

Heterogeneous Paths of Structural Transformation

Duc Nguyen


University of Toronto

February 09, 2022

Motivation

- Structural transformation is a robust feature of economic development
 - Reallocation of labor from agriculture into manufacturing and services
 - Hump-shaped pattern in manufacturing and rise in services
- Extensive literature on factors driving the process of labor reallocation away from agriculture
- This paper belongs to the literature on labor allocation between manufacturing and services
 - Heterogeneous patterns across economies
 - Implications for growth and development


Heterogeneity in Structural Change - Literature



Recent literature - Rodrik (2016) and Huneeus and Rogerson (2020) - focus on


- Heterogeneity in the peak of *MAN* hump shape
- Several Latin American and Asian economies: lower peak value and the peak occurs at earlier stage of development

Arising questions:



- Does the peak necessarily indicate steep decline in manufacturing?
"Premature Deindustrialization" as described by Rodrik (2016)?
- Do low-*MAN*-peak economies allocate labor into the same type of *SER*? Skip industrialization to become *SER* economies like high-income economies?

Heterogeneity in Structural Change - This Paper



Manufacturing:

- The peak value is associated with the steepness of the hump shape
- Low-MAN-peak indicates flat shape and not sharp deindustrialization


Services:

- Large heterogeneity in services sector: high- and low-skilled services
- High-income economies are dominated by high-skilled services
- Flat Manufacturing economies allocate substantial labor into low-skilled services

Heterogeneity in Structural Change:

- Steep Manufacturing
- Flat Manufacturing

Implication for Aggregate Growth



- Different structural transformation patterns are associated with different aggregate growth experience
- During the period 1960-2010, relative to the US (frontier economy),
 - Steep Manufacturing: fast catch up
 - Flat Manufacturing: stagnation or decline
- Labor allocation between manufacturing and services sectors have important implication for growth and development

Research Questions and Findings

Research Questions:

- What factors drive heterogeneous paths of structural change?
- How does this phenomenon contribute to cross-country growth experience?



Findings:

- Difference in relative productivity between *MAN* and *SER*, accounts for majority of the heterogeneity in structural change
- Heterogeneity in structural change contributes to cross-country growth differences:
 - Steep manufacturing economies tend to have catch-up episodes due to high growth in manufacturing sector
 - Flat manufacturing economies have stagnation due to lack of growth in low-skilled services

Breakdown of Services Sector


- Large degree of heterogeneity within services sector
- Standard classification of services sectors by skill intensity:
hour share of high-skilled labor over all labor
- Final classification:
 - Low-skilled services: G+H (Trade, Hotel, Restaurants), I (Transport, Storage, Communications), O+P (Community and Personal Services)
 - High-skilled services: J+K (Finance, Real estate, Business services) and L+M+N (Government, Education, Health)

Structural Transformation in the US





- Different types of *SER* rise at different stage of development
- Different patterns between industrialization and deindustrialization phases
- Industrialization: Labor out of AGR is mostly reallocated to MAN and *SER_I*
- Deindustrialization: Decline in MAN is associated with the rise of *SER_h*


Structural Transformation in the US





- Representation of US structural change pattern over non-agricultural employment share




Steep Manufacturing: Structural Transformation Patterns





- Similar pattern to the US across steep manufacturing economies
- Different patterns before and after *MAN* peak: Industrialization and Deindustrialization



Flat Manufacturing: Structural Transformation Patterns



- Insignificant difference in patterns before and after the manufacturing peak
- *MAN* labor share is relatively flat
- Most labor is allocated towards low-skilled *SER*
- High-skilled *SER* sector is relatively small for most economies



Heterogeneous Paths of Structural Transformation

Literature

- Heterogeneity: Peak value and timing of *MAN* hump shape
- *MAN*: Rodrik (2016), Rodrik et al. (2019, 2021)
- *AGR*: Huneeus and Rogerson (2020)
- Trade costs: Sposi et al. (2019)
- *SER*: no special role

Heterogeneous Paths of Structural Transformation

Literature

- Heterogeneity: Peak value and timing of *MAN* hump shape
- *MAN*: Rodrik (2016), Rodrik et al. (2019, 2021)
- *AGR*: Huneeus and Rogerson (2020)
- Trade costs: Sposi et al. (2019)
- *SER*: no special role

This Paper

- Heterogeneity in *MAN*: steepness of the hump-shaped path
- Heterogeneity in *SER*: Flat manufacturing economies allocate substantial amount of labor into SER_I
- Explore the role of SER_I and *MAN* productivity in accounting for heterogeneity in structural change and growth experiences

Explanatory Factors

- Question: What factors quantitatively account for heterogeneous patterns of structural change?
- Literature: Differences in evolution of sectoral productivity
 - Initial condition: Initial sectoral productivity levels
 - Sectoral productivity growth rates
- This paper finds:
 - Initial condition is the major driving force
 - Indicate important role of country-specific distortions

4-sector Model

- 4 sectors: AGR (a), MAN (m), SER_I (ls) and SER_h (hs)
- Technologies linear in labor (L_i):

$$Y_i = A_i L_i, i \in \{a, m, ls, hs\}$$

- Endowments: representative household with 1 unit of time, population size is normalized to 1
- Preferences $u(c_a, c_m, c_{ls}, c_{hs})$ with two main features:
 - Gollin et al.(2002): Subsistence AGR consumption \bar{a}
 - Conditional on $c_a \geq \bar{a}$, consumers have CES preferences over MAN , SER_I and SER_h : $\sigma \in (0, 1)$

$$u(c_m, c_{ls}, c_{hs}) = \left[\varphi_m^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} c_m^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} + \varphi_{ls}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} c_{ls}^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} + \varphi_{hs}^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} c_{hs}^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \right]^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}}$$

Competitive Equilibrium

A competitive equilibrium is a set of prices $\{p_i\}$, allocations $\{c_i\}$ for households and labor inputs $\{L_i\}$ for firms such that

- Given prices $\{p_i\}$, $\{c_i\}$ solves the household's problem

$$\max u(c_a, c_m, c_{ls}, c_{hs}) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad p_a c_a + p_m c_m + p_{ls} c_{ls} + p_{hs} c_{hs} = 1$$

- Given price p_i , L_i solves the firm's problem

$$\max p_i A_i L_i - L_i, i \in \{a, m, ls, hs\}$$

- Markets for labor and goods clear

$$L_a + L_m + L_{ls} + L_{hs} = 1$$

$$c_i = Y_i, i \in \{a, m, ls, hs\}$$

Analytical Solution

- From the firm's problem:

$$p_i = \frac{1}{A_i}, i \in \{a, m, ls, hs\}$$

- Focus on case $A_a > \bar{a}$, household only consumes \bar{a} amount of agricultural goods and allocate labor

$$L_a = \frac{\bar{a}}{A_a}$$

- FOCs from household's problem imply that for $i, j \in \{m, ls, hs\}$,

$$\frac{p_i c_i}{\sum_j p_j c_j} = \frac{\varphi_i p_i^{1-\sigma}}{\sum_j \varphi_j p_j^{1-\sigma}} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{p_i c_i}{p_j c_j} = \frac{\varphi_i p_i^{1-\sigma}}{\varphi_j p_j^{1-\sigma}}$$

Analytical Solution

- Goods market clearing conditions imply that $p_i c_i = p_i Y_i = L_i$
- Labor share of sector $i, j \in \{m, ls, hs\}$ can be derived as

$$\frac{L_i}{L_j} = \frac{\varphi_i}{\varphi_j} \left(\frac{A_j}{A_i} \right)^{1-\sigma}$$

- Combining with labor market clearing, we can solve for labor share in sector $i \in \{m, ls, hs\}$ as


$$L_i = \frac{\varphi_i A_i^{\sigma-1}}{\sum_j \varphi_j A_j^{\sigma-1}} \left(1 - \frac{\bar{a}}{A_a} \right)$$

Calibration to USA Historical Data

- Standard calibration practice in literature: Huneeus and Rogerson (2020)
- Assume constant sectoral productivity growth: annualized growth between 1950-1970
- Set initial productivity level of all sectors to 1
- Set \bar{a} to 0.6
- Calibrate σ, φ_i to match USA sectoral employment shares during industrialization phase 1880-1960

Parameters	σ	\bar{a}	φ_m	φ_{ls}	φ_{hs}
Value	0.3	0.60	0.47	0.40	0.13

Model vs. Data: USA Historical Data




Cross-country Calibration


Following Duarte and Restuccia (2010),

- Use the calibrated parameters for the US
- Calibrate agricultural productivity growth (following Huneeus and Rogerson (2020))
- Calibrate initial sectoral productivity level to match
 - initial sectoral EMP share for each country
 - initial aggregate labor productivity relative to the US
- Use annualized growth rate of sectoral labor productivity in data to infer productivity index and employment share

Last-Period EMP Share: 4-sector Model vs. Data



Peak Manufacturing EMP Share: 4-sector Model vs. Data



Factors Drive Structural Transformation Patterns

- Dynamics: Assume constant labor productivity growth g_i for sector $i \in \{a, m, ls, hs\}$
- Labor share of sector $i \in \{hs, ls\}$ relative to manufacturing:

$$\frac{L_{it}}{L_{mt}} = \frac{\varphi_i A_{it}^{\sigma-1}}{\varphi_m A_{mt}^{\sigma-1}} = \frac{\varphi_i}{\varphi_m} \left(\frac{A_{i0}}{A_{m0}} \right)^{\sigma-1} e^{(\sigma-1)(g_i - g_m)t}$$



- Factors leading to different structural change patterns from a benchmark economy (USA):
 - AGR labor productivity growth g_a
 - Relative labor productivity growth $g_i - g_m$ for $i \in \{ls, hs\}$
 - Initial relative labor productivity $\frac{A_{i0}}{A_{m0}}$

Role of Initial Relative Labor Productivity

- $\frac{A_{i0}^c}{A_{m0}^c}$ measure the "gap" in relative labor productivity between a country c and the US.
- The size of "gap" is proportional to deviation in structural change pattern from the US.
- If the relative growth of a country c is similar to the US, the "gap" does not change over time:

$$\frac{A_{it}^c/A_{mt}^c}{A_{it}^{US}/A_{mt}^{US}} = \frac{A_{i0}^c/A_{m0}^c}{A_{i0}^{US}/A_{m0}^{US}} \frac{e^{(g_i - g_m)t}}{e^{(g_i - g_m)t}} = \frac{A_{i0}^c}{A_{m0}^c}$$

Low-Skill SER Initial Relative Labor Productivity



- Counterfactuals to USA model
 - Blue connected line is US structural change pattern (initial productivity is 1 for all sectors)
 - Dotted lines are counterfactuals with lower values of initial SER_I , productivity
- Results: Lower relative SER_I , productivity can generate observed patterns
 - MAN share: Lower and flatter hump-shape curve
 - SER_I share: Higher and steeper increase

Counterfactuals with USA growth

■ Counterfactual Methods

- Use the initial sectoral productivity level for each country that match initial employment share
- Calculate counterfactual employment share by using USA sectoral productivity growth

■ Results

- The counterfactual matches the data well for peak MAN share as well as last-period sectoral EMP share for most countries
- AGR productivity growth has limited role
- For some countries, non-AGR growth rates have quantitative role

Colombia as an Example

Figure 1: USA Model and COL data





Figure 2: Counterfactual with USA growth and COL data





■ Descriptions

	A_{i0}	g_a	g_i
Figure 1	US	US	US
Figure 2	COL	US	US

■ Results

- The counterfactual generates close pattern to data
- The result indicates high explanatory power of the relative productivity level

Colombia as an Example





■ Descriptions

	A_{i0}	g_a	g_i
Figure 3	COL	US	COL
Figure 4	COL	COL	COL

■ Results

- Using growth from data improves the fit
- AGR productivity growth has limited role

Counterfactual vs. Data



Counterfactual: For any country c ,

A_{i0}	g_a	g_i
c	US	US


Results:

- The counterfactual can generate MAN peak and SER_i patterns close to the data
- For several steep manufacturing economies, sectoral productivity growth rates are important factors

Implications:

- Heterogeneous patterns of low MAN and high SER_i shares are driven by low relative productivity of SER_i to MAN

Quantitative Role of Sectoral Productivity Growth





- During the period 1965-2010, relative to the US (frontier economy),
 - Steep Manufacturing: fast catch up
 - Flat Manufacturing economies: stagnation or decline
- What are quantitative contributions of sectoral productivity growth rates?

Counterfactuals with US Sectoral Growth Rates

- Start an economy c with the sectoral productivity levels in 1965
- Set the growth rate in 1 sector to the US growth rate ($g_i = g_i^{US}$) and keep the others as the data ($g_j = g_j^c, j \neq i$)
- Calculate counterfactual aggregate productivity relative to the US in 2010 and compare with the data
- The counterfactual presents the quantitative role of each sectoral productivity growth in accounting for growth experience in each economy

Labor Productivity Relative to US: Counterfactuals





- Counterfactual with US MAN productivity growth rates:

- Steep Manufacturing: substantially lower than the model
- Flat Manufacturing: close to the model

- Counterfactual with US SER_I productivity growth rates:

- Steep Manufacturing: close to the model
- Flat Manufacturing: substantially lower than the model

Labor Productivity Relative to US: Counterfactuals



- Counterfactuals with US growth rates in AGR and SER_h do not generate significant difference
- Implications: Growth rates in AGR and SER_h do not account for different growth experience across economies

Aggregate Implications

- Steep Manufacturing:
 - Fast catch-up with the US
 - High productivity growth rate in *MAN* mainly accounts for the catch-up
- Flat Manufacturing:
 - Stagnation experience with slow or no catch-up
 - Lack of catch-up in *SER*, productivity mainly contributes to stagnation


Conclusions

- Large heterogeneity in labor allocation between *MAN* and *SER*
- Relative productivity between *MAN* and *SER*, accounts for majority of the heterogeneity
- Important aggregate impacts on growth
- Future research:
 - understand sources driving the heterogeneity in relative productivity between *MAN* and *SER*
 - country-specific distortions, frictions, policies
 - role of other key features of heterogeneity within services sector

► Suggestive Explanations



Thank You!

Steep Manufacturing: Industrialization Phase




1% decline in AGR EMP share results in

	MAN	SER _I	SER _h
US	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%
Average	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%





Steep Manufacturing: Deindustrialization Phase





Deindustrialization Phase:

- MAN share decline is largely associated with the rise of SER_h
- SER_l share is relatively flat







Heterogeneous Structural Transformation




- These two figures show the slope of labor reallocation into *MAN* against into *SER_i*.
- Upper figure present the pattern in the countries included in 10-Sector Database during the earlier period 1950s-2010s.
- Lower figure present the pattern in the countries included in Economic Transformation Database during the later period 1990-2018.
- Both steep and flat manufacturing patterns are prevalent in both samples.

Recent Developing Economies



Potential Explanatory Sources



- Strong correlation between informality in low-skilled services and the patterns of steep/flat manufacturing → Suggest that distortions leading to the large size of informal economies are potential forces explaining heterogeneity
- Little correlation between human capital and structural change patterns

