



UNITED NATIONS
UNIVERSITY

UNU-MERIT

Working Paper Series

#2018-003

**Natural, effective and BOP-constrained rates of growth:
Adjustment mechanisms and closure equations**

Gabriel Porcile and Danilo Sartorello Spinola

Maastricht Economic and social Research institute on Innovation and Technology (UNU-MERIT)

email: info@merit.unu.edu | website: <http://www.merit.unu.edu>

Maastricht Graduate School of Governance (MGSoG)

email: info-governance@maastrichtuniversity.nl | website: <http://www.maastrichtuniversity.nl/governance>

Boschstraat 24, 6211 AX Maastricht, The Netherlands

Tel: (31) (43) 388 44 00

UNU-MERIT Working Papers

ISSN 1871-9872

**Maastricht Economic and social Research Institute on Innovation and Technology
UNU-MERIT**

**Maastricht Graduate School of Governance
MGSoG**

UNU-MERIT Working Papers intend to disseminate preliminary results of research carried out at UNU-MERIT and MGSoG to stimulate discussion on the issues raised.

Natural, Effective and BOP-Constrained Rates of Growth: Adjustment Mechanisms and Closure Equations

Gabriel Porcile¹

Danilo Sartorello Spinola²

Abstract

The interaction between the effective (y^E) and the natural rates of growth (y^N) is a central part - implicitly or explicitly addressed - in all growth models. A stable equilibrium requires these two rates to converge; otherwise, one or more macroeconomic variables would be rising or falling without bounds. In addition, the Keynesian tradition stressed the Balance-of-Payments constraint as a determinant of the equilibrium growth rate in the long run (y^{BP}). This paper discusses alternative mechanisms through which these three growth rates may converge and relates these mechanisms to different theoretical approaches to the determinants of growth. With this objective, we extend the model suggested by Setterfield (2011) to include the evolution of the North-South technology gap and the pattern of specialization as components of the Kaldorian productivity regime. Drawing from the Schumpeterian literature, we stress the importance of the National System of Innovation in shaping the learning parameters and outcomes of the model. A successful development strategy emerges when the NSI enhances indigenous technological capabilities that allow the South economy to catch-up with the technological frontier.

Keywords: BOP-constrained growth models, Growth Models, Structural Change, Technological Capabilities.

JEL: E12, F43, O30

¹ Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC) and Federal University of Parana (UFPR), Brazil

² United Nations University – Maastricht Economic and Social Research Institute on Innovation and Technology (UNU-MERIT), The Netherlands

Introduction

The interaction between the effective (y^E) and the natural rates of growth (y^N) is a central part - implicitly or explicitly addressed - in all growth models. The effective rate of growth is the one actually observed at a certain point in time, and depends on effective demand. The natural growth rate, on the other hand, represents a potential that may or may not be attained. It is driven by supply side forces (technology, the growth of labor supply and capital accumulation). While both growth rates do not necessarily coincide in the short run or even in the medium run, they must converge in the long run. The effective rate cannot exceed the ceiling imposed by the natural rate except momentarily by overstressing the use of resources. The effective rate cannot be below the natural rate for many years, since this would imply that an increasingly larger share of valuable resources is kept idle. Some labor and capital may be unemployed in equilibrium, but the share of unemployed capital or labor cannot grow without bounds. Such disequilibrium would elicit a response from the economic system to place the economy back in an equilibrium path³. Identifying the compensating forces that ensure the move towards such equilibrium helps us understand the different theoretical approaches to economic growth and also illuminates its policy implications.

Moreover, there is a third rate of growth that must be considered. The effective rate of growth is demand-driven and hence it is necessary to consider the dynamics of the different sources of effective demand to understand the adjustment process. Keynesian growth models for open economies highlight the Balance-of-Payments constraint as a key determinant of the growth of effective demand. In the long run the rate of growth of exports (an addition to effective demand) and imports (a leakage to effective demand) must grow hand in hand. The other sources of effective demand must endogenously adjust to preserve the external equilibrium. Therefore the effective rate must converge not only with the potential rate (as expressed in the natural rate), but also with the *equilibrium rate of growth* of effective demand (as expressed in the Balance-of Payments constraint or Thirlwall's Law; see below).

The objective of this paper is to develop a framework which allows us to discuss in a simple way how the adjustment process may occur, what mechanisms bring about the adjustment and what possible implications they have for economic policy. Our point of

³ For instance, if the natural rate of growth is higher than the effective rate, unemployment or excess capacity will be increasing steadily, a trend that could not persist indefinitely. Inversely, if the effective rate of growth is higher than the natural rate, the economy will find the barrier of full employment and full utilization of the capital stock. Either compensating mechanisms will be at work to curb this disequilibrium path or a major crisis would reshape the system and produce a new, sustainable dynamic system.

departure and the basic framework we adopt in this paper is the one set forth by Setterfield (2011). Building on his framework, and trying to keep its simplicity and clarity, we expand it in four directions.

First, we consider the Balance-of-Payments (BOP) constrained rate of growth as the demand-side driven equilibrium growth rate. Second, different mechanisms driving productivity growth are considered besides learning by doing. In particular, the insights of the technology gap literature on innovation and competitiveness are used to shed light on the Kaldorian “productivity regime”. By doing so, this paper takes into consideration the impact of international asymmetries in technological capabilities on competitiveness and growth, which are at the core of the center-periphery or North-South models of economic development. Last but not least, the paper allows structural change to play a role in the different (effective, BOP-constrained and natural) rates of growth in a North-South setting. Structural change, technology and effective demand co-evolve - as pointed out in the rising “Keynes meets Schumpeter” literature on economic growth (Ciarli, Lorentz, Savona, & Valente, 2010; Cimoli & Porcile, 2014; Dosi, Fagiolo, & Roventini, 2010). Center-periphery and North-South are used as exchangeable terms in the paper and both point out to the same idea, namely that there are asymmetries in technological and productive capabilities in the international economy, and that these asymmetries shape the economic performance of each country / region.

The paper consists of three sections besides this introduction and the concluding remarks. Section 1 presents the general framework in which the main variables and interrelations are discussed. Section 2 discusses adjustment mechanisms based on the interactions between the effective, BOP-constrained and the natural rates of growth, in a context in which the dynamics of the North-South technology gap is ignored. Section 3 includes North-South asymmetries in technological capabilities in the analysis.

A family of models emerge from the discussion with the same basic structure but different “closure equations” which highlight the main theoretical differences between the models. In the main text the emphasis is on the economic intuitions of the models, while most of the technical aspects are presented in boxes in each section.

1. Demand, productivity and structural regimes: the general framework

a) Building blocks: Kaldorian regimes and structural change

This section presents the general framework that will be used to analyze the interactions between the natural and effective rates of growth. There are three building blocks in the model: (I) the Kaldorian demand regime; (II) the Kaldorian productivity regime; and (III) a structural change regime that interacts with the previous two.

Each building block is directly related to different pieces of the Keynesian-Schumpeterian growth models. They will be more formally discussed later, but the main insights can be rapidly summarized. First, the BOP-constrained rate of growth, based on Thirlwall's Law - see Thirlwall (2012) - represents the rate of growth consistent with equilibrium in current account, to which the Kaldorian growth model must converge⁴. Secondly, the productivity regime is based on the Kaldor-Verdoorn Law and the technology gap literature. Therefore it considers not only the traditional forces of increasing returns from learning by doing, but also the possibility of international spillovers of knowledge from the advanced North to the laggard South - a pioneer contribution is Nelson & Phelps (1966); see also Fagerberg & Verspagen (2002). Finally, the structural change regime focuses on how the pattern of specialization evolves as a result of technical change. Leads and lags in innovation and learning redefine the parameters of Thirlwall's law and therefore the BOP-constrained rate of growth (Cimoli & Porcile, 2014; Dosi, et al, 1990; Verspagen, 1992). The structural change regime represents the channel through which the Schumpeterian dynamics (supply side) affects the Keynesian BOP-constrained rate of growth (demand side).

b) The demand regime: the BOP-constrained rate of growth

There are two demand-driven rates of growth. One represents the effective rate of growth, in which the deficit in current account as a percentage of the GDP could be either falling or increasing. The other is the equilibrium rate of growth, driven by the external constraint, which requires that exports and imports grow at the same rate (equilibrium in current account). In the long run both rates of growth must be equal, and also equal to the natural rate

⁴ This paper follows Blecker (2013) in the analysis of the Kaldorian export-led and its relation with the BOP-constrained growth.

of growth. The effective rate of growth (y^E) is given by the Kaldorian equations (1) and (2) below - for more details see Setterfield & Cornwall (2002):

$$(1) y^E = \alpha a + \beta x$$

$$(2) x = g\varepsilon + \psi_X \dot{q}$$

According to these equations, the effective rate of economic growth depends on the growth of autonomous expenditure (a) and the growth of exports (x) (Blecker, 2013; Kaldor, 1975; McCombie & Thirlwall, 1994). The parameters α and β are a function of the relative weight of autonomous expenditure and exports, respectively, in total income, along with the income elasticity of the demand for imports (π) which for simplicity is assumed constant in the paper. The growth of exports - equation (2) - depends on the income elasticity of exports (ε), the expansion of the world economy (g), and the rate of depreciation of the real exchange rate (\dot{q}), in which $q = \ln\left(\frac{P^*\varepsilon}{P}\right)$. P^* is the international price index, P is the domestic price index, ε is the price of the foreign currency (units of domestic currency per unit of foreign currency) and ψ_X is the price elasticity of exports.

The discussion of this paper applies to the long run, in which the real exchange is in equilibrium and hence $\dot{q} = 0$ and $x = \varepsilon g$. The assumption of a stable real exchange rate reproduces that of Thirlwall's model - for simplicity fully adopted here. Such an assumption, however, has been challenged by several authors. There is no dearth of models suggesting a significant impact of wage bargaining and the real exchange rate on growth and the income elasticity of the demand for exports and imports⁵. This view is supported by historical and empirical evidence pointing out that the real exchange rate is an important determinant of economic growth and could not be ignored in the long run. However, to the extent that these aspects have already been discussed in several other works, we remit the reader to the literature⁶. In addition, a discussion of the dynamics of the real exchange rate would require modeling the labor market and wage bargaining in more detail, which is beyond the scope of this paper. For this reason, we will suggest a way in which the impact of the real exchange rate on the elasticities could be included in the basic framework of our model in section 2.d, but we will not develop this insight.

⁵ See Cimoli & Porcile (2011, 2014), Lima & Porcile (2013), Bresser-Pereira et al (2014), and Gabriel et al (2016) for details.

⁶ See also Frenkel & Rapetti (2012) and Missio et al (2015).

As mentioned, in equilibrium exports and imports grow at the same rate, which implies $\varepsilon g = \pi y^{BP}$, where y^{BP} is the equilibrium rate of growth⁷. Under these assumptions the simplest version of BOP-constrained rate of growth is obtained (Thirlwall's Law – more details in the appendix at the end of this article):

$$(3) y^{BP} = \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} g$$

In equation (3), ε/π is the income elasticity ratio. This ratio depends on the degree of diversification and technological intensity of the pattern of specialization. A more technology-intensive production structure is associated with higher technological capabilities, which allows the country to respond more effectively to changes in global demand and competition, raising ε (Araujo & Lima, 2007; Catela & Porcile, 2012; Cimoli & Porcile, 2014; Gouvea & Lima, 2010). In other words: the higher the technological capabilities of the country, the higher are the income elasticity ratio and the equilibrium rate of growth.

How does the adjustment between the effective rate of growth (y^E) and the equilibrium rate of growth (y^{BP}) proceed? One possible path is by making endogenous the growth rate of a component of effective demand that has been considered exogenous in the short run. For instance, the autonomous component of investment in the short run may depend on agents' expectations. Such expectations in turn vary with the perception on external equilibrium. If the external debt is growing and the external situation is deemed unsustainable, then this component of investment will fall (and with it effective demand) if economic actors foresight a crisis. Another mechanism is through adjustments in public expenditure. If the government thinks that the external front shows high vulnerability, it is likely that it will seek to reduce effective demand by reducing public expenditure. We will continue to call this component of effective demand which is expectation-driven as autonomous in the specific sense that it does not react “mechanically” to current changes in effective demand:

$$(4) \dot{a} = \lambda(y^{BP} - y^E)$$

Equation (4) implies that the effective rate of growth converges to the long run growth rate at an adjustment speed given by λ . The adjustment mechanism is in line with that

⁷ The demand for imports is given by $m = \pi y^E + \psi_M \dot{q}$, as shown in Setterfield & Cornwall (2002).

suggested by Blecker (2013), p.26, who stresses that the Balance of Payments Constraint growth rate may be seen as “a stable attractor for the long run equilibrium”. In the same vein, Carlin & Soskice (2005) define the transition from the medium run to the long run as a transition from equilibrium in the labor market towards equilibrium in current account. Changes in autonomous expenditures concur to sustain such a transition, although it may not be the only force at work. This view is also consistent with the assumption made in this paper (and in Thirlwall’s Law models in general) that in the long run the real exchange rate is stable and hence can play no role in restoring the external balance. Therefore, the only instrument left for private and public agents to stabilize a rising external deficit (as a percentage of GDP) are changes in the growth of autonomous expenditure.

c) The productivity regime and the natural rate of growth

The production function comprises homogeneous labor and technology, which drives labor productivity. The natural rate of growth (y^N) equals the rate of growth of labor supply ($n = \dot{N}/N$, where N is the total labor supply) plus the rate of growth of labor productivity (z). Formally:

$$(5) y^N = n + z$$

As regards the growth of labor supply (n), it is a function of the population growth (\bar{n}) and the wage rate of the economy (W). The higher the wage rate, the higher the attraction of labor from either the subsistence sector within the economy and from other economies with lower wages. This wage rate is defined as the ratio between wages in the modern sector of the economy and the wage in the subsistence sector or in other (lower wage) countries.

$$(6) n = \bar{n} + \sigma(W)$$

A central concern of classical growth theory (Dutt, 1990; Foley & Michl, 1999) and classical development theory (Levine, 2005; Lewis, 1954; Prebisch, 1950) is the elasticity of labor supply (σ) with respect to the relative wage between the modern and the traditional sectors. It is generally considered that in developing economies there is a large reserve of labor that could be easily mobilized to feed the formal labor market. This labor reserve

sustains employment growth with minimal changes in real wages. In practice this view is challenged by the need to educate and train workers coming from the informal and / or laggard segments of the economy. In this paper only the two extreme cases will be considered: that of infinite elasticity of labor supply ($\sigma = \infty$, section 2.a), and that of zero elasticity of labor supply, which implies an exogenous rate of growth of labor supply ($n = \bar{n}$ in all the other sections).

The relative wage between the modern sector and subsistence depends on the rate of employment:

$$(7) W = \omega(E)$$

In equation (7), $E = L/N$, $0 \leq E \leq 1$, where L is total employment and N total labor supply in the economy. The wage ratio is a function of the level of employment. Note that when the elasticity of labor supply is infinite ($\sigma = \infty$), E approaches zero. The difference in wages between the modern and the traditional sector is then the subsistence wage (\bar{W}) times a constant factor ω that captures the cost of migration to the modern sector: $W = \omega\bar{W}$ (or the cost of migration from a low-wage country to a high-wage economy).

Productivity growth (z) is driven by different types of learning that spur innovation and the adoption of advanced technology. The *first source* is (I) learning by doing, as expressed in the Kaldor-Verdoorn Law. The higher is the rate of growth, the higher the accumulation of experience in production, investments in new technology, and opportunities for innovation and diffusion of technology. In addition, more workers are transferred from the subsistence to the modern sector, where learning is faster. To capture the effects of the Kaldor-Verdoorn law, we assume that the intensity of learning by doing (and productivity growth) is a function of the level of activity of the economy - of which the employment rate E is a proxy.

The *second driver* of learning and productivity growth are (II) complementarities and externalities arising from the flow of knowledge across sectors. Positive externalities are stronger when the economic structure is more diversified towards knowledge intensive sectors. As the share of these sectors in total value added increases, so do the opportunities for innovation and cross-fertilization between sectors, labor and technology. Formally, this effect is captured in the model by the income elasticity of exports (ε), as this variable is a positive function of the knowledge intensity of the specialization pattern – this is captured by the income elasticity ratio ε/π , where π is assumed to be constant.

A third variable affecting learning is (III) the technology gap (T) defined as the ratio between technological capabilities in the leading country and technological capabilities in the laggard country ($T = T^N/T^S$). T^N represents technological capabilities in the North and T^S technological capabilities in the South. The technology gap opens opportunities for absorbing foreign technology and therefore for catching up with the technological frontier. International spillovers of technology are an important source of learning for laggard countries that invest in strengthening their absorptive capabilities (Abramovitz, 1986; Narula, 2004). These spillovers are not spontaneous, but the result of persistent efforts at investing in mastering and improving foreign technology in the laggard economies.

The factors shaping productivity growth can be formally represented as follows:

$$(8) z = z(E, \varepsilon, T, s)$$

Equation (8) describes a modified Kaldor's "productivity regime", where E is the employment rate, ε is the income elasticity of exports, T is the technology gap, and s is a shift parameter that represents domestic efforts at technological learning. A higher s implies higher productivity growth for a given E , ε and T . The effects of the first two sources of learning - learning by doing (E) and learning from diversification (ε) - are addressed in section 2, while catching up (reducing T) is left for section 3. In the rest of this section T is not considered in the argument of equation (8). The parameter s varies with the industrial and technological policy and reflects what the Schumpeterian literature calls the National System of Innovation (Lundvall, 2007; Nelson, 1993).

The rate of change of the employment rate (e) is given by:

$$(9) e = y^E - y^N$$

Using equation (5) in (9), and using the definition of employment rate ($E = L/N$), it is straightforward that the growth of labor demand ($l = \dot{L}/L$) equals the difference between the rate of economic growth and that of labor productivity, $l = y^E - z$ (which is just a different way of stating that $e = l - n$). In the long run e must be zero, for if y^E exceeds y^N , the ceiling of full employment ($E = 1$) will be reached; and if y^E is below y^N , then the rate of unemployment would rise with no limits, a situation that cannot be sustained for a long time.

So far the system of equations comprises eleven endogenous variables (y^E , a , x , y^{BP} , ε , y^N , E , e , n , W and α), six exogenous parameters (π , α , β , λ , ω , s), and only nine independent equations. To solve the model two additional equations are needed. In the next section, we define “closure equations” based on specific assumptions which represent different theoretical approaches to the interaction between learning, growth and structural change - and therefore on how the economy adjusts.

2. Alternative scenarios and closure equations

The adjustment scenarios depend on the specific assumptions regarding the behavior of income elasticities, labor supply, technology, and labor productivity growth. Which of these variables are endogenous and which are exogenous define a different role for supply side and demand side variables in long run growth with distinct policy implications.

a) The Lewis-Prebisch-Thirlwall (LPT) case

The simplest case is the one in which the income elasticity of exports is exogenous ($\varepsilon = \bar{\varepsilon}$) and labor supply is infinitely elastic à la Lewis ($\sigma = \infty$) and hence the increase of labor supply closes any gap between production and productivity growth. i.e. $n = l = y^E - z$ (see box 1). Any increase in effective demand above productivity growth elicits a proportional increase in labor supply (and hence in the natural rate of growth) that matches labor demand, as labor moves from the subsistence sector to the modern sector of the economy. Growth takes the form of a horizontal production expansion through labor absorption with no structural change. BOP-constrained growth (à la Prebisch-Thirlwall) is fully validated: changes in autonomous demand lead the economy towards the BOP-constrained growth path (convergence of effective and BOP-constrained growth), while labor migration fills in any gap between the natural and effective rates of growth.

In other words, no supply constraints emerge as the economy expands: there is large pool of labor ready to move and feed the labor market. As the stock of labor N is very large, the rate of employment is close to zero ($E = L/N \cong 0$) and plays no role in eliciting productivity growth or in stimulating new investments. Box 1 presents the model under the assumptions of infinitely elastic labor supply and exogenous growth rate of exports⁸, in which growth is fully

⁸ The rate of growth of exports (x) is exogenous because g and ε are exogenous.

determined by the pattern of specialization (ε/π) and the rate of growth of the international economy (g).

Box 1. The Lewis-Prebisch-Thirlwall (LPT) case

Closure equations

$$(LPT1) \varepsilon = \bar{\varepsilon}$$

$$(LPT2) n^* = y^* = z^*$$

Equilibrium values of the endogenous variables

$$(LPT3) y^* = y^{BP} = \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{\pi} g$$

$$(LPT4) x^* = \bar{\varepsilon} g$$

$$(LPT5) a^* = \frac{1}{\alpha\pi} [\bar{\varepsilon} g (1 - \beta\pi)]$$

$$(LPT6) E = L/N \cong 0$$

$$(LPT7) z^* = z(\bar{\varepsilon})$$

$$(LPT8) W = \omega \bar{W}$$

$$(LPT9) y^N = y^E = y^{BP}$$

Motion equation and stability

$$(LPT10) \dot{a} = \lambda \left(\frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{\pi} g - \alpha a - \beta \bar{\varepsilon} g \right)$$

The system is stable since $\frac{\partial \dot{a}}{\partial a} = -\lambda\alpha$, where α and λ are both positive.

In this model growth is entirely determined by Thirlwall's Law, and the natural rate fully adjusts to the effective rate through the increase in the supply of labor, which is infinite. The given (peripheral) structure determines economic growth and productivity growth, while changes in the growth of autonomous demand ensure BOP equilibrium.

Productivity growth is constant for it depends on the pattern of specialization (knowledge intensity of the production basis as captured by $\bar{\varepsilon}$) and efforts at learning (s) which are constant (see equation LPT7). The model illustrates the forces driving growth in an economy in which the structure is rigid while labor is abundant. It is likely that in such an economy $\bar{\varepsilon}$ is very low and hence the rate of reallocation of the labor force to the modern sector would advance at a slow pace. Informality and duality may persist for a rather long period. The crucial challenge to this economy is to raise $\bar{\varepsilon}$ so that it succeeds in exhausting the labor stock in the subsistence sector and increasing labor productivity. This, however, as it will be

discussed in the next section, could hardly be achieved without reducing the technology gap with the technological frontier country leaders.

b) The Kaldor-Prebisch-Thirlwall (KPT) case

As in the LPT case, in the Kaldor-Prebisch-Thirlwall (KPT) case income elasticities are exogenous. But different than the LPT, there is no infinite supply of labor. Technological learning and productivity growth both rise with economic growth à la Kaldor, while the rate of growth of labor supply is an exogenous constant ($\sigma = 0$). In the KPT it is productivity growth - and not the growth of labor supply - that makes the natural rate of growth converge with the effective rate of growth. A closure equation along these lines is suggested by Setterfield (2011).

Causality goes from the BOP-constrained growth rate to the effective growth rate and from that to productivity - and hence to the natural rate of growth. The model is Prebischian-Thirlwallian because BOP-constrained growth holds (as in the LPT model) in equilibrium; and it is Kaldorian because the supply side reacts based on the endogenous forces of learning by doing (which expands production *pari passu* with effective demand).

Assuming that equation (8) is linear and s is the fraction of autonomous expenditure (a) that goes to R&D and other productivity-enhancing technological activities, we have:

$$(10) \quad z = sa + bE + v\varepsilon$$

In equation (10), b is the Kaldor-Verdoorn coefficient and v the increasing returns to diversification coefficient. The Kaldorian productivity regime is thus redefined so as to allow private and public investments in R&D and human capital to contribute to the process of learning. The higher are these investments, the more intense learning and productivity growth. The parameter s is considered a function of policies aimed at strengthening the National System of Innovation (NSI). Learning is not automatic or spontaneous, but there is a crucial role for public policy in accelerating technical change.

Equation (10) allows us to find explicit solutions for the model, as presented in Box 2.

Box 2. The Kaldor-Prebisch-Thirlwall (KPT) case

Closure equations

$$(KPT1) \varepsilon = \bar{\varepsilon}$$

$$(KPT2) n = \bar{n}$$

Equilibrium values of the endogenous variables

$$(KPT3) y^* = y^{BP} = \frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{\pi} g$$

$$(KPT4) x^* = \bar{\varepsilon} g$$

$$(KPT5) a^* = \frac{1}{\alpha\pi} [\bar{\varepsilon} g (1 - \beta\pi)]$$

$$(KPT6) E^* = \frac{1}{b} [(\alpha - s)a^* + \bar{\varepsilon}(\beta g - v)]$$

$$(KPT7) z^* = sa^* + bE^* + v\bar{\varepsilon}$$

$$(KPT8) W^* = \omega(E^*)$$

$$(KPT9) y^* = y^E = y^N$$

Motion equations and stability

$$(KPT10) \dot{a} = \lambda \left(\frac{\bar{\varepsilon}}{\pi} g - \alpha a - \beta \bar{\varepsilon} g \right)$$

$$(KPT11) \dot{e} = (\alpha - s)a + \beta \bar{\varepsilon} g - bE - v\bar{\varepsilon} - \bar{n}$$

$$(KPT12) J = \begin{vmatrix} -\lambda\alpha & 0 \\ \alpha - s & -b \end{vmatrix}$$

Growth is entirely determined by Thirlwall's Law and the natural rate fully adjusts to the effective rate. But the convergence between the two rates is produced by Kaldorian increases in productivity, not by the Prebisch-Lewis infinite supply of labor as it is in the LPT. But productivity increases may not come out so automatically, as discussed below.

The trace of the Jacobian is negative and the determinant positive; hence the model is stable.

In the model the response of productivity to the level of activity is strong enough as to allow production to keep pace with effective demand. The model largely relies on the productivity-enhancing effects of Kaldor-Verdoorn. However, the cumulative forces of learning by doing may not suffice to produce all the required adjustment in y^N . The full employment ceiling may be met before the economy reaches the BOP constraint. It is then necessary to discuss in more detail the role for technological policy, as addressed in the next subsection.

c) *Technological policy, growth and employment*

The speed with which effective demand and productivity growth respond may be very different. Productivity moves at a slower pace than effective demand. This implies that short lived turbulences may emerge during the transitional dynamics towards the equilibrium path defined by the BOP-constrained rate of growth. The problems of mismatch between these forces may not be solved even in the long run. The institutional requirements for productivity-led adjustment are highly demanding. It is necessary a strong technological policy to ensure the rapid response of productivity to changes in effective demand in order to prevent the economy from facing supply-side constraints.


To formalize the critical role of the NSI in the KPT model, we assume that it is captured by the share of autonomous expenditure directed at building the technological capabilities that fosters productivity growth (s in equation 10). The system of differential equations is the same as in the previous sub-section:

$$(11) \quad \dot{a} = \lambda \left(\frac{\bar{\varepsilon}g(1-\beta\pi) - \alpha a}{\pi} \right)$$

$$(12) \quad e = (\alpha - s)a + \beta \bar{\varepsilon}g - bE - v\bar{\varepsilon} - \bar{n}$$

Figure 1 shows the phase diagram under different technological policies - i.e under different values of s . When policy increases the share of autonomous expenditure invested in learning, it makes more likely that equilibrium could be attained before the economy reaches the supply-side constraint. This is illustrated in Figure 1, which represents the isoclines corresponding to equations (11) and (12). There is just one value of a which makes $\dot{a} = 0$, represented by the vertical line a^* . The isocline in which the employment rate is constant ($e = 0$) is $E = [(\alpha - s)a + \beta \bar{\varepsilon}g - v\bar{\varepsilon} - \bar{n}]b^{-1}$ which is positively sloped assuming $\alpha > s$. The increase in the technological effort, from s_1 to s_2 and s_3 , where $s_1 < s_2 < s_3$, moves the $e = 0$ curve downwards, as it requires a lower E to sustain the same growth rate of autonomous expenditure a . The full employment level is depicted by a horizontal line at $E = 1$.

Figure 1: productivity and demand regimes with technological policy



Note: The effect of the technological policy is to move $e = 0$ to the right, making it possible to attain a higher rate of productivity growth when $E = 1$. In the curve $e = 0$ it is assumed $\alpha > s$.

Three alternative scenarios can be constructed. In the first scenario learning is so low (a low s) that productivity growth does not match the growth of effective demand when $E = 1$ (the required equilibrium level E_1^* would be above the ceiling of full employment). In such a scenario the natural rate of growth would never reach the effective rate. The dynamic model is not valid in this case, as autonomous expenditure must adjust to satisfy $E = 1$ with economic growth equal to the natural rate.

In a second scenario, technological policy raises s and shifts the $e = 0$ curve downwards so as to attain equilibrium with full employment (in point $E_2^* = 1$ on the dashed curve). The economy grows at the rate defined by the BOP constraint, while technological variables ensure that productivity responds accordingly.

The third and last scenario emerges when policy focuses just on productivity growth and neglects structural change. A poorly diversified economy, with a low income elasticity ratio, offers little stimulus from the point of view of effective demand. On the other hand, efforts at increasing productivity growth and rationalization of productive activities imply that the natural rate equals the effective rate at an employment level (E_3^*), below full employment (round dotted curve). If there is no parallel effort to change the pattern of specialization and the elasticity ratio, a pure technological policy may mean higher unemployment rather than faster growth. This scenario illustrates the dynamics of several Latin America economies that rapidly opened to international trade in the nineties. The opening to trade elicited a

rationalization response from many firms in order to survive international competition. To the extent that this was not associated with a change in the pattern of specialization, but it led to a rise in labor unemployment (Cimoli, Porcile, & Rovira, 2010).

d) The Krugman-Palley (KP) case

Krugman (1989) coined the expression 45-degree rule to refer to the same stylized fact of economic growth which the Keynesian literature had called BOP-constrained growth rate. Krugman's 45-degree rule and Thirlwall's Law are identical, as both state that in the long run $y^*/g = \varepsilon/\pi$. However, for Krugman, the demand elasticities for export and imports solely depend on the rate of technical change. As a result, the variables related to technology and productivity entirely explain the long run growth rate, with no role for demand side variables.

The simplest form of formalizing this approach is by making two assumptions about the rate of growth of exports (x) and about labor productivity growth (z). The first is that the rate of growth of exports is a negative function of the employment rate (E). This is equivalent to assume that the ratio of the income elasticity of exports and imports is a negative function of the employment rate, as suggested by Palley (2009) (see equation KP1)⁹. As the economy approaches the full utilization of its production capabilities, it tends to export less and import more. The second assumption is that the natural rate of growth is exogenous (KP2) and equal to \bar{z} (see Box 3; to simplify notation, \bar{n} is assumed to be zero).

Combining these two assumptions (endogenous elasticities and exogenous technical change), when the economy grows above its natural rate and the level of employment rises, the growth of exports falls and the effective rate of growth moves towards the natural rate. In parallel, autonomous expenditure adjusts downwards to follow the declining export capacity - and hence the BOP-constrained growth rate converges to the natural rate. In terms of direction of causality, productivity growth has the upper hand, while all the other variables adjust to it. The pressure that a higher rate of employment poses on the production capacity lowers exports and reduces the BOP-constrained rate of growth.

Note that this is an example of how the *level* of the real exchange rate may affect the *rate of growth* (in spite of the assumption of Thirlwall's Law). A higher E implies a higher W . If we consider the wage level as a proxy for the behavior of the price level and the real exchange rate in the peripheral economy, then the real exchange story may go as follows:

⁹ The original Palley model has been criticized by Oreiro (2016) for being over-determined. We use a simpler version of Setterfield (2011) that avoids this problem.

when the economy approaches full employment and the employment rate (E) increases, then the real exchange rate (q) appreciates, the economy loses competitiveness, and this leads to a rise in the income elasticity of imports (π). Inversely, in the Prebisch-Thirwall model, the infinite supply of labor implies that E and the real exchange rate do not react to higher growth. This ensures the continuity of competitiveness and growth. One can tell a similar story from the point of view of the employment rate (E) and from the point of view of the wage rate (W), and the real exchange rate (q). However, both stories are similar but not the same. The real exchange rate story assumes that if one allows wages to fall enough (and the real exchange rate to rise enough), then the structure of the economy will change so as to bring about an equilibrium with full employment. If, on the other hand, one admits that the real exchange rate is not strong enough to change the structure, then the industrial and technological policies become the central part of the policy recommendations, and managing the real exchange rate becomes a co-adjuvant in attaining full employment.

Box 3. The Krugman-Palley (KP) case

Closure equations

$$(KP1) \varepsilon = f - hE$$

$$(KP2) z = \bar{z}$$

Equilibrium values of the endogenous variables

$$(KP3) y^* = y^N = \bar{z}$$

$$(KP2) x^* = (f - hE^*)g$$

$$(KP3) a^* = \frac{1}{\alpha} [\bar{z}(1 - \beta\pi)]$$

$$(KP4) E^* = \frac{fg - \bar{z}\pi}{hg}$$

$$(KP5) W^* = \omega(E^*)$$

$$(KP6) y^* = y^E = y^{BP}$$

Motion equations and stability

$$(KP6) \dot{a} = \lambda \left(\frac{(f-hE)}{\pi} g - \alpha a - \beta(f-hE)g \right)$$

$$(KP7) e = \alpha a + \beta(f-hE)g - \bar{z}$$

$$(K8) J = \begin{vmatrix} -\lambda\alpha & \lambda hg \left(\beta - \frac{1}{\pi} \right) \\ \alpha & -\beta hg \end{vmatrix}$$

The determinants of growth changed radically in this case as compared to the previous models. Here the effective rate adjusts to the natural rate. The rate of growth continues to be the one defined by Thirlwall's Law, but causality runs in the opposite direction.

The trace of the Jacobian is negative since all parameters are positive. The determinant equals $1/\pi$ and it is positive. The system is therefore stable.

The previous models assumed either no structural change or a change in elasticities just as a result of changes in levels of employment. There is no link between technology, structural change and elasticities. Such an assumption is highly unrealistic and leaves outside the model the Schumpeterian side of the story, namely the critical role of technology in international competitiveness. Technical change affects the pattern of specialization through the construction of indigenous capabilities and the creation of dynamic comparative advantages. This is the focus of the next section.

3. Growth, structural change and the dynamics of the technology gap

In the previous section technological change and competitiveness were discussed without considering shifts in the technological frontier. However, the same rate of productivity growth in a developing economy may entail very different consequences for competitiveness and growth if the technological frontier moves above or below this rate. Building dynamic comparative advantages depends on reducing the technology gap with the main competitors in the international economy. Leads and lags in technological innovation and the international diffusion of technology define the set of goods that each country can competitively produce. The pattern of specialization is not given - to paraphrase the famous dictum of Joan Robinson - by God and factor endowments, but depends on endogenous processes of learning and catching up with the technological leaders.

In developing economies (the South), the diversification of the production structure (and the ensuing pattern of specialization) is closely related to the ability to absorb, master, adapt and improve foreign technology. Changing the international division of labor requires changing the technology gap and the knowledge-intensity of the production structure in the laggard economies. Good luck in the commodity lottery (Diaz-Alejandro, 1986) may contribute to sustain growth for some time, but competing in the most dynamic markets in the long run requires technical and structural change.

The positive association between international competitiveness and technological capabilities can be formalized based on Cimoli (1988), Cimoli & Porcile (2011), and Verspagen (1991), as follows¹⁰:

$$(13) \quad \varepsilon/\pi = \varepsilon(T), \varepsilon_T < 0$$

Equation (13) defines the “structural change regime”, a critical dimension of growth in developing economies, which may be added to the classical Kaldorian regimes (demand regime and productivity regime). T is the technology gap, defined as $T = T^N/T^S$. Laggard countries (the South) may benefit from international technology spillovers from countries on the technological frontier (the North). Taking logs in the technology gap equation and differentiating it with respect to time, we obtain the rate of growth of the technology gap (t):

¹⁰ The first derivative of $\varepsilon(T)$, $v(T)$ and $z(T)$ regarding T are written as ε_T , v_T and z_T respectively.

$$(14) \quad t = t^N - t^S$$

In equation (14) t^N is the rate of technical change in the North and t^S that in the South. Catching-up defines a scenario in which $t < 0$, while falling behind implies $t > 0$. The rate of change of the technology gap depends on a set of variables that the Schumpeterian literature has highlighted (see subsection (c) in section 1; the focus here is on the third part of this subsection, international spillovers).

One of these variables is the initial level of the technology gap. The specific form of the function that relates learning in the laggard economy with the initial level of the technology gap $s(T)$ is a matter of debate. A linear form for this relationship (Fagerberg, 1988), by which the larger the initial level of the technology gap the lower is the rate of change of the technology gap - and the higher the rate of catching up with the leader (i.e. $s_t < 0$) - is attractive for its simplicity; the evidence favors a nonlinear specification (Fagerberg & Verspagen, 2002): spillovers increase with the gap up to a certain critical point of T , after which spillovers decrease with T .

Policies are crucial for catching up. Imitation is by no means effortless, passive or automatic. It requires significant investments in the South to absorb foreign technology. The international diffusion of technology goes hand by hand with minor innovations and continuous investments in (formal or informal) R&D and education in order to adapt the foreign technology to the particular (economic, social and physical) conditions faced by the catching up country (Cimoli & Dosi, 1995; Cimoli et al., 2010; Fransman, 1995; Katz, 1984; Lundvall, 2007; Metcalfe, 1994). Otherwise, the diffusion of technology would be very slow and localized, giving rise to a scenario of lagging behind.

Besides technological spillovers, there are two additional effects of the technology gap that is necessary to consider in the analysis. A high technology gap implies - through equation (13) that the South economy is less diversified and therefore comprises a lower share of knowledge-intensive activities in total production. Therefore, the process of learning out of knowledge complementarities across sectors is hampered. Moreover, since a lower $\varepsilon(T)$ also implies a lower rate of growth (compatible with external equilibrium) in the long run, learning by doing will then be weaker in the laggard economy. These forces are captured (as in the previous section) by the Kaldor-Verdoorn coefficient b and the increasing returns to diversification coefficient v . The negative effects of a higher T on effective demand and

diversification in part compensate for the positive influence on learning from international technological spillovers.

In the next subsections two cases are discussed: the case of linear technological spillovers (case a) and the case of nonlinear technological spillovers (case b). To make room for a new state variable (T) and at the same time keep the model tractable, it is assumed that the economy is always upon its BOP-constrained growth path (i.e. autonomous expenditure, and particularly fiscal policy, automatically fills in the gap between the effective rate of growth and the equilibrium rate of growth). Therefore, y^E equals y^{BP} at any point in time. State variables in the new dynamic system are the technology gap (T) and the employment rate (E).

a) Linear technological spillovers

Based on the previous discussion, the dynamics of the technology gap can be written as follows:

$$(15) \quad t^S = s(T) + bE + v\varepsilon(T)$$

$$(16) \quad \dot{t} = \lambda[t^N - s(T) - bE - v\varepsilon(T)]$$

Recall that $s(T)$ (with $s_t > 0$) represents international spillovers, b is the Kaldor-Verdoorn coefficient, v are returns to diversification and $\varepsilon(T)$ (with $\varepsilon_T < 0$) represents the structural change regime; t^N is the (exogenous) rate of learning in the leading economies.

Economic growth in equilibrium will be given by:

$$(17) \quad y^{BP} = \varepsilon(T)g, \varepsilon_T < 0$$


We consider two different approaches to the dynamics of productivity growth. One approach is to relate productivity growth to the *rate* of technological change, i.e. $z = z(t^S)$, $z(t^S) > 0$. The second approach is to relate productivity growth to the *level* of technological capabilities in the countries, i.e. $z = z(T)$, $z_T < 0$ - the higher the technology gap, the lower the rate of productivity growth.

The assumption of a rate to rate relationship between productivity and technology gives rise to the following motion equation for the growth of employment in the laggard economy, where $e = \xi[\varepsilon(T)g - t^S]$:

$$(18) \quad e = \xi[\varepsilon(T)g - s(T) - bE - v\varepsilon(T)]$$

Equations (16) and (18) form a system of differential equations which renders the equilibrium values of E and T , as represented in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Adjustment with linear technological spillovers: the rate to rate case



There is a role in the model for a structural change policy. If such a policy reduces ε_T (*i.e.* the economy is more diversified and therefore effective demand is higher with the same level of the technology gap), this reduces the slope of the $e = 0$ curve to produce an equilibrium with less unemployment, though with a higher technology gap (from A to B). Although the model produces the natural rate of growth in equilibrium (growth equals productivity growth in the South which in turn equals productivity growth in the North, $y^E = t^N$), and hence is supply-side dominated, structural change and demand side variables do have a role in defining the level of the technology gap and the level of the employment rate. A permanent shock on the income elasticity ratio, or a policy aimed at diversification, redefines growth and the relative stock of capabilities in equilibrium.

The model, however, is not stable, but produces a saddle equilibrium point - see the Jacobian in equation (19).

$$(19) \quad J = \begin{vmatrix} \lambda(-s_T - v\varepsilon_T) & -\lambda b \\ \xi[\varepsilon_T(g - v) - s_T] & -\xi b \end{vmatrix}$$


In effect, the determinant of the matrix is $\lambda\xi b\varepsilon_T g$. Since ε_T is negative, and λ , ξ , b and g are positive, the determinant is negative and the equilibrium is a saddle point. The scenario that emerges from a model with these features is one of divergence, unless the economy is by chance placed on the stable arm, and remains there in the absence of shocks or disturbances.

On the other hand, if it is admitted a level to ratio effect (from the level of the technology gap to the rate of productivity growth), a different scenario emerges. In this case, $z = z(T)$, $z_t < 0$, which leads to the following motion equation for the employment rate in the South:

$$(20) \quad e = \xi[\varepsilon(T)g - z(T)]$$

The system formed by equations (16) and (20) is represented in Figure 3.

Figure 3. Adjustment with linear technological spillovers: the level to rate case



A policy of structural change that reduces ε_T also reduces the slope of the $t = 0$ curve and defines a new equilibrium, with a higher level of employment and the same level of the technology gap. In addition, an increase in world demand reduces the technology gap (moves the $t = 0$ curve to the left) and raises the employment level.

The Jacobian of the system is given by:

$$(21) \quad J = \begin{vmatrix} \lambda(-s_T - v\varepsilon_T) & -\lambda b \\ \xi(\varepsilon_T g - z_T) & 0 \end{vmatrix}$$

Here we have $\lambda > 0$, $\xi > 0$, $s_T > 0$, $z_T < 0$, $v > 0$, $b > 0$ and $\varepsilon_T < 0$. Stability requires $(s_T/v) > -\varepsilon_T < (-z_T/g)$. The rate of growth of the economy will equal productivity growth, which in turn is driven by supply side variables - such as the rate of growth of the world economy (g). While the growth of the technological capabilities is exogenous in the model, given by the growth rate of capabilities in the leading economies ($t^n = t^s$), it is not the same for the other variables. Productivity growth rate, natural growth rate, employment equilibrium rate and the economic growth rate depends as well on demand-side variables.

b. Nonlinear technological spillovers

In this section we address the case of a nonlinear $s(T)$ function. At low levels of the technology gap, a rise in the gap increases technological spillovers towards the laggard economy. After a critical level, however, an increase in the gap reduces technological spillovers due to the lack of the indigenous capabilities required to learn from the countries on the technological frontier. Formally:

$$(22) \quad t^s = bE + T(\phi_0 - \phi_1 T)$$

Maximum spillovers are obtained by the laggard when $T = \phi_0/2\phi_1$. The differential equations system here takes the following form:

$$(23) \quad t = \lambda[t^n - bE - T(\phi_0 - \phi_1 T)]$$


$$(24) \quad e = \xi[\varepsilon(T)g - z(T)]$$

The Jacobian of the system is given by:

$$(25) \quad J = \begin{vmatrix} \lambda(2\phi_1 - \phi_0) & -\lambda b \\ \xi(\varepsilon_T g - z_T) & 0 \end{vmatrix}$$

Stability requires two conditions: firstly that $\varepsilon_T > (z_T/g)$. Secondly that the equilibrium technology gap (T^*) to be smaller than the technology gap which produces maximum spillovers (i.e. $T^* < \phi_0/2\phi_1$) – generating a negative trace. Figure 4 represents the case of nonlinear technological spillovers. A technological policy that increases the level of maximum spillovers (by increasing, for instance, the parameter ϕ_1) shifts the curve $t = 0$ to the right (from the solid to the dashed curve) and gives rise to higher levels of employment (from point A to point B in Figure 4). In the same vein, a policy of structural change that raises the income elasticity ratio (and effective demand for a given rate of growth of the world economy), shifts the $e = 0$ curve to the left and produces a higher employment rate with a lower technology gap (from point A to point C in Figure 4).

Figure 4. Adjustment with nonlinear technological spillovers



Finally, a technological shock that raises the technology gap beyond the critical value $\phi_0/2\phi_1$ will lead to an unstable system and generate growing divergence through time. The dynamics of the system may then be radically affected by the implementation (or the absence) of an industrial policy, as well as by a change in the expansion rate of the world economy. Hence, a policy that reduces (raises) $\phi_0(\phi_1)$ may produce more than a quantitative change, but a qualitative change in the behavior of the system.

Concluding remarks

This paper discusses different adjustment mechanisms to ensure the convergence between the effective rate of growth, the natural rate of growth and BOP-constrained rate of growth. We firstly analyzed such mechanisms assuming that there are no international technological spillovers. The natural rate is endogenous when there is a large subsistence sector (an infinite pool of labor) that allows labor supply to close the gap between effective and natural rates of growth. If income elasticity of exports and imports are exogenous and labor supply is not elastic, the natural rate of growth may still be endogenous if productivity growth closes the gap between the effective and natural rates. But the intensity of the Kaldorian learning by doing may not suffice to produce the convergence between these rates, unless perhaps in the presence of very strong industrial and technological policies that enhance the ability of workers and firms to learn. Note, however, that if policy focuses exclusively on productivity growth and neglects structural change, the economy will remain poorly diversified and the policy can result in a higher rate of unemployment. Another scenario emerges when the export and import elasticities are a negative function of the employment rate: if the economy grows above its natural rate (employment rises), the growth of exports falls and the effective rate of growth moves towards the natural rate. Autonomous expenditure adjusts downwards along with the BOP-constrained growth rate towards the natural rate.

Secondly, we discuss the adjustment process when there are international technological spillovers. The technology gap co-evolves with the pattern of specialization and the rate of employment in such a way that supply-side and demand-side variables interact to shape the effective rate of growth (assumed to always equal the BOP-constrained rate of growth) and the natural rate of growth. Two cases were addressed, which are those most frequently discussed in the literature, namely linear and nonlinear technological spillovers. In the nonlinear case, beyond a critical level of the technology gap, an increase in the gap reduces technological spillovers due to the lack of the indigenous capabilities required to learn from the countries on the technological frontier. In all cases, it is highlighted the key role of the National System of Innovation to allow the economy to spur the rate of productivity growth and change the pattern of specialization. It is also stressed that structural change policies aimed at boosting aggregate effective demand (moving towards sectors with higher income elasticity of exports) are crucial to sustain rapid productivity growth without compromising full employment.

Finally, the paper highlighted the importance of developing indigenous technological capabilities and reducing the technological gap to make convergence (catching up between South and North) possible. On the other hand, many key policy and analytical questions remained outside the scope of the paper. Some of these questions could be addressed with the tools provided by this type of technology gap - structural change-BOP-constrained growth model. In particular, the various mechanisms through which the real exchange rate could affect the structural parameters of the model requires further research, as well as empirical work that may help calibrate and simulate the results of the model with real data.

References

- Abramovitz, M. (1986). Catching Up, Forging Ahead, and Falling Behind. *The Journal of Economic History*, 46, 385–406.
- Araujo, R. A., & Lima, G. T. (2007). A structural economic dynamics approach to balance-of-payments-constrained growth. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 31, 755–774.
- Blecker, R. (2013). Long-Run Growth in Open Economies: Export-Led Cumulative Causation or a Balance-of-Payments Constraint? In Harcourt, G. and Kriesler, P., eds., *Oxford Handbook of Post-Keynesian Economics*., 390-414, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Bresser-Pereira, L. C., Oreiro, J. L., & Marconi, N. (2014). *Developmental Macroeconomics: New Developmentalism as a Growth Strategy*. Routledge: London.
- Carlin, W., & Soskice, D. (2005). *Macroeconomics: Imperfections, Institutions, and Policies*. Oxford University Press.
- Catela, E. Y. da S., & Porcile, G. (2012). Keynesian and Schumpeterian efficiency in a BOP-constrained growth model. *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, 34, 777–802.
- Ciarli, T., Lorentz, A., Savona, M., & Valente, M. (2010). The Effect of Consumption and Production Structure on Growth and Distribution. a Micro to Macro Model. *Metroeconomica*, 61, 180–218.
- Cimoli, M. (1988). Technological Gaps and Institutional Asymmetries in a North-South Model with a Continuum of Goods. *Metroeconomica*, 39, 245–274.
- Cimoli, M., & Dosi, G. (1995). Technological paradigms, patterns of learning and development: An introductory roadmap. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 5, 243–268.
- Cimoli, M., & Porcile, G. (2011). Global growth and international cooperation: a structuralist perspective. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 35, 383–400.
- Cimoli, M., & Porcile, G. (2014). Technology, structural change and BOP-constrained growth: a structuralist toolbox. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 38, 215–237.
- Cimoli, M., Porcile, G., & Rovira, S. (2010). Structural change and the BOP-constraint: why did Latin America fail to converge? *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 34, 389–411.
- Diaz-Alejandro, C. F. (1986). The Early 1980s in Latin America: The 1930s One More Time? In *Theory and Reality in Development* (pp. 154–164). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

- Dosi, G., Fagiolo, G., & Roventini, A. (2010). Schumpeter meeting Keynes: A policy-friendly model of endogenous growth and business cycles. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 34, 1748–1767.
- Dosi, G., Pavitt, K., & Soete, L. (1990). *The Economics of Technical Change and International Trade*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Dutt, A. K. (1990). *Growth, Distribution and Uneven Development*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Fagerberg, J. (1988). International Competitiveness. *The Economic Journal*, 98, 355–374.
- Fagerberg, J., & Verspagen, B. (2002). Technology-gaps, innovation-diffusion and transformation: an evolutionary interpretation. *Research Policy*, 31, 1291–1304.
- Foley, D. K., & Michl, T. R. (1999). *Growth and Distribution*. Harvard University Press.
- Fransman, M. (1995). Is national technology policy obsolete in a globalised world? The Japanese response. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 19, 95–119.
- Frenkel, R., & Rapetti, M. (2012). External Fragility or Deindustrialization: What is the Main Threat to Latin American Countries in the 2010s? *World Social and Economic Review*, 2012, 37.
- Gabriel, L. F., Jayme, F. G., & Oreiro, J. L. (2016). A North-South Model of Economic Growth, Technological Gap, Structural Change and Real Exchange Rate. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 38, 83–94.
- Gouvea, R. R., & Lima, G. T. (2010). Structural change, balance-of-payments constraint, and economic growth: evidence from the multisectoral Thirlwall's law. *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, 33, 169–204.
- Kaldor, N. (1975). Economic Growth and the Verdoorn Law--A Comment on Mr Rowthorn's Article. *The Economic Journal*, 85, 891–896.
- Katz, J. M. (1984). Domestic technological innovations and dynamic comparative advantage: Further reflections on a comparative case-study program. *Journal of Development Economics*, 16, 13–37.
- Krugman, P. (1989). Differences in income elasticities and trends in real exchange rates. *European Economic Review*, 33, 1031–1046.
- Levine, R. (2005). Chapter 12 Finance and Growth: Theory and Evidence. In P. Aghion & S. N. Durlauf (Eds.), *Handbook of Economic Growth* (Vol. 1, pp. 865–934). Elsevier.
- Lewis, W. A. (1954). Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour. *The Manchester School*, 22, 139–191.

- Lima, G. T., & Porcile, G. (2013). Economic growth and income distribution with heterogeneous preferences on the real exchange rate. *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, 35, 651–674.
- Lundvall, B. 2007. National innovation systems-Analytical concept and development Tool. *Industry and Innovation*, 14: 95-119.
- McCombie, J. S. L., & Thirlwall, A. P. (1994). *Economic Growth and the Balance-of-Payments Constraint*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Metcalf, J. S. (1994). Evolutionary Economics and Technology Policy. *The Economic Journal*, 104, 931–944.
- Missio, F. J., Jayme, F. G., Britto, G., & Luis Oreiro, J. (2015). Real Exchange Rate and Economic Growth: New Empirical Evidence. *Metroeconomica*, 66, 686–714.
- Narula, R. (2004). *Understanding absorptive capacities in an “innovation systems” context: consequences for economic and employment growth*. Merit Research Memorandum, 004, Maastricht.
- Nelson, R. R. (1993). *National Innovation Systems: A Comparative Analysis*. Oxford University Press.
- Nelson, R. R., & Phelps, E. S. (1966). Investment in Humans, Technological Diffusion, and Economic Growth. *The American Economic Review*, 56, 69–75.
- Oreiro, J. L. (2016). Inconsistency and over-determination in balance-of-payments-constrained growth models: a note*. *Review of Keynesian Economics*, 4, 193–200.
- Palley, T. I. (2009). Imports and the income-expenditure model: implications for fiscal policy and recession fighting. *Journal of Post Keynesian Economics*, 32, 311–322.
- Prebisch, R. (1950). *The economic development of Latin America and its principal problems*. New York: ECLA, UN Department of Economic Affairs.
- Setterfield, M. (2011). The remarkable durability of Thirlwall’s Law. *PSL Quarterly Review*, 64, 393–427.
- Setterfield, M., & Cornwall, J. (2002). A Neo-Kaldorian Perspective on the Rise and Decline of the Golden Age. In *The Economics of Demand-Led Growth. Challenging the Supply-Side Vision of the Long Run*. (p.67-86). Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Thirlwall, A. P. (1979). The balance of payments constraint as an explanation of the international growth rate differences. *PSL Quarterly Review*, 32.
- Thirlwall, A. P. (2012). Balance of Payments Constrained Growth Models: History and Overview. In *Models of Balance of Payments Constrained Growth* (pp. 11–49). Palgrave Macmillan, London.

Verspagen, B. (1991). A new empirical approach to catching up or falling behind. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 2, 359–380.

Verspagen, B. (1992). *Uneven growth between interdependent economies : an evolutionary view on technology gaps, trade and growth*. University of Limburg, Dissertation no. 92- 10, Maastricht.

List of Variables

y^E - Effective growth rate	n - Rate of growth of labor supply
y^N - Natural growth rate	\bar{n} - Population growth
y^{BP} - Equilibrium growth rate	z - Rate of growth of labor productivity
x - Growth of exports	W - Wage rate of the economy
m - Growth of imports	σ - Elasticity of labor supply
π - Income elasticity of the demand for imports	L - Total employment
ε - Income elasticity of the demand for exports	N - Total labor supply in the economy
ε/π - Income elasticity ratio	T - Technology gap
α - Share of autonomous expenditure in total income	T^N - Technological capabilities in the North
β - Share of exports in total income	T^S - Technological capabilities in the South
a - Growth of autonomous expenditure	t - The rate of change of the technology gap
g - Expansion of the world economy	t^S - Rate of technological change in the South
ϵ - Price of the foreign currency (units of domestic currency per unit of foreign currency)	t^N - Rate of technological change in the North
E - Employment rate	s - Domestic efforts at technological learning
e - Rate of change of the employment rate	l - Growth of labor demand
q - Real exchange rate	λ - Speed of adjustment from the short run to the long run
\dot{q} - Rate of depreciation of the real exchange rate	ω - Cost of migration to the modern sector
P^* - International price index	b - Kaldor-Verdoorn coefficient
P - Domestic price index	v - Returns to diversification
ψ_x - Price elasticity of exports	ϕ_0 and ϕ_1 - Non-linear International Spillovers Parameters (Minimum and Maximum).
ψ_m - Price elasticity of imports	ξ - Speed of the catch-up process

Appendix: – Thirlwall’s Law (based on Thirlwall, 1979)

Exports: The quantity of exports demanded (X) is a function of the price of exports (in foreign currency), the price of competitive exports goods, and the level of world income. We simplify the economy to one of homogeneous goods so we not consider the price of competitive goods. Thus:

$$(26) \quad X = \left(\frac{P^*E}{P}\right)^{\psi_x} g^\varepsilon$$

When converting to growth rates, the elasticities will play a central role defining the growth rate of exports:

$$(27) \quad x = \varepsilon g + \psi_x \dot{q}$$

Imports: The level of imports (M) is a multiplicative function of the price of imports (measured in units of the home currency in order to incorporate the effect of exchange rate changes), the price of import substitutes, and domestic income (Y). Not considering the price of import substitutes, the amount of exports is given by:

$$(28) \quad M = \left(\frac{P^*E}{P}\right)^{\psi_m} Y^\pi, \text{ in growth rates:}$$

$$(29) \quad m = \pi y + \psi_m \dot{q}$$

In equilibrium we have $x = m$. The growth rate compatible with the equilibrium in the Balance of Payments then given as:

$$(30) \quad y^{BP} = \frac{1}{\pi} [\varepsilon g + \dot{q}(\psi_x - \psi_m)]$$

As in the long run $\dot{q} = 0$, we finally have:

$$(31) \quad y^{BP} = \frac{\varepsilon}{\pi} g$$

The UNU-MERIT WORKING Paper Series

2018-01 *The serendipity theorem for an endogenous open economy growth model* by Thomas Zieseemer

2018-02 *Instability constraints and development traps: An empirical analysis of growth cycles and economic volatility in Latin America* by Danilo Sartorello Spinola

2018-03 *Natural, effective and BOP-constrained rates of growth: Adjustment mechanisms and closure equations* by Gabriel Porcile and Danilo Sartorello Spinola