Productivity Gains: Importance of ICTs

Dean Parham

Australia's growth performance since the early 1990s has been remarkable. For nine years, annual growth averaged just under four per cent — a performance not seen since the 1960s and early 1970s. Strong growth even persisted in the midst of the 1997 Asian financial crisis and the 2001 global downturn.

A surge in productivity growth has underpinned Australia's good performance. After showing its weakest rate in the 1980s, Australia's productivity growth accelerated to record highs in the 1990s. The rate of growth in labour productivity from 1993-94 to 1999-2000 was 3.0 per cent a year (up from a previous average from the early 1980s of 1.7 per cent a year) and the rate of multifactor productivity (MFP) growth was 1.8 per cent a year (up from 0.7 per cent a year).

The 1990s productivity surge was also strong by international standards. Australia was one of three countries to show a strong productivity acceleration in the 1990s (OECD, 2001a). It was a period, unlike the post-war 'golden age', when there was no worldwide productivity boom. Australia's rate of productivity growth outclipped the OECD average for the first time and outpointed the resurgent US rate.

Australia's surge started around 1993, or possibly earlier, although an uplift in underlying productivity growth prior to 1993 is difficult to disentangle from the effects of recovery from the 1990-91 recession (Parham, 1999, 2002a). In any case, Australia's surge predated the US productivity acceleration from 1995, which has been linked to an information and communication technology (ICT) boom.

The timing, strength and largely isolated nature of Australia's productivity surge point to the likelihood of some peculiarly Australian explanations. However, there is no single factor. Some credit should be given to deft macroeconomic policy settings, especially in the face of the Asian financial crisis. Education levels in the workforce have also risen markedly over the past two decades (Dowrick, 2002).

However, there is general agreement that microeconomic policy reforms have played a central role in Australia's productivity surge (see, for example, Productivity Commission, 1999; Bean, 2000; Dowrick, 2000; Forsyth, 2000; OECD, 2001b). Policy reforms, which have been introduced progressively since the mid-1980s, have included: deregulation of access to finance; marked reductions in barriers to trade and foreign direct investment; commercialisation

---

Dean Parham is Assistant Commissioner, Productivity Commission. The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the Productivity Commission.

(and some privatisation) of government business enterprises, which have controlled large parts of economic infrastructure; strengthening domestic competition; and increasing labour market flexibility.

Reforms have fostered productivity growth through three main avenues:

- sharpening incentives to be more productive, chiefly by strengthening competition;
- opening the economy to trade, investment and technologies developed overseas; and
- providing greater flexibility (for example, less regulatory restriction, more flexible labour markets) to adjust production processes and firm organisation to improve productivity.

The tendency to link Australia's productivity surge to policy reforms and not to an ICT boom has reinforced a view in some quarters that Australia has not accessed 'new economy' gains. Furthermore, the US evidence has been read to suggest that ICT production is needed to tap 'new economy' productivity gains. According to this view, the lack of a sizeable ICT production industry in Australia has been seen as a preventive barrier to ongoing higher productivity growth.

This paper examines the issue of whether Australia has accessed 'new economy' productivity gains associated with ICTs. The US experience is used as a benchmark to determine upper bounds on the productivity gains that can be attributed to ICT production and use. The paper also draws out policy and statistical implications.

The Role of ICTs in Australia's Productivity Surge

This section reports on a conventional productivity growth accounting exercise, updated from Parham, Roberts and Sun (2001), which investigates the importance of ICTs in Australia's productivity surge.

The nature of the links between ICTs and productivity gains

Computers, telecommunication systems and the Internet have brought revolutionary changes to businesses, consumers, education, health, entertainment and many other aspects of life. A defining characteristic is that the costs of storing, accessing and exchanging information have been greatly reduced. In so doing, ICTs have reduced the costs of coordination, communications and information processing. But, increasingly, they have also facilitated changes in what businesses do and how they do it.

A particular analytical interest has centred on the links between ICTs and productivity growth. Many studies of these links have employed a growth accounting framework, based on national accounts approaches to productivity estimation. This framework provides three avenues for ICTs to influence labour productivity:

- *Increases in capital deepening.* Labour productivity can rise as a result of higher capital use per unit of labour, as firms invest in more ICTs. Many analysts have noted this mechanism accords no special qualities to ICTs. As they have become cheaper, firms have substituted ICTs for labour and other forms of capital — as could happen for many other inputs.
- *Productivity gains in ICT production.* Producers' ability to manufacture much more powerful ICT equipment, with little increase in inputs, generates substantial MFP gains. If the gains are of sufficient magnitude and production is on sufficient scale, they can show up as contributions to aggregate MFP growth and labour productivity.
- *Productivity gains in ICT-using industries.* This is the most controversial source of ICT-related productivity gains. It requires that use of ICTs generates MFP gains. On the one hand, 'new economy' enthusiasts have pointed to MFP gains from such sources as increasing returns from ICT use and spillovers from network economies. On the other hand, sceptics have either denied or found little evidence to support the existence of MFP gains from use.

On the last point, there is, perhaps, some middle ground. For example, US Federal Reserve Board Chairman, Alan Greenspan, pointed to gains that he believes come from greater and cheaper access to information — greater certainty, through the availability of real-time information about customers' demands and the location of inventories and materials flowing through complex production systems, which leads to less wastage from extra production, inventories and staff; more efficient and compressed distribution processes; the development of financial instruments to manage risks; and lower search and transactions costs in business-to-business transactions (Greenspan, 2000a, 2000b).

Australia is an advanced ICT user, not producer

The measurement of ICTs has an important bearing on the source and extent of estimated productivity gains associated with ICTs. The measurement of the volume of ICTs produced affects estimates of output and productivity growth in ICT production. The measurement of the volume of ICT investment affects estimates of growth in capital inputs and therefore the productivity residual in ICT-using industries.

In keeping with modern practice, the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) uses hedonic (or constant-quality) price deflators to estimate real volumes of ICTs produced and purchased. Hedonic prices take into account changes in a number of characteristics of ICTs — processing speed, memory capacity and so on.

The quality-constant prices of ICT characteristics have declined markedly. This stems from the fact that while there have been rapid technological advances

(especially in the capacity of microprocessors), there has been relatively little movement in the nominal prices of equipment.

Hedonic prices have not been specifically generated for ICTs in Australia. The ABS uses the US price deflator for hardware, adjusted for exchange rate movements and a time lag, and a Canadian price deflator for software. The US and Australian deflators are shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1: ICT Hardware and Software Price Indexes, USA and Australia

Source: Unpublished ABS data and BLS data.

Investment in ICTs became a sizeable proportion of total investment in Australia from the mid-1980s. Since then, the growth of investment has been very strong, especially in the 1990s, when investment in hardware grew by 35 per cent a year and software investment grew by 20 per cent a year in real terms.

Australia became a high user by international standards, ranking fourth in 1999 among OECD countries in expenditure on ICTs as a proportion of GDP. Australia's rate of expenditure at 8.7 per cent of GDP came in ahead of the US rate at 8.0 per cent (OECD, 2001c).

In contrast, Australia ranks at the very low end of OECD countries in terms of size of its ICT equipment production industries. Australia imports most of its ICT equipment requirements.

ICT contributions to productivity growth — the USA and Australia compared

The contributions of ICTs to Australia's productivity growth are now assessed and compared with the US experience. Comparison with the USA helps to sort out the sources of Australia's productivity gains.

There have been a number of US studies of ICT contributions to productivity growth (for example, Oliner and Sichel, 2000; Jorgenson and Stiroh, 2000; and Gordon, 2000). For brevity, however, this paper focuses on comparisons with the USA based on Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) data.

There was a big step up in contributions from ICT capital deepening (increases in the use of ICTs per unit of labour) from 1995 in the USA and Australia (Figure 2). The timing and strength of the ICT capital deepening contributions in the USA and Australia are remarkably close.

Figure 2: Contributions of ICT Capital Deepening to Labour Productivity Growth in the USA and Australia, 1961 to 2001

Source: Productivity Commission estimates based on unpublished ABS data and BLS data.

Most studies of the USA have compared productivity growth and ICT contributions before and after this 1995 takeoff. But 1995 was a trough year in US labour productivity, at a point below trend. Estimates from 1995 to the end of the 1990s are from a trough to a peak and therefore overstate the underlying rate of labour productivity growth.

The ABS method of estimating productivity growth over productivity cycles — from productivity peak to productivity peak — is one way of measuring underlying rates of growth. Adopting this method puts the prime focus on accelerations in underlying rates of productivity growth, rather than on the ICT takeoff and its effects.

The 1990s peak-to-peak cycle for the USA is from 1992 to 2000 and for Australia from 1993-94 to 1999-2000. Contributions to the labour productivity *accelerations* in the 1990s cycle (compared with the previous cycle) in both countries are presented in table 1.

Table 1: Contributions to Labour Productivity Accelerations in the 1990s Cycle in the USA and Australia

Per cent per year

	<i>USA^a</i>	<i>Australia^b</i>
Labour productivity growth	0.5	1.0
Capital deepening	0.2	-0.1
- ICT capital	0.3	0.4
- Other capital	-0.2	-0.5
MFP contribution^c	0.3	1.1

Notes: ^a Growth in 1992 to 2000 less growth in 1986 to 1992.

^b Growth in 1993-94 to 1999-00 less growth in 1988-89 to 1993-94.

^c MFP growth for the USA includes the contribution to labour productivity growth from labour quality.

Source: Updated from Parham, Roberts and Sun (2001).

There are several similarities in the US and Australian results:

- ICTs have made strong capital deepening contributions to acceleration in productivity in both countries. The contribution is of a similar order of magnitude (around 0.3 to 0.4 of a percentage point) in both cases.
- However, much or all of the increased use of ICTs (per hour worked) in the 1990s has been offset by slower growth in the use of other forms of capital (per hour worked). There has been little or no increase in the overall rate of capital deepening in either country, especially in Australia (Table 1). This contrasts with most other studies of the USA, which have found that ICTs have contributed to a marked increase in the rate of substitution of capital for labour.

- Faster MFP growth accounts for most of the 1990s labour productivity accelerations in both countries, and entirely so in Australia.

The main difference between the US and Australian results lies in the strength of the productivity accelerations. The acceleration in underlying labour productivity growth in Australia, at 1 percentage point, is twice that in the USA. With similar capital deepening contributions, the chief explanation for the difference lies in the much stronger MFP acceleration in Australia (1.1 percentage point) than in the USA (0.3 of a percentage point).

The stronger productivity acceleration in Australia suggests that Australian firms benefited from one or both of two factors: bigger gains from the use of ICTs and more gains from non-ICT factors.

The first possibility is unlikely. It seems reasonable to assume, consistent with the US leadership in productivity and ICTs, that the US estimates establish the upper limit on productivity gains that can be associated specifically with ICT production and use. The more likely explanation is that Australian industries have had more scope to improve from a lower base and have caught up on at least some of the superior US levels (Parham, 2002a, 2000b). This catch-up is not specifically related to ICTs.

While the US estimates set the upper limit on ICT-related gains, some of the 0.3 of a percentage point MFP acceleration must be attributed to *production* of ICTs. Studies, such as Oliner and Sichel (2000), have attributed around 0.3 of a percentage point of aggregate MFP growth to ICT production, although the acceleration was calculated pre- and post-1995. The acceleration over productivity cycles would be less — perhaps half.

This leaves a contribution of perhaps 1 or 2 tenths of a percentage point from ICT use to the acceleration in underlying aggregate MFP growth in the USA. Even if the more favourable pre- and post-1995 figures are used, the most that can be attributed to ICT use is 0.3 of a percentage point (Parham, 2002a).

Applying these US benchmarks to the Australian case suggests that non-ICT factors have contributed the bulk (0.8 of a percentage point or more) to the acceleration in Australia's productivity growth. This part of the acceleration can be attributed largely to international catch-up and microeconomic policy reforms (Parham, 2002a). Creating a more competitive, open and flexible environment has encouraged and enabled Australian business to move toward established best practice. The remaining gains (up to 0.3 of a percentage point) would represent ICT-related gains associated with new products and new dimensions of best practice.

An Industry Perspective

While the evidence suggests that the aggregate MFP gains to date from ICT use are significant, but not spectacular, there is evidence of strong links in certain industries.

Several studies of the USA have found evidence of productivity acceleration in the 1990s in Wholesale trade; Retail trade; Finance, insurance and real estate (especially in financial intermediation); and Business services. These industries have also been characterised as intensive users of ICTs (Stiroh, 2001; Nordhaus, 2001; Centre for the Study of Living Standards, 2000; Council Of Economic Advisors, 2001; Pilat and Lee, 2001).

Figure 3: Industry MFP growth over the last two productivity cycles in Australia, 1988-89 to 1993-94 and 1993-94 to 1999-2000

Source: PC estimates based on unpublished ABS data.

A similar set of industries emerged in the 1990s as major contributors to Australia's productivity surge. Figure 3 presents MFP growth rates in industry sectors over the past two productivity cycles. In the first cycle (1988-89 to 1993-94), the relatively strong productivity growth in the 'traditional' contributors to aggregate productivity growth — Agriculture, Mining, and Manufacturing — is

evident. These traditional sectors were joined in the 1980s and early 1990s by two other strong performers — Communication services and Electricity, gas and water. Their improved performance stemmed from major reform-induced efficiencies in government enterprises, which have dominated production in these two sectors, as well as technological advances in some activities. While productivity growth remained relatively strong in all five industry sectors in the 1990s cycle (except for Manufacturing), they all experienced a deceleration compared with the previous cycle. On these estimates, none made a contribution to the productivity surge from 1993-94. A new set of service industries made the positive contribution. The stand-out performer was Wholesale trade, suggesting that there have been major changes in traditional wholesaling activities of receiving and storing goods and disbursing them through resale to businesses. Other service industries — for example, Construction and Finance and insurance — also increased their rate of productivity growth.

There is no strong, positive relationship between ICT use and MFP across all Australian industries. There is a strong (above-average) positive relationship between increased ICT use and MFP acceleration in Finance and insurance and a weaker relationship in Wholesale trade. While the ICT link appears largely confined to these sectors, they are major parts of the economy, accounting for 6.6 per cent and 4.7 per cent respectively of Australia's GDP in 2000-01.

The lack of systematic relationship across all industries undoubtedly reflects the fact that ICT use is not the only factor affecting industry MFP growth. It also signals that the productivity gains from ICT use appear — for the moment at least — concentrated in distribution and financial intermediation. (There may also be ICT-productivity links at the firm level in other industries that, because of inter-firm differences in these and other factors, do not translate as readily into industry or aggregate trends — see Brynjolfsson and Hitt, 2000). The lack of a relationship across all industries also tends to support the view that the gains to date cannot be attributed to network economies, which could be expected to be more widespread.

The relationships between ICT use and productivity growth are complex. ICTs are often viewed as general-purpose technologies that require time to bring to their full potential and that provide a platform for other innovations in products and processes (see, for example, Brynjolfsson and Hitt, 2000; and Bresnahan, Brynjolfsson and Hitt, 2002).

The Australian evidence supports the view that it is the changes in products and processes that generate the productivity gains. The Finance and insurance industry has been restructured to operate much more through ICTs (for example, ATMs, Internet and phone banking) than through traditional face-to-face contacts. Many new products (for example, financial derivatives) are now on offer.

An earlier study by Productivity Commission staff (Johnston *et al.*, 2000) also found that ICTs played a part in the restructuring of wholesaling activities. Wholesalers were able to use bar-code and scanning technology and inventory management systems as part of the process of transforming wholesaling from a storage-based to a fast flow-through operation that reduces storage and handling.

But, importantly, reforms were acting as the underlying drivers and facilitators of productivity gains and ICTs were just one component of change. It was not so much that wholesaling became much more ICT intensive or that new ‘breakthrough’ technologies became available. It was more that the competitive incentives to be productive became stronger and that new flexibilities became open to businesses to use ICTs as part of a more general process of restructuring and transformation.

For example, the motor vehicle industry was looking for efficiencies all along the ‘value chain’, including in distribution, to meet the increased competition from cheaper imports entering under lower border protection. Another contributor in some areas was the reform of industrial relations processes that allowed greater labour flexibility through the introduction of split shifts and reduced the rigidity of job demarcations.

Policy Implications

A major implication of the evidence in this and related Productivity Commission papers is that, from a productivity and policy perspective, a prime focus on ICTs and the ‘new economy’ is somewhat misplaced. There are three potential pitfalls:

- too much attention on ICT production as a source of productivity growth;
- insufficient attention on the factors that drive ICT use; and
- insufficient attention on other factors that are potentially the source of greater productivity gains.

On the first point, there have been calls for policy action to foster the development of ICT *production* in order to access ‘new economy’ productivity gains. However, the Australian (and the US) experience clearly demonstrates that there are also productivity gains associated with ICT *use*. ICT production is not necessary to access productivity gains. The US estimates suggest there have been roughly equal productivity gains at the aggregate level from ICT production and use. If anything, the gains from use may well accelerate further in the future. Further product and process innovation is possible and larger and more widespread network effects (associated, for example, with e-commerce) may start to show up.

It also needs to be remembered that the scope for productivity gains in production in the USA does not translate as readily to other countries as does the productivity gains from use. The US production gains come from a very large scale of operations and a degree of technological leadership that cannot be readily established in other countries. Aside from some niche areas (particularly in software), ICT production requires not only large scale operation but also sales in highly competitive international markets. This makes it tough going for a relatively small economy like Australia’s.

Other advantages also come from focussing on use. By being open to imports of ICTs, Australia has been able to gain quickly from advances in ICT

manufacture and has been able to capture a sizeable terms of trade gain from the rapidly declining international prices in ICTs. The Treasury (2002) stated that ICT prices have fallen in domestic currency terms by 9.5 per cent a year and raised the terms of trade by 0.3 per cent a year between 1985 and 2001. Since 1995, ICT prices have fallen by nearly 15 per cent a year and raised the terms of trade by 0.75 per cent a year. Taking the benefits of productivity gains generated by foreign producers through lower prices is a real income gain to Australians.

The second point is that a direct focus on ICTs (and in particular on production) masks the importance of the pre-conditions required to drive the uptake of ICTs. This paper has emphasised the importance of the incentives provided by competition. Sharper competitive incentives to be productive help to explain why Australia moved from being a technology laggard in previous decades to being at the forefront of new technology uptake in the 1990s. Taking full advantage of declining prices and advances in technologies and not restricting them through trade or other barriers is also conducive to ICT uptake. The development of skills in the workforce can also be important in identifying and developing applications for ICTs.

Strong competition also affects the distribution of productivity gains. A competitive environment means that more of the gains are likely to be passed on in lower prices and thereby assist in dampening inflationary pressures. While the productivity gains appear to be concentrated in a few industries, competition means the benefits are enjoyed by a wider range of industries. Many services, including distribution and financial intermediation, are used extensively by manufacturing and other industries (Simon and Wardrop, 2001). The productivity gains in Wholesaling, even though very large, were passed on, with profit margins declining in the 1990s (Parham *et al.*, 2000).

ICT-related or other productivity gains do not in themselves dampen inflation, as some new economy advocates claim. Healthy competition is a necessary pre-condition.

The third and related point is that, especially since ICTs appear (at least thus far) to have generated limited productivity gains in their own right, it is important to foster the factors that are the source of more substantial productivity gains. The USA has enjoyed an MFP acceleration of around 0.3 of a percentage point associated with ICT production and use and other factors. Australia has enjoyed an MFP acceleration of around 1.1 percentage points associated with ICT use — not production — and other factors. To state the obvious, it would be a mistake to focus on chasing a gain of (at most) 0.3 of a percentage point associated with ICTs — especially by concentrating on encouraging ICT production — if that came at the cost of realising a 1.1 percentage point gain from catch-up and ‘smart’ use of ICTs (where ‘smart’ implies combining ICTs with complementary product and process innovations, including firm reorganisation).

The Australian experience suggests that the policy priority should be to enhance competition and flexibility in the business environment, rather than focus too strongly or directly on ICTs and the ‘new economy’. A focus on the right

environmental conditions for business means that the 'smart' productive use of ICTs, and substantial gains unrelated to ICTs, can then follow.

The Australian economy became more focused on productivity and more flexible at just the right time to take advantage of the advances in ICTs that came on stream in the second half of the 1990s. It was not that policymakers deliberately set out with an ICT strategy. Without many predicting or perhaps even realising it, Australia became 'ICT-ready' (and ready for any other technological development that could be usefully employed). Given a history of lagging in the uptake of technology and of relatively poor productivity performance, it is unlikely that Australia would have been as quick on the uptake of ICTs, or as able to use them in productivity-enhancing ways, had it not been for the sea-change that reforms brought.

This is a call for a shift in policy emphasis, rather than a view that few policy implications flow from ICTs and the 'new economy'. Very briefly, ICT-related policy implications include:

- the optimal development of complementary innovations, based on ICTs;
- the optimal development of communications infrastructure;
- the implications of ICT networks for the strength of competition in markets;
- the development of appropriate ICT-related skills;
- adjustment issues concerning job flexibility for those with specific skills displaced by ICTs;
- appropriate protection of intellectual property rights in distribution via the Internet;
- access to networks, including the issue of the 'digital divide';
- regulation of network content; and
- security of tax bases through use of Internet and other networks.

Statistical Needs

Policymakers have a vital interest in productivity growth, as productivity growth is the most important source of improvement in standards of living over the long term.

However, there are no immediate direct productivity 'levers'. Policymakers have to operate indirectly. Understanding the sources and mechanisms of productivity growth helps to set and confirm policy directions.

This paper has pointed to the importance of a number of statistical issues. Accurate measurement of hedonic prices is undoubtedly difficult in an environment in which characteristics are changing rapidly and in ways that make comparisons over time difficult. But accurate measurement is important in determining the extent of output and productivity growth in ICT production industries and the extent of input growth (and the productivity residual) in ICT-using industries.

There is a related and particularly thorny measurement issue that has not been drawn out in this paper. This concerns the view that MFP gains specifically

associated with advances in ICTs and captured by investors in ICTs (due to product and process innovations contingent upon those advances in ICTs) are mismeasurements and should be factored into the income stream attributable to ICTs. The increased ‘usefulness’ of ICTs due to technological advances in them should be captured as embodied quality improvements in ICTs. This raises again the issue of the accuracy of allowances for quality changes in forming price deflators.

More information on the sources of productivity improvement at the micro level is needed. There are complexities in the importance of lags in ICT use and interactions with other factors that suggest the need for extensive and reliable longitudinal micro datasets. Data are also needed to investigate the existence and importance of network economies — savings from increasing use of ICT-based networks.

There also needs to be more accurate measurement of output and therefore productivity in service industries, particularly as service industries appear to be the new source of productivity gains. Issues such as convenience, timeliness, accuracy, product range and customisation, as well as new and improved products in a more conventional sense, are looming as even more important measurement issues, in part because of the increased use of ICTs.

The apparent evidence of ‘disintermediation’ also raises possible measurement issues. For example, some traditional wholesaling activities may have been shifted forward to retailers and backward to manufacturers. Some of the productivity gains, though real, may be misallocated to wholesaling.

In closing, it is worth noting that these statistical issues impinge on the ability of analysts and policymakers to provide some element of detail on the industry sources and mechanisms of productivity growth. However, absence of fully reliable detail does not have to prevent the setting of broad policy directions that centre on competition, openness and flexibility.

Conclusion

Australia has accessed so-called ‘new economy’ productivity gains associated with ICTs. The gains have been associated with the use of ICTs and not their production. ICT production is not a necessary condition. The lack of a large-scale production sector in Australia, therefore, has not been a barrier to benefiting from ICT-related productivity gains.

Importantly, however, ICT use on its own is not sufficient to generate productivity gains. These come from complementary innovations in products and processes, enabled by the platform that ICTs provide.

The US benchmark suggests that productivity gains associated with ‘smart’ ICT use are important, but not spectacular, to date — accounting for a few tenths of a percentage point in annual average productivity growth. This may, however, increase in the future. Productivity gains associated with the production of ICTs in the USA have been of a similar order of magnitude. But, while other countries

may be able to aspire to similar gains from ICT use as the USA, their ability to generate similar gains from ICT production is much more limited.

For most countries, including Australia, it is better to focus on the strength of competition as an incentive to be more productive, openness to technology transfer and the flexibility of businesses to transform their operations in ways that raise productivity. The Australian experience suggests that the smart use of ICTs, with productivity payoffs (and much larger productivity gains unrelated to ICTs) will then follow. There are also terms of trade gains to be had from importing ICT goods that are declining rapidly in price.

From a policy and productivity point of view, a direct focus on ICTs and the 'new economy' to the exclusion of fostering a competitive, open and flexible business environment would be 'putting the cart before the horse' and would miss a major source of improvement in living standards.

References

Bean, C. (2000), 'The Australian Economic 'Miracle': A View from the North' in D. Gruen and S. Shrestha (eds), *The Australian Economy in the 1990s*, Conference Proceedings, Reserve Bank of Australia, July.

Bresnahan, T., E. Brynjolfsson and L. Hitt, (2002), 'Information Technology, Workplace Organization, and the Demand for Skilled Labour: Firm-level Evidence', *Quarterly Journal of Economics* February:339-376.

Brynjolfsson, E. and L. Hitt, (2000), 'Beyond Computation: Information Technology, Organizational Transformation and Business Performance', *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 14(4):23-48.

Council of Economic Advisors (2001), *Economic Report of the President*, Transmitted to Congress January 2001, United States Government Printing Office, Washington.

Centre for the Study of Living Standards (2000), *Trend Productivity and the New Economy*, Paper prepared for the Economic Policy Institute, September.

Dowrick, S. (2000), 'The Resurgence of Australian, Productivity Growth in the 1990s: Miracle or Mirage?', Paper presented to the 29th Annual Conference of Economists.

Dowrick, S. (2002), 'The Contribution of Innovation and Education to Economic Growth', Paper presented to the Melbourne Institute and *The Australian* Conference 'Towards Opportunity and Prosperity', Melbourne, 4-5 April.

Forsyth, P. (2000), 'Microeconomic Policies and Structural Change', pp. 235-267 in D. Gruen and S. Shrestha (eds), *The Australian Economy in the 1990s*, Conference Proceedings, Reserve Bank of Australia, 24-25 July.

Gordon, R. (2000), 'Does the "New Economy" Measure up to the Great Inventions of the Past?', *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 14(4):49-74.

Greenspan, A. (2000a), 'Structural Change in the New Economy', Remarks to the National Governors' Association, 92nd Annual Meeting, State College, Pennsylvania, 11 July, <http://www.federalreserve.gov/boarddocs/speeches/2000/20000711.htm> (accessed on 27 September 2001).

Greenspan, A. (2000b), 'Technology, Innovation and its Economic Impact', Remarks to the National Technology Forum, St Louis, Missouri, 7 April, <http://www.federalreserve.gov/boarddocs/speeches/2000/20000407.htm> (accessed on 27 September 2001).

Johnston, A., D. Porter, T. Cobbold and R. Dolamore (2000), *Productivity in Australia's Wholesale and Retail Trade*, Productivity Commission Staff Research Paper, AusInfo, Canberra.

Jorgenson, D. and K. Stiroh (2000), 'Raising the Speed Limit: US Economic Growth in the Information Age', *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 1:125-211.

Nordhaus, W. (2001), 'Productivity Growth and the New Economy', NBER Working Paper 8096. Cambridge MA, January.

OECD (2001a), *The New Economy: Beyond the Hype*, The OECD Growth Project, OECD, Paris.

OECD (2001b), *OECD Economic Surveys: Australia*, OECD, Paris.

OECD (2001c), *OECD Science, Technology and Industry Scoreboard: Towards a Knowledge-based Economy*, OECD, Paris.

Oliner, S. and D. Sichel (2000), 'The Resurgence of Growth in the Late 1990s: Is Information Technology the Story?', *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 14(4):3-22

Parham, D. (1999), *The New Economy? A New Look at Australia's Productivity Performance*, Productivity Commission Staff Research Paper, AusInfo, Canberra, May.

Parham, D. (2002a), 'Australia's 1990s Productivity Surge and its Determinants', Paper presented to the NBER 13th Annual East-Asian Seminar on Economics, Melbourne, June, (available at <http://www.pc.gov.au/research/confproc/prodsurge/index.html>).

Parham, D. (2002b), 'Productivity Growth in Australia: Are We Enjoying a Miracle', Paper presented to the Melbourne Institute and *The Australian* Conference, 'Towards Opportunity and Prosperity', Melbourne, 4-5 April, (available at <http://www.pc.gov.au/research/swp/pgia/index.html>).

Parham, D., P. Barnes, P. Roberts and S. Kennett (2000), *Distribution of the Economic Gains of the 1990s*, AusInfo, Canberra, November.

Parham, D., P. Roberts and H. Sun (2001), *Information Technology and Australia's Productivity Surge*, Productivity Commission Staff Research Paper, AusInfo, Canberra.

Productivity Commission (1999), *Microeconomic Reforms and Australian Productivity: Exploring the Links*, Commission Research Paper, AusInfo, Canberra, November.

Pilat, D. and F. Lee (2001), 'Productivity Growth in ICT-producing and ICT-using Industries: A Source of Growth Differentials in the OECD?', STI Working Paper 2001/4, OECD, Paris.

Simon, J. and S. Wardrop (2001), 'Australian Use of Information Technology and its Contribution to Growth', Paper prepared for the Conference of Economists, Perth, September (mimeo).

Stiroh, K. (2001), 'Information Technology and the US Productivity Revival: What Do the Industry Data Say?', Federal Reserve Board of New York (mimeo).

Treasury (Commonwealth) (2002), *Budget Papers, Statement 4: Australia's Terms of Trade — Stronger and Less Volatile*, AusInfo, Canberra.

The author is grateful for helpful suggestions from Franco Papandrea and comments from two anonymous referees. This is an edited version of a paper delivered to the International Association of Official Statisticians conference on The New Economy, London, August 2002 (the full conference paper is available at <http://www.pc.gov.au/research/confproc/prodgains/index.html>).