# Neoclassical Growth Accounting and Frontier Analysis: A Synthesis

Thijs ten Raa
Tilburg University

Pierre Mohnen¤
Université du Québec à Montréal and CIRANO

August, 2000

Abstract

The standard measure of productivity growth is the Solow residual. Its evaluation requires data on factor input shares or prices. Since these prices are presumed to match factor productivities, the standard procedure amounts to accepting at face value what is supposed to be measured. In this paper we determine total factor productivity growth without recourse to data on factor input prices. Factor productivities are de…ned as Lagrange multipliers to the program that maximizes the level of domestic …nal demand. The consequent measure of total factor productivity is shown to encompass not only the Solow residual, but also the e¢ciency change of frontier analysis and the hitherto slippery terms-of-trade e¤ect. Using input-output tables from 1962 to 1991 we show that the source of Canadian productivity growth has shifted from technical change to terms-of-trade e¤ects.

JEL Code: O47

¤We thank Nathalie Viennot and So…ane Ghali for their dedicated research assistance and René Durand, Jean-Pierre Maynard, Ronald Rioux and Bart van Ark for their precious cooperation in constructing the data. We are grateful to Carl Sonnen and to the participants of the Service Sector Productivity and the Productivity Paradox conference for their helpful comments. We acknowledge the …nancial support of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), CentER, the Netherlands Foundation for the Advancement of Research (NWO), and the Association for Canadian Studies in the Netherlands.

# 1 Introduction

In this paper we synthesize two strands of productivity analysis, namely neoclassical growth accounting and a frontier approach, known as data envelopment analysis (DEA).[1] In either branch of literature productivity is essentially the output-input ratio and, therefore, productivity growth the residual between output growth and input growth. The difficulty is to implement these concepts when there is more than one output or input. Neoclassical analysis weights them by value shares, a procedure that has been justified for competitive economies by Solow (1957). In such economies inputs are rewarded according to their marginal productivities and outputs according to their marginal revenues. Therefore, the residual measures the shift of the production function. DEA analysis considers the output and input proportions observable in activities (representing various economies and/or various years) and determines for instance how much more output could be produced if the inputs were processed by an optimal combination of all observed activities.

Although each approach tracks changes in the output-input ratio of an economy, the constructions are quite distinct. Neoclassical growth accounting attributes productivity growth to the inputs, say labor and capital. Indeed, Jorgenson and Griliches (1967) have shown that the total factor productivity (TFP-) growth residual equals the growth of the real factor rewards, summed over endowments. In this sense the residual truly represents total factor productivity growth indeed. The frontier approach decomposes productivity growth in a movement of the economy towards the frontier and a shift of the latter. Productivity growth is efficiency change plus technical change. The alternative decompositions inherit the advantages and disadvantages of their respective methodologies. Neoclassical growth accounting imputes productivity growth to factors, but cannot distinguish a movement towards the frontier and a movement of the frontier. This is the contribution of the frontier approach, which, however, is not capable of imputing value to factor inputs.

Practitioners of both approaches are aware of each others' work and sometimes report correlations between the alternative productivity measures (Perelman, 1995). What is missing, however, is a theoretical framework that encompasses the two approaches. This is the purpose of our paper. We reproduce the neoclassical TFP growth formulas, but

[1] In the frontier literature, there is a distinction between deterministic and stochastic frontiers. The former are obtained by linear programming methods such as DEA, the latter are estimated by econometric methods. See Coelli et al. (1998).

in a framework that is DEA in spirit. Unlike Färe, Grosskopf, Lovell and Zhang (1994), we do not determine an economy's frontier by benchmarking on other economies, but by reallocating resources domestically so as to maximize the level of domestic …nal demand (that is excluding net exports) given input and output proportions and subject to a set of feasibility constraints. The shadow prices of the factor constraints measure the individual factor productivities. Our model is a general equilibrium activity analysis model with multiple inputs and outputs, and intermediate inputs, where the frontier is determined by an economic criterion and not a mechanical expansion factor. A …rst attempt to model intermediate inputs was made by Färe and Grosskopf (1996).

Our starting point is the Solow residual between output and input growth. We derive the equality of the Solow residual with the growth rates of the factor productivities by di¤erentiating not the national income identity, but the related formula of the main theorem of linear programming applied to the aforementioned frontier program. By the same token, we capture the movement towards the frontier, or e¢ciency change, in addition to the standard Domar decomposition of TFP, involving technical change at the sectoral levels. A further contribution is the identi…cation of the terms-of-trade e¤ect in productivity analysis. It is well-known that an improvement in the terms of trade is equivalent to technical progress, but the treatment of this e¤ect has been ad hoc so far. For example, Diewert and Morrison (1986) classify commodities a priori as exports or imports. In our frontier program net exports are appropriately endogenous. We model the trade de…cit as a factor input, similar to capital or labor.

Although we reproduce the formulas of neoclassical growth accounting and frontier analysis in a consistent way, there are some subtle di¤erences. Compared to traditional growth accounting, the input value shares that enter our Solow residual are no longer the observed ones, but those based on the shadow prices of the frontier program. In perfectly competitive economies, where inputs are rewarded according to their marginal productivities and outputs according to their marginal revenues, it is perfectly legitimate to use the observed value shares in aggregating inputs or outputs. But, observed economies are not perfectly competitive and are not even on their production possibility frontiers. Hence the Solow residual based on observed value shares does not isolate technical change, but also captures variations of the economy about the competitive benchmark, such as changes in market power, returns to scale or disequilibrium in factor holdings. One approach followed in the literature is to correct the Solow residual for such departures from perfect competition, estimating mark-ups over marginal cost,

scale elasticities and shadow prices, and modifying the formula for the residual (Morisson, 1988, and Hall, 1990). Our approach, however, is to endogenize commodity and factor prices by …nding the frontier of the economy subject to its fundamentals, namely endowments, technology, and preferences. Endowments are represented by the labor force, the accumulated stocks of capital and the trade de…cit. Technology is given by the combined inputs and outputs of the various sectors of the economy. Preferences are represented by the commodity proportions of domestic …nal demand.[2]

Compared to frontier analysis, we use a non-parametric linear programming based technique a la DEA, but our e¢ciency change is not based on cross-sectional or intertemporal benchmarking, but on sectoral e¢ciency-improving reallocations of factors of production within a multi-sectoral economy model. Few frontier analysts have modelled e¢ciency changes in an open DEA economy with interindustry trade.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we set up an activity analysis model to determine an economy's frontier. Then we de…ne TFP-growth in the spirit of Solow (1957) and decompose it into frontier productivity growth and e¢ciency change. In section 3, frontier productivity growth is further decomposed into technical change and a terms-of-trade e¤ect. In section 4 we measure TFP-growth and its various components for the Canadian economy over the period 1962-1991. Section 5 concludes and the data are described in an appendix.

# 2 TFP-growth as the sum of frontier productivity growth and e¢ciency change

We consider an open economy endowed with labor $N$; capital $M$ (decomposed into various types) and an allowable trade de…cit $D$: The economy is subdivided into a number of sectors, each producing a vector of commodities. Part of the commodities are used as intermediate inputs and the rest ‡ows to …nal demand (either domestic …nal demand or exports). The frontier of the economy is de…ned as the maximal expansion of its vector of …nal demand $f$; keeping the relative composition of that vector as …xed.

[2] This is in the spirit of Mohnen, ten Raa and Bourque (1997) who, however, stay in the realm of neoclassical growth accounting and, therefore, do not capture e¢ciency changes nor the terms-of-trade e¤ect.

The composition reflects preferences. The frontier of the economy can be reached by an optimal allocation of inputs (primary and intermediate) and production across sectors and by an optimal trade of commodity with the rest of the world.

The frontier of the economy is defined by the primal program,

$$\max_{s;c;g} e^{|} f c \text{ subject to}$$

$$\begin{array}{rcl} (V^{|} - U)s & \geq & fc + Jg =: F \\ Ks & & M \\ Ls & & N \\ -\gamma g & & -\gamma g^{t} =: D \\ s & \geq & 0: \end{array} \tag{1}$$

We discuss the objective and the constraints, respectively, and then list all the variables and parameters. The objective is the expansion of the level of domestic final demand, c: Domestic final demand comprises consumption and investment. Investment is merely a means to advance consumption, albeit in the future. We include it in the objective function to account for future consumption. In fact, Weitzman (1976) shows that for competitive economies domestic final demand measures the present discounted value of consumption.[3]

Preserving the proportions of domestic final demand, f, we expand its level by letting the economy produce fc; where scalar c is the expansion factor. c = 1 is feasible (as it reflects the status quo), but c > 1 represents a movement towards the frontier of the economy. The model maximizes c. This is equivalent to the maximization $e^{|} f c$; where e is the unit vector (with all entries equal to one), $|$ the transposition sign, and f is the given domestic final demand vector. It is important to understand that f is not a variable but an exogenous vector. The positive multiplicative factor in the objective, $e^{|} f$; will control the nominal price level.

The preservation of domestic final demand in finding the frontier of the economy in each year amounts to imposing a Leontief preference structure (fixed consumption pattern).It

[3] In principle, our methodology could accommodate endogenous investment and the determination of the intertemporal production possibility frontier as in Hulten (1979), but we have not pursued this approach.

should be noted that the ray output expansion typical in multi-output DEA (the Farrell (1957) measure of e¢ciency) implicitly assumes …xed output proportions. It should also be noted that the Leontief speci…cation of production and preferences that we adopt admits a great deal of substitutability as trade is free and, therefore, acts as a valve for factor imbalances between endowments and factor contents of domestic …nal demands. The economy may even mimic a Cobb-Douglas behavior, as demonstrated in ten Raa (1995).

The …rst constraint of the linear program (1) is the material balance: net output must cover domestic …nal demand plus net exports. Then follow the capital and labor constraints.[4] The next to last constraint is the trade balance: net imports valued at world prices may not exceed the existing trade de…cit. Finally, sector activity levels must be nonnegative.

The variables $(s; c; g)$ and parameters (all other) are the following [with dimensions in brackets]

[4] Actually, there is also non-business capital and labor, proportional to the activity level of the non-business sector, that is c: We have included their levels in the capital and labor constraints and their factor rewards in the coe¢cient of c in the objective function. For reasons of clarity in the exposition, we have not indicated these additional terms related to the non-business sector in (1).

| | |
|---|---|
| $s$ | activity vector [# of sectors] |
| $c$ | level of domestic …nal demand [scalar] |
| $g$ | vector of net exports [# of tradeable commodities] |
| $e$ | unit vector of all components one |
| $\mid$ | transposition symbol |
| $f$ | domestic …nal demand [# of commodities] |
| $V$ | make table [# of sectors by # of commodities] |
| $U$ | use table [# of commodities by # of sectors] |
| $J$ | 0-1 matrix placing tradeables [# of commodities by of tradeables] |
| $F$ | …nal demand [# of commodities] |
| $K$ | capital stock matrix [# of capital types by # of sectors] |
| $M$ | capital endowment [# of capital types] |
| $L$ | labor employment row vector [# of sectors] |
| $N$ | labor force [scalar][5] |
| $¼$ | U.S. relative price row vector [# of tradeables] |
| $g^t$ | vector of net exports observed at time t [# of tradeables] |
| $D$ | observed trade de…cit [scalar]. |

The linear program basically reallocates activity so as to maximize the level of domestic …nal demand. Final demand also includes net exports, but they are considered not an end, but a means to ful…ll the objective of the economy.[6] This endogenization of trade explains the role of the terms-of-trade in TFP analysis, as we shall see in section 3.

The theory of mathematical programming teaches us that the Lagrange multipliers corresponding to the constraints of the primal program measure the competitive values or marginal products of the constraining entities (the commodities and factors) at the optimum. We will use the Lagrange multipliers in de…ning productivity growth. They are $p$ (a row vector of commodity prices), $r$ (a row vector of capital productivities), $w$ (a scalar for labor productivity), and $"$ (a scalar for the purchasing power parity). They are determined by the dual program associated with (1),

$$\min_{p;r;w;" \, \geq \, 0} rM + wN + "D \text{ subject to}$$

[5] Labor could also be decomposed into various types, but we have not done so in the empirical part.

[6] We make no distinction between competitive and non-competitive imports. (Non-competitive imports are indicated by zeros in the make table.)

$$\begin{aligned} p(V^{I} - U) \quad & rK + wL \\ pf \quad = \quad & e^{I} f \\ pJ \quad = \quad & \text{"¼ :} \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Factor costs are minimized subject to price constraints.[7] The …rst dual constraint de…nes competitive shadow prices of the commodities. Value added must be less than or equal to factor costs in each sector. (If it is less than factor costs, the sector will be inactive according to the phenomenon of complementary slackness.) The second dual constraint normalizes the prices.[8] Our commodities are measured in base-year prices and hence observed prices are one. The optimal competitive prices from the linear program will be slightly o¤, but we maintain the overall price level. The third and last dual constraint aligns the prices of the tradeable commodities with their opportunity costs: the relative U.S. prices. In free trade, the law of one price must hold (in the absence of transaction costs and imperfect information).

Following Solow (1957) we de…ne total factor productivity growth as the residual between the …nal demand growth and aggregate-input growth, where each of them is a weighted average of component growth rates and the weights are competitive value shares. The growth rate of domestic …nal demand for commodity i is $\hat{f}_i = f_i / f_i$; where $\cdot$ denotes the time derivative. The competitive value shares are $p_i f_i / (\sum p_i f_i) = p_i f_i / (pf)$: Hence overall output growth amounts to

$$\sum [p_i f_i / (pf)] \hat{f}_i = \sum p_i f_i / (pf) = p\dot{f} / (pf): \tag{3}$$

Inputs are aggregated in the same vein. The growth rate of labor is $\hat{N}$ and its competitive value share is $\bar{} = wN/(rM + wN + \text{"}D)$: Likewise, denote the competitive value shares of capital by ® (a row vector) and of the trade de…cit by ° (a scalar). Then overall input growth can be written as

$$®\hat{M} + \bar{}\hat{N} + °\hat{D} \tag{4}$$

where each of the terms can be rewritten in time derivatives as we have done for outputs. For example, $\bar{}\hat{N} = [wN/(rM + wN + \text{"}D)]\hat{N} = w\dot{N}/(rM + wN + \text{"}D)$: Total factor

[7] Since the commodity constraint in the primal program has zero bound, p does not show up in the objective function of the dual program. For details of the derivation see, for example, ten Raa (1995).

[8] Remember from footnote 4 that there are two more constraint terms featuring c; namely non-business capital and labor. To preserve the price normalization, we have also included in the objective function of the primal program, (1), the base-year expenditure on non-business capital and labor which also shows up on the right-hand side of the second dual constraint.

productivity growth is the residual between (1) and (2):

$$\begin{aligned} TFP &= \dot{pf}/(pf) - (\alpha\hat{M} + \beta\hat{N} + \gamma\hat{D}) \\ &= \dot{pf}/(pf) - (rM + wN + \varepsilon D)/(rM + wN + \varepsilon D) : \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

In the growth accounting literature it is customary to assume that the economy is perfectly competitive. Unfortunately this assumption is seldom fulfilled. Observed prices are not perfectly competitive and the economy need not be on its frontier. Also notice that p is not a device to convert nominal values to real values, but the endogenous price vector that sustains the optimal allocation of resources in the linear program.

In the spirit of Nishimizu and Page (1982) and further frontier analysis, such as DEA, for example Färe et al. (1994), we will decompose $TFP$ in a shift of the frontier and a movement towards the frontier:

$$TFP = FP + EC \tag{6}$$

where $FP$ if frontier productivity growth and $EC$ is efficiency change. We will now define each of them.

By the theory of Lagrange multipliers, real shadow prices measure the marginal products of the factors at the optimum. Hence frontier productivity growth is the growth rates of the shadow prices of the factors (weighted by relative factor costs) minus the growth rate of the commodity prices.[9]

$$FP = (\underline{r}M + \underline{w}N + \underline{\varepsilon}D)/(rM + wN + \varepsilon D) - \underline{pf}/(pf) \tag{7}$$

Frontier productivity growth so defined corresponds to the dual expression of TFP-growth for perfectly competitive economies elaborated by Jorgenson and Griliches (1967). It imputes productivity growth to factor inputs, which is beyond the scope of standard frontier analysis. The latter, however, is capable of accounting for efficiency change. In-efficiency is measured by the degree to which the economy can be expanded towards its

[9] Since prices are normalized at unity by the second dual constraint, see (2), the price correction term is a sheer compositional effect. If the composition of domestic final demand, f; is constant, then pf is also constant, by (2), and it follows that $p(f)^{\cdot} = \underline{pf}$ is zero. Otherwise the price correction term corrects marginal factor productivity growth rates for an inflationary effect, which does not reflect a change in the price level (since everything is already specified in real prices) but only a compositional effect.

frontier, c: A reduction in c signals an e¢ciency gain and, therefore, e¢ciency change is de…ned by

$$EC = \dot{c}(= \dot{\underline{c}}=c) \tag{8}$$

We must now demonstrate that frontier productivity growth and e¢ciency change sum to total factor productivity growth. In other words, we must prove equation (6), given de…nitions (5), (7) and (8). Now, by the main theorem of linear programming, (1) and (2) have equal solution values, or, substituting the price normalization constraint of (2),

$$pfc = rM + wN + "D: \tag{9}$$

This is the identity of national product and income, where national income consists of factor costs. Di¤erentiating (9) with respect to time, applying the product rule, rearranging terms, and dividing through by (9) itself, we obtain (6). It is interesting to notice that c cancels out everywhere, except in the denominator under $\underline{c}$; which yields the e¢ciency change.

# 3 Frontier productivity growth decomposition into technical change and the terms-of-trade e¤ect

In the previous section we decomposed TFP into frontier productivity growth and e¢ciency change. This section provides the further decomposition of frontier productivity growth into technical change and the terms-of-trade e¤ect. The latter is not an add-on, but emerges naturally from our linear programming model of TFP. It should not come as a surprise that terms-of-trade and sectoral technical changes arise simultaneously. The trade sector is like a production sector, with multiple inputs (namely exports) and outputs (namely imports). The technology is di¤erent though. While production sectors feature no substitutability, the trade sector features perfect substitutability (with the marginal rate of substitution given by the terms of trade).

Our point of departure is TFP as de…ned in (5). Focus on the numerator of (5), by multiplying with the denominator, or (9). Then we obtain the following TFP numerator,

$$pf\dot{c} - r\dot{M} - w\dot{N} - "\dot{D}: \tag{10}$$

By de…nition of F; see (1), the …rst term is $p\dot{F} - pJg - pf\dot{\underline{c}}$: If the factor constraints are binding, then $M = Ks$; $N = Ls$ and $"D = -"¼g - "\underline{¼}g$: The second subterm of the

…rst term, ¡ pJg; cancels against the …rst subterm of the last term, ¡ "¼g; (because of the third constraint of (2)) and (10) reduces to

$$[p\bar{E} - r(Ks)^{\cdot} - w(Ls)^{\cdot}] + "\bar{¼}g - pf\bar{c}: \tag{11}$$

Dividing by the denominator of TFP, or (9), we reobtain TFP, but now in the following three-way form:[10]

$$TFP = SR + TT + EC \tag{12}$$

where SR is the Solow residual,

$$SR = [p\bar{E} - r(Ks)^{\cdot} - w(Ls)^{\cdot}]=(rM + wN + "D) \tag{13}$$

TT is the terms-of-trade e¤ect,

$$TT = "\bar{¼}g=(rM + wN + "D) \tag{14}$$

and EC is the e¢ciency change, de…ned earlier in (8). Comparison of TFP decompositions (12) and (6) reveals that e¤ectively we have decomposed the structural change term, frontier productivity growth FP; into the technical change and terms-of-trade e¤ects,

$$FP = SR + TT: \tag{15}$$

In discrete time, the expressions involving di¤erentials are approximated using the identity $x_t y_t - x_{t-1}y_{t-1} = \hat{x}\overline{x_t y_t} + \hat{y}\overline{x_t y_t}$, where discrete time $\hat{x}_t = (x_t - x_{t-1})=\dot{x}_t$ and $\dot{x}_t = (x_t + x_{t-1})=2$, and similarly for $\hat{y}_t$ and $\dot{y}_t$.

# 4 Application to the Canadian economy

To illustrate our methodology, we examine productivity growth in the Canadian economy during the period from 1962 to 1991 at the medium level of disaggregation, which comprises 50 industries and 94 commodities. The linear program was solved for each

[10] If the factor constraints are not binding, a fourth term accounts for slack changes. Notice that all components, including the Solow residual, account for the value of trade balance in the numerator. This minor departure from the standard expression in the literature (including Mohnen, ten Raa and Bourque, 1997) is a consequence of our unifying framework that encompasses terms-of-trade e¤ects.

year from 1962 to 1991 yielding the optimal activity levels and shadow prices for the TFP-expressions.

Table 1 contains the shadow prices of labor (in 1986 $/hour), of the three types of capital (building, equipment and infrastructure), and of the trade de…cit (the latter four are in 1986$/1986$, that is rates of return) from 1962 to 1991. Labor was worth at the margin $16.13 in 1986 prices in 1962. Its productivity followed an increasing trend until 1982 and then a bumpy road ending at $46.13 in 1991. The rate of return on buildings followed a downward trend, dropping to zero in 1982, sharply rebounded in 1984, and then dropped again to reach zero from 1988 on. In other words, there were excess buildings in 1982 and in 1988-1991. Equipment was not fully utilized until 1983 and again in 1988, 1990 and 1991. Comparing the evolutions of their shadow prices, labor seems to be a substitute to building and equipment. Infrastructure had an increasing rate of return until 1974, much greater than the other two types of capital, and then a declining productivity until the end of our period. On average over the 1962-1991 period, a dollar increase in the trade de…cit allowed a 64 cents increase in …nal demand.[11] Its shadow price was pretty stable until 1981 and more volatile and somewhat lower after 1981.

Table 2 shows the decomposition of TFP-growth into a shift of the frontier (frontier productivity growth FP) and a movement towards the frontier (e¢ciency change EC). The healthy TFP-growth in the period 1962-1974 re‡ects frontier productivity growth. The frontier slowed down, in fact contracted, in the period 1974-1981, but this was compensated by e¢ciency change, yielding a tiny TFP-growth rate. The period 1981-1991 showed no recovery, but an interesting reversal of the components. The frontier moved out, but this e¤ect was nulli…ed by a detoriation in e¢ciency change. The economy became healthy, but there were severe adjustment problems. The shift of the frontier displays the well-known pattern of the golden 1960s, the slowdown in the 1970s, and the structural recovery of the 1980s.[12]

Table 3 accounts for frontier productivity growth by factor input. The bulk of FP-growth is attributed to labor, next to nothing to the trade de…cit, and the remainder

[11] Final demand does not increase by the full dollar because of the need to produce locally nontradeable commodities for a given commodity composition of …nal demand.

[12] According to Bergeron, Fauvel and Paquet (1995), Canada hit a recession from January 1975 to March 1975, from May 1980 to June 1980, from August 1981 to November 1982, and from April 1990 to March 1991. We chose the breakpoints before the slump years 1975 and 1982 to compare productivity performances as much as possible over comparable phases of the business cycles.

to capital. In the …rst period FP and labor productivity both grow by 2.4%. The 0.2% capital productivity growth is distributed very unevenly over the three types of capital, with infrastructure picking up 1.0%, equipment none, and buildings plummeting by 0.8%. The slowdown in the second period is ascribed to both labor (dropping to 0.4% a year) and capital (turning -1.2% a year). As in the …rst period, infrastructure is decisive, now explaining all of the negative productivity growth in the second period. The successful FP-growth in the last period is again a labor story. Labor productivity grew at a dramatic 4.8% a year, o¤setting a reduction in capital productivity growth of 1.1% a year. Again, the latter is determined by the productivity of infrastructure. The price correction term re‡ecting a change in …nal demand composition played a minor role. Demand has always tended to shift towards commodities requiring scarce resources, decreasing, but not by much, the positive e¤ects of individual factor productivities on frontier productivity growth.

While Table 3 shows the composition of FP-growth by factor input, Table 4 decomposes it into the two sources of frontier shift, namely technical change and the terms-of-trade e¤ect. In the …rst period the bulk of FP-growth (2.4%) is caused by technical change (the Solow residual at shadow prices is 1.7%). The FP-slowdown in the second period is also ascribed to a downturn in technology. The recovery in the last period, however, is due not only to a Solow residual (at shadow prices) increase of one percent, but above all to an improvement in the terms-of-trade e¤ect from 0.5 to 3.8% annually. It might look strange to have some negative Solow residuals, albeit at shadow prices. How can technology regress? There are at least two serious explanations to it. First, technical progress does not show in the statistics right away. This is the argument raised by David (1990) to explain the productivity paradox. It takes time to absorb the new information technology and to use it to its maximal e¢ciency, just as it took time to adjust to electricity at the beginning of the century. Second, the negative productivity growth is due to infrastructure, where the bene…t might show up in the long run, and not in the short run because of adjustment costs.

It is interesting to contrast our measure of technical change (Table 4, line 1) with the traditional Solow residual, which we have added to Table 4. The main distinction of our productivity measures is the endogeneity of value shares. Prices are marginal productivities and quantities re‡ect frontier allocations. The Solow residual is a Domar weighted average of sectoral productivity growth rates, see Equation (18), but our Domar weights are di¤erent, say from Wol¤ (1985), by the use of competitive activity levels for

sectors and supporting prices for commodities and factor inputs. Table 4 reveals quite dramatic di¤erences. The observed-price based Solow residual is fairly unbiased in the period 1962-1974, but overstates the role of technical change in the periods 1974-1981 and 1981-1991. The terms-of-trade e¤ect was far more important in explaining total factor productivity growth, particularly in the 1980s.

The intended contribution of this paper is to demonstrate that, at least in principle, productivity can be measured without recourse to factor shares or prices. The main reason for this disclaimer is that our model is fairly macro-economic in nature, featuring only one type of labor and three types of capital, with perfect mobility across sectors. More detailed speci…cations would a¤ect the shadow prices and hence measured TFP. For example, if some type of capital is sector speci…c, then its constraint separates and each sector yields its own rate of return.

# 5 Conclusion

Standard measures of TFP-growth hinge on the use of value shares, hence of factor input prices. Since the latter are presumed to match factor productivities, the standard procedure amounts to accepting at face value what is supposed to be measured. In this paper we have demonstrated that factor productivities can be determined as the Lagrange multipliers to a program that maximizes the level of domestic …nal demand. The consequent measure of total factor productivity growth encompasses not only the Solow residual, but also the terms-of-trade and the e¢ciency change e¤ects.

We have applied our new measure of TFP-growth to the Canadian economy in the period from 1962 to 1991. Canadian TFP grew by 1.8% yearly in the 1960s, dropped in the 1970s to 0.1% and stayed put in the 1980s. The healthy TFP-growth in the 1960s re‡ects an outward shift of the frontier. The frontier then contracted in the 1970s, but this was o¤set by e¢ciency change. The 1980s shows a reversal of the two components. The frontier moved again, but e¢ciency change was negative, re‡ecting adjustment problems. The shift of the frontier tells the story of the golden 1960s, the slowdown of the 1970s, and the structural recovery of the 1980s. The bulk of this movement in frontier productivity can be ascribed to labor productivity growth. Of the capital stock the infrastructure component is the main driving force. The healthy factor productivity growth in the 1960s and the slowdown in the 1970s were both caused by technical change,

but the recovery in the 1980s was due almost wholly to an improvement in the terms of trade.

The Solow residual measures the shift of the production possibility frontier of an economy that is presumed to be on its frontier. When this assumption is not tenable, this paper shows how the frontier can be traced using input-output statistics. The Lagrange multipliers to the program that determines potential GDP measure the factor productivities. The expansion factor of the program is an inverse measure of the e¢ciency of the economy. By the main theorem of linear programming, factor productivity growth and e¢ciency change sum to TFP-growth.

# 6 References


1. Bergeron, L., Y. Fauvel et A. Paquet (1995), "L'indicateur synthétique avancé de l'économie canadienne selon la méthode de Stock et Watson", mimeo, Centre de recherche sur l'emploi et des ‡uctuations économiques, UQAM.

2. Carter, A.P. (1970), Structural Change in the American Economy, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

3. Coelli, T., D.S.P. Rao and G. Battese (1998), An Introduction to E¢ciency and Productivity Analysis, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Boston.

4. David, P. (1990), "The Dynamo and the Computer", American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings, 80(2), 355-61.

5. Diewert, W.E. and C. Morrison (1996), "Adjusting Output and Productivity Indexes for Changes in the Terms of Trade", Economic Journal, 96, 659-79.

6. de Jong, G. (1996), "Canada's Postwar Manufacturing Performance: A Comparison with the United States", Research Memorandum, Groningen Growth and Development Center, GD-32.

7. Färe, R., S. Grosskopf, C.A.K. Lovell and Z. Zhang (1994), "Productivity Growth, Technical Progress and E¢ciency Changes in Industrialised Countries", American Economic Review, 84, 66-83.

8. Färe, R. and S. Grosskopf (1996), "Productivity and Intermediate Products: A Frontier Approach", Economics Letters, 50, 65-70.

9. Farrell, M. (1957), "The Measurement of Productive E¢ciency", Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series A, General, 120(3), 253-82.

10. Hall, R. (1990), "Invariance Properties of Solow's Residual", in Growth/Productivity/-Employment, P. Diamond (ed.), 71-112, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

11. Hulten, C.R. (1979), "On the Importance of Productivity Change", American Economic Review, 65, 956-965.

12. Johnson, J. (1994), " Une base de données KLEMS décrivant la structure des entrées de l'industrie canadienne", Statistique Canada, Division des Entrées-Sorties, Cahier Technique #73F.

13. Jorgenson, D. and Z. Griliches (1967), "The Explanation of Productivity Change", Review of Economic Studies, 34(3), 308-350.

14. Mohnen P., Th. ten Raa and G. Bourque (1997), "Mesures de la croissance de la productivité dans un cadre d'équilibre général: L'économie du Québec entre 1978 et 1984', Canadian Journal of Economics, 30(2), 295-307.

15. Morrison, C. (1988), "Quasi-…xed inputs in U.S. and Japanese manufacturing: A Generalized Leontief Restricted Cost Function Approach", Review of Economics and Statistics, 70(2), 275-287.

16. Nishimizu, M. and J.M. Page Jr. (1982), "Total Factor Productivity Growth, Technological Progress and Technical E¢ciency Change: Dimensions of Productivity Change in Yugoslavia, 1965-1978", Economic Journal, 92, 920-936.

17. Perelman, S. (1995), "R&D, Technological Progress and E¢ciency Change in Industrial Activities," Review of Income and Wealth, 41(3), 349-366.

18. Solow R. (1957), "Technical Change and the Aggregate Production Function", Review of Economics and Statistics, 39(3), 312-320.

19. ten Raa, Th. (1995), Linear Analysis of Competitive Economies. LSE Handbooks in Economics, Prentice Hall-Harvester Wheatsheaf, Hemel Hempstead.

20. Weitzman, W. (1976), "On the Welfare Signi…cance of National Product in a Dynamic Economy," Quarterly Journal of Economics, 90, 156-162.

21. Wol¤, E. (1985), "Industrial Composition, Interindustry E¤ects, and the U.S. Productivity Slowdown", Review of Economics and Statistics, 67, 268-77.

Table 1: Factor productivities (shadow prices).

| Year | Labor | Buildings | Equipment | Infrastructure | Trade de…cit |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1962 | 16.13 | 0.32 | 0.00 | 0.20 | 0.71 |
| 1963 | 16.50 | 0.33 | 0.00 | 0.19 | 0.71 |
| 1964 | 17.46 | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.69 |
| 1965 | 17.86 | 0.28 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.69 |
| 1966 | 18.28 | 0.28 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.69 |
| 1967 | 19.31 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.68 |
| 1968 | 20.38 | 0.21 | 0.00 | 0.17 | 0.67 |
| 1969 | 20.91 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.67 |
| 1970 | 20.40 | 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.23 | 0.68 |
| 1971 | 21.78 | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.24 | 0.66 |
| 1972 | 22.44 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.28 | 0.66 |
| 1973 | 22.96 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.32 | 0.65 |
| 1974 | 23.24 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.47 | 0.61 |
| 1975 | 22.70 | 0.05 | 0.00 | 0.45 | 0.64 |
| 1976 | 23.61 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.37 | 0.64 |
| 1977 | 24.52 | 0.08 | 0.00 | 0.34 | 0.65 |
| 1978 | 24.83 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.31 | 0.65 |
| 1979 | 24.85 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.32 | 0.65 |
| 1980 | 24.60 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.28 | 0.66 |
| 1981 | 24.31 | 0.10 | 0.01 | 0.25 | 0.69 |
| 1982 | 29.66 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.18 | 0.57 |
| 1983 | 12.07 | 0.62 | 0.83 | 0.15 | 0.82 |
| 1984 | 12.22 | 0.49 | 1.03 | 0.11 | 0.81 |
| 1985 | 23.11 | 0.24 | 0.22 | 0.16 | 0.73 |
| 1986 | 20.09 | 0.18 | 0.83 | 0.05 | 0.72 |
| 1987 | 20.76 | 0.11 | 0.99 | 0.03 | 0.70 |
| 1988 | 44.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.31 |
| 1989 | 22.41 | 0.00 | 1.21 | 0.00 | 0.63 |
| 1990 | 44.33 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.32 |
| 1991 | 46.13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.29 |

Labor productivity is in 1986$ per hour. The shadow prices of capital (buildings, equipment and infrastructure) and the trade de…cit are rates of return.

Table 2: Frontier productivity growth (FP) and e¢ciency change (EC) (Equations (4) and (8), annualized percentages).

| | 1962-1974 | 1974-1981 | 1981-1991 |
|---|---|---|---|
| FP | 2.4 | -0.8 | 3.6 |
| EC | -0.6 | 0.9 | -3.7 |
| TFP | 1.8 | 0.1 | -0.1 |

Table 3: Frontier productivity growth (FP) by factor input (Equation (7), annualized percentages).

| | 1962-1974 | 1974-1981 | 1981-1991 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Buildings | -0.9 | 0.4 | -0.3 |
| Equipment | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| Infrastructure | 1.1 | -1.5 | -1.2 |
| Capital, total | 0.2 | -1.0 | -1.1 |
| Labor | 2.4 | 0.5 | 5.0 |
| De…cit | -0.0 | 0.0 | -0.1 |
| Price | -0.2 | -0.3 | -0.2 |
| FP | 2.4 | -0.8 | 3.6 |

Table 4: Frontier productivity growth (FP) by Solow residual and terms-of-trade e¤ect (Equations (12-14), annualized percentages).

| | 1962-1974 | 1974-1981 | 1981-1991 |
|---|---|---|---|
| SR | 1.7 | -1.3 | -0.3 |
| TT | 0.7 | 0.5 | 3.8 |
| FP | 2.4 | -0.8 | 3.6 |
| SR at observed prices and activity levels | 1.4 | 0.5 | 0.2 |

## APPENDIX: Data

The constant price input-output tables obtained from Statistics Canada are expressed in 1961 prices from 1962 to 1971, in 1971 prices from 1971 to 1981, in 1981 prices from 1981 to 1986, and in 1986 prices from 1986 to 1991. All tables have been converted to 1986 prices using the chain rule. For reasons of con…dentiality, the tables contain missing cells, which we have …lled using the following procedure. The vertical and horizontal sums in the make and use tables are compared with the reported line and column totals, which do contain the missing values. We select the rows and columns where the two …gures di¤er by more than 5% from the reported totals, or where the di¤erence exceeds $250 million. We then …ll holes or adjust cells on a case by case basis …lling in priority the intersections of the selected rows and columns, using the information on the input or output structure from other years, and making sure the new computed totals do not exceed the reported ones.

There are three capital types, namely buildings, equipment, and infrastructure.[13] The gross capital stock, hours worked and labor earnings are from the KLEMS database of Statistics Canada, described in Johnson (1994). In particular, corrections have been made to include in labor the earnings of the self-employed, and to separate business and non-business labor and capital. The total labor force …gures are taken from Cansim (D767870) and converted in hours using the number of weekly hours worked in manufacturing (where it is the highest). Out of the 50 industries, no labor nor capital stock data exist for sectors 39, 40, 48, 49, 50, and no capital stock data for industry 46. The capital stock for industry 46 has been constructed using the capital/labor ratio of industry 47 (both industries producing predominantly the same commodity).

The international commodity prices are approximated by the U.S. prices, given that 70% of Canada's trade is with the United States. We have used the U.S. producer prices from the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, O¢ce of Employment Projection. The 169

[13] Statistics Canada calls them "building constructions," "equipment" and "engineering constructions." Alternatively we could have modeled capital as being sector-speci…c, the so-called putty-clay model. We prefer the present hypothesis of sectoral mobility of capital within each group for three reasons. First, to let the economy expand, we would have needed capacity utilization rates which are badly measured and unavailable for a number of service sectors. Second, to relieve a numerical collinearity problem, we would have to relieve the capital constraint on the non-business sector. Third, the combination of 11 non-tradeables and sector-speci…c capacity expansion limits is too stringent. It would lead to a high shadow price on construction commodities and zero shadow prices almost anywhere else.

commodity classi…cation has been bridged to Statistics Canada's 94 commodity classi…cation. As the debt constraint in (1) is given in Canadian dollars, we convert U.S. prices to Canadian equivalents. We have used, whenever available, unit value ratios, (UVRs, which are industry speci…c) computed and kindly provided to us by Gjalt de Jong (1996). The UVRs are computed using Canadian quantities valued at U.S. prices. For the other commodities, we have used the purchasing power parities (PPP) computed by the OECD (which are based on …nal demand categories). The UVRs establish international price linkages for 1987, the PPPs for 1990 in terms of Canadian dollars per U.S. dollar. We hence need two more transformations. First, U.S. dollars are converted to Canadian dollars using the exchange rates taken from Cansim (series 0926/133400). Second, since the input-output data are in 1986 prices, we need the linkage for 1986, which is computed by using the respective countries' commodity de‡ators: the producer price index for the U.S. (see above) and the total commodity de‡ator from the make table (except for commodities 27, 93 and 94, for which we use the import de‡ator from the …nal demand table) for Canada. Finally, international commodity prices are divided by a Canadian …nal demand weighted average of international commodity prices to express them in real terms.

Are considered as non-tradeable, services incidental to mining, residential construction, non-residential construction, repair construction, retail margins, imputed rent from owner occupied dwellings, accommodation & food services, supplies for o¢ce, laboratories & cafetaria, and travel, advertising & promotion, for which no trade shows up in the input-output tables for most of the sample period.

The structure of some non-tradeability constraints implies the equality of the activity levels of "construction" and …nal demand, "owner-occupied dwellings" and …nal demand, and "printing and publishing" and "travel, advertising and promotion." We have forced the activity level of industry 39 (government royalties on natural resources, which essentially pertains to oil drigging in Alberta) to follow industry 5 (crude petroleum and natural gas) to ensure there are no such royalities without oil drigging. A more detailed documentation of the data and their construction is available from the authors upon request.