



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

## **The Verdoorn law in the Portuguese regions: a panel data analysis**

Martinho, Vítor João Pereira Domingues

Escola Superior Agrária, Instituto Politécnico de Viseu

2011

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/32186/>  
MPRA Paper No. 32186, posted 12 Jul 2011 22:16 UTC

## THE VERDOORN LAW IN THE PORTUGUESE REGIONS: A PANEL DATA ANALYSIS

**Vitor João Pereira Domingues Martinho**

Unidade de I&D do Instituto Politécnico de Viseu

Av. Cor. José Maria Vale de Andrade

Campus Politécnico

3504 - 510 Viseu

**(PORTUGAL)**

**e-mail:** vdmartinho@esav.ipv.pt

### ABSTRACT

This work aims to test the Verdoorn Law, with the alternative specifications of (1)Kaldor (1966), for five regions (NUTS II) Portuguese from 1986 to 1994 and for the 28 NUTS III Portuguese in the period 1995 to 1999. Will, therefore, to analyze the existence of increasing returns to scale that characterize the phenomena of polarization with circular and cumulative causes and can explain the processes of regional divergence. It is intended to test, even in this work, the alternative interpretation of (2)Rowthorn (1975) Verdoorn's Law for the same regions and periods. The results of this work will be complemented with estimates of these relationships to other sectors of the economy than the industry (primary and services sector), for each of the manufacturing industries operating in the Portuguese regions and for the total economy of each region.

**Keywords:** increasing returns; Verdoorn law; Portuguese regions.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

(3)Verdoorn (1949) was the first author to reveal the importance of the positive relationship between the growth of labor productivity and output growth, arguing that the causality is from output to productivity, thus assuming that labor productivity is endogenous. An important finding of the empirical relationship is the elasticity of labor productivity with

respect to output that according to Verdoorn is approximately 0.45 on average, external limits between 0.41 and 0.57. This author also found that the relationship between productivity growth and output growth reflects a kind of production technology and the existence of increasing returns to scale, which contradicts the hypothesis of neoclassical constant returns to scale, or decreasing, and absolute convergence Regional.

Kaldor rediscovered this law in 1966 and since then Verdoorn's Law has been tested in several ways, using specifications, samples and different periods. However, the conclusions drawn differ, some of them rejecting the Law of Verdoorn and other supporting its validity. (4)Kaldor (1966, 1967) in his attempt to explain the causes of the low rate of growth in the UK, reconsidering and empirically investigating Verdoorn's Law, found that there is a strong positive relationship between the growth of labor productivity ( $p$ ) and output ( $q$ ), i.e.  $p = f(q)$ . Or alternatively between employment growth ( $e$ ) and the growth of output, ie,  $e = f(q)$ .

Another interpretation of Verdoorn's Law, as an alternative to the Kaldor, is presented by (5)Rowthorn (1975, 1979). Rowthorn argues that the most appropriate specification of Verdoorn's Law is the ratio of growth of output ( $q$ ) and the growth of labor productivity ( $p$ ) with employment growth ( $e$ ), i.e.,  $q = f(e)$  and  $p = f(e)$ , respectively (as noted above, the exogenous variable in this case is employment). On the other hand, Rowthorn believes that the empirical work of Kaldor (1966) for the period 1953-54 to 1963-64 and the (6)Cripps and Tarling (1973) for the period 1951 to 1965 that confirm Kaldor's Law, not can be accepted since they are based on small samples of countries, where extreme cases end up like Japan have great influence on overall results.

It should be noted, finally, that several authors have developed a body of work in order to test the Verdoorn's Law in a regional context, including (7)Leon-Ledesma (1998).

## **2. ALTERNATIVE SPECIFICATIONS OF VERDOORN'S LAW**

The hypothesis of increasing returns to scale in industry was initially tested by Kaldor (1966) using the following relations:

$$p_i = a + bq_i, \text{ Verdoorn law (1)}$$

$$e_i = c + dq_i, \text{ Kaldor law (2)}$$

where  $p_i$ ,  $q_i$  and  $e_i$  are the growth rates of labor productivity, output and employment in the industrial sector in the economy  $i$ .

On the other hand, the mathematical form of Rowthorn specification is as follows:

$$p_i = \lambda_1 + \varepsilon_1 e_i, \text{ first equation of Rowthorn (3)}$$

$$q_i = \lambda_2 + \varepsilon_2 e_i, \text{ second equation of Rowthorn (4)}$$

where  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$  e  $\varepsilon_2 = (1 + \varepsilon_1)$ , because  $p_i = q_i - e_i$ . In other words,  $q_i - e_i = \lambda_1 + \varepsilon_1 e_i$ ,  $q_i = \lambda_1 + e_i + \varepsilon_1 e_i$ , so,  $q_i = \lambda_1 + (1 + \varepsilon_1) e_i$ .

Rowthorn estimated these equations for the same OECD countries considered by Kaldor (1966), with the exception of Japan, and for the same period and found that  $\varepsilon_2$  was not statistically different from unity and therefore  $\varepsilon_1$  was not statistically different from zero. This author thus confirmed the hypothesis of constant returns to scale in manufacturing in the developed countries of the OECD. (8)Thirlwall (1980) criticized these results, considering that the Rowthorn interpretation of Verdoorn's Law is static, since it assumes that the Verdoorn coefficient depends solely on the partial elasticity of output with respect to employment.

### 3. DATA ANALYSIS

Considering the variables on the models of Kaldor and Rowthorn presented previously and the availability of statistical information, we used the following data disaggregated at regional level. Annual data for the period 1986 to 1994 corresponding to the five regions of mainland Portugal (NUTS II) for the different economic sectors, including the various manufacturing industries in those regions and the total economy of these regions. These data were obtained from Eurostat (Eurostat Regio of Statistics 2000). We also used data for the period from 1995 to 1999 of the twenty-eight NUTS III regions of mainland Portugal and with the same sectoral breakdown mentioned above. The data for the period 1995 to 1999 were obtained from the INE (National Accounts 2003).

#### 4. EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE OF THE VERDOORN'S LAW

The results in Table 1, obtained in the estimations carried out with the equations of Verdoorn, Kaldor and Rowthorn for each of the sectors of the economy and for the total economy of each of the five regions considered in the first period, to state the following.

The industry is the sector that has the biggest increasing returns to scale, followed by agriculture and service sector. Services without the public sector present values for the income scale unacceptable and manufacturing presents surprisingly very low values, reflecting a more intensive use of labor.

It should be noted, finally, for this set of results the following table: Verdoorn's equation is the most satisfactory in terms of statistical significance of the coefficient obtained and the degree of explanation in the various estimations. There is, therefore, that productivity is endogenous and generated by the growth of regional and sectoral output.

**Table 1:** Analysis of economies of scale through the equation Verdoorn, Kaldor and Rowthorn, for each of the economic sectors and the five NUTS II of Portugal, for the period 1986 to 1994

<b>Agriculture</b>						
	<b>Constant</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>G.L.</b>	<b>E.E. (1/(1-b))</b>
<b>Verdoorn</b> $p_i = a + bq_i$	0.042* (5.925)	0.878* (12.527)	1.696	0.805	38	8.197
<b>Kaldor</b> $e_i = c + dq_i$	-0.042* (-5.925)	0.123** (1.750)	1.696	0.075	38	
<b>Rowthorn1</b> $p_i = \lambda_1 + \varepsilon_1 e_i$	-0.010 (-0.616)	-0.621** (-1.904)	1.568	0.087	38	
<b>Rowthorn2</b> $q_i = \lambda_2 + \varepsilon_2 e_i$	-0.010 (-0.616)	0.379 (1.160)	1.568	0.034	38	
<b>Industry</b>						
	<b>Constant</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>G.L.</b>	<b>E.E. (1/(1-b))</b>
<b>Verdoorn</b>	-12.725* (-4.222)	0.992* (8.299)	2.001	0.587	37	125.000
<b>Kaldor</b>	12.725* (4.222)	0.008 (0.064)	2.001	0.869	37	
<b>Rowthorn1</b>	15.346* (9.052)	-0.449* (-3.214)	1.889	0.326	37	

Alert! This author has published many duplicate versions of very similar papers with slightly different titles, but without an appropriate notice. This may apply to this contribution, too.

<b>Rowthorn2</b>	15.346* (9.052)	0.551* (3.940)	1.889	0.776	37	
<b>Manufactured Industry</b>						
	<b>Constant</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>G.L.</b>	<b>E.E. (1/(1-b))</b>
<b>Verdoorn</b>	8.296* (4.306)	0.319* (2.240)	1.679	0.139	37	1.468
<b>Kaldor</b>	-8.296* (-4.306)	0.681* (4.777)	1.679	0.887	37	
<b>Rowthorn1</b>	12.522* (12.537)	-0.240* (-2.834)	1.842	0.269	37	
<b>Rowthorn2</b>	12.522* (12.537)	0.760* (8.993)	1.842	0.891	37	
<b>Services</b>						
	<b>Constant</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>G.L.</b>	<b>E.E. (1/(1-b))</b>
<b>Verdoorn</b>	-0.045* (-3.253)	0.802* (6.239)	1.728	0.506	38	5.051
<b>Kaldor</b>	0.045* (3.253)	0.198 (1.544)	1.728	0.059	38	
<b>Rowthorn1</b>	0.071* (4.728)	-0.694* (-3.607)	1.817	0.255	38	
<b>Rowthorn2</b>	0.071* (4.728)	0.306 (1.592)	1.817	0.063	38	
<b>Services (without public sector)</b>						
	<b>Constant</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>G.L.</b>	<b>E.E. (1/(1-b))</b>
<b>Verdoorn</b>	-0.074* (-4.250)	1.020* (7.695)	1.786	0.609	38	---
<b>Kaldor</b>	0.074* (4.250)	-0.020 (-0.149)	1.786	0.001	38	
<b>Rowthorn1</b>	0.076* (4.350)	-0.903* (-4.736)	1.847	0.371	38	
<b>Rowthorn2</b>	0.076* (4.350)	0.097 (0.509)	1.847	0.007	38	
<b>All Sectors</b>						
	<b>Constant</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>G.L.</b>	<b>E.E. (1/(1-b))</b>
<b>Verdoorn</b>	-0.020* (-2.090)	0.907* (8.367)	1.595	0.648	38	10.753
<b>Kaldor</b>	0.020* (2.090)	0.093 (0.856)	1.595	0.019	38	

<b>Rowthorn1</b>	0.056* (6.043)	-0.648* (-2.670)	2.336	0.255	32	
<b>Rowthorn2</b>	0.056* (6.043)	0.352 (1.453)	2.336	0.225	32	

**Note:** \* Coefficient statistically significant at 5%, \*\* Coefficient statistically significant at 10%, GL, Degrees of freedom; EE, Economies of scale.

Applying the same methodology for each of the manufacturing industries, we obtained the results presented in Table 2.

Manufacturing industries that have, respectively, higher increasing returns to scale are the industry of transport equipment (5.525), the food industry (4.274), industrial minerals (3.906), the metal industry (3.257), the several industry (2.222), the textile industry (1.770), the chemical industry (1.718) and industry equipment and electrical goods (presents unacceptable values). The paper industry has excessively high values. Note that, as expected, the transportation equipment industry and the food industry have the best economies of scale (they are modernized industries) and the textile industry has the lowest economies of scale (industry still very traditional, labor intensive, and in small units).

Also in Table 2 presents the results of an estimation carried out with 9 manufacturing industries disaggregated and together (with 405 observations). By analyzing these data it appears that were obtained respectively for the coefficients of the four equations, the following elasticities: 0.608, 0.392, -0.275 and 0.725. Therefore, values that do not indicate very strong increasing returns to scale, as in previous estimates, but are close to those obtained by Verdoorn and Kaldor.

**Table 2:** Analysis of economies of scale through the equation Verdoorn, Kaldor and Rowthorn, for each of the manufacturing industries and in the five NUTS II of Portugal, for the period 1986 to 1994

<b>Metal Industry</b>						
	<b>Constant</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>G.L.</b>	<b>E.E. (1/(1-b))</b>
<b>Verdoorn</b> $p_i = a + bq_i$	-4.019* (-2.502)	0.693* (9.915)	1.955	0.898	29	3.257
<b>Kaldor</b> $e_i = c + dq_i$	4.019* (2.502)	0.307* (4.385)	1.955	0.788	29	

<b>Rowthorn1</b> $p_i = \lambda_1 + \varepsilon_1 e_i$	-12.019 (-0.549)	0.357 (1.284)	1.798	0.730	29	
<b>Rowthorn2</b> $q_i = \lambda_2 + \varepsilon_2 e_i$	-12.019 (-0.549)	1.357* (4.879)	1.798	0.751	29	
<b>Mineral Industry</b>						
	<b>Constant</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>G.L.</b>	<b>E.E. (1/(1-b))</b>
<b>Verdoorn</b>	-0.056* (-4.296)	0.744* (4.545)	1.978	0.352	38	3.906
<b>Kaldor</b>	0.056* (4.296)	0.256 (1.566)	1.978	0.061	38	
<b>Rowthorn1</b>	-0.023 (-0.685)	-0.898* (-9.503)	2.352	0.704	38	
<b>Rowthorn2</b>	-0.023 (-0.685)	0.102 (1.075)	2.352	0.030	38	
<b>Chemical Industry</b>						
	<b>Constant</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>G.L.</b>	<b>E.E. (1/(1-b))</b>
<b>Verdoorn</b>	0.002 (0.127)	0.418* (6.502)	1.825	0.554	34	1.718
<b>Kaldor</b>	-0.002 (-0.127)	0.582* (9.052)	1.825	0.707	34	
<b>Rowthorn1</b>	9.413* (9.884)	0.109 (0.999)	1.857	0.235	33	
<b>Rowthorn2</b>	9.413* (9.884)	1.109* (10.182)	1.857	0.868	33	
<b>Electrical Industry</b>						
	<b>Constant</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>G.L.</b>	<b>E.E. (1/(1-b))</b>
<b>Verdoorn</b>	0.004 (0.208)	-0.126 (-1.274)	1.762	0.128	32	---
<b>Kaldor</b>	-0.004 (-0.208)	1.126* (11.418)	1.762	0.796	32	
<b>Rowthorn1</b>	0.019 (1.379)	-0.287* (-4.593)	1.659	0.452	32	
<b>Rowthorn2</b>	0.019 (1.379)	0.713* (11.404)	1.659	0.795	32	
<b>Transport Industry</b>						
	<b>Constant</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>G.L.</b>	<b>E.E. (1/(1-b))</b>
<b>Verdoorn</b>	-0.055* (-2.595)	0.819* (5.644)	2.006	0.456	38	5.525



Alert! This author has published many duplicate versions of very similar papers with slightly different titles, but without an appropriate notice. This may apply to this contribution, too.

<b>Kaldor</b>	0.055* (2.595)	0.181 (1.251)	2.006	0.040	38	
<b>Rowthorn1</b>	-0.001 (-0.029)	-0.628* (-3.938)	2.120	0.436	32	
<b>Rowthorn2</b>	-0.001 (-0.029)	0.372* (2.336)	2.120	0.156	32	
<b>Food Industry</b>						
	<b>Constant</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>G.L.</b>	<b>E.E. (1/(1-b))</b>
<b>Verdoorn</b>	0.006 (0.692)	0.766* (6.497)	2.191	0.526	38	4.274
<b>Kaldor</b>	-0.006 (-0.692)	0.234** (1.984)	2.191	0.094	38	
<b>Rowthorn1</b>	0.048* (2.591)	-0.679* (-4.266)	1.704	0.324	38	
<b>Rowthorn2</b>	0.048* (2.591)	0.321* (2.018)	1.704	0.097	38	
<b>Textile Industry</b>						
	<b>Constant</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>G.L.</b>	<b>E.E. (1/(1-b))</b>
<b>Verdoorn</b>	-0.008 (-0.466)	0.435* (3.557)	2.117	0.271	34	1.770
<b>Kaldor</b>	0.008 (0.466)	0.565* (4.626)	2.117	0.386	34	
<b>Rowthorn1</b>	0.002 (0.064)	-0.303* (-2.311)	1.937	0.136	34	
<b>Rowthorn2</b>	0.002 (0.064)	0.697* (5.318)	1.937	0.454	34	
<b>Paper Industry</b>						
	<b>Constant</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>G.L.</b>	<b>E.E. (1/(1-b))</b>
<b>Verdoorn</b>	-0.062* (-3.981)	1.114* (12.172)	1.837	0.796	38	∞
<b>Kaldor</b>	0.062* (3.981)	-0.114 (-1.249)	1.837	0.039	38	
<b>Rowthorn1</b>	0.028 (1.377)	-1.053* (-4.134)	1.637	0.310	38	
<b>Rowthorn2</b>	0.028 (1.377)	-0.053 (-0.208)	1.637	0.001	38	
<b>Several Industry</b>						
	<b>Constant</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>G.L.</b>	<b>E.E. (1/(1-b))</b>

<b>Verdoorn</b>	-1.212 (-0.756)	0.550* (8.168)	2.185	0.529	37	2.222
<b>Kaldor</b>	1.212 (0.756)	0.450* (6.693)	2.185	0.983	37	
<b>Rowthorn1</b>	8.483* (24.757)	0.069 (1.878)	2.034	0.175	37	
<b>Rowthorn2</b>	8.483* (24.757)	1.069* (29.070)	2.034	0.975	37	
<b>9 Manufactured Industry Together</b>						
	<b>Constant</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>G.L.</b>	<b>E.E. (1/(1-b))</b>
<b>Verdoorn</b>	-0.030* (-6.413)	0.608* (19.101)	1.831	0.516	342	2.551
<b>Kaldor</b>	0.030* (6.413)	0.392* (12.335)	1.831	0.308	342	
<b>Rowthorn1</b>	-0.003 (-0.257)	-0.275* (-4.377)	1.968	0.053	342	
<b>Rowthorn2</b>	-0.003 (-0.257)	0.725* (11.526)	1.968	0.280	342	

**Note:** \* Coefficient statistically significant at 5%, \*\* Coefficient statistically significant at 10%, GL, Degrees of freedom; EE, Economies of scale.

At Table 3, with results of estimations performed for each of the sectors and in the period 1995 to 1999, to stress again that the industry has the greatest increasing returns to scale (9.091), followed by services (1.996). Agriculture, in turn, presents unacceptable values.

In Table 4 are the results of an estimation carried out for nine manufacturing industries disaggregated and together, as in the face of data availability (short period of time and lack of disaggregated data for these industries in NUTS III) this is a way to estimate considered the equations for the different manufacturing industries during this period. For the analysis of the data reveals that the values of the coefficients of the four equations are, respectively, 0.774, 0.226, -0.391 and 0.609 (all statistically significant), reflecting the increasing returns to scale increased slightly in this economic sector, i.e. of 2.551 (Table 2) to 4.425.

**Table 3:** Analysis of economies of scale through the equation Verdoorn, Kaldor and Rowthorn, for each of the economic sectors and NUTS III of Portugal, for the period 1995 to 1999

<b>Agriculture</b>						
	<b>Constant</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>G.L.</b>	<b>E.E. (1/(1-b))</b>
<b>Verdoorn<sup>(1)</sup></b>	0.010 (0.282)	0.053 (0.667)	0.542	1.690	23	---
<b>Verdoorn</b> $p_i = a + bq_i$	0.023* (3.613)	1.105* (17.910)	1.959	0.745	110	
<b>Kaldor</b> $e_i = c + dq_i$	-0.023* (-3.613)	-0.105** (-1.707)	1.959	0.026	110	
<b>Rowthorn1</b> $p_i = \lambda_1 + \varepsilon_1 e_i$	-0.032* (-5.768)	-1.178* (-9.524)	1.713	0.452	110	
<b>Rowthorn2</b> $q_i = \lambda_2 + \varepsilon_2 e_i$	-0.032* (-5.768)	-0.178 (-1.441)	1.713	0.019	110	
<b>Industry</b>						
	<b>Constant</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>G.L.</b>	<b>E.E. (1/(1-b))</b>
<b>Verdoorn<sup>(1)</sup></b>	0.017 (0.319)	0.053 (0.673)	0.195	2.380	23	9.091
<b>Verdoorn</b>	-0.014* (-2.993)	0.890* (18.138)	2.253	0.749	110	
<b>Kaldor</b>	0.014* (2.993)	0.110* (2.236)	2.253	0.044	110	
<b>Rowthorn1</b>	0.053* (6.739)	-0.617* (-3.481)	2.069	0.099	110	
<b>Rowthorn2</b>	0.053* (6.739)	0.383* (2.162)	2.069	0.041	110	
<b>Services</b>						
	<b>Constant</b>	<b>Coefficient</b>	<b>DW</b>	<b>R<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>G.L.</b>	<b>E.E. (1/(1-b))</b>
<b>Verdoorn<sup>(1)</sup></b>	0.003 (0.306)	0.096* (8.009)	0.773	2.492	23	1.996
<b>Verdoorn</b>	0.007 (1.098)	0.499* (6.362)	2.046	0.269	110	
<b>Kaldor</b>	-0.007 (-1.098)	0.502* (6.399)	2.046	0.271	110	
<b>Rowthorn1</b>	0.059* (19.382)	-0.432* (-5.254)	1.993	0.201	110	
<b>Rowthorn2</b>	0.059* (19.382)	0.568* (6.895)	1.993	0.302	110	

All Sectors						
	Constant	Coefficient	DW	R <sup>2</sup>	G.L.	E.E. (1/(1-b))
<b>Verdoorn<sup>(1)</sup></b>	0.007 (0.188)	0.090* (2.524)	0.203	2.588	23	6.711
<b>Verdoorn</b>	-0.015* (-3.245)	0.851* (13.151)	2.185	0.611	110	
<b>Kaldor</b>	0.015* (3.245)	0.149* (2.308)	2.185	0.046	110	
<b>Rowthorn1</b>	0.057* (13.017)	-0.734* (-5.499)	2.092	0.216	110	
<b>Rowthorn2</b>	0.057* (13.017)	0.266** (1.989)	2.092	0.035	110	

Note: (1) cross-section Estimation \* Coefficient statistically significant at 5%, \*\* Coefficient statistically significant at 10%, GL, Degrees of freedom; EE, Economies of scale.

**Table 4:** Analysis of economies of scale through the equation Verdoorn, Kaldor and Rowthorn, for nine manufacturing industries together for the period 1995 to 1999 and five in mainland Portugal NUTS II

9 Manufactured Industry Together						
	Constant	Coefficient	DW	R <sup>2</sup>	G.L.	E.E. (1/(1-b))
<b>Verdoorn</b> $p_i = a + bq_i$	0.004 (0.766)	0.774* (20.545)	2.132	0.703	178	4.425
<b>Kaldor</b> $e_i = c + dq_i$	-0.004 (-0.766)	0.226* (6.010)	2.132	0.169	178	
<b>Rowthorn1</b> $p_i = \lambda_1 + \varepsilon_1 e_i$	0.049* (4.023)	-0.391* (-3.392)	2.045	0.112	132	
<b>Rowthorn2</b> $q_i = \lambda_2 + \varepsilon_2 e_i$	0.049* (4.023)	0.609* (5.278)	2.045	0.214	132	

Note: \* Coefficient statistically significant at 5%, \*\* Coefficient statistically significant at 10%, GL, Degrees of freedom; EE, Economies of scale.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

In the estimates made for each of the economic sectors in the first period (1986-1994), it appears that the industry is the largest that has increasing returns to scale, followed by agriculture and service sector.

At the level of estimates made for manufacturing industries, it appears that those with, respectively, higher yields are industry transport equipment, food industry, industrial

minerals, metals industry, the several industries, the textile industry, chemical industry and industry equipment and electrical goods. The paper industry has excessively high values.

The results of the estimations made for each of the economic sectors in the second period (1995-1999), notes that the industry again provides greater increasing returns to scale, followed by services. Agriculture, on the other hand, has overly high values.

## 6. REFERENCES

1. N. Kaldor. Causes of the Slow Rate of Economics of the UK. An Inaugural Lecture. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.
2. R.E. Rowthorn. What Remains of Kaldor Laws? *Economic Journal*, 85, 10-19 (1975).
3. P.J. Verdoorn. Fattori che Regolano lo Sviluppo Della Produttivita del Lavoro. *L'Industria*, 1, 3-10 (1949).
4. N. Kaldor. Strategic factors in economic development. Cornell University, Itaca, 1967.
5. R.E. Rowthorn. A note on Verdoorn's Law. *Economic Journal*, Vol. 89, pp: 131-133 (1979).
6. T.F. Cripps and R.J. Tarling. Growth in advanced capitalist economies: 1950-1970. University of Cambridge, Department of Applied Economics, Occasional Paper 40, 1973.
7. M.A. Leon-Ledesma. Economic Growth and Verdoorn's Law in the Spanish Regions, 1962-1991. Working Paper, Universidad de La Laguna, Spain, 1998.
8. A.P. Thirlwall. Regional Problems are "Balance-of-Payments" Problems. *Regional Studies*, Vol. 14, 419-425 (1980).