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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this article is to examine the phenomenon of the New Economy by focusing on the impact of ICT at national, sectoral and firm level, with specific attention to the case of Spain. This includes a review of the available empirical evidence on the impact of ICT growth and productivity at national, industrial and corporate level. The main indicators that have been devised by various organisations to measure ICT are compared and classified into three areas: infrastructure and size of sector, use of Internet and electronic commerce, and social and economic effects. Analysis of these indicators shows Spain to be lagging behind in ICT and Internet adoption, in a Europe that is characterised by major regional disparities and a North/South divide.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Since the prolonged growth of United States GDP in the 1990s, when real GDP rose dramatically, the rate of inflation decreased and unemployment fell to what was considered a natural rate, there is growing body of literature that relates output and productivity growth in the US to the adoption and diffusion of Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs).

From the macroeconomic point of view, recent literature has focused on analysing the role of ICTs in economic growth and productivity trends in OECD countries. Other studies have investigated further into the impact of ICTs at firm level, in order to determine their influence on behaviour in firms, sectors and markets.

Various bodies, both public and private, have directed their efforts towards the creation of indicators to assess the dimensions of the ICT sector in individual countries and thus obtain more accurate international comparisons. Analysis of the range of available indicators has provided further understanding of the major gaps that exist both between countries and regions when it comes to adopting the New Economy.

It is against such a background that this article aims to examine the phenomenon of the New Economy, from the perspective of ICT impact at national, industrial and firm level, with specific attention to the case of Spain. Section 2 contains a review of the main findings in the literature with respect to the impact of ICTs on economic growth and productivity at national, sectoral, and firm level. Section 3 presents the ICT measurement methodology, based on the comparison of the main indicators devised by various organisations both national (Spanish) and international. Analysis of the existing indicators in Section 4 provides a picture of the extent of ICT and Internet development in Spain as compared to the rest of Europe.
2. THE ICT IMPACT IN COUNTRIES, INDUSTRIES AND FIRMS

The effects of ICT on output and productivity growth have been examined extensively, particularly after the well-known productivity paradox of Solow (1987): “computers can be found everywhere except in the productivity statistics”. With this famous sentence, the author stressed that investment in computers by US firms from the late 70s had no apparent effect on measured productivity.

The pattern of GDP and productivity growth in the United States in the latter half of the nineties sparked off a debate over the possible end to Solow’s paradox and the role of ICT in economic growth. From 1995 to 2000, labour productivity grew by an annual rate of 3.1%, clearly a much faster pace than it had from 1973-1995 (1.5%). Similarly, GDP grew at a rate of 4.8% between 1995 and 2000, versus 3% in the period from 1973-1995 (Dedrick et al., 2003).

Apart from some of the most recent studies, such as the demand approach - that focused on the impact of ICT on consumer welfare (Quah, 2002)- the economic effects of ICT can be examined at three main levels: national, sectoral, and microeconomic or firm level.

**Country and industrial level analysis**

At the macroeconomic level, the impact of ICTs on growth and productivity manifests itself in various ways. First, the production of ICT goods and services contributes directly to increase GDP or GVA in a particular sector of industry and to improvements in aggregate productivity. In addition to this, however, when used as a factor of production, ICTs generate a range of effects in ICT-using sectors and industries. The use of ICTs in production processes is particularly important; first of all because they help to reduce the price while improving the quality of ICT goods and services, especially IT equipment and software (Jorgenson, 2001), and secondly because of their special characteristics as enabling and general purpose technologies.
The indirect impact of ICTs when they are used as input to the production process can, in turn, be analysed, in terms of the following effects:

- Effects deriving from investment in ICT, which replaces investment in other capital goods, and the effects of ICT capital deepening on the productivity of other factors of production.

- The spillover effects of technological progress, which bring about improvements in production processes and product quality. These effects are collectively known as Total Factor Productivity (TFP)).

- Effects on productivity deriving from improvements in skilled labour, generated by the use of ICT in production processes.

The empirical evidence for the contribution of ICT to economic growth and productivity in the United States during the nineties reveals the following:

- The ICT sector contributed between 41% and 55% to the growth of labour productivity (Oliner and Sichel 2000, Jorgenson and Stiroh 2000, Van Ark et al., 2002).

- Industries with the highest investment in ICT also register the highest increases in labour productivity (Stiroh, 2001, Jorgenson, 2001, Oliner and Sichel, 2002).

- Alongside the ICT-producing industries, ICT-using industries also play a fundamental role in the growth and acceleration of productivity, the service industries making a particularly important contribution to growth (Stiroh, 2002, Triplett and Bosworth, 2002, 2003, Jorgenson, 2003).

- The ICT-producing and ICT-using sectors, contributed 23% and 35% respectively to economic growth (Oliner and Sichel 2000, Jorgenson, 2001).

This impact of ICT on the macroeconomic variables is not exclusive to the North American economy, however; it has also taken place, though on a lesser scale, in other OECD countries. (Colecchia and Schreyer, 2002, Van Ark et al., 2002, 2003, Pilat and Lee, 2001, OCDE, 2003, European Commission, 2003a,b).
In Europe, however, there was a significant decline in the productivity growth trend in the latter half of the nineties. In spite of the great rush to adopt ICT that took place between 1998 and 2001, productivity gains were few, and disparities between countries wide. In large European countries, the contribution of ICT capital was a standstill or slight drop in the rate of economic growth and an actual decline in TFP growth in comparison to the first half of the nineties (Daveri, 2002).

However, productivity growth in Europe, both in terms of capital deepening and TFP growth, is not affected solely by weak ICT impact, it is also affected by the negative growth of productivity in other sectors (Daveri, 2001, European Commision, 2003b).

According to recent literature, other factors, apart from the impact of ICT and measurement problems, help to explain differences between Europe and the United States and within Europe. Among these are differences in the size of the ICT-production industries; in the rate of ICT adoption, especially in the service industries where ICT use is intense; in regulations and structural impediments in product and labour markets; in specific features of organizational structure, strategy and management practices; differences in firm size and characteristics; technological and institutional obstacles affecting the diffusion of ICT; low investment in complementary infrastructure and different levels of ICT use by ICT-using industries and consumers in each country.

Among the main studies that focus on Spain, we should mention McMorrow and Roeger (2001), Pulido (2001), Daveri (2001), Van Ark et al., (2001), Hernando and Nuñez (2002) and Sainz (2002). These reveal that between 1996 and 1999, the contribution of the ICT-producing sectors to economic growth was somewhere between the 9% reported by Van Ark et al. (2001), the 11% of Hernando and Nuñez (2002) and the 15.6% of Daveri (2001). ICT accounts also for 25% of labour productivity growth, according to Van Ark et al. (2001).

It is worth noting that, in spite of the loss of economic growth, productivity in the USA continued to grow between 2001 and 2002, which shows that the impact of ICTs is not simply a cyclical or conjunctural phenomenon (Jorgenson et al., 2002, Jorgenson, 2003, European Commission, 2003b, OECD, 2003).
Firm level analysis

The strongest evidence for the impact of ICT use comes from firm-level evidence (Brynjolfsson and Hitt, 1996, Brynjolfsson et al., 2002, Atrostic et al., 2002, Bresnahan et al., 2002, European Commission 2003b, OECD, 2003, Gargallo and Galve, 2003, López et al., 2003, and Dans, 2001). Among the qualitative impacts of introducing IT at firm level we can distinguish, on the one hand, the effects of using IT to automate processes, such as the direct substitution of capital for labour, consistent with capital deepening. The use of IT allows firms to reduce the number of employees or to increase output faster than labour (Dedrick et al., 2003). The labour market is affected by an increasing demand for more highly skilled workers whose average wages are higher.

With regards to the impact of change in the process as a whole, the evidence shows that the use of ICT improves firms’ competitiveness because companies are able to increase their market share by becoming leaner than their competitors. The use of ICT may also help firms expand their product ranges, customise the services they offer or respond better to customer demand. At the same time, the introduction of IT improves information within the firm, thus enabling more effective decision-making by workers and managers (OECD, 2003, Dedrick et al., 2003).

All these effects might lead to an overall increase in productivity. However, the benefits of using ICT depend on sector-specific effects and are not found in equal measure in all sectors. Some ICTs are more important in increasing productivity. This is the case of communication network technologies because of the benefits derived from spillover effects (OECD, 2003, Dedrick et al., 2003).

Empirical evidence also demonstrates that use of ICT has a positive impact on firm performance when accompanied by investments in “intangible assets”, such as new organisational processes and structures, worker knowledge and skills, redesigned monitoring and reporting systems and innovative incentive schemes (Bryolfsson et al., 2003).

The Internet and electronic commerce are good examples of how communication network technologies bring about organisational changes in firms and markets. They
involve changes in organisational structure (de-localisation, coопetition\(^1\) and outsourcing) and in the work process; innovative practices in human resources and industrial relations; new business practices, such as total quality management and business process reengineering; e-business applications, such as Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP), Supply Chain Management (SCM), and Customer Relationship Management (CRM), and Knowledge Management Solution (KMS) systems.

This creates new opportunities for market access and monopolistic competition. Changes also occur in the value chain (See, for example, Rayport and Sviokla, 1995, Tapscott, 1999, Evans and Berman, 2001 or Jacobides, 2003), where some middlemen are ousted, newcomers are admitted and existing agents are forced to take on new functions. The characteristics of ICT make for easier product differentiation and segmentation, which in turn enables firms to adapt more readily to customer demand.

Finally, another of the most noticeable consequences of the electronic market is greater price transparency and the opportunity to charge lower prices on the Internet than in the traditional market.

3. METHODOLOGY TO ASSESS THE DIMENSIONS OF ICT IN THE SPANISH ECONOMY

Measurement problems

Measurement problems are a cause of major concern for researchers. Accurate measurement of the ICT sector is required if we are to discover the characteristics and dimensions of ICT impact on the economy and make valid comparisons between countries.

Measurement problems include the difficulty of defining and classifying ICT sector activities and discerning between goods, services and information, while rapid innovation and shrinking prices complicate the measurement of output in products that embody the new technology.

\(^1\) Market phenomenon in which firms may either cooperate or compete, as the situation dictates at any given moment (Banegas, 2001).
Output measurement in the services sector, where most of the IT capital is concentrated, is very difficult, as is quantifying changes in intangible product attributes, such as quality and variety in the manufacturing sector (Bosworth and Triplett, 2000). Firm output measurement requires quality-adjusted price data, which is usually unavailable.

On the input side, a considerable challenge faced those attempting to develop quality-adjusted price indices for IT inputs (Dedrick et al., 2003), an issue further complicated by the fact that different countries use different statistical methods to develop adjusted price indices, making international comparisons more difficult to obtain. Meanwhile, it has proven very difficult to classify and quantify investment in software.

**Description of the methodology and analysis of the situation in the EU and Spain**

Despite the complexity it involves, considerable progress has recently been made in assessing the dimensions of the New Economy from various perspectives. The large number of measurement proposals currently in existence is a reflection of the variety of objectives pursued and analytical approaches employed. The result is a wide range of indicators devised by different sources, both public and private.

One possible classification of this set of indicators is as follows:

1. Indicators to measure ICT infrastructure and the relevance of the sector within the economy.

2. Indicators to measure Internet activity and electronic commerce.

3. Indicators to detect barriers to the use of ICTs, the Internet and electronic transactions.

4. Indicators to quantify the economic and social effects of the phenomenon.

At European level, within the broad areas of action defined at the Lisbon Council of Europe within the framework of the Lisbon strategy, there are four main measurement categories: technological, industrial, economic and social, which have led to the proposed set of indicators displayed in Table I.
Table I. Information Society benchmarking indicators from the eEurope 2005 draft list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. CITIZENS’ ACCESS TO AND USE OF THE INTERNET</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.1  Percentage of households or individuals having access to the Internet at home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.2  Percentage of individuals regularly using the Internet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. ENTERPRISES’ ACCESS TO AND USE OF THE INTERNET</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.1  Percentage of persons employed using computers connected to the Internet in their normal work routine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. COST OF INTERNET ACCESS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.1  Cost of Internet access broken down by frequency of use in hours per month</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. e-GOVERNMENT</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.1  Number of basic public services fully available on-line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. e-LEARNING</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.1  Number of pupils per computer with Internet connection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F. e-HEALTH</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F.1  Percentage of population, (aged 16 and over) using the Internet to seek health information whether for themselves or others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.2  Percentage of general practitioners using electronic patient records</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G. BUYING AND SELLING ON-LINE (ELECTRONIC COMMERCE)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.1  Percentage of enterprises' total turnover from e-commerce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H. e-BUSINESS READINESS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.1  A composite indicator of electronic commerce combining a number of indicators of ICT adoption by enterprises (Internet use, employees using a PC at work, percentage of enterprises with Web page...) and the use of ICTs in electronic commerce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. INTERNET USERS’ EXPERIENCE AND USAGE REGARDING ICT SECURITY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.1  Percentage of individuals with Internet access having encountered security problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2  Percentage of enterprises with Internet access having encountered security problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J. BROADBAND PENETRATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.1  Percentage of enterprises with broadband access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.2  Percentage of households or individuals with broadband access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.3  Percentage of public administrations with broadband access</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The main attempts at national level in Spain have been made by the National Department of Statistics (NDS) and the Spanish Association of IT Firms (SEDISI) in collaboration with the Spanish Ministry of Science and Technology (SMS&T). Table II shows different types of indicators classified according to the four categories mentioned earlier, and provides a brief outline of the different approaches employed.
Table II. Classification of official indicators used to quantify ICT usage in Spain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of indicator</th>
<th>SEDISI and SMS&amp;T</th>
<th>NDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **ICT Infrastructure and importance of sector** | Infrastructure:  
- Telephones: land lines, mobile, cable  
Access Terminals:  
- PC, laptops, PDA, TV, automatic cash dispensers and  
ICT Industry:  
- Market and expenditure | Economic structure of IT service providers:  
- Number of firms, jobs, G.V.A.  
IT Availability and general use:  
- PCs and mobile phones  
- Internet Servers and users |
| **Internet and electronic commerce activity** | Services:  
- Households with cable and satellite TV  
- Internet Hosts and users  
- Web servers, B2B portals, EDI-Web systems  
Content:  
- Firms with web sites and piracy  
- Investment on advertising on the Internet.  
Uses (1):  
- Use of services: by land line, mobile, cable | IT use by citizens, firms and Public Admin.:  
- Use of PCs and the Internet  
- Investment and current expenditure  
- Internet access and content supply  
- Public IT expenditure  
- E-health |
| **Economic and social effects**         | Uses (2):  
- Situation in financial services:  
Transactions via cash dispenser and smart-card, users of online banking.  
- Educational uses of the Internet:  
- Teleworkers per number of employed | Use of IT in education:  
- PC and Internet in schools and universities  
IT training and employment:  
- Training: courses and expenditure.  
- Job vacancies. |

Source: compiled by authors from Sedisi/DMR (2001) and NDS(2002a,b)

4. MEASURING ICT ADOPTION IN SPAIN. THE NORTH-SOUTH DIVIDE IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

Following the methodology summarised in Table I, we estimate how far Spain lags behind other EU member states in Internet development. Table III shows two different types of indicators: a set referring to the importance of ICTs in the economy (groups 1.1 and 1.2 respectively), and another relating to infrastructure, access to and use of the Internet, by individuals, enterprises and Public Administration (groups 2.1 to 2.4 respectively).
Table III. Internet benchmark indicators for Spain in comparison with EU and USA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>EU</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>GER</th>
<th>DEN</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>IR</th>
<th>SW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>ICT Investment (%GDP), 1999(1)</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td><strong>2.8</strong></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>% Markets ICT/GDP, 2000(2)</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td><strong>6.3</strong></td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>ICT use (%GDP), 1999(1)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td><strong>2.0</strong></td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>% use ICT goods /Household Consumption, 1999(1)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td><strong>3.4</strong></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>% Persons employed in ICT sectors /Total employed, 1999(1)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td><strong>1.1</strong></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Teleworkers/Total employed, 1999(1)</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>2.8</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Broadband Penetration (%), June 2001(1)</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td><strong>0.46</strong></td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Homes with PC (%), 2000(1)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td><strong>30.4</strong></td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Mobile telephone subscribers per 100 pop., 2001(4)</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td><strong>65.5</strong></td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>79.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Internet users per 100 pop., January 2000(1)</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td><strong>9.2</strong></td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Household Internet Penetration, 2000(5)</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Internet servers per 1000 pop. 2001(1)</td>
<td>275.2</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td><strong>26.2</strong></td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>177.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Websites per 1000 pop., June 2000(1)</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Average price 20 hours access to the Internet 1995-2000. PPP dollars (1)</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td><strong>78.3</strong></td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Workers using PC at work, 2000(6)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td><strong>42.6</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Availability of on-line government services, 2002(7)</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Spain is well behind other European countries in investment and employment in ICTs, though the picture improves slightly if we consider the market and consumer indicators as a percentage of GDP. In general, Spain is near to Italy and Ireland, and with an important lag respect to Sweden, Denmark and Germany.

With regards to the Internet, the gap continues to separate Spain from the European average, not only in infrastructure, but also in ICT activity in households and firms. Spain, with Ireland, has the highest Internet access charges in Europe. The
only notable exception to the overall picture is a good level of Internet use by the Public Administration.

The situation is little better when electronic commerce in Spanish firms is compared with the European average (Graph 1). In Spain there is less use of electronic commerce both in buying and selling; the main barriers to their usage being lack of security on the web, followed by high access costs.


![Graph 1](image)

*Source: EUROSTAT (2002).*

In classifications of countries according to the various global indices for the Information Society in the year 2002, Spain appears well behind the main developed countries, and ahead only of Portugal and Greece within the context of the EU (CID, 2002).

With regards to the situation of the European regions, we again notice evidence of this north-south divide. To obtain a clearer view of the situation, it is worth examining the Regional Innovation Scoreboard (RIS. This indicator includes three composite indicators. The most important is the Revealed Regional Summary Innovation Index (RRSII), which uses data on thirteen different regional indicators to define the situation in each region as compared to the rest of its own country and to the European average according to the NUTS 2 and 1 classification.

These are the following indicators: (1) population with tertiary education, (2) lifelong learning, (3) employment in medium/high-tech manufacturing, (4) employment
in high-tech services, (5) public R&D expenditures, (6) business R&D expenditures, (7) EPO high-tech patent applications, (8) all EPO patent applications, (9) and (10) the share of innovative enterprises in both manufacturing and services, (11) and (12) innovation expenditures as a percentage of turnover in both manufacturing and services, and (13) the share of sales of new-to-the-firm products in manufacturing. Also it is used the per capita GDP ad the regional level for the EU member states.

Table IV summarises the national scores compiled from the regional data, and lists countries in three groups: leaders, followers, and slow adopters in the Information Society, each group separated by a thicker line. Note that the slowest group includes most of the countries of Southern Europe.

Also, it is presented some indicators of regional innovation inequality, using traditional parameters such as standard deviation, the coefficient of variation, and the Gini and Theil coefficients.

Gini coefficient is calculated in this way:

\[ G = 1 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i} f_i (s_i - \bar{s}) \]

where \( f_i \) is the coefficient of ponderation, expressed by the regional/national population in 2003, and \( s_i \) is the value of RRSII for the region.

Theil coefficient is calculated in this way:

\[ G_1 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i} f_i \frac{x_i}{\bar{x}} \ln \left( \frac{x_i}{\bar{x}} \right) \]

where \( f_i \) is the coefficient of ponderation, expressed by the regional/national population in 2003, and \( x_i \) is the value of RRSII for the region, and \( \bar{x} \) is the national RRSII median.

In both, regional innovation data are ponderated by the regional population, according to the population forecasting to 2003 by Cambridge Econometrics.
### Table IV. RRSII 2003 Ranking of EU countries and regional inequality measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Mean score</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Coefficient of Variation</th>
<th>Gini Coefficient</th>
<th>Theil Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td>0,3775</td>
<td>0,34</td>
<td>0,19</td>
<td>0,2134</td>
<td>0,5652</td>
<td>0,2970</td>
<td>0,1397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>0,5175</td>
<td>0,505</td>
<td>0,26</td>
<td>0,2899</td>
<td>0,5602</td>
<td>0,2098</td>
<td>0,08719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>0,5050</td>
<td>0,475</td>
<td>0,17</td>
<td>0,2768</td>
<td>0,5482</td>
<td>0,1959</td>
<td>0,0650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>0,4667</td>
<td>0,52</td>
<td>0,17</td>
<td>0,2739</td>
<td>0,5870</td>
<td>0,2196</td>
<td>0,1076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>0,4667</td>
<td>0,41</td>
<td>0,35</td>
<td>0,1949</td>
<td>0,4177</td>
<td>0,2063</td>
<td>0,0685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>0,4483</td>
<td>0,445</td>
<td>0,14</td>
<td>0,2144</td>
<td>0,4783</td>
<td>0,1940</td>
<td>0,0731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>0,4450</td>
<td>0,445</td>
<td>0,15</td>
<td>0,4172</td>
<td>0,9375</td>
<td>0,1958</td>
<td>0,1279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0,4418</td>
<td>0,395</td>
<td>0,34</td>
<td>0,1932</td>
<td>0,4374</td>
<td>0,2369</td>
<td>0,0895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>0,3767</td>
<td>0,39</td>
<td>0,41</td>
<td>0,1827</td>
<td>0,4850</td>
<td>0,2367</td>
<td>0,0978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>0,3385</td>
<td>0,32</td>
<td>0,17</td>
<td>0,1967</td>
<td>0,5812</td>
<td>0,3087</td>
<td>0,1666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>0,3078</td>
<td>0,27</td>
<td>0,23</td>
<td>0,1683</td>
<td>0,5467</td>
<td>0,2859</td>
<td>0,1315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>0,3044</td>
<td>0,265</td>
<td>0,19</td>
<td>0,1909</td>
<td>0,6270</td>
<td>0,3164</td>
<td>0,1622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>0,2271</td>
<td>0,23</td>
<td>0,03</td>
<td>0,1979</td>
<td>0,8712</td>
<td>0,2763</td>
<td>0,1436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>0,2062</td>
<td>0,17</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,1544</td>
<td>0,7490</td>
<td>0,3260</td>
<td>0,1856</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled by the authors from regional data supplied by the European Commission (2003c) and the base de datos de Cambridge Econometrics, using the statistical programs SPSS 11.2 and INEQLuxembourg data are not presented due to the fact that this country is composed by only one region and therefore it is not possible to estimate inequality indicators.

As far as innovative performance is concerned, there are also major regional differences in Spain. In general, national innovative capabilities tend to be concentrated in a few regions, but the slow adopters register the highest inequalities. Among then, Spain and Greece have the greatest regional differences. Spanish regions with higher GDP per capita and the northern regions register the highest degrees of penetration at regional level. At the other extreme, there are 12 Spanish regions, with a very low level of Internet usage (the south and rural regions and the islands).

The Spanish Government, aware of the country's developmental lag with respect to the Internet, has put certain specific plans into action. The most recent is the "Plan España.es" (2003-2005) which is aimed at encouraging demand among the population for access to the new technologies; improving infrastructure, content and services to encourage take-up, and promoting the use of ICT in small and medium enterprises (SMEs).
5. CONCLUSIONS

The digital economy is a complex and emerging phenomenon, with effects at both macro and microeconomic level. A number of studies have documented the significant impact of ICT investment on the productivity of firms, industries and countries during the second half of the 90s and the process appears set to continue into the future. The earlier productivity paradox theory therefore appears to have been refuted.

Nevertheless, there are significant differences between countries and between firms. In addition to the differences relating to ICT take-up, there are other factors to account for Europe's lag behind the USA: differences in market regulation, financial market structure, or amount invested in knowledge. The wide range of performance between different organisations with regard to ICT investment can also be explained by complementary investments in organisational capital, new business styles and firm characteristics. Important as the role of ICT is in economic growth, ICT investments will not yield their full potential in productivity benefits, unless they are accompanied by investment and changes in other areas.

Further research is needed to solve measurement problems in order to obtain an accurate assessment of the impact of ICTs. This means creating valid, internationally comparable, indicators. In spite of the difficulties involved in devising suitable indicators, a great number have already been introduced by a variety of organizations. Existing indicators can be classified into three broad categories: ICT infrastructure and market indicators; indicators of access to and use of ICTs; and indicators that measure the social and economic effects.

In spite of the considerable progress made to date in the penetration of the new economy in Spain, the country stills remains below the European average. This provides some explanation for the lower impact of ICTs in Spanish economic growth, when compared to the rest of Europe.

Support policies are needed in order to improve ICT adoption in southern European countries. Initiatives should be aimed chiefly at:

- Encouraging Internet use by households and small firms, especially in the services sector.
- Promoting investment in human capital.
- Designing public policies to reduce the burden of regulation, introduce more flexibility in markets, and remove barriers to innovation and the creation of new businesses.

Further research in needed to determine the causes of regional disparities in ICT development. Special attention should clearly be paid to the analysis of intangible assets and regional policies to account for existing differences.
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