Anos	y	tr&d est	rtr&d est	rtr&d est/ef	fr&d est	rfr&d est	rfr&d est/ef
1960	12,5968	6,5309	686,0	686,0	4,9001	134,3	134,3
1961	12,6199	6,5694	712,9	712,9	4,9427	140,1	140,1
1962	12,7269	6,7480	852,4	852,4	5,1401	170,7	170,7
1963	12,7557	6,7961	894,3	894,3	5,1931	180,0	180,0
1964	12,7983	6,8672	960,2	1215,3	5,2717	194,7	268,8
1965	12,8741	6,9936	1089,6	1089,6	5,4114	224,0	224,0
1966	12,9265	7,0812	1189,4	1189,4	5,5082	246,7	246,7
1967	12,9542	7,1273	1245,5	1188,0	5,5592	259,6	191,7
1968	13,0626	7,3082	1492,5	1492,5	5,7591	317,1	317,1
1969	13,0563	7,2977	1476,8	1476,8	5,7474	313,4	313,4
1970	13,1504	7,4549	1728,2	1728,2	5,9212	372,8	372,8
1971	13,2400	7,6044	2007,0	2094,8	6,0864	439,8	439,8
1972	13,3103	7,7216	2256,5	2139,7	6,2159	500,6	536,8
1973	13,3347	7,7623	2350,3	2350,3	6,2609	523,7	523,7
1974	13,3098	7,7208	2254,7	2254,7	6,2150	500,2	500,2
1975	13,2472	7,6163	2031,0	2031,0	6,0995	445,7	445,7
1976	13,3177	7,7340	2284,8	1513,6	6,2297	507,6	318,9
1977	13,2976	7,7004	2209,3	2209,3	6,1925	489,1	489,1
1978	13,3538	7,7942	2426,6	2159,6	6,2962	542,5	284,1
1979	13,4024	7,8753	2631,4	2631,4	6,3858	593,3	593,3
1980	13,4328	7,9260	2768,3	2483,0	6,4418	627,5	711,2
1981	13,5041	8,0451	3118,5	3118,5	6,5735	715,8	715,8
1982	13,4990	8,0365	3091,8	2713,3	6,5639	709,1	847,7
1983	13,4570	7,9664	2882,6	2882,6	6,4865	656,2	656,2
1984	13,4620	7,9747	2906,6	3320,8	6,4957	662,3	983,1
1985	13,4993	8,0370	3093,4	3093,4	6,5645	709,5	709,5
1986	13,5347	8,0961	3281,8	4018,4	6,6298	757,4	1054,9
1987	13,6688	8,3199	4104,9	4104,9	6,8772	969,9	969,9
1988	13,7022	8,3757	4340,3	4708,3	6,9388	1031,5	1157,1
1989	13,7666	8,4831	4832,5	4832,5	7,0575	1161,5	1161,5
1990	13,8091	8,5541	5187,9	6071,1	7,1359	1256,3	1585,2
1991	13,8230	8,5773	5309,6	5309,6	7,1615	1288,9	1288,9
1992	13,9120	8,7258	6160,1	7349,3	7,3257	1518,9	1595,3
1993	13,9378	8,7688	6430,2	6430,2	7,3732	1592,6	1592,6
1994	13,9388	8,7705	6441,4	6441,4	7,3751	1595,7	1595,7
1995	13,9784	8,8365	6881,1	6793,3	7,4480	1716,5	1421,0
1996	14,0886	9,0205	8271,0	8271,0	7,6514	2103,5	2103,5
1997	14,1419	9,1094	9039,8	7717,8	7,7496	2320,6	1733,4
1998	14,1984	9,2037	9933,4	9933,4	7,8537	2575,4	2575,4
1999	14,2420	9,2765	10683,8	10554,2	7,9342	2791,2	2393,9
2000	14,2731	9,3285	11253,8	11253,8	7,9917	2956,2	2956,2
2001	14,2955	9,3658	11681,8	11949,4	8,0329	3080,7	3877,8

Notes:

Small letters indicates the natural logarithm of the variables (TR&D, FR&D and GDP). In order to obtain the missing values for real expenditures in R&D, we follow Coe and Helpman's (1993) suggestion estimating an equation relating real R&D expenditures with real GDP and investment (all in logs). However, given that investment was not statistically significant, we opt to estimate R&D expenditures using only real GDP as independent variable.

rtr&d est (*trd_t*) was estimated by OLS as follows:

$$trd_t = -14,570 + 1,674y_t + \hat{\epsilon}_t; \quad \bar{R}^2 = 0,95$$

(-10,397) (16,269)

rfr&d est (*frd_t*) was estimated by OLS as follows:

$$frd_t = -18,331 + 1,844y_t + \hat{\epsilon}_t; \quad \bar{R}^2 = 0,872$$

(-7,121) (9,754)

Table A7: Estimation of the stock of technological knowledge based on total R&D expenditures for several knowledge obsolescence rates

YEAR	RTR&D	RTR&D est	$\delta=0$	$\delta=0.05$	$\delta=0.1$	$\delta=0.15$
1960	#N/A	686,0	16612,0	9726,2	7111,1	5784,5
1961	#N/A	712,9	17324,9	9952,8	7112,9	5629,8
1962	#N/A	852,4	18177,3	10307,6	7254,0	5637,7
1963	#N/A	894,3	19071,6	10686,5	7422,9	5686,4
1964	1215,3	1215,3	20286,9	11367,5	7895,9	6048,7
1965	#N/A	1089,6	21376,6	11888,8	8196,0	6231,0
1966	#N/A	1189,4	22565,9	12483,7	8565,8	6485,7
1967	1188,0	1188,0	23754,0	13047,6	8897,2	6700,9
1968	#N/A	1492,5	25246,5	13887,7	9500,0	7188,3
1969	#N/A	1476,8	26723,3	14670,1	10026,8	7586,9
1970	#N/A	1728,2	28451,5	15664,9	10752,4	8177,1
1971	2094,8	2094,8	30546,4	16976,4	11772,0	9045,3
1972	2139,7	2139,7	32686,0	18267,3	12734,4	9828,2
1973	#N/A	2350,3	35036,3	19704,2	13811,3	10704,2
1974	#N/A	2254,7	37291,0	20973,6	14684,8	11353,3
1975	#N/A	2031,0	39321,9	21955,9	15247,3	11681,3
1976	1513,6	1513,6	40835,5	22371,7	15236,2	11442,7
1977	#N/A	2209,3	43044,8	23462,4	15921,8	11935,5
1978	2159,6	2159,6	45204,4	24448,9	16489,2	12304,8
1979	#N/A	2631,4	47835,8	25857,9	17471,8	13090,5
1980	2483,0	2483,0	50318,8	27048,0	18207,6	13609,9
1981	#N/A	3118,5	53437,4	28814,1	19505,3	14687,0
1982	2713,3	2713,3	56150,7	30086,7	20268,1	15197,2
1983	#N/A	2882,6	59033,2	31464,9	21123,9	15800,2
1984	3320,8	3320,8	62354,0	33212,5	22332,3	16751,0
1985	#N/A	3093,4	65447,4	34645,3	23192,5	17331,7
1986	4018,4	4018,4	69465,9	36931,4	24891,6	18750,4
1987	#N/A	4104,9	73570,8	39189,8	26507,4	20042,8
1988	4708,3	4708,3	78279,1	41938,6	28565,0	21744,6
1989	#N/A	4832,5	83111,5	44674,1	30540,9	23315,4
1990	6071,1	6071,1	89182,6	48511,5	33557,9	25889,2
1991	#N/A	5309,6	94492,2	51395,5	35511,7	27315,4
1992	7349,3	7349,3	101841,5	56175,0	39309,8	30567,4
1993	#N/A	6430,2	108271,7	59796,5	41809,1	32412,5
1994	#N/A	6441,4	114713,1	63248,1	44069,5	33992,0
1995	6793,3	6793,3	121506,4	66879,0	46455,9	35686,5
1996	#N/A	8271,0	129777,4	71806,0	50081,3	38604,5
1997	7717,8	7717,8	137495,2	75933,5	52791,0	40531,7
1998	#N/A	9933,4	147428,6	82070,2	57445,3	44385,3
1999	10554,2	10554,2	157982,8	88520,9	62254,9	48281,7
2000	#N/A	11253,8	169236,6	95348,6	67283,2	52293,2
2001	11949,4	11949,4	181186,0	102530,6	72504,3	56398,7

Notes:

Real average annual growth rate of total R&D expenditures:

$$g = \left[\left(\frac{RTR \& D2001}{RTR \& D1964} \right)^{\frac{1}{37}} - 1 \right] = 0,06372$$

Estimated initial stock of total R&D expenditures: $\frac{RTR \& D1964}{g + \delta}$

$\delta = 0 \Rightarrow SR \& D_0 = 19071,6; \delta = 0,05 \Rightarrow SR \& D_0 = 10686,5; \delta = 0,1 \Rightarrow SR \& D_0 = 7422,9; \delta = 0,15 \Rightarrow SR \& D_0 = 5686,4$

Table A8: Estimation of the stock of technological knowledge based on firm R&D expenditures for several knowledge obsolescence rates

YEAR	RFR&D	RFR&D est	$\delta=0$	$\delta=0.05$	$\delta=0.1$	$\delta=0.15$
1960	#N/A	134,3	3103,5	1966,0	1496,4	1253,1
1961	#N/A	140,1	3243,6	2007,8	1486,9	1205,3
1962	#N/A	170,7	3414,3	2078,2	1508,9	1195,2
1963	#N/A	180,0	3594,4	2154,3	1538,1	1196,0
1964	268,8	268,8	3863,2	2315,4	1653,1	1285,4
1965	#N/A	224,0	4087,2	2423,6	1711,7	1316,6
1966	#N/A	246,7	4333,9	2549,1	1787,3	1365,8
1967	191,7	191,7	4525,6	2613,4	1800,3	1352,6
1968	#N/A	317,1	4842,7	2799,8	1937,3	1466,8
1969	#N/A	313,4	5156,0	2973,2	2057,0	1560,2
1970	#N/A	372,8	5528,9	3197,4	2224,1	1699,0
1971	#N/A	439,8	5968,7	3477,3	2441,5	1884,0
1972	536,8	536,8	6505,5	3840,3	2734,2	2138,2
1973	#N/A	523,7	7029,2	4171,9	2984,4	2341,1
1974	#N/A	500,2	7529,4	4463,5	3186,2	2490,2
1975	#N/A	445,7	7975,1	4686,0	3313,2	2562,3
1976	318,9	318,9	8294,0	4770,6	3300,8	2496,8
1977	#N/A	489,1	8783,0	5021,2	3459,8	2611,4
1978	284,1	284,1	9067,2	5054,2	3398,0	2503,8
1979	#N/A	593,3	9660,5	5394,9	3651,5	2721,6
1980	711,2	711,2	10371,7	5836,3	3997,5	3024,5
1981	#N/A	715,8	11087,5	6260,3	4313,6	3286,7
1982	847,7	847,7	11935,2	6795,0	4729,9	3641,4
1983	#N/A	656,2	12591,4	7111,5	4913,2	3751,4
1984	983,1	983,1	13574,6	7739,0	5405,0	4171,8
1985	#N/A	709,5	14284,1	8061,6	5574,0	4255,5
1986	1054,9	1054,9	15339,0	8713,4	6071,5	4672,1
1987	#N/A	969,9	16308,9	9247,6	6434,2	4941,2
1988	1157,1	1157,1	17466,0	9942,4	6947,9	5357,1
1989	#N/A	1161,5	18627,5	10606,8	7414,7	5715,1
1990	1585,2	1585,2	20212,7	11661,6	8258,3	6443,0
1991	#N/A	1288,9	21501,6	12367,4	8721,4	6765,4
1992	1595,3	1595,3	23096,9	13344,3	9444,6	7345,9
1993	#N/A	1592,6	24689,5	14269,8	10092,8	7836,7
1994	#N/A	1595,7	26285,2	15152,0	10679,2	8256,9
1995	1421,0	1421,0	27706,2	15815,4	11032,3	8439,3
1996	#N/A	2103,5	29809,7	17128,1	12032,5	9276,9
1997	1733,4	1733,4	31543,1	18005,1	12562,7	9618,8
1998	#N/A	2575,4	34118,5	19680,2	13881,8	10751,3
1999	2393,9	2393,9	36512,3	21090,0	14887,4	11532,5
2000	#N/A	2956,2	39468,5	22991,8	16354,9	12758,8
2001	3877,8	3877,8	43346,4	25720,0	18597,2	14722,8

Notes:

Real average annual growth rate of total R&D expenditures:

$$g = \left[\left(\frac{RFR \& D_{2001}}{RFR \& D_{1964}} \right)^{\frac{1}{37}} - 1 \right] = 0,0748$$

Estimated initial stock of total R&D expenditures: $\frac{RFR \& D_{1964}}{g + \delta}$

$\delta = 0 \Rightarrow SR \& D_0 = 3594,4; \delta = 0,05 \Rightarrow SR \& D_0 = 2154,3; \delta = 0,1 \Rightarrow SR \& D_0 = 1538,1; \delta = 0,15 \Rightarrow SR \& D_0 = 1196,0$

Table A9: Portuguese Stock of Technological Knowledge, 1960-2001 (Index 1995=1)

YEAR	TR&DS	FR&DS	KS _T	KS _{FIRM}
1960	9726,2	1966,0	0,1454	0,1243
1961	9952,8	2007,8	0,1488	0,1270
1962	10307,6	2078,2	0,1541	0,1314
1963	10686,5	2154,3	0,1598	0,1362
1964	11367,5	2315,4	0,1700	0,1464
1965	11888,8	2423,6	0,1778	0,1532
1966	12483,7	2549,1	0,1867	0,1612
1967	13047,6	2613,4	0,1951	0,1652
1968	13887,7	2799,8	0,2077	0,1770
1969	14670,1	2973,2	0,2194	0,1880
1970	15664,9	3197,4	0,2342	0,2022
1971	16976,4	3477,3	0,2538	0,2199
1972	18267,3	3840,3	0,2731	0,2428
1973	19704,2	4171,9	0,2946	0,2638
1974	20973,6	4463,5	0,3136	0,2822
1975	21955,9	4686,0	0,3283	0,2963
1976	22371,7	4770,6	0,3345	0,3016
1977	23462,4	5021,2	0,3508	0,3175
1978	24448,9	5054,2	0,3656	0,3196
1979	25857,9	5394,9	0,3866	0,3411
1980	27048,0	5836,3	0,4044	0,3690
1981	28814,1	6260,3	0,4308	0,3958
1982	30086,7	6795,0	0,4499	0,4296
1983	31464,9	7111,5	0,4705	0,4497
1984	33212,5	7739,0	0,4966	0,4893
1985	34645,3	8061,6	0,5180	0,5097
1986	36931,4	8713,4	0,5522	0,5509
1987	39189,8	9247,6	0,5860	0,5847
1988	41938,6	9942,4	0,6271	0,6287
1989	44674,1	10606,8	0,6680	0,6707
1990	48511,5	11661,6	0,7254	0,7374
1991	51395,5	12367,4	0,7685	0,7820
1992	56175,0	13344,3	0,8400	0,8438
1993	59796,5	14269,8	0,8941	0,9023
1994	63248,1	15152,0	0,9457	0,9581
1995	66879,0	15815,4	1,0000	1,0000
1996	71806,0	17128,1	1,0737	1,0830
1997	75933,5	18005,1	1,1354	1,1385
1998	82070,2	19680,2	1,2271	1,2444
1999	88520,9	21090,0	1,3236	1,3335
2000	95348,6	22991,8	1,4257	1,4538
2001	102530,6	25720,0	1,5331	1,6263

Notes:KS_T: Index of Total Stock of Knowledge (1995=1)KS_{FIRM}: Index of Firm Stock of Knowledge (1995=1)

Recent FEP Working papers

Nº 152	Aurora A. C. Teixeira, Measuring aggregate human capital in Portugal. An update up to 2001 , August 2004
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.

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