



**Faculdade de Economia  
da Universidade de Coimbra**

Grupo de Estudos Monetários e Financeiros  
(GEMF)  
Av. Dias da Silva, 165 – 3004-512 COIMBRA,  
PORTUGAL

gemf@fe.uc.pt  
<http://gemf.fe.uc.pt>

CARLOS CARREIRA & PAULINO TEIXEIRA

**Internal and External Restructuring over  
the Cycle: A Firm-Based Analysis of  
Gross Flows and Productivity Growth in  
Portugal**

---

ESTUDOS DO GEMF

N.º 1

2007

**PUBLICAÇÃO CO-FINANCIADA PELA  
FUNDAÇÃO PARA A CIÊNCIA E TECNOLOGIA**

Impresso na Secção de Textos da FEUC  
COIMBRA 2007

**Internal and External Restructuring over the Cycle:  
A Firm-Based Analysis of Gross Flows and Productivity Growth in Portugal \***

CARLOS CARREIRA\* and PAULINO TEIXEIRA

Maio 2007

***Abstract:***

This paper discusses the role played by internal restructuring vis-à-vis external restructuring in industry productivity growth, arguing that the contribution of these two components is expected to be sensitive to the economic cycle. The study describes gross flows (job and output) over a period of one decade, and analyses the productivity differential among continuing, entering and exiting firms in the Portuguese manufacturing sector. The results of the decomposition of industry productivity growth suggest that the share of external restructuring is stronger in recession, while internal restructuring seems to be predominant in expansion. The strong and positive contribution of the cleansing effect, in 1991-1994, was not followed by any passive learning effect of equivalent magnitude in the 1994-1997 sub-period. The active learning effect, measured by the within effect, is, as expected, stronger when output growth is at its peak, but in no case large enough to turn productivity growth procyclical.

***Keywords:*** Cleansing; Active and passive learning; Internal restructuring; External restructuring; Productivity growth.

***JEL Codes:*** L60, L11, O47, O12.

\* We thank two anonymous referees for their most helpful comments on the previous versions of this paper.

\* Corresponding author

Faculdade de Economia  
Universidade de Coimbra  
Av. Dias da Silva, 165; 3004-512 Coimbra  
Portugal  
Email: [ccarreir@fe.uc.pt](mailto:ccarreir@fe.uc.pt)

“There is a large scope for productivity increases in Portugal, and a set of reforms which could achieve them.”

(Blanchard, 2007, p. 20)

## **1 Introduction**

According to a recent report, Portugal lags behind leading OECD countries by 41 percentage points in terms of GDP per hour worked (OECD, 2006). Moreover, the labour productivity growth shows a clear declining trend in the 1990s, especially in the business sector (OECD, 2004: Figure 1.4). This economic performance has attracted the attention of researchers, but, in most studies, attention has been mainly given to aspects related to *internal* restructuring, that is, to aspects related to productivity changes within existing firms (new technologies, human capital accumulation and organizational changes, for example) rather than to the reallocation across firms or *external* restructuring (see Simões, 1995; Faria, Fenn and Bruce, 2002, 2005; Teixeira and Fortuna, 2004; Monteiro-Barata, 2005).

The main purpose of this paper is therefore to examine the contribution of external vis-à-vis internal restructuring to (aggregate) productivity growth. We will also evaluate to what extent these two sources vary over the cycle, by considering that the specific role of internal versus external restructuring on productivity growth depends on the relative importance of *cleansing*, *active learning* and *passive learning* effects. By the *cleansing* effect – an effect identified by Schumpeter (1934, 1939) and other eminent pre-Keynesian ‘liquidationists’ (see DeLong, 1990; Aghion and Saint-Paul, 1998) – we mean the process in which less efficient firms (or technologies) are replaced by more efficient units, while the *passive learning* effect, or selection between continuing firms, comes from firms’ ability to learn their own, pre-determined (but

unknown) productivity, and according to which firms expand when they realize they are efficient and shrink when they learn they are not (e.g. Jovanovich, 1982). The *active learning* effect in turn is taken as an outcome of firms' investment in research and development designed to improve their competitive capabilities (e.g. Ericson and Pakes, 1995).

The relative importance of internal versus external restructuring depends of course on how the cleansing, passive learning, and active learning effects perform in the different phases of the cycle. The Schumpeterian literature, for example, has suggested that cleansing is countercyclical, based on the argument that resource reallocation seems to be more intense in recessions (see Caballero and Hammour, 1994, 1996; Mortensen and Pissaridies, 1994; the evidence on job flows for the United States manufacturing sector can be found in Davis and Haltiwanger, 1992; Davis, Haltiwanger and Schuh, 1996; Baldwin, Dunne and Haltiwanger, 1998, *inter al.*). But if relatively inefficient units disappear in recessions, then, other things constant, productivity growth should be countercyclical, a proposition often at odds with the data (see Aizcorbe, 1992; Caballero and Hammour, 2005; and Hart and Malley, 1999). Recent theoretical literature has indeed suggested that the cleansing effect may be dominated or reversed by other effects arising, for example, from on-the-job search, credit market frictions or (insufficient) passive learning (e.g. Barlevy, 2002, 2003; and Ouyang, 2005) – while the incentive to invest in R&D in downturns may be higher (the cost of growth-enhancing activities in terms of forgone output or sales is lower in recessions), financial constraints are higher too (Barlevy, 2003, 2004), *and* one cannot exclude that excessive exit in downturns may impede potentially superior units to flourish (the “scarring” effect of recessions, Ouyang, 2005). Since the active and passive learning effects are expected to

be procyclical, the combination of the three effects – cleansing, passive and active learning – is then expected to imply that, as a general rule, productivity growth should be procyclical.

By offering a detailed, firm-level, productivity analysis of the Portuguese manufacturing sector in a period of one decade, we aim to shed further light over these controversial issues. To this end, three main contributions are offered in this paper. Firstly, it adds new evidence on job and output gross flows using an original panel of Portuguese manufacturing firms. Secondly, it complements – for Portugal – the OECD survey (2001a) on the determinants of productivity growth by offering two alternative measures – total factor productivity (TFP) and labour productivity (LP). Finally, and more importantly, this paper decomposes the productivity growth into four components – *within*, *between*, *cross*, and *net entry*, as suggested by Foster, Haltiwanger and Krizan (2001) and Griliches and Regev (1995) – and discusses the cyclical pattern of internal versus external restructuring by drawing on the assumption that internal restructuring is captured by the *within* effect, while external restructuring is explained by across firm effects (i.e. *between*, *cross*, and *net entry*). We further assume in this context that the net entry effect captures mainly the *cleansing* effect, while the between and cross effects mirror *passive learning*. The within component of productivity growth, in turn, reflects mostly firms' *active learning*. The main purpose of this mapping is, above all, to offer a workable device that enables us to organize in a simple way the discussion of our findings.<sup>1</sup>

Our empirical enquiry is based on a newly panel of manufacturing firms covering the period 1991-2000 (annual data). The dataset is representative of the manufacturing activity of the central region of Portugal (Região Centro, NUT II) and it

has the unique feature of unambiguously identifying new firms as well as closures (shutdowns). Since it contains all input and output information required to determine the TFP and labour productivity, our dataset is particularly fitted to carry out productivity analysis.

According to our decomposition exercise, we found that the strong and positive contribution of the cleansing effect in 1991-1994 was not followed by a passive learning effect of equivalent magnitude in 1994-1997. Our conclusion is then that in Portugal the competitive pressure towards inefficient firms to shrink is insufficient in expansions. The active learning effect, measured by the within effect, is, as expected, stronger when output growth is at its peak, but in no case large enough to turn productivity growth procyclical.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the data and two alternative productivity growth decomposition methods. Section 3 evaluates the importance of production and employment reallocation flows over the cycle. Section 4 analyses the productivity differential among continuing, entering and exiting firms. Section 5 presents the results of the productivity decomposition exercise and Section 6 offers some concluding remarks.

## **2 Data and methodology**

### **2.1 The dataset**

The raw data is drawn from the *Inquérito às Empresas Harmonizado* (IEH), an annual business survey run by the Portuguese Statistical Office (INE). It contains, in particular, detailed information on input and output, required to determine total factor productivity at firm level. The sample of manufacturing firms comprises some 1,900 units, observed over a 10-year period (1991-2000, unbalanced panel). In the sample, firms with more than 100 employees were chosen with certainty, while those with 20 to 99 employees were drawn randomly. As will be seen in Section 3, our results are weighted to ensure they are representative of the population of the central region of Portugal. The sample is considered representative with respect to sectoral disaggregation (at 3-digit level), both in terms of employment size and output (sales).<sup>2</sup>

The longitudinal dimension of the panel was constructed using firm's identification number in the IEH dataset. Additional information with respect to the year of birth/death was drawn from *Ficheiro de Unidades Estatísticas* (FUE), also run by INE. By combining these two datasets (IEH and FUE), it was then possible to determine, with no margin of error, the status of any given unit in any given period: continuing, entering (newly created) or exiting (closure).<sup>3</sup>

## 2.2 Measurement of productivity

The index of firm-level TFP calculated here is similar to that used by Baily, Hulten and Campbel (1992), with firm-level productivity ( $\ln TFP$ ) for firm  $i$  in year  $t$  given by:<sup>4</sup>

$$\ln TFP_{it} = \ln Q_{it} - \alpha_K \ln K_{it} - \alpha_L \ln L_{it} - \alpha_M \ln M_{it}, \quad (1)$$

where  $Q_{it}$  is the real gross output of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  firm in year  $t$ , and  $K_{it}$ ,  $L_{it}$  and  $M_{it}$  are capital, labour and intermediate inputs, respectively;  $\alpha_j$  denotes factor elasticities,  $j = K, L, M$ .

The index of firm-level labour productivity ( $\ln LP$ ) for firm  $i$  in year  $t$  is calculated as the log of the value added per unit of labour, that is:

$$\ln LP_{it} = \ln VA_{it} - \ln L_{it}, \quad (2)$$

where  $VA_{it}$  is the value added for the  $i^{\text{th}}$  firm in year  $t$ .

The gross output is given by the sum of total revenues from sales, services rendered, self-consumption of own production and the change in inventory of final goods. It is deflated by the producer price index at the 3-digit level. The labour input is a 12-month employment average. The labour costs embrace all employment costs, including those incurred through social security payments, and were deflated by the manufacturing industry labour price index. The intermediate input includes the cost of materials, services purchased, and other operating costs; it is deflated by the GDP deflator. Capital stock is measured as the book value of total net assets. Capital services is defined as the sum of the depreciation and the interest on the net asset. The real interest rate is computed as the difference between annual average of the long-term enterprise interest rates and the annual consumer price index. Finally, factor elasticities  $\alpha_K$ ,  $\alpha_L$  and  $\alpha_M$  are given by the corresponding industry average cost shares.

### 2.3 Decomposition methods of aggregate productivity growth

The industry productivity level,  $P_t$ , in year  $t$  can be defined as the weighted average of firms' productivity levels, that is,  $P_t = \sum_i \theta_{it} p_{it}$ , where  $\theta_{it}$  is the output (or employment) share of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  firm in year  $t$  and  $p_{it}$  is the corresponding productivity level (TFP or LP). Clearly, industry productivity growth can occur through changes in  $p_{it}$  or  $\theta_{it}$ , that is, either through changes in the productivity level across micro units or through changes in their market shares, which in turn will reflect entry, exit and expansion/contraction of continuing firms.

In our study we have followed two routes to decompose industry productivity growth. (Alternative methods can be found in Foster, Haltiwanger and Krizan, 2001; Baldwin and Gu, 2002; Balk and Hoogenboom-Spijker, 2003). The first was proposed by Foster, Haltiwanger and Krizan (2001) and is given by (FHK henceforth):

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta P_t = & \sum_{i \in C} \theta_{i(t-\tau)} \Delta p_{it} + \sum_{i \in C} \Delta \theta_{it} (p_{i(t-\tau)} - P_{t-\tau}) + \sum_{i \in C} \Delta \theta_{it} \Delta p_{it} \\ & + \sum_{i \in E} \theta_{it} (p_{it} - P_{t-\tau}) - \sum_{i \in X} \theta_{i(t-\tau)} (p_{i(t-\tau)} - P_{t-\tau}), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $C$ ,  $E$ , and  $X$  denote the sets of continuing, entering, and exiting firms between  $t-\tau$  (the base year) and  $t$ , respectively.  $P_{t-\tau}$  is the aggregate productivity in  $t-\tau$ . The first term in equation (3), called the “within effect” or internal restructuring, represents the productivity growth within continuing firms (weighted by initial shares in the industry). The second term – the “between effect” – reflects the aggregate productivity improvement coming from high-productivity continuing firms' expanding shares (or from low-productivity continuing firms' contracting shares). The third term – the “cross effect” – represents a *covariance term*. In this case, any gains in productivity will come from increasing (decreasing) shares of continuing firms with growing (falling) productivities. The last two terms on the right-hand-side of equation (3) capture the

contribution of entering and exiting firms, the “entry” and “exit” effects, respectively. The entry effect is positive if an entering firm’s productivity level is larger than the initial industry productivity level; the exit effect is positive if an exiting firm’s productivity level is smaller than the initial industry productivity level. (The weights are given by final- and initial-period firm’s share in the industry, respectively.)

An alternative route (GR henceforth), based on Griliches and Regev (1995) has also been suggested by Foster, Haltiwanger and Krizan (2001):


$$\Delta P_t = \sum_{i \in C} \bar{\theta}_i \Delta p_{it} + \sum_{i \in C} \Delta \theta_{it} (\bar{p}_i - \bar{P}) + \sum_{i \in E} \theta_{it} (p_{it} - \bar{P}) - \sum_{i \in X} \theta_{i(t-\tau)} (p_{i(t-\tau)} - \bar{P}), \quad (4)$$

where  $\bar{\theta}_i$ ,  $\bar{p}_i$ , and  $\bar{P}$  are the average of each variable over the base and end year. The first term is the within effect, the second is the between effect and the third and fourth terms are the entry and exit effects. (There is no cross-effect term.) The main advantage of the GR decomposition is that by averaging over the base- and end- year it reduces the impact of any measurement error.

### **3 Job and output flows**

Our analysis divides the sample period into three sub-periods of equal length: 1991-1994, 1994-1997 and 1997-2000. As Figure 1 shows, the manufacturing output growth rate is highly decreasing (and even negative) in the first sub-period, while in 1994-1997 it is positive and increasing (except in 1996);<sup>5</sup> in the third period (1997-2000), albeit positive, it is clearly decreasing. The growth rate for the whole economy, given by the GDP series, does not replicate entirely the manufacturing profile, but it is clear that there is an overall slowdown in 1991-1994, which is followed by an economic recovery that in the last sub-period loses momentum.

**Figure 1. Growth Rates of GDP and Manufacturing Production Index, 1991-2000**



Source: Banco de Portugal and Instituto Nacional de Estatística (INE).

Notes: GDP denotes the annual growth rate of real GDP, while MPI denotes the annual growth rate in the Manufacturing Production Index.

Table 1 shows output and job reallocation rates in manufacturing. It also gives the corresponding fraction due to entry and exit of firms. We note that, as in Davis, Haltiwanger and Schuh (1996), production/job creation in a given year  $t$  equals production/employment gains summed over all expanding and newly created firms between  $t-1$  and  $t$ . Likewise, production/job destruction in year  $t$  equals production/employment losses summed over all contracting and closing firms between  $t-1$  and  $t$ . The rates were calculated using the average of beginning- and ending-period values of the respective variable as a denominator. Small and large firms were weighted to ensure results were representative of the population at sector level. The aggregate results for the entire manufacturing sector were also sector weighted.

**Table 1. Output and job reallocation rates in Portuguese manufacturing**

	Output				Employment			
	Creation rate (%)	Share due to entrants	Destruction rate (%)	Share due to exits	Creation rate (%)	Share due to entrants	Destruction rate (%)	Share due to exits
1992	12.4	0.208	8.4	0.180	8.2	0.264	9.5	0.100
1993	10.6	0.495	14.2	0.033	6.0	0.628	12.5	0.095
1994	15.9	0.353	5.6	0.207	9.1	0.676	9.7	0.144
1995	12.2	0.070	5.9	0.009	6.5	0.235	6.6	0.018
1996	19.8	0.352	6.1	0.089	14.7	0.590	7.9	0.181
1997	13.9	0.047	6.3	0.468	6.2	0.097	7.1	0.332
1998	11.7	0.197	5.6	0.111	8.4	0.299	5.2	0.172
1999	13.5	0.204	5.3	0.209	9.0	0.388	7.1	0.291
2000	10.7	0.281	6.9	0.392	7.9	0.343	6.9	0.386
Average	13.4	0.245	7.1	0.189	8.4	0.391	8.0	0.191

Notes: Percentage of the average output (employment) of periods  $t$  and  $t-1$ . Small and large firms weighted at sector-level; aggregation weighted over 17 two-digit industries.

In terms of output, the creation rate varies between 10.6% (in 1993) and 19.8% (in 1996), while the destruction rate ranges from 5.3% (in 1999) to 14.2% (in 1993). The average output creation (destruction) rate is 13.4% (7.1%) over the sample period (last row, columns 1 and 3 of the table).

In terms of job creation (destruction), the average rate is 8.4% (8.0%). The maximum rate of job creation is 14.7% (in 1996) and the minimum is 6.0% (in 1993). The destruction rate ranges from 12.5% (in 1993) to 5.2% (in 1998). Over the entire sample period, net job creation is slightly positive at 0.4%, while net production creation is equal to 6.3%.


These job flows broadly confirm the pattern observed in other European countries, as reported by Klette and Mathiassen (1996), Broersma and Gautier (1997) and Vainiomaki and Laaksonen (1999), for example. The job flows in Table 1 are also similar to those found by Addison and Teixeira (2004) for a sample of continuing Portuguese manufacturing firms, in the period 1990-1997. Given that our dataset

excludes firms with less than 20 employees, our figures are lower than those reported by Blanchard and Portugal (2001).


Entry and exit of course play an important part in gross flows. On average, entry contributes to (approximately) one fourth of output creation flows, while exit contributes to one fifth of output destruction (last row, columns 2 and 4, respectively). The share of entry is even bigger in the case of job creation at roughly 40%, while the share of exit is roughly the same at 19%.

**Figure 2. Creation and destruction rates (output and employment)**

a) *Output*



b) *Employment*



Notes: YC, YD and YR denote creation, destruction and reallocation rates of output and LC, LD and LR those rates of employment. Small and large firms weighted at sector-level; aggregation weighted over 17 two-digit industries.

Figures 2, panels a) and b), plot output and job creation and destruction rates, respectively. Clearly, destruction flows are more sizeable in the first sub-period, while creation tends to be more intense in the second sub-period, especially in terms of output.

**Table 2. Correlation between creation, destruction, net creation and reallocation flows**

	Output			Employment		
	Destruction	Net creation	Reallocation	Destruction	Net creation	Reallocation
Creation	-0.424 (0.26)	0.850 (0.00)	0.559 (0.12)	-0.128 (0.74)	0.800 (0.01)	0.732 (0.02)
Destruction		-0.838 (0.00)	0.514 (0.16)		-0.698 (0.04)	0.582 (0.10)
Net creation			0.038 (0.92)			0.177 (0.65)

Notes: Net creation is given by the difference between creation and destruction. In the case of job flows, annual net creation is equivalent to net employment growth. Reallocation is given by the sum of creation and destruction. Marginal significance in parentheses.


Table 2 contains the correlation between different pairs of variables: creation, destruction, net creation and (gross) reallocation flows.<sup>6</sup> As expected, there is a strong and positive correlation between (gross) creation and net creation and a strong and negative correlation between (gross) destruction and net creation, in terms of both output and employment. Creation flows are thus pro-cyclical, while destruction flows are countercyclical, as reported in many other European countries (e.g. Klette and Mathiassen, 1996; Albaek and Sorensen, 1998; Garibaldi, 1998; Vainiomaki and Laaksonen, 1999). Reallocation flows (i.e. creation plus destruction) also tend to exhibit a slightly pro-cyclical pattern as in other European countries, especially in terms of employment (Garibaldi, 1998).

#### **4 Productivity gap among continuing, entering and exiting firms**


Given the size of the observed creation and destruction flows, a key issue is of course whether less productive firms have been replaced by more productive units. As panels a) and b) of Figure 3 show, the productivity of continuing firms is always the highest among the three groups (continuing, entering, and exiting firms). At the same time, the productivity level of entrants is higher than that of exiting firms except in two occasions: in 1997 and 1999 in the TFP case, and in 1991 and 1995 in the LP case. Finally, the productivity level required for entry seems to be higher in recession than in expansion, especially in terms of labour productivity. The productivity gap between new firms and exiting firms is also higher in the 1991-1994 sub-period (on average, 14 percentage points in the TFP case and 31 percentage points in the LP case).

**Figure 3. TFP and labour productivity**

a) *TFP*



b) *Labour productivity*



Notes: Average weighted by firm's output in panel a) and by firm's employment in panel b). The two indicators are set to 100 for continuing firms in 1991. Small and large firms weighted at sector-level; aggregation weighted over 17 two-digit industries.

As Geroski (1995), Caves (1998), and Ahn (2001) have shown, productivity is strongly increasing (decreasing) in the post-entry (pre-exit) period. In Table 3 and for each sub-period we therefore compare the productivity of entering (exiting) units in the ending (beginning) year with the productivity of continuing firms. Clearly, the productivity of new firms is higher than that of continuing firms when the productivity of the latter is measured in the beginning year (an exception to this result is the third sub-period). Following an identical computation, the productivity of entering firms is

also much higher than that of exiting firms. In the 1991-1994 sub-period, for example, the TFP of entrants is 9 percentage points higher than that of continuing firms (measured in the beginning year), while the productivity of exiting firms is 25.1 percentage points below (rows two and three of Table 3). The total productivity gap between entering and exiting firms is therefore no less than 34 percentage points. This gap is even larger in the case of LP, at 37.3 percentage points. In subsequent periods the gap is clearly smaller which means that productivity gains from net entry can be especially strong in economic slowdowns.

**Table 3. Productivity differentials relative to continuing firms**


	TFP		LP	
	In the beginning/ending year		In the beginning/ending year	
Period: 1991-1994	Beginning year: 1991	Ending year: 1994	Beginning year: 1991	Ending year: 1994
Continuing firms	100	113.3	100	121.8
Entering firms	-	108.5	-	110.6
Exiting firms	74.9	-	73.3	-
Period: 1994-1997	Beginning year: 1994	Ending year: 1997	Beginning year: 1994	Ending year: 1997
Continuing firms	100	110.3	100	119.4
Entering firms	-	107.0	-	136.7
Exiting firms	88.4	-	77.9	-
Period: 1997-2000	Beginning year: 1997	Ending year: 2000	Beginning year: 1997	Ending year: 2000
Continuing firms	100	101.6	100	109.6
Entering firms	-	90.9	-	95.0
Exiting firms	90.6	-	82.8	-

Notes: Average weighted by firm's output (TFP) and employment (LP); small and large firms weighted at sector-level; aggregation weighted over 17 two-digit industries. For each sub-period, the productivity of entering (exiting) is expressed in relation to the productivity of continuing firms measured in the ending (beginning) year. The group of entering (exiting) firms comprises all firms that enter (exit) in the corresponding sub-period. Simultaneous entry and exit within any sub-period is excluded.

**5 Quantifying the contribution of internal and external restructuring to industry productivity growth**

In this section we decompose productivity growth into its main components (within, between, cross, and net entry) to obtain the specific contribution of each source in each of the selected sub-periods.

**Figure 4. Annual average growth rate of TFP and labour productivity**



Note: See Figure 3.


As Figure 4 shows, both the TFP and LP growth rates present a clear declining trend over the period 1991-2000. Indeed, in the 1991-1994 period, the TFP growth rate was 3.0% per annum, while during the second sub-period (i.e. 1994-1997) it was 2.5%, reaching a negative annual growth rate at -0.1% in the 1997-2000 period. The corresponding average growth rate in the LP case was 4.0%, 2.7%, and 1.5%. These figures broadly confirm those reported by the OECD (2001b, p. 32), which indicate, for the Portuguese manufacturing sector, a three percentage point reduction in labour productivity growth between 1996 and 1999.

**Table 4. Productivity decomposition**

	Within	Between	Cross	Net entry	Entry	Exit
1991-1994 (Average productivity growth 3.00% per annum)						
FHK	0.0356 (40.2%)	0.0014 ( 1.6%)	0.0352 (39.7%)	0.0164 (18.5%)	0.0136 (15.3%)	0.0028 ( 3.1%)
GR	0.0532 (60.2%)	0.0227 (25.7%)		0.0125 (14.1%)	0.0076 ( 8.6%)	0.0049 ( 5.5%)
1994-1997 (Average productivity growth 2.49% per annum)						
FHK	0.0577 (78.3%)	-0.0045 ( -6.1%)	0.0124 (16.8%)	0.0081 (11.0%)	0.0062 ( 8.4%)	0.0020 ( 2.7%)
GR	0.0639 (87.0%)	0.0031 ( 4.3%)		0.0065 ( 8.8%)	0.0031 ( 4.2%)	0.0034 ( 4.6%)
1997-2000 (Average productivity growth -0.08% per annum)						
FHK	-0.0091	0.0029	0.0075	-0.0036	-0.0038	0.0003
GR	-0.0054	0.0062		-0.0029	-0.0035	0.0006
1991-1994 (Average productivity growth 4.02% per annum)						
FHK	0.0384 (32.4%)	0.0208 (17.6%)	0.0239 (20.2)	0.0353 (29.8%)	0.0084 ( 7.1%)	0.0269 (22.7%)
GR	0.0503 (42.4%)	0.0379 (32.0%)		0.0305 (25.7%)	-0.0003 ( -0.3%)	0.0308 (25.9%)
1994-1997 (Average productivity growth 2.69% per annum)						
FHK	0.0478 (60.0%)	0.0114 (14.3%)	0.0067 ( 8.4%)	0.0138 (17.3%)	0.0029 ( 3.6%)	0.0109 (13.7%)
GR	0.0512 (64.5%)	0.0160 (20.2%)		0.0122 (15.3%)	-0.0010 ( -1.3%)	0.0132 (16.6%)
1997-2000 (Average productivity growth 1.50% per annum)						
FHK	0.0139 (31.0%)	0.0147 (33.0%)	0.0036 ( 8.1%)	0.0124 (27.8%)	-0.0002 ( -0.4%)	0.0126 (28.2%)
GR	0.0157 (35.3%)	0.0178 (40.0%)		0.0110 (24.7%)	-0.0027 ( -6.0%)	0.0136 (30.7%)

Notes: Small and large firms weighted at sector-level; aggregation weighted over 17 two-digit industries by firm's output (TFP) and employment (LP). FHK and GR denote the decomposition methods proposed by Foster, Haltiwanger and Krizan (2001), and Griliches and Regev (1995), respectively.

Figure 5. Productivity decomposition, TFP and labour productivity (in percentage)



Notes: FHK and GR denote the decomposition methods proposed by Foster, Haltiwanger and Krizan (2001), and Griliches and Regev (1995), respectively. Small and large firms weighted at sector-level; aggregation weighted over 17 two-digit industries by firm's output (TFP) and employment (LP).

The results of the productivity growth decomposition exercise are given in Table 4 and Figure 5. Clearly, the two selected decomposition methods (FHK and GR) indicate that the within effect (or internal restructuring) is the dominant source of aggregate productivity growth, with a contribution ranging from 40% (in the 1991-1994 period – the FHK case) to 87% (in 1994-1997 – the GR case). The dominance of the within effect is somewhat smaller in the labour productivity case, with the corresponding share ranging between 31% and 65% (in 1997-2000 and 1994-1997, respectively).<sup>7</sup>

The share of the within effect increases visibly in the second sub-period, explaining more than  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the observed productivity (TFP) growth in the FHK decomposition. In the GR decomposition the share of the within effect is even bigger at 87% of the observed productivity growth. The labour productivity measure implies a slightly smaller increase from 1991-1994 to 1994-1997 in either method, FHK or GR.

The share of the within effect in 1997-2000 falls to approximately  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the observed labour productivity growth. This pro-cyclical contribution of the within effect has also been found by Baily, Hulten and Campbell (1992) and Foster, Haltiwanger and Krizan (2001).<sup>8</sup>

For its part, external restructuring accounts for approximately 60% of the TFP growth observed in 1991-1994, falling substantially in 1994-1997 to 22% in the FHK case (40% and 13% in the GR case, respectively). In terms of labour productivity, external restructuring explains more than  $\frac{2}{3}$  in 1991-1994 and 1997-2000 and approximately 40% in 1994-1997. As far as the specific components of external restructuring are concerned, the between and cross effects represent a total of 41% of the observed TFP growth in the first sub-period, falling to 11% in the 1994-1997 period. The share of the between and cross effects in labour productivity growth is also smaller in the second sub-period at only 23%. (The shares in 1991-1994 and 1997-2000 were 38% and 41%, respectively.) Finally, external restructuring due to entry and exit is equal to 19% of the observed TFP growth in the first period, to fall to 11% in 1994-1997. In terms of LP, the shares in the three sub-periods are equal to 30%, 17%, and 28%, respectively, mostly due to the exit effect.

To summarize, the first main finding is therefore that the net entry effect is stronger when economic growth is smaller, a result that we interpret as evidence in favour of the hypothesis that the cleansing effect is stronger in recessions. The second key finding is that the within effect is stronger when output growth is at its peak, an indication that, under our assumptions, active learning is stronger in expansions. Finally, the across (continuing) firms effect – that is, the sum of the between and cross effects – is clearly lower in the economic upturn, a result that does not seem to totally

validate the assumed hypothesis that passive learning should be higher in expansion times. We note, however, that the between effect in the FHK case – that is, the effect given by  $\sum_{i \in C} \Delta \theta_{it} (p_{i(t-\tau)} - P_{t-\tau})$  in equation (3) – is negative in 1994-1997, which is equivalent to say that, on average, the productivity of expanding firms is smaller than that of the overall industry. A possible explanation for this unexpected finding is that the competitive pressure felt by inefficient firms is smaller in good times, especially when barriers to firm mobility are not small (see Boylaud, Nicoletti and Scarpetta, 2000). We cannot exclude the possible perverse effect of cleansing in the first period either, which indeed may have forced an excessive number of firms to exit, impeding potentially superior units to flourish in subsequent periods – the scarring effect mentioned in Section 1 above. Our conjecture is therefore that it might be the absence of a sizeable passive learning the factor behind the observed downward trend in productivity growth over the 1990s.

## **6 Concluding remarks**

This paper has analysed the impact of internal and external restructuring on manufacturing productivity growth in the period 1991-2000. An empirical approach was adopted, involving the description of output and employment creation and destruction flows, on the one hand, and the study of productivity growth, on the other.

Using an original unbalanced panel of Portuguese manufacturing firms, we found that resource reallocation, measured by gross job and output flows, shows the usual cyclical pattern: pro-cyclical in the case of creation flows and countercyclical in the case of destruction flows. With respect to productivity, we found that the productivity of entering firms is higher than that of exiting firms. Our decomposition of

industry productivity growth also shows that external restructuring has its largest share in economic slowdowns, while internal restructuring makes its largest contribution in economic upturns.

We have provided a detailed view of the process of industrial restructuring in the Portuguese manufacturing sector in the 1990s, a period in which the rate of productivity growth has been clearly decreasing. Aside the fact that 10 years is perhaps too short a period to draw definitive conclusions about the impact of restructuring – internal and external – on productivity growth, especially in relation with the economic cycle, there is clear evidence in favour of the hypothesis that cleansing is countercyclical, while active learning seems to be procyclical, two findings in line with our priors. Under our assumptions, it is surprising though to find that countercyclicity of passive learning, a result that we are tempted to allocate to the “scars” of the first sub-period recession and to what seems to be the lack of sufficient firm competition in the Portuguese manufacturing sector, especially in good times.

## Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> In reality, these effects are not so neat. The net entry effect, for example, which in our analysis is made equivalent to the cleansing effect, cannot unequivocally distinguish cleansing from passive learning when the latter induces exit.
- <sup>2</sup> *Região Centro* represents approximately 1/7 of the Portuguese GDP and 1/6 of total employment. Either in terms of employment or output, the shares of each one of the 17 sub-sectors in the manufacturing aggregate at national and *Região Centro* level are virtually the same, with, for example, the observed differences in 2000 never exceeding 6 percentage points.
- <sup>3</sup> We use firm's reference number and the information on the FUE file to identify entry and exit, so that if, in a given year, there is a new reference number in the panel and the corresponding firm is 1 or 2 years old (in the FUE file), then the firm is taken as a new firm. An exit from the sample is taken as a true exit if and only if the corresponding firm has been coded as non-active in the FUE file. Any change in sector of activity (at 3-digit level) is taken as an entry/exit.
- <sup>4</sup> This approach was also followed by Haltiwanger (1997), Foster, Haltiwanger and Krizan (2001) and Disney, Haskel and Heden (2003).
- <sup>5</sup> The fall in the manufacturing growth rate in 1996 is mostly a statistical artefact connected to changes in the official sector classification, that is, to changes in sectoral classification from CAE-rev.1 to CAE-rev.2. The series associated with CAE-rev2 shows indeed a growth rate of 5.6% in 1996, followed by a growth rate of 3.4% in 1997. Since the CAE-rev2 series starts only in 1995, only the CAE-rev1 series is kept in Figure 1.
- <sup>6</sup> As usual, net creation is given by the difference between creation and destruction, while the reallocation rate is given by the sum of creation and destruction.
- <sup>7</sup> We note that the GR method leads to an overvaluation of the within effect, as it equals the within effect plus one half the cross effect corresponding to the FHK method, that is:
- $$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i \in C} \bar{\theta}_i \Delta p_{it} &= \sum_{i \in C} (1/2) (\theta_{it} + \theta_{i(t-\tau)}) \Delta p_{it} = \sum_{i \in C} (1/2) (\theta_{i(t-\tau)} + \Delta \theta_{it} + \theta_{i(t-\tau)}) \Delta p_{it} \\ &= \sum_{i \in C} \theta_{i(t-\tau)} \Delta p_{it} + (1/2) \sum_{i \in C} \Delta \theta_{it} \Delta p_{it}\end{aligned}$$
- <sup>8</sup> Given that the productivity growth in the third sub-period is very small, we have refrained from presenting the corresponding share figures.

## **References**

- Addison JT, Teixeira P (2005). Employment adjustment in two countries with poor reputations: Analysis of aggregate, firm, and flow data for Portugal and Germany. *International Economics and Economic Policy* 1(4), 329-348.
- Aghion P, Saint-Paul G (1998). Uncovering Some Causal Relationships between Productivity Growth and the Structure of Economic Fluctuations: A Tentative Survey. *Labour Economics* 12(2), 279-303.
- Ahn S (2001). Firm dynamics and productivity growth: a review of micro evidence from OECD countries. *Economics Department Working Papers no. 297*. Paris: OECD.
- Aizcorbe AM (1992). Procyclical Labour Productivity, Increasing Returns to Labour and Labour Hoarding in Car Assembly Plant Employment. *Economic Journal* 102(413), 860-873.
- Albaek K, Sorensen BE (1998). Worker Flows and Job Flows in Danish Manufacturing, 1980-91. *The Economic Journal* 108(451), 1750-1771.
- Baily MN, Hulten CR, Campbell D (1992). Productivity dynamics in manufacturing plants. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity Microeconomics 1992*, 187-249.
- Baldwin JR, Dunne T, Haltiwanger J (1998). A Comparison of Job Creation and Job Destruction in Canada and the United States. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 80(3), 347-356.
- Baldwin JR, G W (2002). Plant turnover and productivity growth in Canadian manufacturing. *STI Working Papers no. 2*. Paris: OECD.
- Balk BM, Hoogenboom-Spijker E (2003). The Measurement and Decomposition of Productivity Change: Exercises on the Netherlands' Manufacturing Industry. Discussion paper no. 3001. Voorburg: Statistics Netherlands.
- Barlevy G (2002). The Sullyng Effect of Recessions. *Review of Economic Studies* 69(1), 65-96.
- Barlevy G (2003). Credit Market Frictions and the Allocation of Resources over the Business Cycle. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 50(8), 1795-1818.

- Barlevy G (2004). The Cost of Business Cycles under Endogenous Growth. *American Economic Review* 94(4), 964-990.
- Blanchard O (2007). Adjustment within the Euro. The Difficult Case of Portugal. *Portuguese Economic Journal* 6(1), 1-21.
- Blanchard O, Portugal P (2001). What Hides Behind an Unemployment Rate: Comparing Portuguese and U.S. Labor Markets. *American Economic Review* 91(1), 187-207.
- Boylaud O, Nicoletti G, Scarpetta S (2000). Summary Indicators of Product Market Regulation with an Extension to Employment Protection Legislation. *Economics Department Working Papers no. 226*. Paris: OECD
- Broersma, L, Gautier P (1997). Job creation and job destruction by small firms: an empirical investigation for the Dutch manufacturing sector. *Small Business Economics* 9(3), 211-224.
- Caballero RJ, Hammour ML (1994). The cleansing effect of recessions. *American Economic Review* 84(5), 1350-1368.
- Caballero RJ, Hammour ML (1996). On the timing and Efficiency of Creative Destruction. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 111(3), 805-852.
- Caballero RJ, Hammour ML (2005). The Cost of Recessions Revisited: A Reverse-Liquidationist View. *Review of Economic Studies* 72(2), 313-341.
- Caves R (1998). Industrial organization and new findings on the turnover and mobility of firms. *Journal of Economic Literature* 36, 1947-1982.
- Davis SJ, Haltiwanger JC (1992). Gross Job Creation, Gross Job Destruction, and Employment Reallocation. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 107(3), 819-863.
- Davis SJ, Haltiwanger JC, Schuh S (1996). *Job creation and destruction*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- DeLong JB (1990). Liquidation Cycles: Old-Fashioned Real Business Cycle Theory and the Great Depression. NBER Working Paper no. 3546. Cambridge: National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Disney R, Haskel J, Heden Y (2003). Restructuring and productivity growth in UK manufacturing. *The Economic Journal* 113(489), 666-694.
- Ericson R, Pakes A (1995). Markov-Perfect Industry Dynamics: A Framework for Empirical Work. *Review of Economics Studies* 62(1), 53-82.

- Faria A, Fenn P, Bruce A (2002). Determinants of Adoption of Flexible Production Technologies: Evidence from Portuguese Manufacturing Industry. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology* 11(6), 569-580.
- Faria A, Fenn P, Bruce A (2005). Production Technologies and Technical Efficiency: Evidence from Portuguese Manufacturing Industry. *Applied Economics* 37(9), 1037-1046.
- Foster L, Haltiwanger J, Krizan CJ (2001). Aggregate productivity growth: lessons from microeconomic evidence. In: Hulten CR, Dean ER, Harper MJ (eds) *New developments in productivity analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 303-363.
- Garibaldi P (1998). Job Flow Dynamics and Firing Restrictions. *European Economic Review* 42(2), 245-275.
- Geroski PA (1995). What do we know about entry?. *International Journal of Industrial Organization* 13(4), 421-440.
- Griliches Z, Regev H (1995). Firm productivity in Israeli industry: 1979-1988. *Journal of Econometrics* 65(1), 175-203.
- Haltiwanger J (1997). Measuring and analyzing aggregate fluctuations: the importance of building from microeconomic evidence. *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review* 79(3), 55-77.
- Hart RA, Malley JR (1999). Procyclical Labour Productivity: A Closer Look at a Stylized Fact. *Economica* 66(264), 533-550.
- Jovanovic B (1982). Selection and the evolution of industry. *Econometrica* 50(3), 649-670.
- Klette TJ, Mathiassen A (1996). Job Creation, Job Destruction and Plant Turnover in Norwegian Manufacturing. *Annales d'Économie et de Statistique* 0(41-42), 97-125.
- Monteiro-Barata J (2005). Innovation in the Portuguese Manufacturing Industry: Analysis of a Longitudinal Company Panel. *International Advances in Economic Research* 11(3), 301-314.
- Mortensen D, Pissarides C (1994). Job Creation and Job Destruction in the Theory of Unemployment. *Review of Economic Studies* 61(3), 397-415.

- OECD (2001a). Productivity and firm dynamics: evidence from microdata. *Economic Outlook* 69, 209-223.
- OECD (2001b). *Economic Surveys: Portugal 2000/2001*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2004). *Economic Surveys: Portugal 2004*. Paris: OECD.
- OECD (2006). *National Accounts of OECD Countries - Volume I, Main Aggregates, 1993-2004*. Paris: OECD.
- Ouyang M (2005). *The Scarring Effect of Recessions*. Working-Paper no. 050609. Irvine: University of California-Irvine, Department of Economics, p. 40.
- Simões VC (1995). Innovation in Portuguese Manufacturing Industry. In: Molero j (ed) *Technological innovation, multinational corporations and new international competitiveness: The case of intermediate countries*. Langhorne, Pa.: Harwood Academic, 215-236.
- Schumpeter JA (1934). Depressions. In: Brown D et al. *Economics of the Recovery Program*. New York: Whittlesey House, 3-12.
- Schumpeter JA (1982 [1939]). *Business cycles: a theoretical, historical, and statistical analysis of the capitalist process*. Philadelphia: Porcupine Press.
- Teixeira AAC, Fortuna N (2004). Human Capital, Innovation Capability and Economic Growth in Portugal, 1960-2001. *Portuguese Economic Journal* 3(3), 205-225.
- Vainiomaki J, Laaksonen S (1999). Technology, Job Creation and Job Destruction in Finnish Manufacturing. *Applied Economics Letters* 6(2), 81-88

## ESTUDOS DO G.E.M.F.

(Available on-line at <http://gemf.fe.uc.pt>)

- 
- 2007-01 *Internal and External Restructuring over the Cycle: A Firm-Based Analysis of Gross Flows and Productivity Growth in Portugal*  
- Carlos Carreira & Paulino Teixeira
- 2006-09 *Cost Structure of the Portuguese Water Industry: a Cubic Cost Function Application*  
- Rita Martins, Adelino Fortunato & Fernando Coelho
- 2006-08 *The Impact of Works Councils on Wages*  
- John T. Addison, Paulino Teixeira & Thomas Zwick
- 2006-07 *Ricardian Equivalence, Twin Deficits, and the Feldstein-Horioka puzzle in Egypt*  
- Carlos Fonseca Marinheiro
- 2006-06 *L'intégration des marchés financiers*  
- José Soares da Fonseca
- 2006-05 *The Integration of European Stock Markets and Market Timing*  
- José Soares da Fonseca
- 2006-04 *Mobilidade do Capital e Sustentabilidade Externa – uma aplicação da tese de F-H a Portugal (1910-2004)*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 2006-03 *Works Councils, Labor Productivity and Plant Heterogeneity: First Evidence from Quantile Regressions*  
- Joachim Wagner, Thorsten Schank, Claus Schnabel & John T. Addison
- 2006-02 *Does the Quality of Industrial Relations Matter for the Macroeconomy? A Cross-Country Analysis Using Strikes Data*  
- John T. Addison & Paulino Teixeira
- 2006-01 *Monte Carlo Estimation of Project Volatility for Real Options Analysis*  
- Pedro Manuel Cortesão Godinho
- 2005-17 *On the Stability of the Wealth Effect*  
- Fernando Alexandre, Pedro Bação & Vasco J. Gabriel
- 2005-16 *Building Blocks in the Economics of Mandates*  
- John T. Addison, C. R. Barrett & W. S. Siebert
- 2005-15 *Horizontal Differentiation and the survival of Train and Coach modes in medium range passenger transport, a welfare analysis comprising economies of scope and scale*  
- Adelino Fortunato & Daniel Murta
- 2005-14 *'Atypical Work' and Compensation*  
- John T. Addison & Christopher J. Surfield
- 2005-13 *The Demand for Labor: An Analysis Using Matched Employer-Employee Data from the German LIAB. Will the High Unskilled Worker Own-Wage Elasticity Please Stand Up?*  
- John T. Addison, Lutz Bellmann, Thorsten Schank & Paulino Teixeira
- 2005-12 *Works Councils in the Production Process*  
- John T. Addison, Thorsten Schank, Claus Schnabel & Joachim Wagner
- 2005-11 *Second Order Filter Distribution Approximations for Financial Time Series with Extreme Outliers*  
- J. Q. Smith & António A. F. Santos
- 2005-10 *Firm Growth and Persistence of Chance: Evidence from Portuguese Microdata*  
- Blandina Oliveira & Adelino Fortunato
- 2005-09 *Residential water demand under block rates – a Portuguese case study*  
- Rita Martins & Adelino Fortunato

- 2005-08 *Politico-Economic Causes of Labor Regulation in the United States: Alliances and Raising Rivals' Costs (and Sometimes Lowering One's Own)*  
- John T. Addison
- 2005-07 *Firm Growth and Liquidity Constraints: A Dynamic Analysis*  
- Blandina Oliveira & Adelino Fortunato
- 2005-06 *The Effect of Works Councils on Employment Change*  
- John T. Addison & Paulino Teixeira
- 2005-05 *Le Rôle de la Consommation Publique dans la Croissance: le cas de l'Union Européenne*  
- João Sousa Andrade, Maria Adelaide Silva Duarte & Claude Berthomieu
- 2005-04 *The Dynamics of the Growth of Firms: Evidence from the Services Sector*  
- Blandina Oliveira & Adelino Fortunato
- 2005-03 *The Determinants of Firm Performance: Unions, Works Councils, and Employee Involvement/High Performance Work Practices*  
- John T. Addison
- 2005-02 *Has the Stability and Growth Pact stabilised? Evidence from a panel of 12 European countries and some implications for the reform of the Pact*  
- Carlos Fonseca Marinheiro
- 2005-01 *Sustainability of Portuguese Fiscal Policy in Historical Perspective*  
- Carlos Fonseca Marinheiro
- 2004-03 *Human capital, mechanisms of technological diffusion and the role of technological shocks in the speed of diffusion. Evidence from a panel of Mediterranean countries*  
- Maria Adelaide Duarte & Marta Simões
- 2004-02 *What Have We Learned About The Employment Effects of Severance Pay? Further Iterations of Lazear et al.*  
- John T. Addison & Paulino Teixeira
- 2004-01 *How the Gold Standard Functioned in Portugal: an analysis of some macroeconomic aspects*  
- António Portugal Duarte & João Sousa Andrade
- 2003-07 *Testing Gibrat's Law: Empirical Evidence from a Panel of Portuguese Manufacturing Firms*  
- Blandina Oliveira & Adelino Fortunato
- 2003-06 *Régimes Monétaires et Théorie Quantitative du Produit Nominal au Portugal (1854-1998)*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 2003-05 *Causas do Atraso na Estabilização da Inflação: Abordagem Teórica e Empírica*  
- Vítor Castro
- 2003-04 *The Effects of Households' and Firms' Borrowing Constraints on Economic Growth*  
- Maria da Conceição Costa Pereira
- 2003-03 *Second Order Filter Distribution Approximations for Financial Time Series with Extreme Outliers*  
- J. Q. Smith & António A. F. Santos
- 2003-02 *Output Smoothing in EMU and OECD: Can We Forego Government Contribution? A risk sharing approach*  
- Carlos Fonseca Marinheiro
- 2003-01 *Um modelo VAR para uma Avaliação Macroeconómica de Efeitos da Integração Europeia da Economia Portuguesa*  
- João Sousa Andrade

- 2002-08 *Discrimination des facteurs potentiels de croissance et type de convergence de l'économie portugaise dans l'UE à travers la spécification de la fonction de production macro-économique. Une étude appliquée de données de panel et de séries temporelles*  
- Marta Simões & Maria Adelaide Duarte
- 2002-07 *Privatisation in Portugal: employee owners or just happy employees?*  
- Luís Moura Ramos & Rita Martins
- 2002-06 *The Portuguese Money Market: An analysis of the daily session*  
- Fátima Teresa Sol Murta
- 2002-05 *As teorias de ciclo políticos e o caso português*  
- Rodrigo Martins
- 2002-04 *Fundos de acções internacionais: uma avaliação de desempenho*  
- Nuno M. Silva
- 2002-03 *The consistency of optimal policy rules in stochastic rational expectations models*  
- David Backus & John Driffill
- 2002-02 *The term structure of the spreads between Portuguese and German interest rates during stage II of EMU*  
- José Soares da Fonseca
- 2002-01 *O processo desinflationista português: análise de alguns custos e benefícios*  
- António Portugal Duarte
- 2001-14 *Equity prices and monetary policy: an overview with an exploratory model*  
- Fernando Alexandre & Pedro Bação
- 2001-13 *A convergência das taxas de juro portuguesas para os níveis europeus durante a segunda metade da década de noventa*  
- José Soares da Fonseca
- 2001-12 *Le rôle de l'investissement dans l'éducation sur la croissance selon différentes spécifications du capital humain.*  
- Adelaide Duarte & Marta Simões
- 2001-11 *Ricardian Equivalence: An Empirical Application to the Portuguese Economy*  
- Carlos Fonseca Marinheiro
- 2001-10 *A Especificação da Função de Produção Macro-Económica em Estudos de Crescimento Económico.*  
- Maria Adelaide Duarte e Marta Simões
- 2001-09 *Eficácia da Análise Técnica no Mercado Accionista Português*  
- Nuno Silva
- 2001-08 *The Risk Premiums in the Portuguese Treasury Bills Interest Rates: Estimation by a cointegration method*  
- José Soares da Fonseca
- 2001-07 *Principais factores de crescimento da economia portuguesa no espaço europeu*  
- Maria Adelaide Duarte e Marta Simões
- 2001-06 *Inflation Targeting and Exchange Rate Co-ordination*  
- Fernando Alexandre, John Driffill e Fabio Spagnolo
- 2001-05 *Labour Market Transition in Portugal, Spain, and Poland: A Comparative Perspective*  
- Paulino Teixeira
- 2001-04 *Paridade do Poder de Compra e das Taxas de Juro: Um estudo aplicado a três países da UEM*  
- António Portugal Duarte

- 2001-03 *Technology, Employment and Wages*  
- John T. Addison & Paulino Teixeira
- 2001-02 *Human capital investment through education and economic growth. A panel data analysis based on a group of Latin American countries*  
- Maria Adelaide Duarte & Marta Simões
- 2001-01 *Risk Premiums in the Portuguese Treasury Bills Interest Rates from 1990 to 1998. An ARCH-M Approach*  
- José Soares da Fonseca
- 2000-08 *Identificação de Vectores de Cointegração: Análise de Alguns Exemplos*  
- Pedro Miguel Avelino Bação
- 2000-07 *Imunização e M-quadrado: Que relação?*  
- Jorge Cunha
- 2000-06 *Eficiência Informacional nos Futuros Lisbor 3M*  
- Nuno M. Silva
- 2000-05 *Estimation of Default Probabilities Using Incomplete Contracts Data*  
- J. Santos Silva & J. Murteira
- 2000-04 *Un Essai d'Application de la Théorie Quantitative de la Monnaie à l'économie portugaise, 1854-1998*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 2000-03 *Le Taux de Chômage Naturel comme un Indicateur de Politique Economique? Une application à l'économie portugaise*  
- Adelaide Duarte & João Sousa Andrade
- 2000-02 *La Convergence Réelle Selon la Théorie de la Croissance: Quelles Explications pour l'Union Européenne?*  
- Marta Cristina Nunes Simões
- 2000-01 *Política de Estabilização e Independência dos Bancos Centrais*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 1999-09 *Nota sobre a Estimação de Vectores de Cointegração com os Programas CATS in RATS, PCFIML e EVIEWS*  
- Pedro Miguel Avelino Bação
- 1999-08 *A Abertura do Mercado de Telecomunicações Celulares ao Terceiro Operador: Uma Decisão Racional?*  
- Carlos Carreira
- 1999-07 *Is Portugal Really so Arteriosclerotic? Results from a Cross-Country Analysis of Labour Adjustment*  
- John T. Addison & Paulino Teixeira
- 1999-06 *The Effect of Dismissals Protection on Employment: More on a Vexed Theme*  
- John T. Addison, Paulino Teixeira e Jean-Luc Grosse
- 1999-05 *A Cobertura Estática e Dinâmica através do Contrato de Futuros PSI-20. Estimação das Rácios e Eficácia Ex Post e Ex Ante*  
- Helder Miguel C. V. Sebastião
- 1999-04 *Mobilização de Poupança, Financiamento e Internacionalização de Carteiras*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 1999-03 *Natural Resources and Environment*  
- Adelaide Duarte

- 
- 1999-02 *L'Analyse Positive de la Politique Monétaire*  
- Chistian Aubin
- 1999-01 *Economias de Escala e de Gama nos Hospitais Públicos Portugueses: Uma Aplicação da Função de Custo Variável Translog*  
- Carlos Carreira
- 1998-11 *Equilíbrio Monetário no Longo e Curto Prazos - Uma Aplicação à Economia Portuguesa*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 1998-10 *Algumas Observações Sobre o Método da Economia*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 1998-09 *Mudança Tecnológica na Indústria Transformadora: Que Tipo de Viés Afinal?*  
- Paulino Teixeira
- 1998-08 *Portfolio Insurance and Bond Management in a Vasicek's Term Structure of Interest Rates*  
- José Alberto Soares da Fonseca
- 1998-07 *Financial Innovation and Money Demand in Portugal: A Preliminary Study*  
- Pedro Miguel Avelino Bação
- 1998-06 *The Stability Pact and Portuguese Fiscal Policy: the Application of a VAR Model*  
- Carlos Fonseca Marinheiro
- 1998-05 *A Moeda Única e o Processo de Difusão da Base Monetária*  
- José Alberto Soares da Fonseca
- 1998-04 *La Structure par Termes et la Volatilité des Taux d'intérêt LISBOR*  
- José Alberto Soares da Fonseca
- 1998-03 *Regras de Comportamento e Reformas Monetárias no Novo SMI*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 1998-02 *Um Estudo da Flexibilidade dos Salários: o Caso Espanhol e Português*  
- Adelaide Duarte e João Sousa Andrade
- 1998-01 *Moeda Única e Internacionalização: Apresentação do Tema*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 1997-09 *Inovação e Aplicações Financeiras em Portugal*  
- Pedro Miguel Avelino Bação
- 1997-08 *Estudo do Efeito Liquidez Aplicado à Economia Portuguesa*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 1997-07 *An Introduction to Conditional Expectations and Stationarity*  
- Rui Manuel de Almeida
- 1997-06 *Definição de Moeda e Efeito Berlusconi*  
- João Sousa Andrade
- 1997-05 *A Estimação do Risco na Escolha dos Portafólios: Uma Visão Selectiva*  
- António Alberto Ferreira dos Santos
- 1997-04 *A Previsão Não Paramétrica de Taxas de Rentabilidade*  
- Pedro Manuel Cortesão Godinho
- 1997-03 *Propriedades Assimptóticas de Densidades*  
- Rui Manuel de Almeida
- 1997-02 *Co-Integration and VAR Analysis of the Term Structure of Interest Rates: an empirical study of the Portuguese money and bond markets*  
- João Sousa Andrade & José Soares da Fonseca

- 1997-01 *Repartição e Capitalização. Duas Modalidades Complementares de Financiamento das Reformas*  
- Maria Clara Murteira
- 1996-08 *A Crise e o Ressurgimento do Sistema Monetário Europeu*  
- Luis Manuel de Aguiar Dias
- 1996-07 *Housing Shortage and Housing Investment in Portugal a Preliminary View*  
- Vítor Neves
- 1996-06 *Housing, Mortgage Finance and the British Economy*  
- Kenneth Gibb & Nile Istephan
- 1996-05 *The Social Policy of The European Community, Reporting Information to Employees, a U.K. perspective: Historical Analysis and Prognosis*  
- Ken Shackleton
- 1996-04 *O Teorema da Equivalência Ricardiana: aplicação à economia portuguesa*  
- Carlos Fonseca Marinheiro
- 1996-03 *O Teorema da Equivalência Ricardiana: discussão teórica*  
- Carlos Fonseca Marinheiro
- 1996-02 *As taxas de juro no MMI e a Restrição das Reservas Obrigatórias dos Bancos*  
- Fátima Assunção Sol e José Alberto Soares da Fonseca
- 1996-01 *Uma Análise de Curto Prazo do Consumo, do Produto e dos Salários*  
- João Sousa Andrade