

Measuring the Social Rate of Return to R&D in the Energy Industry: A Study of the OECD Countries

David Corderi^{*}, C.-Y. Cynthia Lin[†]

Abstract

This paper estimates the social rate of return to research and development in the energy industry using a similar approach to Jones and Williams (1998). Our model tries to quantify the positive contribution that lagged R&D has on Total Factor Productivity (TFP) growth in the manufacturing of coal, petroleum products and nuclear fuel sector for a number of OECD countries. Using a panel of data from the OECD STAN database we are able to obtain results suggesting that R&D has a positive and significant rate of return that varies for each country.

Keywords: social rate of return to R&D, energy, R&D

JEL codes: O30, L71, O13

^{*} Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of California at Davis, One Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616, United States. Telephone: +1 530 400 1023. E-mail: dcorderi@primal.ucdavis.edu

[†] Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of California at Davis, One Shields Avenue, Davis, CA 95616, United States. Telephone: +1 530 752 0824. E-mail: cclin@primal.ucdavis.edu.

We would like to thank Chad Jones, Giovanni Peri and Colin Cameron for helpful comments. Cynthia Lin received financial support from the Giannini Foundation for Agricultural Economics. David Corderi acknowledges financial support from Fundacion Cajamadrid. All errors are our own.

Introduction

Owing to mounting geopolitical, environmental and economic concerns, investment in research and development (R&D) in the energy sector has become increasingly crucial for sustainability, security and environmental protection. A 1997 report from the President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology and a 2004 report from the bipartisan National Commission on Energy Policy each recommended that federal R&D spending be doubled. Several groups have called for even larger commitments, on the scale of the Manhattan Project of the 1940s (Kammen & Nemet, 2005). In his remarks to the U.S. Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, Professor Lee Lynd of Dartmouth College recommended a several-fold increase in the amount of funding for biomass energy R&D, with clearly demarcated support for both pre-commercial research devoted to innovation and applied fundamentals as well as cost sharing for first-of-a-kind pioneer plants (2004).

Since the mid-1990s, however, both public and private sector investment in R&D in the United States has stagnated for renewable energy and energy efficiency, and has declined for fossil fuel and nuclear technology. The 2005 federal budget reduced energy R&D by 11 percent from 2004; the American Association for the Advancement of Science projects that federal energy R&D will decline 18 percent by 2009. In addition, investment in energy R&D by U.S. companies fell by 50 percent between 1991 and 2003 (Kammen & Nemet, 2005). Moreover, funding after earmarks for bioenergy R&D by the Department of Energy has declined yearly for the last several years (Lynd, 2004). These declines are neither new nor unique to the United States: between 1980 and 1995,

international R&D fell 39 percent for energy and 56 percent for renewable energy (Margolis & Kammen, 1999).

According to economic theory, there are several reasons why the private rate of R&D may diverge from the socially optimal rate of R&D. First, firms may under-invest in R&D because there are positive spillovers involved: when a firm makes a discovery, other firms can free ride on the invention and may even imitate the invention without having paid for the R&D efforts. Even with patent protection, these spillovers reduce the payoff to investing in R&D. A second reason why the private rate of R&D is lower than the optimal rate is the appropriability effect: in the absence of perfect price discrimination, the private surplus from innovation is lower than the social surplus (Tirole, 2001). A countervailing effect that leads firms to over-invest in R&D is the business-stealing effect: a firm that introduces a new product does not internalize the loss of profit suffered by its rivals on the product market (Tirole, 2001).

The need to mitigate climate change as well as the impact of high energy prices on growth are two good reasons to draw attention to energy technology research and development (R&D) in a context of economy-wide fossil fuel dependence. As noted above, market imperfections³ in the industry of ideas tend to promote over- and underinvestment in R&D; yet, measuring the size of the distortions to R&D investment is not an easy task. Jones and Williams (1998) try to measure the overall effect of these distortions using an endogenous growth model. The authors conclude that optimal R&D investment in the US is at least twice larger than the actual investment. Furthermore, Margolis and Kammen (1999, 2001) look at the energy sector in the US and conclude that there has been a sustained pattern of underinvestment.

³ See for example Romer (1990), Aghion and Howitt (1992) and Grossman and Helpman (1991).

Determining the optimal resource allocation to R&D depends crucially on estimating the rate of return to R&D investments. This rate of return measures how much productivity increases as a result of investing resources in R&D. In principle, we would want to estimate the social rate of return as opposed to the private rate of return since the former is a more general measure that accounts for R&D spillovers. Furthermore, findings in the empirical productivity literature (Griliches 1992) emphasize that social rates of return remain significantly above private rates.

A considerable number of empirical studies have tried to estimate the social rate of return accounting for different types of spillover. Earlier studies estimate the social rate of return from intra-industry spillovers; see for example Sveilkauskas (1981), Griliches and Lichtenberg (1984b), and Griliches (1994). These studies regress TFP growth on lagged R&D intensity which is measured as the ratio of privately financed R&D spending to sales.

A different set of studies tried to incorporate inter-industry spillovers to the measure of social rate, see for example Terleckyj (1980), Scherer (1982), Griliches and Lichtenberg (1984a) and Jaffe (1996). These authors try to capture the effect of R&D in one industry on measured productivity in other industries; the imputations are based on a technology flow matrix constructed from patent data or input-output flows between industries. Jaffe (1986) incorporates R&D from other industries into the R&D stock used to estimate productivity gains.

The last approach attempts to incorporate international spillovers into the measurement of the social rate of return. These models try to capture the effect that foreign R&D has in domestic productivity through trade (see for example Coe and

Helpman, 1995; and Nadiri & Kim, 1996). Several authors have followed the same approach but have also corrected for human capital effects and depreciation of the R&D stock (see for example Engelbrecht , 1997; Griffith et al., 2000; and Keller, 2002, 2004).

This paper provides estimates of the social rate of return to R&D in the energy industry for a number of OECD countries. We use industry level productivity and R&D intensity measures to capture the inter-firm technology spillovers in the manufacturing of coal, petroleum products and nuclear fuel sector. We adopt a narrow definition of the social rate of return by considering only the intra-industry spillover effects within a country. Hence, our estimates will capture a lower bound for the rate of return.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 1 outlines our theoretical framework for estimating the social rate of return. Section 2 presents a description of the data used in our study. Section 3 outlines our empirical estimation strategy. Section 4 contains an overview of the estimation results. Finally, section 5 concludes and discusses possible future ideas for expanding this research.

1 Theoretical Framework

In this paper we follow a methodology similar to Jones and Williams (1998). We adopt a Cobb-Douglas production function of the form:

$$Y_t = e^{\mu t} Z_{t-1}^{\gamma} K_t^{\alpha} L_t^{1-\alpha} \quad (1)$$

$$\dot{Z}_t = R_t \quad (2)$$

where Y is output produced, Z is the R&D stock, K is capital, L is labor and R is expenditures in R&D. As we can see from equation (2), we assume no depreciation of the R&D stock.

Using some growth accounting we can derive the relationship between TFP growth and R&D:

$$TFP_t = Y_t / (K_t^\alpha L_t^{1-\alpha}) \quad (3)$$

After some manipulation we get the following equation:

$$\Delta \text{Log} (TFP_t) = \mu + \check{r} (R_{t-1}/Y_{t-1}) + \varepsilon \quad (4)$$

where $\check{r} = dY/dZ$ is the rate of return to R&D. As we can see from our empirical specification in equation (4), total factor productivity (TFP) growth is regressed on the lagged R&D share of output. The estimated coefficient \check{r} in (4) corresponds to our desired measure of the rate of return to R&D. As Jones and Williams (1998) point out, \check{r} can represent the private rate of return if we are measuring at the firm level or the social rate of return if we are measuring at the industry level.

Several remarks should be made before proceeding to the actual analysis of the data. First, we are not contemplating the possibility of R&D spillovers between industries, i.e., we are not using a technology flow matrix to impute the effect of R&D in one industry on measured productivity in other industries. Second, we are not capturing intertemporal knowledge spillovers or congestion effects. Finally, we are working under the assumption of a “closed economy”, which means that we don’t account for

technological diffusion through trade. These assumptions will give us, in principle, a lower bound estimate of the social rate of return.

2 Empirical Setting

This section provides an overview of the data used in our study. Data sources and methodological issues are discussed in detail.

2.1 Description of Country and Industry Characteristics in terms of GDP and R&D

We use data on the manufacturing industry of coke, petroleum products and nuclear fuel⁴ in 13 OECD countries for the years 1987-2002. The countries are Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Korea, Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, and United States. The data on input, output and prices comes from the Structural Analysis (STAN) database, OECD (2005). The source for R&D expenditure⁵ data is the Annual National Business Expenditures on Research and Development (ANBERD) database, OECD (2006). Our sample of countries accounts for at least 75 percent of OECD value added in this specific industry. Moreover, R&D expenditures by these countries constitute at least 85 percent of the OECD's innovative activity and almost all business R&D in the energy manufacturing sector between 1987 and 2002.

Table 1 shows value added and R&D expenditures averaged over the period from 1987 to 2002 for the countries used on this study. We can see that both value added and

⁴ This industry corresponds to ISIC (Review 3) number 23.

⁵ We use data on total business enterprises R&D irrespective of source of funding.

R&D expenditures in the energy manufacturing industry vary substantially across countries⁶. The G-7 countries (Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom and the United States) conduct on average 88 percent of R&D in the sample and their share of total value added is 89 percent. Also, note that cross-country variation is higher for R&D than for GDP.

⁶ We are using Purchasing Power Parity exchange rates to compare across countries as in Bernard and Jones (1996). The industry value added data for Japan and Korea do not seem to be plausible. Recall that PPPs are based on a comparison of consumer goods' prices and are heavily weighted towards services. They are neither industry specific nor do they reflect relative producer prices. Conversions of industry-level indicators to a common currency based on PPPs should therefore be interpreted with caution.

TABLE 1 - DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS (Energy Manufacturing)

Country	Size in Terms of R&D*	Relative Size (Percent)	Size in Terms of GDP**	Relative Size (Percent)	Share of Value Added*** (Percent)
Belgium	34.39	1.07%	603.36	1.13%	2.37%
Canada	84.21	2.61%	2069.79	3.86%	1.41%
Finland	19.12	0.59%	322.12	0.60%	1.54%
France	253.21	7.85%	9149.86	17.08%	2.83%
Germany	71.57	2.22%	3194.66	5.96%	0.84%
Italy	50.28	1.56%	3493.31	6.52%	1.81%
Japan	372.23	11.55%	31.81	0.06%	4.90%
Korea	165.61	5.14%	5.69	0.01%	4.17%
Netherlands	51.09	1.58%	2197.69	4.10%	2.34%
Spain	35.74	1.11%	4254.79	7.94%	2.93%
Sweden	9.92	0.31%	329.94	0.62%	0.98%
United Kingdom	428.15	13.28%	4392.80	8.20%	2.05%
United States	1766.13	54.78%	25783.74	48.12%	2.13%
G-7****	2837.60	88.01%	48115.96	89.80%	-
Total	3224.09	100.00%	53578.44	100.00%	-

* Average R&D expenditures over the period 1987-2002, measured in million 2000 \$ U.S. PPP.

** Average value added over the period 1987-2002, measured in million 2000 \$ U.S. PPP.

*** Average share of value added relative to total manufacturing over the period 1987-2002.

**** G-7 is composed of Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, United Kingdom and United States.

2.2 Total Factor Productivity Data

We calculate the growth rate of TFP in the energy manufacturing industry using Tornqvist indexes, a superlative-index-number approach suggested by Caves, Christensen, and Diewert (1982):

$$\Delta \text{Log} (\text{TFP}_{it}) = \Delta \text{Log} (Y_{it}) - \alpha_{it} \Delta \text{Log} (L_{it}) - [1 - \alpha_{it}] \Delta \text{Log} (K_{it}) \quad (5)$$

where $\underline{\alpha}_{it} = (1/2) (\alpha_{it} + \alpha_{it-1})$ and α_i is the labor share of the value added in the energy manufacturing sector of country i . Implicit in this calculation are assumptions of perfect competition and constant returns to scale.

All data used for the construction of the TFP growth rate comes from STAN database⁷ (OECD 2005), unless otherwise noted. Most of the data has been converted from current prices into constant 1995 prices using country and industry-specific deflators that are derived from the STAN database. Output (Y_{it}) is measured as industry gross value added. Changes in labor input (L_{it}) are measured through changes in labor compensation of employees. Measures of the physical capital stock (K_{it}) were available for a number of countries. For the rest of the countries⁸ we constructed the capital stock from the industry investment flows using a perpetual inventory method and assuming a 10 percent rate of depreciation. The labor share of value added (α_{it}) is constructed as the ratio of compensation of employees to gross value added⁹.

Given the fact that we are using different base years in the construction of our price deflators and our physical capital stocks as well as the fact that different accounting standards are used by each national statistical office, we should be cautious with direct

⁷ Note: some of countries did not have a complete time series of the variables. Spain and Sweden did not have data available before 1995. Observations for Germany and West Germany were merged into one series through a rescaling factor.

⁸ Capital stock was estimated using the perpetual inventory method (PIM) for Austria, Germany, Netherlands, and the United States. The capital stock for Korea comes from Pyo (1998), and the capital stock for Japan comes from Fukao et al. (2003).

⁹ Note that labor costs can exceed value added in certain cases. For example, when heavy losses are incurred within a sector or, more generally, when a sector receives significant subsidies.

comparability of variables between countries. A similar issue was raised in other papers such as the one by Nadiri and Kim (1996). However, since we are interested in measuring country-specific social rates of return, our empirical strategy will enable us to obtain estimates that are comparable across countries.

3 Empirical Model and Estimation Issues

Our first model specification has a regression equation of the form:

$$\Delta \text{Log (TFP)}_{it} = \alpha + \check{r}_i * [\text{Country}_i * (\text{RDint})_{it-1}] + \gamma_i * \text{Period} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (6)$$

where $i=1, \dots, C$ and $t=1, \dots, T$; i indexes country, and t is the subscript for time.

Here, “country” is a dummy variable created for each of the countries in our sample; “RDint” is R&D intensity (lagged one year) defined as the ratio of R&D expenditures to value added in each country; “period” is an indicator variable that accounts for either time period one (1987 to 1995) or time period two (1996 to 2002). The α , \check{r}_i , and γ are the parameters to be estimated, and ε_{it} is the error term which is assumed to be heteroskedastic (by country) and serially uncorrelated.

The parameter α captures any trend in TFP growth (see equations (1) and (4)) and γ divides the possible trends in TFP growth according to the specified time periods. The parameter \check{r}_i is of central interest in this paper as it represents the social rate of return to R&D in the energy manufacturing industry for each of our countries.

We also present an alternative model specification of the following form:

$$\Delta \text{Log (TFP)}_{it} = \alpha + \check{r}_i * [\text{Period} * \text{Country}_i * (\text{RDint})_{it-1}] + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (7)$$

For this model, the parameter of interest \check{r}_i has a different interpretation than in model (6). Here, \check{r}_i captures the country-specific social rate of return in a given time period.

Before proceeding to the estimation results, several estimation issues should be addressed. First, measuring the social rate of return through intra-industry spillovers can be problematic due to measurement error at the firm level; yet aggregation to the industry level helps mitigate these measurement problems. Another concern is that the error term ε_{it} may not be orthogonal to the regressors, which would lead to inconsistent estimates. The disturbances capture idiosyncratic factors that affect measured productivity. Some could be country specific, such as receiving strong inter-industry spillovers, and others might be common to all countries such as shocks affecting OECD countries. Generally, this calls for instrumental variable estimation; however, good instruments for the R&D variables are unavailable. Instead, we acknowledge that this approach will have a bias in the estimation; however, according to Jones (1998) the bias can potentially lower our estimates as much as the growth rate of output. The author concludes that this estimation procedure has a small downward bias¹⁰. Hence, we proceed with our estimation with no further adjustments.

¹⁰ Note also that most of the identification of the coefficient on R&D intensity comes from the “within” dimension. Controlling for the possibility of a time trend and specific time periods raises the point estimates and sharpens the precision.

4 Estimation Results

The dependent variable is growth in total factor productivity as defined in equation (5). The regressors are defined in model (6), our benchmark case, and model (7), which is used for sensitivity analysis. The estimation procedure is ordinary least squares (OLS) under two different error variance estimation methods. We acknowledge the possibility of heteroskedastic errors and use White's robust error variance estimation procedure as well as a cluster (by country) robust procedure to sharpen the precision of our estimates. After comparing both specifications (see appendix), it can be seen that cluster robust specification yields the most precise estimates. We will use this model specification of the errors when reporting our estimates of the social rate of return.

4.1 Benchmark Results

Our benchmark estimates of the social rate of return to research and development by country are presented in Table (2) together with a 95 percent confidence interval of the estimates. The appendix presents the coefficient estimates with their standard errors in parentheses. The rates of return estimates for each of our countries are all positive and significant at 1 percent level, which is consistent with our original hypothesis about the existence of intra-industry spillovers. Interesting lessons arise after careful examination of our regression results.

United States and United Kingdom, the two leaders in terms of R&D spending and size of the energy sector, have the lowest rates of return 4.2 and 2.8 percent respectively. We suggest two possible reasons for this fact. First, these countries are the leaders in the

sense that they are closer to the technological frontier; hence we should expect a lower return. Second, these countries may also generate significant international spillovers through trade-related technological diffusion; as we argued before, this type of spillovers are not measured in our exercise.

Being close to the technological frontier due to proximity to the United States may also be the reason for a rate of return of 4 percent in Canada.

The two Asian countries in our sample are the exact opposite to the United States and the United Kingdom. Japan and Korea have the third and fifth largest R&D expenditures and the largest share of value added originated in the energy manufacturing industries in our sample (see Table 1). These two countries exhibit high rates of return; in particular, Japan exhibits the highest rate of return of our sample (19 percent). In contrast, France, the fourth largest R&D spending country, presents a smaller rate of return than Korea and Japan.

The Nordic countries (Sweden and Finland) as well as Netherlands and Belgium have a rate of return around 5 and 6 percent. Spain and Italy have similar R&D spending patterns to Belgium and Netherlands, respectively; yet the Mediterranean countries have a 16 percent rate of return.

TABLE 2 – SOCIAL RATE OF RETURN ESTIMATES BY COUNTRY:
BENCHMARK RESULTS

Country	Social Rate Of Return (percent)*	Confidence Interval (Percent)**	
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Belgium	6.6	2.9	10.4
Canada	4.1	2.6	5.6
Finland	5.4	3.3	7.5
France	7.8	4.8	10.8
Germany	15.6	9.6	21.6
Italy	16.9	7.8	25.9
Japan	19.4	9.2	29.7
Korea	9.9	5.7	14
Netherlands	6.4	3.8	9
Spain	16.8	7.6	26.1
Sweden	5.1	2.1	8.2
United Kingdom	2.8	1.3	4.3
United States	4.2	2.2	6.1

* Regression estimates from model (6), estimation (6) (see appendix, table 1), cluster robust standard errors.

** 95% Confidence Interval from the regression model 6 (see appendix, table 1).

4.2 Sensitivity analysis

A social rate of return that is constant through time was assumed in our benchmark analysis (see model (6)). In this section, we relax that assumption and estimate the country-specific social rate of return for two different time periods. For this analysis, we estimate our coefficients using model (7), in which we interacted lagged R&D intensity by country with the time periods¹¹ defined earlier: 1987-1995 and 1996-2002). The choice of

¹¹ The choice of 1995 as our time period brake has to do with the fact that approximately half of the countries in our sample became part of the European Monetary Union in that year.

1995 as our time period brake has to do with the fact that approximately half of the countries in our sample became part of the European Monetary Union in that year.

Our new estimates of the social rate of return by country and time period are presented in Table (3) together with a 95 percent confidence interval of the estimates (the appendix presents the coefficient estimates with their standard errors in parentheses). The rates of return estimates are all positive and significant at a 1 percent level. However, the estimates differ considerably by time period as we now discuss.

For all countries except Belgium, Italy and United Kingdom, the social rate of return for the period 1987-1995 is smaller than originally estimated in model (6) and the rate of return for the period 1996-2002 is greater than the estimates in both the first period and model (6). Japan, Spain, Germany, and Korea have rates of return greater than 20 percent in the second time period. The new estimates for the two R&D leaders do not differ greatly from our previous estimation. The United Kingdom stays around 3 percent and the United States has a slightly greater return (7.4 percent) in the second time period. Italy is the only country for which the rate of return in first time period exceeds the original return estimated with model (6).

TABLE 3 – SOCIAL RATE OF RETURN ESTIMATES BY COUNTRY:
SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS

Country	Time Period 1987-1995			Time Period 1996-2002		
	Rate Of Return (percent)*	Confidence Interval (Percent)**		Rate Of Return (percent)*	Confidence Interval (Percent)**	
		Lower B.	Upper B.		Lower B.	Upper B.
Belgium	8.6	4.8	12.4	7.8	3.8	11.8
Canada	3.8	2.7	4.9	7	4.4	9.5
Finland	5.3	3.6	7.1	7.1	4.5	9.6
France	6.7	4.3	9.2	12.5	8.9	16.1
Germany	12.2	6.8	17.7	23.7	16.7	30.6
Italy	20.3	12	28.6	17.4	8	26.9
Japan	15.4	7.6	23.2	48.8	36.2	61.3
Korea	8.5	5.4	11.5	21.5	15.5	27.6
Netherlands	6.1	4.2	8	10.2	5.6	14.9
Spain	-	-	-	25.9	14.3	37.5
Sweden	-	-	-	8.1	4.6	11.7
United Kingdom	3.2	1.9	4.5	2.9	1.3	4.6
United States	3.4	1.9	5	7.4	5.1	9.8

* Regression estimates from model (7) (see appendix, table 2 estimation (2)), cluster robust standard errors.

** 95 % Confidence Interval from the regression model (7) (see appendix, table 2).

5 Conclusion

We have estimated the social rate of return to research and development in the energy manufacturing industry by analyzing the productivity effects of intra-industry spillovers from R&D expenditures in 13 OECD countries. The evidence suggests that these spillovers are present and are quite significant. The estimated magnitude of the rates

of return varies across significantly across countries. We see that United States and United Kingdom have small rates of return even though they are the technological leaders. At the same time, our results suggest that the rates of return tend to be similar for countries that are closely related. In our sample, Japan and Korea, Italy and Spain, Sweden and Finland, Belgium and Netherlands, are good examples of this. In fact, Keller (2002) suggests that geographic factors often lead to clusters of countries that have access to a common pool of knowledge. Finally, the results from our second model specification suggest that the social rates of return not only vary across countries but also across time periods.

It should also be emphasized that these results are not exempt from measurement error since our productivity index does not adjust for human capital or factor utilization differences across countries. Bearing these limitations in mind, we should also point out that the objective of this paper was to estimate a lower bound for the social rate of return by using the narrowest definition of spillover effects. To the extent that product innovations are created and used in the same industry, intra-industry spillovers would be a good proxy for the social rate of return. However, the energy sector does affect productivity in many other sectors of the economy; hence the presence of inter-industry spillovers is very plausible in the industry studied. Further, the temporal dimension of spillovers might matter as well; in our analysis we focused on contemporaneous effects of technology. Finally, international spillovers are very likely to happen among OECD countries; technological diffusion from the United States is very likely to affect productivity in the rest of the OECD countries industry through international trade.

Future research on this subject could attempt to incorporate green accounting into the productivity equation. Given the need to reduce fossil fuel dependence, carbon-saving

technological improvements could be distinguished from non-carbon-saving innovations.

Measuring the social rate of return for these types of innovations is definitely needed.

APPENDIX: REGRESSION OUTPUTS

TABLE 1 SOCIAL RATE OF RETURN ESTIMATES BY COUNTRY

Dependent Variable is Total Factor Productivity Growth						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Belgium	0.049 (0.036)	0.066 (0.037)	0.066 (0.037)	0.049** (0.014)	0.066** (0.017)	0.066** (0.017)
Canada	0.032** (0.011)	0.041** (0.013)	0.041** (0.013)	0.032** (0.005)	0.041** (0.007)	0.041** (0.007)
Finland	0.042** (0.012)	0.054** (0.013)	0.054** (0.013)	0.042** (0.007)	0.054** (0.010)	0.054** (0.010)
France	0.060** (0.021)	0.078** (0.024)	0.078** (0.024)	0.060** (0.010)	0.078** (0.014)	0.078** (0.014)
Germany	0.127** (0.045)	0.156** (0.047)	0.156** (0.047)	0.127** (0.022)	0.156** (0.027)	0.156** (0.027)
Italy	0.119* (0.046)	0.169** (0.053)	0.169** (0.053)	0.119** (0.031)	0.169** (0.042)	0.169** (0.042)
Japan	0.127* (0.058)	0.194** (0.068)	0.194** (0.068)	0.127** (0.030)	0.194** (0.047)	0.194** (0.047)
Korea	0.072** (0.025)	0.099** (0.029)	0.099** (0.029)	0.072** (0.012)	0.099** (0.019)	0.099** (0.019)
Netherlands	0.047** (0.014)	0.064** (0.018)	0.064** (0.018)	0.047** (0.008)	0.064** (0.012)	0.064** (0.012)
Spain	0.163* (0.080)	0.168* (0.081)	0.168* (0.081)	0.163** (0.042)	0.168** (0.042)	0.168** (0.042)
Sweden	0.041 (0.021)	0.051* (0.021)	0.051* (0.021)	0.041** (0.013)	0.051** (0.014)	0.051** (0.014)
United Kingdom	0.019* (0.008)	0.028** (0.009)	0.028** (0.009)	0.019** (0.005)	0.028** (0.007)	0.028** (0.007)
United States	0.030 (0.017)	0.042* (0.017)	0.042* (0.017)	0.030** (0.006)	0.042** (0.009)	0.042** (0.009)
1987-1995		-0.001* (0.001)			-0.001 (0.001)	
1996-2002			0.001* (0.001)			0.001 (0.001)
Observations	162	162	162	162	162	162
R-squared	0.10	0.13	0.13	0.10	0.13	0.13

Notes: Standard Robust standard errors in parentheses for models (1) through (3). Robust standard errors clustered by country for models (4) through (6). Period dummies capture observations from 1987 to 1995 and from 1996 to 2002. A constant is included in the models. Significance codes: * 5% level, ** 1% level.

TABLE 2 SOCIAL RATES OF RETURN ESTIMATES BY COUNTRY AND DECADE

Dependent Variable is Total Factor Productivity Growth

	(1)	(2)
Belgium_1	0.086* (0.040)	0.086** (0.018)
Canada_1	0.038** (0.013)	0.038** (0.005)
Finland_1	0.053** (0.014)	0.053** (0.008)
France_1	0.067** (0.020)	0.067** (0.011)
Germany_1	0.122** (0.037)	0.122** (0.025)
Italy_1	0.203** (0.067)	0.203** (0.038)
Netherlands_1	0.061** (0.016)	0.061** (0.009)
Spain_1	0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)
Sweden_1	0.040 (0.028)	0.040* (0.015)
United Kingdom_1	0.032** (0.010)	0.032** (0.006)
United States_1	0.034 (0.020)	0.034** (0.007)
Japan_1	0.154** (0.058)	0.154** (0.036)
Korea_1	0.085** (0.025)	0.085** (0.014)
Belgium_2	0.078 (0.056)	0.078** (0.018)
Canada_2	0.070** (0.019)	0.070** (0.012)
Finland_2	0.071** (0.020)	0.071** (0.012)
France_2	0.125* (0.050)	0.125** (0.017)
Germany_2	0.237** (0.081)	0.237** (0.032)
Italy_2	0.174** (0.056)	0.174** (0.043)
Netherlands_2	0.102 (0.069)	0.102** (0.021)
Spain_2	0.259** (0.092)	0.259** (0.053)
Sweden_2	0.081** (0.025)	0.081** (0.017)
United Kingdom_2	0.029* (0.011)	0.029** (0.008)
United States_2	0.074**	0.074**

	(0.019)	(0.011)
Japan_2	0.488*	0.488**
	(0.197)	(0.058)
Korea_2	0.215	0.215**
	(0.111)	(0.028)
<hr/>		
Observations	162	162
R-squared	0.18	0.18
<hr/>		

Notes: Standard Robust standard errors in parentheses for model (1). Robust standard errors clustered by country for model (2). A constant is also included in the models. Country_1 means country estimates for years 1987 through 1995. Country_2 means country estimates for years 1996 through 2002. Significance codes: * 5% level, ** 1% level.

References

- Adams, James D. and Jaffe, Adam B. (1996). "Bounding the Effects of R&D: An Investigation Using Matched Establishment-Firm Data." *The Rand Journal of Economics*, 27 (4): 700-721.
- Aghion, Philippe and Howitt, Peter (1992). "A Model of Growth through Creative Destruction." *Econometrica*, 60(2): 323-351.
- Bernard, Andrew B. and Jones, Charles I. (1996). "Comparing Apples to Oranges: Productivity Convergence and Measurement Across Industries and Countries." *American Economic Review*, 86(5): 1216-1238.
- Coe, David T. and Helpman, Elhanan (1995). "International R&D Spillovers." *European Economic Review*, 39(5): 859-887.
- Caves, Douglas W.; Christensen, Laurits R. and Diewert, W. Erwin (1982). "Multilateral Comparisons of Output, Input, and Productivity Using Superlative Index Numbers." *Economic Journal*, 92(365): 73-86.
- Engelbrecht, H.-J. (1997). "International R&D Spillovers, Human Capital and Productivity in OECD Countries: An Empirical Investigation." *European Economic Review*, 41 (8): 1479-1488.
- Fukao, Inui, Kawai, and Miyagawa (2003). "Sectoral Productivity and Economic Growth: 1970-98," Economic Analysis No. 170. ESRI, Tokyo, Japan.
- Griffith, Rachel, Redding, Stephen and Van Reenen, John (2004). "Mapping Two Faces of R&D: Productivity Growth in a Panel of OECD Industries." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86 (4): 883-895.

- Griliches, Zvi, and Frank Lichtenberg (1984a). “Interindustry Technology Flows and Productivity Growth: A Reexamination.” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 66 (2): 324–329.
- _____ (1984b) “R&D and Productivity Growth at the Industry Level: Is there Still a Relationship?” In Zvi Griliches, ed., *R&D, Patents and Productivity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Griliches, Zvi (1992). “The Search for R&D Spillovers.” *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 94: S29–S47.
- _____ (1994). “Productivity, R&D and the Data Constraint.” *American Economic Review*, 84 (1): 1–23.
- Grossman, Gene M., and Elhanan Helpman (1991). *Innovation and Growth in the Global Economy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jaffe, Adam B. (1986). “Technological Opportunity and Spillovers of R&D: Evidence from Firms’ Patents, Profits and Market Value.” *American Economic Review*, 76 (5): 984–1001.
- Jones, C., and J. Williams (1998). “Measuring the Social Rate of Return to R&D.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 113 (4): 119–135.
- Kammen, D. M. and Margolis, R. (1999). “Evidence of Under-investment in Energy R&D in the United States and the Impact of Federal Policy.” *Energy Policy*, 27 (10): 575-584.
- Kammen, D.M., and Nemet, G.F. (2005). “Reversing the Incredible Shrinking Energy R&D Budget.” *Issues in Science and Technology*, Fall. [online: web]. Cited 5 Dec 2006. URL: <http://www.issues.org/22.1/realnumbers.html>

- Keller, W. (2002). "Geographic Localization of International Technology Diffusion." *American Economic Review*, 92 (1): 120-142.
- Keller, W. (2004). "International Technology Diffusion." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 42 (3): 752-782.
- Lynd, L.R. (2004). "Biomass Use in Energy Production: New Opportunities for Agriculture." U.S. Senate Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry Committee hearing. [online: web]. Cited 5 Dec 2006. URL: <http://agriculture.senate.gov/Hearings/hearings.cfm?hearingid=1161&witnessId=33>
- Margolis, R.M., and Kammen, D.M. (1999). "Underinvestment: The Energy Technology and R&D Policy Challenge." *Science*, 285: 690-692.
- Margolis, R. M. and Kammen, D. M. (2001). "Energy R&D and Innovation: Challenges and Opportunities." In Stephen Schneider, Armin Rosencranz, and John Niles, eds., *Climate Change Policy: A Survey*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Nadiri, M. Ishaq and Kim, Seongjun (1996). "International R&D Spillovers, Trade and Productivity in Major OECD Countries." National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper No. 5801. October 1996. Cambridge, MA.
- OECD (2006). ANBERD Research and Development Database. Paris.
- OECD (2005). STAN Database for Industrial Analysis, 1987-2003. Paris.
- Pyo, H-K. (1998). "Estimation of Korean Physical Capital Stock by Industry and Type of Asset." Korean Institute of Public Finance. Korea.
- Romer, Paul M. (1990). "Endogenous Technological Change." *Journal of Political Economy*, 98 (5): S71-S102.

- Scherer, Frederic M. (1982). "Inter-Industry Technology Flows and Productivity Growth." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 64 (4): 627–634.
- Sveikauskas, Leo (1981). "Technological Inputs and Multifactor Productivity Growth." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 63 (2): 275–282.
- Taegi, Kim and Park, Changshu (2003). "R&D, Trade, and Productivity Growth in Korean Manufacturing." *Review of World Economics*, 139 (3): 460-483.
- Terleckyj, Nestor E. (1980). "Direct and Indirect Effects of Industrial Research and Development on the Productivity Growth of Industries." In John W. Kendrick and Beatrice N. Vaccara, eds., *New Developments in Productivity Measurement and Analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tirole, J. (2001). *The Theory of Industrial Organization*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.