

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO PARANÁ

FRANCISCO ADILSON GABARDO

STRUCTURAL CHANGE AND GROWTH: THE ROLE OF PRODUCTIVITY AND  
DEMAND EVOLUTION

CURITIBA

2021

FRANCISCO ADILSON GABARDO

STRUCTURAL CHANGE AND GROWTH: THE ROLE OF PRODUCTIVITY AND  
DEMAND EVOLUTION

Monografia apresentada ao curso de Graduação em Ciências Econômicas, Setor de Ciências Sociais Aplicadas, Universidade Federal do Paraná, como requisito parcial à obtenção do título de Bacharel em Ciências Econômicas.

Orientador: Prof. João Basilio Pereima Neto

CURITIBA  
2021

**TERMO DE APROVAÇÃO**  
**FRANCISCO ADILSON GABARDO**

**STRUCTURAL CHANGE AND GROWTH: THE ROLE OF PRODUCTIVITY AND  
DEMAND EVOLUTION**

Monografia apresentada ao curso de Graduação em Ciências Econômicas, Setor de Ciências Sociais Aplicadas, Universidade Federal do Paraná, como requisito parcial à obtenção do título de Bacharel em Ciências Econômicas, pela seguinte banca examinadora:

---

**Prof. João Basílio Pereima Neto**  
**Orientador**

---

Profa. Dayani Cris de Aquino  
Departamento de Economia, Universidade  
Federal do Paraná

---

Prof. Fernando Motta Correia  
Departamento de Economia, Universidade  
Federal do Paraná

Curitiba, 15 de Dezembro de 2021.

## RESUMO

Os economistas ainda lutam para entender por que alguns países são muito mais ricos do que outros. A transferência da mão-de-obra do setor agrícola para outros setores, como manufatura e serviços, é uma peça importante desse quebra-cabeça. Portanto, é crucial compreender não apenas os mecanismos motrizes e as forças por trás do processo de mudança estrutural, mas também como esses mecanismos interagem e se reforçam mutuamente. No presente trabalho, desenvolvemos um modelo baseado em agentes computacionais (ABM) parcimonioso, onde a mudança estrutural é impulsionada pelos efeitos da renda e do preço relativo simultaneamente. O efeito renda é gerado pela suposição de uma estrutura de demanda hierárquica não homotética simples, em que os consumidores gastam sua renda de acordo com uma determinada prioridade. O efeito do preço relativo deriva de diferentes taxas de crescimento da produtividade setorial. Nosso objetivo não é apresentar um quadro completo do processo de mudança estrutural, mas demonstrar que, dadas certas hipóteses a respeito do comportamento dos agentes, os dois efeitos propostos pela literatura (renda e preço relativo) não são concorrentes, mas, na verdade, complementares e mutuamente necessários para replicar os padrões macroeconômicos observados na realidade.

**Palavras-chaves:** Mudança estrutural; Crescimento; Efeito renda; Efeito preço-relativo; Modelo baseado em agentes.

## ABSTRACT

Economists still struggle to understand why some countries are so much richer than others. The shift of labour out of the agricultural sector into other such sectors as manufacturing and services is one important piece of this puzzle. Therefore, understanding not only the driving mechanisms and forces behind the process of structural change but also how these mechanisms interact and reinforce each other is crucial. In the present work we develop a parsimonious computational agent-based model (ABM) where structural change is driven by income and relative-price effects simultaneously. The income effect is generated by the assumption of a simple non-homothetic hierarchical demand structure where consumers spend their income according to a given priority. The relative price effect derives from different rates of sectoral productivity growth. Our objective is not to present a full picture of the process of structural change, but to demonstrate that, given certain assumptions regarding agents' behaviour, the two effects proposed by the literature (income and relative-price) are not competing but actually complementary and mutually necessary to replicate the macroeconomic patterns observed in reality.

**Key-words:** Structural change; Growth; Income effect; Relative-price effect; Agent-based model.

## LISTA DE FIGURAS

FIGURE 1 – Sectoral Shares of Employment and Value Added - Selected Developed Countries 1800-2000 . . . . .	13
FIGURE 2 – Labor shares in the US. Source: Historical statistics of the U.S. . .	14
FIGURE 3 – SECTORAL DYNAMICS . . . . .	28
FIGURE 4 – AGGREGATE VARIABLES EVOLUTION . . . . .	29

## LISTA DE TABELAS

TABELA 1 – SECTORAL PARAMETERS AND INITIAL CONDITIONS . . . . .	39
TABELA 2 – AGGREGATE INITIAL CONDITIONS . . . . .	39

## SUMÁRIO

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b> . . . . .	<b>8</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>SOME EMPIRICAL REGULARITIES AND STYLIZED FACTS ABOUT STRUCTURAL CHANGE</b> . . . . .	<b>12</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>THE AGENT-BASED MODEL</b> . . . . .	<b>15</b>
3.1	Sequence of events . . . . .	15
3.2	Expected sales and production . . . . .	17
3.3	Price, mark-up, income and firms' profit . . . . .	18
3.4	The Financing of the Firm . . . . .	20
3.5	Technological Progress and Productivity . . . . .	21
3.6	Consumers' Demand . . . . .	22
3.7	Aggregate and Averaged Variables . . . . .	25
<b>4</b>	<b>SIMULATION AND RESULTS</b> . . . . .	<b>26</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS AND FINAL REMARKS</b> . . . . .	<b>30</b>
	<b>REFERÊNCIAS</b> . . . . .	<b>31</b>
	<b>APÊNDICE 1 - Parameter values and Initial conditions</b> . . . . .	<b>38</b>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Economists have struggled for centuries to understand why some countries are so much richer than others. This might be the single most complex question in all of economic theory. This question is particularly challenging as the factors that make a country rich may vary not only across countries but also within countries across time. Factors and conditions that once benefited a particular nation's development might not be present or be effective at a different time or might not have the same effect on a different nation.

Despite all the progress done in the understanding of the mechanisms behind the process of economic growth, there are still many unanswered questions. However, over the years, economists have identified some pervasive features of the process of economic growth and development. Among these features, is the shift of labour out of the agricultural sector into other such sectors as manufacturing and services.

Economists know that the large heterogeneity that we see today in countries' income levels is the result of a combination of endogenous and exogenous factors. However, when we look at the data we are able to identify some common features among poor countries. Caselli (2005) observes that there are three proximate reasons for poor countries' poverty: their much lower labour productivity in agriculture; their somewhat lower labour productivity outside agriculture; and their larger share of employment in the sector that – on average – is less productive. This empirical observation can be seen evidence that economic growth and structural change are close companions.

Structural change can be defined as the reallocation of labour and other resources across the agriculture, manufacturing, and service sectors. A broader definition, however, would also encompass the changes in the structure of production and employment within and between all sectors<sup>1</sup> of the economy as well as the emergence of new sectors and the disappearance of old ones (GABARDO et al., 2017). As part of this larger and longer process of structural change, the decline of the agricultural sector has led to a massive transformation of the economic landscape in today's developed and rich nations. The process of industrialization has not only dramatically changed the size and share of sectors in those economies, but also the size of their cities and ultimately their people's way of life (GABARDO et al., 2017).

There are basically two reasons that make economists believe that this pattern of labour reallocation out of agriculture is a necessary condition of the process of growth. First, per capita demand for agricultural goods is relatively price- and income-inelastic at high levels of income. Second, the presence of a dominant fixed factor in agricultural production (land) limits the ability of the agricultural sector to absorb labour

<sup>1</sup> In the literature, a sector is often equivalent to an industry. Thus, it is possible to say that the manufacturing sector is composed of several manufacturing industries. As in Herrendorf et al. (2014), we use the term manufacturing to refer to activities neither classified as agriculture nor as service.

in the face of growing population levels (FOSTER; ROSENZWEIG, 2007). Therefore, understanding the causes not only of this labour reallocation out of agriculture but out of the manufacturing and into the service sector is of great importance.

Despite its prominence and substantial empirical macroeconomic literature, in a theoretical perspective the study of structural change has been given less attention than that of economic growth. Only in the last two decades that the subject of structural change has gained more prominence and has become a relevant research area <sup>2</sup>. The existing literature has advanced several explanations to account for the process of structural change. However, there are three channels or explanations that have received more attention and have been better developed (DENNIS; İŞCAN, 2009, p.187):

1. A version of Engel's Law operating on employment shares: as incomes rise, agriculture sheds labour due to the low income elasticity of demand for farm goods;
2. A version of Baumol's (1967) "cost disease": relatively faster productivity growth in agriculture pushes farm workers to produce complementary non-farm goods;
3. Different factor intensities in production: agricultural production is more conducive to rapid capital deepening, which in turn pulls labour into the more labour intensive non-farm sector.

These three explanations or channels seek to account for the process of structural change by means of different mechanisms. The first explanation is a demand side based explanation, while the second and third are supply side ones. The first channel, also called the income or utility-based explanation, relies on differences in income elasticities of demand across sectors. This explanation goes back to Fisher (1935) and Clark (1940), who applied Engel's law to the demand for manufacturing goods. Proponents of this explanation, have suggested that if one assumes non-unitary expenditure elasticities of demand (non-homothetic preferences), then changes in income lead to changes in expenditure shares and to labour reallocation across sectors even if relative prices are constant. The utility-based explanation is consistent with Engel's law <sup>3</sup>, which is not only valid for basic or necessity goods but is a more general law of consumption<sup>4</sup>.

<sup>2</sup> Krüger (2008), Matsuyama (2008), Silva e Teixeira (2008) and Gabardo et al. (2017) review the literature on structural structural change.

<sup>3</sup> In his famous 1857's article, Ernest Engel produced empirical evidence showing that the poorer a family is, the larger the budget share it spends on nourishment. This empirical regularity is known as Engel's law. Ernest Engel's analysis initially suggested that as income rises, the proportion of income spent on food falls, even if actual expenditure on food rises. Moreover, he argued that such a change in the composition of demand implies that, as the economy grows and per capita income increases, new resources can be dedicated to the production of other goods unrelated to food (ENGEL, 1857, p. 50). The relation that describes how expenditure on a particular good or service depends on income is known as the Engel curve.

<sup>4</sup> Deaton e Muellbauer (1980) concluded that the vast majority of studies obtains the result that the expenditure share of a product changes systematically with income.

Many authors rely on this channel to explain the process of structural change, including Matsuyama (1992), Echevarria (1997), Laitner (2000), Kongsamut et al. (2001), Gollin et al. (2002) and Foellmi e Zweimüller (2008).

The second and third channels rely on changes in relative prices. These changes affect sectoral expenditure and labour shares whenever the elasticity of substitution across sectors is different from one. In the second channel, relative prices change as a result of differential productivity growth across sectors. This explanation goes back to Baumol (1967) and was recently formalized by Ngai e Pissarides (2007), which assert that structural change results from differences in the (exogenous) rates of total factor productivity across sectors. These differences cause changes in relative prices which induce the reallocation of labour across sectors.

In the third channel, relative prices change as a result of changes in the relative prices and supply of inputs if sectors factor's intensities in production are different. In this case, one can generate structural transformation via relative price changes even if technological change is neutral (HERRENDORF et al., 2014). This last mechanism is described in the literature in two papers Caselli e Coleman (2001) and Acemoglu e Guerrieri (2008). In Caselli e Coleman (2001), skilled and unskilled workers are the two inputs of interest, while in Acemoglu e Guerrieri (2008) the two inputs are capital and labour. The former argue that as a result of a decrease in the cost of education in the first half of the 20th century, there was an increase in the relative supply of skilled workers which decreased the relative price of non-agricultural goods, and moved resources out of agriculture. The later allows for differences in sectoral capital intensities, which as growth driven by technological change is associated with an increase in the capital-to-labour ratio, lead to differential capital deepening across sectors.

Most authors see the income and the relative price effects as competing explanations. However, there is no evidence in the literature that proves that they cannot simultaneously determine and drive the process of structural change. Furthermore, Boppart (2014) provides empirical evidence that both drivers of structural change are relevant. Since both explanations describe the same phenomenon, their integration, despite being a natural step, is a theoretical challenge. By combining non-homothetic preferences and differential TFP growth, Boppart (2014) developed one explanation of how the process of structural change can be driven by income and the relative price effects simultaneously.

Notwithstanding the recent contributions, the microeconomic foundations of the transition from an agriculture-based economy to a diversified industrial and to a services-based economy are still poorly understood. The process of structural change is a complex phenomenon. Its understanding demands not only the analysis of the microeconomic behaviour of firms and consumers but also the analysis of the interaction between demand and supply forces that generate sectoral reallocation of resources. In

a comprehensive review of the subject, Krüger (2008) observes that in all the theories that he reviewed, technological progress drives structural change, but it is frequently the demand side that is crucial for determining which industries grow faster than others and which shrink, and it therefore shapes the direction of structural change. Moreover, Krüger (2008) continues and points out that further research, particularly on the feedback effects between structural change and aggregate growth, should therefore deserve much more attention. He suggests that the theoretical explanation of these issues almost surely requires other means of analysis than used so far and concludes arguing that agent-based computational models analysed by simulation methods might be an alternative (KRÜGER, 2008, p.357).

Agent based models that integrate growth and structural change are fairly recent in the literature, some examples are Lorentz e Savona (2008), Ciarli et al. (2010), Ciarli e Lorentz (2010), Ciarli (2012), Lorentz et al. (2016) e Ciarli e Valente (2016). This methodology help us to understand how individual decisions give rise to patterns, how these patterns in turn affect individual behaviour, and the dynamics that emerge from this interaction at the macro level. Agent-based models allow for a dynamical more realistic and evolutionary representation of the economic system (GRÄBNER, 2016), therefore being suitable to exploring the dynamics of growth and structural change.

In the present undergraduate thesis we developed a parsimonious agent-based model where structural change is driven by income and the relative price effects simultaneously. The income effect is generate by the assumption of a simple non-homothetic hierarchical demand where consumers spend their income according to given priorities as in Falkinger (1990, 1994) and Andersen (2001). The relative price effect results from different rates of sectoral productivity growth. The model developed here is not aimed at presenting a full picture of the process of structural change. We seek to contribute to the literature by theoretically showing the possibility that the two proposed explanations of structural change are not competing but actually complementary and mutually necessary to replicate the macroeconomic patterns observed in reality.

The remaining of the present undergraduate thesis is organized as follows: the next section briefly presents some of the empirical regularities and stylized facts about the process of structural change. Sections 3 and 4 present the model and the simulation results respectively. Section 5 presents our concluding remarks.

## 2 SOME EMPIRICAL REGULARITIES AND STYLIZED FACTS ABOUT STRUCTURAL CHANGE

In his Nobel lecture, Simon Kuznets summarized six characteristics of modern economic growth that emerged from his analysis based on conventional measures of national product and its components: population, labour force, and the like. The third of his six characteristics states that “the rate of structural transformation of the economy is high. Major aspects of structural change include the shift away from agriculture to nonagricultural pursuits and, recently, away from industry to services.”(KUZNETS, 1973, p.248).

Simon Kuznets was among the first economists to empirically describe the process of structural change. Some of the early empirical studies are Fischer (1939), Clark (1940), Kuznets (1957), Chenery (1960). Since then, much effort has been done by many researchers to reconstruct historical data in order to provide a more comprehensive picture of this process. Important contributions were made by Maddison (1987), Syrquin (1988), Kaelble (1997), Dennis e İşcan (2009), Buera e Kaboski (2012), Broadberry et al. (2013) and Herrendorf et al. (2014) and many others<sup>1</sup>. Some authors like, Gollin et al. (2002) and Alvarez-Cuadrado e Poschke (2011) focused on the role of agriculture productivity in the process of industrialization and on the fall in the share of agriculture in output and employment that accompanied long-run increases in income per capita.


To give an example of the magnitude of transformation that occurred in the last centuries, Maddison (1987) described the reallocation of labour in six major industrialized countries (France, Germany, Japan, Netherlands, U.K. and U.S.) showing that the average employment share in agriculture was 46.0% in 1870 and fell to 5.5% by 1984. During the same period, the average employment share in the service sector increased from 26.4% to 62.2%. The most commonly observed pattern of structural change is characterized by a systematic fall in the share of labour allocated to agriculture over time, by a steady increase in the share of labour in services, and by a hump-shaped pattern for the share of labour in manufacturing (GABARDO et al., 2017).

Herrendorf et al. (2014) published one of the most comprehensive studies in recent years on structural change. Many of the stylized facts observed earlier were confirmed and a broader picture unfolded (FIGURE 1). A similar structural change pattern was reported by Alonso-Carrera e Raurich (2015) for the American economy. This particular pattern is reproduced here on FIGURE 2.

There are other important empirical observations that worth mention. Gollin et al. (2002) reported a negative relationship between agriculture productivity and the share of employment in agriculture. This same relationship holds for the productivity


<sup>1</sup> The list of contributions is too large for it to be included in its entirety.

FIGURE 1 – Sectoral Shares of Employment and Value Added - Selected Developed Countries 1800-2000



Fonte: Extracted from Herrendorf et al. (2014).

FIGURE 2 – Labor shares in the US. Source: Historical statistics of the U.S.



Fonte: Extracted from Alonso-Carrera e Raurich (2015)

of agriculture relative to non-agriculture. The same authors conclude that growth in agriculture productivity is quantitatively important in understanding the growth of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per worker for developing countries. On average, the contribution of agricultural growth, non-agricultural growth, and sectoral shifts are 54%, 17%, and 29%, respectively (GOLLIN et al., 2002).

The agent-based model developed in the next section theoretically replicates the above presented empirical regularities. The objective of this exercise is to demonstrate that, in order to replicate the kind of structural change pattern observed in the data, the two effects described in the literature as the sources of the process of structural change, namely the income and the relative price effect, must coexist.

### 3 THE AGENT-BASED MODEL

We build a general *disequilibrium* agent-based model where agents are boundedly rational and follow simple rules of behaviour in an incomplete and asymmetric information context. The model depicts a three-sector economy (agriculture, manufacturing and services) where each sector is populated by heterogeneous firms that follow the same strategies regarding pricing, investment on R&D and sales expectation formation. Nevertheless, since success in innovating is a stochastic process, their productivities and unit costs are different and consequently, they have different cash-flows, profit and price levels, demand and financing needs. The resulting differential growth rates of firms' productivities generates a relative price effect. Moreover, the availability of labour is not the same for all firms, as we assumed a generic labour market where all firms in all sector pay the same salary the rule of "first come, first served" determines which firms get the available labour hours.

In the present model, firms not only produce goods and invest in R&D but also interact with a generic banking system by taking out loans to finance their negative cash flow (negative profit). If a firm has negative profit it will have to finance it by taking out a loan on the amount of the negative profit. Financing allows firms to continue operating even with losses. In the current version of the model firms do not go bankrupt and the lending interest rate is fixed throughout the simulation. The bank system only finance firms.

On the demand side, in each period, consumers observe the prices charged by a random subset of  $(\chi)^1$  firms and consume following to a hierarchical rule, spending their income according to given priorities and to the availability of the goods in the subset of firms observed. The rule establishes that any consumer wants to consume a satisfactory (satiation) level of one good before consuming anything of the next good in the hierarchy. If the consumers is not able to buy the quantity desired and the disposable income is not spent on its entirety, the consumer saves and uses the money to consume in the next period. Thus saving is not a conscious decision of the consumer. This simple non-homothetic hierarchical demand structure generates an income effect in the economy.

In the following subsections we firstly describe the sequence of events that takes place at each time step. Subsequently, we explain the firms and consumers' behaviour in greater detail.

#### 3.1 SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

In each period of the simulation, the following sequence of events takes place:

---

<sup>1</sup> This parameter reflects the degree of imperfect information on the consumers side.

1. *Firms' expected demand*: firms compute their expected demand ( $s_{z,i,t}^e$ ) based on past sales ( $s_{z,i,t-1}$ ), unfulfilled orders ( $us_{z,i,t}$ ) and expected demand ( $s_{z,i,t-1}^e$ ).
2. *Production planning*: firms confront their level of inventories ( $inv_{z,i,t-1}$ )<sup>2</sup> and their current production capacity, given by their level of productivity ( $a_{z,i,t-1}$ ) and their workforce ( $l_{z,i,t-1}$ ), with their expected demand.
3. *Firms' labour demand*: firms decide to increase, decrease or to keep unchanged their workforce whether ( $s_{z,i,t}^e > inv_{z,i,t-1} + a_{z,i,t-1}l_{z,i,t-1}$ ), ( $s_{z,i,t}^e < inv_{z,i,t-1} + a_{z,i,t-1}l_{z,i,t-1}$ ) or ( $s_{z,i,t}^e = inv_{z,i,t-1} + a_{z,i,t-1}l_{z,i,t-1}$ ) respectively.
4. *Production*: Firms produce consumption goods and put in the goods market their current period production ( $x_{z,i,t}$ ) and previous period inventories ( $inv_{z,i,t-1}$ ).
5. *Wages and R&D expenses.*: Firms pay their workers. Firm's wage bill is given by ( $wb_{z,i,t} = l_{z,i,t}w_t$ ). Moreover, firms pay workers for R&D expenses.
6. *Desired consumption*: Individuals decide their satisfactory (satiation) consumption level for each good based on the growth of their income, which is composed of wages, R&D income and dividends.
7. *Effective consumption*: Individuals randomly select ( $\chi$ ) firms from each of the three sectors, compare their prices, their disposable income (income + savings) and their desired consumption level and calculate how many units of each good they are willing and able to purchase.
8. *Consumption*: Individuals and firms interact in the goods market. As a result, some individuals totally satisfy their desired consumption level for one or all goods, while others may remain with residual cash; on the other hand, some firms sell all the produced output, while others may accumulate inventories.
9. *Savings*: Individuals with residual cash after consumption deposit their cash in the banking system and receive interest ( $i^d$ ) on it.
10. *Profits*: Firms calculate gross and net profits, if indebted they repay their debt in full or in part or if they have negative profits they take out new loans.
11. *Dividends and Accumulated Profits*: If firms generate positive net profits they distribute a share  $\delta$  as dividends and keep the rest as accumulated profits.
12. *Aggregate Variables*: Sector and Economy level variables are computed and the cycle restarts.

<sup>2</sup> We assume that only firms in the agriculture and in the manufacturing sectors do accumulate inventories, firms in the service sector cannot accumulate inventories.

In the next sections we explain the firms and consumers' behaviour in greater detail.

### 3.2 EXPECTED SALES AND PRODUCTION

In the model, firms' production is jointly determined by demand and supply elements. Since we are interested in describing the labour dynamics under structural change, we assume a pure labour economy. Production oscillations are determined by variations on the quantity of labour employed at each period, by the technology available and by the level of inventories. As the present version of the model is intended to be very parsimonious, technical change, when it happens, takes the form of process rather than product innovation, so that "growth" means producing more of the same good(s).

Although the absence of physical capital may at first seem strange, one needs to beware that most "growth" models that give rise to sustained growth are either based on endogenously determined accumulation of knowledge or exogenously given technological change. Frequently, models built around the accumulation of physical capital are not capable of generating sustained growth. The present model focuses on the endogenous accumulation of knowledge to generate increases in income-per-capita and dispenses physical capital altogether. The process through which firms increase their productivities will be described later on seção 3.5.

The economy is divided into three consumption sectors ( $z = 1, 2, 3$ ) namely: agriculture, manufacturing and services. Each sector produces a different final good which satisfy one consumer need. Sectors are composed of  $N^F$  firms. For simplicity, the economy has a fixed labour supply. Firms start the cycle by computing their expected sales ( $s_{z,i,t}^e$ ) through a simple adaptive scheme based on past sales ( $s_{z,i,t-1}$ ), unfulfilled orders ( $us_{z,i,t}$ ) and expected sales ( $s_{z,i,t-1}^e$ ):

$$s_{z,i,t}^e = s_{z,i,t-1}^e + \lambda_s [(s_{z,i,t-1} + us_{z,i,t-1}) - s_{z,i,t-1}^e] \quad (3.1)$$

Once firms have determined the amount of goods they want to produce based on their expected sales they turn to their production capacity and to their inventories. Only firms in the agriculture and in the manufacturing sectors do accumulate inventories. Inventories in these firms are computed according to:

$$inv_{z,i,t} = (x_{z,i,t} + inv_{z,i,t-1}) - s_{z,i,t} \quad (3.2)$$

Given their inventories and their expected sales, firms define how many units they would have to produce, that is  $s_{z,i,t}^e - inv_{z,i,t-1}$ . At this point, after assessing their current productivity ( $a_{z,i,t-1}$ ) and labour force ( $a_{z,i,t-1}$ ), firms decide to increase, decrease

or to keep unchanged their workforce whether  $(s_{z,i,t}^e > inv_{z,i,t-1} + a_{z,i,t-1}l_{z,i,t-1})$ ,  $(s_{z,i,t}^e < inv_{z,i,t-1} + a_{z,i,t-1}l_{z,i,t-1})$  or  $(s_{z,i,t}^e = inv_{z,i,t-1} + a_{z,i,t-1}l_{z,i,t-1})$  respectively. In the case that firms decide to reduce their labour force, they will fire workers, that means, reduce  $l$  up to the point where  $(s_{z,i,t}^e = inv_{z,i,t-1} + a_{z,i,t-1}l_{z,i,t})$ . In the second case, if a firm decides to increase its labour force, it will have to go to the labour market and check if there are any labour hours available. If there are no labour hours available, the firm sticks to  $l_{z,i,t-1}$  and produces less than what it wanted. However, if there are labour hours available, the firm will try to hire then. Here there is a coefficient that determines how many hours of work the firm is able to hire when there are labour hours available. This is the labour hiring rigidity coefficient ( $\gamma_L \in (0; 1]$ ). What this coefficient does is it limits the firm's ability to hire all the workers that otherwise it would like to. Let us imagine that a firm wants to hire a quantity  $l_{z,i,t} - l_{z,i,t-1}$ , if there are labour hours available in the market, the firm will be able to hire  $\gamma_L(l_{z,i,t} - l_{z,i,t-1})$  hours. If the amount of labour hours available is less than  $\gamma_L(l_{z,i,t} - l_{z,i,t-1})$ , the firm hires all that is available. Since the wage rate is uniform across all sectors and firms and there is no matching protocol of any kind, the allocation of labour hours to firms is based on a simple "first come, first served" rule.

After adjusting their labour force, firms finally carry out production. Actual production can be represented by the following expression:

$$x_{z,i,t} = \min(s_{z,i,t}^e - inv_{z,i,t-1}, x_{z,i,t}^{max}) \quad (3.3)$$

where  $x_{z,i,t}^{max}$  is the maximum production capacity determined by the level of productivity and the firm's labour force according to:

$$x_{z,i,t}^{max} = a_{z,i,t-1}l_{z,i,t} \quad (3.4)$$

The reader must have noticed that, by the design of the equations, it is possible that  $(s_{z,i,t}^e - inv_{z,i,t-1} > x_{z,i,t}^{max})$ , but it is not possible to have  $(s_{z,i,t}^e - inv_{z,i,t-1} < x_{z,i,t}^{max})$ . This means that, although firms can accumulate inventories (except service sector) they cannot have excess capacity. At every time step, each firm's supply of goods is:

$$xs_{z,i,t} = x_{z,i,t} + inv_{z,i,t-1} \quad (3.5)$$

### 3.3 PRICE, MARK-UP, INCOME AND FIRMS' PROFIT

Once firms have finished producing their goods they are able to calculate their unit costs and selling prices. Firms unit costs  $uc_{z,i,t}$  are calculated in a straightforward manner:

$$uc_{z,i,t} = \frac{wb_{z,i,t}}{x_{z,i,t}} \quad (3.6)$$

where  $(wb_{z,i,t})$  is given by:

$$wb_{z,i,t} = (v_z w_t) l_{z,i,t} \quad (3.7)$$

the wage rate  $(w_t)$  is determined at the economy level and its calculation is explained on seção 3.7. The parameter  $(v_z)$  is used to adjust the aggregated wage rate so that sectors may have different wage rates.

Before firms are able to set their prices they have to determine their mark-up<sup>3</sup>. Firms' mark-ups are variable and dependent on the difference between their past expected sales  $(s_{z,i,t-1}^e)$ , sales  $(s_{z,i,t-1})$  and unfulfilled orders  $(us_{z,i,t-1})$ . A firm's mark-up is given by:

$$\mu_{z,i,t} = \mu_{z,i,t-1} + \sigma^\mu [(s_{z,i,t-1} + us_{z,i,t-1}) - s_{z,i,t-1}^e] \quad (3.8)$$

where  $(\sigma^\mu)$  is the mark-up adjustment coefficient. After having calculated their unit costs and mark-up rates, firms set their prices according to:

$$p_{z,i,t} = uc_{z,i,t} \mu_{z,i,t} \quad (3.9)$$

After firms and individuals have interacted in the goods market, firms assess their sales, inventories, unfulfilled orders, R&D and financial expenses and calculate their operational, gross and net profits. Firms operational profits are given by:

$$\pi_{z,i,t}^o = s_{z,i,t} p_{z,i,t} - wb_{z,i,t} - (inv_{z,i,t-1} uc_{z,i,t-1} - inv_{z,i,t} uc_{z,i,t}) \quad (3.10)$$

Firms gross profits are given by:

$$\pi_{z,i,t}^g = \pi_{z,i,t}^o - fin_{z,i,t}^{exp} + fin_{z,i,t}^{rev} - rd_{z,i,t} \quad (3.11)$$

where  $(fin_{z,i,t}^{exp})$  and  $(fin_{z,i,t}^{rev})$  are the firms financial expenses and revenues. These variables are explained on seção 3.4. The variable  $(rd_{z,i,t})$  is the firms expenses with R&D. This variable's calculation and importance are discussed on seção 3.5.

<sup>3</sup> Survey data evidence summarized in Fabiani et al. (2006) show that firms in the Euro area mostly set prices according to some mark-up rules.

Firms' net profits are given by:

$$\pi_{z,i,t}^n = \begin{cases} \pi_{z,i,t}^g - debt_{z,i,t-1} & \text{if } \pi_{z,i,t}^g > debt_{z,i,t-1} \\ 0 & \text{if } \pi_{z,i,t}^g < debt_{z,i,t-1} \end{cases} \quad (3.12)$$

$$\pi_{z,i,t}^g < debt_{z,i,t-1} \quad (3.13)$$

After having calculated their net profits, if they are positive firms will distribute all or part of them as dividends and keep the rest as accumulated profits. Thus, firms dividends are calculated according to:

$$div_{z,i,t} = \begin{cases} \delta \pi_{z,i,t}^n, & \text{if } \pi_{z,i,t}^n > 0 \\ 0, & \text{if otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (3.14)$$

$$(3.15)$$

where ( $\delta$ ) is the firms' share of net profits distributed as dividends. The last thing firms do is to evaluate their accumulated profits. If they do not distribute all the net profits in dividends, then they accumulate profits and receive interest on them (see seção 3.4). Firms accumulated profits are define as:

$$\pi_{z,i,t}^{ac} = \pi_{z,i,t-1}^{ac} + (1 - \delta) \pi_{z,i,t}^n \quad (3.16)$$

### 3.4 THE FINANCING OF THE FIRM

In the present model, firms not only produce goods and invest in R&D but also interact with a generic banking system by taking out loans to finance their negative cash flow (negative profit). If a firm has negative gross profit it will have to finance it by taking out a loan on the amount of the negative gross profit. The loan operation lasts one period, if an indebted firm generates positive net profit greater than its debt, then it will write the debt off. If the profit is not enough to pay for the entirety of its debt the firm will use all of it to pay as much as possible of the debt. In the later case, the firm still pays interest on the remaining debt on the next period. In the case that the firm does not obtain any profit a new loan is taken out and the firms debt increases. Therefore firms debts are given by:

$$debt_{z,i,t} = \begin{cases} debt_{z,i,t-1} + \pi_{z,i,t}^g & \text{if } \pi_{z,i,t}^g < 0 \\ debt_{z,i,t-1} - \pi_{z,i,t}^g & \text{if } 0 < \pi_{z,i,t}^g < debt_{z,i,t-1} \\ 0 & \text{if } \pi_{z,i,t}^g > debt_{z,i,t-1} \end{cases} \quad (3.17)$$

$$(3.18)$$

$$(3.19)$$

If a firm had a positive debt in the past period, on period  $t$  it will have to pay an interest rate  $i^l$  on it. In this case, the firm will have financial expenses given by:

$$fin_{z,i,t}^{exp} = i^l debt_{z,i,t-1} \quad (3.20)$$

In the opposite scenario, were a firm accumulates profits, it receives financial revenues on its undistributed or accumulated part of net profit. In this case, firms receive financial revenues according to:

$$fin_{z,i,t}^{rev} = i^d \pi_{z,i,t-1}^{ac} \quad (3.21)$$

### 3.5 TECHNOLOGICAL PROGRESS AND PRODUCTIVITY

In the present model, technical progress or innovation is limited to the process of process innovation<sup>4</sup>. It is known that if one assumes non-linear Engel curves with income elasticities less than one for the aggregate of existing products, the consumption ratio of an economy is bound to fall continuously in the absence of new products, which means that, the rise in per-capita income due to technical progress on the production side is not accompanied by a similarly rise in demand, leading to under-consumption (FREY, 1969). Under-consumption may lead to generalized unemployment in the economy.

In order avoid too much under-consumption and to keep the model simple, the consumers' satiation limit increases with the increase in their income (see seção 3.6). Once technical change is taken into account, technological improvements that raise labour productivity will affect firms' profitability as they affect unit labour costs and, therefore, the firms' competitiveness. Technological progress, in this model, results from investment on R&D. At the beginning of each period each firm invests a fraction ( $\phi \in (0, 1]$ ) of its past sales ( $s_{z,i,t-1}$ ) on R&D<sup>5</sup>, so that:

$$rd_{z,i,t} = \phi s_{z,i,t-1} \quad (3.22)$$

R&D expenses are paid to the same workers that produce the goods. This is a rather strange way to model innovation, however makes the model much simpler. Each worker is a production worker and a researcher at the same time.

<sup>4</sup> There is a vast literature that shows that the introduction of new consumer products is a necessary condition for economic progress in a market economy, Andersen (2001), Aoki e Yoshikawa (2002), Saviotti (2001), Saviotti e Pyka (2008) e Foellmi e Zweimüller (2008).

<sup>5</sup> The literature indicates that R&D growth is caused by growth in sales rather than profits (DOSI et al., 2006; COAD; RAO, 2010).

Even though innovation depends on R&D expenses, it is a highly uncertain process. Therefore, in the present model this process is set as a two stages stochastic event (e.g. Aghion e Howitt (1998); Silverberg e Verspagen (2005)). In the first stage, there is the event “success or failure” in the discovery of a new technology, while in the second stage there is the event of increasing labour productivity. In the first stage, the probability ( $\rho_{z,i,t}$ ) of success in discovering a new technology depends not only on the amount of financial resources devoted to it but also on the parameter  $\zeta$  (NELSON; WINTER, 1982; VALENTE; ANDERSEN, 2002; LLERENA; LORENTZ, 2004):

$$\rho_{z,i,t} = 1 - e^{-\zeta rd_{z,i,t}} \quad (3.23)$$

R&D investment is successful when a random number from a uniform distribution ( $[0; 1]$ ) is smaller than ( $\rho_{z,i,t}$ ). In this case, the firm’s productivity may increase according to a value extracted from a normal distribution centred on its current productivity (CIARLI, 2012):

$$a_{z,i,t} = a_{z,i,t-1}(1 + \max\{\varepsilon_{z,i,t}; 0\}) \quad (3.24)$$

where  $\varepsilon_{z,i,t} \sim N(0; \psi_{z,i,t})$  is a normally distributed random function. The higher the  $\psi_{z,i,t}$  the larger the potential productivity increase. We refer to this parameter as the productivity shock. The productivity shock does not only differs across sectors but also varies across time and firms:

$$\psi_{z,i,t} = \frac{\sigma_z^a}{(a_{z,i,t-1})^{\xi_z}} \quad \text{with} \quad \xi_z \in [0; 1] \quad (3.25)$$

where ( $\sigma_z^a$ ) is the initial productivity shock. The initial productivity shock differs across sectors and is in part responsible for generating different sectoral averages productivities and consequently the relative price effect in the economy. According to equation (3.25), the larger the past productivity level the smaller the productivity shock in the case of a successful innovation. The parameter ( $\xi_z$ ) adjusts the size of the effect of past productivity to the productivity shock. When set to 0, past productivity has no effect on the productivity shock, which is in turn still determined randomly, but now from a normal distribution with constant standard deviation given by ( $\sigma_z^a$ ).

### 3.6 CONSUMERS’ DEMAND

The present model’s demand side follows is built based on a simple non-homothetic hierarchical demand where consumers spend their income according to given priorities as in Falkinger (1990, 1994) and Andersen (2001). This demand structure

establishes that any consumer wants to consume a satisfactory (satiation) level of one good, if available, before consuming anything of the next good in the hierarchy. This notion of consumption hierarchy is also described by Pasinetti (1981, 1993). According to him, consumption is ultimately governed by a generalised version of Engel's Law. The generalised law says that the consumption of any (basic category of) good cannot be expanded beyond its satiation level. Furthermore, when consumption of a good has become satiated, attention turns to the next higher good in the hierarchical ordering of goods according to their importance in consumption (ANDERSEN, 2001).

Consumption begins after firms have set their prices and paid their workers. Each individual ( $h$ ) is a worker, a consumer and also a shareholder at the same time, which means that, individuals consume out of their wealth ( $wh$ ), which is composed of wages, payment received for R&D ( $rd_t^r$ ), savings ( $sav_{h,t}$ ) and dividends received ( $div_t^r$ ). For simplicity, the number of individuals ( $N^h$ ) in the economy is fixed and each individual offers the same amount of labour hours in the market ( $H^{wj}$ ). Firms do not hire individuals *per se*, they hire labour hours, which means that a worker might work for different firms. In the model this is not a problem as we assumed that all firms in all sectors pay the same wage rate ( $w_t^r$ ). Moreover, in order to simplify the analysis all the individuals receive the same income, that is, the wage bill of all firms is summed together and divided by the number of individuals in the economy<sup>6</sup>. One of the consequences of this mechanism is that when unemployment rises, nobody receives zero income, but everybody receives less income. The same mechanism is applied to payments for R&D and in the distribution of dividends, everyone in the economy receives the same amount. Thus:

$$wh_{h,t} = w_t^r + rd_t^r + div_t^r + sav_{h,t-1} \quad h = [1, 2 \dots N^h] \quad (3.26)$$

where:

$$w_t^r = \frac{\sum_{z=1}^3 \sum_{i=1}^{N_{z,t}^F} wb_{z,i,t}}{N^h} \quad (3.27)$$

$$rd_t^r = \frac{\sum_{z=1}^3 \sum_{i=1}^{N_{z,t}^F} rd_{z,i,t}}{N^h} \quad (3.28)$$

<sup>6</sup> This might seem too socialist to some, however our intention here is just to simplify the model avoiding income dispersion among workers and among employed and unemployed individuals.

$$div_t^r = \frac{\sum_{z=1}^3 \sum_{i=1}^{N_{z,t}^F} div_{z,i,t}}{Nh} \quad (3.29)$$

Individuals' wealth may differ due to differences in their savings ( $sav_{h,t}$ ). For the sake of simplicity, individuals do not save as a conscious decision. Saving is a the result of not being able to buy all the units desired of all the goods due to supply shortages, or having more resources than enough to buy the satiation quantity for all of the three goods. Thus, individual savings is given by:

$$sav_{h,t} = sav_{h,t-1} + (wh_{h,t} - exp_{h,t}) \quad (3.30)$$

where ( $exp_{h,t}$ ) is each individual's total expenditure on all three goods.

Individuals have to determine their satiation level for each sector/good before start spending. For simplicity, individuals satiation level varies across goods and time but not across individuals. Recent empirical works on Engel curves (MONETA; CHAI, 2010; CHAI; MONETA, 2012, 2014; MONETA; CHAI, 2014) show that absolute demand saturation rarely occurs and that non-saturation is a more frequent outcome, even if more complex Engel curves are observed in a number of cases. Therefore, in order to avoid absolute satiation, satiation level is initially set at ( $sat_{z,0}$ ) and increases with increases in income-per-capita ( $y$ ) according to:

$$sat_{z,t} = sat_{z,t-1} [1 + \eta_z (\ln(y_t) - \ln(y_{t-1}))] \quad (3.31)$$

where ( $\eta_z$ ) is the good's satiation level growth coefficient. Since ( $\eta_z$ ) differs across sectors, demand becomes non-homothetic. The income-per-capita ( $y$ ) is given by:

$$y_t = w_t^f + rd_t^r + div_t^r \quad (3.32)$$

Once prices, satiation level and income-per-capita are determined consumption takes place. The first consumer goes to the goods market and observes the prices charged by a random subset of ( $k = (1, \dots, \chi)$ ) firms from sector 1 (agriculture). He orders this subset of ( $\chi$ ) firms by price, from the cheapest to the most expensive and goes to the firm that charges the lowest price first. His expenditure on good 1 is given by:

$$exp_{h,1,t} = \begin{cases} sat_{1,t}p_{1,k,t} & \text{if } wh_{h,t} \geq sat_{1,t}p_{1,k,t} \text{ and } xs_{1,k,t} \geq sat_{1,t} & (3.33a) \\ xs_{1,k,t}p_{1,k,t} & \text{if } wh_{h,t} \geq sat_{1,t}p_{1,k,t} \text{ and } xs_{1,k,t} < sat_{1,t} & (3.33b) \\ wh_{h,t} & \text{if } wh_{h,t} < sat_{1,t}p_{1,k,t} \text{ and } xs_{1,k,t} \geq wh_{h,t}/p_{1,k,t} & (3.33c) \\ xs_{1,k,t}p_{1,k,t} & \text{if } wh_{h,t} < sat_{1,t}p_{1,k,t} \text{ and } xs_{1,k,t} < wh_{h,t}/p_{1,k,t} & (3.33d) \end{cases}$$

In cases (3.33b) and (3.33d), the consumer is still left with money to consume. In these cases the consumer moves to the next cheapest firm and executes the same routine. The consumer continues until he exhausts his resources, reaches his satiation point, or finishes his list of ( $\chi$ ) selected firms. After executing the routine for good 1 (agriculture), if there is money left the consumer goes to good 2 (manufacturing) and executes the same routine, and then to good 3 (service). If after consuming the three goods the consumer still have resources left, he saves them for the next period. The effective consumption is always bound by the real production of the consumption-good sector.

### 3.7 AGGREGATE AND AVERAGED VARIABLES

The wage rate ( $W_t$ ) is determined by the growth of the economy's average productivity level:

$$W_t = w_{t-1}[1 + (\ln(A_t) - \ln(A_{t-1}))] \quad (3.34)$$

where ( $A$ ) is the economy's average productivity level, which is a weighted average of sectoral productivity level ( $SA$ ), with the weight being the share of sector employment ( $SL$ ) in total employment ( $L$ ). The average of sectoral productivity level is given by the weighted average of the firms productivity level within each sector. The weight used is the firms' market share given by:

$$ms_{z,i,t} = \frac{x_{z,i,t-1}}{SX_{z,t-1}} \quad (3.35)$$

where ( $SX$ ) is the sector's total production in units, calculated as as:

$$SX_{z,t} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{z,t}^F} x_{z,i,t} \quad (3.36)$$

Sector employment ( $SL$ ) is calculate as:

$$SL_{z,t} = \sum_{i=1}^{N_{z,t}^F} l_{z,i,t} \quad (3.37)$$

## 4 SIMULATION AND RESULTS

We ran 50 Monte Carlo simulations<sup>1</sup> of the model. The model is able to generate endogenous growth and structural change. The results of our simulations shows that the model is able to replicate some interesting patterns and empirical regularities.

First of all, as Caselli (2005) observes, the reasons for poor countries' poverty is strongly related to their productivity in the agricultural sector and with the share of the working population employed in that sector. Gollin et al. (2002) reports that there is a positive relationship between the growth in a country's agricultural productivity and the movement of labour out of agriculture. The model was able to replicate this empirical observation as we can see on FIGURE 3f.

We can see on FIGURE 3a, FIGURE 3b and FIGURE 3c a correlation between the sectors employment and value added shares and the growth of GDP per capita (represented in log). This patterns were reported by Herrendorf et al. (2014) (FIGURE 1). Herrendorf et al. (2014) observes that over the last two centuries, increases in GDP per capita have been associated with decreases in both the employment share and the nominal value added share in agriculture, and increases in both the employment share and the nominal value added share in services.

Another interesting regularity reported by Herrendorf et al. (2014), is that for low levels of development, the value added share is considerably lower than the employment share in the agricultural sector. This regularity was also replicated by the model as we can see on FIGURE 3a. In our model, this difference is in part due to a substantial difference between the wage and the productivity in the agricultural sector. Workers in agriculture receive 60% less than their productivity. The parameter  $v_z$  is responsible for this adjustment in the wage rate (TABLE 1).

Regarding the manufacturing sector, empirical studies have reported that manufacturing employment and nominal value added shares follow a hump shape, that is, they are increasing for lower levels of development and decreasing for higher levels of development (HERRENDORF et al., 2014). This pattern can be seen on FIGURE 3b with relation to income-per-capita and on FIGURE 3d across time.

One of the striking features of developed economies is the large size of their service sector. According to some early works, such as Fisher (1935) and Clark (1940), the income-elasticity for services (which were considered luxuries) is greater than one. Therefore, as income-per-capita grows, the share of goods in overall demand will decline and that of services will rise. Because services rank higher in the hierarchy of needs, countries would allocate more resources to services as their incomes grow and consequently wealthier countries would have a higher share of service demand and of


<sup>1</sup> Each simulation lasts 550 time steps. The first 50 time steps were not analysed as they are used to adjust the parameters.

service employment. Following this hypothesis, today's share of service industry employment is higher than in the past because societies demand more services (SCHETTKAT; YOCARINI, 2006). Moreover, since the productivity in the service sector is in general low, the sector tends to absorb most of the labour force in developed economies. Fourastié e Siegfried (1949) saw in low productivity growth of services the hope for employment.

Buera e Kaboski (2012) and Herrendorf et al. (2014) observe that the nominal value added share for manufacturing peaks around the same log GDP at which the nominal value added share for the service sector accelerates, so it appears that the accelerated increase in the value added share of services coincides with the onset of the decrease in the value added share for manufacturing sector. Furthermore, Buera e Kaboski (2012) also reports that at low levels of GDP per capita the manufacturing sector expands more quickly than does the service sector. Both regularities were also replicated by the model (FIGURE 3d).

The dynamics of some of the aggregate variables can be seen on FIGURE 4. As expected, the economy's GDP growth rate follows the same trend as the average productivity growth. As the economy's income-per-capita increases, labour is shifted towards the service sector and the average productivity tends to fall. This is the result of a much lower average productivity in that sector compared to the other sectors, see (FIGURE 3e).


FIGURE 3 – SECTORAL DYNAMICS




Fonte: Author's own elaboration.

FIGURE 4 – AGGREGATE VARIABLES EVOLUTION


(a) Economy Average Productivity Growth




(b) Real GDP Growth Rate



(c) Real GDP



(d) Inflation Rate



Fonte: Author's own elaboration.

## 5 CONCLUSIONS AND FINAL REMARKS

Economists still struggle to understand why some countries are so much richer than others. The shift of labour out of the agricultural sector into other such sectors as manufacturing and services is one important piece of this puzzle. It is known that poor countries have lower labour productivity in agriculture, lower labour productivity outside agriculture and a larger share of employment in the agricultural sector that – on average – is less productive. Structural change and economic growth and development are strongly interconnected. Therefore, understanding not only the driving mechanisms and forces behind the process of structural change but also how these mechanisms interact and reinforce each other is crucial.

The model developed in the present undergraduate thesis is able to theoretically replicate the dynamics of structural change where labour is reallocated across the three macro-sectors of agriculture, manufacturing and services. The process of structural change is driven by demand and supply factors simultaneously, as sectors differ in their income elasticities of demand and in their productivity growth rates. As we have discussed, the literature offers several explanations for the process of structural change, some based on the income effect and others on the relative-price effect. These two types of effects are often presented as competing mechanisms. Our model demonstrates that, given certain assumptions regarding agents' behaviour, the two mechanisms are not competing but actually complementaries and must coexist in order to replicate the kind of labour and value-added structural change observed in the data.

Our model can be extended in several directions. Three extensions are most promising. First, while the model assumes a fixed number of goods, the introduction of a process of product creation within each macro-sector would enrich the analysis by allowing the reallocation of labour not only across the three macro-sectors but also within them. Second, while our analysis has assumed a uniform income distribution, the introduction of heterogeneous labour where workers receive different incomes is potentially interesting, as the existence of rich and poor households with different consumption bundles would open up a new channel by which income inequality could affect growth and structural change. Third, our analysis have focused on a closed economy, the next natural step would be to consider how hierarchic preferences and product specialization in a world economy would affect the process of structural change and growth.

## REFERÊNCIAS

- ACEMOGLU, D.; GUERRIERI, V. Capital deepening and nonbalanced economic growth. **Journal of Political Economy**, v. 116, n. 3, p. 467–498, jun. 2008. ISSN 00223808. DOI: [10.1086/589523](https://doi.org/10.1086/589523). Citado 2 vez na página 10.
- AGHION, P.; HOWITT, P. **Endogenous Growth Theory**. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1998. Citado 1 vez na página 22.
- ALONSO-CARRERA, J.; RAURICH, X. Demand-based structural change and balanced economic growth. **Journal of Macroeconomics**, Elsevier Inc., v. 46, p. 359–374, 2015. ISSN 01640704. DOI: [10.1016/j.jmacro.2015.10.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmacro.2015.10.005). Citado 1 vezes nas páginas 12, 14.
- ALVAREZ-CUADRADO, F.; POSCHKE, M. Structural Change Out of Agriculture: Labor Push versus Labor Pull. **American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics**, v. 3, n. 3, p. 127–158, jul. 2011. ISSN 1945-7707. DOI: [10.1257/mac.3.3.127](https://doi.org/10.1257/mac.3.3.127). Citado 1 vez na página 12.
- ANDERSEN, E. S. Satiation in an evolutionary model of structural economic dynamics. **Journal of Evolutionary Economics**, v. 11, n. 1, p. 143–164, 2001. Citado 4 vezes nas páginas 11, 21–23.
- AOKI, M.; YOSHIKAWA, H. Demand saturation-creation and economic growth. **Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization**, v. 48, n. 2, p. 127–154, 2002. Citado 1 vez na página 21.
- BAUMOL, W. J. Macroeconomics of Unbalanced Growth: The Anatomy of Urban Crisis. **The American Economic Review**, v. 57, n. 3, p. 415–426, 1967. ISSN 00028282. DOI: [10.2307/1812111](https://doi.org/10.2307/1812111). Citado 1 vezes nas páginas 9, 10.
- BOPPART, T. Structural Change and the Kaldor Facts in a Growth Model With Relative Price Effects and Non-Gorman Preferences. **Econometrica**, v. 82, n. 6, p. 2167–2196, nov. 2014. ISSN 00129682. DOI: [10.3982/ECTA11354](https://doi.org/10.3982/ECTA11354). Citado 2 vez na página 10.
- BROADBERRY, S.; CAMPBELL, B. M.; LEEUWEN, B. van. When did Britain industrialise? The sectoral distribution of the labour force and labour productivity in Britain, 1381-1851. **Explorations in Economic History**, Elsevier Inc., v. 50, n. 1,

p. 16–27, 2013. ISSN 00144983. DOI: [10.1016/j.eeh.2012.08.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eeh.2012.08.004). Citado 1 vez na página 12.

BUERA, F. J.; KABOSKI, J. P. Scale and the origins of structural change. **Journal of Economic Theory**, Elsevier Inc., v. 147, n. 2, p. 684–712, 2012. ISSN 0022-0531. DOI: [10.1016/j.jet.2010.11.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jet.2010.11.007). Citado 3 vezes nas páginas 12, 27.

CASELLI, F. Accounting for Cross-Country Income Differences. In: AGHION, P.; DURLAUF, S. N. (Ed.). **Handbook of Economic Growth**. [S.l.]: Elsevier, 2005. v. 1. cap. 9, p. 679–741. ISBN 9780444520418. DOI: [10.1016/S1574-0684\(05\)01009-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1574-0684(05)01009-9). arXiv: [arXiv:1011.1669v3](https://arxiv.org/abs/1011.1669v3). Citado 2 vezes nas páginas 8, 26.

CASELLI, F.; COLEMAN, W. J. The U.S. Structural Transformation and Regional Convergence : A Reinterpretation. **Journal of Political Economy**, v. 109, n. 3, p. 584–616, 2001. Citado 2 vez na página 10.

CHAI, A.; MONETA, A. Back to Engel? Some evidence for the hierarchy of needs. **Journal of Evolutionary Economics**, Springer-Verlag, v. 22, n. 4, p. 649–676, set. 2012. ISSN 0936-9937. DOI: [10.1007/s00191-012-0283-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00191-012-0283-3). Citado 1 vez na página 24.

\_\_\_\_\_. Escaping Satiation Dynamics: Some Evidence from British Household Data. **Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik**, Lucius & Lucius, v. 234, n. 2-3, p. 299–327, jan. 2014. ISSN 2366-049X. DOI: [10.1515/jbnst-2014-2-311](https://doi.org/10.1515/jbnst-2014-2-311). Citado 1 vez na página 24.

CHENERY, H. B. Patterns of Industrial Growth. **The American Economic Review**, American Economic Association, v. 50, n. 4, p. 624–654, 1960. Citado 1 vez na página 12.

CIARLI, T. Structural interactions and long run growth: an application of experimental design to agent based models. **Observatoire Francais des Conjonctures Economiques Revue**, v. 124, p. 295–345, 2012. ISSN 1265-9576. Citado 2 vezes nas páginas 11, 22.

CIARLI, T.; LORENTZ, A. Product Variety and Changes in Consumption Patterns: The Effects of Structural Change on Growth. **13th Conference of the International Schumpeter Society, Alborg University**, Denmark, 2010. Citado 1 vez na página 11.

CIARLI, T.; LORENTZ, A.; SAVONA, M.; VALENTE, M. The Effect of Consumption and Production Structure on Growth and Distribution: A Micro to Macro Model.

**Metroeconomica**, v. 61, n. 1, p. 180–218, 2010. DOI:

[10.1111/j.1467-999X.2009.04069.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-999X.2009.04069.x). Citado 1 vez na página 11.

CIARLI, T.; VALENTE, M. The complex interactions between economic growth and market concentration in a model of structural change. **Structural Change and Economic Dynamics**, North-Holland, v. 38, p. 38–54, set. 2016. ISSN 0954-349X.

DOI: [10.1016/J.STRUECO.2016.04.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/J.STRUECO.2016.04.006). Citado 1 vez na página 11.

CLARK, C. **The Conditions of Economic Progress**. London: McMillan & Co, 1940. Citado 3 vezes nas páginas 9, 12, 26.

COAD, A.; RAO, R. Economics of Innovation and New Technology Firm growth and R&D expenditure Firm growth and R&D expenditure. **Economics of Innovation and New Technology**, v. 19, n. 2, p. 127–145, 2010. DOI: [10.1080/10438590802472531](https://doi.org/10.1080/10438590802472531).

Citado 1 vez na página 21.

DEATON, A.; MUELLBAUER, J. **Economics and consumer behavior**.

Cambridge-USA: Cambridge University Press, 1980. Citado 1 vez na página 9.

DENNIS, B. N.; İŞCAN, T. B. Engel versus Baumol: Accounting for structural change using two centuries of U.S. data. **Explorations in Economic History**, v. 46, n. 2, p. 186–202, 2009. ISSN 00144983. DOI: [10.1016/j.eeh.2008.11.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eeh.2008.11.003). Citado 2 vezes nas páginas 9, 12.

DOSI, G.; MARENGO, L.; PASQUALI, C. How much should society fuel the greed of innovators?. On the relations between appropriability, opportunities and rates of innovation. **Research Policy**, v. 35, 8 SPEC. ISS., p. 1110–1121, 2006. ISSN 00487333. DOI: [10.1016/j.respol.2006.09.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2006.09.003). Citado 1 vez na página 21.

ECHEVARRIA, C. Changes in Sectoral Composition Associated with Economic Growth. **International Economic Review**, v. 38, n. 2, p. 431–452, 1997. Citado 1 vez na página 10.

ENGEL, E. Die Produktions-und Consumtionsverhältnisse des Königreichs Sachsen. **Zeitschrift des Statistischen Bureaus des Königlich Sachischen Ministeriums des Innern**, p. 1–54, 1857. Citado 1 vez na página 9.

FABIANI, S.; DRUANT, M.; HERNANDO, I.; KWAPIL, C.; LANDAU, B.; LOUPIAS, C.; MARTINS, F.; MATH, T.; SABBATINI, R.; STAHL, H.; STOKMAN, A. What Firms' Surveys Tell Us about Price-Setting Behavior in the Euro Area. **International Journal of Central Banking**, v. 2, p. 3–47, 2006. Citado 1 vez na página 19.

FALKINGER, J. An Engelian model of growth and innovation with hierarchic consumer demand and unequal incomes. **Ricerche Economiche**, Academic Press, v. 48, n. 2, p. 123–139, jun. 1994. ISSN 0035-5054. DOI: [10.1016/0035-5054\(94\)90003-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0035-5054(94)90003-5). Citado 2 vezes nas páginas 11, 22.

\_\_\_\_\_. On growth along a hierarchy of wants. **Metroeconomica**, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, v. 41, n. 3, p. 209–223, out. 1990. ISSN 0026-1386. DOI: [10.1111/j.1467-999X.1990.tb00466.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-999X.1990.tb00466.x). Citado 2 vezes nas páginas 11, 22.

FISCHER, A. G. B. Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Production. **Economic Record**, v. 15, June, p. 24–38, 1939. Citado 1 vez na página 12.

FISHER, A. G. B. **Clash of progress and security**. [S.l.]: Macmillan e Co. Limited, London, 1935. Citado 2 vezes nas páginas 9, 26.

FOELLM, R.; ZWEIMÜELLER, J. Structural Change, Engel's Consumption Cycles and Kaldor's Facts of Economic Growth. **Journal of Monetary Economics**, v. 55, n. 7, p. 1317–1328, 2008. Citado 2 vezes nas páginas 10, 21.

FOSTER, A. D.; ROSENZWEIG, M. R. Economic Development and the Decline of Agricultural Employment. In: SCHULTZ, P. T.; STRAUSS, J. A. (Ed.). **Handbook of Development Economics**. [S.l.]: Elsevier, 2007. v. 4. cap. 47, p. 3051–3083. ISBN 9780444531001. DOI: [10.1016/S1573-4471\(07\)04047-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-4471(07)04047-8). Citado 1 vez na página 9.

FOURASTIÉ, J.; SIEGFRIED, A. **Le grand espoir du XXe siècle: progrès technique, progrès économique, progrès social**. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1949. Citado 1 vez na página 27.

FREY, B. Product and Process Innovations in Economic Growth. **Zeitschrift für Nationalökonomie / Journal of Economics**, Springer, v. 29, p. 29–38, 1969. Citado 1 vez na página 21.

GABARDO, F. A.; PEREIMA, J. B.; EINLOFT, P. The incorporation of structural change into growth theory: A historical appraisal. **Economia**, Elsevier, v. 18, n. 3, p. 392–410,

set. 2017. ISSN 1517-7580. DOI: [10.1016/j.econ.2017.05.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econ.2017.05.003). Citado 4 vezes nas páginas 8, 9, 12.

GOLLIN, D.; PARENTE, S.; ROGERSON, R. The Role of Agriculture in Development. **The American Economic Review**, American Economic Association, v. 92, n. 2, p. 160–164, 2002. ISSN 0002-8282. DOI: [10.2307/3083394](https://doi.org/10.2307/3083394). Citado 5 vezes nas páginas 10, 12, 14, 26.

GRÄBNER, C. Agent-based computational models– a formal heuristic for institutionalist pattern modelling? **Journal of Institutional Economics**, Cambridge University Press, v. 12, n. 1, p. 241–261, mar. 2016. ISSN 1744-1374. DOI: [10.1017/S1744137415000193](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1744137415000193). Citado 1 vez na página 11.

HERRENDORF, B.; ROGERSON, R.; VALENTINYI, Á. Growth and Structural Transformation. In: HANDBOOK of Economic Growth. [S.l.]: Elsevier, jan. 2014. v. 2. cap. 6, p. 855–941. ISBN 9780444535467. DOI: [10.1016/B978-0-444-53540-5.00006-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-53540-5.00006-9). arXiv: [arXiv:1011.1669v3](https://arxiv.org/abs/1011.1669v3). Citado 9 vezes nas páginas 8, 10, 12, 13, 26, 27.

KAELBLE, H. Der Wandel der Erwerbsstruktur in Europa im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert. **Historical Social Research**, v. 22, p. 5–28, 1997. Citado 1 vez na página 12.

KONGSAMUT, P.; REBELO, S.; XIE, D. Beyond Balanced Growth. **The Review of Economic Studies**, v. 68, n. 4, p. 869–882, 2001. DOI: [10.1111/1467-937X.00193](https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-937X.00193). Citado 1 vez na página 10.

KRÜGER, J. J. Productivity and structural change: a review of the literature. **Journal of Economic Surveys**, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, v. 22, n. 2, p. 330–363, abr. 2008. DOI: [10.1111/j.1467-6419.2007.00539.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6419.2007.00539.x). Citado 4 vezes nas páginas 9, 11.

KUZNETS, S. Modern Economic Growth: Findings and Reflections. **The American Economic Review**, American Economic Association, v. 63, n. 3, p. 247–258, 1973. Citado 1 vez na página 12.

\_\_\_\_\_. Quantitative Aspects of the Economic Growth of Nations: II. Industrial Distribution of National Product and Labor Force. **Economic Development and Cultural Change**, The University of Chicago Press, v. 5, n. 4, p. 1–111, 1957. Citado 1 vez na página 12.

LAITNER, J. Structural Change and Economic Growth. **The Review of Economic Studies**, Oxford University Press, v. 67, n. 3, p. 545–561, 2000. Citado 1 vez na página 10.

LLERENA, P.; LORENTZ, A. Cumulative causation and evolutionary micro-founded technical change: On the determinants of growth rate differences. **Revue Economique**, v. 55, n. 6, p. 1191–1214, 2004. ISSN 00352764. DOI: [10.2307/3503350](https://doi.org/10.2307/3503350). Citado 1 vez na página 22.

LORENTZ, A.; CIARLI, T.; SAVONA, M.; VALENTE, M. The effect of demand-driven structural transformations on growth and technological change. **Journal of Evolutionary Economics**, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, v. 26, n. 1, p. 219–246, mar. 2016. ISSN 0936-9937. DOI: [10.1007/s00191-015-0409-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00191-015-0409-5). Citado 1 vez na página 11.

LORENTZ, A.; SAVONA, M. Evolutionary Micro-dynamics and Changes in the Economic Structure. **Journal of Evolutionary Economics**, v. 18, p. 389–412, 2008. Citado 1 vez na página 11.

MADDISON, A. Growth and Slowdown in Advanced Capitalist Economies: Techniques of Quantitative Assessment. **Journal of Economic Literature**, v. 25, n. 2, p. 649, 1987. ISSN 0022-0515. DOI: [10.2307/2726106](https://doi.org/10.2307/2726106). Citado 2 vez na página 12.

MATSUYAMA, K. Agricultural productivity, comparative advantage, and economic growth. **Journal of Economic Theory**, v. 58, p. 317–334, 1992. Citado 1 vez na página 10.

\_\_\_\_\_. **Structural Change**. Edição: Steven N. Durlauf e Lawrence E. Blume. 2. ed. [S.l.]: Palgrave MacMillan UK, 2008. ISBN 978-0-333-78676-5. Citado 1 vez na página 9.

MONETA, A.; CHAI, A. Retrospectives: Engel Curves. **Journal of Economic Perspectives**, v. 24, n. 1, p. 225–240, 2010. Citado 1 vez na página 24.

\_\_\_\_\_. The evolution of Engel curves and its implications for structural change theory. **Cambridge Journal of Economics**, v. 38, n. 4, p. 895–923, 2014. Citado 1 vez na página 24.

NELSON, R. R.; WINTER, S. **An evolutionary theory of economic change**. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982. Citado 1 vez na página 22.

NGAI, L. R.; PISSARIDES, C. A. Structural Change in a Multisector Model of Growth. **The American Economic Review**, American Economic Association, v. 97, n. 1, p. 429–443, 2007. Citado 1 vez na página 10.

PASINETTI, L. L. **Structural change and economic growth**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981. Citado 1 vez na página 23.

\_\_\_\_\_. **Structural economic dynamic: A theory of the economic consequences of human learning**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. Citado 1 vez na página 23.

SAVIOTTI, P. P. Variety, growth and demand. **Journal of Evolutionary Economics**, Springer-Verlag, v. 11, n. 1, p. 119–142, jan. 2001. ISSN 0936-9937. DOI: [10.1007/PL00003853](https://doi.org/10.1007/PL00003853). Citado 1 vez na página 21.

SAVIOTTI, P. P.; PYKA, A. Product variety, competition and economic growth. **Journal of Evolutionary Economics**, Springer-Verlag, v. 18, n. 3-4, p. 323–347, ago. 2008. ISSN 0936-9937. DOI: [10.1007/s00191-008-0097-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00191-008-0097-5). Citado 1 vez na página 21.

SCHETTKAT, R.; YOCARINI, L. The shift to services employment: A review of the literature. **Structural Change and Economic Dynamics**, North-Holland, v. 17, n. 2, p. 127–147, jun. 2006. ISSN 0954-349X. DOI: [10.1016/J.STRUECO.2005.04.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/J.STRUECO.2005.04.002). Citado 1 vez na página 27.

SILVA, E. G.; TEIXEIRA, A. A. C. Surveying structural change: Seminal contributions and a bibliometric account. **Structural Change and Economic Dynamics**, v. 19, n. 4, p. 273–300, 2008. Citado 1 vez na página 9.

SILVERBERG, G.; VERSPAGEN, B. Evolutionary theorizing on economic growth. In: DOPFER, K. (Ed.). **The Evolutionary Foundations of Economics**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. P. 506–539. ISBN 9780511492297. DOI: [10.1017/CB09780511492297.016](https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511492297.016). Citado 1 vez na página 22.

SYRQUIN, M. Patterns of structural change. In: HANDBOOK of Development Economics. [S.l.]: Elsevier, jan. 1988. v. 1. cap. 7, p. 203–273. ISBN 9780444703378. DOI: [10.1016/S1573-4471\(88\)01010-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1573-4471(88)01010-1). Citado 1 vez na página 12.

VALENTE, M.; ANDERSEN, E. S. A Hands-on Approach to Evolutionary Simulation: Nelson and Winter Models in The Laboratory for Simulation Development. **The**

**Electronic Journal of Evolutionary Modeling and Economic Dynamics**, IFR e DE-Université Montesquie Bordeaux IV, 2002. Citado 1 vez na página 22.

## APÊNDICE 1 - PARAMETER VALUES AND INITIAL CONDITIONS

TABLE 1 – SECTORAL PARAMETERS AND INITIAL CONDITIONS

Symbol	Description	Agriculture	Manufacturing	Services
$N_z^f$	Number of Firms	25	25	25
$\xi$	Innovation probability adjustment coefficient	1	1	1
$\xi_z$	Productivity shock alleviation	0.5	1.2	1.2
$\lambda_D$	Expected Demand adaptive expectations coefficient	0.25	0.25	0.25
$\eta_z$	Satiation level growth coefficient	0.05	0.35	0.7
$v_z$	Sectoral wage rate adjustment coefficient	0.4	0.8	1
$\phi$	R&D investment propensity over past sales	0.01	0.01	0.01
$\gamma_L$	Labour hiring rigidity coefficient	0.006	0.005	0.008
$\sigma^\mu$	Mark-up adjustment coefficient	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
$\sigma^a$	Initial productivity Shock	0.06	0.03	0.01
$a$	Initial labour productivity	0.5	0.5	0.5
$C_{max}$	Initial Maximum Household Consumption (units)	5	5	5
$uc$	Initial unit Cost	1	1	1
$\mu$	Initial mark-up	0.05	0.05	0.05
$SX$	Initial total Sector Production (units)	1750	750	500
$L$	Initial total Labour Demand (hours)	3500	1500	1000
$W$	Initial total Wage Paid (MU)	1750	750	500
$sat_{z,0}$	Initial satiation level	5	5	5
$P_0$	Initial prices	1	1	1

Fonte: Author's own elaboration.

TABLE 2 – AGGREGATE INITIAL CONDITIONS

Symbol	Description	Value
$N^h$	Number of Households	750
$i^l$	Interest rate on loans	0.01
$i^d$	Interest rate on deposits	0.01
$\delta$	Firms' net profits' share distributed as dividends	1
$H^{wj}$	Household work journey	8
$\chi$	Number of firms that consumers consult before buying	3
$w$	Initial wage rate	0.5
$y$	Initial income per capita	4
$u_0$	Initial unemployment	0

Fonte: Author's own elaboration.