

Blien, Uwe; Sanner, Helge

**Conference Paper**

## Structural change and regional employment development

Beiträge zur Jahrestagung des Vereins für Socialpolitik 2015: Ökonomische Entwicklung - Theorie und Politik - Session: Growth theory, No. F06-V2

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Verein für Socialpolitik / German Economic Association

*Suggested Citation:* Blien, Uwe; Sanner, Helge (2015) : Structural change and regional employment development, Beiträge zur Jahrestagung des Vereins für Socialpolitik 2015: Ökonomische Entwicklung - Theorie und Politik - Session: Growth theory, No. F06-V2, ZBW - Deutsche Zentralbibliothek für Wirtschaftswissenschaften, Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft

This Version is available at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10419/113162>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

# **Structural change and regional employment development**

**Uwe Blien, Helge Sanner**

1 January 2015

**Contents**

Abstract..... 4

1 Introduction..... 5

2 Structural change, demand, and employment..... 8

3 Structural change, and the dynamics of demand and unemployment ..... 10

3.1 Setting ..... 11

3.2 Individual and aggregate production ..... 14

3.3 Aggregate demand and equilibrium ..... 15

3.4 Results ..... 16

4 Structural change and regional employment disparities ..... 20

5 Conclusion..... 22

References..... 23

## **Abstract**

An examination of regional unemployment rates reveals that there are vast differences which cannot be explained by different institutional. Our paper traces these differences in the regions' labour market performance back to the regions' specialisation in products that are more or less advanced in their product cycle. The model we develop shows how profit maximisation and its interaction with individual preferences endogenously lead to initially increasing and then decreasing employment in the presence of process innovation. We show how processes of structural change develop in time and how they are linked to technological progress.

**JEL classification:** O41; D91; J23; R23

**Keywords:** Structural change; Productivity growth; Labour market dynamics; Specialisation of Regions


# 1 Introduction

One standard explanation of unemployment is related to the institutional structure. Influential studies by Layard, Nickell & Jackman (1991, 2005) and Mortensen & Pissarides (2011) state that the more flexible the institutional setting is the lower is the unemployment rate. However, there is a striking discrepancy between this proposition and (at least) one empirical fact. At the regional level, within one country, there are vast disparities between unemployment rates. Before the financial crisis they were of about the same size as they were {?} have been at the country level (Südekum, 2005). Today they are somewhat smaller, but only to a limited extent. Map 1 shows this regional differentiation for the example of Germany. The variation of regional unemployment levels cannot be explained by different institutional settings, since these do not vary much within one country. Therefore, other explanations are required.

In this paper a theoretical model is developed which explains differing employment levels and paths by processes of structural change and technological progress. To some extent regions (or nations) are specialised to different products. These products are subject to different demand conditions on their specific markets and there are specific paces of progress in the production technology. These conditions can be used to explain disparities between labour markets.

To begin with a rough outline of the argument, two effects of technical progress have to be taken into account. The first is a labour-saving one. Due to productivity gains less labour is required to produce the same amount of products. But then there is a secondary effect working in the opposite direction. Prices decrease as a consequence of technological progress. Lower prices boost product demand, so more labour is needed to produce a larger output. Whether this compensating effect outweighs the first labour-saving one is an empirical question. In fact three cases are possible. In the first case the labour-saving effect dominates. In the second case, labour demand remains constant and in the third case labour demand even increases. It is obvious that the elasticity of aggregate demand is decisive for the outcome. As been shown in Blien, Sanner (2014) and by others and later will be demonstrated in this paper, the limiting value – for the case of a one-good economy – is an elasticity of minus one, under quite general conditions: labour demand increases if product demand is elastic.

Map 1: Unemployment rates in Germany (May 2014)



- von 1,41 bis 4,00 (89)
- von 4,00 bis 6,00 (91)
- von 6,00 bis 8,00 (88)
- von 8,00 bis 10,0 (63)
- von 10,0 bis 17,19 (71)

Our results regarding the effects of productivity gains on employment are quite diverse for the industries, regions, cities and nations that are affected. It is easy to see that productivity increases in a nation’s leading industry can have a positive impact on employment and other important economic variables, whereas in a completely

symmetric case detrimental consequences are to be expected if the crucial condition is not met.

In the literature the term structural change is used in a narrow and in a broad sense. Although we usually employ the former interpretation, both of them are compatible with our analytical framework. In the narrow sense structural change refers to the substitution of one industry by another in a country's productive sector. The properties of product cycles may be analysed within the framework presented here. In the broad sense the term structural change is related to the change of proportions between the large sectors of the economy and to the secular expansion of the service sector at the expense of the industrial and the agrarian sectors. Again it is possible to analyse this process by means of our basic theorem on structural change.

Standard analyses of economic growth are mainly concerned with productivity develops. The effects on employment are often ignored and market clearing is assumed. In comparison, we show that the relationship between technical progress and employment is not trivial. A framework is provided permitting a detailed analysis.

Our theorem about the effects of productivity increases on employment has several precursors. The importance of the demand elasticity (without any formal analysis, however) was emphasised by Neisser (1942). The possibility of "technological unemployment" was familiar to some of the classical writers of the economics discipline like Ricardo and Keynes. As far as we know a basic version of a theorem on technological effects on employment was first stated in a simple macro-economic model (Appelbaum and Schettkat, 1993). Möller (2001) supported its empirical relevance. Later, versions of the theorem appeared in papers on agglomeration effects (see Cingano and Schivardi, 2004, and Combes, Magnac and Robin, 2004).

In recent discussions among economists technological progress plays a prominent role. In these debates, mostly, it is not a determinant of employment in general but it is an influence on the fates of different skill groups. Autor, Levy and Murnane (2003) show positive effects of skill biased technological change on the demand for high-skilled workers. A recent paper of Autor and Dorn (2014) demonstrates polarisation effects. Our concern, however, is a more basic question: What are the effects of technological progress on employment in general?

The main contribution of this paper is the provision of a still simple, but fully-fledged model which includes a proper micro-foundation of the process of structural change. This is done in two steps: in a first step, a basic theorem on technological progress and employment is derived and generalised to the case of  $n$  industries producing goods that may exhibit any sort of substitutability. In a second step the micro-model is developed, which shows the full dynamics of one good being replaced by another one. Both steps give insights about the conditions to be met for the stated consequences of productivity increases on (un-)employment. We will see later that it is

even possible to reconcile the model presented here with the standard macroeconomic approach of Layard et al. (2005) and their followers.

The explanation of unemployment from the interaction of product demand, technological progress and structural change is consistent with many stylised facts about real-world economies:

- As stated above, regional employment develops very differently – even when regions are comparable with respect to institutions and resources.
- New literature shows that agglomeration effects are empirically important with respect to productivity, but not with respect to employment. The labour market performance of regions with more concentrated economies might even be worse than the one of the rural country (Combes et al., 2004).
- It is often difficult to derive differences in unemployment rates of nations from their labour market institutions (cf. the review by Freeman, 2001).
- The relationship between productivity gains and the development of employment changes over time (Cavelaars, 2005). This could be due to shifts on the product market related to the product cycle of some leading industries.

In section 2 the employment effects of productivity gains are traced back to the elasticity of aggregate demand. Our findings are summarised in a basic theorem. In section 3 a microeconomic model is presented suggesting that decreasing price elasticities and thus a decline of employment is an inherent feature of every product cycle. Section 4 discusses the results obtained, and section 5 concludes.

## 2 Structural change, demand, and employment

Assume an economy whose supply side consists of  $n$  perfectly competitive industries. Each firm within the same industry exhibits the same linear-homogenous production function. This assumption is more than necessarily restrictive, and has primarily been made to ease the presentation. For our results to become effective without qualification, any production function that leads to a constant capital intensity would suffice, e.g. the Leontieff and every homothetic production function.

Aggregation at the industry level yields production functions  $Q_j(t) = A_j(t) \cdot f(K_j, L_j)$  for each industry, where  $K$  and  $L$  denote the amount of capital and labour employed, respectively. It is assumed that the prices of these factors, denoted  $r$  and  $w$  are constant.  $A_j(t) = A_j e^{\gamma_j t}$  specifies the pace of technological progress.  $A_j(t)$  is an industry-specific scaling factor, which increases over time  $t$  with the exogenous industry-specific rate of technical progress,  $\gamma_j$ . Labour productivity in industry  $j$  is  $\pi_j(t) = Q_j(t)/L_j(t) = A_j(t) \cdot f(k_j)$ , where  $k_j$  expresses capital intensity,  $k \equiv K/L$ , which is time-invariant, since we assume homothetic production functions and constant factor prices.



Demand at the industry level  $\kappa$  is denoted  $Q_\kappa(p_1, \dots, p_\kappa, \dots, p_n)$ . In this formula,  $p_j$  denote prices which are equal for all firms within the same industry  $j$  and correspond to the marginal costs of production. Labour costs make up a constant share of these costs. Therefore, prices contain a constant mark-up on labour input per unit produced,  $L_j/Q_j = 1/\pi_j$ , i.e.  $p_j(t) = \theta_j/\pi_j(t)$ . Here,  $\theta_j$  is an industry-specific parameter depending on factor prices and the technology employed, but is time-invariant. This is due to the assumptions of homothetic production functions and given factor prices. Therefore, in this model product prices only change over time because they depend on productivity, *ceteris paribus*.

The functional relationships assumed so far are rather standard and of a very weak nature (see further Blien, Sanner 2014). They enable us to analyse the development of employment over time. To summarise:

$$Q_j(t) = Q_j(p_1(t), \dots, p_j(t), \dots, p_n(t)) \quad (\text{A})$$

$$\pi_j(t) = \frac{Q_j(t)}{L_j(t)} = A_j(t) \cdot f(k_j) \quad (\text{B})$$

$$A_j(t) = A_j e^{\gamma_j t} \quad (\text{C})$$

$$p_j(t) = \frac{\theta_j}{\pi_j(t)} \quad (\text{D})$$

The derivative of the price-setting equation (D) with respect to  $\pi_j$  is

$$\frac{\partial p_j}{\partial \pi_j} = \frac{-\theta_j}{\pi_j(t)^2} = \frac{-p_j}{\pi_j(t)} \quad (1)$$

The evolution of employment over time can be inferred from the total derivative of  $L_\kappa = Q_\kappa(p_1, \dots, p_\kappa, \dots, p_n)/\pi_\kappa$  with respect to  $t$ :

$$\frac{dL_\kappa}{dt} = \frac{1}{\pi_\kappa^2} \cdot \left[ \sum_{j=1}^n \left( \frac{\partial Q_\kappa(\cdot)}{\partial p_j} \frac{\partial p_j}{\partial \pi_j} \frac{\partial \pi_j}{\partial t} \right) \pi_\kappa - Q_\kappa(\cdot) \frac{\partial \pi_\kappa}{\partial t} \right] \quad (2)$$

Making use of eq. (1) and  $\partial \pi_j / \partial t = \gamma_j \pi_j$ , the derivative becomes

$$\frac{dL_\kappa}{dt} = \frac{-1}{\pi_\kappa^2} \cdot \left[ \sum_{j=1}^n \left( \frac{\partial Q_\kappa(\cdot)}{\partial p_j} \frac{p_j}{\pi_j} \gamma_j \pi_j \right) \pi_\kappa + Q_\kappa(\cdot) \gamma_\kappa \pi_\kappa \right]$$

$$\frac{dL_\kappa}{dt} = -\gamma_\kappa L_\kappa \cdot \left[ \sum_{j \neq \kappa}^n \left( \eta_{Q_\kappa, p_j} \frac{\gamma_j}{\gamma_\kappa} \right) + \eta_{Q_\kappa, p_\kappa} + 1 \right] \quad (3)$$

In (3)  $\eta_{Q_\kappa, p_j}$  denotes the elasticity of aggregate demand for commodity  $\kappa$  with respect to the price of commodity  $j$ . While it can safely be assumed that the direct price elasticity is negative, this is not clear for the cross-price elasticities. Their signs

depend on the substitution relationships between the relevant products. In case they are substitutes  $\eta_{Q_\kappa, p_j} > 0$ , if they are complements  $\eta_{Q_\kappa, p_j} < 0$ . However, if the rate of technological progress is zero in one specific industry  $l \neq \kappa$ , the evolution of employment in industry  $\kappa$  is independent of the degree of substitutability between goods  $l$  and  $\kappa$ . If  $\gamma_\kappa = 0$ , the development of employment in the  $\kappa$ -industry hinges solely on the technological progress in other industries and the corresponding cross-price elasticities:

$$\left. \frac{dL_\kappa}{dt} \right|_{\gamma_\kappa=0} = -L_\kappa \cdot \sum_{j \neq \kappa}^n (\eta_{Q_\kappa, p_j} \gamma_j)$$

The result expressed in eq. (3) is summarized in the following theorem, which thus holds under relatively weak and largely standard conditions:

**Basic theorem on the effect of technological progress on employment:** *Employment in one specific industry  $\kappa$  rises if and only if the sum of all cross-price elasticities of the commodity produced by this industry, weighted by the relative rates of technological progress, plus the direct price elasticity are below minus one.*

From this general theorem a special version stated in the literature (Appelbaum and Schettkat 1993, Cingano, Schivardi 2004, Combes, Magnac, Robin 2004) can be derived. If the technology of all the other industries is constant or if the cross-price elasticities are zero, only the direct demand elasticity is decisive. In this case technological progress in industry  $\kappa$  leads to an increase in employment if the price elasticity of demand of the corresponding good is below minus one. If, on the other hand, the direct price elasticity is greater than minus one, a higher rate of technological progress in this industry actually accelerates the decrease in employment due to its labour-saving effect.

The next section uses the basic theorem in a two-industry microeconomic model. By assuming that wages do not fully adjust to changes in the scarcity of labour for whatever reason – we will return to this point later – we link technological progress and the development of unemployment. Cross-country differences in unemployment are hence explained by technological change, in addition to (partial) stickiness of wages.

### 3 Structural change, and the dynamics of demand and unemployment

In the following, we derive that endogenous forces decrease the elasticity of demand over time, so that eventually productivity gains start to have a detrimental effect on employment. In the end it follows that the changes of the price elasticity are part of a product cycle, which is generated endogenously under very general assumptions.

### 3.1 Setting

We assume an economy consisting of three industries. One perfectly competitive industry produces the homogenous consumption bundle ('the rest of the world') that serves as a reference throughout the analysis. The two other industries, denoted by the index  $j \in \{a, b\}$ , respectively produce an indivisible good (e.g. automobiles) under likewise perfect competition. Consumers either buy one of the indivisible goods produced by any of the two industries, or none. The intertemporal utility function to be maximized by each infinitely living and myopic consumer  $i$  is

$$\max v_i = \int_0^{\infty} u_i(t) e^{-rt} dt \quad (6)$$

where  $r$  denotes the uniform subjective rate of time preference, which is equal to the interest rate, and  $u_i(t)$  denotes utility of one consumer in period  $t$ . Period utility depends in the following way on the amounts consumed:

$$\begin{aligned} u_i(t) &= \ln c_i(t) + q_{a,i}(t) + \delta q_{b,i}(t); & q_{j,i} &\in \{0,1\}; & (7) \\ & & \forall i &(q_{a,i} + q_{b,i}) &\in \{0,1\}; \\ & & \forall i &\delta > 0 \end{aligned}$$

$c$  denotes consumption of the homogenous consumption bundle. For our results to become effective, it is merely necessary that this part of the additive utility function exhibits decreasing marginal utility. Each consumer may or may not consume one unit of one  $q$ -good. The utility contribution of these goods is 1 and  $\delta$ , respectively. Without loss of generality we assume  $\delta < 1$ , i.e. consumers prefer the  $a$ -good. This implies that the price of the other good must be lower in order to be competitive. Unlike the homogenous consumption bundle, which must be used up immediately, both  $q$ -goods yield a utility flow within an interval of length  $T$ .

Consumers face the budget constraint

$$y_i = c_i(t) + s_a(\tau)q_a(\tau) + s_b(\tau)q_b(\tau); \quad \tau \in [t, t + T] \quad (8)$$


where the price of the homogenous consumption bundle is standardised to unity, i.e. this good is taken as the numeraire. An individual's period income,  $y_i$ , is assumed to be constant in time.  $s_j$  are annuities, and stand for the amount that must be saved each period so that the  $q$ -good can be bought in period  $\tau$  (either for the first time, or as a replacement, see fig. 1). This amount remains constant within the interval because of the diminishing marginal utility of the composite good and because the individual rate of time preference equals the interest rate. At  $t_0$  the considered household starts to save money in order to buy the  $q$ -good in period  $\tau_1$  for the first time. Since we will assume a continuum of different incomes below, the number of consumers who start consuming a  $q$ -good at a specific point in time is negligible in relation to the total number of consumers. Notice that consumers must be able to anticipate future prices for our diagram to be exact.

From

$$p_j(\tau) = \int_0^T s_j(\tau) e^{rt} dt$$

where  $p_j(\tau)$  denotes the price of industry  $j$ 's  $q$ -good in the moment of the purchase,  $\tau$ , we get

$$s_j(\tau) = \frac{rp_j(\tau)}{e^{rT} - 1} \quad (9)$$



**Fig. 1. Timeline and moments of replacement**

Due to the decreasing marginal utility of the homogenous consumption good, a critical period income exists at which consumers are indifferent between consuming or not consuming one of the  $q$ -goods with constant utility. The higher price and utility contribution of the  $a$ -good effectuates that this good is purchased by richer households than industry  $b$ 's good. Next, we derive the critical incomes  $y_a$  and  $y_b$  above which a consumer respectively purchases industry  $a$ 's and industry  $b$ 's goods.  $c_a$  and  $c_b$  denote homogenous good consumption of the marginal consumers, respectively. The marginal consumers of the  $b$ -good are indifferent to whether they consume more of the homogenous consumption bundle or whether they buy one unit of good  $b$ :

$$\int_0^T \{\ln [c_b(t)] + \delta\} e^{-rt} dt = \int_0^T \ln [c_b(t) + s_b(T)] e^{-rt} dt \quad (10)$$

Due to the decreasing utility of the homogenous consumption bundle, the amount saved in each period must be constant, so that the equality between the flows of utility must hold in every period, i.e.

$$\ln [c_b(T)] + \delta = \ln [c_b(T) + s_b(T)]$$

$$c_b(T) = \frac{s_b(T)}{e^\delta - 1}$$

This relationship must hold for each period's marginal consumer:

$$c_b(t) = \frac{s_b(t)}{e^\delta - 1}$$

The critical income is defined the income of the marginal buyer

$$\begin{aligned} y_b(t) = c_b(t) + s_b(t) &= \frac{e^\delta s_b(t)}{e^\delta - 1} \\ &= \frac{e^\delta}{e^\delta - 1} \frac{rp_b(t)}{e^{rT} - 1} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The critical income  $y_a$  at which a consumer is indifferent between consuming the  $a$ -good and less of the composite good, or the less appreciated  $b$ -good and more of the composite good can be derived from the following condition:

$$\int_0^T \{\ln [c_a(t)] + 1\} e^{-rt} dt = \int_0^T \{\ln [c_a(t) + s_a(T) - s_b(T)] + \delta\} e^{-rt} dt \quad (12)$$

Optimality requires that consumers split the costs of the  $q$ -good evenly:

$$\ln [c_a(T)] + 1 = \ln [c_a(T) + (s_a(T) - s_b(T))] + \delta$$

$$c_a(T) = \frac{s_a(T) - s_b(T)}{e^{1-\delta} - 1}$$

The critical consumption level  $c_a$  in period  $t$  is

$$c_a(t) = \frac{s_a(t) - s_b(t)}{e^{1-\delta} - 1}$$

Finally, we can derive the income of the marginal  $a$ -consumer as

$$\begin{aligned} y_a(t) = c_a(t) + s_a(t) &= \frac{s_a(t)e^{1-\delta} - s_b(t)}{e^{1-\delta} - 1} \\ &= \frac{[e^{1-\delta} p_a(t) - p_b(t)]r}{(e^{1-\delta} - 1) \cdot (e^{rT} - 1)} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

By means of eq. (11) and (13) we can infer which consumer buys one unit of good  $a$ , one unit of good  $b$ , or none  $q$ -good at all. As expected, both critical incomes depend negatively on the price of the corresponding good.

Figure 2 illustrates the amounts consumers spend on the consumption bundle, or save each period to finance the acquisition of a  $q$ -good. Households endowed with an income between  $y_l$  and  $y_b$  only buy the consumption bundle (recall that the price of the consumption bundle is one). Households with an income in the interval  $[y_b, y_a)$  buy one unit of the  $b$ -good and spend the remaining income on the composite consumption good. All households with an income above  $y_a$  buy the more expensive  $a$ -good, and  $y - s_a$  units of the composite good.




Fig. 2. Individual income and consumption

### 3.2 Individual and aggregate production

Assume perfect competition on the market for the homogenous good, as well as on both of the markets for the  $q$ -goods. All firms regard input prices and output prices as being given to them exogenously. The production functions for both  $q$ -goods is of the Cobb-Douglas type. Since it is linearly homogenous, production functions at the industry level have the same structure:

$$Q_j(t) = A_j(t)K_j(t)^\beta L_j(t)^{1-\beta} \quad (14)$$

where  $Q, A, K, L, \beta$  and  $1 - \beta$  denote the amount produced, a scale factor, capital employed, labour employed and the partial production elasticities of capital and labour, respectively. The scale factors increase over time due to exogenous technological progress (process innovations) in the following way:

$$A_j(t) = A_j e^{\gamma_j t}$$

where  $\gamma_j$  are the industry-specific rates of technological progress. The costs of one firm  $\ell$  in the  $j$ -industry are

$$C_j^\ell(t) = r^\beta w^{1-\beta} \beta^{-\beta} (1-\beta)^{-(1-\beta)} \frac{Q_j^\ell(t)}{A_j(t)}$$

where  $r$  and  $w$  denote the exogenously determined prices of capital and labour, i.e. capital input is standardised such that its price coincides with the rate of time preference. Profit maximisation for all identical firms yields that the price equals marginal costs:

$$p_j(t) = r^\beta w^{1-\beta} \mu \frac{1}{A_j(t)} \quad (15)$$

where  $\mu \equiv \beta^{-\beta} (1-\beta)^{-(1-\beta)}$ .

Since the scale factors  $A_j(t)$  increase in time due to technological progress, marginal costs and prices are monotonically decreasing functions of time. This implies that the critical incomes,  $y_b(t)$  and  $y_a(t)$ , at which a consumer is indifferent to whether

he buys one specific good or not, decrease over time as well. Since the income differs across consumers, but is constant over time, the number of consumers of the two  $q$ -goods and aggregate demand increase within a certain range of parameters.

### 3.3 Aggregate demand and equilibrium

In order to calculate aggregate demand, we need to make an assumption about the distribution of income within the economy. For the ease of calculation, we adopt a rectangular distribution.

$$g(y) = \begin{cases} \alpha & \forall y: y \in [y_l, y_h] \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

$y_l$  and  $y_h$  denote minimum and maximum income, respectively. The density of consumers with an income between  $y_l$  and  $y_h$  is  $\alpha$ .

Bearing in mind that industry  $a$ 's good is purchased by richer consumers than industry  $b$ 's good, the dynamic development of the economy can be divided in the following way: Initially, none of the  $q$ -goods are being produced (phase 0). The profit maximising prices are both higher than the willingness to pay even of the richest consumers with income  $y_h$ . Then, the  $b$ -good is purchased by some fraction of the consumers, while industry  $a$ 's good is not yet competitive due to its high marginal costs of production (phase 1). Next, both  $q$ -goods become competitive (phase 2). The following overview illustrates the different phases.

**Phase 1:** Some consumers can afford good  $b$ , while good  $a$  is not yet competitive.

$$y_a(t) \geq y_h > y_b(t) > y_l$$

Aggregate demand for good  $b$  is

$$Q_b^D(t) = \frac{1}{T} \int_{y_b(t)}^{y_h} g(y) dy = \frac{\alpha}{T} (y_h - y_b(t)) \quad (16)$$

**Phase 2a:** The richest households respectively buy one unit of the  $a$ -good, while a middle-class household buys the  $b$ -good. The poorest consumers fare better by buying neither of the goods (this is the case depicted in fig. 2).

$$y_h > y_a(t) > y_b(t) > y_l$$

If the proportion of consumers who buy one of the  $q$ -goods for the first time is small, aggregate demand approximates the replacement of all previous consumers' endowment of one good. Demand for the two  $q$ -goods then reads

$$Q_a^D(t) = \frac{1}{T} \int_{y_a(t)}^{y_h} g(y) dy = \frac{\alpha}{T} (y_h - y_a(t)) \quad (17)$$

$$Q_b^D(t) = \frac{1}{T} \int_{y_b(t)}^{y_a(t)} g(y) dy = \frac{\alpha}{T} (y_a(t) - y_b(t)) \quad (18)$$

**Phase 2b:** Market saturation. All consumers buy one unit of either  $q$ -good. During this phase, *ceteris paribus*, the market share of industry  $a$ 's good increases until it reaches 100%.

$$y_h > y_a(t) > y_l \geq y_b(t)$$

Demand for the  $a$ -good is as in Phase 2a, while demand for the  $b$ -good becomes

$$Q_b^D(t) = \frac{1}{T} \int_{y_l}^{y_a(t)} g(y) dy = \frac{\alpha}{T} (y_a(t) - y_l) \quad (19)$$


**Phase 3:** Only good  $a$  is competitive. Consumers are sufficiently rich to value the difference in the quality between the  $q$ -goods more than the corresponding difference in the prices.

$$y_h > y_l > y_a(t) > y_b(t)$$

Demand for good  $a$  is maximal:

$$Q_a^D(t) = \frac{1}{T} \int_{y_l}^{y_h} g(y) dy = \frac{\alpha}{T} (y_h - y_l) \quad (20)$$

Fig. 3 depicts the phases, and the respectively corresponding relationship of critical incomes  $y_b$  and  $y_a$ . It becomes clear that not all phases must necessarily actually occur. For instance, if the  $y_a$ -curve is sufficiently far above the  $y_b$ -curve, it may be that the market is saturated with good  $b$  before good  $a$  becomes cheap enough for any consumer to buy it.



**Fig. 3. Technological change and the product cycle**

### 3.4 Results

In order to explore the dynamics of production and employment, it is appropriate to make some further assumptions regarding the industries' technology, i.e. the parameters  $\gamma_j$  and  $A_j$ . Specifically, we consider proportionally decreasing costs of pro-



duction in industry  $a$  and  $b$ . That is, the rates of technological progress in both industries are equal,  $\gamma_a = \gamma_b = \gamma$ , and the scale factors  $A_j$  differ:  $A_a < A_b$ .<sup>1</sup>

In the case considered here the profit maximizing prices (15) become

$$p_a(t) = \frac{r^\beta w^{1-\beta} \mu}{A_a e^{\gamma t}}; \quad p_b(t) = \frac{r^\beta w^{1-\beta} \mu}{A_b e^{\gamma t}} \quad (21)$$

Production in the two phases can be calculated by plugging prices (21) in equations (16-20).

When does the transition between different phases take place? Phase 1 starts when the richest households start buying the less expensive good  $b$ . The condition that must be fulfilled at the moment of transition is  $y_b(t) = y_h$ . Inserting eq. (11) for  $y_b$  and solving for  $t$  gives:

$$t_1 = \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \ln \left[ \frac{\mu r^{1+\beta} w^{1-\beta} e^\delta}{y_h A_b (e^{rT} - 1) \cdot (e^{\delta-1} - 1)} \right] \quad (22)$$

An analogous procedure yields the point in time when the  $a$ -good becomes competitive:

$$t_{2a} = \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \ln \left[ \frac{\mu r^{1+\beta} w^{1-\beta} \cdot (e^{\delta-1} A_a - A_b)}{y_h A_a A_b (e^{rT} - 1) \cdot (e^{\delta-1} - 1)} \right] \quad (23)$$

As figure 3 illustrates, the length of the phases depends on the distance between the two curves representing  $y_b$  and  $y_a$ , respectively. If the  $y_b$ -curve intersects the horizontal  $y_l$  line before the  $y_a$ -curve reaches  $y_h$ , phase 2a will be missed out. According to the definition of phase 2b, it starts when even the poorest consumer begins to buy one  $q$ -good. Therefore, we can state the condition that must be fulfilled at that moment as  $y_b = y_l$ . Using eq. (11) obtains

$$t_{2b} = \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \ln \left[ \frac{\mu r^{1+\beta} w^{1-\beta}}{y_l A_b (e^{rT} - 1) \cdot (1 - e^{-\delta})} \right] \quad (24)$$

Phase 2b is terminated when  $q_b$  is no longer competitive. This takes place when  $y_a = y_l$ . Making use of eq. (13) gives

$$t_3 = \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \ln \left[ \frac{\mu r^{1+\beta} w^{1-\beta} \cdot (A_a - A_b e^{1-\delta})}{y_l A_a A_b (e^{rT} - 1) \cdot (1 - e^{1-\delta})} \right] \quad (25)$$

Does technological progress have a detrimental effect on employment in this model? The answer is a conditional yes. From a critical point in time onwards, the labour-saving effect of technological progress more than compensates for the labour-augmenting effect of a higher demand that may result from price cuts. The reason for this unambiguous result is related to theorem 1 and equation (3). In the begin-

---

<sup>1</sup>Without this assumption, the  $b$ -good would be redundant because no consumer would buy it at any time.

ning, the price cuts that are caused by costs-reducing process innovations bring about higher demand. The relative size of these increases in demand shrink, however, precisely because total demand increases, i.e. demand becomes ever less elastic over time. When the elasticity approaches minus one, eventually a point is reached where both effects on labour demand are equally strong. From this moment on, technological progress lowers demand for labour.

The points in time when employment starts to decrease due to technological progress are different for the two  $q$ -goods. The elasticity of demand for the  $b$ -good from phases 2a and 2b (demand functions eq. (18) and eq. (19)) is clearly greater than minus one. This implies that either the critical moment is at  $t_{2a}$  (i.e. when the  $a$ -good becomes competitive, see eq. (23)), or before. Since the cross-price elasticity  $\eta_{Q_2, p_1}$  is zero during phase 1, the condition that must be fulfilled at the moment when technical progress starts to be detrimental to employment in the  $b$ -production is that the direct price elasticity equals -1 (see eq. (3)):

$$\eta_{Q_b, p_b} = \frac{d}{dp_b} \left[ \frac{\alpha}{T} (y_h - y_b(t)) \right] \cdot \frac{p_b}{Q_b} = \frac{-\mu r^{1+\beta} w^{1-\beta} e^{\delta-\gamma t}}{(e^{rT} - 1) \cdot (e^\delta - 1) y_h A_b - \mu r^{1+\beta} w^{1-\beta} e^{\delta-\gamma t}} = -1$$

Solving this equation for  $t$ , we get

$$t_b^* = \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \ln \left[ \frac{2 r^{1+\beta} \mu w^{1-\beta} e^\delta}{y_h A_b (e^\delta - 1) \cdot (e^{rT} - 1)} \right]$$

Building the derivative of  $t_b^*$  with respect to  $w$  and  $T$  gives

$$\frac{\partial t_b^*}{\partial w} = \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \frac{1-\beta}{w} > 0; \quad \frac{\partial t_b^*}{\partial T} = \frac{-1}{\gamma} \cdot \frac{r e^{rT}}{e^{rT} - 1} < 0$$

Higher wages thus extend the period during which productivity has a positive impact on employment. The reason for this is that the number of consumers of the good is lower due to a higher price, which implies a higher elasticity. The level of employment must be lower than with low wages, however. The second result is that a longer economic life of the  $q$ -goods causes employment to reach its maximum earlier. The reason for this is simply that more consumers can afford the annual savings that are necessary to buy the  $q$ -good. The elasticity of demand decreases, and the point in time when productivity growth starts to have a detrimental effect on employment is reached earlier.

If this moment is before good  $a$  becomes competitive (phase 2a), increasing production and productivity are accompanied by decreasing employment. The condition that must be fulfilled is

$$t_b^* < t_{2a}$$

$$\frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \ln \left[ \frac{2 r^{1+\beta} \mu w^{1-\beta} e^\delta}{y_h A_b (e^\delta - 1) \cdot (e^{rT} - 1)} \right] < \frac{1}{\gamma} \cdot \ln \left[ \frac{\mu r^{1+\beta} w^{1-\beta} \cdot (e^{\delta-1} A_a - A_b h t)}{y_h A_a A_b (e^{rT} - 1) \cdot (e^{\delta-1} - 1)} \right]$$

$$\frac{A_1}{A_2} < \frac{e - e^{1-\delta}}{2e - e^\delta - 1}$$

As to be expected, the answer depends on the relationship between the productivity parameters  $A_j$ , and on the relative preference of consumers regarding the two  $q$ -goods, expressed by the parameter  $\delta$ . The lower the costs in the  $b$ -production relative to the  $a$ -production, and the less pronounced the consumers' preference towards the  $a$ -good, the more likely it is that employment in the  $b$ -production decreases before good  $a$  becomes competitive.

Good  $b$  is the first specific good that is ready for the market. Because of this, the cross-price elasticity with respect to  $p_a$  is zero during the first phase, so that only the direct price elasticity must be considered (see equation (3)). In this view, phase 1 represents the one-industry case. In reality, there are more or less close substitutes, and the technology in the production of these substitutes is subject to changes as well, however. Therefore, finding the point in time when productivity growth has a detrimental effect on employment in the  $a$ -industry is somewhat more complicated, but also more interesting, since this case is meant to be representative for the continuum of industries that characterizes real-world economies.

In our two-industry case, productivity growth lowers the prices of both  $q$ -goods, and the lower price of the respective substitute causes a further negative effect on production and employment (in addition to the decreasing direct elasticity of demand). As a consequence, the sum of the direct and the cross-price elasticity must equal minus one at the moment when employment has reached its peak:  $\eta_{Q_a p_a(t_a^*)} + \eta_{Q_a p_b(t_a^*)} = -1$ . Building the elasticities and solving for  $t$  yields

$$t_a^* = \frac{1}{\gamma} \ln \left[ \frac{2 r^{1+\beta} w^{1-\beta} \mu (A_b - e^{\delta-1} A_a)}{y_h A_a A_b (e^{rT} - 1) \cdot (1 - e^{\delta-1})} \right]$$

Again, this point in time depends positively on factor prices  $r$  and  $w$ , and negatively on  $T$ . The first derivative with respect to  $\delta$  is positive, which means that maximum employment in the  $a$ -industry is later if this good is less preferred with respect to the  $b$ -good. Since this is accompanied by lower demand for good  $a$  throughout the entire product cycle, the relative change in demand that is caused by a decrease in the price  $p_a$  is stronger and the employment effect is positive.

The results we derived for employment and the production of good  $a$  are meant to be representative of industries that face competition not only within the industry, but also with firms in other industries, due to the substitutability of the goods. In order to elaborate the effects most clearly, we assumed that the goods are close substitutes (only one of which may be consumed), but our most basic findings do not hinge on this assumption, as is shown in section 2, where no assumptions regarding the degree of substitutability were made.

## 4 Structural change and regional employment disparities

The model we described in the previous section provides a micro-foundation for the more general analysis of section 2. The point we made in an admittedly stylised framework is that the effects of technological progress on employment depend upon the elasticity of aggregate demand. The latter decreases as the product of the industry we look at advances in its product cycle, so that eventually the point is reached when price cuts come along with less than proportionately growing demand. At the latest then, employment in the industry starts to decrease.

Our results may explain the large differences in the employment performance of various countries. In an econometric paper Möller (2001) found that in the passing of time the demand elasticity decreased in all three countries he studied, in the USA, in the UK, and in Germany. In the latter country the decrease was strongest and affected the economy especially during the early nineteen-seventies, in a phase of growing unemployment. This might have been due to the specialisation of the country on manufacturing and especially on products of a relatively high quality. Often these products are not innovative in the true sense. The German economy has been highly competitive regarding relatively mature products, whose markets are characterised by low demand elasticities. The price for this specialisation may be a relatively low employment level.

It is possible to reconcile the model presented here with the standard approach of macroeconomics developed by Layard et al. (1991) and their many followers. In that framework a price-setting function takes the role of the labour demand function. The corresponding wage-setting function represents the functional relationship between wages and unemployment, which may be based on efficiency wages or wage negotiation processes. Shifts of the price setting functions could be triggered by the theorem substantiated here. It should be noted that models of the Layard et al. -type are based on monopolistic competition whereas our model relies on perfect competition. But this is of minor importance for the causal process studied here. At any rate one might add a wage setting curve to our model to reproduce the style of modern macroeconomics. In a framework of this kind different unemployment rates could be obtained.<sup>2</sup>

The comparison with modern macroeconomic approaches helps to clarify another point, namely the role of our assumption of fixed wages. If wages would adjust flexibly according to the regional scarcity of labour, the industry mix of the regions and the maturity of the corresponding products would have no effect on unemployment.

---

<sup>2</sup>Under monopolistic competition the firm is operating on the elastic part of the firm-individual demand function. For an individual firm the actions of all other firms are given. If all firms would set their prices symmetrically, however, the consumers' ability to react to price changes would be reduced. Therefore, the elasticity of aggregate demand is always lower than the elasticity one specific firm faces. Therefore, it may well be that aggregate demand is inelastic, even under monopolistic competition.

This is excluded in the concept of the wage setting curve. According to this concept, which is compatible with many of the prevailing theories of unemployment like efficiency wages and union bargaining, a higher unemployment rate comes along with a lower wage rate. If we would allow for wages that are to some extent flexible, this would mitigate our results. Lower employment would translate into higher unemployment, which comes along with lower wages. The decrease of wages would lead to an increase in labour demand, which could not outweigh the initial impulse, however. In addition, the comparative-static results we derived suggest that the lower wage rate would only accelerate the process, so that wages would have to decline ever faster. In summary we claim that the specialisation of regions with respect to their industrial structure could explain interregional differences in the dynamics of unemployment.

Our findings may help to clarify why employment, and accordingly unemployment differ strongly across regions within one country. The standard approach (Layard et al., 1991) emphasises the influence that institutions have on labour market outcome, and is thus silent regarding regional differences, since the institutional setting is usually the same for all regions within one country. Two more steps are required for our claim to hold: first, we argue that the industrial structure differs across regions, and that according to the results of our theoretical analysis these differences are at the source of the employment dynamics. Second, we maintain that the development of employment is closely related to the regions' performance regarding unemployment (see Blanchard and Katz 1992 and Elhorst 2003).

It should be emphasised that there is a regional equivalent to the macroeconomic concept of the wage-setting curve, called the "wage curve". According to this concept, which was proposed by Blanchflower and Oswald, the empirical elasticity of wages with respect to regional unemployment is  $-0.1$ .<sup>3</sup> Therefore, regional wages are far from being completely flexible. Only fully flexible wages would be able to neutralise our results, however.

The production of many goods is clustered in relatively small areas. A new debate revealed a characteristic asymmetry. Agglomeration forces are visible for productivity, but not for employment (see Cingano and Schivardi 2004 and Combes et al. 2004). This means that productivity grows faster in large agglomerations but employment in the rural country. This striking discrepancy can easily be understood by the results derived in this paper.

Although there are only few regions that are as lopsided as, for instance, the automobile industry in Detroit (at least historically), or high-tech businesses in Silicon

---

<sup>3</sup>The absolute size of the effect is a point of debate. Arguably, it might be smaller in absolute terms than  $-0.1$ . This is the result of a meta-analysis which corrects for 'publication bias' (Nijkamp and Poot, 2005). In the German case, many studies showed that the coefficient is smaller than the international average, see Blien (2001) and Baltagi, Blien and Wolf (2009).

Valley, it is certainly the case that each region has its specific mix of industries, which is shaped by economic as well as historical, geographical and other factors. Our model suggests that the specific industrial structure that characterises a region determines how employment evolves over time. Regions that exhibit a relatively large share of "young" industries, which produce goods that are at the beginning of their product cycle, fare better in terms of employment than other regions. Notice that our argument is not restricted to industries in decline, as mining and heavy industry, which would be trivial. Regions with a high number of silicon chip producers may well encounter the same sort of employment problems in the future as regions with a high share of automobile industry are experiencing now. Rather, our analysis suggests that the rise and decline of employment is inherent in any industry.

## **5 Conclusion**

The model presented in this study captures an important, but widely ignored property of product markets, namely a decreasing elasticity of aggregate demand over the product cycle (see Möller, 2001). We are able to trace the decrease of the price elasticity back to individual preferences.

We explain the development of employment by the interaction of supply and demand forces. Technical progress has two different effects on employment: The labour saving effect is directly related to the increase in productivity, since less labour is needed to produce the same amount of the product. On the other hand there is a compensating effect of technical progress: Price decreases leads to higher demand and to more employment. The relative strength of the two effects depend on the elasticity of demand and on the substitution relationships to other products. Since we found forces which shift the demand elasticity from higher to lower values (in absolute terms), product cycles are related to their microeconomic basis. The employment of nations, regions, cities or industries is affected by the position of their leading products within their respective product cycle.

As to policy conclusions, the results obtained are quite striking. In the first phase of development – after the introduction of an innovative product – measures taken to assist the infant industry have positive employment effects. These grow even larger when the industry matures and gains more and more weight in the region or nation it is located. During this time all the measures assisting the ascending industry increase employment. But then, unknown to the actors in the respective region (or nation), a turning point is reached. Now the same measures intended to increase productivity have detrimental effects on employment and therefore adverse effects on the whole region (or nation). Thus, the same measure might have very different effects depending on location and time.

Only policies fostering the introduction of new products are unambiguous with respect to employment. They start again the product cycle, which could lead to higher levels of employment.

## References

- Appelbaum E. and Schettkat R. (1993): "Employment Developments in Industrialized Economies: Explaining Common and Diverging Trends." Discussion Paper 93-313, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung.
- Autor D.H., Levy F. and Murnane R.J. (2003): "The Skill Content Of Recent Technological Change. An Empirical Exploration", in: *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 118/4: 1279-1333
- Autor D.H. and Dorn D. (2014): "The Growth of Low Skill Service Jobs and the Polarization of the U.S. Labor Market", *American Economic Review*
- Baltagi B.H., Blien U. and Wolf K. (2009): "New evidence on the dynamic wage curve for Western Germany: 1980-2004", *Labour Economics* 16/1: 47-51
- Blanchard O.J. and Katz L.F. (1992): "Regional Evolutions." *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1, 1–75.
- Blanchflower D.G. and Oswald A.J. (2005): "The Wage Curve Reloaded." Working Paper 11338, NBER.
- Blien U. (2001): *Arbeitslosigkeit und Entlohnung auf regionalen Arbeitsmärkten: Theoretische Analyse, ökonometrische Methode, empirische Evidenz und wirtschaftspolitische Schlussfolgerungen für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland*. Heidelberg: Physica-Verlag.
- Blien U. and Sanner H. (2014): "Technological Progress and Employment." *Economics Bulletin* 34/1: 245-251
- Cavelaars P. (2005): "Has the Tradeoff Between Productivity Gains and Job Growth Disappeared?" *Kyklos*, 58, 45–64.
- Cingano F. and Schivardi F. (2004): "Identifying the Sources of Local Productivity Growth." *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 2, 720–742.
- Combes P.P., Magnac T. and Robin J.M. (2004): "The Dynamics of Local Employment in France." *Journal of Urban Economics*, 56, 217–243.
- Elhorst P.J. (2003): "The Mystery of Regional Unemployment Differentials: Theoretical and Empirical Explanations." *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 17, 709–748.
- Freeman R.B. (2001): "Single-peaked versus Diversified Capitalism: The Relation Between Economic Institutions and Outcomes." In *Advances in Macroeconomic Theory*, J. Drèze, ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 139–170.
- Layard R., Nickell S. and Jackman R. (1991): *Unemployment: Macroeconomic Performance and the Labour Market*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Extended second edition (2005)
- Möller J. (2001): "Income and Price Elasticities in Different Sectors of the Economy: An Analysis of Structural Change for Germany, the UK and the USA." In *The Growth of Service Industries: The Paradox of Exploding Costs and Persistent Demand*, T. ten Raa and R. Schettkat, eds. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar, 167– 208.
- Mortensen D.T. and Pissarides C.A. (2011) (ed.): "Job Matching, Wage Dispersion, and Unemployment", Oxford: Oxford University.

Neisser H. (1942): "'Permanent' Technological Unemployment. 'Demand for Commodities is Not Demand for Labor'", *American Economic Review*: 50-71.

Nijkamp P. and Poot J. (2005): "The Last Word on the Wage Curve?" *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 19, 421–450.

Südekum J. (2005): "Increasing Returns and Spatial Unemployment Disparities." *Papers in Regional Science*, 84, 159–181.



