No.27
AGOSTO DE 2016

Documentos **CEDE**

ISSN 1657-7191 Edición electrónica.

Variable Factor Shares and the Index Number Problem: A Generalization

Brad Sturgill
Hernando Zuleta

Serie Documentos Cede, 2016-27
ISSN 1657-7191 Edición electrónica

Agosto de 2016

© 2016, Universidad de los Andes, Facultad de Economía,
CEDE. Calle 19A No. 1 – 37 Este, Bloque W.
Bogotá, D. C., Colombia Teléfonos: 3394949- 3394999,
extensiones 2400, 2049, 3233
infocede@uniandes.edu.co
<http://economia.uniandes.edu.co>

Impreso en Colombia – Printed in Colombia

La serie de Documentos de Trabajo CEDE se circula con propósitos de discusión y divulgación. Los artículos no han sido evaluados por pares ni sujetos a ningún tipo de evaluación formal por parte del equipo de trabajo del CEDE.

El contenido de la presente publicación se encuentra protegido por las normas internacionales y nacionales vigentes sobre propiedad intelectual, por tanto su utilización, reproducción, comunicación pública, transformación, distribución, alquiler, préstamo público e importación, total o parcial, en todo o en parte, en formato impreso, digital o en cualquier formato conocido o por conocer, se encuentran prohibidos, y sólo serán lícitos en la medida en que se cuente con la autorización previa y expresa por escrito del autor o titular. Las limitaciones y excepciones al Derecho de Autor, sólo serán aplicables en la medida en que se den dentro de los denominados Usos Honrados (Fair use), estén previa y expresamente establecidas, no causen un grave e injustificado perjuicio a los intereses legítimos del autor o titular, y no atenten contra la normal explotación de la obra.

Variable Factor Shares and the Index Number Problem: A Generalization

Brad Sturgill y Hernando Zuleta*

Abstract

Factor shares vary over time and across countries, so incorporating variable factor shares into growth and development accounting is both warranted and desirable. However, variable factor shares create an index number problem in analyses relying on our most commonly used production functions. We show that in the presence of competitive factor markets, the problem exists for all workhorse production functions exhibiting constant returns to scale. Therefore, any efforts to align empirical growth research with the reality of the factor share data cannot be carried out using standard techniques. New techniques need to be developed.

JEL Codes: O11, O30, O41, O47, E01, E25

Keyword: Factor Shares, Growth Accounting, Production Function, Index Numbers

* Brad Sturgill, The University of the South, e-mail: sturgillbs@gmail.com
Hernando Zuleta, Universidad de Los Andes, email: h.zuleta@uniandes.edu.co

Cambios en la participación factorial y el problema de escala: Una generalización

Brad Sturgill y Hernando Zuleta

Resumen

La participación de los factores en la función de producción varía con el tiempo y entre países, de modo que es necesario incorporar esta variación a los ejercicios de contabilidad de crecimiento. Sin embargo, la variabilidad de la participación factorial genera un problema de escala (o índice) cuando se realizan ejercicios de contabilidad de. Esto es, los cambios en las unidades de medida de los factores alteran los resultados de los ejercicios de contabilidad de crecimiento y, por lo tanto, la metodología estándar de contabilidad de crecimiento es inadecuada en un contexto de variaciones en la participación factorial.

En presencia de mercados de factores competitivos, el problema existe para todas las funciones de producción con rendimientos constantes a escala. Por lo tanto, cualquier esfuerzo para alinear la investigación empírica sobre el crecimiento con la realidad requiere del desarrollo de nuevas técnicas.

Códigos JEL: O11, O30, O41, O47, E01, E25

Palabras clave: Participación de los factores, contabilidad de crecimiento, función de producción, números de índice.

1. Introduction

There is substantial empirical support for the systematic variation of factor shares over time and across countries.¹ Yet the majority of growth and development accounting studies adhere to the constant factor share claim first made by Phelps Brown and Webber (1953) and reiterated by Kaldor (1961) as one of his widely accepted “stylized facts” of macroeconomics.² In light of the evidence, why do virtually all empirical growth studies continue to treat factor shares as constant parameters?

A major hurdle to incorporating variable factor shares is the index number problem. This problem stems from the basic properties of our most commonly used production functions. In this letter, we show that variable factor shares, when combined with the assumption of competitive factor markets, create an index number problem in our workhorse constant returns to scale production functions. We illustrate the problem for growth accounting and so focus on the time dimension, but our illustration generalizes to development accounting and cross section analyses.

The index number problem means that the incorporation of variable factor shares into growth accounting using standard assumptions, techniques and production functions will yield invalid results. New approaches must be created in order for empirical growth exercises and their resulting conclusions to reflect the reality of the factor share data.

2. The Index number problem: A simple illustration

Zuleta (2012) argues that changes in factor shares have different effects on output depending on the relative factor abundance of the economy. To illustrate this result, he considers a constant returns to scale Cobb-Douglas production function with two factors: capital (K) and

¹For evidence of the negative time trend in labor’s share, see Blanchard (1997), Young (2010), Sachs and Kotlikoff (2012), Elsby, Hobijn, and Sahin (2013), Karabarbounis and Neiman (2013), Rodriguez and Jayadev (2013), and Growiec, McAdam and Muck (2014, 2015), among others. Other authors calculate the income share of reproducible factors (human and physical capital) and non-reproducible factors (natural capital and raw labor) and find that the former is positively correlated with the income level while the latter is negatively correlated with the income level (see Krueger (1999), Acemoglu (2002), Caselli and Feyrer (2007), Zuleta (2008), Sturgill (2012) and Zuleta, Parada, García and Campo (2010)).

² See Solow (1957), Klenow and Rodriguez-Clare (1997), Hall and Jones (1999), Easterly and Levine (2002), Caselli (2005), and Vollrath (2009), among others.

labor (L). Output per worker ($y = Y/L$) can be expressed in terms of capital per worker ($k = K/L$) as

$$y_t = A_t k_t^{\alpha_t} \quad (1)$$

where A is productivity, α is the elasticity of output with respect to capital and t indexes the time period.

Because factor shares are central to this paper, further discussion of α is warranted. The elasticity of output with respect to capital is equivalent to capital's share only if factor markets are competitive. Therefore, implicit in the common reference to α as "capital's share" is the assumption that capital earns its marginal product. Virtually all growth accounting studies measure α as physical capital's share. This means that 1) factor markets are assumed to be competitive in these studies and/or 2) factor shares are interpreted as reasonable estimates of factor elasticities.

Equation (1) reveals that if the share of capital increases, then the effect on output per worker depends on the relative abundance of capital,

$$\frac{\partial y}{\partial \alpha} = A k^{\alpha} \ln k .$$

Specifically, if $k > 1$ the effect is positive, and if $k < 1$ the effect is negative.

The problem with this result is that the magnitude of k can be manipulated simply by altering the units used to measure the inputs. Moreover, the aforementioned partial derivative is not insensitive to the choice of measurement units. It should not matter if we measure physical capital in dollars or in thousands of dollars nor should it matter if we measure workers in number of bodies or thousands of bodies. Because it does matter, stating that " k is greater than 1 at time t " is a meaningless statement. In turn, stating that " $\frac{\partial y}{\partial \alpha}$ is greater than 1 at time t " is also meaningless. This is the classic index number problem. We show that it exists not just for the simple Cobb-Douglas function but for any constant elasticity of substitution (CES) or variable elasticity of substitution (VES) production function exhibiting constant returns to scale.

3. The Index Number Problem: Formal Proofs

Proposition 1: For any constant returns to scale CES or VES production function, the impact of a change in factor shares on output per worker depends on the magnitude of

factor specific productivities, which are scaling parameters that are unobserved and dependent on the choice of measurement units.

3.1 Proof 1

For any production function with constant returns to scale (CRS) and two factors of production $F(K_t, L_t)$, the assumption of competitive factor markets implies

$$F_K(.) = \alpha_t \frac{F(\phi_{K,t}K_t, \phi_{L,t}L_t)}{K_t} \text{ and } F_L(.) = (1 - \alpha_t) \frac{F(\phi_{K,t}K_t, \phi_{L,t}L_t)}{L_t}$$

where K_t is physical capital, L_t is labor, α_t is the elasticity of output with respect to capital, $1 - \alpha_t$ is the elasticity of output with respect to labor, and $\phi_{K,t}$ and $\phi_{L,t}$ are physical capital and labor specific productivities, respectively. The ϕ parameters depend on the measurement units associated with each factor and can be thought of as “scaling” parameters. So $\phi_{K,t}K_t$ is “effective” physical capital and $\phi_{L,t}L_t$ is “effective” labor.

Given the assumption of CRS, if α_t is constant then

$$\frac{\Delta Y_t}{Y_t} = \alpha_t \left(\frac{\Delta K_t}{K_t} + \frac{\Delta \phi_{K,t}}{\phi_{K,t}} \right) + (1 - \alpha_t) \left(\frac{\Delta L_t}{L_t} + \frac{\Delta \phi_{L,t}}{\phi_{L,t}} \right). \quad (2)$$

In per worker terms,

$$\frac{\Delta y_t}{y_t} = \alpha_t \left(\frac{\Delta k_t}{k_t} + \frac{\Delta \phi_{K,t}}{\phi_{K,t}} \right) + (1 - \alpha_t) \left(\frac{\Delta \phi_{L,t}}{\phi_{L,t}} \right). \quad (3)$$

This is equivalent to:

$$\ln y_{t+1} - \ln y_t = \alpha_t (\ln k_{t+1} - \ln k_t + \ln \phi_{K,t+1} - \ln \phi_{K,t}) + (1 - \alpha_t) (\ln \phi_{L,t+1} - \ln \phi_{L,t}). \quad (4)$$

Now, suppose there is a change in α_t which affects y_{t+1} but not y_t then

$$\frac{\partial (\ln y_{t+1} - \ln y_t)}{\partial \alpha_t} = \left(\ln \left(\frac{\phi_{K,t+1}}{\phi_{L,t+1}} \right) + \ln k_{t+1} \right). \quad (5)$$

Therefore, the effect of changes in factor shares depends on the scaling parameters, $\frac{\phi_{K,t+1}}{\phi_{L,t+1}}$.

The CES and the VES Production Functions.

Now apply equations (2) - (5) to the CES and VES forms. Consider the following function,

$$Y_t = \left(\gamma (\phi_{K,t}K_t)^\lambda + (1 - \gamma) (\phi_{L,t}L_t)^\lambda \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}. \quad (6)$$

The λ parameter determines the degree of substitutability between capital and labor. Specifically, $\frac{1}{1-\lambda}$ is the elasticity of substitution between capital and labor. The γ is often called the distribution parameter and helps define the factor elasticities. Assuming competitive factor markets,

$$F_K(.) = \alpha_t \frac{F(K_t, L_t)}{K_t} \text{ and } F_L(.) = (1 - \alpha_t) \frac{F(K_t, L_t)}{L_t}$$

where

$$\alpha_t = \frac{\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \left(\frac{\phi_{K,t} K_t}{\phi_{L,t} L_t} \right)^\lambda}{\left(\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \left(\frac{\phi_{K,t} K_t}{\phi_{L,t} L_t} \right)^\lambda + 1 \right)} \text{ and } 1 - \alpha_t = \frac{1}{\left(\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \left(\frac{\phi_{K,t} K_t}{\phi_{L,t} L_t} \right)^\lambda + 1 \right)}. \quad (7)$$

So, $\frac{\alpha_t}{1-\alpha_t} = \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \left(\frac{\phi_{K,t} K_t}{\phi_{L,t} L_t} \right)^\lambda$. Changes in α_t can occur because of changes in γ , $\frac{\phi_{K,t}}{\phi_{L,t}}$, $\frac{(K_t)}{(L_t)}$ or λ .

Now, consider the production function in per worker terms

$$y_t = \frac{Y_t}{L_t} = \phi_{L,t} (1 - \gamma) \left(\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \left(\frac{\phi_{K,t} K_t}{\phi_{L,t} L_t} \right)^\lambda + 1 \right)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}. \quad (8)$$

Therefore,

$$\log(y_t) = \log((1 - \gamma)\phi_{L,t}) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \log \left(\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \left(\frac{\phi_{K,t} K_t}{\phi_{L,t} L_t} \right)^\lambda + 1 \right) \quad (9)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \log(y_t)}{\partial \lambda} = \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \left[\frac{\lambda \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \left(\frac{\phi_{K,t} K_t}{\phi_{L,t} L_t} \right)^\lambda \log \left(\frac{\phi_{K,t} K_t}{\phi_{L,t} L_t} \right) - \log \left(\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \left(\frac{\phi_{K,t} K_t}{\phi_{L,t} L_t} \right)^\lambda + 1 \right)}{\left(\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \left(\frac{\phi_{K,t} K_t}{\phi_{L,t} L_t} \right)^\lambda + 1 \right)} \right]. \quad (10)$$

Therefore

$$\left(\frac{\phi_{K,t} K_t}{\phi_{L,t} L_t} \right)^\lambda \frac{\log \left(\frac{\phi_{K,t} K_t}{\phi_{L,t} L_t} \right)}{\log \left(\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \left(\frac{\phi_{K,t} K_t}{\phi_{L,t} L_t} \right)^\lambda + 1 \right)} > \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma} \Leftrightarrow \frac{\partial \log(y_t)}{\partial \lambda} > 0. \quad (11)$$

First, note that the left hand side of the first inequality is strictly increasing in $\frac{\phi_{K,t} K_t}{\phi_{L,t} L_t}$ while the right hand side is constant. Second, note that if $\frac{\phi_{K,t} K_t}{\phi_{L,t} L_t} > 1$ then the left hand side is strictly increasing in λ while the right hand side is decreasing. Finally, if $\frac{\phi_{K,t} K_t}{\phi_{L,t} L_t} \leq 1$ then $\frac{\partial \log(y_t)}{\partial \lambda} < 0$. Therefore, it is clear that in order to identify the effect of a change in the elasticity

of substitution on output per worker we need to properly identify $\frac{\phi_{K,t}K_t}{\phi_{L,t}L_t}$, which varies with the choice of measurement units.³

3.2 Proof 2

Suppose we do not think of factor specific productivities (ϕ_K and ϕ_L) as being an element of the initial production function. Can it still be shown that the response of output per worker to a change in factor shares depends on a “scaling” parameter and the choice of measurement units? Consider the following.

Let the aggregate production function be given by

$$Y_t = A_t f(K_t, L_t, \alpha_t, \beta_t, \lambda_t) \quad (12)$$

where Y is output, K is physical capital, L is labor, α is physical capital's share, β is labor's share, and λ determines the degree of substitutability between capital and labor. If we assume constant returns to scale and competitive factor markets (i.e. $\beta = 1 - \alpha$), then the per worker form of equation (12) can be written as

$$y_t = A_t f(k_t, \alpha_t, \lambda_t) \quad (13)$$

where y is output per worker and k is physical capital per worker.

Taking natural logs, we have

$\ln y_t = \ln A_t + \ln f(k_t, \alpha_t, \lambda_t)$. (14) Taking the derivative with respect to time yields:

$$\frac{1}{y_t} \frac{dy_t}{dt} = \underbrace{\frac{1}{A_t} \frac{dA_t}{dt}}_{\text{Residual Growth (RG)}} + \underbrace{\frac{1}{f(\cdot)} \left[f_k(\cdot) \frac{dk_t}{dt} + f_\alpha(\cdot) \frac{d\alpha_t}{dt} + f_\lambda(\cdot) \frac{d\lambda_t}{dt} \right]}_{\text{Observable Growth (OG)}} \quad (15)$$

³ Though we analyze a scenario where there are only two inputs, capital and labor, this conclusion generalizes to any number of inputs.

The *OG* term is what matters. Growth in y is not impacted by a change in measurement units, and the growth in A , because it is a residual, will be impacted if *OG* is impacted. Given that we are interested in the case of variable factor shares consider the following scenarios:

Scenario 1

Assumptions: $\lambda = 0$ and α varies over time
(i.e. Cobb-Douglas with variable factor shares)

Assuming that we have competitive factor markets and constant returns to scale, factors earn their marginal products and we can define $\alpha = \frac{f_k(\cdot)k}{f(\cdot)}$. Thus, under Scenario 1, we can write the *OG* term from equation (16) as

$$\alpha_t \frac{dk_t}{dt} \frac{1}{k_t} + \frac{1}{f(\cdot)} f_\alpha(\cdot) \frac{d\alpha_t}{d_t} \quad . \quad (16)$$

The impact of a change in measurement units on the *OG* term will depend on the specific functional form of $f(\cdot)$. Let us assume that the unit elasticity assumption is encompassed by a Cobb Douglas technology of the form $f(\cdot) = k_t^{\alpha_t}$. The expression in (16) can now be written as

$$\alpha_t \frac{dk_t}{dt} \frac{1}{k_t} + \frac{1}{k_t^{\alpha_t}} k_t^{\alpha_t} \ln k_t \frac{d\alpha_t}{d_t} = \alpha_t \frac{dk_t}{dt} \frac{1}{k_t} + \ln k_t \frac{d\alpha_t}{d_t} \quad . \quad (17)$$

Suppose now that there is a change in units used to measure k . Perhaps the original data are in dollars but are then multiplied by the constant $\theta = 1/1000$ to convert the data into thousands of dollars.⁴ Expression (17) now becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha_t \frac{d(\theta k_t)}{dt} \frac{1}{\theta k_t} + \ln(\theta k_t) \frac{d\alpha_t}{d_t} \\ &= \alpha_t \frac{\theta dk_t}{dt} \frac{1}{\theta k_t} + (\ln \theta + \ln k_t) \frac{d\alpha_t}{d_t} \quad . \\ &= \alpha_t \frac{dk_t}{dt} \frac{1}{k_t} + (\ln \theta + \ln k_t) \frac{d\alpha_t}{d_t} \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

⁴ Of course, θ can be any constant; the specific value does not matter.

Because $\alpha_t \frac{dk_t}{dt} \frac{1}{k_t} + (\ln \theta + \ln k_t) \frac{d\alpha_t}{dt} \neq \alpha_t \frac{dk_t}{dt} \frac{1}{k_t} + \ln k_t \frac{d\alpha_t}{dt}$, the *OG* term is affected by θ and

we have a units of measurement issue. Note that if alpha were constant, the value of θ has no impact on the *OG* term and the index number problem goes away.

Scenario 2

Assumptions: λ is constant but non-zero, and α varies over time
(i.e. CES with variable shares)

Assuming competitive factor markets and a per worker constant returns to scale CES

functional form of $f(\cdot) = [\alpha_t k_t^\lambda + (1 - \alpha_t)]^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}$ we can write the *OG* term from equation (15) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha_t \frac{dk_t}{dt} \frac{1}{k_t} + \frac{1}{[\alpha_t k_t^\lambda + (1 - \alpha_t)]^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}} \frac{1}{\lambda} [\alpha_t k_t^\lambda + (1 - \alpha_t)]^{\frac{1}{\lambda} - 1} [k_t^\lambda - 1] \frac{d\alpha_t}{dt} \\ &= \alpha_t \frac{dk_t}{dt} \frac{1}{k_t} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{[k_t^\lambda - 1]}{\alpha_t k_t^\lambda + (1 - \alpha_t)} \frac{d\alpha_t}{dt} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Suppose now that there is a change in units so that k is multiplied by θ . Expression (19) now becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha_t \frac{d(\theta k_t)}{dt} \frac{1}{\theta k_t} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{(\theta k_t)^\lambda - 1}{\alpha_t (\theta k_t)^\lambda + (1 - \alpha_t)} \frac{d\alpha_t}{dt} \\ &= \alpha_t \frac{dk_t}{dt} \frac{1}{k_t} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \frac{\theta^\lambda k_t^\lambda - 1}{\alpha_t \theta^\lambda k_t^\lambda + (1 - \alpha_t)} \frac{d\alpha_t}{dt} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Expression (19) is not equal to expression (20), so the *OG* term is dependent on the value of θ and we again have an index number problem.

Scenario 3

Assumptions: λ and α both vary over time
(i.e. VES with variable shares)

λ now has a time subscript and we can write the *OG* term from equation (15) as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\{ \alpha_t \frac{dk_t}{dt} \frac{1}{k_t} + \frac{1}{\lambda_t} \frac{[k_t^{\lambda_t} - 1]}{\alpha_t k_t^{\lambda_t} + (1 - \alpha_t)} \frac{d\alpha_t}{dt} + \right. \\
& \left. \frac{1}{[\alpha_t k_t^{\lambda_t} + (1 - \alpha_t)]^{\frac{1}{\lambda_t}}} [\alpha_t k_t^{\lambda_t} + (1 - \alpha_t)]^{\frac{1}{\lambda_t}} \ln[\alpha_t k_t^{\lambda_t} + (1 - \alpha_t)] (-\lambda_t)^{-2} \lambda_t \alpha_t \right\} k_t^{\lambda_t - 1} \frac{d\lambda_t}{d_t} \quad . \quad (21) \\
& = \left\{ \alpha_t \frac{dk_t}{dt} \frac{1}{k_t} + \frac{1}{\lambda_t} \frac{[k_t^{\lambda_t} - 1]}{\alpha_t k_t^{\lambda_t} + (1 - \alpha_t)} \frac{d\alpha_t}{dt} \right. \\
& \left. + \ln[\alpha_t k_t^{\lambda_t} + (1 - \alpha_t)] (-\lambda_t^{-1} \alpha_t k_t^{\lambda_t - 1}) \frac{d\lambda_t}{d_t} \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose now that there is a change in units so that k is multiplied by θ . Expression (21) now becomes

$$\alpha_t \frac{dk_t}{dt} \frac{1}{k_t} + \frac{1}{\lambda_t} \frac{\theta^{\lambda_t} k_t^{\lambda_t} - 1}{\alpha_t \theta^{\lambda_t} k_t^{\lambda_t} + (1 - \alpha_t)} \frac{d\alpha_t}{dt} + \ln[\alpha_t (\theta k_t)^{\lambda_t} + (1 - \alpha_t)] (-\lambda_t^{-1} \alpha_t (\theta k_t)^{\lambda_t - 1}) \frac{d\lambda_t}{d_t} \quad . \quad (22)$$

Expression (21) is not equal to expression (22), so the *OG* term is dependent on the value of θ and we have an index number problem.

4. Conclusion

We show that existing techniques used to carry out growth accounting are plagued by an index number problem when factor shares vary over time. Finding a solution to the index number problem would be very useful because the current literary frontier is not in line with the reality of the factor share data. Sturgill (2014) incorporates variable factor shares into a development accounting framework. By considering variance decompositions of translog multilateral indices, Sturgill is able to eliminate the sensitivity of the results to a change in measurement units. However, Sturgill only circumvents the index number problem. He ignores the means of the production function variables and does not consider the response of the output level to a change in factor shares, which is where the problem resides.

One potential solution may be to move away from constant returns to scale production functions. Another possibility would be to find a way to estimate and properly identify ϕ_K and ϕ_L , the scaling parameters.

5. REFERENCES

- Acemoglu, D., 2002. Directed Technical Change. *The Review of Economic Studies*. 69 4 781-809.
- Blanchard, O. J., 1997. The Medium Run. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, Economic Studies Program, The Brookings Institution, 28 2, 89-158.
- Caselli, F., Feyrer, J., 2007. The Marginal Product of Capital. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122 2, 535-568.
- Easterly, W. and Levine, R. 2001. What have we learned from a decade of empirical research on growth? It's Not Factor Accumulation: Stylized Facts and Growth Models *World Bank Economic Review*, Volume 15, Issue 2, 177-219.
- Elsby, M.W.L., Hobijn, B. and Sahin, A. 2013. The decline of the US labor share. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*.
- Growiec, J., McAdam, P and Muck, J. 2014. Understanding the Dynamics of the US Labor Share. *University of Surrey Working Paper*.
- Growiec, J., McAdam, P. and Muck, J. 2015. Endogenous Labor Share Cycles: Theory and Evidence. *European Central Bank Working Paper No 1765*.
- Hall, Robert E., and Charles I. Jones. 1999. "Why Do Some Countries Produce So Much More Output per Worker Than Others?" *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 114 (1): 83-116.
- Karabarbounis, L. and Neiman, B. 2013. The Global Decline of the Labor Share. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 129 1, 61-103.
- Klenow, P. and Rodriguez-Clare, A. 1997. The Neoclassical Revival in Growth Economics: Has It Gone Too Far?, 73-114 in *NBER Macroeconomics Annual 1997*, 12, 73-114.
- Krueger, A., 1999. Measuring Labor's Share. *American Economic Review*, 89 (2), 45-21.
- Rodriguez, F. and Jayadev, A. 2013. The Declining Labor Share of Income. *Journal of Globalization and Development*, 3 (2), 1-18.
- Sachs J.D. and Kotlikoff, L. J. 2012. Smart Machines and Long-Term Misery. *NBER Working Papers 18629*, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc.
- Vollrath, Dietrich, 2009. "How important are dual economy effects for aggregate productivity?" *Journal of Development Economics*, 88 (2), 325-334.
- Solow, R.M. 1957. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 39 (3) 312-320.
- Zuleta, H., 2008. An Empirical Note on Factor Shares, *Journal of International Trade & Economic Development*, 17 3, 379-390.

Zuleta, H. 2012. Variable Factor Shares, Measurement and Growth Accounting. *Economics Letters* 114, 91–93.

Zuleta, H., Parada, J., García, A., Campo, J., 2010. Participación factorial y contabilidad del crecimiento económico en Colombia 1984-2005. Una propuesta de modificación del método de contabilidad del crecimiento *Desarrollo y Sociedad*, 65, 71-121.