

Murphy, Gavin; Traistaru-Siedschlag, Iulia

Working Paper

The effect of human capital on output growth in ICT industries: Evidence from OECD countries

ESRI Working Paper, No. 184

Provided in Cooperation with:

The Economic and Social Research Institute (ESRI), Dublin

Suggested Citation: Murphy, Gavin; Traistaru-Siedschlag, Iulia (2007) : The effect of human capital on output growth in ICT industries: Evidence from OECD countries, ESRI Working Paper, No. 184, The Economic and Social Research Institute (ESRI), Dublin

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/68022>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

The Effects of Human Capital on Output Growth in ICT Industries: Evidence from OECD Countries^{*}

Gavin Murphy^a and Iulia Traistaru-Siedschlag^{a,b}

Abstract: In this paper we analyse the effects of human capital in fostering output growth in ICT manufacturing and services using data from a sample of twenty OECD countries over the period 1980-2002. We focus on within country between industry differences and control for country and industry specific effects. The results of our econometric analysis suggest that countries with a high human capital stock experienced a faster output growth in ICT producing services and ICT using services. This result is robust when controlling for both the quantity and the quality of the human capital stock as well as country and industry specific effects, the initial income per capita, investment level, labour force growth and the degree of economic openness. Furthermore, we find that the human capital stock and human capital accumulation at country level had a direct positive and significant effect on physical capital investment. Our findings indicate that in developed countries human capital is an important factor driving the output growth of ICT industries, in particular in the services sector. As far as ICT industries are concerned, the improvement in education attainment is however likely to pay off after a long period.

Key words: Human capital, ICT industries, Economic growth

JEL classification: E62, F43, O33

^{*}This paper was written as part of a research project on “Dynamic Regions in a Knowledge-Driven World Economy. Lessons and Policy Implications for the EU” (DYNREG). Financial support from the European Union’s RTD 6th Framework Programme (Contract No. CIT5-028818) is gratefully acknowledged. We thank John Fitz Gerald, Gabriel Byrne, and participants in research workshops in the ESRI and European Foundation Dublin for helpful comments and suggestions.

^a The Economic and Social Research Institute, Whitaker Square, Sir John Rogerson’s Quay, Dublin 2, Ireland. Telephone: +353-1-8632000. Fax: +353-1-8632100

^b Corresponding author: email: iulia.traistaru@esri.ie

The Effect of Human Capital on Output Growth in ICT Industries: Evidence from OECD Countries

1. Introduction

Information and communication technologies (ICT) play a central role in the transition to knowledge - based economies. In this paper we analyse the effects of human capital in fostering output growth in ICT manufacturing and services in a sample of twenty OECD countries over the period 1980-2002. We focus on within country between industry differences and control for country and industry specific effects.

The question whether human capital fosters economic growth, in particular the output growth in ICT industries is interesting and relevant for both research and policy. First, notwithstanding a well established theoretical literature showing the positive effects of human capital on economic growth, existing empirical evidence is mixed. Second, ICT is at the core of the knowledge driven economy and there is growing evidence suggesting that ICT-linked knowledge, innovation and technological changes are strong determinants of growth differentials and the ability of countries to benefit from globalization. The renewed Lisbon Strategy agreed in March 2005 put a special emphasis on the role ICT can play in boosting growth, competitiveness and cohesion in the European Union (EU). A large amount of EU expenditure over the period 2007-2013 has been allocated to ICT investment. Furthermore, the ICT strategy at the EU level outlined in the i2010 Communication of the EU Commission points to ICT investment, research and use as a main explanation for differences in economic performance among industrialised countries. Third, our research about the relationship between human capital and ICT growth is relevant for education policy in developed countries.

In comparison to existing literature, the novelty of this paper is fivefold. First, we link human capital to ICT output growth by focusing on within country, between industry differences. We employ a cross-country, cross-industry analysis and control for country and industry specific effects which is less subject to criticism about an

omitted variable bias and model specification. Second, in contrast to most of the existing studies examining the correlation between human capital and growth, we provide empirical evidence for a sectoral channel through which human capital affects growth.

Third, given the multiple observations per country, by exploiting the within country variation in the data we alleviate the limited degrees of freedom problem. Fourth, we investigate the effect of human capital on ICT growth using measures for both the quantity and quality of human capital as well as measures of the level and accumulation of human capital. Fifth, we distinguish between ICT producing and ICT using manufacturing and services.

The main message of this paper is that in developed countries, past educational attainment reflected in human capital rather than educational attainment improvement affected the ability to produce and use ICT in services rather than producing and using ICT in manufacturing. Specifically, the following key findings support this message:

- 1) in countries with a *a priori* high human capital stock the output in ICT producing services and ICT using services grew faster relative to the other industries
- 2) human capital accumulation had no significant effect on the ICT output growth
- 3) human capital stock and human capital accumulation had a positive and significant effect on physical capital investment

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we discuss briefly the related theoretical and empirical literature. Further in Section 3 we present our empirical strategy, model specifications and explain how we test and account for potential econometric issues. Section 4 analyses summary statistics of the main variables. In Section 5 we discuss our regression results. Finally, we conclude in Section 6.

2. Related Theoretical and Empirical Literature

The effects of ICT on economic growth

The analysis of the effects of ICT on economic growth has gained an increased interest. While earlier studies have found little evidence about a link between ICT and productivity growth, more recent studies point to a positive effect of ICT investment on GDP growth (Oliner and Sichel, 2000; Daveri, 2001, Roeger, 2001; van Ark, 2001; Pilat and Lee, 2001; OECD, 2001).

ICT have become a general purpose technology in developed economies (Carlsson, 2004) and they play a central role in the transition to the knowledge based economy (“the digital economy”). While early research found ICT *producing* industries to be an important factor of economic growth, more recent research found a significant contribution to economic growth from ICT *using* industries. Carlsson (2004) and Hollestein (2004) find evidence suggesting that ICT had a positive effect on economic growth via new products and services and new organisation methods.

The effects of human capital on economic growth

There is a well established theoretical literature on the effect of human capital on growth initiated by Becker (1964) and followed by the seminal papers of Nelson and Phelps (1966), Lucas (1988), Romer (1990) and Mankiw, Romer and Weil (1992).

Two approaches can be distinguished in the theoretical literature. The first strand of literature focuses on the *stock* of human capital as an explanation of cross-country growth differentials as suggested by Nelson and Phelps (1966). The second approach looks at human capital as an input factor in a production function as in Lucas (1988) and points to the *accumulation* of human capital as the main factor driving growth differentials among countries.

The theoretical literature indicates different channels through which human capital affects economic growth. Nelson and Phelps (1966) shows that high levels of human capital facilitate the adoption of new technologies. In contrast to this view, Lucas (1988) focuses on skill acquisition as an input in an aggregate production function. Romer (1990) assumes that both the stock as well as the growth of human capital generate ideas for new designs and goods which in turn drive endogenously physical capital investment and growth. Mankiw, Romer and Weil (1992) include physical capital and human capital investment rates (as ratios of GDP) as distinct arguments in an extended Solow model.

Most empirical analyses use education attainment as a proxy for human capital and investigate the relationship between the level of education or education improvement and output growth at country level. In most of the existing studies model specifications explain the growth of GDP or GDP per capita with a series of macroeconomic variables including educational attainment.

The results obtained with cross-country growth regressions are mixed. While Romer (1990), Benhabib and Spiegel (1994) found a positive effect of the schooling level on output growth, Cohen and Soto (2001) found no link. The same mixed evidence has been found in the case of the relationship between improvements in education and growth. In contrast to a significant positive correlation between improvements in education and growth found by Temple (1999), Cohen and Soto (2001), de la Fuente and Domenech (2001, 2005), no effect of schooling improvement on growth is found in other studies (Benhabib and Spiegel, 1994; Barro and Sala-i-Martin, 1995; Casseli, Esquivel and Lefort, 1996). Furthermore, Topel (1999) and Lindhal (2001) find a positive effect of the education level as well as of education improvement on economic growth.

Cross-country growth regressions have several shortcomings (unobserved heterogeneity, limited degrees of freedom, among others). Analysis at industry level across countries can correct for these limitations by exploiting the within country variation between industries. Rajan and Zingales (1998) use a cross-country cross-industry analysis to examine whether financial development fosters economic growth. They find that industries that are dependent on external finance grew faster in countries with more developed financial markets. Using a similar analysis at industry level in a large sample of countries, Ciccone and Papaioannou (2006) find that

industries that are more dependent on human capital grew relatively faster in countries that initially have more human capital.

3. Empirical Strategy, Model Specifications and Econometric Issues

In this paper we examine the relationship between the stock and accumulation of human capital at country level and the output growth in ICT industries. We estimate the effect of human capital at country level on the output growth in ICT industries building on the methodology used by Rajan and Zingales (1998) and Ciccone and Papaioannou (2006).

We test the following three hypotheses derived from the theoretical and empirical literature discussed above:

- 1) ICT industries grew faster in countries with an initial high stock of human capital
- 2) ICT industries grew faster in countries with greater improvement in human capital
- 3) ICT industries grew faster in countries with an initial high stock of human capital and greater improvement in human capital

Our basic model specification is as follows:

$$\Delta Y_{i,k,T} = \alpha + \beta_1(HC_{i,t_0} * ICT_{pm}) + \beta_2(HC_{i,t_0} * ICT_{ps}) + \beta_3(HC_{i,t_0} * ICT_{um}) + \beta_4(HC_{i,t_0} * ICT_{us}) + \lambda_i + \mu_k + \sum_j \delta_j Othe_j + \varepsilon_{i,k} \quad (1)$$

The dependent variable ($\Delta Y_{i,k,T}$) is a measure of industry output growth, specifically, the average annual growth rate of the real gross value added at industry (k) level within country (i) over the analysed period (T). The main explanatory variables are four interacted variables capturing the effect of human capital on the output growth of ICT industries. For human capital, we use both stock (HC) and accumulation measures (ΔHC). For the stock of human capital we use both human capital quantity (HC) and quality measures (HQ). We use the following dummy variables to distinguish between four categories of ICT industries following the taxonomy¹ proposed by Robinson et al (2003):

¹ Details about the ICT taxonomy are given in Appendix A1.

- ICT_{pm} : 1 if industry is ICT producing manufacturing and 0 otherwise
- ICT_{ps} : 1 if industry is ICT producing services and 0 otherwise
- ICT_{um} : 1 if industry is ICT using manufacturing and 0 otherwise
- ICT_{us} : 1 if industry is ICT using services and 0 otherwise

Our sample includes 20 countries² and 54 industries³. The data set covers the period 1980 until 2002 resulting in a number of 1080 observations. Details about data sources are given in Appendix A2 and summary statistics of the main variables are shown in Tables 1-4.

The quantity of the stock of human capital, HC is measured as average years of schooling at a point in time taken from Cohen and Soto (2001). The respective regressions include the natural logarithm of the average years of schooling at country level in 1980 (hc_i).

The quality of the stock of human capital (HQ) is measured on the basis of scores in international science tests taken from Hanushek and Kimko (2000). The respective regressions include the natural logarithm of the international test scores at country level (hq_i).

The human capital improvement (ΔHC) is measured by the growth in the average years of schooling or educational attainment over the analysed period (dhc_i).

We control for country specific (λ_i) and industry specific (μ_k) growth effects. Country specific growth effects include unobserved factors affecting economic growth at country level such as economic policy, social norms, and political stability. Industry specific growth effects include unobserved industry characteristics such as price changes and technological innovation at industry level.

Other control variables include:

² Australia Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Spain, Finland, France, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Germany, United Kingdom, United States and South Korea.

³ See Appendix A1

- the share of each industry in total real gross value added at country level in the initial year ($share_{i_0}$)
- gross domestic product per working age population at country level in the initial year (gdp_{i_0})
- the ratio of investment to GDP at country level, average over the analysed period ($inv_{i,T}$)
- labour force growth at country level over the analysed period ($dlf_{i,T}$)
- the ratio of trade to GDP (openness measure) at country level over the analysed period ($op_{i,T}$)

$\varepsilon_{i,k}$ is the error term.

If in equation (1) $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4 > 0$, ICT output growth was relatively faster in countries with an initial high human capital stock (HC, HQ) or alternatively a high human capital accumulation if human capital growth (ΔHC) is used in the regression.

The regression results (models 1-6) are reported in Table 5.

To account for both the quantity and the quality of the human capital we include in our regressions an interaction variable obtained by interacting the measure for human capital quantity (average years of schooling) and the measure for human capital quality (international scores in science and maths), $hc_i * hq_i$. The regression results are shown in Table 6 (model 1).

To account for the combined effect of human capital stock and human capital growth we include in the regression models interactions between the quantity measure of the human capital stock and human capital growth, $hc_i * dhc_i$, and between the quality measure of the human capital stock and human capital growth, $hq_i * dhc_i$ (model 8).

The regression results are shown in Table 6 (models 2 and 3).

Endogeneity

It can be argued that the growth (accumulation) of human capital could be endogenous as countries with a high income level or fast growing economies are able to allocate a higher proportion of their resources to education (Gemmel, 1996). We tested for endogeneity using a Durbin-Wu-Hausman (DWH) test. As instruments for human capital growth we used the initial human capital stock, lagged human capital growth as well as country and industry specific effects, and the GDP per working population at country level in 1980.

The system of simultaneous equations to be estimated is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta Y_{i,k,T} &= \alpha_2 + \gamma_1(\Delta HC_{i,T} * ICT_{pm}) + \gamma_2(\Delta HC_{i,T} * ICT_{ps}) + \gamma_3(\Delta HC_{i,T} * ICT_{um}) + \gamma_4(\Delta HC_{i,T} * ICT_{us}) + \\ &+ \lambda_i + \mu_k + \sum_j \delta_j Other + \xi_{i,k} \\ \Delta HC_{i,T} * ICT_{pm} &= \phi_1 + \eta_1(HC_{i,t_0} * ICT_{pm}) + \eta_2(\Delta HC_{i,T-1} * ICT_{pm}) + \pi_i + \omega_k + gdp_i * ICT_{pm} + \psi_{1,i,k} \\ \Delta HC_{i,T} * ICT_{ps} &= \phi_2 + \eta_3(HC_{i,t_0} * ICT_{ps}) + \eta_4(\Delta HC_{i,T-1} * ICT_{ps}) + \pi_i + \omega_k + gdp_i * ICT_{ps} + \psi_{2,i,k} \\ \Delta HC_{i,T} * ICT_{um} &= \phi_3 + \eta_1(HC_{i,t_0} * ICT_{um}) + \eta_2(\Delta HC_{i,T-1} * ICT_{um}) + \pi_i + \omega_k + gdp_i * ICT_{um} + \psi_{3,i,k} \\ \Delta HC_{i,T} * ICT_{us} &= \phi_4 + \eta_1(HC_{i,t_0} * ICT_{us}) + \eta_2(\Delta HC_{i,T-1} * ICT_{us}) + \pi_i + \omega_k + gdp_i * ICT_{us} + \psi_{4,i,k} \end{aligned}$$

In the first stage regressions, we regress each endogenous variable on instrumental variables. We then perform an augmented regression including in the original model the residuals obtained from the first stage regressions. If the coefficients of the residuals are jointly significantly different from zero, the OLS estimates are not consistent. To obtain consistent estimates we would then need to perform an IV regression.

The results of the DWH test are reported in Table 7. The test rejects the endogeneity hypothesis which implies that our OLS estimates are consistent.

Simultaneity

Romer (1990) argues that both the stock and the growth of human capital generate ideas for new designs and goods which in turn drive physical capital investment and economic growth. To account for these potential simultaneous effects of human capital on physical investment and ICT output growth we estimate the following system of equations using a 3SLS estimator:

Primary equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta Y_{i,k,T} = & \rho + \beta_1(HC_{i,t_0} * ICT_{pm}) + \beta_2(HC_{i,t_0} * ICT_{ps}) + \beta_3(HC_{i,t_0} * ICT_{um}) + \beta_4(HC_{i,t_0} * ICT_{us}) + \\ & + \beta_5(\Delta HC_{i,T} * ICT_{pm}) + \beta_6(\Delta HC_{i,T} * ICT_{ps}) + \beta_7(\Delta HC_{i,T} * ICT_{um}) + \beta_8(\Delta HC_{i,T} * ICT_{us}) + \\ & + \beta_9(INV_{i,T} * ICT_{pm}) + \beta_{10}(INV_{i,T} * ICT_{ps}) + \beta_{11}(INV_{i,T} * ICT_{um}) + \beta_{12}(INV_{i,T} * ICT_{us}) + \lambda_i + \mu_k + \\ & + \sum_j \delta_j Other + \varepsilon_{i,k} \end{aligned}$$

Structural equations:

$$\begin{aligned} INV_{i,T} * ICT_{pm} = & \rho_1 + \sigma_1(HC_{i,t_0} * ICT_{pm}) + \sigma_2(\Delta HC_{i,T-1} * ICT_{pm}) + \lambda_i + \mu_k + \omega_{1i,k} \\ INV_{i,T} * ICT_{ps} = & \rho_2 + \sigma_1(HC_{i,t_0} * ICT_{ps}) + \sigma_2(\Delta HC_{i,T-1} * ICT_{ps}) + \lambda_i + \mu_k + \omega_{2i,k} \\ INV_{i,T} * ICT_{um} = & \rho_3 + \sigma_1(HC_{i,t_0} * ICT_{um}) + \sigma_2(\Delta HC_{i,T-1} * ICT_{um}) + \lambda_i + \mu_k + \omega_{3i,k} \\ INV_{i,T} * ICT_{us} = & \rho_4 + \sigma_1(HC_{i,t_0} * ICT_{us}) + \sigma_2(\Delta HC_{i,T-1} * ICT_{us}) + \lambda_i + \mu_k + \omega_{4i,k} \end{aligned}$$

$INV_{i,T}$ denotes the average over the analysed period (T) of the physical capital investment to GDP ratio at country level.

The 3SLS estimates are reported in Table 8.

Heterogeneity of slopes

The model specifications discussed above assume a homogeneous impact of human capital on ICT output growth across countries. However, the effects of human capital may vary across different groups of countries. To test the homogeneity of slopes across different groups of countries, we include in model specifications an interacted variable obtained by interacting a dummy variable with the human capital variables. We then test the null hypothesis that the coefficient of this variable is equal to zero.

We consider the following groups of countries: a) countries with human capital stock below and above the sample average; b) countries with a human capital improvement below and above the sample average; c) countries with a human capital quality below and above the sample average.

We use the following dummy variables to distinguish between countries below and above the sample average with respect to the human capital measures:

- ed: 1 if country is below average human capital stock and 0 otherwise;
- edg: 1 if country is below average human capital growth and 0 otherwise;

- edq: 1 if country is below average human capital quality and 0 otherwise.

The OLS estimates are presented in Table 9.

4. Descriptive Analysis

Table 1 shows summary statistics of the main variables included in our model specifications. The average annual output growth across all countries was 3.80 per cent over the analysed period. Average output growth across ICT industries was 5.84 per cent compared to 2.02 per cent for non-ICT industries. Inspection of the four ICT industry classifications which combine to make up the ICT industry grouping shows ICT producing industries have recorded the strongest performance with an average annual output growth rate of 14.03 per cent for ICT producing manufacturing and 7.44 per cent for ICT producing services. ICT using manufacturing and services industries have grown notably slower with average growth rates of 1.76 per cent and 3.88 per cent respectively. Table 2 provides a summary of average output growth rates over the full period by countries and industry groupings. In terms of average output growth, Korea and Ireland have outperformed all other countries across all ICT producing and using defined industry groupings.

The above GVA growth summary statistics give some indication to the increasing importance of the ICT industry sectors to a country's economic development. It suggests the emphasis the Lisbon Agenda places on capturing, promoting and sustaining the dynamism associated with the ICT industry sectors is warranted.

Human capital measured in terms of average years of schooling is unsurprisingly high (10.03 years) for the sample in 1980 given that the countries are relatively well developed. Portugal and Spain had the lowest educational attainment levels whilst Germany and Australia recorded the highest levels (see Table 3).

Those countries with the lowest levels of educational attainment tended to experience the highest rates of human capital accumulation over the full period (correlation between the two series is -0.85).

The average country level investment ratio is 23.1 per cent. Table 4 presents a cross-country summary of the investment ratio. Japan and Korea emerge as the countries

with the highest investment ratios, in excess of 30 per cent. The average annual labour force growth was 1.04 per cent for the full period of investigation.

5. Estimation Results

Table 5 shows the effects of human capital on ICT output growth in regressions controlling for country specific effects and the initial share of industry in the total real gross value added at country level (models 1-3). The F test for the joint significance of the country specific effects allows us to reject the hypothesis that they are jointly equal to 0. The OLS estimates suggests that in countries with an initial high human capital stock measured by the average years of schooling the ICT producing manufacturing, ICT producing and ICT using services grew significantly faster than the rest of industries (model 1). Similar results are obtained when the human capital quality measure is used (model 2). The estimation of the effect of human capital improvement leads to similar results (model 3).

Given omitted variables, the above estimates are likely to be upward biased. Models 4 - 6 shown in Table 5 include as additional control variables the GDP per working age population, the ratio of investment to GDP over the analysed period, labour force growth, the degree of openness and industry specific growth effects. The explanatory power of the regression is higher compared with the previous three models. The country and industry effects are jointly significantly different from zero. The estimated effect of human capital stock quantity suggests that in countries with a high level of human capital stock, ICT producing and ICT using services grew relatively faster. We find no significant effects of the quality of human capital on the ICT output growth. The coefficient for the interaction between human capital improvement and the dummy for ICT using services is negative and significant at 10 % level indicating that in countries with a low human capital improvement (i.e. countries with an *a priori* high human capital stock), ICT using services grew faster relative to the other industries. We find no significant effect of human capital improvement at country level on the other ICT industries.

The estimated effects of combinations of human capital measures on ICT output growth are shown in Table 6. The results are in line with the results of the previous three models. Model 1 estimates the combined effect of the quantity and quality

human capital on the ICT output growth. The estimates suggests that in countries with a high level and high quality of human capital stock, ICT producing and ICT using services grew relatively faster. ICT using services grew faster in countries with high human capital stock and low human capital improvement (model 2). Similar results in the case of ICT using services are obtained for human capital quality interacted with human capital improvement (model 3).

As discussed above, in the previous regressions, human capital accumulation may be correlated with the error term as countries with a high income level were able to allocate a larger share of their resources to education. The results of the Durbin-Wu-Hausman test for the endogeneity of human capital accumulation are shown in Table 7. The estimates of the augmented regression show that the coefficients for the residuals from the first stage regressions are not jointly significantly different from zero implying that the OLS estimates shown in Tables 5 and 6 are consistent.

Table 8 shows the 3SLS estimates of the simultaneous effects of human capital measures on physical capital investment and ICT output growth following Romer (1990). We find that human capital stock as well as the human capital accumulation in the previous period had a positive and significant effect on the physical investment. However, in contrast to the expected results, physical investment does not appear to have a significant and positive effect on the ICT output growth.

Finally, Table 9 shows the results of the regressions testing the homogeneity of slopes across different groups of countries. The values of the corresponding F tests indicate that the difference between the slopes of the compared groups are not significantly different from zero with one exception, in the case of the quality of human capital stock interacted with ICT producing services. The significant and negative coefficient in this case indicates that output growth in the ICT producing services grew significantly slower in countries with a quality of human capital stock below the sample average.

6. Summary and Conclusions

In this paper we investigated the effects of human capital on the output growth in ICT industries using data from a sample of twenty OECD countries and 54 industries over the period 1980-2002. We focus on within-country, between industry differences and control for country and industry specific effects. We distinguished between ICT producing and ICT using manufacturing and services. Furthermore, we use both quantitative and qualitative measures for the human capital stock as well as measures of human capital accumulation.

We test for endogeneity and account for simultaneity effects of human capital variables in the model specifications. The results of our econometric analysis suggests that in the OECD countries, past educational attainment reflected in the human capital stock affected the ability of countries to produce and use ICT in services. On average, other things equal, in countries with an *ex-ante* high level and high quality of human capital stock, ICT producing and ICT using services grew relatively faster in comparison with the other industries. Human capital improvement over the analysed period had no significant effect on ICT output growth. Furthermore, we find that human capital stock and human capital improvement achieved in a period previous to the analysed period had a positive and significant effect on physical capital investment.

Our results suggest that in developed countries human capital is an important factor driving the ICT output growth in particular in the services sector. As far as ICT industries are concerned, the improvement in education attainment is however likely to pay off after a long period.

References

- Barro, R.J. and X. Sala-I-Martin (1995), *Economic Growth*, McGraw-Hill. Barro R. J. and Sala-i-Martin X. (1992), *Convergence*, *The Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 100, issue 2, pp. 223 – 251
- Becker, G. 1964. *Human Capital*. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Benhabid, J. and M. Spiegel (1994), “The role of human capital in economic development: Evidence from aggregate cross-country data”, *Journal of Monetary Economics* 43, pp. 143-174.
- Carlson, B. (2004), “The digital economy: what is new and what is not?” *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* vol. 15.
- Caselli, F., G. Esquivel, and F. Lefort (1996). “Reopening the Convergence Debate: A New Look at Cross-country Growth Empirics.” *Journal of Economic Growth*, 1(3), 363–389
- Ciccone, A. and Papaioannou E., “Human Capital, the Structure of Production and Growth”, ECB Working Paper Series No 623, May 2006.
- Cohen, D. and M. Soto (2001). “Growth and Human Capital: Good Data, Good Results.” CEPR Discussion Paper no. 3025
- Daveri, F. (2000). “Is Growth an Information Technology Story in Europe Too?” Mimeograph. Parma: University of Parma and IGIER.
- de la Fuente, A. and R. Doménech (2000). “Human Capital in Growth Regressions: How Much Difference Does Data Quality Make?” Economics Department Working Paper no. 262, OECD, Paris.
- de la Fuente, A., and R. Doménech (2006). “Human Capital in Growth Regressions: How Much Difference Does Data Quality Make?” *Journal of the European Economic Association*, Vol. 4, No. 1, Pages 1-36.
- Gemmell, N (1996), “Evaluating the impacts of human capital stocks and accumulation on economic growth: Some New Evidence”. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 58,1
- Hanushek, E.A. and D. Kimko (2000). “Schooling, Labour Force Quality and Economic Growth.” *American Economic Review* 90(5), 1184-1208

- Hollenstein, H., (2004), Determinants of the adoption of information and ICT. An empirical analysis based on firm-level data for the Swiss business sector, *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* vol.15, 315-342.
- Lucas R. E. (1988), On the mechanics of economic development, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, vol. 22, n. 1, pp. 3-42.
- Mankiw, G., D. Romer, and D. Weil (1992). "A Contribution to the Empirics of Economic Growth." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 107, 407–437.
- Nelson, R. and E Phelps (1966), " Investment in humans, technological diffusion and economic growth", *American Economic Review*, 56, pp 69-75.
- Oliner, S.D. and D.E. Sichel, (2000), 'The Resurgence of Growth in the Late 1990s: Is Information Technology the Story?', *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 14 (4), pp. 3-22.
- OECD (2001), *OECD Economic Outlook*, No. 69, June 2001, Paris: OECD.
- Pilat, D. and F.C. Lee, 2001. "Productivity Growth in ICT-producing and ICT-using Industries: A Source of Growth Differentials in the OECD?," *OECD Science, Technology and Industry Working Papers* 2001/4, OECD Directorate for Science, Technology and Industry.
- Rajan, R. G and L. Zingales, 1998. "Financial Dependence and Growth," *American Economic Review*, American Economic Association, vol. 88(3), pages 559-86,
- Robinson, C., L.Stokes, E. Stuivenwold and B. van Ark (2003): "Industry Structures and Taxonomies" in van Ark, Bart and M. O'Mahony, M. (eds) *EU productivity and competitiveness: an industry perspective, Can Europe resume the catching up process? DG Enterprise*, Luxembourg: European Commission
- Roeger, W. (2001). 'The contribution of information and communication technologies to growth in Europe and the US: a macroeconomic analysis', *EC Economic Papers*, 147, January
- Romer P. M. (1990), "Endogenous technological change", *Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 98, pp. 71–101.
- Benhabid, J. and M. Spiegel (1994), "The role of human capital in economic development: Evidence from aggregate cross-country data", *Journal of Monetary Economics* 43, pp. 143-174.

- Cohen, Daniel, and Marcelo Soto (2001). "Growth and Human Capital: Good Data, Good Results." CEPR Discussion Paper no. 3025
- Temple, J. (1999), "The new growth evidence", *Journal of Economic Literature*, vol. 37, n.1, pp. 112-156.
- Topel, R. (1999). Labor markets and economic growth. In O. C. Ashenfelter and D. Card (eds.) *Handbook of Labor Economics*, Vol. 3C, North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- Van Ark, B., (2002). "Understanding Productivity and Income Differentials Among OECD Countries: A Survey," in: A.Sharpe, F. St-Hilaire, K. Banting (ed.), *The Review of Economic Performance and Social Progress: Towards a Social Understanding of Productivity*, vol. 2, Centre for the Study of Living Standards.

Appendix A1

ICT Taxonomy

The source of this ICT taxonomy is Robinson et al (2003). On the basis of the latest OECD STAN Database on National Accounts, industries are classified in the following seven categories depending on whether they produce ICT goods or services, and whether they use intensively ICT or they do not use ICT intensively.

1. ICT Producing - Manufacturing (ICTPM)

Office machinery (30); Insulated wire (313); Electronic valves and tubes (321); Telecommunication equipment (322); Radio and television receivers (323); Scientific instruments (331).

2. ICT Producing – Services (ICTPS): Communications (64); Computer & related activities (72).

3. ICT Using – Manufacturing (ICTUM)

Clothing (18); Printing & publishing (22); Mechanical engineering (29); Other electrical machinery & apparatus (31-313); Other instruments (33-331); Building and repairing of ships and boats (351); Aircraft and spacecraft (353); Railroad equipment and transport equipment nec (352+359); Furniture, miscellaneous manufacturing; recycling (36-37).

4. ICT Using – Services (ICTUS)

Wholesale trade and commission trade, except of motor vehicles and motorcycles (51); Retail trade, except of motor vehicles and motorcycles; repair of personal and household goods (52); Financial intermediation, except insurance and pension funding (65); Insurance and pension funding, except compulsory social security (66); Activities auxiliary to financial intermediation (67); Renting of machinery & equipment (71); Research & development (73); Legal, technical & advertising (741-3).

5. Non-ICT Manufacturing (NICTM)

Food, drink & tobacco (15-16); Textiles (17); Leather and footwear (19); Wood & products of wood and cork (20); Pulp, paper & paper products (21); Mineral oil refining, coke & nuclear fuel (23); Chemicals (24); Rubber & plastics (25); Non-metallic mineral products (26); Basic metals (27); Fabricated metal products (28); Motor vehicles (34).

6. Non-ICT Services (NICTS)

Sale, maintenance and repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles; retail sale of automotive fuel (50); Hotels & catering (55); Inland transport (60); Water transport (61); Air transport (62); Supporting and auxiliary transport activities; activities of travel agencies (63); Real estate activities (70); Other business activities, nec (749); Public administration and defence; compulsory social security (75); Education (80); Health and social work (85); Other community, social and personal services (90-93); Private households with employed persons (95); Extra-territorial organizations and

bodies (99).

7. *Non-ICT Other (NICTO)*

Agriculture (01); Forestry (02); Fishing (05); Mining and quarrying (10-14);
Electricity, gas and water supply (40-41); Construction (45)

In this paper we combine NICTM, NICTS, NICTO as one group (non-ICT industries).

Appendix A2

Data Sources

Variables	Description	Source
Dependant Variable		
$\Delta Y_{i,k,T}$	Average annual growth in real gross value added in country i, industry k, 1980-2002	www.ggdc.net
Explanatory Variables		
<i>Human capital variables</i>		
$HC_{i,t0}$	Average number of years of schooling in 1980	Cohen and Soto (2001)
$\Delta HC_{i,T}$	Growth in average number of years of schooling between 1980-2000	Cohen and Soto (2001)
$HQ_{i,t0}$	Measure of a country's human capital quality based on international test scores	Hanusek and Kimko (2000)
<i>Control variables</i>		
$Share_{i,t0}$	Industry's share of total gross value added at country level in 1980	www.ggdc.net
$GDPWP_{i,t0}$	GDP per working age population, 1980	International Financial Statistics, IMF and OECD
INV_{iT}	Average investment ratio over 1980-2002	Penn World Tables 6.2
ΔLF_{iT}	Average annual labour force growth over 1980 -2002	OECD
$OP_{i,T}$	Average ratio of exports and imports to real GDP 1980-2002	Penn World Tables 6.2

Table 1: Summary Statistics

Variables	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
<u>Dependant variable</u>					
Average annual real gross value added growth rate, 1980-2002 (%)	1080	3.80	7.20	-14.40	51.30
<u>Human capital measures</u>					
Average years of schooling, 1980	20	10.03	1.87	5.57	12.65
Average years of schooling, 2000	20	11.47	1.50	7.28	13.12
Human capital accumulation, 1980-2000 (%)	20	14.30	8.40	2.30	30.30
Human capital quality	20	55.50	5.93	44.20	65.50
<u>Other control variables</u>					
Industry share in total gross value added at country level, 1980 (%)	1080	1.80	2.20	0.00	15.20
GDP per working age population (US dollars)	20	15,332.37	6,029.65	3,288.98	24,698.00
Investment to GDP ratio (%)	20	23.03	3.99	17.26	35.29
Average annual labour force growth (%)	20	1.04	0.62	0.15	2.09

Table 2: Average annual real gross value added growth rate by country and sector, 1980-2002 (%)

Country	Total	ICT	Non ICT	ICTUM	ICTPM	ICTPS	ICTUS
Australia	2.4	3.0	1.8	1.0	2.0	8.7	4.6
Austria	4.1	6.3	2.1	1.9	15.6	7.7	3.9
Belgium	3.0	4.6	1.5	1.6	13.1	3.9	1.9
Canada	2.6	3.2	2.2	1.2	4.5	6.1	3.6
Denmark	3.5	5.5	1.9	1.0	14.7	9.0	2.7
Spain	3.7	5.5	2.1	3.3	12.2	6.7	2.8
Finland	4.4	6.9	2.2	1.3	19.1	7.4	3.8
France	3.2	5.7	1.1	1.5	16.6	5.6	2.2
Greece	3.4	5.3	1.8	1.3	12.2	8.4	3.9
Ireland	6.5	10.1	3.5	4.2	25.0	8.2	6.0
Italy	3.1	5.0	1.4	1.3	13.4	6.0	2.7
Japan	3.6	6.6	1.0	1.7	16.9	6.1	4.7
Netherlands	3.5	5.3	2.0	1.7	12.5	7.1	3.4
Norway	2.4	3.7	1.2	-1.4	11.3	7.7	2.6
Portugal	4.4	6.7	2.5	3.6	15.2	6.6	3.8
Sweden	3.2	5.1	1.5	0.6	12.5	5.6	4.6
Germany	2.6	4.6	0.8	0.3	12.6	6.6	3.0
United Kingdom	3.1	5.1	1.4	0.4	13.5	7.8	3.4
United States	3.8	5.4	2.4	0.5	14.0	6.9	4.2
South Korea	9.4	13.1	6.1	8.3	23.7	16.5	9.8
Mean	3.8	5.8	2.0	1.8	14.0	7.4	3.9

Table 3: Human capital variables by country

Countries	HC Stock 1980	Growth rate (%) 1980-2000	HC quality
Australia	12.20	7.04	59.0
Austria	10.31	10.31	56.6
Belgium	9.24	15.97	57.1
Canada	11.59	12.02	54.6
Denmark	11.03	10.08	61.8
Spain	7.45	24.31	51.9
Finland	9.49	20.76	59.6
France	9.34	13.87	56.0
Greece	7.72	24.87	50.9
Ireland	8.94	12.89	50.2
Italy	7.96	26.06	49.4
Japan	11.2	11.86	65.5
Netherlands	10.28	9.81	54.5
Norway	11.56	7.66	64.6
Portugal	5.57	26.77	44.2
Sweden	11.26	4.00	57.4
Germany	12.65	2.34	48.7
United Kingdom	11.57	12.57	62.5
United States	12.19	3.55	46.8
Korea	9.11	30.35	58.6
Obs.	20	20	20
Mean	10.03	14.36	55.5
Standard Deviation	1.88	8.40	5.93
Minimum	5.57	2.34	44.2
Maximum	12.65	30.35	65.5

Table 4: Average investment ratio and average annual labour force growth by country

	Average Investment to GDP Ratio (%)	Average Annual Labour Force Growth Rate (%)
<i>Countries</i>	1980-2002	1980-2002
Australia	23.83	1.74
Austria	23.50	1.04
Belgium	21.42	0.44
Canada	23.31	1.50
Denmark	20.56	0.27
Spain	22.37	1.42
Finland	25.97	0.28
France	22.32	0.65
Greece	20.73	1.36
Ireland	20.77	1.74
Italy	21.66	0.30
Japan	30.83	0.77
Netherlands	21.61	1.94
Norway	24.80	0.93
Portugal	21.01	0.96
Sweden	20.22	0.15
Germany	23.20	1.59
United Kingdom	17.25	0.36
United States	19.88	1.35
South Korea	35.29	2.09
Count	20	20
Mean	23.03	1.04
Standard Dev.	3.99	0.62
Minimum	17.26	0.15
Maximum	35.29	2.09

Table 5: The effect of human capital on ICT output growth, OLS estimates
Dependant Variable: Average annual real gross value added growth rate, 1980-2002

	(1)		(2)		(3)	
	Coefficient	Robust Std Error	Coefficient	Robust Std Error	Coefficient	Robust Std Error
$hc_i * ict_{pm}$	0.051 ***	0.006				
$hc_i * ict_{ps}$	0.023 ***	0.002				
$hc_i * ict_{um}$	-0.002	0.001				
$hc_i * ict_{us}$	0.008 ***	0.001				
$hq_i * ict_{pm}$			0.03 ***	0.004		
$hq_i * ict_{ps}$			0.013 ***	0.001		
$hq_i * ict_{um}$			-0.001	0.001		
$hq_i * ict_{us}$			0.005 ***	0.001		
$dhc_i * ict_{pm}$					0.652 ***	0.092
$dhc_i * ict_{ps}$					0.285 ***	0.026
$dhc_i * ict_{um}$					-0.006	0.019
$dhc_i * ict_{us}$					0.094 ***	0.012
$share_{i,1980}$	-0.08 *	0.043	-0.069	0.043	-0.144 ***	0.051
constant	0.079 ***	0.01	0.077 ***	0.01	0.067 ***	0.009
Obs.	1080		1080		1080	
Adj R ²	0.309		0.316		0.268	
Country Specific Effects	Yes		Yes		Yes	
F(19,1055)	3.16		2.99		2.27	
Prob >F	0		0		0.001	

Note: *** significance at the 1% level, ** significance at the 5% level, * significance at the 10% level.

Table 5 (ctd): The effect of human capital on ICT output growth, OLS estimates
Dependant Variable: Average annual real gross value added growth rate, 1980-2002

	(4)		(5)		(6)	
	Coefficient	Robust Std Error	Coefficient	Robust Std Error	Coefficient	Robust Std Error
$hc_i * ict_{pm}$	-0.029	0.117				
$hc_i * ict_{ps}$	0.062 **	0.032				
$hc_i * ict_{um}$	-0.006	0.027				
$hc_i * ict_{us}$	0.054 **	0.024				
$dhc_i * ict_{pm}$					-0.022	0.208
$dhc_i * ict_{ps}$					-0.115	0.093
$dhc_i * ict_{um}$					-0.072	0.084
$dhc_i * ict_{us}$					-0.162 *	0.083
$hq_i * ict_{pm}$			0.018	0.125		
$hq_i * ict_{ps}$			-0.005	0.052		
$hq_i * ict_{um}$			-0.022	0.046		
$hq_i * ict_{us}$			-0.042	0.046		
Obs.	1080		1080		1080	
Adj R ²	0.326		0.325		0.327	
Country Specific Effects	yes		yes		yes	
Ind Specific Effects	yes		yes		yes	
F(48,1010)	9.66		9.55		9.81	
Prob >F	0		0		0	

Notes:

Models 4, 5 and 6 include a constant and the following country level control variables: the share of each industry in total real gross value added in the initial year ($share_{t_0}$); gross domestic product per working age population in the initial year (gdp_{t_0}); the ratio of investment to GDP, average over the analysed period ($inv_{i,T}$); labour force growth over the analysed period ($dlf_{i,T}$); the ratio of trade to GDP (openness measure) over the analysed period ($op_{i,T}$). The additional estimation results not shown above are available from the authors.

*** significance at the 1% level, ** significance at the 5% level, * significance at the 10% level.

Table 6: The effect of interacted human capital measures on ICT output growth, OLS estimates
Dependant Variable: Average annual real gross value added growth rate, 1980-2002

	(1)		(2)		(3)	
	Coefficient	Robust Std Error	Coefficient	Robust Std Error	Coefficient	Robust Std Error
$hc_i*hq_i*ict_{pm}$	-0.011	0.023				
$hc_i*hq_i*ict_{ps}$	0.013 **	0.007				
$hc_i*hq_i*ict_{um}$	-0.002	0.006				
$hc_i*hq_i*ict_{us}$	0.01 *	0.005				
$hc_i*dhc_i*ict_{pm}$			-0.003	0.109		
$hc_i*dhc_i*ict_{ps}$			-0.041	0.041		
$hc_i*dhc_i*ict_{um}$			-0.026	0.036		
$hc_i*dhc_i*ict_{us}$			-0.071 **	0.036		
$dhc_i*hq_i*ict_{pm}$					-0.004	0.054
$dhc_i*hq_i*ict_{ps}$					-0.027	0.023
$dhc_i*hq_i*ict_{um}$					-0.017	0.021
$dhc_i*hq_i*ict_{us}$					-0.04 *	0.021
Obs.	1080		1080		1080	
Adj R ²	0.327		0.326		0.327	
Country and Industry Specific Effects	yes		yes		yes	
F(48,1010)	9.64		9.76		9.79	
Prob >F	0		0		0	

Notes:

Model specifications include a constant and the following country level control variables: the share of each industry in total real gross value added in the initial year ($share_{t_0}$); gross domestic product per working age population in the initial year (gdp_{t_0}); the ratio of investment to GDP, average over the analysed period ($inv_{i,T}$); labour force growth over the analysed period ($dlf_{i,T}$); the ratio of trade to GDP (openness measure) over the analysed period ($op_{i,T}$). The additional estimation results not shown above are available from the authors.

*** significance at the 1% level, ** significance at the 5% level, * significance at the 10% level.

Table 7. Durbin- Wu-Hausman test for the endogeneity of human capital growth

Dep. Var.	First Stage								Augmented Regression	
	dhc _i *ict _{pm}		dhc _i *ict _{ps}		dhc _i *ict _{um}		dhc _i *ict _{us}		$\Delta Y_{i,k,T}$	
	Coefficient	Robust Std Error	Coefficient	Robust Std Error	Coefficient	Robust Std Error	Coefficient	Robust Std Error	Coefficient	Robust Std Error
resid_pm									0.017	0.381
resid_ps									0.036	0.103
resid_um									0.078	0.099
resid_us									0.082	0.076
dhc _{6070pm} *ict _{pm}	0.952***	0.085								
dhc _{6070ps} *ict _{ps}			0.952***	0.159						
dhc _{6070um} *ict _{um}					0.952***	0.065				
dhc _{6070us} *ict _{us}							0.952***	0.071		
hc _i *ict _{pm}	-0.254***	0.036							-0.044	0.201
hc _i *ict _{ps}			-0.254***	0.067					0.059	0.045
hc _i *ict _{um}					-0.254***	0.028			-0.055	0.042
hc _i *ict _{us}							-0.254***	0.03	-0.012	0.033
dhc _i *ict _{pm}									-0.113	0.42
dhc _i *ict _{ps}									-0.088	0.17
dhc _i *ict _{um}									-0.199	0.168
dhc _i *ict _{us}									-0.238	0.156
Obs.	1080		1080		1080		1080		1080	
Adj R ²	0.884		0.882		0.886		0.886		0.322	
DWH endogeneity test									0.34	
Prob>F									0.854	

Notes: The first stage regressions include a constant, gross domestic product per working age population at country level in the initial year, country and industry specific effects. The augmented regression includes a constant, country and industry specific effects and the following country level control variables: the share of each industry in total real gross value added in the initial year (*share_{it0}*); gross domestic product per working age population in the initial year (*gdp_{it0}*); the ratio of investment to GDP, average over the analysed period (*inv_{it}*); labour force growth over the analysed period (*dlf_{it}*); the ratio of trade to GDP (openness measure) over the analysed period. Also, The additional estimation results not shown above are available from the authors. *** significance at the 1% level, ** significance at the 5% level, * significance at the 10% level.

Table 8: The effect of human capital on ICT output growth, 3SLS estimates

Dep. Var.	Primary equation		Structural Equations							
	$\Delta Y_{i,k,T}$		inv_i*ict_{pm}		inv_i*ict_{ps}		inv_i*ict_{um}		inv_i*ict_{us}	
	Coefficient	Std Error	Coefficient	Std Error	Coefficient	Std Error	Coefficient	Std Error	Coefficient	Std Error
hc_i*ict_{pm}	-0.023	0.152	0.072 ***	0.001						
hc_i*ict_{ps}	0.077	0.255			0.072 ***	0.001				
hc_i*ict_{um}	-0.046	0.128					0.072 ***	0.001		
hc_i*ict_{us}	-0.004	0.134							0.072 ***	0.001
$dhc_{i,T-1}*ict_{pm}$			0.463 ***	0.016						
$dhc_{i,T-1}*ict_{ps}$					0.463 ***	0.016				
$dhc_{i,T-1}*ict_{um}$							0.463 ***	0.016		
$dhc_{i,T-1}*ict_{us}$									0.463 ***	0.016
$dhc_{i,T}*ict_{pm}$	-0.074	0.31								
$dhc_{i,T}*ict_{ps}$	-0.054	0.505								
$dhc_{i,T}*ict_{um}$	-0.175	0.263								
$dhc_{i,T}*ict_{us}$	-0.216	0.276								
Obs.	1080		1080		1080		1080		1080	
R ²	0.3697		0.98		0.98		0.98		0.98	
Country and ind. specific effects	yes		yes		yes		yes		yes	

Notes: The primary regression includes a constant and the following country level control variables: the share of each industry in total real gross value added in the initial year ($share_{i_0}$); gross domestic product per working age population in the initial year (gdp_{i_0}); the ratio of investment to GDP, average over the analysed period ($inv_{i,T}$); labour force growth over the analysed period ($dlf_{i,T}$); the ratio of trade to GDP (openness measure) over the analysed period ($op_{i,T}$). The structural equations include a constant. The additional estimation results not shown above are available from the authors. The null that country and industry specific effects are jointly zero is rejected at 1 percent level ($\chi^2(240) = 1029.89$; Prob > $\chi^2 = 0.000$).

*** significance at the 1% level, ** significance at the 5% level, * significance at the 10% level.

Table 9: The effect of human capital on ICT output growth between countries below and above mean human capital measure, OLS estimates

Dependant Variable: Average annual real gross value added growth rate, 1980-2002

	(1)		(2)		(3)	
	Coefficient	Robust Std Error	Coefficient	Robust Std Error	Coefficient	Robust Std Error
$hc_i * ict_{pm}$	0.079	0.171				
$hc_i * ict_{ps}$	0.064 *	0.035				
$hc_i * ict_{um}$	-0.009	0.033				
$hc_i * ict_{us}$	0.037 *	0.021				
$hc_i * ict_{pm} * ed$	0.021	0.022				
$hc_i * ict_{ps} * ed$	0.002	0.005				
$hc_i * ict_{um} * ed$	0.001	0.005				
$hc_i * ict_{us} * ed$	-0.002	0.004				
$hq_i * ict_{pm}$			-0.003	0.138		
$hq_i * ict_{ps}$			-0.014	0.071		
$hq_i * ict_{um}$			-0.037	0.067		
$hq_i * ict_{us}$			-0.054	0.067		
$hq_i * ict_{pm} * edq$			0.004	0.009		
$hq_i * ict_{ps} * edq$			-0.007 *	0.004		
$hq_i * ict_{um} * edq$			-0.001	0.003		
$hq_i * ict_{us} * edq$			-0.004	0.003		
$dhc_i * ict_{pm}$					0.032	0.232
$dhc_i * ict_{ps}$					-0.103	0.096
$dhc_i * ict_{um}$					-0.061	0.085
$dhc_i * ict_{us}$					-0.157 *	0.086
$dhc_i * ict_{pm} * edg$					0.172	0.337
$dhc_i * ict_{ps} * edg$					0.03	0.08
$dhc_i * ict_{um} * edg$					0.027	0.059
$dhc_i * ict_{us} * edg$					0.007	0.045
Obs.	1080		1080		1080	
Adj R ²	0.328		0.325		0.325	
Joint significance of slope differences						
F(4,1006)	0.39		1.88		0.14	
Prob >F	0.8171		0.1126		0.9665	
Country and Industry specific effects	yes		yes		yes	
F(48,1006)	9.58		9.49		9.93	
Prob >F	0		0		0	

Notes:

Model specifications include a constant and the following country level control variables: the share of each industry in total real gross value added in the initial year; gross domestic product per working age population in the initial year; the ratio of investment to GDP, average over the analysed period; labour force growth over the analysed period ;the ratio of trade to GDP (openness measure) at country level over the analysed period. The additional estimation results not shown above are available from the authors. The dummy variables are defined as follows: ed = 1 if human capital stock is below sample average; ed =0 otherwise; edg=1 if human capital improvement is below sample average; edg=0, otherwise; edq=1 if human capital quality is below sample average; edq=0 otherwise.

*** significance at the 1% level, ** significance at the 5% level, * significance at the 10% level.

Year	Number	Title/Author(s) <i>ESRI Authors/Co-authors Italicised</i>
2007	183	Real Interest Parity in the EU and the Consequences for Euro Area Membership: Panel Data Evidence, 1979-2005 <i>Martin O'Brien</i>
	182	Can Small Firms' Perceived Constraints Help Explain Survival Rates? <i>Seán Lyons</i>
	181	Understanding the Implications of Choice of Deprivation Index for Measuring Consistent Poverty in Ireland <i>Christopher T. Whelan</i>
	180	Economics in Ireland <i>Frances Ruane and Richard S.J. Tol</i>
	179	Airline Emissions of Carbon Dioxide in the European Trading System <i>John Fitz Gerald and Richard S.J. Tol</i>
	178	An Environmental Input-Output Model for Ireland <i>Joe O'Doherty and Richard S.J. Tol</i>
2006	177	The Impact of a Carbon Tax on International Tourism <i>Richard S.J. Tol</i>
	176	Economic Integration and Structural Change: The Case of Irish Regions <i>Edgar Morgenroth</i>
	175	Macroeconomic Differentials and Adjustment in the Euro Area <i>Iulia Traistaru-Siedschlag</i>
	174	The Impact of Climate Change on Tourism in Germany, The UK and Ireland: A Simulation Study Jacqueline M. Hamilton and <i>Richard S.J. Tol</i>
	173	Regional Growth Cycle Synchronisation with the Euro Area Gabriele Tondl and <i>Iulia Traistaru-Siedschlag</i>
	172	Measuring Material Deprivation with EU-SILC: Lessons from the Irish Survey <i>Christopher T. Whelan and Bertrand Maitre</i>
2005	171	Levels and Patterns of Material Deprivation in Ireland: After the 'Celtic Tiger' <i>Christopher T. Whelan and Bertrand Maitre</i>
	169	The Case for an EU-wide Measure of Poverty <i>Tony Fahey</i>

- 168 Market Size, Market Structure & Market Power in the Irish Electricity Industry
N. McCarthy
- 167 An Integrated Micro-Macro (IMM) Approach to the Evaluation of Large-scale Public Investment Programmes: The Case of EU Structural Funds
John Bradley and T. Mitze, Edgar Morgenroth, G. Untiedt
- 166 Rising House Prices in an Open Labour Market
David Duffy and J. Fitz Gerald, I. Kearney
- 165 Measuring Consistent Poverty in Ireland with EU SILC Data
Christopher T. Whelan and Brian Nolan, Bertrand Maitre
- 164 Income, Deprivation and Economic Strain in the Enlarged European Union
Christopher T. Whelan and Bertrand Maitre
- 2004**
- 163 Living in Ireland Survey – Technical Report and Codebook for Data Users
Dorothy Watson
- 162 Research Needs of Sustainable Development
Sue Scott
- 161 Generation Adequacy in an Island Electricity System
John Fitz Gerald
- 160 Energy Policy in Ireland
John Fitz Gerald
- 159 Lessons From 20 Years of Cohesion
John Fitz Gerald
- 158 Human Capital, The Labour Market and Productivity Growth in Ireland
Adele Bergin and I. Kearney
- 157 Ireland – an Ageing Multicultural Economy, Paper to Merriman Summer School, 26th August 2004
John Fitz Gerald
- 156 An Economy-Wide Perspective on Earnings Data in Ireland: Methodological Issues and Analysis
B. Casey