

Grossmann, Volker; Steger, Thomas M.; Trimborn, Timo

**Working Paper**

**Dynamically optimal R&D subsidization**

Working Paper, No. 97

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

University of Leipzig, Faculty of Economics and Management Science

*Suggested Citation:* Grossmann, Volker; Steger, Thomas M.; Trimborn, Timo (2011) : Dynamically optimal R&D subsidization, Working Paper, No. 97, Universität Leipzig, Wirtschaftswissenschaftliche Fakultät, Leipzig

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/48851>

**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.*

UNIVERSITÄT LEIPZIG

**Wirtschaftswissenschaftliche Fakultät**  
**Faculty of Economics and Management Science**

Working Paper, No. 97

Volker Grossmann / Thomas M. Steger /  
Timo Trimborn

**Dynamically Optimal R&D  
Subsidization**

August 2011

ISSN 1437-9384

# Dynamically Optimal R&D Subsidization

Volker Grossmann  
Thomas M. Steger  
Timo Trimborn

CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 3153  
CATEGORY 6: FISCAL POLICY, MACROECONOMICS AND GROWTH  
AUGUST 2010

*An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded*

- *from the SSRN website:* [www.SSRN.com](http://www.SSRN.com)
- *from the RePEc website:* [www.RePEc.org](http://www.RePEc.org)
- *from the CESifo website:* [www.CESifo-group.org/wp](http://www.CESifo-group.org/wp)

# Dynamically Optimal R&D Subsidization

## Abstract

Previous research on optimal R&D subsidies has focussed on the long run. This paper characterizes the optimal time path of R&D subsidization in a semi-endogenous growth model, by exploiting a recently developed numerical method. Starting from the steady state under current R&D subsidization in the US, the R&D subsidy should significantly jump upwards and then slightly decrease over time. There is a negligible loss in welfare, however, from immediately setting the R&D subsidy to its optimal long run level, compared to the case where the dynamically optimal policy is implemented.

JEL-Code: H20, O30, O40.

Keywords: R&D subsidy, transitional dynamics, semi-endogenous growth, welfare.

*Volker Grossmann  
University of Fribourg  
Department of Economics  
Bd. de Pérolles 90  
CH – 1700 Fribourg  
Switzerland  
volker.grossmann@unifr.ch*

*Thomas M. Steger  
University of Leipzig  
Institute for Theoretical Economics  
Grimmaische Strasse 12  
04109 Leipzig  
Germany  
steger@wifa.uni-leipzig.de*

*Timo Trimborn  
University of Hanover  
Institute for Macroeconomics  
Königsworther Platz 1  
30167 Hannover  
Germany  
trimborn@vwl.uni-hannover.de*

August 4, 2010

# 1 Introduction

A large body of empirical evidence suggests that the social return to R&D exceeds the private return by a wide margin (e.g., Scherer, 1982; Grilichis and Lichtenberg, 1984).<sup>1</sup> By focussing on the long run, a similar finding is typically derived from calibrated endogenous growth models. In fact, positive externalities from R&D seem to substantially outweigh negative externalities (e.g., Romer, 2000; Jones and Williams, 2000; Steger, 2005; Grossmann, Steger and Trimborn, 2010). For instance, Jones and Williams (2000) argue on basis of a semi-endogenous growth model in the spirit of Jones (1995), that the optimal long run R&D effort may be about twice the decentralized R&D effort.

One widely discussed policy implication from the apparent R&D underinvestment problem is to provide R&D subsidies to innovating industries. According to empirical evidence, such tax incentives indeed seem to be successful in stimulating R&D investments (e.g., Bloom, Griffith and van Reenen, 2002). The question is thus not so much whether or not R&D subsidies should be provided to innovating industries. One rather needs to know to what extent R&D should be subsidized and how R&D subsidization should change over time as the economy develops.

The existing literature has examined optimal R&D subsidization by either focussing on static models or exclusively on the steady state in dynamic models. However, as it is well known, in R&D-based models of economic growth the speed of convergence is typically low.<sup>2</sup> Thus, any attempt to provide a careful policy recommendation requires to investigate the entire time path of the first-best R&D subsidy along the transition to the steady state. This is true even for advanced economies, which may have come close to their decentralized steady state. The reason is that current R&D subsidy rates may be far away from their long run social optimum. In this case, implementing the optimal long run policy would induce transitional dynamics with potentially long

---

<sup>1</sup>See also Jones and Williams (1998) for a discussion of the empirical literature in the light of endogenous growth theory.

<sup>2</sup>See, for instance, Steger (2003) who examines the speed of convergence in the endogenous growth model of Segerstrom (1998). Grossmann, Steger and Trimborn (2010) find a similar pattern for an extended Jones (1995) model.

lasting adjustment to the new steady state. Hence, it is a priori not clear whether looking at the long run optimal R&D subsidization is indeed meaningful when it comes to providing careful policy recommendations.

This paper attempts to characterize the dynamically optimal, i.e. first-best, R&D subsidy on the basis of a calibrated R&D-based growth model with accumulation of both knowledge and physical capital. We show how the optimal time path of the R&D subsidy and important allocation variables depend on the initial conditions of the economy. For instance, we take the steady state under the status quo R&D subsidization of a calibrated US economy as anchor (i.e., we assume that the US is in long-run equilibrium) to investigate the dynamics induced by a shift towards the dynamically optimal R&D subsidization.

We also calculate the welfare loss, in terms of permanent consumption-equivalent changes, which results from implementing the long run optimal (time-invariant) policy rather than the dynamically optimal one (i.e. the time-varying, first-best policy). This exercise may be of high relevance for real-life policy. Policy makers may be constrained to set policy instruments at time-invariant levels for the sake of simplicity. We would like to have an idea about the magnitude of the loss from such a political constraint. Moreover, policy makers do not know at which point along the transition path the economy is located.

We deliberately choose to analyze the optimal dynamic R&D tax in a standard growth model, i.e., a standard version of the semi-endogenous growth model by Jones (1995). The reason is that, for a first analysis of a dynamically optimal R&D policy, we consider it an advantage to be able to analytically derive the steady state (decentralized equilibrium and social planner solution) and to draw on a deep understanding of its properties (e.g., Jones, 2005). Nevertheless, to examine the evolution of the variables of interest along the transition to the steady state requires the solution of highly dimensional, non-linear differential equation systems. We are able to do so by applying a novel numerical procedure which was suggested recently by Koch, Steger and Trimborn (2008).

Our results indicate that the optimal R&D subsidy is time-dependent and adjusts monotonically towards the steady state. Whether it should decrease or increase over time depends on the gap in the knowledge stock and the capital stock to their optimal steady state levels. For instance, if the knowledge stock is far away from the optimal steady state relative to the capital stock, the optimal R&D subsidy should initially start above its long run level and decrease over time when the economy approaches the steady state. For the US, our analysis suggests that the R&D subsidy should jump up significantly from its current level and then slightly decrease over time. The striking result from our analysis is that the welfare loss from immediately setting the R&D subsidy to its optimal long run level (i.e. the constrained optimum) is negligible compared to the case where the dynamically optimal policy path is implemented. In other words, the error of neglecting the transitional dynamics when designing the optimal R&D subsidy is very small, despite the fact that the speed of convergence to the steady state is fairly low.<sup>3</sup>

Dynamic optimal tax problems have been extensively studied in neoclassical growth models with fixed government expenditure (e.g., Judd, 1985; Chamley, 1986). For instance, it is well known that the optimal Ramsey-tax on capital income is highly time-variant in a closed-economy neoclassical growth framework with endogenous labor supply. Early in the transition, capital should be taxed at high rates due to the lump-sum tax character of taxing the existing capital stock. However, in an infinite horizon context the optimal capital tax becomes zero when the economy approaches the steady state (i.e., required tax revenue is exclusively financed by labor income taxation).<sup>4</sup> In an endogenous growth model there is no analogy with respect to R&D subsidies.<sup>5</sup> Rather than studying a second-best Ramsey-tax problem, we seek for dynamically optimal Pigouvian subsidies which eliminate inefficient investment incentives under

---

<sup>3</sup>Our analysis suggests that after a policy reform in the US which implements the optimal R&D subsidization it takes more than 200 years to close half of the gap of per capita consumption to the new steady state.

<sup>4</sup>The result is potentially modified in overlapping-generation models (e.g., Conesa, Kitao and Krueger, 2009).

<sup>5</sup>Moreover, the transitional dynamics are more complex when, in addition to physical capital accumulation, R&D-based innovations are a second engine of growth.

laissez-faire R&D incentives are distorted, for instance, by intertemporal knowledge spillovers. Inefficiency of capital accumulation arises from market power of capital good producers. We show that the first-best allocation can be restored with two linear policy instruments in our framework.

Our paper is most closely related to studies which numerically derive the long run optimal R&D subsidy in an endogenous growth framework. For instance, Sener (2008) studies an endogenous growth model without scale effects where the steady state growth rate depends on the R&D subsidy. Calibration exercises indicate that the optimal steady state R&D subsidy should range between 5 and 25 percent. However, the analysis abstracts from transitional dynamics. Grossmann, Steger and Trimborn (2010) extend the semi-endogenous growth framework of Jones and Williams (2000) to capture distortions from the tax-transfer system. Their results suggest that in the long run firms should be allowed to deduct at least twice the R&D costs from sales revenue to calculate corporate income. This policy recommendation still holds when the whole transition path is taken into account, provided that the subsidy rates are constrained to be time-invariant. In this paper, we relax the latter restriction and analyze the socially optimal transitional dynamics. To the best of our knowledge, the optimal time path of the R&D subsidy and the welfare loss arising from neglecting the dynamic nature of the optimal R&D subsidy has not previously been analyzed.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the endogenous growth model with linear subsidies on capital costs and R&D costs, derives the dynamic system in decentralized equilibrium and analytically characterizes the dynamically optimal capital and R&D subsidization. Section 3 presents and discusses the calibration of the model. Based on the calibration strategy, section 4 numerically analyzes the socially optimal evolution of important allocation variables and the R&D subsidy when varying initial conditions. Most importantly, it also compares the optimal dynamics with the one resulting from implementing the time-invariant, optimal long run R&D subsidy from the start. The last section concludes.



## 2 The Model

Consider the following continuous-time model with semi-endogenous economic growth, based on Jones (1995). There is a homogenous final output good with price normalized to unity. Final output is produced under perfect competition according to

$$Y = (L^Y)^{1-\alpha} \int_0^A (x_i)^\alpha di, \quad (1)$$

$0 < \alpha < 1$ , where  $L^Y$  is labor input in the manufacturing sector,  $A$  is the mass (“number”) of intermediate goods and  $x_i$  denotes the quantity of intermediate good  $i$ . (Time index  $t$  is omitted whenever this does not lead to confusion.) The number of varieties,  $A$ , expands through horizontal innovations, protected with patent rights of infinite length. As usual,  $A$  is interpreted as the economy’s stock of knowledge.  $A_0 > 0$  is given. The labor market is perfect.

In each sector  $i$  there is one firm – the innovator or the buyer of a blueprint for an intermediate good – which can produce good  $x_i$  with a one-to-one technology: one unit of foregone consumption (capital) can be transformed into one unit of output. Capital depreciates at rate  $\delta \geq 0$ . Capital supply in the initial period,  $K_0$ , is given. The capital market is perfect.

Moreover, in each sector  $i$  there is a competitive fringe which can produce a perfect substitute for good  $i$  (without violating patent rights) but is less productive in manufacturing the good: one unit of output requires  $\kappa$  units of capital;  $1 < \kappa \leq 1/\alpha$ .<sup>6</sup>

There is free entry into the R&D sector. Ideas for new intermediate goods are generated according to

$$\dot{A} = \tilde{\nu} A^\phi L^A, \text{ with } \tilde{\nu} \equiv \nu (L^A)^{-\theta}, \quad (2)$$

where  $L^A$  is the labor input in the R&D sector,  $\nu > 0$ ,  $\phi < 1$ ,  $0 \leq \theta < 1$ .  $\tilde{\nu}$  is taken as given in the decision of the representative R&D firm; that is, similar to Jones

---

<sup>6</sup>See Aghion and Howitt (2005), among others, for similar way of capturing a competitive fringe.

and Williams (2000), R&D firms perceive a constant returns to scale R&D technology, although the social return to higher R&D input is decreasing when  $\theta > 0$ . The wedge between the private and social return may arise because firms do not take into account that rivals may work on the same idea such that there is redundant R&D in market equilibrium.  $\theta$  measures the strength of such “duplication externality”. If  $\phi \neq 0$ , there is a second R&D externality;  $\phi > 0$  captures a standard “standing on shoulders” effect, whereas the case  $\phi < 0$  reflects by contrast that R&D productivity declines with the number of preceding innovations (possibly because the most obvious innovations are detected first; see Jones, 1995, for a discussion).<sup>7</sup>

There is an infinitely-living, representative dynasty with initial per capita wealth,  $a_0 > 0$ . Household size,  $N$ , grows with constant exponential rate,  $n \geq 0$ .  $N_0$  is given and normalized to unity. Preferences are represented by the standard utility function

$$U = \int_0^{\infty} \frac{(c_t)^{1-\sigma} - 1}{1-\sigma} e^{-(\rho-n)t} dt, \quad (3)$$

$\sigma > 0$ , where  $c$  is consumption per capita. Households take factor prices as given.

The government may subsidize both R&D costs (R&D sector) and capital costs (intermediate goods sector), financed by lump-sum taxes ( $T$ ) on households. The subsidy rates are independent of total costs at one point in time, but possibly time-variant. They are denoted by  $s_A$  (R&D) and  $s_K$  (capital), respectively.

Let  $w$  and  $r$  denote the wage rate and the interest rate, respectively. Financial wealth per individual,  $a$ , accumulates according to

$$\dot{a} = (r - n)a + w - c - T, \quad (4)$$

with  $a_0$  being given.

It turns out that, for the transversality conditions to hold and the value of the

---

<sup>7</sup>In his seminal contribution on endogenous technical change, Romer (1990) assumes  $\phi = 1$ . This assumption has been modified by Jones (1995) as  $\phi = 1$  implies that the economy’s growth rate depends on the aggregate human capital level (“strong scale effect”), a prediction which seems to be largely inconsistent with the data. We therefore follow Jones (1995).

utility stream,  $U$ , to be finite, we have to restrict the parameter space such that

$$\rho - n + (\sigma - 1)g > 0 \text{ with } g \equiv \frac{(1 - \theta)n}{1 - \phi}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

As will become apparent,  $g$  is the economy's long run growth rate in decentralized equilibrium as well as in social planning optimum. We maintain assumption A1 throughout.

## 2.1 Market Equilibrium

We first derive the decentralized equilibrium and show how the steady state allocation of labor and the steady state savings rate (equal to the investment rate) depends on policy parameters.

We start with intermediate goods producers. Note that  $r + \delta$  is the user cost per unit of capital for an intermediate good firm. As one unit of capital is required for one unit of output, if the government subsidizes capital costs at rate  $s_K$ , producer  $i$  has profits

$$\pi_i = [p_i - (1 - s_K)(r + \delta)] x_i, \quad (5)$$

where  $p_i$  is the price of good  $i$ . According to (1), the inverse demand function for intermediate good  $i$  reads  $p_i = \alpha(L^Y/x_i)^{1-\alpha}$ .

Profit maximization implies that the optimal price of each firm  $i$  is given by

$$p_i = p = \kappa(1 - s_K)(r + \delta). \quad (6)$$

To see this, note that a firm which owns a blueprint would choose a mark-up factor which is equal to  $1/\alpha \geq \kappa$  if it were not facing a competitive fringe. Moreover, the competitive fringe would make losses at a price lower than  $\kappa(1 - s_K)(r + \delta)$ . Thus, each firm  $i$  sets the maximal price allowing it to remain monopolist. We can substitute (6) into the inverse demand function and solve for  $x_i$  to obtain output

$$x_i = x = \left( \frac{\alpha}{\kappa(1 - s_K)(r + \delta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} L^Y. \quad (7)$$

Substituting (7) into (1) gives

$$Y = A \left( \frac{\alpha}{\kappa(1-s_K)(r+\delta)} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} L^Y \quad (8)$$

Moreover, as the total amount of physical capital is  $K \equiv \int_0^A x_i di = Ax$ , the capital-output ratio is given by

$$\frac{K}{Y} = \frac{\alpha}{\kappa(1-s_K)(r+\delta)}. \quad (9)$$

Thus, if the interest rate  $r$  is stationary in the long run, the total capital stock and aggregate income grow at the same rate along a balanced growth path.

Let us denote the present discounted value of the profit stream generated by an innovation by  $P^A$  (being equal to the price an intermediate good producer pays to the R&D sector for a new blueprint and to the stock market evaluation of a firm). In equilibrium, there are no arbitrage possibilities in the capital market. Noting that all intermediate goods producers have the same profit due to the symmetry in their sector, i.e.,  $\pi_i = \pi$  for all  $i$ , this implies the standard capital market equilibrium condition

$$\frac{\dot{P}^A}{P^A} + \frac{\pi}{P^A} = r. \quad (10)$$

Let us define  $\tau \equiv 1 - s_A$ . In the R&D sector, under R&D subsidy rate  $s_A$ , a representative firm maximizes

$$\Pi = P^A \underbrace{\tilde{\nu} A^\phi L^A}_{=A} - \tau w L^A, \quad (11)$$

taking  $A$ ,  $\tilde{\nu}$  and prices as given. That is, in equilibrium,  $\Pi = 0$ .

The household's problem is to solve

$$\max_{\{c_t\}} \int_0^\infty \frac{(c_t)^{1-\sigma} - 1}{1-\sigma} e^{-(\rho-n)t} dt \text{ s.t. (4), } \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} a_t e^{-\int_0^t (r_s - n) ds} \geq 0. \quad (12)$$

The household chooses the optimal consumption path, where savings are supplied to

the financial market.

**Definition.** A market equilibrium in this economy consists of time paths for the quantities  $\{L_t^A, L_t^Y, c_t, \{x_{it}\}_{i=0}^A, a_t, Y_t, K_t, A_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$  and prices  $\{P_t^A, \{p_{it}\}_{i=0}^A, w_t, r_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$  such that

1. final goods producers, intermediate goods producers and R&D firms maximize profits,
2. households maximize intertemporal welfare,
3. the capital resource constraint  $\int_0^A x_{it} di = K_t$  holds,
4. the capital market equilibrium condition, equ. (10), holds,
5. the labor market, the intermediate goods market, and the financial market clear.<sup>8</sup>

We define per capita measures  $l^A \equiv L^A/N$ ,  $l^Y \equiv L^Y/N$ ,  $k \equiv K/N$ ,  $y \equiv Y/N$  and  $p^A \equiv P^A/N$ . Clearing of the financial market requires  $aN = K + P^A A$ . Moreover, in labor market equilibrium,  $l^A + l^Y = 1$ . Along a balanced growth path, all variables grow at a constant (possibly zero) rate. We descale those variables which turn out to grow with rate  $g = \frac{(1-\theta)n}{1-\phi}$  in steady state and define  $\tilde{A} = A/N^{\frac{1-\theta}{1-\phi}}$ ,  $\tilde{k} = k/N^{\frac{1-\theta}{1-\phi}}$  and  $\tilde{c} = c/N^{\frac{1-\theta}{1-\phi}}$ . Proposition 1 (below) presents the full dynamical system which governs the evolution of the market equilibrium and its steady state.

**Proposition 1.** (Dynamic system for market equilibrium)

(i) Given the time path of  $\tau$ , the evolution of  $\tilde{A}$ ,  $p^A$ ,  $\tilde{k}$ ,  $\tilde{c}$ ,  $r$ ,  $l^A = 1 - l^Y$  is governed

---

<sup>8</sup>According to Walras' law, the final goods market then clears as well.

by the following dynamic system (together with appropriate boundary conditions)

$$\frac{\dot{\tilde{A}}}{\tilde{A}} = \nu \tilde{A}^{\phi-1} (l^A)^{1-\theta} - g, \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{\dot{p}^A}{p^A} = r - n - \frac{(\kappa - 1) (\alpha/\kappa)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} (1 - l^A)}{[(1 - s_K)(r + \delta)]^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} p^A}, \quad (14)$$

$$\frac{\dot{\tilde{k}}}{\tilde{k}} = \left( \frac{\tilde{A}(1 - l^A)}{\tilde{k}} \right)^{1-\alpha} - \frac{\tilde{c}}{\tilde{k}} - \delta - n - g, \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{\dot{\tilde{c}}}{\tilde{c}} = \frac{r - \rho}{\sigma} - g, \quad (16)$$

$$r + \delta = \frac{\alpha}{\kappa(1 - s_K)} \left( \frac{\tilde{A}(1 - l^A)}{\tilde{k}} \right)^{1-\alpha}, \quad (17)$$

$$p^A \nu \tilde{A}^{\phi-1} (l^A)^{-\theta} = \tau(1 - \alpha) \left( \frac{\tilde{k}}{\tilde{A}(1 - l^A)} \right)^{\alpha}. \quad (18)$$

(ii) In the long run, there exists a unique balanced growth equilibrium, where

$$r = \sigma g + \rho \equiv r^*, \quad (19)$$

$$l^A = \frac{1}{\frac{\tau(1/\alpha-1)(\sigma g + \rho - n)}{(1-1/\kappa)g} + 1} \equiv l^{A*}, \quad (20)$$

$$\tilde{A} = \left( \frac{\nu (l^{A*})^{1-\theta}}{g} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\phi}} \equiv \tilde{A}^*, \quad (21)$$

$$p^A = \frac{(\kappa - 1) (\alpha/\kappa)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} (1 - l^{A*})}{[(r^* + \delta)(1 - s_K)]^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} (r^* - n)} \equiv p^{A*}, \quad (22)$$

$$\tilde{k} = \tilde{A}^*(1 - l^{A*}) \left( \frac{\alpha}{\kappa(1 - s_K)(r^* + \delta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \equiv \tilde{k}^*, \quad (23)$$

$$\tilde{c} = (\tilde{k}^*)^{\alpha} (\tilde{A}^*)^{1-\alpha} (1 - l^{A*})^{1-\alpha} - (\delta + n + g) \tilde{k}^* \equiv \tilde{c}^*. \quad (24)$$

In the long run,  $k$ ,  $y$ ,  $c$  and  $A$  grow at rate  $g = \frac{(1-\theta)n}{1-\phi}$ . The savings and investment rate,  $sav \equiv 1 - \frac{c}{y}$ , is given by

$$sav = \frac{\alpha(n + g + \delta)}{\kappa(1 - s_K)(\sigma g + \rho + \delta)} \equiv sav^*. \quad (25)$$

**Proof.** See Appendix. ■

Like in Jones (1995), the growth rate of per capita income along a balanced growth path is independent of economic policy (in contrast to the level of income). Proposition 1 also implies that life-time utility (3) is finite if and only if assumption (A1) holds.

Moreover, Proposition 1 shows that subsidizing physical capital does not affect the allocation of labor in long run equilibrium, but an increase in  $s_K$  raises the long run savings and investment rate,  $sav^*$ . Similarly, an increase in the R&D subsidy rate  $s_A$  (i.e., a decline in  $\tau$ ) stimulates R&D activity of firms (i.e.,  $l^{A*}$  increases); it does not, however, affect the long run equilibrium rate of investment in physical capital,  $sav^*$ .

## 2.2 Social Planning Optimum

A social planner chooses a symmetric capital allocation across intermediate firms, i.e.,  $x_i = K/A$  for all  $i$ . Using this in production function (1) yields per capita output ( $y = Y/N$ ):

$$y = k^\alpha (Al^Y)^{1-\alpha}. \quad (26)$$

Thus, using the goods market clearing condition  $\dot{K} = Y - Nc - \delta K$ , the capital stock per capita ( $k = K/N$ ) evolves according to

$$\dot{k} = k^\alpha (Al^Y)^{1-\alpha} - (\delta + n)k - c. \quad (27)$$

Also note that the social planner takes R&D externalities into account such that the relevant knowledge accumulation technology is

$$\dot{A} = \nu A^\phi (Nl^A)^{1-\theta}. \quad (28)$$

The social planner's problem thus is to solve

$$\max U \text{ s.t. } (27), (28), l^A = 1 - l^Y, \quad (29)$$

and non-negativity constraints, where  $c, l^A, l^Y$  are control variables and  $k, A$  are state variables.

Comparing the social planning optimum to the decentralized equilibrium, we may ask if the two policy instruments, a subsidy to R&D and capital costs, can restore the first best optimum, in view of the following market failures. First, due to monopolistic competition as compared to marginal cost pricing, intermediate goods supply and therefore the demand for capital is inefficiently low. Thus, savings (and thus capital investment) may be too low, calling for a capital cost subsidy. Moreover, there are three sources of inefficient R&D incentives. The duplication externality ( $\theta > 0$ ) promotes overinvestment in R&D, whereas a standing on shoulders effect ( $\phi > 0$ ) promotes underinvestment. (In the case where  $\phi < 0$ , there is a force towards overinvestment.) Finally, innovators can only appropriate part of the economic surplus from raising the knowledge stock of the economy. To see this, first note that  $x_i = x = \frac{K}{A} = \frac{K}{Y} \frac{Y}{A}$ . Substituting this into (5) and using (6) and (9) implies that instantaneous profit of an intermediate goods firm reads  $\pi = \alpha(1 - \frac{1}{\kappa}) \frac{Y}{A}$ . Moreover, according to (8), we have  $\frac{\partial Y}{\partial A} = \frac{Y}{A}$ . Since  $\alpha(1 - \frac{1}{\kappa}) < 1$ , the per-period profit  $\pi$  for an innovator is lower than the contribution of an additional blueprint to output,  $\frac{\partial Y}{\partial A}$ . In other words, there is a “surplus appropriability problem” which promotes underinvestment.

The next proposition shows that appropriately setting  $\tau = 1 - s_A$  and  $s_K$  in the market economy can indeed implement the first best optimum. Moreover, it turns out that the optimal R&D subsidy is time-variant rather than being equal to the time-invariant long run optimum, whereas the optimal capital subsidy does not change over time. We will closely examine the implications of this insight below.

**Proposition 2.** (Social optimum) *The first-best optimal evolution of the economy can be implemented by setting a time-invariant capital cost subsidy*

$$s_K = 1 - \frac{1}{\kappa} \equiv s_K^{opt} \quad (30)$$

*together with a time-variant R&D subsidy  $s_A = 1 - \tau$ , where the optimal  $\tau$  evolves*



according to

$$\frac{\dot{\tau}}{\tau} = \left[ \left( 1 - \theta - \frac{1}{\tau} \frac{1 - 1/\kappa}{1/\alpha - 1} \right) \left( \frac{1}{l^A} - 1 \right) + \phi \right] \nu \tilde{A}^{\phi-1} (l^A)^{1-\theta} \quad (31)$$

with terminal condition (long-run optimal R&D subsidy)

$$\tau = \frac{1 - 1/\kappa}{1/\alpha - 1} \frac{(\sigma - 1)g + \rho - \theta n}{(1 - \theta)(\sigma g + \rho - n)} \equiv \tau^{opt}. \quad (32)$$

**Proof.** See Appendix. ■

A higher mark up factor  $\kappa$  drives a bigger wedge between the equilibrium investment rate and the socially optimal investment rate, calling for a higher subsidy on capital costs. At the same time, if  $\kappa$  rises, the surplus appropriability problem, which promotes sub-optimally low investment in R&D, becomes less severe, such that the optimal long run R&D subsidy,  $1 - \tau^{opt}$ , decreases. This suggests that stronger patent protection should be accompanied by lower R&D subsidies. As long run growth is policy-independent and the dynamically optimal Pigouvian subsidies implement the first best allocation, Proposition 2 implies that the long-run growth rate in social optimum coincides with the one arising in decentralized equilibrium.

The important questions we examine below is whether the optimal R&D subsidy should increase or decrease over time, given that the capital cost subsidy is set optimally. Moreover, as previous studies of optimal R&D subsidies have exclusively focussed on the long run, it is interesting to compare the evolution of important variables under the first-best (i.e. time-varying) R&D subsidy and the optimal steady state (i.e. the time-invariant) R&D subsidy. As both requires numerical analysis, we need to calibrate the model first.

### 3 Calibration

We calibrate the model for the US economy. The strategy is to match steady state values of important variables. First,  $g$  is set to the average US GDP per capita growth

rate for the period 1990-2004. Taking data from the Penn World Tables (PWT) 6.2 (Heston, Summers and Baten, 2006), we find that approximately  $g = 0.02$ .<sup>9</sup> Moreover, for the same period and again from PWT 6.2, the average population growth rate is approximately  $n = 0.01$ .

We use measures for the investment rate and the capital-output ratio to calibrate the depreciation rate of physical capital as follows. The investment share is given by  $sav = (\dot{K} + \delta_K K)/Y = (\dot{K}/K + \delta)K/Y$ . Using  $\dot{K}/K = n + g$  and solving for  $\delta$  yields

$$\delta = \frac{sav}{K/Y} - n - g. \quad (33)$$

Averaging over the period 1990-2004,  $sav$  is equal to about 21 percent, according to PWT 6.2. For the capital-output ratio,  $K/Y$ , we take averages over the period 2002-2007 calculated from data of the US Bureau of Economic Analysis. The capital stock is measured by total fixed assets (private and public structures, equipment and software). When measuring  $K$  and  $Y$  in current prices, this gives us  $K/Y = 3$ . From (33), the evidence thus suggests  $\delta = 0.04$ , a standard value in the literature.

Moreover, the steady state interest rate is set to seven percent, which coincides with the real long-run stock market return estimated by Mehra and Prescott (1985).<sup>10</sup> According to (19), for  $g = 0.02$ ,  $r = 0.07$ , and a typical value for the time preference rate of  $\rho = 0.02$ , one gets  $\sigma = 2.5$ .

We also assume that the capital cost subsidy rate,  $s_K$ , is at the optimal level, for two reasons: First, this allows us to focus on the consequences of deviating from the optimal path of the R&D subsidy rate. Second, one may argue that  $s_K$  actually is at the optimal level ( $s_K^{opt}$ ) at present in the US. In line with estimates for the average mark up factor in the economy (e.g. Norrbin, 1993), setting  $\kappa = 4/3$  implies  $s_K^{opt} = 1 - 1/\kappa = 0.25$ . Now, given a rate of depreciation allowances for capital investments,  $s_d$ , and a corporate income tax rate,  $\tau_c$ , the behaviorally relevant capital cost subsidy is  $s_K = \frac{\tau_c s_d}{1 - \tau_c}$  (e.g., Grossmann, Steger and Trimborn, 2010). According to Devereux, Griffith and Klemm

<sup>9</sup>Averaging over some years takes out business cycle phenomena.

<sup>10</sup>Jones and Williams (2000) argue that this rate of return is more appropriate for calibration of growth models than the risk-free rate of government bonds.

(2002), in the US, we approximately have  $s_d = 0.75$ . For large corporations, the federal US statutory corporate income tax rate is 35 percent (and about 39 percent including sub-governments).<sup>11</sup> For small corporations, it is 15 (with sub-governments, about 20) percent. We may thus base our calibration on  $\tau_c = 0.25$ , which together with  $s_d = 0.75$  indeed implies  $s_K = 0.25$ .

Next, using (9), we find that  $\kappa(1 - s_K) = 1$ ,  $r = 0.07$ ,  $\delta = 0.04$  and  $K/Y = 3$  implies  $\alpha = 0.33$ , which is a typical value of the output elasticity of capital used in the growth literature.<sup>12</sup>

Parameter  $\nu$  is irrelevant for the steady state allocation of labor in both market equilibrium and social optimum. Moreover, for a given growth rate of per capita income ( $g$ ) and population size ( $n$ ), we can use the relationship between the standing on shoulders parameter ( $\phi$ ) and the duplication externality parameter ( $\theta$ ) which is implied by  $g = \frac{(1-\theta)n}{1-\phi}$ . Hence, from  $g = 0.02$  and  $n = 0.01$  we get

$$\phi = 0.5(1 + \theta). \quad (34)$$

This leaves us with one degree of freedom. We focus our discussion on the case where  $\theta = 0.5$  (medium degree of duplication externality), which implies that  $\phi = 0.75$ . According to (32), this implies an optimal long run R&D subsidy rate,  $s_A^{opt} \equiv 1 - \tau^{opt}$ , of 81.5 percent.<sup>13</sup> In a model with corporate income taxation, assuming a corporate tax rate  $\tau_c = 0.25$ , this would mean that innovating firms should be allowed to deduct  $1 + \frac{(1-\tau_c)s_A}{\tau_c} = 3.4$  times their R&D costs from sales revenue to compute the corporate income tax base (Grossmann, Steger and Trimborn, 2010). Our main results and conclusions are unchanged when we use other values for  $\theta$ , as long as  $\theta$  is not too high

---

<sup>11</sup> See the OECD tax database.

<sup>12</sup> We consider it to be an advantage of our calibration strategy that we do not have to assume a value for  $\alpha$ , but infer it from observables. Although  $\alpha$  is one minus the labor share of income in neoclassical models, we cannot use this standard argument in our context where labor is not only used in final goods production. Moreover, as discussed by Krueger (1999), measurement of the labor share is difficult and inevitably depends on strong assumptions.

<sup>13</sup> This may seem high at the first glance. However, it is in line with previous calibration exercises. For instance, Grossmann, Steger and Trimborn (2010) show that a R&D subsidy of that kind of magnitude is required to solve the R&D underinvestment problem which is identified in the seminal paper by Jones and Williams (2000).

(obviously, for  $\theta \rightarrow 1$  no R&D should be conducted). For instance, for  $\theta = 0.25$  we find that 3.6 times R&D costs and for  $\theta = 0.75$  about three times the R&D costs should be deductible. The current US R&D subsidy rate is given by  $s_A = 0.066$  (OECD, 2009),<sup>14</sup> which means that in the US only 1.2 times the R&D costs are deductible. With  $s_A = 0.066$ , we find that the share of labor devoted to R&D,  $l^{A*}$ , is about 4.2 percent for our calibration, according to (20). This corresponds to a steady state R&D intensity,  $wl^A/Y$ , of 2.9 percent.

## 4 Quantitative Analysis

In this section, we make use of Proposition 1 and 2 to examine, based on the calibration described above, the optimal time path of the R&D subsidy rate ( $s_A$ ) and main allocation variables and compare the results to the case where the optimal steady state R&D policy  $\tau = \tau^{opt}$  is implemented from the start. We also discuss policy implications from our analysis for the US economy.

### 4.1 The Role of Initial Conditions

Panel (a) of Fig. 1 shows how the optimal level of  $\tau = 1 - s_A$  evolves over time when the adjusted capital stock per capita ( $\tilde{k}$ ) and/or the adjusted stock of knowledge ( $\tilde{A}$ ) start below their optimal long run levels. For instance, suppose the initial knowledge stock is at 50 percent of its optimal long run level ( $\tilde{A}_0 = 0.5\tilde{A}^*$ , where the long run level  $\tilde{A}^*$  is evaluated at  $\tau = \tau^{opt}$ ) and the capital stock is initially optimal ( $\tilde{k}_0 = \tilde{k}^*$ , where  $\tilde{k}^*$  is evaluated at  $\tau = \tau^{opt}$ ), which is *Scenario (i)* in Fig. 1. Then  $\tau$  should start below the long run optimum,  $\tau^{opt}$ , and increase over time. That is, the R&D subsidy rate,  $s_A$ , should be high initially in view of the high initial gap in the knowledge stock

---

<sup>14</sup>OECD (2009) reports a R&D subsidy rate  $RDT S = 1 - Bindex$ , where the so-called B-index is given by  $Bindex = \frac{1-\Xi}{1-\tau_c}$ , with  $\tau_c$  being the statutory corporate income tax rate and  $\Xi$  the net present discounted value of depreciation allowances, tax credits and special allowances on R&D assets. We have  $\Xi = \tau_c(1 + s_R)$ , where  $s_R$  is the subsidy rate at which R&D costs which can be deducted from pre-tax profits. Thus,  $RDT S = \frac{\tau_c s_R}{1-\tau_c}$ . Grossmann et al. (2010) show that  $RDT S$  is equal to the behaviorally relevant R&D subsidy rate,  $s_A$ .

(“knowledge gap”) and decrease over time when  $\tilde{A}$  comes closer to the steady state.<sup>15</sup> Quantitatively, however, the variation in the dynamically optimal  $s_A$  over time is small.




Figure 1: Transitional dynamics (solid lines: first-best solution, dashed lines: constrained optimal policy). Scenario (i):  $\tilde{A}_0 = 0.5\tilde{A}^*$  and  $\tilde{k}_0 = \tilde{k}^*$ ; Scenario (ii):  $\tilde{A}_0 = \tilde{A}^*$  and  $\tilde{k}_0 = 0.5\tilde{k}^*$ ; Scenario (iii):  $\tilde{A}_0 = 0.5\tilde{A}^*$  and  $\tilde{k}_0 = 0.5\tilde{k}^*$ . The time path for  $c$  is normalized such that the final steady state equals unity.

A qualitatively similar evolution is induced for the fraction of R&D labor,  $l^A$ , as displayed by the solid line in panel (b) for *Scenario (i)*. In this scenario the social planner reallocates labor in favor of R&D to close the initial knowledge gap, as seen in panel (b). This implies a drop in final output production and, holding the saving rate constant, would also imply a low level of consumption. To achieve a comparably smooth consumption path, however, the social planner reduces the savings rate,  $sav$ ,

<sup>15</sup>A gap expresses the proportional difference between the initial value of the state variable under consideration and its socially optimal steady state value.

in parallel to high R&D investment. Subsequently,  $sav$  rises quite quickly over time. Panel (c) shows the evolution of per capita consumption,  $c$ , relative to its optimal long run level. One recognizes that consumption decreases initially and then starts to increase.

In panels (b)-(d) of Fig. 1, we also compare the time paths of the allocation variables ( $l^A$  and  $sav$ ) and consumption under optimal R&D subsidization (solid lines) with the ones under the steady state R&D subsidy (dashed lines). A time-invariant R&D subsidy rate which is set at its long run level may be referred to as “constrained optimal policy”.<sup>16</sup> The constraint captures the potential difficulty to write tax laws which specify how policy rates change over time as well as the difficulty to know at which point along the transition path the economy is located. We see rather small differences in the respective time paths. It should also be observed that the difference between the first-best solution (solid line) and the solution under the constrained optimal steady state policy (dashed line) appears small.<sup>17</sup> This raises the question about the welfare gain which results from implementing the first-best rather than the constrained optimal steady state policy. This welfare gain is expressed in terms of the permanent percentage gain in consumption (see the appendix for details). It turns out that this consumption equivalent welfare gain is negligible. For *Scenario (i)*, the permanent increase in consumption is merely about 1.1 *per mill*. This result is in line with our finding that, although an unconstrained social planner would like to reduce the R&D subsidy rate as the knowledge gap narrows, quantitatively the initial dynamically optimal R&D subsidy rate is close to the optimal long run value,  $s_A^{opt}$ . Intuitively, the result is an implication of the standard consumption-smoothing motive which prevents the social planner to close the knowledge gap too fast at the cost of lower consumption early on.

---

<sup>16</sup>There is an alternative notion of a constrained optimum, where the welfare gain from a policy reform is maximized (taking into account the transition phase and assuming the economy is initially in steady state under the status quo policy). As shown in Grossmann, Steger and Trimborn (2010), a R&D policy which is optimal in this sense is very close to the optimal long run policy.

<sup>17</sup>Moreover, a detailed inspection shows that a dynamically optimal R&D policy implies to give up slightly more consumption in the beginning than under the constrained optimal policy. As the knowledge gap is closed faster, the consumption level in the first-best optimum overtakes the one under the constrained optimal R&D subsidy at a later stage of development.

Fig. 1 also contains the scenarios where only the capital stock is at 50 percent of its optimal long-run level (*Scenario (ii)*) and the scenario where both the capital and the knowledge stock are at 50 percent of their long run levels (*Scenario (iii)*). In *Scenario (ii)*, the dynamically optimal R&D subsidy rate and the fraction of labor devoted to R&D both increase over time, whereas the savings rate decreases over time. Hence, these variables qualitatively follow the opposite paths than in *Scenario (i)*. As a result, the consumption level relative to the long run optimal value is monotonically increasing over time. In *Scenario (iii)*, neither the allocation variables ( $l^A$  and  $sav$ ) nor the first-best R&D subsidy change much over time and are close to their steady state values right from the start. This is unsurprising given the contrary evolution of these variables over time in *Scenario (i)* and *(ii)*. In *Scenario (iii)* the gaps in both stock variables (knowledge and capital) have to be closed simultaneously. Fig. 1 thus suggests that when the gap (i.e. the proportional difference between the initial value of the state variable and its socially optimal steady state) in knowledge is large relative to the gap in the capital stock, then in the beginning one should, relative to the steady state optimum, save little and invest much in R&D via a high R&D subsidy, whereas the opposite holds when the initial conditions constitute a relatively large gap in the capital stock.

Interestingly, the welfare gain from choosing the dynamically optimal R&D subsidy instead of the constrained optimal steady state policy is again very small in *Scenario (ii)* and *(iii)*. The potential gain in the per capita consumption level is 0.3 and 0.1 *per mill*, respectively, and thus even smaller than in *Scenario (i)* where there was a knowledge gap only.

## 4.2 The US Economy

We now consider the optimal R&D policy in the US. Obviously, as shown in section 3, the long run optimal subsidy rate  $s_A^{opt} = 0.815$  (for  $\theta = 0.5$ ) exceeds the current one,  $s_A = 0.066$ , dramatically. Consequently, we find that the current knowledge stock and capital stock are merely at 5.4 percent and 6.3 percent of the long run optimal levels,

respectively.

Starting from these initial conditions, a policy reform which implements the dynamically optimal R&D subsidy is characterized as follows, shown in Fig. 2 (solid lines). The R&D subsidy rate,  $s_A = 1 - \tau$ , should initially jump upwards significantly (to about 83.6 percent) and then slightly decrease over time to  $s_A^{opt}$  (panel (a)). Again, the optimal change in  $s_A$  over time is small, despite the fact that we start far away from the long run optimum. Also the fraction of labor devoted to R&D (initially at about 4.2 percent under current R&D subsidization in the US),  $l^A$ , should jump upwards dramatically and then decrease considerably over time towards 18.2 percent (panel (b)). Thus, in steady state, the US should devote about four times as much labor to R&D than at present. The importance of knowledge accumulation for the growth process in the model is so high, that the initial savings rate should be slightly negative in the beginning under the optimal resource allocation (panel (d)). Overall, a steep increase in per capita consumption is induced (panel (c)). Notably, there is a long transition towards the new steady state with a half life of more than 200 years.

With respect to the welfare gain when the dynamically optimal policy rather than the constrained steady state optimal R&D subsidy is implemented, the insights of the previous subsection are confirmed also for the US. Despite the dramatic R&D underinvestment in the US, which is suggested by the model, the welfare difference is equivalent to a permanent change in per capita consumption of merely 0.4 *per mill*. Notice that the time paths for per capita consumption and the savings rate are strikingly similar in the first-best and the constrained-optimum case. This observation is in line with the negligible welfare gain reported above. The fraction of R&D labor under the first-best policy should be somewhat higher than in the constrained optimum, especially in the beginning, but the difference in the two paths is rather small.






Figure 2: Transitional dynamics for the US economy (solid lines: first-best solution, dashed lines: constrained optimal policy). The time path for  $c$  is normalized such that the final steady state equals unity. In panel (b) and (d) the circles indicate the initial steady state values under the status quo policies in the US.

## 5 Conclusion

We characterized the time path of first-best (i.e. time-varying) R&D subsidization in a semi-endogenous growth model and compared the allocative impact to the one arising from implementing the optimal steady state (i.e. time-invariant) policy from the start. We find that the differences in the time paths of per capita consumption and the allocation variables which result from the comparison between the first-best and the constrained optimal steady state policy are rather small. Our results suggest that the optimal R&D subsidization should change little over time, even when the economy

starts far away from its socially optimal steady state. As a result, the welfare loss from a possible political constraint to use time-invariant policies is negligible. This insight is striking, and at a first glance surprising, given the slow speed of convergence to the steady state in R&D-based endogenous growth models. The economic reasoning for this observation lies in the standard consumption-smoothing motive which prevents the social planner to sacrifice a high level of consumption in the early transition phase.

Our analysis also suggests that the US economy is currently far away from its socially optimal steady state. Starting from the steady state under current R&D subsidization, the R&D subsidy should significantly jump upwards and then slightly decrease over time. Again, the welfare loss from implementing the long run optimal policy from the start compared to the dynamically optimal one is almost zero.

Our results may have important implications for further research on optimal policy design. In line with previous research which employs semi-endogenous growth models, we identify a huge R&D underinvestment gap. This suggests to dramatically raise R&D subsidies. Such an analysis is of major importance in view of the huge potential welfare gains from a reform of growth policy. Future research should investigate optimal growth policy in alternative models of endogenous technical change in order to obtain a robust picture on the optimal policy programme. Moreover, although our paper suggests that policy makers may focus on policy rates which are optimal in the long run, it is necessary to substantiate also this conclusion in alternative frameworks.

## Appendix

**Proof of Proposition 1:** The current-value Hamiltonian which corresponds to the household optimization problem (12) is given by

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{c^{1-\sigma} - 1}{1-\sigma} + \lambda [(r-n)a + w - c - T], \quad (35)$$

where  $\lambda$  is the co-state-variable associated with constraint (4). Necessary optimality conditions are  $\partial\mathcal{H}/\partial c = 0$ ,  $\dot{\lambda} = (\rho - n)\lambda - \partial\mathcal{H}/\partial a$ , and the corresponding transversality

condition. Thus,

$$\lambda = c^{-\sigma}, \text{ i.e., } \frac{\dot{\lambda}}{\lambda} = -\sigma \frac{\dot{c}}{c}, \quad (36)$$

$$\frac{\dot{\lambda}}{\lambda} = \rho - r, \quad (37)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_t e^{-(\rho-n)t} a_t = 0. \quad (38)$$

Combining (36) with (37), we obtain the standard Euler equation

$$\frac{\dot{c}}{c} = \frac{r - \rho}{\sigma}. \quad (39)$$

Using  $\dot{N}/N = n$  together with definitions  $\tilde{c} = c/N^{\frac{1-\theta}{1-\phi}}$  and  $g = \frac{(1-\theta)n}{1-\phi}$  confirms (16). In a similar fashion, (13) can be derived from (2).

Moreover, it can be shown (available upon request) that the capital stock per capita ( $k = K/N$ ) evolves according to

$$\dot{k} = y - (\delta + n)k - c. \quad (40)$$

Using  $x_i = K/A$  for all  $i$  in production function (1) gives us for per capita output ( $y = Y/N$ ) the expression

$$y = k^\alpha (Al^Y)^{1-\alpha}, \quad (41)$$

where  $l^Y = L^Y/N$  has been used. Combining (40) and (41) as well as using  $l^Y = 1 - l^A$ ,  $\dot{N}/N = n$ ,  $\tilde{k} = k/N^{\frac{1-\theta}{1-\phi}}$  and  $g = \frac{(1-\theta)n}{1-\phi}$  confirms (15). From (9), we find in addition that

$$r = \frac{\alpha}{\kappa(1-s_K)} \frac{y}{k} - \delta. \quad (42)$$

Substituting (41) into (42) and using that  $A/k = \tilde{A}/\tilde{k}$  then confirms (17).

Next, substitute (6) and (7) into (5) to obtain the following expression for the profit of each intermediate goods producer  $i$ :

$$\pi_i = \pi = (\kappa - 1) \left( \frac{\alpha}{\kappa} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} [(1-s_K)(r + \delta_K)]^{-\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} L^Y. \quad (43)$$

Now recall definition  $p^A = P^A/N$  as well as  $L^Y/N = 1 - l^A$  to rewrite (10) such as to confirm (14).

Since final goods producers take the wage rate as given, we have  $w = (1 - \alpha)Y/L^Y$ . Thus,

$$w = (1 - \alpha)A^{1-\alpha} \left( \frac{k}{l^Y} \right)^\alpha, \quad (44)$$

according to (41) and the fact that  $Y/L^Y = y/l^Y$ . Moreover, due to free entry in the R&D sector, in equilibrium,  $\Pi = 0$  holds, i.e.,  $p^A \nu A^\phi N^{1-\theta} (l^A)^{-\theta} = \tau w$ , according to (11). Inserting (44) implies

$$(1 - \alpha)A^{1-\alpha} \left( \frac{k}{l^Y} \right)^\alpha = \frac{p^A \nu A^\phi N^{1-\theta} (l^A)^{-\theta}}{\tau}. \quad (45)$$

Using the definitions of  $\tilde{k}$  and  $\tilde{A}$  (thus,  $A^{\phi-1} N^{1-\theta} = \tilde{A}^{\phi-1}$ ), we then obtain

$$(1 - \alpha) \left( \frac{\tilde{k}}{\tilde{A} l^Y} \right)^\alpha = \frac{p^A \nu \tilde{A}^{\phi-1} (l^A)^{-\theta}}{\tau}. \quad (46)$$

Substituting  $l^Y = 1 - l^A$  into (46) confirms (18). This concludes the proof of part (i).

To prove part (ii), first, set  $\dot{\tilde{c}} = 0$  (implying that  $c$  grows at rate  $g$  in steady state) in (16) to confirm (19). Next, set  $\dot{p}^A = 0$  in (14) to find

$$p^A = \frac{(\kappa - 1) (\alpha/\kappa)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} (1 - l^A)}{(r - n) [(1 - s_K)(r + \delta)]^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}}}. \quad (47)$$

Moreover, substituting (8) into  $w = (1 - \alpha)Y/L^Y$  implies

$$\frac{w}{A} = (1 - \alpha) \left( \frac{\alpha}{\kappa(1 - s_K)(r + \delta)} \right)^{\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}}. \quad (48)$$

It will become apparent, that in steady state knowledge stock  $A$  grows with rate  $g$ . From condition  $\Pi = 0$ , i.e.,  $p^A \dot{A} = \tau w l^A$ , we find that  $\dot{A}/A = g$  implies  $p^A g = l^A \tau w/A$ . Substituting both (47) and (48) into this expression and using (19) leads to (20). According to (13),  $\dot{\tilde{A}} = 0$  implies (21). (22) immediately follows from (47). (23) follows from rearranging (17). To confirm (24), set  $\dot{\tilde{k}} = 0$  in (15).

The savings rate (and investment share) is given by

$$sav = (\dot{K} + \delta K)/Y = (\dot{K}/K + \delta)K/Y. \quad (49)$$

As  $\dot{\tilde{k}} = 0$ , we have  $\dot{K}/K = n + g$  in steady state. Substituting this and (9) into (49) and using (19) confirms (25).

Finally, using  $\dot{\lambda}/\lambda = -\sigma g$  from (36) and the fact that  $\dot{c}/c = g$ , we find that if  $a$  grows with rate  $g$  in the long run, the transversality condition (38) holds under assumption (A1). Rewriting (4) to

$$\frac{\dot{a}}{a} = r - n + \frac{w}{a} - \frac{c}{a} - \frac{T}{a} \quad (50)$$

reveals that  $\dot{a}/a = g$  indeed holds in steady state, if both the lump-sum tax per household ( $T$ ) and wage rate  $w$  grow at rate  $g$  (recall that  $c$  grows at rate  $g$  and  $r$  is time-invariant in steady state). That  $w$  grows at the same rate as  $A$  (namely at rate  $g$ ) in steady state can be seen from (48), since  $r$  is time-invariant in the long run. Moreover, we have

$$T = s_K(r + \delta)k + s_A w l^A, \quad (51)$$

which also confirms that, in steady state,  $\dot{T}/T = g$ . This concludes the proof. ■

**Proof of Proposition 2:** The current-value Hamiltonian which corresponds to the social planning problem (29) is given by

$$\mathcal{H} = \frac{c^{1-\sigma} - 1}{1 - \sigma} + \lambda_k \underbrace{(k^\alpha (Al^Y)^{1-\alpha} - (\delta + n)k - c)}_{=y} + \lambda_A \underbrace{\nu A^\phi N^{1-\theta} (1 - l^Y)^{1-\theta}}_{=l^A}, \quad (52)$$

where  $\lambda_k$  and  $\lambda_A$  are co-state variables associated with constraints (27) and (28), respectively. Necessary optimality conditions are  $\partial \mathcal{H}/\partial c = \partial \mathcal{H}/\partial l^Y = 0$  (control variables),  $\dot{\lambda}_z = (\rho - n)\lambda_z - \partial \mathcal{H}/\partial z$  for  $z \in \{k, A\}$  (state variables), and the corresponding

transversality conditions. Thus,

$$\lambda_k = c^{-\sigma}, \text{ i.e., } \frac{\dot{\lambda}_k}{\lambda_k} = -\sigma \frac{\dot{c}}{c}, \quad (53)$$

$$(1 - \alpha)A^{1-\alpha} \left( \frac{k}{l^Y} \right)^\alpha = \frac{\lambda_A}{\lambda_k} (1 - \theta) \underbrace{\nu A^\phi N^{1-\theta} (l^A)^{-\theta}}_{=\dot{A}/l^A}, \quad (54)$$

$$\frac{\dot{\lambda}_k}{\lambda_k} = \rho - \alpha \left( \frac{Al^Y}{k} \right)^{1-\alpha} + \delta, \quad (55)$$

$$\frac{\dot{\lambda}_A}{\lambda_A} = \rho - n - \frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda_A} (1 - \alpha) \underbrace{\left( \frac{k}{A} \right)^\alpha (l^Y)^{1-\alpha}}_{=y/A} - \phi \frac{\dot{A}}{A} \quad (56)$$

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_{z,t} e^{-(\rho-n)t} z_t = 0, \quad z \in \{k, A\}. \quad (57)$$

( $\lambda_{z,t}$  denotes the co-state variable associated with state variable  $z$  at time  $t$ .)

To find the optimal capital cost subsidy, first note that from (36) and (53) that we must have  $\lambda = \lambda_k$  in social optimum; thus, according to (37) and (55),

$$r + \delta = \alpha \left( \frac{Al^Y}{k} \right)^{1-\alpha}. \quad (58)$$

Comparing (58) with (17), by using  $l^Y = 1 - l^A$  and the definitions of  $\tilde{c}$ ,  $\tilde{k}$ ,  $\tilde{A}$ , we find that  $\kappa(1 - s_K) = 1$  must hold in social optimum at all times, which is equivalent to (30).

Next, note from (45) and (54) that a R&D subsidy which implements the social optimum must fulfill

$$p^A = (1 - \theta) \tau \frac{\lambda_A}{\lambda_k}, \text{ i.e.,} \quad (59)$$

$$\frac{\dot{\tau}}{\tau} = \frac{\dot{p}^A}{p^A} - \left( \frac{\dot{\lambda}_A}{\lambda_A} - \frac{\dot{\lambda}_k}{\lambda_k} \right). \quad (60)$$

Moreover, substituting optimality conditions  $1 - s_K = 1/\kappa$  and (59) into (14), we find

$$\frac{\dot{p}^A}{p^A} = r - n - \frac{(1 - 1/\kappa)\alpha(1 - l^A) \lambda_k}{(Al^Y/k)^\alpha \tau(1 - \theta) \lambda_A}. \quad (61)$$

Rewriting (54) to

$$\frac{\lambda_k}{\lambda_A} = \frac{(1 - \theta) (Al^Y/k)^\alpha \dot{A}}{(1 - \alpha)l^A A} \quad (62)$$

and substituting into (61) leads to

$$\frac{\dot{p}^A}{p^A} = r - n - \frac{(1 - 1/\kappa)(1 - l^A) \dot{A}}{\tau(1/\alpha - 1)l^A A}. \quad (63)$$

Moreover, combining (55) and (56) by subtracting both sides of the equations from each other and substituting (62), we have

$$\frac{\dot{\lambda}_A}{\lambda_A} - \frac{\dot{\lambda}_k}{\lambda_k} = \alpha \left( \frac{Al^Y}{k} \right)^{1-\alpha} - \delta - n - (1 - \theta) \frac{l^Y \dot{A}}{l^A A} - \phi \frac{\dot{A}}{A}. \quad (64)$$

Substituting (63) and (64) into (60) and making use of (58) and  $l^Y = 1 - l^A$  then leads to

$$\frac{\dot{\tau}}{\tau} = \left[ \left( 1 - \theta - \frac{1}{\tau} \frac{1 - 1/\kappa}{1/\alpha - 1} \right) \frac{1 - l^A}{l^A} + \phi \right] \frac{\dot{A}}{A}. \quad (65)$$

From (28) and the definition of  $\tilde{A}$  we find

$$\frac{\dot{A}}{A} = \nu \tilde{A}^{\phi-1} (l^A)^{1-\theta}. \quad (66)$$

Substituting (66) into (65) confirms (31).

It remains to confirm terminal condition (32), i.e., the optimal long run R&D policy. We seek for a steady state where  $A$ ,  $k$  and  $c$  all grow at rate  $g$  and  $\dot{l}^Y = \dot{l}^A = \dot{\tau} = 0$ . Setting  $\dot{\tau} = 0$  in (31) implies that, in long run social optimum,

$$\left( 1 - \theta - \frac{1}{\tau} \frac{1 - 1/\kappa}{1/\alpha - 1} \right) \left( \frac{1}{l^A} - 1 \right) + \phi = 0. \quad (67)$$

To infer (32) from (67) we need to find the steady state value for the fraction of R&D

labor,  $l^A$ . From (53),  $\dot{\lambda}_k/\lambda_k = -\sigma g$ ; combining with (55) implies

$$\alpha \left( \frac{Al^Y}{k} \right)^{1-\alpha} - \delta = \sigma g + \rho. \quad (68)$$

From (62) and  $\dot{A}/A = g$ , together with the property that  $Al^Y/k$  are  $l^A$  are constant in the long run, we find  $\dot{\lambda}_k/\lambda_k = \dot{\lambda}_A/\lambda_A$ . Using  $\dot{\lambda}_k/\lambda_k = \dot{\lambda}_A/\lambda_A$ ,  $\dot{A}/A = g$ , (68) and  $l^Y = 1 - l^A$  in (64) we can solve for  $l^A$ . Doing so and using  $(1 - \phi)g = (1 - \theta)n$  from the definition of  $g$  in (A1) implies

$$l^A = \frac{1}{\frac{(\sigma-1)g+\rho-\theta n}{(1-\theta)g} + 1}. \quad (69)$$

Substituting (69) into (67) and using  $(1 - \phi)g = (1 - \theta)n$  confirms (32).

From (53) and  $\dot{c}/c = g$ , we have  $\dot{\lambda}_k/\lambda_k = -\sigma g$ . Using that  $\dot{\lambda}_k/\lambda_k = \dot{\lambda}_A/\lambda_A = -\sigma g$  for  $t \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\dot{k}/k = \dot{A}/A = g$ , transversality condition (57) is fulfilled under assumption (A1) for both state variables,  $k$  and  $A$ .

So far we have shown that the policy mix in Proposition 2 is necessary for a first-best optimum. To show that it is also sufficient, we need to prove that under this policy mix, the market equilibrium is the same as the social planning optimum.

From (27) we obtain

$$\frac{\dot{k}}{k} = \left( \frac{Al^Y}{k} \right)^{1-\alpha} - \delta - n - \frac{\tilde{c}}{\tilde{k}}, \quad (70)$$

which coincides with (15) by using  $l^Y = 1 - l^A$  and the definitions of  $\tilde{c}$ ,  $\tilde{k}$ ,  $\tilde{A}$ . Similarly, (66) coincides with (13) and combining (53) with (55) leads to (16) when using (58). Finally, combining (59) with (62) and using (66) leads to (18). This concludes the proof. ■

**Measuring Welfare Differences:** To quantify the welfare difference between implementing the dynamically optimal policy mix and the optimal steady state policy mix, we express it as the percentage change of a hypothetical steady state per capita



consumption stream when implementing the dynamic optimal policy rather than the steady state optimal policy. Formally, recall that in the long run adjusted per capita consumption,  $\tilde{c} = c/N^{\frac{1-\theta}{1-\phi}}$ , is stationary and per capita consumption  $c$  grows with rate  $g = \frac{(1-\theta)n}{1-\phi}$ . Thus, in the long run,  $c = \tilde{c}^* e^{gt}$ . Moreover, denote the steady state value of  $\tilde{c}$  when using the (suboptimal) steady state optimal policy by  $\tilde{c}_{sub}^*$ , the change in life-time utility when switching to the dynamically optimal policy by  $\Delta U$ , and the associated hypothetical increase in adjusted steady per capita consumption by  $\Delta\tilde{c}$ . Then we have:

$$\Delta U = \int_0^\infty \frac{((\tilde{c}_{sub}^* + \Delta\tilde{c})e^{gt})^{1-\sigma} - 1}{1-\sigma} e^{-(\rho-n)t} dt - \int_0^\infty \frac{(\tilde{c}_{sub}^* e^{gt})^{1-\sigma} - 1}{1-\sigma} e^{-(\rho-n)t} dt \quad (71)$$

which we can solve to find

$$\frac{\Delta\tilde{c}}{\tilde{c}_{sub}^*} = \frac{(\tilde{c}_{sub}^* e^{gt})^{1-\sigma} + \Delta U(\sigma-1)(g(1-\sigma) + n - \rho)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}}}{\tilde{c}_{sub}^*} - 1, \quad (72)$$

which is the measure we use to quantify welfare differences.

## References

- [1] Bloom, Nick and Rachel Griffith and John Van Reenen (2002). Do R&D tax credits work? Evidence from a panel of countries 1979-1997, *Journal of Public Economics*, 85(1), 1-31.
- [2] Conesa, Juan Carlos, Sagiri Kitao and Dirk Krueger (2009). Taxing Capital? Not a Bad Idea after All!, *American Economic Review* 99, 25-48.
- [3] Devereux, Michael P., Rachel Griffith and Alexander Klemm (2002). Corporate Income Tax Reforms and International Tax Competition, *Economic Policy* 17, 449-495.
- [4] Grossmann, Volker, Thomas M. Steger and timo Trimborn (2010). Quantifying Optimal Growth Policy, CESifo Working Paper No. 3092.

- [5] Heston, Alan, Robert Summers and Bettina Aten (2006). Penn World Table Version 6.2, Center for International Comparisons of Production, Income and Prices at the University of Pennsylvania.
- [6] Jones, Charles I. (1995). R&D-based Models of Economic Growth, *Journal of Political Economy* 103, 759–784.
- [7] Jones, Charles I. (2005). Growth and Ideas, in: P. Aghion and S. Durlauf (eds.), *Handbook of Economic Growth*, North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- [8] Jones, Charles I. and John C. Williams (2000). Too Much of a Good Thing? The Economics of Investment in R&D, *Journal of Economic Growth* 5, 65-85.
- [9] Krueger, Alan B. (1999). Measuring Labor’s Share, *American Economic Review Papers & Proceedings* 89, 45-51.
- [10] Mehra, Rajnish and Edward C. Prescott (1985). The Equity Premium: A Puzzle, *Journal of Monetary Economics* 15, 145-61.
- [11] Norrbin, Stefan C. (1993). The Relationship Between Price and Marginal Cost in U.S. Industry: A Contradiction, *Journal of Political Economy* 101, 1149-1164.
- [12] OECD (2009). Science Technology and Industry Scoreboard 2009, Paris.
- [13] Scherer, Frederic (1982). Inter-industry Technology Flows and Productivity Growth, *Review of Economics and Statistics* 64, 627-634.
- [14] Romer, Paul (2000). Should the Government Subsidize Supply or Demand in the Market for Scientists and Engineers?, NBER Working Paper No. 7723.
- [15] Segerstrom, Paul (1998). Endogenous Growth Without Scale Effects, *American Economic Review* 88, 1290-1310.
- [16] Sener, Fuat (2008). R&D Policies, Endogenous Growth and Scale Effects, *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 32, 3895-3916.

- [17] Steger, Thomas (2003). The Segerstrom Model: Stability, Speed of Convergence and Policy Implications *Economics Bulletin* 15, 1-8.
- [18] Steger, Thomas M. (2005). Welfare Implications of Non-Scale R&D-based Growth Models, *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 107, 737-757.
- [19] Strulik, Holger (2007). Too Much of a Good Thing? The Quantitative Economics of R&D-driven Growth Revisited, *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 109, 369-386.
- [20] Trimborn, Timo, Karl-Josef Koch and Thomas M. Steger (2008). Multi-Dimensional Transitional Dynamics: A Simple Numerical Procedure, *Macroeconomic Dynamics* 12, 301–319.

## Supplementary Material (not intended for publication)

Here we show that the goods market clearing condition (40) holds in equilibrium.

- Given the linear-homogenous production function (1) and due to perfect competition we know that profits are zero in the final goods sector. Thus,

$$Y = \int_0^A p_i x_i di + wL^Y. \quad (73)$$

Using (5), i.e.,  $\pi_i = p_i x_i - (1 - s_K)(r + \delta)x_i$  together with  $K = \int_0^A x_i di$  and  $\pi_i = \pi$  for all  $i$  (firms are symmetric) we obtain

$$\int_0^A p_i x_i di = \pi A + (1 - s_K)(r + \delta)K \quad (74)$$

and thus

$$\pi A = Y - (1 - s_K)(r + \delta)K - wL^Y. \quad (75)$$

- Under a balanced government budget, the aggregate lump-sum tax faced by households is

$$NT = s_K(r + \delta)K + s_A wL^A. \quad (76)$$

- According to (11) and  $\Pi = 0$ , we have (recall  $\tau = 1 - s_A$ ):

$$P^A \dot{A} = (1 - s_A)wL^A. \quad (77)$$

- Total assets of households are given by  $Na = K + P^A A$ . Differentiating with respect to time yields:

$$\dot{Na} + N\dot{a} = \dot{K} + \dot{P}^A A + P^A \dot{A}. \quad (78)$$

Using  $\dot{N} = nN$  we can write

$$N\dot{a} = \dot{K} + \dot{P}^A A + P^A \dot{A} - nNa. \quad (79)$$

Combining (79) with asset accumulation equation (4) we find

$$\dot{K} + \dot{P}^A A + P^A \dot{A} = rNa + wN - Nc - NT.$$

Using  $Na = K + P^A A$  and  $\pi = rP^A - \dot{P}^A$  from (10) we obtain

$$\dot{K} = rK + wN - Nc + NT + \pi A - P^A \dot{A}.$$

Substituting (75), (76), (77) and using  $N = L^Y + L^A$  implies

$$\dot{K} = Y - Nc - \delta K.$$

Using the definition of per capita measures  $k$  and  $y$  confirms (40). *Q.E.D.*

# CESifo Working Paper Series

for full list see [www.cesifo-group.org/wp](http://www.cesifo-group.org/wp)

(address: Poschingerstr. 5, 81679 Munich, Germany, [office@cesifo.de](mailto:office@cesifo.de))

---

- 3089 Marcel Fratzscher and Julien Reynaud, IMF Surveillance and Financial Markets – A Political Economy Analysis, June 2010
- 3090 Michel Beine, Elisabetta Lodigiani and Robert Vermeulen, Remittances and Financial Openness, June 2010
- 3091 Sebastian Kube and Christian Traxler, The Interaction of Legal and Social Norm Enforcement, June 2010
- 3092 Volker Grossmann, Thomas M. Steger and Timo Trimborn, Quantifying Optimal Growth Policy, June 2010
- 3093 Huw David Dixon, A Unified Framework for Using Micro-Data to Compare Dynamic Wage and Price Setting Models, June 2010
- 3094 Helmuth Cremer, Firouz Gahvari and Pierre Pestieau, Accidental Bequests: A Curse for the Rich and a Boon for the Poor, June 2010
- 3095 Frank Lichtenberg, The Contribution of Pharmaceutical Innovation to Longevity Growth in Germany and France, June 2010
- 3096 Simon P. Anderson, Øystein Foros and Hans Jarle Kind, Hotelling Competition with Multi-Purchasing: Time Magazine, Newsweek, or both?, June 2010
- 3097 Assar Lindbeck and Mats Persson, A Continuous Theory of Income Insurance, June 2010
- 3098 Thomas Moutos and Christos Tsitsikas, Whither Public Interest: The Case of Greece's Public Finance, June 2010
- 3099 Thomas Eichner and Thorsten Upmann, Labor Markets and Capital Tax Competition, June 2010
- 3100 Massimo Bordignon and Santino Piazza, Who do you Blame in Local Finance? An Analysis of Municipal Financing in Italy, June 2010
- 3101 Kyriakos C. Neanidis, Financial Dollarization and European Union Membership, June 2010
- 3102 Maela Giofré, Investor Protection and Foreign Stakeholders, June 2010
- 3103 Andrea F. Presbitero and Alberto Zazzaro, Competition and Relationship Lending: Friends or Foes?, June 2010

- 3104 Dan Anderberg and Yu Zhu, The Effect of Education on Marital Status and Partner Characteristics: Evidence from the UK, June 2010
- 3105 Hendrik Jürges, Eberhard Kruk and Steffen Reinhold, The Effect of Compulsory Schooling on Health – Evidence from Biomarkers, June 2010
- 3106 Alessandro Gambini and Alberto Zazzaro, Long-Lasting Bank Relationships and Growth of Firms, June 2010
- 3107 Jenny E. Ligthart and Gerard C. van der Meijden, Coordinated Tax-Tariff Reforms, Informality, and Welfare Distribution, June 2010
- 3108 Vilen Lipatov and Alfons Weichenrieder, Optimal Income Taxation with Tax Competition, June 2010
- 3109 Malte Mosel, Competition, Imitation, and R&D Productivity in a Growth Model with Sector-Specific Patent Protection, June 2010
- 3110 Balázs Égert, Catching-up and Inflation in Europe: Balassa-Samuelson, Engel's Law and other Culprits, June 2010
- 3111 Johannes Metzler and Ludger Woessmann, The Impact of Teacher Subject Knowledge on Student Achievement: Evidence from Within-Teacher Within-Student Variation, June 2010
- 3112 Leif Danziger, Uniform and Nonuniform Staggering of Wage Contracts, July 2010
- 3113 Wolfgang Buchholz and Wolfgang Peters, Equity as a Prerequisite for Stable Cooperation in a Public-Good Economy – The Core Revisited, July 2010
- 3114 Panu Poutvaara and Olli Ropponen, School Shootings and Student Performance, July 2010
- 3115 John Beirne, Guglielmo Maria Caporale and Nicola Spagnolo, Liquidity Risk, Credit Risk and the Overnight Interest Rate Spread: A Stochastic Volatility Modelling Approach, July 2010
- 3116 M. Hashem Pesaran, Predictability of Asset Returns and the Efficient Market Hypothesis, July 2010
- 3117 Dorothee Crayen, Christa Hainz and Christiane Ströh de Martínez, Remittances, Banking Status and the Usage of Insurance Schemes, July 2010
- 3118 Eric O'N. Fisher, Heckscher-Ohlin Theory when Countries have Different Technologies, July 2010
- 3119 Huw Dixon and Hervé Le Bihan, Generalized Taylor and Generalized Calvo Price and Wage-Setting: Micro Evidence with Macro Implications, July 2010

- 3120 Laszlo Goerke and Markus Pannenberg, 'Take it or Go to Court' – The Impact of Sec. 1a of the German Protection against Dismissal Act on Severance Payments -, July 2010
- 3121 Robert S. Chirinko and Daniel J. Wilson, Can Lower Tax Rates be Bought? Business Rent-Seeking and Tax Competition among U.S. States, July 2010
- 3122 Douglas Gollin and Christian Zimmermann, Global Climate Change and the Resurgence of Tropical Disease: An Economic Approach, July 2010
- 3123 Francesco Daveri and Maria Laura Parisi, Experience, Innovation and Productivity – Empirical Evidence from Italy's Slowdown, July 2010
- 3124 Carlo V. Fiorio and Massimo Florio, A Fair Price for Energy? Ownership versus Market Opening in the EU15, July 2010
- 3125 Frederick van der Ploeg, Natural Resources: Curse or Blessing?, July 2010
- 3126 Kaisa Kotakorpi and Panu Poutvaara, Pay for Politicians and Candidate Selection: An Empirical Analysis, July 2010
- 3127 Jun-ichi Itaya, Makoto Okamura and Chikara Yamaguchi, Partial Tax Coordination in a Repeated Game Setting, July 2010
- 3128 Volker Meier and Helmut Rainer, On the Optimality of Joint Taxation for Non-Cooperative Couples, July 2010
- 3129 Ryan Oprea, Keith Henwood and Daniel Friedman, Separating the Hawks from the Doves: Evidence from Continuous Time Laboratory Games, July 2010
- 3130 Mari Rege and Ingeborg F. Solli, The Impact of Paternity Leave on Long-term Father Involvement, July 2010
- 3131 Olaf Posch, Risk Premia in General Equilibrium, July 2010
- 3132 John Komlos and Marek Brabec, The Trend of BMI Values by Centiles of US Adults, Birth Cohorts 1882-1986, July 2010
- 3133 Emin Karagözoğlu and Arno Riedl, Information, Uncertainty, and Subjective Entitlements in Bargaining, July 2010
- 3134 John Boyd, Gianni De Nicolò and Elena Loukoianova, Banking Crises and Crisis Dating: Theory and Evidence, July 2010
- 3135 Michael R. Baye, Dan Kovenock and Casper G. de Vries, The Herodotus Paradox, July 2010
- 3136 Martin Kolmar and Hendrik Rommeswinkel, Group Contests with Complementarities in Efforts, July 2010

- 3137 Carolina Manzano and Xavier Vives, Public and Private Learning from Prices, Strategic Substitutability and Complementarity, and Equilibrium Multiplicity, July 2010
- 3138 Axel Löffler, Gunther Schnabl and Franziska Schobert, Inflation Targeting by Debtor Central Banks in Emerging Market Economies, July 2010
- 3139 Yu-Fu Chen and Michael Funke, Global Warming and Extreme Events: Rethinking the Timing and Intensity of Environmental Policy, July 2010
- 3140 Lawrence M. Kahn, Labor Market Policy: A Comparative View on the Costs and Benefits of Labor Market Flexibility, July 2010
- 3141 Ben J. Heijdra, Jochen O. Mierau and Laurie S.M. Reijnders, The Tragedy of Annuitization, July 2010
- 3142 Erkki Koskela, Outsourcing Cost and Tax Progression under Nash Wage Bargaining with Flexible Outsourcing, July 2010
- 3143 Daniel Osberghaus and Christiane Reif, Total Costs and Budgetary Effects of Adaptation to Climate Change: An Assessment for the European Union, August 2010
- 3144 Philip E. Graves, Benefit-Cost Analysis of Environmental Projects: A Plethora of Systematic Biases, August 2010
- 3145 Sabrina Di Addario and Daniela Vuri, Entrepreneurship and Market Size. The Case of Young College Graduates in Italy, August 2010
- 3146 Shoshana Amyra Grossbard and Alfredo Marvão Pereira, Will Women Save more than Men? A Theoretical Model of Savings and Marriage, August 2010
- 3147 Jarko Fidrmuc, Time-Varying Exchange Rate Basket in China from 2005 to 2009, August 2010
- 3148 Ilja Neustadt and Peter Zweifel, Is the Welfare State Sustainable? Experimental Evidence on Citizens' Preferences for Redistribution, August 2010
- 3149 Marcus Dittrich and Andreas Knabe, Wage and Employment Effects of Non-Binding Minimum Wages, August 2010
- 3150 Shutao Cao, Enchuan Shao and Pedro Silos, Fixed-Term and Permanent Employment Contracts: Theory and Evidence, August 2010
- 3151 Ludger Woessmann, Cross-Country Evidence on Teacher Performance Pay, August 2010
- 3152 Lorenzo C. G. Pozzi, Casper G. de Vries and Jorn Zenhorst, World Equity Premium Based Risk Aversion Estimates, August 2010
- 3153 Volker Grossmann, Thomas M. Steger and Timo Trimborn, Dynamically Optimal R&D Subsidization, August 2010



# Universität Leipzig

## Wirtschaftswissenschaftliche Fakultät

Nr. 1	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Stock Options wegen oder gegen Shareholder Value? Vergütungsmodelle für Vorstände und Führungskräfte 04/1998
Nr. 2	Thomas Lenk / Volkmar Teichmann	Bei der Reform der Finanzverfassung die neuen Bundesländer nicht vergessen! 10/1998
Nr. 3	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Gedanken über Führen – Dienen – Verantworten 11/1998
Nr. 4	Kristin Wellner	Möglichkeiten und Grenzen kooperativer Standortgestaltung zur Revitalisierung von Innenstädten 12/1998
Nr. 5	Gerhardt Wolff	Brauchen wir eine weitere Internationalisierung der Betriebswirtschaftslehre? 01/1999
Nr. 6	Thomas Lenk / Friedrich Schneider	Zurück zu mehr Föderalismus: Ein Vorschlag zur Neugestaltung des Finanzausgleichs in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der neuen Bundesländer 12/1998
Nr. 7	Thomas Lenk	Kooperativer Förderalismus – Wettbewerbsorientierter Förderalismus 03/1999
Nr. 8	Thomas Lenk / Andreas Mathes	EU – Osterweiterung – Finanzierbar? 03/1999
Nr. 9	Thomas Lenk / Volkmar Teichmann	Die fiskalischen Wirkungen verschiedener Forderungen zur Neugestaltung des Länderfinanzausgleichs in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland: Eine empirische Analyse unter Einbeziehung der Normenkontrollanträge der Länder Baden-Württemberg, Bayern und Hessen sowie der Stellungnahmen verschiedener Bundesländer 09/1999
Nr. 10	Kai-Uwe Graw	Gedanken zur Entwicklung der Strukturen im Bereich der Wasserversorgung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung kleiner und mittlerer Unternehmen 10/1999
Nr. 11	Adolf Wagner	Materialien zur Konjunkturforschung 12/1999
Nr. 12	Anja Birke	Die Übertragung westdeutscher Institutionen auf die ostdeutsche Wirklichkeit – ein erfolg-versprechendes Zusammenspiel oder Aufdeckung systematischer Mängel? Ein empirischer Bericht für den kommunalen Finanzausgleich am Beispiel Sachsen 02/2000
Nr. 13	Rolf H. Hasse	Internationaler Kapitalverkehr in den letzten 40 Jahren – Wohlstandsmotor oder Krisenursache? 03/2000
Nr. 14	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Unternehmensführung (Corporate Governance) und Hauptversammlung 04/2000
Nr. 15	Adolf Wagner	Materialien zur Wachstumsforschung 03/2000
Nr. 16	Thomas Lenk / Anja Birke	Determinanten des kommunalen Gebührenaufkommens unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der neuen Bundesländer 04/2000
Nr. 17	Thomas Lenk	Finanzwirtschaftliche Auswirkungen des Bundesverfassungsgerichtsurteils zum Länderfinanzausgleich vom 11.11.1999 04/2000
Nr. 18	Dirk Büttel	Continuous linear utility for preferences on convex sets in normal real vector spaces 05/2000
Nr. 19	Stefan Dierkes / Stephanie Hanrath	Steuerung dezentraler Investitionsentscheidungen bei nutzungsabhängigem und nutzungsunabhängigem Verschleiß des Anlagenvermögens 06/2000
Nr. 20	Thomas Lenk / Andreas Mathes / Olaf Hirschfeld	Zur Trennung von Bundes- und Landeskompetenzen in der Finanzverfassung Deutschlands 07/2000
Nr. 21	Stefan Dierkes	Marktwerte, Kapitalkosten und Betafaktoren bei wertabhängiger Finanzierung 10/2000
Nr. 22	Thomas Lenk	Intergovernmental Fiscal Relationships in Germany: Requirement for New Regulations? 03/2001
Nr. 23	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Stock Options – Aktuelle Fragen Besteuerung, Bewertung, Offenlegung 03/2001

Nr. 24	Thomas Lenk	Die „kleine Reform“ des Länderfinanzausgleichs als Nukleus für die „große Finanzverfassungs-reform“? 10/2001
Nr. 25	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Biotechnologie im Spannungsfeld von Menschenwürde, Forschung, Markt und Moral Wirtschaftsethik zwischen Beredsamkeit und Schweigen 11/2001
Nr. 26	Thomas Lenk	Finanzwirtschaftliche Bedeutung der Neuregelung des bundestaatlichen Finanzausgleichs – Eine allkoative und distributive Wirkungsanalyse für das Jahr 2005 11/2001
Nr. 27	Sören Bär	Grundzüge eines Tourismusmarketing, untersucht für den Südraum Leipzig 05/2002
Nr. 28	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Der Deutsche Corporate Governance Kodex: Zuwahl (comply) oder Abwahl (explain)? 06/2002
Nr. 29	Adolf Wagner	Konjunkturtheorie, Globalisierung und Evolutionsökonomik 08/2002
Nr. 30	Adolf Wagner	Zur Profilbildung der Universitäten 08/2002
Nr. 31	Sabine Klinger / Jens Ulrich / Hans-Joachim Rudolph	Konjunktur als Determinante des Erdgasverbrauchs in der ostdeutschen Industrie? 10/2002
Nr. 32	Thomas Lenk / Anja Birke	The Measurement of Expenditure Needs in the Fiscal Equalization at the Local Level Empirical Evidence from German Municipalities 10/2002
Nr. 33	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Die Lust am Fliegen Eine Parabel auf viel Corporate Governance und wenig Unternehmensführung 11/2002
Nr. 34	Udo Hielscher	Wie reich waren die reichsten Amerikaner wirklich? (US-Vermögensbewertungsindex 1800 – 2000) 12/2002
Nr. 35	Uwe Haubold / Michael Nowak	Risikoanalyse für Langfrist-Investments Eine simulationsbasierte Studie 12/2002
Nr. 36	Thomas Lenk	Die Neuregelung des bundesstaatlichen Finanzausgleichs auf Basis der Steuerschätzung Mai 2002 und einer aktualisierten Bevölkerungsstatistik 12/2002
Nr. 37	Uwe Haubold / Michael Nowak	Auswirkungen der Renditeverteilungsannahme auf Anlageentscheidungen Eine simulationsbasierte Studie 02/2003
Nr. 38	Wolfgang Bernhard	Corporate Governance Kodex für den Mittel-Stand? 06/2003
Nr. 39	Hermut Kormann	Familienunternehmen: Grundfragen mit finanzwirtschaftlichen Bezug 10/2003
Nr. 40	Matthias Folk	Launhardtsche Trichter 11/2003
Nr. 41	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Corporate Governance statt Unternehmensführung 11/2003
Nr. 42	Thomas Lenk / Karolina Kaiser	Das Prämienmodell im Länderfinanzausgleich – Anreiz- und Verteilungsmittelnwirkungen 11/2003
Nr. 43	Sabine Klinger	Die Volkswirtschaftliche Gesamtrechnung des Haushaltsektors in einer Matrix 03/2004
Nr. 44	Thomas Lenk / Heide Köpping	Strategien zur Armutsbekämpfung und –vermeidung in Ostdeutschland: 05/2004
Nr. 45	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Sommernachtsfantasien Corporate Governance im Land der Träume. 07/2004
Nr. 46	Thomas Lenk / Karolina Kaiser	The Premium Model in the German Fiscal Equalization System 12/2004
Nr. 47	Thomas Lenk / Christine Falken	Komparative Analyse ausgewählter Indikatoren des Kommunalwirtschaftlichen Gesamt-ergebnisses 05/2005
Nr. 48	Michael Nowak / Stephan Barth	Immobilienanlagen im Portfolio institutioneller Investoren am Beispiel von Versicherungsunternehmen Auswirkungen auf die Risikosituation 08/2005

Nr. 49	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Familiengesellschaften – Quo Vadis? Vorsicht vor zu viel „Professionalisierung“ und Ver-Fremdung 11/2005
Nr. 50	Christian Milow	Der Griff des Staates nach dem Währungsgold 12/2005
Nr. 51	Anja Eichhorst / Karolina Kaiser	The Institutional Design of Bailouts and Its Role in Hardening Budget Constraints in Federations 03/2006
Nr. 52	Ullrich Heilemann / Nancy Beck	Die Mühen der Ebene – Regionale Wirtschaftsförderung in Leipzig 1991 bis 2004 08/2006
Nr. 53	Gunther Schnabl	Die Grenzen der monetären Integration in Europa 08/2006
Nr. 54	Hermut Kormann	Gibt es so etwas wie typisch mittelständige Strategien? 11/2006
Nr. 55	Wolfgang Bernhardt	(Miss-)Stimmung, Bestimmung und Mitbestimmung Zwischen Juristentag und Biedenkopf-Kommission 11/2006
Nr. 56	Ullrich Heilemann / Annika Blaschzik	Indicators and the German Business Cycle A Multivariate Perspective on Indicators of Ifo, OECD, and ZEW 01/2007
Nr. 57	Ullrich Heilemann	“The Soul of a new Machine” zu den Anfängen des RWI-Konjunkturmodells 12/2006
Nr. 58	Ullrich Heilemann / Roland Schuhr / Annika Blaschzik	Zur Evolution des deutschen Konjunkturzyklus 1958 bis 2004 Ergebnisse einer dynamischen Diskriminanzanalyse 01/2007
Nr. 59	Christine Falken / Mario Schmidt	Kameralistik versus Doppik Zur Informationsfunktion des alten und neuen Rechnungswesens der Kommunen Teil I: Einführende und Erläuternde Betrachtungen zum Systemwechsel im kommunalen Rechnungswesen 01/2007
Nr. 60	Christine Falken / Mario Schmidt	Kameralistik versus Doppik Zur Informationsfunktion des alten und neuen Rechnungswesens der Kommunen Teil II Bewertung der Informationsfunktion im Vergleich 01/2007
Nr. 61	Udo Hielscher	Monti della citta di firenze Innovative Finanzierungen im Zeitalter Der Medici. Wurzeln der modernen Finanzmärkte 03/2007
Nr. 62	Ullrich Heilemann / Stefan Wappler	Sachsen wächst anders Konjunkturelle, sektorale und regionale Bestimmungsgründe der Entwicklung der Bruttowertschöpfung 1992 bis 2006 07/2007
Nr. 63	Adolf Wagner	Regionalökonomik: Konvergierende oder divergierende Regionalentwicklungen 08/2007
Nr. 64	Ullrich Heilemann / Jens Ulrich	Good bye, Professir Phillips? Zum Wandel der Tariflohndeterminanten in der Bundesrepublik 1952 – 2004 08/2007
Nr. 65	Gunther Schnabl / Franziska Schobert	Monetary Policy Operations of Debtor Central Banks in MENA Countries 10/2007
Nr. 66	Andreas Schäfer / Simone Valente	Habit Formation, Dynastic Altruism, and Population Dynamics 11/2007
Nr. 67	Wolfgang Bernhardt	5 Jahre Deutscher Corporate Governance Kodex Eine Erfolgsgeschichte? 01/2008
Nr. 68	Ullrich Heilemann / Jens Ulrich	Viel Lärm um wenig? Zur Empirie von Lohnformeln in der Bundesrepublik 01/2008
Nr. 69	Christian Groth / Karl-Josef Koch / Thomas M. Steger	When economic growth is less than exponential 02/2008
Nr. 70	Andreas Bohne / Linda Kochmann	Ökonomische Umweltbewertung und endogene Entwicklung peripherer Regionen Synthese einer Methodik und einer Theorie 02/2008
Nr. 71	Andreas Bohne / Linda Kochmann / Jan Slavik / Lenka Slaviková	Deutsch-tschechische Bibliographie Studien der kontingenten Bewertung in Mittel- und Osteuropa 06/2008

Nr. 72	Paul Lehmann / Christoph Schröter-Schlaack	Regulating Land Development with Tradable Permits: What Can We Learn from Air Pollution Control? 08/2008
Nr. 73	Ronald McKinnon / Gunther Schnabl	China's Exchange Rate Impasse and the Weak U.S. Dollar 10/2008
Nr. 74	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Managervergütungen in der Finanz- und Wirtschaftskrise Rückkehr zu (guter) Ordnung, (klugem) Maß und (vernünftigem) Ziel? 12/2008
Nr. 75	Moritz Schularick / Thomas M. Steger	Financial Integration, Investment, and Economic Growth: Evidence From Two Eras of Financial Globalization 12/2008
Nr. 76	Gunther Schnabl / Stephan Freitag	An Asymmetry Matrix in Global Current Accounts 01/2009
Nr. 77	Christina Ziegler	Testing Predictive Ability of Business Cycle Indicators for the Euro Area 01/2009
Nr. 78	Thomas Lenk / Oliver Rottmann / Florian F. Woitek	Public Corporate Governance in Public Enterprises Transparency in the Face of Divergent Positions of Interest 02/2009
Nr. 79	Thomas Steger / Lucas Bretschger	Globalization, the Volatility of Intermediate Goods Prices, and Economic Growth 02/2009
Nr. 80	Marcela Munoz Escobar / Robert Holländer	Institutional Sustainability of Payment for Watershed Ecosystem Services. Enabling conditions of institutional arrangement in watersheds 04/2009
Nr. 81	Robert Holländer / WU Chunyou / DUAN Ning	Sustainable Development of Industrial Parks 07/2009
Nr. 82	Georg Quaas	Realgrößen und Preisindizes im alten und im neuen VGR-System 10/2009
Nr. 83	Ulrich Heilemann / Hagen Findeis	Empirical Determination of Aggregate Demand and Supply Curves: The Example of the RWI Business Cycle Model 12/2009
Nr. 84	Gunther Schnabl / Andreas Hoffmann	The Theory of Optimum Currency Areas and Growth in Emerging Markets 03/2010
Nr. 85	Georg Quaas	Does the macroeconomic policy of the global economy's leader cause the worldwide asymmetry in current accounts? 03/2010
Nr. 86	Volker Grossmann / Thomas M. Steger / Timo Trimborn	Quantifying Optimal Growth Policy 06/2010
Nr. 87	Wolfgang Bernhardt	Corporate Governance Kodex für Familienunternehmen? Eine Widerrede 06/2010
Nr. 88	Philipp Mandel / Bernd Süsmuth	A Re-Examination of the Role of Gender in Determining Digital Piracy Behavior 07/2010
Nr. 89	Philipp Mandel / Bernd Süsmuth	Size Matters. The Relevance and Hicksian Surplus of Agreeable College Class Size 07/2010
Nr. 90	Thomas Kohstall / Bernd Süsmuth	Cyclic Dynamics of Prevention Spending and Occupational Injuries in Germany: 1886-2009 07/2010
Nr. 91	Martina Padmanabhan	Gender and Institutional Analysis. A Feminist Approach to Economic and Social Norms 08/2010
Nr. 92	Gunther Schnabl / Ansgar Belke	Finanzkrise, globale Liquidität und makroökonomischer Exit 09/2010
Nr. 93	Ulrich Heilemann / Roland Schuhr / Heinz Josef Münch	A "perfect storm"? The present crisis and German crisis patterns 12/2010
Nr. 94	Gunther Schnabl / Holger Zemanek	Die Deutsche Wiedervereinigung und die europäische Schuldenkrise im Lichte der Theorie optimaler Währungsräume 06/2011
Nr. 95	Andreas Hoffmann / Gunther Schnabl	Symmetrische Regeln und asymmetrisches Handeln in der Geld- und Finanzpolitik 07/2011
Nr. 96	Andreas Schäfer / Maik T. Schneider	Endogenous Enforcement of Intellectual Property, North-South Trade, and Growth 08/2011
Nr. 97	Volker Grossmann / Thomas M. Steger / Timo Trimborn	Dynamically Optimal R&D Subsidization 08/2011