

## A non linear model of the new economic geography for Portugal. Another perspective

Martinho, Vítor João Pereira Domingues

Escola Superior Agrária, Instituto Politécnico de Viseu

2011

Online at https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/33511/ MPRA Paper No. 33511, posted 20 Sep 2011 10:56 UTC Alert! This author has published many duplicate versions of very similar papers with slightly different titles, but without an appropriate notice. This may apply to this contribution, too.

### A NON LINEAR MODEL OF THE NEW ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY FOR PORTUGAL. ANOTHER PERSPECTIVE

### Vitor João Pereira Domingues Martinho

Unidade de I&D do Instituto Politécnico de Viseu Av. Cor. José Maria Vale de Andrade Campus Politécnico 3504 - 510 Viseu (PORTUGAL) e-mail: vdmartinho@esav.ipv.pt

### ABSTRACT

With this work we try to present a non linear model for Portugal based on the new economic geography. We built the model taking into account an analyse about the agglomeration process in Portugal, using the New Economic Geography models, in a non linear way. In a non linear way, of referring, as summary conclusion, that with this work the existence of increasing returns to scale and low transport cost, in the Portuguese regions, was proven and, because this, the existence of agglomeration in Portugal.

Keywords: new economic geography; non linear models; Portuguese regions.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

To built the model, we mainly aimed to analyze the process of agglomeration across regions (NUTS II) of Portugal, using non linear models of New Economic Geography, in particular, developments considered by (1)Krugman (1991), (2)Thomas (1997), (3)Hanson (1998) and (4)Fujita et al. (2000). We will also try to compare the results obtained by the empirical models developed by each of these authors.

Although the agglomeration process have appeared more associated with economic geography, it is however noted that it is based, as the polarization, the earlier ideas of (5)Myrdal (1957) and (6)Hirschman (1958), pioneers of the processes of regional growth with characteristics cumulative. The work developed at the level of economic geography, traditional and recent attempt to explain the location of economic activities based on spatial factors. The liberal economic policies, international economic integration and technological progress have created, however, new challenges that promote agglomeration (7)(Jovanovic, 2000). So, have been developed new tools for economic geography, such as increasing returns, productive linkages, the multiple equilibria (with the centripetal forces in favor of agglomeration and centrifugal against agglomeration) and imperfect competition. These contributions have allowed some innovations in modeling the processes of agglomeration, which has become treatable by economists, a large number of issues. In particular the inclusion of increasing returns in the analytical models, which led to the call of increasing returns revolution in economics (Fujita et al., 2000). (8-10)Krugman (1994, 1995 and 1998) has been the central figure in these developments. (11)Fujita (1988),(12) Fujita et al. (1996) and (13)Venables (1996), in turn, have been leaders in the development and exploration of the implications of economic models of location, based on increasing returns. These developments have helped to explain the clustering and "clustering" of companies and industries.

Hanson, in 1998, taking into account the model of Krugman (1991) and the extent of Thomas (1997) this model, had a good theoretical and empirical contribution to empirically examine, with reduced forms, the relationship between increasing returns to scale, costs transportation and geographical concentration of economic activity.

### 2. THE MODEL

The model of Krugman (1991) describes himself, then, as follows:

$$\begin{split} Y_{i} &= (1 - \mu)\phi_{i} + \mu\lambda_{i}w_{i}, \text{ income equation (1)} \\ G_{i} &= \left[\sum_{j}\lambda_{j}(w_{j}e^{\pi d_{ij}})^{1 - \sigma}\right]^{\frac{1}{1 - \sigma}}, \forall i, \text{ index price equation (2)} \\ w_{i} &= \left[\sum_{j}Y_{j}(G_{j}e^{-\pi d_{ij}})^{\sigma - 1}\right]^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}, \forall i, \text{ nominal wage equation (3)} \end{split}$$

Alert! This author has published many duplicate versions of very similar papers with slightly different titles, but without an appropriate notice. This may apply to this contribution, too.

$$\frac{w_i}{w_j} = \left(\frac{G_i}{G_j}\right)^{\mu}$$
, real wage equation (3)

In these equations, Yi is the income in region i, wi the wage in region i,  $\phi_i$  is the percentage of

agricultural workers in region i, Gi the price index for manufactured goods in the region i and dij is the distance between each pair of locations. In equilibrium the region i share  $\lambda_i$  employed in sector of manufactured goods

which is equal to the fraction of companies located in manufactured goods in region i, ni/n. Alternatively Thomas (1997) presents the following extension of the model of Krugman (1991):

$$\begin{split} Y_{i} &= \lambda_{i}Lw_{i}, \ \forall i \text{ , income equation (5)} \\ P_{i}H_{i} &= (1-\mu)Y_{i}, \ \forall i \text{ , housing price equation (6)} \\ G_{i} &= \left[\sum_{j}\lambda_{j}(w_{j}e^{\pi d_{ij}})^{1-\sigma}\right]^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}}, \forall i \text{ , price index equation (7)} \\ w_{i} &= \left[\sum_{j}Y_{j}(G_{j}e^{-\pi d_{ij}})^{\sigma-1}\right]^{\frac{1}{\sigma}}, \forall i \text{ nominal wage equation (8)} \\ &\frac{w_{i}}{P_{i}^{1-\mu}G_{i}^{\mu}} = \frac{w_{j}}{P_{j}^{1-\mu}G_{j}^{\mu}}, \ \forall i \neq j \text{ , real wage equation (9)} \end{split}$$

Yi is the income in region i, wi the wage in region i, L the total supply of workers for the manufactured goods sector,  $\lambda_i$  the percentage of employees in the sector of manufactured products. Pi the price of housing in region i, the Gi price index for manufactured goods in region i. Hi the supply of housing in the region i and dii is

region i, the Gi price index for manufactured goods in region i, Hi the supply of housing in the region i and dij is the distance between each pair of locations.

Recently Fujita et al. (2000) also presented an alternative model:

$$\begin{split} Y_i &= \mu \lambda_i w_i + (1 - \mu) \phi_i \text{, income equation (10)} \\ G_i &= \left[ \sum_j \lambda_j (w_j T_{ji})^{1 - \sigma} \right]^{1/(1 - \sigma)} \text{, price equation (11)} \\ w_i &= \left[ \sum_j Y_j T_{ij}^{1 - \sigma} G_j^{\sigma - 1} \right]^{1/\sigma} \text{, nominal wage equation (12)} \\ \omega_i &= w_i G_i^{-\mu} \text{, real wage equation (13)} \end{split}$$

Yi is the income in region i, wi the wage in region i,  $\phi_i$  is the percentage of agricultural workers in the region i,  $\lambda_i$  the percentage of employees in the sector of manufactured products, Gi price index for manufactured goods in region i, and Tij transport costs between regions i and j.

The parameters to be estimated, these models are  $\sigma$  the elasticity of substitution between manufactured goods,  $\mu$  the share of expenditure on manufactured goods and  $\tau$  the transport costs to send a unit of manufactured goods in a unit distance.

Note that, as can be seen, the three models are very similar, the main difference is that Thomas (1997) have considered building housing sector (power anti-agglomeration) and have created more than one equation and Fujita et al. (2000) have considered transport costs as variables and not considered as parameters in their models Krugman (1991) and Thomas (1997).

It should be noted also that the equations of the income of the previous models, it is assumed that agricultural workers earn the same wage everywhere, given that agricultural goods are freely transported. Were chosen, on the other hand, units such that there are  $\mu$  workers in manufacturing and  $1-\mu$  agricultural workers.

# Alert! This author has published many duplicate versions of very similar papers with slightly different titles, but without an appropriate notice. This may apply to this contribution, too.

It could be argued that as industrial workers who are potential users, then locations with large concentrations also tend to have high demand for manufactured goods. This concentration of consumers and producers to some extent explains the cumulative process that may lead to agglomeration phenomena.

Following procedures of Hanson (1998), substituting equations (1) and (4) in (2) yields the reduced equation (14), substituting equations (5), (6) and (9) in (8) obtain the reduced equation (15) and substituting equations (10) and (13) in (11) yields the reduced equation 16, namely:

$$\log(w_{i}) = C + \sigma^{-1} \log\left(\sum_{j} Y_{j} w_{j}^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\mu}} e^{-\tau(\sigma-1)d_{ij}}\right) + v_{i}, (14)$$

$$\log(w_{i}) = D + \sigma^{-1} \log\left(\sum_{j} Y_{j}^{\frac{\sigma(\mu-1)+1}{\mu}} H_{j}^{\frac{(1-\mu)(\sigma-1)}{\mu}} w_{j}^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\mu}} e^{-\tau(\sigma-1)d_{ij}}\right) + \eta_{i}, (15)$$

$$\log(w_{i}) = F + \sigma^{-1} \log\left(\sum_{j} Y_{j} w_{j}^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\mu}} T_{ij}^{-(\sigma-1)}\right) + \psi_{i}, (16)$$

Thus Hanson (1998) solved the problem of lack of price indices for manufactured products and prices for housing at more disaggregated geographic levels. In the last two equations C, D and F are constants and parameters, and  $\eta_i$ ,  $v_i$  and  $\psi_i$  are error terms.

Furthermore, if the sources of correlation are unobservable factors that are constant over time, then these factors can be controlled using a specification with differentiation in time, which makes the variables expressed in growth rates. Given the dearth of statistical data for the Portuguese regions and the small size of the Portuguese territory, this third alternative to solve the problems of endogeneity seems to be the most viable and as such will be adopted in this work.

Using the differences in the timing of the regression equations, the equation (14) becomes:

$$\Delta \log(w_{it}) = \sigma^{-1} \left[ \log(\sum_{j} Y_{jt} w_{jt}^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\mu}} e^{-\tau(\sigma-1)d_{ij}}) - \log(\sum_{j} Y_{jt-1} w_{jt-1}^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\mu}} e^{-\tau(\sigma-1)d_{ij}}) \right] + \Delta v_{it}, (17)$$

Equation (15) is also

:

:

$$\Delta \log(w_{it}) = \sigma^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} \log(\sum_{j} Y_{jt}^{\frac{\sigma(\mu-1)+1}{\mu}} H_{jt}^{\frac{(1-\mu)(\sigma-1)}{\mu}} w_{jt}^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\mu}} e^{-\tau(\sigma-1)d_{ij}}) - \\ \log(\sum_{j} Y_{jt-1}^{\frac{\sigma(\mu-1)+1}{\mu}} H_{jt-1}^{\frac{(1-\mu)(\sigma-1)}{\mu}} w_{jt-1}^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\mu}} e^{-\tau(\sigma-1)d_{ij}}) \end{bmatrix} + \Delta \eta_{it}, (18)$$

Similarly, equation (16) is as follows

$$\Delta \log(w_{it}) = \sigma^{-1} \left[ \log(\sum_{j} Y_{jt} w_{jt}^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\mu}} T_{ijt}^{-(\sigma-1)}) - \log(\sum_{j} Y_{jt-1} w_{jt-1}^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\mu}} T_{ijt-1}^{-(\sigma-1)}) \right] + \Delta \psi_{it}$$
(19)

On balance, taking into account the developments of the New Economic Geography, a value  $\sigma/(\sigma-1)$  greater than one indicates that the production is subject to increasing returns to scale. This is because, for the New Economic Geography economies of scale arise through the number of varieties of

manufactured goods will be greater the lower the elasticity of substitution  $\sigma$ . Thus, the lower the elasticity of substitution is further away from one the value of  $\sigma/(\sigma-1)$  and the greater the increasing returns to scale.

(14)Krugman (1992) shows that if  $\sigma(1-\mu) > 1$ , then increasing returns to scale are sufficiently weak or the fraction of the manufactured goods sector is sufficiently low and the range of possible equilibria depends on transport costs. If  $\sigma(1-\mu) < 1$ , then increasing returns are sufficiently strong or the fraction is sufficiently high, such as economic activity is concentrated geographically to any value  $\tau$ .

### 3. THE NON LINEAR MODEL

Analysis of the results, obtained in the estimations, it appears that these are slightly different for the reduced equations of the three models considered, with the estimates made with the equation of the Thomas model present statistically better results. Possibly because it is an equation to work harder and thus beyond the centripetal forces of agglomeration, consider also the centrifugal forces of anti-agglomeration by immobile factors. Anyway, the results obtained with the estimates of the three equations confirm some importance, but small, of the transport costs, given the low values of the parameter  $_{\mathcal{T}}$ . Looking at the increasing returns to scale, calculating, as noted, the value  $\sigma/(\sigma-1)$ , it appears that this is always greater than one, reflecting the fact that there were increasing returns in the Portuguese regions in this period. It should be noted also that the parameter values  $_{\mathcal{U}}$ 

are unreasonably high in all three estimations, however, as stated there is a tendency for these values that fall around the unit in most empirical work.

### 4. THE DATA USED

Considering the variables of the model presented previously, and the availability of statistical information, we used the following data at regional level: temporal data from the period 1995 to 1999, for the NUTs III and for total manufacturing, from the INE (National Accounts 2003).

### 5. CONCLUSIONS

Note that the results obtained with the estimates of Thomas model equations are statistically more satisfactory, possibly because they consider in these equations in addition to the centrifugal forces present in the increasing returns, also centrifugal forces, in this work, by the number of employees in the sector agricultural. It should be noted, finally, that transport costs have had some importance in the evolution of the space economy in Portugal, although has been decreasing in recent years, which is understandable given the investments that have been made in terms of infrastructure, especially after our entrance into the European Economic Community in 1986, with the support that has been under structural policies.

### 6. REFERENCES

1. P. Krugman. Increasing Returns and Economic Geography. Journal of Political Economy, 99, 483-499 (1991).

2. A. Thomas. Increasing Returns, Congestion Costs and the Geographic Concentration of Firms. Mimeo, International Monetary Fund, 1997.

3. G. Hanson. Market Potential, Increasing Returns, and Geographic concentration. Working Paper, NBER, Cambridge, 1998.

4. M. Fujita; P. Krugman and J.A. Venables. The Spatial Economy: Cities, Regions, and International Trade. MIT Press, Cambridge, 2000.

5. G. Myrdal. Economic Theory and Under-developed Regions. Duckworth, London, 1957.

6. A. Hirschman. The Strategy of Economic Development. Yale University Press, 1958.

7. M.N. Jovanovic. M. Fujita, P. Krugman, A.J. Venables - The Spatial Economy. Economia Internazionale, Vol. LIII, nº 3, 428-431 (2000).

8. P. Krugman. Complex Landscapes in Economic Geography. The American Economic Review, Vol. 84, n $^{\circ}$  2, 412-416 (1994).

9. P. Krugman. Development, Geography, and Economic Theory. MIT Press, Cambridge, 1995.

10. P. Krugman. Space: The Final Frontier. Journal of Economic Perspectives, Vol. 12, nº 2, 161-174 (1998).

11. M. Fujita. A monopolistic competition model of spatial agglomeration: Differentiated product approach. Regional Science and Urban Economics, 18, 87-125 (1988).

12. M. Fujita and T. Mori. The role of ports in the making of major cities: Self-agglomeration and hub-effect. Journal of Development Economics, 49, 93-120 (1996).

13. A.J. Venables. Equilibrium locations of vertically linked industries. International Economic Review, 37, 341-359 (1996).

14. P. Krugman. A Dynamic Spatial Model. Working Paper, NBER, Cambridge, 1992.