DISCUSSION PAPERS IN ECONOMICS

Working Paper No. 02-12

Korean and Taiwanese Productivity Performance
-- Comparisons at Matched Manufacturing Levels

Frank S.T. Hsiao
Department of Economics, University of Colorado at Boulder
Boulder, Colorado

Changsuh Park
Department of Economics, University of Colorado at Boulder
Boulder, Colorado

October 2002

Center for Economic Analysis
Department of Economics

University of Colorado at Boulder
Boulder, Colorado 80309

© 2002 Frank S.T. Hsiao, Changsuh Park

Korean and Taiwanese Productivity Performance
-- Comparisons at Matched Manufacturing Levels

Frank S.T. Hsiao*
University of Colorado at Boulder

Changsuh Park*
University of Colorado at Boulder

Frank S.T. Hsiao**
Professor of Economics
Department of Economics
University of Colorado at Boulder
Boulder, CO 80309-0256

Office (303)492-7908, 6396
FAX (303) 492-8960 (Dep't)
e-mail hsiao@spot.colorado.edu

**Corresponding author

Changsuh Park
Department of Economics
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80309-0256
U.S.A.

e-mail: changsuh.park@colorado.edu

Abstract of the Paper

We compare productivity performances of the world's two most rapidly growing countries using matched manufacturing sectors by finding the Malmquist productivity index and its four components, aided by visual methods and correlation analysis. The distance functions are estimated by using category-wise cross-industry meta frontiers from1979 to1996. We find that the overall productivity and technology growth rates of Korea are lower than those of Taiwan, explaining postwar Korea's per capita GDP being less than that of Taiwan. At disaggregated levels, in general, the productivity index is positively and significantly correlated with the technology index, and negatively and insignificantly correlated with the efficiency index. Technology appears to be independent of efficiency in these two countries.

Keywords: Productivity analysis, Malmquist Indexes, Korea and Taiwan, Economic Growth

Contents of the Paper

Korean and Taiwanese Productivity Performance
-- Comparisons at Matched Manufacturing Levels

Frank S.T. Hsiao* and Changsuh Park*
University of Colorado at Boulder

I. Introduction

The postwar rapid growth of the Republic of Korea (hereafter Korea) and Taiwan has been a center of studies among the scholars of development economics. Their development experiences began in the early years of the twentieth century (Hsiao and Hsiao, 2002b), accelerated after WWII (Park and Park, 1989; Page, 1994; Hsiao and Hsiao, 2002a, 2002b). Since the late 1960s, they quickly entered the world production process, achieved impressive growth through rapid industrialization and accelerated exports, like two wheels of a cart, with double dependence on Japanese imports (capital equipment and intermediate goods), and the vast US markets (Hsiao and Hsiao, 1996; Hattori and Sato, 1997; Okuda, 1997).

Figure 1 compares long-run GDP per capita levels of 10 Asian countries[1] : Korea (K), Taiwan (T), Thailand (Th), Indonesia (Indo), the Philippines (Ph), Burma (B), China (C), India (Indi), Bangladesh (Ba), and Pakistan (P). The chart is congested and is difficult to distinguish among individual countries. However, the major purpose here is to focus on the general trend of the growth of Taiwan and Korea as compared with other countries. The lines on the upper left-hand side of Figure 1 is enlarged diagrams of the lines below, and should read from the secondary right-hand side Y-axis. It is clear from the chart that the long-run growth of real GDP per capita of Taiwan (the heavy solid line) and Korea (the light solid line) has indeed been extraordinary among these countries, especially during the postwar period. They grew like twins. Both Thailand (Th) and China (C) have also experienced steady growth, but only in recent years, and they still lag far behind Korea and Taiwan. The growth of Korea and Taiwan accelerated during the 1970s and the 1980s, while the Philippines and Burma stumbled, Pakistan, India and Bangladesh experienced either slower growth or no growth throughout the prewar and postwar periods. Thus, in comparing these countries, it is indeed unusual that Korea and Taiwan have been able to sustain their levels of economic growth at such a rapid pace over such a long duration since the onset of the 20th century.

Place Figure 1 here

In the postwar period, Korea and Taiwan had very high export-GDP ratio, import-GDP ratio, and their rapid growth of exports has been backed by equally rapid growth of manufacturing sector. By 1996, Korea was admitted to the prestigious OECD countries. Taiwan should have followed suite if not for the reason of international politics. Thus, in view of their exceptionally rapid growth after the war, which, as we have shown elsewhere, has been a continuation of prewar rapid growth (Hsiao and Hsiao, 2002b), one may expect a similar pattern of productivity growth in manufacturing industry in these two newly developed countries, and its study may yield useful information about productivity of rapidly growing economies.

While both countries experienced rapid growth, one of the most prominent features is that in the postwar period, in contrast with the prewar period, the real GDP per capita level of Korea has been consistently lower than that of Taiwan, as shown in Figure 1. Curiously, economists in Korea and Taiwan, as well as se in the field of development economics, completely ignore this fact. The difference is not due to the different stage of development between the two countries, nor due to historical differences. Elsewhere we have shown that the situation was reversed before the war, and that, despite the destruction of the economy by Allied air raid of Taiwan during the war (1944 -1945) and the Korean War in Korea (1950-1953) during the early postwar period, Korean real GDP per capita was almost the same as that of Taiwan from 1953 to 1955 (Hsiao and Hsiao, 2002b) that both Korea and Taiwan were on the same development stage by the mid-1950s, and have continued to be so until the mid 1990s, as illustrated in Figure 1. Thus, in this paper, we submit that we may justify one-to-one direct comparison of these two countries, and, as the second purpose of this paper, we would like to explain the difference in the real GDP per capita level and growth rate by examining productivity performance of the two countries.

Section II reviews the overall industrial structure of Korea and Taiwan by comparing the industry composition of GDP in the two countries, and points to the different characteristics of the secondary industry, especially the manufacturing industry, between Korea and Taiwan.
Section III explains the Malmquist output index and its two components, the efficiency change index and the technology change index, and the two component of efficiency change index, that is, the pure efficiency change index and the scale efficiency change index. To help understand the paper, we have illustrated and explained these five indexes in a very simple way diagrammatically.

In Section IV, we explain the sources of data and the method of deriving the five indexes. We use the three-digit matched industry levels of 15 manufacturing industries of the two countries so that the differences in productivity are not due to product composition of each industry. Torii and Caves (1992) also use the matched manufacturing sectors. However, they are more concerned with the different estimation methods of frontier production functions and the determination of the productivity[2] in Japan and the United States. The 15 manufacturing sectors are grouped into three categories, the traditional, basic, and high-tech industries. The time series data ranges from 1979 to 1996. Our method of deriving the five indexes is unique in the literature since we use the category-wise meta frontier rather than industry-wide frontier, and the indexes are weighted in accordance with the value-added output shares in the category so to take into account of the different importance of manufacturing sectors in each category.

In Section V, we first examine the structure of the manufacturing industry in terms of the value-added output shares of industrial sectors in each category. Section VI then compares the aggregate productivity performances of the whole manufacturing industry by category and by indexes (Section VIA).

This gives rise to the comparisons of the time trend of each index among the three categories (Section VIB), and the comparisons of the time trend of five indexes within each category (Section VIC).

Sections VII and VIII use correlation analysis to examine the difference and similarity of the five indexes in the overall manufacturing industry as well as in each of the three industrial categories of the two countries. The analysis allows us to compare the indexes directly between the countries and the correlations among the indexes inside each country. Section VII compares the whole period. However, in view of the rapidly growing countries like Korean and Taiwan, we expect differences in productivity performances between the early period and the later period during the 18 years of our investigation. Thus, in Section VIII, we divide the data into two periods: Period A, 1979 to 1987, and period B, 1986 to 1996, and compare the productivity performances of the two period.

Section IX is a dynamic version of Section VIII. We ask which of the 15 manufacturing sectors has improved productivity performances, in terms of productivity, efficiency, and technology indexes, in period B over the period A. Section X then finds the innovators among the 15 manufacturing sectors that push the category-wise meta production frontier outward each year. Section XI concludes.

II. Overall Industrial Structure of Korea and Taiwan

We first present an overview of the Korean and the Taiwanese industrial structures, reviewing the position of the manufacturing industry in each economy. Figure 2 shows the overall industrial structures of Korea and Taiwan as the composition of GDP by industries: the primary, secondary, and tertiary industries[3] from 1970 to 1999. We also present the trend of manufacturing and financial sectors, as the manufacturing industry is the prominent factor in a country's industrialization and modernization, and the financial industry is the fast growing sector in both countries in recent years. The extended time period is to put the industrial structures from 1978 to 1996, the range of which our matched data are available, in time perspective.

For both countries, we see almost the same steady growth[4] of real GDP (shown as columns which are drawn from the right–hand-side secondary Y axis labeled in italic).

Place Figure 2 here

The lines are percentage distribution of each industry in real GDP in each year and they are comparable among countries. Korea has higher percentage of the secondary industry and lower percentage in the tertiary industry. Its manufacturing industry[5] increased from 15% of total output in 1970 to 33% in 1988, and flattened out at about 32% between 1989 and 1997, then started increasing again to 35% in 1999. Taiwan's manufacturing industry was at a higher rate of 24% in 1970 and increased to 36% in 1987, and started decreasing after 1988 to 28% in 1999. There seems a clear change in time series trend after 1987 or 1988 in both countries. This justifies the division of the whole matched industry period at 1987. It appears that Taiwan has experienced de-industrialization (and the rise of the tertiary industry) after lifting of martial law in 1987. Although Auty (1997) pointed out that Korea outpaced Taiwan in macroeconomic performance, Taiwan's trend of de-industrialization is similar to more advanced countries and may be taken as the advancement of industrial society in Taiwan as compared with that in Korea.

Except the secondary industry, especially the manufacturing industry, after mid-1980s, the trend of each pair of the corresponding curves in both countries looks very similar.

III. The Malmquist Productivity Index and its Composition

Unlike most of the current literature on productivity comparisons (Wagner and van Ark, 1996), we now consider total productivity of the manufacturing industry in both countries.

There are several methods of computing productivity growth either at the aggregate level or at industrial levels. Before the mid-1990s, most studies estimated the total factor productivity (TFP) growth rate by using Solow's residual method, or the growth accounting method. There are several papers that compare directly the TFP of Korea and Taiwan, including, Oshima (1987), Kawai (1994), Okuda (1997), and Timmer (2000). Despite the considerable amount of literature (Hsiao and Hsiao, 1998), there is no consensus about the adequate magnitude of TFP growth rates in the process of economic growth (ibid.).

In addition to the strong assumptions of perfect competition and constant returns to scale, the basic problems of the growth accounting method are perfect mobility and divisibility of factors and no distortion due to government regulations. It also assumes that the production activities are always efficient, that outputs are always produced along the production possibility curve. Thus, TFP growth as a measure of technical change is now being considered misleading conceptually and methodologically (Nelson, 1973; Nelson and Pack, 1999).

The recent method of estimating productivity growth rate is the Malmquist productivity index (MPI) method, which has become popular after the mid-1990s. Without using general or specific production function form, this method is based on distance functions and defines productivity as an index of outputs over inputs. Unlike the growth accounting method, it does not require cost and revenue shares to aggregate inputs, nor use cost minimization assumption. We adopt the MPI method in this paper. A comparison of the results using the growth accounting method and the MPI method will be examined elsewhere (Hsiao and Park, 2002a).

Let the pair of observed input vector x_t at time t and the corresponding observed output vector y_t at time t be denoted as $a^t = (x^t, y^t)$. Then the output distance function at time t is defined as

$$D^t(a^t) = \inf_{\delta} \{\delta \mid y^t/\delta \text{ is in } P^t(x^t)\} \tag{1}$$

$$= [\sup_{\delta} \{\delta \mid \delta y^t \text{ is in } P^t(x^t)\}]^{-1}$$

where $P^t(x^t) = \{y^t \mid x^t$ can produce $y^t\}$ is the production set at time t which is convex, closed, bounded, and satisfies strong disposability of x^t and y^t (Coelli, 1996, 62). The scalar δ is a fraction, $0 < \delta \leq 1$ for all $y^t \geq 0$, and $\delta = 1$ if y^t is in the production set. Then, the MPI at time t when the production set (technology) is $P^t(x^t)$ is defined as $M^t = D^t(a^{t+1})/ D^t(a^t)$, which is the ratio of the maximum proportional changes in the observed outputs required to make each of the observed outputs efficient in relation to the technology at t. Here, $D^t(a^t)$ is applied to the constant-returns-to-scale benchmark. Similarly, the MPI at time t+1 when the production set is $P^{t+1}(x)$ is $M^{t+1} = D^{t+1}(a^{t+1})/ D^{t+1}(a^t)$, which refers to the technology at t+1. To avoid ambiguity in choosing the production set, the output-oriented MPI is then defined as the geometric mean of the MPI in two consecutive periods (Coelli, et al., 1998, 128; Faere et al., 1994):

$$MPI^t = (M^t M^{t+1})^{1/2} = \left[\left(\frac{D^t(a^{t+1})}{D^t(a^t)}\right)\left(\frac{D^{t+1}(a^{t+1})}{D^{t+1}(a^t)}\right)\right]^{1/2} \qquad (2)$$

where MPI > = < 1 implies productivity growth (or change) is positive, zero, or negative[6] from period t to period t+1. Generally, definition (2) may be decomposed into three parts,

$$MPI^t = \underbrace{\frac{D^{t+1}(a^{t+1})}{D^t(a^t)}}_{EI}\underbrace{\left[\left(\frac{D^t(a^{t+1})}{D^{t+1}(a^{t+1})}\right)\left(\frac{D^t(a^t)}{D^{t+1}(a^t)}\right)\right]^{1/2}}_{TI} \qquad (3)$$

$$= \underbrace{\frac{V^{t+1}(a^{t+1})}{V^t(a^t)}}_{PI}\underbrace{\left[\left(\frac{V^t(a^t)}{D^t(a^t)}\right)\Big/\left(\frac{V^{t+1}(a^{t+1})}{D^{t+1}(a^{t+1})}\right)\right]}_{SI}\underbrace{\left[\left(\frac{D^t(a^{t+1})}{D^{t+1}(a^{t+1})}\right)\left(\frac{D^t(a^t)}{D^{t+1}(a^t)}\right)\right]^{1/2}}_{TI} \qquad (4)$$

The first term in (3) is called the efficiency change index (or simply efficiency index, EI, hereafter), and the second term is the technology change index (or simply technology index, TI, hereafter). Note that the concept of the distance function can be applied to either a constant- returns-to-scale (CRS) or a variable-returns-to-scale (VRS) benchmark. In (4), $V^t(a^t)$ is the output distance function based on a variable-returns-to-scale benchmark. The ratio $V^{t+1}(a^{t+1})/V^t(a^t)$ is the pure efficiency change index (or simply pure efficiency index, PI, hereafter) from time t to t+1, based on the variable-returns-to-scale technology. The ratio, $V^t(a^t)/ D^t(a^t)$, is the scale efficiency index at time t, which measures the output difference between the variable-returns-to-scale technology and the constant-returns-to-scale technology at time t. The ratio of this difference at t and t+1 is the scale efficiency change index from time t to t+1, and is called the scale efficiency change index (or simply scale index, SI, hereafter).

Place Figure 3 here

The MPI in (2) is the standard definition. It is enigmatic and obscure. In Figure 3, we present a simple diagram to illustrate the basic concepts intuitively. To avoid the cluttering of superscripts, we denote the observed outputs for periods t and t+1 as y and z, respectively, and the corresponding efficient outputs at time t as y' and z' along the constant-returns-to-scale technology $P^{'}(x)$, and those at time t+1 as y" and z" along the constant-returns-to-scale technology P"(x), respectively. Similarly, we denote the efficient outputs at time t as a' and b' along the variable-returns-to-scale technology $V^{'}(x)$, and those at time t+1 as a" and b" along the variable-returns-to-scale technology V"(x), respectively.

Since, from Figure 3, the definition of the distance function gives $D^t(a^t) = y/y'$, etc., the definition of the MPI above reduces to (5) and (6) below:

$$\text{MPI} = \left(\frac{z}{y}\right)\left[\left(\frac{y'}{z'}\right)\left(\frac{y''}{z''}\right)\right]^{1/2}$$

$$= \left(\frac{z/z''}{y/y'}\right)\left[\left(\frac{y''}{y'}\right)\left(\frac{z''}{z'}\right)\right]^{1/2} = \text{EI*TI} \tag{5}$$

$$= \left(\frac{z/b''}{y/a'}\right)\left(\frac{y'/a'}{z''/b''}\right)\left[\left(\frac{y''}{y'}\right)\left(\frac{z''}{z'}\right)\right]^{1/2} = \text{PI*SI*TI} \tag{6}$$

Thus, the efficiency index EI in (5) is based on the constant-returns-to-scale benchmark, and the pure efficiency index PI in (6) is based on the variable-returns-to-scale benchmark. Both measure the ratio of the degree of deficiencies of the observed points y to a' for (6) in Figure 3 (or y to y' for (5)) and z to b" for (6) (or z to z" for (5)) relative to the corresponding maximum possible output (a' and b" for (6)) and (y' and z" for (5)) using the benchmark technology at each period. It reflects the results of learning, knowledge diffusion, and spillover across the industrial sectors, improvement in market competitiveness, cost structure, and capacity utilization, etc.

The scale index SI measures the ratios of the maximum output based on the constant-returns-to-scale technology as compared with the variable-returns-to-scale technology between the two periods. Roughly speaking, in Figure 3 it measures the change of the line segment a'y' in the first year to the segment b"z" in the second year. It indicates the change in efficiency due to the scale of production between the two periods.

The term in the square root measures the relative movement of the productivity curves based on the constant-returns-to-scale benchmark between two periods and is the technology index TI, shown by the (geometric) average of the line segment y'y" and z'z" in Figure 3. It represents new product and process innovation, new management system, or the external shock that shifts the productivity curves.

In this paper, we will refer the output-oriented Malmquist productivity index (MPI) simply as the productivity index. When the observed outputs are on the productivity curve at each period, that is, y = y' and z = z", then EI = 1 and, as in Faere et al., (1994), we have TI = z/y, which is the same as the conventional definition of the total factor productivity (TFP) ratio between two periods. When 1 is subtracted from this ratio, TFPG ≡ (z/y – 1)*100 is the discrete growth rate,[7] or the percentage change, of TFP between the two consecutive periods. Hence, the TFP growth rate is a special case [8] of the MPI when EI =1. Similarly, MPG ≡ (MPI-1)*100 is the growth rate of productivity, EG ≡ (EI – 1)*100, is the growth rate of efficiency, and TG ≡ (TI-1)*100 is the growth rate of technology. SG ≡ (SI-1)*100 and PG ≡ (PI-1)*100 are growth rate (or percentage change) of scale efficiency and pure efficiency, respectively. Comparisons of productivity performance of Taiwan and Korea are carried out using indexes as well as growth rates, both of which are pure numbers, independent of the units of measurement used in each county.

IV. The 15 Matched Manufacturing Levels

The data set for 15 manufacturing sectors for Korea and Taiwan consists of one output, the real value-added output of each sector, net of intermediate goods, and two inputs, the number of workers and the real capital stock from 1978 to 1996. The data on Taiwan are based on Taiwan Area National Income and Survey of Manpower Allocation published by the Ministry of Economic Affairs. The data were made available to the authors by the courtesy of Drs. Sheng-cheng Hu and Vei-lin Chan, who used the data to find the total factor productivity at the industrial level in Hu and Chan (1999), applying the growth accounting method. The data set consists of 15 sectors, as shown on the left-hand side of Table 1, and has a range for 19 years.

Place Table 1 here

The data set for Korea is taken from the OECD (2000) STAN database. It has 28 three-digit manufacturing sectors based on the ISIC Rev. 2, and ranges from 1970 to 1996. The productivity growth of the 28 sectors for Korea has been analyzed in Kim and Park (2002). The Korean data are rearranged and matched with the Taiwanese data and are reduced to 15 sectors, as noted in the last column of Table 1. Additional details of data sources are explained in the Appendix of this paper.

The 15 sectors in the cross-section data set are further grouped into three categories [9] : The traditional industry category (T, Sectors 1 to 6), the basic industry category (B, Sectors 7 to 11), and the high-tech industry category (H, Sectors 12 to 15), as shown in the first "Category" (Ca) column in Table 1.

We estimate the distance functions in (4) by non-parametric one-output two-inputs linear programs[10] following Faere, et al. (1994), Coelli (1996), and Coelli et al. (1998) for each category. For this paper, our method is to construct a category-wise cross-industry best-practice meta production frontier from the observed outputs each year, as shown by four productivity curves in Figure 3. The best-practice meta frontier is estimated each year from the observed inputs and outputs by linear constraints

$$\{-y_j^t + Y^t w \geq 0, \ -x^{jt} + X^t w \geq 0, \ w \geq 0\}, \tag{7}$$

where for our problem, Y^t is 1xN vector, X^t is 2xN, and w is Nx2, j = 1, 2, … N, and N is the number of manufacturing sectors in each category (see below). We then compare the actual output of each manufacturing sector (like y and z in Figure 3) in the category with the corresponding maximum outputs on category-wise frontier (like y', y", a', a", etc.), and construct the distance functions $D^t(a^t)$, etc., for consecutive years by maximizing the inverse of the distance δ subject to the frontier technology (7).

Our derivation of the category-wise cross-industry meta frontier is different from the current practice of finding the distance functions for all 15 manufacturing sectors by constructing the manufacturing industry-wide frontier (e.g., Faere, et al. (1994), Lee, et al (1998)). Our method takes into account that the meta production frontiers for the three categories in each year are different, for example, the technology used in traditional industries is quite different from that used in high-tech industries. Thus, we submit that technology used in an individual manufacturing sector in an industrial category should be compared with the production frontier of that category, not with the manufacturing industry as a whole.[11]

For each category, we calculated Nx(4x18-2) distance functions using linear programs, where N = 6 for the traditional category, 5 for the basic category, and 4 for the high-tech category, a total of 1050 distance functions. From them, we have constructed five indexes TI, EI, PI, SI and MPI for each sector in each category for 18 years (we lose one year since the indexes start from the second year of the sample), a total of 1350 (=5x15x18) indexes. Since the importance of each sector in each category is different in terms of the value-added share[12] in each category (see Figure 4 below), each index in a year in each category is weighted by the share of the corresponding value-added output in that year and in that category.[13] The sums of the weighted indexes within each category in selected years are presented in Table 2. The column of manufacturing (Mfg) is the geometric mean of the indexes of three categories. The rows of geometric mean (geomean) are the geometric mean of the indexes of 18 years in each category. Note that the decomposition of the MPI indexes (3) and (4) still holds approximately even though the original indexes are weighted by value-added outputs in each category.

Place Table 2 here

In the following analysis, we compare the time-series data as well as the cross-section data for the two countries. Because the years in the mid-1980s are considered a period of transition from traditional industrialization to the high-tech and service-oriented industrialization for both countries, in addition to other factors delineated below, the time-series data have been divided into two sub-periods: Period A covers from 1979 to 1986 and Period B from 1987 to 1996. Taiwan lifted its 37 years long Martial Law in 1987, and entered a new era of political freedom and economic liberalization and reform (Hsiao and Hsiao, 2002b). Similarly, Korea passed 6.29 Declaration on democratization to change the presidential election method from indirect to direct election by people, and promulgated seven other laws to democratize the economy and society. One of its consequences is, like Taiwan, the gain of the power of labor unions (Lee, et al., 2001) and higher wages, stimulating massive outward foreign investment.

V. The Structure of the Manufacturing Industry

Since our Malmquist productivity index and its components are weighted by the value-added output shares in each category, we first examine the differences and similarities of the structure of the manufacturing industry in terms of the output shares of Korea and Taiwan. This is shown in Figure 4. The number after the sector label, like 1Food(94a), shows the sector's correlation coefficient (94% in this case) between Korea and Taiwan. The alphabet after the number shows the level of significance of the student t distribution under the null hypothesis that the population correlation coefficient is zero for two-sided test: a shows that the level of significance of the sample correlation coefficient is 1%, b, 5%, c, 10% and d, 20%, respectively.

Place Figure 4 here

The upper three curves in Figure 4a shows the output shares of the three categories in the whole manufacturing industry. All three have similar trend between the two countries over time. In fact,

their correlation coefficients are positive and significant at 1% level, showing very strong similarity of the structure of the manufacturing industry between these two fast growing countries: the importance of the traditional industries has been replaced by high-tech industries, especially in Taiwan after 1987, and that both countries are apparently climbing up the technology ladder for rapid growth as evidenced by constantly increase share of high-tech and basic categories, especially after 1987. This is a source of the parallel growth of Taiwan and Korea shown in Figure 1.

As may be expected, there are differences in the importance among the manufacturing sector in each category. In the traditional categories, Figure 4b shows that the food industry is the most important sector in both countries with very high correlation coefficient (94%), followed by textiles, paper, apparel, wood, and leather. The ranking is almost the same between Korea and Taiwan in the mid-1990s, and their patterns are very similar, except the textile and paper sectors, whose correlation coefficients are only 16% and 40%, respectively. The two sectors have opposite trend in the two countries. The textiles sector in Korea is declining, while that of Taiwan stays flat, and the share of paper industry sector is increasing, while that of Taiwan also stays flat.

The value-added output share of the five sectors in the basic category in Figure 4c is quite different. The correlation coefficients are generally low and not significant, and the basic metal sector has negative and low (10%) level of significance between the two countries. In contrast, the ordering of the importance of the high-tech industries in Figure 4d is the same in both countries in the mid-1990s, and is also highly correlated.

Note that the importance of the industries in each category is examined by comparing the industries in the individual category. Since in both countries, the most important industry in each category is the same, that is, the food sector in the traditional category, chemicals in the basic category, and electronics in the hi-tech category, we have plotted these three sectors at the bottom of Figure 4a, in which the comparisons are made for all 15 manufacturing sectors. It turns out that these three sectors are still the largest industries in both countries, and they are highly correlated except the chemical sector. In both countries, the importance of the value-added output of the food sector in the whole manufacturing industry continues to slide down after 1987, to about 10% of the whole manufacturing industry. But in the traditional category, it turned up to increase 50% for Korea and 40% for Taiwan in Figure 4b. The trend is similar in both countries.[14] Apparently, the food industry sector was squeezed out by the high-tech industries, especially by the electric and electronic sector.

In general, so far as the structure of manufacturing industry is concerned, both Korea and Taiwan are similar, except the basic industry sectors. Does this means that their productivity growth rates are also similar during 1979 to 1996?

VI. Productivity Performances in Period 1979-1996

Since we have calculated five indexes for Korea and Taiwan covering the cross-section of 15 manufacturing sectors, each of which has time-series of the five indexes from 1979 to 1996, we discuss their properties separately.

A. Aggregate Productivity Performances

Figure 5 shows the average percentage changes or the growth rates of the five indexes (see equations (7) to (9)) in the overall manufacturing (the line with circle markers) and three manufacturing categories (the three column charts) for the period from 1979 to 1996. The growth rates are derived by subtracting 1 from the rows of geometric mean in Table 2 multiplied by 100.

Figure 5 appears that the overall variation of performance indexes in Korea is much larger than that of Taiwan, and the sectional performance is quite different. The overall productivity growth rates (MPG), technology growth rate (TG), scale efficiency growth rate (PG) in Korea are only 40%, 20%, and 60% of those of Taiwan, respectively, and only the efficiency growth rate (EG) is the same as that of Taiwan. According to Kaldor's first law, the growth of GDP is positively related to the growth of manufacturing output, and his second law states that the growth of manufacturing output is positively related to the growth of manufacturing productivity (Thirlwall, 2002), we can explain from this findings why per capita GDP growth rate of Korea consistently falls behind that of Taiwan, as we have alluded to in the introduction.

Pure efficiency index is low for both countries, but Taiwan registered negative growth rate (-0.3%), due mostly to the large negative growth rate (-0.7%) in the traditional category. Korea has growth rates of 0.1%, mainly due to high pure efficiency growth rate (0.6%) in the high-tech category. The overall scale efficiency growth rate of Korea (0.7%) is lower than that of Taiwan (1.1%). This may reflect the law of diminishing returns and inefficiency in larger Korean firms (Abe and Kawakami, 1997) as compared with the generally small-and-medium size enterprises in Taiwan.

Among individual categories, Korea's technology growth rate in the traditional category is on average –2.6%, one of the largest negative growth rates among the categories, resulting in negative productivity growth in that sector, and also contributing the low productivity growth in overall manufacturing industry. Korea's basic industries have much lower technical growth rates, while its high-tech industries have much higher efficiency and technology growth rates. Since the future of the economy depends very much on the development of the high-tech industry, there is an uncertain whether Taiwanese economy can maintain its real per capita GDP superiority in the future.

Place Figures 5 here

The table attached to Figure 5 is the basis of the studies of the rest of this paper. The columns of table in Figure 5 may be extended to compare the performance of the time trend of each index in the three categories (Figure 6). The rows can be extended to compare the time trend of the five indexes within a category (Figure 7). The correlation coefficients among the five indexes in each category for the whole period and sub-periods are shown in Tables 3 to 5.

B. Comparison of Each Index in Three Categories

Figure 6, as well as Figure 7 below, shows the time series trend of sequential multiplicative products of the indexes[15] for the whole manufacturing industry and for each category. Figure 6a is the productivity index. The line with Mfg is the geometric mean of the three categories obtained in Table 2. The manufacturing productivity ranges from 87 to 120 in the case of Korea, and from 102 to 143 in the case of Taiwan. In the sample range, both countries started at almost the same level of the productivity index, but Korea's index increased slowly, and Taiwan's index accelerated until around 1987, leveled afterward, but still kept about 20 points higher than that of Korea.

Place Figures 6 here

The performance of each category is quit different, however. The productivity of Korea's high-tech category accelerated unevenly, while that of Taiwan accelerated at the beginning, but then decelerated after 1989. Taiwan's indexes in the basic category also tend to decelerate after 1987, but still kept about 60 points higher than that of Korea. In Korea, the productivity of the traditional category grew horizontally, and after 1987 it started to decrease. By 1996, Korea's index fell from the high of 97 to 71. But in Taiwan, it accelerated until 1987, and then fell from the high of 147 to 122, still maintained much higher position than that of Korea. Here is the time trend difference in productivity performance in two countries, and also the source of the strength of the Taiwanese manufacturing sector during the years under our studies.

In terms of the components of the productivity index, the difference is large. Korea and Taiwan have more or less the same level of overall efficiency index over the years (Figures 6b). However, Taiwan's efficiency index in high-tech category grew faster than that of Korea, that in the traditional category decline faster, and that in the basic category fluctuated much widely than that of Korea over the period. On the other hand, Korea has much lower rate of overall technology change than that of Taiwan (Figure 6c), and also in the traditional category. The technology change in Korea is low and uneven, and that in Taiwan is very high and even more uneven. On the other hand, the technology index in the high-tech category in Korea was uneven hut accelerated, and that of Taiwan kept low and even decelerated in the early 1990s. In fact, Taiwan's technology index in the high-tech category is the lowest among the three categories.. Considering the accelerated productivity growth of Korea in the high-tech industry, it is not clear how far Taiwan can maintain its superiority over Korea in the near future.

Compared with other indexes, the change in the scale index and the pure efficiency index are subdued. We only note that Taiwan' overall scale index (Figure 6d) is slightly higher than that of Korea in the early 1990s, and that in the high-tech category accelerated after 1987, as compared with Korea, which has leveled. This may reflect the trend in the size of the enterprises in two countries: enterprise size in Korea is decreasing and that in Taiwan increasing (Abe and Kawakami, 1997). The overall pure efficiency index in Korea is slightly higher than that of Taiwan (Figure 6e), and the pure efficiency index in Taiwan's basic category fluctuated much larger than that of Korea.

C. Comparison of Five Indexes in Each Category

Figure 7 provides category-by-category time series performance of the five indexes. It shows the details of the rows of Figure 5 and is extracted from the columns of Table 2. Most of the indexes in each category show a clear turning point at 1987. Figure 7a reveals the history of the indexes in the overall manufacturing industry as a whole. In 1979, both countries started at about the 100 level of the productivity index (MPI), but Korea stumbled and Taiwan grew rapidly and leveled after 1987. So is the technology index (TI), except that Taiwan's TI fell precipitously after 1987, but still maintained much higher position than Korea's.

Place Figure 7 here

In the traditional sector (Figure 7b), all indexes, except the scale index, are decreasing after 1987. However, Taiwan's productivity and technology indexes are still much higher than those of Korea, while Korea's efficiency and scale efficiency indexes exceed those of Taiwan in the early 1990s. In the basic category (Figure 7c), the overall productivity index of Taiwan is consistently much higher than that of Korea, which stagnates during the whole period of study. Note the extremely volatile technology index in Taiwan's basic category: it rapidly increased before 1987 and rapidly fell afterward. Other indexes in both countries are also volatile, especially those of Taiwan. This is in contrast with Korea's rapid but zigzag increases in productivity and technology indexes in its high-tech category (Figure 7d). It appears that the high-tech industries in Korea are rapidly catching up with Taiwan. Here is another warning sign of the future of Taiwanese competitiveness with Korea.

VII. Correlation Analyses of the Whole Period

Our analyses of Figure 6 and 7 are based on visual examination. While diagrams provide us an insight into the nature of similarity and difference between the two countries, it is less precise and often misleading. Thus, in Tables 3 to 5, we have computed the correlation coefficients of the five indexes[16] between the two countries as well as within the countries. We submit that if both Korean and Taiwanese economies are at the same stage and the structures of production are similar, as we have seen in Figure 4, then the growth rates of efficiency, technology, productivity, pure efficiency, and scale efficiency may be expected to be more or less similar and of the same magnitude and order, as the sample may be regarded as drawn from the same population. This implies that the Pearson correlation coefficients between the indexes and countries can be expected to be high.

Place Table 3

The data are based on the category-wise weighted indexes in columns of Table 2. Table 3 is arranged in terms of whole manufacturing industry and its three categories. In each part, the upper left block shows the correlations among the pairs of data consisting of EIk, TIk, MPIk, PIk, and SIk within Korea, and the lower right block shows the correlations among the pairs of data of EIt, TIt, MPIt, PIt, and SIt within Taiwan. The coefficients along the diagonal elements with bold-faced numbers are the direct cross-country comparison of the five indexes between Korea and Taiwan. The off-diagonal elements are cross-country correlation coefficients. Since we consider that economic relations between Taiwan and Korea are more or less independent to each other, there are less interdependency on technology and efficiency between the two countries at the industrial level, and we could not find meaningful interpretation of the off-diagonal coefficient coefficients. In this paper they are listed for reference only, and will be ignored.

Table 3 presents the correlation coefficients for the whole period, 1979-96.

A. Inter-country comparisons

We first study the bold-faced diagonal elements. This is the analytical version of Figure 7. Curiously, there are only a few strong correlation coefficients between the same indexes in two countries, belying our visual examination in the previous sections.

In Table 3a, only the productivity indexes between Korea and Taiwan are significant at the 5% level. The scale efficiency indexes are even negatively correlated but not significant, implying a possibility of opposite scale efficiency performance of industries in both countries due to different size of the firms in each country. The efficiency, technology, and pure efficiency indexes in the traditional category (Table 3b) are very weakly significant (at the 20% level), but interestingly, the productivity index is not significant. Only the pure efficiency indexes in the basic category (Table 3c) are highly correlated at the 1% level of significance. In the high-tech category (Table 3d), only the productivity indexes are significant at 5% level, which, as no other categories have significant correlations, probably has contributed to the overall significance level of the productivity correlation coefficient in the whole manufacturing industry.

B. Intra-country comparisons

More similar patterns of relationship among the indexes appear within each country. For the basic, high-tech, and whole manufacturing categories in both countries, efficiency and technology indexes are consistently negatively and strongly correlated, except those in the traditional category, in which the coefficients are also negative but not significant. This implies that, although EI and TI are multiplicative components of the productivity index MPI, they are either strongly substitutes to each other or even independent from each other within a country.

This is in contrast with the relations between the efficiency index (EI) and its components, pure efficiency index (PI) and the scale efficiency index (SI). In all categories, they are positively and very significantly correlated in both countries, except EI and PI in the high-tech category in Taiwan. However, PI and SI themselves are not necessarily correlated in all categories in both countries, there seems no particular pattern between them.

Another interesting relations among the indexes which are common to both countries are that the technology index (TI) is very highly correlated with the productivity index (MPI) in all categories, but negatively and highly correlated with the scale efficiency indexes (SI) in all categories, except the traditional categories, in which the correlation between SI and TI is negative but not significant. Furthermore, since the coefficients of the efficiency index (EI) and the productivity index (MPI) are generally negative but not significant in all categories except the traditional category, we may conclude that the major determinant of productivity (MPI) in the manufacturing industry in each country is the technology index (TI), not the efficiency index (EI). Only in the case of the traditional category in both countries, the efficiency indexes have positive and significant correlation with the productivity indexes. This implies that, since the traditional industries are generally small in both countries, there is more room to increase efficiency along with technology.

In both countries, the productivity indexes (MPI) are generally not correlated, or even negatively correlated, with the pure efficiency indexes (PI) or the scale efficiency indexes (SI). Since SI and PI are multiplicative components of EI, this may be the reason of generally very weak relationship between the efficiency index (EI) and the productivity index (MPI) in both countries.

VIII. Correlation Analyses of the Sub-Periods

In the previous section, we have found several interesting common patterns of the relations between the five indexes in both countries. In the rapidly changing and growing economies like Korea and Taiwan, the pattern of productivity performances may be different in the early period and the later period, as we have seen in Figures 6 and 7. It is conceivable that there may also have common patterns within the sub-period and between the sub-periods. Table 4 repeats the contents of Table 3 for subperiod A, 1979-1986, and the same for Table 5 for subperiod B, 1987-1996.

A. Inter-country comparisons

In Table 4, in period A there are weak correlation (at the 10% level of significance) of productivity indexes in traditional and high-tech categories (Tables 4b and 4d) except the basic category, resulted in the same weak correlation in the overall manufacturing industry. Note that all the five indexes in the traditional category are weakly correlated, indicating weak similarity between the two countries in Period A (see Figure 7a). Other indexes between the two countries in the overall manufacturing and basic and high-tech categories are not correlated at all, and the scale efficiency indexes have consistently negative correlation coefficients, but generally not significant.

Place Table 4 here

In Period B (Table 5), the weak correlations of the indexes between Korea and Taiwan in the traditional category disappear completely, indicating the even the weak development pattern of both countries in the traditional category had deviated from each other. In the high-tech sector, there is a weak correlation between the productivity indexes in period A, and it also disappear in period B. Furthermore, the scale efficiency indexes of traditional and hi-tech categories have turned to positive but not significant, showing that the two countries moving toward the same pattern of scale efficiency indexes in Period B. Whether all the scale efficiency indexes will eventually turn to positive and significant, as the scale of the industries in both countries converges, as we have observed in Figure 6d, is interesting to watch.

In Period B, the productivity indexes lost its significance in the traditional category and high-tech category, showing the deviation of the growth pattern of the productivity indexes in the two countries. But they gained significance in the basic category. The coefficient of the pure efficiency index in the basic category remained the same through out both periods, implying both countries have similar pattern of the pure efficiency index in the basic category.

In general, throughout both periods, the coefficients of the five indexes along the diagonal elements indicate that the indexes are independent between Korea and Taiwan, they do not change in the same pattern, and if they do, they most likely show only in the productivity indexes, not its components, and the relation between the two countries are only weakly significant (at the 10% to 20% level).

B. Intra-country comparisons

In both countries and both periods (Table 4 and 5), efficiency and technology in each category consistently move in the opposite direction, and the tendency is much stronger (that is, strong significant relations) in Period B (Table 5). It implies that the nature of substitution relation between TI and EI becomes stronger as the economy progress. We will discuss their relations in detail in the next section. In contrast, the efficiency index and pure efficiency index in both countries and in both periods have positive relations, and are significant in most of the categories with some exception in Korea and Taiwan. The correlations between efficiency and productivity in each country are generally not significant, and the sign also vary. For example, in period A in the overall manufacturing industry, the coefficient is negative but not significant in Korea, but positive and significant at the 5% level in Taiwan. The situation reversed in period B. The coefficient is positive but not significant in Korea, but negative and not significant in Taiwan.

Another similar pattern in both countries in both periods is that technology and productivity are positively correlated among all the categories, mostly significant, especially in period A for Korea and period B for Taiwan. In contrast, technology and scale efficiency are consistently negatively correlated except the traditional category in Korea in both period. The sign of correlation may be negative or positive.

IX. Did Indexes Improve Over Two Periods?

Table 6 shows the comparisons of efficiency, technology, and productivity indexes over the two periods (columns 1 to 3, 5 to 7). These indexes are obtained by taking the geometric mean[17] of the category-wise unweighted indexes, respectively, of the 15 manufacturing sector from 1979-1986 (period A) and from 1987-1996 (period B), and then subtracted one from the mean and multiplied by 100. Thus, unlike the data in Figure 7, we are now dealing with the growth rates of the indexes. The growth rates in each category in each period are then weighted by the proportion of value-added outputs in that period in the category.[18] The positive or negative number means the positive or negative average growth in period B over period A in that particular manufacturing sector. Since technology, rather than efficiency, is the primary mover of productivity growth, as indicated in Section VI, columns 4 and 8 compare the difference of the technology growth rates and the efficiency growth rates between the two periods. Positive means that the difference has been increased in period B. The sum listed below each category is the sum of the growth rates in each category. The number of sectors that shows positive growth rates in each category is listed below the sum.

Compared with Figure 5, in which the data are taken from the whole period, the division of the time periods gives rise to quite a different picture of the growth process in the two countries. For the traditional sector, all the productivity, efficiency, and technology indexes decreased in period B, indicating that the traditional industries in both countries are declining industries giving way to the high-tech industries (see below). However, Taiwan's decrease in the growth rates of these indexes are much faster than those in Korea, partially reflecting the decrease in the share of the manufacturing industry and the secondary industry after 1987 in Figure 2. While the three indexes decrease, technological progress is still occurring in the traditional sectors, as the growth rate of technology is larger than that of efficiency in period B, and Korea's growth is twice higher than that of Taiwan.

The situation is different in the other two categories. In the basic category, the growth patterns of the two countries are far apart. In Korea, productivity and technology in the basic industries, especially petroleum and coal, and non-metallic mineral products, had positive growth in period B, while efficiency growth declined. In Taiwan, both productivity and technology declined, especially in the chemical products, rubber, and plastic industry, but gained considerably in efficiency in the second period. In period B, technology grew faster than efficiency in Korea, while it grew much slower than efficiency in Taiwan. Thus, their pattern of growths are just opposite.

On the other hand, in the high-tech categories, Korea's productivity and efficiency growth rates are higher in the second period, especially in the machinery products and electric, electronic machinery products sectors, but technology of these industries lagged behind greatly in the second period. Taiwan had much larger productivity growth in the second period in the high-tech category. However, its efficiency lagged behind, especially in the machinery products sector, but technology grew much faster in the second period. Thus, the relations between efficiency and technology in Korea and Taiwan in the second period are reversed, and interestingly, the reversed relations are just opposite compared with the basic category. Technology lagged far behind efficiency in Korea in all high-tech industries, but grew much faster than efficiency in Taiwan in all high-tech industries.

Overall, when we take the (arithmetic) average of the indexes of the three categories, we found that the productivity, efficiency, and technology generally declined in the second period, except efficiency in Korea, and the degree of decline is larger in Taiwan than in Korea. Among the 60 indexes in both countries, Korea had 22 positive indexes, and Taiwan had 17. Here is another sign of warning to the Taiwanese economic development. However, if we consider that the high-tech industries are the future of industrialization, as its weight becomes larger and larger (see Figure 4a), and since productivity and technology are positively and highly correlated, the results in the high-tech category in Table 6 may let Taiwan maintain its superiority in the near future.

X. The Innovators

Lastly, we ask which manufacturing sector(s) in each category makes the category-wise best-practice production frontier to shift in each year. Are they the same in Korea and Taiwan? We follow Faere, et al. (1994) to identify the "innovators," which exhibit the following properties:

$$\{TI > 1,\ D^{t}(a^{t+1}) > 1,\ D^{t+1}(a^{t+1}) = 1\}$$

That is, the manufacturing sector that has technology growth at time t, located beyond the previous technology set but inside the current technology set based on the constant-returns-to- scale technology. We find again that Korea and Taiwan have the same pattern as shown in Table 7.

Place Table 7

Table 7 shows that for the traditional category, the most frequent innovator in Korea is the food sector (1), followed by the apparel sector (3). This is the same as Taiwan, except that, in Taiwan, the leather sector (4) also plays as an innovator in period A. It appears that in general Taiwan's meta frontiers shift more often than that of Korea's, indicating more innovation activities in Taiwan's traditional sector.

For the basic category, the petroleum (8) and fabricated metal (11) sectors are innovators in Korea, but fabricated metal sector is never an innovator in Taiwan. For the high-tech category, all four high-tech sectors played a role as an innovator one time or another in Korea. In particular, the transportation sector (14) is the most prominent, followed by the precision instruments and other manufacturing goods sector (15). The machinery sector (12) was an innovator only once in 1990, while the electric and electronic sector (13) was an innovator in the early 1990s.

Both transportation (14) and precision instrument and other manufacturing goods sector (15) are also predominant innovators in Taiwan. However, unlike Korea, the machinery sector (12) never was, and curiously, the electric and electronic sector was an innovator only once in 1995. The fact that the precision instruments and other manufacturing goods sector can be innovator indicates that, as the rapidly developing countries, both countries constantly produce new products and adopt new technology, which cannot be classified into conventional classification of the manufacturing sectors.

In general, while there are some variations, the innovators in each category in both countries are basically the same, showing the same economic vitality. Note also that, an innovator may not be the largest sector in a category (see Figure 4), except the food sector, which has the largest share in the traditional category. Another interesting finding is that, curiously, electric and electronic sector, which both governments have tried so hard to protect and promote in the late 1980s to early 1990s, is not an important innovator. Whether this sector is overprotected and lost competitiveness, or the effects of protection and promotion are still to come, only time can tell.

XI. Conclusions

In this paper, we have examined the difference and similarity of productivity performances of the world's two most rapidly growing countries using the matched manufacturing sectors. For the first time in the literature, the comparisons at the manufacturing levels of the two countries were performed by using the Malmquist output index and its components, using the visual methods and correlation analysis extensively. Since we have the panel data of 15 matched manufacturing sectors of two countries for 19 years, and they are classified into three categories in two periods, the analysis of the five productivity indexes become quite complicated.

We found there is a clear similarity in the structure of the manufacturing industry in terms of value-added output shares in overall manufacturing industry and traditional and high-tech categories. However, when we examine the productivity performance indexes, the difference appears. Korea's growth rates of overall productivity, technology, and scale efficiency are well below those of Taiwan, and the efficiency growth rate just equals that of Taiwan. This may explain why per capita GDP growth rate of Korea consistently falls behind that of Taiwan in the postwar period.

While we may find much similarity in the time trend of the performance indexes of many of the manufacturing sectors in three categories, the correlation analysis presents more restricted picture. The correlation coefficients of the five indexes indicate that they are generally independent between the two countries, and if they are correlated, they occur most likely in the productivity index, the correlation coefficients of which are only weakly significant.

In the intra-country analysis, we found that, in both countries, efficiency and technology indexes are generally negatively and strongly correlated, however, efficiency and its components, pure efficiency and scale efficiency indexes, are positively and very significantly correlated in both countries. These two indexes are in turn generally independent to each other. Furthermore, the correlation coefficients of the efficiency index and the productivity index in each country are generally negative but not significant in each country. This is in contrast with the technology index, which is positively and highly correlated with the productivity index and negatively and highly correlated with the scale efficiency index in each category in both countries. When the period is divided into two, these characteristics are reinforced generally in the second period.

When the indexes are compared between two period, we found that in high-tech industries, technology lagged behind efficiency in Korea, but grew much faster than efficiency in Taiwan, although Korea is catching up with Taiwan quickly. On the other hand, we also found that, in general, productivity, efficiency, and technology generally declined in the second period, except efficiency in Korea, and the degree of decline is larger in Taiwan than is Korea. In view of our finding that productivity has generally negative but insignificant correlated with efficiency, and has strong and positive correlation with technology, Taiwan is compared favorably over Korea. However, there are several signs that indicate Korea is catching up with Taiwan. It is not clear how long Taiwan can maintain its superiority in the future.

Lastly, our findings also indicate that while efficiency performance and technology change are the same components of productivity, only the technology has positive and significant relation with productivity. While productivity can be increased in many ways, our finding suggests that, as neoclassical propositions taught us, technology still is the crucial factor in achieving economic growth.

* We are indebted to Professors Vei-lin Chan, Song-ken Hsu, Sheng-cheng Hu, Keith Maskus, and Ms. Li-Min Weng for making the data on Taiwan and Korea available to the authors. Without their help, this paper cannot be written. Comments and suggestions from Professors Tim Coelli, Mei-Chu W. Hsiao and the seminar participants at the University of Colorado at Boulder are most helpful. All errors of omission and commissions are ours.

Appendix: Sources of Data

Korea: For the real value-added output (at 1995 constant price) and the number of workers by industry, see OECD (2000), STAN Database for Industrial Analysis 1970-1997. We didn't use "Report on Mining and Manufacturing Survey" since its industry classification has been changed several times over the years, and is difficult to find the matched classification. For the physical capital stock, see Pyo, H-K. (1998), "Estimation of Korean Physical Capital Stock by Industry and Type of Asset," Korea: Korea Institute of Public Finance (in Korean). For GDP by industry in Figure 4, Korea National Statistic Office (2002) homepage: http://www.nso.go.kr.

Taiwan: Real GDP (calculated by dividing GDP deflator for each industry) is from Taiwan Area National Income, which has data on 22 manufacturing sectors. Due to the lack of consistency among the data, Hu and Chan (1999) selected 15 industries, which are used in this paper. Real capital (at 1991 constant price) is adopted from the table on Series of Real Net Fixed Capital Stock (excluded land) of Industrial and Service Sectors in The Trends and Multifactor Productivity, Taiwan Area, published every four years by the Directorate-General of Budget, Accounting and Statistics, Executive Yuan, Taiwan (ROC). The number of workers is taken from Monthly Statistics of Manpower Allocation, Taiwan Area, published by the Ministry of Economic Affairs. For details, see the appendix of Hu and Chan (1999).

REFERENCES

Abe, Makoto and Momoko Kawakami (1997), "A Distributive Comparison of Enterprise Size in Korea and Taiwan," The Developing Economies, Vol. 35, No. 4. 382-400.

Auty, R.M. (1997), "Competitive Industrial Policy and Macro Performance: Has South Korea Outperformed Taiwan?" The Journal of Development Studies. April. pp. 445-463.

Coelli, T. (1996), "A Guide to DEAP Version 2.1: A Data Envelopment Analysis (Computer) Program," CEPA Working Paper 96/08, University of New England.

Coelli, T., D.S.P. Rao, and G.E. Battese (1998), An Introduction to Efficiency and Productivity analysis, Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Faere, R., S. Grosskopf, M. Norris, and Z. Zang (1994), "Productivity Growth, Technical Progress, and Efficiency Change in Industrialized Countries," American Economic Review, 84, 66-83.

Faere, R., S. Grosskopf, and W. F. Lee (1995), "Productivity in Taiwanese Manufacturing Industries," Applied Economics 27. pp. 259-65.

Hattori, Tamio, and Yukihito Sato (1997), "A Comparative Study of development Mechanisms in Korea and Taiwan: Introductory Analysis," The Developing Economies, Vol. 35, No. 4. 341-357.

Hsiao, F. S.T. and M. C. W. Hsiao (2002a), "Taiwan in the Global Economy – Past, Present, and Future", in Taiwan in Global Economy – From an Agrarian Economy to an Exporter of High-Tech Products, ed. by Peter C.Y. Chow. Greenwood Press. pp. 161-222.

--------- and ------- (2002b), "'Miracle Growth' in the Twentieth Century—Comparisons of East Asian Development," revised and resubmitted to World Development.

--------- and -------- (1998), "Miracle or Myth of Asian NICs' Growth—The Irony of Numbers" in The New Industrial Revolution in Asian Economies, ed. by M. Jan Dutta and Richard W. Hooley. CN: JAI Press, 51-68.

----- and ----- (1996). Taiwanese economic development and foreign trade. In John Y.T. Kuark Ed., Comparative Asian economies. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1996. 211-302. Originally published in W. C.

Kirby, & J.M. Greene, eds., Harvard studies on Taiwan: Papers of the Taiwan study workshop I. The Fairbank Center for East Asian Research, Harvard University, 1995. 199-270.

------- and Changsuh Park (2002a), "Estimation of Total Factor Productivity-Residuals or Indexes?" Working Paper.

------- and Changsuh Park (2002b), "Efficiency, Technology, and Productivity Changes_Comparisons of Korean and Taiwanese Manufacturing Industries. Working Paper.

Hu, S.C. and V.L. Chan (1999), "The Determinants of Taiwan's Total Factor Productivity" (in Chinese), Industry of Free China (Taiwan), September. 1- 50.

Kawai, Hiroki (1994), "International comparative Analysis of Economic Growth: Trade Liberaliza6ion and Productivity," the Developing Economies, 32(4), 373-97.

Kim, T. and C. Park (2002), "Productivity Growth in Korea: Efficiency Improvement or Technical Progress?" Working Paper, University of Colorado at Boulder.

Lee, Jeong-Dong, Tui-Yoo Kim, Eunnyeong Heo (1998), "Technological Progress versus Efficiency Gain in Manufacturing Sectors," Review of Development Economics, 2(3), 268-281.

Lee, Ju-Ho, Young-Kyu Moh, and Dae-Il Kim (2001), "Do Unions Inhibit Labor Flexibility? Lessons from Korea," KDI School of Public Policy and Management, Korea. Working Paper W01-05.

Maddison, Angus (1995), Monitoring the Word Economy, 1820-1992, Development Center, OECD, Paris.

Nelson, Richard R. (1973), "Recent Exercises in Growth Accounting: New Understanding or Dead End?" American Economic Review, 63, 462-4 68.

----- and Pack, H. (1999), "The Asian Miracle and Modern Growth Theory," Economic Journal, 109 (456), 416-436.

Nishimizu, Mieko, and Charles R. Hulten (1978), "The Sources of Japanese Economic growth: 1955-71," Review of Economics and Statistics. 60. pp. 351-61.

Oshima, Harry T. (1987), Economic Growth in Monsoon Asia: A Comparative Survey. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Okuda, Satoru (1997), "Industrialization Policies of Korea and Taiwan and Their Effects on Manufacturing Productivity," the Developing Economies, vol. 25, No. 4. 358-81

Page, J. (1994), "The East Asian Miracle: Four Lessons for Development Policy, In S. Fisher and J. J. Rotemberg, eds., NBER Macroeconomics, Annual 1994. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Park, Y.C. and Park, W.A. (1989), "Changing Japanese Trade Pattern and the East Asian NICs," In P. Krugman (ed.), Trade with Japan, Has the Door Opened Wider? Chapter 3. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Pyo, H. K. (1998), "Estimation of Korean Physical Capital Stock by Industry and Type of Asset" (in Korean), Korea: Korea Institute of Public Finance.

Ray, Subhash and Evangelia Desli (1997), "Productivity Growth, Technical Progress, and Efficiency Change in Industrialized Countries: Comment." American economic review, 87(5). 1033-39.

Tatje, E. Grifell and C.A.K. Lovell (1995), "A Note on the Malmquist Productivity Index," Economics Letters, 47. 169-175.

Taiwan Statistical Data Book (TSDB), 1975, 1985, 1993, 2000. Council for Economic Planning and Development, Taiwan.

Thirlwall, A. P. (2002), The Nature of Economic Growth: An Alternative Framework for Understanding the Performance of Nations, Northampton, MA: E. Elgar.

Timmer, Marcel (2000), The Dynamics of Asian Manufacturing, A Comparative Perspective in the Late Twentieth Century. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar

Torii, Akio, and Richard E. Caves (1992), "Technical Efficiency in Japanese and U.S. Manufacturing Industries," in Chapter 11, Industrial Efficiency in Six Nations, Richard E. Caves, ed. The MIT Press.

Wagner, K. and B. van Ark, ed. (1996), International Productivity Differences, Measurement and Explanations, Contributions to Economic Analysis, 233. North-Holland: Elsevier.

Endnotes

[1] The diagram is taken from Figure 1 of Hsiao and Hsiao (2002b). We also shown that, according to Maddison's data (1995), the real GDP per capita growth rates of Korea and Taiwan from 1951 to 1992 were highest in the world: Korea 5.8%, Taiwan 6.03%, per annum, exceeding the third ranking Japan, 5.57% (ibid. Table 1)

[2] We plan to examine and compare economic factors that determine efficiency, technology, and productivity of Korea and Taiwan in our future project.

[3] The primary industry consists of agriculture, forestry, and fishery; the secondary industry includes manufacturing, electricity, gas, and water, construction; the tertiary industry includes commerce, transport, storage, communication, finance, insurance, business, government, social and personal services. (TSDB, 2000, 51).

[4] Note that the GDP levels are measured in Korean Won for Korea and New Taiwan dollar for Taiwan, thus, the sizes of the columns are not directly comparable except the trends and growth rates between the two countries.

[5] The percentage of manufacturing sector and the financial sector is calculated as the percentage of the whole industry, not as the percentage of the secondary or the tertiary industry.

[6] The statement here is true only under constant-returns-to-scale technology. According to Tatje and Lovell (1995), (2) will "understate the magnitude of productivity growth when input growth occurs in the presence of increasing returns-to-scale," and overstate it under decreasing returns to scale. The biases are reversed when input contraction occurs. Thus, we could assume constant-returns-to-scale technology like neoclassical theory, and ignore SI and PI in (4), or assume that Taiwan and Korea have the same kind and degree of returns-to-scale technology, making the indexes still comparable between the two countries. In view of the long-run contemporaneous development process of the two countries, the latter assumption may not be as strong as it appears.

[7] In conventional notation, since $y = y_t$ and $z = y_{t+1}$, TFPG = $(z/y) - 1$ is a discrete growth rate, which is compounded once a year. On the other hand, if we define TFPG = $\ln z - \ln y$, then it is a continuous growth rate, which is compounded instantaneously. In the continuous case, the sum from period 0 to period 17 will cancel out the middle terms and the average growth rate is $(\ln y_{17} - \ln y_0)/17$. Since some growth rates are negative, we use the discrete growth rate.

[8] Thus, it is confusing, if not in error, to call MPI as TFP or the TFP ratio.

[9] We follow the classification made by Hu and Chan (1999) for the manufacturing industry in Taiwan.

[10] Ray and Desli (1997) emphasize the importance of variable returns to scale (VRS) in using a reference technology. However, the method of VRS in some cases has an infeasible solution (See Ray & Desli; 1997, p. 1037). One of

comments of Faere et al. (1997) responding to Ray and Desli (1997) is that the constant returns to scale captures long-run and the VRS is appropriate for the short-run. Since our study analyzes the long-run productivity trend over 1979-96, we use the method of Faere et al. (1994).

[11] We owe Professor Tim Coelli for this point. However, the current literature uses the cross-section frontier rather than category (or sector) specific frontier. See Faere, et al. (1994, 1995), Lee, et al. (1998), and Nishimizu and Hulten, 1978). Elsewhere we also experimented with the industry-wide cross-section frontier method (Hsiao and Park, 2002b).

[12] For example, in Figure 4b, the value-added output in the "food, beverage, and alcohol" sector consistently maintained 41% to 50% of the total value-added output in the traditional category during 1979 and 1997, while that of "leather, Fur, and Products" sector ranged only between 8 to 20%.

[13] Thus, for the six MPI's in the traditional category in 1979, we calculated the weighted MPI by $w_i MPI_i$, where $w_i = q_i/\sum q_i$, i = 1, 2, … 6, and q_i is the value-added output of the ith sector in 1979 in the traditional category. The sum of the six $w_i MPI_i$ multiplied by 100 is given as the first number in the "79 row" in Table 2.

[14] The food and textile sectors are the only sectors that have different trend in the whole manufacturing industry as compared with their trend in the category.

[15] See Faere, et al. (1994). Our series is constructed as follows. Let m_i be a Malmquist index. Then, the multiplicative series at time t is defined as $s_t = 100*\Pi_{i=1}^{t} m_i$,where m_i at i = 1 is the index at 1979, and t is 1979, 1980, …, 1996. Note that, $s_t/ s_{t-1} = m_t$, and the growth rate of s_t , that is, $100*((s_t/s_{t-1})-1)$, is $(m_t – 1)*100$, the growth rate of index m_i defined in Section III.

[16] The correlation coefficient between two indexes is the same as the correlation coefficient between two growth rates of the indexes as defined in Section III.

[17] The difference between the geometric mean and the arithmetic mean are very small.

[18] For example, we constructed 6 weights in the traditional category in period A (the weights sum to one in a category). Then, use each of these 6 weights to multiply the corresponding growth rate of the index in the traditional category. Subtracting the weighted index of period A from that of period B, we obtain the entries in Table 6.

Table 1. Classification of 15 Manufacturing Industries.

Ca	ISIC	No.	Taiwan's 15 Sectors	STAN Industry Category for Korea Combination of Korean Mfg Sectors
T	01	1	Food, Beverage & Tobacco	311, 312, 313, 314
T	02	2	Textiles	321
T		3	Apparel and Ornaments	322
T		4	Leather, Fur, and Products	323
T	03	5	Wood Products & Non-metalic Furniture	331, 332
T	04	6	Paper, Paper Products & Printing	341, 342
B	05	7	Chemical Products, Rubber, and Plastics	351, 352, 355, 356
B		8	Petroleum, Coal, and Products	353, 354
B	06	9	Non-Metallic Mineral Products	361, 362, 369
B	07	10	Basic Metal Industries	371, 372
B	08	11	Fabricated Metal Products	381
H		12	Machinery Products and Repairs	382
H		13	Electric, Electronic Machinery Products and Repairs	383
H		14	Transportation Products and Repairs	384
H	09	15	Precision Instruments and Other Manufacturing	385, 390

Notes:

1 The Korean list includes "#324 Footwear" which may be "wearing apparel" or "leather products." Since we don't have detail information, we divide the numbers in 324 in two: one half puts in Apparel (322), and another half in Leather and Products (323).

2 The title of 385 in the Korean list is "Professional Goods."

Table 2. The Weighted Malmquist Indexes within Each Category

	Korea				Taiwan			
	Mfg	Trad	Basic	Hi-tech	Mfg	Trad	Basic	Hi-tech
Productivity Index (MPI)								
79	0.970	0.972	0.961	0.979	1.020	1.035	1.099	0.931
80	0.896	0.958	0.894	0.838	1.035	1.055	1.060	0.992
81	1.060	1.004	0.978	1.215	1.068	1.092	1.130	0.988
82	0.993	0.979	0.977	1.023	0.986	1.002	0.952	1.005
83	1.073	0.996	1.101	1.125	1.070	1.041	1.071	1.099
84	1.078	1.020	1.050	1.171	1.070	1.057	1.083	1.070
85	0.960	0.969	0.968	0.943	0.981	0.993	1.003	0.950
86	1.073	1.022	1.012	1.197	1.104	1.101	1.065	1.148
87	1.062	1.021	1.021	1.148	1.066	1.039	1.038	1.124
88	1.017	1.028	0.978	1.047	0.983	0.926	0.983	1.045
89	0.957	0.977	0.973	0.921	0.993	0.987	0.956	1.037
90	1.015	1.005	0.945	1.100	0.967	0.967	0.953	0.982
91	1.020	0.943	1.078	1.043	1.037	1.025	1.037	1.050
92	0.994	0.965	0.954	1.066	0.993	0.990	0.992	0.998
93	0.997	0.978	1.077	0.942	0.987	0.960	1.002	1.001
94	1.023	0.969	1.038	1.064	1.010	0.980	1.047	1.004
95	1.004	0.936	0.978	1.105	1.007	0.969	1.015	1.038
96	0.976	0.922	0.974	1.035	0.994	0.995	1.016	0.972
geomean	1.008	0.981	0.996	1.049	1.020	1.011	1.027	1.023
Efficiency Index (EI)								
79	1.000	0.996	1.040	0.966	0.961	1.000	0.867	1.024
86	0.999	1.030	0.933	1.036	1.118	1.070	1.260	1.036
87	1.069	1.028	1.054	1.129	0.946	0.977	0.877	0.989
96	0.969	0.983	0.931	0.994	0.960	0.979	0.898	1.007
geomean	1.006	1.007	0.994	1.018	1.006	0.997	0.997	1.023
Technology Index (TI)								
79	0.970	0.976	0.923	1.014	1.061	1.036	1.269	0.909
86	1.075	0.992	1.082	1.157	0.988	1.030	0.845	1.108
87	0.994	0.994	0.971	1.017	1.126	1.063	1.182	1.136
96	1.007	0.937	1.045	1.042	1.035	1.016	1.131	0.965
geomean	1.002	0.974	1.003	1.031	1.014	1.014	1.029	0.999
Pure Efficiency Index (PI)								
79	0.991	0.983	0.994	0.995	0.993	1.023	0.959	0.998
86	1.034	1.017	1.018	1.069	1.041	1.065	1.059	1.000
87	1.023	1.012	0.988	1.071	0.968	0.983	0.923	1.000
96	0.986	0.983	0.985	0.990	0.989	0.980	0.975	1.011
geomean	1.001	0.997	0.999	1.006	0.997	0.993	1.000	0.998
Scale Index (SI)								
79	1.010	1.014	1.045	0.971	0.969	0.979	0.907	1.025
86	0.967	1.013	0.918	0.974	1.076	1.004	1.199	1.036
87	1.046	1.016	1.068	1.056	0.987	0.994	0.978	0.989
96	0.983	1.001	0.946	1.004	0.972	0.999	0.922	0.996
geomean	1.007	1.011	0.994	1.015	1.011	1.005	1.003	1.027

Note: All geomeans are taken for 18 years from 1979 to 1996,

Table 3. Pearson Correlation Coefficients of Manufacturing Industry, 1979-1996

a. Manufacturing Industry Number of sample = 18

	EIk	TIk	MPIk	PIk	SIk	EIt	TIt	MPIt	PIt
TIk	*-0.587 b*								
MPIk	0.119	0.733 a							
PIk	0.570 b	-0.314	0.110						
SIk	0.877 a	-0.497 b	0.117	0.110					
EIt	**0.030**	0.051	0.096	0.297	-0.133				
TIt	-0.039	**0.313**	0.350 d	-0.074	0.022	-0.729 a			
MPIt	-0.016	0.506 b	**0.615** a	0.252	-0.124	0.147	0.569 b		
PIt	0.273	-0.114	0.080	**0.175**	0.229	0.697 a	-0.449 d	0.195	
SIt	-0.021	0.090	0.107	0.312	**-0.205**	0.914 a	-0.722 a	0.048	0.363

b. Traditional Category

	EIk	TIk	MPIk	PIk	SIk	EIt	TIt	MPIt	PIt
TIk	-0.141								
MPIk	0.564 b	0.738 a							
PIk	0.561 b	-0.260	0.160						
SIk	0.590 a	0.097	0.487 b	-0.336 d					
EIt	**0.351** d	-0.065	0.186	0.487 b	-0.080				
TIt	-0.230	**0.342** d	0.137	0.155	-0.417 c	-0.128			
MPIt	0.124	0.186	**0.246**	0.501 b	-0.354 c	0.719 a	0.597 a		
PIt	0.265	0.024	0.205	**0.335** d	-0.033	0.917 a	0.034	0.767 a	
SIt	0.335 d	-0.187	0.067	0.522 b	**-0.124**	0.655 a	-0.372 d	0.266	0.299

c. Basic Category

	EIk	TIk	MPIk	PIk	SIk	EIt	TIt	MPIt	PIt
TIk	-0.818 a								
MPIk	-0.012	0.569 b							
PIk	0.738 a	-0.671 a	-0.211						
SIk	0.976 a	-0.783 a	0.050	0.575 b					
EIt	**0.021**	0.077	0.179	0.347 d	-0.066				
TIt	-0.077	**0.003**	-0.101	-0.344 d	0.003	-0.936 a			
MPIt	-0.098	0.189	**0.229**	-0.212	-0.045	-0.440 c	0.682 a		
PIt	0.473 b	-0.284	0.126	**0.718** a	0.345 d	0.794 a	-0.794 a	-0.477 b	
SIt	-0.103	0.170	0.180	0.204	**-0.167**	0.969 a	-0.901 a	-0.397 d	0.634 a

d. High-Tech Category

	EIk	TIk	MPIk	PIk	SIk	EIt	TIt	MPIt	PIt
TIk	-0.636 a								
MPIk	-0.078	0.816 a							
PIk	0.884 a	-0.555 b	-0.048						
SIk	0.756 a	-0.427 c	-0.011	0.369					
EIt	**-0.120**	-0.026	-0.132	0.007	-0.225				
TIt	0.387 d	**0.158**	0.485 b	0.382 d	0.255	-0.572 b			
MPIt	0.379 d	0.212	**0.542** b	0.452 c	0.167	-0.080	0.862 a		
PIt	-0.187	0.010	-0.132	**0.016**	-0.392 d	0.137	0.046	0.135	
SIt	-0.004	-0.031	-0.046	-0.007	**0.021**	0.821 a	-0.549 b	-0.160	-0.451 c

Notes: Two sides hypothesis testing of r, a = statistical significance at 1% level, b = at 5% level, c = at 10% level, d = at 20% level

Table 4. Pearson Correlation Coefficients of Manufacturing Industry, 1979-86

a. Manufacturing Industry Number of sample = 8

	EIk	TIk	MPIk	PIk	SIk	EIt	TIt	MPIt	PIt
TIk	-0.423								
MPIk	-0.060	0.930 a							
PIk	0.786 b	-0.333	-0.043						
SIk	0.295	-0.021	0.089	-0.353					
EIt	**0.280**	0.015	0.139	0.575 d	-0.451				
TIt	-0.421	**0.490**	0.362	-0.455	0.131	-0.739 b			
MPIt	-0.178	0.700 c	**0.699** c	0.157	-0.404	0.350	0.371		
PIt	0.048	0.218	0.271	**0.458**	-0.617 d	0.919 a	-0.554 d	0.486	
SIt	0.364	-0.066	0.081	0.598 d	**-0.363**	0.987 a	-0.779 b	0.281	0.844 a

b. Traditional Category

	EIk	TIk	MPIk	PIk	SIk	EIt	TIt	MPIt	PIt
TIk	-0.270								
MPIk	0.257	0.861 b							
PIk	0.830 b	-0.431	0.002						
SIk	-0.120	0.430	0.376	-0.651 c					
EIt	**0.752** b	-0.077	0.318	0.679 c	-0.187				
TIt	-0.422	**0.535** d	0.315	-0.451	0.262	-0.636 c			
MPIt	0.648 c	0.315	**0.656** c	0.520	-0.022	0.796 b	-0.039		
PIt	0.581 d	0.123	0.431	**0.368** d	0.137	0.893 a	-0.435	0.820 b	
SIt	0.669 c	-0.337	0.009	0.843 a	**-0.596** d	0.739 b	-0.676 d	0.421	0.359

c. Basic Category

	EIk	TIk	MPIk	PIk	SIk	EIt	TIt	MPIt	PIt
TIk	-0.445								
MPIk	0.203	0.786 b							
PIk	-0.295	0.278	0.099						
SIk	0.979 a	-0.469	0.164	-0.482					
EIt	**-0.083**	0.367	0.346	0.792 b	-0.242				
TIt	-0.048	**-0.176**	-0.229	-0.674 c	0.096	-0.955 a			
MPIt	-0.027	0.154	**0.143**	-0.080	-0.011	-0.508 d	0.694 c		
PIt	-0.027	0.355	0.372	**0.754** b	-0.182	0.993 a	-0.967 a	-0.526 d	
SIt	-0.082	0.349	0.328	0.801 b	**-0.242**	1.000 a	-0.955 a	-0.509 d	0.991 a

d. High-Tech Category

	EIk	TIk	MPIk	PIk	SIk	EIt	TIt	MPIt	PIt
TIk	-0.659 c								
MPIk	-0.153	0.842 a							
PIk	0.953 a	-0.636 c	-0.146						
SIk	0.704 c	-0.331	0.039	0.463					
EIt	**-0.193**	-0.067	-0.241	-0.063	-0.373				
TIt	0.370	**0.312**	0.672 c	0.420	0.187	-0.261			
MPIt	0.290	0.327	**0.630** c	0.390	0.049	0.111	0.930 a		
PIt	0.109	-0.254	-0.280	**0.048**	0.199	0.519 d	0.028	0.213	
SIt	-0.201	-0.059	-0.235	-0.066	**-0.387**	1.000 a	-0.267	0.105	0.493

Notes: Two sides hypothesis testing of r, a = statistical significance at 1% level, b = at 5% level, c = at 10% level, d = at 20% level

Table 5. Pearson Correlation Coefficients of Manufacturing Industry, 1987-96

a. Manufacturing Industry Number of sample = 10

	EIk	TIk	MPIk	PIk	SIk	EIt	TIt	MPIt	PIt
TIk	-0.837 a								
MPIk	0.373	0.193							
PIk	0.692 b	-0.334	0.663 b						
SIk	0.976 a	-0.891 a	0.243	0.520 d					
EIt	**-0.105**	0.087	-0.058	-0.465 d	0.012				
TIt	0.146	**0.050**	0.373	0.512 d	0.026	-0.877 a			
MPIt	0.136	0.207	**0.619** c	0.367	0.059	-0.392	0.785 b		
PIt	0.376	-0.512 d	-0.230	**-0.228**	0.506 d	0.510 d	-0.453 d	-0.185	
SIt	-0.211	0.323	0.171	-0.256	**-0.172**	0.821 a	-0.726 b	-0.355	-0.043

b. Traditional Category

	EIk	TIk	MPIk	PIk	SIk	EIt	TIt	MPIt	PIt
TIk	-0.146								
MPIk	0.610 c	0.695 b							
PIk	0.433	-0.286	0.080						
SIk	0.757 b	0.050	0.595 c	-0.261					
EIt	**-0.045**	-0.313	-0.278	-0.204	0.103				
TIt	-0.403	**0.219**	-0.108	0.220	-0.606 c	-0.183			
MPIt	-0.412	0.060	**-0.240**	0.121	-0.542 d	0.289	0.888 a		
PIt	-0.094	-0.236	-0.252	**-0.160**	0.017	0.945 a	0.007	0.448 d	
SIt	0.182	-0.089	0.057	-0.062	**0.244**	-0.218	-0.502 d	-0.588 c	-0.524 d

c. Basic Category

	EIk	TIk	MPIk	PIk	SIk	EIt	TIt	MPIt	PIt
TIk	-0.900 a								
MPIk	-0.097	0.499 d							
PIk	0.875 a	-0.872 a	-0.385						
SIk	0.983 a	-0.865 a	-0.002	0.775 a					
EIt	**0.078**	-0.119	-0.083	0.208	0.036				
TIt	-0.140	**0.216**	0.198	-0.307	-0.082	-0.975 a			
MPIt	-0.204	0.461 d	**0.648** b	-0.452 d	-0.120	-0.535 d	0.695 b		
PIt	0.637 b	-0.566 c	-0.096	**0.757** b	0.552 c	0.688 b	-0.724 b	-0.465 d	
SIt	-0.157	0.078	-0.062	-0.080	**-0.161**	0.907 a	-0.855 a	-0.432	0.345

d. High-Tech Category

	EIk	TIk	MPIk	PIk	SIk	EIt	TIt	MPIt	PIt
TIk	-0.529 d								
MPIk	0.166	0.748 b							
PIk	0.777 a	-0.202	0.369						
SIk	0.892 a	-0.625 c	-0.026	0.409					
EIt	**-0.022**	-0.066	-0.086	0.114	-0.101				
TIt	0.406	**-0.050**	0.249	0.424	0.273	-0.773 a			
MPIt	0.600 c	-0.115	**0.328**	0.739 b	0.334	-0.267	0.816 a		
PIt	-0.329	0.007	-0.256	**0.035**	-0.501 d	0.131	0.080	0.234	
SIt	0.172	-0.045	0.094	0.060	**0.217**	0.773 a	-0.731 b	-0.404	-0.526 d

Notes: Two sides hypothesis testing of r, a = statistical significance at 1% level, b = at 5% level, c = at 10% level, d = at 20% level

Table 6. Difference of Growth Rates in Period B over Period A.

Country			Korea				Taiwan			
Index			MPGk	EGk	TGk	TGk-EGk	MPGt	EGt	TGt	TGt-EGt
Column No.			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	T	Food	-0.1	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	-0.2	0.0	-0.2	-0.2
2	T	Textiles	0.0	-0.1	***0.1***	***0.1***	-1.4	-0.9	-0.6	***0.3***
3	T	Apparel	***0.1***	0.0	***0.1***	***0.1***	-1.3	-0.3	-1.0	-0.7
4	T	Leather	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.5	-0.2	-0.3	-0.1
5	T	Wood	-0.5	-0.5	0.0	***0.4***	-0.8	-0.4	-0.4	-0.1
6	T	PpPulp	-1.3	-0.8	-0.5	***0.3***	-1.7	-1.4	-0.3	***1.1***
sum Tradition			-1.8	-1.3	-0.5	***0.8***	-6.0	-3.2	-2.8	***0.4***
No. of positive growth			1	0	2	4	0	0	0	2
7	B	ChemRub	-0.5	-0.4	-0.1	0.3	-3.4	-0.7	-2.7	-2.0
8	B	PetroCoal	***0.6***	0.0	***0.6***	***0.6***	-0.9	0.0	-0.9	-0.9
9	B	Non-met	***1.0***	***0.7***	***0.3***	-0.4	***0.5***	***1.2***	-0.8	-2.0
10	B	BasicMet	0.0	-0.9	***0.9***	***1.8***	***0.1***	***1.2***	-1.2	-2.4
11	B	FubMet	-0.8	-0.4	-0.5	-0.1	-0.3	***0.5***	-0.8	-1.2
sum Basic			***0.3***	-1.0	***1.2***	***2.2***	-4.0	***2.2***	-6.3	-8.5
No. of positive growth			2	1	3	2	2	3	0	0
12	H	Mach	***0.2***	***1.0***	-0.9	-1.9	***0.1***	-0.7	***0.7***	***1.4***
13	H	Elect	***1.9***	***2.5***	-0.7	-3.2	***1.6***	***0.3***	***1.2***	***0.8***
14	H	Transp	-1.5	0.0	-1.5	-1.5	-0.3	-0.7	***0.3***	***1.0***
15	H	PriciMisc	-0.4	0.0	-0.4	-0.4	-0.4	-0.2	-0.2	***0.1***
sum High-tech			***0.2***	***3.6***	-3.5	-7.0	***0.9***	-1.2	***2.1***	***3.3***
No. of positive growth			2	*2*	0	3	2	1	3	4
Average of 3 categories			-0.5	0.4	-0.9	-1.3	-3.0	-0.7	-2.3	-1.6
Total of positive growth			5	3	5	9	4	4	3	6
						22				17

Table 7. The List of Innovators by Category Each Year

	Korea								Taiwan						
	Tradition		Basic		High-tech				Tradition			Basic	Hig-tech		
79	Fd		Pe				Tp				Le	Pe			
80									Fd			Pe			
81	Fd	Ap	Pe	Fm			Tp	Pr		Ap		Pe		Tp	
82	Fd								Fd	Ap	Le			Tp	Pr
83			Pe	Fm				Pr	Fd					Tp	Pr
84	Fd		Pe				Tp		Fd	Ap	Le	Pe		Tp	Pr
85									Fd						
86	Fd		Pe	Fm			Tp	Pr	Fd	Ap	Le			Tp	Pr
87		Ap		Fm				Pr	Fd	Ap		Pe		Tp	Pr
88	Fd	Ap	Pe				Tp							Tp	Pr
89	Fd			Fm						Ap				Tp	
90	Fd		Pe	Fm	Ma		Tp		Fd					Tp	
91	Fd		Pe			El	Tp		Fd	Ap		Pe		Tp	
92	Fd	Ap	Pe				Tp		Fd					Tp	
93	Fd		Pe					Pr	Fd						
94			Pe			El		Pr	Fd			Pe			
95			Pe			El	Tp	Pr	Fd			Pe	El	Tp	
96			Pe				Tp		Fd	Ap		Pe			
Count	11	4	13	6	1	3	10	7	14	8	4	9	1	12	6

Note: See Table 1. Fd=Food, etc., Ap=Apparel; Pe=Petroleum, Coal, etc., Fm=Fabricated Metal, Ma=Machinery, El=Electric, Electronic Machinery, Tr=Transportation.

Figure 1. Levels of Real GDP Per Cap ita in 10 Asian Countries, 1820-1992



Figure 2. GDP by Industry
South Korea and Taiwan



Figure 3. Output Distance Functions




Figure 4a. Value-added Shares in Mfg
Share
Korea
Taiwan
Trad(97a)
Basic(67a)
Hi-tech(74a)
1Food(94a)
7Chem(22)
13Elec(82a)
0.6
0.5
0.4
0.3
0.2
0.1
0.0
79
83
87
91
95


Figure 4b. Shares in the Traditional Category
Korea
Taiwan
1Food(94a)
2Tex(16)
3Appa
(86a)
6Ppr(40d)
5Wood(69a)
4Lethr(92a)
0.6
0.5
0.4
0.3
0.2
0.1
0.0
79
83
87
91
95


Figrue 4c. Shares in the Basic Category
Share
Korea
Taiwan
7Chem(22)
10BasicM
(-51c)
9NonM(20)
11FabM
(16)
8Petro(26)
0.6
0.5
0.4
0.3
0.2
0.1
0.0
79
83
87
91
95


Figure 4d. Shares in the Hi-Tech Category
Korea
Taiwan
13Elec(82a)
14Trans(51d)
12Mach(58b)
15PreMis(91a)
0.6
0.5
0.4
0.3
0.2
0.1
0.0
79
83
87
91
95

Figure 5. Growth Rates of the Components of Output Indexes
Mfg Overall and 3 Categories, 1979-1996



	MPG	EG	TG	PG	SG		MPG	EG	TG	PG	SG
T	-1.9	0.7	-2.6	-0.3	1.1		1.1	-0.3	1.4	-0.7	0.5
B	-0.4	-0.6	0.3	-0.1	-0.6		2.7	-0.3	2.9	0.0	0.3
H	4.9	1.8	3.1	0.6	1.5		2.3	2.3	-0.1	-0.2	2.7
Mfg	0.8	0.6	0.2	0.1	0.7		2.0	0.6	1.4	-0.3	1.1

Category

Figure 6a. Mfg Productivity Index by Category



Figure 6b. Efficiency Index by Category



Figure 6c. Technology Index by Category



Figure 6d. Scale Index by category



Figure 6e. Pure Technology Index by category



Figure 7a. Malmquist Indexes of the Manufacturing Industry



Figure 7b. Malmquist Indexes of the Traditional Category



Figure 7c. Malmquist Indexes of the Basic Category



Figure 7d. Malmquist Indexes of the Hi-Tech Category