

Guerrazzi, Marco

Working Paper

Wage bargaining in an optimal control framework: A dynamic version of the right-to-manage model

Open Discussion Papers in Economics, No. 61

Provided in Cooperation with:

Department of Economics, Faculty of Social Sciences, The Open University

Suggested Citation: Guerrazzi, Marco (2007) : Wage bargaining in an optimal control framework: A dynamic version of the right-to-manage model, Open Discussion Papers in Economics, No. 61, The Open University, Economics Department, Milton Keynes

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/65689>

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.



———— OPEN ————
DISCUSSION PAPERS IN
———— ECONOMICS ————

Wage Bargaining in an Optimal Control Framework: A Dynamic Version of the Right-to- Manage Model

Marco Guerrazzi

June 2007

NUMBER 61

Copies may be obtained from:

Economics Department
Faculty of Social Sciences
The Open University
Walton Hall Milton Keynes MK7 6AA
Telephone: 01908 654437
Email: economics@open.ac.uk
Fax: 01908 654488

This series is registered under

ISSN 1753-2590 (Print)

ISSN 1753-2604 (Online)

Economics Research at The Open University

Throughout the 1990s, The Open University has been developing its research capacity in economics. Economists at the OU comprise a lively and expanding group with a wide set of interests ranging from development policy to decision theory, from Marxist theories of profit to libertarian foundations of environmental policy and from econometric analysis of large data sets through institutional economics to the use of case-studies in policy formation. Nearly a 1000 students from around the world register each year to study economics courses and their needs, together with the multi-disciplinary nature of social science at the university, shape out research. Through a variety of personal and group research projects, our work makes a strong contribution to areas like business, public policy and even philosophy where sharply focused analysis can inform decision-making as well as contribute to scientific progress.

In 1999, approximately £250,000 million worth of externally funded grants (3 from the ESRC) were held by discipline members, some of whom also act as consultants to national and international bodies. Approximately half a dozen students are currently reading for doctorates with members of the discipline and we are always interested in proposals from colleagues or potential students who would like to do research with us.

Some of the journals in which discipline members have published include: *Annals of Operations Research*, *Economic Journal*, *Economica*, *Economics and Philosophy*, *Feminist Economics*, *Feminist Review*, *International Journal of the Economics of Business*, *International Journal of Industrial Organisation*, *Journal of Economic Issues*, *Journal of Economic Psychology*, *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, *Journal of Social Policy*, *Local Government Studies*, *The Locke Newsletter*, *Open Learning*, *Oxford Economic Papers*, *Public Policy and Administration*, *Radical Statistics*, *Review of Economic Dynamics*, *Revue d'Économie Politique*, *Risk Decision and Policy*, *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, *Technovation* and *Theory and Decision*.

The papers contain results of economic research which are the sole responsibility of the authors. Opinions expressed in these papers are hence those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect views of the University.

Wage Bargaining in an Optimal Control Framework: A Dynamic Version of the Right-to-Manage Model*

Marco Guerrazzi[†]

Department of Economics

University of Pisa

Abstract

This paper aims to represent wage bargaining as an optimal control problem. Specifically, by assuming that employment follows a stock adjustment principle towards the level that maximises profits, *i.e.*, towards labour demand, we build an intertemporal optimising model in which the real wage is continuously set by an infinitely-lived omniscient arbitrator that is called in to resolve the dispute between the workers and the employers. Our theoretical proposal allows to show that unions may speed up the adjustment to equilibrium and it suggests that standard (static) models may understate the distortions implied by wage bargaining.

JEL Classification: C61, E24

Keywords: Wage Bargaining, Optimal Control Theory, Right-to-Manage Model and Numerical Solutions

1 Introduction

There are two main approaches to modelling the bargaining behaviour as it was pioneered by Nash (1950, 1953): the *axiomatic* approach and the *game-theoretic* approach. The former aims to find the weak set of axioms under which a unique outcome can be found¹.

*This paper has been developed while I was visiting the Department of Economics of the Open University, Walton Hall, Milton Keynes, MK7 6AA (UK).

[†]Research Fellow at Department of Economics, University of Pisa, via Serafini n. 3, 56124 Pisa (Italy), e-mail guerrazzi@ec.unipi.it

¹See, for example, Peters (1992).

The latter aims to build plausible non-cooperative games and determine - through their solution - the actual outcome of the bargaining process².

The negotiation between management and workers concerning wages is probably one of the most recurring application of the bargaining theory. In this field of theoretical labour economics, there are two competing framework to model wage bargaining, *i.e.*, the right-to-manage model and the efficient bargaining model. In the former, the union and the representative firm bargain over the wage while the employment is unilaterally chosen by the employer. In the latter, the union and the firm bargain simultaneously over the wage *and* employment. An excellent overview is given by Booth (1995).

Most of the models of collective bargaining are static in the sense that they do not explicitly consider the dynamic implication of negotiations on wages and employment. Of course, there are some good exceptions. Specifically, the seminal work by Booth and Schiantarelli (1987) provides a dynamic analysis of the monopoly union model developed with optimal control techniques aimed at assessing the employment effects of a reduction of the standard working week. Moreover, there is a paper by Kidd and Oswald (1987) that builds a dynamic model developed within an optimal control framework in which an utilitarian union pick a time path for employment (and, implicitly, the wage) by tacking into account its membership dynamics³. Finally, we find the work by Lockwood and Manning (1989) that derives a dynamic version of the right-to-manage and efficient bargaining model by exploiting dynamic programming techniques .

To our knowledge, the present contribution is the first attempt to model wage bargaining as a continuous process in an optimal control framework. For reasons of analytical tractability, this task is carried out in the context of the right-to-manage model. Specifically, we develop an intertemporal optimisation model developed in continuous time in which an infinitely-lived arbitrator is called to choose the real wage rate by tacking into account that employment adjusts towards the appropriate level that satisfies labour demand. This framework allows for a straightforward derivation of an explicit dynamic law for the real wage rate and a sharp analysis of the dynamic properties of an economy in which the employment (wage) path is affected by the time path of the wage (employment).

The remainder of the paper is arranged as follows. Section 2 presents the model. Section 3 concludes.

²See, for example, Sutton (1986).

³Kidd and Oswald (1987) builds also a dynamic version of the efficient bargaining model in which wages result in being time-independent.

2 The Model

By following the principles of the optimal control theory, we develop an intertemporal optimisation model in which employment adjusts towards the level desired by employers, *i.e.*, towards labour demand. Therefore, employment dynamics derives from the standard profit-maximising behaviour assumption. In this sense, our model can be thought as a microfoundation of a supply-constrained equilibrium as described by Solow and Stiglitz (1968).

A distinctive feature of the present contribution is that the real wage is continuously set by an infinitely-lived omniscient arbitrator. Specifically, in each instant, our arbitrator is assumed to choose the real wage rate by weighting the objective functions of a group of identical (risk-averse) unionised workers and a representative firm. Our approach seems to provide a well-tested tool for describing the behaviour of a mediator whose job is precisely to settle a stream of bargaining conflicts. In other words, we view wage bargaining as a continuous process in which consecutive agreements take place while the parties' underlying opportunities constantly change. Thereafter, in contrast to the traditional approach, which assumes the presence of a single and constant set of payoff and predicts a single agreement, in our framework the parties's set of opportunities changes continuously over time and the solution specifies the whole path of agreements. Similar arguments may be found in Raiffa (1953) and, more recently, in Wiener and Winter (1998).

2.1 Employment Dynamics

In our framework, employment (L) adjusts towards the appropriate level desired by employers. In other words, we are making the *had hoc* assumption that employment follows a stock adjustment principle, whereby a fixed fraction of the gap between the equilibrium and the actual level of employment is closed at each point of time.

Suppose that the production function has a quadratic specification:

$$Y = \alpha_1 L - \alpha_2 L^2 \quad \alpha_1 > 0, \alpha_2 > 0 \quad (1)$$

As it will become apparent, a quadratic utility function is necessary to preserve the concavity of the Hamiltonian in the optimal control problem.

Under competitive conditions, labour demand has the following linear specification:

$$w = \alpha_1 - 2\alpha_2 L \quad (2)$$

where w is the real wage.

Given (2), the dynamic law which describes the employment evolution is the following:

$$\dot{L} = \theta \left(\frac{\alpha_1 - w}{2\alpha_2} - L \right) \quad (3)$$

where θ is an attrition parameter.

Obviously, the stationary locus for L , *i.e.*, the pairs (L, w) such that $\dot{L} = 0$, is downward sloped.

In the remainder of the paper, we will make the convenient assumption that

$$\alpha_1 = 1 + 2\alpha_2 \quad (4)$$

Given an inelastic labour supply L^S normalised to unity in each period, (4) suggests that the real wage that clears the labour market is equal to 1. Obviously, $u = 1 - L$ provides the corresponding rate of unemployment. See figure 1.




Figure 1: The stationary locus for employment

2.2 Wage Bargaining as an Optimal Control Problem

A distinguishing feature of the present contribution is that w is continuously set by an omniscient arbitrator by following the principles of the optimal control theory⁴. In other words, we interpret the solution of the dynamic system made up of the control variable

⁴See Koopmans (1965).

(the wage) and the state variable (the employment) that results from a well-specified optimal control problem as the potential outcome of the bargaining process.

The first step of this theoretical exercise is the definition of the instantaneous preferences of the objective arbitrator that is called in to resolve the dispute between the workers and the firm. Given our purposes, a sensible choice is certainly a (linear) weighted average between the net gain of the union (U) and the net gain of the representative employer (π). Therefore, the real wage is assumed to be set through the continuous maximisation of the following expression:

$$\Omega \equiv \gamma\pi + (1 - \gamma)U \quad 0 < \gamma < 1 \quad (5)$$

where γ represents the relative bargaining strength of the firm.

The linear bargaining solution in (7) is useful in order to preserve analytical tractability. Moreover, it allows for the same comparative statics results for a change in γ as would be obtained in more conventional bargaining solutions⁵.

The net gains of the two parties are represented in a conventional way, *i.e.*,

$$\pi = (1 + 2\alpha_2 - w)L - \alpha_2 L^2 \quad \text{and} \quad U = L(u(w) - u(b)) \quad (6)$$

where $u(\cdot)$ is the utility function of individual worker and b is its reservation wage.

The reading of the expressions in (6) is straightforward. On the one hand, the net gain for the firm is given by the level of profits in real terms. On the other hand, the net gain for the union is given by the expected utility of its representative member⁶.

Given (5) and (6), our optimal control problem becomes the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_w \int_0^{+\infty} e^{-\rho t} (\gamma\pi + (1 - \gamma)U) dt \\ \dot{L} = \theta \left(\overset{s.to}{\frac{1+2\alpha_2-w}{2\alpha_2}} - L \right) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where ρ is the rate of time preferences of the arbitrator.

Notice that whenever $\gamma = 0$ our framework provides a version of the monopoly union model.

The present-value Hamiltonian is given by

⁵See Lockwood and Manning (1989).

⁶The expressions in (6) suggest that the outside option of the bargaining is zero for the firm and $u(b)$ for the union. Moreover, we are implicitly assuming that *all* the labour force is unionised.

$$H_S = \Omega + \Lambda \theta \left(\frac{1 + 2\alpha_2 - w}{2\alpha_2} - L \right) \quad (8)$$

where Λ is the costate variable.

The f.o.c. for w is the following:

$$(1 - \gamma) L u'(w) = \gamma L + \Lambda \frac{\theta}{2\alpha_2} \quad (9)$$

The result in (9) suggests that in each instant the real wage will be set by equalising the proportional marginal benefit of the union to the proportional marginal benefit of the firm *augmented* by shadow-value of the employment variation. Obviously, each marginal benefit is weighted by the respective bargaining strength of the two parties.

Along the optimal path, Λ has to satisfy the following differential equation:

$$\dot{\Lambda} = \Lambda (\rho + \theta) - \Omega_L \quad (10)$$

where $\Omega_L = \frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial L}$.

By exploiting the results in (9) and (10) it is possible to derive a non-linear law of motion for the real wage, *i.e.*,

$$\dot{w} = \frac{2\alpha_2 \Phi \left(L(\rho + \theta) - \dot{L} \right) - \theta \Omega_L}{2\alpha_2 L (1 - \gamma) u''(w)} \quad (11)$$

where $\Phi = \frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial w} \frac{1}{L}$.

Notice that whenever the firm has all the bargaining power, *i.e.*, $\gamma = 1$, or the workers are risk-neutral, *i.e.*, $u''(w) = 0$, (11) implies an explosive dynamics for w .

Finally, the transversality condition is the following:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow +\infty} e^{-\rho t} \Lambda(t) L(t) = 0 \quad (12)$$

2.2.1 Steady-State

On the one hand, the equality $\dot{L} = 0$ implies that

$$w = 1 + 2\alpha_2 (1 - L) \quad (13)$$

On the other hand, $\dot{w} = 0$ implies that

$$2\alpha_2\Phi\left(L(\rho+\theta)-\dot{L}\right)=\theta\Omega_L \quad (14)$$

Given the definitions of Φ and Ω_L , (13) can be substituted in (14) to yield a function which depends only on L , *i.e.*,

$$((1-\gamma)u'(1+2\alpha_2(1-L))-\gamma)L=\frac{\theta(1-\gamma)}{2\alpha_2(\rho+\theta)}(u(1+2\alpha_2(1-L))-u(b)) \quad (15)$$

By assuming that workers are risk-averse, *i.e.*, $u(w)=w^\beta$, $0<\beta<1$, (15) can be written as

$$\left((1-\gamma)\beta(1+2\alpha_2(1-L))^{\beta-1}-\gamma\right)L=\frac{\theta(1-\gamma)}{2\alpha_2(\rho+\theta)}\left((1+2\alpha_2(1-L))^\beta-b^\beta\right) \quad (16)$$

Notice that the expression on the left-hand side of (16) is a parabolic function with two real roots, *i.e.*, 0 and $\left(2\alpha_2-\left(\frac{(1-\gamma)\beta}{\gamma}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\beta}}+1\right)/2\alpha_2$ whose derivative is positive for $L\geq 0$. By contrast, the expression on the right-hand side is a decreasing monotonic function with a positive intercept given by $\theta(1-\gamma)\left((1+2\alpha_2)^\beta-b^\beta\right)/2\alpha_2(\rho+\theta)$. Therefore, we may conclude that it exists a positive meaningful stationary solution (L^*, w^*) . A graphical outlook is given in figure 2.




Figure 2: The steady-state

2.2.2 Local Dynamics

By assuming that workers are risk-averse, *i.e.* $u(w) = w^\beta$, $0 < \beta < 1$, the linear expansion of our dynamic system around a generic stationary solution (L^*, w^*) following:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{w} \\ \dot{L} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} j_{1,1} & j_{1,2} \\ -\frac{\theta}{2\alpha_2} & -\theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} w - w^* \\ L - L^* \end{pmatrix} \quad (17)$$

where:

$$j_{1,1} = \frac{(\rho + \theta) \left((1 - \gamma) (1 - \beta) \beta + (\beta - 2) \Phi^* (w^*)^{1-\beta} \right)}{(1 - \gamma) (1 - \beta) \beta} + \frac{\theta \left((w^*)^\beta - b^\beta \right) (2 - \beta)}{2\alpha_2 (1 - \beta) \beta L_S^* (w^*)^{1-\beta}} \quad (18)$$

$$j_{1,2} = -\frac{\theta \Phi^* (w^*)^{2-\beta}}{(1 - \gamma) (1 - \beta) \beta L^*} - \frac{\theta (w_S^*)^{2-\beta} \left(2\alpha_2 \gamma L^* + (1 - \gamma) \left((w^*)^\beta - b^\beta \right) \right)}{2\alpha_2 (1 - \gamma) (1 - \beta) \beta (L^*)^2} \quad (19)$$

Given the sign of the elements of the Jacobian matrix in (17), it can be shown that the stationary solution (L^*, w^*) is represented by a saddle point. This means that there will be only one trajectory that satisfies (3) and (11) which converges to steady-state while all the others diverge. In other words, in our bargaining model the equilibrium path is locally determinate, *i.e.*, there will be a unique w_0 in the neighborhood of w_S^* that generates a trajectory converging to (L^*, w^*) . This value of w_0 should be selected in order to satisfy the transversality condition in (12) and it will place the system on the stable branch of the saddle point (L^*, w^*) .

Moreover, given that $j_{1,1} > 0$ and $j_{1,2} < 0$ the slope of stationary locus for w , *i.e.*, the pair (L, w) such that $\dot{w} = 0$, satisfies - at least in the neighborhood of the steady-state - what Solow and Stiglitz (1968, pg. 547) call the “*natural presumption*” about real wage bargaining. Specifically, the sign of the elements in (18) and (19) show that the $\dot{w} = 0$ locus crosses the $\dot{L} = 0$ locus with a positive slope. This means that in the neighborhood of (L^*, w^*) a higher value of w is consistent with a stable real wage only at a lower unemployment rate.

2.3 Some Numerical Examples

In order to have a better understanding of the model’s local dynamics and confirm the analytical results derived above, we carry out some numerical simulations⁷. Specifically, by

⁷The MATLAB 6.5 code used in this paper is available from the author upon request.

using the configuration of parameters described in Appendix, we calculate the stationary solution of our dynamic system and the characteristic roots of the Jacobian matrix in (17) for different values of γ . Some results are collected in Table 1.

γ	L^*	w^*	r_1	r_2
0.00	0.4395	1.5605	0.8609	-0.9506
0.05	0.4555	1.5445	0.8283	-0.9109
0.10	0.4735	1.5265	0.7973	-0.8668
0.15	0.4965	1.5035	0.7579	-0.8179
0.20	0.5245	1.4755	0.7158	-0.7632
0.25	0.5595	1.4405	0.6703	-0.7019
0.30	0.6065	1.3935	0.6153	-0.6329
0.35	0.6695	1.3305	0.5553	-0.5550
0.40	0.7615	1.2385	0.4830	-0.4673
0.45	0.9035	1.0965	0.3978	-0.3699
0.50	1.1415	0.8585	0.2931	-0.2678

Table 1: Numerical Simulations

The results in Table 1 suggests some straightforward conclusions. First, lower values of γ leads to higher values of the wage and the unemployment rate. This result is in perfect consonance with the standard (static) right-to-manage model. However, if the firm becomes too strong our model may deliver bargaining solutions which are not plausible because they imply a value of the real wage lower than the union's outside option that we assumed to equal the workers' reservation wage⁸. Specifically, if we set $b = 1$, then the wage outcome of the bargaining process *cannot* be lower of the full employment retribution. By using the configuration of parameters described in Appendix, this is what happens when the firm and the union have the same bargaining strength⁹.

Moreover, each stationary solution (L^*, w^*) is characterised by two real eigenvalues of opposite sign. Obviously, this confirms that in the neighbourhood of the steady-state there is a saddle path. This path is the only one the satisfies the transversality condition in (12) and guarantees the non-negativity of L and w .

Finally, the value of the (negative) convergent root is a decreasing function of the bargaining strength of the firm. This result suggests that trade unions may speed up the

⁸This result is due to the linear bargaining solution adopted in (5).

⁹Moreover, notice that the monopoly union version of our model ($\gamma = 0$) does not provide a bargaining solution below the firm's outside option ($\pi = 0$).

adjustment to equilibrium. The same counter-evident conclusion is reached in the dynamic programming right-to-manage model proposed by Lockwood and Manning (1989).

2.4 The Dynamic Model *versus* the Static Model

Before concluding, it may be of some interest to make a comparison between the wage-employment outcomes of our dynamic model and a companion static model that exploits the same linear bargaining solution. Specifically, we may be interested in comparing the results collected in Table 1 with the solutions of the following problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_w & \gamma ((1 + 2\alpha_2 - w) L - \alpha_2 L^2) + (1 - \gamma) L (w^\beta - b^\beta) \\ & \text{s.to} \\ & w = 1 + 2\alpha_2 (1 - L) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

The f.o.c. for w is given by

$$\left(\frac{1 + 2\alpha_2 - w_s^*}{2\alpha_2} \right) \beta (w_s^*)^{\beta-1} - \frac{(w_s^*)^\beta - b^\beta}{2\alpha_2} = \frac{\gamma}{1 - \gamma} \left(\frac{1 + 2\alpha_2 - w_s^*}{2\alpha_2} \right) \quad (21)$$

By using the configuration of parameters described in Appendix, we calculate some optimal pair (L_s^*, w_s^*) for different values of γ . Some results are collected in Table 2.

γ	L_s^*	w_s^*
0.00	0.5045	1.4955
0.05	0.5205	1.4795
0.10	0.5385	1.4615
0.15	0.5605	1.4395
0.20	0.5875	1.4125
0.25	0.6215	1.3785
0.30	0.6655	1.3345
0.35	0.7235	1.2765
0.40	0.8045	1.1955
0.45	0.9225	1.0775
0.50	1.1095	0.8905

Table 3: The static model

A straightforward comparison between the results in Tables 1 and 2 suggests that the static model may understate the distortions caused by wage bargaining. This conclusion is at odd with respect to the findings in Kidd and Oswald (1987).

3 Concluding Remarks

This paper aimed to build a dynamic model in which wage bargaining were represented as a continuous process in an optimal control problem. This task has been carried out by building a dynamic version of the right-to-manage model in which an infinitely-lived omniscient arbitrator continuously chooses the real wage rate by tacking into account that employment adjusts towards labour demand.

Our theoretical proposal allowed for a straightforward derivation of a dynamic law for the real wage rate which imposed some interesting restrictions to the model. Specifically, we found that if the union has no bargaining power and/or workers are risk-neutral, the rules of optimal control deliver an explosive dynamics for the real wage. Moreover, our framework allowed for a sharp analysis of the stationary solution and local dynamics of the employment and the real wage. Specifically, under quite general conditions, our model displayed a unique stationary solution characterised by a determined equilibrium trajectory. Furthermore, in the neighbourhood of the steady-state, our dynamic law for real wages verified the Solow and Stiglitz's (1968) "*natural presumption*" on real wage bargaining.

Finally, by resorting to some numerical simulations, we shown that in our framework unions may enhance the adjustment to equilibrium and that standard static models of bargaining my understate the distortions implied by wage negotiations.

The results collected in this paper have to be though as very preliminary. By following Solow and Stiglitz (1968), an interesting theoretical development should be the concern of an employment dynamics that arises from the goods market rationing. As in the present contribution, aggregate supply may derived from the standard profit-maximising behaviour assumption. By contrast, aggregate demand could be obtained by resorting to the Cambridge theory of distribution. Therefore, aggregate spending would result in depending on the different propensities to save and spend wage incomes and profits¹⁰. This will be done in later work.

4 Appendix

4.1 The Parametrisation of the Model

The numerical simulations in Section 2.3 are carried out by using the set of parameters in Table 3.

¹⁰See Kaldor (1955-1956).

Parameter	Description	Value
α_2	<i>productivity parameter</i>	0.5
θ	<i>labour market attrition</i>	0.10
ρ	<i>discount rate</i>	0.03
b	<i>reservation wage</i>	1
β	<i>risk-aversion parameter</i>	0.9

Table 3: The parameters of the model

References

- [1] Benhabib J. and Farmer R. (1994), *Indeterminacy and Increasing Returns*, Journal of Economic Theory, Vol. 63, pp. 19-41
- [2] Booth A. (1995), *The Economics of Trade Union*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press
- [3] Booth A. and Schiantarelli F. (1987), *The Employment Effects of a Shorter Working Week*, Economica, New Series, Vol. 54, no. 214, pp. 237-248
- [4] Burgess S. (1988), *Employment Adjustment in UK Manufacturing*, The Economic Journal, Vol. 98, no. 389, pp. 81-103
- [5] Kaldor N. (1955-1956), *Alternative Theories of Distribution*, The Review of Economic Studies, Vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 83-100
- [6] Kidd D. and Oswald A. (1987), *A Dynamic Model of the Trade Union Behaviour*, Economica, New Series, Vol. 54, no. 215, pp. 355-365
- [7] Koopmans T. (1965), *On the Concept of Optimal Economic Growth*, Cowles Foundation Paper no. 238
- [8] Lockwood B. and Manning A. (1989), *Dynamic Wage-Employment Bargaining with Employment Adjustment Costs*, The Economic Journal, Vol. 99, no. 398, pp. 1143-1158
- [9] McDonald I. and Solow R. (1981), *Wage Bargaining and Employment*, The American Economic Review, Vol. 71, no. 5, pp. 896-908

- [10] Nash J. (1950), *The Bargaining Problem*, *Econometrica*, Vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 155-162
- [11] Nash J. (1953), *Two-Person Cooperative Games*, *Econometrica*, Vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 128-140
- [12] Peters H. (1992), *Axiomatic Bargaining Game Theory*, Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers
- [13] Raiffa H. (1953), *Arbitration Schemes for Generalized Two-Person Games*, in Kuhn H. and Tucker A., *Contributions to the Theory of Games*, Vol. 2, Princeton, pp. 361-387
- [14] Solow R. and Stiglitz J. (1968), *Output, Employment, and Wages in the Short-Run*, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. LXXXII, n. 4, pp. 537-560
- [15] Sutton J. (1986), *Non-Cooperative Bargaining Theory: An Introduction*, *The Review of Economic Studies*, Vol. 53, no. 5, pp. 709-724
- [16] Wiener Z. and Winter E. (1998), *Gradual Nash Bargaining*, Mimeo

Titles available in the series:

- | | |
|-----------|--|
| Number 1 | Valuing the environmental impacts of open cast coalmining: the case of the Trent Valley in North Staffordshire
<i>Andrew B Trigg and W Richard Dubourg, June 1993</i> |
| Number 2 | Scarcity and stability in a very simple general equilibrium model
<i>Vivienne Brown, February 1994</i> |
| Number 3 | A conflict model, with rational expectations, of the disinflation of the early 1980s
<i>Graham Dawson, February 1994</i> |
| Number 4 | Foreign Investment, Globalisation and International Economic Governance
<i>Grahame Thompson, May 1994</i> |
| Number 5 | Testing the Small Country Hypothesis for Developing Countries
<i>Jonathan Perraton, December 1994</i> |
| Number 6 | The Discovery of 'Unpaid Work': the social consequences of the expansion of 'work'
<i>Susan Himmelweit, June 1995</i> |
| Number 7 | Exit, Voice and Values in Economic Institutions
<i>Graham Dawson, June 1995</i> |
| Number 8 | Residential Summer Schools Attendance and Students' Assessed Performances on Open University Foundation Courses
<i>Alan Gillie and Alan Woodley, June 1995</i> |
| Number 9 | Putting Words into People's Mouths? Economic Culture and its Implications for Local Government
<i>Maureen Mackintosh, December 1995</i> |
| Number 10 | What is a Fair Wage? A Critique of the Concept of the Value of Labour-Power
<i>Susan Himmelweit, December 1995</i> |
| Number 11 | The Origin of the Poverty Line
<i>Alan Gillie, December 1995</i> |
| Number 12 | The Determinants of Product and Process Innovations
<i>Roberto Simonetti, Daniele Archibugi, Rinaldo Evangelista, February 1996</i> |
| Number 13 | Technical Change and Firm Growth: 'Creative Destruction' in the Fortune List, 1963-1987
<i>Roberto Simonetti, February 1996</i> |
| Number 14 | Utilities vs. Rights to Publicly Provided Goods: Arguments and Evidence from Health-Care Rationing
<i>Paul Anand and Allan Wailoo, January 2000</i> |
| Number 15 | Proceeding to the Paddling Pool: The Selection and Shaping of Call Centre Labour
<i>George Callaghan and Paul Thompson, January 2000</i> |
| Number 16 | Doing 'Qualitative Research' in Economics: Two Examples and Some Reflections
<i>Elizabeth Hill and Gabrielle Meagher, November 1999</i> |
| Number 17 | Veblen, Bourdieu and Conspicuous Consumption
<i>Andrew B Trigg, January 2000</i> |

- Number 18 The Effect of Idiosyncratic Events on the Feedback between Firm Size and Innovation
Mariana Mazzucato, January 2000
- Number 19 Non-market relationships in health care
Maureen Mackintosh and Lucy Gilson, January 2000
- Number 20 Selling pollution and safeguarding lives: international justice, emissions trading and the Kyoto Protocol
Graham Dawson, October 2000
- Number 21 Entrepreneurship by Alliance
Judith Mehta and Barbara Krug, September 2000
- Number 22 A disorderly household - voicing the noise
Judith Mehta, October 2000
- Number 23 Sustainable redistribution with health care markets?
Rethinking regulatory intervention in the Tanzanian context
Maureen Mackintosh and Paula Tibandebage, November 2000
- Number 24 Surplus Value and the Keynesian Multiplier
Andrew B Trigg, October 2000
- Number 25 Edwards Revised: Technical Control and Call Centres
George Callaghan and Paul Thompson, November 2000
- Number 26 Social Norms, Occupational Groups and Income Tax Evasion: A Survey In The UK Construction Industry
Maria Sigala, November 2000
- Number 27 Procedural Fairness in Economic and Social Choice: Evidence from a Survey of Voters
Paul Anand, December 2000
- Number 28 Alternative rationalities, or why do economists become parents?
Susan Himmelweit, December 2000
- Number 29 Agglomeration and Growth: A Study of the Cambridge Hi-Tech Cluster
Suma Athreye, December 2000
- Number 30 Sources of Increasing Returns and Regional Innovation in the UK
Suma Athreye and David Keeble, January 2001
- Number 31 The Evolution of the UK software market: scale of demand and the role of competencies
Suma Athreye, September 2000
- Number 32 Evolution of Markets in the Software Industry
Suma Athreye, January 2001
- Number 33 Specialised Markets and the Behaviour of Firms: Evidence from the UK's Regional Economies
Suma Athreye and David Keeble, January 2001
- Number 34 Markets and Feminisms
Graham Dawson, January 2001
- Number 35 Externalities and the UK Regional Divide in Innovative Behaviour
Suma Athreye and David Keeble, January 2001
- Number 36 Inequality and redistribution: analytical and empirical issues for developmental social policy
Maureen Mackintosh, March 2001

- Number 37 Modelling the Dynamics of Industry Populations
Mariana Mazzucato and P A Geroski, January 2001
- Number 38 Advertising and the Evolution of Market Structure in the US Car Industry during the Post-War Period (withdrawn)
Mariana Mazzucato and P A Geroski, January 2001
- Number 39 The Determinants of Stock Price Volatility: An Industry Study
Mariana Mazzucato and Willi Semmler, February 2001
- Number 40 Surplus Value and the Kalecki Principle in Marx's Reproduction Schema
Andrew B Trigg, March 2001
- Number 41 Risk, Variety and Volatility in the Early Auto and PC Industry
Mariana Mazzucato, March 2003
- Number 42 Making visible the hidden economy: the case for gender impact analysis of economic policy
Susan Himmelweit, August 2001
- Number 43 Learning and the Sources of Corporate Growth
Mariana Mazzucato and P A Geroski, June 2001
- Number 44 Social Choice, Health and Fairness
Paul Anand, September 2002
- Number 45 The Integration of Claims to Health-Care: a Programming Approach
Paul Anand, November 2002
- Number 46 Pasinetti, Keynes and the principle of Effective Demand
Andrew B Trigg and Frederic S Lee, June 2003
- Number 47 Capabilities and Wellbeing: Evidence Based on the Sen-Nussbaum Approach to Welfare
Paul Anand, Graham Hunter and Ron Smith, January 2004
- Number 48 Entry, Competence-Destroying Innovations, volatility and growth: Lessons from different industries
Mariana Mazzucato, June 2004
- Number 49 Taking risks with ethical principles: a critical examination of the ethics of 'ethical investment'
Graham Dawson, November 2004
- Number 50 Innovation and Idiosyncratic Risk: an Industry & Firm Level Analysis
Mariana Mazzucato and Massimiliano Tancioni, November 2005
- Number 51 Industrial Concentration in a Liberalising Economy: a Study of Indian Manufacturing
Suma Athreye and Sandeep Kapur, October 2004
- Number 52 Creating Competition? Globalisation and the emergence of new technology producers
Suma Athreye and John Cantwell, October 2005
- Number 53 Measuring Human Capabilities (previously entitled "The Development of Capability Indicators and their Relation of Life Satisfaction", released in September 2005)
Paul Anand, Graham Hunter, Ian Carter, Keith Dowding, Francesco Guala, Martin van Hees, January 2007
- Number 54 Does International Trade Transfer Technology to Emerging Countries? A Patent Citation Analysis
Elif Bascavusoglu, August 2006

- Number 55 Stock Price Volatility and Patent Citation Dynamics: the case of the pharmaceutical industry
Mariana Mazzucato and Massimiliano Tanconi December 2006
- Number 56 Violent Crime, Gender Inequalities and Well-Being: Models based on a Survey of Individual Capabilities and Crime Rates for England and Wales
Paul Anand and Cristina Santos, January 2007
- Number 57 Innovation and Firm Growth in High-Tech Sectors: A Quantile Regression Approach
Alex Coad (CES-Matisse) and Rekha Rao (LEM) January 2007
- Number 58 Estimating Linear Birth Cohort Effects. Revisiting the Age-Happiness Profile
Cristina Santos January 2007
- Number 59 Prices of Production are Proportional to Real Costs
Ian Wright January 2007
- Number 60 Temporary Work in Tuscany: a Multinomial Nested Logit Analysis
Lorenzo Corsini (Pisa University) and Marco Guerrazzi (Pisa University) May 2007