

## The diffusion of regional innovation capabilities: evidence from Italian patent data

Quatraro, Francesco

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

[www.peerproject.eu](http://www.peerproject.eu)

### Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Quatraro, F. (2009). The diffusion of regional innovation capabilities: evidence from Italian patent data. *Regional Studies*, 43(10), 1333-1348. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343400802195162>

### Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

**gesis**  
Leibniz-Institut  
für Sozialwissenschaften

### Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der  
  
Leibniz-Gemeinschaft



**The Diffusion of Regional Innovation Capabilities: Evidence from Italian Patent Data**

Journal:	<i>Regional Studies</i>
Manuscript ID:	CRES-2007-0277.R1
Manuscript Type:	Main Section
JEL codes:	O33 - Technological Change: Choices and Consequences Diffusion Processes < O3 - Technological Change Research and Development < O - Economic Development, Technological Change, and Growth, R11 - Regional Economic Activity: Growth, Development, and Changes < R1 - General Regional Economics < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics
Keywords:	Regional Innovation Capabilities, Growth Retardation, Diffusion

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

# The Diffusion of Regional Innovation Capabilities: Evidence from Italian Patent Data<sup>1</sup>

Francesco Quatraro

BRICK (Bureau of Research on Innovation, Complexity and Knowledge)

Collegio Carlo Alberto, Moncalieri (Torino)

and

Laboratory of Economics of Innovation "F. Momigliano"

Department of Economics

University of Turin

Tel. +390116704980

Fax + 390116703895

[francesco.quatraro@unito.it](mailto:francesco.quatraro@unito.it)

First received: September 2007

Accepted: February 2008

## ABSTRACT.

This paper investigates the diffusion of regional innovation capabilities within the manufacturing sector. The competence-based theory of the region allows for combining the Schumpeterian view upon innovation and business cycles and the growth poles theory. Innovation capabilities spread within the region after the expansion of the propulsive sector, due to learning dynamics. Adopting a methodology for the analysis of diffusion processes, the paper presents empirical evidence on Italian regions. The results show that in late-industrialized regions the diffusion of innovation capabilities is faster

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 than in the early-industrialized ones. The role of R&D and complementary changes in  
6  
7 the economic structure is also investigated.

8  
9 JEL Classification Codes: O33, R11

10  
11  
12 Keywords: Regional Innovation Capabilities, Growth Retardation, Diffusion

13  
14  
15  
16 La diffusion des capacités d'innovation régionale:  
17 des preuves provenant des données italiennes sur les brevets.

18  
19  
20  
21 Quatraro

22  
23  
24 Cet article cherche à examiner la diffusion des capacités d'innovation régionale au sein  
25 du secteur industriel. La théorie des régions fondée sur la notion de compétences permet  
26 la combinaison des points de vue de Schumpeter sur l'innovation, les cycles  
27 économiques et les pôles de croissance. Les capacités d'innovation se répandent au sein  
28 de la région suite au développement du secteur moteur à cause de la dynamique  
29 d'apprentissage. En employant une méthodologie relative à l'analyse des processus de  
30 diffusion, cet article présente des preuves empiriques sur les régions italiennes. Les  
31 résultats laissent voir que dans les régions qui se sont industrialisées tardivement la  
32 diffusion des capacités d'innovation s'avère plus rapide qu'elle ne l'est dans les régions  
33 qui se sont industrialisées tôt. On examine aussi le rôle de la recherche et  
34 développement et des changements complémentaires de la structure économique.

35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 Capacités d'innovation régionale / Croissance tardive / Diffusion

41  
42  
43 Classement JEL: O33; R11

44  
45  
46 **Die Diffusion des regionalen Innovationspotenzials: Belege anhand der**  
47 **Daten von italienischen Patenten**

48  
49 Francesco Quatraro

50  
51 ABSTRACT.

52 In diesem Beitrag wird die Diffusion des regionalen Innovationspotenzials  
53 innerhalb des produzierenden Sektors untersucht. Die kompetenzbasierte  
54 Theorie der Region gestattet eine Kombination der Schumpeterschen  
55 Perspektive der Innovation und Geschäftszyklen mit der Theorie der  
56 Wachstumspole. Das Innovationspotenzial breitet sich nach der Expansion des  
57 propulsiven Sektors aufgrund der Lerndynamik innerhalb der Region aus. In  
58 diesem Beitrag werden empirische Belege aus den italienischen Regionen mit  
59  
60

Hilfe einer adaptierten Methodologie zur Analyse von Diffusionsprozessen vorgestellt. Aus den Ergebnissen geht hervor, dass die Diffusion von Innovationspotenzial in spät industrialisierten Regionen rascher voranschreitet als in früh industrialisierten Regionen. Ebenso werden die Rolle von Forschung und Entwicklung sowie die komplementären Änderungen in der Wirtschaftsstruktur untersucht.

JEL Classification Codes: O33, R11

Keywords:

Regionales Innovationspotenzial

Wachstumsverzögerung

Diffusion

La difusión de las capacidades de innovación regional: ejemplo de los datos de patentes italianas

Francesco Quatraro

ABSTRACT.

En este artículo investigo la difusión de las capacidades de innovación regional en el sector manufacturero. La teoría de la región basada en la competencia permite combinar la imagen *Schumpeteriana* de los ciclos empresariales y de innovación con la teoría de los polos de crecimiento. Las capacidades de innovación se extienden en la región tras la expansión del sector propulsor debido a las dinámicas de aprendizaje. En este ensayo muestro ejemplos empíricos sobre las regiones italianas con ayuda de una metodología para el análisis de los procesos de difusión. Los resultados indican que en las regiones con una industrialización tardía, la difusión de las capacidades de innovación es más rápida que en las regiones con una industrialización temprana. También analizo el papel de I+D y los cambios complementarios en la estructura económica.

Keywords:

Innovación regional

Capacidades

Retraso del crecimiento

Difusión

JEL Classification Codes: O33, R11

## 1 Introduction

Different schools of thought have stressed the importance of innovation to regional competitive advantage in the last decades. On the one hand, the concept of learning regions refers to the capacity of areas featured by systemic ties, to enhance the creation of new knowledge and foster innovation (ASHEIM, 1996). On the other hand the

1  
2  
3  
4 Regional Innovation System (RIS) approach, drawing explicitly upon the notion of  
5  
6 national innovation systems, has emphasized the relevance of interactive learning for  
7  
8 the different kinds of actors involved in the innovation process (COOKE *et al.*, 1997).  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 Besides these perspectives, a new one recently emerged which extends the concept of  
14  
15 firms capabilities to the regional domain. FOSS (1996) proposed the concept of “higher-  
16  
17 order capabilities”, i.e. capabilities going beyond the scope of single firm command,  
18  
19 which may be key to regional competitive advantage. The idea has been further  
20  
21 articulated in the competence-theory of the region, where new knowledge is created by  
22  
23 combining both internal and external resources. The density and the quality of network  
24  
25 relationships, as well as the appropriate institutional endowment, are the main pillars of  
26  
27 regional capabilities. These have to be accumulated over time, as they stem from daily  
28  
29 activities and interactions of economic agents (FOSS, 1996; LAWSON, 1999;  
30  
31 LAWSON and LORENZ, 1999).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 In particular, innovation capabilities may be defined as the degree of technological  
41  
42 accumulation and the efficiency of search processes (DOSI, 1988). They emerge out of  
43  
44 the learning process, and refers to the ability to both absorb and create technological  
45  
46 knowledge (LALL, 1992). Areas characterized by institutional variety, high degrees of  
47  
48 proximity among the innovating agents, low communication costs and relevant  
49  
50 knowledge externalities, will hence show better technological performances, other  
51  
52 things being equal (ANTONELLI, 2000; PATRUCCO, 2003; BOSCHMA, 2005).  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 The appreciation of regional innovation capabilities provides an interesting bridge with  
5  
6 Schumpeter's business cycles theory. The geographical bearings of Schumpeter's  
7  
8 analysis have been emphasized by PERROUX (1955) and further articulated at regional  
9  
10 level by THOMAS (1975). On the one hand radical innovations enable sustained  
11  
12 economic growth by creating new industries within the regional economy. On the other  
13  
14 hand it allows firms within an industry to gain competitiveness.  
15  
16  
17

18  
19  
20  
21 Innovation efforts tend to emerge with a sensible delay with respect to the expansion  
22  
23 stage of the industry within which they are generated. This is due to a delayed diffusion  
24  
25 of innovation capabilities (SCHUMPETER, 1939). Industries grouping around the  
26  
27 dynamic core then develop the set of competences and skills that make it possible the  
28  
29 systematic application of knowledge to economic activities through the working of  
30  
31 interactive learning and network externalities. Innovation capabilities hence gradually  
32  
33 emerge within the propulsive industry, and then spread to closely related industries.  
34  
35  
36  
37

38  
39  
40 In this paper we enquire into the emergence of regional innovation capabilities within  
41  
42 the manufacturing sectors, by grafting the regional capabilities approach into the  
43  
44 analytical framework of innovation diffusion (GRILICHES, 1957; MANSFIELD,  
45  
46 1961). We specifically focus on the diffusion of innovation capabilities within the  
47  
48 manufacturing sectors, using patent applications as a reliable proxy. The context of the  
49  
50 analysis consists of the 20 Italian regions in the 1981-2003 period.  
51  
52  
53

54  
55  
56 The case of Italy within this picture is very peculiar. Indeed, already in the 1970s  
57  
58 eminent scholars maintained that the Italian economic system was characterized by a  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 dualism in the industrial structure. On the one hand North-West regions were the cradle  
5 of modern industrial firms, and during the 1980s the manufacturing sectors had already  
6 completed their growth phase, leaving the floor to service industries. On the other hand,  
7 North-Eastern-Central (NEC) regions showed a delayed process of manufacturing  
8 activities, carried out mostly by small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) often  
9 operating in peculiar economic and social environments (FUÀ, 1983). It follows that the  
10 Italian case provides a good benchmark to investigate the patterns of diffusion of  
11 innovating capabilities, and its relationships with the stages of industrial development.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 In this context, the contribution of this paper to the literature is twofold. On the one  
27 hand it aims at rejuvenating a field of enquiry which has been lacking appropriate  
28 consideration since the 1980s. For this reason, the debate about the economic  
29 development of Italian regions has somehow missed the important opportunity of  
30 investigating cross-regional differences in the light of the economics of innovation. On  
31 the other hand, such an analysis is also relevant for its theoretical implications  
32 concerning the relationships between development patterns and technological change.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we articulate the  
46 theoretical framework and the working hypotheses. Section 3 presents the background  
47 economic context. Section 4 discusses the methodology and the data. In Section 5 we  
48 present the results of the empirical analysis. Finally the conclusions follow in Section 6.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



## 2 Regional Industrial Development and the Diffusion of Innovation Capabilities

Since the seminal contribution by SCHUMPETER (1911), innovation has been regarded as crucial to the process of economic development. The main agents of innovation firstly were new firms created by risk-taking entrepreneurs and then large corporations, which sacrifice static to dynamic efficiency (SCHUMPETER, 1942). PERROUX (1955) integrated the role of technological change in his “growth pole” theory following Schumpeter’s legacy. Regional economic systems are characterized by *rounds of growth*, i.e. periods in which firms within the *propulsive industry* grow at faster rates, propagating the positive effects across firms directly and indirectly relate to the propulsive industry. The main driving factor of such expansion is technical efficiency gained through innovation efforts.

The competitive forces driving the expansion of such an industry however do not work indefinitely. Sooner or later growth rates starts declining and a new industry is likely to emerge, as an effect of the introduction of radical innovations within the system. Within the new industry firms will innovate to gain competitive advantages and gales of innovations show up at some point in time. In the positive climate related to the expansion of the industry one firm will introduce an innovation, stimulating other creative agents.

THOMAS (1975) articulated the implications of Perroux’ framework on regional economic growth using a product life-cycle perspective, wherein the saturation of product markets are the main responsible for the slowdown of growth rates and the

1  
2  
3  
4 quest for innovations aims at opening new markets<sup>2</sup>. Although mainly focused on the  
5  
6 demand side, an important link is identified therein, i.e. the one between innovation as a  
7  
8 process of creative destruction and the reduction of industry's growth rates (KUZNETS,  
9  
10 1930; BURNS, 1934).  
11  
12

13  
14  
15  
16 In the retardation theory framework new industries emerge as an effect of radical  
17  
18 innovation. This generates a cycle which terminates when the related technological  
19  
20 opportunities are exhausted. Of course, not all industries declines at the same time, and  
21  
22 performances of a region are strictly related to its leading industry<sup>3</sup>. When the expansion  
23  
24 stage is exhausted, a clustering of innovations emerges within sectors, as an effect of  
25  
26 delayed diffusion of innovation capabilities, which spread like a disease  
27  
28 (SCHUMPETER, 1939). Innovating efforts are then stimulated in the decreasing stages  
29  
30 of the business cycles by creative response mechanisms of firms which perceive the  
31  
32 threat of new emerging sectors in the economic environment (SCHUMPETER, 1947).  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 The recent research on innovation capabilities enhances the understanding of the  
41  
42 process through which they emerge in regional contexts. Within a context shaped by  
43  
44 Schumpeterian competition, firms dynamic capabilities stand for the "ability to  
45  
46 integrate, build, and reconfigure internal and external competences to address rapidly  
47  
48 changing environments" (TEECE *et al.*, 1997: p. 516). Innovation and technological  
49  
50 capabilities specifically denote the firm's capacity to combine internal and external  
51  
52 sources of both tacit and codified knowledge, directed towards the introduction of  
53  
54 product and process innovations (LALL,1992; ANTONELLI, 1999).  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 The emphasis on external linkages calls the attention upon factors going beyond the  
5 firm level. Higher-order innovation capabilities relates to knowledge which resides in  
6 the region, and “emerge in a historical process from the systemic interaction among  
7 firms” (FOSS, 1996: p.3). The different institutions involved in the innovation process  
8 need time to learn to interact. This requires iterate interactions, the development of  
9 common communication codes and the availability of effective channels to access  
10 external knowledge. Such a kind of learning is highly localized in the specific context in  
11 which it takes place. As a result, regional innovation capabilities are highly  
12 idiosyncratic and related to the conditions of the economic and institutional  
13 environment, and hence they are difficult to replicate in the same way in other regions  
14 (LAWSON and LORENZ, 1999; ANTONELLI, 2000; ROMIJN and ALBU, 2002).  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Different propulsive industries feature diverse regional systems. Long after the growth  
34 stages, innovation capabilities come out as the result of learning activities, which  
35 gradually infect creative agents. The grafting of innovation capabilities framework into  
36 the diffusion theory provides suitable methodological tools to investigate such dynamics  
37 at the regional aggregate level. The pioneering work in this respect is the analysis of  
38 diffusion of hybrid corn across US states, carried out by GRILICHES (1957).  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 Within epidemic models, bounded rationality, information asymmetries and networks  
51 effects are the major forces determining the characteristic S-shape of the diffusion  
52 process. Learning dynamics are gradual, and the working of communication channels is  
53 crucial to the diffusion of an innovation within a system. The increase in the number of  
54 adopters makes it available more information about the possible applications and  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 consequences of the innovation, and hence it helps the diffusion process within the  
5  
6 particular subset of the social system which is defined by the potential adopters. This  
7  
8 gradually reduces the uncertainty about the innovation, and stimulates its adoption  
9  
10 (GRILICHES, 1957; MANSFIELD, 1961; HALL, 2004).  
11  
12  
13

14  
15  
16 According to the growth pole theory, industries tend to group around a central core of  
17  
18 other industries, which act as catalyst to economic growth in the area. Proximity among  
19  
20 firms enhances the probability of interactions and stimulates the flow of knowledge.  
21  
22 Innovation capabilities within local contexts are thus likely to emerge as the result of an  
23  
24 endogenous process in which firms within the propulsive industry play as pioneers. The  
25  
26 emergence of local competences can hence be seen as the outcome of learning processes  
27  
28 occurring in time, triggered by local interactions and network effects.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34  
35 Therefore the development of innovation capabilities by firms needs time to both ignite  
36  
37 and propagate. In the early stages of the innovation cycle a few firms innovate and the  
38  
39 system is characterized by low levels of technological performance. The stimulus to  
40  
41 innovate spread to other firms, which realize the benefit from innovating within a  
42  
43 competitive context. Where possible, they eventually commit financial resources to  
44  
45 more formalized search activities. Where internal R&D is not feasible due to financial  
46  
47 constraints, the availability of high quality public research centres within the region  
48  
49 enhances the innovation capabilities of the system.  
50  
51  
52  
53

54  
55  
56 In such a context, the availability of effective protection tools may increase the returns  
57  
58 to R&D. The higher returns to R&D in turn may well determine an increase in patenting  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 activities (JAFFE, 2000; WEBSTER, 2004; KORTUM and LERNER, 2003).  
5  
6 Moreover, patents also represent a tool through which firms can exchange knowledge  
7  
8 on the markets, making it easier for interactive learning to work in environments  
9  
10 characterized by the existence of strong systemic ties (LUNDVALL, 1992; ARORA *et*  
11  
12 *al.* , 2001; PEETERS and VAN POTTELSBERGHE, 2006).  
13  
14

15  
16  
17  
18 Drawing upon the argument elaborated so far, we may now spell out our hypotheses as  
19  
20 follows:  
21  
22

- 23  
24  
25  
26 1) Regional innovation capabilities emerge over time, as an outcome of the  
27  
28 increase of innovation activities within the system, and the working of learning  
29  
30 dynamics which enhance agents' capacity to interact and combine external with  
31  
32 internal inputs. At the aggregate level this would amount to an initial  
33  
34 exponential stage in which there is an explosion of technological performances,  
35  
36 followed by a gradual saturation due to the infection of all potential innovators.  
37  
38  
39 2) Regional innovation capabilities appear with a sensible delay with respect to the  
40  
41 expansion of the propulsive industry within the area. This leads us to expect that  
42  
43 over the same period, the speed of diffusion of regional innovation capabilities  
44  
45 in an industry will be faster in areas where the expansion has come out late, than  
46  
47 in areas where the same industry has developed earlier.  
48  
49  
50 3) Regional innovation capabilities vary across different regions. In contexts  
51  
52 characterized by the predominance of SMEs the interaction between firms and  
53  
54 public research institutions is expected to be more crucial than in areas  
55  
56 characterized by large firms.  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE  
8  
9  
10

11 Figure 1 summarizes the theoretical framework elaborated so far. Continuous lines refer  
12 to industry cycle, while the dashed line refers to innovation cycle. The focus of the  
13 empirical analysis will be mainly on the emergence of innovation capabilities within  
14 Italian regions in manufacturing sectors. However we firstly need to identify the  
15 different patterns the process of industrialization followed in different areas, in order to  
16 make it clear which one is early-industrialized and which is late-industrialized. This is  
17 the purpose of the following Section.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

### 30 **3 The Economic Context**

31  
32  
33 In the 1950s most Italian regions were rural, and populated by a large share of small-  
34 and medium-sized enterprises, as opposed to North-Western regions, which specialized  
35 in manufacturing activities, carried out by large firms. Analyzing the distribution of  
36 growth rates and structural change at the regional level in the period 1950-1970, the  
37 Ancona School identified and found the clues of a successful diffusion process of  
38 manufacturing activities towards such rural regions in the North-East and eventually in  
39 Central Italy, along the Adriatic coast. For this reason they proposed to group such  
40 regions into a larger macro-area which has been eventually called NEC (North-East-  
41 Centre)<sup>4</sup>. At the same time, the growth of manufacturing industries was slowing down  
42 in the North-West, wherein the growth of business service industries was already *in*  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
*nuce* (PETTENATI, 1991; FUÀ and ZACCHIA, 1983).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Different factors were proposed in the 1970s as conducive to the successful territorial  
6  
7 diffusion of manufacturing activities towards the NEC. On the one hand it has been  
8  
9 argued that the widespread presence of small- and medium-sized firms contributed to  
10  
11 create a favourable environment, characterized by low costs of living, intense utilization  
12  
13 of labour potential, and the persistence of pretty informal labour relationships. Firms in  
14  
15 turn benefited from these peculiarities in terms of lower costs and better business  
16  
17 efficiency. Moreover they maintained that the small size scale and the specialization in  
18  
19 labour-intensive activities, permitted in many ways swifter adaptation to changes in  
20  
21 markets and technologies (FUÀ, 1983, 1991a and 1991b; FUÀ and ZACCHIA, 1983;  
22  
23 GAROFOLI, 1981 and 1983).  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 On the other hand the relevance of the features of the social texture has been stressed,  
31  
32 whereby the traditions rooted into the sharecropping system largely drawing on the  
33  
34 informal institution of the “extended family” were persisting. The gradual diffusion of  
35  
36 manufacturing did not seem to be paralleled by a simultaneous change of the social  
37  
38 organization. Low wages and temporary jobs were accepted because of the weakness of  
39  
40 labour market as an institution, substituted by the “extended family” which worked as a  
41  
42 real self-regulatory system. In such a context dynamic pressures and attitude toward  
43  
44 self-employment represented a key factor for the successful creation of manufacturing  
45  
46 enterprises<sup>5</sup> (PACI, 1973 and 1992). The boosting role of institutional factors (above all  
47  
48 embedded in the labour market) and the peculiarities of the economic structure, were  
49  
50 maintained to lead to the set of positive-feedbacks well described by the industrial  
51  
52 district theorists (BRUSCO, 1982; BECATTINI, 1989).  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### 3.1 The Recent Evidence

To investigate the persistence of late industrialization and its geographical distribution, we use time series data on employment at the regional level, drawn from the Italian National Institute of Statistics (ISTAT). The issue of territorial diffusion of manufacturing activities can be addressed by looking at the dynamics of regional specialization index, defined as the region's relative share of employment within an industry. Formally it is defined as employment in sector  $i$  located in region  $j$  at time  $t$  ( $IL_{ijt}$ ), divided by the region's total employment in all industries, compared to the same measure at the national level<sup>6</sup>.

In Table 1 we report the results of the calculations for *manufacturing industries*<sup>7</sup>. North-Western and NEC regions are characterized by well differentiated patterns. The former indeed show up decreasing values, both as an aggregate and singling out the regions. The Lombardy and Piedmont regions are characterized by the highest specialization indexes in 1982. It must be considered that, according to Fuà and his colleagues, the process of territorial diffusion started in the late 1960s.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

This is the reason why regions like Veneto, Emilia-Romagna, Umbria and Marches are characterized by values just slightly lower than in the above mentioned North-Western regions. The main important aspect is that the North-Eastern and Central regions are characterized by specialization indexes increasing over time. It is worth stressing that in Veneto and Marches the specialization in manufacturing grew very impressively along



1  
2  
3  
4 the 1980s (respectively +13.6% and +19.6% in the period 1981-1991), slowing down in  
5  
6  
7 1990s (but still growing). In Emilia-Romagna and Molise its growth was sustained both  
8  
9  
10 in the 1980s and the 1990s, while in the Umbria region the index decreased until the  
11  
12 first half of the 1990s, and then started increasing steadily. At the end of the observed  
13  
14 period, it seems that North-Eastern and Central regions are characterized by  
15  
16 specialization indexes very close to (and in the case of Marches even higher than) the  
17  
18 values featuring North-Western regions. Moreover the trend appears to be soundly  
19  
20 positive in the former, while the values in the latter are continuously decreasing since  
21  
22 the early 1980s.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## 29 **4 Data and Methodology**

30  
31  
32 The empirical analysis of the diffusion of regional innovation capabilities within  
33  
34 manufacturing sectors in Italy, is based on the evidence about the evolution of patent  
35  
36 applications to the EPO<sup>8</sup>. The limits of patent statistics as indicators of innovation  
37  
38 activities are well known. The main drawbacks can be summarized in their sector-  
39  
40 specificity, the existence of non patentable innovations and the fact that they are not the  
41  
42 only protecting tool. Moreover the propensity to patent tends to vary over time as a  
43  
44 function of the cost of patenting, and it is more likely to feature large firms (PAVITT,  
45  
46 1985; LEVIN *et al.*, 1987; GRILICHES, 1990).  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54 Nevertheless, previous studies highlighted the usefulness of patents as measures of  
55  
56 production of new knowledge, above all in the context of analyses of innovation  
57  
58 performances at the aggregate regional level (ACS *et al.*, 2002). Besides the debate  
59  
60 about patents as an output rather than an input of innovation activities, empirical

1  
2  
3  
4 analyses showed that patents and R&D are dominated by a contemporaneous  
5 relationship, providing further support to the use of patents as a good proxy of  
6 innovation (HALL *et al.*, 1986).  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14 The emergence of regional innovation capabilities manifest itself in high quality  
15 innovation processes, wherein firms commit internal resources to R&D and cooperate  
16 with other firms and R&D institutions. Patenting represents the last stage of this  
17 process. The application to the European Patent Office is a time- and resource-  
18 consuming process, which is likely to exert an ex-ante selection of the innovations to be  
19 patented. This allows us to identify high-value innovations stemming from systematic  
20 more formalized innovation efforts, which are precisely the object of our analysis.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Table 2 provides empirical evidence of the regional diffusion of innovation  
34 capabilities<sup>9</sup>, over the time span 1980-2001. Absolute value data about patent  
35 applications are not that suitable for comparative purposes, due to cross-regional  
36 dimensional differences. In order to investigate the diffusion of innovation capabilities  
37 the data about patent applications need to be somehow normalized. Different  
38 alternatives could apply to the case. First of all we ruled out population statistics, in that  
39 their link with innovation variables is too weak and difficult to assess<sup>10</sup>. A variable  
40 related to the dimension of the production system would be more appropriate to our  
41 analysis. The alternatives are thus either the regional number of firms or the number of  
42 workers. The former seem to be inappropriate as there can be a bias towards those areas  
43 characterized by a large number of small and medium-sized firms, with the consequent  
44 underestimation of dimensions in areas characterized by a lower number of large firms.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Thus we decided to take the number of patent applications per worker as the indicator of  
5  
6 the level of diffusion of innovation capabilities within each region.  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE  
12  
13

14  
15  
16 With the help of Figure 2, we focus on the differences among early- and late-  
17  
18 industrialized regions. As far as the former are concerned, the dynamics of Lombardy  
19  
20 and Piedmont are characterized by high levels in the early 1980s in both of them, but in  
21  
22 1988 it can be noted a further speeding up of Lombardy which clearly overtake  
23  
24 Piedmont, outperforming it until 2001. Around 1991 the growth of patent applications  
25  
26 begins to slow down in both regions, but more markedly in Piedmont. The evidence  
27  
28 about Emilia-Romagna is of much interest for the purpose of our analysis. Indeed the  
29  
30 diffusion of patent applications seem to be more sustained all over the period observed.  
31  
32 Innovation capabilities diffuse at a very fast pace, such that Emilia-Romagna  
33  
34 outperformed Piedmont already in 1998 and Lombardy in 1999. Friuli-Venezia Giulia  
35  
36 and Veneto are characterized by fairly opposite dynamics, as the former appears to grow  
37  
38 sensibly along the 1980s and then slowing down in the 1990s, while the latter is  
39  
40 characterized by modest growth rate until the late 1990s, and then a sudden  
41  
42 acceleration. Finally Umbria, Marches and Abruzzi show up dynamics very similar to  
43  
44 Veneto's, in that the hastening of growth in patent applications can be devised around  
45  
46 1995.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54  
55  
56 INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 In Table 3 we report the breakdown of quinquennial growth rates of patent applications  
5 by region. It is evident that in most Italian regions in the period such growth rates were  
6 higher in the first five years, then it lowers in the second one, becoming even negative  
7 in the third one. The last quinquennial is then characterized by very low growth rates. It  
8 is moreover fair to note that in the first five years the growth rates of Piedmont and  
9 Lombardy were higher than those of Emilia-Romagna, Marches and Umbria, while in  
10 the last five years the situation is reversed, the latter showing higher growth rates than  
11 the former. The evidence in Tables 2 and 3 shows that, with obvious cross-regional  
12 differences in absolute levels, the dynamics of patent applications across Italian regions  
13 are interpretable as a diffusion process. Insofar as patents are reliable indicators of  
14 innovative activity, the sequence of growth rates suggests that innovation capabilities  
15 have diffused in most Italian regions following an S-shaped time path, and that the  
16 patterns characterizing North-Eastern-Central regions are different from those  
17 characterizing North-Western regions.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 In conclusion, the preliminary evidence about data applications appears to suggest that  
46 the territorial diffusion of manufacturing activities is still ongoing in the North-East-  
47 Central regions, as they are sustained by the diffusion of innovation capabilities, and the  
48 consequent advantages stemming from innovation. Emilia-Romagna seems to be the  
49 leading region in such a process, whereby Marches, Abruzzi and to some extent Umbria  
50 are the immediate followers. The case for a possible extension towards Molise and  
51 Puglia seems very difficult to assess, as the data up to 2001 are not very supportive.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 The regional aggregate data on R&D expenditure, both private and public, have been  
8  
9 drawn from the ISTAT to provide a suggestive evidence of the increase in the  
10  
11 availability of the knowledge stock accessible in the area<sup>11</sup>. To gain better  
12  
13 understanding of the regional dynamics, in Tables 4 and 5 we calculated a regional  
14  
15 specialization index for public and private R&D expenditure, defined as R&D in sector  
16  
17  $i$  (public vs. private) located in region  $j$  at time  $t$ , divided by the region's total R&D  
18  
19 expenditure, compared to the same measure at the national level. It is straightforward  
20  
21 from the data that North Western regions are characterized by strong concentration of  
22  
23 private R&D expenditure, with the only exception of the Liguria region. The Piedmont  
24  
25 region turned out to have the highest value for the index, followed by Valle d'Aosta and  
26  
27 Lombardy. Some regions with an index value above 1 can be found also in the North-  
28  
29 East. They are Veneto and Emilia-Romagna, which is not so surprising considering that  
30  
31 high tech sectors increasingly gained relevance in the area, due to the local positive  
32  
33 feedbacks characterizing the upgrading from consumer goods to dedicated capital goods  
34  
35 of the manufacturing activity in the area. In the remainder regions the value of the index  
36  
37 is below one, above all in the regions along the Adriatic coast.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 As far as the public R&D expenditure is concerned, of course in the North-West the  
48  
49 only region that can be defined public-R&D-intensive is the Liguria one. It is worth  
50  
51 noting that in the North-East, the value of the index for Emilia-Romagna and Veneto is  
52  
53 just slightly below 1. This means that in the area the public and the private inputs for  
54  
55 innovative activity are pretty balanced. The highest value for the index can be found in  
56  
57 the regions along the Adriatic coast, and in Southern Italy in general.  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 INSERT TABLES 4 AND 5 ABOUT HERE  
8  
9

10  
11 Thus the Italian case seems to be characterized by a clear and strong divide also  
12 according to the path of change followed by the old industrialized regions and the late  
13 industrializing ones. While within the former firms seem exposed to raising problems,  
14 unable to cope with the decline of performances in both domestic and international  
15 markets, in the latter they seem better able to take advantage of the new technologies by  
16 means of a process of creative adoption (Quatraro, 2007).  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

#### 28 **4.1 Econometric Strategy**

29  
30 The econometric strategy is articulated in two steps. Firstly, in order to estimate the  
31 different rates of diffusion of patent application across Italian regions, we use the  
32 standard logistic equations proposed by GRILICHES (1957) and MANSFIELD (1961).  
33 A similar exercise was put forth by ANDERSEN (1999) in her analysis of differential  
34 growth rates at the industry level<sup>12</sup>. The logistic function can formally be written as  
35 follows:  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

$$P = \frac{K}{1 + e^{-\alpha - \beta t}} \quad (2)$$

where  $P$  is the level of adoption,  $t$  the time and  $K$  the ceiling. The features of this curve are well known, in that it is asymptotic to 0 and  $K$ , it is symmetric around the inflexion point and its time derivative is  $dP/dt = -b/(P/K)(K-P)$ , which confers the S-shape.

Equation (2) is well suited to represent the diffusion process as the result of learning and imitation dynamics. It can be rearranged dividing both sides by  $(K-P)$  and taking logs, to obtain the following econometric specification:

$$\ln\left[\frac{P_t}{K-P_t}\right] = \alpha + \beta t \quad (3)$$

Secondly, we investigate the relationships diffusion of innovation capabilities and structural change on the one hand, and the links with the availability of accessible knowledge stocks on the other. This is done by taking the estimated time coefficients from the logistic fit and regressing them as follows:

$$\beta_i = a + b \cdot MAN_i + c \cdot FIN_i + d \cdot TRA_i + u \quad (4)$$

$$\beta_i = e + h \cdot GRGFI_i + m \cdot GRPUR_i + n \cdot GRPRD_i + z \quad (5)$$

Where  $\beta$  clearly stands for the estimated time coefficients of the logistic equation, and  $u$  and  $z$  are the respective error terms. In Equation (4)  $MAN$ ,  $FIN$  and  $TRA$  are respectively the average annual growth rates of the employment share of manufacturing, finance business services and trade industries. In Equation (5) the rates of diffusion are instead regressed against the average growth rate of public and private R&D (respectively  $GRPUD$  and  $GRPRD$ ), plus the average annual growth rate of gross fixed investment ( $GRGFI$ ) as control variable accounting for the embodiment hypothesis.

## 5 The Empirical Results

In order to investigate the patterns of diffusion of innovation capabilities within regional contexts we fitted the data by using the logistic function specified in Equation (3)<sup>13</sup>. Due to the problem of auto correlated disturbances affecting this kind of time series relationship, the choice of a Chi-square estimator seemed to be the most appropriate. We thus carried out a feasible GLS regression by region, yielding the results displayed in Table 6. The coefficient  $\beta$  is interpreted as the rate at which local competences emerged over time. In this case, through the diffusion of patents applications, we obtain a measure of how fast the innovation capabilities have spread within each Italian region in the period 1981-2001. Although this measure is affected by the definition of  $K$ , nonetheless it can provide very useful information to understanding regional differences in economic and industrial dynamics. In particular, we start with a simple comparison among the different levels of  $\beta$  yielded in each region.

INSERT TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE

Within the relevant North-Western regions, Lombardy shows up the fastest rate of emergence, followed by Liguria and then Piedmont. A glance at the values featuring North-Eastern and Central regions is very instructive. Actually, within this subgroup the first rank goes to the Abruzzi region, immediately followed by Emilia-Romagna and Marches, while the Umbria region instead features a low coefficient. At a comparative level it is worth noting that the speed at which innovation capabilities spread within the Abruzzi region is 76.6% greater than that of Piedmont and 40% than that of Lombardy. For what concerns the Emilia-Romagna region the magnitude of the difference is of



1  
2  
3  
4 +55.1% and +23% as compared to Lombardy and Piedmont respectively. The Marches  
5  
6 region has a  $\beta$  value 25.2% higher than that of Piedmont, but almost equal to that of  
7  
8 Lombardy. It must be also noted that the rate of appearance in Liguria is in between that  
9  
10 of Piedmont and that Lombardy The results of the econometric estimations therefore  
11  
12 provide strong support not only to the idea that the emergence of innovation capabilities  
13  
14 followed a logistic path, but also to the hypothesis concerning cross-regional  
15  
16 differences. Some regions in the North-East-Centre, specifically Emilia-Romagna,  
17  
18 Marches and Abruzzi are characterized by diffusion rates systematically higher than  
19  
20 those of Piedmont, and equal or higher to those of Lombardy. The Emilia-Romagna  
21  
22 region, in particular, can be considered as the first region in the North-East-Centre side  
23  
24 of Italy in which the diffusion of innovation capabilities took place, while Abruzzi and  
25  
26 Marches seem to follow it with a slight delay<sup>14</sup>.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 As far as the relationship between the emergence of innovation capabilities and the  
36  
37 change in the economic structure is concerned, Equation (4) has been estimated through  
38  
39 OLS with robust standard errors. The estimation yielded the following results:  
40  
41  
42  
43

$$44 \beta = 0.157 + 3.911 \cdot MAN^{**} - 5.610 \cdot TRA + 1.128 \cdot FIN \quad (6)$$

45  
46  
47 (2.89) (-1.57) (0.59)  
48  
49  
50

51  $F = 2.93$ ,  $t$  of Student between parentheses. As expected the coefficient on the growth  
52  
53 rate of the employment share of manufacturing industries is positive and significant,  
54  
55 while the coefficients for the two service industries are not statistically significant. The  
56  
57 evidence of higher diffusion rates of innovation capabilities in some NEC regions is  
58  
59 hence to be related to the evidence, already presented in Section 2, about the enduring  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 growth of manufacturing activities in the area. This process could be thus interpreted as  
5  
6 a specific stage in the development of manufacturing activities, according to which  
7  
8 learning dynamics and the increasing international competition are likely to foster  
9  
10 innovative efforts, as long as technological opportunities are at the same time on hand.  
11  
12

13  
14  
15  
16 In this direction the availability of an accessible knowledge stock is supposed to be  
17  
18 closely related to the diffusion of innovation capabilities. To this purpose Equation (5)  
19  
20 has been estimated through OLS with Huber-White heteroscedastic consistent standard  
21  
22 errors. The econometric test yielded the following result:  
23  
24

$$25 \beta = 0.172 - 0.026 \cdot GRGFI + 0.076 \cdot 10^{-3} \cdot GRPRD^{***} + 0.379 \cdot 10^{-3} \cdot GRPUR^{***} \quad (7)$$

26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

(-1.06)                      (3.05)                      (3.74)

35 F=84.9, *t* of Student between parentheses (coefficients on R&D are both significant at  
36  
37 1%). It is worth emphasizing that the coefficient on public R&D is far larger than that  
38  
39 on private one. This confirms that faster rates of diffusion of innovation, and faster rates  
40  
41 of public R&D, are at the heart of the process leading to faster growth rates in late-  
42  
43 industrializing regions. The stronger impact of public R&D also suggests that the  
44  
45 absorption of formal inventive activity within firms' productive routine doesn't imply  
46  
47 necessarily a parallel process of dimensional growth. It is likely that within areas  
48  
49 characterized by local capitalism, firms may also outsource R&D services, particularly  
50  
51 relying on the public knowledge infrastructure. In this direction, it is worth mentioning  
52  
53 that also the organization of public R&D labs (say the National Research Council) is  
54  
55 becoming more and more functional to the needs of local production systems, trying to  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 exploit the advantages of the competencies and the reputation that such areas gained in  
5  
6 some particular markets (CNR, 2005).  
7  
8  
9

## 10 11 **6 Concluding Remarks** 12

13  
14 In this paper we tried to shed new light onto the persistent process of diffusion of  
15 manufacturing activities, integrating the analysis with the study of the regional patterns  
16 of innovation within the NEC regions. While in the 1970s the explanations were mainly  
17 based on aspects related to institutional conditions and the structure of local economic  
18 and social systems, we proposed an interpretation in the light of the economics of  
19 innovation. The combination between the diffusion theory and the concept of growth  
20 poles has allowed us to appreciate the emerging development of innovation capabilities  
21 within the late-industrializing regions.  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34  
35 Growth poles theory suggest that regions are dominated by propulsive industries, which  
36 act as catalyst to economic performances of close economic activities. Core industries  
37 however are not evenly distributed across regions and they are not static, as mature  
38 industries within regional contexts are possibly characterized by slackening growth  
39 rates, while some other industries gain momentum (PERROUX, 1955; FUÀ 1983).  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 The emergence of innovation capabilities within a regional context is strictly related to  
51 the relative stage of development of the propulsive industry and of its related industries.  
52  
53 Therefore, regions in which the process of industrialization occurred with some delay,  
54  
55 are also likely to experience a delayed emergence of innovation capabilities within the  
56 manufacturing sectors. The competences about how to innovate spread over time as the  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 outcome of learning dynamics, in which local interactions and networking play a crucial  
5  
6  
7 role.

8  
9  
10  
11 The results obtained through the analysis of the diffusion of patent applications strongly  
12  
13 support the hypothesis according to which the NEC regions are still exploiting the  
14  
15 advantages of the late industrialization. The exploitation of the innovative potential  
16  
17 stemming from learning dynamics is actually fed by the parallel growth of technological  
18  
19 opportunities and the strengthening of the productive system. Indeed the thickening of  
20  
21 the manufacturing production system and the increasing availability of accessible  
22  
23 knowledge stock proved to be positive related to the rate of diffusion of innovation  
24  
25 capabilities across Italian regions.  
26  
27  
28  
29

30  
31  
32  
33 It is also fair to note that in the econometric test the impact of public R&D expenditure  
34  
35 on the speed of diffusion of innovation capabilities, turned out to be far higher than that  
36  
37 of private R&D expenditure. This suggests that the idiosyncratic features of the regions  
38  
39 mostly affected by the process played a crucial role. The increasing availability of  
40  
41 public knowledge represents a competitive advantage, provided the existence of  
42  
43 conditions enabling knowledge communication and absorption. This is the case for  
44  
45 many areas in the NEC regions, wherein the dynamics typical of industrial districts have  
46  
47 allowed for the evolution towards either technology districts, or technology-based  
48  
49 industrial districts.  
50  
51  
52

53  
54  
55  
56 Along the lines of Kuznets, industrial development does not take a unique shape, but  
57  
58 followed different paths according to the specific regional characteristics of economic  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 activities. The capitalization of the benefits stemming from innovation can be, in this  
5  
6 light, interpreted as a distinct stage in the industrialization process, which characterizes  
7  
8 an industry as old enough to properly manage emerging technological opportunities, but  
9  
10 not so mature to incur in the slackening of growth rates.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

## 23 NOTES

24  
25  
26  
27  
28 <sup>1</sup> Part of the background research for this paper has been carried out during my visiting periods at the  
29  
30 CRIC – University of Manchester and at the Columbia University of New York. Preliminary versions was  
31  
32 presented at the CESPRI lunch seminar at the Bocconi University of Milan on 10 May 2006, the CRIC  
33  
34 “Monday afternoon” seminar at the University of Manchester on 7 July 2006 and the Annual CCC  
35  
36 Doctoral Colloquium held at the GeorgiaTech College of Management in Atlanta on 13-15 April 2007. I  
37  
38 wish to thank Cristiano Antonelli, Davide Consoli, Giovanni Dosi, Roberto Mazzoleni, Stan Metcalfe,  
39  
40 Dick Nelson, Pier Paolo Patrucco and two anonymous referees for their useful comments. The usual  
41  
42 disclaimers on errors and inadequacies apply.

43 <sup>2</sup> It is fair to quote also the pretty similar analysis of industry lifecycles proposed by KLEPPER (1997).

44  
45 <sup>3</sup> The theory about the retardation of growth rates of mature industries was elaborated by KUZNETS  
46  
47 (1930) by considering the evolution of industries within different countries. Like all models it maybe  
48  
49 provides a simplified view of reality, which nonetheless enhances the understanding of evolutionary  
50  
51 processes at aggregate levels. This perspective was then successfully articulated also at the regional level  
52  
53 by Giorgio Fuà and subsequently by the scholars belonging to the so-called School of Ancona, e.g. FUÀ  
54  
55 (1977), GAROFOLI (1981) and PETTENATI (1991).  
56

57 <sup>4</sup> The grouping of Italian regions is as follows. North-West: Piedmont, Lombardy, Valle d’Aosta and  
58  
59 Liguria. North-East: Veneto, Emilia-Romagna, Friuli Venezia-Giulia, Trentino Alto-Adige. Centre:  
60

Tuscany, Abruzzi, Marches, Lazio, Umbria and Molise. South: Campania, Apulia, Calabria, Basilicata, Sicilia and Sardegna.

<sup>5</sup> The empirical analysis carried out by GAROFOLI (1994) addresses the issue of firms creation very exhaustively.

$$S_{i,t} = \left( \frac{IL_{ijt}}{\sum_i IL_{ijt}} \right) / \left( \frac{\sum_j IL_{ijt}}{\sum_i \sum_j IL_{ijt}} \right)$$

<sup>7</sup> ISIC 15-37.

<sup>8</sup> The debate about the nature of innovation activities within service sectors have recently received increasing attention. TETHER (2005) and CONSOLI (2007) offer good critical syntheses of it. EVANGELISTA and SIRILLI (1998) and EVANGELISTA (2000) present the Italian evidence, emphasizing the very marginal role played by patents in innovation dynamics within service sectors.

<sup>9</sup> Patent applications are classified according to the inventor's residence address.

<sup>10</sup> As also emphasized by KUZNETS (1930).

<sup>11</sup> Time series concerning public and private R&D expenditure at the regional level are available since 1982 on. Moreover, it is worth noting that public expenditure is not comprehensive of expenditure by Universities, as these data are available since 1993 on.

<sup>12</sup> S-shaped curves were used also in the study of business cycles, many years before they entered the study of technological change. It is fair to recall, in this direction, the works by KUZNETS (1930) and MERTON (1935).

<sup>13</sup> The fit of the logistic equation through linear techniques allow for estimating two parameters, requiring the ceiling to be specified ex-ante. As a reference, we used the overall maximum value of the dependent variable, and we multiplied it by the annual average growth rate of added value in manufacturing industries.

<sup>14</sup> These results are consistent with the empirical analyses carried out by PATRUCCO (2005) concerning the Emilia-Romagna technology district, the works by BELUSSI (2003) and by BELUSSI and ARCANGELI (1998) concerning both the North-Eastern regions, and BELUSSI (1999), QUATRARO (2005) and BOSCHMA and TER VAL (2005) for more recent evidence about Southern regions. The work at the aggregate level by CAINELLI and DE LISO (2005) is also particularly interesting in

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

---

pinpointing innovation dynamics within Italian industrial districts. It is worth stressing that in some contexts the evolution of the industrial structure is led by the emergence of groups of firms within the districts, i.e. by peculiar forms of evolution of local capitalism (BRIOSCHI *et al.*, 2002; CAINELLI *et al.*, 2006).

For Peer Review Only

## References

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 ACS Z.J., L. ANSELIN and A. VARGA (2002) Patents and innovation counts as measures of  
12 regional production of new knoweldge, *Research Policy*, **31**, 1069-1085.

13  
14  
15  
16 ANDERSEN, B. (1999) The hunt for s-shaped growth paths in technological innovation: A  
17 patent study, *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, **9**, 487-526.

18  
19  
20 ANTONELLI C. (1999) *The microdynamics of technological change*, Routledge, London.

21  
22  
23 ANTONELLI C. (2000) Collective knowledge communication and innovation: The evidence  
24 of technological districts, *Regional Studies*, **34**, 535-547.

25  
26  
27 ANTONELLI C. and QUATRARO F. (2007), Information and communication technologies  
28 and productivity growth: How to disentangle creative adoption from radical innovation. The Italian  
29 evidence, 1981-2001, Department of Economics, University of Torino, mimeo.

30  
31  
32 ARORA, A., A. FOSFURI. and A. GAMBARDELLA, A. (2001) *Markets for technology*,  
33 Cambridge, MIT Press.

34  
35  
36 ASHEIM B. T. (1996) Industrial districts as 'learning regions': A condition for prosperity,  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
*European Planning Studies*, **4**, 379-400.

44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
BECATTINI G. (1989) *Modelli Locali di Sviluppo*, Bologna, Il Mulino.

46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
BELUSSI F. (1999) Path Dependency vs. Industrial Dynamics: An Analysis of Two  
Heterogeneous Districts, *Human Systems Management*, **18**, 161-174.

51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
BELUSSI F. (2003) The Generation of Contextual Knowledge. The Case of the Packaging  
Machinery Industry in The Bologna District in Belussi, F., Gottardi, G., and Rullani, E. (Eds) *The  
Technological Evolution of Industrial Districts*, Boston, Kluwer Academic.

58  
59  
60  
BELUSSI, F. and F. ARCANGELI (1998) A Typology of Networks: Flexible and  
Evolutionary Firms, *Research Policy* **27**, 415-28.



1  
2  
3 BOSHMA R. (2005) Proximity and Innovation: A critical assessment, *Regional Studies*, **39**,  
4  
5 61-74.  
6

7  
8 BOSCHMA, R. and A.L.J. TER VAL (2005), Knowledge Networks and Innovative  
9  
10 Performances in an Industrial District. The Case of a Footwear District in the South of Italy, Papers  
11  
12 in Evolutionary Economic Geography n. 06.01, University of Utrecht.  
13

14  
15 BRIOSCHI, F., M. S. BRIOSCHI and G. CAINELLI, G. (2002) From the industrial district to  
16  
17 the district group: An insight into the revolution of local capitalism in Italy, *Regional Studies*, **36**,  
18  
19 1037-1052.  
20

21  
22 BRUSCO, S., 1982, The Emilian model: Productive decentralization and social integration,  
23  
24 *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, **6**, 167-184.  
25

26  
27 BURNS A. F. (1934) *Production trends in the United States since 1870*, Boston, NBER.  
28

29  
30 CAINELLI, G. and N. DE LISO (2005) Innovation in industrial districts: Evidence from  
31  
32 Italy, *Industry and Innovation*, 383-398.  
33

34  
35 CAINELLI, G., D. IACOBUCCI and MORGANTI, E. (2006) Spatial agglomeration and  
36  
37 business groups: New evidence from industrial districts, *Regional Studies*, **40**, 507-518.  
38

39  
40 CNR (National Research Council) (2005), Piano Annuale 2005,  
41  
42 [http://www.cnr.it/documenti/DocumentiProgrammatici/PA2005\\_07MaterialieDispositivi.pdf](http://www.cnr.it/documenti/DocumentiProgrammatici/PA2005_07MaterialieDispositivi.pdf)  
43

44  
45 CONSOLI D. (2007) Services and Systemic Innovation: A Cross-Sectoral Analysis, *Journal*  
46  
47 *of Institutional Economics*, **3**, 71-89.  
48

49  
50 COOKE P., M. URANGA and G. ETXEBARRIA (1997) Regional innovation systems:  
51  
52 Institutional and organizational dimensions, *Research Policy*, **26**, 475-491.  
53

54  
55 DOSI G. (1988) Sources, procedures and microeconomic effects of innovation, *Economic*  
56  
57 *Journal*, **26**, 1120-1171.  
58

59  
60 EVANGELISTA R. (2000) Sectoral patterns of technological change in services, *Economics*  
*of Innovation and New Technology*, **9**, 183-221.

- 1  
2  
3 EVANGELISTA, R. and G. SIRILLI (1998) Innovation in the service sector. results from the  
4 Italian innovation survey, *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, **58**, 251-269.  
5  
6  
7  
8 FOSS N. J. (1996) Higher-order industrial capabilities and competitive advantage, *Journal of*  
9  
10 *Industrial Studies*, **3**, 1-20.  
11  
12  
13 FUÀ G. (ed) (1991a) *Orientamenti per la Politica del Territorio*, Bologna, il Mulino.  
14  
15  
16 FUÀ, G (1991b) The environmental bases of diffuse industrialization, *International Studies of*  
17  
18 *Management & Organization*, vol. XXI, n. 1, pp. 5-20.  
19  
20  
21 FUÀ G. (1983) Industrializzazione nel Nord Est e nel Centro, in G. Fuà e C. Zacchia (ed.),  
22  
23 *Industrializzazione senza fratture*, Bologna, il Mulino, pp. 7-46.  
24  
25  
26 FUÀ G. (1977) Sviluppo ritardato e dualismo, *Moneta e Credito*, pp. 355-366.  
27  
28  
29 FUÀ G. and C. ZACCHIA (eds.) (1983) *Industrializzazione senza fratture*, Bologna, il  
30  
31  
32 Mulino.  
33  
34  
35 GAROFOLI G. (1994) New firm formation and regional development: The Italian case,  
36  
37 *Regional Studies*, **28**, 381-393.  
38  
39  
40 GAROFOLI G. (1981) Lo Sviluppo delle aree periferiche nell'economia italiana degli anni  
41  
42 Settanta, *L'Industria*, a. II, n. 3, pp. 391-404.  
43  
44  
45  
46 GAROFOLI G. (1983) Aree di specializzazione produttiva e piccole imprese in Europa,  
47  
48 *Economia Marche*, a. II, n. 1, pp. 3-43.  
49  
50  
51  
52 GRILICHES, Z. (1957) Hybrid corn: An exploration in the economics of technological  
53  
54 change, *Econometrica*, **25**, 501-522.  
55  
56  
57 GRILICHES Z. (1990) Patent statistics as economic indicators: A survey, *Journal of*  
58  
59 *Economic Literature*, **28**, 1661-1707.  
60  
61  
62 HALL B. H. (2004) *Innovation and Diffusion*, NBER Working Paper No 10212, NBER,  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

1  
2  
3 HALL, B.H., Z. GRILICHES and J. A. HAUSMAN (1986) Patents and R and D: Is There a  
4  
5 Lag?, *International Economic Review*, **27**, 265-283.  
6

7  
8 JAFFE A. B. (2000), The US patent system in transition: Policy innovation and the  
9  
10 innovation process, *Research Policy*, **29**, 531-557.  
11

12 KLEPPER S. (1997) Industry life cycles, *Industrial and Corporate Change*, **6**, 145-181.

13  
14 KORTUM S. and J. LERNER (2003) Unravelling the Patent Paradox, AEA Annual Meeting,  
15  
16 Washington, DC, 2003.  
17

18  
19 KUZNETS S. (1930) *Secular Movements in Production and Prices*, Boston, Houghton  
20  
21 Mifflin.  
22

23  
24 LALL S. (1992) Technological capabilities and industrialization, *World Development*, **20**,  
25  
26 165-186.  
27

28  
29 LAWSON C. (1999) Towards a competence theory of the region, *Cambridge Journal of*  
30  
31 *Economics*, **23**, 151-166.  
32

33  
34 LAWSON C. and E. LORENZ (1999) Collective learning, tacit knowledge and regional  
35  
36 innovative capacity, *Regional Studies*, **33**, 305-317.  
37

38  
39 LEVIN R.C., A.K. KLEVORICH, R.R. NELSON and S.G. WINTER (1987), Appropriating  
40  
41 the returns from industrial research and development, *Brooking Papers on Economic Activity*, **3**,  
42  
43 783-831.  
44

45 LUNDVALL B.A. (ed.) (1992) *National Systems of Innovation*, London, Pinters.

46  
47 MANSFIELD E. (1961) Technical change and the rate of imitation, *Econometrica*, **29**, 741-  
48  
49 766.  
50

51  
52 MERTON R.K. (1935) Fluctuations in the rate of industrial invention, *Quarterly Journal of*  
53  
54 *Economics*, **49**, 454-474.  
55

56  
57 PACI M. (1973) *Mercato del Lavoro e Classi Sociali in Italia. Ricerche sulla Composizione*  
58  
59 *del Proletariato*, Bologna, il Mulino.  
60

PACI M. (1992) *Il Mutamento della Struttura Sociale in Italia*, Bologna, il Mulino.

1  
2  
3 PATRUCCO P.P. (2003) Institutional variety, networking and knowledge exchange:  
4  
5 Communication and innovation in the case of the Brianza technological district, *Regional Studies*,  
6  
7 **37**, 159-172.

10 PATRUCCO P.P. (2005) The emergence of technology systems: Knowledge production and  
11  
12 distribution in the case of the Emilian plastics district, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, **29**, 37-56.

15 PAVITT K. (1985) Patent statistics as indicators of innovative activities: Possibilities and  
16  
17 problems, *Scientometrics*, **7**, 77-99.

20 PEETERS, C. and B. VAN POTTELSBERGHE (2006) Innovation strategy and the patenting  
21  
22 behavior of firms, *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, **16**, 109-135.

24 PERROUX F. (1955) Note sur la notion de 'pole de croissance', *Économie Appliquée*, **7**, 307-  
25  
26 320.

29 PETTENATI P. (1991) I Modelli di Organizzazione Economica del Territorio, in Fuà, (ed).,  
30  
31 *Orientamenti per la Politica del Territorio*, Bologna, Il Mulino.

34 QUATRARO, F. (2005) A Schumpeterian approach to innovation clustering in a low-tech  
35  
36 technology in a peripheral region: The case of garments in Mezzogiorno, *Innovation: Management*,  
37  
38 *Policy & Practice*, **7**, 435-450.

41 QUATRARO F. (2007) Change vs. decline: A comparative analysis of the evolution of TFP  
42  
43 in Italian regions, with a particular attention to the case of Turin, *International Review of*  
44  
45 *Economics*, **54**, 86-105.

48 ROMIJN H. and M. ALBU (2002) Innovation, networking and proximity: Lessons from  
49  
50 small high technology firms in the UK, *Regional Studies*, **36**, 81-86.

53 SCHUMPETER J. A. (1911) (1934) *The theory of economic development*, Galaxy Books,  
54  
55 Oxford.

57 SCHUMPETER J. A. (1939) *Business cycles. A theoretical, historical and statistical analysis*  
58  
59 *of the capitalist process*, McGraw Hill, New York and London.

60  
SCHUMPETER J. A. (1942) *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*, Unwin, London.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

SCHUMPETER J. A. (1947) The creative response in economic history, *Journal of Economic History*, **7**, 149-159.

TEECE D, G. PISANO and A. SHUEN (1997) Dynamics capabilities and strategic management, *Strategic Management Journal*, **18**, 509-533.

TETHER B. (2005) Do services innovate (differently)? Insights from the European innobarometer survey, *Industry and Innovation*, **12**, 153-184.

THOMAS M. J. (1975) Growth pole theory, technological change and regional economic growth, *Papers in Regional Science*, **34**, 3-25.

WEBSTER E. (2004) Firms' decisions to innovate and innovation routines, *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, **13**, 733-745.

Figure 1 – The Conceptual Model





Figure 2 – Diffusion of Innovating Capabilities in Early- and Late-Industrialized Regions



Source: Elaborations on EPO and ISTAT Data.

Note: Patent Applications per 1000 Workers on Y-axis.

Table 1 - Regional Specialization Index for Manufacturing Sectors<sup>†</sup>

	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Piedmont	1.362	1.359	1.381	1.369	1.319	1.333	1.350	1.376	1.389	1.380	1.358	1.313	1.290	1.257	1.277	1.291	1.290	1.300	1.306	1.285	1.280	1.278
Aosta Valley	0.720	0.737	0.781	0.823	0.786	0.744	0.711	0.655	0.668	0.594	0.578	0.583	0.579	0.558	0.561	0.531	0.538	0.548	0.567	0.554	0.536	0.548
Lombardy	1.505	1.503	1.499	1.500	1.478	1.469	1.459	1.440	1.407	1.416	1.445	1.416	1.428	1.447	1.434	1.404	1.395	1.377	1.381	1.361	1.355	1.355
Liguria	0.783	0.769	0.756	0.758	0.740	0.698	0.681	0.700	0.657	0.670	0.659	0.652	0.658	0.619	0.631	0.627	0.626	0.615	0.602	0.615	0.655	0.644
<i>North West</i>	<b>1.377</b>	<b>1.374</b>	<b>1.379</b>	<b>1.378</b>	<b>1.346</b>	<b>1.339</b>	<b>1.338</b>	<b>1.337</b>	<b>1.317</b>	<b>1.321</b>	<b>1.333</b>	<b>1.303</b>	<b>1.305</b>	<b>1.303</b>	<b>1.304</b>	<b>1.290</b>	<b>1.285</b>	<b>1.275</b>	<b>1.278</b>	<b>1.262</b>	<b>1.261</b>	<b>1.259</b>
Trentino-Alto Adige	0.657	0.655	0.641	0.643	0.696	0.656	0.654	0.697	0.724	0.698	0.691	0.688	0.725	0.709	0.708	0.701	0.709	0.718	0.705	0.713	0.716	0.733
Veneto	1.230	1.198	1.213	1.213	1.265	1.343	1.320	1.307	1.326	1.344	1.346	1.361	1.349	1.383	1.360	1.372	1.384	1.397	1.397	1.403	1.381	1.370
Friuli-Venezia Giulia	0.971	0.898	0.911	0.909	0.910	0.927	0.953	0.978	0.993	1.001	0.993	1.014	0.999	1.016	1.005	1.054	1.082	1.101	1.080	1.049	1.061	1.036
Emilia-Romagna	1.112	1.141	1.157	1.162	1.213	1.220	1.222	1.270	1.280	1.274	1.247	1.196	1.200	1.207	1.215	1.218	1.218	1.222	1.233	1.242	1.249	1.257
<i>North East</i>	<b>1.101</b>	<b>1.090</b>	<b>1.104</b>	<b>1.105</b>	<b>1.150</b>	<b>1.183</b>	<b>1.179</b>	<b>1.200</b>	<b>1.216</b>	<b>1.219</b>	<b>1.208</b>	<b>1.196</b>	<b>1.195</b>	<b>1.212</b>	<b>1.205</b>	<b>1.216</b>	<b>1.225</b>	<b>1.235</b>	<b>1.235</b>	<b>1.239</b>	<b>1.234</b>	<b>1.231</b>
Tuscany	1.155	1.176	1.161	1.213	1.199	1.212	1.230	1.187	1.167	1.104	1.126	1.132	1.168	1.170	1.162	1.157	1.158	1.150	1.153	1.131	1.131	1.142
Umbria	1.133	1.072	1.075	1.132	1.135	1.106	1.049	0.959	1.014	1.006	1.005	1.042	1.057	1.020	1.001	0.992	0.998	0.990	1.011	1.026	1.052	1.058
Marche	1.154	1.133	1.168	1.186	1.224	1.239	1.239	1.342	1.323	1.365	1.328	1.355	1.333	1.371	1.329	1.339	1.347	1.332	1.349	1.376	1.351	1.390
Lazio	0.591	0.591	0.581	0.569	0.583	0.555	0.574	0.546	0.536	0.546	0.530	0.551	0.547	0.542	0.544	0.528	0.521	0.518	0.514	0.517	0.525	0.517
Abruzzi	0.799	0.802	0.792	0.814	0.831	0.811	0.820	0.805	0.831	0.812	0.830	0.926	0.910	0.925	0.935	0.935	0.975	0.986	0.988	1.021	1.034	1.013
Molise	0.505	0.532	0.526	0.536	0.569	0.565	0.541	0.642	0.683	0.696	0.699	0.673	0.735	0.726	0.737	0.763	0.776	0.787	0.817	0.833	0.820	0.837
<i>Central Italy</i>	<b>0.913</b>	<b>0.914</b>	<b>0.906</b>	<b>0.918</b>	<b>0.922</b>	<b>0.911</b>	<b>0.919</b>	<b>0.899</b>	<b>0.888</b>	<b>0.881</b>	<b>0.872</b>	<b>0.890</b>	<b>0.897</b>	<b>0.898</b>	<b>0.891</b>	<b>0.883</b>	<b>0.882</b>	<b>0.875</b>	<b>0.877</b>	<b>0.876</b>	<b>0.879</b>	<b>0.884</b>
Campania	0.689	0.699	0.700	0.704	0.690	0.674	0.622	0.631	0.639	0.637	0.632	0.688	0.679	0.667	0.676	0.685	0.676	0.682	0.666	0.682	0.680	0.688
Puglia	0.665	0.694	0.682	0.687	0.692	0.701	0.726	0.727	0.743	0.728	0.713	0.717	0.727	0.686	0.694	0.694	0.684	0.708	0.720	0.719	0.706	0.700
Basilicata	0.441	0.436	0.465	0.453	0.439	0.458	0.477	0.429	0.420	0.440	0.498	0.493	0.482	0.492	0.544	0.657	0.678	0.685	0.698	0.748	0.793	0.837
Calabria	0.363	0.369	0.387	0.370	0.388	0.346	0.388	0.362	0.342	0.312	0.348	0.389	0.393	0.359	0.371	0.377	0.366	0.363	0.351	0.358	0.385	0.392
Sicily	0.502	0.507	0.507	0.493	0.482	0.485	0.471	0.457	0.462	0.482	0.460	0.476	0.466	0.465	0.467	0.457	0.446	0.452	0.450	0.467	0.470	0.471
Sardinia	0.580	0.567	0.542	0.554	0.574	0.580	0.560	0.551	0.536	0.537	0.563	0.560	0.569	0.577	0.527	0.522	0.511	0.496	0.491	0.483	0.495	0.532
<i>South</i>	<b>0.598</b>	<b>0.606</b>	<b>0.605</b>	<b>0.605</b>	<b>0.604</b>	<b>0.597</b>	<b>0.588</b>	<b>0.583</b>	<b>0.589</b>	<b>0.586</b>	<b>0.588</b>	<b>0.617</b>	<b>0.615</b>	<b>0.601</b>	<b>0.606</b>	<b>0.610</b>	<b>0.605</b>	<b>0.612</b>	<b>0.609</b>	<b>0.622</b>	<b>0.625</b>	<b>0.630</b>

Source: Elaboration on ISTAT data.

Note: † ISIC codes 15-37



Table 2 – Patent Applications per 1000 Workers, by Region, 1980 – 2001.

	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Piedmont	0.017	0.057	0.061	0.093	0.114	0.106	0.131	0.154	0.165	0.185	0.185	0.205	0.204	0.208	0.180	0.191	0.207	0.233	0.222	0.250	0.280	0.250
Aosta Valley	0.000	0.000	0.034	0.034	0.000	0.017	0.064	0.000	0.017	0.050	0.065	0.064	0.096	0.017	0.034	0.000	0.053	0.070	0.017	0.018	0.034	0.067
Lombardy	0.025	0.053	0.071	0.076	0.096	0.106	0.129	0.145	0.191	0.225	0.209	0.205	0.219	0.223	0.195	0.220	0.216	0.234	0.263	0.288	0.305	0.314
Liguria	0.008	0.022	0.020	0.032	0.039	0.048	0.064	0.052	0.074	0.074	0.075	0.058	0.087	0.116	0.128	0.133	0.161	0.134	0.139	0.153	0.146	0.178
<i>North West</i>	<b>0.021</b>	<b>0.051</b>	<b>0.062</b>	<b>0.076</b>	<b>0.094</b>	<b>0.099</b>	<b>0.122</b>	<b>0.136</b>	<b>0.170</b>	<b>0.197</b>	<b>0.188</b>	<b>0.189</b>	<b>0.201</b>	<b>0.206</b>	<b>0.183</b>	<b>0.202</b>	<b>0.206</b>	<b>0.223</b>	<b>0.237</b>	<b>0.262</b>	<b>0.281</b>	<b>0.281</b>
Trentino-Alto Adige	0.009	0.016	0.018	0.025	0.034	0.020	0.020	0.029	0.041	0.038	0.061	0.065	0.038	0.051	0.077	0.070	0.094	0.081	0.081	0.094	0.075	0.117
Veneto	0.009	0.024	0.025	0.042	0.043	0.055	0.076	0.082	0.099	0.090	0.120	0.120	0.117	0.116	0.120	0.127	0.153	0.138	0.147	0.202	0.198	0.196
Friuli-Venezia Giulia	0.030	0.032	0.071	0.071	0.082	0.113	0.097	0.100	0.159	0.196	0.175	0.183	0.199	0.181	0.164	0.196	0.201	0.218	0.197	0.206	0.226	0.223
Emilia-Romagna	0.018	0.036	0.050	0.070	0.055	0.061	0.092	0.093	0.126	0.140	0.127	0.175	0.173	0.188	0.177	0.188	0.233	0.216	0.233	0.292	0.314	0.317
<i>North East</i>	<b>0.015</b>	<b>0.029</b>	<b>0.039</b>	<b>0.054</b>	<b>0.051</b>	<b>0.061</b>	<b>0.079</b>	<b>0.083</b>	<b>0.110</b>	<b>0.116</b>	<b>0.123</b>	<b>0.143</b>	<b>0.140</b>	<b>0.144</b>	<b>0.143</b>	<b>0.153</b>	<b>0.183</b>	<b>0.171</b>	<b>0.179</b>	<b>0.227</b>	<b>0.234</b>	<b>0.238</b>
Tuscany	0.007	0.015	0.028	0.027	0.035	0.043	0.053	0.064	0.060	0.066	0.090	0.094	0.098	0.101	0.078	0.078	0.095	0.069	0.099	0.102	0.128	0.119
Umbria	0.012	0.034	0.012	0.041	0.029	0.039	0.041	0.032	0.058	0.055	0.041	0.075	0.040	0.058	0.024	0.067	0.058	0.055	0.080	0.104	0.124	0.122
Marche	0.002	0.008	0.013	0.028	0.025	0.027	0.016	0.036	0.051	0.063	0.066	0.067	0.077	0.054	0.076	0.082	0.060	0.084	0.096	0.108	0.128	0.159
Lazio	0.010	0.016	0.020	0.037	0.027	0.033	0.051	0.049	0.047	0.058	0.065	0.086	0.085	0.067	0.068	0.071	0.065	0.073	0.082	0.093	0.107	0.104
Abruzzi	0.000	0.009	0.013	0.009	0.013	0.011	0.015	0.019	0.021	0.031	0.046	0.030	0.043	0.036	0.030	0.025	0.069	0.114	0.141	0.167	0.239	0.192
Molise	0.000	0.017	0.017	0.000	0.009	0.000	0.000	0.016	0.008	0.026	0.008	0.009	0.017	0.009	0.027	0.000	0.018	0.036	0.036	0.054	0.026	0.017
<i>Central Italy</i>	<b>0.007</b>	<b>0.015</b>	<b>0.020</b>	<b>0.030</b>	<b>0.028</b>	<b>0.033</b>	<b>0.042</b>	<b>0.047</b>	<b>0.049</b>	<b>0.057</b>	<b>0.068</b>	<b>0.079</b>	<b>0.080</b>	<b>0.071</b>	<b>0.065</b>	<b>0.068</b>	<b>0.072</b>	<b>0.075</b>	<b>0.093</b>	<b>0.104</b>	<b>0.127</b>	<b>0.122</b>
Campania	0.001	0.005	0.006	0.005	0.004	0.006	0.006	0.009	0.012	0.015	0.014	0.011	0.016	0.023	0.020	0.024	0.019	0.025	0.026	0.031	0.040	0.035
Puglia	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.005	0.007	0.005	0.003	0.011	0.014	0.011	0.015	0.007	0.011	0.013	0.012	0.014	0.016	0.015	0.025	0.023	0.029	0.041
Basilicata	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.010	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.000	0.029	0.015	0.010	0.000	0.016	0.000	0.011	0.016	0.016	0.032	0.095	0.088	0.071	0.066
Calabria	0.003	0.002	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.005	0.005	0.014	0.011	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.008	0.009	0.008	0.003	0.002	0.016	0.010	0.017	0.021	0.013
Sicily	0.000	0.004	0.003	0.005	0.004	0.006	0.010	0.006	0.019	0.017	0.016	0.025	0.018	0.017	0.021	0.036	0.045	0.035	0.030	0.030	0.059	0.054
Sardinia	0.000	0.008	0.002	0.004	0.006	0.010	0.006	0.014	0.014	0.010	0.010	0.015	0.012	0.016	0.005	0.011	0.018	0.014	0.023	0.018	0.032	0.022
<i>South</i>	<b>0.001</b>	<b>0.004</b>	<b>0.004</b>	<b>0.005</b>	<b>0.005</b>	<b>0.006</b>	<b>0.006</b>	<b>0.009</b>	<b>0.015</b>	<b>0.013</b>	<b>0.013</b>	<b>0.013</b>	<b>0.014</b>	<b>0.016</b>	<b>0.015</b>	<b>0.021</b>	<b>0.023</b>	<b>0.024</b>	<b>0.027</b>	<b>0.028</b>	<b>0.041</b>	<b>0.038</b>
<b>Italy</b>	<b>0.011</b>	<b>0.026</b>	<b>0.032</b>	<b>0.042</b>	<b>0.046</b>	<b>0.051</b>	<b>0.064</b>	<b>0.071</b>	<b>0.089</b>	<b>0.100</b>	<b>0.101</b>	<b>0.108</b>	<b>0.111</b>	<b>0.112</b>	<b>0.104</b>	<b>0.114</b>	<b>0.124</b>	<b>0.127</b>	<b>0.138</b>	<b>0.159</b>	<b>0.174</b>	<b>0.173</b>

Source: Elaborations on ISTAT and EPO data.

Table 3 – Patent Applications Growth Rates, by Region†

	1980-1984	1985-1989	1990-1994	1995-1999
Piedmont	0.307	0.099	-0.013	0.047
Aosta Valley	-	0.183	-0.116	-
Lombardy	0.224	0.137	-0.019	0.050
Liguria	0.251	0.069	0.075	0.025
<i>North West</i>	<b>0.250</b>	<b>0.123</b>	<b>-0.012</b>	<b>0.048</b>
Trentino-Alto Adige	0.220	0.116	0.036	0.057
Veneto	0.272	0.095	-0.003	0.083
Friuli-Venezia Giulia	0.169	0.096	-0.021	0.011
Emilia-Romagna	0.186	0.144	0.051	0.078
<i>North East</i>	0.209	0.117	0.021	0.071
Tuscany	0.281	0.069	-0.025	0.049
Umbria	0.153	0.063	-0.093	0.082
Marche	0.462	0.147	0.015	0.050
Lazio	0.186	0.093	0.004	0.051
Abruzzi	-	0.183	-0.083	0.312
Molise	-	-	0.183	-
<i>Central Italy</i>	<b>0.243</b>	<b>0.093</b>	<b>-0.012</b>	<b>0.074</b>
Campania	0.231	0.159	0.058	0.047
Puglia	0.251	0.127	-0.037	0.079
Basilicata	-	0.183	0.000	0.289
Calabria	-0.116	0.000	0.085	0.268
Sicily	-	0.170	0.030	-0.025
Sardinia	-	0.030	-0.116	0.085
<i>South</i>	<b>0.257</b>	<b>0.134</b>	<b>0.020</b>	<b>0.051</b>
<b>Italy</b>	<b>0.239</b>	<b>0.118</b>	<b>-0.002</b>	<b>0.059</b>

Source: Elaborations on EPO data.

Note: † Missing values are due to high number of zeros in some regions.

Table 4 – Regional Specialization Index for Private R&amp;D Expenditure

	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Piedmont	1.341	1.327	1.352	1.338	1.302	1.312	1.300	1.284	1.292	1.344	1.322	1.634	1.612	1.601	1.583	1.660	1.705	1.651	1.639	1.647
Aosta Valley	1.148	0.911	1.428	1.407	1.321	1.379	0.995	0.865	1.359	1.408	1.257	1.292	1.517	1.704	1.673	1.369	1.908	1.960	1.928	1.598
Lombardy	1.333	1.306	1.300	1.275	1.243	1.250	1.238	1.228	1.202	1.244	1.234	1.413	1.429	1.430	1.404	1.450	1.506	1.487	1.477	1.470
Liguria	1.060	1.100	1.134	1.142	1.079	1.054	1.036	0.985	1.027	0.926	0.964	0.942	0.889	0.848	0.651	0.894	0.839	0.925	0.898	0.856
<i>North West</i>	<b>1.308</b>	<b>1.293</b>	<b>1.306</b>	<b>1.287</b>	<b>1.253</b>	<b>1.256</b>	<b>1.245</b>	<b>1.229</b>	<b>1.226</b>	<b>1.266</b>	<b>1.254</b>	<b>1.459</b>	<b>1.450</b>	<b>1.442</b>	<b>1.398</b>	<b>1.469</b>	<b>1.516</b>	<b>1.496</b>	<b>1.489</b>	<b>1.493</b>
Trentino-Alto Adige	0.611	0.983	0.521	0.839	0.708	0.633	0.477	0.632	0.678	0.864	0.581	0.415	0.684	0.790	0.861	0.881	0.821	0.907	0.920	0.792
Veneto	1.042	1.031	1.026	1.088	1.042	1.006	1.059	1.088	1.053	1.018	0.978	0.761	0.903	0.875	0.901	0.824	0.882	0.861	0.953	1.029
Friuli-Venezia Giulia	0.890	0.882	1.142	1.076	0.965	1.058	0.941	0.896	0.971	0.967	1.040	0.821	0.992	1.067	1.122	1.047	1.084	0.978	0.941	0.911
Emilia-Romagna	0.444	0.570	0.424	0.433	0.498	0.664	0.774	0.828	0.960	0.995	0.925	0.756	0.871	0.950	0.970	0.974	1.029	1.042	1.031	1.128
<i>North East</i>	<b>0.626</b>	<b>0.725</b>	<b>0.617</b>	<b>0.647</b>	<b>0.678</b>	<b>0.817</b>	<b>0.878</b>	<b>0.921</b>	<b>0.981</b>	<b>0.992</b>	<b>0.943</b>	<b>0.754</b>	<b>0.891</b>	<b>0.939</b>	<b>0.968</b>	<b>0.938</b>	<b>0.985</b>	<b>0.972</b>	<b>0.988</b>	<b>1.048</b>
Tuscany	0.972	0.929	0.842	0.744	0.894	0.831	0.807	0.819	0.825	0.893	0.892	0.705	0.681	0.636	0.626	0.534	0.505	0.620	0.594	0.693
Umbria	1.129	0.986	1.048	0.996	1.075	0.918	1.050	0.936	1.008	0.997	0.995	0.332	0.409	0.334	0.293	0.268	0.256	0.272	0.339	0.391
Marche	0.478	0.730	0.556	0.685	0.712	0.550	0.670	0.809	0.864	1.011	0.936	0.376	0.536	0.529	0.519	0.744	0.489	0.480	0.532	0.723
Lazio	0.509	0.495	0.494	0.561	0.549	0.498	0.491	0.516	0.480	0.461	0.498	0.579	0.575	0.615	0.658	0.659	0.633	0.619	0.624	0.520
Abruzzi	1.304	1.277	1.327	1.291	1.247	1.245	1.199	1.132	1.154	1.145	1.121	1.005	1.007	0.998	1.216	1.108	0.866	0.801	0.935	0.930
Molise	0.411	0.546	0.000	0.000	-	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.154	1.238	0.572	0.192	0.175	0.013	0.775	0.000	0.630	0.000	0.529	0.160
<i>Central Italy</i>	<b>0.618</b>	<b>0.591</b>	<b>0.575</b>	<b>0.620</b>	<b>0.645</b>	<b>0.581</b>	<b>0.581</b>	<b>0.599</b>	<b>0.573</b>	<b>0.567</b>	<b>0.606</b>	<b>0.616</b>	<b>0.615</b>	<b>0.628</b>	<b>0.679</b>	<b>0.646</b>	<b>0.598</b>	<b>0.605</b>	<b>0.618</b>	<b>0.583</b>
Campania	0.843	1.113	1.073	1.047	0.979	1.024	0.907	0.858	0.927	0.906	0.942	0.828	0.740	0.641	0.645	0.620	0.566	0.619	0.691	0.630
Puglia	0.366	0.721	0.914	0.834	0.727	0.772	0.743	0.869	0.936	0.924	0.921	0.684	0.645	0.655	0.988	0.602	0.428	0.455	0.432	0.446
Basilicata	0.410	0.395	0.405	0.518	0.211	0.196	0.229	0.210	0.258	0.433	0.425	0.441	0.396	0.328	0.321	0.319	0.407	0.548	0.431	1.013
Calabria	0.122	0.235	0.176	0.768	0.777	0.727	0.500	0.533	0.719	0.768	0.709	0.205	0.176	0.098	0.025	0.028	0.053	0.052	0.040	0.112
Sicily	0.666	0.578	0.837	0.849	0.759	0.819	0.783	0.768	0.694	0.691	0.740	0.231	0.256	0.139	0.112	0.163	0.419	0.379	0.494	0.455
Sardinia	0.261	0.422	0.798	0.506	0.931	0.810	0.745	0.647	0.550	0.479	0.550	0.305	0.301	0.243	0.263	0.252	0.169	0.192	0.173	0.166
<i>South</i>	<b>0.627</b>	<b>0.837</b>	<b>0.935</b>	<b>0.919</b>	<b>0.843</b>	<b>0.883</b>	<b>0.798</b>	<b>0.782</b>	<b>0.820</b>	<b>0.803</b>	<b>0.838</b>	<b>0.566</b>	<b>0.518</b>	<b>0.443</b>	<b>0.464</b>	<b>0.437</b>	<b>0.442</b>	<b>0.465</b>	<b>0.512</b>	<b>0.499</b>

Source: Antonelli and Quatraro (2007)

Table 5 – Regional Specialization Index for Public R&amp;D Expenditure

	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001
Piedmont	0.216	0.210	0.202	0.193	0.199	0.212	0.206	0.223	0.187	0.155	0.181	0.265	0.312	0.311	0.329	0.345	0.341	0.366	0.359	0.377
Aosta Valley	0.658	1.216	0.029	0.030	0.148	0.041	1.014	1.369	0.000	0.000	0.347	0.662	0.419	0.193	0.226	0.633	0.150	0.065	0.069	0.423
Lombardy	0.234	0.260	0.320	0.345	0.354	0.368	0.370	0.375	0.436	0.402	0.406	0.522	0.517	0.507	0.535	0.553	0.527	0.526	0.521	0.547
Liguria	0.862	0.759	0.697	0.660	0.791	0.864	0.904	1.040	0.926	1.182	1.092	1.067	1.125	1.175	1.402	1.105	1.151	1.073	1.102	1.139
<i>North West</i>	<b>0.291</b>	<b>0.293</b>	<b>0.306</b>	<b>0.315</b>	<b>0.327</b>	<b>0.354</b>	<b>0.352</b>	<b>0.373</b>	<b>0.370</b>	<b>0.346</b>	<b>0.356</b>	<b>0.468</b>	<b>0.494</b>	<b>0.493</b>	<b>0.542</b>	<b>0.534</b>	<b>0.517</b>	<b>0.517</b>	<b>0.510</b>	<b>0.525</b>
Trentino-Alto Adige	1.896	1.041	2.085	1.383	1.776	1.930	2.385	2.007	1.897	1.334	2.065	1.678	1.356	1.241	1.160	1.118	1.168	1.090	1.080	1.201
Veneto	0.904	0.925	0.942	0.790	0.890	0.984	0.843	0.759	0.852	0.955	1.057	1.277	1.109	1.143	1.114	1.175	1.111	1.135	1.047	0.972
Friuli-Venezia Giulia	1.253	1.284	0.677	0.820	1.092	0.854	1.155	1.284	1.079	1.081	0.899	1.207	1.009	0.923	0.860	0.953	0.922	1.022	1.060	1.086
Emilia-Romagna	2.281	2.040	2.306	2.353	2.334	1.850	1.598	1.472	1.112	1.013	1.191	1.282	1.145	1.057	1.035	1.026	0.973	0.959	0.969	0.877
<i>North East</i>	<b>1.861</b>	<b>1.664</b>	<b>1.868</b>	<b>1.842</b>	<b>1.855</b>	<b>1.464</b>	<b>1.323</b>	<b>1.215</b>	<b>1.052</b>	<b>1.020</b>	<b>1.145</b>	<b>1.284</b>	<b>1.122</b>	<b>1.070</b>	<b>1.036</b>	<b>1.061</b>	<b>1.014</b>	<b>1.027</b>	<b>1.012</b>	<b>0.954</b>
Tuscany	1.065	1.170	1.358	1.611	1.283	1.427	1.510	1.496	1.488	1.262	1.275	1.341	1.359	1.418	1.430	1.463	1.463	1.370	1.407	1.296
Umbria	0.703	1.034	0.892	1.010	0.800	1.207	0.869	1.176	0.978	1.008	1.013	1.773	1.664	1.764	1.813	1.728	1.697	1.708	1.663	1.587
Marche	2.201	1.653	2.006	1.751	1.766	2.137	1.875	1.524	1.378	0.974	1.163	1.723	1.522	1.539	1.553	1.254	1.478	1.506	1.469	1.266
Lazio	2.129	2.221	2.146	2.046	2.197	2.271	2.348	2.325	2.447	2.322	2.275	1.487	1.478	1.441	1.393	1.339	1.343	1.370	1.377	1.462
Abruzzi	0.301	0.331	0.258	0.307	0.345	0.380	0.474	0.640	0.571	0.644	0.694	0.994	0.993	1.002	0.752	0.892	1.126	1.194	1.065	1.068
Molise	2.355	2.096	3.267	3.385	-	3.530	3.646	3.736	0.571	0.417	2.086	1.935	1.928	2.131	1.259	1.993	1.346	1.973	1.472	1.809
<i>Central Italy</i>	<b>1.880</b>	<b>1.988</b>	<b>1.963</b>	<b>1.906</b>	<b>1.943</b>	<b>2.061</b>	<b>2.110</b>	<b>2.099</b>	<b>2.188</b>	<b>2.062</b>	<b>2.000</b>	<b>1.444</b>	<b>1.433</b>	<b>1.426</b>	<b>1.369</b>	<b>1.352</b>	<b>1.377</b>	<b>1.384</b>	<b>1.383</b>	<b>1.402</b>
Campania	1.361	0.726	0.834	0.888	1.056	0.941	1.246	1.388	1.202	1.232	1.148	1.199	1.293	1.411	1.408	1.378	1.406	1.370	1.310	1.356
Puglia	2.460	1.673	1.195	1.397	1.724	1.578	1.679	1.358	1.179	1.186	1.201	1.366	1.400	1.395	1.014	1.395	1.536	1.530	1.570	1.534
Basilicata	2.357	2.460	2.350	2.150	3.094	3.035	3.040	3.161	3.065	2.392	2.460	1.648	1.679	1.770	1.781	1.677	1.556	1.440	1.570	0.988
Calabria	3.020	2.848	2.868	1.553	1.591	1.690	2.324	2.277	1.781	1.570	1.739	1.920	1.927	2.034	2.121	1.966	1.886	1.923	1.962	1.856
Sicily	1.770	2.018	1.370	1.361	1.640	1.457	1.574	1.635	1.853	1.758	1.660	1.890	1.837	1.986	2.021	1.831	1.544	1.604	1.507	1.525
Sardinia	2.701	2.395	1.457	2.178	1.182	1.482	1.675	1.965	2.253	2.279	2.142	1.804	1.786	1.868	1.848	1.743	1.778	1.787	1.829	1.803
<i>South</i>	<b>1.859</b>	<b>1.394</b>	<b>1.148</b>	<b>1.193</b>	<b>1.418</b>	<b>1.297</b>	<b>1.535</b>	<b>1.597</b>	<b>1.501</b>	<b>1.482</b>	<b>1.412</b>	<b>1.503</b>	<b>1.543</b>	<b>1.639</b>	<b>1.617</b>	<b>1.559</b>	<b>1.522</b>	<b>1.520</b>	<b>1.490</b>	<b>1.483</b>

Source: Antonelli and Quatraro (2007)

**Table 6 - Results of GLS Estimation of Equation (3), by Region**

Dependent Variable: $\ln\left(\frac{P_t}{K - P_t}\right)$			
Region	Const	Time	Wald- $\chi^2$
Piedmont	-218.49 (-7.95)	.110 (7.94)	63.01
Aosta Valley	-444.82 (-1.94)	.221 (1.92)	3.71
Lombardy	-292.13 (-8.82)	.142 (8.81)	77.67
Liguria	-253.38 (-11.48)	.127 (11.42)	130.47
Trentino Alto Adige	-212.29 (-11.32)	.106 (11.22)	125.80
Veneto	-254.57 (-9.57)	.127 (9.53)	90.83
Friuli Venezia Giulia	-223.69 (-6.85)	.112 (6.83)	46.69
Emilia Romagna	-332.97 (-18.98)	.170 (18.95)	359.03
Tuscany	-201.04 (-6.43)	.100 (6.38)	40.67
Umbria	-161.70 (-6.68)	.080 (6.60)	43.60
Marche	-279.33 (-8.89)	.139 (8.83)	77.92
Lazio	-185.14 (-6.99)	.092 (6.93)	47.96
Abruzzo	-376.36 (-7.03)	.188 (6.99)	48.83
Molise	-474.67 (-1.91)	.235 (1.89)	3.57
Campania	-231.80 (17.51)	.114 (13.05)	170.19
Puglia	-232.66 (-8.98)	.115 (8.84)	78.18
Basilicata	-750.42 (-3.18)	.374 (3.16)	10.00
Calabria	-184.71 (-3.28)	.091 (3.21)	10.28
Sicily	-289.45 (-12.51)	.144 (12.38)	153.17
Sardinia	-173.02 (-5.90)	.085 (5.77)	33.33

Note: z Statistics between parentheses.