A note on the boundedness of the variables in two-sector models of optimal economic growth with learning by doing

Alfred Greiner

Angaben zur Veröffentlichung / Publication details:

Greiner, Alfred. 1993. “A note on the boundedness of the variables in two-sector models of optimal economic growth with learning by doing.” Augsburg: Volkswirtschaftliches Institut, Universität Augsburg.

INSTITUT FÜR VOLKSWIRTSCHAFTSLEHRE

der

UNIVERSITÄT AUGSBURG

A Note on the Boundedness of the Variables in Two-Sector Models of Optimal Economic Growth with Learning by Doing

von

Alfred Greiner

Beitrag Nr. 94 Juni 1993

lkswirtschaftliche Diskussionsreihe

Institut für
Volkswirtschaftslehre
Universität Augsburg

Memminger Straße 14
8900 Augsburg
Telefon (08 21) 5 98-(1)

A Note on the Boundedness of the Variables in Two-Sector Models of Optimal Economic Growth with Learning by Doing

von

Alfred Greiner

Beitrag Nr. 94

Juni 1993

A Note on the Boundedness of the Variables in Two-Sector Models of Optimal Economic Growth with Learning by Doing

Alfred Greiner
University of Augsburg, Memminger Str. 14,
86135 Augsburg, FRG

JEL classification: 110, growth theory

Abstract

It is shown that for two-sector models of optimal economic growth where learning by doing is present, the existence of an upper bound for the marginal products in the social production function is sufficient for the boundedness of per-capita variables.

The goal of this paper is to demonstrate that an upper bound for the marginal products of productive input factors in the production possibility frontier is sufficient to guarantee the boundedness of economic per-capita variables. This result holds for two-sector models of optimal economic growth with learning by doing [see Arrow (1962)].

We consider a closed economy with one consumption good, $c(t)$, and one investment good, $I(t)$. The stock of physical capital, $K(t)$, evolves according to $\dot{K}(t) = I(t) - \delta K(t)$, δ constant depreciation rate. The stock of human capital, $A(t)$, is formed as a by-product of past gross investment with exponentially declining weights put on investment flows further back in time and is given by $A(t) = \rho \int_{-\infty}^{t} e^{-\rho(t-s)} I(s) ds$, such that $\dot{A}(t) = \rho(I(t) - A(t))$. We make this assumption here because from the economic point of view it seems plausible to suppose that investment further back in time contributes less to the formation of workers' skill than more recent investment. Supposing efficient production, consumption is given by $c(t) = T(A(t), K(t), I(t))$, with $T(A(t), K(t), I(t))$ denoting the production possibility frontier (PPF). The amount of labour is assumed to be constant and is normalized to 1 such that the variables give per-capita values.

As to the PPF, we make the following assumptions.

(A1) $T(A, K, I)$ is increasing in A and K and decreasing in I. Furthermore, $T_{II}(.,.,.) < 0$, $T_{AA}(.,.,.) \leq 0$, $T_{KK}(.,.,.) \leq 0$, $T_{ij}(.,.,.) \geq\leq 0$, $i, j = A, K, I$, $i \neq j$.

(A2) There exists an upper bound for $T_A(.,.,.)$ and $T_K(.,.,.)$, i.e. $T_A(.,.,.) \leq M$, $T_K(.,.,.) \leq M$, $0 < M =$ constant.

The maximization problem for a social planner is then given by:

$$\max_{I} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-rt} T(A(t), K(t), I(t)) dt \tag{1}$$

subject to

$$\dot{K}(t) = I(t) - \delta K(t), \; K(0) = K_0 > 0, \tag{2}$$

$$\dot{A}(t) = \rho(I(t) - A(t)), \; A(0) = A_0 > 0, \tag{3}$$

$$I(t) \in \Omega(K(t), A(t)) = \{I | I \geq 0, \; T(A, K, I) \geq 0, \; I \in \mathbb{R}\}. \tag{4}$$

We now show that for our problem the domain of all possibly optimal values for $I(t)$ is bounded. To do this we adopt an idea from Sorger (1986), p. 73/74.

Theorem *Under assumptions (A1) and (A2) the domain of all possibly optimal values of the control I(t) for problem (1)-(4) is bounded.*

Proof: To prove that $I(t)$ is bounded from above we consider two controls $I_1(t)$, $I_2(t)$ and a constant $\bar{I}$ for which:

$$I_2(t) \begin{cases} = \bar{I} < I_1(t) \text{ for } t \in (\tau_1, \tau_3) \\ = I_1(t) \text{ for } t \notin (\tau_1, \tau_3), \end{cases}$$

with $\tau_3 = min(\tau_1 + 1, \tau_2)$ and $\int_0^{\tau_3} I_1(t)dt < \infty$.

Let (A_i, K_i) denote the trajectory belonging to I_i according to (2) and (3). $A(t)$ and $K(t)$ are then given by

$$A(t) = A(0)e^{-\rho t} + \rho \int_0^t I(s)e^{-\rho(t-s)}ds,$$

$$K(t) = K(0)e^{-\delta t} + \int_0^t I(s)e^{-\delta(t-s)}ds,$$

such that the following holds for all $t \in [0, \infty)$,

$$0 \leq A_1(t) - A_2(t) \leq \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_3} \rho(I_1(\tau) - I_2(\tau))d\tau, \tag{5}$$

$$0 \leq K_1(t) - K_2(t) \leq \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_3} (I_1(\tau) - I_2(\tau))d\tau. \tag{6}$$

We may write:

$T(A_2, K_2, I_2) - T(A_1, K_1, I_1) = T_1(A_2 + \kappa(A_1 - A_2), K_2 + \kappa(K_1 - K_2), I_2 + \kappa(I_1 - I_2))(A_2 - A_1) + T_2(A_2 + \kappa(A_1 - A_2), K_2 + \kappa(K_1 - K_2), I_2 + \kappa(I_1 - I_2))(K_2 - K_1) + T_3(A_2 + \kappa(A_1 - A_2), K_2 + \kappa(K_1 - K_2), I_2 + \kappa(I_1 - I_2))(I_2 - I_1)$, with $\kappa(t)$ function taking values in $(0, 1)$ and thus $\int_0^\infty e^{-rt}[T(A_2, K_2, I_2) -$

$T(A_1, K_1, I_1)]dt = \int_{\tau_1}^{\infty} e^{-rt}[T_1(.,.,.)(A_2-A_1)+T_2(.,.,.)(K_2-K_1)]dt+\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_3} e^{-rt}\cdot$ $[T_3(.,.,.)(I_2 - I_1)]dt.$

As $I_2 \leq I_1$, $\bar{I} < I_1$ and $T_I(.,.,.) < 0$, $T_{II}(.,.,.) < 0$, we know that $\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_3} e^{-rt}[T_3(.,.,.)(I_2-I_1)]dt > \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_3} e^{-rt}[T_3(.,.,\bar{I})(I_2-I_1)]dt \geq \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_3} e^{-rt}[T_3(A_i, K_j, \bar{I}) \cdot (I_2 - I_1)]dt > T_3(C_1, C_1, \bar{I}) \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_3} e^{-rt}(I_2 - I_1)dt.$ (7)

Note that $i = 1$ if $T_{IA}(.,.,.) \geq 0$, $i = 2$ if $T_{IA}(.,.,.) \leq 0$ and $j = 1$ if $T_{IK}(.,.,.) \geq 0$, $j = 2$ if $T_{IK}(.,.,.) \leq 0$. Since $A(t)$ and $K(t)$ are bounded for $t \in [0, \tau_3]$ we can find a non-negative constant C_1 such that the last inequality in (7) holds.

Knowing that there exists a constant M with $T_A(.,.,.) \leq M$, $T_K(.,.,.) \leq M$ we can write $|\int_{\tau_1}^{\infty} e^{-rt}[T_1(.,.,.)(A_2 - A_1) + T_2(.,.,.)(K_2 - K_1)]dt| \leq \int_{\tau_1}^{\infty} e^{-rt}M[(A_1 - A_2) + (K_1 - K_2)]dt \leq \int_{\tau_1}^{\infty} \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_3} e^{-rt}M\rho(I_1(\tau) - I_2(\tau))d\tau dt + \int_{\tau_1}^{\infty} \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_3} e^{-rt}M(I_1(\tau) - I_2(\tau))d\tau dt = \int_{\tau_1}^{\infty} \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_3} e^{-rt}M_1(I_1(\tau) - I_2(\tau))d\tau dt = M_1 \cdot (e^{-r\tau_1}/r) \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_3}(I_1 - I_2)dt \leq (M_1 e^r/r) \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_3} e^{-rt}(I_1 - I_2)dt.$ (8)

Here we used $|\tau_3 - \tau_1| \leq 1$ and defined $(1 + \rho)M \equiv M_1$.

Taking (7) and (8), we see that $\int_0^{\infty} e^{-rt}[T(A_2, K_2, I_2)-T(A_1, K_1, I_1)]dt > (-T_3(C_1, C_1, \bar{I}) - M_1 e^r/r) \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_3} e^{-rt}(I_1 - I_2)dt.$

Putting $\bar{I} = -T_3^{-1}(.,., M_1 e^r/r)$, it is immediately seen that $\int_0^{\infty} e^{-rt}(T(A_2, K_2, I_2)-T(A_1, K_1, I_1))dt > 0$ and it is shown that the domain of all possibly optimal controls is bounded. □

Remarks:

1. The assumption of an upper bound for the marginal products of human capital and physical capital was crucial for condition (8). This demonstrates that in this sort of models the variables remain bounded as long as there is an upper bound for the marginal products in the production possibility frontier $T(A, K, I)$.

The boundedness of $A(t)$ and $K(t)$ follows immediately from the existence of an upper bound for investment, i.e. from $I(t) < \bar{I}$.

The boundedness of investment is also assured if no weight is put on investment contributing to the formation of human capital, i.e. if $A(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{t} I(s)ds$. But then, for $t \to \infty$, $A(t) = A(0) + \int_0^t I(s)ds$ may become unbounded and thus $c(t) = T(A(t), K(t), I(t))$, too. This demonstrates, on the other hand, that increasing returns are not necessary to generate persistent growth of per-capita consumption if the input factors (here $A(t)$) increase without bound. A fact used by Lucas (1988) in his paper.

2. It can also be shown that the domain of all possibly optimal controls is bounded from below. The proof that a lower bound for $I(t)$ exists proceeds as follows.

Let us denote the lower bound with $\underline{I}$ and assume,

$$I_2(t) \begin{cases} = \underline{I} < I_1(t) < 2\underline{I} \text{ for } t \in (\tau_1, \tau_3) \\ = I_1(t) \text{ for } t \notin (\tau_1, \tau_3). \end{cases}$$

Now we have to show $\int_0^\infty e^{-rt}[T(A_2, K_2, I_2) - T(A_1, K_1, I_1)]dt < 0$.

As the lower bound for the partial derivatives of A and K is 0, it follows that $\int_{\tau_1}^\infty e^{-rt}[T_1(.,.,.)(A_2 - A_1) + T_2(.,.,.)(K_2 - K_1)]dt \leq 0$. (8′)

Moreover, in analogy to (7) it can be shown that $\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_3} e^{-rt}[T_3(.,.,.)(I_2 - I_1)]dt < -T_3(C_1, C_1, 2\underline{I}) \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_3} e^{-rt}(I_1 - I_2)dt$. (7′)

Here we used the fact $I(t) < 2\underline{I}$.

Combining (7′) and (8′) the existence of a lower bound is immediately established if the opportunity costs of investment tend to zero for a finite value of investment. For demonstrating that $I(t)$ is bounded from below the assumption of an upper bound for the partial derivatives of A and K is of course not needed.

The restriction $I(t) \geq 0$, i.e. the assumption of the irreversibility of investment (condition (4)), often encountered in economic literature, may be neglected by assuming that the set $I(t) \in \Omega(K(t), A(t)) = \{I | I > 0,\ T(A, K, I) > 0,\ I \in [0, \bar{I}]\}$ is non-empty and by imposing the conditions $\lim_{I \to 0} T_I(.,.,.) = 0$ and $\lim_{I \to \bar{I}} T_I(.,.,.) = -\infty$.

If $\lim_{I \to \check{I}} T_I(.,.,.) = 0$, with $\check{I} < 0$, negative gross investment cannot be excluded.

References

Arrow, K.J., 1962, The Economic Implications of Learning by Doing, Review of Economic Studies 29, 155-174.

Lucas, R.E., 1988, On the Mechanics of Economic Development, Journal of Monetary Economics 22, 3-42.

Sorger, G., (1986), Referenzpreisbildung und optimale Marketingstrategien: Eine kontrolltheoretische Untersuchung, PhD Thesis, TU Wien (relevant pages available on request).

Beiträge in der Volkswirtschaftlichen Diskussionsreihe seit 1991

Im Jahr 1991 erschienen:

Beitrag Nr. 50:	Manfred Stadler	Determinanten der Innovationsaktivitäten in oligopolistischen Märkten
Beitrag Nr. 51:	Uwe Cantner Horst Hanusch	On the Renaissance of Schumpeterian Economics
Beitrag Nr. 52:	Fritz Rahmeyer	Evolutorische Ökonomik, technischer Wandel und sektorales Produktivitätswachstum
Beitrag Nr. 53:	Uwe Cantner Horst Hanusch	The Transition of Planning Economies to Market Economies: Some Schumpeterian Ideas to Unveil a Great Puzzle
Beitrag Nr. 54:	Reinhard Blum	Theorie und Praxis des Übergangs zur marktwirtschaftlichen Ordnung in den ehemals sozialistischen Ländern
Beitrag Nr. 55:	Georg Licht	Individuelle Einkommensdynamik und Humankapitaleffekte nach Erwerbsunterbrechungen
Beitrag Nr. 56:	Thomas Kuhn	Zur theoretischen Fundierung des kommunalen Finanzbedarfs in Zuweisungssystemen
Beitrag Nr. 57:	Thomas Kuhn	Der kommunale Finanzausgleich - Vorbild für die neuen Bundesländer?
Beitrag Nr. 58:	Günter Lang	Faktorsubstitution in der Papierindustrie bei Einführung von Maschinen- und Energiesteuern
Beitrag Nr. 59:	Peter Welzel	Strategische Interaktion nationaler Handelspolitiken. Freies Spiel der Kräfte oder internationale Organisation?
Beitrag Nr. 60:	Alfred Greiner	A Dynamic Model of the Firm with Cyclical Innovations and Production: Towards a Schumpeterian Theory of the Firm
Beitrag Nr. 61:	Uwe Cantner Thomas Kuhn	Technischer Fortschritt in Bürokratien
Beitrag Nr. 62:	Klaus Deimer	Wohlfahrtsverbände und Selbsthilfe - Plädoyer für eine Kooperation bei der Leistungserstellung
Beitrag Nr. 63:	Günter Lang Peter Welzel	Budgetdefizite, Wahlzyklen und Geldpolitik: Empirische Ergebnisse für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland, 1962-1989
Beitrag Nr. 64:	Uwe Cantner Horst Hanusch	New Developments in the Economics of Technology and Innovation
Beitrag Nr. 65:	Georg Licht Viktor Steiner	Male-Female Wage Differentials, Labor Force Attachment, and Human-Capital Accumulation in Germany
Beitrag Nr. 66:	Heinz Lampert	The Development and the Present Situation of Social Policy in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) within the Social-Market-Economy
Beitrag Nr. 67:	Manfred Stadler	Marktkonzentration, Unsicherheit und Kapitalakkumulation

Beitrag Nr. 68:	Andrew J. Buck Manfred Stadler	R&D Activity in a Dynamic Factor Demand Model: A Panel Data Analysis of Small and Medium Size German Firms
Beitrag Nr. 69:	Karl Morasch	Wahl von Kooperationsformen bei Moral Hazard

Im Jahr 1992 erschienen:

Beitrag Nr. 70:	Horst Hanusch Uwe Cantner	Thesen zur Systemtransformation als Schumpeterianischem Prozeß
Beitrag Nr. 71:	Peter Welzel	Commitment by Delegation. Or: What's "Strategic" about Strategic Alliances?
Beitrag Nr. 72:	Friedrich Kugler Horst Hanusch	Theorie spekulativer Blasen: Rationaler Erwartungswertansatz versus Ansatz der Quartischen-Modalwert-Erwartungen
Beitrag Nr. 73:	Uwe Cantner	Product and Process Innovations in a Three-Country-Model of International Trade Theory - A Ricardian Analysis
Beitrag Nr. 74:	Alfred Greiner Horst Hanusch	A Dynamic Model of the Firm Including Keynesian and Schumpeterian Elements
Beitrag Nr. 75:	Manfred Stadler	Unvollkommener Wettbewerb, Innovationen und endogenes Wachstum
Beitrag Nr. 76:	Günter Lang	Faktorproduktivität in der Landwirtschaft und EG-Agrarreform
Beitrag Nr. 77:	Friedrich Kugler Horst Hanusch	Psychologie des Akienmarktes in dynamischer Betrachtung: Entstehung und Zusammenbruch spekulativer Blasen
Beitrag Nr. 78:	Manfred Stadler	The Role of Information Structure in Dynamic Games of Knowledge Accumulation
Beitrag Nr. 79:	Gebhard Flaig Manfred Stadler	Success Breeds Success. The Dynamics of the Innovation Process
Beitrag Nr. 80:	Horst Hanusch Uwe Cantner	New Developments in the Theory of Innovation and Technological Change - Consequences for Technology Policies
Beitrag Nr. 81:	Thomas Kuhn	Regressive Effekte im Finanzausgleich
Beitrag Nr. 82:	Peter Welzel	Oligopolistic Tragedies. National Governments and the Exploitation of International Common Property

Bisher im Jahr 1993 erschienen:

Beitrag Nr. 83:	Manfred Stadler	Innovation, Growth, and Unemployment. A Dynamic Model of Creative Destruction
Beitrag Nr. 84:	Alfred Greiner Horst Hanusch	Cyclic Product Innovation or: A Simple Model of the Product Life Cycle
Beitrag Nr. 85:	Peter Welzel	Zur zeitlichen Kausalität von öffentlichen Einnahmen und Ausgaben. Empirische Ergebnisse für Bund, Länder und Gemeinden in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland
Beitrag Nr. 86:	Gebhard Flaig Manfred Stadler	Dynamische Spillovers und Heterogenität im Innovationsprozeß. Eine mikroökonometrische Analyse